SOCIAL AND CULTURAL FUNCTIONS OF LANGUAGE COMMUNICATIVE EXCHANGE

Suleymanova Nargiza Mardonovna
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Uzbekistan

Abstract

In this article, communication is considered as the most important mechanism for the formation of the individual as a social person. Based on a certain goal, the speaker resorts to a combination of linguistic forms in a speech act from the possibilities of phonetic, lexical, grammatical and syntactic previously given by the language, which results in a speech act. The choice of a language unit is determined by its ability to solve relevant communication problems. The essence of the language, its purpose and action in society, its nature are manifested in its functions. They are its characteristics, without which language cannot exist as a means of communication. The social functions of language can be represented by its role, use and purpose in human society. The most important function of language as a means of communication between people is the communicative function. Linguists distinguish language functions that manifest themselves in any communication situation and secondary functions that arise in special situations. Given the pragmatic nature of any communicative act, many researchers of language and speech today take as the basic division of the communicative function proposed by R. Jacobson into six components: reference, emotive, conative, phatic, metalanguage and poetic functions. The study of the communicative functions of the English interjection, conducted in accordance with R. Yakobson's scheme, revealed the pragmatic polyfunctionality of this class of words. The development of modern linguistics and, in particular, pragmalinguistics shows that the functioning of language units is important for adequate perception and implementation of the act of communication. The term "communication" by us means communication, exchange of thoughts, information, ideas, etc. (Latin communicatio, from communico - I do common, communicate, communicate). In the communicative function of the language, its instrumental and sign essence is manifested. Communication thus becomes the most important mechanism for becoming an individual as a social person. This society determines the formation of individual and group attitudes, the conductor of which is a person. Communication becomes the corrective means of social manifestation of an individual or group. As a social process, communication is aimed at forming society as a whole and performs a connecting function in it. Along with modal words and particles, interjections function in the language in a special status, thereby distinguishing themselves from language units, which are only building material for expression.

When studying language functions and language situations, it becomes necessary to take into account the postulates of the functional typology of languages, as opposed to their structural typology. The scientific approach to the study of functional styles deepens the formation of a functional approach to language, based on which we justify our choice of method of studying interjections. The speaker, based on a certain goal ("function"), resorts to one or another combination of linguistic forms in a speech act from the possibilities given in advance by the language - phonetic, lexical, grammatical and syntactic, the result of which is a text, in general, a speech act, oral or written. In this interpretation of stylistics is the concept of "communicative" or "functional" style of speech. In the process of using interjections

in speech communication, the speaker implements certain targets. The use of this language unit is determined by its ability to solve relevant communication problems. The most important function of language as a means of communication between people is its communicative function.

According to V.G. Gack, "for language, the function is related to communition", and the very concept of the function is defined as "the purpose of a certain element" [1, p. 7]. Whatever the speech situation, the function of language manifests itself in the process of living human communication, which can be characterized simply as communicative. "If we take it in abstraction from ... the unity of communication and generalization, this function is, in our opinion, essentially a function of behavior regulation. There is nothing else in the concept of "communication"; another question is that this regulation may be direct or indirect, the reaction to it is instantaneous or delayed" [2, p. 32].

Some researchers of both various communicative acts and the functioning of individual, smaller, language signs noted the heterogeneity of the content of this phenomenon. "The concept of a communicative function includes all the functions of the language, as they serve the purposes of communication" [3, p. 188]. However, it is important to note fundamentally incorrect identification of the communicative function with the logical-intellectual (or reference) function of language, since "a person speaks not only to express thought. A person also speaks to influence others and express his own feelings" [4, p. 134]. Otherwise, the communicative function can be represented by at least three main components: intellectual, volitional and emotional. But such a division, proposed by many linguists, cannot be considered exhaustive, since with a closer study of language material, it is possible to identify other, without a doubt much more secondary functions, but still quite designed.

