ISSN 2307—4558; ISSN 2414—9489. МОВА. 2023. № 39

DOI: 10.18524/2307–4558.2023.39.284907

УДК 811.161.2'282.2–133

HROMKO Tetiana Vasylivna,
Doctor of Philological Sciences (Grand Ph.D.), Associate Professor; tel.: +38 0500310222;
e-mail: hromkot@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000–0002–4661–4302.

DESCRIPTIONS AS A WAY OF EXPLICATING THE LANGUAGE SYSTEM OF AN IDIOM: A THEORETICAL ASPECT

Summary. The ***purpose*** of this article is the description and theoretical understanding of the description as a way of explicating the language system of the idiom, which consists in the scientific interpretation of language and speech units of idiom discourse, and thus, as a whole, gives the opportunity to increase the degree of evidence and reliability of linguistic observations of the lingual of the entire expressive resource of the idiom. The ***object*** is the concept of the description of the lingual as a language-speech system of linguistic analysis. The ***subject*** of the research is the theoretical and functional principles of description in the historical-linguistic aspect and the latest presentation of the description of the idiom as a language system. The ***result*** of the study is the substantiation of the appropriateness of revising the traditional theoretical qualification of description in linguistics, as well as, based on the experience of describing idiom discourse, its actualization in terms of identifying all potential possibilities of distributive description of the structure of the language, that is, the entire repertoire of linguistic elements (expressive resource of the lingual of the idiom) according to the contextual type of description. The proposed explication of the linguistic system of the idiom involves overcoming the incompleteness, non-systematic and incomparability of information of the monoidiom description and is focused on the maximum set of their relevant structural features, their systemic connections, etc. ***Conclusions***: Description is one of the most common methods of description and study of facts, objects and phenomena of the linguistic picture of the world in linguistic scientific practice. The monoidiom description serves as a basis for further application in research of its methodology, research apparatus (metalanguage) and algorithm for describing a specific lingual as one of the techniques for building a description model for obtaining objective research results in linguistic science.

Key words: descriptive linguistics, description, lingual, subdialect, spoken discourse, expressive resource, methodology of linguistic description, explication of the language system.

Introduction. Formulation of the problem. The description of linguistic objects is a basic principle of language research, which is obvious for modern linguistic science. The description of a certain linguistic object (natural language) consists in the analysis and scientific interpretation of its linguistic units [7]. Dialectological research descriptions prioritize the analysis of dialectographic material based on the differential principle of empirical data selection. The rethinking of descriptions in dialectology consists in an updated interpretation of the linguistic system of an idiom as a certain model of analysis, as opposed to traditional descriptions characterized by differential laclunarity [1]. After all, the modern linguistic approach to dialectology as a macro-paradigm requires a set of objective research methods aimed at describing a separate language system, which, in fact, constitutes a separate paradigm of language levels. Such a separate language system is an idiom — a local variety of language that is a means of communication of a group of speakers (dialect speakers) limited to one locality and is characterized by the relative unity of the language system of the dialect formation. In terms of the language system, the idiom is a relevant language subsystem (monoidiom) and at the same time is an independent microsystem organized by a set of language levels that has systemic features (indivisibility of elements, hierarchy and structure) and similarities to the language system (norms, attributes expressed by the trichotomy "substance — structure — function", language signs) [2, p. 187]. Consequently, monoidiom descriptions consist in the scientific interpretation of linguistic and idiom units as expressive resources of colloquial discourse, which in general makes it possible to increase the degree of evidence and reliability of linguistic observations of the lingual — the idiom language system as opposed to the traditional description by the place of the dialect in the system of dialectal division of the Ukrainian linguistic landscape. And mainly descriptions are a way of explicating the idiom material and systematizing the phenomena represented in the dialect and the typology of the dialect as a linguistic system.

