

LINGUISTIC-STYLISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPLEX SENTENCES WITH A PARENTHESIC INSERTED COMPONENT IN SPEECH

M.G.Khoshimov

Ph.D., Associate Professor, ASIFL (Uzbekistan)

Annotation

The article examines the linguistic-stylistic features of complex sentences with a parenthetical inserted component (CSPIC) as a linguostyleme in speech. The study attempts to identify and analyze these constructions through a systematic linguostylistic approach. The analysis demonstrates that the parenthetical component of CSPIC can function as a carrier of various syntactic stylistic devices, including polysyndeton, asyndeton, chiasmus, antithesis, irony, gradation, and hyperbole. In discourse, these devices are predominantly employed in different sentences or texts as linguostylemes representing the “assessive complementive.”

Key words: *complex sentences, complex sentences with a parenthetical component, linguostylemes, stylistic devices, asyndeton, polysyndeton, chiasmus, irony, antithesis, etc.*

Complex sentences, including complex sentences with a parenthesized inserted component (CSPEIC), are large syntactic units with a multifaceted nature, which is manifested in their systemic and comprehensive linguacognitive analysis, taking into account the linguapragmatic, linguacultural, linguastylistic, and linguagender approaches.

An analysis of specialized literature devoted to the disclosure of the anthropocentric nature of the CSPEIC in language shows that among their above-mentioned aspects, the linguostylistic one is understudied, which requires a scrupulous analysis of the CSPEIC as a linguostylome, objectifying their linguostylistic semantics in texts of various functional styles of language, including religious style.

It should be noted that the frequency of use of the CSPEIC varies across different functional styles of vernacular speech, which also requires addressing the stylistic characteristics of this unit both within a single language and across languages. The varying frequency of use of a particular type of CSPEIC across functional styles is primarily due to the use of various means of communication between the components of the CSPEIC, which we have termed parentizers (similar to coordinators and subordinators). It is also necessary to determine the specificity of the CSPEIC with a particular means of communication for the following main functional styles of speech: 1) fiction; 2) colloquial language; 3) scientific prose; 4) journalism; 5) poetics; 6) religious texts. Identifying the stylistic features of the use of SPPVSK in various languages

will make it possible to determine which varieties of CSPEIC are characterized by stylistic neutrality and which of them tend to function only in certain styles of speech or within a single style, i.e. are characterized by stylistic charge.

The identification of stylistic features of the CSPEIC in various languages is also important because “the question of the relationship of language units belonging to its different levels, of their interaction is specific to stylistics both in a comparative and in a monolingual sense, since a stylistic phenomenon arises in the very process of language implementation; in the act of speech, linguistic means acquire a stylistic function in a specific combination with each other, developing within the limits of one or another functional style. Posing this same question within the framework of comparative language studies allows us to trace the enormous diversity of such combinations as bearers of diverse functions and to identify, on the one hand, the features that specifically distinguish a particular language, and, on the other, general patterns in the combination of linguistic units of different orders and in the relationship between a given linguistic unit and the functions it performs. The latter task should be of particular interest from the perspective of general linguistics”.¹

¹ Федоров А. В., 1971, Очерки общей и сопоставительной стилистики, Москва. -145 с. С.-18



With the help of comparative-typological stylistic analysis of the CSPEIC of languages of different systems, it is possible to identify and describe certain universal syntactic stylistic means², which are primarily represented in languages through the use of spherical-semantic-complex-systems (SPPSCs), with their characteristic structural-semantic, communicative-pragmatic, linguacultural, and linguastylistic features.

Furthermore, addressing the stylistic characteristics of spherical-semantic-complex-systems (SPPSCs) will also help identify the reasons for the particular order of their components, related to the fulfillment of a specific stylistic load in languages.

