



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: AT1120618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.
<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/>

Año: VII Número: Edición Especial Artículo no.:99 Período: Noviembre, 2019

TÍTULO: El silencio y su funcionamiento en el Texto Dramático.

AUTORES:

1. Ph.D. Viacheslav P. Khodus.
2. Ph.D. Khadisha R. Nurgali.
3. Ph.D. Asemgul A. Moldozhanova.
4. Ph.D. Anatoliy A. Serebriakov.
5. Ph.D. Elena Y. Khodus.
6. Ph.D. Gulzhan Z. Shashkina.

RESUMEN: El artículo presenta etapas del estudio del texto dramático a través de sus textos teatrales y dramáticos constituyentes y abrió las esferas de acción y verbalización del fenómeno del silencio. Se hace especial hincapié en las características del texto teatral y la visualización del silencio en la esfera del discurso teatral. Los materiales del artículo son de valor práctico para estudiar un lenguaje de la formación sincrética complicada, que es un texto dramático, y al mismo tiempo, proporcionan información para la investigación fundamental de los procesos de habla y silencio, que en su complementariedad mutua, reflejan procesos del pensamiento, la realización y la construcción del discurso.

PALABRAS CLAVES: texto dramático, texto teatral, sincretismo, esferas de acción y verbalización, pragmática del texto.

TITLE: Silence and its functioning in Dramatic Text.

AUTHORS:

1. Ph.D. Viacheslav P. Khodus.
2. Ph.D. Khadisha R. Nurgali.
3. Ph.D. Asemgul A. Moldozhanova.
4. Ph.D. Anatoliy A. Serebriakov.
5. Ph.D. Elena Y. Khodus.
6. Ph.D. Gulzhan Z. Shashkina.

ABSTRACT: The article presents stages of the study of the dramaturgical text through its constituent theatrical and dramaturgical texts and opened the spheres of action and verbalization of the phenomenon of silence. Special emphasis is placed on the characteristics of the theatrical text and the visualization of silence in the sphere of theatrical discourse. The materials of the article are of practical value to study a complicated syncretic formation language, which is a dramatic text, and at the same time, provide information for the fundamental investigation of speech and silence processes, which in their mutual complementarity, reflect Thought processes, realization and construction of discourse.

KEY WORDS: dramaturgic text, theatrical text, syncretism, the spheres of action and verbalization, pragmatics of the text.

INTRODUCTION.

The silence phenomenon has been comprehended by the mankind since the first word was said. The silence (as a human phenomenon) is always an important absence of the sound when the broken quiet (a natural phenomenon) is recovered.

In the XIXth century, before the flowering of belles-lettres, the issue of “art of silence” was considered. So, A.A. Potebnya in his book “Thought and Language” says that “silence is the art not to allow an imagination to become movement of the organs, with which it is connected, - the art that the modern man acquires late and that is quite unnoticeable in children” [Potebnya 1999: 88]. Later on, in the XXth century, M. Heidegger, after Husserl, distinguishes an occurrence and a phenomenon of the silence and raises an issue about the dialectics of silence (phenomenon) and muteness (occurrence). “Only genuine speech can have silence expressed by a sense pause, those who cannot speak about the existence, cannot be silent too. So, a person who is silent, can say more than a person who speaks much” [Heidegger 1993: 38]. Silence about the existence as understanding of the existence is only a prologue to the conversation. Heidegger believes that the verbosity, on the contrary, can make a supposed clarity.

N.D. Arutyunova presented the most complete and detailed analysis of the silence as a communicative phenomenon. The researcher believes that the silence, or absence of sounds, cannot be a sign by itself. It does not give rise to differential indications. A context, a situation, regulations of the social behavior, popular beliefs, a ritual gives sense to the silence. A pause is assessed in the conversation. The silence in a dialogue “can be caused by the perplexity, the thoughts about other things, indecision or other reasons. It is of importance as symptom, not as a sign. This is a pause in the conversation, and it is assessed as a departure from the communicative standard. In the majority [...] of the contexts the silence is considered as a departure from a speech practice that is natural for the man who possesses the gift of speech: the gift of speech is not intended for keeping in vain” [Arutyunova 2005: 417].

If for the everyday spoken language the silence was always an indisputable fact, then in literary texts of the Russian literature, as an equitable language element of the text, the silence starts to become firmly established since the beginning of the XIXth century. As the researchers say, the

“word – hush” opposition becomes important initially, which is one of the significant components of development of the artistic action.

The word – hush correlation reflects the most ancient syncretism, which “succeeds to a syncretism of the mythological ideas and the vocabulary of ancient languages, and which is a derivative of the syncretism of the most archaic consciousness. The logics, the metaphorical tools of description, the syncretism, which are different from classical ones, are a force, which seizes the intellectual space more and more actively, and not the past of the culture development. The civilizations history tells us that the art often (and unconsciously) makes cognitive breakthroughs, which, decades later, catch up with the exact and natural sciences by means of using their methods” [Chernigivskaya 2017: 26]. Search for answers of the language material in the drama – text space (an initially syncretic phenomenon, which is archaically designated and develops in our epoch too) can show the drama structure essence at a modern stage.

The silence, which is represented via one of its semantic indications - “hush”, is “not just opposed to the word (an act of speaking) as “absence of sound – availability of sound”, it is a special nature of this Word: deprivation of the word of significance (in a situation when a hero is recognized as a madman) or recognition of a word as senseless (in a situation of the imposture). The “hush” is implemented in dialogues and polylogues, characterizing relations of the heroes with each other or relations of a hero with the society” [Markova 2005: 3]. For instance, “The Inspector General” by Nikolai Gogol elaborates principles of designing the “hush symbol” including all the signs of the “hush” deconcentrated in the text.

In the prosaic texts by Fyodor Dostoevsky, in terms of specific implementation, the hush signs are located horizontally. In terms of sense, each level of the “hush poetics” can have two limits: *top limit* (“hush as expression by means of other words”) and *bottom limit* (“before-word”, non-

existence, spiritual death). In a poetic text, the artistic sign of silence was determined in the XIXth century by vectors of senses of the poem “Silentium” by F.I. Tiutchev.

In the dialogic parties of short stories by Heinrich von Kleist, who exerted influence upon a language of the German-language literature of the end of the XIXth century, “the silence does not mean cessation of communication, on the contrary, it gives a text additional expressive powers, although the silence does not give rise to differential indications” [Serebriakov 2008: 171].

This creates prerequisites to determining the sign nature of the silence in the text space. “Boundaries of the silence extension are determined by the fact that the silence is spoken about only against the background of the communication” [Arutiunova 2005: 425]. In the situation of a dialogue, the silence becomes speaking and addressed, acquires a semiotic function. The silence becomes a sign of the content behind it (which is implied with a zero signifier), but a sense of such silence grows from a specific communication pragmatics. And this sign silence in a space of the artistic language of the XIXth century lays the groundwork for a vanguard way of the crabbed poetry, which, in the article “Our basis” V. Khlebnikov interprets as a way of overcoming the silence: “Word creation is an outbreak of the language silence, the deaf and mute language layers” [Khlebnikov 1920: 24].

The turning of the literary text language to the opposition *word – hush, language – muteness, speech – quiet*, which express a conceptually significant role of silence as a sign, becomes so powerful by the end of the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth centuries, that the silence “penetrates” to and is established in the dramatic text space.

DEVELOPMENT.

Materials and methods.

A dual nature of the dramaturgic text determined two ways of its research: *a literary way*, when the analysis is carried out only from the perspective of the “text – reader” correlation, and *a*

synthetic way, which takes into account the dramaturgic text inclusion into the theatrical impersonation context.

