





## Constructions with the application in language and speech: Semantic and functional approach

Olga V. Chetverikova <sup>a1</sup> , Larisa G. Lisitskaya <sup>a</sup> , Natalia P. Selina <sup>a</sup> ,  
Inessa V. Kirichenko <sup>a</sup> , Lyubov V. Chernova <sup>a</sup> 

<sup>a</sup> *Armavir State Pedagogical University, Armavir, Russian Federation*

### APA Citation:

Chetverikova, O.V., Lisitskaya, L.G., Selina, N.P., Kirichenko, I.V., Chernova, L.V. (2021). Constructions with the application in language and speech: Semantic and functional approach. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(Special Issue 2), 1243-1252.

Submission Date: 01/01/2021

Acceptance Date: 12/03/2021

---

### Abstract

In modern studies of linguistic science concerning the syntax of a complicated sentence, applications are not specifically considered, but only mentioned in connection with the study of separate definitions. For the system description of the syntax structure of the language, it is necessary to clarify the syntax status of the application, to develop criteria for distinguishing applications from the actual definitions, to describe the ways and means of communication of separate applications with a basic sentence, to identify their semantic-functional specificity, not only at the level of the proposal but also at the level of text. All this determines the relevance of the stated topic. The article raises and solves the problem of determining the status of an application as a syntactic unit that semantically and structurally complicates a simple sentence; develops criteria for distinguishing the application from the actual definitions; describes the specifics of the functioning of separate applications at the level of the sentence and text; proves that the application goes beyond the isolated sentence due to the fact that the application becomes a kind of reporting point for subsequent deployment of thought.

© 2021 JLLS and the Authors - Published by JLLS.

*Keywords:* application; syntactic communication tools; semantics; speech situation; inter-phrasal communication

---

## 1. Introduction

In recent decades, linguistic science has focused on the problems of syntax dynamism in language, particularly the problems of transition (Beloshapkova, 1977; Lekant, 2010; Boneh & Nash, 2017; Ivantsova, 2019; Çiloğlan & Bardakç1, 2019). Among the transitional designs should be made simple sentences, complicated by separate applications. The fact is that in modern studies concerning the syntax of a complicated sentence, applications are not specifically considered, but only mentioned in connection with the study of separate definitions (Quirk et al., 1982; Korolev, 1992; Meyer, 1992; Ukhanova &

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [ochetverikova5971@nuos.pro](mailto:ochetverikova5971@nuos.pro)

Kosova, 2016; Murzina et al., 2016; Roettger et al., 2019; Erton, 2020; Moldovan; 2020). In the educational literature, syntagmatically dissected applications are considered, first of all, in terms of the correctness of punctuation in them.

Traditionally, the application is studied in the aspect of problems related to the identification of the functioning of secondary members of the proposal, and is considered as “a definition expressed by the name of a noun, consistent with a defined word in the case” (Rosenthal & Telenkova 1976). Thus, it is emphasized that the defined and defining are two names of nouns, one of which is the application. However, we note that in the phrase definition concretizes the meaning of the defined word, narrows the concept expressed by it, indicates the relationship between the trait and its carrier (attribute relationship between the defined and the defining). The type of syntax communication in such structures is a subordinate connection: *fresh air; an old book; a sunny morning*. The application, having a substantive form, as opposed to the definition, not only denotes a sign of an object, but also gives the subject a different name, characterizing the subject as a carrier of property, quality through the establishment of a relationship of common and private, gender and species, through the evaluation of the subject. The application plan is combined with elements of refinement, specification, motivation. In this case, it should be said not so much about attributes of relationships as about the relationship of explanatory, and they are not typical of the typical definition.

