

## Expression of Speech Efficiency in the English and Uzbek Languages

*Khushnuda Batirovna Samigova*

*Professor of the English language translation theory department, Uzbekistan state world languages university, Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

*Askaraliyeva Mushtariy Bahodir kizi*

*Student of the UZDJTU Translation faculty*

### ABSTRACT

*Though a lot of scientific researches have been carried out in rhetoric aspect up to date in the world and Uzbek linguistics, this theme has not been studied in the patterns of English and Uzbek dialogic speech as one system. This indicates the necessity of comparative study of gender and linguocultural peculiarities of rhetoric aspect of speech culture, and the linguistic and extra linguistic factors in dialogic rhetoric in the kindred languages.*

**KEYWORDS:** *rhetoric, culture, just, please.*

The types of public speech and linguistic-stylistic means expressed in the orator's speech were studied in A.Kh. Arkhipova's work in Uzbek linguistics. D. Teshabaeva conducted the modern aspects of speech culture on the basis of mass media texts. Scholars such as H. Jalilov, H. Pasulov, S. Svirskiy, A.Y. Mikhnevich, I.A. Krivelev, N. Mahmudov worked out the issue connecting with teachers and lecturers' art of speaking. S. Inomkhujayev, A. Ahmedov, N. Bekmirzaev, H. Jalilov, Y. Mukhibov, E. Mukhibovs' monographic works were devoted to reveal the basis of public speaking. The developing periods of the Eastern art of public speaking was described in S. Inomkhujayev's work. B. Omonov analyzed political speaking skills<sup>1</sup>.

In linguistics a lot of works on rhetoric were carried out in different languages and remarkable researches by scientists can be considered as a great contribution to linguistics. For instance, A. Judith conducting dialogic rhetoric in English mainly concentrated on revealing the dialectical features of it. C. Patricia Foley studied the significance of permission in rhetoric on the basis of English speech patterns. M.M. Hincks focused on conducting the written speech in rhetoric aspect. L.M. Long, W.A.I. Paton and other scholars devoted their works to reveal other issues related to the

<sup>1</sup> Арипова А.Х. Нотиклик нутқининг лисоний-услубий воситалари: Филол. фан. номз. ...дис. – Тошкент: ЎзР ФА, Алишер Навоий номидаги Тил ва адабиёт институти, 2002. – 170 б.; Тешабоева Д.М. Оммавий ахборот воситалари тилининг нутқ маданияти аспектида тадқиқи (ЎзР ОАВ мисолида): Филол. фан. док. ...дис. автореф. – Тошкент: ЎзДЖТУ, 2012. – Б. 20-28; Жалилов Ҳ. Ижтимоий фан ўқитувчиларининг нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1987. – 32 б.; Расулов Ҳ., Свирский С. Лекторнинг нотиклик санъати – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1978. – 39 б.; Кривелев И.А. Лекторнинг нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1980. – 15 б.; Михневич А.Е. Лекторнинг нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1979. – 44 б.; Махмудов Н. Ўқитувчи нутқ маданияти. – Т.: Алишер Навоий номидаги Ўзбекистон Миллий кутубхонаси, 2007. – Б. 20-157; Иномхўжаев С. Нотиклик санъати асослари. – Т.: Ўқитувчи, 1982. – Б. 5-124; Аҳмедов А. Нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1967. – 56 б.; Bekmirzaev N. Notiqlik asoslari. – Т.: Yangi nashr, 2008. – 140 б.; Бекмирзаев Н. Нотик ва нутқ. – Т.: Наврўз, 2015. – Б. 17-39; Жалилов Ҳ. Нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1976. – 77 б.; Муҳибов Я., Муҳибов Ё. Искусство публичного выступления. Риторика. – Т.: Ўқитувчи, 2011. – 173 б.; Иномхўжаев С. Ўтмиш шарқ нотиклиги. – Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1982. – 38 б.; Б. Омонов. Сийсий етакчининг нотиклик маҳорати. – Монография. – Т.: Ўзбекистон, 2000. – 91 б.

English rhetoric<sup>2</sup>.

The results of the research and scientific conclusions can be used in carrying out scientific researches in Comparative Linguistics, Translation Studies. The materials of the research can be in great use in defining the national-cultural peculiarities of the languages in Linguistics and Translation Studies. The scientific-theoretical conclusions of the thesis will also serve to further improvement of the teaching and educational process.

In linguistic dictionaries the word *rhetoric* is interpreted in the following way: «Rhetoric is the aspect that studies efficient and eloquent speech theoretically»<sup>3</sup>.

Ancient times orators expounded this word in this way: «*It is the art that teaches us to be aware of the ways in making people believe in a definite issue*» (Aristotle), «*It is the workmanship that knows how to impress others that can find the way to the heart of mankind, and can lead them towards a speaker's intentions, ambitions*» (N. Koshanskiy, M.M. Speranski)<sup>4</sup>.

