

DOI: 10.24412/2470-1262-2023-1-58-72

УДК (UDC) 81-13

**Mitsushi Kitajo,
Kyoto Sangyo University,
Kyoto, Japan
Мицусу Китадзё,
Киото Сангё Университет,
Киото, Япония**

**For citation: Mitsushi Kitajo, (2023).
'Verbs of Non-Speech in Dialogue forms of Russian Novels.
Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science,
Vol. 8, Issue 1 (2023), pp. 58-72 (in USA)**

Manuscript received 15/02/2023

Accepted for publication: 26/03/2023

The author has read and approved the final manuscript.

CC BY 4.0

‘VERBS OF NON-SPEECH IN DIALOGUE FORMS OF RUSSIAN NOVELS

ГЛАГОЛЫ НЕ-РЕЧИ В ДИАЛОГОВЫХ ФОРМАХ РУССКИХ РОМАНОВ

Abstract:

In literary works the dialogue is expressed by the direct speech construction. The direct speech construction consists of author's words (AW) and character's words (CW). The predicate verbs of AW in the conversational expressions of characters include not only verbs (TVS) indicating speech but also verbs (TVN) that do not denote speech. The dialogue forms are divided into four types according to the positional combinations of AW and CW. Type A: AW is in preposition to CW; Type B: AW is in postposition to CW; Type C: AW is in interposition to CW; Type D: AW includes CW. Previous studies on the direct speech construction have not paid sufficient attention to the relationship between TVN and the dialogue forms. This paper analyzes TVN used in dialogue forms in Russian novels (18 works) from the second half of the 19th century to the second half of the 20th century, from the viewpoint of the relationship with four types of dialogue forms and the lexical classification of TVN. The analysis results reveals the following:

- 1) TVN is used intensively in type C.
- 2) TVN, meaning facial expressions and body movements, is used more frequently.
- 3) The use of TVN is one of the author's strategies to attract readers' attention.

Keywords: TVN, 4 types of dialogue forms, type C, the lexical meanings, facial expressions, body movements, the reader's attention, markedness

Аннотация:

В литературных произведениях диалог выражается прямой речевой конструкцией. Прямая речевая конструкция состоит из слов автора (AW) и слов персонажа (CW). К глаголам-сказуемым AW в разговорных выражениях персонажей относятся не только глаголы (TVS), обозначающие речь, но и глаголы (TVN), не обозначающие речи. Диалоговые формы делятся на четыре типа в зависимости от позиционных комбинаций AW и CW. Тип А: AW находится в препозиции к CW; Тип В: AW находится в постпозиции к CW; Тип С: AW находится в интерпозиции к CW; Тип D: AW включает в себя CW. Прежние исследователи не уделяли должного внимания взаимосвязи TVN и форм диалога. В статье анализируются TVN, используемые в диалоговых формах в 18 русских романах второй половины XIX – второй половины XX века, с точки зрения соотношения с четырьмя типами диалоговых форм и лексической классификации TVN.

По результатам анализа выяснилось следующее:

- 1) TVN интенсивно используется при типе С.
- 2) TVN, означающий мимику и телодвижение, используется чаще.
- 3) Использование TVN является одной из стратегий автора по привлечению внимания читателей.

Ключевые слова: 4 типа диалоговых форм, Тип С, лексические значения, мимика, телодвижение, внимание читателя, маркированность

1. Introduction

According to A.N. Baranov and G.E. Krejdlin [1, p.89], “An invariant feature of all types of dialogues is the dynamic nature of speech interaction.” In the novels, expressive forms of transmitting someone else’s speech (direct speech, improper direct speech, indirect speech, etc.) are used. Unlike others, direct speech, as the closest form of conveying someone else’s utterance to living speech, is distinguished by special emotionality. In the novels, the dialogue is expressed by the direct speech construction. The direct speech construction consists of author’s words (hereinafter AW) and character’s words (hereinafter CW).

The predicate verbs of AW in the conversational expressions of characters in Russian novels fall into two groups: verbs indicating speech and verbs that do not denote speech (M. Kitajo [7]). We call the direct speech construction with verbs of the first group ‘the type of verb of speech (TVS)’, and the direct speech construction with verbs of the second group ‘the type of verb of non-speech (TVN)’:

TVS

(1) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit’sja! – skazal Ivan.*
 I not can agree said Ivan

[“I can’t agree!” said Ivan.]

TVN

(2) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit’sja! – vstal Ivan.*
 I not can agree stood up Ivan

[“I can’t agree!” Ivan stood up.]

