

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.22.01>.

UDC: 811.161.1'366.547:177:821.161.1-3''18''

**Shen Binbin**

Zhejiang Yuexiu University,  
Shaoxing, China



## ETIQUETTE VOCATIVES IN FAMILY COMMUNICATION OF RUSSIAN NOBILITY IN THE XIX<sup>th</sup> CENTURY

### **Bibliographic Description:**

Binbin. Sh. (2021). Etiquette Vocatives in Family Communication of Russian Nobility in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 22. 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.22.01>.

### **Abstract**

*The article is an analytical research from the standpoint of the latest linguistic knowledge – linguistic pragmatics and cultural linguistics – vocatives as speech etiquette formulas that function in Russian classical prose of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century. In the article, an attempt was made to comprehensively study such a component of communicative-speech interaction in a family as vocative, or address: considering this category not only as performing a number of important functions in the communication process, but also setting a certain “pattern” of deployment of the entire communicative process, as well as significantly affects the tonality of the latter.*

*Vocatives as components of the process of verbal communication are considered as formulas of speech etiquette, which makes it possible to take into account not only the linguistic characteristics of the category under consideration, but also extremely important semantic increments of social, cultural and other extralinguistic properties. The analyzed fragments of works of art allowed the author to demonstrate that in the noble environment, communication between parents and children took a special place in family communication. The vocatives used in this case almost always have an explicit positive emotional-expressive colouring, which contributes to the formation of the corresponding communication tonality: the tonality of love, tenderness, trust, and the like.*

**Keywords:** *vocative, address, speech etiquette, family communication, speech-etiquette formula.*

## 1. Introduction.

The primary formation of the personality, including the linguistic personality, more precisely, the communicative-speech personality, is carried out precisely in the family, which determines the fundamentally important role of the latter in this process. A special place in the process of communicative and personal formation is occupied by mastering the native language and skills of verbal communication. It is in the family where the cultural and behavioral stereotypes of the personality are laid, which are then implemented by the communicants in various communication situations.

This statement, among other factors, is responsible for a significant increase in research interest in the multidimensional study of the family at this stage of linguistic and humanitarian knowledge in general. The family is considered by psychologists (from the point of view of the formation of the psychological climate in the family and the nature of relations between its members – J. M. Gottman & L. F. Katz & C. Hooven (2013), G. Zakharova (2009)); sociologists (as a small social group – R. M. Berns (2009), N. Gorbacheva (2015)); culturologists (from the standpoint of the formation of a special cultural space in the family – V. Glazkova (2014), Yu. Lotman (1996)), etc.

The interest of linguists studying this phenomenon has significantly increased in the study of the family, in particular, from the point of view of the distribution of communicative (socio-communicative) roles in the family in various situations of verbal communication (A. Balakay (2011), N. Formanovska (1989), V. Kashkin (2013), O. Leontovich & Ye. Yakusheva (2014), V. Maslova (2001). A detailed consideration is currently being given to definite genres of family communication, family folklore and familielect – speech means functioning within the framework of communication between members of a family (A. Baykulova (2012), Ye. Bondarenko (2010), Ya. Rytnikova (1996), E. Salikhova & K. Nilova (2016), V. Zviagintseva (2011)).

In the context of a significant drop in the level of speech culture in modern society, which undoubtedly affected the sphere of speech etiquette, the sources that have recorded the best examples of the functioning of speech etiquette formulas in Russian culture at different time periods of the existence of this national-cultural community acquire special value.

Such sources, no doubt, include classical Russian literature – works that reflect the life of Russian society at various periods of its development, including its rich and varied speech culture with its numerous speech etiquette formulas, some of which are not relevant today, however represent a unique wealth of the national linguistic culture.

## 2. Aim and Objectives.

The paper *aims* to identify vocatives as speech etiquette formulas of Russian noble family communication in Russian classical literature, as well as to establish aesthetic and cultural significance in the analyzed artistic discourses and in Russian linguistic culture in general.

The main *objectives* are as follows:

- to characterize family communication as a special type of communication and the originality of speech etiquette in it;
- to carry out a comprehensive analysis of vocatives used in literary texts, identifying their functions as speech-etiquette formulas of family communication of the Russian noble society of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century;
- to classify the collected material, taking into account the social status of the communicants and the nature of the family relationship between them.

### 3. Methodology.

In the paper such general and special linguistic research methods as observations, descriptive method, comparative method, contextological analysis, structural-semantic analysis (sociolinguistically oriented), linguopragmatic analysis, as well as elements of diachronic analysis of linguistic units and a method of analyzing dictionary definitions were used.

### 4. Results.

#### 4.1. Communication between Parents and Children: Speech-Etiquette Aspect.

At all times, a lot has depended on the nature of the relationship between children and parents, including how successful the grown-up child will be in further communication – both with relatives and people close to them, and with strangers. This truth was very well understood in Russian noble families, therefore, the communication of parents with a child not only always presupposed the indispensable disposition of adults towards the younger, expressed in kindness, patience and love towards them, but also the organization of communicative interaction between the elders and the younger according to certain rules, which all family members had to adhere to in a very strict manner and practically everywhere.

