

## Linguistic mechanisms of pre-substantive clauses in communicative aspect

Aigul Yskakkyzy Safargalieva

Kazakh National Technical University after K.I. Satpayev, Satpayev Str. 22, Almaty, 050013, Kazakhstan

**Abstract.** This article is devoted to analysis of linguistic mechanisms of pre-substantive clauses in Russian language in communicative aspect. The article actualizes the idea that any complex sentence being a unit of higher syntax level is intended mainly for realization of main function of the language – communicative function and therefore study of language units in terms of structural-semantic character must be considered as a tool for achieving of some communicative aims.

[Safargalieva A.Y. **Linguistic mechanisms of pre-substantive clauses in communicative aspect.** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(5s):215-218]. (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 41

**Keywords:** pre-substantive clauses, communicative grammar, communicative perspectives, linguistic mechanisms.

### Introduction

Communicative language teaching approach has been widely discussed in the last few decades. Grammar as a method of teaching language has been used since the Greek and latin period [1]. Scholars and scientists of different theoretical orientations define it in their own ways. Some of them consider grammar as an important component that relates phonology and semantics [2]. Others have a broader vision of grammar as any kind of information about words since there are no boundaries around grammar [3]. H.W.Fowler states grammar as the branch that deals with a language's inflexions, with its phonetic system, and with the arrangements of words in sentences [4]. Another prominent scientist defines grammar as a set of rules and principles that help a person to make use of words to manipulate and combine [5].

Communicative approach is based on the role of the "learners as communicators, naturally endowed with the ability to learn languages. It seeks to provide learners with the target language system. It is assumed that learners will have to prepare to use the target language (orally and in written form) in many predictable and unpredictable acts of communication which arise both in classroom interaction and in real-world situations, whether concurrent with language training or subsequent to it" [6].

Our study emphasizes the idea that any complex sentence being unit of higher syntax level is intended mainly for realization of main function of the language – communicative function and therefore study of language units in terms of structural-semantic character must be considered as a tool for achieving of some communicative aims.

### Methods

"Communication is conversation, exchange of thoughts, data, ideas etc. - specific form of interaction of people in the process of their cognitive and labour

activity" [7]. Main idea of theory of communicative grammar which is used by us in our study [8] is that sentence is multi-aspect phenomenon in terms of objective contents (dictum) and meanings and implications outgoing from the speaker and colouring the sentence in very different tones (modus). G. A. Zolotova believes that grammar science in transition period of its development is striving to realize the language system as a tool for expressing meaning, elevating from morphological basis onto the level of sentence and text. "Linguistics, grammar lived under dictate of morphology. Components of sentence were defined by case form regardless of their structural and meaning role. Aspect and tense forms of the verb, significant for organization of utterance, were broken down with great deliberation into parts, details, names and that was the peak of analysis. Cases, flexions, suffixes, prefixes are of course necessary step of knowledge. But it is only foundation - without a house in which people live, think and communicate by means of language" [9]. Taking said above into consideration "communicative function of speech is realized in no other way but by means of syntax constructions - bearers of expressed contents. Communicative aspects are an attempt to consider the structure of Russian syntax in terms of its communicative purpose for the sake of which syntax means exist" [10].

### Main part

In the framework of pre-substantive construction the provisions of communication theory and the theory of communicative grammar can be provided with convincing proofs: existing 2 types of attributive constructions, diverse set of communication means, opportunity of transformation into participial phrase are realization of different communicative perspectives in the process of study of linguistic mechanism of phenomena, practical understanding and use of them in learning process.

Subordinate pre-substantive are one of the most complex syntax units included into system of communicative means of Russian language. Main attributes which differentiate their meaning are formed on different levels of language system: lexical-semantic, morphological, syntax (constructive and communicative). "Differentiation of the aspects of study of pre-substantive clauses does not contradict their complex characteristics. All approaches are interrelated; they are main condition of adequacy of qualification of complex sentence with pre-substantive clauses as communicative unit" [11]. Structure of clauses is determined by availability of logical subject-object ratio of prop substantive in the main part and its anaphoric substitute in the dependent part.

Communicative perspective in the structure of pre-substantive construction is determined by communicatively-significant syntax fitness of sentence members. "Position of every sentence member has its rank which allows to actualize the name of every component of denotative structure more or less individually" [12]. Positions of connective words as sentence members are defined on the base of the following formal indicators: 1) place (distant/contact) in sentence structure, identified in accordance with their mutual semantic relations; 2) ability for substitution of the place by specified word; 3) morphological characteristics.

