THOUGHT IN THOUGHT IN A DIEGETIC MINIMALIST NARRATIVE

Abstract. Diegetic narrative is a general linguistic phenomenon, which together with other types and modifications forms a system of language for the transmission of information, thoughts, expressions of will, states, feelings of the characters. Analysis of the thoughts of the characters in the novels of M. Drebble helps to solve certain problems.
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Elaboration of the concept of communicative structure of M. Drebble's novels requires special attention to the figure of the producer of the text, the author of the work of art, which determines not only the plot and fate of her characters, but also the form of this information. At the same time, the author “manifests” herself differently in the text of her novels, she can directly enter into a dialogue with the reader or try to play the role of an impartial observer, she can associate herself with one of the characters more than with others, and so on.

First of all, “the language thinking of the character, as well as his image in general, in the reader's perception is a fact or process of objective reality, which is realized through artistic means” [4, p. 453–468]. Secondly, the mental and verbal activity of the characters, verbalized by a system of textual elements, is a reflection of their characteristic features. Moreover, the linguistic thinking of the character in the text is perceived by the reader as reliable information, as a kind of artifact that reflects in the form of mental-speech activity of the character's intentions, thoughts, worldview, views and linguistic experience [1].

According to M. Mylykh, “the discourse zone of a character is a discourse layer
introduced into the narrator's narration, i.e. into the narrator's discourse plan, which is the background for the character register and formally correlates with it, because it is the narrator who combines heterogeneous verbal elements into a single whole and leaves an imprint on the whole work” [9, p. 13]. A characteristic feature of the types of personal discourse is that they are (in the way of their expression) the forms of reproduced thought-speech acts, in contrast to the discourse of the narrator, which is actual speech manifested by the corresponding speech act.

If the narrator's discourse is implied in the creation of the composition, revealing the situation from the outside in its temporal-spatial and causal correlations with the events of the plot, the character discourse reveals artistic events from within, filling them with individual psychological and emotional impulses (if character discourse is a colloquial language and internal thought processes).

The components of the structure that introduce thought in thought into the discourse zone of the character perform the task of realizing the factors and conditions of the actual thought-speech process, revealing the communicative direction, illocutionary power of the thought-speech act, and perlocutionary effect [3]. They differ in the ways of representation of personal discourse (with components of thought in thought in it) - with a focus on the product or reception of linguistic thinking, with the neutralization of subject-object structure in the surface structure of the text, performing pictorial and evaluative-characteristic functions in application situations [8, c. 74-75].

The characteristic of thought in thought in the text space of M. Drebble's novels is expressed not only through the prism of inner speech in the form of thought processes, we also observe the location of thought in thought in various speech forms, in the view of their contaminating nature in artistic texts and the abrupt nature of the narrative, which are inherent in the personal speech in the texts of the writer's novels [11].

Reproduction of language thinking in the works of M. Drebble plays an important role in the diegetic (in-universe) minimalist narrative, because the writer often resorts to methods of psychologization [7, p. 69–73; 12, c. 218–221] and creating polyphony of the text. For example, she often uses direct speech with
thought in thought impregnation into it without a representative component as a mechanism that slows down the identification of communicators for as long as possible. For example:

1. “‘Still going out with Joe, Rosie?’
   ‘I’m still seeing him. Do stop calling me Rosie, who gave you that idea? You couldn’t have come up with it on your own!’
   ‘Lydia. She called you Rosie just now.’
   ‘She likes diminishing people. I’m sure it makes her feel better, doesn’t it, Lyd?’”[2]

   “I almost felt that I might abandon the whole project and go to bed instead, or cook myself some bacon and eggs, or listen to the radio: but I knew that I would have to go through it, having once felt that I might, and regardless of its possible effectiveness. I wondered if it would be so unpleasant, and I could not let myself off. So I picked up the bottle and carried it into my bedroom where I undressed and put on my dressing gown.”[2]

In the example passage 1 thought in thought is expressed in the direct speech, which is used without representative component, which allows to briefly understand the thoughts of the character, but fully rely on them and the reader cannot trust them, because they are explicated, expressed in the act of communicating with another character and therefore lose authenticity (often expressed opinions are not true, because people tend to think one thing and say another).

In the example fragment 2, where thought in thought is verbalized in indirect speech, the reproduction of the character's thoughts through verbs to know, to wonder, to feel and modal verbs might, would help to reveal the character's view as if from within. The character's opinion is not voiced to the public (is implied), and the reader is more likely to perceive it as credible.

In this way, M. Drebble combines direct and indirect speech, influencing the perception of the thought-speech act by the reader, to some extent manipulates their perception of a character.

During the analysis of M. Drebble's novels, we noticed that the most common
method of verbalization of thought in thought in personal speech are internal reflections and the flow of consciousness. And the most expedient form of “glorification” of thought in thought is an internal monologue. Moreover, the reader perceives them as true and authentic, because they do not express certain demonstrative acts in the process of communication, but reveal the inner world of the character during reflection and conversation with themselves. Example:

1. “And I, hearing it, knew that I had from the first expected to hear it, for what did telegrams mean but death? Not, in her family, births or greetings or weddings or events or excitements, but death itself, quite simply so. Nothing else was worth so extravagant a gesture, so expensive an announcement.” [2] (inner reflections)

