УДК: 811.161.1 (575.2) (04)

Durus Kozuev, Assoc. Prof., PhD, BHU
Evgeny Dronov, BHU

TOWARDS TO THE SEMIOTIC TYPOLOGY OF LANGUAGES

СЕМИОТИЧЕСКАЯ ТИПОЛОГИЯ ЯЗЫКОВ

Аннотациясы: Биз тилди структуралык системанын ичинде анын символикалык, индексалдык, жана иконикалык белгилер катары карайбыз. Жалпысынан, алар адамдын конкреттуу суйлоо кебинде байланыш каражакктары катышат. Суйлоочунун модели негизинен уч коду камтыйт: конкреттуу жана элестетуучу ситуацияда; суйлоочунун тажрыйбасы менен же анын жоктугу; угуучунун тажрыйбасы же анын жоктугу. Угуучу маалымат табуучун озунун каражаттарын колдонот себеби айтылбаган нерсени семиотикалык каражаттар аркылуу жеткирет.

Тил ар турдуу ситуацияны, маалыматты жана тажрыйбаны камтыйт. Демек, лингвисти-калык супер тип негизинен томонкулор менен белгиленет: чындыкты коркомдоочу тилдер же ситуацияны грамматикалык жактан суроттоо; суйлоочунун тили б.а. оузунун тажрыйбасын грамматикалык жактан тура айтылышы; угуучунун тили грамматикалык жактан жаны же эски маалыматтарды тура билдириши (угуучу менен айтуучунун салыштырма анализи). Тилдер негизинен ушул уч типтерине карайт.

Структуралык жактан алар учко болунот: 1) чыныгы ситуацияда ундун катышы; 2) дик-тордын жана анын тажрыйбасы аркылуу; 3) угуучунун маалымат жыйноосу ошол эле учурда супертиптин озгочолугу.

Негизги *сөздөр: тилдин супертиби, типология, ситуация, тажрыйба, чындыкты коркмдоочуу тилдер, угуучуга негизделген тилдер, айтуучуга негизделген тилдер*

Аннотация: Мы будем рассматривать язык как структурированную систему символических, индексальных и иконических знаков, которая функционирует в виде общих средств связи и в качестве создания общей системы координат для людей в данном речевом сообществе в конкретной ситуации общения.

Модель говорящего состоит из обязательного выбора между тремя типами кода (грамматического), соответствующих трем направлениям, в которых говорится о текущем положении дел: ситуации в реальном или воображаемом мире, опыте говорящего или отсутствии его, или опыте слушающего или его недостаток. Слушатель использует свою модель в качестве поиска информации для того, чтобы компенсировать те элементы содержания, которые остались невысказанными путем выбора семиотической ориентации говорящего.

Указывая на ситуацию в реальности, которая является общей для говорящего и слушающего, с опытом говорящего ситуации или опыта слушающего его по сравнению с говорящим. Язык может говорить о ситуациях, опыте, или о информации.

Таким образом, лингвистические супертипы можно определить следующим образом: (1) языки ориентированные на описании реальности, т.е. грамматическое описание ситуации; (2) языки ориентированные на говорящего, т.е. грамматически говорящие о его или ее собственном опыте или ситуации; (3) языки, ориентированные на слушателя, что грамматически говорит о новых или старых кусочках информации, которые являются результатом сравнения говорящего о своих переживаниях с тем, что есть у слушающего. Языки принадлежат к одному из трех из этих супертипов, и поэтому пользователи должны выбрать одно знаковое направление из трех возможных. Входя в тот или иной супертип, язык говорит в своей внешней структуре либо (1) голосом реальности с участием в ситуациях, (2) либо голосом диктора с учетом его опыта; или (3) голосом слушателя с участием частей информации известным для него, с учётом того чем один супертип отличается от другого.

Ключевые слова: *лингвистический супертип, типология, ситуация, опыт, языки ориентированные на описании реальности, языки ориентированные на говорящего, языки ориентированные на слушателя*

Abstract: We will be consider language as a structured system of symbolic, indexical and iconic signs that functions as a common means of communication and as a common frame of reference for people in a given speech community at specific communication situation.

The speaker's model consists of an obligatory choice between three types of code corresponding to the three ways in which states of affairs exist: situations in a real or in an imagined world, the speaker's experience or non-experience of them or the hearer's experience or non-experience of them. The hearer uses his model as an information seeker in order to compensate for those pieces of content that were left out by the speaker's choice of semiotic orientation.

Pointing situations in reality being common to the speaker and the hearer, to the speaker's experience of the situation or to the hearer's experience of it compared to that of the speaker. A language may talk about situations, or experiences, or about informations.

