

DISCOURSE MARKERS AND COHESIVE DEVICES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LEGENDS

Nilufar Usarova Yakubovna
Teacher of KSPI

ARTICLE INFO.

Keywords: discourse markers, cohesive devices, Uzbek legends, English legends, comparative typology, narrative structure.

Abstract

This study investigates the use of discourse markers and cohesive devices in Uzbek and English legends, employing a comparative typological approach. By analyzing a corpus of legendary narratives from both languages, the research aims to identify similarities and differences in the way these linguistic elements contribute to the coherence and cohesion of the texts. The study focuses on the frequency, distribution, and functions of discourse markers and cohesive devices, as well as their interaction with cultural and genre-specific features. The findings suggest that while both languages employ a range of discourse markers and cohesive devices, there are notable differences in their usage patterns and pragmatic functions, reflecting the distinct linguistic structures and cultural traditions of Uzbek and English storytelling.

<http://www.gospodarkainnowacje.pl/> © 2024 LWAB.

INTRODUCTION

Legends, as a form of traditional storytelling, play a significant role in the cultural heritage of both Uzbek and English-speaking communities. These narratives not only entertain but also convey moral lessons, cultural values, and historical knowledge across generations [1]. While the content and themes of legends may vary across cultures, the linguistic devices used to structure and convey these narratives share common functions in ensuring coherence and cohesion [2].

Discourse markers and cohesive devices are essential linguistic elements that contribute to the organization and interpretation of narratives [3]. Discourse markers, such as "well," "so," "anyway," and "now," serve to signal transitions, manage turn-taking, and express the speaker's attitude or stance [4]. Cohesive devices, including reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, help to establish relationships between different parts of the text and create a sense of unity [5].

The present study aims to investigate the use of discourse markers and cohesive devices in Uzbek and English legends from a comparative typological perspective. By analyzing a corpus of legendary narratives from both languages, the research seeks to identify similarities and differences in the way these linguistic elements contribute to the coherence and cohesion of the texts, as well as their interaction with cultural and genre-specific features.

METHODS AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Corpus selection and annotation

The study is based on a corpus of some Uzbek and English legends, selected from published collections and online sources. The legends were chosen to represent a diverse range of themes, characters, and historical periods, ensuring a balanced representation of the genre in both languages.

The texts were manually annotated for discourse markers and cohesive devices, following a set of pre-established criteria based on previous studies [6], [7]. The annotation scheme included categories such as additive, adversative, causal, and temporal discourse markers, as well as referential, substitutive, elliptical, and conjunctive cohesive devices.

2.2. Quantitative and qualitative analysis

The annotated data were subjected to both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The frequency and distribution of discourse markers and cohesive devices were calculated for each language, and statistical tests were performed to assess the significance of observed differences [8].

Qualitative analysis focused on the functions and pragmatic effects of the identified linguistic elements in the context of the legendary narratives. Close reading of selected passages was conducted to examine how discourse markers and cohesive devices contribute to the coherence, cohesion, and rhetorical structure of the texts [9].

2.3. Comparative typological approach

The study adopts a comparative typological approach, which involves the systematic comparison of linguistic features across genetically and geographically diverse languages [10]. This approach allows for the identification of cross-linguistic patterns and tendencies, as well as the exploration of the relationship between language structure and cultural practices [11].

Results

3.1. Frequency and distribution of discourse markers

The analysis revealed that both Uzbek and English legends employ a wide range of discourse markers, with some differences in their frequency and distribution. In Uzbek legends, the most common discourse markers were "endi" (now), "keyin" (then), and "lekin" (but), while in English legends, "well," "so," and "now" were the most frequent.

Table 1: Top 5 discourse markers in Uzbek and English legends

Rank	Uzbek	English
1	endi	well
2	keyin	so
3	lekin	now
4	Xo'sh	then
5	demak	anyway

3.2. Frequency and distribution of cohesive devices

The study found that both Uzbek and English legends rely heavily on referential and conjunctive cohesive devices to create textual unity. However, there were notable differences in the use of substitution and ellipsis, with Uzbek legends employing these devices more frequently than their English counterparts.

