

COLLOQUIAL SPEECH AS A SPECIAL LANGUAGE SUBSYSTEM

KUCHSHANOVA A.N.^{1*} , EKICI M.² , TOLEGENOVA G.G.¹ 

*Kuchshanova Ainur Nuraslovna¹ – PhD, K.Zhubanov Aktobe regional university, Aktobe, Kazakhstan.

E-mail: ainur.kuchshanova@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1730-2032>

Ekici Metin² – PhD, Professor, Ege university, Izmir, Turkey

E-mail: metin.ekici@ege.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9400-8462>

Tolegenova Gulmira Ganibetovna¹ – Master of arts, K.Zhubanov Aktobe regional university, Aktobe, Kazakhstan.

E-mail: gtolegenova85@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1061-6538>

Abstract. Colloquial speech is a kind of language that is realized mainly orally in a situation of unprepared, relaxed communication with the direct interaction of communication partners. The main sphere of implementation of colloquial speech is everyday communication, taking place in an informal setting. The problem of studying the syntax of colloquial speech is one of the most pressing problems of modern linguistics. The linguistics of oral speech as a field of linguistics received the close attention of scientists, since earlier oral speech was not considered an independent linguistic object, but was only opposed to written speech as an irregular form of language. An important requirement of language proficiency culture is the requirement to distinguish between its functional varieties, to use any of them freely, clearly knowing which of the varieties of language should be chosen in accordance with the tasks of communication. One of the fundamental differences between a non-literary form of language such as spoken language and a literary language is that in most cases the varieties of the language are difficult to distinguish.

Key words: colloquial speech, modern linguistics, syntactic properties, linguistic and extralinguistic processes, culture of speech.

Introduction

The definition of colloquial speech and its role within the broader literary language framework varies. The aim of studying this issue is to investigate colloquial speech as special language subsystem, identifying its linguistic features and functions as well as its role relationship with standard literary language. Special attention is paid communicative functions of informal speech in social interaction. The article explores the social and cultural factors that influence the formation and development of colloquial language.

Some scholars view it as a spoken form of the literary language or a distinct style. E.A. Zemskaya proposed a theoretical model where informal speech, being uncoded, stands in contrast to the coded literary language. This distinction arises from both external factors (how it's used) and internal linguistic characteristics (its unique systemic and structural traits) [1, 19]. Therefore, the coded colloquial linguistics and non-formal speech are performed as two cross-connected parts of the colloquial language, their use shown by communication context. The coded language is employed in formal establishments (both individual and social), while non-formal speech is stated for instant individual communication.

More recently, some linguists have highlighted how public shifts influence the contexts in which different speech types are used. This has led to a less rigid difference between formal and non-formal communication. Moreover, the connections between functional domains have become diffused, resulting in the percolation of non-formal language into public discourse, media, and an increased adoption of foreign word-stock.

Many linguistic peculiarities of non-formal speech are a direct consequence of its clear interconnection to the urgent situation, which contributes to the frequent use of omissions in informal speech. A communicative exchange in informal speech is marked by a strong interplay between spoken words and non-verbal cues. Various paralinguistic signs, when integrated into the context, can effectively substitute for explicit linguistic expressions. The intimate relation between spoken language and body language communication suggests a dynamic interaction between sign and oral grammar.

Recently, research has shifted from studying the structure of spoken language to studying its

perception in the form of text. This is why interest in various types of informal conversations has increased. Speech types, seen as different text forms, show up in certain situations. You can check them out by looking at who's talking and why. To explain any talk situation, some things are key: where it happens, when, who's there (like if they're family or coworkers, who's in charge, and what they want to say), and what they're talking about. Each thing changes how someone picks what to say. Casual speech means how people talk when they're just chatting without a script, mainly to get their point across.

Materials and methods of research

Academic discourse identifies two primary methods of investigating colloquial speech. One method focuses on the core of colloquial language as a self-contained system. The other method examines this core in relation to its periphery, other literary language variations and non-literary colloquial forms. We argue that the latter interactive approach is more useful for studying spoken language given its inherent link with other speech modalities. Colloquial elements are often used to mimic spoken language in both journalistic and artistic writing, particularly in styles designed to be persuasive. In such instances, conversational word order conventions are often used.