In the literary analysis, the dramaturgic text exists only in the form of the main text, but “during the stage impersonation the verbal text disappears completely as a literary phenomenon, turning from the language structure into the stage structure” [Polyakov 2000: 325].

The dramaturgic text research from the perspective of its correlation with the theatrical text makes it possible to consider such a complicated notion as the “drama language” in more detail, which “is a language, in its complete essence and completeness, which we perceive only when it forms a stage action, developing in time together with it” [Vinokur 1990: 197]. Permanent connection of a word with the “stage *preparation*”, its action in sounding, which is usually accompanied by mimicry/a gesture/ an action, couldn’t help creating special features of the dramaturgic structure and selection of such indications of the verbal material, the use of which led to specification of *the dramatic* word [Balukhaty 1927: 8].

The drama operates with a “pronouncing word”, and on which its reckoning upon a more expressive force of a word, which is given in the sounding, is built, with the use of all qualities of the intonated word. Verbal fixation of the “pronouncing word”, the dramatic context, into which it is plunged in the stage interpretation, is found in a special, so-called theatrical text, — acting copies. “Critical restriction of the language’s expressive powers and a subjective attitude to the extralinguistic reality can be combined in the silence, which preserves the communicative significance in full” [Serebriakov 2008: 114].

The possibility to compare a language of the dramaturgic and theatrical text is driven by the fact that “all kinds of the semiotic activities in the sphere of the theatre are unifying the integral work only via the drama text” [Ployakov 2000: 31], and here, one can say that the word names other kinds of the semiotic activities.

The interaction of different arts and the functioning of various codes (sign systems) bring forth two basic problems.

1) The interrelation of a literary text and a performance (the theatrical interpretation). The double orientation of a dramatic work (*perforation*, according to the terminology used by Ubersfeld, of the dramaturgic text [Ubersfeld 1977]) as genetic and typological reflection of two forms of the artistic consciousness.

2) The dramaturgic and theatrical texts as special types of the artistic activities.

The semioticians E. Marconi and A. Rowetta in their paper “Theatre as a model of language” [Marconi, Rowetta 1975] tried to completely reconstruct a structurally-semiotic model of a language of the theatrical text. The research’s main idea is that “the structure and the dynamics of the theatre are similar to the ethnic language’s structure in many aspects, so the research of a consistency between them will help to penetrate into many regularities of the play text and the performance text correlation” [Marconi, Rowetta 1975: 4]. The researchers believe that the main peculiarity of the dramaturgic text is that this is a written text and it is created to be *pronounced*. The oral speech creates infinite possibilities to modify the written text. Thus, “the written text verbalization means a transition from the written speech space to the stage speech and stage activities prospects” [ibid.: 21].

The theatrical text is built “exclusively under the language laws”, and the researchers believe that the stage action laws exist separately. However, with all the autonomy of a dramaturgic text Marconi and Rowetta see a dialectical basis in it, which consists in the fact that a theatrical text is all-sufficient and is not all-sufficient at the same time: “the play test exists as in independent narration and, at the same time, it is only the basis for the stage interpretation; the play text is simultaneously a closed, integral structure and something open, uncompleted — an object for further interpretations” [ibid.: 24].

The main conclusion, to which the researchers come, that “the theatrical matrix is a linguistic script, since it consists of the drama text in the language and of the accompanying elements in the language too, which have an explanatory nature. But is it necessary to distinguish between the scriptural and operative complexes. The operative complex is verbal and non-verbal implementation of the script and the stage narration requirements” (ibid.: 98).

The established linguistic characteristics of a theatrical text make it possible to consider correlation of the dramaturgic and theatrical texts in the unified semiotic system.

Connection between the dramaturgic and theatrical texts is driven by their correlation in the single structural-functional model and by the semantic closeness of the lexical-terminological apparatus of these texts.

The play (a lexeme belonging to the literary and to the theatrical discourse) is formed as a result of implementing a certain syntagma: a model of senses (MS), which is connected with the epistemological and cultural background of an (modern/historical) epoch, is implemented by the writer in the dramaturgic text (DT) by means of using the certain artistic-aesthetic devices and the linguistic means. Later on, the dramaturgic text “goes through” the “perception — reflection” area in the director’s consciousness, which is embodied at a mental or verbal-graphical level — in the acting copies (ac). A dramaturgic text, which is supplemented or changed by commentaries, is the basis of the stage interpretation (si), which, in the aggregate with the acting copies, presents a sphere of the theatrical text (TT). This syntagma elements ratio makes it possible to speak about a sequential elements coupling:

$$MS — DT — \{TT(ac) — TT(si)\},$$

and about a parallel coupling:

$$MS — TT(ac),$$

$$MS — TT(sv),$$

DT — TT(sv).

All the four elements present various semiotic systems, but, at the same time, the dramaturgic and theatrical texts are the dramatic text essence, which is confirmed by a componential analysis of the following lexemes:

Dramatic: ‘relating to the drama’ ← *drama*: 1. ‘a kind of literary works that are built in a dialogic form without the author speech and intended for the stage performance’ [Comprehensive Academic Dictionary of the Russian Language];

Dramaturgic: ‘relating to the dramaturgy’ ← *dramatist*: ‘the author of a drama (in the 1st meaning)’ [Comprehensive Academic Dictionary of the Russian Language];

Theatrical: ‘relating to the theatre’ ← *theatre*.

The lexemes semantics indicates that a broader notion *dramatic* text includes spheres of the functioning of the *dramaturgic* and *theatrical* texts that are mutually complementary phenomena of the dramatic art.

The acting copies, as a verbal-graphical element of the theatrical text, are in the same semiotic system with the dramaturgic text. On this basis, it is possible to consider the correlative connections of these texts, having detected the mutually complementary interpretative senses of the theatrical text.

An analysis of a semantic row with the central element **the silence** represents the following model:

Silence – quiet, muteness, pause, hush – having the following semantic shades [Small Academic Dictionary]:

SILENCE (FROM) BE SILENT – To pronounce nothing, to utter no sounds.

QUIET – **1.** Absence of noise, hush. **2.** Calm, tranquil state.

MUTENESS – Absence of the gift of speech, of the ability to speak.

PAUSE – ‘a break, suspense of the speech, the work, some actions’.

HUSH – 1. Deep stillness. 2. Complete silence (in response to somebody’s speech, among the people who gathered together).

The silence was practically unusual for the dramaturgic text as a syncretical formation of the literary and theatrical sphere. The dramaturgic text, which is fastened with cues organizing a continuous dramaturgic dialogue, and with stage directions (functional-semantic secondary elements), represents an action via an active and “effective” word. The dramaturgic semantics is shown via a word, and not via its absence. The dramaturgic text’s language does not set descriptive means that, unlike a prosaic and poetic text, are able to describe the silence. In the classical dramaturgic text the hush means only a surprise or the end of an action. A comic or tragic effect was always accompanied with a sound (often with an interjection).

At the turn of the XIXth and the XXth centuries in the European dramaturgy, the silence semantics becomes one of the main elements of the drama language. This is confirmed by an analysis of the texts by A.P. Chekhov and M. Meterlink. The dramaturgic texts by Chekhov and Meterlink, which are unified by community of the epistemological space, which outlines a conceptual plan of the modernist perception of the world that is discretely presented in the semantic blocks of significant positions of mutually complementary style features of the symbolism and the impressionism; at the same time, represent peculiarities of the Russian and French linguistic view of the world.

