

Substitute Construction as an Indicator of Structurally-Semantic Expansion of Sentence (As exemplified by English, Russian and Tatar languages)

Rishat Zhurkenovich Saurbayev and Kairat Muhamekhafizovich Tekzhanov

Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute, 140000, Pavlodar, Mira Street, 60, Kazakhstan

rishat_1062@inbox.ru

Abstract: The presented article deals with the syntax problems of expanded sentence in contrastive-comparative presentation. The authors of the article put forward a statement that, besides the traditional expansion categories, there exist the ones that are presented outside the sentence structure itself; that the sentence does not end in punctuation signs; the expansion is caused by its semantic links with the previous and subsequent syntactical constructions. The authors put forward a thesis about the necessity to study the substitute constructions as a syntactic unit; the majority of researchers concentrates their attention on the study of substitute as a lexical and stylistic unit and does not consider it as a full syntactic phenomenon. The existence of such category as "an expanded sentence" is also a disputable moment in modern linguistics; only few researchers consider this linguistic phenomenon as a separate linguistic unit. The authors make an attempt to prove the existence of this unit in modern syntax by presenting the substitute construction as an element of utterance expansion. In modern speech, a great role is fulfilled by the linguistic means of ellipsis, substitution, representation, at which the structurally-required element is transferred into implication, so there is a compression of verbal elements into a succinct predicative unit, which is presented in the substitute construction, also fulfilling a function of semantic and syntactic completeness of the utterance. The substitute construction is an element of structural-semantic expansion of the sentence in languages, different in structure and system, such as English, Russian and Tatar, which belong to different language families. [Saurbayev R. Zh. Tekzhanov K.M. **Substitute Construction as an Indicator of Structurally-Semantic Expansion of Sentence (As exemplified by English, Russian and Tatar languages)**. *Life Sci J* 2013;10(10s):30-35] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 6

Keywords: substitute construction; substitute; predication; sentence expansion.

1. Introduction

There are various means in the languages, which prevent bulking and structural sameness of speech and allow to avoid the pleonastic utterances. Substitute constructions can be distinguished from them.

This construction has a general property - its usage in conjunction with the context, where the replaced or omitted syntactic element is present.

The use of substitute construction is connected, firstly, with the colloquial speech, as the drive for saving the linguistic means and for complete syntactic construction.

At the substitute construction the structurally-required element of the construction is transferred into implication.

As is known, the conditions of origination of any oral utterance are characterized by a number of peculiarities. Spontaneity of the colloquial speech, its orientation at a definite listener, time and physical limits together with no officiality of speakers make an impact on the structure of verbal message [1]. The speaker is usually limited by time frames to create the verbal message, for adequate verbal implementation of his intention; communicative conditions do not provide an opportunity to edit. The main purpose of

the speaker is to hold the communicative initiative and attention of the listener; it results in wide use of cliched phrases in speech; the speaker frequently replaces a full informative communication act with some kind of formal verbal action - communicative in form, but absolutely ambiguous in content [2].

This peculiarity of the colloquial speech shows itself when the speaker uses the substitute construction. The substitute, as an element of syntactic completion, is characterized by obligatory co-occurrence with the verbs, which are the predicative centers of any utterance. The obligatory co-occurrence of the verb with the substitute is connected with the idea of words "valency", based on the necessity or the possibility of the verb to be supplemented by another words, present in the verbal area before the verb or after it [3].

J. Sol in his investigation considered the substitute construction as a construction-substitution, having the co-referential meaning [4].

G.K. Pullum and S.B. Shtoltz see in the notion "substitutionality" a philosophical language category, implying under this notion a substitution of one full structure by another reduced one, condensing the initial version in its construction [5].

V.M. Vuvich considers the substitute structures in terms of ellipse, as a linguistic mechanism of substitution of some overloaded syntactic constructions by easier and economic ones in order to prevent the repetition of the same structures [6]. F.Khartyan has the same opinion; he considers that the substitute is a synonym of ellipsis, as a linguistic phenomenon, which is a mean to replace the repetition [7].

The use of construct-substitution as an element of syntactic completeness corresponds to the notion of syntactic valency, where it is consistent with the statement of K.Buller, that the words of the definite range create free places around them, which can be filled or supplemented by the words of definite ranges [8].

The substitute, as a component of structural and semantic expansion of the sentence, is considered in the works of R.Zh. Sayrbaev and R.A. Vafeev [9].

