

# АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА И МЕТОДИКИ ЕГО ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ

## THE SPECIFICITY OF REASONING EXPRESSION IN THE ARTISTIC TEXT

R.V. Lopukhina

Tula State Lev Tolstoy Pedagogical University  
*Lenina Av., 125, Tula, Russia, 300026*

The article deals with the specificity of cultural identity and linguistic variability of reasoning expressions in the artistic text.

**Key words:** the artistic text, the logic of thinking, reasoning, cause-and-effect relations, antilogism

Nowadays in the study of the artistic text there is a great number of mutually complementary approaches and concepts that contribute to better understanding of its linguistic and cultural aspects. The artistic text as a “reproduction” and reflection of reality creates its own system of correlation of words, composition components and the parts of different content and various structures [1. P. 28]. In addition, each well-known writer, as a bright representative of the language community that he belongs to, in the form of art reflects the characteristic features of the national mentality and peculiarities of national communication. Based on this, we consider the literary text as linguocultural formation, which is the bearer of the author’s individual and the general ethno-cultural characteristics of communicative behavior of people [2. P. 78].

Although the author’s attitude to the depicted finds expression in the direct estimation relatively rare, it manifests itself at the different levels of the text system. One of the little-investigated areas at the present stage of development of linguistics is the study of the literary text from a logical-language position in the aspect of the relation between language and thought. In our opinion, this relation is most evident in the specific cultural and linguistic inferences resulting variability of expression as reported on the subconscious level of a native speaker.

This article analyzes the features of the reasoning expressed in judgments and evaluations of artwork characters thus reflecting the characteristic features of contemporary discourse of 80s—90s of the XX century. The research carried out within the framework of anthropocentric paradigm, defined as one of the leading paradigms in modern

linguistics. This approach involves the interpretation of the text in the aspect of text generation (the author's position) and perception (the reader's position), as well as its impact on the reader.

The works of one of the modern Russian authors V.S. Tokareva were the material for analysis [3]. This material reflects universal values, the subtle perception of life and at the same time a purely national, "Russian" attitude to many life situations and phenomena. The German critic H. Schlaffer defined the main feature of the creativity of the writer:

The stories by Tokareva are as prosaic and monotonous as life itself when you interpret it as daily routine, though they are as exciting as daily routine if you want to learn its system and its foundation.

The works of V. Tokareva composed in Russian, are addressed primarily to the representatives of the linguistic community, they are structured on the basis of the national paradigm of thinking and cultural sets of the Russian people. Thus logical and linguistic analysis enables us to identify author's patterns of consumption of the means of the national language in terms of the specific models of artistic communication functioning.

As we know, the world around us is reflected in the minds of people in a variety of forms of thought (concepts, judgments, reasoning), which are fixed in the associative language signs. Language thus expresses not only the specific content of thought (semantic level), but also reinforces the logic of thinking. Syntactic language tier plays a special role in the translation of cultural identity of the people and stereotyping the world outlook.

To ask questions, to explain, to argue, to prove, to refute, to doubt, to ask for something, to request, to authorize, to forbid — all these and other forms of mental activity are the kinds of reasoning. Therefore we can assert that thinking and reasoning is the same.

Reasoning is the most important and the most difficult form of thought which occupies the central place in logic, since due to them humans have accumulated vast theoretical knowledge in the cognition of the world and the humanity itself. "... Our conversations are full of reasoning, but we almost do not notice them" [4. P. 39].

As one of the most common and the most difficult intellectual operations, reasoning in each concrete case appears as a specific section of the intellectual and verbal activity, consisting in the fact that some part of thought and speech is shaped as logical deduction [5. P. 48].

There are three types of deductive logical reasoning in modern formal logic: 1) a simple categorical syllogism; 2) conditional categorical syllogism; 3) separating-categorical syllogism [6].

