



Marat ESHCHANOV
English Faculty Student
Uzbek State University World Languages
uzbekgeeze@mail.ru

COMPARISON OF WRITTEN DISCOURSE ELEMENTS IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK IN WRITTEN TEXTS

Мақолада инглиз ва ўзбек тилларидаги ёзма нутқ элементлари қиёсий таҳлил этилган. Мазкур илмий иш Қорақалпоғистон Республикасининг, Нукус шаҳридаги Савицкий музейи ҳақида инглиз тилида ёзилган Эллен Беррининг “Декадент рус саънати хануз этик сояси остида” ҳамда Элмурод Матназаровнинг “Қизилқум дурдонаси” матнларига асосланган. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларидаги ёзма матнлар лексик ва грамматик алоқалар лингвистик нуқтаи назардан ўрганилиб, ўхшаш, ўхшаш бўлмаган ҳамда ўзига хос тил хусусиятлари аниқланган.

Статья посвящена анализу элементов дискурса в узбекском и английском языках путём сравнения. Работа основана на текстах двух статей: «Декадентское русское искусство, все ещё в тени сапога» Эллена Берри, «Жемчужина Кызылкума» Матназара Элмуродова о знаменитом музее Савицкого в Республике Каракалпакстан городе Нукусе. В данной статье лексические и грамматические связи письменных текстов в английском и узбекском отражают как схожие, так и несхожие и уникальные особенности языка с лингвистической точки зрения.

The article is dedicated to the analysis of written discourse elements in the English and Uzbek languages in a comparative way. The work is based on the text of two articles “Decadent Russian Art, Still under the Boot’s Shadow” by Ellen Barry and “Qizilqum Durdonasi” by Matnazar Elmurodov about the amazing as well as famous Savitsky Museum in Nukus, Karakalpakstan. The lexical and grammatical ties of written texts in English and Uzbek reflect similar, non-similar as well as unique language features from linguistic point of view in the following article.

Калит сўзлар: катафорик мурожаат, анафорик мурожаат, сўзлар қатори, бириккан сўзлар, эллипсис, қиёсий, боғловчи, лексик алоқалар.

Ключевые слова: катафорическое обращение, анафорическое обращение, словосочетание, эллипсис, сравнение, союз, лексические связи.

Key words: cataphoric reference, anaphoric reference, ordered series, collocation, ellipsis, comparative, conjunction, lexical ties.

The articles via which the research work has been realized are rich in discourse elements, which can show the relation of sentences to each other in texts. One of such elements is the use of cohesive devices in written texts.

Cohesive devices are extendedly used in the articles. However, they have some differences and similarities in the contextual meaning. In the English article called “Decadent Russian Art, Still Under the Boot’s Shadow” by Ellen Barry, use of reference is distinguishable and different from the Uzbek article “Qizilqum durdonasi” by Matnazar Elmurodov. The English article provides cataphoric reference within the text whereas any cataphoric reference is impossible to notice in the Uzbek article. This shows the variety of the English language features from the Uzbek language features. It is visible through the article that cataphoric reference is used to introduce a new idea or an idea which is coming later. The following example can elucidate the abovementioned statements.

“*It is a great satisfaction that we are getting international recognition*”. In this example the cataphoric reference is referred with the help of the pronoun “*it*”. However, this type of reference is impossible in Uzbek in the same context. The alternative would be the following quotation in the text.

“*Qoraqolpoq eli bunday betakror va ajoyib muzey bilan qancha faxrlansa arziydi*”. As it is visible, it is not difficult to make the statement have cataphoric reference with translation. The translated version would be “*It is worthy that the Karakalpaks are proud of such a unique and wonderful museum so much*”. In this case the cataphoric reference appears in the statement. Nevertheless, the fact that cataphoric reference is not used in the Uzbek article shows its different sentence structures from the English ones. Language has its norms embedded in its construction and is never able to change these fixed rules.