Of course, in this case, for the children in the family, the personal example of the parents played an important role – the manner of communication that the adult relatives of the children used in communication with each other, and above all, the father and mother. Such an example of building family relations between parents, perceived through the eyes of a child, the main character of the trilogy, with a high level of artistic skill is embodied in Leo Tolstoy's novel "Childhood", in the initial part of the work (until the moment of the death of little Nicola's mother). The story includes only a few episodes of communication between the father and mother of Nicolinka Irteniev, but it is quite possible to judge from them what tone they preferred communicating with each other. The following fragments of the text, from our point of view, make it possible to form a fairly complete picture of this:

“– Ах, не говори этого, **мой друг**, – прервала его татап, как будто испугавшись чего-нибудь, – почём ты знаешь?”;

“– Знаешь, что я сейчас решил? – сказал он весёлым голосом, положив руку на плечо татап.

– Что, **мой друг**?”;

“Папá обнял татап и несколько раз поцеловал её.

– Полно, **мой дружок**, сказал папа, – ведь не навек расстаёмся.

– Всё-таки грустно! – сказала татап дрожащим от слёз голосом” (henceforth emphasis added by me – B. Sh.) (Толстой, 1986, p. 19, 22, 41–42).

In Russian noble families of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, the address *милый друг* and variations (*любезный друг*, *бесценный друг*, etc.), used in its original meaning, was widespread both in family and in general in secular communication. A. Balakay in “Dictionary of Russian speech etiquette” characterizes it as follows: “**Мой друг** (♦ **Друг мой**) ... A friendly address to a casual friend or relative, equal or younger in age (In the preposition, it is usually sublime). In the nineteenth century, it was widely used in both male and female speech; in the Soviet and post-Soviet period it is used much less often, in sublime or familiarly condescending male addresses to a friend or casual friend” (Балакай, 2001, p. 155). From this commentary it follows that this speech-etiquette formula (*мой друг*) in the modern period of the functioning of the language in comparison with the XIX<sup>th</sup> century has undergone significant – both semantic and stylistic – transformations: being a widely used one and a half to two centuries ago as neutral in its stylistic coloration nomination (both in

male and female speech), it has significantly lost its popularity in the XX<sup>th</sup> and XXI<sup>st</sup> centuries, while moving from an active vocabulary to a passive one and changing the stylistic coloring (in the XX<sup>th</sup> century this nomination began to be used in a familiar and condescending meaning, which was practically not characteristic of it in the period under consideration).

All the semantic and stylistic features of the address *мой друг*, its multifunctionality in Leo Tolstoy's work "Childhood" are most fully demonstrated in a letter from Nicolinka's mother to her husband (Chapter XXV "Letter"), which is fragmentary (citing the paragraphs with the speech etiquette formulas) is given below.

*"Пожалуйста, не пугайся, милый друг: я чувствую себя довольно хорошо и, если Иван Васильевич позволит, завтра думаю встать. ...*

*Вот тебе, мой друг, подробный отчёт в том, как я занемогла и как сама в том виновата. ...*

*Ты так добр, милый друг, что из страха огорчить меня скрываешь настоящее положение своих дел; но я догадываюсь: верно, ты проиграл очень много, и несколько, боюсь тебе, не огорчаюсь этим; поэтому, если только дело это можно поправить, пожалуйста, много не думай о нём и не мучь себя напрасно. ...*

*Не знаю, милый друг, согласишься ли ты со мною; но во всяком случае умоляю тебя, из любви ко мне, дать мне обещание, что, покуда я жива и после моей смерти, если богу угодно будет разлучить нас, этого никогда не будет. ...*

*Прощай же, милый друг, не беспокойся, пожалуйста, ни о моей болезни, ни о своём проигрыше; кончай скорей дела и приезжай к нам с детьми на целое лето. ...*

*Я не могу писать больше от слёз. Может быть, я не увижу тебя, благодарю же тебя, мой бесценный друг, за всё счастье, которым ты окружил меня в этой жизни; я там буду просить бога, чтобы он наградил тебя. Прощай, милый друг; помни, что меня не будет, но любовь моя никогда и нигде не оставит тебя. Прощай, Володя, прощай, мой ангел, прощай Веньямин – мой Николенька" (Толстой, 1986, р. 78–82).*

The letter was written by Natalia Nicolaevna Irtenieva in a time of severe sudden illness, which became the reason for her death. Anticipating her close death, the woman wrote a goodbye letter to her husband and all her dearest people, trying, on the one hand, to calm them down, and on the other, to express her love and tenderness as much as possible. To a large extent, the speech-etiquette formula *милый друг* and a number of its synonyms (*мой друг*, *мой бесценный друг*, *мой дружок*, *мой ангел*), in which the phatic and emotional functions are actualized and which are used repeatedly in the speech of the addressee, are aimed to contribute to the embodiment of this semantics, with the emphasis on the emotional component.

It is noteworthy that the tone of the letter remains positive throughout the entire text, although it also contains clear anxiety about the future of children and even veiled kind of reproaches to her husband in connection with his passion for card games.

The most frequent in the letter is the address *милый друг* (used five times) – "affectionate or intimate address to a close, beloved person" (Балакай, 2001, р. 154). In addition to this, the letter also contains the vocative addressed to the husband *мой друг* and the vocative with the highest degree of expression – *мой бесценный друг*. Thus, in the epistolary text, there is a 7-component system of addresses to the husband, which is supplemented by three speech-etiquette units addressed to children in the final phrase of the text: *Володя, мой ангел, Веньямин – мой Николенька*. Taken together, this system of speech-etiquette formulas forms a completely unique emotional-semantic frame of the text, conveying an unusually high degree of its expression and phatic colouring. In this case, the

main functions of the used speech-etiquette formulas become precisely the phatic and emotional-expressive, and the latter is of an exclusively positive nature.