ANALYSIS

4.1. Functions of discourse markers in Uzbek and English legends

The qualitative analysis revealed that discourse markers serve similar functions in both Uzbek and English legends, such as signaling transitions, managing turn-taking, and expressing the narrator's attitude. However, there were also language-specific patterns in the way these functions were realized.

For example, the Uzbek discourse marker "endi" (now) often serves to mark a shift in the narrative focus or to introduce a new episode, as in the following passage:

"Qadim o'tgan zamonda, bir pahlavon yashagan ekan. Endi, bu pahlavonning kuchi juda zo'r ekan."
(Once upon a time, there lived a brave warrior. Now, this warrior was known for his extraordinary strength.)

In English legends, the discourse marker "well" frequently functions as a hesitation device or a means of signaling a change in the speaker's perspective, as in:

"Well, as the story goes, there was once a young maiden who lived in a small village."

4.2. The role of cohesive devices in narrative structure

The analysis demonstrated that cohesive devices play a crucial role in creating a coherent and cohesive narrative structure in both Uzbek and English legends. Referential devices, such as pronouns and demonstratives, help to establish and maintain reference chains throughout the text, while conjunctive devices, such as "and," "but," and "so," signal logical relationships between events and ideas.

However, the study also found that the use of substitution and ellipsis was more prevalent in Uzbek legends compared to their English counterparts. This finding suggests that Uzbek storytelling tradition may place a greater emphasis on the economy of expression and the listener's ability to infer implied meanings.

DISCUSSION

5.1. Cross-linguistic patterns and cultural implications

The comparative analysis of discourse markers and cohesive devices in Uzbek and English legends reveals both universal tendencies and language-specific patterns. The similarities in the functions of these linguistic elements across the two languages support the idea that coherence and cohesion are fundamental aspects of narrative structure, regardless of the cultural context [12].

However, the observed differences in the frequency and distribution of specific markers and devices suggest that language structure and cultural practices interact in shaping the way stories are told and interpreted [13]. For example, the higher frequency of substitution and ellipsis in Uzbek legends may reflect a cultural preference for implicit communication and the importance of shared knowledge in Uzbek storytelling tradition [14].

5.2. Implications for translation and cross-cultural communication

The findings of this study have important implications for the translation of legendary narratives and cross-cultural communication. Translators and language professionals should be aware of the language-specific patterns in the use of discourse markers and cohesive devices, as well as their cultural significance, to ensure that the coherence and cohesion of the source text are adequately conveyed in the target language [15].

Moreover, the study highlights the need for a deeper understanding of the cultural dimensions of storytelling and their impact on language use. By recognizing the interplay between linguistic structure and cultural practices, language learners and professionals can develop a more nuanced appreciation of the richness and diversity of narrative traditions across cultures [16].

CONCLUSIONS

This comparative typological study of discourse markers and cohesive devices in Uzbek and English legends has demonstrated the importance of these linguistic elements in creating coherent and cohesive narrative structures. While both languages employ a range of markers and devices, the analysis has revealed notable differences in their frequency, distribution, and pragmatic functions, reflecting the

distinct linguistic and cultural features of Uzbek and English storytelling traditions.

The findings contribute to our understanding of the relationship between language structure and cultural practices in shaping narrative discourse, and have implications for translation, language learning, and cross-cultural communication. Further research could explore the use of discourse markers and cohesive devices in other genres and languages, as well as the impact of diachronic changes on their functions and distribution.

