

Free indirect speech as a means to introduce archaic style into the author's narration: A Russian linguistics perspective

by Gayane Petrosyan

Gayane Petrosyan Stavropol State University 11ga1978@mail.ru

Published in *Training, Language and Culture* Vol 2 Issue 1 (2018) pp. 67-82 doi: 10.29366/2018tlc.2.1.5

Recommended citation format: Petrosyan, G. (2018). Free indirect speech as a means to introduce archaic style into the author's narration: A Russian linguistics perspective. *Training, Language and Culture*, 2(1), 67-82. doi: 10.29366/2018tlc.2.1.5

The phenomenon of free indirect speech was intensively studied in the 20th century from two fundamentally different directions. Some scholars viewed it as a special syntactic or stylistic-syntactic structure in comparison with direct and reported speech. Others considered it more as a poetic-stylistic technique of characters' speech reproduction in artistic works. The main aim of this research is to reveal the specific functions of free indirect speech in the genre of the historical novel and show their determining influence on the use of stylistic forms. The study shows that in the genre of historical novels the use of free indirect speech is represented in its small forms, in particular lexical, phraseological, phonetic and grammatical microforms, bearing the imprint of the living and documentary language of the epoch described. The paper also gives a detailed account of the studies concerned with aesthetic-stylistic approach to free indirect speech in Russian linguistics.

KEYWORDS: historical novel, free indirect speech, reported speech, direct speech, archaism, poetic-stylistic device



This is an open access article distributed under the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited (CC BY 4.0)

1. INTRODUCTION

The term *archaism* refers to words that are no longer in everyday use or have lost their particular meaning in current usage, but are sometimes used to impart an old-fashioned flavour to historical novels, for example in standard conversation, or writing just for humorous effect. The study considers archaisms in the author's narration as a form of free indirect speech helping us feel the historical period in which the main characters are situated. Free indirect speech is a linguistic and stylistic term used to indicate thoughts and feelings

using a third person narrative rather than direct speech. For example, instead of saying, *Why am I feeling so tired?* the author might write, *He put down his book and put his head in his hands. Why was he feeling so tired?*

The main aim of the research is to reveal the specific functions of free indirect speech in the genre of the historical novel and to show their determining influence on the use of stylistic forms of the phenomenon being studied. The practical value of the article is determined by the fact that

its theoretical speculations and the material studied can be used in university and school teaching of the Russian language, in stylistics, in the linguistic analysis of literary texts, in special courses and special seminars on the language of literary texts and journalism.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 Free indirect speech as a linguistic problem

The aesthetic-stylistic approach to free indirect speech in Russian linguistics was significantly influenced by Academician Vinogradov's monographs. Following Vinogradov, many other scholars considered free indirect speech as a poetic-stylistic method of artistic speech in their publications. From the artistic and aesthetic point of view, free indirect speech was considered much broader, and its lexical, phraseological, and phonetic microforms were distinguished as its particular varieties. Although scholars did not deny the grammatical features of free indirect speech and the existence of its particular syntactic structure, they tended to focus on the combination of various forms of free indirect speech and the author's objectified narrative aspect with the appraisal of the characteristic expressiveness of characters in the text. Scholars identified large blocks of free indirect speech, which are syntactically pronounced and are clearly distinguished against the background of the author's objective text due to their personalised semantics and typical expression, representing the

character's voice. The scholars paid less attention to the lexical and phraseological microforms of free indirect speech, but rather focused on individual words representing the expression of someone else's utterances, reflecting the point of view of a particular character, and attributed to free indirect speech.

To understand the essence of free indirect speech, scholars studying the syntactic and poetic-stylistic fields investigated this phenomenon and focused mainly on fiction. This was largely due to the growing conviction that free indirect speech is a specific phenomenon of artistic speech (Leskiv, 2009). However, free indirect speech is a popular device not only in fiction and journalism, but also in other styles of language, including various non-fiction genres, though its forms are different. Most vividly, it is represented in fiction and journalism and embraces large fragments and independent syntactic structures. However, its small forms, especially lexical-phraseological microforms are present in all styles of Russian language usage, business, scientific and colloquial. Obviously, free indirect speech should be studied both as a poetic-stylistic device of artistic speech, since it is widely used in fiction to reproduce the characters' speech in the author's text, and as a syntactic structure, since its most vivid, large-block forms have a definite syntactic design that distinguishes it from reported and direct speech (McHale, 1978). However, from the standpoint of these traditional

'Free indirect speech as a general language category is a widespread way of conveying someone else's utterances in different communications'

approaches, researchers do not treat it as a general language category or study its use in other speech aspects, outside the language of fiction. Free indirect speech as a general language category is a widespread way of conveying someone else's utterances in different communications. But unlike direct and reported speech, free indirect speech is characterised by its syntactic non-standard nature, structural dynamism, multifacetedness, the ability to reproduce not only the syntactic structures of someone else's utterance, but also individual words and expressions containing the semantics and expression of someone else's utterance, in the speech of the speaker or writer (Banfield, 1973).