If the actual attributes are characterized by the grammatical subordination of one (dependent) component to another (principal), in the designs with the application components are in a relationship of semantic and grammatical identity (Karimullina et al., 2016; Klushina et al., 2019; O’neill et al., 2020). Being a noun name, the app simply matches in grammatical forms with the member it explains. The submission of the application, unlike the definition, is not grammatically expressed, and the delineation of components is not at the grammatical, as in all definitions, but at the semantic level. Moreover, the application can be used in a grammatical form that does not match the form of the word to which this app is “attached”: *I read the magazine “Youth”*.

### 1.1.Literature review

The study of the application as a syntactic phenomenon causes a certain complexity associated, paradoxically, with the lack of a single comprehensive definition of the concept. Traditionally, in university practice, the application is considered as a type of definition; expressed by a noun. Thus, the academic tradition defines an application as a definition expressed by a noun (Valgina et al., 2002). Some scholars understand by an appendix a secondary member of the sentence, which contains the second name of the subject (Lekant, 2002). The authors of the "Concise Russian Grammar" define the appendix as "an agreement in which nouns enter into the relationship between the determinant and the determinant" (Shvedova and Lopatin, 2002).

There is no single point of view on the type of subordinate relationship connecting the word being defined and the application. As already mentioned, the authors of The Concise Russian Grammar qualify this connection as an agreement (Shvedova and Lopatin, 2002). But the noun, by its grammatical properties, does not belong to the agreed words. In addition, the application can be in the nominative form, which by its very nature is not intended to express dependency. Some linguists propose to designate the connection between the application and the word being defined as an apposition (Lekant, 2002), others as an application, still others as coordination, and still others as parallelism of forms. A special kind of connection arises in cases where the application does not agree with the word being defined neither in gender, nor in number, nor in case. Some linguists unconditionally call such connection contiguity (Beloshapkova, 1977), others - occasional contiguity of the nominal type (Malakhov, 2008).

## 1.2. Research questions

This study answers the following research questions:

1. How to solve the problem of determining the status of an application as a syntactic unit that semantically and structurally complicates a simple sentence?
2. What are the criteria for distinguishing applications from the actual definitions?

## 2. Methods

The methodology of this research is based on general philosophical principles, according to which language is represented as a material, objective, dynamic, functioning, and developing system. The production of certain linguistic units is carried out in strict accordance with the existing rules and is clearly determined by the sphere of use.

General scientific methodological principles of the research are based on systematicity, anthropocentrism, and determinism. The private scientific methodology is formed on the basis of the concept of syntactic nomination and nominal-syntactic semiosis, based on a dynamic approach to syntactic phenomena of the language, as well as on the data of structural-semantic and functional approaches to language, the theory of linguistic personality.

The main methods used in the study, in addition to the traditional ones: observation, generalization, and systematization, are the methods of semantic-functional analysis of the material, methods of distributive and component analysis, the method of anthropogenic analysis from the standpoint of the theory of linguistic personality, the method of statistical calculation, etc.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1. Design with applications as a special kind of explanation

The designs with the application are built on the basis of semantic relationship of components reflecting the same object of reality, but in different aspects, which causes the potential reversibility, interchangeability of components. In structures with a typical definition, this is not possible. Compare: *Caucasian by his father, Artyom was able to drink not drunk*. The explanatory member of the proposal (*Artyom*) and the explanatory separate application (*Caucasian*) denote the same person, i.e. have the same reference. The typical definition does not have such an ability. Let's emphasize that in combinations with the application, the denotates of the components that make up the name are preserved. At the same time, there will be no new nomination. Thus, the traditional interpretation of the application as a kind of definition expressed by the name of the noun and characterized by such a connection with the defined as "parallelism of forms", in other terminology – "correlation", "apposition", in our opinion, is lopsided. Of course, there is no denying the presence of high-quality shades of value in the applications (*beauty girls – beautiful girls*), but the purpose of the application – explaining the reality through its re-name, which, in turn, is conditioned by the communicative tasks of the author of speech in a particular communication situation.

