

Karadeniz Uluslararası Bilimsel Dergi

Volume: 53, Spring-2022, p. (82-95)

ISSN: 1308-6200 **DOI Number:** <https://doi.org/10.17498/kdeniz.1076019>

Research Article

Received: Feb 19, 2022 | **Accepted:** Mar 4, 2022

This article has been checked for plagiarism.

**ARTISTIC TEXT AS A STATEMENT
(ON EXAMPLE OF THE A.P. CHEKHOV STORY “WARD № 6”)**

**BİR İFADE OLARAK EDEBİ METİN
(ÇEHOV’UN “6 NUMARALI KOĞUŞ” ÖYKÜSÜNDE ALINAN
MATERYALE DAYANARAK)**

**ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННЫЙ ТЕКСТ КАК ВЫСКАЗЫВАНИЕ
(НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ ПОВЕСТИ А. П. ЧЕХОВА «ПАЛАТА № 6»)**

Shalala RAMAZANOVA*

ABSTRACT

Anton Pavlovich Chekhov is a world famous Russian play and short story writer and one of the greatest writers in history. The article reviews one of the most famous Chekhov’s stories “Ward № 6”. The article describes the method of analysis of the text taking into account the internal dynamics of the construction of statements and their inclusion in the chain of communication in the practice of interactive teaching Turkish students of the Russian language in an extralinguistic environment.

The text of Chekhov’s story “Ward № 6” is considered as an appeal to the reader and a message to the addressee from whom a response is expected in the form of assessment, criticism, sympathy or objection.

Three types of utterances constructing the text are studied and analyzed: author monologue speech, direct speech of the characters and their dialogs. The individuality of the speech subject, that is the author of the story, his style, worldview, the idea of the work as well as various forms of transferring the speech of the characters in relation to the author’s speech is revealed. The role of the landscape sketch is analyzed as a reference to the time of year, month, time of day, weather, scene of action, from which the description of the development of the story’s plot begins as well as a marker of the emotional state of the character.

Analysis of the text of Chekhov’s story “Ward № 6” was made with Turkish students as part of an interactive teaching of Russian as a foreign language in comparative literature. Analysis of the text including the difficulties of perceiving a foreign language text allows to conclude that the strategy of reading and understanding Russian literature texts involves a conscious approach to those speech means that are used by the writer in the process of

* ORCID: [0000-0002-3252-6504](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3252-6504), Dr. Öğr.Üyesi, Ardahan Üniversitesi İnsani Bilimler ve Edebiyat Fakültesi, Rus Dili ve Edebiyat Bölümü, shramazan18@gmail.com

Artistic Text as A Statement (ON EXAMPLE OF THE A.P. CHEKHOV...)

compiling the text as a complex statement that poses essential questions to readers, to which each of them will have to find their own individual answer.

Key words: literary text, utterance, monologue speech, dialogical speech, author's speech, direct speech

ÖZET

Çalışmada dünyaca ünlü Rus oyun ve kısa öykü yazarı olarak tanınmış ve alanında haklı bir şöhrete ulaşmış yazarlar arasında sayılan Anton Pavloviç Çehov'un tanınmış öyküsü "6 Numaralı Koğuş" ele alınmıştır. Çalışmada anlatının inşasının içsel dinamiklerini dikkate alarak ve bunları iletişim silsilesine dahil ederek, yabancı dil ortamında Türk öğrencilere Rus dilinin etkileşimli öğrenme pratiğinde edebi metni analiz etme metodolojisi uygulanmıştır.

Anton Pavloviç Çehov'un "6 Numaralı Koğuş" adlı öyküsü, okuyucuya bir hitap, muhabata bir çağrı, değerlendirme, eleştiri, empati ya da muhalefet açısından bir yanıt vermesi beklenen muhabata bir mesaj olarak kabul edilmektedir. Çalışmada metni oluşturan üç tür ifade incelenmiştir; yazarın monolog konuşması, karakterlerin dolaylı konuşması ve karşılıklı konuşmalarıdır. Yazar, eserde, konuşma konusunun bireyselliğini; hikaye yazarının tarzı, dünya görüşü, eserin olay örgüsünün peripeteia'sı, yazarın konuşmasına göre karakterlerin konuşmasının farklı aktarım biçimlerini ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Ayrıca çalışmamızda tasvirlerin rolü aracılığıyla; yılın ayı, günün saatinin, havanın, eylem sahnesinin yanı sıra bir işaretleyici olarak eserin olay örgüsünün peripeteia'si ve karakterin duygusal durumunun bir göstergesi olarak analiz edilmektedir.

Çalışma konusu, karakterler arasında olduğu kadar yazar ve okuyucular arasında da bir iletişim aracı olarak hikaye metninde yer alan ifade türleridir.