2. Features of TVN

Many researchers (M.G. Byrka [5], V.D. Levin [10], V.L. Rinberg [14], etc.) argue that TVN is one of the varieties of TVS and in AW an ellipsis of the verb of speech occurs. According to Yu.A. Bel'chikov [2], "ellipsis is the omission of one or another member of a sentence, a component of an utterance, easily restored from the context, and semantic clarity is usually provided by semantic and / or syntactic parallelism" [2, p.592]. In other words, the omitted member of the sentence or the component of the statement is restored without changing the meaning of the sentence. However, sometimes a change in the meaning of the sentence does occur. So, in examples (3) and (4), the verbs (*vstal* 'stood up' and *usmekhnulsja* 'grinned') represent an action that occurs simultaneously with the speech:

(3) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit'sja!* – *vstal Ivan.* (= (2))
 I not can agree stood up Ivan

["I can't agree!" Ivan stood up.]

(4) – *Sejchas ona tebe navorozhit!* – *usmekhnulsja Anton.*
 now she you spoil grinned Anton

["Now she will spoil you!" Anton grinned.]

In examples (5) and (6), the verbs (*vstal* and *usmekhnulsja*) denote the action that followed the speech: Ivan said, then he stood up (5); Anton said, then he grinned (6).

(5) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit'sja!* – *skazal i vstal Ivan.*
 I not can agree said and stood up Ivan

["I can't agree!" Ivan said and stood up.]

(6) – *Sejchas ona tebe navorozhit!* – *skazal i usmekhnulsja Anton.*
 now she you spoil said and grinned Anton

["Now she will spoil you!" Anton said and grinned.]

In examples (7 - 10), the verbs (*vstal* and *usmekhnulsja*) and converbs (*vstavaja* 'standing up' and *usmekhajas'* 'grinning') denote an action that accompanies in time only one of the moments making a speech: Ivan stood up when he was speaking (7); Ivan said when he was standing up (8); Anton grinned when he was speaking (9); Anton said when he was grinning (10).

(7) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit'sja!* – *vstal, govorja eto, Ivan.*
 I not can agree stood up saying it Ivan

["I can't agree!" Ivan stood up, saying it.]

(8) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit'sja!* – *skazal, vstavaya, Ivan.*
 I not can agree said standing up Ivan

["I can't agree!" Ivan said, standing up.]

(9) – *Sejchas ona tebe navorozhit!* – *usmekhnulsja, govorya eto Anton.*

now she you spoil grinned saying it Anton
 [“Now she will spoil you!” Anton grinned, saying it.]

(10) – *Sejchas ona tebe navorozhit! – skazal, usmekhayas’, Anton.*
 now she you spoil said grinning Anton
 [“Now she will spoil you!” Anton said with a smile.]

Thus, the TVN does not always act as an elliptical unit. Further, considering the syntactic difference between TVS and TVN, let's pay attention to the following factors.

First, does CW enter or does it not fall within the scope of negation of AW?

In TVS, CW is denied when the form of the verb of AW is negative. Example (11) can be interpreted as follows: Ivan said not “I can’t agree!”, but, for example, “I agree!”. So, in TVS, CW is included in the scope of negation of AW.

(11) *Ivan ne skazal: – Ja ne mogu soglasit’sja!*
 Ivan not said I not can agree
 [Ivan did not say. “I can't agree!” said Ivan.]

In TVN, CW is not denied when the form of the verb of AW is negative. Example (12) cannot be interpreted in such a way that Ivan stood up from his seat not with the words “I cannot agree!”, but, for example, “I agree!”. Here the verb "stood up" is negated.

(12) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit’sja! – ne podnjalsja s mesta Ivan.*
 I not can agree not stood up from seat Ivan
 [“I can't agree!” Ivan didn't stand up from his seat.]

Secondly, does the restrictive particle ‘only’ in AW apply or does not apply to CW?

The restrictive particle ‘only’ indicates a limit, a limitation in quantity, quality, degree of action, etc. Example (13) can be understood in this way that ‘only’ refers to Ivan or Ivanov's speech. Ivan alone did not agree, but all the others silently agreed, or Ivan said nothing but “I can't agree!” (He did not say, for example, “I will leave!”). In TVS, the particle ‘only’ in AW refers to CW.

(13) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit’sja! – tol’ko skazal Ivan.*
 I not can agree only said Ivan
 [“I can't agree!” Ivan just said.]

An example (14) cannot be considered that ‘only’ has a restrictive meaning. Here, ‘only’ highlights Ivan as the only one who expressed disagreement. Consequently, in case of TVN, ‘only’ in AW does not refer to CW.

(14) *Tol’ko Ivan vstal: – Ja ne mogu soglasit’sja!*
 only Ivan stood up I not can agree

[Only Ivan stood up: - I cannot agree!]

Thirdly, is it possible or impossible, using AW, to compose an interrogative sentence to CW?

With TVS, you can make an interrogative sentence to CW, using AW:
In example (15), the answer to this question is CW.

(15) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit'sja! – skazal Ivan. "Chto Ivan skazal?"*

I not can agree said Ivan what Ivan said

["I can't agree!" said Ivan. "What did Ivan say?"]