The range and number of such secondary functions is quite difficult to determine. Many linguists studied the problem of language functions, the question of its main and secondary functions (see the works of Sepir, Peshkovsky, Martin, Leontiev, Avrorin, Yakobson, Desheriev, Efstafieva, Zvegintsev, Shmelev, Vedenina, Slyusareva, Stepanov, Thus, in 1934, the non-German linguist K. Bühler, in the light of the semiological principle, identified three functions of the language manifested in any speech act: the function of expression (expressive), correlated with the speaker, the function of treatment (appellative), correlated with the listener, and the function of communication (represent 28]. The author decided on the main functions depending on which of these three aspects is leading in this statement. In addition to these three main functions, the researchers also identified secondary functions. For example, E. Sapir considered the function of linguistic solidarity of a certain group of people, the function of establishing communication between members of the temporary group, the function of developing individuality, etc.

E. Sapir also wrote about the secondary function of language in the field of science and cognition (terminology) and about the aesthetic function put forward by B. Croce and K. Fosler as the main [6, p. 32]. To the question of what function interjections perform, linguists were brought by the process of clarifying the dichotomy between language and speech. A. Gardiner attributed exclamation words to speech, and interjections to language, thereby arguing that interjections are not characterized by an intellectual function [7, p. 16]. The question of interpreting the essence of the function in philosophy and linguistics has been ambiguously resolved for many years. At the end of the twentieth century, R. Yakobson described the terms "structure" and "function" as "the most ambiguous and stencil words in the science of language" [8, p. 198].

Studying speech activity as a unity of communication and generalization, A.A. Leontiev separated the functions of language manifested in any situation of communication from the functions of speech as secondary, arising in special situations [2, p. 78]. The functions of language in the field of communication include communicative, in the field of generalization - the function of the instrument of thinking, the function of the existence of socio-historical experience and the national and cultural function. All these functions can be duplicated by non-linguistic means, which include mnemonic funds, account tools, plans, cards, schemes, etc. From the considered functions of speech, A.A. Leontiev singled out magical (taboo, euphemisms), diacritic (speech compression, for example, in telegrams), expressive (expression of emotions), aesthetic (poetic) and some others. A. Martine also spoke about the presence of three functions of the language: the main one - communicative, expressive (expressive) and aesthetic, closely related to the first two [9, p. 372]. Language functions and speech functions are also highlighted in the works of V.A. Aurora.

It's It includes four functions of language: communicative, expressive (expression of thought), constructive (formation of thought) and accumulative (accumulation of social experience and knowledge). Among the functions of speech, the linguist distinguishes six: nominative, emotive-voluntative, signaling, poetic, magical and ethnic [10, p. 134]. V.A. Avrorin stressed that "the function of language as a scientific concept is a practical manifestation of the essence of language, the implementation of its purpose in the system of social phenomena, the specific action of language, due to its nature itself, something without which language cannot exist, as there is no matter without movement" [Ibid.]. In the works of Yu.D. Desheriev we find the following: "the essence of the functional development of language stems from its communicative function - the most important function of language, which largely determines its nature," and that "social (social) functions of language represent a concrete implementation of the communicative function in a particular sphere of human activity" [11, p. 26]. N.A. Slyusareva believes that the existing definitions of functions do not answer the question of their categorical characteristics. In addition, she refers to one of the generalizing philosophical works specifically devoted to the features of the functional approach, which states: "... the concept of 'function' has no unambiguous definition, as it is used in various fields and at different levels of object study" [12, p. 139]. But she emphasizes that the sensual-emotional finds its immediate expression in the language, and the aesthetic function highlighted by D.N. Shmelev [13, p. 138] offers "it is more advisable to call emotional, because not only positive but also negative emotions are expressed in the language." The emotional function of the language is also related to the previous experience of the speaker, as well as cognitive [12, p. 142].