Literature Review. The term "descriptive expression" was firstly introduced into scientific circulation by the representative of analytical philosophy B. Russell in the British academic journal "Mind" in 1905 [21, p. 479–493], and this was his contribution to the development of the philosophy of language. It is significant that, created by a linguist, the theory of descriptions was first realized in philosophy and mathematics (in formal systems, in the theory of formalizations, and in various kinds of computation), and, unfortunately, was rejected by linguists, especially in our time, a time of orientation towards the logical analysis of scientific knowledge and global computer capabilities. The history of the descriptive trend in linguistics has its own specifics [5]. Nowadays, its manifestation of the ontological status of language is actualized [1], which emphasizes the hypothesis of our monographic study "Methodology

and Experience of Dialect Descriptions" [3], which at the same time confirms the general scientific and linguistic interpretation of the concept of "description", which is the subject of the article.

Methods. The methodology of descriptive analysis qualifies its subdialect as a segment of idiomology — an idiom. Given this specificity of the object and subject of the study, the basic approach is systematic. Mono-linguistic description has specifics of linguistic procedures of inventory, classification and interpretation of linguistic data. Its methods include linguistic experiment, descriptive, observation, inductive and deductive, continuous sampling, component analysis, etc. The methodological basis of idiom descriptive research is a combination of dialectographic and general linguistic methodology.

The methodology of dialect descriptions has a well-planned organization and research apparatus based on metalinguistic technologies [2]. As an interdisciplinary and inter-paradigmatic synthesis of research methods, techniques, methods and procedures, descriptive analysis opens up the possibility of studying the linguistics of an idiom in order to create a global theory of real linguistics.

Results and Discussion. The tasks of empirical description are: first, to translate sensory, abstract information into a sign form convenient for further rational processing; second, to generalize, systematize, group and classify, standardize observation (experiment) and measurement data. In the latter case, descriptions are correlated with explanation procedures that grow out of them, control them, and subordinate them to their goals [4].

Description in the general scientific meaning is 1) procedures for recording information about objects by means of natural or artificial language based on observation, experiment, and measurement; 2) a method of linguistic individualization of objects, which allows to interpret them within themselves as some separate wholes [10, p. 151; 8, p. 157; 9].

In the modern philosophical and linguistic understanding, the first interpretation of the term «description» is called «empirical description», the second one is called «theoretical description».

The tasks of empirical description are, firstly, the transfer of sensory, abstract information into a symbolic form, convenient for further rational processing; secondly, generalization, systematization, grouping and classification, standardization of observation (experiment) and measurement data. In the latter case, description correlates with explanatory procedures that grow out of it, control it, and subordinate it to its goals.

Throughout the history of linguistic descriptive studies, the positioning of this description technology has changed. For example, its main status was revealed in the 1960s in a number of studies by Joseph Greenberg (e.g., [16]), who focused on patterns of similarity among apparently diverse languages, data associations that would confirm the theory of linguistic universals rather than differences. The linguistic descriptivist tradition is based on "respect for linguistic diversity, careful collection and classification of relevant data, and a commitment to language in the real world" [20, p. xxix]. The history of linguistics in recent decades has been characterized by extremely active and multidirectional searches for new methods of linguistic research, among which descriptive linguistics was once presented [8], a separate and rather independent direction in the science of language, which proceeded from the understanding of language as a structural formation and, in accordance with this understanding, formed its methods and methodology, as well as had a practical orientation. At the same time, aspects of the historical perspective and internal genetic relations of linguistic units in the methods of comparative interpretation were ignored by linguists, and the creation of so-called objective methods of describing a particular language system emphasized their external formal qualities.

The description within descriptive linguistics focused on the formal elements of the language structure, defined by these linguists as its metalinguistics, and the method of linguistic description was operationalist, relying on the structural qualities of the language, not on specific elements, but on their distribution and the study of the distribution of linguistic elements. Accordingly, the main methodological category is distribution, a concept that originated and was used by descriptivists initially only in the field of phonology, then in morphology, syntaxis, and semasiology [19]. Therefore, as a general linguistic principle of linguistic research and description, it was applied to linguistic units filled with "metalinguistic" content, i.e. qualitatively different elements of the language structure and, according to Z. Harris, "all kinds of distribution of linguistic features in relation to other features within an utterance" [18, p. 164] and thus reveal all potential possibilities of distributive description of the language structure.

