

## HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF RUSSIAN SPOKEN LANGUAGE

**Petrov Igor Valerevich**

Republic of Uzbekistan, Andijan State University  
Faculty of philology, Russian Language and Literature

### ABSTRACT

This article describes the history of the study of Russian colloquial speech, indicates how this study began, names of linguists who have devoted their work to this issue, and lists their works on the disclosure of this topic. In different works, different scientists have given different names to the term "colloquial speech". Some scientists called it "spoken speech", while other researchers called it "spoken speech". Our article also contains a comparison of colloquial speech with a codified literary language, and their distinctive features are indicated. We also point out that fiction that exists in written form cannot sufficiently reflect natural spoken language.

**Keywords:** Language, territorial dialect, local dialect, semi-dialect speech, argotic speech, slang speech, urban vernacular, spoken untrained informal speech, spoken language, spoken language, Russian spoken language, codified literature language.

### INTRODUCTION

Scientists have long been attracted by the fact that the literary language does not coincide with the language of live, unprepared and relaxed speech of native Russian speakers. This discrepancy is reflected in the whole field of linguistics – dialectology, which studies the territorial features of the Russian language. The territorial dialect – local dialect) is the only means of communication for its speakers. Its norms are not codified, they are learned from childhood, intuitively, and were maintained until the General secondary compulsory education that came to Russian villages, the spread of radio and television did not lead to the fact that native speakers of dialects did not learn the norms of the literary language. As people began to assimilate these norms, dialect features in their speech became less and less, and these features turned out to be only individual "inclusions»; moreover, the phonetic features of the dialect were kept in the speech of these residents, the former speakers of the dialect, for the longest and most persistently (and often throughout their lives). Thus, the codified Russian literary language with its functional and stylistic differentiation was opposed by both dialects and the live speech of those former dialect speakers, mainly rural residents, who did not fully master the literary norms (it can be called "semi-dialect").

However, not only dialect and described "semi-dialect" speech was opposed to the codified Russian literary language, but also argotic, slang speech, which characterizes the communication of limited, narrow, closed-professionally or socially – isolated from the rest of society, including merchants-offend, thieves, prisoners, etc., urban vernacular, as well as oral unprepared informal speech of native speakers of the literary language.

In the 50-60 years of the XX century, scientists began to actively study the latter, that is, oral unprepared informal informal speech, and it was for it that the name "colloquial speech" (CS) was fixed. The tape recordings of such speech accurately and clearly showed its significant differences from the oral speech of the same native speakers of the literary language, which

they uttered in an official setting, and naturally, complete bewilderment and disbelief became their response when listening to these recordings: *"Невозможно, чтобы я так сказал"; "Да нет же, я так не говорила!"* etc.

Initially, there were two centers for the study of spoken language and, accordingly, two main points of view on this phenomenon: on the one hand, the Institute of the Russian language of the Academy of Sciences in Moscow (works by E. N. Shiryaev, L. A. Kapanadze, E. V. Krasilnikova, and others under the leadership of E. A. Zemskaya and M. V. Panov) and on the other, the Saratov University (works by O. B. Sirotinina, her colleagues and students).

Some linguists, although they consider spoken language to be one of the functional types of literary language, are increasingly inclined to believe that it is a separate literary language [9, 13]. However, there is a big difference between literary language and spoken language. In addition, colloquial speech is based on features inherent in other functional forms of the language. Therefore, some linguists hold the view that many aspects of colloquial speech complement the literary language: "The composition of a literary language will not be definitively established until the nature of colloquial speech as one of its functional varieties is clarified" [2, 16]. However, colloquial speech has its own characteristics.

In the 50s, the problems of functional stylistics were widely discussed on the pages of the journal «Вопросы языкознания» ("Questions of linguistics"). In scientific articles published during this period, colloquial speech was interpreted as one of the functional styles of literary language. Some studies have been conducted to determine the features of the spoken language of characters in works of art, the properties of spoken language and the qualities of functional style.

Putting colloquial speech on par with functional style and defining it as one of the functional styles puts this system on par with the official, scientific, and journalistic styles. This point of view is shared by V. K. Kostomarov, A. N. Vasiliev, Yu. M. Skrebnev, as well as other linguists who consider the issues of colloquial speech on the basis of specific language materials. However, observations have shown that colloquial speech has properties that distinguish it from ordered styles of literary speech. This leads to two conclusions: first, colloquial speech exists only in oral form, and speech phenomena that are characteristic of functional styles of literary language have oral and written forms. Secondly, all types of functional styles are expressed in colloquial speech, i.e. colloquial speech can be scientific, scientific-journalistic, etc. On this basis it is impossible to combine spoken language with functional styles, and it follows, conversely, to distinguish, to separate, because "speaking not opposed to individual functional styles, and all the codified literary language in General, since all functional styles of the literary language are the limits of codified literary language. In other words, colloquial speech occupies a very special position in relation to the functional styles of the literary language" [8, 21]. Thus, colloquial speech cannot be compared with functional style.