With TVN it is impossible to make an interrogative sentence to CW, using AW:
In example (16), the interrogative sentence "How did Ivan stand up?" requires as the answer is not the content of the speech, but the image of the gesture. Indeed, the question can be put like this: "What words did Ivan get up with?", but it is unlikely that he will be appropriate.

(16) – *Ja ne mogu soglasit'sja! – vstal Ivan. "Kak Ivan vstal?"*

I not can agree stood up Ivan how Ivan stood up

["I can't agree!" Ivan stood up. "How did Ivan get up?"]

Three factors indicate that between CW and AW with TVS there is a close syntactic connection, but with TVN it is not.

Next, consider the stylistic difference between TVS and TVN, comparing direct speech with indirect speech. Indirect speech differs from direct speech in that the speaker or author integrates someone else's statement into his narration without preserving its individual linguistic features. In indirect speech, there is no stylistic gap between someone else's statement and the speaker's or author's narration. TVS can go into the construction of indirect speech (example (17)), but TVN cannot (example (18)), since in this case it is impossible to eliminate the stylistic gap.

(17) *Ivan skazal, chto on ne mozhet soglasit'sja.* (Compare example (1))

I said that he not can agree

[Ivan said that he could not agree.]

(18) ?? *Ivan vstal, chto on ne mozhet soglasit'sja.* (Compare example (2))

I stood up that he not can agree

[?? Ivan got up, that he could not agree.]

So, as can be seen from the above, TVN is not one of the varieties of TVS, but an independent construction of direct speech.

3. Purpose of the article

Many researchers (A.A. Burov [4], N.I. Chirkova [6], M.K. Milykh [13], N.F. Shumilov [15], L.V. Umantseva [17]) note stylistic and lexical meanings of verbs in AW, without mentioning the difference between TVS and TVN. M. Kitajo [8] analyzed lexical meanings of TVN but did not mention dialogue forms in the novel. The purpose of the paper is to clarify the relationship between TVN and dialogue forms.

4. Material

We take the material from Russian novels (18 works, see Table 1) of the second half of the 19th - second half of the 20th centuries.

(At the beginning of each work, the abbreviation of the work is written.)

Table 1. Russian novels

[LED]	<i>Ledi Makbet mtsenskogo uezda (Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk district) (N.S. Leskov, 1864)</i>
[PRS]	<i>Prestuplenie i nakazanie (part 1-2) (Crime and punishment)(F.M.Dostoevskij, 1866)</i>
[OBR]	<i>Obryv (The cliff) (I.A. Goncharov, 1869)</i>
[NOV]	<i>Nov' (part 1) (Virgin Soil)(I.S. Trugenev, 1877)</i>
[CHE]	<i>Cherny monakh (The black monk) (A.P. Chekhov, 1894)</i>
[VOS]	<i>Voskresenie (Resurrection) (part 1) (L.N. Tolstoj, 1899)</i>
[MAT]	<i>Mat' (Mother)(M. Gor'kij, 1906)</i>
[KHO]	<i>Khozhenie po mukam (book 1)(The Road to calvary) (A.N.Tolstoj, 1920)</i>
[MAS]	<i>Master i Marugarita (The Master and Margarita)(M.A. Bulugakov, 1928)</i>
[POD]	<i>Podnjataya tselina (book 1)(Virgin Soil Upturned) (M.A.Sholokhov, 1932)</i>
[KOL]	<i>Kolkhida (Colchis)(K.G. Paustobskij, 1934)</i>
[PER]	<i>Pervye radosti (Early Joys) (K.A. Fedin, 1945)</i>
[DOK]	<i>Doktor Zhivago (book 1) (Doctor Zhivago) (B. Pasternak, 1957)</i>
[LUJ]	<i>Ljubaviny (Lubavin's) (V. Shukshin, 1965)</i>
[RAK]	<i>Rakovyj korpus (book 1) (Cancer ward) (A.I. Solzhenitsyn, 1966)</i>
[POS]	<i>Paslednij srok (Deadline)(V.G. Rasputin, 1970)</i>
[DET]	<i>Deti Arbata (part 1) (Children of the Arbat) (A.N. Rybakov, 1987)</i>
[SHE]	<i>Shest'sot let posle binvy (Six hundred years after the battle) (A.A. Prokhanov, 1990)</i>

5. Analysis of materials

5-1. 4 types of dialogue forms

We analyze dialogue forms by combining AW and CW. Our study identifies 4 possible positions of AW in relation to CW.

Type A: AW is in preposition to CW

Type B: AW is in postposition to CW

Type C: AW is in interposition to CW

Type D: AW includes CW

H. Bonheim [3] presents Type A, B, C in English but does not notice the existence of Type D. In addition, M. Kitajo [9] gives examples of Type D in Japanese but does not give examples of Type D in Russian.