In his investigation R.Zh. Sayrbaev analyses the substitute constructions in terms of dialogical unities, where, in author's opinion, they do not only expand and supplement the utterance structurally and meaningfully, but also fulfill the communicative purposes, presenting a new rheumatic utterance in the structure of the actual division, as the fully predicative one serves as thematic and carries already known information [10].

Thus, based on statements and approaches of linguists, we can conclude that we understand the syntactic completeness as the ability of substitute constructions to make a sentence structurally and semantically complete in accordance with the logical and communicative structure of the utterance.

Being an element of syntactic completeness of the utterance, the substitute construction stands both in preposition and postposition in relation to the subjective-predicative center of the utterance. In case of postposition relatedness, the use of substitute construction is frequently caused by the syntactic reasons, the specific character of the syntactic construction itself. This is the case, when the represented member is expressed by the semi-predicative construction, which completes and supplements the utterance; the repetition of this construction in subordinate clause is abundant and replaced by the construction of easier structure; at this its semantic expansion is observed. Such constructions include the stable combinations, such as *and all that, and that sort of thing, something (anything) like that, or something, or what, or anything, something of that kind, and the like* in English, and also the words with maximally abstractive meaning and the nouns of wide semantics *thing, kind, sort, stuff*.

In Tatar language similar constructions are determined by the character of their constituents,

represented by pronouns, with maximally abstractive meaning *ber narsa, ber kem, berese-ber*, adverbs *anda-sanda, anda-monda*, parenthesis and particles *imesh, bolay imesh, tegelay imesh* adjectives, *berse da barly – yukly* etc.

In Russian language the substitute constructions are represented by indefinite pronouns with abstractive meanings and adverbs.

These constituents act in utterances as the substitute construction, forming with the surrounding utterances one syntactic-semantic unity.

Semantic lameness and unrenewable character of these combinations are obvious, and it is mainly compensated by the character of their constituents.

In speech these semantic lame constructions act as the substitutes, i.e. verbally unexpressed message. They are just approximate; express the most general notions, not naming them, and being only a deictic mean, aimed at the general, further content. It is here the nature of substitute constructions is revealed; they are aimed at semantic implicitness, pronominality and deicticity.

In verbal communication the substitute constructions, as a rule, take the postposition and function as the secondary, reduced predicate of indefinite content.

As per the information theory, the most important part is located in the beginning of the sentence, the secondary part is located in the end. Postposition of the abovementioned constructions reflects their colloquial characteristics.

Thus, the main, initial part of the sentence delivers the information, most relevant for this communication act, and provides the listener with the idea of the speaker's intension, determines the subject of the message, facilitating for the listener the potential actualization of the substitute constructions [2].

The meaning of the whole utterance is that the meaning of the left surrounding predetermines the verbal filling of the substitute constructions; there is a retrospective semantic dependence of the substitute constructions on the content of preceding structures.

Using the substitute constructions in the process of communication, the speaker subconsciously takes into account the knowledge, experience and emotional state of the listener. Here is the social status of the communication partner, their professional community, sphere of interests etc., general knowledge and knowledge of communicative situation mainly predetermine the selection of the quantity of communicated information by the speaker.

Acting as a substitute element, the substitute constructions function as correlates. They correlate with the subsequent utterance as a subordinate clause,

fill them with content and fulfill the same syntactic function as a part of the complex, as the correlated utterance.

Characterizing the words-correlates, the researchers place the primary emphasis on their role as the form words, forming with the subordinate clause the inseparable structural-semantic unity [3,8]. Correlates play the specialized function, consisting in unification of parts into one semantic complex, as well as the notification of the subordinate clause. For instance:

"Why don't you go first? It is many years since you set foot in London, Elizabeth."

She alighted, and saw her look up at the red brick house. "It's just as I imagined it would be."

"I hope it remained inside the same thing." She added. (J. W. Brown)

Let us consider the example from the novel of English writer Joan Brown "Penross Manor". Elizabeth, returning to London after a long-term absence, finds out, that the house, which she left since her mother had died, remained the same as at that sorrowful day, however, she hopes, that everything inside the house is the same as it was prior to her departure. In the given utterance the word-substitute with the generalized semantics *the same thing* logically continues the idea as it was before my leaving, where the substitute construction forms the general semantic unity and implicitly expresses the subordinate clause of the utterance.