The structural and semantic peculiarities of organizing the communicative space of a prosaic text are added to semantics of the opposition *speech – silence* in the texts by Chekhov-dramatist, and in dramas by Meterlink there is influence of the author’s philosophic comprehension of the silence in the tideway of aesthetic principles of the French symbolism. It is necessary to consider the study of a volume of the silence impersonation in the dramaturgic and theatrical tests, which are together constituent parts of the dramaturgic text.

Results.

Direct nomination of the silence act in the dramaturgic text is community of the texts. However, in the texts by Chekhov the silence is represented by means of substitution – a lexeme *pause*. This is conventional silence, since from a semantic perspective the *pause* – “a break, suspense in the speech, the work, some actions” – has a seme ‘suspense’, which indicates obligatory continuation of an action. Thus, the silence is not in direct opposition to the speech, but the silence only breaks the speech, forming the accentual semantic fields. Classification of the functional-semantic nature of *pauses* in Chekhov’s drama was confirmed in a paper by V. Kuznetsov:

- A pause uncovers the emotion of a person or a group of persons.
- A pause serves as an indication of the lowered down flow of associations or thoughts of a character, which are strange within a dialogue.
- By means of pauses (a sum of pauses) characters’ relations are characterized.
- A pause performs a plot function (via sorting out some the most important cues.
- Pauses perform a tempo-rhythmical function (via totality of pauses of the work) [Kuznetsov 1985].

In the texts by Chekhov [Chekhov 1980], there is a lexeme *silence* that expresses a phenomenon of the natural peace, which, however, **keeps** “interacting” with lexemes of the semantic field “sound”: **Silence** follows it, and only the sound is **heard**, some way away in the orchard, of the axe **falling** on the trees.

Then the **sound** of an axe against the trees is heard in the **silence** sadly and by itself.

Often, via the use of a lexeme *softly* and lexemes with a “weak” sound mode, the dramaturgic activities “tend” to silence:

Telegin plays **softly**; Maria Vasilievna **writes** something on the margin of her pamphlet; Marina **knits** her stocking.

It is evening. The room is dimly lighted by a shaded lamp on a table. The wind **moans** in the tree tops and **whistles down** the chimney. The watchman in the garden is heard **sounding** his rattle.

There is no complete silence in Chekhov's text, and there is no complete silence in the nature: it is always moving and is supplemented with "live" sounds. Silence and quiet are not idealized, but concretized in Chekhov's texts.

In the philosophic treatise "Le Trésor des humbles" by Maeterlinck, there is a commentary to perceiving the silence – a big chapter "Le silence". Let's consider one of the significant premises:

Si je vous parle en ce moment des choses les plus graves de l'amour, de la mort ou de la destinée, je n'atteins pas la mort, l'amour ou le destin, et malgré mes efforts, il restera toujours entre nous une vérité qui n'est pas dite, qu'on n'a même pas l'idée de dire, et cependant cette vérité qui n'a pas eu de voix aura seule vécu un instant entre nous, et nous n'avons pas pu songer à autre chose. Cette vérité c'est notre vérité sur la mort, le destin, l'amour; et nous n'avons pu l'entrevoir qu'en silence [Maeterlinck 1999: 273].

Before considering ways of expressing the silence in the dramaturgic texts by M. Maeterlinck, let's note that in the French language *silence* is the main lexeme expressing both the silence and the quiet. Synonyms, which concretize the meaning, are used rarely, and clarity of the meanings is determined by distribution.

At the same time, in the said metastatement, one can clearly see a mental projection of the dramatist in relation to a source of the silence and, simultaneously, his pragmatic tasks. In the text a play with patronymic attraction, which is enshrined in the French linguistic view of the world, is repeated three times. The words *amour* (love) and *mort* (death), which are used with the determinants (the definite articles), are perceived as a sign coincidence leading to comprehending the practically identity of meanings. The Love and the death are comprehended as the unified whole, which is inseparable and interdependent. Maeterlinck introduces another quite transparent lexeme symbol –

le destin (destiny) into this diad, which equalizes meanings of two other lexemes. Thus, the silence reflects the interaction of two forces – the destiny and the love-the death. In Maeterlinck's texts, the silence / *silence* is presented via direct nomination.

The texts *L'Intruse* (*The uninvited*), *Intérieur* (*There, inside*), *Les Aveugles* (*The blind*), *La Mort de Tintagiles* (*The Death of Tintagiles*), which are determined by the dramatist as *petite drames pour marionettes* (*small dramas for marionettes*), have a different dramatic plane. The action does not develop in them under the laws of the classical theatre, in a horizontal acting space, it develops vertically. This is confirmed by the term "marionettes" offering the stretched threads and presence of a person above the stage and behind the screen. Thus, the space implies the development of the action above and behind the stage, against the background. The time becomes pointed, and not stretched. An event of only this moment, of which the ordinariness consists, is of importance. A type of the text of a fairy tale or a myth is firmly established as something ordinary, which flows from one generation to another. The truth repetition is represented via an unreal form of the text, which is relative in terms of connection with the reality.

The Maeterlinck's texts also have the "sound – silence" opposition, however, *silence* ('the silence'), complete absence of sounds, is determined as the most important. If the *silence* moment comes, it is determined as a sign of tragedy. For example, in the drama "La Mort de Tintagiles" [Maeterlinck 1999], where *the death (mort)* in the initial part of the text favors the formation of a sign of tragicalness in the consciousness, the indications and the reasons of the death of Tintagiles are determined through the silence sign:

Tintagiles. Il n'y a pas d'herbe, petite sœur. *Un silence*. Qu'est-ce qu'elle fait, la reine?

Deuxième servante. Vous savez que *la reine* ne veut pas qu'elles le sachent...

La première servante ouvre la porte avec prudence et entre dans la chambre.

Troisième servante. Ah...

Un silence. La première servante sort de l'appartement.

The death sign is *la reine* (the queen), which is confirmed during the whole text via a structural correlation *la reine – silence*, and by means of analyzing the dramaturgic semantics.

Let's note that in the last cue the silence is formed by means of special structural organization – sparsity of utterance by means of three dots:

Ygraine. Vous allez ouvrir, n'est-ce pas?... Je ne demande presque rien... Je ne dois l'avoir qu'un moment, un tout petit moment... Je ne me rappelle pas... tu comprends... Je n'ai pas eu le temps... Il ne faut presque rien pour qu'il passe... Ce n'est pas difficile... (*Un long **silence** inexorable*).
Monstre!... Monstre! Je crache!... – which extends a boundary of the silence.

The silence is presented in a theatrical text in a greater degree. Linguistically, the acting copies are a special type of the text that determines a way of transferring a dramaturgic text into the theatrical production sphere, whose conditionality and laws create a difficulty in determining this type of the text. It is remarkable that the linguists practically ceased to consider and study them.

The acting copies are created by the director himself, which is indicated by the data of K.S. Stanislavsky metapoetics: “I wrote everything in the acting copy: how and where it is necessary to understand a role and instructions of the poet” [Stanislavsky 1954: 201]. Thus, the acting copies text presents the verbal-graphical implementation of a mental process of the producer, which is aimed at adapting the dramaturgic text for the theatrical space conditions. Various opinions of the directors, theatrical conditions and chronological framework of the theatrical production cause various acting copies relative to the same dramaturgic text, which, in its turn, is implemented in the play stage impersonations that differ from each other.

The acting copies are formed from the director's stage directions (commentaries), which make up a body of this text space. Unlike the stage directions of the dramaturgic text, which have a phenomenologic setting, which forms pictures and scenes of the dramatic activities in

consciousness of the play reader, the director's stage directions are pragmatically aimed at the theatrical impersonation. The director's stage directions take account of the communicative orientation of the dramaturgic text having a unilateral connection in the stage impersonation. From a perspective of the data communication, a promising thing is "a thing with which *somebody* is addressed, *what* the dramatic information transfers and in what *form* it transfers that, and not that *somebody* transfers information to *somebody*" [Polyakov 2000: 67]. Consequently, a position order of the dramaturgic text structure: 1) thematic, 2) stage, 3) dialogic composition [Balukhaty 1927: 8], is transformed in the acting copies in the following way: stage — thematic — dialogue composition.