Studies of free indirect speech in foreign research in the late 19th and 20th centuries included two main points. The first of these is that free indirect speech is an intermediate phenomenon between direct and indirect speech, and free indirect speech is viewed mainly from the formal side as a specific syntactic construction in the language. This position is mainly supported by researchers of the Geneva School. The second position is that free indirect speech is a poetic-stylistic device.

In free indirect speech both the author and the character speak simultaneously, and in doing so appear to cross voices. This point of view is supported by researchers of the Vossler School. In modern research, free indirect speech is divided according to McArthur et al. (2005) into four types of represented discourse: direct speech, indirect speech, free direct speech and free indirect speech. His research indicates that the major markers of direct speech (DS) are the exact words in the report and the quotation marks in writing and print. Indirect speech (IS) conveys the report in the words of the reporter, with verbs generally 'backshifted' in tense and changes in pronouns and adverbials of time and place made to align with the time of reporting. Free direct speech lacks a reporting clause to show the shift from narration to reporting; it is often used in fiction to represent the mental reactions of characters to what they see or experience (Blakemore, 2013). Free indirect speech (FIS) resembles indirect speech in terms of tense shifts and other aspects, but there is generally no reporting clause and it retains some features of direct speech (such as direct questions and the use of the vocative).

The main attribute of free indirect speech, which is inherent in all its various forms, is the semantics and expression of someone else's utterance, contrasted with the speech of the reproducing person. According to the established tradition, scientific research usually refers in free indirect

‘At the same time, fragments of someone else’s utterance are clearly distinguished in the speech of the reproducing person due to their exogenous personalised semantics and expression’

speech to the interaction of the author’s and the character’s voices. But the author and character exist only in works of art. As such, in relation to other verbal communication fields (cultural, everyday, business, scientific communication), it is more appropriate and correct to refer to the speech of the reproducing person and someone else’s utterance. Taking these comments into account, free indirect speech can be defined as a special, non-standardised syntactically, dynamic way of conveying certain fragments of someone else’s utterance directly in the speech of the reproducing person. At the same time, fragments of someone else’s utterance are clearly distinguished in the speech of the reproducing person due to their exogenous personalised semantics and expression (Dillon & Kirchhoff, 1976).

As a non-standardised, dynamic way of conveying someone else’s speech, free indirect speech is used in different speech genres. The

above naturally raises the problem of broader, more varied research into its forms and functions as a general language category, studying features of its use in various verbal communications, various verbal situations, and various verbal acts.

2.2 Free indirect speech in fictional historical narrative

Free indirect speech in a historical novel as a genre form of artistic speech performs both the general and specific genre functions. General style functions in the historical novel genre consist in using free indirect speech as a way of revealing the character’s inner world in the author’s narrative, his/her vision of events, reflections, evaluations, as a way of conveying fragments of the inner speech of the characters. The use of free indirect speech allows the writer to portray a distant historical epoch from the point of view of contemporaries, as characters living in that epoch could see it. Personalised description of past events through the perception of contemporaries of the epoch brings the historical narrator closer to such a remote epoch and its characters, helping evoke a distant epoch from within, and making the author’s narrative multidimensional, reflecting the characters’ different subjective points of view (Booth, 2010).

A specific genre function of free indirect speech is its use as a way of documenting a historical narrative. In works of the genre in question, free

indirect speech allows documenting the storyteller's narrative speech, as well. Free indirect speech allows writers to include words, word combinations, and integral statements, consisting of one or two or more sentences, sometimes taken from historical documents, into the author's narrative. This has the effect of making the entire linguistic basis of historical novels more authentic (Fludernik, 1995).

A specific function of the use of free indirect speech in historical novels is as a way of introducing an archaic style into the author's narrative, which might otherwise look out of date and out of sync with literary norms. Archaic vocabulary is particularly common in free indirect speech in Tolstoy and Tynyanov's texts in its various forms: lexical, lexical-phonetic, lexical-word-formative, lexical-morphological, and lexical-semantic archaisms. Outdated phraseology, obsolete syntactic microforms are also often used. This allows the author to recreate the verbal charm of the epoch in which the plot is set, not only in the characters' dialogues, but also in the author's narrative (Yuzefovich, 2005).

