STYLISTIC, SEMANTIC AND GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF PERSONIFICATION, ANIMISM AND SUBJECT SENTENCES

Akhmadali Mamadaliev

Associate Professor of the Department of Theory and Practice of the French Language, ASIYAZ

ABSTRACT

This article examines the stylistic, semantic and grammatical features of personification, animism and subject sentences. Based on the method of transformation analysis, their differences in the paradigmatic and syntagmatic plans will be determined.

Key words

personification, animism, subject sentences, virtuema, deep and surface structure, transformation, anthroponym, faunonym, imposition of families.

Introduction. In modern linguistics, personification is usually considered as a compositional and stylistic device (Pototskaya, 1974: 135), which consists in attributing qualities to inanimate objects, abstract concepts (Morin, Teterevnikova, 1960: 207), animals (hereinafter referred to as faunonyms) (Riesel, 1975: 204). animate, such as the gift of speech, the ability to enter into relationships characteristic of human society, etc. (Akhmanova, 1969: 236) and used to create imagery and poetry, as well as to achieve a humorous and satirical effect (Riesel, 1975: 204), while animism is understood as "the equation of an inanimate object with an active agent" (Huck, 1966: 100), or with an animate agent (Malblanc, 1961: 234).

Materials and methods. At the same time, animism is understood very broadly, including such linguistic facts as animation - giving inanimate objects and abstract concepts properties, signs and actions inherent in all living beings (Ce sol se refuse à toute espèce d'arbres fruitiers; animalization giving anthroponyms, inanimate objects and abstract concepts of the properties of signs and actions of faunonyms (Les vagues hurlantes); personification - giving faunonyms, inanimate objects and abstract concepts of properties, signs and actions of an anthroponym.

Sur le flanc des coteaux déjà court le gazon;

Cependant du plaisir la folâtre saison,

Sous ses grelots légers, rit et voltige encore,

Pendant que, soulevant les voiles de l'aurore

Le Printemps, inquiet, parait à l'horizon;

subject sentences (see below about them) (la porte ferme mal) and cases where the subject denotes the real place of action, etc. (le mur grouille de mouche) (examples A. Malblanc 1964: 234). By subject sentences we mean: 1) sentences that contain a subject subject (two-part); 2) sentences from which the objective subject is partially or completely eliminated (single-component)". The table (it) stands by the window. (Yurchenko, 1976: 91)

Already a cursory glance suggests the existence of certain differences between the above-mentioned acts of language. Their difference is observed not only in the attitude of the speaker to the subject of speech (compare the subject sentences with the other cases in the above examples), but also in their own linguistic features. This work is devoted to the study of these features, in particular, and the distinction between personification, animism and objective sentences from each other.

Personification as a fact of language has its support at two levels of language: at the level of paradigmatics and at the level of syntagmatics.

At the level of paradigmatics during personification, the semantic structure (Gak, 1971: 95) of an anthroponym is superimposed on the semantic structure of the personified non-anthroponym based on a common seme (Shandels, 1972: 48). For example: la tambour bégayait encore un peu, mais il n'avait plus rien de son appel jovial, quand à l'aube, le Simidor, le martelait avec une savante autorité (Roumain), where, based on the general seme "to produce sound", the semantic the structure of the anthroponym une personne is superimposed on the semantic structure of the personified inanimate object "drum". Moreover, their semantic structures coincide in the common seme "to make sound", expressed in the verb bégayer, in the semes "concreteness" and "substantiality", while their semes "inanimateness"/"anthroponymity" (through it and the seme "animation") collide . And in this collision there arises bi-isotopie (Greimas, 1961: 69-101) in speech, isotopy of metatext and isotopy of text (Greimas, 1961: 99). The isotopy of the metatext indicates what is being said, while the isotopy of the text marks the attitude of the speaker to the subject of speech. In the above example, therefore, a two-isotopy arises: the isotopy of inanimateness in the metatext and the isotopy of anthroponymicity in the text. In such cases, the seme "anthroponymity" acts as a virtuema (Pottier, 1974: 30) a seme that produces an evaluative effect (in our example, the effect of personification).

