

FUNCTIONAL SYNTAXEMIC STUDY OF INCOMPLETE SENTENCES IN DIALOGIC SPEECH (BASED ON ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Artikova Nodirabegim

Teacher of the department of English Philology
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Elena E. Deberdeeva,

Professor, Taganrog Institute named after A.P. Chekhov (branch) of Rostov State University of
Economics, Taganrog, Russia
edeberdeeva@mail.ru

Abstract: In the article, functional syntaxemic features of incomplete sentences in dialogic speech based on English and Uzbek languages are studied. In addition, the article examines the analysis of the information structure of the dialogic text (speech), its connection with the communicative division.

Key words: information structure, dialogic speech, dialogue, emotional sign, modal relations, introductory words.

INTRODUCTION. Semantic field - a set of language units (integral) semantic attribute that combines some commonalities; in other words, having a non-common trivial component of value. Initially, the role of such lexical units was thought to be lexical-level units - words; Later, descriptions of semantic domains, including phrases and sentences, appeared in linguistic writings. One of the classic examples of the semantic field is that a series of colors consists of several color series (red-pink-pink-raspberry; blue-blue-bluish turquoise, etc.): where the common semantic component is "color". The semantic field has the following main features. 1. The semantic field is sensitive to the mother tongue and has a psychological reality for it. 2. The semantic field is autonomous and can be distinguished as an independent subsystem of language. 3. Units of semantic field are associated with different structural semantic relationships. 4. Each semantic field is related to other semantic fields of language and together with them forms a language system. The area separates the nucleus represents the integral sema (archisema) and forms a rest around it. For example, the field is the parts of the human body: the head, the arms, the heart is the nucleus, the rest are less important. The theory of semantic domains is based on the idea that certain semantic groups exist in a language and that language units are likely to belong to one or another group.

MATERIALS AND METHODS.

In particular, the word combinations of the language can be expressed as separate groups of words combined with different relationships: synonymous (boasting -boasting), antonymic (speaking -to be silent), and so on. The individual semantic field elements are connected by regular and systematic relationships and therefore all the words of the field are opposite to each other. Semantic fields may intersect or enter a completely different one. The meaning of each word is determined only when the meanings of other words in a particular field are known. A

single language unit can have multiple meanings and can therefore also be assigned to different semantic fields. For example, quality can be included in the semantic field of red color terms and at the same time in the field where the units are combined with the generalized meaning of “revolutionary”. The simplest type of semantic field is the paradigmatic field, where the units belong to a part of speech and are semantically combined with a common category semaphore. pincha is so called semantic classes or lexical and semantic groups. Verbs form this field. elements of the semantic realm of verbs such as discussion, conversation, conversation, confusion, etc. are combined with the holistic semantic attribute of ‘speaking’, but their meaning is not the same. The lexical system is the highest-order lexical category -fully and adequately reflected in the semantic field. A semantic field is a hierarchical structure of a set of lexical units combined with a common (invariant) meaning. Lexical units are incorporated into a particular joint venture on the basis that they contain the archetype that unites them. Fields are distinguished by a homogeneous conceptual structure of the unit, so its elements are usually lexical-semantic variants rather than words associated with different concepts with their meanings. The entire dictionary content can be represented as a hierarchy of semantic fields at different levels: large semantic areas of the dictionary are divided into classes, classes into subclasses, and so on, to primary semantic microphones. The primary semantic microfilm is the lexical and semantic group (LSG) -a relatively closed series of lexical units of a part of speech that have a specific content and are linked in a hierarchically lower order than the field archeeme. The most important structural connection of elements in the semantic field is hyponymy -its hierarchical system based on general relations.

Starting to analyze the problem of “information structure” of a text (speech), we note that this term is primarily used to resolve issues related to the communicative development of thought, the distribution of information, primarily in foreign grammar (Meibaner, Brown Jule, Rooth) and goes back to the work M.Halliday.

Initially, its content was associated with the phenomenon and was reduced to information, but subsequently pragmatologists (Meibaner, Hohle) and others began to consider the content of the “Information Structure” more broadly, including the facts of “relation” to this basic information.

Thus, the content of the terms “information structure” and “communicative division” (the topic is rhematic division), as it turns out, does not coincide. The first term is broader in content than the second.

The above applies to an even greater extent to the structure of dialogic communication, as M. Bakhtin and his followers I. Suss and L. Mikhailov pointed out in their works, characterizing dialogical relationships.

Here is what L. Mikhailov notes about this: “dialogical relations are not reduced to those logical-semantic relations that develop between the components of complex and complex sentences, although many of them also take place in dialogical relations. And further: “When entering into a dialogue, the interlocutor (speaker and listener) agrees or disagrees with the content of the partner’s statement: he denies, parries, objects, refutes, protests, confirms emotionally, adds, affirms, partially agrees, has his own arguments, asks, asks again, reacts emotionally, is indignant, irritated, surprised, offended, rejoices, encourages, recognizes the opinion of his interlocutor, doubts, hesitates, is sure, is not sure, avoids reacting, answering, is silent, does not have information, gives reserved information, asks, offers, demands, advises, commands, invites, orders, etc.” [1].

Discussion and results. Dialectical communication is assessed today as “a change in the information state of the interlocutor” [2, P. 132]. But how does the information state of the interlocutor change, what linguistic signs (and non-linguistic ones) are involved? The list of speech acts (far from exhaustive) given in the quotation from L. Mikhailov’s textbook allows us to draw the following conclusion: in the process of dialogic communication, information is exchanged not about the components of the proposition, reflecting the reflective relations of the situation, but also information that expresses the attitude towards the components propositions (arguments - actants). This attitude towards elements is realized in speech through modality and emotionality. It is the latter that bring the statement to a truly communicative level (cf. speech acts: rejoice, be indignant and doubt, hesitate).

