

UDC 811.111

**COMMUNICATIVE SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTIC OF DISCOURSE MARKERS
IN ENGLISH COLLOQUIAL SPEECH**

Ibrayev Ilyas Ernazarovich

Elias.ibraev@gmail.com

Master Student, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,
Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan

Supervisor- candidate of Philological Sciences, docent

Ubaidullayeva Guljan Jaksybayevna

Discourse markers, or discourse words, are verbal ways of expressing an auxiliary function in communication. These include special lexical units: words, phrases, and stable speech turns (sometimes sentences), whose common function is to help communicants in the process of creating a discourse, its implementation and perception.

Discourse markers are transcategorical in nature, the criteria for combining all of these heterogeneous objects into one class of discursives are their common function associated with the regulation of speech and the organization of discourse to help the addressee. A public list of such words does not exist and probably cannot exist. Different linguists define in different ways both the discursive words themselves and the class boundaries. This class is replenished with new units that operate in this class. Many discursive words are conditional.

With regular performance of discursive functions, such words can be attributed to the class of discursive, despite their original significance and belonging to one or another part of speech. Nevertheless, most linguists agree that discursive discourses are responsible for its organization and design, regulate the relationship between the speaker and the listener, and clarify the speaker's position.[3]

Discursive functions can conditionally be divided into two groups: regulatory and organizational in nature. Regulatory functions are associated with the expression of varying degrees of reliability of the statement, additional meanings, your opinion, assessments of content and speech, emotional attitude, speech, emphasis, highlighting the main thing, regulating the relationship of the speaker and the listener. Organizational functions manifest themselves at the sentence level and at the level of text and discourse. At the sentence level, discursive links connect several sentences or parts of them - these are signals of logical relationships, introducing an example, adding information, searching for a word.

At the level of discourse it indicates its components (beginning, transitions from topic to topic, conclusion), the order and sequence of topics, ideas, refer to fragments of the same text or other texts. We believe that all these functions allow us to consider discursive units of the auxiliary level of communication and contrast them with the main communicative units that transmit basic, factual information. In previously published works, we have already considered the features of the meaning and use of many discursive words of various types in scientific and journalistic discourse[1].

For us, discursive means are units primarily of a functional-pragmatic level, which can have different meanings and different structures, many of which are characterized by a complete or partial absence of a denotative meaning. The semantics of such discursives are, on the one hand, blurred, vague, on the other hand, their meanings are complex, cohesive, indecomposable into components, i.e. they can be characterized as diffuse. As an example, we can cite Russian discourses: *собственно говоря*; *скажем*; *на самом деле*; *дело в том, что*; *хорошо* etc. They are used in a variety of speech situations, their meanings are difficult to describe due to their uncertainty; in addition, their meanings in speech sometimes differ from the meanings in the dictionary, and in our material they are very frequent. This article is devoted to the features of the functioning of the most common in the scientific and mass media discourses of discourses with diffuse meaning. Diffusion is considered in the theoretical-linguistic aspect, within the framework of which a functionally justified extension of the semantics and functions of the words being analyzed is established, and orthologically - violations of the norms in the use of such units are revealed.

Recently, the diffuseness of linguistic units is increasingly becoming the subject of study of linguists. Diffusivity is defined as a special category of a word or sentence, manifested in the form of indifference, indiscrimination of its meanings. A. Kiklevich defines diffusivity as "the indeterminacy of the content of language signs of various levels (morphemes, lexemes, phrases, sentences, texts), the blurred nature of the boundaries between meanings and their categories in the semantic system of language and in language communication".[4] According to D.N. Shmeleva, diffuseness is "the compatibility of individual lexical meanings when their distinction is not carried out (and does not seem necessary)". Diffuse words, or diffuses, according to N.V. Zimina, become "omnipresent", and this is one of the manifestations of the category of uncertainty [2].

O.B. Sirotinina says that "diffuse designations are in principle no less necessary than accurate ones, since they save the efforts of both the sender and the addressee." These vague notations of something are applicable "in different situations, to very different objects and phenomena of the world around us and serve as original classifiers - elements of the language grid that is superimposed on the perception of the world". Diffuses include not only pronouns of various types (personal, indicative, indefinitely personal)[3].