Free indirect speech also has its own place in historical novels as a device to reproduce in the author's narrative the verbal characteristics of specific historical figures in particular social environments. Each historical figure has its own specific verbal features; each epoch has its own

social-speech features. Their reproduction in an author's text is a special genre function of free indirect speech. Depending on the individual speech characteristics of a historical character and their social environment, Tolstoy and Tynyanov each reproduce in their own way through the author's narrative the colloquial and idiomatic language tools peculiar to their characters such as a bookish style, formal style, expression through a foreign-language and so on. The use of such devices makes the historical narrative stylistically dynamic and diverse.

Naturally, all those functions of free indirect speech in a historical novel as an integral work are organically interconnected. Using free indirect speech, authors can document the historical narrative and its general style in accordance with the verbal characteristics of the epoch described (Pascal, 1977). As a result, instead of the speech synchronism inherent in non-historical genres, one can observe a diachronic-synchronic speech picture, in which the author's narrative combines both modern speech and the aspects of speech of the epoch described. These two aspects of speech are combined most frequently by writers through the inclusion in the author's text of colourful microforms of ancient speech: individual words, phraseological units and grammatical features.

While large-block fragments of free indirect speech, designed as independent syntactic

‘Using free indirect speech, authors can document the historical narrative and its general style in accordance with the verbal characteristics of the epoch described’

structures, commonly perform the universal artistic function of revealing the inner world, the psychology of characters, their thinking and vision, and convey their internal monologues, the use of small forms or microforms of free indirect speech is conditioned by specific functions in the historical genre that are organically interconnected with general artistic functions, but at the same time are more specifically targeted and reflect the genre specificity of the language of a historical novel (Schlenker, 2004).

A new approach to the study of free indirect speech as a general language category can open up opportunities for researchers for the detailed study of colloquial-speech styles used in journalism, business, and science. It also has certain specific features in different genres of fiction. In this connection, a multifaceted study of this phenomenon in different styles and genres of speech is relevant. In the next section of this article, we dwell in more detail on the function of free indirect speech as a stylistic method of adding archaic style to the author’s narrative and consider

the language forms used to implement this function in a historical novel.

3. STUDY AND RESULTS

The historical vocabulary and phraseology perform not only a stylistic but also an identification function in an artistic work about the past (Shen, 1991). Its use in the author’s text is due to the need to name objects and phenomena as they were called in the past. The use of archaic language performs a purely stylistic function in the historical genre, and this stylistic function gives greater historical depth to the characters using the terms, for example, in a narrative, if it is composed in the form of a story or is conducted on behalf of a contemporary of the epoch described, as in *The Captain’s Daughter* by Pushkin (Andrew & Reid, 2003).

However, stylised narration was not popular in the historical novel genre, and neither was the personalised narrative by the person who takes part in the events. In this respect, many works of the historical genre novels of the 19th and 20th centuries feature a stylistic gap between the archaised dialogues of the characters and the impersonal contemporary language of the narrator.

To overcome this disharmony, Tynyanov and Tolstoy widely used forms of free indirect speech.

In a number of cases, the author’s remarks indicate

words and expressions associated with historical figures. For example, in the novel by Tynyanov:

‘Теперь, после крестин, он (Сергей Львович) собирался устроить ‘куртаг’, как говорили гвардейцы, – скромную встречу с милыми сердцу, как сказал бы он сейчас’ (*‘Now, after the christening, he (Sergei Lvovich) was going to arrange ‘kurtag,’ as the guardsmen used to say, or a modest meeting with those he is fond of, as he would say now’*).

‘Будучи донельзя чувствительными, или, как говорили, ‘сенсительными’, Пушкины через две минуты вполне осваивались с положением’ (*‘Being utterly sensitive, or, as they say, ‘sensible,’ the Pushkins fully mastered the situation in two minutes’*).

‘По реляции государь бил французов, а вестовщики говорили, что французы ‘утюжат нас’ (*‘According to the report, the sovereign was defeating the French, and newsmen said that the French ‘are belabouring us’*).

In this case, the writer confronts different styles of speech.

‘Заседания вражеской ‘Беседы’ происходили на дому у престарелого Державина, который отдал для них большую залу в своем доме. Члены ‘Беседы’ называли это жертвою на

алтарь русского слова, противники говорили, что старик рехнулся’ (*‘Meetings of the hostile ‘Conversation’ took place at the house of elderly Derzhavin, who gave them a large hall in his house. Members of the ‘Conversation’ called it a sacrifice on the altar of the Russian word. Opponents said that the old man had gone crazy’*).

