OCCURRENCE TYPES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF NON-LITERARY LEXICAL ELEMENTS IN ANONYMOUS LETTERS

Sevara Yoqubova,
Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, PhD
TSPU in the name of Nizomi

ANNOTATION

In linguistics, non-literary lexical elements are studied in the lexicon with a limited scope of use. A number of studies have been conducted on the linguistic nature of the lexemes of this group. The issue of the concept of non-literary lexical element, its role and importance is relevant in linguistic expertise. In the article, the non-literary lexical element, its importance, as well as factors related to its occurrence in speech are shown on the basis of examples.

Key words: non-literary lexicon, literary norm, linguistic expertise, communicative purpose, anonymous letter.

INTRODUCTION

Any speech has common aspects. At the same time, it also shows its own individuality and uniqueness. In linguistic expertise, the identification of specific factors and the classification of linguistic features are of great importance in the organization of linguistic expertise and the formation of expert conclusions. The individual aspects of the person are clearly visible in the manuscripts. However, it is a rather difficult and complicated process to determine the characteristic factors of speech in conflicting texts in printed form, and to find the author of anonymous letters. For this reason, determining the characteristics of speech according to age characteristics of a person requires a special approach in linguistic expertise.

The type of personal correspondence includes various handwritten letters, sms-notifications, messages of social networks and telegram, whats up, viber messengers. In addition, various comments serve as an object of analysis in linguistic expertise. In any type of anonymous letters, there are signs that represent certain characteristics of a person. These signs are clearly reflected in the use of lexical elements in a person's speech. The factors and characteristics of the use of non-literary lexical elements in anonymous letters also serve to clarify the issue of text authorization in linguistic expertise.

One of the English researchers T.B. Jay (1981) points out that non-literary lexical items can be used in each speaker's discourse and differ from each other in pragmatic terms. In Jay's studies, non-literary elements are divided into the following types:

- Cursing;
- Blasphemy of an atheistic character;
- Profanity
- Taboos;
- Vulgarisms;
- Expletives

All types of non-literary lexical elements (insults, vulgarisms, cursing, slang words, etc.) are part of any language[1]. According to researchers P. Brown and S. Levinson, the use of lexical elements in speech that contradict moral standards depends on cultural and personal characteristics[2]. According to E. Goffman, interpersonal communication is considered the main tool that motivates the use of non-literary lexical elements. In this situation, the speaker uses such words according to his social background, and in most cases he uses cursing, cursing, insulting words as a means of protection against threats.[3]. Beebe Leslie says that non-literary lexical elements are not used intentionally in people's speech. According to him, the use of such elements is carried out in connection with the increase of negative emotions[4]. By Locher and Watt, the use of non-literary lexical elements is based on the dependence of the means of influence on the interaction of the addressee and the addressee[5]. Casper evaluates the coefficient of influence of a certain non-literary lexical element on a person and puts forward the opinion that in fact any word depends on how it is perceived by the addressee. In order to justify his opinion, he gives examples of children and people who do not know a foreign language well. Children do not take a bad word in a negative sense. They can respond to such words only when they are old enough to understand the meaning of that word. Even a person learning a foreign language does not understand the essence of the word used against him.

In the above-mentioned studies, the main attention is paid to the communicative purpose of the use of insults, cursing, and vulgarisms among non-literary elements. Of course, the speech situation and communicative purpose also play a leading role in the use of non-literary lexical elements. However, non-literary lexical elements are not limited to the above units. Among these, there are also slang and slang units, dialectisms. The usage of non-literary lexical elements is different. The use of these elements is directly related to the pragmatic situation of communicants' speech. According to researcher Bebeb, the use of non-literary elements, especially vulgar elements, depends on the addresser's strategy. That is, the speaker's facial expressions and voice tempo are also taken into account. If the tempo of aggression is felt in a person's voice and facial expressions express the same situation, then it means that he has a rude attitude towards the addressee.

The characteristics of the use of non-literary elements in oral speech can be determined depending on the pragmatic content direction of the communicant's speech. In written speech, this creates some complications. The reason is that it is impossible to determine what state the communicator's facial expressions and voice tempo are in written speech. Also, slang, slang, barbarism, vulgarism, dialectisms are mixed in personal correspondence. Their use in different age groups also differs from each other. Usually, the non-literary elements used in

[1]Foote R. & Woodward J. A preliminary investigation of obscene language // Journal of Psychology, 83, 1973. – P. 263-275.

[2]Brown Penelope and Stephen Levinson. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978. – P. 156-167

[3]Goffman Erving. Interaction Ritual. Pantheon. – New York, 1967. – P. 190-201.

[4]Beebe Leslie. Polite fictions: Instrumental rudeness as pragmatic competence. In Linguistics and the Education of Language Teachers: Ethnolinguistic, Psycholinguistic, and Sociolinguistic aspects. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1995, James Alatis, Carolyn Straehle, Maggie Ronkin, and Brent Gallenberger (eds.), 154168. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

[5]Locher Miriam and Richard Watts. Politeness theory and relational work // Journal of Politeness Research 1: 933, 2005. – P. 225-232.

oral speech are not chosen with a certain plan. They are related to the emotional state of the speaker.

