

ФИЛОЛОГИЯ ИЛИМДЕРИ
ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ НАУКИ
PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Жумабекова Н.М.

**ЖАШ МУУНДУН КЫРГЫЗ-ОРУС ТИЛИНДЕГИ СҮЙЛӨШМӨДӨГҮ
ТИЛ КОДУНУН ӨЗГӨРҮҮСҮ**

Жумабекова Н.М.

**АНАЛИЗ ПЕРЕКЛЮЧЕНИЯ КОДОВ В РУССКО-КЫРГЫЗСКОМ
РАЗГОВОРЕ МОЛОДОГО ПОКОЛЕНИЯ**

N.M. Zhumabekova

**THE ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHED RUSSIAN-KYRGYZ
CONVERSATION OF YOUNG GENERATION**

УДК: 801.80/81.454

Макалада эки тил катышкан студенттердин сүйлөшмөсүндөгү үч түрдө берилген суроолордун семантикалык жана структуралык өзгөчүлүктөрү анализделген. Сүйлөшмөдөгү кыймыл тили жана гендерлик өзгөчүлүктөр дагы анализге алынган. Кыргыз тилинен да бөлүкчөсү катышкан декларативдүү суроолордун көбүнө болгондугу, сүйлөшмөнүн контексти неформалдуу экенин, сүйлөшмөдө пикирлештер бири бири менен жакшы тааныш болуп, жоопторун алдын ала билгендиктерин дадилдейт. Суроолорго оң жооптор көбүнчө берилет, кээ бир учурларда суроолорго жооп кайтарылбагандыгы, жооп белгилүү болгондугун билдирет. Пикирлештердин сүйлөшмөдө талкууланып жаткан маселелер жөнүндө маалыматтары бар экенин, алардын бирдиктүүлүгүн кыскартылган сүйлөмдөрдөн билсек болот. Тил кодун аралаштырып сүйлөгөндөрү пикирлештердин эки тилди жетиштүү билбегендигин, алардын бир тилде сүйлөө кажети жоктугун туура көрүүсүн, бири бирине түшүнүү жана сезүү мамиле жасаганын билдирет.

Негизги сөздөр: сүйлөшмө, гендер, язык, семантика, структура, эркин сүйлөө, пикирлештер, код алмашуу, бирдиктүүлүк, ээ болуу, түшүнүү, угуучулар, суроолор.

В статье представлен анализ двух язычного разговора студентов с целью выявления соотношения трех видов вопросов, их семантических и структурных особенностей. Также были рассмотрены язык жестов и гендерные особенности применительно к разговору. Преобладающее количество декларативных вопросов с компонентом да в кыргызском языке свидетельствует о неформальном контексте разговора, когда говорящие хорошо знают друг друга и предполагают ответы слушателей, строя вопро-

сы с уже имеющимся ответом. Предпочтительный ответ на вопросы положительный, в некоторых случаях вопрос остается неотвеченным, ввиду очевидности соответствующего ответа. Солидарность в разговоре прослеживается в неполных эллиптических вопросах, предполагающих осведомленность собеседников в обсуждаемых предметах. Переключение кодов обуславливается недостаточным знанием языка, отсутствием необходимости соблюдать правильность высказываний, пониманием и способностью прочувствовать собеседника.

Ключевые слова: разговор, гендер, язык, семантика, структура, собеседники, переключение кодов, солидарность, владение, понимание, слушатели, вопросы.

The article presents conversational analysis of code-switched talk of students in order to reveal the correlation of three types of questions, their semantic and structural peculiarities. Body language and gender peculiarities in connection to the conversation have also been studied. The prevailing number of declarative questions with component da in Kyrgyz in the conversation indicate at informal context of the talk when the interlocutors anticipate the answers of the listeners thus building their questions including the answers in them. The preferable answers to the questions are positive, some of them are left without answer due to the clearness of the answer. Solidarity in the conversation is seen in elliptical questions presupposing the awareness of the listeners of the discussed subjects. Code-switching together with inability to speak in one language because of lack of command, not paying attention to the speech conveyed takes place to call for solidarity, understanding and feeling in one's shoes.

Key words: talk, gender, language, semantics, structure, interlocutors, code-switching, solidarity, command, understanding, listeners, questions.

The conversation in bilingual community may reveal more detailed peculiarities of two languages explaining the background of the used language unit, thus contributing to typological characteristics of the languages. The choice of the code is at times essential and may be reasoned by social factors. Among them might be solidarity, call for understanding or the necessity to use exactly this code. The structure of questions and preferred answers, the length of the turns may vary depending on which code was used.