‘Государство со всеми пространствами, которое в беседах со Сперанским было громоздкою частию Европы, в разговоре с Аракчеевым становилось его большою вотчиной, где были верные и неверные слуги’ (*‘The state with all the spaces, which in conversations with Speranski was referred to as a cumbersome part of Europe, in a conversation with Arakcheev became his great patrimony, where there were faithful and unfaithful servants’*).

In most cases, the vocabulary and phraseology characteristic of Pushkin's epoch is reproduced without the author's remarks and is a veiled component of the character's speech characteristic:

‘Отрывки принадлежали парижскому богохулу Францу Вильону’ (*‘The excerpts belonged to the Parisian blasphemer François Villon’*).

‘Все увидели на опыте ее

бренность ('Everyone has seen from experience its frailty').

'Он противоборствует' ('He antagonises').

'Матюшкин внемлет дисциплине' ('Matyushkin observes discipline').

'Он написал на ту же статью Певца в кремле' ('He wrote in the same manner 'The Singer in the Kremlin').

Naturally, all the words and expressions, like *богохул* (*blaspheme*), *бренность* (*frailty*), *противоборствует* (*antagonises*), *внемлет* (*observes*), *статья* (*manner*), *наперсник* (*confidant*), are reproduced as the characteristic speech signs of the epoch and are the elementary components of free indirect speech. Archaic words reproduced by Tynyanov in the form of indirect speech often differ from their modern equivalents only by their suffixes.

Устройство instead of *устройство* (meaning *structure*). *'Зависит от устройства тела человеческого'* ('Depends on the structure of the human body').

Австрияк instead of *австриец* (meaning *Austrian*). *'Австрияк, едва говорящий по-русски'* ('An Austrian who hardly speaks Russian').

Правительствующий instead of

правительственный (meaning *governing*). *'Правительствующий сенат'* (*Governing Senate*).

Особливо instead of *особенно* (meaning *especially*). *'Как делают жители островов, особливо Японии'* ('How the inhabitants of the islands do ... especially in Japan').

Contemporary readers distinguish the speech of the Pushkin epoch by nouns with a suffix *-ность*, such as *будущность* instead of *будущее* (meaning *the future*), as in *'Будущность была темна для Карамзина'* ('The future was dark for Karamzin').

In the author's speech, Tynyanov often reproduces nouns ending with *-тель*, typical of the late 18th – early 19th centuries, meaning the *doer, producer*, as in *'Делатели фальшивой монеты'* ('The producers of counterfeit coins').

In Tynyanov's works, the author's narrative features elementary components of free indirect speech of characters that are adjectives with a suffix *-енн*, widely used in Pushkin's time and formed from nouns ending in *-ство*, as well as adjectives ending in *-ческий*.

Соседственный (meaning *neighbouring*). *'Соседственный замок'* ('Neighbouring castle'). *Гражданственный* (meaning *civil*).

Деятельность гражданственная ('Civil activity').

Семейственный (meaning family).

Семейственная жизнь ('Family life').

Философический (meaning philosophical).

Философические оды

Державина ('Philosophical odes by Derzhavin').

Modern readers perceive the archaised words used by Tynyanov in the author's narrative, which differ from their contemporary equivalents by the composition of the prefix only, as signs of speech.

Дозволение instead of *позволение* (meaning permission). *Прошение о дозволении воспитанникам сочинять* ('Requesting permission for students to compose').

Tynyanov often used free indirect speech in his narratives to reproduce lexical-phonetic archaisms characteristic of Pushkin's epoch.

Гошпиталь (meaning hospital). *Он болен в гошпитале* ('He is ill in hospital'). *Долго лежал в гошпитале* ('He stayed at the hospital for a long time').

Шпектакль (meaning performance). *Приватный шпектакль* ('Private performance').

Нумер (meaning room; issue). *На Мойке у*

Демута сняли для него удобные номера ('They booked comfy rooms for him at Moika with Demut'). *Первый нумер газеты* ('The first issue of the newspaper').

In modern Russian, there are synonyms among lexical archaisms, reproduced in the novel by Tynyanov, that correspond to the norms of the word usage contemporary to the author. But Tynyanov preferred to use archaic words, which imprinted the manner of speech of the depicted epoch in the novel's style.

For example, when depicting the older generation of the epoch, he widely used the word *стихотворец* instead of *поэт* in the meaning of poet or *словесность* instead of *художественная литература* (meaning fiction).

Приятная репутация стихотворца ('Pleasant reputation of a poet').