Two different features are observed in the use of non-literary elements in personal letters. First, non-literary elements are used involuntarily according to the emotional state of the speaker's speech. Secondly, it is expressed in a planned and controlled situation. Both are important in linguistic expertise. The second case is usually done intentionally in anonymous letters to mask the communicative purpose. The use of non-literary elements can be understood as the final products of neurological, psychological and socio-cultural processes[6].

English linguist Timoy Jay develops a model of the use of non-literary units in speech. According to him, non-literary units in human speech are related to neurological, psychological and socio-cultural factors. Timothy Jay's model is called NPS (Neurological, psychological, social-cultural), and in his research he analyzes the contexts of the use of various non-literary units by people. According to the scientist's approach, the final form of any vulgar content (mainly cursing, insults, swearing) depends on the psychological development of the speaker and the social context in which he operates. NPS theory explains why a person may use a nonliteral unit in one context but not another. According to NPS theory, profanity, cursing, and cursing are never disordered, unintelligible, or random behaviors—they are purposeful and rule-governed[7].

In fact, the theory of NPS, as stated by Timothy Jay, has a broad meaning. However, as the scientist noted, the purposeful and rule-based non-literary units with rough content are somewhat controversial. According to the theory of NPS, psychological factors also affect the use of non-literary units, so psychological disorders are included in them. Usually, people who have experienced strong psychological crises and neurological diseases do not always have a purposeful speech. Also, the speech of such people will not have a pragmatic program according to the speech situation. As the product of involuntary psychological changes and attacks, self-applied crude non-literary units cannot be called "purposive and rule-based" as Timothy Jay points out.

In fact, the neurological feature also played a leading role in the use of non-literary elements. Neurological factors include neurobiology related to emotional states associated with the use of nonliterary elements. According to E. Kensinger and S. Corkin, the use of vulgarisms from non-literary elements is related to the language processing process in the left cerebral hemisphere, as well as the emotional state of the right cerebral hemisphere. The frequency of use of non-literary elements is caused by the speech characteristic of social inconsistency in the cognitive control area of the brain (ventral and prefrontal cortex). Of course, the use of non-literary elements in these comments is shown to be in accordance with neurological factors. The result of changes in the brain is reflected in speech. Neurological factors are closely related to the use of non-literary units. In fact, this process can also be the basis for determining the specific features of the use of a certain non-literary element. Manifestation of neurological factors is evident in the manuscripts. In the case of printed texts, it is a little more difficult to determine.

---

[6]Jay T.B. Why We Curse. – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000. – 270 p.
[7] Jay T.B. Why We Curse. – Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2000. – P. 14.

The psychological characteristics of the use of non-literary elements are related to the mental state of a person and to a large extent related to his experience in the process of growing up. The psychological nature of the use of non-literary elements is related to anger, form of belief, gender identity, verbal aggression, adolescence. The use of non-literary elements is influenced by sociopragmatic factors such as the topic of the conversation, the relationship between the addressee and the addressee, gender and territorial identity, profession, age.

If we pay attention to the opinions expressed by researchers above, we can see that in the characteristics of the use of non-literary elements, more emphasis is placed on the connection with negative emotions. However, as a result of our observations and research, the use of non-literary elements can be associated with positive emotions. In this, the communicative goal of the addressee played a key role.

In conclusion, it can be said that the study of psychological, neurological, sociopragmatic features of personal correspondence helps to determine the communicative purpose of the author, the pragmatic direction of the speech. In addition, the use of non-literary elements in personal correspondence is directly related to the speech situation. Also, the use of non-literary elements in the speech of communicants can be associated with positive or negative emotions.

REFERENSES

1. Jay T.B. (1992). Cursing in America. Philadelphia: John Benjamins
2. Foote, R, & Woodward, J. (1973). A preliminary investigation of obscene language. Journal of Psychology, 83, 263-275
3. Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson (1987 [1978]). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Goffman, Erving (1967). Interaction Ritual. Pantheon: New York
5. Beebe, Leslie (1995). Polite fictions: Instrumental rudeness as pragmatic competence. In Linguistics and the Education of Language Teachers: Ethnolinguistic, Psycholinguistic, and Sociolinguistic aspects. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1995, James Alatis, Carolyn Straehle, Maggie Ronkin, and Brent Gallenberger (eds.), 154168. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press
6. Jay, Timothy B. (2000).Why We Curse. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
7. Kensinger, Elizabeth and Suzanne Corkin (2004). Two routes to emotional memory: Distinct neural process for valence and arousal. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences101: 33103315
8. Kensinger, Elizabeth and Suzanne Corkin (2004). Two routes to emotional memory: Distinct neural process for valence and arousal. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences101: 3310331
9. Grafman J., K. Schwab, D. Warden, A. Pridgen, H. R. Brown, A. Salazar (1996). Frontal lobe injuries, violence, and aggression: A report of the Vietnam Head Injury Study.Neurology46: 12311238
10. Locher Miriam and Richard Watts. Politeness theory and relational work // Journal of Politeness Research 1: 933, 2005. – P. 225-232.