Descriptive linguistics dealt not with idiom — with speech activity — but with the regularity of certain linguistic features in distributional relations — distribution or arrangement — of individual parts or features of language relative to each other within utterances, in the process of speech. In the statements of the adherents of descriptive linguistics, there are no components of the interaction of language with thinking, cultural outlook of speakers, etc., which does not allow to penetrate the inner essence of language [3].

Every linguistic study begins with the identification of linguistic elements. Linguistic elements represent, indicate, or identify characteristic features, but do not describe them. Therefore, each language system establishes a detailed list of elements called its lingual [3]. The statement that a particular element is used, for example, in a certain position means that in this case there is an utterance, the features of a certain part of which are linguistically represented by this element. Each such element occurs in a

certain segment of the utterance, i.e., taking into account the environment or position of the element — the distribution of the element in relation to the use of other elements [15]. In the semantic field of the linguistic meaning of description, we find the identification of this type of description with the main goals of the subject — to give a comprehensive, systematic, objective and accurate account of the patterns and usage of a particular language or dialect at a certain point in time. Therefore, its modern linguistic definition includes several aspects that contrast with other concepts of linguistic research. These are the emphasis on objectivity, systematicity, etc., which put descriptions in contrast to the prescriptive goals of traditional grammar: the goals of descriptive linguistics are to describe the facts of language use as they are, not as they should be, with reference to some imaginary ideal state. The emphasis on objectivity, systematicity, etc., contrasts with the deviant goals of much of traditional grammar: the goal of descriptive linguistics is to describe the facts of language use as they are, not as they should be, even with reference to some imaginary ideal state. The emphasis on a specific time puts it in contrast to historical linguistics, where the goal is to demonstrate language change: descriptive linguistics aims to describe language synchronously, at a specific time (not necessarily the present — language patterns from any period can be described). The emphasis on "one" language, or language system, distinguishes the subject from comparative linguistics, as the name implies, as well as from general linguistics, which aims to make theoretical statements about language as a whole, i.e., a language system. Of course, we should not forget that there is an interdependence between these different branches of the subject: descriptions are the result of analysis, which in turn must be based on a number of theoretical assumptions. But in descriptive linguistics, theory is only a means to an end, i.e., the creation of a descriptive grammar (or one of its subdivisions, e.g., phonology, lexicon, syntax, morphology). Within the framework of American anthropological and structuralist studies [6; 11; 17], the "generativist" approach of the late 1950s, in particular in the generative grammar of N. Chomsky [13; 12], the phrase "descriptive adequacy" added a special dimension to the use of the term: it refers to the accounting of linguistic competence of native speakers (rather than simply accounting for a set of data, as the previous use of "description" would have intended) [14, p. 139–140]. In this respect, the description of a dialect as a linguistic system contrasts strikingly with dialectological description, which is typically based on empirical evidence drawn from differential selection of linguistic data (for more details, see [3]). A description is based on the procedures of schematization and idealization, on a system of concepts and constructs, hypotheses and laws, i.e. it is focused on a holistic theoretical model of a particular subject area as a monographic description of an object. In other words, a description defines a certain model of seeing an object in a certain language (natural or artificial). At the same time, it is a means of understanding and conceptualizing the meanings and contents introduced in the research program.

In accordance with the field of linguistic knowledge, a description represents units of a particular usus according to the accepted intra-field theoretical and formal principles: This includes their fixation in certain corpora, determination of grammatical and semantic relations based on certain ways of creation in the natural speech of native speakers and the corresponding lexicographic organization with a certain parameterization; this includes theoretical generalizations of the interpretation of descriptive objects, establishment of criteria for the correspondence of primary and secondary descriptions, as well as ways of their introduction and definition in the theory of linguistic descriptions.

In linguistics, descriptions provide: 1) fixing information (the procedure of defining, operationalizing and conceptualizing research concepts); 2) transmitting information (in certain languages and at appropriate levels of knowledge); 3) understanding and primary explanation of information; 4) typologizing and outlining predictions of the place of information in the linguistic world picture.