The term rhetoric is interpreted in two ways. Mainly rhetoric is referred to a subject that aims to study the basis of public speaking. It is also defined as an aspect that theoretically reveals any kind of expressive and impressive speech.

Linguistic means belonging to different language levels and serving to increase speech efficiency are also determined in this article.

Pronouncing the last vowel of a word longer in Uzbek and stressing each word in the sentence and expressing it politely in English increases the efficiency of speech in both languages. By pronouncing the words *please* and *ўмумос* longer and louder the persuasion is strengthened. Some consonant sounds are often omitted in Uzbek as the result of pronouncing the last vowel in a word longer (беақо-о-о, келақо-о-о), but in English this linguistic phenomenon is not used. Accurately and clearly expressed words, phrases expressed with love and care may have a positive impact on listeners in both languages. Stressing each word in English and each syllable separately in Uzbek increases speech efficiency. Using excessing sounds in these languages (*uh...*, *ums...*, *ahs...*, *er...* / *ҳм...*, *э...*), coughing and pausing decrease the quality of eloquency. By stressing addressing words in the sentence one can easily attract a listener's attention to himself/herself in both languages. Stressing not only a syllable and a word but the whole sentence or a text surely would increase the speech efficiency in both languages as well.

Suffix *-сиз*, second person singular expressing the meaning of respect, negative meaning forming suffix *-май*, interjections such as *-ми*, *-чу* are constantly used in Uzbek dialogic rhetoric. But in English this linguistic phenomenon is expressed by the usage of negative and interrogative forms of modal verbs in sentences (*could you*, *couldn't*, *will you*, *won't you*). Adding diminutive and affectionate suffixes to a person's name also has an impact on the expressiveness of speech (*Ann+ie* / *Жавлон+жон*) in both languages. Expressiveness is increased by adding to a listener's name the suffixes such as *-жон*, *-хон*, *-бек* that express the meaning of respect in Uzbek. But in English

<sup>2</sup> Judith A. The Genre of Logic and Artifice: Dialectic, Rhetoric, and English Dialogues. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Toronto, Toronto university, 1998. – 280 p.; Patricia C. Foley. Paradox and Promise in the Dialogue on Race: a Case Study Analysis of the Dialogues of the Springfield World Class City Commission. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Massachusetts, Massachusetts University, 1999. – 200 p.; M.M. Hincks. Successful Dialogues: Systematic, Written, and Prominent Self-analysis in College Composition. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Boston, Boston College, 2005. – 170 p.; Long L.M. Associative Rhetoric: Beyond Rhetorical Sensitivity and Individual Rhetoric. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Georgia, University of Georgia, 1997. – 287 p.; Paton W.A.I. Current-Traditional Rhetoric Reexamined. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Michigan, Michigan University, 1990. – 267 p.

<sup>3</sup> Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1969. – С. 389.

<sup>4</sup> Габуния З., Башиева С. Риторика как часть традиционной культуры. – Нальчик, ЭЛЬФА, 1993. – С. 3-77.

adding to a person's name words such as *Mr.*, *Mrs.*, *Miss* expressing the same meaning would increase speech efficiency. This linguistic phenomenon is interpreted with the fact that the Uzbek language is considered to be in a group of agglutinative languages and English is included into the analytical languages group. Thus in major cases suffixes are mainly added to a word in Uzbek, meanwhile in English this linguistic phenomenon is seldom used.

Adding diminutive and affectionate affixes, possessive pronoun of the first person singular to the words expressing relatives such as *ака*, *она*, *ука* (brother, sister) in Uzbek as well as using them before names (*Ботир+жон укам*, *опоқи+жон*) surely increases effectiveness of speech. The words of relatives in this language are even used to unfamiliar people, but in English they are only used to relatives (*auntie*, *daddy*).

In dialogic rhetoric personal pronouns have a significant role. Using the plural forms of the pronoun *you / siz* is positively approved in rhetoric aspect of both languages.

In researched languages any kind of word can be used as a basic word (word that can be a reason in impressing a person). Using the auxiliary verb *do* or the word *just* before the main verb in English, adding the adverbs and adjectives such as *жуда*, *қаттиқ*, *роса* to the verbs in Uzbek increases efficiency of speech. In Uzbek repeated words (*қани-қани*, *олинг-олинг*, *келинг-келинг*) have significance in speech expressiveness, but in English this linguistic phenomenon does not exist. Equivalents for this kind of words in English can be a word, a word combination or a phrase (such as *welcome*, *help yourself*). Using unnecessary words (such as *well*, *so*, *just* / *анақа*, *тавба*, *астағфуриллоҳ*) repeatedly in dialogic rhetoric in both languages decreases effectiveness of the communication.