In syntagmatic terms, a personified non-anthroponym is equal to the subject anthroponym. For example, in the case of Est-ce un oiseau, est-ce l'âme incomplète encore de la petite phrase, est-ce une féd, cet être invisible et gémissant dont

le piano ensuite redisait tendrement la plainte? (Prouste). the personified inanimate object "piano" occupies the position of an anthroponym-subject and is semantically and syntagmatically equated to an anthroponym.

Animism is mainly carried out syntagmatically using inanimate objects and abstract concepts: 1) denoting the object of real action in the role of the subject,

Vers six heures du matin, tous ces journaux commencent à se vendre dans les queues qui s'installent aux portes des magasins... (Camus).

2) denoting the cause of a real action in the role of the subject,

Un coup frappé sur la porte exterieure le souleva (Maupassant).

3) indicating the place of real action in the role of the subject,

... les boutiques ne vendaient rien, (Flaubert);

4) the use of a verbal noun as the subject. Soudain, les chants se turent. (Camus);

5) metonymic character of the subject. Dans la nuit, je sens une main qui cherche la mienne et qui la serre (Laffitte).

All these cases are generally considered as a surface structure (Huck, 1969; 1), the purpose of which is to give speech a certain liveliness, which, however, does not reach the level of effect produced by personification, animalization, animation, etc., since the unit , undergoing animism, is not the subject denoting the real bearer of the action. It is a syntactic substitute for the subject, denoting the real subject of the action. Therefore, semantically it is not equal to an anthroponym, faunonym, or living beings in general. For example: J'ai oublié le titre du film. Il racontait la vie d'un garçon et d'une fille (Lanoux), where the film, although it plays the role of the subject, is not and is not equal to the subject denoting the real subject of the action, which can be established using the method of transformation analysis. For example, if we take the same examples above, they can accordingly be transformed as:

1) Vers six heures du matin, on commencement à vendre tous ces journaux dans les queues qui s`installent aux portes des magasins, where the unit denoting the object of real action takes its usual place, the place of the object.

2) In the same way, you can bring the subject to its usual place, denoting the real cause of the action: Il se souleva à cause d'un coup frappé sur la porte extérieure;

3) Place of real action: On ne vendait rien dans les boutiques:

4) Verbal subject: Soudain, on se tu de chanter;

5) Subject having a metonymic character: Dans la nuit je sens la main de quelqu'un qui cherche la mienne et qui la serre.

Sentences where personification is observed have a peculiar transformation, sharply different from animism. For example, the sentence: Mais le corps et la

pansée sont deux frères jumeaux, qui ne vont point du même pas (Rolland) can be transformed as Mais le corps et la pensés sont comme deux frères jumeaux, qui ne vont point du même pas[19].

At the same time, the opinion is expressed that "structures with concrete inanimate and abstract nouns are transformed structures" (Evstafiev, 1974: 42). However, this statement requires clarification, since usually transformed structures are understood as surface structures. Surface structures are "indirect nominations, the elements of which are used in a figurative meaning, in a derivative, secondary function, and deep structures are direct nominations, where the elements of the signifier are used in their direct meanings and primary functions, for the expression of which they were formed in the language " (Gak, 1969: 80).

This understanding of deep and surface structures (or transformed structures) gives grounds to include such sentences as Les arbres bourgeonnent au printemps (P. Robert); la pluie ruisselait sur les murs (P.Robert); Catte maisan croule (P.Robert), etc. to deep structures, since the verbal lexemes bourgeonner, ruisseler, crouler are called upon in the language to denote the activity of precisely these inanimate objects. Therefore, their subjects in the sigmatic plane fulfill their primary functions, the functions of the subject, denoting the real bearer of actions.