The description of an idiom involves overcoming the incompleteness, unsystematicity and incomparability of information about the entire repertoire of elements of this monoidiom description, focused on the maximum set of their relevant structural features, their systemic connections, etc.

The monoidiom description is aimed at overcoming the incompleteness in the study of speakers' speech behavior, the set of all units of this subdialect and the systematic nature of the monographic description in practice in the form of a qualitatively new generalized portrait of the dialect as a real communicative system. The ideologeme of systematic description (perception and reflection of dialectal language as a complete system, completeness, as well as involvement of other aspects in the application of research procedures) aims at finding dialectal features that can show area, genetic and dynamic relevance.

In its methodological orientation, descriptive research is the basis for the creation of explanatory dictionaries or other systems that are interpreted verbally. The paradigmatic aspect of a word's meaning is represented by synonyms, antonyms, hyponyms, and words of the same thematic group as a particular lexeme. The syntagmatic aspect of the meaning can be realized in the form of typical word combinations contained in a dictionary entry. The epidigmatic aspect of the meaning is revealed in concordances. In this type of lexicographic sources, the denotative and signification aspects of meaning are also revealed and described [3].

Conclusions. Description is one of the most common methods of describing and studying facts, objects and phenomena of the human language environment, including linguistics, in scientific practice. At

the modern level of dialectological research, which focuses on the description of the idiom language system, it constitutes the main form of explication of the dialect. The peculiarity of mono-speak descriptions in the linguistic paradigm is that linguistic data — the lingual of the idiom — serve as a basis for further application of other methods in research, because before applying them, it is necessary to describe the main properties of the subject under consideration, while descriptions as a method are often used in parallel with other methods of idiom studies. In the monograph we present, we theoretically substantiate the concept of "descriptive analysis", its methodology, research apparatus (meta-language) and algorithm for describing the dialectal linguistics as one of the techniques for building a descriptive model. At the same time, the experience of extrapolating the idiom lingual is to verify descriptive modeling as one of the ways to explicate the language system, and its main components are aimed at obtaining objective research results in linguistic science.

References I

1. Громко Т. В. Дескрипція як вияв онтологічного статусу говірки : доповідь. *Кримський міжнародний філологічний форум,* 24–25 вересня 2020 р.). Київ : Таврійський національний університет імені В. І. Вернадського. URL : https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TS5FWlpkolM&t=1s/
2. Громко Т. В. Методологія лексико-граматичної дескрипції лінгварію говірки : дис. ... докт. філол. н. Одеса, 2021. 685 авт. арк.
3. Громко Т. В. Методологія та досвід дескрипції говірки : монографія / за ред. проф. О. І. Іліаді. Дніпро, 2021. 452 с.
4. Громко Т. В. Сучасна текстографія діалектоносіїв степової говірки. *Наукові записки. Філологічні науки.* Кропивницький : Вид-во «КОД», 2019. Вип. 175. С. 29–33.
5. Катализен А. І. Проблема співвідношення мови, мислення та людської діяльності в структуралістських та генеративних концепціях лінгвістики і філософії. *Вісник НТУУ «КПІ». Філософія. Психологія. Педагогіка.* 2012. № 1 (34). С. 42–46.
6. Селіванова О. О. Актуальні напрями сучасної лінгвістики (аналітичний огляд). Київ : Фітосоціоцентр, 1999. 148 с. ISBN: 966–7459–28–4.
7. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика : напрями та проблеми : Підручник. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2008. 712 с.
8. Словник української мови : у 20 томах. Том четвертий (Д–Ж). Київ : Український мовно-інформаційний фонд НАН України, 2013. 1010 с.
9. Філософський енциклопедичний словник. 2023. URL : https://slovnyk.me/dict/fes/
10. Філософський енциклопедичний словник : енциклопедія / НАН України, Ін-т філософії ім. Г. С. Сковороди ; голов. ред. В. І. Шинкарук. Київ : Абрис, 2002. 742 с.
11. Bloomfield L. Language. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass Publ., 1994. 566 p.
12. Chomsky N. Cartesian Linguistics. A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thoaght. 3rd ed. / edited by J. McGilvray. New York : Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009. 158 p.
13. Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures. The Hague : Mouton, 1957. 134 p.
14. Crystal D. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 6th ed. Oxford : Blackwell, 2008. URL : https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781444302776/
15. *Gleason* H. A., Jr. An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics. Hartford Seminary Foundation. New York : Henry Holt and Company, 1955. 389 p.
16. Greenberg, J. H. (1963). Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. *Universals of Language.* Cambridge, Mass., and London : MIT Press, 1963. P. 73–113.
17. Fries Ch. C. The Bloomfield 'School'. *Trends in European and American Linguistics 1930–1960.* Utrecht ; Antwerpen, 1961. P. 196–224.
18. Harris, Z. From morpheme to utterance. *Language.* 1946. Vol. 22. P. 161–183.
19. Haugen E. I. Directions in modern linguistics. *Language.* 1951. Vol. 27. P. 211–222.
20. The Routledge Linguistics Encyclopedia : 3rd ed. / Edited by Kirsten Malmkjær. Routledge : London and New York : Taylor & Francis, 2010. 763 p.
21. Russell, B. On Denoting. *Mind. New Series.* 1905. Vol. 14. No. 56. P. 479–493.

