

**“FAMILY” AS A CULTURAL NOTION AND ITS VERBALIZATION IN ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN FICTION**

*Elza V. Garipova*

*Kazan Federal University*

*Roza A. Ayupova*

*Kazan Federal University*

*Elena M. Markova*

*Moscow Region State University*

*elsa.gar@yandex.ru*

**Abstract.** The paper is a part of the research analyzing methods of verbalizing the social and cultural notion “family” in the works “War and peace” by a well-known Russian writer Leo Tolstoy and “The man of property” by a prominent British writer John Galsworthy. The whole research is much broader studying the use of words denoting various family relationships in these two works; in this paper we do not go further than comparing the use of the word “family” and detecting the methods of realizing ameliorative and pejorative emotional attitudes to the notion “family” when using this word. As the result of the given level of our research we draw the conclusion about the linguistic means enabling to realize positive and negative connotative components of the meaning of the word “family” used in combination with it. Also the images of the families in the British and Russian works depicted by the analyzed linguistic units are compared.

**Key words:** cultural notion, social notion, verbalization, stylistic devices, ameliorative emotiveness, pejorative emotiveness.

**1. Introduction.** Universal Declaration of Human Rights defines family as "the natural and fundamental group unit of society" [1].

There are several definitions of the term family suggested by scholars working in the field of sociology in Russia; most of them reflect the essence of traditional family. For example, A.G. Kharchev's definition underscores that family is characterized by historically settled system of relationships between spouses, parents and children [2, p. 75].

Intercultural communication studies based on the opinions of such scholars as H. Freeman, M. Showel (2010), M. Kohn (1963) D.A. Sharmanjiev (2016), Murdock G.P. (1949) etc. recognizes the family as one of the three agents of socialization process [3], [4], [5], [6].

Researches in comparative studies of the English and Russian languages emphasize the existence of differences between them related to the cultures. D.N. Davletbaeva, A.M. Ivanova and Yu.A. Kozlova write about English and Russian “phraseological units possessing cultural component” of meaning among others [7, p. 353]. Similar conclusion is made by V.L. Gataullina, R.N. Salieva, U.V. Aslanova on the basis of studying English and Russian phraseological units with the component denoting family relations [8, p. 2603]. Kulkova M.A., Rakhimova A.E., Zinecker T. [9, p. 299] write about cultural component of linguistic units on the level of German and Russian paroemiology.

Current paper analyzes means of verbalizing the social and cultural notion ‘family’ in the works “The man of property” by John Galsworthy and “War and peace” by Leo Tolstoy. Galsworthy's work describes the life of the Forsytes' family beginning approximately from the middle of the 19th century. Tolstoy's novel gives account of events related to the war between France and Russia starting in 1812. “The man of property”, as the whole trilogy “The Forsyte Saga”, is about one well-off noble British family, while as “War and peace” is about the aforementioned war and its impact on the lives of several well-off noble Russian families. Therefore we find that comparative study of picturing the family as a unit of society in these works can provide useful information related to this facet of British and Russian cultures.

Though family relations are central to both the novels, there are not so many scholarly works devoted to analyzing them from this viewpoint. Ye. Yevdokimova [10] states, in her dissertation, negative or positive views of Tolstoy connected with Christianity are revealed when describing family relations. Contemporary philologists (Shilnikova) underscore dominance of the value of property over the value of family relations in this work by John Galsworthy [11].

Moreover modern literature studies admit the importance of comparative analysis of fiction works of different languages, V.R. Amineva calls this process ‘interliterature dialogues’ [12, p. 248].

**2. Methods.** Achieving the goal of our research requires scrupulous comparative analysis of the texts of the works under study. As far as comparative analysis takes place on various levels, it presupposes conducting the following methods of analysis:

1. Method of discourse analysis, which enables us single out stylistic devices utilized in each context.
2. Method of semantic analysis, which helps to identify the exact meaning of a linguistic unit realized in each particular discourse.
3. Method of componential analysis, to comprehend all components of meaning a linguistic unit realizes within a definite context.