The first of these, which can be studied only Aristotelian subject-predicate logic, occupies a leading position both in its complexity and types and forms diversity, as well as on the frequency of the actual operation of a natural language. Relatively categorical and separation-categorical conclusions investigated only by means of propositional logic, because relations here can be established only between propositions, but not concepts. If the concept is expressed by a single word or phrase, and judgment — by a separate proposal, or a combination of proposals, the conclusion is always the connection of several, two or more sentences. For example:

It is possible to treat the problem via sport: do morning exercises, practice yoga breathing, fasting once a week. *But in order to live like* [premise], should be very strong to love yourself [conclusion]. To me it is boring ("Pirates of the Distant Sea").

The study of reasoning has been the subject of formal logic study, but at the present stage of development of science, there is a high interest in this phenomenon from the side of the linguists. Reasoning has been thoroughly examined within scientific speech studies, while the language of reasoning in the artistic text are still not studied well enough [7]. Meanwhile the identification of mentioned specificity of reasoning may shed light on a number of problems faced by the researchers of linguistics and semantics of the text may face, in particular on issues such as the participation of various agencies in creating writer's idiostyle, in the reflection of the typical personality assessments and cultural attitudes adopted in the society etc.

The presence of reasoning in an artistic text is a natural and logical phenomenon exemplifying the progress of the author's thinking process author, embodied in the specific language forms and structures.

It should be noted that as a rule the formal type of arguments with strong cause-and-effect relations and logical structure is in works of art is transformed or truncated. Generally literature is characterized by informal, value judgments and conclusions, reflecting general cultural and personal experience of the person.

The general rule of linguistic expression of reasoning in the Russian language is next: if the conclusion follows the premises, it is necessary to put such words like *consequently, therefore, so, thus, it follows that* etc before them. For example:

They continued standing: either did not understand, or perhaps could not move because of joy [premise]. Great joy as well as a lot of pain acts as shock [conclusion]. ("The Long Day").

If the conclusion precedes premises, then one should put the words *because, because of, as since, that is why* etc after it:

Destiny — is the character [conclusion]. And my character cannot be changed, because it is my size [premise] ("Pirates of the Distant Sea").

If the conclusion is located between the premises, the appropriate words simultaneously precede and follow it.

In a lively speech, unlike the textbook logic, this order is relative: conclusion can complete reasoning or start it; as well the conclusion can be in the middle of the reasoning — between its premises.

One of the difficulties in the study of reasoning in the artistic text is the premise that such structures are available, thus if they are, they must be presented in the same way as in the textbooks of logic (three-term form of reasoning with the obligatory presence of two premises and conclusion). Therefore, there is a request for a detailed analysis of the context in order to understand what way and in what semantic, lexical, syntactic forms reasoning are presented in an artistic text.

Another difficulty in the study of reasoning is caused by their familiarity to our mentality. Such phenomena as "cause" and "effect" are common in our life, they are naturally reflected in the text so that we practically do not notice them [8. P. 42].

To identify the reasoning structures in the language means, first of all, to find cause-and-effect semantic relations in the text. Here are some examples of such analysis.

The semantic meaning of a sentence, “I realized that they was a struggle. Wife defended their right to identity” we cannot find the reasons for *fight*. However, in the same syntactical constructions, but with a partially modified lexical content, we discover the reason:

I realized that they was a struggle for power. *Lodya wanted to subordinate his wife*. And the wife defended her rights (“Pirates of the Distant Sea”).

The semantic meaning of the highlighted words indicates the cause of action, and semantic value of the other words — the consequence of this cause. A similar situation is also possible in the simple sentences with prepositional-substantive structures:

Of course, I could deny Lodya (there is no indication of the cause). *But I can see the rejection and betrayal* of childhood and common roots... (there is an indication of the cause).

During the study of literary texts from logical-linguistic positions we have discovered mainly reduced definitive conclusions (enthymeme) and have set the lexical and grammatical means used to express them. Enthymeme in formal logic is abbreviated syllogism that omits one of the judgments — the major premise, minor premise and a conclusion. Most of all, the major premise is omitted (omitted judgments put in square brackets). For example:

She is angry and vents her anger on me, because I am not the one who she needs. She needs a completely different person, and I am instead of him (“Pirates of the Distant Sea”). [All the women are angry, if they do not meet the person who they want (major premise). I am not the kind of person she needs (minor premise), so she vents her anger on me (conclusion)].