Там был стихотворец Пушкин ('The poet Pushkin was there').

Отечественная словесность ('Domestic Fiction').

All of these words in the context of the author's style are clearly perceived components of the character's free indirect speech.

Tynyanov often uses the form of free indirect

speech to reproduce obsolete grammatical forms. *Дерев* instead of *деревьев* (meaning *trees*). '*В тени померанцевых деревьев*' ('*In the shadow of orange trees*').

Пособиев instead of *пособий* (meaning *benefits*). '*Не нужно ли каких пособиев*' ('*Any need for benefits*').

Кофею instead of *кофе* (meaning *coffee*). '*Выпив чёрного кофею*' ('*Having had some black coffee*').

Край instead of *края* (meaning *farness*). '*Дальние край*' ('*Farness*').

Such deviations from modern standards are also observed in the use of the plural rather than the singular form of certain nouns (Maier, 2014). For example, instead of the modern singular form of *мебель* (meaning *furniture*), we encounter its plural form *мебели*: '*... Мебели переставлять*' ('*... to rearrange the furniture*'); '*... Лишил мебели*' ('*... Deprived of furniture*'). Instead of *кресло* (meaning *armchair*), he uses *кресла*: '*... Сидел в креслах*' ('*... He was sitting in the armchair*'), '*... Его усадили в кресла*' ('*... He was seated in the armchair*'), etc.

Lexical-semantic archaisms are perceived as the explicit elements of the speech of the past in the author's text, for example, *производство*

(meaning *production*; obs.: *promotion*) in the sense of promoting in rank or title: '*Он любил просматривать известия о производствах его бывших товарищей*', etc.

Free indirect speech is also used by Tynyanov to reproduce phraseological units characteristic of the Pushkin epoch (Bayley, 1971).

Попасть в милость (meaning *to fall into mercy*). '*Чуть не попал в милость к императору*' ('*I almost fell into the mercy of the emperor*').

Ходить в должность (meaning *to go to work*). '*Он стал ходить в должность*' ('*He started going to work*'). '*Сергей Львович прекратил хождение в должность*' ('*Sergei Lvovich stopped going to work*').

Взять силу (meaning *become a powerful figure*). '*Большую силу в театре взял*' ('*He became a powerful figure in the theatre*'). '*Арапки большую силу взяли*' ('*Arapki became very powerful*').

Быть в опале (meaning *to be in disgrace*). '*Самый лицей был в опале*' ('*The liceum was in disgrace*').

Просить руки (meaning *to ask for the hand*). '*Просил руки, все еще не думая, что женится*' ('*Asked for the hand without planning*')

to marry').

He also uses literary and paraphrastic expressions of the Karamzin school: *любимцы муз* (favorites of muses), *апостол чести* (apostle of honour), *раны любви* (wounds of love), *поцелуй души* (a hearty kiss), *друзья сердца* (intimate friends), *милые дамы* (sweet ladies), etc.

'Он попросил передать поклон милой жене его' ('He asked to pass a bow to his sweet wife').

'Как только заводились деньги, он (Сергей Львович) шил себе у портного модный фрак и покупал жене перстень, память сердца' ('As soon as he made some money, he (Sergei Lvovich) ordered from the tailor a fashionable tailcoat for himself and bought a ring for his wife, a memory for the heart').

'Потом он (Василий Львович) тут же прочел новую басню Крылова, грубую, по его мнению, и отверженную гармонией' ('Then he (Vasily Lvovich) immediately read a new fable by Krylov, rude, in his opinion, and rejected by harmony').

'По дороге он дал еще один совет Александру: не пускать петуха' ('On the way, he gave another piece of advice to Alexander: do not hit the wrong note').

Tynyanov often used the form of free indirect

speech to express the forms of verb control typical of Pushkin's time, such as *жертвовать чему-то* (sacrifice + Instrumental case noun) instead of *жертвовать ради чего-то* (sacrifice + for the sake of + Genitive case noun), or *относиться до чего-то* (be related to + Genitive case noun) instead of *относиться к чему-то* (be related to + Dative case noun).

'Он (Каразмин) спросил Сергея Львовича о здоровье милой жены его' ('He (Karazmin) asked Sergei Lvovich about the health of his sweet wife').

'Готов всем жертвовать спокойствию' ('Ready to sacrifice everything for the sake of calmness').

Thus, one of the most important functions of free indirect speech in a historical novel is to archaize the author's narrative, reproducing the linguistic tinges of antiquity in the author's text, which recreate the verbal charm typical of the epoch (Hernadi, 1972).