References II

1. Hromko, T. V. (2020), "Description as a way of showing the ontological status of speech : report on: *Crimean International Philological Forum,* Sept. 24–25, 2020 ["Deskryptsiya yak vyyav ontolohichnoho statusu hovirky" : dopovid, *Kryms'kyi mizhnarodnyi filolohichnyi forum,* veresen, 24–25, 2020], Taurian National University named after V. I. Vernadsky, Kyiv, available at : https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TS5FWlpkolM&t=1s/
2. Hromko, T. V. (2021), *Methodology of lexical and grammatical description of the language of subdialect :* Grand Ph.D. thesis [*Metodolohiya leksyko-hramatychnoyi deskryptsiyi linhvariyu hovirky :* dys. ... dokt. filol. nauk], Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University, Odessa, 685 pp.
3. Hromko, T. V. (2021), *Methodology and additional description of the subdialect* : monograph [*Metodolohiya ta dosvid deskryptsiyi hovirky*: monohrafiya], Dnipro, 452 p.
4. Hromko, T. V. (2019), "Modern textography of dialect speakers in the steppe subdialect", *Scientific Notes. Philological Sciences* ["Suchasna tekstohrafiya dialektonosiyiv stepovoyi hovirky", *Naukovi zapysky. Filolohichni nauky*], Central Ukrainian State Pedagogical University named after Vinnychenko, KOD Publishing House, Kropyvnytskyi, vol. 175, pp. 29–33.
5. Katalzen, A. I. (2012), "The problem of speech development, thought and human activity in structural and generative concepts of linguistics and philosophy", *Bulletin of NTUU "KPI". Philosophy. Psychology. Pedagogy* ["Problema spiv-

vidnoshennya movy, myslennya ta lyudskoyi diyalnosti v strukturalistskykh ta heneratyvnykh kontseptsiyakh linhvistyky i filosofiyi", *Visnyk NTUU «KPI». Filosofiya. Psykholohiya. Pedahohika*], KPI University, Kyiv, Issue 1 (34), pp. 42–46.

6. Selivanova, O. O. (1999), *Current directions of modern linguistics (analytical review)* [*Aktual'ni napryamy suchasnoyi linhvistyky (analitychnyy ohlyad)*], Fitosociotsentr Press, Kyiv, 148 p. ISBN: 966–7459–28–4.

7. Selivanova, O. O. (2008), *Modern linguistics : directions and problems* : Textbook [*Suchasna linhvistyka : napryamy ta problemy* : Pidruchnyk], Dovkillya-K Publishers, Poltava, 712 p.

8. *Glossary of Ukrainian language* : in 20 volumes. Volume 4 (D–Zh) (2013) [*Slovnyk ukrainskoi movy*, u 20 t. Tom chetvertyi (D–Zh)], Ukrainian fund of language information, NAS of Ukraine, Kyiv, 1010 p.