Below, for each position, we provide examples in Russian. (CW are highlighted graphically (dash, quotation marks). The abbreviations written at the end of the examples indicate the titles of the works in Table 1)

A) AW is in preposition to CW

(19) *Anna* *perekrestilas'*:
Anna crossed herself

– *Slava tebe gospodi! Ogljanulsja milostivets nasyu nuzhdu!*
glory you lord looked back merciful person our need [POD]

[Anna crossed herself:

“Glory to you, Lord! The merciful looked back at our need!”]

B) AW is in postposition to CW

(20) – *Na koj chert on tebe nuzhen? – smorshchilsja Pastukhov.*
 why it you need grimaced Pastukhov
 at
 you

[“Why the hell do you need it?” Pastukhov grimaced.] [PER]

C) AW is in interposition to CW

(21) – *No chego vy mozhetе bojat’sja? – ona obernulas’ obizhennaja. –*
 but what you can fear she turned around offended

Neuzheli vy mne ne verite?

really you me not believe [RAK]

[“But what can you be afraid of?” She turned around, offended. "Don't you believe me?"]

D) AW includes CW

(22) *Voshel Pavel co dvora, uverenno skazal:*

entered Pavel from yard confidently said

– *Ne najdut! – i stal umyvats’ja.*

not find and began wash [MAT]

[Pavel entered from the yard, confidently said:

“They won't find it!” and began to wash.]

5-2. Frequency of use of TVN and 4 types in Russian novels

All data on 4 types in Russian novels of the second half of the 19th – second half of the 20th centuries are summarized in Table 2, Table 3, Table 4. Three tables are structured as follows: the lines indicate the titles of the works, the columns ‘A’ : AW is in preposition to CW; ‘B’ : AW is in postposition to CW; ‘C’ : AW is in interposition to CW; ‘D’ : AW includes CW. High frequencies of TVN are indicated in bold.

For example, in ‘Crime and punishment’ [PRS] (see Table 2), in type A TVN is used 1 time (2.4%), in type B TVN is used 15 times (36.6%), in type C TVN is used 25 times (61.0%), and in type D TVN is not used. Here type C shows high frequency of TVN.

Table 2. Frequency of use of TVN in Russian novels of the second half of the 19th

	A	B	C	D	Total
[LED]	0 (0%)	2 (40%)	3 (60.0%)	0 (0%)	5
[PRS]	1 (2.4%)	15 (36.6%)	25 (61.0%)	0 (0%)	41
[OBR]	0 (0%)	7 (29.2%)	17 (70.8%)	0 (0%)	24
[NOV]	1 (2.7%)	9 (25.0%)	26 (72.2%)	0 (0%)	36
[CHE]	1 (9.1%)	2 (9.1%)	20 (81.8%)	0 (0%)	23
[VOS]	1 (3.8%)	8 (30.8%)	16 (61.5%)	1 (3.8%)	26

$\chi^2=5.4822$. $v=5$. $p<0.975$

Table 3. Frequency of use of TVN in Russian novels of the first half of the 20th

	A	B	C	D	Total
--	---	---	---	---	-------

[MAT]	5 (26.3%)	5 (26.3%)	7 (36.8%)	2 (10.5%)	19
[KHO]	17 (27.0%)	10 (15.9%)	27 (42.8%)	9 (14.3%)	63
[MAS]	1 (3.3%)	3 (10.0%)	24 (80.0%)	2 (6.7%)	30
[POD]	13 (12.1%)	43 (40.2%)	47 (43.9%)	4 (3.7%)	107
[KOL]	14 (29.8%)	3 (6.4%)	30 (63.8%)	0 (0%)	47
[PER]	5 (9.8%)	23 (45.1%)	23 (45.1%)	0 (0%)	51

$$\chi^2=15.8370. v=5. p<0.010$$

Table 4. Frequency of use of TVN in Russian novels of the second half of the 20th

	A	B	C	D	Total
[DOK]	3 (12.5%)	8 (33.3%)	13 (54.2%)	0 (0%)	24
[LIU]	17 (11.0%)	43 (27.9%)	92 (59.7%)	2 (1.3%)	154
[RAK]	37 (19.4%)	63 (33.0%)	90 (47.1%)	1 (0.5%)	191
[POS]	15 (15.8%)	19 (20.0%)	61 (64.2%)	0 (0%)	95
[DET]	15 (22.1%)	25 (36.8%)	28 (41.2%)	0 (0%)	68
[SHE]	1 (1.5%)	9 (13.6%)	55 (83.3%)	1 (1.5%)	66

$$\chi^2=43.4663. v=10. p<0.005$$

Three tables (Table 2, Table 3, Table 4) show that in all 18 works from the second half of the 19th century to the second half of the 20th century, TVN is most used in Type C. In relation to this result, let us give examples of type C where TVNs are used. You can see various verbs in AW.

(23) – *Chto ty, mal'chik! – zasmejas' zhenshchina. – Kto zhe chistit noch'ju?*
 what you boy laughed woman who clean night

[KOL]

[“What are you, boy!” the woman laughed. “Who cleans at night?”]

