

© Darya E. ERTNER, Olga B. KLEVTSOVA

edasha@mail.ru, olga_bk@mail.ru

UDC 81'22

**COMMON LANGUAGE FORMS
IN LINGUISTIC AND LITERARY DISCOURSE:
COGNITIVE ASPECTS**

SUMMARY. This article deals with the laws of functioning and possible interpretations of substandard language forms in linguistic and literary discourse. Substandard language forms, as part of everyday life, create specific mechanisms that determine the nature of thought and speech, encode perception of the world. In this regard, we consider substandard language forms (linguistic units belonging to a low speech register) as a multimodal mechanism of culture. Based on this premise, substandard language cultural code in speech and a literary text (on the basis of the Russian translation of Robert Burns' poetry) is interpreted at different hierarchical levels of the language system. The survey of actual material showed that the compilation of linguistic units belonging to different stylistic registers creates an author's individual style and can capture the spirit of an era and the uniqueness of a particular culture.

Substandard language forms are based on the semantization of human reality; they create a common cultural code, involving the synthesis of concepts: substandard language forms as a linguistic rudiment and substandard language forms as expressive means. Due to their expressive nature, substandard language forms are an integral part of a language, enriching its communication system, encouraging the development of a language and cultural contexts.

KEY WORDS. Common language form, metaphor, cultural code.

The main issues determining a semiotic system, either language or culture, are the relationship of elements within the system of linguistic signs, and the relationship of linguistic components to the world (language and cultural context). It is due to this binary impact of the outer world on the internal system that the language is able to develop. Thus, speaking of common language forms, the problem cannot simply be reduced to the opposition of common language forms (derogatory forms) / literary norm, yet, however, we can describe the system in terms of modeling. Common language forms, as part of everyday life, represent specific mechanisms that determine the nature of thought and speech [1, 110]. These language units encode our perception of the world. Taking it as established that the cognitive mechanisms of thinking are universal, common language forms designate mechanisms of individual choice of elements and are closely linked with the mythological consciousness of linguistic

identity. They cease to be purely formal organizers of text space, and, by their nature, acquire new meanings that appeal to the mythological tradition.

These language techniques have a dual nature: a low-colloquial character and the ability to design artistic space. Since any worldview is anthropocentric, common language forms are based on the philistine view of the world surrounding an individual and including them in semiosis [2].

Recently there has developed a broad tradition of studying linguistic units in terms of the description of their cognitive structure through modeling relationships. So, we can talk about the prevailing theory of cognitive metaphor, where metaphor is seen as a specific language code, the mechanism of thought. There are grounds to present ironic utterances in terms of linguistic modeling, when the meaning is transformed within the paradigm: denotative — figurative, ironic. In this regard, we propose to consider such language units as common language forms belonging to the low-colloquial speech register as a multimode (multicode) mechanism of culture. Within this approach, every linguistic unit can be described through the target sphere and the source; the transformation occurs in the paradigm of denotation sphere — the sphere of allegorical sense [3, 138]. Of course, one cannot talk about a complete transformation of meaning in common language forms (the meaning does not transform completely), but, of course, their semantics is far from the direct subject matter. The peculiarity of these forms is that the transformation occurs not so much on the level of semantics, but rather on the level of expressive potential. Sometimes a metaphorical or metonymic image is assigned to common language expressions, but, in most cases, expressiveness is inherent in the figurative aesthetic code of a language form [4].

Based on this assumption, we study the common cultural code in language and literary texts at various hierarchical levels of the language system. Common language forms realize the potential of the cultural code by means of the socio-cultural aspect of the communicative competence of the subjects of communication. Common language forms are opposed to the literary norm, being, on the one hand, the phenomenon which is practically extinct, used in the situation of informal communication (the speech of an educated person should be free from common linguistic elements), and, on the other hand, a way to create a specific ironic or distancing effect and accentuation (since an educated person is able to switch from one register to another rapidly enough to allow common language forms to be used not for direct nomination, and to achieve certain psychological, emotional and stylistic effect) [5].