Burada, Anton Pavloviç Çehov'un "6 Numaralı Koğuş" adlı öyküsünün metin analizi, yabancı dil olarak Rusça'nın etkileşimli öğretiminin bir parçası olarak Türk öğrencilerle birlikte karşılaştırmalı edebiyat dersinde yürütüldü. Yabancı bir dil metnini algılamanın tüm zorluklarını hesaba katarak metnin analizi, Rus edebi metinlerini okuma ve anlama stratejisinin bilinçli bir yaklaşım gerektirdiği sonucuna varmayı mümkün kılmaktadır. Yazarın metni kapsamlı bir anlatı olarak hazırlama sürecinde kullandığı söz varlıkları, okuyucuların önüne her birinin kendi bireysel cevaplarını bulması gereken hayati derecede önemli sorular koymaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: kurmaca metin, ifade, monolog konuşma, diyalojik konuşma, yazarın konuşması, doğrudan ve dolaylı konuşma

АННОТАЦИЯ

Антон Павлович Чехов - всемирно известный русский автор пьес и рассказов, один из величайших писателей в истории. В статье рассматривается один из самых известных рассказов "Палата № 6", Антона Павловича Чехова.

В данной статье описывается методика анализа художественного текста с учетом внутренней динамики построения высказываний и их включения в цепь коммуникации в практике интерактивного обучения турецких студентов русскому языку во внеязыковой среде. Текст повести Антона Павловича Чехова «Палата № 6» рассматривается как обращение к читателю, как послание адресату, от которого ожидается ответная реакция в виде оценки, критики, сочувствия либо возражения. Исследуются три типа высказываний, конструирующих текст: монологическая авторская речь, несобственно-прямая речь персонажей и их диалогическая речь. Выявляется индивидуальность речевого субъекта – автора повести – его стиль,

Shalala RAMAZANOVA

мировоззрение, перипетии замысла произведения, различные формы передачи речи персонажей по отношению к авторской речи.

Проанализирована роль пейзажных зарисовок в качестве упоминания времени года, месяца, времени суток, погоды, места действия, с которых начинается описание очередной перипетии в развитии сюжета, а также в качестве маркера эмоционального состояния персонажа. Анализ текста повести Антона Павловича Чехова «Палата № 6», проведённый вместе с турецкими студентами в рамках интерактивного обучения русскому языку как иностранному в сравнительной литературе.

Анализ текста с учетом всех трудностей восприятия иноязычного текста позволяет прийти к выводу о том, что стратегия чтения и понимания русских художественных текстов предполагает осознанный подход к тем речевым средствам, которые используются писателем в процессе составления текста как комплексного высказывания, ставящего жизненно важные вопросы перед читателями, на которые каждому из них придется найти свой индивидуальный ответ.

Ключевые слова: художественный текст, высказывание, монологическая речь, диалогическая речь, авторская речь, несобственно-прямая речь

Introduction

Ilya Efimovich Repin in his letter to Anton Pavlovich Chekhov wrote the following with the reference to the short novel “Ward No. 6”: “...*It is utterly incomprehensible how such an irresistible, deep and colossal idea of humanity rises from such a simple, unpretentious, and even lacking the content story*” (Repin, 1950: 102). So, what constitutes this idea? Highlighting the issue of understanding true harmony in human life and the ways of achieving it does. This harmony can be achieved either by creating a man’s own isolated and steady little world, separated by the “fence” of indifference from all surrounding woes and iniquities, and justified by philosophical theories that work as “nails with their points outwards”, or by being open to the world with all its joys and sorrows, empathic to everything that happens and aspiring to contribute his fair share to change the world for the better.

The author demonstrates how the problem of indifference, lack of interaction and sympathetic understanding, citizenship, and professionalism rises in all levels of communication: between family members, between “friends”, between doctors and their patients, between convicts and their judges, between the state and its people.

To agree on all these levels, communicants must be able to articulate their thoughts and feelings verbally, have their statements reflect the reality adequately, not be self-deceptive or manipulative, be not only formally, but truly addressing the counterpart to get a response. (Stepanov, 2005) The study of various ways of communication between the short novel characters as the reflection of human relations provides foreign students with an opportunity to get familiarized not only with various types of linguistic units but also with typical extralinguistic conditions specific to Russia of the described period.

The purpose of this article is to present the methods used for an analysis of a literary text with respect to the internal dynamics of constituent statements and their inclusion into the communication chain in practical interactive teaching

Artistic Text as A Statement (ON EXAMPLE OF THE A.P. CHEKHOV...)

Russian to Turkish students in a nonlinguistic environment. The analysis of the text of Anton Chekhov's short story "Ward No. 6" is performed with the above objective in mind.

It is a common fact that in order to understand the content of a foreign text one must understand not only its objective but also pragmatically conditioned content. The types of statements in the text of the short novel as means of communication between characters and between the author and his readers constitute the subject of this study.

