



Problems of definition of interjections in English and Russian languages

B. B. Kasimova

Student

National University of Uzbekistan

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article discusses the general characteristics of interjections in English and Russian. This includes some problems of definition and classification of interjections in English and Russian. As well as their role, meaning and functions in speech. Also, this article will consider some issues of determining emotional interjections in British English and Russian in speech. The similarities and differences between interjections and onomatopoeia will be studied in contrast between the two languages.

Key words: interjections, onomatopoeia, expressive, conative, phatic, functional, peripheral.

161

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматриваются общие характеристики междометий в английском и русском языках. Сюда входят некоторые проблемы определения и классификации междометий в английском и русском языках. А также их роль, значение и функции в речи. Также в данной статье будут рассмотрены некоторые вопросы определения эмоциональных междометий в британском английском и русском языках в речи. Сходства и различия между междометиями и звукоподражаниями будут изучены в сравнении с двумя языками.

Ключевые слова: междометия, звукоподражание, экспрессивное, конативное, фатическое, функциональное, периферическое.

For decades, interjection has been one of the most controversial phenomena in modern linguistics. There is still no agreement on how to describe and categorize them [3; 315]. "Thrown, inserted between other words" is the literal definition of an interjection. Differences between oral and written speech, as well as the inability to distinguish between them, are the main causes of disagreements and uncertainty over the concept of interjection [4; 244]. Onomatopoeic expressions and discursive markers may or may not be included in definitions of interjections, but emotional interjections are usually included. Numerous interjections are derived from emotional exclamations and sounds generated in response to external stimuli by the body's reflexes. Interjections are a form of extralinguistic communication that both humans and animals employ. For instance, animals are able to express their needs using sounds that are not found in human speech. Despite his criticism of other linguists' approaches to the study of interjections, Norrick categorizes expressions

like “eh,” “mmm”, “uh-huh” and “right” as the most frequent type of interjections and places emotional interjections on the periphery of the language. It is ideal to view interjections as part of the language if the focus is on function rather than form. Additionally, because they are often utilized in everyday conversation, they are an essential component of human speech.

There have been several attempts to categorize interjections according to both their form and purpose, but there is still disagreement about the «correct» categorization [6; 18]. In British English interjections are broken down into expressive, conative, and phatic interjections (emphasis on function), as well as main and secondary interjections (focus on form). The primary interjections are not otherwise used, do not come into construction with other classes of words and have a propensity to phonological and morphological anomalies [1; 105]. The second category, in contrast to the first, consists of those words that do not understand, but which, taken alone, might be used to reflect mental attitude or complicity [1; 111]. Examples: “Oh” or “Ugh” and “Oh my God” or “My God”.

Buehler developed the organon model, which schematizes the components of effective communication as follows: 1. contextual-referential 2. message – poetic 3. addressee – expressive/emotional 4. addressee – conative 5. contact – phatic 6. code – metalinguistic [2]. Interjections can convey a variety of emotions, such as shock, relief, delight, perplexity, and wonder, but they can also convey scorn, rejection, fear, disgust, and pain, along with a sensation of coldness or warmth [5; 17]. The conative function is obligated for exclamations like “Shhh” or “Shh!”. Because their meaning incorporates a deictic argument, their usage is only appropriate if there is an addressee [8;37]. Say, “Shhh!”- “Can you spare some time for me?” “Shhh!” – “Don't make noise!”.

Interjections illustrate rich semantic patterns that are frequently challenging to comprehend and communicate consistently. For instance, a. Someone makes a mistake and exclaims, “Oops!” b. Or, “I'm surprised that I made such a stupid mistake” is what he or she says. “Oops!” Clearly, this is a more concise linguistic rendering of the speaker's emotional state. There is disagreement on interjections' function in discourse despite the semantic diversity of these words.

The famous Russian scholar M.V. Lomonosov conducted the first research of interjections in Russian linguistics. Interjections, according to V.V. Vinogradov, are “collective signs of emotional expression” rather than individual expressions of emotion [9;585]. Interjections are a significant and diverse set of words in Russian like “ну и ну, батюшки, ой-ой-ой, брр, ого, ура, ох, то-то, тьфу, ух, фи; айда, кс-кис”. Three primary points of view, however, may be distilled from the multiplicity of opinions that have been spoken throughout time: “1) Interjection is a syntactic class heterogeneous in composition, standing in the assignment of words to parts of speech. 2) Interjections are part of the system of parts of speech, but they are treated separately within it. 3) Interjections are under the category of “particles of speech” [10;290] and are a member of the group of parts of speech, together with prepositions and conjunctions. Interjections are divided into three categories based on their semantic functions: “these are interjections that serve the areas of 1) emotions and emotional assessments, 2) expressions of will, and 3) etiquette (greetings, wishes, thanks, and apologies)”. So professor V.V. Vinogradov divides interjections into the following categories: those that express feelings or emotions (а!, ах!, ба!, ай!, ура!, эх!, уф!, ух!..); those that have a unique intonation and semantic possibilities (батюшки!, глупости!); Expletive interjections, vociferous

