

Analysis Of Written And Spoken Texts In English And Uzbek And Methods Of Developing Speech Literacy

Kodirova Mashrabxon Kozimjonovna
Andijan state institute of foreign languages
Second-year student of Master's Degree

Annotation. This article studies the problems of speech and the usage of speech in different discourse. It analyzes written and spoken text in Modern English and Uzbek and methods of developing speech literacy.
Key words: communication, speech, written text, spoken text, speech literacy, method.

As you know, text is a unit of information exchange and it mainly serves this task. Therefore, its content requires the harmony of tasks such as communication and information exchange. Usually, the text is considered as a two-stage phenomenon of communicative-informational structure. The first of these is the theme-rhema construction of the text, and the second is its substantive (thematic) center or basis.

It is customary to study these two features, which are considered to be the dynamic (in motion) and static (stationary) shells of text content, separately. The reason for this, in our opinion, can be explained by the disproportion of the used research methods. Therefore, if the issue of theme-rhema construction of units above the sentence is studied in relation to the interaction of the parts of these units and the gradual formation of a single whole based on this relation, the phenomenon of the meaningful center is considered in relation to the formed integrated structure - the text. In addition, in most cases, the content center is considered as the same phenomenon as the subject of the text, that is, the name of the main object in the depicted reality, the subject of the message, etc [1].

It is customary to study these two features, which are considered to be the dynamic (in motion) and static (stationary) shells of text content, separately. The reason for this, in our opinion, can be explained by the disproportion of the used research methods. Therefore, if the issue of theme-rhema construction of units above the sentence is studied in relation to the interaction of the parts of these units and the gradual formation of a single whole based on this relation, the phenomenon of the meaningful center is considered in relation to the formed integrated structure - the text. In addition, in most cases, the content center is considered as the same phenomenon as the subject of the text, that is, the name of the main object in the depicted reality, the subject of the message, etc. When it is considered as an abstract unit, a template, it is difficult to imagine that its construction will be actual or, in other words, have any meaningful division. The phenomenon of substantive division and theme-rhema relations are characteristic only of communicative structures realized in speech. Therefore, it is better to study these phenomena and relations from the point of view of text grammar. However, even in the research conducted in the field of text grammar, there is almost no clear information about the role of theme-rhema relations in the formation of the overall textual content center. In the works of this direction, the main attention is focused on the formation of the content center only with the emergence of thematic relations, and other aspects of the communicative-informational structure of the text are left out of consideration. We can see the relationship between theme and rheme in English and Uzbek languages and the similarities through the following example.

Akmal kitobni ukasiga berdi.

Akhmal gave the book to his brother.

In both sentences, Akmal is the subject, and in Uzbek, he gave the book to his brother, and in the English sentence, gave the book to his brother is the rheme. In addition to this, we would like to mention that in the process of analyzing sentences or texts, we can also see grammatical, lexical, syntactic and stylistic differences in the languages being compared [2].

In our opinion, it is appropriate to analyze the content and semantics of the text in the totality of the factors that ensure its integrity, in the communicative action of the components, that is, at the level of the role of these parts in the formation of the content of the text. Text-speech units are subjugated to the goal of fulfilling a common communicative task, combining a single step into a content-semantic whole.

Each text has its own content, a specific communicative plan is expressed in it, and it is formed in the process of consciously performed speech creation. A person who engages in speech communication aims at a certain goal and creates his communication plan in relation to this goal. To implement this plan, he appeals to the resources of the language system. A communicative plan is a structure capable of taking the form of a speech message, which has the form of a hidden logical predicate [3].

As A.I. Novikov, who dealt with the problem of text semantics in detail, reminded, the speaker must first have an understanding and an opinion about a certain subject that he wants to convey information about. It is possible that the same idea, as a conceptual structure, forms the substantive center of the text. Of course, the text, like any speech unit, has an appearance and form. In order to feel the harmony of form and content or asymmetric disproportion, it is necessary to perceive it. What should be perceived and understood is the inner form of the text. The inner form forms the content and content of the text. The content of the text is "a structure in thinking, which is formed in the human mind and is not related to the connection of parts (elements) formed by the external form, but to the fact that all linguistic means form a whole."