This suggests that designs with applications can be classified only conditionally, because they have a set of specific features, characteristic not for a subordinate, but for explanatory design, and we, following a number of scientists, design with applications will consider as a special kind of explanation (Korolev 1992, Chetverikova 2000). At the same time, the syntax relationship between the components of the block "explainable – explanatory application" can be explanatory or there is an explanation with a touch of an attribute value. The coincidence of grammatical forms outwardly puts the explanatory and explanatory application in an equal position, placing them as if in the same plane.

However, the lexic-semantic relationship between the components of these combinations, their syntax function, the meaning of the entire sentence with the application, finally, the place of the application in relation to the explanatory and possible means of syntax communication between the components in the conditions of separation of the application allow us to talk about the presence of primary information about the reality (explained base offer) and information secondary, indicated by the application. In other words, the application refers to the same object of reality, which in this speech situation receives a second name, which, from the point of view of the sender of the speech, is communicatively important, illocative. In our opinion, the main criterion for highlighting an application is probably denotative analysis, because the application is a member of the proposal, which is denotatively identical to the explanatory one, but the denotate has classifying features. As the equivalent of an explanatory one, the application differs from the definition, which is always un-equivalent to its definition, both in terms of content and expression. Other criteria for highlighting applications are indicated in the Table 1.

**Table 1.** Criteria for highlighting applications

Criteria	Explanation	Example
The lexical meaning of the word-app	if there are two nouns in the study unit, the function of the application is one that has a qualitative and appraisal value or refers to the explanatory concept as an ancestral concept	<i>the grandfather-feeder; Violet flower</i>
Presupposition	Where it is difficult to establish which word in combination refers to the species concept (annex) and which generic (explained) should be based on the meaning of the whole sentence, based on the so-called presupposition, which is a semantic prerequisite for thinking about the statement	<i>It cannot be said that the Great Envious was not treated with envy – every Sunday The Healer-Apothecary brought him drops</i>
The app's location in relation to the word you're explaining	The word "healer" should be recognized as an explanatory word in this sentence, because it is important from the point of view of the semantics of the sentence. In this case, the nomination "healer" is the main name of the person, and the word "apothecary" – additional, clarifying, i.e. the application	<i>It cannot be said that the Great Envious was not treated with envy – every Sunday The Healer-Apothecary brought him drops</i>

In some cases, the word order is used as a criterion on the basis that the application usually stands after the word he explains: *the fisherman father*. It should be noted that applications in combinations of this type, if desired, can be singled out in a separate syntagma, that is to separate: *This is the father, the fisherman*. The unequipped application often contains more important information: *the Don River, the Trud newspaper, the city of Ryazan*. When you combine a household name and your own name, the app will be your own name.

### 3.2. The offers with separate applications

Let's take a closer look at the app in isolation. As you know, the isolation is called a syntax tool, which consists in the specific selection of a fragment of a sentence consisting of a secondary member, a single, or with dependent words. The purpose of separation is the semantic and intonation of secondary members in order to give them a known syntax autonomy in the sentence. The application is more prone to isolation than the definition itself. Separate applications, acquiring in the context of relative communicative independence, along with the basic predicative core of the sentence something is asserted, that is, enter with explainable in syntax relationships of a different type than in phrases – semi-predicative relationships, within the sentence as a result of interaction between individual

syntagmas that make up the “explained-explaining application” block. In isolation conditions, the application stands out intonation, which leads to the graphic selection of this design. These allocation tools are not formal signs, but indicate a special type of syntax status of the application.