Connective words (relyats) being grammar indicators of attributive clauses and not being the bearers of their own meaning act like distinctive pointers, differentiating the relation of subordinate clause to main sentence by means of case forms. By this formal indicator paradigmatic series is produced able to cover all diversity of real relations.

Connective word *which* has highest communicative rank. Techniques of building of parts, forms of their correlation and relations in the sentences with indirect cases of connective word *which* are characterized by the fact that verb-predicate of dependent part of the sentence regulates these relations. Connective word acts like secondary part. This connective word is characterized by its ability to be both in contact and distant position [13]: 1) connective word *which* is in contact position when it syntactically directly depends on the predicate of dependent part; 2) distant position of connective word is when it is indirectly connected with predicate of dependent part. Connective words can depend on: 1) noun in any case acting as subject, object or adverbial modifier in dependent part: [...] (horses of which); 2) on infinitive, and it in turn depends on predicate or is included into it: [...], (to avoid which); 3) on adjective:[...] (like which..); 4) on adverb: [...] (near of which); 5) on comparative: [...] (sweeter and

tastier of which...); 6) on adverbial participle [...] (knowing which); 7) there are cases of dependency of connective word *which* on numeral are restricted to steady word combinations with meaning of pointing out to number: [...]. (nine of which ...); 8) use of pronouns in main positions in regard to the word *which* is restricted to similar word combinations [...] (each of which...).

Communicative status of connective word *which* in distant position is broadened: connective word *which* acts like a substitute for main noun representing it in the most general substantive semantics in dependent part. And depending on that the issue of correlation between tense and mood forms in 2 parts of compound sentence is raised. Such analysis of correlation between verb forms is performed when it is necessary to show the difference of given structure from close to them by combination of elements of paradigmatic and systematic series.

Next communicative rank (in descending order) is with connective word *that*. The word *that* is used in those dependent clauses which informs about attributes and signs of identified notion; in dependent part this word is always in the first position and is changed by laws of 2 types of relationship.

Rather high communicative rank has connective word *whose* which conveys the meaning of belonging of prop word in the main part but is correlated in gender, number and case with defined by it noun in dependent part.

In communicative aspect in the framework of attributive clauses the word *what* is used. In the beginning of XVIII century the use of *what* instead of *which* has reduced greatly because in that period syntagmatically related constructions of relative subordination were more common, and correlated word *which* performed its function in them quite well. Main grammar reason of refusal from the use of *what* in attributive clauses is their rigidity, revealed in morphological simplicity: it has no forms of number and gender, is always in nominative or accusative. If it is in nominative and performs the role of a subject then the predicate of dependent part is correlated with identified word of the main part in gender and number.

In terms of communicative particularities of attributive clauses the words *where*, *when*, *from where* are rarely used.

Pronoun adverbs have their own lexical significance which restricts their combinatory opportunities in a sentence. With such dependency the need for formal support by gender and number because choice of adverb is determined by need of verb-predicate of dependent clause for circumstantial definition and opportunity of specified noun to have

meaning of adverbial modifier (specified words in main sentence are usually nouns with very general meanings of place, time etc.).

High communicative rank have communicative types of pre-substantive clauses. 1) Pre-substantive sentences of attributive type can be divided into 2 kinds: A) emphasizing-attributive – dependent part is joined by connective words *which, that, whose, what, where, from where, when*, in main part defined word is emphasized by the pronoun *that*. In this kind of sentence dependent part contains message which differentiates this object from similar ones and points out to its distinctive attribute; B) qualitative-attributive - dependent part is joined by means of connective words *which, whose, what, where, from where, when*. Main word has various semantics and correlates with pointing word *such* which underlines attribute, quality of object and correlated with noun in gender, number and case. In this kind of attributive sentences qualitative estimates dominate. Particularity which divides kinds of attributive type is availability (or possible availability) of antecedents at specified word in the main part.

2) Pre-substantive clauses of narrative-extended type can be of only one type and consist of main and dependent parts which can be easily transformed into 2 simple sentences because there is a tone of joining between them. Dependent part extends, supplements information about already known person or object and is joined by connective words *which, whose, that, where, from where*. In narrative-extended sentences the relations of tense and mood forms of predicates are more diversified, the meaning of simultaneity or sequence of main and dependent parts depends on them. Auto-semanticity of prop word suggests availability of supplementary message in dependent part which together with context conveys additional semantics of the construction. Main structural-semantic particularity of analyzed constructions is that their components have independent communicative contents.

