T.V.Shmeleva

EXPLANATORY CONSTRUCTION IN TERMS OF SEMANTIC SYNTAX

The article examines the explanatory structure from the standpoint of semantic syntax, which allows, understanding the explanatory structure as a combination of modus and dictum with the participation of the technique of their combination, to expand its boundaries, on the one hand, going beyond the limits of a complex sentence and to recognize as explanatory simple and conjunctionless sentences of explanatory semantics, on the other hand, see all the explanatory constructions. The concept of its representations is proposed, which are created by changing the form of the modus predicate and its derivational capabilities, as well as the technique and form of the dictum. Such representations of an explanatory construction allow it to be included in the semantic structure of other statements in the role of a predicate, including a secondary one, an attribute, an actant. The proposed concept is illustrated by real statements of their media texts and the National Corpus of the Russian language. It is argued that it is significant for the study of the semantics of elucidation in the Russian language and semantically complex expressions.

Keywords: Russian language, syntax, semantics, explanatory structure, collapsed semantic structure

Semantic syntax as a direction of syntactic science developed in native Russian studies in the mid-1970s, starting with the works of N.Yu.Shvedova, N.D.Arutyunova, V.G.Gak, E.V.Paducheva. As early as in the next decade, the study of the semantic side of the sentence was introduced into the courses of the modern Russian language for universities, see, for example, [1, 2]; this aspect of the sentence found a place in the later educational literature [3, 4].

It would be an exaggeration to say that all questions are resolved in semantic syntax, but a number of the most important concepts have been formed and demonstrated in different types of Russian utterances, see, for example, [5, 6] and others. Without setting the task here to assess the current state of semantic syntax, it should be noted that the developed concepts are sufficient to consider explanatory sentences in Russian from such positions.

The main of these concepts are *dictum* and *modus*, known from the famous book of Charles Bally, who, in turn, referring to medieval scholastics, claims that these are obligatory components of the meaning of the utterance, where dictum is the objective content of the utterance, and modus is subjective, including a number of relations and estimates of the author [7, p. 44]. A peculiarity of modus is a tendency to express using grammar and official vocabulary, as well as to implicitly manifest in a sentence. Later, the meanings of the modus were calculated, which includes the meta-aspect and the actualization, qualification, social aspects, and the means of expressing the modus meanings were also described [2, p. 28-41].

The concepts that allow one to describe and explore the semantic structure include *proposition*, understood as a "model of a "state of affairs" called a sentence, as the objective content of the sentence, considered in abstraction from all accompanying subjective meanings and from the projection that one or another formal organization of the sentence gives it"[1, p. 481].

A proposition can be perceived as an elementary particle of the semantics of a sentence, while it is essential to note that modus and dictum are positions in the semantic structure, and some meanings can only occupy the positions of dictum, while others — of dictum and modus; thus, the proposition of knowledge can appear in a dictum, as in the sentence, *Он знал этот текст наизусть [He knew this text by heart]*, and in a modus, as in the phrase, *Он знал, что этот текст подлинный [He knew that this text was original]*.

Speaking about the designs of a proposition in a statement, it should be noted that it can be embodied in a predicative construction, or maybe in the form of an adverbial participle, participle and a noun that occupies the positions of an actant, a predicate and even a sirconstant, and finally an infinitive, for example: *Мы **гуляли** в лесу; **Гуляя**, мы заметили зайца; **Гуляющие** недалеко от нас тоже увидели его; **Прогулка** запомнилась нам надолго; **Гулять** в нашем лесу — одно удовольствие [We **were walking** in the forest; While **walking**, we noticed a hare; Those **walking** not far from us also saw it; We will remember **the walk** for a long time; It's a pleasure **to walk** in our forest]* It is proposed to call these formal variants of the design of a proposition its representations [8], they rely on the grammar of the verb and its derivational capabilities, they can be used in one text when changing the view of the proposition (for example, the given list of examples can be perceived as text), but more often they can be found in different texts, in general they constitute the potential for the design of a proposition in a sentence.