(24) – *Nu chto zhe, – pozhals plechami Kirill, – v svoem dome steny pomagajut.*
 well shrugged shoulders Kirill in his house walls help
 at
 you

[PER]

[“Well,” Kirill shrugged his shoulders, “walls help in your house.”]

(25) – *Da ty chto! – Asja khlopnula ego po plechu. – Kak eto – nogu otrezat'?*
 yes you what Asja patted his on shoulder how it leg cut

[RAK]

[“What are you!!” Asja patted him on the shoulder. “How is it to cut off a leg?”]

(26) – *Ne vri ty, chego ne znaesh'! – rasserdilsja na Rjukhina Ivan, – ja, a ne*

not lie you what not know got angry at Ryukhin Ivan I but ne

ty byl pri etom!

you were at this [MAS]

[“Don't lie about what you don't know!” Ivan got angry at Rjukhin, “I, not you, were at the same time!”]

(27) *Pankratov, – Baulin surovo smotrel na Sashu, – ne shitaesh' nuzhnym javljat'sja*

Pankratov Baulin sternly looked at Sasha not think necessary come

na demonstratsiju?

to demonstration [DET]

[“Pankratov,” Baulin looked sternly at Sasha, “don't you think it's necessary to come to the demonstration?”]

(28) – *Ne oshibka li v diagnose? – podumal on. – Vse priznaki krupoznogo.*

not mistake in diagnosis thought he all signs croupous [DOK]

[“Is there a misdiagnosis?” he thought. “All signs of croupous.”]

(29) – *Togda delaj to, za chem prishel, – ona podoshla k Nikolaju Ivanovichu vplot'. –*

then do it for what came she went closer to Nikolaj Ivanovich near

Nu, delaj. V litso tebe govoryu. Ja tebja ne ljublju.

well do to face you tell I you not love [KHO]

[“Then do what you came for,” she went right up to Nikolaj Ivanovich. “Well, do it. I tell you to your face, I don't love you.”]

(30) – *A! – Solomin pomolchal. – Ona rodstvennitsa zdesnim gospodam?*

a Solomin paused she relative here gentlemen [NOV]

[“A!” Solomin paused. “Is she related to the gentlemen here?”]

AWs in these sentences contain verbs with different lexical meanings: *zasmej alas'* (laughed), *pozhal* (shrugged), *khlopnula* (patted), *rasserdilsja* (got angry), *smotrel* (looked), *podumal* (thought), *podoshla* (went closer), *pomolchal* (paused).

Next, let's look at the relationship between the four types and the lexical meanings of TVN.

5-3. The lexical meanings of TVN and 4 types in Russian novels

We divided the verbs in AW with TVN, found with great frequency in 18 works, according to certain semantic features. Got 8 ranks. We are talking about verbs with the meaning:

- facial expressions (*usmekhnut'sja* (grin), *zasmej at'sja* (laugh), *vzdokhnut'* (sigh))
- body movements (*obratit'sja* (turn), *kivnut'sja* (nod), *makhnut' rukami* (wave hands))

- c) direct action (*stuknut* ' (knock), *podtolknut* ' (push), *vzjat* ' (take))
- d) emotions (*serdit'sja* (angry), *obidet'sja* (offended), *obradovat'sja* (be happy))
- e) perception (*posmatret* ' (look), *gljadet* ' (see))
- f) thoughts (*podumat* ' (think), *reshit* ' (decide))
- g) motion (*ujti* (leave), *podojti* (come closer))
- h) stop (*ostanovit'sja* (stop), *pomolchat* ' (pause))

The features chosen for classification are a modification of the properties that T. Tsunoda [16] uses when defining prototypical transitive verbs.

All data on 4 types in Russian novels of the second half of the 19th – second half of the 20th centuries are summarized in Table 5, Table 6, Table 7. Three tables are structured as follows: the lines indicate the titles of the works, the columns 'A' : AW is in preposition to CW; 'B' : AW is in postposition to CW; 'C' : AW is in interposition to CW; 'D' : AW includes CW. High frequencies of TVN are indicated in bold.

For example, in Type B in Table 5, the TVN meaning 'facial expressions' is used 7 times (16.3%), the TVN meaning 'body movements' is used 22 times (51.2%), the TVN meaning 'direct action' is used once (2.3%), and the TVN meaning 'emotion' is used 3 times (7.0%), TVN meaning 'perception' is used 5 times (11.6%), TVN meaning 'thoughts' is used 2 times (4.7%), TVN meaning 'stop' is used 3 times (7.0%), and TVN meaning 'motion' is not used. In this case, TVN, which means 'body movements', shows the highest frequency.

