



Sociolinguistic Potential of Polypredicative Syntactic Constructions and the Problems of its Study

Nadejda Emrovna Shakurbanova

Senior Lecturer, Department of Contemporary Russian Language, Faculty of Russian Philology,
Uzbek State World Languages University

ARTICLE INFO

Published Online:
22 March 2021

Corresponding Author:
**Nadejda Emrovna
Shakurbanova**

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the problem of studying the sociolinguistic potential of polypredicative syntactic constructions, defining the principles of analysis of multi-term complex sentences and complex sentences of a complicated type, describing the position of choosing the social roles considered in the work and justifying the inclusion of the interpersonal role “narrator” in the concept of social role in a literary text.

The relevance of the chosen topic is due to the need to study the syntax of the modern Russian language in the sociolinguistic aspect, since at present the sociolinguistic approach is applied only to phonetics, vocabulary, phraseology. We have not identified significant studies related to the analysis of the syntactic structure of the Russian language, and in particular, polypredicative syntactic constructions presented in the sociolinguistic aspect. Therefore, it seems to us interesting to consider this problem.

KEYWORDS: Russian language, syntax, sociolinguistics, social roles, speech act, speech behavior, polypredicative syntactic constructions, linguistics, complex sentences, syntactic analysis.

METHODS

Description; comparison, method of generalization and systematization, comparative analysis, as well as methods of conceptual and contextual analysis.

Sociolinguistics is a branch of linguistics that has an applied nature. This is a fairly young industry that appears as a separate area of linguistics in the second half of the 20th century. Nowadays, sociolinguistics is experiencing another surge of interest, revival, and this is associated with extralinguistic processes.

Sociolinguistics refers to the so-called external linguistics. Sociolinguistics considers language not in itself, not as a structure, but in its connections with a collective of native speakers.

Since we are interested in polypredicative constructions considered in the sociolinguistic aspect, we will tell you in more detail why there are still no studies devoted to the syntactic side of the Russian language, considered through the prism of sociolinguistics.

This is due to the fact that since the mid-50s, the development of serious linguistic science in Russia has gone towards the structural study of language, primarily phonology, morphology and syntax. Interesting results were

achieved along this path, but the social side of the problem remained outside the scope of attention.

In the United States during the same period of time, as in Russia, science was characterized by an increase in the interest of linguists in formal problems. With the publication of N. Chomsky's book “Syntactic Structures” in 1957, the so-called “Chomsky revolution” in linguistics began, which was based on the principle of formalization of description. The study of the system of language rules was separated from the study of individual and social rules that determine the contextual use of language structures. Thus, the real language was “cleared” of specific communicants, only the ideal speaker and listener were considered, no language functions were taken into account, except for the communicative [4].

Currently, the sociolinguistic approach is applied to phonetics, vocabulary, phraseology. We have not identified studies concerning the syntactic structure of the Russian language, and in particular, polypredicative syntactic constructions (which include polynomial complex sentences and complex sentences of a complicated type) presented in a sociolinguistic aspect. Therefore, it seems to us interesting to consider this problem. In this we see the sociolinguistic potential of the above constructions.

Until now, there is no single approach to the analysis of language from the point of view of sociolinguistics. No

clear analysis criteria are defined. This creates a fertile ground for scientific research in this area, and hence for the development of sociolinguistics as a science.

We believe that each area of the language may have its own special analysis criteria, but for the development of science as a whole, it is necessary to formulate specific, universal principles of analysis, which will include both sociolinguistic parameters and purely linguistic foundations for the analysis of specific areas of the language. Therefore, on the agenda for the development of this science is the task of developing such methods and conceptual apparatus that “will help overcome the fragmentation of sociolinguistic research, raise their level from descriptive to typological, which will reveal not only particular patterns of language development, but also sociolinguistic universals” [2, p. 135].

We see the sociolinguistic potential of polypredicative syntactic constructions in the study of how they characterize a particular social role, for what purpose they are used in the text and what function they perform. Thus, we will define a specific sociolinguistic informativeness.

A social role is a set of actions that must be performed by a person holding a given status. A person must fulfill certain material values in the social system. This is a model of human behavior, objectively set by the social position of an individual in the system of social, social and personal relations [1].

Speaking about the social role in our research, we will focus on the main, in our opinion, roles of characters in works of art – these are “man – woman”, “adult – young” and “narrator (narrator – relay)”.

The problem of studying the sociolinguistic potential of polypredicative syntactic constructions is which polypredicative constructions with the same type and different type of connection between predicative parts are more often used in their speech by men and women, adults and young characters, as well as the narrator as a special character of the society of the work.