4. Statistic method is utilized to find out the frequency of some linguistic units use in the abovementioned texts.

5. Descriptive method is applied to describe the process and results of our research on the given level.

### 3. Results And Discussion.

**3.1 The notion “family” verbalized by Galsworthy.** Family bonds are called by John Galsworthy a “tribal instinct” that was even in Victorian era “the prime force”, and that “family and the sense of home and property counted as they do to this day”. These words sound as a firm conviction of the writer that the family had always been of great importance in the British society.

The Forsytes, as they think, are really a very important unit of England and London, as they are a big, powerful and well-off family. Moreover, they are united by the idea of being a force as a family, which is very clearly seen from the description of two vital events when the Forsytes come together. The first one is Old Jolyon’s granddaughter June and Mr. Philip Bosinney’s engagement. As the fiancé was a person with no appropriate income that was something bizarre for this family with specific “sense of property” they all gathered in Old Jolyon’s house. The Forsytes’ opinion about this personage is expressed by the following metaphor: “strange and unsafe thing”. The second time the Forsytes were brought together by the grief of losing Aunt Ann, the eldest of the Forsyte sisters.

In general the feature of the Forsytes’ family being united is depicted by the author as their positive characteristics, which is achieved with the help of various stylistic devices. Though he uses the metaphor “tribal instinct” speaking about the characteristics of the family mentioned above, Galsworthy combines this trope with the word combinations “sense of home”, “sense of property” and personification “in the bravery of light gloves, buff waistcoats, feathers and frocks”, metaphor “put a burnish on their armour”, where the tropes describe expensive and beautiful clothes of the family members matching their status, Bosinney being absolutely indifferent to his outfit. It is the same function of expressing ameliorative emotiveness towards the family as a united entity, that the metaphors “the very hall-mark and guarantee of the family fortunes” denoting 5 Forsyte brothers, “had a stake in the family soul” (about each member of the family).

The older generation of the Forsytes are portrayed as trustworthy and solid people. For example, the author calls old Jolyon “the head of the family”, “the figurehead of his family”. These metaphors alongside with the epithet “white” (with his white head) and simile “dome-like forehead” used when describing this personage add to the same trait of his character. The epithets in the word combinations “inflexible back, and the dignity of her calm face”, the metaphor “backwater of the family energy” depicting another representative of this generation – Aunt Hester and the epithets “straight-backed”, “strong” about Aunt Ann should also be mentioned here. “The spirit” of Aunt Ann even when she was “lying in her last sleep had called the family to demonstrate their “tenacious unity” and “that law of property underlying the growth of their tree, by which it had thriven and spread, trunk and branches, the sap flowing through all, the full growth”. In this example one can observe the use very bright stylistic devices: the epithet “tenacious” and extended metaphor comparing the Forsytes’ family with a powerful tree in full growth.

J. Galsworthy underscores the fact of this generation of the Forsytes being very mindful and caring for the younger generation. This is evidenced by such tropes as the simile “the family she had watched like a mother”, metaphors “the spirit of the old woman ...had called”, “saw only her (Aunt Ann) own flesh and blood” (looking at her family).

The older generation of the Forsytes looked at the younger ones as their property, which is expressed by excessive use of possessive pronouns. So, for Aunt Ann “it was her world, this family” everything taking place in this family “was her property, her delight, her life”; old Jolyon calls the Forsytes “my people”. Moreover they took even Mr. Bosinney, the person who just is engaged to old Jolyon’s granddaughter, “as belonging to the family”.

Being a noble family the Forsytes scrupulously preserve the family traditions. The following three short sentences seem to be very simple from linguistic viewpoint: “Family dinners of the Forsytes observe certain traditions. There are, for instance, no hors d’oeuvre. The reason for this is unknown”. But we see symbolic meaning in these sentences; it is about the family having their own traditions and remaining faithful to them by all means, though sometimes being not conscious of the origin of the tradition.

One more feature of this family is its tenacity. This noun and its derivatives “tenacious”, “tenaciously” are used 16 times in this book, each time in combination with the words “family”, “the Forsytes” or the name of the most typical representatives of the family, e.g.: Soames, old Jolyon.

The Forsytes are portrayed as a family with a peculiar “sense of property”, here one should mention an extremely bright metaphor “Forsytes ...have shells”, followed by the hyperbole “they are never seen, or if seen would not be recognized, without habitats, composed of circumstance, property, acquaintances, and wives”. Everything mentioned in this example are viewed by a Forsyte as property. It is symbolic the word “property” is part of the title and it is used 79 times in the text under analysis.