Re-designation in the statement has different goals: specification, clarification, interpretation, example, disclosure of the essence of the phenomenon, evaluation, etc. All this is expressed in the choice of communication, intonation, lexical composition of designs with the application as an explanatory member of the proposal. At the same time, the application is able to establish with the explanatory syntax relationships explanations, refinements, attributes (attribute and attribute-circumstantial): *Races on the dry path of hare-rusak; The reception is led by surgeon Matveyev; A wonderful storyteller, Andrei has always been the soul of the company.*

A separate application, not being grammatically dependent on the explanatory member of the proposal, often has its own means of communication with the basic proposal – alliances, their analogues, pretexts, other words that can be considered as union-like (introductory-modal, some pronouns, adverbs): *Muromsky, as an educated European, drove up to his opponent and greeted him courteously; He is a simple man, of peasants; By the light curls, Girin identified the seducer Anna, a really beautiful man; This is Dmitry Plotnikov, in the past, the famous tenor.* Entering with the half-predicative syntax relationship, separate applications acquire the properties of the “concomitant” predicate (second narrator). Being separate, the application carries an element of an additional message, indications that there are any signs in the explanatory, which are essential to the proposal in terms of communicative-semantic, but less important than the signs expressed to the narrator. Although a proposal with a separate application represents one communicative unit, one message, this communication unit allows the selection of a separate member of the independent message in the form of a separate sentence, in which the individual member is already told. Compare: *The older sister, a biologist, arrived; The older sister came. She’s a biologist.*

Separation, on the one hand, distinguishes the application, and on the other – it is a certain form of syntax communication, expressing semantic emphasis. The sender of the speech seeks not only to provide additional information about the subject, face, but warns the reader or listener that he causes him to know something about the explanatory. The isolation in the above sentences expresses the author’s mark-up of meaning, i.e. meta-predicate (Ortega et al., 2016). Statements about the subject are intertwined with threads of expression about the utterance, which leads to the separation of heterogeneous components, to the actualization and isolation of the application: *Onegin, my good friend, was born on the logs of Neva; And here is Alexei Vasilyevich, school teacher, a friend of Oleg.* Thus, separate applications perform two semantic functions: the semi-preventive function of the additional message and the function of the additional feature of the subject or action. These semantic functions are implemented on a lexical-grammatical basis, i.e. in certain lexical, morphological, and syntax conditions.

### 3.3. The syntactical relationship in offers with separate applications

Note that the syntactical relationship in offers with separate applications is not one-plan. In some cases, an explanatory relationship – the relationship of identity – is formed between the explanatory basic sentence and the explanatory application. In other cases, the explanation relationship with the attributes of the attribute is established between the members of the block. Explanatory relationship: relationships of identity type and the relationship of gender and kind, common and private. In turn, the relationship of the type of identity, in our opinion, includes two types of explanatory values: the actual identification and subjective interpretation of a fact, a phenomenon. The importance of self-identification occurs when the situation of communication requires clarification in order to remove the

addressee's communication difficulties. In this case, the explanatory application is included in the basic proposal by the union, that is, or its analogues: *in other words, in other words: According to him, "the change of sensations", that is, the mental process, is nothing but "nervous activity..."; Wife, that is Mary Ignatyevna, all days sits on the chest and cries.* Unions emphasize the absence of differences between realities. Denial of differences indirectly indicates similarities, equality, their identity in one way or another, the ability to swap the explanatory and explanatory application. The second type of explanatory meaning is a subjective interpretation of fact, phenomenon (*in meaning*). The union is used that is: *E... yes, you've forgotten that she's not just a woman, she's a female writer, that is, the creation of special, ugly whim of nature.* The link that is expresses the identity of the explanatory (referee), the subject or the phenomenon indicated by the explanatory application. It is the sender of the speech who perceives these two components as identical, based on their considerations and conclusions.