This study will help to determine the features of the speech behavior of characters, namely, the features of constructing structures, the specifics of their use to achieve a specific goal in a conversation, a clear definition of the function of these structures in the speech of characters in works of art. Having conducted this sociolinguistic research, we will find out the general features of the syntactic organization of speech of characters in different social roles that use polypredicative syntactic constructions.

To implement all of the above, it is necessary to determine the principles of analysis of polypredicative syntactic constructions (polynomial SSP, SPP, BSP and SPUT) to identify patterns in the construction and determine their sociolinguistic information content, capacity and meaningfulness for each social role.

To begin with, we describe the techniques for analyzing multi-term complex sentences. These constructions

have the same type of connection between the predicative parts: compositional, subordinate and non-union. Moreover, there should be at least three predicative parts (PP). Thus, the first thing we need to determine is the type of supply by the number of inverters. If there are three or more of them, then we define the general term “polynomial complex sentence” or “polynomial construction”.

Next, you should characterize each of the PPs: determine the predicative centers (PC), the morphological expression of the subject or predicate, the type of predicate; to characterize what design each PP is (simple two-part sentence (TPS), one-part sentence (OPS)).

The next step in the analysis is to identify the syntactic connection between the PP (compositional, subordinate, having a dismembered – undivided structure, or non-union connection). After that, we recommend building a structural diagram of the structure for a visual representation, since further analysis will focus on the structure diagram.

It is also necessary to pay attention to whether the frequency converter is contaminated, and to designate the logical components (LC) of the contaminated structure on the diagram. Further analysis concerns the characteristics of LCs, which are constructions of a minimal structure, namely, complex sentences consisting of only two PPs – compound sentence (SSP), complex sentence (SPP), non-union compound sentence (BSP), depending on the type of communication of the entire polynomial sentence, after which we characterize the communication means.

It is especially necessary to dwell on polynomial complex sentences, which have different types of subordination within the same construction: sequential, parallel, heterogeneous subordination of clauses, homogeneous subordination of subordinate clauses, as well as mixed type. These constructions are always visually visible on the structural diagram of the proposal.

Let us turn to the level-by-level analysis of contaminated multi-term complex sentences. The first level is on the border of contamination – this is the logical-semantic level, at which two LCs are usually distinguished. That is, a complex proposal of a minimal construction arises, and the SSP, SPP or BSS depends on the syntactic connection at this level of division.

The next level (the second level of division) is the syntactic proper, which is already inside the LC. This is where the parsing of the component takes place in terms of structure, semantics, the nature of the means of communication between the inverters, such as a subordinate clause (if the SPP).

In conclusion of the syntactic analysis, we give an exact definition of the type of the analyzed structure.

The next part of the analysis of polynomial syntactic constructions is their sociolinguistic characteristics. Here, first of all, it is necessary to pay attention to the character in which social role the analyzed structure belongs, for what

purpose this particular structure of the utterance was used and in what function it was used.

Thus, we will see a characteristic of the internal organization of the statements of characters who are in different social roles, namely, what types of multi-term complex sentences characterize gender, age and interpersonal social roles, what are the constructions built according to certain models, what semantic load they carry to characterize a particular role.

There are two opposites for gender social roles: man and woman. It is known that the speech of a man and a woman is different. By speech, we mean the construction of phrases, which is associated with male or female speech behavior. The study of these differences is of great interest for sociolinguistics. But the interest is not even in specific differences, but in the very belief that these differences exist.

We are also interested in the study of polypredicative constructions, the use of which takes place in male speech behavior and in female behavior.

Is Polynomial composite sentence (MnSP) or Complex sentence of the complicated type (SPUT) used more often by men - women? Of the MnSP, which types are more often present in speech phrases, and which are not at all? SPUT with what leading connection are the speech of men – women inherent? Why are some designs favored by men, and others by women? – these are the questions that need to be answered.

In the study, we included the concept of the social role of the narrator of a work of art because we are convinced that this character is also a participant in speech acts, is in a certain society and has interpersonal relationships with other characters, about whom he talks, reflects or describes, communicates with them on in their typical language and participates in their life, since it turns out to be an observer of all events. The narrator refers to an interpersonal social role for the reasons described above. Note that even if the narrator is not a specific hero of the work, does not have a name, character, replicas with direct speech and is not indicated by the first person in any way, leading the story from a third person, then he is still considered a separate major character with interpersonal relationships, a participant in speech acts with specific speech behavior. The non-personalized (anonymous) narrator objectifies speech, i.e. there is a discrepancy between the producer of speech and its subject – the description of the content of speech from the outside. In other words, the subjective act of speech is presented by the narrator as objectified. The result is constructions that resemble indirect or improperly direct speech.

The anonymous narrator as a fictional character presents a huge field of research. It is the speech of the narrator, who is often a typical representative of the described society, inherits the speech skills of this environment, the structure of speech of which, to a greater or lesser extent, includes characteristic linguistic means, forms the basis of the dynamics of the work.