Based on the above and on the analysis of the linguostylistic features of the SPPVSK of the compared (English, Uzbek and Russian) languages, we have found that these complex sentences, in addition to their stylistic features, manifested in the degree of frequency of their use in all existing functional styles of the language (among them, in comparison with other styles, the frequency of use of CSPEIC is very high in the artistic style), The complex sentences under study can function as such major stylistic devices as asyndeton, polysyndeton, parallel constructions, repetition, hyperbole, gradation, chiasmus, antithesis, irony, etc., which provides full grounds for calling them "linguostylemes".

Of no small interest is the question of the frequency of use of complex sentences in existing functional styles, although they are characteristic of all styles of language. The varying possibilities and frequency of use of one or another type of SPPVSC in functional styles of language are primarily associated with the use of various means of communication between the components of the CSPEIC, which we have called parentizers (similar to coordinators and subordinators). It is necessary to determine the specificity of the CSPEIC with one or another means of communication for the following main functional styles of speech: 1) fiction; 2) colloquial language; 3) scientific prose; 4) journalism; 5) poetics³ and others. The identification of stylistic features of the use of CSPEIC in various languages made it possible to determine which varieties of CSPEIC are characterized by stylistic neutrality and which of them tend to function only in certain styles of speech or within one style, i.e. are characterized by stylistic charge.

Using comparative-typological stylistic analysis of the syntactic structure of the pronunciation of words in languages of different systems, it is possible to identify and describe certain universal syntactic stylistic devices such as polysyndeton, asyndeton, parallel constructions, repetitions, hyperbole, gradation, chiasmus, antithesis, irony, etc.⁴, which are primarily represented in languages also through the use of CSPEICs with their characteristic structural-semantic, communicative-pragmatic, linguacultural, and linguastylistic features.

In our work, we established that in CSPEICs with various parentizers (even zero) as a means of communication between components, their parentetic component can function as the following stylistic devices:

1) asyndeton (lack of union), for example, in English: "My boy, don't ask any more questions, don't, it's all useless, it's too late" (J. London. Short Stories); in Uzbek: "Bolakay, boshqa savol berma, so'rama, hammasi befoyda, juda kech" (J. London); in Russian: "My boy, don't ask any more questions, don't, it's all useless, it's too late, too late" (J. London.);

2) polysyndeton (polysyndeton), for example, in English: "By my troth, and in good earnest, and so God mend me, and by all pretty oaths that are not dangerous, if you break one jot of your promise or come one minute behind your hour, I will think you the most pathological break-promise." (W. Shakespeare); in Uzbek: Биз сени роза кутдик(келиб қоласанми деб, кўришамиз деб, вақт ғанимат деб.) (Андижоннома); in Russian: Frankly speaking and

²Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. - М.: "Наука", 1966. -с.335, 535;Гальперин И.Р. Стилистика английского языка. - М.: "Высшая школа", 1973. -с.191-246.

³Гальперин И.Р. Стилистика английского языка. - М.: "Высшая школа", 1973. -с.24.;

⁴Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. - М.: "Наука", 1966. -с.335, 535;Гальперин И.Р. Стилистика английского языка. - М.: "Высшая школа", 1973. -с.191-246.



sincerely, and may God mend me, and by all pretty and harmless oaths, if you break even one iota of your promise or come even one minute late, I will think you the most pitiful person (W. Shakespeare);

3) chiasm, for example, in English: "Be sure, men are the sport of circumstances, when the circumstances seem the sport of men, got it?" (I.R.Galperin); in Uzbek: Ўзингизни бонинг, катта кетманг(бугун сиз бошлиқсиз, эртага мен бошлиқман), хўпми? (Т.Ашуров); in Russian: "I have given young people advice more than once (It is better to make love with difficulty than to make work with love)" (М.М. Жванетский);

4) antitheses, for example, in English: "This is the bare truth (Youth is lovely, age is lonely)" (I.R.Galperin. Stylistics); in Uzbek: "Mana oddiy ҳақиқат (Yoshlik – zhushkinlik, karilik – gamginlik); In Russian: "It's the absolute truth (Youth is wonderful, old age is sad);