In the conversation we analyzed we describe the body language mainly eye contact, hand movements. The body language is connected with either the semantics of the utterances, or the structure of the questions and answers.

This is an informal talk between three students. Two male students begin the conversation and female student joins them at the end.

From line 1 to 7 we see that special question is answered negatively and the talk goes on with a new topic. A. is asking about how many books he read in his life and B. is telling that writing and reading is not what he likes. A. is making an appeal to B. looking at him. When he looks forward he is thinking “how many books has he read, that’s interesting” before saying it. When looking at B. he seeks for exact answer but stressing “in the whole life” he is sure that B. has read a few books, so A. wants to confirm his assumption, which turns out to be correct when the answer followed. B.’s negative answer is accompanied by first looking at A., raising brows – showing he didn’t expect the question. Then looking aside with “Da v” is a sign of thinking, he tries to find justification for not reading much. Also, when he begins speaking he will be looked at by A., so feeling awkward here, he looks aside. When B. looks again at A. at the word “chitat” he seeks for confirmation “do you mean this?”. Looking aside when confessing that he doesn’t like reading shows he feels awkward which is strengthened by touching his eye with his finger.

The next turn consists of nodding – understanding and affirming the answer. Looking forward means thinking, maybe something like “you didn’t read much, but did I read much myself?”

1. A. (patting on B’s shoulder, looking at him) Skazhi mne moi drug, (looking forward) skolko knig ty prachel (looking at B) za vsyu zhizn?
2. B. (looking at A, raising brows) Da v (looking aside) printsipe chitat (looking at A.) ne lyublyu esli chestno (looking aside)

chitat i pisat (shaking head,

5. sniffing) eto ne moye
6. touching right eye with his indicating finger
7. A. Nodding. Looking forward.

The topic changes on next four lines with special question which is asked being confident and looking at A. The question is inversed “mother how is” making stress on *mamka*. B. looks aside knowing A. will look at him and also thinking what to say next. He asks short declarative question “Well?” There is no pause between the two questions, so A. not catching up with answering to the first question which would require content answer “well”, has to give affirmative answer “yes” to the second question. Though if the two questions had made up one “Is your mother doing well?”, the answer would also be “yes”. Maybe here B. to avoid silence after previous topic exhausted, filled in the conversation with first coming to his mind – mother. That’s why the question came to be inversed. The answer to the question is code-switched “Thanks to the God, well” and proceeded with looking forward which is the sign of thinking “Yes, Mum, suppose, she is rather well”. The next turn begins with looking aside because the topic is exhausted-the answer is gotten. However, B. trying to say something seems to paraphrase his own question “Harasho?” or clarifies the answer of A. He sniffs and looks aside because it’s evident that there is no sense to continue the topic. So not waiting for the answer which was already given in the previous line he adds “Well, that’s the main thing”. That’s interesting that A. overlaps him “Oy, well, yes”, which is appropriate answer to both speech utterances in line 16. A. quite possibly tried to answer to the question “Is she Ok?”

B’s question on line 16. is also code-switched: the first word in Russian and the rest two are in Kyrgyz. From this question we can infer that the mother has been unwell because this “Normalno le bi?” actually variant of “Djakshy le bi?”, however with the component “normalno” it seems more emphasized. This question is polar one and requires affirmative *yes*.

14. B. (looking at A.) Mamka kak pazhivayet? (looking aside) Harasho?

15. A. Da. (looking from B. forward) kудayga shugur, dzhakshy

16. B. (looking aside) Normalno le bi? (sniffing, looking aside) [Nu, samaya glavnaye]

17. A. (looking at the book in his hands) [Oy, nu da.]

The next piece of the talk is about German textbook which was begun by A. His each finished thought is

accompanied with nodding, maybe because he is not very sure B. will support this topic and he supports himself. His turn is code-switched. In “german book” there is no agreement in gender according to Russian grammar. “alyvalgan bolchumun”, “praiznasheniyelemerin chi” are in Kyrgyz, though praiznasheniye is in Russian A. added affixes of plurality and possessiveness. This code-switching is aimed to establish solidarity among them – the topic is not very interesting to B., so A. mixing up grammar and words, also using particle “chi”(something close to “isn’t it?”, but there isn’t any equivalent in English), tries to make the conversation go on. After looking through the textbook B. asks if A. speaks German. The question is inappropriate because A. told he wanted to attend courses, the fact he has poor German. So, he looks at B. and wrinkles his forehead thinking what to answer. On line 59. he searches for information and looks at B. “how is it called?”. He tries to tell he has idea about pronunciation, etc. And here B. says “not very” which in Russian and Kyrgyz (more in Kyrgyz) means “not very good”. Did he tell it about the textbook or about A.’s poor German? A. misheard and asked other-initiated repair question “A?” which he answered himself by continuing his previous turn.