The language used by J. Galsworthy depicting such a trait of the Forsytes as their passion to discuss various rumours about other members of the family is really admirable due to the bright metaphors, e.g.: “the mist of family gossip”, “family secrets were bartered”, “the family tongues buzzing in his ears”, etc.

**3.2 Verbalization of the notion “family by Leo Tolstoy.** Leo Tolstoy’s work describes the life of several noble families representing mostly the upper class of the Russian society, which can be seen from concise dwelling of the author on the backgrounds of these families. The writer provides this information about the Bolkonskiis when depicting their family portrait, where he uses the epithet “владельческий” denoting “possessing inherited power”. This

word is used when characterizing one of the ancestors of the Bolkonskiis. Tolstoy combines this trope with an allusion “Рюрик” (Ryurik) – a well-known historic figure in Russia, from whom many prince families originated. One more epithet “известный” (well-known) is utilized in combination with the name “prince Bolkonskii” and mentioning that he had a nick name “Prussian king”. Though originating from such a noble family the old prince Bolkonskii has a disgusting character that is very clearly seen from his attitude to his daughter Maria, whom he treats unfairly.

One more personage, representing the older generation of upper class families is introduced with the help of a bright epithet знаменитый (prominent). He is Graph Cirill Vladimirovich Bezukhii who possesses even higher title – “вельможа” and his reputation is very contradictory, as he has so many illegitimate children, which is expressed by the hyperbole “Детям своим он и счет потерял” (Does not remember the number of his children).

Graph Rostov is portrayed as an affectionate father, caring head of his family and merciful person.

We can observe mostly ameliorative emotive attitude towards the family as a cultural and social notion being expressed in the work “War and peace” by Leo Tolstoy. This is achieved, firstly, by combining the word “семья” (family) with such words as “любовь” (love), “забота” (care), “счастье” (happiness). Secondly, the author provides description of such scenes of family life where really affectionate attitude of family members to each other is demonstrated. Such scenes witness also about the unity of the family, for example, when the Rostovs were giving a ball, the head of the family and his wife were sitting at the opposite ends of the table, their children being in the middle. We find this order of arranging the family has a symbolic meaning. One more example is about the graph kissing his wife under the music beginning to play.

Here one should give the example of very frequent use of diminutive suffix with the names and other words in this function, e.g.: “графинюшка”, “матушка”, “доченька”, etc.

What concerns the relationship between the older and younger generations, it is also different in various families. The Rostovs parents and children communicate with real sincerity playing, joking with each other. The father uses such a metaphor, speaking about his beloved daughter Natasha, as “попox” (gunpowder) and the epithet “славные” (glorious) about his children. We come across one more metaphor “заливаться смехом” (break into laughter) the author uses describing Natasha’s laugh at her father’s dancing during her birthday party. Though it is a dead metaphor it sounds quite interesting.

Throughout the book a reader feels the parents’ love for their children and caring about them in this family. At least one trope picturing it should be mentioned here: it is about symbolic disappearance of sun beams as it seemed to the mother when her children left the room.

Being in the family children do not pay much attention to the warmth, love they get from their parents, appearing far from home, in a difficult situation they recall this entire atmosphere. It is very vividly expressed in the description of the scene, when Nikolay Rostov is lying wounded after the battle, where the words “дом” (home) and “семья” (family) are given in combination with the words “тепло” (warm), “светло” (light), “забота” (care), “любовь” (love).

Unfortunately, the relationship between old Prince Bolkonskii and his daughter are quite different, where the father is very rude to Duchess Maria. Writing about the thoughts of this personage about his daughter Tolstoy uses such epithets as “неуклюжа” (awkward) and “дурна” (ugly). He is not grateful to his daughter even for sacrificing her private life for his sake – refusing to marry and remaining with him.

These noble families are fond of gossiping about each other which is expressed by the hyperbole used by one of the personages “в Москве больше делать нечего, как сплетничать” (literally: there is nothing to do in Moscow than gossiping).

**4. Summary.** Verbalizing the notion “family” J. Galsworthy uses the word “family” 109 times. In 44 cases the word realizes ameliorative emotional attitude to this notion; in 21 cases – pejorative emotional attitude and in 44 cases – neutral one.