The address *мой друг* or even more intimate, characteristic mainly of the conversational style – *мой дружок* – was often used in communication between adults and children, both with their own and with strangers – cf. the following examples:

“*Паня читал что-то и на вопрос мой “Бывают ли синие зайцы?”, не поднимая головы, отвечал: “Бывают, мой друг, бывают”*” (Толстой, 1986, р. 31).

“*Сонечка улыбнулась, покраснела и сделалась так мила, что я тоже покраснел, глядя на неё.*

– *Надеюсь, ты не будешь скучать у меня, мой дружок, – сказала бабушка, приподняв её личико за подбородок, – прошу же веселиться и танцевать как можно больше. Вот уж и есть одна дама и два кавалера, – прибавила она, обращаясь к 2-же Валахиной и дотрагиваясь до меня рукой*” (Толстой 1986, с. 65).

“*А, ты здесь! – сказала, поворачиваясь в своём кресле, бабушка. – Иди же, мой дружок, иди*” (Толстой, 1986, р. 72);

“– *Нет, друг мой, играй почаще, – сказал он (father) дрожащим от волнения голосом – коли бы ты знала, как мне хорошо поплакать с тобой...*” (Толстой, 1986, р. 158).

Often, in casual everyday communication, when addressing children, adults used informal or clearly subjectively evaluative versions of their personal names: *Катя, Любочка, Николенька* and the like:

“– *Ну, покажи же, Николенька, что у тебя – коробочка или рисование? – сказал мне папа*” (Толстой, 1986, р. 50);

“– *Нет, играй, Люба, играй, – сказал он (father), усаживая её, – ты знаешь, как я люблю тебя слушать...*” (Толстой, 1986, р. 158).

This phrase as a speech-etiquette formula – moreover, a formula of a stable, phraseological nature – is also included in the “Dictionary of Russian speech etiquette”: in the corresponding dictionary entry (“Angel”) this meaning is fixed at number 2: “2. Mostly in combination ♦ **Ангел мой** (♦ **Мой ангел**). ... Affectionate address to a loved one, younger or equal in age, more often to a woman, girl, child (calque from French *mon ange*)” (Балакай, 2001, р. 24). And one cannot but pay attention to the fact that in the corpus of illustrative material of this meaning there is also a text example from one part of the trilogy of Leo Tolstoy we are considering, and it is from the novel “Childhood”: “Бабушка заговорила трогательным, нежным голосом: “*Поди сюда, мой дружок, подойди, мой ангел*” (Балакай, 2001, р. 24).

In Leo Tolstoy’s novel “Childhood,” some other speech-etiquette formulas appear in the communication of adults with children – for example, *мой ангел* – address with a clearly heightened expression, which Madame Valakhin uses to her daughter:

“... я, не смея следовать за ним, подошёл, с любопытством, прислушиваться к тому, что говорила Валахина с дочерью.

– *Ещё полчаса, – убедительно говорила Сонечка.*

– *Право, нельзя, мой ангел.*

– *Ну для меня, пожалуйста – говорила она, ласкаясь*” (Толстой, 1986, р. 74).

The speech-etiquette formulas considered above, which clearly express positive semantics, although inherent in each of their used nominations to a different degree, it seems, can be considered a manifestation of a general process characteristic of the cultural and social process of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and conditioned by the influence of the Western cultural context.

Describing the features of the social cultural situation at the turn of the XVIII<sup>th</sup> and XIX<sup>th</sup> centuries, the famous culturologist and linguist Yu. Lotman notes: “The change in the general style of culture was reflected in the most diverse aspects of life. The desire for “naturalness” primarily influenced the family. ... And gradually the culture includes the idea that a child is a normal person. Children’s clothing appears, a children’s room, the idea that playing is good. Not only a child, but also an adult must be taught by playing. Teaching with the rod is contrary to nature. So, the relationship of humanity, respect for the child is brought into the home life. And this is mainly the merit of women” (Лотман, 1996, p. 53–54).

Sometimes, in the literary and artistic context, speech etiquette formulas that are clearly positive in their initial meaning, addressed by parents to children acquire an obviously ironic or even clearly negative stylistic connotation in L. Tolstoy’s trilogy, being in such situations the means of expression of completely different from those described earlier (in cases of their initial use), feelings and emotions of the speaker. The most illustrative examples of this kind can be considered communication of a grandmother with a grandson and a father with a son in one of the plot components of the novel “Boyhood” (chapters XIV–XVI: “The Retribution”, “Dreams”, “Keep on grinding, and you’ll have flour”), which describes one of the most dramatic moments for the main character of the trilogy, when the whole world around him seems to him extremely hostile, opposed to him. This is how Nicola talks about his state during this period of his life: *“Я не плакал, но что-то тяжёлое, как камень, лежало у меня на сердце. Мысли и представления с усиленной быстротой проходили в моём расстроенном воображении; но воспоминание о несчастье, постигшем меня, беспрестанно прерывало их причудливую цепь, и я снова входил в безысходный лабиринт неизвестности о предстоящей мне участи, отчаяния и страха”* (Толстой, 1986, p. 137). He appeared in such a state of mind after a rather serious conflict with his governor St.-Jérôme, who, despite everyone, reproached his pupil with a bad attitude towards studies and a bad behaviour, and then who took the boy by the hand in order to take him out and thereby punish him, after which Nicola pulled away his hand from the governor and, “with all my childish might” in his own words, struck St. Jérôme.