The phenomenon of the narrator's speech acts lies in the fact that in his speech behavior, the fusion of the narrative itself and someone else's speech can occur. On the one hand, he, being close to the depicted environment, being its anonymous representative, is endowed with comprehensive knowledge, because only those who are well acquainted with them can talk about heroes and events. He is inside the depicted events and at the same time above them as an observer [3]. The result is the story itself.

On the other hand, the narrator can be so close to the characters he is narrating that he involuntarily conveys their words, their thoughts, their actions through improperly direct speech – as if merging with one character or another.

Based on the foregoing, we propose to call the first type of narrator a narrator, and the second, a repeater.

Thus, the non-personalized (anonymous) narrator is also a social interpersonal role in the society of a work of art, whose speech behavior would also be interesting to consider and analyze in detail from the point of view of constructing voluminous statements of a polypredicative nature; identify the typical and special in these constructions.

Conclusion. Thus, we substantiated our belief that even a non-personalized (anonymous) narrator is also a social interpersonal role in the society of a work of art, whose speech behavior would also be interesting to consider and analyze in detail from the point of view of constructing voluminous statements of a polypredicative nature; identify the typical and special in these constructions.

Thus, we have revealed the problem and outlined a range of issues for studying the sociolinguistic potential of polypredicative syntactic constructions through the prism of speech behavior of gender, age and interpersonal social roles, and also identified a new role in the society of a work of art “narrator” and identified asymmetry within the role itself.

REFERENCES

1. Davydov S. Lecture notes on sociology. 2008. URL: <http://texts.news/obschaya-sotsiologiya-knigi/sotsialnyie-statusyi-rol-rol-statusno-rolvoy-32325.html>
2. Mikhalchenko V., Kryuchkova T. Sociolinguistics in Russia // Questions of linguistics. 2002. No. 5. P. 135.
3. Solganik G. Category of the narrator and the specificity of artistic speech // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism. 2014. No. 2. S. 109-119. URL: <http://vestnik.journ.msu.ru/books/2014/2/kategoriya-rasskazchika-i-spetsifika-khudozhestvennoy-rechi/>
4. Vakhtin N. Social aspects of language research. URL: <http://window.edu.ru/resource/466/38466/files/spr0000010.pdf>

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Akhmanova O.S. Modern syntactic theories. – Moscow: Publishing house of Moscow University, 1963.

2. Andryushchenko T. Ya. Text structure as a tool in the study of semantic perception of speech communication. Communication. Text. Statement. – Moscow: Nauka, 1988.
3. Babaytseva V.V. Phenomena of transitivity in the grammar of the Russian language: Monograph. – Moscow: Bustard, 2000.
4. Davydov S. Lecture notes on sociology. 2008. URL: <http://texts.news/obschaya-sotsiologiya-knigi/sotsialnyie-statusyi-rol-i-rol-statusno-rolevoy-32325.html>
5. Hamaganova VM Structural-semantic and lexical model of the text of the "description" type: Problems of semiotics and ontology: dis. dr. philol. Sciences: 10.02.01 / V.M. Hamaganova. – Moscow, 2002.
6. Kruchinina I.N. Asyndeton. // Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary / Ch. ed. V.N. Yartseva. – Moscow: Great Russian Encyclopedia, 2002.
7. Kustova G.I. Syntax of the modern Russian language. – Moscow: Publishing Center "Academy", 2005.
8. Lapteva O.A. Live Russian speech from the TV screen. - Moscow, 2000.
9. Mikhalchenko V., Kryuchkova T. Sociolinguistics in Russia // Questions of linguistics. 2002. № 5.
10. Nechaeva OA Functional-semantic types of speech: author. dis.doc. philol. sciences. / O.A. Nechaev. – Moscow, 1975.
11. Referovskaya EA Communicative structure of the text in the lexical and grammatical aspect. Ed. 2nd, rev. – Moscow: Publishing house of LCI, 2007.
12. Rosenthal D.E Modern Russian language: textbook. Benefit. – Moscow: Ayriss-press, 2006.
13. Solganik G. Category of the narrator and the specificity of artistic speech // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 10. Journalism. 2014. No. 2. S. 109-119.
URL:<http://vestnik.journ.msu.ru/books/2014/2/kategoriya-rasskazchika-i-spetsifika-khudozhestvennoy-rechi/>
14. Vakhtin N. Social aspects of language research. URL:<http://window.edu.ru/resource/466/38466/files/spr000010.pdf>
15. Valgina N.S. Modern Russian language. – Moscow: Logos, 2002.
16. Zolotova G.A. Essay on the functional syntax of the Russian language. – Moscow: Nauka, 2005.