In dialogic rhetoric except a word a word combination, a sentence and a text can also be used as a basic linguistic unit in persuading, involving, reassuring a person in a certain issue in both languages. In researched languages efficiency can be increased by different means in declarative, interrogative, imperative, exclamatory sentences, rhetoric questions and conditional subordinate clause. Stressing the addressing and introductory words in these languages one can strengthen the effectiveness of speech. Interrogative sentences are considered to be more effective during communication process rather than declarative sentences. Unlike the English the Uzbeks often use advising words in the texts while making an impact on a listener.

Relative words are mainly expressed in Uzbek (as *опоқижон*, *амакижон*, *укажон*) while words of respect in English (as *sir*, *Mrs.*, *dear*) increase speech efficiency by stressing addressing words. This linguistic phenomenon depicts the differential sides of dialogic rhetoric in these languages.

All sounding means that are not excepted as linguistic units, and have a significant importance in transferring information to the members of communication are called *paraphonetic means*. For instance, pronouncing a sound in a very soft tone in dialogic rhetoric one can obtain a suspected results of communication. Here is the speech:

«Wormtail will get us drinks», said Snape. «I am not your servant!» he squeaked, avoiding Snape's eye. «Really? I was under the impression that the Dark Lord placed you here to assist me.» «To assist, yes – but not to make you drinks...» «I had no idea, Wormtail, that you were craving more dangerous assignments», said Snape silkily. «This can be easily arranged: I shall speak to the Dark Lord.» Wormtail hesitated for a moment... within seconds he was back, bearing a dusty bottle and three glasses upon a tray<sup>5</sup>.

➤ *Тўйда сени Ёқуб кўрган экан, – деди йўзи аралаш онам. – Тегмасанг бўлмайди.*

<sup>5</sup> Rowling J.K. Harry Potter. – New York: Scholastic inc., 2005. – P. 24.

- *Нега ахир? Ким экан мени мажбурлаб хотин қилиб оладиган?..Мен тегмайман унга!*
- *... Ёқуб кириб келди.*
- *Сиз... сиз..., – дея олдим титраб-қақшаб...*
- *Ўзингизни босинг, Латофатхон, – деди Ёқуб... – Қўрқманг, – дея секин товушда юпата бошлади у мени... – Сизни бир кўришдаёқ ёқтириб қолдим... Мана шу ҳовли-жойни сенинг номингга расмийлаштираман. Шу жой сеники! Тагинда машина, истаган жойингга олиб боради...*

*...охирги шоҳона ҳаёт ҳақидаги ваъдалар таъсирида бўшашидим, Ёқубники бўлдим...<sup>6</sup>*

Pronouncing sounds softly in a mandative tone, expressing phrases in a begging and pleasing tone are also approved in the rhetoric aspect of both languages. Unlike in English, adding vowel sounds such as *-a, -e, -я, -ю* to the end of the last word surely increases the persuasiveness of speech in the Uzbek language.

Different lifestyle, religion, culture and other factors that are related to these both nations reflect the existence of national gender peculiarities in dialogic rhetoric.

On the basis of the research analysis we come to the following conclusions:

In the West the art of speaking was initially formed from the speeches of sophists (teachers), but in the East it began from the speeches of preachers (people reading a king's verdict to public). Rhetoric has historical development stages, it is considered to change constantly.

In dialogic rhetoric there are different and common sides in English and Uzbek men and women's speech. The impact of western and eastern culture on forming these languages is reflected on dialogic rhetoric too.

Praying for the sake of a listener, bequeathing, advising, swearing, promising, pleasing, reminding about financial support and names of dishes, endorsing, reminding the laws, rules and peoples opinion, making people feel sorry, telling lies, caressing, respecting, praising, speaking on religious topics are considered to be the most frequently used topics in dialogic rhetoric. The usage frequency of the linguistic means referred to these topics in the researches languages differ from each other.

In the dialogic rhetoric of both languages linguistic means that express negative meaning are used in foul language, while insulting, cursing, frightening, threatening. English speaking women in majority cases use foul language, in Uzbek women's speech cursing is constantly expressed.

Variety of the following factors such as living conditions, geographic location, history, religious beliefs, culture, customs and traditions, national values, national character, national food, educational and upbringing basic principles, internal rules and laws of the area they live in and other factors are considered to be the main reasons for existence of national peculiarities of dialogic rhetoric in both languages. As well as it depends on how these two nations interpret the concept *culture*. This phenomenon approves once again the existence of connection between language and culture.

<sup>6</sup>Ибодинов А. «Латофат» дўконидаги қатл. – Т.: Шарқ, 2001. – Б. 106.