Materials and Methods

Considering a literary text as an independent subject of linguistic studies, scholars suggest its various definitions. (Vereshhagin and Kostomarov, 1973:126 Glaperin, 1981:138, Nikolayeva, 1978: 5-39, Hrapchenko, 1987:320). In this study, following Mikhail Bakhtin (1996: 159-206) we proceed from the perception of a literary text as a whole statement built with inner statements, either monologic or dialogic, elementary or complex, primary or secondary, depending on their connection to a particular speech genre. According to Mikhail Bakhtin, only specific statements of individual speech subjects can actually exist as a form of speech. Speaking of features of a statement that distinguish it from linguistic units (words, collocations, and sentences), Mikhail Bakhtin points out its distinct boundaries specified by the change of speech subjects, and its specific completeness demonstrated in the subject-semantic comprehensiveness and in the ability to define the active responsive position of other participants of communication, in the speech concept and in typical compositional generic forms of completeness.

The initial point of our proposed method of studying a literary text is understanding the active and responsive nature of a living statement "*every understanding implies a response and produces it in some form: the listener becomes the speaker...*" (Bakhtin, 1996: 159-206). Both the speaker and the listener, both the writer and the reader, are focused toward active responsive understanding; i.e., they expect a verbal response either in the form of agreement or disagreement, sympathy or objection to what they have said or written. At the same time, literary genres generally suggest an active responsive understanding of "slow action", when initially silent understanding can be implemented in speeches or actions of the reader over time. Moreover, each statement can be considered as a response to some previous statements – this new statement interacts with them in some way: it assumes them to be known, leans on them, and argues with them.

Interpreting the text of the short novel as a statement comprised of other statements, i.e., as written speech, consisting of a complexly organized chain of statements, we accordingly analyze each statement as a certain link in this speech, using the methods of descriptive, functional-structural and stylistic analysis.

Results and Discussion

Shalala RAMAZANOVA

Thus, the text of the short novel with its relatively stable types of statements, both monologic and dialogic, both elementary and complex structure can be considered as a secondary literary genre. At the same time, the individuality of the author of the short novel as the speech subject is revealed along with his style, mindset, peripeteia of the story concept, various forms of transmitting the characters' speech in relation to the speech from the author.

In general, the text of the short novel, just like any other text, can be interpreted as addressing to the reader, as a message to the recipient, from whom a response is expected in terms of assessment, criticism, sympathy, or objection. The important role in this respect belongs to the method of declamatory construction of a monologue (Matezius, 2003: 1-232) manifested in expressing the speaker's attitude to the recipient by using the first and second-person pronouns and speech forms. Thus, the text contains a number of statements with markers of direct address to the reader. For example, when describing the exterior of the building lodge, Chekhov uses the pronoun “**in our**” meaning “in Russia”, identifying himself with the people of the country: *These nails, with their points upwards, and the fence, and the lodge itself, have that peculiar, desolate, God-forsaken look which is only found in **our** hospital and prison buildings.* Further, addressing the readers, the author uses the pronoun “**you**” followed by an invitation to do something together: “*If **you** are not afraid of being stung by the nettles, **come** by the narrow footpath that leads to the lodge, and **let us see** what is going on inside.*” Showing the interior of the ward, the writer uses the pronoun “**we**” meaning himself together with his readers: “*Opening the first door, **we** walk into the entry*”. Then the author invites his readers to continue exploring the building without him by using the “**you**” pronoun again: “*Next **you** come into a big, spacious room which fills up the whole lodge except for the entry.*” “*... and for the first minute this stench gives **you** the impression of having walked into a menagerie.*” /Chapter 1/

As we can see, the monologue of the short novel is a detailed statement of one person – the author or the characters. Two main types of monologues can be distinguished in the short novel text: a monologue in the form of a conscious addressing a specific reader to communicate certain information and receive a response from the reader, and a monologue as a speech alone with oneself. The monologue of the first type can be of an inciting nature /the above monologic description of the lodge and the ward/, and of a persuasive nature /Gromov's monologue with his characterization of the doctor /Chapter 10/. The monologue of the second type is not addressed to a specific listener, and thus it does not imply the counterpart's response /the monologue of Andrey Yefimitch that there is no point in preventing people from dying if death is a normal and legal end for everyone / Chapter 5 /

Using the third-person pronoun in a generalizing sense when describing the porter Nikita is equally interesting: “*He belongs to the class of simple-hearted, practical, and dull-witted people, prompt in carrying out orders, who like discipline better than anything in the world, and so are convinced that it is their duty to beat **people*** [Translator's note: in Russian text **them**].” / Chapter 1/ *Them*

Artistic Text as A Statement (ON EXAMPLE OF THE A.P. CHEKHOV...)

that is, those who violate the order, whoever it was established and whatever it was. A number of homogeneous epithets that emphasize Nikita's traits also draw attention. Three positive qualities, as well as love for order, combined with the fourth negative one, turn him into a heartless sadistic warden. Describing the patients of the ward, Chekhov refers to himself as a narrator, using the first-person pronoun: "*Ivan Dmitritch's neighbour on the left hand is, as I have said already, the Jew Moiseika; his neighbour on the right hand is a peasant so rolling in fat that he is almost spherical, with a blankly stupid face, utterly devoid of thought.*" /Chapter 1/