[a) facial expressions / b) body movements / c) direct action / d) emotions / e) perception / f) thoughts / g) motion / h) stop]

Table 5. Frequency of use of TVN depending on semantics in Russian novels of the second half of the 19th

	A	B	C	D
a	0 (0%)	7 (16.3%)	25 (23.4%)	0 (0%)
b	1 (25.0%)	22 (51.2%)	46 (43.0%)	0 (0%)
c	0 (0%)	1 (2.3%)	11 (10.3%)	0 (0%)
d	0 (0%)	3 (7.0%)	6 (5.6%)	0 (0%)
e	2 (50.0%)	5 (11.6%)	6 (5.6%)	0 (0%)
f	0 (0%)	2 (4.7%)	8 (7.5%)	0 (0%)
g	1 (25.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.9%)	1 (100%)
h	0 (0%)	3 (7.0%)	4 (3.7%)	0 (0%)
Total	4	43	107	1

$$\chi^2=1.6715. v=2. p<0.975$$

Table 6. Frequency of use of TVN depending on semantics in Russian novels of the first half of the 20th

	A	B	C	D
a	16 (29.1%)	34 (39.1%)	50 (31.7%)	0 (0%)
b	17 (30.9%)	20 (23.0%)	51 (32.3%)	7 (41.2%)
c	7 (12.7%)	12 (13.8%)	21 (13.3%)	4 (23.5%)
d	4 (7.3%)	9 (10.3%)	14 (8.9%)	1 (5.9%)
e	8 (14.5%)	7 (8.1%)	12 (7.6%)	0 (0%)

f	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	1 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
g	2 (3.6%)	3 (3.5%)	7 (4.4%)	4 (23.5%)
h	1 (1.8%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.3%)	1 (5.9%)
other s	0 (0%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	55	87	158	17

$$\chi^2=8.4937. v=10. p<0.975$$

Table 7. Frequency of use of TVN depending on semantics in Russian novels of the second half of the 20th

	A	B	C	D
a	22 (25.0%)	41(24.6%)	73 (21.5%)	0 (0%)
b	38 (39.8%)	43 (25.7%)	111 (32.7%)	2 (50.0%)
c	5 (5.7%)	26 (15.6%)	38 (11.2%)	0 (0%)
d	10 (11.4%)	22 (13.2%)	46 (13.6%)	0 (0%)
e	4 (4.5%)	8 (4.8%)	28 (8.3%)	0 (0%)
f	4 (4.5%)	18 (10.8%)	26 (7.7%)	1 (25.0%)
g	4 (4.5%)	6 (3.6%)	13 (3.8%)	0 (0%)
h	0 (0%)	3 (1.8%)	4 (1.2%)	1 (25.0%)
others	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Total	88	167	339	4

$$\chi^2=18.6868. v=10. p<0.05$$

From the three tables (Tables 5, 6, and 7), the following is clarified.

Type A:

As far as the second half of the 19th century is concerned, the total number of TVN is so small that it is not possible to clearly point out trends in their use. Looking at the frequency of use of TVN from the first half of the 20th century to the second half of the 20th century, TVN, which means ‘body movements’, is used the most.

Type B:

In the second half of the 19th century, TVN, which means ‘body movements’, is most frequently used, and in the first half of the 20th century, TVN, which means ‘facial expressions’, is most frequently used. In the second half of the 20th century, TVN meaning ‘facial expressions’ and TVN meaning ‘body movements’ are used equally the most.

Type C:

In the second 19th century and the second 20th century, TVN, which means ‘body movements’, is most prevalent. In the first half of the 20th century, TVN meaning ‘facial expressions’ and TVN meaning ‘body movements’ are used equally the most.

Type D:

The total number of examples of TVN is very small, so it is not possible to point out the usage trend of TVN.

To summarize the above, the use of TVN, which means ‘body movements’ and ‘facial expression’, stands out in Type A, Type B, and Type C.

6. Discussion

The results of the analysis of the frequency of use of TVN in the four types of dialogue forms and the frequency of use of TVN by lexical semantic category are summarized as

follows: in Russian novels, TVN, which means ‘body movements’ and ‘facial expressions’ used in C type, is a typical use of TVN.

According to B.A. Uspenskij [18, c.21] “The artistic space in a literary work is the result of the interaction of multiple points of view – the author, the character, the recipient.” In the novel, the author tries to catch the reader’s attention as the story progresses. One of such devices is the dialogue form.

The characteristic that the C type is decisively different from the other three types (A type, B type, D type) is that it has two CWs. Type C is the dialogue form that emphasizes that the characters ‘keep talking’. In general, it is difficult for humans to concentrate on another activity while talking. For example, it is practically impossible to ‘do math while talking’ or ‘snipe while talking’. Actions that can be performed while talking are limited to relatively light actions. For this reason, it is natural that many verbs meaning ‘facial expressions’ and ‘body movements’ are used in Type C.

Next, let's talk about the effects of TVN on readers. In the dialogue form where the characters are supposed to ‘keep talking’, the author's use of ‘verbs that imply speech’ in AW does not make a strong impression on the reader. It is the same as when a red picture is hung on a red wall, the impression of the picture to the viewer is weak. But, when a blue picture is hung on the red wall, the impression of the picture on the viewer is strong. The effect of using TVN is the same as the relationship between the red wall and the blue picture.