Free indirect speech allowed Tolstoy to reproduce 'obsolete' language widely in his novels. In general, obsolete words and forms comprise 10% of the text in the novels by Tolstoy. According to our approximate estimates, they account for about 20,740 of 210,300 words of the entire text of the novel. Among obsolete words and words that are

becoming obsolete, the largest group in the novel is represented by historicalisms and vocabulary derived from them, which characterises the historical character of the epoch. Comprising 645 lexemes in absolute terms, i.e. 3.9%, the historical vocabulary covers about 7% of the entire text of the novel; it accounts for 14,720 word uses.

The most commonly used are words representative in social terms (more rarely, everyday terms describing everyday life), such as: *царь* (tsar; 375), *царица* (tsarina; 112), *царевна* (princess; 137), *государь* (sovereign; 67), *князь* (prince; 283), *князь-кесарь* (prince-caesar; 54), (grand prince; 39), *боярин* (boyar; 193), *боярский* (of boyar; 86), *боярыня* (boyarynia; 23), *вотчина* (estate; 31), *воевода* (governor; 91), *дворянин* (noble; 65), *дворянский* (of noble; 35), *купец* (merchant; 109), *купечество* (merchantry; 48), *дьяк* (secretary; 110), *мужик* (peasant; 208), *дворовый* (house serf; 34), *челядь* (menials; 27), *челобитная* (petition; 26), *дыба* (rack; 21), *мушкет* (musket; 35), *шпага* (court sword; 112); *ботфорты* (boots; 42), *драгуны* (dragoons; 39), as well as religious and moral words, which in the past were used much more widely than in modern language: *патриарх* (patriarch; 59), *монах* (monk; 43), *обедня* (mass; 31), *икона* (icon; 28), *раскольник* (schismatic; 30), etc.

Socio-political vocabulary and phraseology characterising the social structure of Russia in the

late 17th to early 18th centuries and the inner estate's hierarchy is widely represented, as well. To characterise the higher estates, the royal environment, the writer used flamboyant names characteristic of the epoch, such as *верхние бояре* (upper boyars), *ближние бояре* (proximal boyars), *думный дворянин* (a nobleman of the Duma), *палатные люди* (the palace people), *думные люди* (the Duma people), *начальные люди* (the senior people), *окольничий* (okolnichy – an advisor to the Russian ruler), *кравчий* (kravchy – an court official at the time of Ivan the Terrible), *стольники* (dapifers – stewards), *постельничий* (chamberlain), *ясельничий* (master of the forage), *сокольничий* (falconer), *рында* (royal squire), *жилец* (tenant), etc.

In characterising the merchant class, writer uses words, such as *торговые люди* (commercial people), *купец гостиной сотни* (the merchant hundreds of living), *интересант* (interested parties), *негоциант* (patrician), *гостинодворец* (shopkeeper), *купец суконной сотни* (a merchant of the cloth hundred), *купец черной сотни* (a merchant of the black hundred), *целовальник* (tax-collector; the seller and duty collector in a tavern), *сиделец* (salesman in a shop), *лавочник* (shopkeeper), *кабатчик* (tavern keeper), *сбитенщик* (saloon hot drink vendor), *пирожник* (pieman), *зипунщик* (tailor), *лесоторговец* (forest merchant), *прибыльщик* (profit-seeker), *приказчик* (clerk), *трактирщик*

(innkeeper), **корчмарь** (tavern keeper), as well as **обжорный ряд** (refreshment stand), **бурмистерская палата** (burmister's chamber), **кумпания** (company), **кумпанство** (kumpanstvo – shipbuilding company), **кружало** (the tsar's tavern), **мясницкая** (meat shop – a place to meet), etc.

The characteristics of class and status are closely related to the use of local vocabulary and phraseology, such as **место** (seat), **сидеть выше** (sit higher), **сидеть ниже** (sit lower), **сидеть на великих столах** (sit by the great tables), **старшие по месту** (the senior by the seat), **невместно** (inappropriately), etc.

‘Буйносовы от века сидели выше Лыковых’ (‘The Buinosovs for ages had sat above the Lykovs’).