The polar question on line 65. “..is it spoken?” was answered by laughing in next turns and by “that’ll do bro”. The special question “why are you trying to persuade me?”, accompanied with opening a hand to strengthen the meaning, is not answered because refers to mismatch of linguistic behavior of B. to A.’s previous utterances. So, A. continues the turn after the question. The declarative question “isn’t it similar?” is answered with the same question in affirmative form. The declarative question on line 74. “I know nothing, don’t I?” is answered by laughing – there is no other variant to this.

50. A. (nodding, listing over his book)(0.3) *Vot nemetskiy kniga alyvalgan*

51. *bolchumun (nodding) hachu na nemetskiye kursy zapisatsya(nodding) i*

52. *slava uchu (nodding) tak pa filmam vaabshe praiznasheniyelemerin nemelerin chi*

53. B. (looking at A. stretching his hand to take the book)

54. A. (giving the book to B. looking at him)

55. B. (looking through the book) *Ty vaabshe razgavariyaesh na nemetskom?*

56. A. (looking at B.) *Tam. Net. (looking at the book wrinkling his*

57. *forehead)Tak ne gavaryu.*

58. *Vaabshe razbirayus emesinechi mne dep*

koyotle (looking at B.) kyrgyzcha

59. *aytkanda intanatsiya, tam [praiznasheniye]*

60. B. *[ne ochen](listing over the pages)*

61. A. (looking at B) *A? osho men (showing with hands) oshondo razbirayus*

62. B. *A razbirayeshsya. nu v printsipe da.(listing over the pages)*

63. A. *Toka sen ty mne padskazhi vot(taking the book from B.) nemetski*

64. *okshosh bolotken razgavorniy beken? (looking at open book) tak (0.2) tut*

65. *slava est (0.2)*

66. *[reads in German laughing]*

67. B. *[laughing into his fist]*

68. A. *continues reading.*

69. B. *(laughing, looking aside, closing the book with his hand) Da ladno bratan.*

70. A. (looking at B.) *Chyo ty ugarayesh? (showing with hand). Nu ya tak.*

71. *Smahivaet da?*

72. B. (looking down) *ne smahivaet. No vish (moving closed lips to both sides)*

73. A. (looking at) *nifiga ne znayu da? [laughing]*

74. B. *[laughing]*

75. A. *Da.(looking up)*

The continuation of the talk is argument about Kyrgyz being rude. A. is trying to prove showing a finger and hands, looking forward accompanies thinking process. B. does not agree with him, so he overlaps him, and repeats his statement in Kyrgyz “to confirm inference” [1].

Lines 83-87 are constructed of arguing repeating utterances with shaking head and looking at the interlocutor. Then the flow of the talk touches tadjiks whose language is rude according to B. Here A. overlaps B. (which doesn’t happen to him anywhere in this talk) with “u kazakav”, and continue his thought throughout several turns below (he behaved so in previous pieces of the talk), despite B’s attempt to take the turn.

A. has suggestion like utterance which is close to question, so B. answers “Nu”(well = yes). In both cases A. touches B.’s knee –suggesting to do something, expecting consent [2].

A. suggests be to do several things and these utterances are accompanied by showing his hand –sign of a question, uncertainty. Only the last one of these is followed by “da” and reminds polar question form. That’s why the preferred answer was “Nu”.

76. A. (showing with finger) *Dzhok, mynday karap korson chuy.(looking from*

77. B. forward) ozbek, kazaktardy karasan (showing with hands, looking

78. forward) myaganko tak pa lyubeznomu [byolyokchyo suyloshot].