In this connection, here are several examples of TVS and TVN being used in novels. The AW in example (31) only indicates that Stolper is ‘talking’, and the focus is on the content of speech, not on Stolper’s figure. Because of this, the reader’s attention is focused only on what Stolper says.

(31) – *Ne takie ljudi stanovilis' vragami partii, – skazal Stolper. – Poslushaem*
 not that people became enemies party said Stolper let's listen
 at
 you

Pankratova.”

Pankratov [DET]
 at
 you

[“People like that didn’t become enemies of the party,” said Stolper. “Let's listen to Pankratov.”]

However, the AW in example sentences (32) and (33) refer not only to the content of speech, but also to Stolper’s facial expressions (*skrivil guby* (pursed lips), *usmekhnulsja* (grinned)), so that the readers feel a sense of realism.

(32) – *U nego net Danykh! – Stolper skrivil guby. – Pankratov vystupaet proyiv*
 in he not data Stolper pursed lips Pankratov opposes
 against

markisizma v nauke.

Marxism in science [DET]

“He has no data!” Stolper pursed his lips. “Pankratov opposes Marxism in science.”

(33) – *Nichego sebe organizatsija, – usmekhnulsja Stolper, – ne sluchajno vas*
 wow organizatuin grinned Stolper not by chance you

obvodjat vokrug pal'tsa.

be fooled [DET]

[“Wow organization,” Stolper grinned. “It is not by chance that you are being fooled.”]

Other researchers (I.A. Mel’chuk [12], V.L. Rinberg [14], N.S. Volgina [19]) indicate that the verbs in AW with TVN have a pronounced emotional nuance.

Finally, we would like to mention markedness of TVN. Table 8 summarizes the frequency of use of TVS and TVN in our material. The title of the work is written in the leftmost column of the table. Each row lists the number of TVS and TVN used in the works. For example, in [LED], TVS is used 400 times (98.8%) and TVN is used 5 times (1.2%).

Table 8. Frequency of use of TVS and TVN in Russian novels

	TVS	TVN	total
[LED]	400 (98.8%)	5 (1.2%)	405
[PRS]	349 (89.5%)	41 (10.5%)	390
[OBR]	373 (94.0%)	24 (6.0%)	397
[NOV]	400 (91.7%)	36 (8.3%)	436
[CHE]	71 (75.5%)	23 (24.5%)	94
[VOS]	230 (89.8%)	26 (10.2%)	256
[MAT]	365 (95.1%)	19 (4.9%)	384
[KHO]	211 (77.0%)	63 (23.0%)	274
[MAS]	358 (92.3%)	30 (7.7%)	388
[POD]	207 (65.9%)	107 (34.1%)	314
[KOL]	187 (79.9%)	47 (20.1%)	234
[PER]	293 (85.2%)	51 (14.8%)	344
[DOK]	206 (89.6%)	24 (10.4%)	230
[LIU]	223 (59.2%)	154 (40.8%)	377
[RAK]	158 (45.3%)	191 (54.7%)	349
[POS]	178 (65.2%)	95 (34.8%)	273
[DET]	295 (81.3%)	68 (18.7%)	363
[SHE]	128 (65.3%)	68 (34.7%)	196

$\chi^2=787.3106$. $v=17$. $p<0.005$

This table shows the following: only [RAK] uses TVN more frequently than TVS, but in all other works, TVN is used far less frequently than TVS. This suggests that TVS is unmarked and TVN is marked.

In general, speaking verbs are usually used in dialogue forms. On the other hand, using non-speech verbs in the dialogue forms gives us a contradictory image. Nevertheless, writers continue to use TVN in their novels. The author of the text has the opportunity to choose the language in which he builds the text. “An important means of information activation of the structure is its violation. A literary text is not just a realization of structural norms, but also their violation. The life of a literary text is in their mutual tension” [11, p.283]. This may be reflected in the use of TVN.

7. Conclusion

This paper analyzes TVN used in dialogue forms in Russian novels from the second half of the 19th century to the second half of the 20th century, from the viewpoint of the relationship with four types of dialogue forms and the lexical classification of TVN. The analysis results revealed the following:

- 1) TVN is used intensively in type C
- 2) TVN, meaning 'facial expressions' and 'body movements', is used more frequently.
- 3) The use of TVN is one of the author's strategies to attract readers' attention.