According to calculations of the 3,300 French verbs we took into account, verbs denoting the activity of inanimate objects without any evaluative characteristics and thereby forming subject sentences account for about 15%. Therefore, it seems legitimate to talk about the inconsistency of considering in every use an inanimate noun in the position of the subject of a transformed structure, especially animism or personification.

Such sentences should be considered as subject sentences - sentences whose subject is expressed by inanimate and abstract nouns and denoting the real bearer of actions.

The differences between transformed (surface) and non-transformed (deep) structures, in other words, animism and subject sentences, can also be established using transformation analysis. If, during transformation, surface structures reveal their deep structures, then objective sentences, being themselves deep structures, cannot be subjected to such transformations.

As for the transformability of sentences where the subject is an abstract noun, it also requires clarification.

The fact is that there are no things without properties and relations, just as there are no properties and relations without things (Uemov, 1963: 49). Consequently, with the appearance or recognition of new things (concrete or

---

[19] On the possibility of such a transformation, see in particular (Miclau, 1970: TRA; Arutyunova, 1978: 335).

abstract), the concept of their properties and relationships arises, which in turn require their names. To satisfy such needs, language resorts to denominational (Arutyunova, 1970: 336) or also called denotative metaphors (Guiraud, 1969: 50), which differ from poetic or connotative metaphors with a lack of imagery, since in such cases the transferred language unit acquires a new semantic structure (cf. satellite person and satellite - aircraft), emanating from a thing, the properties or relationships of which receive their names. With a connotative metaphor, there is an overlay of the semantic structure of one unit on the semantic structure of another, where imagery is achieved due to colliding categorical semes (see above).

With the emergence of new abstract concepts, concepts of their properties and relationships also arise, which in turn need to be named[20]. In this case, the language in most cases resorts to the use of resources already existing in it to denote them. Therefore, it is considered legitimate to recreate sentences such as: Le moment venu, on l'éprouverait assurement (Camus). Mais, à d`autres moments, sa douleur le reprenait, (Prouste), where, in our opinion, there is no imagery due to the fact that these sentences are no different from personal or objective sentences except for the motivation (nominative nature of the metaphor) of their predicates. At the same time, such sentences cannot be subject to transformations like sentences where animism or personification is observed. Therefore, sentences whose subject is expressed by abstract nouns, which are real carriers of actions, must belong to the sphere of objective sentences.

Conclusion. Thus, we can say that personification, animism and subject sentences are different from each other. Their difference lies in the fact that when personification is carried out by superimposing the semantic structure of an anthroponym on the semantic structure of a personified non-anthroponym on the basis of a common seme, animism is achieved by moving unreal carriers of action and the place of the subject. In objective sentences, their subjects perform their primary functions, the function of the subject, denoting the real bearer of the action.

LITERATURES

1. T. Pototskaya N.P., Stylistics of the modern French language. M., 1974.

2. Moren M.K., Teterevnikova N.N. Stylistics of modern French. M., 1960.

3. Riesel E.G. "Personification, allegory, symbol." On Sat. scientific works "Issues of Romano-Germanic philology", Moscow State Pedagogical Institute named after. M. Thorez, vol. 91, M., 1975.

4. Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. M., 1969.

---

[20] It is interesting to note that among the 3,300 French verbs we took into account, we did not find a verb called upon in French to denote the activity of only abstract concepts.

5. Gak V.G. Conversations about the French word. M., 1966.

6.AnarboyevaI.O.(2023).https://scholar.google.ru/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=czuxyxkAAAAJ&citation_for_view=czuxyxkAAAAJ:Zph67rFs4hoC

7. Nortoeva Nodira Muhammadalievna. (2023).Communicative-pragmatic direction in the study of phraseological units and their derivatives in French and Uzbek. https://gejournal.net/index.php/IJSSIR/article/view/1526