Depicting the biography of Doctor Andrey Efimych and using the indefinite-personal construction "*They say...*" to demonstrate the source of information, the writer clarifies in the first person: "*How far this is true I don't know, but Andrey Yefimitch himself has more than once confessed that he has never had a natural bent for medicine or science in general.*" /Chapter 5/ Drawing a portrait of Gromov, Chekhov several times expresses his immediate impression of him: "*I like his broad face with its high cheekbones, always pale and unhappy, and reflecting, as though in a mirror, a soul tormented by conflict and long-continued terror.*" "*I like the man himself, courteous, anxious to be of use, and extraordinarily gentle to everyone except Nikita.*" "*His talk is disordered and feverish like delirium, disconnected, and not always intelligible, but, on the other hand, something extremely fine may be felt in it, both in the words and the voice.*" /Chapter 1/

Gromov makes a similar impression on Doctor Andrey Yefimitch: "*Andrey Yefimitch liked Ivan Dmitritch's voice and his intelligent young face with its grimaces. He wanted to be nice to the young man and calm him down.*" /Chapter 9/ He is admired by the erudition and intelligence of this mentally ill person: "*—Well said, —said Andrey Yefimitch, smiling with pleasure.*" "*—its a good thing you are a rational and thoughtful man.*" "*What an agreeable young man! —thought Andrey Yefimitch, going back to his flat.*" "*—That's original, —said Andrey Yefimitch, laughing with pleasure and rubbing his hands. —I am agreeably struck by your inclination for drawing generalizations, and the sketch of my character you have just drawn is simply brilliant. I must confess that talking to you gives me great pleasure.*" /Chapter 9/

Quite often indefinite personal phrases are used to point out the source of the information "*... but for some reason, they always send us such men as I would rather not see*" /Chapter 9/; "*Come, tell me, what is the newspapers and calendars?*" /Chapter 9/; "*It is rumoured that the doctor has begun to visit Ward No. 6.*" /Chapter 4 / "*In spite of the severity of his judgments and his nervousness, he was liked, and behind his back was spoken of affectionately as Vanya.*" /Chapter 2 / "*Within a year Ivan Dmitritch was completely forgotten in the town, and his books, heaped up by his landlady in a sledge in the shed, were pulled to pieces by boys.*" /Chapter 3/ "*These disorderly proceedings were perfectly well known in the town, and were even exaggerated, but people took them calmly; some justified them on the ground that there were only peasants and working men in the*

Shalala RAMAZANOVA

hospital, who could not be dissatisfied, since they were much worse off at home than in the hospital they couldn't be fed on woodcocks! Others said in excuse that the town alone, without help from the Zemstvo, was not equal to maintaining a good hospital; thank God for having one at all, even a poor one." /Chapter 5/

As one can see from the examples, the townspeople serve as the source of the information, albeit the author does not refer to them directly: "... *Moreover, he was well educated and well-read; according to the townspeople's notions, he knew everything and was in their eyes something like a walking encyclopedia.*" /Chapter 2 /

In their reasoning, the main characters frequently refer to statements, feelings, actions of famous people, or events in their lives, as well as to historical or mythological facts implanted into the cultural heritage of the people: "*Somebody in Dostoevsky or Voltaire said that if there had not been a God men would have invented him*"; "*Pushkin suffered terrible agonies before his death, poor Heine lay paralyzed for several years...*"; "*Thanks to the antiseptic system operations were performed such as the great Pirogov had considered impossible even in spe.*" /Chapter 7/; "*And the theory of heredity, hypnotism, the discoveries of Pasteur and of Koch, hygiene based on statistics, and the work of Zemstvo doctors!*" /Chapter 7/; "*Diogenes lived in a tub, yet he was happier than all the kings of the earth.*"; /Chapter 10/ "*Marcus Aurelius says: "A pain is a vivid idea of pain; make an effort of will to change that idea, dismiss it, cease to complain, and the pain will disappear.*" /Chapter 10/; "*The Stoics, whom you are parodying, were remarkable people, but their doctrine crystallized two thousand years ago and has not advanced, and will not advance, an inch forward, since it is not practical or living*" /Chapter 10/; "*Take Christ, for instance: Christ responded to reality by weeping, smiling, being sorrowful and moved to wrath, even overcome by misery. He did not go to meet His sufferings with a smile, He did not despise death, but prayed in the Garden of Gethsemane that this cup might pass Him by.*" /Chapter 10/; "*... in any other place the public and the newspapers would long ago have torn this little Bastille to pieces*" /Chapter 7/; "*Psychiatry with its modern classification of mental diseases, methods of diagnosis, and treatment, was a perfect Elborus in comparison with what had been in the past.*" / Chapter 7 /

The active use of these names and titles as allusions that refer to certain historical and cultural traditions provides the text with intertextuality that allows one to consider it, among other things, as a reactive statement to preceding stimulative statements. Thus, dialogic relations are formed between the precedent texts and the text of the short novel.