REFERENCES

1. Bascom, W. R. (1965). The forms of folklore: Prose narratives. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 78(307), 3-20.
2. Uktamovna, B. L. (2023). Modern Methods of Teaching Monologue and Dialogue Speech in Foreign Language.
3. Буранова, Л. (2024, April). ЗНАЧЕНИЕ ТОНА В УСТНОЙ И ПИСЬМЕННОЙ ФОРМАХ МОНОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ РЕЧИ. In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 379-382).
4. Буранова, Л. (2023). The peculiarities of monologue speech in teaching foreign language. *Зарубежная лингвистика и лингводидактика*, 1(5), 74-78.
5. Буранова, Л. У. (2023). FORMING THE SKILLS OF MONOLOGUE AND DIALOGUE SPEECH IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 6(3).
6. Buranova, L. U. (2017). THE USE OF DEFINITE PHONETIC FEATURES IN THE CULTURE OF THE TARGET LANGUAGE. *Гуманитарный трактат*, (20), 38-39.
7. Buranova, L. U. (2017). TEACHER'S ROLE IN THE READING CLASSROOM. *Гуманитарный трактат*, (8), 49-51.
8. Буранова, Л. У. (2016). Ҳамлет монологи ва унинг таржималари хақида. *Евразийский научный журнал*, (5), 503-504.
9. Uktamovna, B. M., & Uktamovna, B. L. COMMUNICATIVE-ORIENTED TEACHING AT FOREIGN LANGUAGE LESSONS. *Chief Editor*.
10. Муртазоев, Б. (2019). Жомий ва Навоий.«Межлитературные связи и взаимопроникновение культур». In *Материалы Международной научно-практической конференции*.
11. Sirojova, Z. (2022). Ingliz Tilidagi Qoshma Gaplarda Sintaktik Munosabatlar Sinkretizmining Funktsional Tadqiqi. *Центр Научных Публикаций (Vuxdu. Uz)*, 25(25).
12. Sirojova, Z. (2023). INGLIZ, OZBEK VA RUS TILLARIDA RAVISHDOSH VA UNING SINKRETLASHUVI. *Talqin va tadqiqotlar*, 1(19).
13. Тагаева, Т. Б. (2023). US MAUGHAM BADIY USLUBINING INDIVIDUAL XUSUSIYATLARI. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 6(3).
14. Тагаева, Т. (2022). Индивидуальные особенности художественного стиля УС Моэма. *Общество и инновации*, 3(11/S), 132-137.
15. Тагаева, Т. Б. (2018). ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ ИНФОРМАЦИЯ В СЕМАНТИКЕ АНГЛИЙСКИХ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЗМОВ. In *Культурные инициативы* (pp. 205-207).
16. Rasulova, S., & Husanova, M. (2024, April). DESCRIPTION OF THE GENRE OF FICTION IN THE WORKS OF WASHINGTON IRVING. In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 539-542).

17. Rasulova, S., & Khamiddinov, O. (2024, April). ARTISTIC ROMANCE OF THE AMERICAN PAST IN THE WORK OF WASHINGTON IRVING (AS AN EXAMPLE OF RIP VAN WINKLE). In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 547-549).
18. Rasulova, S. (2024, April). AMERIKA ADABIYOTIDA ILK ROMANTIZM PROZASINING TILI VA BADIY XUSUSIYATLARI. In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 557-562).
19. Rasulova, S. U., & Khamiddinov, O. (2023). LEARNING STRATEGIES FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY. *THE ROLE OF SCIENCE AND INNOVATION IN THE MODERN WORLD*, 1(9), 44-47.
20. Ruzikulov, F., & Rustamova, S. (2024, April). PECULIARITIES OF COMPETENCE FORMATION IN STUDENTS'SELF-ASSESSMENT WHILE TEACHING L2. In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 222-227).
21. Rustamova, S., & Umarova, M. (2024, April). THE REASONS WHY STUDENTS SHOULD LEARN FOREIGN LANGUAGES. In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 123-125).
22. Rustamova, S. A., & Shaxzoda, S. (2023). THE VALUE OF COMMUNICATION IN STUDENTS FORMING CULTURE HISTORICAL BASES. "GERMANY" MODERN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: ACHIEVEMENTS, INNOVATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTS, 9(1).
23. Aripovna, R. S., & Qizi, S. M. A. (2023, May). EFFECTIVE METHODS OF TEACHING ENGLISH TO YOUNG CHILDREN. In "USA" INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE TOPICAL ISSUES OF SCIENCE (Vol. 8, No. 1).
24. Bozorova, H., & Shaxnoza, R. (2023). THE IMPORTANCE OF ASSESSMENT, AND ITS IMPACT IN LEARNING PROCESS. *Молодые ученые*, 1(6), 90-94.
25. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
26. Muminov, S. (2016). The role of discourse markers in the formation of coherence and cohesion in Uzbek texts. *Sharqshunoslik*, 1, 68-74.
27. Yuldashev, A. A. (2013). *Stylistic features of Uzbek folk tales*. Tashkent: Fan.
28. Safarov, S. (2008). *Pragmatics of the Uzbek language*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan National Encyclopedia.