After a while, a scene with the grandmother, who was completely on the side of St.-Jérôme’a, followed. She demanded an explanation from Nicola about his extremely unworthy, from her point of view, behaviour. When addressing her grandson, she repeatedly uses the speech-etiquette formula *мой милый*, which in its original meaning is focused on the expression of sympathy, disposition of an affectionate and friendly attitude towards the interlocutor – i.e. exclusively for the implementation of the phatic function, accompanied by the expression of positive emotions and feelings of the speaker. However, in this context, this nomination becomes a means of disapproval and censure of a boy for a committed misconduct, a way to emphasize the speaker’s sharp rejection of what the interlocutor has done, which became the reason for the distance from the latter both to the grandmother herself and all adults: *“– Да, мой милый, – сказала она после довольно продолжительного молчания, во время которого она осмотрела меня с головы до ног таким взглядом, что я не знал, куда девать свои глаза и руки, – могу сказать, что вы очень цените мою любовь и составляете для меня истинное утешение. Monsieur St.-Jérôme, который по моей просьбе, – прибавила она, растягивая каждое слово, – взялся за ваше воспитание, не хочет теперь оставаться в моём доме. Отчего? от вас, мой милый. Я надеялась, что вы будете благодарны, – продолжала она, помолчав немного и тоном, который доказывал, что речь её была приготовлена заблаговременно, – за попечение и труды его, что вы будете уметь ценить его заслуги, а вы, молокосос, мальчишка, решились поднять на него руку. Очень хорошо! Прекрасно!! Я тоже начинаю думать, что вы не*

способны понимать благородного обращения, что на вас нужны другие, низкие средства... *Проси сейчас прощения*, – прибавила она строго-повелительным тоном, указывая на *St.-Jérôme'a*, – слышишь?” (Толстой, 1986, p. 141).

In this fragment, in addition to the contextual meaning of the speech-etiquette formula *мой милый*, which is directly opposite to its original meaning, one more feature of communicative interaction deserves research attention: a cardinal change in the register of communication that occurs during the deployment of one, moreover, not very voluminous, monologue replica belonging to grandmother. Having started a conversation with her grandson in an emphatically official tone, which naturally corresponds to communication (especially taking into account the rules of family communication in Russian noble families), by the end of her statement, the grandmother, despite her inherent good manners and ability to control herself in any situations, nevertheless could not fully cope with herself, which was expressed in direct insults to the grandson (*“вы, молокосос, мальчишка”*), as well as in the transition in the final phrase to *ты*-communication, which was very rarely allowed by representatives of her circle: *“Проси сейчас прощения ..., слышишь?”*.

The last slap for Nicola in the series of misfortunes that befell him was communication with his father, who found in his portfolio the castle broken by his son (however, this episode was unidirectional communication – only the father pronounced the words, Nicholas reacted to them with his actions, without answering):

*“– Ты куда? – спросил меня вдруг знакомый голос. – Тебя-то мне и нужно, голубчик.*

*Я хотел было пробежать мимо, но папа схватил меня за руку и строго сказал:*

*– Пойдём-ка со мной, любезный! Как ты смел трогать портфель в моём кабинете, – сказал он, вводя меня за собой в маленькую диванную. – А? что ж ты молчишь? а? – прибавил он, взяв меня за ухо”* (Толстой, 1986, p. 142–143).

In this fragment, we also observe a process similar to the previously considered process of a significant rethinking of the original meaning of two speech etiquette formulas. The address *голубчик* in this case is used with an atypical semantic connotation, which in the “Dictionary of Russian Speech Etiquette” is interpreted as a nomination “with a connotation of censure, threat of malevolence” (Балакай, 2001, p. 107). In the above context from the novel “Boyhood”, the nomination *голубчик* used in the function of address-vocative has quite clear semantic shades of censure and threat.

In general, the same can be stated in relation to the speech-etiquette formula *любезный*, which in its main meaning in the period of time we are considering (in the first half of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century) was used primarily to express a positive attitude towards the interlocutor, although it functioned as stylistically limited nomination (“2. **Любезный. Мой любезный. (Моя любезная.)** ... а) Vernacular. Darling, dear. Affectionate, friendly address to an equal or inferior in position” (Balakay, 2001, p. 243)). In this context, the semantics of this speech-etiquette formula is much closer to another meaning, also marked by the dictionary (although, in our opinion, it does not completely coincide with it): “b) Familiar-indulgent. Address to the lowest in position” (Balakay, 2001, p. 244).

It seems that in the context of the novel “Boyhood”, the analysed nomination *любезный* in its functional significance is largely synonymous with the nomination *голубчик* used in the same fragment, that is, it conveys not so much the condescension and familiarity of the father towards his son, as censure and threat contained in the words of the speaker. Thus, in this case we can talk about the contextual synonymy of speech etiquette formulas, *голубчик* and *любезный*, and in the second case, the formation of shades of meaning can also be observed in the address, which are not recorded by such an authoritative

lexicographic source on the history of Russian research as “Dictionary of Russian speech etiquette”.