The structure of the text consists of three types of statements: the speech from the author, free indirect speech of the characters, and their dialogical speech.

By using free indirect statements, Chekhov conveys the inner monologue of the characters, for example in the description of the first symptoms of Gromov's illness or the reasons for Ragin's disappointment in his professional life: "He did not know of any harm he had done, and could be certain that he would never be guilty of murder, arson, or theft in the future either; *but was it not easy to commit a*

Artistic Text as A Statement (ON EXAMPLE OF THE A.P. CHEKHOV...)

crime by accident, unconsciously, and was not false witness always possible, and, indeed, miscarriage of justice? It was not without good reason that the agelong experience of the simple people teaches that beggary and prison are ills none can be safe from. A judicial mistake is very possible as legal proceedings are conducted nowadays, and there is nothing to be wondered at in it...” /Chapter 3/

“But in process of time, the work unmistakably wearied him by its monotony and obvious uselessness. *Today one sees thirty patients, and tomorrow they have increased to thirty-five, the next day forty, and so on from day to day, from year to year, while the mortality in the town did not decrease and the patients did not leave off coming. To be any real help to forty patients between morning and dinner was not physically possible, so it could but lead to deception...*” /Chapter 5 /

These examples demonstrate the vocabular and syntactic specifics of Gromov and Ragin’s statements, the unique manner of their speech with emotional coloring typical for direct speech; however, this speech is conveyed through the author, who expresses the thoughts and feelings of his characters by merging them with his own speech.

Both Gromov and Ragin can be considered monomaniacs, i.e., obsessed with only one idea, talking on the same topic all the time. Gromov’s discourse of dull, vicious life of society and the need for change constitute the main characteristic of his speech: “*Whatever one talked to him about he always brought it round to the same subject: that life was dull and stifling in the town; that the townspeople had no lofty interests, but lived a dingy, meaningless life, diversified by violence, coarse profligacy, and hypocrisy; that scoundrels were well fed and clothed, while honest men lived from hand to mouth; that they needed schools, a progressive local paper, a theatre, public lectures, the co-ordination of the intellectual elements; that society must see its failings and be horrified.*” /Chapter 2/. Reasoning of intelligence as a source of interesting conversation and pleasure are a constant topic of Doctor Ragin’s dialogues and monologues: “... *what a great pity it is that there are no people in our town who are capable of carrying on intelligent and interesting conversation, or care to do so.*”; “...*the intellect is the only possible source of enjoyment. We see and hear of no trace of intellect about us, so we are deprived of enjoyment.*” /Chapter 6/

However, the doctor's way of life, his indifference to his job and people turned him into a useless, and sometimes even harmful to community person. The author says about him: “*Andrey Yefimitch loved intelligence and honesty intensely, but he had no strength of will nor belief in his right to organize an intelligent and honest life about him.*” /Chapter 5/.

The doctor’s statements, such as “*one should not interfere with people who are going out of their minds*” or “*there is no point in preventing people from dying if death is a normal and legal end for everyone.*” /Chapter 5/ practically disqualify him as a doctor. Broken by strokes of bad luck and illness, Gromov is also not able to do anything for the community. Ragin formulates the reason for their social unsuitability: “*We are weak, my dear friend... I used to be indifferent. I reasoned boldly and soundly, but at the first coarse touch of life upon me, I have lost heart...*”

Shalala RAMAZANOVA

Prostration... We are weak, we are poor creatures... and you, too, my dear friend, you are intelligent, generous, you drew in good impulses with your mother's milk, but you had hardly entered upon life when you were exhausted and fell ill... Weak, weak!"/Chapter 18/

As for dialogic speech, the dialogues between Gromov and Ragin can be qualified as complete dialogues, as we consider them to be the exchange of contemplated statements from both parties, when a statement of one communicant stimulates a reactive statement of the counterpart. Generally, they are complex dialogical unities where both communicants actively participate in elaborating the topic and maintaining semantic continuity in verbal communication. Moreover, in terms of their content and stylistic design, these dialogues are formed as accusations-explanations, requests-objections, questions-answers, discussions, confessions. An example of a dialogic unity is the situation when Gromov accuses Ragin of theft, charlatanism, excruciation: "The door into the ward was open. Ivan Dmitritch, lying propped on his elbow on the bed, listened in alarm to the unfamiliar voice, and suddenly recognized the doctor. He trembled all over with anger, jumped up, and with a red and wrathful face, with his eyes starting out of his head, ran out into the middle of the road. —*The doctor has come!* he shouted and broke into a laugh. —*At last! Gentlemen, I congratulate you. The doctor is honouring us with a visit! Cursed reptile!* —he shrieked and stamped in a frenzy such as had never been seen in the ward before. —*Kill the reptile! No, killing's too good. Drown him in the midden-pit!* —Andrey Yefimitch, hearing this, looked into the ward from the entry and asked gently: —*What for? —What for?* —shouted Ivan Dmitritch, going up to him with a menacing air and convulsively wrapping himself in his dressing-gown. —*What for? Thief!* —he said with a look of repulsion, moving his lips as though he would spit at him. —*Quack! Hangman! —Calm yourself,* —said Andrey Yefimitch, smiling guiltily. —*I assure you I have never stolen anything; and as to the rest, most likely you greatly exaggerate. I see you are angry with me. Calm yourself, I beg, if you can, and tell me coolly what are you angry for?"* ... /Chapter 9/

