

Geterogeneity of speech system
Ernazarova M. (Republic of Uzbekistan)
Гетерогенность речевой системы
Эрназарова М. С. (Республика Узбекистан)

*Эрназарова Манзура Сапарбоевна / Ernazarova Manzura - кандидат педагогических наук, доцент,
кафедра начального обучения,
Навоийский государственный педагогический институт, г. Навои, Республика Узбекистан*

Abstract: *in the article linguistic systems, communication system and its elements, the level of complexity of communication heterogenic system, the features of elements of person in communication system were widely analyzed. Also, person's communicative actions in communication systems, occurrence of discursive activity in the entirety of language, cognitive and communication abilities was proven.*

Аннотация: *в статье описаны лингвистические системы, системы связи и ее элементов, уровень сложности системы гетерогенной связи. Были широко проанализированы особенности элементов личности в системе связи. Кроме того, были доказаны коммуникативные действия человека в системах связи, появление дискурсивной деятельности в полном объеме языковых, познавательных и коммуникационных способностей.*

Keywords: *linguistic system, communication system, homogenous ideal systems, heterogenic ideal systems, elements of person, language ability, cognitive ability, communicative ability.*

Ключевые слова: *языковая система, система связи, однородных идеальных систем, гетерогенных идеальных систем, элементы личности, способность языка, когнитивные способности, коммуникативные способности.*

We are not mistaken if we say XX century was a century of systems study. It reflected in linguistics too. But social value of the language and it was a basic means of communication was mentioned by linguists in all periods of time with unanimity, it hadn't been focused on by linguists from the time of Aristotle up to the 60 s of the last century that language occurred with ethnic, social-psychical, situational factors as a means of communication, it made a living contact. The scientists assigned only pure linguistic units as the object of the research of linguistics, which can only occur in oral or written form of speech which are the composition of antro-po-linguo-ethno-psyco-situational factors comprising the whole entirety in the process of communication and worked on their analysis [1; 10; 9; 6; 4; 5]. Three trends of linguistic structuralism – Prague functional linguistics, Copenhagen glossemantics, American descriptive linguistics divided the speech activity into two opposite sides – chance (language) and reality (speech) [3; 2]. It was based on the following ideas of F.de Saussure, the founder of linguistic structuralism: «while distinguishing language from speech, we distinguish social commonness from personal particularity, essence from sudden event». F. De Saussure mentioned about speech «There is no any generality in speech», «Speech is a product (result) of an individual person's will and mind» [8].

Linguistic structuralism researched the language as an ideal system, and was more busy only with verifying the linguistic chance, linguistic system which never occurs in practice, therefore, language linguistics widely developed. Speech was considered to be as if it was an unimportant phenomenon, it remained out of attention because of having peculiarities given in temporary, immediate and direct observations. There was a break between theory and practice.

It is known, certain systems are characterized by heterogeneity of their composition. Heterogeneity provides vitality of these systems. The communication which is the study object of pragmalinguistics is such a system.

In the system of any real communication there are following elements: a) space; b) time; c) situation; d) language; e) person.

These elements are significant with being separate from common features besides belonging to the same system. Being separate from commonness is the living requirement of real systems.

Communication system is a complicated immediate system. It lives in the process of communicating and goes to “communication archive” as soon as the communication finishes. The researcher made certain theoretical conclusions about a certain communication system by scientifically verifying these “archive” materials.

It should be mentioned that the dialect of commonness and particularity finds its reflection in communication system too. There are common laws and private forms of communication. The communication in a certain space and time reflects the peculiarities of all living systems in itself as an immediate system. The system whose common features were mentioned above is an abstract, ideal system consisted of synthesis of

general laws of private communication systems. So, it can be concluded that the ideal systems are divided into two groups again:

- a) homogeneous ideal systems;
- b) heterogeneous ideal systems.

Language system and its composition language level systems can be shown as homogeneous ideal systems. When ideal language systems and ideal communication systems are compared from the point of view of occurrence, there will come out an important and principal distinction between them. This distinction will be base to clarify some aspects between them as well as help to evaluate in real the systemic features of the systems.

Language systems cannot occur in speech in this case. In other words, the homogeneous ideal language system consisted of vowel phonemes cannot make a real speech system consisting of only six vowel sounds. So, it can be said that the systemacy of the language systems cannot appear, it is a system that doesn't occur. The system that doesn't occur exists as a product of human mind. The abstract communication system in the mind appears with the features of its every element. It is not possible any of the elements of different type space, time, situation, language and person not to participate in every living communication system.