The ultimate reduction of reasoning can be enthymeme, consisting only of the conclusion. In this regard, revealing remark logic: “Seeing the pure sky., we conclude: *The weather will be good...* This is deductive though compressed to the limit explanation. The general statement and the first premise are omitted: *Whenever the sky is clear, the weather is good*. The premise *sky is clear* is omitted. The both assertions are obvious so it is not necessary to say them out loud” [4. P. 39].

However reasoning can be expressed exceptionally by lexical means:

After a week Prokushev realized that consider and weigh all the *impossible because every circumstance has two straight contradictory aspects* (“Love and travel”).

The use of enthymemes in an artistic text is caused by definite linguistic and psychological reasons. The complete reasoning mostly contain some well-known information, which makes no sense for a reader. At the same time, enthymeme makes a reader to think, it increases reader’s interest in the written. The author, who gives one or two premises for his conclusions, should “keep in mind” the rest of the premises. He must be sure that the readers are aware of the missing premises and they can restore them easily.

Since enthymeme is most often found in the live speech, sometimes it is difficult to answer the question of whether there is a direct relationship between the necessary premises or this dependence is hidden by omitting of definite elements of thought. Some authors compare reconstruction of enthymemes into the complete syllogisms with “proof of the theorem” [9. P. 195]. The other authors figuratively write: “An attempt to restore the logical connections omitted in the text can be compared with the work of a detective

who has to deal with a set of disparate facts and must find a way to combine them with the causal relationships in one verisimilar version” [10. P. 37].

These procedures were studied at great length on the material of Russian and German languages in the works of A.T. Krivonosov [5; 8].

In practical life, a person thinks mostly in enthymemes. If thought in full, three-term syllogisms and kept in mind all the three premises, his speech would be absurd, with lots of redundant and unnecessary words, known as self-evident axioms.

Here are some examples of such condensed conclusions reflecting the typical characteristics of heroes estimated speech. The examples were taken from the stories of V. Tokareva.

Enthymeme expressed by two separate proposals:

I am offended, but I do not show that... [premise]. *Otherwise, she would say: “Never suffer in front of the woman [the conclusion]. Go home and suffer as long as you want”* (“Pirates of the Distant Sea”).

Claudia turned and walked out of the room. She did not want to argue with me: *after all, she depended on me* (“Pirates of the Distant Sea”).

... There are smart fools, like Tamara, and there are solemn ones. And I am the utter fool [premise]... Those kinds make sense, me — no. [conclusion] (“Pirates of the Distant Sea”).

Enthymeme expressed by a complex sentence:

Fate — is character. And my character cannot be changed, *because it is my dimension type* (“Pirates of the Distant Sea”).

Enthymeme expressed by a compound sentence:

As a rule, people first deliberate... [premise], *and after that they leave their family* [conclusion]. I first left, and then began to deliberate (“We Need to Talk”).

Enthymeme expressed by a simple sentence:

— ... But why do not you marry him? [premise]

— *Because he is a dishonourable man* [conclusion]. He has no desire for order. He prefers complete chaos in relationships (“Pirates of the Distant Sea”).

Star Boy. Alien boy. He does his work and does not put himself into anybody’s position [premise]. *That is why Kira preferred him to me* [conclusion]. Although, objectively, I am more beautiful and positive and I prefer the order to complete chaos (“Pirates of the Distant Sea”).

Simple sentences, consisting of predicative and detached phrase “Stunned with violent onslaught, she got confused” (“Nothing Special”).

The presence of compressed reasoning in human daily thinking confirms the fact that the process of thinking is not closely associated with the language, as definite assessments, most well-known within the representatives of the community, do not need language explication.

The carried out research of the artistic texts allows to draw another important conclusion concerned the language specificity of the structures mentioned. The Russian language has a big variety of forms, not only for expression of the “correct” deductive reasoning (syllogisms), but also for the deliberate expression “wrong” syllogisms, antilogism as a reflection of the contradictions of material reality, human interaction with this reality and the interaction between people.