As we can see, the dialogue is preceded by the description of the situation with direct verbal communication between the characters. Extralinguistic means and nonverbal aspects that shape the dialogue are conveyed by the speech of the author. From the standpoint of the social position of the communicants, the dialogue can be characterized as an asymmetrical one, built on the principle of confrontation between the patient and the doctor. The individual intentions of the communication participants in the dialogue have a conflicting nature from Gromov's perspective, who makes accusations, insults, and threats to Ragin, and reconciling and explaining nature from Ragin's perspective, who follows the social expectations in behaviour.

The dialogues between Ragin and Gromov are personal because in the course of their communication Ragin demonstrates himself not as a doctor in the first place, but as a personality; besides, before everything else he sees his counterpart as a personality, not a mentally ill patient, having distinguished him out

Artistic Text as A Statement (ON EXAMPLE OF THE A.P. CHEKHOV...)

of surroundings and showing interest to him as a person: *“What an agreeable young man! —thought Andrey Yefimitch, going back to his flat. —In all the years I have been living here I do believe he is the first I have met with whom one can talk. He is capable of reasoning and is interested in just the right things.”* /Chapter 9/

The conversations of Ragin’s friends and the postmaster Mihail Averyanitch illustrate *“a dialogue of the deaf”* or a quasi-dialogue that reveal total contradiction of the topical intentions between the communicants: either the doctor talks of *“the higher spiritual manifestations of the human mind”*, to which the postmaster constantly replies with the words *“Perfectly true”* or *“I agree”*, or the postmaster lengthily talks about the entertaining and interesting life in the past, *“how they used to lend money without an IOU, and it was thought a disgrace not to give a helping hand to a comrade in need”*, and *“Andrey Yefimitch would listen without hearing”*. /Chapter 6/

Sometimes an indication of the situation where the verbal communication takes place promotes a more precise understanding of its content and individual intentions of the communicators. Thus, the dialogue between Doctor Hobotov and the medical assistant Sergey Sergeyitch is a phatic communication, when Hobotov expresses his opinion about Ragin’s condition in a dismissive form, and the assistant not only confirms his “diagnosis” with emphatic respect for the speaker but also talks about its expectancy: *“Next day Hobotov went to the lodge, accompanied by the assistant. Both stood in the entry and listened. —I fancy our old man has gone clean off his chump! —said Hobotov as he came out of the lodge. —Lord have mercy upon us sinners! —sighed the decorous Sergey Sergeyitch, scrupulously avoiding the puddles that he might not muddy his polished boots. —I must own, honoured Yevgeny Fyodoritch, I have been expecting it for a long time.”* /Chapter 11/ However, the verbal communication situation described by the author points out how trivial this talk is for the assistant, who at the moment is much more interested in “not muddying his polished boots”, than in Ragin’s health, Hobotov’s career, and even the Lord’s mercy, as opposed to Khobotov, who is interested in recognizing Ragin as delusional.

The dialogue can be non-verbal, but no less understandable: *“Hobotov opened the door an inch and glanced into the ward; Ivan Dmitritch in his night cap and the Doctor Andrey Yefimitch were sitting side by side on the bed. The madman was grimacing, twitching, and convulsively wrapping himself in his gown, while the doctor sat motionless with bowed head, and his face was red and look helpless and sorrowful. Hobotov shrugged his shoulders, grinned, and glanced at Nikita. Nikita shrugged his shoulders too.”* /Chapter 12/. Nikita expresses his agreement with Hobotov by repeating his motion.

A fragment of the committee meeting for enquiring the mental condition of Doctor Ragin, where the military commander, the superintendent of the district school, a member of the town council, Khobotov, and the fair-haired doctor were present besides Ragin, can be looked into as a multilogue. (Crystal, 2005: 1-499) Verbal communication occurs in the following sequence: stimulative remark of the council member - reactive remark of Ragin - pause - further remark of Ragin -

Shalala RAMAZANOVA

reactive remark of the council member - reactive remark of Ragin - reactive remark of the fair-haired doctor - reactive remark of the council member - stimulative remark of Khobotov proceeded with the speech of the author, conveying questions in indirect speech: *“Having received an answer, the fair-haired doctor and he, in the tone of examiners conscious of their lack of skill, began asking Andrey Yefimitch what was the day of the week, how many days there were in the year, and whether it was true that there was a remarkable prophet living in Ward No. 6.”* A response to the last question of the “examiners” is given with direct speech: *“In response to the last question, Andrey Yefimitch blushed and said: —Yes, he is mentally deranged, but he is an interesting young man.”* /Chapter 12/. As we can see, obvious responses that do not add anything to Ragin's portrait are given by the author in indirect speech.