79. B. [Ty chyо naabarot ozbekter] (wrinkling his forehead, looking

80. at A., folding his fingers) net pachemu u ozbekov naabarot grubuyi

81. A. (saying something in Uzbek, shaking his body)

82. B. (looking at A., shaking his head) net u uzbekov naabarot u nih grubuy

83. A. (looking at B, shaking his head) net u nas grubee naverno.

84. B. (looking at A.) Net, net. U nih grubee.

85. A. (looking at B.) Nu ya schitayu nash yazyk grubuy.

86. B. (looking at A., showing with hand) Ne, nu pachemu [u tadzhikov]

87. A. (looking at B.) [u kazakav]

88. B. (looking at A., moving his left hand forward.) u tyurkav u nih [grubuy]

89. A. [naprimer]

90. (looking at

91. B. showing with hand) vot skazhi mne na kyrgyzskam shot nibud

92. predlazheniye, zaday mne vapros, (showing with hand) vot predsta

93. (touching B`s knee) sebe shot ty vaabshe ne znayesh kyrgyzskiy yazyk da,

94. B. Nu.

95. A. vot ty (looking at B. touching B`s knee) Amerikanets

96. B. Nu.

Conclusion

In the talk there are 7 special, 4 polar and 10 declarative questions. There are more declarative questions and about 10 declarative questions looking suggestions with final component “da”. This is reasoned by informal situation where interlocutors know each other very well and having information about each other try to foresee the answer, thus asking declarative questions which already contain the answer. The questioner`s knowledge of the answer is proven by correlating words and the affirmative answer in the following turn. Though some questions require full form of one polarity, the answer is short and of another polarity. The preferred answer to questions is affirmative, such as “well, yes”. In some cases, the question is not answered being with quite evident answer or the questioner doesn`t give the responder

chance to answer and continues his turn. Also, the declarative question is not answered immediately because the respondent may ask a clarifying question and answer after this.

Omission of a component is justified by the fact that the questioner is sure the respondent will get the idea of the question; asking in Kyrgyz calls for solidarity. Inversed form of a question tells that the questioner asked what first came to his mind in order to support the conversation. Also, putting any component on the first place is willingness to emphasize exactly this thing in the question. Using short forms of words justify informal character of the talk.

In the talk there are special questions being full-fledged questions with appropriate content answer and also short clarifying or repairing questions (to whom?). Some questions are questions inside a turn, either not requiring the answer (why are you persuading me?) or not having been given chance to answer. Polar questions make up less number because the discussion is about topics the interlocutors are familiar with. Moreover, two questions are short clarifying questions one of which was not answered. The rest two questions are given negative and positive answers.

Body language consists mostly of looking at the interlocutor, looking forward, looking aside, looking down, looking up, scratching/touching nose, showing fingers/hand(s), touching knee. Looking at the interlocutor takes place at the end of the question or inside of the turn after each finished idea at the expectance of/feeling understanding, solidarity or sympathy. Feeling confident is accompanied by looking at the person. Also, looking at the interlocutor expresses disagreement or seeking confirmation by him. Another aim of looking at the interlocutor is compensating verbal omission in the utterance. Looking forward turned out to evidence thinking, supposing, being not sure. Looking aside shows that the speaker is not confident or about the question being asked or about his own state of being. He may feel awkward at his interlocutor`s looking at him after finishing his idea. Also, looking aside a person tries to find justification for his “imperfectness” in the situation described. Looking down tells about discontent with what said in the previous turn. Looking up demonstrates thinking. Scratching or touching nose shows disagreement, doubting and thinking about the contra argument. Showing fingers is to prove correctness of an idea. Declarative questions looking suppositions are accompanied by showing hand or moving it forward. Touching another person`s knee happens to attract his attention and ask him to

imagine himself in a suggested situation. Touching face means being bored with another person`s repeating ideas.

Code-switching together with inability to speak in one language because of lack of command, not paying attention to the speech conveyed takes place to call for solidarity, understanding and feeling in one`s shoes. Also, it happens when a person wants to emphasize something using words from another language.

The gender differences are clearly seen in the talk. Men sometimes prefer not to answer a question being too concentrated on the general idea of the talk or immediately continue their idea having given quick short answer to the question, whereas women tend to reply each question, not omitting any information. They also feel they have to support men with reacting to their

question. Males develop their ideas until it is exhausted and they have nothing to add anymore. They are hardly distracted from the idea they convey, and continue keeping the topic throughout several turns. Unlike women who maybe distracted by intrusion and answer the subsequent turn, men tend to answer the initial question. Males try to give factual information in the conversation.

References:

1. Heritage, John, Raymond, Geoffrey. Navigating Epistemic Landscapes: Acquiescence, Agency and Resistance in Responses to Polar Questions. In J-P de Ruiter(ed) Questions, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 2. www.indiabix.com/body-language
-