The greatest attention of syntaxists was attracted by the representation of a proposition in the form of a substantive, known under the term *nominalization* [9, p. 63-66], considered as one of the cases of re-nominating an event in the text along with the grammatical forms of the verb and pronominal substitution [10]. Substantive representation is characteristic of many propositions and in their first appearance in the text, as *competition, devaluation, self-isolation*, etc.

In this work, we propose the concept of representing an explanatory structure as a modus-dictum unity. The material for such a consideration was made up of utterances from various texts, primarily fiction and media discourses.

An explanatory construction within the framework of the structural-semantic approach is defined as a type of complex "sentences, the structure of which is determined by the semantic nature of the reference word", while the

reference words are "words of certain lexical groups, of which the most extensive are groups of words with meanings: 1) of speech, thought, perception, feeling; 2) of estimation; 3) of being, detection, and the means of communication are conjunctions *что, как, будто (как будто), чтобы, как бы [that, as if (as if), so that, as it were]*" [4, p. 701-702]. At the same time, observations were expressed that made it possible to think about expanding the boundaries of clarity. So, the equivalence of the explanatory subordinate and dependent word form was pointed out in [11, p. 701], from here it is one step to consider a simple sentence like *Он говорил о своем отъезде [He spoke of his departure]* as explanatory. Later, it was proved that explanatoryness is expressed in a conjunctionless sentence [12].

Expanding the boundaries of the explanatory structure is consistent with its interpretation within the framework of semantic syntax. This understanding allows, considering a complex sentence to be the main means of expressing explanatory semantics, to see its embodiment in a series of options that are linked by common explanatory semantics, but differ in the embodiment of modus and dictum with the technique of their conjunction. These variants can be classified as three paradigms — technical, modus and dictum, which is proved in a special work [13].

Further observations on the manifestations of the semantics of explicability in the text allow one to talk about another range of its variants, for which the term *representation in a sentence* is chosen by analogy with the concept of representation of a proposition. The substantiation of this concept is the content of this work.

Having such an authoritative source of information about complex explanatory sentences as the dictionary [14], where about 3000 "lexico-syntactic models of a complex sentence" are presented and thousands of real utterances from fiction texts and Internet resources are used as illustrative material, it is logical to start the research with this source. Looking through the illustrations of the dictionary with attention to the explanatory part of the statements, we find the variability of the modus predicate. Moreover, in some cases, these variants do not go beyond the morphological paradigm of the verb, which means that the actual explanatory part can be an independent complex sentence. In other cases, the explanatory part does not reveal such a possibility: *Дедушка проснулся часу в пятом пополудни и после студеной бражки, несмотря на палящий зной, скоро захотел накушаться чаю, **веруя, что** горячее питье уменьшает тягость жары* (С.Т.Аксаков) [*Granddaddy woke up at about five o'clock in the afternoon and after a cold home brew, despite the scorching heat, he soon wanted to have a lot of tea, **believing that** hot drinking reduces the burden of the heat* (S.T. Aksakov)]; *Ничто не могло **выбить у нас из головы, что** наши беды кончились* (Н.Я.Мандельштам) [*Nothing could **knock it out of our heads that** our troubles were over* (N. Ya. Mandelstam)]; *Ожидался поезд; уже было получено **извещение, что** он вышел со станции* (А.Серафимович) [*A train was expected; a **notice** has already been received **that** it has pull out of the station* (A. Serafimovich)].

Semantic analysis of these sentences allows one to conclude that

an explanatory construction in the form of a gerunds denotes a secondary proposition which is mainly associated with causal connections: *…захотел накушаться чаю, **веруя, что** это уменьшает тягость жары* [*...wanted to have a lot of tea, **believing that** hot drinking reduces the burden of the heat*]; compare *захотел..., **потому что** веровал [wanted..., **because** he believed];*

an explanatory construction in the form of an infinitive appears in conjunction with modal vocabulary: *не могло **выбить у нас из головы, что**… [could [not] **knock it out of our heads that**...];*

an explanatory construction in the form of a substantive is used as an actant: ***получено извещение** [a **notice has been received**]*.

This kind of embodiment of explicability is what constitutes its representation. Their purpose is to act in non-predictive positions, responding to the needs of the structure of the text, to "embed" explicity into other types of sentences, reducing it to an element of the semantics of the utterance.