The dialogue found in both dramatic and literary texts is often viewed as a representation of everyday conversational speech. However, this interpretation is somewhat flawed, as the written medium can only partially capture the subtleties inherent in spoken language; thus, the concept of stylization is more fitting in this context. Authors often struggle to replicate every facet of verbal communication in their writing. V.V. Vinogradov observes that what is referred to as spoken language in literary contexts is distinguished by specific markers and indicators, rather than merely mirroring actual spoken exchanges [2]. Moreover, the elements of conversation may differ notably between various authors. The abstraction of informal language, often identified as colloquial, further influences perceptions regarding word choices. A comprehensive analysis of literary texts shows that a single author might employ diverse techniques to represent colloquial dialogue, mirroring their distinct stylistic inclinations.

In literature, the author's imaginative prowess is crucial in shaping the literary creation. The language utilized in this verbal artistry is imbued with expressive, personalized, and emotive linguistic features that engage a broad spectrum of human cognitive and emotional experiences, including thoughts, aspirations, and imaginative contemplations. The intricate composition of a literary work - which encompasses imagery, structure, and language - functions as a medium for stylistic expression and aligns with a specific artistic framework that reflects the ideological and metaphorical core of the piece [3, 52]. Language, as a formal component of literature, operates within an overarching style that influences its artistic presentation. Consequently, the variety of speech styles and the encompassing stylistic framework manifest an aesthetic and artistic system that embodies the broader principles of art as a distinctive representation of social consciousness. The genre of a literary piece is closely linked to its stylistic design.

The development of literature as an artistic medium significantly shapes the characteristics and evolution of literary style. The conventions that define such styles are grounded in essential literary principles and components. Academic studies of fictional language reveal a multitude of stylistic influences, encompassing themes, key concepts, character depictions, authorial voice, genre distinctions, and dominant literary movements [4, 121].

Ordinary speech operates under its own set of conventions. A notable feature of spoken language norms is their flexibility, as shown by the existence of multiple expressions conveying the same idea - such as «opener» compared to «something that needs to be opened». Likewise, intense anger can be conveyed through various phrases, including «to be furious», «to go crazy», «to lose one's temper», or «to go nuts».

A key attribute of colloquial norms is their non-absolute nature. They are not universally compulsory, permitting alternative expressions that maintain an informal tone while ensuring clarity. Colloquial language represents spontaneous literary communication in casual environments, characterized by direct engagement and adapted to fulfill practical communicative needs. The distinctiveness of colloquial language is so pronounced that some scholars argue it operates as an

independent system, separate from standard linguistic frameworks, often referred to as «folk» language. Regardless of the acceptance of this perspective, it is evident that colloquial language possesses traits that differentiate it from formal, codified linguistic forms.

The overall conceptual framework, which represents the apex of the system, permeates every level of the structure. However, for some readers, fully grasping this ultimate level may be challenging. Understanding the author's viewpoint is generally more accessible when rooted in the factual basis of the text—such as character motivations and plot progression—while it can become more complicated when evaluated solely through stylistic and linguistic characteristics. In such instances, linguistic tools offer only indirect insights into the author's stance. As a consequence, the perception of style may bring to light certain creative linguistic features that deviate from the work's entirety. Embracing a sequential and analytical perspective on style as part of an interconnected system allows for a deeper investigation of its psychological aspects. The concept of «literary imagination», introduced by aesthetician M.S. Kagan, systematically explores and defines its scope and application. M.S. Kagan posited that artists construct an additional layer of illusions, which are intellectual processes designed to elicit specific responses from readers, viewers, or listeners. This functions akin to a program engineered to influence the individual engaging with the artwork [5, 128].

The inherent communicative nature of text, its capacity to generate speech, and its functional role as a service underscore its identity as fundamentally a speech phenomenon. G.A. Zolotova categorizes texts (or speech registers) into five types based on their linguistic structure and the narrator's (writer's) communicative intent: reproductive (visual), informative, generative (information accumulation) – typical of monologues, and volitional and reactive-dialogic [6, 61].