The question arises how, on what basis and by what units does the language perform a communicative function? Modern linguistics, text linguistics and pragmalinguistics make it possible to clarify both the very concept of "communicative function of language" and the concept of the units of its implementation. The essence of the language, its purpose and action in society, as well as its nature, are manifested in its functions, which are its characteristics. Without them, language cannot exist as a means of communication. The social functions of language can be represented by its role, use and purpose in human society. The functions of language are to be a means of researching and describing the language in terms of the language itself.

When using the language, its main functions are interdependent on each other, but in separate speech acts in the texts are revealed to varying degrees. Particular, derived functions of the language correspond to its main functions as primary. N.A. Slyusareva attributes the following to the main functions of the language: communicative, cognitive, emotional and metalanguage (metalinguistic). The implementation of the communicative function, in turn, takes place through the contact-setting (fatian), connotative (assimilation), voluntative (impact) and the function of storage and transmission of national identity, traditions, culture and history of the people and some others (see the works of Martine, Leontief, Stepanov, Zvegin Researchers mostly come to the conclusion that the number of language functions should be small, not just limited (Aurin, Shmelev). But all linguists without exception agree on one thing: all the functions they allocate are integral parts of one - the communicative function of the language. Any communicative is pragmatic. Its purpose may be to inform about something, encourage action, be convinced of something, etc.

Depending on these goals, R. Jacobson identifies the integral components that make up any act of communication, and, in parallel with them, six main language functions: reference, reference-oriented, contextual, emotive or expressive, addressee-oriented, conative, recipient-oriented, fatical, contact-oriented, metalanguage, code-oriented, poetic, 202].

Today, many researchers of language and speech take as the basic division of the communicative function proposed by R. Yakobson into six components (Suprun, Vassileva, etc.). We also conduct a study of interjections based on R. Yakobson's theory. Let's explain what we, following R. Yacobson, understand by each of the above communicative functions. The reference function is recognized as the main function of the language. Many linguists define it differently: denotative, cognitive (Jacobson, Suprun), logical-intellectual (Kosov), informative and even simply communicative (Suprun). In our opinion, many different interpretations lead to confusion in the understanding of the communicative function of language as the unity of all its pragmatic functions. However, its main function is a meaningful or reference function. The meaning of this function follows from its name: it focuses on the substantive aspect, that is, it is aimed at the referent. The interest of the subject of communication or communicator is aimed at what they actually talk about. The emotive function "has aimed at directly expressing the speaker's attitude to what he's talking about" [8, p. 198]. Thus, it is the addressee (the sender of the act of speech) that becomes the main factor in its expression. The emotional function consists in expressing individual conscious and unconscious reactions, opinions, feelings, emotional states as opposed to fact. I would like to note that R. Yakobson in his work does not distinguish between emotive and expressive functions, but uses these terms as synonymous. We would like to emphasize the fact that the term "emotional function" used by R. Jacobson should be replaced by the "expressive function" he puts forward as a synonym, since this, in our opinion, represents the essence of the phenomenon more accurately and brighter, and the allocation of one emotiveness, on the contrary, narrows it. An expressive function can be represented by an emotive function as the main one and a number of additional functions that are not actually emotive, but also determine the expressiveness of the message. In our opinion, these include the intensification function, excretory and a number of others. A conative function aimed at convincing the addressee of something can also be defined as incentive, appeal or convincing.