In a number of works devoted to the study of the problem of colloquial speech and its scientific analysis, one can find many thoughts that colloquial speech is a normalized oral form of a literary language or normalized oral literary speech.

The relationship between literary language and spoken language is understood differently by different linguists.

The understanding of colloquial speech in its relation to the literary language as a separate speech type, and the interpretation of the formal side of speech as a leading property are clearly reflected in the research of I. R. Galperin. However, other linguists assume that colloquial speech is oral speech and this feature is the leading feature of colloquial speech. This point of view is held by E. A. Zemskaya, G. A. Barinova, E. V. Krasilnikova, L. A. Kapanadze, E. N. Shiryaev and others.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Recently, the number of studies devoted to colloquial speech as a phenomenon of the literary language system has increased. The material is taken from the speech of persons who have a good command of the literary language and its norms. For example, O. B. Sirotinina studied the spoken Russian language based on the speech of scientists, engineers, teachers, doctors, editors, librarians, employees, and students. She writes: "All the characteristics of spoken language are given only on the basis of recording the speech of people who are fully proficient in the norms of the literary language. For comparison, sometimes additional materials are also involved - recordings of speech of children and people with a lower cultural level..." [4, 4-5]. Examples of studying spoken language based on the speech of speakers of a literary language are found in the collection «Русская разговорная речь» ("Russian spoken language"). The authors of the collection take "the easy speech of native speakers of the literary language" as the objects of their research.

Colloquial speech is also captured in the works of various writers, but in fiction, different writers (in different works of the same writer) reflect it in varying degrees.

According to a number of linguists, there is a significant difference between colloquial speech reflected in fiction and natural colloquial speech. In particular, the linguist K. Kozhevnikov, comparing natural colloquial speech (spontaneous) with that reflected in fiction, comes to the conclusion that fiction cannot sufficiently (in principle) reflect natural colloquial speech [1, 36]. V. V. Vinogradov, L. S. Kovtun, and O. A. Lapteva came to the same conclusions.

The approach to natural colloquial speech in a work of fiction is related to the degree of the writer's study of the national language, the features of the forms of live conversation, and the writer's talent and language abilities. However, the reflection of colloquial speech in a work of art depends on the nature of the work, its genre, and the social status of its characters.

Reflection of the norm of colloquial speech in works of art is carried out in different ways: "The phenomena inherent in live colloquial speech in the language of fiction can be reflected strongly or weakly, depending on the degree of awareness of the writer of the norms of live, colloquial speech, on his artistic tastes and tasks" [6, 38]. Thus, the O. B. Sirotinina believes that modern colloquial literature can sufficiently reflect colloquial speech and its linguistic features, that on the basis of this material it is possible to study the nature of colloquial speech, to study it.

Colloquial speech in fiction and colloquial speech in the literary language system are not the same phenomenon. In the composition of colloquial speech, along with formulas that obey the norms of the literary language, we find forms inherent in dialect speech.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

Regardless of what colloquial speech is called in modern linguistics, in what senses and aspects it is studied, the point of view that this type of speech is a kind of system continues to be proved.

However, in the process of studying the problem of colloquial speech, we met with different opinions in the description of this term. D. E. Rosenthal and M. A. Telenkova, for example, pay attention to the stylistic side of speech: “Spoken language. A special stylistic homogeneous functional system contrasted with book speech as a recodified and codified form of literary language. Colloquial speech is characterized by special conditions of functioning...” [3, 328].

D. E. Gorelik, describing the term colloquial speech, relies on elements of a simple language. L. G. Podkidysheva characterizes it in connection with the style of a work of art, T. G. Vinokur – in connection with its place in the system of literary language.

The authors of the collection “Russian colloquial speech”, focusing on the characteristics of colloquial speech, write: “In our understanding, spoken language is a special language system that has a specific set of language units and specific laws of their functioning. In fact, this is a spoken language, we keep the name "spoken language" because of its familiarity” [7, 25].

O. B. Sirotinina considers colloquial speech to be a kind of literary language used in direct, personal, and mostly informal communication. This means that “it cannot be equated to a functional style...” [5, 39].

In the process of studying the features of colloquial speech, various judgments are found when establishing its linguistic nature and highlighting the structure, intonation, and inversion.

