ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКАЯ, ПРИКЛАДНАЯ И СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНАЯ ЛИНГВИСТИКА / THEORETICAL, APPLIED AND COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SYNTACTIC INTEGRATION OF PARENTHETICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND TAJIK

Research article

Sanginova S.A.[1], *
[1] ORCID : 0009-0006-1061-6185;
[1] Khujand State University named after academician Bobojon Gafurov, Khujand, Tajikistan

* Corresponding author (shakhnoza.sanginova.82[at]mail.ru)

Abstract

The article dwells on the comparative analysis of the syntactic integration of parenthetical units in English and Tajik, two typologically distinct languages. With its Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order, English contrasts with Tajik, a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) language. The study focuses on how these languages incorporate parentheticals into the host clause, considering factors such as word order, constituent length and complexity, prosodic features, and the availability of grammatical resources like converbs and conjunctions. Thus, the analysis reveals that while both languages display flexibility in parenthetical placement, this flexibility is constrained by their respective syntactic structures.

Keywords: parentheticals, syntactic integration, English, Tajik, comparative linguistics.

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ СИНТАКСИЧЕСКОЙ ИНТЕГРАЦИИ ВВОДНЫХ ЕДИНИЦ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И ТАДЖИКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Научная статья

Сангинова Ш.А.[1], *
[1] ORCID : 0009-0006-1061-6185;
[1] Худжандский государственный университет имени академика Бободжона Гафурова, Худжанд, Таджикистан

* Корреспондирующий автор (shakhnoza.sanginova.82[at]mail.ru)

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается сравнительный анализ синтаксической интеграции вводных единиц в английском и таджикском, двух типологически различных языках. С его порядком слов «субъект-глагол-объект» (SVO) английский язык контрастирует с таджикским языком, языком «субъект-объект-глагол» (SOV). Исследование фокусируется на том, как эти языки включают вводные предложения в основное предложение, учитывая такие факторы, как порядок слов, длина и сложность составляющих, просодические особенности и наличие грамматических ресурсов, таких как деепричастия и союзы. Таким образом, анализ показывает, что, хотя оба языка демонстрируют гибкость в размещении вводных предложений, эта гибкость ограничена их соответствующими синтаксическими структурами.

Ключевые слова: вводные предложения, синтаксическая интеграция, английский, таджикский, сравнительное языкознание.

Introduction

Linguistic elements that furnish supplementary or elucidative content, known as parenthetical units, are frequently observed across natural languages. These units encompass a range of syntactic structures, including appositive constructions, non-restrictive relative clauses, and adverbial clauses [2]. Although parentheticals are often perceived as tangential to the primary clausal structure, the degree of their syntactic integration exhibits significant variability, spanning a continuum from loose adjunction to close embedding within the host clause [5]. The corpus of our study undertakes a comparative analysis of the syntactic integration of parenthetical units in English and Tajik, and considers the mechanisms by which these languages, categorized by divergent grammatical architectures, assimilate parentheticals into the matrix of sentence structure. The distinct grammatical structures of the compared languages in this research will be essential in understanding the integration process.

1.1. Theoretical Background

The study and consideration of parenthetical integration is informed by theoretical constructs derived from syntax, prosody, and information structure. Within the syntactic domain, parentheticals can be analyzed concerning their venues of attachment within the host clause, their syntactic relationships with constituents of the main clause, and their capacity to disrupt or modify the structure of the host clause [4]. In the prosodic domain, parentheticals are frequently asserted by distinctive intonational contours, junctural pauses, or tonal variations, which serve to delineate their boundaries from the primary clausal material [10]. With regard to informational structure, parentheticals typically encode information that is backgrounded or supplementary, thereby contrasting with the foregrounded information conveyed within the main clause [3].

The research of parenthetical integration within this framework will be based on the previous studies of Safarova [8], Tagliamonte [9], Wagner, & Watson [10].

Main results and discussion

This study's primary focus is a comparative analysis of the syntactic integration of parenthetical units in English and Tajik. While prior research has extensively carried out the morphological and pragmatic features of parentheticals, the specific

mechanisms of their syntactic integration have received comparatively less attention, often being relegated to secondary status or not addressed in sufficient detail [1].

Consequently, the present research endeavours to elucidate how parentheticals are incorporated into the syntactic structure of the host clause in the compared languages. The analysis will focus on the diverse positions that parentheticals may occupy within the sentence, and the effects of their form and position on their degree of syntactic integration within the host clause.

2.1. English

The relatively flexible Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order characteristic of English affords parentheticals a range of potential positions within the host clause. One such position is:

– *Initial Position:* Parenthetical units situated at the clause's inception frequently display a broader scope, modifying the entirety of the subsequent proposition. These initially positioned parentheticals are typically defined by a comma and are generally regarded as demonstrating a lesser degree of syntactic integration:

However, the experiment yielded unexpected results.

In my opinion, the policy needs to be revised.

Frankly speaking, I am not impressed.