The term "volitional" seems to us less successful, as it expresses the essence of the phenomenon, but does not correspond to the main orientation of this function - the focus on the addressee. The addressee or sender of the message aims to influence the addressee, achieve the implementation or termination of any actions, convince of something, etc. The phatic function is based on the contact of interlocutors. Its main task is to establish or maintain voice contact, as well as, in some cases, to check the presence of such communicative contact for the transmission of information in the absence of the latter as such. According to Suprun's definition, a metalanguage function is nothing more than an interpretative function [14, p. 28]. It is directly related to the message code, that is, the language itself, and manifests itself when it becomes necessary to explain the language tools used. The sixth poetic function is manifested primarily in the message itself and is related to its design, appearance, sound. The message is thus built (or more often drawn up in a specific way) for the sake of itself, for the sake of transmitting aesthetic information. As practice shows, most speech acts present a set of the above functions. This is also confirmed by R. Yakobson: "The differences between messages are not in the monopoly manifestation of any one function, but in their different hierarchy" [8, p. 198]. G.V. Kolshansky holds the same opinion: "No matter how diverse the spheres of manifestation of language are, no matter how multifaceted the goals of specific speech acts are, no matter how peculiar the goals of using language in different communication systems and in different genres are, the language remains the same in nature, having one goal - to establish mutual understanding in the 3].

By the end of the twentieth century, the problems of language functioning had led to everyone's interest in the text, in the analysis of colloquial speech. Interest in determining the functions of the language is generally relevant to this day. Language is a social phenomenon, and in sociology a functional approach is considered one of the leading ones. Consequently, the problem of social functions of language is becoming paramount - the peculiarities of its use in general in different conditions of society, at different levels and in different spheres. This problem causes the following equally important problem of the functioning of individual elements of the language, on the one hand, depending on the external influence of objective and subjective factors, and on the other hand, depending on the internal structural impact of the language itself.

Recently, the problems of the relationship in the language of functional and semantic, functional and pragmatic have been investigated. The analysis of interjections carried out from these positions [16, p. 55] led us to the conclusion that the choice of interjection among other semantically similar means of language is due to its high degree of expressiveness, greater expressiveness compared to other units of the lexical and grammatical plan. Thus, in oral speech, they primarily achieve the strengthening of the basic pragmatic attitude (emotional, reference, etc.), and in writing - more imagery is created, which writers actively use in the creation of artistic works.

REFERENCES

1. Gak V.G. To the typology of functional approaches to language learning // Problems of functional grammar. Moscow: Nauka, 1985. P.3-24.
2. Leontiev A.A. Language, speech, speech activity. Moscow: Nauka, 1969. 565 p. 3. Kosov V.T. Interjections as a means of expressing the emotional and volitional functions of language (based on

the German language) // Questions of Germanic and Romanesque philology / Uch. Moscow State Pedagogical Institute named after M. Toreza. M., 1963. v. 27. P.188-213.

4. Vandriez J. Language. Linguistic introduction to history. Moscow: United URSS, 2004. 410 p.

5. Bühler K. Sprachtheorie. Джена, 1934. 375 S.

6. Sapir E. Selected works on linguistics and cultural studies. Moscow: Progress, 1993. 656 p.

7. Gardiner A. The difference between speech and language. On Sat. V.A. Zvegintsev "History of Linguistics of the 19th and 20th centuries in essays and extractions", Part 2. Moscow: Nauka, 1960. 386 p.

8. Jacobson R. Linguistics and poetics // Structuralism pros and cons. Moscow: Progress, 1975. P.193-230.

9. Martine A. Fundamentals of general linguistics. Moscow: Librocom, 2009. 226 p. 10. Avrorin V.A. Problems of learning the functional side of the language. L.: Nauka, 1975. 274 p.

11. Desheriev Yu.D. Social linguistics. Moscow: Nauka, 1977. 456 p.

12. Slyusareva N.A. Methodological aspect of the concept of language functions. Ped. USSR Academy of Sciences, ser. L and Ya, 1979, v. 38, v. 2. P.136-144.

13. Shmelev D.N. Russian language in its functional varieties.s. Moscow: Enlightenment, 1977. 384 p.

14. Suprun A.E. Lectures on the theory of speech activity. Minsk: Enlightenment, 1996. 288 p.

15. Kolshansky G.V. Communicative function and language structure. Moscow: LKI, 2007. 176 p.

16. Mamushkina S.Yu. Semantics and pragmatics of interjections in modern English. Togliatti: Volga University named after V. N. Tatishcheva, 2006. 132 p.