In modern Russian linguistics, diffusivity is studied on the basis of colloquial speech, mass media speech, artistic speech, and folklore. T.E. Janko writes about the diffusivity of performative meanings expressed using some intonation accents in the English language. L.A. Petrova reveals

tokens in literary texts with "deep semantic diffusion" and believes that such units "determine the vectors of artistic generalization and convey the semantic completeness of aesthetic transformations in the conceptual-lexical system." B.T. Ganeev examines the diffusion of words in different languages in connection with the problem of enantiosemy - the ability of a word to express antonymical meanings. A.U. writes about the uncertainty and diffusivity in the semantics of Russian particles. Chernysheva. M.A. Kormilitsyna explores uncertainty in media texts at the level of semantics and syntax. Diffusion is also studied in connection with teaching foreign vocabulary. T.M. Shkapenko argues that "in certain cases, native speakers do not feel the discreteness of individual lexical-semantic variants of a word, and semantic diffusivity is a way of storing a class of polysemantic words in the mental vocabulary of its speakers." The most saturated with diffuses is colloquial speech, and only in them their use, as a rule, is not associated with risks, i.e. does not lead to misunderstanding and does not cause communication failures. In other areas of communication - in business, scientific and media communication - using diffuse vocabulary, one should be careful. In several of his works in recent years, O.B. Sirotinina notes with concern the growing tendency to unjustifiably use such vocabulary in Russian speech, in particular in the language of the media, which entails not only communicative, but also social risks[5].

As one of the most common discursive words in oral speech with a diffuse meaning, we noted a discursive actually, having a word in the composition, the meaning of which is rather vague, indefinite. In the dictionaries we find two varieties of this discourse: an adverb with the meaning "in reality; as it is" and an introductory word indicating the authenticity of what is happening, what happened. If in written speech (for example, in a newspaper), the differences between the two meanings are also determined, in addition to context, by punctuation (the opening word is highlighted with commas), then in oral speech the adverb from the opening word is more difficult to distinguish, especially when the discursive use is inappropriate[6].

Above, we have already mentioned the diffusivity of predicate estimates normally and nothing. In the materials of oral scientific dialogues there is often a discursive well, which also differs in the diffusion of meaning. In some situations, its general value is almost completely lost, and it functions only as a phatic signal for receiving a message, as a kind of assent, as a "universal indicator of the speech genre of consent, positive response" or as "an expression of the speaker's readiness to make a certain assumption, assumption". It is also used well as a signal for switching to another topic, the beginning of a new message. A proof of the diffuseness of this discursive can be situations when something negative or even tragic is discussed in the dialogue, which cannot be reacted to well with any help. Nevertheless, it also occurs well in such cases and is regarded by us exclusively as a discursive that regulates speech contact - a feedback signal. It seems to us that this discursive loses the value of a positive assessment of the content of speech and transfers it from the content of speech to speech itself or speech contact. That is, there is a certain shift in the estimation vector in connection with the change in the object of assessment. In addition, in this discursive mix of organizational functions (the completion of one topic and the transition to another) and regulatory-evaluative, which is also a manifestation of diffusion.

All communication units are heterogeneous in relation the functions they perform and the information they transmit. Naturally, approaches to distinguishing types of communicative units can be different. We focus on the division of communication levels used by many linguists into communicative-informative, i.e., primary, and communicative-organizing - auxiliary (meta-information, metacommunicative, secondary (secondary), speech-organizing). Accordingly, units operating on these two levels can also be divided into main and auxiliary. According to S.V. Andreeva, the main units serve the communicative-nominative area and transmit factual information, and the auxiliary units - the speech-organizing area and participate in the transmission of discursive-pragmatic information. Auxiliary communicative units in recent years are usually called discursive words (markers) or discursive.

Discourses form an auxiliary discourse system, which is a complex system of communication units, the main purpose of which is to help the author / speaker in creating, verbalizing and realizing the discourse and to help the addressee in his perception. The system of these units, on the one

hand, as has already been said, is opposed, and on the other hand, closely interconnected with the system of basic communicative units, focused on the transmission of factual information. WKE transmit information on grammatical relationships between words, word forms, sentences (prepositions, conjunctions) and discursive-pragmatic relationships, namely, reflect the interaction between the speaker and her addressee, adjusting the plan of interpersonal and status-role relationships, expressing an author's assessment, opinion, attitude, organize discourse, ensuring its integrity, connectedness, consistency, logic.

Literature

1. Kiseleva K., Paillard D. (eds.) Diskursivnye slova russkogo yazyka: kontekstnoe var'irovanie i semanticheskoe edinstvo [Discourse Russian words: context variation and semantic unity] // Moscow: Azbukovnik Publ., 2003. 206 p.
2. Kormilitsyna M.A. [Quality of the transmitted information in the print media as a factor of social risks]. Problemy rechevoy kommunikatsii [Problems of speech communication] // 2012, issue 12
3. Severskaya O.I. Slova-parazity kak by, na samom dele i dostatochno [Fillers 'kak by', 'na samom dele' and 'dostatochno']. Nauka i zhizn', 2004, no 5. Available at: <http://www.nkj.ru/archive/articles/3530/>. (Accessed: 15th January 2014).
4. Dailey-O'Cain J. The sociolinguistic distribution of and attitudes toward focuser like and quotative like. // Journal of Sociolinguistics, 2000
5. Ajmer K. English Discourse Particles. Evidence from a Corpus. // Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publ. Company, 2002. 299 p.
6. Buchstaller I. Social stereotypes, personality traits and regional perceptions displaced : Attitudes towards the 'new' quotatives in the UK. Journal of Sociolinguistics, 2006