9. *Philosophical encyclopedic vocabulary* (2023) [*Filosofskyi entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk*], available at: https:// slovnyk.me/dict/fes/

10. *Philosophical encyclopedic vocabulary* (2002) [*Filosofskyi entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk*], ed. V. I. Shynkaruk, NAS of Ukraine, Kyiv, 2002. 727 p.

11. Bloomfield, L. (1994), *Language,* Motilal Banarsidass Publ., Delhi, 566 p.

12. Chomsky, N. (2009), *Cartesian Linguistics. A Chapter in the History of Rationalist Thoaght,* 3rd ed., edited by J. McGilvray, Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 158 p.

13. Chomsky, N. (1957), *Syntactic Structures*, Mouton, The Hague, 134 p.

14. Crystal, D. (2008), *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics,* 6th ed., Blackwell, Oxford, URL : https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781444302776/

15. *Gleason,* H. A., Jr. (1955), *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics,* Hartford Seminary Foundation, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 503 p.

16. Greenberg, J. H. (1963), "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements", *Universals of Language,* MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., and London, pp. 73–113.

17. Fries, Ch. C. (1961), "The Bloomfield 'School'", *Trends in European and American Linguistics 1930–1960*. Utrecht ; Antwerpen, pp. 196–224.

18. Harris, Z. (1946), "From morpheme to utterance", *Language*, vol. 22, pp. 161–183.

19. Haugen, E. I. "Directions in modern linguistics", *Language*, 1951, vol. 27, pp. 211–222.

20. *The Routledge Linguistics Encyclopedia* (2010), Third edition, ed. by K. Malmkjær, Routledge.

21. Russell, B. (1905), "On Denoting", *Mind*, *New Series*, Vol. 14, No. 56, pp. 479–493.

ГРОМКО Тетяна Василівна,
доктор філологічних наук, доцент; тел.: +38 0500310222; e-mail: hromkot@gmail.com;
ORCID ID: 0000–0002–4661–4302.

ДЕСКРИПЦІЯ ЯК СПОСІБ ЕКСПЛІКАЦІЇ МОВНОЇ СИСТЕМИ ІДІОМУ: ТЕОРЕТИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ

Анотація. ***Метою*** запропонованої статті є опис та теоретичне осмислення дескрипції як способу експлікації мовної системи говірки, що полягає в науковій інтерпретації мовних і мовленнєвих одиниць говіркового дискурсу і цим самим, у цілому, дає можливість підвищити ступінь доказовості та достовірності лінгвістичних спостережень за лінгварієм усього виражального ресурсу субдіалекту. ***Об'єктом*** є поняття дескрипції лінгварію як мовно-мовленнєва система лінгвістичного аналізу. ***Предмет*** дослідження — теоретичні та функціональні засади дескрибування в історико-лінгвістичному аспекті й новітнє подання опису говірки як мовної системи. ***Результатом*** дослідження є обґрунтування доречності перегляду традиційної теоретичної кваліфікації дескрипції в лінгвістиці, а також на досвіді опису говіркового дискурсу актуалізація її в плані виявлення всіх потенційних можливостей дистрибутивного опису структури мови, тобто увесь репертуар лінгвістичних елементів (виражального ресурсу лінгварію говірки) за контекстуальним типом дескрибування. Запропонована експлікації мовної системи говірки передбачає подолання неповноти, несистемності й незіставності інформації моноговіркового опису й орієнтована на максимальний набір їх релевантних структурних рис, їх системні зв'язки тощо. ***Висновки***: Дескрипція є одним із найбільш поширених у лінгвістичній науковій практиці методів опису й вивчення фактів, предметів і явищ мовної картини світу. Моноговіркова дескрипція служить підставою для подальшого застосування в дослідженнях її методології, дослідницького апарату (метамова) та алгоритму опису конкретного лінгварію як однієї з технік побудови моделі дескрибування для отримання об'єктивних результатів дослідження в лінгвістичній науці.

Ключові слова: дескриптивна лінгвістика, дескрипція, лінгварій, говірка, говірковий дискурс, виражальний ресурс, методологія лінгвістичного опису, експлікація мовної системи.

Статтю отримано 19.04.2023 р.