The dialogic composition of the acting copies is identical with the dramaturgic text composition. As a matter of fact, it is a frame of the dramatic action development, to which the director's stage directions are added. Together with the dramaturgic stage directions, the dialogues present an object of producer reflection, whose consequence is an indissoluble connection of the director's text and the dramaturgic text. This connection is also observed via the use of demonstrative pronouns in the director's stage directions; therefore, a character name can be established only via a nominative stage direction of the dramaturgic text. Without turning to the play text, it is difficult to understand what or who is spoken about in the action. The acting copies represent a wordless drawing of the stage impersonation commenting the play text.

The obtained "drawing" opens the thematic composition of the director's script, which is based on "a director-plotted counterpoint of voices that start playing consistently and perform their themes" [Solovieva 1983:8]. The thematic composition of the acting copies is formalized from separate elements of the dramaturgic text, on which the producer lays emphasis. The emphasized fragments form a *super-task* (the term of K.S. Stanislavsky) of the stage impersonation. All of that provides the basis of a stage composition of the acting copies.

Adaptation for the stage impersonation is reflected in the acting copies texts by means of lexemes belonging to the theatre meta-language system: *stage, curtain, stage scenery, properties*, and so on. The use of these lexemes has a pragmatic orientation expressed in subsequent instructions of the director, which apply to one or another sphere of the theatrical activities. An additional element of the stage composition is graphical scenes of the *mise-en-scenes*, which visually reproduce the actors and stage scenery location. The stage composition influences a structure of the text space of the acting copies. Apart from division into the same quantity of acts as in the dramaturgic text, with graphic inclusion, Stanislavsky's acting copies text has a stage direction-preface containing an instruction to the "mood" of the whole stage action, and a stage direction-postface that describes the properties and progress of the action.

The stage composition influence as the foundational composition creates certain difficulties in differentiating the acting copies as a text. The director's stage directions vertical presents externally segmental and unsystematic sentences:

Half-asleep.

Quite unexpectedly. This is typical.

She rushed to bring to a stop.

Varya calmed down and went back [Stanislavsky 1983].

However, the acting copies connection with the dramaturgic text, which is detected at a level of the dialogic composition, indicates that there are implicit data uniting the director's stage directions. When establishing connection with the dramaturgic text, the data, which the director does not stipulate (frequently to express an idea clearly), are determined: names, cues, the action orientation. The dramaturgic text coherence conveys the coherence to the director's text. This is confirmed also by the dramatic cue nature, which, when it is separated from the dialogic basis of the text (the cues), presents the sphere of a completed implicit text narrating about an intonational side of utterances

and about the dramatic action development. Thus, the stage direction structure (director's and dramaturgic stage direction) includes the implicit basis creating the information field's external incoherence, which is made up for only when turning to the dialogic composition of the dramaturgic text.

At the same time, if a dramaturgic text has a broad communicative field, a peculiarity of the acting copies text is a separate ring communicative connection: the director himself writes and reads this text. The communicative field is extended only by means of voicing the instructions by the producer.

Close connection of the acting copies with the dramaturgic text and a metatextual nature of the stage directions (the speech reflection, metalinguistic components, for example, *speaks, hears, words* etc.) indicate that the acting copies form a kind of *supertext* of the play in the unified sphere of the stage impersonation of the dramaturgic work, which is the semantic and semiologic gap that objectively exists between the author and the producer, the literary text and the stage text.

The acting copies present a special type of the text, in which there is a verbal comprehension and a way of transferring the literary text into the theatrical interpretation plane.

The authors believe that the described structure has features that are inherent, in the scientists' opinion, in the text. For example, I.R. Galperin says that the text is a work "that possess the completeness, is objectified in the form of a written document,... consists of a name... and a number of special units (supra-phrasal units), which are unified by various types of lexical, grammatical, logic connections, and have a certain orientation and a pragmatic set" [Galperin 1980:18].

The acting copies are the basis for forming a new type of the text that appeared in the XXth century, a film script — a text "with prevalence of the event information and the assembling composition principle" [Martianova 1996:121], which was covered in linguistic papers. In Stanislavsky's text there is outlined an extensive, epic form of some stage directions aimed at the visual perception.

External incoherence of the stage directions will be developed in an assembling principle of the scenario composition. However, if a broad communicative field of the scenario allowed it to occupy an intermediate area between the cinema and the literature, then a special communicative orientation of the acting copies “preserves” its positions in the theatrical text sphere. The acting copies are a way of translation, while “the crucial thing is to convey the author’s artistic originality in translation, so the poet and translator dialogue is of great importance” [Nurgali 2015: 465].

The above-defined structural, communicative and pragmatic peculiarities of the acting copies as a special type of the text are expressed in the main constituent parts of this text – the director’s stage directions.

The secondary position and the dramaturgic text reflection, which is in the acting copies, make it possible to speak about a metatextual nature of the director’s commentaries. The metatext theory implies availability of two spheres: *the parent text* and *the text about a text*, in which the text reflection is based on the description metalanguage. In the dramatic art, a generalized and integral text is the stage interpretation. This text basis is a dramaturgic text, while by means of the theatre metalanguage the director “overbuilds” the acting copies text. In this original *double text* a perceiving person hears two voices: the author’s speech [the dramatist] and mental remarks [the director]. According to their structural-functional indications, the acting copies present a *separative* metatext, which is oriented “not so much to the formation, organization of the main text, as to the adequate perception of the main text by the addressee”.

K.S. Staniskavsky’s acting copies for A.P. Chekhov’s plays were among the first to be formalized verbally. These acting copies’ texts contain two main groups of the metatextual commentaries: *direct* and *comprehensive*. The metatextual direct commentaries belong to the single cues or stage directions and they only specify an instruction, which the author gives.

DT: Yasha. ... (*Hardly able to keep from laughing*). —

AC: Nearly laughing.

DT: Lopakhin. How much will she send? A hundred thousand roubles? Or two, perhaps? —

AC: Angry, but restrained.

Sometimes, an object of commenting is set off graphically by the director, which introduces the gradational relations on the basis of “important — the most important” elements into this group structure. A group of comprehensive metatextual commentaries always contains the director’s inference drawn from certain text elements. The inference can be created by a single cue or stage direction, which the director considers in the context of a previous/subsequent text, so it is extended in the metatextual commentaries.

An object of the extended metatextual commentaries is also great text fragments, whose reflection presents a description of the mise-en-scenes supplied with graphic illustrations. The reflection objects are *a part* of the action, *a whole* action and a whole dramaturgic text.

The metatextual characteristics of the director’s stage directions determine a structural hierarchy of the dramaturgic text and acting copies correlation relative to various structural and semantic fragments of the text: the whole text of a play; a completed fragment of the text (the act); a character’s utterances (for convenience – a cue + a stage direction); stage directions; cues. Therefore, the acting copies are a field of structurally and grammatically united commentaries, in which there is a hierarchy on the basis of an object of commenting. Let’s consider this correlation in comparison of the dramatic and theatrical texts of the play “The Cherry Orchard”.

The commentaries about the whole text of the play are marked with a correlate *in the whole play*.

For example:

AC: Sometimes (in the whole play) the plaster flakes off. [Stanislavsky 1983: 293].