“Antilogism is a logic concept characterizing the incompatibility of categorical syllogism premises with denial its inference or conclusion. Antilogism is based on the laws of logic, according to which the conclusion cannot be false, in case if the premises are true” [11. P. 43]. This is a syllogism with the different conclusion, “anticonclusion”, created by the use of the predicate of the restored major premise (or its synonyms) with the denial or antonymous predicate concepts, but without negation.

While analyzing the facts we found the cases of regular violation of logical and properly constructed syllogisms, though abused by certain rules — judgments in function of conclusion where everything is put “upside down”. Compare, for example,

“Galya had every reason to consider himself a happy woman [premise]. *The grounds were, but there was no happiness* [conclusion]. She acquired Trofimov territorially, but could not get his mind and did not know what to do”. “As a rule, people first deliberate ... [premise], *and after that they leave their family* [conclusion]. I first left, and then began to deliberate” (“We Need to Talk”).

The ability to express antilogism a person realizes by means of natural language according to the laws of formal logic.

Thus, the logical laws of cause and effect phenomena of objective reality are reflected in the language, so the language causality as a complex and multifaceted phenomenon continues to attract scientists’ attention and it is studied in various aspects of modern linguistics. This connection of language and logic of thought is primarily manifested in the features of ethnically related conclusions expressed in the artistic texts as well.

Review of the distinguished judgment is certainly incomplete even for the specified works of V. Tokareva as well as their set itself. However, this analysis indicates that the conclusions can provide better understanding of the peculiarities of national mentality and community representatives’ value orientations. So, it requires more detailed study within the sphere of intercultural communication.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Dorofeev V.G., Martemijanov Yu.S. Logicheskij vyvod i vyjavlenie svjazej mezhdu predlozhenijami v tekste. Mashinnyj perevod i prikladnaja lingvistika [The logical conclusion and exploring linkages between proposals in the text machine translation and applied linguistics]. ISS. 12. M., 1969, pp. 48—69.
- [2] Getmanova A.D. Logika [Logic]. M.: New school, 2001.
- [3] Ivin A.A. Strogij mir logiki [Strict world logic]. M.: Pedagogy, 1988.
- [4] Kondakov N.N. Logicheskij slovar’-spravochnik [Logical Handbook]. Nauka, 1975.
- [5] Krivonosov A.T. Sistema klassov slov kak otrazhenie struktury jazykovogo soznanija (Filosofskie osnovy teoreticheskoj grammatiki) [System classes of the words as a reflection of the structure of language consciousness (Philosophical foundations for theoretical grammar)]. M.—New York, N.Y.: Cheraw, 2001.
- [6] Krivonosov A.T. Filosofija jazyka [The Philosophy of language]. M.: Azbukovnik, 2012.
- [7] Saltanova N.Yu. Specifika rassuzhdenija v hudozhestvennom tekste: v sravnenii s rassuzhdeniem v nauchnom tekste [The specificity of reasoning in the artistic text: compared to the reasoning in scientific text]. The Abstract. of. ... Cand. PhD. Sciences. M., 2008.
- [8] Shaklein V.M. Lingvokulturologija: tradicii i innovacii [Linguistic culture: traditions and innovations] (electronic resource): monograph. M.: Flint, 2012.

- [9] Svinzov V.I. Logika [Logic]: Stud. for high schools. M.: Top. school, 1987.  
[10] Tokareva V.S. Letajushhie kacheli. Nichego osobennogo: Povesti, rassказы [Flying swing. Nothing special: Novels, stories]. M.: Soviet writer, 1987.  
[11] Vinogradov V.V. Problemy russkoj stilistiki [The Problem of Russian style]. M.: Vysshaya Shkola, 1981.

## **СПЕЦИФИКА ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ УМОЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЙ В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОМ ТЕКСТЕ**

**Р.В. Лопухина**

Тульский государственный педагогический университет им. Л.Н. Толстого  
*проспект Ленина, 125, Тула, Россия, 300026*

В статье рассматривается национально-культурная специфика и языковая вариативность выражения умозаключений в художественном тексте.

**Ключевые слова:** художественный текст, логика мышления, умозаключение, причинно-следственные связи, антилогизмы