In the multilogue with the postmaster, Khobotov and Ragin, which became the climax in the life of Andrey Yefimitch, the play, pretense, indifference of the two communicants is replaced by Ragin's sharp reaction to vulgarity: *“—You have a much better colour today than you had yesterday, my dear man, —began Mihail Averyanitch. —Yes, you look jolly. Upon my soul, you do! —It's high time you were well, dear colleague, —said Hobotov, yawning. —I'll be bound; you are sick of this bobbery. —And we shall recover, —said Mihail Averyanitch cheerfully. —We shall live another hundred years! To be sure! —Not a hundred years, but another twenty, —Hobotov said reassuringly. —It's all right, all right, colleague; don't lose heart. Don't go piling it on! —We'll show what we can do, —laughed Mihail Averyanitch, and he slapped his friend on the knee. —We'll show them yet! Next summer, please God, we shall be off to the Caucasus, and we will ride all over it on horseback—trot, trot, trot! And when we are back from the Caucasus I shouldn't wonder if we will all dance at the wedding. —Mihail Averyanitch gave a sly wink. —We'll marry you, my dear boy, we'll marry you... —Andrey Yefimitch felt suddenly that the rising disgust had mounted to his throat, his heart began beating violently. —That's vulgar, —he said, getting up quickly and walking away to the window. —Don't you understand that you are talking vulgar nonsense? He meant to go on softly and politely, but against his will, he suddenly clenched his fists and raised them above his head. —Leave me alone, —he shouted in a voice unlike his own, blushing crimson and shaking all over. —Go away, both of you! Mihail Averyanitch and Hobotov got up and stared at him first with amazement and then with alarm. —Go away, both! —Andrey Yefimitch went on shouting. —Stupid people! Foolish people! I don't want either your friendship or your medicines, stupid man! Vulgar! Nasty! Hobotov and Mihail Averyanitch, looking at each other in bewilderment, staggered to the door and went out. Andrey Yefimitch snatched up the bottle of bromide and flung it after them; the bottle broke with a crash on the door-frame. —Go to the devil! —he shouted in a tearful voice, running out into the passage. —To the devil!”* /Chapter 16/ While the expressiveness of the postmaster's remarks is consistently muffled by more restrained remarks of Khobotov which are accompanied by yawns, the expressiveness and imperativeness of Ragin's reactive remarks are in no way

Artistic Text as A Statement (ON EXAMPLE OF THE A.P. CHEKHOV...)

inferior to Gromov's remarks, with which he greeted the doctor when the latter first appeared in the ward for mentally ill patients. They represent a cry of despair of a person who has fallen into a "trap", into a "vicious circle". The metamorphosis that occurred to Ragin is reflected in his speech: he moved from a quiet speech to a shout, from the subjunctive mood / "How about tea" ... or: "How about dinner"/ - to the imperative form.

Compared to other texts of Chekhov, the landscape as "any open space of the external world" is described in the text quite briefly. This is understandable: the short novel with the title "Ward No. 6", which is likened in the text to such definitions as "prison", "little Bastille", cannot abound in landscapes. Basically, the references are made to the time of year, month, time of day, weather, scenery where the next peripeteia in the plot takes place: "*One autumn morning Ivan Dmitritch, turning up the collar of his greatcoat and splashing through the mud, made his way by side-streets and back lanes to see some artisan, and to collect some payment that was owing.*" /Chapter 3/; "*On a spring evening towards the end of March, when there was no snow left on the ground and the starlings were singing in the hospital garden, the doctor went out to see his friend the postmaster as far as the gate.*" /Chapter 9/; "*It was a still, bright day. —I came out for a walk after dinner, and here I have come, as you see, —said the doctor. —It is quite a spring. —What month is it? March? —asked Ivan Dmitritch. —Yes, the end of March. —Is it very muddy? —No, not very. There are already paths in the garden.*" /Chapter 10/; "*One day -- it was at the end of June - Dr. Hobotov went to see Andrey Yefimitch about something. Not finding him at home, he proceeded to look for him in the yard; there he was told that the old doctor had gone to see the mental patients.*" /Chapter 11/; "*A week later it was suggested to Andrey Yefimitch that he should have a rest -- that is, send in his resignation a suggestion he received with indifference, and a week later still, Mihail Averyanitch and he were sitting in a posting carriage driving to the nearest railway station. The days were cool and bright, with a blue sky and a transparent distance.*" /Chapter 13/; "*By the time the friends were back in their own town it was November, and deep snow was lying in the streets.*" /Chapter 14 /.