– *Medial Position:* Parenthetical units interspersed within the clausal structure often dislocate the linear progression of the primary constituents. These medially positioned parentheticals are typically defined by commas, dashes, or parentheses, a convention that further accentuates their disjuncture from the host clause. Consequently, medial parentheticals are generally assessed as displaying a reduced degree of syntactic integration. Let`s consider the following illustrative examples:

The researchers, **I believe**, are close to a breakthrough.

The new model, **to be honest**, is not significantly better than the previous one.

The project, **as you know**, has faced numerous challenges.

– *Final Position:* Parenthetical units appended to the terminus of the clause display a wider range of integrative potential. While concise adverbial elements or brief phrases in this position may display greater integration, more extensive clausal parentheticals tend to retain their status as discrete syntactic units. For instance:

The situation is under control, **apparently**.

She accepted the offer, **it seems**.

We need to address this issue immediately, **I think**.

2.2. Factors Influencing Degree of Integration

Several factors contribute to the degree of syntactic integration displayed by parenthetical units:

– *Formal Structure:* As previously noted, monolexemic parentheticals, particularly those of the adverbial class, tend to display a higher degree of integration compared to phrasal or clausal parentheticals.

– *Prosodic Realization:* Intonational patterns and junctural pauses play a pivotal role in defining the boundaries of parentheticals and signaling their degree of integration. Parentheticals are frequently characterized by a distinct intonational contour and are often delimited by pauses.

– *Orthographic Representation:* In written English, orthographic conventions such as commas, dashes, and parentheses serve to visually segregate parentheticals from the host clause, thereby reflecting their relatively lower degree of syntactic integration.

– *Semantic Scope:* Parentheticals that exert a broader semantic scope, modifying the propositional content in its entirety, generally display a lesser degree of integration compared to those whose scope is restricted to a specific constituent.

Tajik

Tajik, characterized by its canonical Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) word order, similarly displays positional flexibility in the placement of parenthetical units. However, this flexibility is constrained by the robust tendency for verb-final placement within the clause.

– *Initial Position:* This position is frequently shown for parentheticals in Tajik, analogous to the pattern observed in English. Parentheticals in initial position often display a broad semantic scope, modifying the entire proposition. They are generally perceived as displaying a lower degree of syntactic integration.

Albatta, in natijaho nomuayyan budand – **Of course,** these results were inconclusive.

Ba gufti u, vokhuri fardo meshavad – **According to him,** the meeting will be held tomorrow.

Mutaassifona, mo in peshnihodro qabul karda nametavonem – **Unfortunately,** we cannot accept this offer.

– *Medial Position:* The medial positioning of parentheticals within a Tajik clause, while permissible, is often perceived as more disruptive than its English counterpart. This heightened sense of intermission stems from the strong expectation in SOV languages for the verb to occupy the clause-final position. Consequently, medial placement is typically reserved for shorter parenthetical constituents or those displaying a close semantic relationship with a specific element within the clause. Examples include:

In natijaho, **ba fikram,** nomuayyan budand – These results, **in my opinion,** were inconclusive.

In masala, **albatta,** halli khudro meëbad – This issue, **of course,** will find its solution.

Mo, **rosti gap,** az in khabar hayron shudem – We, **frankly speaking,** were surprised by this news.

– *Final Position:* The final position is also a frequent locus for parenthetical elements in Tajik. Similar to English, the degree of syntactic integration can vary. Shorter parentheticals, particularly single adverbs, tend to be more integrated, while longer phrases or clauses display greater syntactic independence. Notably, the placement of a parenthetical after the typically clause-final verb can create a pronounced sense of disjunction or afterthought.

In natijaho nomuayyan budand, **shoyad** – These results were inconclusive, **perhaps**.

U ba in kor rozi shud**, albatta** – He agreed to this work, **of course.** (Placing **albatta** after the verb emphasizes the **of course** aspect.)

Mo in masalara hal mekunem, **ba fikri man** – We will solve this problem, **in my opinion**.

2.3. Factors Influencing Parenthetical Integration in Tajik

The syntactic integration of parenthetical elements in Tajik is a multifaceted phenomenon influenced by several factors:

– ***Canonical Word Order:*** The strong preference for Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) word order exerts a significant influence on both the placement and perceived integration of parentheticals. Deviations from this canonical order, such as post-verbal placement of a parenthetical, are considered syntactically marked and often signal a lower degree of integration.

– ***Constituent Length and Complexity:*** Analogous to English, the length and internal complexity of a parenthetical constituent correlate with its degree of integration. Single-word adverbial elements tend to exhibit greater integration than longer phrasal or clausal parentheticals.

– ***Prosodic Features:*** Prosodic cues, including intonation contours and pause placement, play a crucial role in defining parentheticals and signalling their degree of integration in Tajik. Further research is required to elucidate the specific prosodic characteristics associated with parenthetical elements in this language.

– ***Converbal Constructions:*** The utilization of converbs in expressions displaying parenthetical-like functions offers a mechanism for creating more syntactically compact and potentially more integrated structures compared to their full clausal counterparts. This suggests that the grammatical form of the parenthetical element can impact its integration.