In addition to the three found in the dictionary, the number of representations of the explanatory structure includes the participle form, which allows one to "translate" the explanatory into the position of the attribute, for example, *Успешный чиновник, занимающийся полностью проваленной сферой государственных дел, — чисто советский (а также российский) феномен, **демонстрирующий, что** номенклатура действительно бессмертна* (Новая газета. 23.01.2003; НКРЯ) [*A successful bureaucrat who deals with a completely failed sphere of state affairs is a purely Soviet (as well as Russian) phenomenon, **demonstrating that** the nomenclature is truly immortal* (Novaya Gazeta. 01/23/2003; RNC)]. In addition, it is worth emphasizing that the substantive representation can take the position of not only an actant, but also a predicate, which is no less typical for a substantive in the form of the corresponding cases: *А нападение на машину — демонстрация того, что неприкосновенность здесь нельзя гарантировать даже иностранным журналистам* (Lenta.ru. 11.03.2016; НКРЯ) [*And the attack on the car is **a demonstration that** even foreign journalists cannot be guaranteed immunity here* (Lenta.ru. 11.03.2016; RNC)].

Thus, the representations of the explanatory structure constitute four variants with the potential to include a more complex utterance in the semantic structure. This row can also be called a paradigm, but of a different property than the three considered earlier, which correspond to each of the structural elements — dictum, modus and the technique of their connection; the paradigm of representations unites the variants of manifestation of this entire semantic complex, providing its various inclusions in the semantic structure of the utterance.

It is important to note that in this paradigm, along with a change in the form of the modus predicate, sometimes the communication technique also changes; so, when a modus predicate is transformed into a substantive, there is a need for the pronoun *то [then]*, there are at least 90 such substantives, as shown in [15, p. 129]: *С самого начала лета я слышал **разговоры о том, что** надо подрубать ветки этому каштану* [*From the very beginning of the summer I have heard **the talks about the need of chopping** off the branches of this chestnut]; compare: я слышал, как **говорили, что...** [I heard **it said that** ...]*.

Representations can be combined with variants that make up the dictum paradigm of an explanatory construction, for example, an explanatory construction in the form of a participle can be combined with a folded dictum: *Журнал National Geographic опубликовал ролик, **демонстрирующий** полет колибри в ускоренном режиме съемки* (Lenta.ru, 13.07.2017; НКРЯ) [*National Geographic magazine published a video **demonstrating** the flight of a hummingbird in accelerated shooting mode* (Lenta.ru, 07/13/2017; RNC); compare: *демонстрирующий, как летает колибри* [*demonstrating how a hummingbird flies*].

So, there is reason to attribute to an explanatory construction from the standpoint of semantic syntax not only a complex sentence as its initial means of expression with a predicative embodiment of modus and dictum, but also representations that differ in the form of the modus predicate and convolution of explanatory semantics, which allows for such representations to take different positions in the semantic structure of a sentence — a secondary predicate, attribute, actant and adverbial modifier. The convolution of a proposition and modus is known from syntactic works, the most interesting of which is [16], and attention is paid to the possibility of a reduced presentation of the explanatory complex for the first time. These facts convince that explication as a complex semantics is not "monopolized" by a complex sentence; if necessary, during text-building it can be folded and built into sentences of different structures, playing different semantic roles.

This seems to be important for the study of both the clarity and semantics of the Russian utterance in general. In particular, it should be clarified that when considering semantic roles in the semantic structure, it should be borne in mind that they can be distributed not only between word forms and predicative units, but also between such complex complexes as modus-dictum connection.