Separate applications quite often establish with the explanatory relationship of identity on the line "general/private" and "genus/species". In this case, we highlight the following values: a) the meaning of specification is the affirmation of an identity by disclosing content. The importance of specification in the explanation is expressed by the union *namely*. At the same time, the explanatory and separate application is linked together as a distraction and concrete: *There is also a nasty class three miles away, namely the landowner Tarantayev;* b) clarifying explanation – private (explaining application) presents a general (explained) not in full, but as an example. The clarification narrows down the amount of information that is contained in the explanatory and is of a clear-illustrative meaning. The inclusion relationships in the study unit are formalized by the unions, *especially, in particular, for example, say;* combinations of a type *including, well, there: Even his associates, such as General Dieterichs, believe so;* c) A hypothetical identity is the desire to give a more precise, in the opinion of the addressee, the definition of reality. At the same time, the identity of the members of the bloc qualifies as possible. Formally, the relationship between the explanatory and explanatory application is expressed by words *more accurately, or rather more precisely, perhaps, it can be: And yet in his role as emperor, or rather "good manipulator", Pridius was exposed.*

The attributes between the components of the block in question arise when a separate application is designed to give the subject a qualitative characteristic. In this case, the connection between the components is carried out at the level of wordforms, but there are possible alliances too, also, the pretext of its analogues: *by origin, by nationality, gender, etc.: This is Timoshka, a native Cuban Cossack; Praskovya, also a widow, entered the room.* Sometimes applications through the characterization of an object somehow motivate the actions of this subject, communicating not only with the explanatory word, but also with the tell-tale basic sentence. These applications already express attribute-in-question values (motivating applications) and are involved in shaping the meaning of the proposal as a whole. In this case, the connection between the components may be either at the wordform level, or marked by *alliances as, though not, only: And her father, a professor with a world-renowned reputation, had to receive royalties with flour, a sight, a clump of Monpansier; He visited their house, sat at midnight for coffee and wine, just a student and a talker.*

The union-link "how" expresses its restrictive meaning, emphasizes that the subject is characterized and actualized only in one of the possible values, while the remaining values are beyond this actualization. The separate applications act as a determinant. Unions, *though, just* by connecting the annex to the basic proposal, give the separate syntagma the character of reverse conditioning. Sometimes this kind of relationship serves as a backdrop for the manifestation of temporal relations, the expressions of which in the separate design are words *in the past, in youth, then, now, in the future: In the past, a well-known lawyer, Ivantsov early retired from business and lived on the dependents of his children.* Let us emphasize that the separate application, being logical told, differs

from the actual told, because the latter is always characterized by grammatical time, the application has a relative time, i.e. the trait is manifested in the subject in a certain attitude to action, named in the fairy tale as a sign simultaneous with this action.

Let's say a few words about the text-forming function of applications, although this problem requires a separate study. As our observations show, the application's exit from the isolated sentence is due to the fact that "the application becomes a kind of the point of a report for the subsequent deployment of thought" (Chetverikova 2000). A semantic chain is formed in the text, manifested in the existence of stable, repetitive semantic-syntax relationships between the members of the combined sentences. Let's turn to the text: *Avel (Enukidze) loved women, but by timidity did not marry, was an aesthete to the bone, this in the past railway driver. He graduated from secondary railway school in Tbilisi, went with my father Kalistrat on a single steam locomotive.* The ability of a separate application to function outside the phrase is manifested against the background of a chain anaphoric connection: "railroad driver" – "he".

Among the elements expressing communication, it is possible to include words that are part of the same conceptual field. In our case, it is the nominations of "railroad driver", "steam locomotive", "railroad school". The components of the text in question represent different realities, but have common semantic indicators and are able to implement an interfaith connection called diffuse. The separate application "this former railway driver" can be considered as the center of the conceptual field, which includes such language units as "steam locomotive" and "railway school". The ratio of nominations and implemented diffuse internal connection, which together with the relationship anaphoric organizes the structural and semantic unity of the text.

#### 4. Conclusions

The application, being a syncretic member of the offer, combines properties, signs of different members of the offer. The syncrethism of a separate application in terms of content is manifested in syntagmatic multiplication, i.e. the presence of a language unit of several values, which are implemented in the wordform at the same time. Syncretism in terms of expression manifests itself in the way the application is expressed – the name of the noun; in the form of communication – explanatory with the elements of the attribute. The relationship between a separate application and the explanatory word is also syncretic.