Consequently, speaking about the information structure of speech (text as a result of speech activity), one should proceed from the assumption that it contains at least the relations of 1) propositions, 2) modality, 3) emotionality. Accordingly, there must be a methodological approach to the study of the information structure of a dialogic text. A study of the relevant linguistic literature shows that the study of the information structure of dialogue was carried out only on the basis of propositional relations, i.e. there was an establishment of how the components of the proposition relate to each other, i.e. semantic structure of a complex linguistic sign [4].

But a change in the information state of speakers is carried out in dialogue not only by verbalizing the elements of a proposition, but very often by involving other linguistic signs, namely, linguistic units expressing an attitude towards the components of a proposition, i.e. modal and emotional signs. The function of the latter is the expression of relations 1) modal as a definition of reliability - unreliability of an action, event, 2) emotional - as a sensory assessment, emotional attitude to an action, an object.

Consequently, when analyzing the information structure of a dialogic text, one should distinguish;

- 1) the information structure of the propositional elements themselves, their interactions and relationships when reaching the level of communication, i.e. in the traditional sense - theme-rhematic (communicative) division,
- 2) the information structure of the text in terms of the participation of emotional components,
- 3) information structure to which modal linguistic signs are involved. The need for such a distinction follows from the achievements of previous research and a more adequate description and knowledge of the patterns of organization of the information structure of a text, in particular, a separate dialectical text.

Without going into the details of the organization of the information structure reflecting proportional relationships, i.e. of the actual semantic structure of a linguistic sign, we point out that at the level of semantic structure in dialogue, there are specific patterns of organization of theme-rhematic division, characteristic only of this form of speech, and, in particular, diversified verbalization of the rhematic element.

Let us dwell on the features of the information structure of a dialogic text, in which the emotional component is involved. In doing so, we are guided by two fundamental principles: 1) emotionality is an integral part of many linguistic signs belonging to different levels of language - morphological, lexical, syntactic. Emotional markers “give off” a sensory-emotional assessment during their verbalization, because they are objectively fixed in linguistic signs.

As for the relationship between the propositional (radical) and the emotional, as evidenced by the relevant studies of authoritative authors (G. Koshansky, L. Mikhailov, V. Shakhovskiy), their proportions in different linguistic signs are different, but as the study of G. Koshansky shows, propositionality, in any proportion, always remains in a linguistic sign if this sign belongs to the paradigmatic level. This leads to the conclusion that emotional signs are involved in organizing the information structure of the text, which, despite the skepticism of some researchers (A. Besedina, M. Bloch, etc.), was convincingly proven in the dissertation research of Yu. Belova.

Modal linguistic signs are markers of another type of relationship - second-order relationships, highlighting in communication only the attitude of speakers to the verbalized elements of a proposition. That is why, and on this basis, modal operators, organizing the communicative-pragmatic level (modal words, modal verbs) have unique syntactic flexibility: they can be used 1) absolutely, i.e. without syntactic support on the left and right, 2) enter into a syntagmatic chain with a statement consisting of propositional elements, 3) enter into speech communication in combination with each other, i.e. form “modal complexes” [1], [2].

Modal relations are relations of a different order than propositional ones; they express information about other information, accompanying and characterizing it. Therefore, the definition of the status of yes, no, maybe in the Russian language as words-sentences, introductory words that we find even in modern textbooks does not seem satisfactory and inapplicable, because it does not affect the essence of the linguistic signs under discussion. The term “introductory words” defines their punctuation features, and the designation “word-sentence” contradicts the modern

understanding of the sentence, because signs like yes, no do not have a typical meaning, they, in the apt expression of L. Mikhailov, are only “communicative indicators and pseudorhemes”, since their function is an indication of the connection between the agent and the sign with a plus or minus sign [5]. They do not carry any other information. If “yes” and “no” signal the nature of the correlation between the agent and the sign, modal words signal the speaker’s attitude to the entire sign as a whole - the statement and only from the position of the strength of the reliability of the fact of the event.

REFERENCES:

1. Mikhailov L.M. Grammar of German dialectical speech - Higher School, 2006
2. Mikhailov L.M. Communicative grammar of the German languages. - Higher School, 2004
3. Shevlyakova V.E. Modern English - 2000
4. Sergeev A.I. Communicative organization of question-answer units. Abstract for the dissertation of a candidate of philological sciences. Pyatigorsk, 2006
5. Mikhailov L.M. Grammar of oral speech - Ast-Astrel, 2003
6. Юсупов, О. (2022). Хорижий тилларни ўқитишда таржиманинг аҳамияти. *Анализ актуальных проблем, инноваций, традиций, решений и художественной литературы в преподавании иностранных языков*, 1(01), 9-11.
7. Sanakulovna, A. N. (2021). The Use of the Innovative “Flipped Classroom” Model for the Organization of Independent Learning Activities of Students. *European journal of innovation in nonformal education*, 1(2), 76-78.
8. HOLMURADOVA, L. E. (2018). Lingvoculturology as an important part of a new philological subject. *Иностранные языки в Узбекистане*, (3), 33-38.
9. Shahram, A., & Zarina, R. MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES (US EXPERIENCE). *Zbiór artykułów naukowych recenzowanych.*, 277.
10. Kushbakova, M., Shahram, A., & Zarina, R. INTERCULTURAL TRAINING AT EARLIER STAGES—AS AN INNOVATIONAL PROJECT AT EFL TEACHING. *Zbiór artykułów naukowych recenzowanych.*, 72.