In order to characterise the lower classes, the writer uses the following words: **холоп** (servant), **лакэй** (footman), **челядь** (menials), **страдник** (farm hand; or farm labourer), **смерд** (peasant farmer), **мужик** (muzhik – a boor, unpleasant person), **дворовой** (house serf), **дворня** (menials), **дворовая девка** (peasant girl), **чернь** (the mob), **крепостной** (serf), **гулящие люди** (funseekers), **гультаи** (hellbenders), **юродивый** (holy fool), **шпыни** (jesters), **разбойные люди** (robbers), **колодники** (convicts), **покрученник** (working in the fields, kept boy), **крестьянин**

(peasant), and others. At the same time, peasants are differentiated as follows: **кабальные** (enslaved serfs), **барщинные** (corvée serfs), **оброчные** (peasants on quitrent), **пашенные** (field peasants), **государевы** (state serfs), **монастырские** (monastery serfs), **помещичьи** (landlord's serfs), **задворные** (serfs belonging to the yard), **черносошные** (black soil serfs), etc.

The lexical microsystem, connected with the social obligations of the lower class and their taxation, is diversely reflected by Tolstoy: **барщина** (corvée), **кабала** (tribute), **дань** (tribute), **оброк** (render), **пошлина** (duty), **тягло** (tax), **подать** (impost; from plough, from smoke), **стрелецкая подать** (Streltsy tax), **окладные подати** (cover tax), **кормовые деньги** (fodder money), **мостовые деньги** (bridge money), **повытошные деньги** (service money), **ямские деньги** (parish money), **казацкие деньги** (Cossack money), **откуп** (ransom), **подводы** (podvody), **поборы** (informal fees), **кормление** (foddering), etc.

The vocabulary and phraseology characterising the system of punishment typical of the epoch is also widely represented: **кнут** (whip), **батоги** (batogs – beating sticks), **ковать в цепи** (chain up), **кандалы** (cuffs), **застенок** (confine), **доставить на правез** (deliver to the law), **кинуть в тюрьму** (imprison), **на царскую казну животы** (submit one's life for the tsar's treasury), **казнь** (execution),

отсечение головы (beheading), *четвертование* (quartering), *колесование* (wheeling), *посадить на кол* (staking), *вздернуть на виселицу* (hanging), *зарыть живую в землю* (bury alive), *лобное место* (place of execution), *плаха* (block: *кинуть на плаху* (throw on the block), *положить голову на плаху* (put one's head on the block), *дыба* (rack), *пытка* (torture), etc.

The service class is represented by the following historicisms: *дьяк* (secretary), *приказной дьяк* (secretary of prikaz – a government administrative office), *подьячие* (scribes), *писцы* (penmen), *добытчик* (getter or breadwinner), *пристав* (bailiffs), *урядник* (sergeant), *кат* (headman), *запечных дел мастер* (hangman), *бирюч* (public herald), *скороходы* (footmen), *губные старосты* (labial headman), *земской* (zemskoy), *ярыжка* (yaryzhka), etc.

In accordance with the social and bureaucratic differentiation of the society in the time of Peter the Great, the word *люди* (people) was used by Tolstoy in different ways: *государевы* (state serfs), *палатные* (palace people), *служилые* (service men), *посадские* (Posad people), *торговые* (merchants), *тяглые* (serfs), *промышленные* (industry workers), *дворовые* (menials), *рабочие* (workers). However, workers and industrial employees are defined differently: as in a later, not characteristic epoch. In the late 17th to 18th centuries, *промышленник*

(*industrialist*), *промышленные люди* (*industrial people*) meant people engaged in hunting furry animals, fishing and the like (Balzer, 2016).

Tolstoy used the word in his later work to mean rich merchants. And instead of *рабочие* (workers) in Peter's epoch, the words *работные люди* (working people) and *мастеровые люди* (craftsmen) were used.

The social and official stratification of Russian society during the late 18th century (see Bonnel, 1983) is shown by such vocabulary as *высокородный* (high-born), *худородный* (low-born), *знатный* (noble), *вельможа* (nobleman), *ясновельможный* (yasnovelmozhny, in the territory of Poland), *шляхетство* (nobility, in the territory of Poland), *подлого рода* (despicable kind), *подлый* (vile), *чернь* (mob), *холопство* (serfdom), etc.

Objects in domestic life, clothing, and, accordingly, their names are numerous mentioned in the pages of the novel. When characterising clothing, the typical for the era objective-visual way of conveying its colour is used: *кафтан крапивного цвета* (caftan of nettle color), *табачный кафтан* (tobacco caftan), *клюквенный армяк* (cranberry mackerel), *кафтан мышинный* (mouse caftan), *персикового цвета летник* (summer dress of the colour peach), *желудевое бархатное платье* (acorn

velvet dress), *орехового шелка платье* (walnut silk dress), etc. However, the list of clothing items, as well as household items, is generally short. Tolstoy often limited himself to abstract names when describing clothing:

‘Одевалась она пышно, все по-девичьи’ (*‘She used to dress wonderfully, all girlish’*).