The two articles differ from each other in terms of the use of collocation and ordered series. You can see the considerable use of order series in the Uzbek article while the English one provides collocation to some extent. The numerous uses of ordered series in the Uzbek text shows the relation of one thing to another and in this way series of things and ideas are increased and cohesively tied. You can observe the following examples. *Azaldan **dehqonchilik, chorvachilik, baliqchilik bilan shug’ullangan, o’ziga xos qadimiy tarixiga ega qoraqolpoq elining bugungi davriga kelib dunyoga ma’lum va mashur muzeyiga ega ekanligi faxrlidir, albatta.*** The highlighted words show the series of activities in which the Karakalpaks engaged and embellish the article with the help of stress of counting. In addition to text embellishment, emphatic words such as ***dunyoga ma’lum va mashur*** add peculiarity to the text referring to that nation. Other variants of ordered series in the text: *Gap mo’jiza bilan saqlanib qolingan va eng muhimi, mukammal ma’lumot bilan*

xos betakror san'at namunalari, voha xalqlari o'tmishiga oid uy-ro'zg'or buyumlari bugungi kunda ham har qanday kishini hayrat va hayajonga solishi tabiiy.

In terms of providing the synonym of *the collection* the English text repeats the same word many times and sometimes use pronoun “*it*” to avoid the boredom of readers as a result of meeting the same word several times. However, the Uzbek text seems more meaningful and abounds in the variety of alternatives of the word. For example, the writer uses *ekspozitsiya, asarlar, xalq amaliy san'ati durdonalari, etc* within the whole text.

There is also a difference in terms of pronoun within the two texts.

The writer in the Uzbek text mostly speaks about Savitskiy from the third voice, which neither a speaker or an addressee while the writer of the American newspaper sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly expresses the statements of Ms. Babanazarova by using the pronoun “*we*” and “*they*”. In each case, the writer keeps the way she applies to her staff. By using “*we*” and “*they*” Ms. Babanazarova’s staff is meant as the whole or general members of the events happening in the text, who share the same profession by museum employees: *The collectors from the West started to come in their private planes, bringing bags of money, showing this to us,” Ms. Babanazarova told the filmmakers. “Of course, they had very good taste, we understood this immediately — they wanted the best pieces.”* Besides, other two different significant differences can be realized within the texts in terms of pronoun usage. The Uzbek writer applies for Uzbekistan as his country, the country where he lives by using the possessive form added after the noun “*my country*”- “*mamlakatimiz*” whereas the American writer uses the definite article “*the*” before “*country*”-the country: *Mamlakatimizning Orolbo'yi hududi o'ziga xos go'zal tabiati, oqko'ngil va mehnatkash odamlari, boy madaniy qadriyatlari bilan azal-azaldan sayyohlar diqqatini o'ziga tortib kelgan. We have to prove that we are doing something good for the country, that we are not a gang of bandits,” said Ms. Babanazarova, 55, who has run the museum since Mr. Savitsky's death in 1984.* Here, it is certain that the Uzbek writer says “*my country*” because he is sharing the same status of the same nation in this context. In fact, the American writer says “*the country*” because he generally thinks of Karakalpakstan as the country. Another reason is that there is no need to show possession when one can use article to refer to the same country in English. That’s one can avoid mentioning the possession by simply meaning generality if obvious to the audience which country the person is speaking about.

Another difference in terms of ellipsis and comparatives would also attract attention to their analysis.

The American newspaper consists of many comparatives and some ellipsis whereas the Uzbek text hardly provides only comparative, but not ellipsis. You can look through the following examples:

*The building has since stood empty, its fate unknown, and more than 2,000 works are no longer on view at the museum, **more formally known** as the Karakalpakstan State Museum of Art.* The writer compares the name of the museum since it can be called with two names. That's why he uses comparative *more formally known* to show that he also shares the general comparison with majority.

