



## LINGUISTICS ANALYSIS OF SPECIALIZED VARIETIES AND REGISTERS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Rasulova Nadira Baxadirovna

Senior Teacher,

The Department of English Functional Lexicon  
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

### Abstract

The current article discusses linguistic and functional analysis of registers and specialized varieties of English languages. Using the definition from this paper, we think about specialized varieties as any registers that use language to investigate examples and meaning. This article opens up a wealth of possible examples, most of which are informative and easily understood on the context or perhaps in our everyday lives.

**Keywords:** style, register, formality, spectrum, modification, reduction, linguistic formulas.

### Introduction

Styles are often analyzed along a scale of formality, as in the examples from social variations research discussed below. Registers, on the other hand, when they are distinguished from styles, tend to be associated with particular groups of people or sometimes specific situations of use. Journalese, baby-talk, legalese, the language of auctioneers, race-callers and sports commentators, the language of airline pilots, criminals, financiers, politicians and disc jockeys, the language of the courtroom and the classroom, could all be considered examples of different registers.

The term 'register' here describes the language of groups of people with common interests or jobs, or the language used in situations associated with such groups [2].

### Literature Review

One of the most analyzed areas where the use of language is determined by the situation is the formality scale. The term "register" is often, in language teaching especially, shorthand for formal/informal style, although this is an aging definition. Linguistics textbooks may use the term "tenor" instead, but increasingly prefer the term "style" – "we characterise styles as varieties of language viewed from the point of view of formality"– while defining "registers" more narrowly as specialist language use related to a particular activity, such as academic jargon. There is very little agreement as to how the spectrum of formality should be divided [1].

In one prominent model, Martin Joos describes five styles in spoken English:

- **Frozen:** Also referred to as **static** register. Printed unchanging language, such as Biblical quotations, often contains archaisms. Examples are the Pledge of Allegiance of



the United States of America and other "static" vocalizations. The wording is exactly the same every time it is spoken.

- **Formal:** One-way participation; no interruption; technical vocabulary or exact definitions are important; includes presentations or introductions between strangers.

- **Consultative:** Two-way participation; background information is provided – prior knowledge is not assumed. "Back-channel behavior" such as "uh huh", "I see", etc. is common. Interruptions are allowed. For example teacher/student, doctor/patient, or expert/apprentice.

- **Casual:** In-group friends and acquaintances; no background information provided; ellipsis and slang common; interruptions common. This is common among friends in a social setting.

**Intimate:** Non-public; intonation more important than wording or grammar; private vocabulary. Also includes non-verbal messages. This is most common among family members and close friends.

**Methodology.** We will discuss just one example – sports announcer talk – to illustrate the kind of linguistic features which may distinguish different registers.

**Example 1.** *Cooley – steaming in now, – bowls to Waugh again, – stroking it out into the covers, –just thinking about a single, – Tucker taking a few ah stuttering steps down the wicket from the bowler's end but Waugh sending him back.*

[‘–’ marks a short pause, commas indicate non-final intonation contour.]

When people describe a sporting event, the language they use is quite clearly distinguishable from language used in other contexts. The most obvious distinguishing feature is generally the vocabulary. Terms like *silly mid on*, *square leg*, *the covers* and *gully*, for instance, to describe positions, and *off-break*, *googly* and *leg break* to describe deliveries, are examples of vocabulary peculiar to cricket. But the grammar is equally distinctive. This is especially true of the kind of sports announcer talk which is known as ‘play-by-play’ description.

Play-by-play description focuses on the action, as opposed to ‘colour commentary’ which refers to the more discursive and leisurely speech with which commentators fill in the often quite long spaces between spurts of action. Play-by-play description is characterised by telegraphic grammar. This involves features such as syntactic reduction and the inversion of normal word order in sentences. Each feature contributes to the announcer’s aim of communicating the drama of the moment. In colour commentary, by contrast, where there is more time, nouns tend to be heavily modified. In both types of commentary, as well as in the ‘state of the play’ score or summary, sports announcers make extensive use of linguistic formulas and routines. I will illustrate each of these features in turn [4].



**Example 2.** *In our gerontological sociolinguistic context, we would argue that when, in inter-generational encounters, contextual features trigger an elderly (or even ‘aged’) identity in people, they will assume communicative strategies they believe to be associated with older speakers.*

This is an example of the kind of jargon which a group of specialists often develop to talk about their speciality. It could be described as an occupational style. The label ‘Corporate Responsibility Analyst’ to describe a role that involves examining the effects of an organisation on the environment provides another example. I have used the term ‘style’ in earlier sections to refer to language variation which is influenced by changes in situational factors, such as addressee, setting, task or topic. Some linguists describe this kind of language variation as ‘register’ variation. Others use the term ‘register’ more narrowly to describe the specific vocabulary associated with different occupational groups. The distinction is not always clear, however, and many sociolinguists simply ignore it.

### Syntactic Reduction

**Example 3.** *From baseball or cricket commentaries.* [The words in brackets were not uttered.]

- (a) [It] bounced to second base
- (b) [It’s] a breaking ball outside
- (c) [He’s a] guy who’s a pressure player
- (d) McCatty [is] in difficulty
- (e) Tucker [is] taking a few ah stuttering steps down the wicket from the bowler’s end but Waugh [is] sending him back

While describing the action they are observing, sports announcers often omit the subject noun or pronoun, as in (a), and frequently omit the verb *be* as well, as utterances (b) and (c) illustrate. Utterances (d) and (e) omit only *be*. There is no loss of meaning as a result of this syntactic reduction, since the omitted elements are totally predictable in the context. The referent is unambiguous – in (a) *it* refers to the hit, and in (b) *it* could not refer to anything other than the bowler’s pitch.

### Heavy noun modification

*From baseball or cricket commentaries.*

- (a) David Winfield, the 25-million-dollar man, who is hitting zero, five, six in this World Series . . .
- (b) First-base umpire Larry Barnett . . .
- (c) This much sought-after and very expensive fast bowler. . . .

People rather than action are the focus of interest at certain points during the sports announcer’s spiel. When this is the case, the subject nouns which are the focus of interest are often heavily modified both after the noun as in (a), and before the noun as in (b) and (c).

These examples are taken from cricket and baseball commentary, but similar sorts of



features characterise commentaries in other sports, including soccer and rugby [3].

### **Conclusion**

Stylistic variation of this sort can be observed in all languages. In multilingual communities, it is often signalled by the choice of a specific language, as well as by choice of linguistic variants within a particular language. The linguistic distinctions between styles within a language are more clear-cut in some languages, such as Javanese, Korean and Japanese, than in others, such as Tasmanian English.

### **References**

1. Ammon, Ulrich, Norbert Dittmar and Klaus-Jürgen Mattheier (eds) 1987. *Sociolinguistics - Soziolinguistik*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
2. Chambers, Jack 2003. *Sociolinguistic theory. Linguistic variation and its social significance*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell. Holmes, Janet 1992. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman.
3. Mesthrie, Rajend et al. (eds) 2000. *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: University Press. Romaine, Suzanne 2000. *Language in society. An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 2nd edition. Oxford: University Press.
4. Wardhaugh, Ronald 2001. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 4th edition. Oxford: Blackwell.