Thereby linguistic sypertypes can define as follows: (1) reality-oriented languages that grammatically speak about situations; (2) speaker-oriented languages that grammatically speak about his or her own experience or of situations; (3) hearer-oriented languages that grammatical speaks about new or old pieces of information which are results of the speaker's comparison of his own experiences with those of the hearer. Languages belong to either of three, because language users must choose among three semiotic directions. According to supertype memberships, a language speaks in its output structure either with (1) the voice of reality involving situations, (2) the voice of speaker involving his experiences; or (3) the voice of the hearer involving pieces of information to him. the private sphere, they differ from supertype to supertype.

Keywords: linguistic supertype, typology, situation, experience, reality-oriented languages, speaker-oriented languages, hearer-oriented languages

We will be consider language as a structured system of symbolic, indexical and iconic signs that functions as a common means of communication and as a common frame of reference for people in a given speech community at specific communication situation. This situation can be explain as a setting in which a speaker, a hearer and reality are obligatory participants, either as near entities as in an oral dialogues or as distant entities as in written discourse. Sign types is: (1) Icons where there is relation of similarity between the expression unit and the image content (e.g. diagrams or metaphors); (2) indexes where there is dynamical relation of contiguity between the expression unit and image content – the expression unit may point backwards (symptom), forwards (signal) or ahead (model); symbols where there is static relation of arbitrariness between expression unit and the image content – their static nature makes them impotent, but the same time omnipotent. Symbols become dynamic by means of grammar.

The speaker's model consists of an obligatory choice between three types of code corresponding to the three ways in which states of affairs exist: situations in a real or in an imagined world, the speaker's experience or non-experience of them or the hearer's experience or non-experience of them. The hearer uses his model as an information seeker inorder to compensate for those pieces of content that were left out by the speaker's choice of semiotic orientation.The speaker knows the potential three-way ambiguity of any symbol and in order to be able to provide the hearer with an unambiguous tool that can instruct him as to how the string of words should understood, there is an obligatory choice between three type of indexes, i.e. between three grammatical supertypes, the function of which is to able to bring symbols to their target by giving them a semiotic direction, i.e. by pointing situations in reality being common to the speaker and the hearer, to the speaker's experience of the situation or to the hearer's experience of it compared to that of the speaker. Any symbol is omnipotent and is ready to be brought to the one of the three targets. But just as a vehicle cannot drive in the three different directions at the same time, a grammar cannot point to the situation, the speaker and the hearer at the same time. A language may talk about situations, or experiences, or about informations. Also, superstructure can declared as consists of (1) a neustics part (I hereby say), (2) a tropical part (it is true) and (3) a phrastic part (e.g. 'X is home') with communicative functions: (1) the representative function linked to the third person; (2) the expressive function connected to

first person; (3) the appeal function attached to second person.

Let us take the lexeme for "book" in three different languages and let us attach a grammeme to each lexical unit in order to make the linguistic symbol dynamic and goal-directed and certain grammatical meaning occurs: (1) with respect to nouns: something may be presented as having local reference, as being experienced by the speaker or be known to the hearer or the opposite; (2) with respect to verbs: an utterance may involve a situation description, a generalization, a characterization or a hypothesis; or – in the case of state descriptions – it may involve the speaker's own' experience of an animate or inanimate entity, a categorization of characterization of it.

For example, *Knig-a* ('book-nominative case' in Russian), *kniga-ta* ('book-article' in Bulgarian) and *the book* ('definite article-book' in English) all have exactly the same linguistic content, i.e. all three evoke the same image and the same idea, i.e. three lexical expression units mediate exactly the same two type of content. However, the Russian, the Bulgarian and the English grammemes make them point in the different directions. Russian *kniga* points to a specific book situated at a certain place in a certain situations; Bulgarian *knigata* points to a specific book in the speaker's mind; English *the book* points to a specific book in the hearer's mind.

If we substitute the Russian nominative case (i.e. *kniga*) for genitive *knigi,* i.e. semantic opposition, the specific book automatically removed from concrete place in a certain situation. If there is no local reference, you will have to use the genitive in Russian – you could never use nominative or the accusative, i.e. so-called direct cases. Therefore "The book is not here" will be *Knigi* (Genitive) *net* (Negation) – the genitive noun will denote a specific book and speaker's and in the hearer's memory, but Russian noun is not triggered by that. It is triggered by fact the model has no local reference at the moment of speech. The nominative is simply not possible, because it asserts local reference. If we substitute the so-called definite article in Bulgarian (i.e. *knigata*) for the zero-form, *kniga* – its semantic opposition, the specific book in the hearer's mind is removed and what is left is what is in the speaker's mind (almost equivalent to Bulg. *Knigata*)

Thereby linguistic sypertypes can define as follows: (1) reality-oriented languages that grammatically speak about situations; (2) speaker-oriented languages that grammatically speak about his or her own experience or of situations; (3) hearer-oriented languages that grammatical speaks about new or old pieces of information which are results of the speaker's comparison of his own experiences with those of the hearer. Languages belong to either of three, because language users must choose among three semiotic directions.