1. Белошапкова В.А. Смысловая организация предложения // Белошапкова В.А., Земская Е.А., Милославский И.Г., Панов М.В. Современный русский язык: учебник / Под ред. В.А.Белошапковой. М.: Высшая школа, 1981. С. 471-489.
2. Шмелева Т.В. Семантический синтаксис: Текс лекций. Красноярск: Красноярский университет, 1988. 54 с.
3. Всеволодова М.В. Смысловая устроенность предложения // Всеволодова М.В. Теория функционально-коммуникативного синтаксиса: Фрагмент прикладной (педагогической) модели языка: Учебник. М., 2000. 502 с.
4. Федосюк М.Ю. Ономасиологический аспект синтаксиса // Федосюк М.Ю. Синтаксис современного русского языка: учебное пособие. М.: ИНФРА-М, 2012. С. 171-234.
5. Арутюнова Н.Д., Ширяев Е.Н. Русское предложение. Бытийный тип (структура и значение). М.: Русский язык, 1983. 198 с.
6. Стексова Т.И. Семантика невольности в русском языке (значение, выражение, функции). Новосибирск: Изд. НГПУ, 2002. 200 с.
7. Балли Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. М., 1955. 412 с.
8. Шмелева Т.В. Пропозиция и ее репрезентация в предложении // Вопросы русского языкознания. Вып. 3. Проблемы теории и истории русского языка. М.: Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 1980. С. 131-137.
9. Арутюнова Н.Д. Предложение и его смысл. Логико-семантические проблемы. М.: Наука, 1976. 383 с.
10. Гак В.Г. Повторная номинация на уровне предложения // Синтаксис текста: сб. статей / Под ред. Г.А.Золотовой. М.: Наука, 1979. С. 91-102.
11. Белошапкова В.А. Предложения, структура которых определяется семантической природой опорного слова (изъяснительные) // Грамматика современного русского литературного языка / Под ред. Н.Ю.Шведовой. М., 1970. С. 701-708.
12. Чайковская Н.И. Бессоюзное изъяснительное предложение. Алма-Ата: Изд-во «Наука» Казахской ССР, 1988. 188 с.
13. Шмелева Т.В. Русская изъяснительная конструкция в перспективе синтаксической парадигматики [Электр. ресурс] // Ученые записки Новгородского государственного университета имени Ярослава Мудрого. 2020. № 6(31). URL: https://www.novsu.ru/file/1654938 (дата обращения: 01.10.2020).
14. Ильенко С.Г., Левина И.Н. Лексико-синтаксический словарь русского языка: Модели сложноподчиненного предложения / Отв. ред. М.Я.Дымарский. СПб.: Изд-во РГПУ им. А.И.Герцена, 2007. 440 с.
15. Кошкарева Н.Б. Делиберативная скрепа о том, что и модель изъяснительных сложноподчиненных предложений [Электр. ресурс] // Вестник Новосибирского государственного университета: научный журнал. Филология. 2015. Т. 14. Вып. 9. С. 126-137. URL: https://vestnik.nsu.ru/historyphilology/14-9-koshkareva (дата обращения: 01.08.2020)
16. Колосова Т.А. Русские сложные предложения асимметричной структуры. Воронеж: Изд-во Воронежского гос. ун-та, 1980. 211 с.

References

1. Beloshapkova V.A. Smyslovaya organizatsiya predlozheniya [Semantic organization of the sentence]. In: Beloshapkova V.A. (ed.), Zemskaya E.A., Miloslavskiy I.G., Panov M.V. Sovremennyy russkiy yazyk: uchebnik. Moscow, 1981, pp. 471-489.
2. Shmeleva T.V. Semanticheskiy sintaksis: Teks lektsiy [Semantic syntax]. Krasnoyarsk, 1988. 54 p.
3. Vsevolodova M.V. Smyslovaya ustroennost' predlozheniya [Semantic structure of the sentence]. In: Vsevolodova M.V. Teoriya funktsional'no-kommunikativnogo sintaksisa: Fragment prikladnoy (pedagogicheskoy) modeli yazyka: Uchebnik. Moscow, 2000. 502 p.
4. Fedosyuk M.Yu. Onomasiologicheskiy aspekt sintaksisa [Onomasiological aspect of the syntax]. In: Fedosyuk M.Yu. Sintaksis sovremennogo russkogo yazyka: uchebnoe posobie. Moscow, 2012, pp. 171-234.
5. Arutyunova N.D., Shiryaev E.N. Russkoe predlozhenie. Bytiynyy tip (struktura i znachenie) [The Russian sentence. Being type (structure and meaning)]. Moscow, 1983. 198 p.
6. Steksova T.I. Semantika nevol'nosti v russkom yazyke (znachenie, vyrazhenie, funktsii) [Semantics of involuntary behavior in the Russian language (meaning, expression, functions)]. Novosibirsk, 2002. 200 p.
7. Balli Sh. Obshchaya lingvistika i voprosy frantsuzskogo yazyka [General linguistics and questions of the French language]. Moscow, 1955. 412 p.
8. Shmeleva T.V. Propozitsiya i ee reprezentatsiya v predlozhenii [Proposition and its representation in a sentence]. Voprosy russkogo yazykoznaniya, iss. 3. Problemy teorii i istorii russkogo yazyka. Moscow, 1980, pp. 131-137.
9. Arutyunova N.D. Predlozhenie i ego smysl. Logiko-semanticheskie problemy [The Sentence and its meaning. Logical and semantic problems]. Moscow, 1976. 383 p.