A little apart were the research works of O. A. Lapteva, who used a different term when defining this phenomenon: “oral-colloquial variety of literary language” and at the early stages of her research included dialect speech and tried to find common features of the oral form of any speech (both public and unofficial, unprepared). Laptev noted that the verbally - spoken variant of the literary language is intended to serve a broad scope of oral communication of literary language speakers, needs which is very wide and diverse, as include everyday domestic, service, and “shop” and “street” talk, and casual conversation of several participants in the form of a dialogue or polylogue on various topics. In this approach to the object of study, it was emphasized that in terms of style, the oral-colloquial variety of literary language is heterogeneous, but on the contrary, it is heterogeneous, and its main distinguishing feature from the functional style is “oral”. Consequently, the works of O. A. Lapteva are devoted to the study of oral public (official) and non-public (i.e. unofficial unprepared) speech, and not the colloquial style of the literary language and not colloquial speech, which is opposed to the codified literary language with all its functional styles in General. Consequently, the works of O. A. Lapteva are devoted to the study of oral public (official) and non-public (i.e. unofficial untrained) speech, rather than the colloquial style of the literary language and not colloquial speech, which is opposed to the codified literary language with its functional styles in General.

E. A. Zemskaya and E. N. Shiryayev polemicized with O. A. Lapteva, who emphasized that oral public speech and oral unofficial speech are fundamentally different, and that although they share a common parameter — “oral”, yet oral public speech is not a manifestation of colloquial speech, but a codified literary language. In other words, a business report, a rally speech, a popular science conversation, a lecture, and so on are all genres of oral public speech, which is the implementation of a codified literary language (CLL), and they should not be included in the concept of “colloquial speech”.

Last for a number of parameters differs from oral public speech, that the public it assumes that 1) there is one speaker and many listeners; 2) exchange of roles of “speaking — listening” or

impossible, or extremely rare (for example, when the lecturer interrupted monologue speech, drawn from some question to the audience or to determine how much students have understood or that they have made the conclusion that the lecturer failed them the previous statement of the problem, etc.); 3) the relationship between the speaker and the listener – official; 4) the theme fixed. These four features of public speech are mandatory, and they are not present in colloquial speech, which is characterized by opposite signs in all these parameters (there may be several speakers and listeners, the change of roles “speaker-listener” occurs constantly, the relationship between them is unofficial, the topic is not fixed). In addition to these mandatory attributes, there are also less mandatory, variable attributes: 1) prepared/unprepared (public speech is mostly prepared, although in principle it may be unprepared); 2) immediacy/the mediation (an example of the latter is the radio address, appeal to a mass audience on TV); 3) a connection with the situation/lack of communication (public speaking such a connection, unlike speaking, is not peculiar, although there are exceptions: for example, reporting from the scene, television or radio – review sporting events). Depending on the presence of certain variables, different genres of oral public speech are either more contrasting in relation to spoken speech (if there are also optional features in addition to the main, mandatory features of public speech), or they may be less contrasting. For example, those genres of oral public speech that are not monologue in the full sense, i.e., are less contrasting with colloquial speech. which proceed as a speech intended for the public, for the mass listener, but at the same time it is possible to change the roles of “speaker — listener” (as in cases of TV debates, debates, interviews). The conclusion reached by these scientists is that oral public speech is the implementation of a codified literary language in oral form, and not colloquial speech. According to the concept of Saratov scientists led by O. B. Sirotinina, speaking consists of several layers: one layer is an implementation of conversational colloquial functional style of the literary language in the presence of three conditions: a) oral speech b) unprepared speech C) immediacy of communication; the second part is the implementation of other functional styles, if you meet all three of these conditions and the communication is of an informal nature (the latter, of course, is when you implement conversational-colloquial style). In other words, colloquial speech is always direct, oral, untrained, and informal. Consequently, from the colloquial-everyday style, colloquial speech is distinguished by thematic unlimited, oral and direct communication. So, according to O. B.-Sirotinina, a friendly letter can be made in a conversational style (this will be a written form of its implementation), but it will not be a colloquial speech, since communication by letter is indirect communication. Therefore, the conversational style can be implemented in colloquial speech, but should not be identified with it. The fact that colloquial speech is always only in oral form determines the primacy of intonation in it, many meanings here can be transmitted only by intonation means. In written speech, intonation can never be the only or even the main means of expressing any meaning, since in written speech intonation is secondary and is always the result of the reader's choice, it is always derived from vocabulary, word order, punctuation, and context. The overall conclusion by the linguists of this school, is that the concept of spoken language and the notion of “conversational style” (speaking is possible only in oral form, and conversational style to shape indifferent), and wider because the spoken language is not always implementing only the conversational style of the literary language (it can be non-literary, and can be the implementation of other functional styles, for example: research of spontaneous speech in an informal setting).