Also, these types are distinguished by different attitude to structure and utterance meaning: (1) input structure – the speaker's own contribution to utterance meaning; (2) output structure – the ordinary grammar's contribution to utterance meaning; and (3) intake structure – the hearer's own contribution to utterance meaning. In this context utterance meaning is the total meaning conveyed by an utterance. It may be composed of (1) an Assertion, i.e. a foreground proposition that is claimed to be true or false and real or an imagined world; (2) a Presupposition, i.e. background proposition that is true despite the fact that a foreground proposition is claimed to be false; (3) a Logical entailment, i.e. a background proposition that has to be true in order to assert foreground proposition; a Standard implicature, i.e. proposition the truth or false of which must always be determined by the hearer; an Implicature, i.e. an assumption that naturally follows from an asserted proposition, and a Presumption, i.e. an Assumption is a prerequisite for making an assertion, a request or asking a question.

By saying that there is a determinant category, i.e. a category that governs the entire system, we automatically get the idea that some categories are more important that others. In other words, determinant category is verbal category that can be aspect, mood or tense, which forces all other categories to speak with the same so-called basic voice – voice that is heard when a grammar has been applied to its input structure and has turned it into output structure. If the basic voice involves situations, its speaker will give a report; if it involves experiences, its speaker will give a commentary; if it involves pieces of information, its speaker will give a message. Here Voice comprehend as Bakhtinian inspired term (i.e. not used in the sense of the diathesis). According to supertype memberships, a language speaks in its output structure either with (1) the voice of reality involving situations, (2) the voice of speaker involving his experiences; or (3) the voice of the hearer involving pieces of information to him. Irrespective of that, in the input structure

the speaker must choose between a principal voice (the public voice) and secondary voice (the private voice). Although grounded in the same kind of basis, the public vs. the private sphere, they differ from supertype to supertype. The also be subvoices (first person, second person and third person) within the principal and secondary voices.

By looking at particular system of a specific linguistic supertype (e.g. Russian as member of reality-oriented languages) and by comparing it with a specific system of another linguistic supertype (e.g. English as a member of hearer-oriented languages), we automatically obtain a contrastive framework. Thus we can explain why, for instance, the Russian and English languages seem to have few categories in common. Russian has aspect, but it is differs fundamentally from English aspect. Russian and English, however, seem to share tense in that they both refer concretely to the past and present (activity) situations (we shall return to that). On other hand, Russian has a host of formalized categories which are simply absent in English (such as case, animacy, mood, subjectless sentences, etc.) just as the English language has (such as compound and non-compound tense forms, definiteness, it- and there-sentences, it- and there-cleft sentences, etc.). In the same way, it becomes clear why it is difficult – if not impossible – for Russian students to learn to speak and write correct English as well to comprehend oral and written English discourse, and conversely, for English students to learn to speak and write correct Russian as well as to to comprehend oral and written discourse.

If this is true, it is no wonder why most people have difficulty when speaking a foreign language that belongs to another supertype than their mother tongue. people have to express themselves an a way they are not used to. At the same time, we may explain why hearers misinterpret the speaker when confronted with language that belongs to another supertype that their mother tongue. These kinds of misunderstandings become even more serious when two persons are speaking a language which not their mother tongue (e.g. English) and their respective mother tongues belong to two different supertypes (e.g. Chinese and Turkish). In this case the communication will often break down. They will not know what they are actually saying and they will not use the right decoding strategies. Moreover, if we assume that they also negotiating a social contract in the same way they would normally do in their mother tongue, we can safely say that they will be facing serious communication problems. It seems to me that theory such as the theory of linguistic supertypes can be used as a basis for solving existing problems of that kind and, last but not least, for preventing new problems from occurring.

Literature

1. Per Durst-Andersen Linguistic Supertypes: A Cognitive-semiotic Theory of Human Communication, Volume 6 in the series Semiotics, Communication and Cognition edited by Paul Cobley and Kalevi Kull and published by De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, 2011. ISBN: 978-3-11-025314-6.
2. Janos J. Sarbo & József I. Farkas. Towards Meaningful Information Processing: A unifying representation for Peirce's sign types. Signs vol. 7: pp.1-44, 2013. ISSN: 1902-8822.
3. Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). The problem of the text in linguistics, philology, and the human sciences: An experiment in philosophical analysis. In Speech Genres and Other Late Essays (pp. 103-131). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
4. Bakhtin, M. M. (1995). Author and hero in aesthetic activity. In Art and answerability (M. Holquist & V. Liapunov,Eds; pp. 4-256). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
5. Bakhtin, M. M. (2001). Discourse in the novel. In The Dialogic imagination (pp. 259–422). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Appendix

Semiotic typology of languages