5) hyperbole, for example, in English: "He was incredibly so tall (that I hesitated whether he had a head), believe me" (E. Hemingway); in Uzbek: .; "U aql bovar qilmaydigan darajada novcha edi (men uning boshi bor-yo'qligiga shubha qildim), menga ishonin"; in Russian: "He was incredibly so tall (that I hesitated whether he had a head), believe me";

6) repetitions, for example, in English: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us", (I.Galperin); in Uzbek: Сиз биздан сўранг(биз айтайлик, биз тушунтирайлик, биз кулоғингизга уни куюйлик), хўпми?; in Russian: Вы нас обрuche (мы сказке, разнимаем, вливаем в ухо), ладно?;

7) parallel constructions, for example, in English: "And know what it is to pity, and be pitied, If ever you have looked on better days, If ever been where bells have knolled to church, If ever sat at any good man's feast, If ever from your eyelids wip'd a tear. (I.Galperin. Stylistics); in Uzbek: "That's enough for us (we no longer ask, we no longer pray, we no longer intercede!), we will defeat them!" (W. Bryan);

8) gradations, for example, in English: "Damn these Italian shoes! (They're killing me, oh, they have already killed me), I can't make a step!" (M. Spark); in Uzbek: "These Italian shoes are so strong that they can't stand up to the task of washing them" (O. Yokubov); in Russian: "Tatiana, who held the position of a laundress (however, as a skilled and learned laundress, she was only entrusted with fine linen, nothing more), was a woman of about twenty-eight years old" (Turgenev);

9) Irony, for example, in English: "So, you have lost all your money (How clever of you to have lost it!), sonny!"; in Uzbek: "Бу одам узун кекирди (ош бўлсин мирзо йигитга), оғзини қоғоз билан артди." (А.Қаҳҳор); in Russian: "Father was a purveyor of puns and jokes. Mother had a sense of humor (the distance is like between a baker and a starving man)" (S. Dovlatov).

As can be seen from the above, in the CSPEIC, as a truly existing invariant type of complex sentence, their parentheses function in language as actualizers of certain stylistic semantics—as linguostylomemes in various functional styles of language. As for their comparative study, it serves to reveal their general stylistic nature as large syntactic units, similar to any complex sentence in language and speech. The data of the CSPEIC languages reveal certain isomorphic and allomorphic features, where the former are explained by the general patterns of development and functioning of languages as tools of communication, while the latter indicate the idiomatic nature of stylistic means reflecting the concrete linguistic and speech thinking of the speakers of a particular language.

In the previous analysis, we examined interesting examples of CSPEIC's use of various structures, where parentheses primarily serve as markers of the author's idiostyle and idiopersonalization, characteristic only of the individual author of the narrative. These components reveal distinct stylistic features of the author's style in both oral and written speech, enriching the substantive and semantic organization of the text.



References

1. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. - М.: "Наука", 1966. –с.335, 535;
2. Галиева М. Дунёнинг лисоний тасвирида диний-мифологик тафаккурнинг акс этиши: Филол.фан.д-ри (DSc) дис. .. автореф. – Фарғона, 2019. – Б. 26.
3. Гальперин И.Р. Стилистика английского языка. - М.: "Высшая школа", 1973. – с.191;.
4. Федоров А. В., 1971, Очерки общей и сопоставительной стилистики, Москва. -145 с. С.-18
5. Улуқов Н.М. Тилшунослик назарияси. – Тошкент: Баркамол файз медиа, 2016. – 192 б.
6. Умархўжаев М.Э. Диний атамалар ва иборалар. Оммабоп қисқача изоҳли луғат. – Тошкент: Ғафур Ғулом номидаги нашриёт-матбаа ижодий уйи, 2016. – 218 б.
7. Усаров И.К. Проблемы общей стилистики сложных предложений. .Автореф. дисс. на соиск. уч.степ. канд.филол. наук, Ташкент, 2004.- с. 9.