These commentaries present the director's superstructure over the dramaturgic text, which, in some degree, reflects cultural schemes in the director's consciousness. This superstructure system also includes commentaries about a completed fragment of the text. The commentaries are entitled "Mood" and present an initial part of some acts. The majority of elements of these commentaries indicate a way of stepping up various modes of the perceiving person (the spectator).

With respect to smaller fragments, there is a clear connection between the dramaturgic text and the acting copies.

Commentaries to the dramaturgic stage directions are the most frequent: the director opens the stage directions content, indicates the movement direction on the stage, explains the character's actions.

The director's commentaries can contain the graphical markers that are certain semiotic indicators; for example:

DT: Dunyasha comes in and brings Lopakhin some kvass.

AC: She took a crust of bread with salt*

**is underlined with red color as an instruction to the property man.— Editorial staff.*

This example shows a two directional permeability of the acting text: on the one hand, it is based on the dramaturgic text, on the other hand — by the laws of stage impersonation.

Some local structures of the dramaturgic text stage directions are presented as some graphical (or, rather, ideographical) commentaries reflecting the properties and stage scenery arrangement, and the actors' movement on the stage at a certain moment of the act. This indicates that the dramaturgic and theatrical texts correlation takes place in the word-word system as well as in the word-sign system.

The commentaries about utterances (side direction+cue) describe the stage action, which is not reflected, but which is driven by a previous part of the dramaturgic text. The acting copies specify and concretize what is going on:

DT: Lubov Andreevna ... Don't I hear music? (*Listens*).

AC: Deafly heard music. Later on the evening wind brings near the music and then moves it away.

They listen to the music, turning round in the music direction. Gaev conducts the music in time.

The cited example shows that the acting copies' commentaries are aimed at forming the stage space and the space behind the stage (the background). This indicates an intra-textual connection between the commentaries about the utterances and a completed fragment of the text.

The cues commentaries are quite rare, which is driven by good development of a system of the inserted stage directions characterizing the character's speech in Chekhov's dramaturgic text.

In most cases, the cues commentaries present the director's fantasy relative to the current action.

These commentaries appeared due to the dramaturgic text structure: They usually write up a stage action relative to the parts, in which there is a minimum of the author's stage directions, and the characters' cues tend to a monological form.

For example, in the dramaturgic text extract between two stage directions, there are 10 sentences belonging to a character – Ranevskaya. In the acting copies Syanislavsky fills an “effective pause” with his commentary:

AC: Gaev lies fanning himself.

Gaev whistles a plaintive Italian melody knocking his boots with a stick in time. He lies.

Ranevskaya holds an opened umbrella.

In the commentaries about the dramaturgic text cues, there is another peculiarity of the acting copies – the communicative orientation. A communicative peculiarity of such a text, which operates with a “pronouncing word”, causes some additional structural and grammatical peculiarities in a

structure of the acting copies commentaries. As an example, let's compare the dramaturgic and theatrical texts of the play "The Three Sisters".

Unlike a prosaic text, where the dialogue is "quite natural, since here the writer has a possibility to imagine a person's verbal behavior and to describe nonverbal reality" [Izotova 1999: 173], the dramaturgic dialogue is multifunctional. It contains the main themes of the drama, builds a plotline, conveys the emotional mood, "watches" the characters' language portrait. However, the dramaturgic dialogue cannot be separated from the whole dramatic field of the play: in each individual moment the dialogue has its meaning in the general structure of the play. When reading a play, the reader sees narrative parts in it, which escape from the text's speech texture; those are stage directions, "a trace of stage processing" of the text, staging by the dramatist of his play. "The dramatist *produces* his play and, taking into account his modern experience, the dramatist reflects in the stage directions ... the assumed stage design" [Balukhaty 1927: 17]. However, a stage direction of the dramaturgic text with internal orientation to the stage impersonation is a structural element of the literary text, while preserving its artistic and aesthetic value. In other words, when reading a dramaturgic text, the dialogue creates, in the reader's consciousness, an informative picture of the characters' communication, which is built by the stage directions circumstantially and eventually. Along a trajectory set by the text, the reader goes through the events presented. The reader independently constructs in his consciousness the spatial (stage) action (when fulfilling the director's function), says the characters' speeches (the actor's function) and keeps track of what is going on (the spectator's function), in other words, the reader makes a theatrical transformation of the text at all the levels.

The functions are distributed in a different way in view of the stage implementation of the dramaturgic text, where the dialogues and stage directions build up the senses. The "insignificant" stage directions, when reading them, acquire importance in the stage production, and by means of

“addition” by the director of metaspeech stage directions, the emphasis is shifted in the dialogues and the general psychological structuring of what is going on. One should keep in mind that “when singling out, from the dramaturgic text, a vertical of stage directions containing the reflection on speech of an addresser, there appears a sphere of the “living space” of one or another character, which detects a semantic vertical inside the dramaturgic text. Quantity of such verticals is equal to the number of the “speaking” characters” [Khodus 2006: 94].

Due to the acting copies’ texts, there appears a visual picture of what the spectator perceives, which makes it possible to analyze peculiarities of functioning and perception of the dramaturgic text by the reader (who sees only the play’s text) and by the spectator (who listens to the dramaturgic text in its stage impersonation). G.O. Vinokur said that it was necessary to carry out such research. He believed that “the general coloring of the stage speech and a way of its perception depends in large part on to which character and in what sequence the said words ... belong... The speech transition from one character to another is a change of this speech nature, which is accompanied by a change of stage positions and a new turn in representing the stage personage” [Vinokur 1990: 197].

When comparing the communicative task of the dramaturgic text and the acting copies, there are sorted out two main groups of the director’s commentaries: to the stage directions (The maximum expression of that is seen in the stage directions containing lexemes with the acting space semantics, for example, *Is going through a stage*) and to the cues. Commentaries to the stage directions concretize their constituent elements or describe parallel actions of other characters. Commentaries to the cues are divided into metaspeech commentaries and the commentaries about the character’s actions.

Commentaries to the stage directions of the dramaturgic text simultaneously represent the intents of both the director and the spectator. For example, the director’s commentary *Andrey slams the door, Ferapont goes away*, which concretizes the stage direction *Ferapont goes away*, shows

comprehension of the scene by the producer, who “moves” the characters on the stage. Another commentary, while preserving the director’s vision of the production, represents the spectators’ commentary.

DT: Masha. ... (*Goes away*). —

AC: *Near the door Olga kisses Masha in a motherly way. As a matter of fact, she understands her, in the secret places of the heart she realizes that she would act in the same way. Now she does not condemn her, she feels sorry for her. So, she kissed her tenderly as a mother* [Stanislavsky 1983: 235].

Availability in the commentary of an inserted structure, unreal mood, adverbs and the comparative turn of speech: *now, in a motherly way, tenderly, like a mother* — display the sense vector of the analysis, and not of building of what is going on. The director “watches” a picture from outside, which was built in the consciousness, and analyses what he sees.

Commentaries to the stage directions build a stage picture of what is going on in horizontal direction, stringing the actions of what is going on. This is confirmed by the commentaries describing parallel actions that are determined according to availability of such structures as *by this time, in the background* and availability of several names of characters in a commentary. These commentaries are the director’s excellent superstructure supplementing the general semantics of the dramatic action via the characters’ actions, thanks to which the spectator sees the “director’s version” of the play.

Commentaries to the stage directions, which describe the parallel actions, are closely connected with the commentaries to the cues showing the characters’ actions. And just as “the spoken speech demands the description of supersegmental nonverbal units (mimicry, gesture, situational communication parameters) to be included in the general semantics of a statement” [Kapnadze 2001: 101], so the dramatic speech is perceived in terms of events and circumstances accompanying

it. K.S. Stanislavsky, who understood and accepted this condition, was very attentive to this issue. Commentaries to the cues, which describing the character's action, excel all other things quantitatively.