An ability of the speaker to predict the subsequent verbal structures plays a definite role in communication. Presupposition of the utterance is in the ability of the listener to foresee any event, which follows the already reported event, and to expect the possible event taking into consideration the already accumulated experience of the language interaction.

Thus, commonness of the language interaction depends on the ability to predict and to react to verbal situations, using the substitute syntactic constructions, as a structure, replacing the main structure of the utterance in order to avoid its repetition in the following units, keeping the whole process of communication.

For colloquial speech the reverse connection is typical, as a reaction of the listener to the message of the speaker, which allows the speaker to judge, how he perceives one or another message; that is why he always can make sure in this by asking the corresponding question and, if necessary, to change the form of the utterance or to provide the additional information for the reported subject.

"His face tells you nothing, Isaac said to himself, but he did look up – rather quickly, too."

"She was almost distracted with loneliness."

"Been here long?"

"A few months, something like that I think"

"Know anything about her?"

"Not a thing except that she is a distant niece of the present Villier. A poor relative probably. I hear they used to be quite a clan. Now big Gert is the last of the line except for Sarie. But you would know some sort of that. You were born here."

"You mean some sort of that?" (P. Abraham)

Let us consider the following example of functioning of the substitute constructions in English colloquial speech:

"If I drink some, will you talk to me decently, man to man, without wise cracking?"

"I'll try. I don't promise to spill all my ideas."

"I can't without those," he said acidly.

"That's nice suit you're wearing."

The flush dyed his face again. "This suit cost twenty-seven-or twenty eight or something like that". (R. Chandler)

In the given abstract of the dialogue from the novel of Raymond Chandler "Farewell, My Love" there is a substitute construction *something like that*, which introduces additional information, underlines the hypothetical character of the whole utterance and gives evidence of the inaccuracy of information. The presented construction *something like that* delivers predication in economic condensed form. If we expand the construction, we obtain its full structure, where the latent predication, i.e. the subjective-predicative basis is represented in the full form *it costs something like that*, it proves that the substitute construction has the predicative properties, which are not expressed on the surface layer, but exist in the latent form. Thus, we can find out two predicative bases, the first with the full set of the subject-predicate base *This suit cost twenty-seven or twenty eight* and the second one, with the reduced base, where the predication is expressed in the folded view *it is something like that*.

In the functional expression plane, non-verbalization of the presented information can be first of all caused by the conditions of communication, when the communicative situation and the previous experience of the communicators make it abundant, or the speaker does not have exact information or the strong opinion about something; that by means of the substitute construction he informs of the approximate nature of his knowledge or judgments, or when the speaker is at fault and cannot accurately put his thoughts into words.

Let us consider the examples from the dialogical unities from the juxtaposed Tatar speech:

Ul zhirne kutaru ochen durt at zhigarga kirak shul, Ibray abzasy, - dide berau, "jukny kaigartasyn" digan tysle, suzyp, ometsez itep aytte.

Tik Ibray ana karap kefsezlenmede, kirsenche, uze telep shulay eyttergen tozle elekterep kitte:

Durt at narsa, durt at pustyak ul, ahda mena...

Sinda ikese da yuk bit ale anyn, berse da barly-yukly... (M. Amir)

(– Eh, Ibray Uncle, - one of lying on the grass drawled with despair, - to dig up this ground, we need not less than four horses....

– four horses are trifle, - contradicted Ibray stubbornly.

You don't have even two horses!).

In the abovementioned example from the story of the famous Tatar writer Mirsay Amir "Agydel", the old man Ibray contradicts, because four horses are not enough to dig up the ground, in reply one of the interlocutors contradicts that he does not have even two horses; in Tatar example the substitute construction is expressed by the adjective *berse da barly-yukly* (you do not have even one), replacing the fully predicative unit, represented in the main utterance, and being the additional information to the main message. Thus, the adjective *berse da barly-yukly* is semi-predicative, substitute construction, expanding the simple sentence structurally and semantically. The substitute construction expresses folded predication, *berse da barly-yukly* can be compensated by the fully predicative unit *sinda de ber de atta yuk* (you don't have even one horse), where by means of the substitute unit in order to save the speech efforts, the fully predicative unit is not reproduced.

