IDENTIFYING THE MAIN FEATURES OF ENGLISH SYNTAX AND THEIR IMPACT IN TEACHING SPEAKING

Abdurasulov Nazirjon, Abdurasulova Guljahon
EFL teachers of NamSU, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Taking into account the similarities and differences in the trends of the spoken style of a particular pair of languages is one of the key conditions for achieving a high degree of equivalence in translation. An attempt was made to systematize the most striking characteristic features of the syntax of colloquial Russian and English speech. To identify the main syntactic features of English and Russian colloquial speech.

Key words: *syntax, oral speech, Spoken language, language, communication*

Introduction

The problem of studying the syntax of colloquial speech is one of the most pressing problems of modern linguistics. Linguistics of oral speech as a field of linguistics received close attention of scientists only in the 60-70s of the twentieth century, since earlier oral speech was not considered an independent linguistic object, but only opposed to written speech as an irregular form of language. Spoken language is a type of language that is implemented mainly in oral form in a situation of unprepared, relaxed communication with the direct interaction of communication partners. The main sphere of implementation of colloquial speech is everyday everyday communication, which takes place in an informal setting.

Methodology

Colloquial speech and its place in the system of literary language is defined in different ways. Some researchers consider it as an oral variety as part of the literary language (O.A. Lapteva, 2003) or as a special style (O.B. Sirotinina, 1980). E.A. Zemskaya developed a theoretical concept according to which Russian colloquial speech, being an uncodified variety of literary language, is opposed to the literary language and differs from it both from the point of view of extralinguistic (conditions

of use) and from the point of view of language (specific system-structural properties). Recently, many linguists talk about socially conditioned changes that have affected the conditions for the implementation of different types of speech (official informal, personal public, prepared unprepared communication). So, the binary division of the communicative space into official and unofficial has become not so rigid. Recently, many linguists talk about socially conditioned changes that have affected the conditions for the implementation of different types of speech (official informal, personal public, prepared unprepared communication). So, the binary division of the communicative space into official and unofficial has become not so rigid. In recent years, the focus of research interest has shifted from the study of the systemic-structural features of spoken language to the analysis of its textual characteristics. This explains the special attention to the genre stratification of colloquial speech. Speech genres as types of texts are implemented in certain conditions and can be considered through the prism of the communicative situation and its participants. To characterize any communicative situation, its parameters such as space (the place where communication takes place), time, communication partners (their communicative roles - the talking listener, family, professional roles, the nature of their ratio on the scale "above" "below", the communicative goals of the speaker and the listener, etc.) are important. Situational theme (for example, "Awakening", "Lunch", "Family Holiday", "Shop", "Transport", etc.). Each of the parameters of the situation has an impact on the genre choice of the speaker. (Bakhtin, 1979, 65-68

Result

As it is known, oral spoken language is unprepared and involves an informal situation. As a result, a characteristic feature of the spoken style is the violation of the norms of the codified language. In addition, not all frequency lexical units and grammatical structures of the written literary language are used in colloquial speech. Thus, V.V. Buzarov notes that complex view-time structures (Future Perfect Continuous, Future Perfect) are never used in a colloquial style. As for the

wordposition, in colloquial speech, the direct order of words in the interrogative sentence is often preserved:

'You've made a sale?' (R.Bach)

You heard the horn-blowing? (J.R.R.Tolkien. The Lord of the Rings)

Another trend in English colloquial syntax is the use of verb verb constructions consisting of a verb with a broad meaning (have, take, give, do, make) and a noun with an indefinite article. Such phrases are more common in colloquial speech than synonymous intransitive verbs. ou heard the horn-blowing? (J.R.R.Tolkien. The Lord of the Rings).

Thus, verbs in phrases such as He ate / He swam / He shaved give way to the constructions described above: He had a meal/a swim/a shave. In American English, the verb "take" is used in such cases. (Buzarov, 1998, 84-85).

Like to have a look at them? (P.G.Wodehouse)

V.V. Buzarov notes that one of the characteristics of the English colloquial style is the widespread use of the verb "get" in all the variety of its meanings.

In addition, in spoken English, there is a pronounced tendency to use phrasal verbs instead of synonymous single-part lexical units (cf. give in - surrender, find out - discover, break down - collapse). By combining the most common verbs with 16 basic adverb particles (the most productive are "up", "down", "out" and "off"), it is possible to express a large number of meanings using a limited number of lexemes. E.A. Trofimova distinguishes the following types of elliptical constructions in English:

Sentences with a null subject, expressed by a personal pronoun or introducing "it":

Got some rope - have been told. Promise you - have been true. (C.Cobain).

Had to ead my dinner there. Had mashed potatoes and stuff like that. Couldn't chew my meat too good. (C.Cobain). In all the examples given, the personal pronoun "I" is omitted.

Conclusion

The systemic nature of colloquial speech allows us to talk about the existence of a certain system of norms in it. A feature of colloquial norms is their high variability,

for example, the possibility of using different types of nominations to designate the same object: a can opener - what to open; to be enraged - to go mad - to lose it - to run amuck. To be knowledgeable language teachers, profound understanding on what is being taught is of paramount importance. Therefore, the comprehension of syntax and syntactic characteristics of the language being taught is inevitably beneficial, in terms of the quality of the teaching materials and teaching activity. Teachers should realize that teaching a language is not only about the   methodology or the media, but it is also about the language itself. Understanding that studying   syntax is a salient part of being a competent language teacher should be emphasized, especially in   language education departments.

REFERENCES

Abad, J.V. & Alzate, P.A. (2016). Strategies instruction to improve the preparation for English oral exams. PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 18(1), 129–147. Doi: https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v18n1.49592

Adger, D. (2019). Language unlimited. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Askia, S. & Manurung, K. (2016). Improving speaking skills through active learning strategy of the year   eight students. E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society, 4(2), 1-13.

Bigelow, M. & Ranney, S. (2010). Knowledge about language for teachers is more than knowing grammar rules. Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics , 3(1), 217-228. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/shll- 2010-1070

 Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.Gelderen, E. van (Ed.). (2016).   Cyclical change continued . Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing   Company.Gunada,

Hardiah, M. (2019). Improving students listening skill by using audio visual media.   Al-Lughah: Jurnal   Bahasa, 7(2),   39-49. Doi: https://doi.org/10.29300/lughah.v7i2.1673

Jackendoff, R. (1997). The architecture of the language faculty. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jones, P.T., & Chen, H. (2012). Teachers' knowledge about language: Issues of Pedagogy and Expertise.   Research Online, 35(1), 147-168