‘Оглянулся на пышно одетых бояр’ (*‘Looked back at the magnificently dressed boyars’*).

‘Подъехали верхоконные, богато одетые’ (*‘The richly dressed horsemen came up’*).

‘Царь был в царском для малого выхода платье’ (*‘The Tsar was wearing the royal dress for minor official occasions’*).

This is due to the writer's desire not to complicate the description with obscure words. For example, instead of the old and currently obscure word *накапки* (*nakapki*; a cloak), Tolstoy used a descriptive word phrase *просторные, до полу, рукава летника* (*‘spacious sleeves of the summer dress reaching the floor’*); instead of the word *обнизь* (*obniz*) – *шитый жемчугом ворот* (*‘pearl-studded collar’*), etc. But at the same time, apparently, the perfectionist artist demonstrates his caution, the desire to prevent any inaccuracies, which are rather common in this respect even among major novelists (Tolstoy, 2008).

4. CONCLUSION

Thus, thanks to free indirect speech, Tynyanov and Tolstoy widely reproduced in the pages of their novels – in particular in narrative texts – a variety of linguistic words and phrases characteristic of the epochs described. Of course, the function of archaising historical narratives is often combined with the function of its documentation. However, this is not always the case. When documenting historical narratives, the authors often borrow from written sources in the past, many not out of date, but still used in contemporary language. In particular, they reproduce the documented vocabulary, phraseology, and phrases which are still used. And on the other hand, obsolete linguistic styles used to add an archaic flavour to the historical narrative are also not necessarily the same as those documented. Many archaic words and expressions are used by writers based on general ideas about the language of the past, i.e. they are not taken from any particular documentary sources used by the writers.

Therefore, the function of archaising a historical narrative is relatively independent, although it is closely connected with documentation. There is a noticeable difference between them in the forms of free indirect speech that have been used. The range of syntactic terms, especially undocumented archaisation, is further narrowed and limited mainly to word combinations with obsolete word agreement forms. Lexical and phraseological

microforms of free indirect speech prevail in this case. At the same time, not only lexical archaisms, but also lexical-phonetic, lexical-word-formative, lexical-morphological, and lexical-semantic ones

are widely used. Due to their semantic transparency, they do not impede the perception of the author's text and at the same time provide a vivid flavour of the ancient language.

References

- Andrew, J., & Reid, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Two hundred years of Pushkin* (Vol. 3). Rodopi.
- Balzer, H. D. (2016). *Russia's missing middle class: The professions in Russian history*. Routledge.
- Banfield, A. (1973). Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. *Foundations of Language*, 10(1), 1-39.
- Bayley, J. (1971). *Pushkin: A comparative commentary*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blakemore, D. (2013). Voice and expressivity in free indirect thought representations: Imitation and representation. *Mind & Language*, 28(5), 579-605.
- Bonnell, V. E. (Ed.). (1983). *The Russian worker: Life and labor under the tsarist regime*. University of California Press.
- Booth, W. C. (2010). *The rhetoric of fiction*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dillon, G., & Kirchhoff, F. (1976). On the form and function of free indirect style. *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*, 1(3), 431-40.
- Fludernik, M. (1995). The linguistic illusion of alterity: The free indirect as paradigm of discourse representation. *Diacritics*, 25(4), 89-115.
- Hernadi, P. (1972). Dual perspective: Free indirect discourse and related techniques. *Comparative Literature*, 24(1), 32-43.
- Leskiv, A. (2009). The literary phenomenon of free indirect speech. *Studia Anglica Resoviensia*, 6, 51-58.
- Maier, E. (2014). Language shifts in free indirect discourse. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 43(2), 143-167.
- McArthur, T. B., McArthur, T., & McArthur, R. (Eds.). (2005). *Concise Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- McHale, B. (1978). Free indirect discourse: A survey of recent accounts. *Poetics and Theory of Literature*, 3(2), 249-287.
- Pascal, R. (1977). *The dual voice: Free indirect speech and its functioning in the nineteenth-century European novel*. Manchester University Press.
- Schlenker, P. (2004). Context of thought and context of utterance: A note on free indirect discourse and the historical present. *Mind & Language*, 19(3), 279-304.
- Shen, D. (1991). Re-evaluation of functions of free indirect speech. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 2, 11-16.
- Tolstoy, G. L. (2008). *Tolstoy's short fiction: Revised translations, backgrounds and sources, criticism*. Norton & Company.
- Yuzefovich, N. G. (2005). English in Russian cultural contexts. *World Englishes*, 24(4), 509-516.