2.4. Comparative Analysis and Conclusion

Both English and Tajik display flexibility in the syntactic placement of parenthetical elements; however, this flexibility is modulated by the respective typological characteristics of each language. English, characterized by a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order, allows for relatively unconstrained placement. Conversely, Tajik's SOV structure renders medial placement more syntactically marked and potentially more disorderly to the canonical flow of the clause. In both languages, the internal composition of the parenthetical (e.g., single word, phrase, clause) and its semantic scope exert influence on its degree of syntactic integration. Further research, including corpus-based analyses and psycholinguistic experimentation, is warranted to achieve a more granular understanding of the factors governing parenthetical placement and integration across these languages [6], [7].

Moreover, the availability of specific grammatical resources, such as dedicated conjunctions or complementizers, can shape the strategies employed for parenthetical integration. For instance, the usage of conjunctions like ***ki*** in Tajik may establish a more explicit syntactic connection between the parenthetical and the host clause compared to certain English parentheticals, which may rely more heavily on prosodic marking for their demarcation.

Conclusion

This comparative analysis has illuminated key distinctions in the syntactic integration of parenthetical elements in English and Tajik. These differences are rooted in the fundamental typological properties of each language, particularly their basic word order and the inventory of available grammatical resources. Future research, encompassing comprehensive corpus analyses and experimental investigations of prosodic realization, is crucial to elucidate the full complexity of parenthetical integration in these and other languages. This study contributes to a broader understanding of cross-linguistic variation in syntactic structure and the interplay between syntax, prosody, and information structure in the realization of parenthetical elements.

<table>
<tr><td>

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

</td><td>

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

</td></tr>
<tr><td>

Рецензия

Все статьи проходят рецензирование. Но рецензент или автор статьи предпочли не публиковать рецензию к этой статье в открытом доступе. Рецензия может быть предоставлена компетентным органам по запросу.

</td><td>

Review

All articles are peer-reviewed. But the reviewer or the author of the article chose not to publish a review of this article in the public domain. The review can be provided to the competent authorities upon request.

</td></tr>
</table>

Список литературы / References

1. Biber D. Longman grammar of spoken and written English / D. Biber, S. Conrad, G. Leech. — Pearson Education, 2020.

2. Parentheticals / N. Dehé, Y. Kavalova. — John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012.

3. Eckardt R. Information structure and the syntax-semantics interface / R. Eckardt // Annual Review of Linguistics. — 2020. — № 6. — P. 1-20.

4. Haegeman L. Introduction to government and binding theory / L. Haegeman. — John Wiley & Sons, 2014.

5. Kaltenböck G. The pragmatics of parenthesis: A corpus-based analysis / G. Kaltenböck, E. Keizer, E. Popescu // Journal of Pragmatics. — 2011. — № 43 (14). — P. 3454-3468.

6. Mulligan B. The syntax of appositives / B. Mulligan. — Cambridge University Press, 2017.

7. Rzehak L. Tajik reference grammar for beginners / L. Rzehak. — Slavica Publishers, 2017.

8. Safarova D. Prosodic features of compound sentences in Tajik / D. Safarova. — Dushanbe: Donish, 2015.

9. Tagliamonte S.A. Teen talk: The language of adolescents / S.A. Tagliamonte. — Cambridge University Press, 2016.

10. Wagner M. Experimental and theoretical advances in prosody: A review / M. Wagner, D. Watson // Language and Cognitive Processes. — 2010. — № 25 (7-9). — P. 905-945.

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Biber D. Longman grammar of spoken and written English / D. Biber, S. Conrad, G. Leech. — Pearson Education, 2020.

2. Parentheticals / N. Dehé, Y. Kavalova. — John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012.

3. Eckardt R. Information structure and the syntax-semantics interface / R. Eckardt // Annual Review of Linguistics. — 2020. — № 6. — P. 1-20.

4. Haegeman L. Introduction to government and binding theory / L. Haegeman. — John Wiley & Sons, 2014.

5. Kaltenböck G. The pragmatics of parenthesis: A corpus-based analysis / G. Kaltenböck, E. Keizer, E. Popescu // Journal of Pragmatics. — 2011. — № 43 (14). — P. 3454-3468.

6. Mulligan B. The syntax of appositives / B. Mulligan. — Cambridge University Press, 2017.

7. Rzehak L. Tajik reference grammar for beginners / L. Rzehak. — Slavica Publishers, 2017.

8. Safarova D. Prosodic features of compound sentences in Tajik / D. Safarova. — Dushanbe: Donish, 2015.

9. Tagliamonte S.A. Teen talk: The language of adolescents / S.A. Tagliamonte. — Cambridge University Press, 2016.

10. Wagner M. Experimental and theoretical advances in prosody: A review / M. Wagner, D. Watson // Language and Cognitive Processes. — 2010. — № 25 (7-9). — P. 905-945.