ЗАМОНАВИЙ ТИЛШУНОСЛИК ВА ТАРЖИМАШУНОСИЛИКНИНГ ДОЛЗАРБ МУАММОЛАРИ

interjections (господи!), interjective “verb forms” (прыг, скок), and words that express volitional expressions or motives (но!, вон!, прочь!, долой!, полно!.) are examples of interjections that represent an emotional characteristic or assessment of the state. Interjections can function as a sentence's member, equivalent, or modal component [10;735]. The option of using an interjection as a sentence component often occurs when it replaces a certain word form: “Она все ох да ох” (means she is unhappy) “Дела — увы и ах” (unfortunately, it is not gone happen!) [7; 735].

To summarize, we can say that interjections in both English and Russian are of tremendous research interest to linguists.

The conducted study of interjections, the analysis of semantic and structural features of interjections on the material of modern English and Russian languages allows us to draw a number of conclusions that: they are a heterogeneous syntactic class, illustrate rich semantic patterns that are often difficult to understand and consistently convey, and also have a tendency to phonological and morphological anomalies. The diverse combinability of the semantic features of specific classes of interjections creates a rather ramified system of classes, groups, subgroups and series of these units, functioning both in English and in Russian.

REFERENCES:

1. Ameka Felix. Interjections: The universal yet neglected part of speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18(2-3): 101–118. 1992a.
2. Bühler Karl. *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Stuttgart: Fischer. 1999[1934].
3. Gehweiler Elke. Interjections and expletives. In *Historical Pragmatics [Handbook of Pragmatics 8]*, Andreas Jucker & Irma Taavitsainen (eds.), 315–349. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 2010.
4. Norrick Neal R. Interjections. In *Pragmatics of Society*, Gisle Andersen & Karin Aijmer (eds.), 243–291. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 2011.
5. Nübling Damaris. Die prototypische Interjektion: Ein Definitionsvorschlag. *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 26(1-2): 11–46. 2004.
6. Stange Ulrike. *The Acquisition of Interjections in Early Childhood*. Hamburg: Diplomica. 2009.
7. Ulrike Stange *Emotive Interjections in British English A corpus-based study on variation in acquisition, function and usage*. John Benjamin publishing company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia. 218p. 2016
8. Wilkins David P. Interjections as deictics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18(2-3): 119–158pp. 1992.
9. Виноградов В.В. *Русский язык (грамматическое учение о слове): Учеб. пособие для вузов. 2-е изд., испр. М.: Высшая школа, 1972.*
10. Кручинина И.Н. Междометия // *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / Под ред. В.Н. Ярцевой. М., 1990.*
11. *Русская грамматика: В 2 т. Т. 1 / Под ред. Н.Ю. Шведовой. М.: Наука, 1980.*
12. Najmiddinova, M. R., & Jalolova, S. M. (2021). CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK PUNCTUATION RULES. *CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGICS*, 2(06), 1-5.
13. BALANCES, O. S. W. O. C. ROOTABLE LAYER IN EXPERIMENTAL PRODUCTION SECTIONS. *Ozatboy Bazarovich Imamnazarov, Tokhirjon Olimjonovich Qosimov, Makhammadali Rustamjonovich Abdullaev ISSN, 2349-0721.*
14. IMAMNAZAROV, O. B., QOSIMOV, T. O., & ABDULLAEV, M. R. (2020). Balances Of Soil Waters Of Cotton Rootable Layer In Experimental Production Sections. *International Journal of Innovations in Engineering Research and Technology*, 7(05), 318-321.
15. Jalolova, S. M., Otakulov, N. B., Urmonova, N. M., & Nazarova, D. O. (2022). MODERN METHODS AND TECHNOLOGIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 14(4).
16. Odilov, B., & Karimov, N. (2022). COVERAGE OF ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL TRADITIONS IN THE YEARS OF INDEPENDENCE IN ETHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH (ON THE EXAMPLE OF THE FERGANA VALLEY). *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 14(3).

ЗАМОНАВИЙ ТИЛШУНОСЛИК ВА ТАРЖИМАШУНОСИЛИКНИНГ ДОЛЗАРБ МУАММОЛАРИ

17. Имамназаров, О. Б. (1993). Регулирование мелиоративного режима при близком залегании слабоминерализованных грунтовых вод.