Sentences with participial phrase are also communicative kind of pre-substantive construction. Being iso-functional they appeared later than subordinate clause when organic phrase was forming on the base of development of general subordinate structure of sentence. Syntax synonyms differ by structure, tones of logical-semantic and grammar meaning, modality, expressivity degree, style.

Structural and semantic-stylistic specifics of pre-substantive construction is distinctly realized against the background of synonymic participial phrases. Structure of pre-substantive construction is determined by availability of logical subject-object correlation of prop substantive in main part and its anaphoric substitution in dependent part and

participial phrase is participle with dependable words. Structural differences are evident. These sentences are almost similar by speech semantics. Nearness of meanings of syntax constructions is provided by the same lexical contents which is changed only by use of auxiliary words. Difference of informative tones is provided by language semantics: in pre-substantive construction subordinate clause makes action distinct, and participle only emphasizes an attribute. In terms of communicative-semantic aspect participle is shorter, laconic form of thought expression in comparison with pre-substantive construction because in isolated part there is an indication to both quality and action. Subordinate clause is used more often in colloquial and bookish speech, but participial phrase is not used in colloquial speech. Transformed character of synonyms includes known restrictions in regard to conditions of substitution of subordinate clause for participial phrase. Impossibility of transformation on the level of synonyms can depend on non-compliance of verbal categories (aspect, reflexivity, tense) of participle and a verb.

### Conclusion

Analyzed by us material shows great diversity of communicative kinds of pre-substantive construction. In this regard pre-substantive category is functionally more compact and economic, and in communicative aspect the notion of pre-substantive is much broader than in a number of other languages.

Communicative aspect of study of pre-substantive construction allows to analyze more deeply structural and semantic characteristics of pre-substantive construction kinds; to assess semantic significance of sentence parts; with non-morphologized parts of a sentence - to qualify the list of main parts without mistake; to open new horizons of pre-substantive construction study.

Study of linguistic mechanisms of pre-substantive clauses in communicative aspect shows that modern linguistic foundations of speech development include the provisions about different sides and attributes of this construction which are as follows: availability of common for both parts component - anaphoric substantive; set of means of relationship; fixed allocation of dependent part (post-position in regard to specified word); obligatory or optional character of correlation word; division of construction into 2 types (attributive, narrative-extended); availability of syntax synonym.

So, “grammar studies is method of teaching communicatively comprehensive speech. Role of grammar in this case is to master grammar system as a tool of communication in studied language ... Syntax foundation of teaching allows to imagine not

only the fact of language but its communicative significance. The key moment in this case is that such language fact is syntax unit itself. Sentence is minimum component of utterance, if we assume that the latter is main communicative unit. In its turn unit can be equal to sentence - unit which has signs of semantic and intonation completeness. Only on the level of sentence language unit becomes communicatively significant" [14].

**Corresponding Author:**

Dr. Safargalieva A.Y.

Kazakh National Technical University after K.I. Satpayev, Satpayev Str. 22, Almaty, 050013, Kazakhstan

**References**

1. Kachru, Y., 2006. World Englishes in Asian Contexts. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
2. Leech, G., 1975. Communicative Grammar of English. London: Longman, 1975.
3. Fraser, N.M., and R.A. Hudson, 1992. Inheritance in word grammar. Computational Linguistics.
4. Fowler, H.W., 1983. Fowler's Modern English Usage: Dictionary of modern English Usage. Oxford: Oxford. University Press.
5. Cobbett, W.A., 1984. Grammar of the English Language in a series of Letters. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Yalden, J., 1987. The communicative syllabus: Evolution, design and Implementation. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall.
7. Johnson K. and H. Johnson, 1999. Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics: A Handbook for Language Teaching. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
8. Safargalieva, A., 2006. Communicative-speech training of students of the Kazakh philology faculty by complex sentences with attributive clauses in practical course of Russian language, PhD thesis, Almaty: Kaz NPU named after Abai.
9. Bolshova, A., 1997. Functional aspects of pre-substantive clauses in Russian language, PhD thesis, Krasnodar.
10. Zolotova, G., 2006. About opportunities of grammar science. Issues of language study, 3: 14-21.
11. Zolotova, G., 1982. Communicative aspects of Russian Syntax. Moscow: Nauka, pp: 367.
12. Vsevolodova, M. and S. Shuvalova, 1989. Issues of communicative-functional description of syntax structure of Russian language. MSU, pp: 183.
13. Akhmanova, O. and G. Mikaelyan, 2003. Modern syntax theories. Editorial URSS, pp: 123.
14. Safargalieva, A., 2012. About role of language and speech exercises in the process of formation of communicative competence of students. Perspectives of science, 5 (32): 219-221.

3/23/2014