10. Gak V.G. Povtornaya nominatsiya na urovne predlozheniya [Re-nomination at the level of the sentence]. In: Zolotova G.A., ed. Sintaksis teksta. Moscow, 1979, pp. 91-102.

11. Beloshapkova V.A., Shvedova N.Yu. (ed.). Predlozheniya, struktura kotorykh opredelyaetsya semanticheskoy prirodoy opornogo slova (iz"yasnitel'nye) [Sentences whose structure is determined by the semantic nature of the reference word (explanatory)]. In: Grammatika sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka. Moscow, 1970, pp. 701-708.

12. Chaykovskaya N.I. Bessoyuznoe iz"yasnitel'noe predlozhenie [Besoyuznoe explanatory sentence]. Alma-Ata, 1988. 188 p.

13. Shmeleva T.V. Russkaya iz"yasnitel'naya konstruktsiya v perspektive sintaksicheskoy paradigmatiki [Russian explanatory construction in the perspective of syntactic paradigmatic]. Memoirs of NovSU, 2020, no. 6(31). Available at: https://www.novsu.ru/file/1654938 (accessed: 01.10.2020).

14. Il'enko S.G., Levina I.N., Dymarskiy M.Ya. (ed.). Leksiko-sintaksicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka: Modeli slozhnopodchinennogo predlozheniya [Lexico-syntactic dictionary of the Russian language: Models of complex sentences]. St. Petersburg, 2007. 440 p.

15. Koshkareva N.B. Deliberativnaya skrepa o tom, chto i model' iz"yasnitel'nykh slozhnopodchinennykh predlozheniy [Deliberative staple on the fact that the model of explanatory complex sentences]. Vestnik Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta: nauchnyy zhurnal. Filologiya, 2015, vol. 14, iss. 9, pp. 126-137. Available at: https://vestnik.nsu.ru/historyphilology/14-9-koshkareva (accessed: 01.08.2020).

16. Kolosova T.A. Russkie slozhnye predlozheniya asimmetrichnoy struktury [Russian complex sentences of asymmetric structure]. Voronezh, 1980. 211 p.

Шмелева Т.В. Изъяснительная конструкция с позиций семантического синтаксиса. Рассматривается изъяснительная конструкция с позиций семантического синтаксиса, что позволяет, понимая изъяснительную конструкцию как соединение модуса и диктума при участии техники их соединения, расширить ее границы, с одной стороны, выйдя за пределы сложноподчиненного предложения и признать изъяснительными простые и бессоюзные предложения изъяснительной семантики, а с другой стороны, увидеть все варианты изъяснительной конструкции. Предлагается понятие ее репрезентаций, которые создаются за счет изменения формы модусного предиката и его деривационных возможностей, а также техники и формы диктума. Такие репрезентации изъяснительной конструкции позволяют включать ее в семантическую структуру других высказываний в роли предиката, в том числе второстепенного, атрибута, актанта. Предложенное понятие иллюстрируется реальными высказываниями их медиатекстов и Национального корпуса русского языка. Утверждается, что оно значимо для изучения семантики изъяснительности в русском языке и семантически сложных высказываний.

Ключевые слова: русский язык, синтаксис, семантика, изъяснительная конструкция, свернутая семантическая структура.

Сведения об авторе. Татьяна Викторовна Шмелева — доктор филологических наук, профессор, профессор кафедры журналистики Новгородский государственный университет имени Ярослава Мудрого; ORCID: 0000-0003-4386-1671; szmiel@mail.ru.