2. “Anything, anything would make death tolerable, anything that could admit something for the grand somewhere, and not this small, cramped sitting room, this domestic duplicity, this pouring of cups of tea, these harshly unaltered faces. One tear would have sufficed her, one murmur of regret, but there was nothing; the family were not even in mourning, for they found the wearing of mourning a false and hypocritical extravagance. Oh, there’s no doubt they would aamit nothing; they sat there like stones, and their one aim was to sit there like stones, so that no one could tell if they care or did not care, so that there should be no difference between caring and not caring.” [2] (stream of consciousness)

3. “I’m not leaving him because I don’t want him, but because I do, and because it will prove that I do, because he will know that I want himso much that for his sake I have made myself able to leave this room, for him I have left him, and when I want, I prepare myself most endlessly to leave. For to renounce is to value.” [2] (inner monologue)

In fact, thought in thought is presented in the forms of indirect speech, is an example of speech diffusion of different points of view, different presentation strategies, mutual speech influence of discourse spheres of narrator and characters, contamination of subject-author perspectives and plans. The above passages serve as an example of subject-speech contamination of the narrator and the character, because these forms of inner speech allow different levels of their merging and interaction, which provides ample opportunities to combine extranarative and
intraphersonal plot construction, subjective and objective.

As for the discourse markers that indicate thought in thought (thoughts of the character in the construction of indirect speech), they include different lexical units: lexical combinations, phrasal adverbs, exclamations, verbs, prepositional syntagms, phrases, modal and introductory-modal words or expressions, communicative impregnation.

The use of discourse markers in the narrative is related to the author's intention to depict colloquial language. Therefore, the thought in thought introduces primarily discourse markers, the most common in colloquial speech. They play an important role in ensuring the coherence of thought in thought’s statements, pointing out to the reader the character's experiences, his reaction to the external situation or the course of the character's thoughts.

Discourse markers facilitate the perception of the text [10, p. 90-92], allowing to distinguish the voice of the character, despite the transposition of personal verb and pronoun forms and the possible change of the time plan by type of indirect speech. In a monologue thought in thought, discourse markers can function as a means of organizing feedback: signaling the character's attention to a previous thought or statement, to the general course of thought, and most often they are a replica of the character's own words or thoughts. Example:

“‘And that which should accompany old age, as honor, love, obedience, troops of friends, I must not look to have... I must not look to have! What comfort would they be to me: honor, love, obedience and troops of friends: as night fell?’ those were the words that an elderly Italian woman, an old crone who swept the chairs, had uttered to Fran when she was working as an au pair girl in Florence, a hundred years ago. ‘La note e vicina per me, but old age has its comforts, its recognitions.’” [2]

In the above example, an older female character seeks to convince another character, and most importantly - themselves, that older age has its charms and advantages. To express the conversational speech of this woman and the depth of her experiences, M. Drebble quotes Shakespeare's “Macbeth” in her statement / opinion (quoting or referring to the words of famous people interests the reader and
motivates to in-depth understanding of the communicative situation) [5, p. 410–418] (And that which should accompany old age, as honor, love, obedience, troops of friends, I must not look to have) and then by repetition (I must not look to have... I must not look to have!) the writer emphasizes the character's desire to convince herself that she, in fact, does not believe, even afraid to admit to herself. The expressiveness of the statement is also given by a rhetorical question, to which it really does not seek to find answers (What comfort would they be to me: honor, love, obedience and troops of friends: as night fell?), which enhances the reader's reaction and their desire to realize the tragedy of the situation. We observe that the parcelling and connecting constructions in the thought in thought segment the text into intonation-semantic segments and create the effect of ease of linguistic thinking and the natural flow of the character's thought. Repetitions in thought in thought are another formal technique that performs the function of selection and indicates the voice of the character. In thought in thought, interrogative repetitions are common, which are a reaction to interrogative-stimulus cues transmitted by direct speech. Since the construction of the thought in thought expresses the thoughts of the character, not his speech, the emergence of clarifying questions-reactions is quite natural. Replicas caused by the statement convey the emotional state of the character, his doubts and experiences.

As for the syntactic structure of thought in thought, in the narrative of texts of postmodernist novels by M. Drebble it is represented by constructions of expressive syntax typical for conversational discourse, which indicate the introduction of the character's voice into the narrative “these are intonationally marked and distinguishing constructions, elliptical, parceled and connecting constructions, repetitions and infinitive sentences” [6, p. 18-19].

The clearest constructions of expressive syntax for the reader are graphically selected questions (What comfort would they be to me: honor, love, obedience and troops of friends: as night fell?), exclamations (I must not look to have!) and unfinished statements. They indicate the expression of thinking of the character itself. The syntactic structure of thought in thought depends on the communicative orientation of the character's expression.
The desire of the character to know the truth, to understand this or that situation determines the widespread use of interrogative constructions in the constructions of thought in thought. Highlighted, stressed constructions in thought in thought, like spontaneous spoken language, draw the reader's attention to the informatively significant component of the message, obscuring everything that is not of paramount importance.

Elimination of any parts of the sentence in thought in thought involves switching the reader's attention to the component of expression that the author actualizes in the language of the character. In elliptical sentences, thought in thought usually omits those parts that are not relevant because of their contextual obviousness. The fragmentary and structural blurring of the elliptical structures introduced into thought in thought allows the author, without breaking away from his own narrative, to convey the spontaneity of the character's expression.

The various semantic shades of infinitives (I must not look to have, What comfort would they be to me?) express a wide range of emotions of the subject, approximate thought in thought with direct speech and indicate to the reader the appearance of the character's voice in the narrative. Thought in thought is dominated by reflexive infinitive sentences, framed in the form of a question, and these questions are in most cases rhetorical, i.e. addressed by the characters to themselves.
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