Concluding the analysis of the process of communication between adults and children in L. Tolstoy’s trilogy, in particular, the characteristics of the speech-etiquette formulas chosen by the addressees, which are used as vocatives, we note one more feature that was quite typical in the field of noble communicative interaction in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century. This, to adolescents and young men, and even to children of preschool age in this environment it was customary to address by name and patronymic, even by addressees of a much older age than addressees. We observe the use of just this kind of speech-etiquette formula in an episode of communication between old man Grap – father of Ilinka Grap, a friend of Nicola, with the main character of the trilogy (the novel “Youth”, chapter XVII “I get ready to pay some calls”):

*“Я ходил по комнате, оглядывая разложенные на стульях платье, шапку и шляпу, и собирался уже ехать, когда ко мне пришёл старик Грап и привёл с собой Иленьку. ...*

*– Так-то-с, **Николай Петрович**, – говорил мне старик, следуя за мной по комнате, в то время как я одевался, и почтительно медленно вертя между своими толстыми пальцами серебряную, подаренную бабушкой, табакерку, – как только узнал от сына, что вы изволили так отлично выдержать экзамен – ведь ваш ум всем известен – тотчас прибежал поздравить, **батюшка**; ведь я вас на плече носил, и бог видит, что всех вас, как родных, люблю я, и Иленька мой всё просился к вам. Тоже и он привык уж к вам.*

*Иленька в это время сидел молча у окна, рассматривая будто бы мою треугольную шляпу, и чуть заметно что-то бормотал себе под нос.*

*– Ну, а я вас хотел спросить, **Николай Петрович**, – продолжал старик, – как мой-то Илюша, хорошо экзаменовался? Он говорит, что будет с вами вместе с вами, так вы уж его не оставьте, присмотрите за ним, посоветуйте” (Толстой, 1986, р. 215–216).*

In the above fragment, the speech-etiquette formula, created according to the “name + patronymic” model, is used by an elderly person in relation to a young man who has just “stepped over” adolescence. From the context, we can conclude that the interlocutor who turns to him is unpleasant to Nicola: he makes it clear in every possible way, trying to get rid of the unpleasant addressee (walking around the room, dressing, etc. during this “one-sided” communication); nevertheless, the young man does not dare to clearly interrupt the words addressed to him by an interlocutor who is much older than him, equal to him in position in society: the rules of decency cultivated in him in his family do not allow him to do this.

#### **4.2. Speech Etiquette Formulas Used as Vocatives when Addressing Children to their Parents.**

The norms of family communication, established and in most cases strictly observed in Russian noble families of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, certainly included the rules according to which children had to communicate with their parents, including addressing them in a certain way. However, first of all, it should be noted that the basis of children’s attitude to their parents was unconditional respect for them, often turning into reverence, which, of course, did not exclude manifestations of love, tenderness, trust, sincerity and other positive feelings and emotions.

It is precisely this – emphatically positive – attitude towards parents in the overwhelming majority of cases can be clearly traced when addressing the parents of the main characters of two works: Nicolinka (and later – Nicolas, and even Nicolas Petrovitch)

Irteniev from the trilogy by L. Tolstoy, and the boy Sergey from the novel by S. Aksakov "The childhood years of Bagrov-grandson" (the prototype of the future famous Russian writer himself). In this case, special attention should be paid to the first part of Leo Tolstoy's trilogy ("Childhood") – primarily because it is in this work (in its initial part) that events are depicted before one of the most tragic events in children's and the whole human life of the main character – the loss of his mother; during some of the events that take place in this story, Nicola's mother is still alive, and the son has the happy opportunity to communicate directly with his dearest person.

Secondly, in the work "Childhood" Nicola Irteniev is as close as possible in age to the main character of S. Aksakov's story – Sergey, which makes it possible to compare the speech etiquette formulas used by these characters in communicating with their parents according to the most complete set of a list of the social characteristics of these characters; the similarity of the communicative situations in which they communicate, etc.).

Let's consider the range of etiquette formulas that children use when referring to their mothers:

*"Когда карета съехала со двора и пропала из моих глаз, я пришёл в исступленье, бросился с крыльца и побежал догонять карету с криком: **Маменька**, воротись!"* (Аксаков, 1986, p. 274);

*"Она другой рукой берёт меня за шею, и пальчики её быстро шевелятся и щекотят меня. В комнате тихо, полутемно; нервы мои возбуждены щекоткой и пробуждением; **мамаши** сидит подле самого меня; она трогает меня; я слышу её запах и голос. Всё это заставляет меня вскочить, обвить руками её шею, прижать голову к её груди и, задыхаясь, сказать:*

*– Ах, **милая, милая мамаши**, как я тебя люблю!*

*Она улыбается своей грустной, очаровательной улыбкой, берёт обеими руками мою голову, целует меня в лоб и кладёт к себе на колени.*

*– Так ты меня очень любишь? – Она молчит с минуту, потом говорит:*

*– Смотри, всегда люби меня, никогда не забывай. Если не будет твоей мамыши, ты не забудешь её? не забудешь, Николенька?*

*Она ещё нежнее целует меня.*

*– Полно! и не говори этого, **голубчик мой, душечка моя**, – вскрикиваю я, целуя её колени, и слёзы ручьями льются из моих глаз – слёзы любви и восторга" (Толстой, 1986, p. 53).*

At first glance, this is a description of an ordinary life situation that is repeated many times (not only from year to year, but also from century to century) in any family – a mother puts her ten-year-old son to bed, who at the same time is quite a little capricious, with all her might resisting fatigue, in order to extend the time of his presence near the dearest and most beloved person – his mother, even for a minute. However, the writer unusually skilfully verbally embodies in his work the feeling of happiness for the son and mother from the fact that they are together, conveys the love experienced to each other and warmth, which seems to pervade everything happening in this episode. This is proved by the words of an adult Nicolinka, preceding the depiction of this situation in the novel: *"Счастливая, счастливая, невозвратимая пора детства! Как не любить, не лелеять воспоминаний о ней? Воспоминания эти освежают, возвышают мою душу и служат для меня источником лучших наслаждений"* (Толстой, 1986, p. 52).