The said commentaries can relate to the cues having different values (from a sentence to a monologic utterance). The basis for forming a commentary is internal potential of the so-called "intentional dialogue" in the dramaturgic text, where "one can say that a cue sets a program of reaction to it" [Kapnadze 2001: 102]. For example, as for Andrey's monologue in the final of the third act of "The Three Sisters", the acting copies contain three commentaries, which do not coincide with the three-part division of a monologue in the dramaturgic text:

AC: Darkness. Drinks water and takes away the glass with himself; Near the chair, knocking with a finger in time with the said words; Sitting down on the sofa armrest.

In addition to three pauses, which divide the monologue, a commentary is made

Drinks;

Drinks;

Drinks.

Very anxious.

The lexical system of the commentaries "displays" anxiousness of Andrey (the darkness, the knock, the fourfold repetition of the verb *to drink* and, finally, clear determination of state: *very anxious*).

Each commentary is semantically connected with the cues content. The first part concerning Natasha, who separates the sisters and Andrey, takes place in the *darkness* and during the first commentary *drinks water*. During transition to tougher tone, after the phrase "I repeat,..." a commentary is changed: *knocking with a finger in time with the said words*. At last, to the third part, in which Andrey has to confess about the house mortgage, a commentary is made: *Sitting down on*

the sofa armrest, — which supplement the confusion expressed in a cue by means of a lot of dots, lexical repetitions. This example indicates that commentaries in the acting copies are formed under the influence of the intentional setting of the dramaturgic cue.

Metaspeech commentaries to the dramaturgic cues make up a special stratum. According to their functions, the metaspeech commentaries repeat the metaspeech inserted stage directions of the dramaturgic text, but their introduction into the dramaturgic text helps the director to create a more accurate, in his opinion, psychological drawing of what is going on. The Final of the third act (the fire) in the dramatic text of “The Three Sisters” is conveyed via the vocabulary with a sense “anxiety” in the cues and stage directions. The metaspeech commentaries, the pauses increase, on the contrary “calm” the scene: *Soothingly; In a sleepy weak voice; Sigh; Sleepy; 10 seconds pause, 5 seconds pause*, and after the long pause, via this exterior quietness, the anxiety, which is expected in the dialogue, “bursts through”: *Alarm bell, big bell and coming of firemen*. Due to uniting of two emotionally differentially-directed commentaries in the text of the acting copies, there is created a feeling of the simultaneous contrast, which is absent in the dramaturgic text.

It is necessary to particularly note a role of the stage directions and the commentaries *Pause*. This stage direction visually indicates the “pronunciation” of the dramaturgic word: the pause is felt only during pronouncing the text, and the reader perceives it more frequently as a semantic, and not as an expressive separation. If to look though the dramaturgic text attentively, the stage direction performs a sense distinctive function, but in the stage impersonation, the pause is used mainly as the means of “finding an emotional degree of the scene”.

In the acting copies the sense pauses are preceded by the commentaries (actions of the heroes or their state) forming the picture’s emotional disposition:

DT: Olga. You, Masha is stupid. You are the most stupid in our family. I am sorry.

Pause

AC: *The striking of a clock — 6 o' clock. Small watch is broken, it does not operate.*

Masha stands up quickly, she is anxious, she looks determinate, she is excited, she stretches herself nervously.

The producer, by means of increasing the quantity of his *own* pauses in the acting copies, creates a certain emotional rhythm, and emphasizes some phrases that he finds important.

The acting copies, when presenting the basis for the stage impersonation, make it possible to analyze the context and the emotionally-psychological drawing of “sounding” of the dramaturgic word. They make it possible to consider the dramaturgic text in terms of the reader’s perception, while the play text analysis represents only interaction with the reader.

The acting copies’ uniqueness is their motivation by the dramaturgic text and the fact that they open a view of the main interpreter of the dramaturgic text — the director combining a position of the reader and the spectator who project the position.

Discussion.

In relation to the dramaturgic text (the parent text), the acting copies, as a verbal-graphical expression of the theatrical text, serve as a metatext, as an element in the text interpretation system, as a decoder of semiotic fragments of the dramaturgic text. The theatrical text is not identically equal to the dramaturgic text: the theatrical text implements the intentional premises of the director, which sometimes has sense vectors that are different from those of the dramaturgic text, due to which some emphases are shifted (sometimes in the opposite side), the action orientation is specified/extended/changed.

In the texts differentiation, the author consciousness is different: the text, which is supplemented by the other author, opens new parameters of the artist’s consciousness and indicates new ways in interpreting the senses model. However, the interpretation force of the acting copies, which, make up, jointly with the dramaturgic text, the unified space of the dramatic text, helps to comprehend a

sophisticated “language of the drama in its development” deeper and comprehensively, to detect “concealed sides” of the dramaturgic text, which open only during the stage interpretation and escape the phenomenological perception of the reader - addressee of this text type.

Taking into account an earlier-determined correlation of the dramaturgic and theatrical texts, a position of the acting copies as a text-interpretation of the dramaturgic text, it is possible to conclude about the contextual semantic-functional syncretism – “combination (synthesis) of the differential structural and semantic indications of units opposed to each other in the language system” [Babaitseva 1998: 446] of those lexical units.

▼
Syncretism, as a special state of the lexical organization, in which semantics of the meaning A includes, in one or another volume, the components of semantics of the meaning B, in a system of general linguistic means of the silence expression, present “application” of the additional silence semantics to a semantic lexemes field in the context of development of the acting copies text. The syncretical vocabulary can contain shades of the functional silence meaning.

A definition of syncretism of the lexical units makes it possible to say that the majority of lexical units of the text are somehow aimed at expressing the theatrical text silence. A priority role of the linguistic expression of the silence in the acting copies texts plays an organizing role: the externally separate commentaries are united at a semantic-functional level having the main set of forming the theatrical text silence.

A special component is the lexemes *pause* forming the rhythmical order of the theatrical text and making it possible to turn attention from the main action to the background action. So, a commentary is added to the dialogue between Varya and Epikhodov in the dramaturgic text:

Pause. Varya drinks water. Epikhodov comes to the table dispassionately [Stanislavsky 1983: 415].

The commentary represents continuity of the long development of the action, change of the accentual positions. However, the lexeme *pause* favors the expression of both the time and the mood of the theatrical text. This is indicated by the above-mentioned example containing the lexeme with semantics of emotional state *dispassionately*, and a metacommentary in the text, where the functional significance of the pause is determined: *A long **pause** for the mood and sounds* [Stanislavsky 1983: 133].

The numerous *pauses* in the acting copies texts confirm this set: this lexeme places the emphasis on the emotional and efficient state of the theatrical text:

Pause. *Great noise in the stove. Violin stops playing.*

Pause. *A mouse scrapes under the sofa. Masha knocks on the sofa with her hand and hushes to drive it away.*

Pause. *Immediately all the revival went down. Guests sit on their places for some time and don't know what to do. Nobody is going to entertain them.*

Pause. *She closed her face with her hands, then she leant back quickly.*

The lexeme *pause* presents the syncretical formation, which is frequently aimed simultaneously at expressing the *time* and the *mood* in the theatrical text.