References:

1. Baranov A.N., Krejdlin G.E. (1992) Struktura dialogicheskogo teksta: leksicheskie pokazateli minimal'nykh dialogov [Structure of the dialogical text: lexical parameters of the minimal dialogues] *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 3, 84-93.
2. Bel'chikov Yu.A. (1990) Ellipsis // *Lingvisticheskij entsiklopedicheskij slovar'* [Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary]. Moskva.
3. Bonheim H. (1982) *The Narrative Modes: Techniques of the Short Story*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
4. Burov A.A. (1983) Glagoly vvoda pryamoj rechi v khudozhestvennom tekste [verbs introducing direct speech in the literary text] // *Russkij yazyk v shkole*. No2. pp.85-87.
5. Byrka M.G. (1986) Ellipsis glagolov govoreniya v predlozhenii I realizatsiya okh funktsii glagolami inykh leksicheskikh grupp [Ellipsis of speaking verbs in a sentence and the implementation of their function by verbs of other lexical groups] // *Funktsial'no-semanticheskij aspekt yazykovykh edinits raznykh urovnej (romano-germanskaya filologiya [Functional and semantic aspect of linguistic units of different levels (Romano-Germanic philology)]*). Kishnev.
6. Chirkova N.I. (1992) *Reprezentatsiya dialoga v khudozhestvennom prozaicheskom tekste: (na materiale romanov I.A. Goncharova "Obyknovennaya istoriya", "Oblomov", "Obryv")* [Representation of dialogue in fictional prose text: (based on the novels by I.A. Goncharov "An Ordinary History", "Oblomov", "Break")]. Avtoref. dis... kand. filol. nauk [Abstract of dissertation for the degree of candidate of philology]. SPb.
7. Kitajo M. (1994) *Tekstovye kharakteristiki dvukh tipov konstruksij prjamoj rechi*. [Text characteristics of two types of direct speech constructions] // *Russkij yazyk za rubezhom*. №6. 67-71.
8. Kitajo M. (2020) *Analiz konstruksii prjamoj rechi s tochki zrenija lingvistiki teksta i kontseptsii semanticheskoy perekhodnosti* [Analysis of the structure of direct speech from the point of view of text linguistics and the concept of semantic transitivity]. *The American scholarly journal Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science (CCS&ES)* Vol.5, Issue 3, 133-145.
9. Kitajo M. (2022) *Sopostavlenie form dialoga v russkikh i japonskikh literaturnykh proizvedenijakh* [Comparison of dialogue forms in Russian and Japanese literary works]. *The American scholarly journal Cross-Cultural Studies: Education and Science (CC&ES)* Vol.7, Issue 2, pp.24-35. 2022.
10. Levin V.D. (1960) *Pryamaya, kosvennaya i nesobstvenno-pryamaya rech'* [Direct, indirect and improperly direct speech] // *Grammatika resskogo yazyka [Russian grammar]*. Tom II, Ch.2. Moskva.
11. Lotman Yu.M. (1998) *Ob iskusstve [About art]*. *Iskusstvo – SPB*. Sankt-Peterburg.
12. Mel'chuk I.A. (1995) *Russian Direct Speech Sentences wuth Verbs of Emotion*. In *Russkij yazyk v modeli "Smysl-Tekst"*. pp.215-234. Moskau-Wien.

13. Milykh M.K. (1962) Konstruktsii s pryamoj rech'yu v sovremennom russkom yazyke [Constructions with direct speech in modern Russian]. Avtoref. dis... dokt. filol. nauk [Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philology]. Leningrad.
14. Rinberg V.L. (1987) Konstruktsii chuzhoj rech' v sisteme svyaznogo teksta v sovremennom russkom yazyke [Structures of someone else's speech in the system of coherent text in modern Russian]. L'vov.
15. Shumilov N.F. (1959) Stilisticheskie funktsii avtorskikh slov v konstruktsiyakh s pryamoj rech'yu [Stylistic functions of author's words in constructions with direct speech] // Russkij yazyk v shkole. No2. pp.36-38.
16. Tsunoda T. (1985) Remarks on transitivity // Journal of Linguistics 21. pp.385-396.
17. Umantseva L.V. (1980) Leksiko-grammaticheskie svojstva glagolov i glagol'nykh slovosochetaniy, vvodyashchikh pryamuyu rech' [Lexico-grammatical properties of verbs and verb phrases that introduce direct speech]. Avtoref. dis... kand. filol. nauk [Abstract of dissertation for the degree of candidate of philology]. Moskva.
18. Uspenskij B.A. Poetika kompozitsii. Struktura khudozhestvennogo teksta i tipologija kompozitsionnoj formy [Poetics of composition. The structure of the artistic text and the typology of the compositional form]. Moskva.
19. Volgina N.S. (1979) Sintaksis sovremennogo russkogo yazyka [Syntax of the modern Russian language]. Vysshaya shkola. Moskva.

Information about the Author:

Kitajo Mitsushi (Kyoto, Japan) - Ph.D. The owner of the Medal of Pushkin (Russian Federation National Award), professor, Head of the department of Russian language, Faculty of foreign studies, Kyoto Sangyo University.

e-mail: kitajo@cc.kyoto-su.ac.jp

Acknowledgments: Expresses gratitude to the reviewer.

Author's contribution: The work is solely that of the author.