Only in the climax part, two landscapes under the moonlit sky correlate with the emotional state of the character, as if pointing to his insight and horror of real life: "*Andrey Yefimitch walked away to the window and looked out into the open country. It was getting dark, and on the horizon, to the right, a cold crimson moon was mounting upwards. Not far from the hospital fence, not much more than two hundred yards away, stood a tall white house shut in by a stone wall. This was the prison. "So, this is real life," —thought Andrey Yefimitch, and he felt frightened. The moon and the prison, and the nails on the fence, and the far-away flames at the bone-charring factory were all terrible.*" /Chapter 18/; "*Ivan Dmitritch gave a loud scream. He must have been beaten too. Then all was still, the faint moonlight came through the grating, and a shadow like a net lay on the floor. It was terrible. Andrey Yefimitch lay and held his breath: he was expecting with horror to be struck again.*" /Chapter 18/

Conclusion

Having analyzed the text of Anton Pavlovich Chekhov's short novel "Ward No. 6" as a secondary literary genre with its relatively stable types of statements, we can conclude that the text is built with three types of statements: monologic speech of the author, free indirect speech of the characters and their dialogic speech.

In general, the text of the short novel can be interpreted as an address to the reader, as a message to the recipient, from whom a response is expected in terms of assessment, criticism, sympathy, or objection. The important role in this respect belongs to the method of declamatory construction of the text, which is manifested by expressing the speaker's attitude to the recipient using the first and second-person pronouns and verbal forms.

Free indirect speech along with statements, feelings, actions of famous people, or events or events in their lives, as well as historical or mythological facts implanted into the cultural heritage of the people are used as a reference to the source of the message. This provides the text with intertextuality that allows to consider it, among other things, as a reactive statement to preceding stimulative statements.

Free indirect speech is used to convey the inner monologue of the characters and reflects the vocabular and syntactic specifics of their statements, the unique manner of their speech with emotional coloring typical for direct speech. However, this speech is conveyed through the author, who expresses the thoughts and feelings of his characters by merging them with his own speech.

When describing dialogic speech, dialogic unities in the text are highlighted as a combination of statement remarks that elaborate the same micro topic, as well as elementary dialogues that consist of one or two brief and incomplete stimulative remarks together with question-answer types of reactive remarks, "the dialogues of the deaf", nonverbal dialogues, multilogues. Syntactic means of dialogization and expressive coloring of remarks as a speech characteristic of the emotional condition of communicants have been considered. It has been established that the dialogues occur in an atmosphere of direct live communication between the characters, are specified extralinguistically, and also contain an indication of the situation of verbal communication.

The role of landscape sketches has been analyzed as a reference to the time of year, month, time of day, weather, scenery that serve as the description of the beginning of the next peripeteia in the plot, as well as a marker of the emotional state of the character.

The analysis of Anton Chekhov's short novel "Ward No. 6" performed together with Turkish students in the course of interactive teaching Russian as a foreign language allow to conclude that taking into account the difficulty of comprehension of a foreign text, the strategy of reading and understating Russian literary texts offers an acknowledged approach to the linguistic means used by writers in the process of writing the text as a complex statement that asks their

Artistic Text as A Statement (ON EXAMPLE OF THE A.P. CHEKHOV...)

readers vital questions, the answer to which must be found by the readers one by one.

Bibliography

- Baxtin, M. (1996). *Problema rechevyh zhanrov*, Sobr. soch., Moscow, Russkie slovari, T.5: Raboty 1940-1960 gg. http://philologos.narod.ru/bakhtin/bakh_genre.htm
- Vereshhagin, E. and Kostomarov, V. (1973) *Yazyk i kul'tura*. – Moscow
- Gal'perin, I. (1981) *Tekst kak obekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya*. Moscow, Nauka
- Crystal, D. (2005) *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*, Cambridge University Press.
- Matezius, V. (2003) *Izbranny'e trudy' po yazy'koznaniyu Editorial URSS* ISBN:20035-354-00522-1
- Nikolaeva, T. (1978) Lingvistika teksta. *Sovremennoe sostoyanie i perspektivy', Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. -Moscow, Progress, 1978.-Vy'p. 8, 5-39.*
- Repin, I. (1950) *Pis'ma k pisatelyam i literaturny'm deyatelyam. 1880—1929.* Moscow
- Stepanov, A. (2005) Problemy' kommunikacii u Chekhova. *Tema dissertacii i avtorefetata po VAK RF 10.01.01., doktor filologicheskix nauk.* Moscow. <https://www.dissercat.com/content/problemy-kommunikatsii-u-chekhova>
- Hrapchenko M. (1987) *Tekst i ego svojstva. // Issledovaniya po drevnej i novoj literature.* Leningrad, Nauka.
- Chekhov, A. (2003) *Izbrannoe: Rasskazy'. Povesti. P'esy'. Vospominaniya pisatelej o Chekhove.* Moscow, Izd-vo E'ksmo.