Thus, in the present research, a common language form is considered to be a kind of a semiotic structure formed by the form and the content (the meaning). If language nomination is conducted by the scheme — *the reality — an individual — a language sign*, then common language nomination derives from the intention of the speaker who perceives the reality and has a cognitive image of it to self-express and create vivid images highlighting the imagery and the emotional component of their values [6]. Nominations in common language employ an existing inventory, which acquires expressive pejorative shades ranging from familiarity to brutality, and has neutral

synonyms in literary language (to whack — to strike, to sleep sluggishly and immoderately — to sleep, to skedaddle — to run)*, as well as other ways of figurative and descriptive nomination of realia, which have no synonyms in the literary language, for instance, a debauchee.

The human factor explains the zones of meaning covered by common language nominations. Anthropocentrism is an inherent property of common language forms, due to the biological, social, ethnic, and individual personal and professional qualities of a speaking individual in society [7], [8].

Common cultural code simulates reality within the semantic scope “human life”, which, on the one hand, serves as the source sphere, and on the other hand, as the target sphere of common language forms’ semantics. Functioning as part of this vicious circle, the sphere “human life” initially has a negative connotation, helping to simplify the whole image.

Knowledge about reality allows an individual to associatively and interpretatively process nominations and emotionally reflect. Consequently, on the linguistic level, we can talk about three areas of common language nominations, realizing an individual’s abilities: nominative, predicative and deictic. It is possible to identify the following parameters of the semantic area “human life”: within the nominative category we observe the subject-object nominations (debauchee, an ugly mug, a belly) and attributive nominations (tedious, cheeky, with a thick face); predicative nominations are constituted by predicative constructions (to hammer, to sleep, to cheat, to seize), and deictic nomination determines the space-time relation: inside, just now, always, in half, spawn. The relationship of the suggested parameters in the mental space of a speaking individual can be treated in the following manner: the space-time parameters, create a continuum, which is then filled with objects that have certain characteristics and perform certain actions.

The spatial continuum is formed in accordance with the vectors interior / exterior (*inside, baldheaded, askance*), unity / division (*in half*), continuous / discrete, far / close, a little / a lot (*actually, quite, like, stock and barrel* (as intensification of meaning). Time continuum is built along the vectors of continuity and discontinuity (*forever*). A number of indefinite adverbs fix the intersection of space and time continuum in homonymous common language forms: somehow (*however/whenever*), somehow (*in some way/one day*), forward (*the spatial direction*), front (*in the future*).

Analyzing nominative and predicative nominations, we can witness the transfer of the semantics of the source area of “an individual” into other semantic areas. Metaphorical mechanisms help to achieve some consistency and socio-culturally organize common language nominations. In order to determine the specifics of metaphors functioning in the formation of common language nominations, we have identified the following types: anthropomorphic and zoomorphic metaphors. All

* Here and below the examples of language nominations are taken from the Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language by S.I. Ozhegov, N.Y. Shvedova [9].

analyzed subtypes we refer to the semantic field of “an individual”, dividing anthropomorphic metaphors into space-household, medical and zoomorphic. The latter refers to this area due to the fact that the nomination process used in metaphor actualizes the meaning of domesticated animals, or parasites in humans. That is, although they are originally alive, they also verbalize “human life”.

Everyday metaphors in colloquial categories are based on the following taxons: *room* (space): an aquarium, a hole; *household items*: (a gimp — a very thin metallic thread for embroidery, is transformed into — a boring long-time trial; a picture — an illustration, a drawing in a book or a separate figure / a picture — smb / smth very attractive, beautiful, elegant, a lovely sight; a merry-go-round — a rotating device for driving in a circle, with seats made in the form of chairs, horses, boats / a carousel — a waste of time, confusion); *food*: kasha — a dish of boiled or steamed cereal / kasha — something chaotic, confusing.

An anthropomorphic metaphor sets the transformation of meaning between the nomination of the human body, and the individual himself. The anthropomorphic metaphor also includes the transfer of meaning from a specific human action to a more abstract associated with thinking, behavior (incense — the transfer from a particular action — smoking incense, swinging a censer — to flatter; to repent — to confess sins / to repent — to regret or admit mistakes.