Syncretism of values and functions in applications determines the following:

- the application is expressed by the name of the noun and is therefore an unmorphological member of the sentence, i.e. in the definition of "face" two meanings – subject matter and sign;
- the referent receives a second name in this speech situation through the application;
- the application is denotatively identical to the explanatory one, but the denotate also has classifying features;
- as the equivalent of an explanatory one, the application differs from the definition, which is always non-equivalent to its definition, both in terms of content and expression;
- in the designs with the application, there are not subordinates, and explanatory relationships. In addition to the explanatory value, the application can have an attribute value, which also gives the right to call the application a syncretic syntax unit;
- in isolation, the application acquires an accompanying prediction, because the noun is able to characterize the subject, determine it, as well as the verb;
- the location of the isolated application is not fixed. Inversion, distant use, preposition often lead to the establishment of a double relationship application – with the explanatory word and

with the told base sentence. In this case, the application can have a multi-member composition, i.e. be common;

- separate applications can be included in the basic sentence through incomplete words, including alliances and particles, prepositions, pronouns and adverbs, words by name, now, now, in the past, etc.;
- the means of communication of a separate application with a basic offer are not only as markers of explanatory syntax relations between the components of the block, but also emphasize the application itself. At the same time, some of the means of communication are able to express modal or temporal values, which, in turn, allows us to say that the separate application has its own modal-time plan, and the modality of the application may not coincide with the modality of the basic offer. Compare: *It was Fedor's neighbor, a locksmith. It was Fyodor's neighbor, it seems a locksmith;*
- syntagmatically dissected applications, acquiring the value of an additional message, as if to contrast the subject's trait to the subject itself. As a result, a separate application is perceived not as an attribute, but as a logical predicate, a potential second Verb. A separate application creates a secondary predication, and a simple sentence essentially becomes polypredicative, somewhat getting closer to a complex offer;
- if the unsequent application is closely related to its explanatory and forms a two-member structure with it, the syntagmatically separated application, being in a grammatical connection with the explanatory, detects additional connections with the said sentence, thus establishing a double syntax relationship.

The above suggests that annex designs can only be quantitated, as applications in terms of content and expression combine the characteristics of multiple members of the proposal. Moreover, the application is capable of the manifestation of interface connections, i.e. participates in text formation.

## References

- Beloshapkova, V.A. (1977). *Modern Russian language: Syntax*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
- Boneh, N., Nash, L. (2017). The syntax and semantics of dative DPs in Russian ditransitives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 35(4), 899-953.
- Chetverikova, O.V. (2000). *Application in the structure of a simple sentence*. Armavir: Armavir State Pedagogical University.
- Çiloğlan, F., Bardakçı, M. (2019). The relationship between intercultural sensitivity and English language achievement. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(3), 1204-1214.
- Erton, İ. (2020). Linguistic and cognitive aspects of translation and interpretation skills. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(4), 1910-1920.
- Ivantsova, E. V. (2019). The interaction of subsystems of the modern Russian language in an idiolectic reflection: The speech portrait of a resident of an urban-type village. *Vestnik Tomskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, Filologiya*, 62, 104-120.
- Karimullina, G.N., Karimullina, R.N., Galiullin, K.R. (2016). The increase of information potential in general dictionaries: Linguographic description of international word-formation elements. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(3), 263-267.
- Klushina, N.I., Liulikova, A.V., Nikolaeva, A.V., Selezneva, L.V., Skorokhodova, E.Y., Tortunova, I.A. (2019). Language use nowadays in Russian communication: Specifics and trends. *Language and Dialogue*, 9(3), 444-470.
- Korolev, A.P. (1992). *Interpretive communication in the modern Russian language*. Izhevsk: Udmurt State University.
- Lecant, P.A. (2002). *Modern Russian language*. Moscow: Drofa.
- Lekant, P.A. (2010). *Modern Russian language: Syntax*. Moscow: Yurayt.