Features of personal elements in communication system. Heterogenic system of communication is characterized with the complexity of its composition and different types of its elements. Among the elements of communication system personal elements have a particular place.

It is known that in the systemology theory the following three signs of the system elements are distinguished:

a) signs making a system; b) signs made in the system; c) signs neutral to the system [7]. It is the same for communication system and its elements.

Personal elements have basic place in communication system together with situational elements. Because, these two elements are dominant in this system. But person uses the situation, although the situation doesn't impact on the intention of person's communication, it requires adaptation of way of reaching this intention. Otherwise, it fully harms the quality and result of communication, that is, the communicative intention of the addresser.

The person must have the following features to choose and properly use the language devices which are the linking means, elements of communication:

- a) language ability; b) cognitive ability; c) communicative ability.

These signs are very necessary for the personal elements to take place in communication system, from the view point of systemology they are the signs organizing systems.

In communication system the person participates either addressee (recipient) or addresser (sender). Its being addressee or addresser doesn't have substantial nature, it occurs in communication system. Therefore, the sign of being addressee/addresser of person can be evaluated as the sign occurring in the system.

Personal element has a numerous signs such as gender, character, ethical (moral), belief, aesthetic, physical, professional, age, level of development, these sign are important for some of the system and in others they are unimportant. Therefore, these personal qualities can be evaluated as neutral, irrelevant signs for the communication system.

The signs making important and necessary system for communication system are necessary requirement of any communication. They are internal elements of person, and have dense connection. If any of these signs doesn't exist, and doesn't act equally, the role of person in communication system decreases and seriously harms the reality of communicative intention. For example, language ability, that is, incapability of speaking in a certain language prevents the person from communicating. Or having no cognitive competence turns out to be prevention in achieving necessary purpose. Let's say, the result of the conversation on any theme is defined by in what level is the necessary knowledge of both sides on this theme.

Communicative competence (communicative ability) is a wide sign, it includes tactics of using communication units, skills of using the situation of communication, skills of combining the communication elements on the way of communicative intention. Each of these internal elements are of great importance in the result of communication, each of them should be separately researched.

Communicative intention controls the person's discursive or communication activity. Therefore, communicative intention is worth being evaluated as the motivating force of discursive "idea", communication. Because, communicative intention shows the scale and power of person's speech act. That's why person's discursive activity stands in the center of pragmalinguistic analysis. In this sense, Sh. Safarov refuses some linguists' ideas about it: «... if we put the impact of speech act aside the circle of pragmalinguistic analysis, then don't we make the communication system dull?! Communication is done to influence the speaker, to make him/her reply anything! Speech communication purpose is two level, that is, in speech act exchanging information and communicative pragmatic purpose occurs. In the first the aim of the speaker is to give (send) or receive information» [6].

So, in certain communication systems person's communicative action, discursive activity appear in the wholeness of language, cognitive and communicative abilities, the element person and its discursive activity can be fairly and fully evaluated by studying these elements entirely.

References

1. *Grice G. P.* Logic and verbal communication // New in foreign linguistics. Vol. 16. Linguistic pragmatics. M.: Progress, 1985. Pp. 217–237.
2. *Losev A. F.* Sign, Symbol, Myth. M.: Moscow state university, 1982. Pp. 480 .
3. *Nurmonov A.* Structural linguistics: roots and trends. Andijan: Andijan state university, 2006. Pp. 182.
4. *Safarov Sh.* System of verbal communication. Universal and ethnospecific. Samarkand, 1991. Pp. 170.
5. *Safarov Sh., Toirova G.* The bases of ethnosociopragmatic analysis of speech. Samarkand, 2007. Pp. 40.
6. *Safarov Sh.* Pragmalinguistics. Tashkent: Uzbekistan national encyclopedia, 2008. Pp. 286.
7. *Solnsev V. M.* Language is as a system-structural education. M.: Science, 1977. Pp.46.
8. *Saussure F.* Works on linguistics. M.: Progress, 1977. Pp. 696.
9. *Formanovskaya N. I.* Functional and categorical essence of stable formulas of communication: Abstract of doctoral dissertation. M.: 1979. Pp.50.
10. *Formanovskaya N. I.* Speech etiquette and culture of communication. M.: High school, 1989. Pp. 8–10.