Let us consider one more example which proves the idea that the substitute construction in speech acts as a syntactic completion and cohesion of elements into one syntactic unity. They correlate with the subsequent utterance as a subordinate clause, fill with the content and fulfill the syntactic function as a part of the complex, the same as the correlated utterance.

Aptekashev. Aye...Yuk momkin tugel. Ale bugen gena ministrnyn uze belan soylashtem. Bik aybet soyleshtte ul. Kursatmalar birde, hatta ber masala buyencha kinashemne sorady.

Marfuga. Kinash, imesh. Sine kuarga zhenabyz, iptash Aptekashev,ni uylysyn, dip aytmademe? (T. Minnullin)

(Aptekashev. Yes, possibly no. Only today personally have a talk with the minister. He talked very good. Provided with the visual material, even asked for the advice for one problem.

Marfuga. He said the advice. We are going to get rid of you, comrade Aptekashev, what you think he would say about it.)

In this example the replica of the first utterance continues in the reply, as if repeating it

structurally and semantically, forming the syntactic unity *hatta ber masala buyencha kinashemne sorady* and the reply *kinash, imesh*, the modal word *imesh* acts as the substitute construction (so called, allegedly), where the this element expresses hypothetical modality, probability and possibility.

Thus, it is possible to consider that the modal word and the repeated replica are the substitute construction in relation to the main utterance as a reply, which is used by the speaker for the definite nomination, has the communicative character and plays an important part in the communication process.

Let us consider the following example:

Ul kup soyli; bolay imesh, tegeley imesh. (He speaks a lot: telling that, telling this)

In this example the sentence consists from one predicative center *Ul kup soyli* and substitution construction *bolay imesh, tegeley imesh* latently presented the second predicate center, which adds to the utterance structure additional predication. The substitute construction in this example acts as a subordinate clause.

In our opinion, the substitute construction is important structurally not only for the subordinate part, i.e. the subordinate clause, but for the subordinating one, i.e. for the main clause. Despite the fact that the subordinate clause fulfills the subordinate syntactic function as a part of the complex, it is structurally and semantically complete, as it has its own predicative core. Due to this, the predicative part is differentiated from the main one by the pause, so, it structurally does not join directly to the verb of the main clause.

Kalimullinnan kuzemne alyp, bashkalarga karyim: bashkalarda shulay. Nak chyn chynnan sugyshkan shiklle kylanalar. Berse-ber kolmas, berse-ber tavyshlanmas. (M. Amir)

(Shifting his glance from Kalimullin, I look at the others, the others do the same. I'm getting the impression that all this is almost true, nobody laughs, nobody makes noise.)

In the abovementioned example from the story "Pair of Pigeons" by Mirsay Amir the author describes Red Army men preparation to the bayonet charge, the whole situation, psychological state of soldiers is close to the battle. Tension of the situation, faced by the author, is expressed by means of the substitute construction, where this structure acts as an intensifying instrument. The author avoids to use the fully predicative units in the subordinate clause, the substitute construction, despite the uncertainty, also introduces to the utterance the generalizing element and fulfills the intensifying function. Thus, in the utterance there is used the substitute construction, expressed by the adjective *bashkalarda shulay*, which compensates for the explicitly unexpressed fully

predicative unit *allarda kuzlerne alyp, ber-beresene karyilar* (they are the same as I, shifting their glances, look at each other.) Thus, we can conclude that at substitution, the structural-required element of the subordinate clause is transferred into implication. The substitute construction is represented by the implicit, latent predication, structurally and semantically expanding the sentence and so complicating it.

Let us illustrate this linguistic phenomenon by the example from Russian speech: *v etoy knige sobrany raznye veschi. Odnakak budto sovsen dlya detey. Drugaya – dlya yunoshesiva. Esche tri poslednie po vremenam napisaniya, vrode by otnosyatsy k vzrosloy proze. Men'she vsego mne khotelos' vozvodit' peregorodki mezhdumoiimi povestiyami. Dlya menyay, po krayney mere, vse oni prodolzhayut drug drugu i dazhe vytekyut drug iz druga, tochno ruch'y ili rechki.*

Prosto inogdaya obrazshayus' k malym, a inogdaya k starym, starayus' chtoby prezhdvsego oni uslyshali to. Chto khochetsyay mne skazat'. (iz predisloviyaya A. Likhanov)

(Different stories are collected in this book. One is as if just for children. Another one is for young people. It seems that another three last ones per time of writing belong to the adult prose. Least of all I wanted to separate my stories. For me, at least, they all continue each other and even follow from one another like streams or rivers.