A zoomorphic metaphor is a mechanism for nominating an individual, for instance — a pig — a pet / a pig — who goes low, mean, a dirty man, a slut; a cuttlefish — a clam, releasing some brown substance / a cuttlefish — a short-legged, clumsy person.

The same productive resources (the same metaphorical patterns) are involved in the objectification of the attributive and predicative categories: gimp — slow.

Literary text operates the concepts of different levels: from common language forms, corresponding to the literary norm, to vernacular forms and expressions [10]. It is common knowledge that the overuse of conversational clichés makes the entire text sound very colloquial. But often, the specific combination of linguistic units belonging to different stylistic registers creates the individual style of an author, and can capture the spirit of the literary epoch, the uniqueness of the national culture. In this aspect, of special interest are the poetic translations of the famous Scottish poet Robert Burns into the Russian language. His poems were characterized by extensive use of vulgarisms. Researchers refer the literary works of this poet to the periods of the Enlightenment and Romanticism. R. Burns uses the pastoral tradition, romanticizing it by the means of the unexpected mixture of styles, creating literary images with common language forms [11, 124].

Thus, interpreters encoding the images of the poet, plowman, into the associative context of “modern” Russian culture, sometimes resort to using not only common language expressions, but also slang forms. We will not proceed here commenting on the relevance of these structures in general. It is worth mentioning, though, that despite the negative attitude to this vocabulary in society, in a poetic text such kinds of expressions are of particular stylistic and cultural relevance.

“Эдинбуржанки косили под французенок...”. In the Russian language the expression “косить под кого-то” (to imitate) has both expressive and evaluative connotations. Together with other vernacular forms, it charges the entire text with additional shades of meaning and thus models the poem into a verbal framework. Meaning expands not only on the semantic level, a “re-coding of aesthetic values” takes place. In poetic texts, specific language forms become a special mechanism coding the language unit and transforming purely Russian colloquial words into particular realia, rendering the unique character of another culture. Due to their inherent expressiveness, common language forms create a literary model, and thus facilitate multiple interpretations.

Но коли зенки ты зальешь
прокисшим старым зельем,
Весь околоток заблюешь,
не справишься с похмельем.

In the literary text, the slang expression “залить зенки” (to drink) does not initialize the sphere of its everyday use, but on the contrary, is interpreted as a specific, vivid stylistic device. In particular, this form is based on metaphorical transfer of meaning. The human is observed in terms of a container, tank, which is filled with liquid (alcohol). In this case, the word form “зелье”, which has mythological implications, in the vernacular context is transformed into “alcohol of poor quality”. The overall negative connotative background is surfaced. The lexeme “Зенки — eyes” verbalizes metonymic model “a man — a part of the human body”, as it is in the eyes of a person that we can tell if he is drunk. The eclectic mixture of different layers of vocabulary allows common language forms to function as stylistic means, with bright, expressive and evaluative potential.

Modern translators interpret poetic images, creating interesting weave of meanings. The expression “А потому — оставь алчбу” in the context of the above mentioned examples, in the modern Russian language can be treated as a neologism, made on the basis of already existing forms and language laws. Yet, initially, “алчба” is an outdated word of native Russian origin (craving, seeking). There occurs not only a certain narrowing of meaning, but a complete transformation of values takes place. The outdated form receives a new life, increasing the volume of dictionary meaning, encoding the actual perception through the transition from high to low stylistic register.

Хотя понятно, — не подмажь —
лошадка не поскачет...

The common language form “подмазывать” (with the meaning “to bribe”) in the poetic text also receives semantic development and is perceived as a specific stylistic image-creating tool. Stylistic register interchange becomes a cognitive mechanism due to which colloquial forms are decoded and organically incorporated into the language system, enriching the literary language by expressive codes of semantic compression and verbal polyphony.

Ironic modeling is one of the most common applications of common language forms in a literary text. Transformation, based on the mixture of different stylistic registers, leads to the fact that these expressions are almost impossible to imagine functioning aside from the context; they are determined by it:

Нам красно-синие цвета завещаны веками.
А на побитых гамма та проступит синяками.