The comparison has been realized with the help of superlative as well: *Her friends urged her to sell a few paintings, if only to provide better conditions for the rest of the collection. But Ms. Babanazarova refused, partly out of fear that one sale would prompt the government to auction off **the best works**.* Comparative in this sentence helps the reader to understand that she does not want to sell the works because she considers them as the valuable pieces of the museum collection. In this way, comparative can be tied to the sentence within the text.

Different from the comparative in the American article, the Uzbek article caters for comparative only once with the help of hypothetical statements, which are considered comparatives in the Uzbek language. Though the very comparative does not exist in English, it is substantially common in Uzbek. It appears in the following example.

Uning birinchi, asosan, Rossiya san'ati bo'lib, rus avangardi bilan bog'liq rassomlar asarlarining noyob qismi hisoblansa, ikkinchi yo'nalishni Markaziy Osiyo san'ati, uning negizini O'zbekiston milliy san'atiga asos bo'lgan o'zbek avangardi mualliflarining asarlari tashkil etadi. This comparison can be altered with not hypothetical statement, but with the conjunctions **while**, **whereas** in compound sentences in English. These all points can state the differences and similarities of comparatives in both languages, in which there is a great interest of linguists.

Within the English text, a clausal ellipsis is used. They mostly appear at the beginning of the following sentences as the omitted parts of the sentences comprehensible, though.

Independent since 1991, Uzbekistan vigorously promotes native art forms like weaving and engraving. **Asked** what prompted the scrutiny, Ms. Babanazarova said she had no idea. In both examples, participles and adverbial clauses are used to fill in the omitted part of the sentences. The original long form variants of the statements could be: **Having been independent** since 1991, Uzbekistan vigorously promotes native art forms like weaving and engraving. **After she was asked** what prompted the scrutiny, Ms. Babanazarova said she had no idea.

osori-atiqalar, xo'jalik va uy-ro'zg'or buyumlari, kiyim-kechak hamda hunarmandchilik namunalarini yig'ish, ayniqsa, Orolbo'yi quyi qismida yashovchi xalqlarning mutlaqo ma'lum bo'lmagan san'ati tarixini o'rganish bilan jiddiy shug'ullanadi. As it is seen in the examples, conjunctions are also means of lexical and grammatical ties in sentences to refer to correlation.

The tenses in both texts change time-frame shifts to narrate and support a claim about the present with examples from the past, introduce a general idea leading to further development of the events. For example: *Uning maqsadi mahalliy aholining o'tmishiga xos muzey tashkil etish edi. Shuning uchun u hatto Moskvadagi o'z uyidan voz kechib, Nukusga ko'chib keladi. Savitskiy safdoshlari bilan Qoraqalpog'istonning shimolini kezib chiqdi va qoraqalpoq madaniyatining genofondi hisoblangan kolleksiyani to'pladi.*

"The Desert of Forbidden Art," an American-made documentary, will try to draw international attention to Mr. Savitsky's life's work: a museum in the parched hinterland of Uzbekistan that is home to one of the world's largest collections of Russian avant-garde art. Until now the museum has been known chiefly to journalists and art lovers who returned from the remote city of Nukus with a dazed look and a remarkable tale, as if they had stumbled into Ali Baba's cave.

In these examples it can be obvious that the writers wanted to embellish their articles with the help of time-frame shifts changing them within different paragraphs for the purposes stated above.

In conclusion, it can be surely stated that texts keep coherence between the paragraphs within the whole story, report, article or any kind of written discourse by means of lexical and grammatical ties. These ties make them not only coherent but also logically and structurally ordered. As a result, this causes the texts to be understandable and easily deliverable to the audience.

REFERENCES

1. Discourse and Language Education. – Cambridge, Evelyn Marcussen Hatch, 1992.
2. Grammar Dimensions 4 Heinle & Heinle, Jan Frodesen, Janet Eyring, 2000.