But the main thing that distinguishes the approach of linguists – “never” these Two schools is that the scientists of the Saratov school talking about spoken language, and scientists at the Moscow school of the spoken language, though, not to break with tradition, continue to use the term “speaking” for them a codified literary language and “speaking” (it would be more

accurate to say that, in their opinion, — “spoken language”) – two different language systems, which converge in some areas and diverge in others. In essence, this describes a situation that these scientists first called bilingualism (meaning that native speakers of Russian are bilinguals, i.e. they are fluent in two languages, two language systems), and then, after clarifying this situation, they defined it as diglossia. In diglossia, native speakers of the Russian literary language are fluent not in two languages, but in two subsystems of the same national language: the codified literary language and the spoken language (“colloquial speech”), and they move freely from the first system to the second. But if in bilingualism the transition from one language to another is dictated by purely subjective factors, then diglossia means such a transition from one subsystem to another, which is dictated by socially fixed, objective factors, namely: it is carried out in conditions of unprepared, easy communication with the direct participation of speakers in the speech act.

Then the scientists of the Moscow school reveal two concepts: “native speaker of a literary language” and “ease of communication”.

Indigenous Russian is a native speaker of the Russian language, who was born and raised in the city (therefore, this factor ensures that dialects are not affected, as mentioned above); with a higher education (this parameter is entered in order to ensure the condition of proficiency in the norms of the literary language).

*Note.* According to scientists, the presence of the three criteria put forward should have outlined the circle of people who know the norms of the literary language and whose untrained oral speech could be recorded on tape in conditions of easy communication, in order to then study it as the spoken language of native speakers of the literary language. This, however, does not mean that you cannot meet people who also mastered the full literary standards, although they did not meet all three parameters put forward (for example, they were born and raised in the village or have only a secondary education.). However, their speech, so as not to violate the purity of the experiment, was not recorded.

Ease of communication implies that 1) there is an informal relationship between the communicants; 2) there is no setting for the official nature of the message (for example, if a student enters the classroom where his groupmates are gathered, with whom he is naturally in an informal relationship, should make an official announcement: for example, if you pass an order on behalf of the Dean that applies to students in this entire group, then the second requirement will be violated); 3) there are no elements in the situation that violate the ease of communication (for example, the ease of communication will be violated if the speakers find out that a technical device is installed that records their speech). Therefore, if the speech is prepared in advance or the speakers are in an official relationship, the transition from a codified literary language to a spoken one should not be carried out. The conclusion reached by the scientists of the Moscow school is as follows: the main parameter that determines the choice of two subsystems of the national language: the codified literary language — CLL or colloquial speech (language) — CS — is the opposition: the public sphere/the private sphere of communication. If the sphere of communication is public, then the codified literary language (CLL) is chosen; if private, then CL can be used in informal relations. But there are also intermediate areas where both CLL and CS can be used; for example, a patient's conversation with a doctor, a dialogue on the street, etc. when the speakers are strangers, but the relationship between them is devoid of emphasized formality.

## CONCLUSION

Comparison of the three approaches to “colloquial speech” allows us to conclude that O.A. Lapteva's main parameter that determines this phenomenon is the “oral” parameter, O.B. Sirotinina and her followers—the immediacy of communication, unpreparedness of speech and the oral nature of communication, and E. A. Zemskaya and her colleagues — the ease of speech, the informal nature of relations between communicating people. It is obvious that, despite all the differences, there is something in common that brings these approaches together and allows us to clearly define the center that everyone will clearly define as “spoken language”: this is the relaxed, unprepared, direct oral speech of native speakers of a literary language in the sphere of private, everyday communication. Then professional, scientific, political, and so on conversations in the same conditions will be the periphery of the CS. In any case, the property of CS, which was defined above as thematic limitlessness, is manifested, which means that it is possible to use the resources of all functional styles of the literary language, as well as the inclusion of colloquial, slang, professional elements and violation of the codified norms of the literary language.

## REFERENCES

1. Kozhevnikov K. Spontaneous oral speech in epic prose. XXXII, Prague, 1971, p. 36
2. Lapteva O. A. on the structural components of colloquial speech. Selected articles, Moscow, 1996, p. 16
3. Rosenthal, D. E., Telenkova, M. A. Handbook of linguistic terms, Moscow, Prosveshchenie, 1972, p. 328
4. Sirotinina O. B. Modern colloquial speech and its features. Moscow, 1993, p. 4-5.
5. Sirotinina O. B. Modern colloquial speech. Moscow, 1996, p. 39
6. Sirotinina O. B. Modern colloquial speech. Moscow, 1996, p. 38
7. Zemskaya E. A. Russian colloquial speech. Moscow, 1996, p. 25
8. Zemskaya E. A. Russian colloquial speech. Moscow, 1996, p. 21
9. Zemskaya E. A. Russian colloquial speech. Moscow, 1992, p. 13