It seems that there is every reason to assert that in the above fragment, the vocatives used by these literary characters when addressing each other play an essential role in conveying the unusually deep mutual disposition, sincere love of Nicolinka and his mother.

For little Nicolinka, these are such etiquette formulas as: *мамаша*; *милая*, *милая мамаша*; *голубчик мой*, *душечка моя*; for his mother – *Николенька*; *моя душечка*; *мой ангел*.

The cited and other examples from the works analysed demonstrate the range of the addresses most commonly used in noble families by children when communicating with their mothers, including: *маменька*, *мамаша*, often with the preservation of the French *taman* in the source language (the French word *taman*, used several times in this text, in the version in which it exists in the source language, in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century it was extremely often used to address the mother in noble families (the significant influence of French culture on Russian at this time was noted by many researchers)); *голубчик (мой)*; *душечка (моя)*. All these vocatives – with the possible exception of *taman* – carry an obvious positive meaning, since when used in the function of addressing, they not only denote a person dear to children, but also express their attitude towards him: love, tenderness, delight from their presence (cf. ‘*слёзы любви и восторга*’), the desire to constantly be near and so on.

Let's consider each of the etiquette formulas in more detail, taking into account the changes that have occurred in the Russian language from the middle of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century to the present.

The vocative *маменька* was very widely used in the noble families of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century when addressing the mother, which we learn about first of all from literary, artistic and documentary sources created at that time and later. V. Dal in his famous “Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language” gives this word as commonly used, actively functioning: “Мама ... *маменька*, *мамонька*, *-мочка*, *матушка*, *родительница*” (Даль, 1978, p. 307). A detailed commentary on this etiquette formula is contained in the “Dictionary of Russian speech etiquette” by A. Balakay, who also qualifies this nomination from the standpoint of the modern Russian language as stylistically limited and in passive use: “**Маменька**. 1 ... Vernacular. Courtesy or affectionate address of children to their mother. 2.... Vernacular. At the present time – regional. A courteous address to the mother-in-law” (Балакай, 2001, p. 253–254).

The data of modern explanatory dictionaries indicate that in the modern language this etiquette formula, unfortunately, has practically disappeared from “living” use and functions at the present time as stylistically limited – cf., for example, “**Мама...** Vernacular. *Маменька*” (Кузнецов, 1998, p. 518) – and is rarely used when a child addresses his mother.

A similar story is with the etiquette formula *мамаша*, which is also actively used in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century both when referring to the mother and for the nomination of this person – for example, in the earlier fragment from Leo Tolstoy's novel “Childhood” this nomination used in the function of both addressing (in Nicolinka's speech) and designating a person (in his mother's speech). In modern language, as evidenced by the “Dictionary of Russian Speech Etiquette”, when performing the function of address, this designation is perceived only as stylistically marked (regional, or dialectal); both meanings of the noun *мамаша* used in the vocative function (when referring to the mother) are qualified by this dictionary as limited in use: “**Мамаша**. 1.... Vernacular. Currently – regional. Respectful address to the mother. Used more often with *Вы*-forms. 2.... Vernacular. Currently – regional. A courteous address to the mother-in-law” (Балакай, 2001, p. 253).

As follows from the above definition, the nomination *мамаша*, although it is currently used as an address, qualifies as stylistically limited in use. This is confirmed by the explanatory dictionaries of the modern Russian language, for example: “**Мамаша** ... Vernacular. 1. = Мама (usually about smb.'s mother). 2. (usually in the address). About an elderly woman” (Кузнецов, 1998, p. 518).

Thus, the nominations *маменька* and *мамаша* used in the function of addresses, in the semantic volume of which the positive connotative seme is undoubtedly present at the modern stage of language development, for the era described in the works of S. Aksakov and L. Tolstoy were not only common (in any case – in the noble environment), but also largely neutral in stylistic terms. These addresses, as follows from the above, in the process of family communication were always addressed to a specific person – primarily the mother, and in some cases – the mother-in-law, whom, in accordance with patriarchal Russian traditions, the children in the family (in this case, the son-in-law or daughter-in-law) should honour almost as much as their own mother.

Therefore, it can be stated that in the modern Russian language these nominations, including when functioning as addresses, have undergone a very significant stylistic transformation.

Such a transformation of the stylistic characteristics of the analysed addresses, it seems, had a very negative effect in the modern period on their speech-etiquette properties, leading to an almost complete loss of one of the grammatical functions – the commonly used vocative, which was primarily reflected (and, in our opinion, not at all the best way) and on the nature of communication between children and their parents in Russian linguoculture as a whole.

In the above fragment from Leo Tolstoy's story "Childhood", the child in communication with his mother also uses addresses of a wider range of addressing – *голубчик мой* and *душечка моя*, which have significant emotional and expressive potential. Thus, A. Balakay characterizes the nomination for darling as follows: "**Душечка (моя)**, m. and f. Vernacular. The same as Душенька. Affectionate address to a casual friend, relative (mainly to a woman, girl)" (Балакай, 2001, p. 161–162).

Not less expressive potential, judging by the characteristic given in the dictionary of speech etiquette, is also possessed by the address *голубчик*, which in modern Russian is also stylistically limited: "**Голубчик**. ♦**Мой голубчик**. (♦**Голубчик мой**.) Vernacular. Hypocoristic. addressing a relative or close friend (man, woman, child). Often used in conjunction with kinship terms (*дедушка, голубчик; голубчик дедушка*), with the first name, patronymic, last name (*голубчик Машенька; голубчик Иван Васильевич; голубчик Денисов*)" (Балакай, 2001, p. 106).