The acting copies are a special text. Its structural and semantic organization is driven by the functioning of this text type in the theatrical text sphere. When presenting the verbal-graphical implementation of the stage interpretation of the dramaturgic text, the acting copies are characterized as a proto-text. Indirect correlation of the acting copies and the dramaturgic text (commenting of the dramaturgic text fragments having different volumes) determine the metatextual parameters of the acting copies. Structural organization of the acting copies and semantic completeness of the commentaries are subordinated to the formal, communicative and pragmatic sets of the theatrical text.

It is said about the people who died that they *lapsed into silence forever*. The speech is associated with the life, the silence is associated with the death. However, the semantics of silence and quiet is different: the quiet is absence of sounds, the silence is non-speaking. The quiet is subjectless and impersonal, the silence is subjective and personalized. So, the quiet is traditionally realized as a natural phenomenon, the silence is realized as a human phenomenon. The nature's hush is seen as a metaphor.

At the same time, psychological lines of each speaking person are not reduced to the common denominator, but they receive the open prospect. But this prospect is in the behind-text space, where the "the text starts to be silent". However, "then the text does not speak about many things, so that it was always possible to carry out the exchange between the silence and the speech, so that negentropy activity – in particular, the hermeneutical activity, – could develop tirelessly, maintaining the fundamental conditions of our existence" [Virolainen 2003: 16].

CONCLUSIONS.

The silence is understood as an element of action, which historically and logically contradicts an idea of the dramatic text that initiates and is based on the word-action. At the same time, immersion in the aesthetic and functional textual alter ego – the theatre text – the silence was formed as one of the efficient principles, which returned to and was enshrined in the drama text. Syncretism of the language elements brought back to life the mental ritual senses of the silence as remembrance, which were peculiar to the archaic ritual.

The researched field of the dramatic text, which unites and contains essences of the dramaturgic verbalized word and the so-called theatrical word-action that cannot become apparent without the theatrical context-impersonation, brings closer to insight into the theatrical gesture described/written in the drama text.

The initially ironical question how the word can be silent (since in the theatre text in initial conscience, the revelation implies the word-speaking in its efficient-pragmatic and onthological orientation), in the process of the research, shows that in the epoch fin de siècle, irrespective of the mental bases, theatrical traditions, styles and aesthetic sets, the movement started towards a type of theatricality in the silence giving freedom to the consciousness that perceives and opens the interpretative largeness. At the same time, the data of texts of the leader-sender of an interpretation line – the director are attracted consciously, which makes it possible to see mechanisms towards surrogation/development of the silent senses.

The final arguments reflect the development prospect intentions. The main vector, which can be indicated within this article, is search for the functional silence in its manipulative role in the politics (the authors started to write about that in their earlier papers), but the main task and addressing of the research conducted is to dig into the research of semiotically heterogeneous texts, study of shades of semantics and syntactics of the word in its silent opposition, supplement to the study and comprehension of the drama and theatre language, a language of great artists of the word.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Maeterlinck M. Oevres II: Théâtre. — T. 1. — Bruxelles: Editions complex, 1999. — 340 p.
2. Marconi E., Rovetta A. Il teatro come modello generale del linguaggio. — Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1975. — 164 p.
3. Ubersfeld A. Lire le Theatre. — Paris: Éditions sociales, 1977. — 316 p.
4. Arutyunova N.D. The silence phenomenon // Language about language. — M., 2005. — P. 417–436. [Arutyunova N.D. Phenomen molchania // Yazyk o yazyke. — M., 2005. — S. 417–436.]
Арутюнова Н.Д. Феномен молчания // Язык о языке. — М., 2005. — С. 417–436.

5. Babaitseva V.V. Phenomena of transitivity in the Russian grammar. — M.: Drofa, 2000. — 638 p. [Babaitseva V.V. Yavlenia perekhodnosti v grammatike russkogo yazyka. — M.: Drofa, 2000. — 638 s.] Бабайцева В.В. Явления переходности в грамматике русского языка. —
6. Balukhaty S.D. Problem of the dramaturgic analysis. Chekhov. — M.: Academia, 1927. — 42 p. [Balukhaty S.D. Problema dramaturgicheskogo analiza. Chekhov. — M.: Academia, 1927. — 42 s.] Балухатый С.Д. Проблема драматургического анализа. Чехов.
7. Vinokur G.O. Philological research: Linguistics and poetics. — M.: Science, 1990. — 452 p. [Vinokur G.O. Filologicheskie issledovania: Lingvistika i poetika. — M.: Nauka, 1990. — 452 s.] Винокур Г.О. Филологические исследования: Лингвистика и поэтика.
8. Virolainen M.N. Speech and silence: Plots and myths of the Russian language and literature. — St. Petersburg.: Amfora, 2003. — 456 s. [Virolainen M.N. Rech and molchanie: Syuzhety i mify russkoi slovesnosti. — SPb.: Amfora, 2003. — 456 s.] Виролайнен М.Н. Речь и молчание: Сюжеты и мифы русской словесности. — СПб.: Амфора, 2003. — 456 с.
9. Galperin I.R. The text as a subject of the linguistic research. — M.: CobBook, 2007. — 144 p. [Galperin I.R. Tekst kak objekt lingvisticheskogo issledovania. — M.: ComKniga, 2007. — 144 s.] Гальперин И.Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования.
10. Izotova N.V. Types of a dialogue in the fictional prose (case study of the prose by A.P. Chekhov) // Structure and semantics of the literary text: Reports of the VIIth International conference. — M., 1999. — P. 172—181. [Izotova N.V. Tipy dialoga v khudozhestvennoi proze (na materiale prozy A.P. Chekhova) // Struktura i semantika khudozestvennogo teksta: Doklady VII Mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii. — M., 1999. — S. 172—181.] Изотова Н.В. Типы диалога в художественной прозе (на материале прозы А.П. Чехова) // Структура и семантика художественного текста: Доклады VII Международной конференции.

11. Kapanadze I.L., Shiryaev I.N. Text and its implementation. // Bulletin of scientific humanitarian foundation. — 2001. — No. 1. — P. 101—110. [Kapanadze I.L., Shiryaev I.N. Tekst i ego realizatsia. // vestnik nauchnogo gumanitarnogo fonda. — 2001. — No. 1. — S. 101—110.] Капанадзе И.Л., Ширяев И.Н. Текст и его реализация. // Вестник научного гуманитарного фонда.
12. Kuznetsov S.N. About function of the stage direction in Chekhov drama // Russian literature. — 1985. — No. 1 — P. 139—148. [Kuznetsov S.N. O funktsii remarki v chekhovskoi drame // Russkaia literatura. — 1985. — No. 1 — S. 139—148.] Кузнецов С.Н. О функции ремарки в чеховской драме // Русская литература.
13. Markova V.V. Poetics of silence in the Russian literature of the 1820s – the beginning of the 1840s (from “inexpressible” V.A. Zhukovsky to “Dead Souls” by N.V. Gogol): Dissertation of Candidate of sciences. — Tumen, 2005. — 193 s. [Markova V.V. Poetika bezmolvia v russkoi literature 1820 – nachala 1840-kh godov (ot “nevyrazimogo” V.A. Zhukovskogo k “Mertvym dusham” N.V. Gogol): Dissertatsia kandidata nauk. — Tumen, 2005. — 193 s.] Маркова В.В. Поэтика безмолвия в русской литературе 1820 – начала 1840-х годов (от «невыразимого» В.А. Жуковского к «Мертвым душам» Н.В. Гоголя): Диссертация кандидата наук. — Тюмень, 2005. — 193 с.
14. Martianova I.A. Film script as a type of the text oriented to transfer to the semiotic system of cinematographic art // Organization and self-organization of the text: Collection of articles of the scientific and methodological workshop “Textus”. Issue 1. — St. Petersburg — Stavropol: SSU, 1996. — P. 112—122. Мартянова И.А. Киносценарий как тип текста, ориентированный на перевод в семиотическую систему киноискусства // Организация и самоорганизация текста: Сб. стат. научно-метод. семинара «Textus». Вып. 1. — СПб. — Ставрополь: СГУ, 1996. — С. 112—122.