- Malakhov, A.S. (2008). About the connection of components in appositive combinations of text. *Russian Language at School*, 5, 68-73.
- Meyer, Ch.F. (1992). *Apposition in contemporary English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moldovan, A.M. (2020). The Russian language: Current status and academic studies. *Herald of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, 90(2), 183-188.
- Murzina, N.Y., Safonova, S.S., Chupryakova, O.A. (2016). The syntactic phraseologization in the mass media language. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(3), 310-313.
- O'neill, E.R., Parke, M.N., Kreft, H.A., Oxenham, A.J. (2020). Development and validation of sentences without semantic context to complement the basic English lexicon sentences. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 63(11), 3847-3854.
- Ortega, L., Tyler, A.E., Park, H.I., Uno, M. (2016). *The usage-based study of language learning and multilingualism*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (1982). *A university grammar of English*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
- Roettger, T.B., Mahrt, T., Cole, J. (2019). Mapping prosody onto meaning – the case of information structure in American English. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 34(7), 841-860.
- Rosenthal, D.Z., Telenkova, M.A. (1976). *Dictionary-reference of linguistic terms*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
- Shvedova, N.Yu., Lopatin, V.V. (2002). *Concise Russian grammar*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Ukhanova, T.V., Kosova, V. A. (2016). Russian adjectives with confixes from an anthropocentric viewpoint. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(2), 328-331.
- Valgina, N.S., Rosenthal, D.E., Fomina, M.I. (2002). *Modern Russian language*. Moscow: Logos.

## Dil ve konuşmada uygulama içeren yapılar: anlamsal-işlevsel bir yaklaşım

---

### Özet

Karmaşık bir cümlenin sözdizimi ile ilgili modern dilbilimsel çalışmalarda, uygulamalar özel olarak ele alınmaz, ancak yalnızca bireysel tanımların incelenmesi ile bağlantılı olarak bahsedilir. Bir dilin sözdizimsel yapısının sistematik bir açıklaması için, uygulama sözdiziminin durumunu netleştirmek, uygulamaları gerçek tanımlardan ayırt etmek için kriterler geliştirmek, temel bir cümle kullanarak semantik ve işlevsel özellikleri yalnızca cümle düzeyinde değil, aynı zamanda metin düzeyinde de bireysel uygulamaların iletişim yöntemlerini ve araçlarını tanımlamak gerektir. Bütün bunlar, belirtilen konunun alaka düzeyini belirler. Makale, basit bir cümleyi anlamsal ve yapısal olarak karmaşıklaştıran bir sözdizimsel birim olarak bir uygulamanın durumunu belirleme sorununu gündeme getiriyor ve çözüyor; uygulamayı gerçek tanımlardan ayırmak için kriterler geliştirilmektedir; cümle ve metin düzeyinde bireysel uygulamaların işleyişinin özelliklerini açıklar; uygulamayı, düşüncenin sonradan yayılması için bir tür başlangıç noktası haline getirerek, uygulamanın izole edilmiş önerinin ötesine geçtiği iddia edilmektedir.

*Anahtar sözcükler:* uygulamalar; sözdizimsel iletişim araçları; anlambilim; konuşma durumu; ifadeler arası iletişim.

#### **AUTHORS BIODATA**

**Olga V. Chetverikova** is a Full Doctor in Philology, Professor at the Department of Russian Philology and Journalism of the Armavir State Pedagogical University.

**Larisa G. Lisitskaya** is a Full Doctor in Philology, Professor at the Department of Pedagogy and Technologies of Preschool and Primary Education of the Armavir State Pedagogical University.

**Natalia P. Selina** is a PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Russian Philology and Journalism of the Armavir State Pedagogical University.

**Inessa V. Kirichenko** is a PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Russian Philology and Journalism of the Armavir State Pedagogical University.

**Lyubov V. Chernova** is a PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of Russian Philology and Journalism of the Armavir State Pedagogical University.