It is noteworthy that the nomination *голубчик* by noble children could be used in communication not only with the mother, but also with the father; so, in the second part of Leo Tolstoy's trilogy (the novel "Boyhood") in the speech of Lubotshka, Nicola's sister, we find: "– *Ах, бог мой! Ты плачешь!* – вдруг сказала Любочка, выпуская из рук цепочку его часов и уставляя на его лицо свои большие удивлённые глаза. – Прости меня, **голубчик папа**, я совсем забыла, что это мамина пьеса" (Толстой, 1986, p. 158).

It should be noted that in the text the author (L. Tolstoy) emphasizes the phrase *мамина пьеса*. From our point of view, this allows us to regard it as an expression with a special author's accent, acquiring a certain symbolic meaning under the conditions of verbal and artistic discourse. This is due to the fact that the communicative situation depicted in the story develops during Lubotshka's performance on the piano of a piece that her deceased mother often played, which probably prompted the father to become emotional to tears: "Когда, окончив пьесу, Любочка подошла к нему с вопросом: "Хорошо ли?", он молча взял её за голову и стал целовать в лоб с такою нежностью, какой я никогда не видывал от него" (Толстой, 1986, p. 153). This, in turn, probably became the incentive for such a gentle, especially expressive address of Lubotshka to her father, expressed in the speech-etiquette formula *голубчик папа*.

Despite their stylistic limitations, addresses *голубчик* and *душечка* are quite widespread as vocatives in modern society – moreover, as vocative addresses with explicit positive semantics. The data of the dictionary of speech etiquette indicate that in the modern communicative context these addresses continue to function, albeit with a significant change in their functions: as a colloquial nomination used mainly in casual everyday communication.

The main feature of addresses such as *голубчик*, *душечка*, *матушка* (in relation to the last address, we mean those cases when it is used not only in relation to the mother, but in relation to any woman) and the like, first of all, is that they tune the addressee to communication in a certain – usually extremely positive – tone, setting it initially and supporting it throughout the entire communication process. In other words, such addresses regulate the communication process in a special way, creating an emotional context in which the communication participants, the addressee and the addressee act. V. Goldin calls this type of address *regulatory*, noting their etiquette meaning: “they offer the addressees to communicate in a certain tone, observing certain relationships: relationships of people close or distant, equal or unequal, friendly, familiar, respectful, etc.” (Гольдин, 1983, р. 76).

Regulatory addresses form a not very large group among other addresses used in the Russian language. This is quite understandable, since the addresses of this group “are adapted to express only typical, often repeated relationships between people” (Гольдин, 1983, р. 76). Some of the regulatory addresses – among them the considered nomination *голубчик* – are almost never used as names at all; such are, for example, the addresses *дружище*, *старина*, which in our speech mainly perform the functions of vocative addresses. However, the regulatory addresses are of particular value for Russian speech etiquette and for Russian culture in general precisely because they already initially carry a clear emotional charge of a positive nature, which is very important for the successful implementation of the communicative process in almost any communication situation. The use of regulatory addresses by communication participants to a large extent predetermines the success of communication, since it contributes to the creation of an atmosphere of friendliness, respect for the addressee, indicates the desire of the interlocutors to understand each other as fully as possible, respond to requests made, etc.

### 5. Discussion.

For the modern reader, especially when it comes to a non-adult audience, it is, of course, quite difficult to grasp and correctly interpret all the nuances of speech etiquette embodied in classical literature; this requires some preparation. Therefore, from our point of view, an integral part of the work with literary texts similar to the novels of L. Tolstoy, i.e., significantly distant from the modern reader (especially for representatives of the younger generation) in time, of course, should be reliance on a fairly wide social-and-cultural and linguistic-and-cultural context in which such works were created by writers.

Such an approach presupposes an acquaintance of the addressee-reader – at least in general terms – with the social (in a broad sense – social, family, etc.) foundations of the depicted era, its moral and ethical principles and ideals. This, as it seems, will contribute to a relatively adequate perception of the content of the work, that is, closer to the understanding of the author’s intention, which is manifested in numerous details of the text, including the system of speech etiquette modelled in it.

Literary works, recreating the pictures of the life of the past, not only figuratively convey the characteristic features of both everyday and official life of people, but also contain unusually valuable information about the moral and ethical foundations and spiritual originality of the past. The best examples of classical Russian literature provide modern

researchers with opportunities for clarifying, expanding, supplementing the ideas about the presence and norms of a speech-etiquette character in different periods of the existence of the Russian language.

However, it was demonstrated that the material of Russian classical literature, containing information about speech etiquette, can serve as the basis for some conclusions of a theoretical nature – in particular, in relation to the Russian language in its diachronic development.

## 6. Conclusions.

Russian classical literature contains rich, diverse and often unique in its characteristics material about national speech etiquette, which deserves detailed research and systematization from linguistic positions. In particular, in Russian fiction, depicting the life of Russian society in the XIX<sup>th</sup> century, the family communication of the noble and landlord estates is widely and multifaceted: children with parents and parents with children; non-adult family members among themselves.

Analysis of speech etiquette formulas used in communication between parents and children allows us to conclude that, for the most part, they were distinguished by a positive emotional colouring, were focused on expressing love, gratitude, and respect of family members for each other. At the same time, the nominations-vocatives addressed by the children of the mother (*маменька, мамаша* etc.) were distinguished by a special variety, many of which in modern Russian have significantly narrowed the scope of their use.