15. Nurgali K.R. Art of fiction translation in interpretation by N.S.Rovensky // The Russian language and culture in the mirror of translation. — M.: Higher school of translation (department) Lomonosov Moscow State University, 2015. — P. 464–472. Нурғали К.Р. Искусство художественного перевода в интерпретации Н.С.Ровенского // Русский язык и культура в зеркале перевода. — М.: Высшая школа перевода (факультет) Московский государственный университет им. М.В. Ломоносова, 2015. — С. 464–472.
16. Ployakov M.Ya. About theater: poetics, semiotics, theory of the drama. — M.: International agency “A.D. and Theatre”, 2000. — 384 p. [Ployakov M.Ya. O teatre: poetika, semiotika, teoria dramy. — M.: Mezhdunarodnoe agentstvo “A.D. i Teatr”, 2000. — 384 s.] Поляков М.Я. О театре: поэтика, семиотика, теория драмы. — М.: Международное агентство «А.Д. и Театр», 2000. — 384 с.
17. Potebnya A.A. Thought and language. — M.: Labyrinth, 1999. — 300 p. [Potebnya A.A. Mysl i yazyk. — M.: Labirint, 1999. — 300 s.] Потебня А.А. Мысль и язык. — М.: Лабиринт, 1999. — 300 с.
18. Serebriakov A. A. Composition-speech organization of short of Heinrich von Kleist in the linguistic-poetical aspect. — Stavropol: Publishing House of Stavropol State University, 2008. — 340 p. [Serebriakov A. A. Kompozitsionno-rechevaya organizatsia novell H. von Kleista v lingvopoeticheskom aspekte. — Stavropol: Izd-vo SGU, 2008. — 340 s.] Серебряков А. А. Композиционно-речевая организация новелл Г. фон Клейста в лингвопоэтическом аспекте. — Ставрополь: Изд-во СГУ, 2008. — 340 с.
19. Dictionary of modern Russian literary language: In 17 volumes / Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Institute of Russian Language. — M. — L.: Publishing House of Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1948—1965. [Comprehensive Academic Dictionary] Словарь современного

русского литературного языка: В 17 т. / АН СССР. Институт русского языка. — М. — Л.: Изд-во АН СССР, 1948—1965. [БАС]

20. Dictionary of the modern Russian language: In 4 volumes / Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Institute of Russian Language; Under the general editorship of A.P. Evgenieva. — The second revised and enlarged edition. — М.: The Russian language, 1981—1984. [Small Academic Dictionary] [Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo yazyka: In 4 t. / AN SSSR. Institut russkogo yazyka; Pod obschei red. A.P. Evgenievoyi. — Vtoroe izd., ispr. i dop. — М.: Russkii yazyk, 1981—1984. [MAS]] Словарь современного русского языка: В 4 т. / АН СССР. Институт русского языка; Под общей ред. А.П. Евгеньевой. — Второе изд., испр. и доп. — М.: Русский язык, 1981—1984. [MAC].
21. Solovieva I.N. “Three Sisters” and “Cherry Orchard” produced by The Arts Theatre // Stanislavsky K.S. Acting copies of K.S. Stanislavsky: In 6 volumes — М.: Art, 1983. — Volume 3. — P. 68—69. [Solovieva I.N. «Tri Sestry» i «Bishevy Sad» v postanovke Khudozhestvennogo teatra // Stanislavsky K.S. Rezhisserskie ekzemplary K.S. Stanislavskogo: V 6 t. — М.: Iskusstvo, 1983. — Т. 3. — S. 68—69.] Соловьева И.Н. «Три сестры» и «Вишневый сад» в постановке Художественного театра // Станиславский К.С. Режиссерские экземпляры К.С. Станиславского: В 6 т. — М.: Искусство, 1983. — Т. 3. — С. 68—69.
22. Stanislavsky K.S. Acting copies, 1898—1930: In 6 volumes — М.: Art, 1983. — V. 3: 1901—1904: Plays by A.P. Chekhov “Three Sisters”, “Cherry Orchard”. — 464 p. [Stanislavsky K.S. Rezhisserskie ekzemplary, 1898—1930: V 6 t. — М.: Iskusstvo, 1983. — Т. 3: 1901—1904: Piesy A.P. Chekhova «Tri Sestry», «Vishnyovy Sad». — 464 s.] Станиславский К.С. Режиссерские экземпляры, 1898—1930: В 6 т. — М.: Искусство, 1983. — Т. 3: 1901—1904: Пьесы А.П. Чехова «Три сестры», «Вишневый сад». — 464 с.

23. Heidegger M. Works and thoughts of various years. — М.: Gnozis, 1993. — 447 p. [Heidegger M. Raboty i razmyshlenia raznykh let. — М.: Gnozis, 1993. — 447 s.] Хайдеггер М. Работы и размышления разных лет. — М.: Гнозис, 1993. — 447 с.
24. Klebnokov V. Our basis // Liren. — М., 1920. — P. 23–24. [Klebnokov V. Nasha osnova // Liren — М., 1920. — S. 23–24.] Хлебников В. Наша основа // Лирень. — М., 1920. — С. 23–24.
25. Khodus V.P. Impressionism of the dramaturgic text by A.P. Chekhov. — Stavropol: Publishing House of Stavropol State University, 2006. — 176 p. [Khodus V.P. Impressionistichnost dramaturgicheskogo teksta A.P. Chekhova. — Stavropol: Izd-vo SGU, 2006. — 176 s.] Ходус В.П. Импрессионистичность драматургического текста А.П. Чехова. — Ставрополь: Изд-во СГУ, 2006. — 176 с.
26. Chernogovskaya T.V. Cheshire smile of Shrodinger's cat: language and consciousness. — М.: Languages of the Slavic culture, 2017. — 448 p. [Chernogovskaya T.V. Cheshyrskaya ulybka kota Shrodingera: yazyk i soznanie. — М.: Yazyki slavyanskoi kultury, 2017. — 448 s.] Черниговская Т.В. Чеширская улыбка кота Шрёдингера: язык и сознание. — М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2017. — 448 с.
27. Chekhov A.P. The complete works and letters: In 30 volumes / Works: In 18 volumes — М.: Science, 1974—1982. [Chekhov A.P. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem: V 30 t. / Cochinenia: V 18 t. — М.: Nauka, 1974—1982.] Чехов А.П. Полное собрание сочинений и писем: В 30 т. / Сочинения: В 18 т. — М.: Наука, 1974—1982.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

- 1. Viacheslav P. Khodus**, Dr. in Philological Sc., Assoc. Prof., Head of Russian Language Department, North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, Russia.

2. **Khadisha R. Nurgali**, Dr. in Philological Sc., Prof., Head of Russian Philology Department, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.
3. **Asemgul A. Moldozhanova** Dr of Philological Sc., Prof., Academic Deputy Rector, L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.
4. **Anatoliy A. Serebriakov** Dr of Philological Sc., Assoc. Prof., Head of Native and World Literature Department, North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, Russia
5. **Elena Y. Khodus**, PhD of Philological Sc., Assoc. Prof., Romanian Germanic Philology and Linguodidactics Department, North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, Russia.
6. **Gulzhan Z. Shashkina**, PhD of Philological Sc., Assoc. Prof., Prof. of Russian Philology Department, L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan.

RECIBIDO: 2 de octubre del 2019.

APROBADO: 11 de octubre del 2019.