In “War and peace” by Leo Tolstoy a reader comes across the word “семья” (family) only 15 times. In 7 sentences it expresses positive attitude towards this unity, in 4 sentences – neutral and in 4 sentences negative one.

Mostly the aforementioned word is used in combination with various stylistic devices among which one can find epithets, similes, hyperboles, personifications and reiteration of some words. One of the most frequent tropes in both the works under analysis is metaphor, including dead and extended ones.

Expressing ameliorative or pejorative emotive attitude to the notion “family” both the authors combine the word denoting it with words having positive or negative connotative meaning; it also concerns reiteration of various words; as to the metaphor, inanimate object as the source domain enables to realize pejorative emotiveness of the word “family”, provided the source domain does not express something valued in the given society. Personification proves to result in positive emotiveness of the word used in combination with it.

**5. Conclusions.** In our opinion the difference in the frequency of the use of the words “family” in “The man of property” (109 times) and “семья” in “War and peace” (15 times) is related to the peculiarities of the novel, the first one being devoted to the family of the Forsytes, the second one – to the war between Russia and France and its impact to the life of the upper class families.

Galsworthy portrays “family” as a formidable unit of society, or society “in miniature” with its stable traditions, where the older generation tries to control that the family remains faithful to them. On this stage of our research we can assume that the conclusion about the traditions in the British family can be referred to the cultural level. The family reveals a number of positive and negative characteristics, some of them remaining debatable.

In Tolstoy's work there is no image of one particular family; several families introduced in the work are given various characterizations, some having more positive features than others. Alongside with the negative characteristics of the family the emphasis is made on warm and sincere relationships observed between members of some families, which can be referred to cultural peculiarities of Russian families.

**6. Acknowledgements.** The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

#### References

1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, URL: [http://www.un.org/en/udhrbook/pdf/udhr\\_booklet\\_en\\_web.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/udhrbook/pdf/udhr_booklet_en_web.pdf)
2. Matandare, M. A. (2018). Botswana Unemployment Rate Trends by Gender: Relative Analysis with Upper Middle Income Southern African Countries (2000-2016). *Dutch Journal of Finance and Management*, 2(2), 04. <https://doi.org/10.20897/djfm/3837>
3. Freeman H., Showel M., "The Role of the Family in the Socialization Process", *The Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 37, №1, pp. 97-101, 2010.
4. Kohn, M. L. "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships: An Interpretation", *Academic Journal of Sociology*, vol. 68, №8, pp. 471-480, 1963.
5. D.A. Sharmanjiev, "The definition of the notion "family" in social-philosophical research", *Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i juridicheskie nauki, kul'turologija i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki Tambov: Gramota*, vol. 12(74), №3, pp. 209-211, 2016.
6. Laamena, C. M., Nusantara, T., Irawan, E. B., & Muksar, M. (2018). How do the Undergraduate Students Use an Example in Mathematical Proof Construction: A Study based on Argumentation and Proving Activity. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(3), 185-198..
7. Davletbaeva D.N., Ivanova A.M., Kozlova Y.A., "Psycholinguistic criteria for understanding phraseological units", *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 6 (4S2), pp. 353-358, 2015.
8. Gataullina Veronika L., Salieva Rimma N., Aslanova Ulduz V., "The use of phraseological units with components denoting family relationships in mass media in English and Russian languages", *Quid-Investigation Ciencia y Tecnologia*, vol. 1, №1, pp. 2598-2603, 2017.
9. Kulkova M.A., Rakhimova A.E., Zinecker T., "Hermeneutical analysis of paroemiological texts with semantics of permission", *Journal of Language and Literature*, vol. 6, №1, pp. 297-300, 2015.
10. Romero, Juan Bautista Abello, and Claudio Mancilla. "Análisis multi-teórico de los gobiernos corporativos universitarios sobre la divulgación de información." *Opción* 34.86 (2018): 358-392.
11. Shilnikova I.S.. "Linguistic cultural type of The man of property's value of family: on the base of the works by John Galsworthy", *Simvol nauki*, vol. 1, pp. 117-120, 2016.
12. Amineva V.R., "Phenomenon of border in interliterary dialogues", *Journal of Language and Literature*, vol. 6, №2, pp. 246-249, 2015.
- 13.