Speech etiquette formulas used by non-adult members of noble families in communication with each other deserve special research attention: among them, variants of anthroponyms with positive suffixes (in particular, diminutive) predominate: *Николенька, Катенька, Любочка* and other. The use of such variants of full names-anthroponyms in the function of addresses contributed to the creation of a benevolent tone of communicative-speech situations, which, accordingly, increased the efficiency of communication in general.

The prospect of further research is the extrapolation of the results obtained to other periods of the development of the Russian language up to its current state with the involvement of the latest approaches to the study of works of verbal-and-cognitive activity.

## References

- Berns, R. M. *Child, Family, School, Community*. Wadsworth Publishing [in English].
- Gottman, J. M., Katz L. F., Hooven C. (2013). *Meta-emotion: How families communicate emotionally*. Routledge [in English].
- Байкулова, А. Н. (2012). *Неофициальное общение и его разновидности: критерии выделения и реальное функционирование*. Саратов : Наука [in Russian].
- Бондаренко, Е. В. (2010). *Межкультурная семейная коммуникация как особый тип общения*. Дис. ... канд. филол. н. : 10.02.19 Теория языка. Волгоград [in Russian].
- Глазкова, Т. В. (2014). Семья как ценностно-смысловая модель культуры. *Вестник Московского государственного университета культуры и искусств*, 6 (62), 52–56 [in Russian].
- Гольдин, В. Е. (1983). *Речь и этикет*. М. : Просвещение [in Russian].
- Горбачева, Н. Б. (2015). Влияние межпоколенной коммуникации на социализацию молодежи. *Карельский научный журнал*, 1 (10), 111–114 [in Russian].
- Захарова, Г. И. (2009). *Психология семейных отношений*. Челябинск: Изд-во ЮУрГУ [in Russian].
- Звягинцева, В. В. (2011). *Обращение в семейном дискурсе* : дис. ... канд. филол. н. : 10.02.19 Теория языка. Курск [in Russian].
- Кашкин, В. Б. (2013). *Введение в теорию коммуникации*. М. : Флинта [in Russian].
- Леонтович, О. А., Якушева Е. В. (2014). *Понимание – начало согласия: межкультурная семейная коммуникация*. М. : Гнозис [in Russian].

Лотман, Ю. М. (1996). *Беседы о русской культуре: Быт и традиции русского дворянства (18 – начало 19 века)*. СПб. : Искусство [in Russian].

Маслова, В. А. (2001). *Лингвокультурология*. М. : Академия [in Russian].

Рытникова, Я. Т. (1996). *Семейная беседа: обоснование и риторическая интерпретация жанра*. Дис. ... канд. філол. н. : 10.02.01 Русский язык. Екатеринбург [in Russian].

Салихова, Э. А., Нилова, К. В. (2016). *Интразона семейной коммуникации: социопсихолингвистический аспект*. Лондон : IASHE [in Russian].

Формановская, Н. И. (2007). *Речевое взаимодействие: коммуникация и прагматика*. М. : Икар [in Russian].

### *Lexicographic Sources*

Балакай, А. Г. (2011). *Словарь русского речевого этикета*. М. : АСТ-ПРЕСС [in Russian].

Даль, В. И. (1979). *Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка*. В 4 т. Т. 2. М. : Русский язык [in Russian].

Кузнецов, С. А. (сост. и гл. ред.). (1998). *Большой толковый словарь русского языка*. СПб. : Норинт [in Russian].

### *Sources of Illustrative Material*

Аксаков, С. Т. (1986). *Семейная хроника; Детские годы Багрова-внука; Стихотворения*. М. : Художественная литература [in Russian].

Толстой, Л. Н. (1986). *Детство; Отрочество; Юность*. М. : Художественная литература, 1986 [in Russian].

### **Бібліографічний опис:**

Біньбінь, Ш. (2021). Етикетні вокативи в сімейному спілкуванні російського дворянства у XIX-ому столітті. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 22. 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2021.22.01>.

### **Анотація**

Стаття є аналітичним узагальненням з позицій новітнього лінгвістичного знання – лінгвістичної прагматики та лінгвокультурології – вокативів як мовленнєвих етикетних формул, що функціонують у російській класичній прозі XIX-го століття. У статті зроблено спробу комплексного вивчення такого компонента комунікативно-мовленнєвої взаємодії в умовах сім'ї, як вокатив, або звертання: ця категорія розглянута не тільки як така, що виконує в процесі спілкування низку найважливіших функцій, а й задає певну “схему” розгортання всьому комунікативному процесу, а також суттєво впливає на тональність останнього.

Вокативи як компоненти процесу мовленнєвої комунікації розглядаються як формули мовленнєвого етикету, що дозволяє враховувати не тільки власне лінгвістичні характеристики аналізованої категорії, але й вкрай важливі семантичні припоєнення соціальної, культурної та іншої екстралінгвістичної властивості. Проаналізовані фрагменти художніх творів дозволили автору продемонструвати, що у дворянському середовищі спілкуванню батьків із дітьми відводилося особливе місце у сімейній комунікації. Використані в цьому випадку вокативи практично завжди мають виражену позитивну емоційно-експресивну забарвленість, що також сприяє формуванню відповідної тональності спілкування: тональності кохання, ніжності, довірливості тощо.

**Ключові слова:** вокатив, звертання, мовленнєвий етикет, сімейна комунікація, мовленнєво-етикетна формула.