After all, "any linguistic phenomenon loses its ability to express meaning if it does not have a harmony of form and meaning at the same time, or if the signs of materiality and abstraction-symbolism are not harmonious."

The relationship between the formal and substantive structure of the text is important. When studying this relationship, researchers are based on various research methods and standards. Some of these are methods of analysis in the direction of "pure" linguistics (for example, distributive analysis, direct division into participants), while others are of a functional nature (for example, the method of analysis based on the theory of actual division of speech structures).

In recent years, it is known that the methods of psycholinguistic analysis, which require the study of the structure of the text in direct connection with the communication environment and situation, are becoming widespread [6]. However, regardless of the direction of the used methods, the study of text structure is undoubtedly based on three main criteria. The criteria for this study are:

- a) character (characteristics) of parts of the structure;
- b) their interaction;
- c) the role of these relations in the expression of the overall content.

Taking into account these norms leads the researcher's attention to the form and formal structure of the text in any case. N.N. Leontyeva, who is engaged in the research of the content of texts on scientific and technical topics, follows the indicated path and urges to distinguish the linguistic and information transmission aspects of the formation and analysis of the text content. The linguistic approach relies on the analysis of sentence semantics. In other words, the meaning of the text is imagined as a reflection of the semantic structure of individual sentences or as a collection of them. In the second approach, it is taken into account that the transmitted information reflects the content of the whole text. In the content of the information structure, the division of the general meaning structure into the meanings of separate sentences is not taken into account [4].

Information structures are complex, sufficiently large entities that can take the form of general concepts, concepts. No matter how much N.N. Leontyeva tries to distinguish these two directions from each other, the methods she proposes regarding the analysis of the text structure are based on the form and formal features of this structure, and rely on them. Approaching the dependence of formal and substantive features of the text in this way (that is, within the framework of the grammar of the text) is nothing more than the realization of the research goal and plan typical of structural-system linguistics. In this case, the syntax of the text is the final stage of the theory of general syntax, because at the same stage it is possible to study the laws of construction of structures that are more complex than words and sentences, and to research the principles and rules of speech construction. As a result, the text is placed in the "speech - word - morpheme - phoneme" sequence, and a place is allocated to it from the highest level [5].

The inclusion of the text in this line causes it to be given the status of a unit of the language system. In it, the analysis of this phenomenon begins with the interconnection of small units, their interaction in terms of content and form, and in the end, it seeks to determine the content of a single integrated "product". We mentioned above that A.I. Novikov proposed that the content of the text should be defined as a semantic structure formed in connection with its communicative purpose and idea in human thinking. But this proposal of a psychologist does not satisfy linguists. First, as the scientist himself admitted, the semantic structure being

described should in any case consist of components, but the given definition did not take into account the interaction of its parts. Secondly, the text is not only a product of emotional experiences and actions such as imagination, feeling, perception, but it is a phenomenon that requires the harmony of speech and intellectual actions and is formed in the course of a certain activity.

References

1. Amosova N.N. Основы английской фразеологии. – М. 1963.
2. Axmanova A.S. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: СЭ. 1966.
3. Antrushina G.V. English Lexicology. – М. 1985.
4. Bafoyeva M. Badiiy nutqda frazeologik sinonimlardan foydalanish. – T.: O'TA. 2003. № 2.
5. Vinogradov V.V. Leksikologiya i leksikografiya. – М. 1977.
6. Gizburug G.V. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. – М. 1966.
7. Doniyorov X. Yo'ldoshev B. Adabiy til va badiiy stil. – T.: Fan. 1988.
8. Yo'ldoshev B. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tilida frazeologik birliklarning funksional-uslubiy xususiyatlari. Filologiya fanlari doktori dissertatsiya avtoreferati. – T. 1993. 47b.