Originally high flown speech: “гамма”, “завещанный”, “века” — is lowered by the means of allegory: the contrast in colors of the national flag and bruises received in a fight. At the heart of the irony is a metaphor built on the basis of color. Such lexico-semantic combinations make the whole context more vivid, giving a jump-start to new shades of emotional coloring.

The combination of words of different stylistic registers facilitates dual interpretation: “Омары ножками сучат и краб крадется...”. The ironic implications are manifest due to the interaction of common language forms: “сучить ножками” (quickly sort out) and nominations typical for the higher strata of vocabulary: “lobster”. The image becomes more prominent, enriched with new expressive nuances.

Common language forms, thus, do not correspond to the norm (they are built according to standard rules, but break them). However, this does not concern evasion of literary standards, their simplification, but rather a new development of linguistic forms, occurring due to the break with linguistic predictability. Juxtaposed dominant stylistic registers exchange their attributes and, as a result, the words of high register turn into common language forms, and can be regarded as the stylistic mechanisms of image creation. The ironic twist of stylistic registers, coded perception of common language forms, contributes to metaphoric interpretations: “Заго стригут нас как овец жестокие налоги”, “Вода стоячая в болоте — душа у вас”, the formation of zoomorphic metaphors: “вошь”, “собака”, “свинья”. Consequently, the set of semantic transformations is constantly enriched with new shades of meaning.

Thus, common language forms are based on the semantisation of reality. They create a unique cultural code, developing the synthesis of concepts: common language forms regarded both as rudiments and as specific expressive means. Due to their expressive nature, they are an integral part of the language, enriching its communication system, and their eradication seems to be impossible. Common language forms become a special mechanism embedding the mythological layer into the text structure.

As for the correlation of the internal language structure and external reality, we can conclude that in reference to language as a system, common language forms can be regarded as degradation of a separate linguistic identity or culture in general. If we consider the same linguistic forms in interaction with the cultural context, the poetic text, they are the mechanisms of enriching the language. Language, being a unique semiotic system, develops precisely due to the transformations of such common language forms.

REFERENCES

1. D'jachok, M.T. Russian colloquial language as a sociolinguistic phenomenon. *Gumanitarnye nauki — Humanities*, No. 21. Moscow, 2003. Pp. 102-113 (in Russian).
2. Jertner, E.N. Geocultural approach to researching the spatial imagery of Russian literature. *Vestnik Tjumenskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta — Tyumen State University Herald*. 2011. No. 1. Philology. Pp. 6-13 (in Russian).
3. Petrov, V.V. Metaphor: from semantic conception to cognitive analysis. *Voprosy jazykoznanija — Linguistic Inquiries*. 1990. No. 3. Pp. 135-146 (in Russian).
4. Lakoff, G., Johnson M. *Metaphors We Live by*. London: University of Chicago Press, 2003. 276 p.
5. Bel'chikov Ju.A. Colloquial expressions. *Lingvisticheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar' — Linguistic Encyclopaedical dictionary*. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopedia publ., 1990. 402 p. (in Russian)
6. Klevtsova, O.B. Historical principle in reconstruction of mental structures. *Vestnik Tjumenskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta — Tyumen State University Herald*. 2006. No. 8. Pp. 210-213 (in Russian).
7. Lotman, Ju.M. *Semiosfera* [Semiosphere]. Saint-Petersburg, 2000. 704 p. (in Russian)
8. Lotman, Ju.M. *Istorija i tipologija ruskoj kul'tury* [History and Typology of Russian Culture]. Saint-Petersburg, 2002. 768 p. (in Russian)
9. Ozhegov S.I., Shvedova N.Ju. *Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka* [Dictionary of the Russian Language] / Russian Academy of Science. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute. Moscow: Azbukovnik publ., 1999. 944 p. (in Russian)
10. Thomas, J. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman, 1995. 224 p.
11. Ertner, D.E. Metaphorical code of R.Burns' poetry: to the problem of metaphorical concepts' interpretation. *Vestnik Tjumenskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta — Tyumen State University Herald*. 2011. No. 1. Philology. Pp. 120-125 (in Russian).
12. Burns, R. *Sobranie poeticheskikh proizvedenij* [The Collection of Poetry]. Moscow: RIPOI Classic Publ., 1999. 704 p. (in Russian)