Sometimes I appeal to the youth, and sometimes to the adults, I try to make them listen what I would like to say (from the preface A.Likhanov)

In the abovementioned example from the preface to collection of stories by Albert Likhanov, we found out that the small fragment abounds with the substitute constructions *Odnakak budto sovsen dlya detey. Drugaya – dlya yunoshesiva. Esche tri poslednie, prodolzhayut drug drugu.* (one is as if just for children. Another one is for young people, Another three last ones continue each other), the presented structures express the latent, implicit predication, as we can reconstruct the fully predicate unit by means of transformation constructions *odna vesch' napisana, budto dlya detey, drugaya vesch' napisana dlya yunoshesiva, esche tri esche tri poslednie veschi prodolzhayut drug drugu...* (one story is written as if just for children, another story is written for young people, another three last stories continue each other....) The author introduces uncertainty, which is expressed by the substitute *odna, drugaya, tret'ya* (one, another, the third) in order to avoid the unnecessary repetition, redundant information, which is directly presented in the fully predicative *v etoy knige sobrany raznye veschi* (different stories are collected in this book). The substitute constructions in this example are semantically and structurally

dependent, continue the narrative line of the main fully predicative clause, thus complicating the idea of the first part of the sentence, despite the fact that they are unattached and separated by punctuation. We may state that the substitute constructions fulfill the role of structural-semantic complicating component in the syntactic constructions. Thus, we can conclude that the expanded sentences are the complex syntactic unities and can fall outside their constructions, forming the interdependent and complementary structures, which are closely intertwined meaningfully and structurally with each other.

It is possible to conclude that the substitute constructions are universal in their function of substitution, syntactic and semantic completeness, and also expression in relation with the subsequent utterance, in the ability to fill it with the content and to predict the existence and character of the subsequent utterance in the colloquial speech. Differentiating characteristics of the substitute constructions for modern English and Tatar languages are the pronouns, words with maximally abstractive meaning, in English there are also the words with wide semantics, for Tatar language such words are the pronouns, adverbs, modal words and adjectives, which semantically and structurally expand the sentence, provide the whole utterance with the additional predication, thus being the element of the sentence expansion. Expansion of semantics and structure of the sentence is not limited by the punctuation signs and can fall outside their syntactic constructions, forming the complex syntactic unity, which is universal for the juxtaposed languages, despite their genetic and system remoteness.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Saurbayev
Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute, 140000,
Pavlodar, Mira Street, 60, Kazakhstan
rishat_1062@inbox.ru

References

1. Blokh, M.Ya. and S.M. Polyakov, 1992. Structure of Dialogical Speech. M., pp: 153.
2. Lysenko, O.M., 1987. Functional and Semantic Characteristics of Substitute Diffusion Utterances of English Colloquial Speech. Theory and Practice of Linguistic Description of Colloquial Speech. Gorkiy, pp: 89-96.
3. Kukushkina, A.T., 1977. Substitute, as an Element of Lexical and Semantic Completeness of the Construction. Implementation Standards of Variation if Language Means, Gorkiy, Issue 3, pp: 121-133.
4. Saul, J., 2007. Simple Sentence, Sustitution, and Intution. Oxford Univer. Press, pp: 176.

5. Pullum, G.K. and C.B. Sholtz, 2007. Systematicity and Natural Language Syntax Croatian Journal of Philosophy. 21(7), pp: 375-402.
6. Vucic, V., 2012. Ellipsis and Substitution as Cohesive Device. Originalni Naucni Rad, pp: 407- 416 .
7. Haratyan, F., 2011. Halliday's SFL and Social Meaning 2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences. IPEDR vol.17 IACSIT Press, Singapore, pp: 260-264.
8. Bühler, K., 1990. Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language. John Benjamins Publishing, pp: 508.
9. Saurbaev, R.Zh. and R.A. Vafeev, 2012. Structural and Semantic Sentence Extension in Different in Structure languages (by the example of Tatar and English Languages). Pavlodar, pp: 128.
10. Saurbaev, R.Zh., 2011. Structural and Semantic Sentence Extension by the Substitute Construction in English and Tatar Languages. European Social Science Journal, 12(15): 209-215.

9/3/2013