Results and its discussion

Colloquial speech has its own ways of naming objects, signs or actions. The close cohesion of colloquial utterances with a communicative act generates a special type of names, called «the name of the situation». Behind such one-word nominations used by the speaker, there is a whole complex of meanings that is understandable to the interlocutor, «included» in the situation, but remains unclear to the rest, «uninitiated», and requires comment. The speech signal of the name of the situation is an unusual combination of words in the text: Have we changed our mind about skiing? (they changed their minds about discussing the details of the ski trip). Many book words and expressions often have correspondences in the spoken language, similar in meaning, but related to a more reduced lexical layer: resuming in nature - like, reach a decision - decide, announced himself to be in favor of - said he favored.

When studying the syntax of spoken language, linguists face a number of difficulties. Many linguists believe that there is no such unit as a sentence in colloquial speech and rely on such a criterion as intonation, highlighting the utterance as the main communicative unit. An utterance is a syntactic unit of colloquial speech, which usually consists of a single phrase [7, 64]. However, in colloquial speech, the phenomenon of parceling is possible - splitting one utterance into several phrases with the help of a lowering intonation: *I'll come to you // by all means // tomorrow evening*. Facts of this kind are considered as one statement consisting of several phrases. Another problem in the study of colloquial speech is the fact that it, as a rule, does not function in writing. Nevertheless, it is widely reflected in fiction, where it is used to create a certain stylistic effect. However, such syntactic structures are modeled in advance, while oral colloquial speech is spontaneous.

The oral form of the functioning of colloquial speech explains many of its syntactic features. Therefore, complicated types of communication are not typical for her. In general, colloquial speech is characterized by simpler means of expressing certain meanings than in a codified language. When analyzing the features of the syntax of colloquial speech, it is necessary to take into account the fact that in English the word order in a sentence is fixed. The actual division of a sentence is expressed mainly by word order. In English, rhema can be expressed primarily by using an indefinite article, in a sentence - by setting communicatively significant components at the end of a phrase. However, the latter statement is true only in relation to the written language. In oral speech, the opposite trend is observed: the core of the utterance is at the beginning and stands out intonationally.

In colloquial utterances, some grammatically and semantically necessary components often turn out to be non-verbalized. Their absence is compensated by the presence of a certain situation common to the participants of the discourse. Thus, verbal ellipsis does not interfere with mutual understanding of the interlocutors. E.A. Zemskaya calls statements of this type constructions with unsupported syntactic positions [1]. In linguistics, the term «ellipsis» is most often used to refer to three phenomena: significant absence of a syntactic construction member. («null» term or «syntactic zero»): *My brother is a student*. Omission of one or another member of the syntactic construction available in the context (contextual ellipsis): *The boy got a scooter, and the girl got a doll*. The missing member is understood unambiguously, since it is given in context. The absence of one or another member of the construction, clear from the consituation (constitutive ellipsis): *Show me the red ones*. Constructions of this kind are understandable only under certain conditions.

The constitutive ellipsis is mainly considered, since this phenomenon is specific to colloquial speech. Colloquial speech has its own norms of word arrangement, which are closely related primarily to the features of the actual articulation of the utterance. One of the most important trends regulating the order of words in an utterance is the tendency to bring the most important component into the preposition communicatively. Spontaneity, unpreparedness of colloquial speech, the linear nature of its construction lead to the fact that the utterance is created on the principle of free associative attachment of its parts. As a result, semantically and grammatically related phrases often turn out to be disconnected, while the most significant word is placed at the beginning: *Have you seen my hat? Good job, this*.

Colloquial speech has a specific type of connection of two predicative constructions into one utterance - the connection of a free connection. The semantic relations formed on the basis of free connection connections are very diverse: *Where was my wallet lying here? What kind of show did you say would be on TV today? Have you been there a lot of mosquitoes?* So-called chains of simple sentences are typical for English colloquial speech, while there are usually no connecting elements: *Came home late. Had supper and went to bed. Couldn't sleep, of course*.

Thus, the syntactic properties of colloquial speech are due to the peculiarities of its functioning - spontaneity, close connection with the situation, the generality of the apperceptive base of the interlocutors.

Based on the considered linguistic works, the following characteristic features of colloquial speech can be distinguished, regardless of a particular language:

- 1) The oral form of implementation;
- 2) Spontaneity;
- 3) Informality;
- 4) A wide thematic range;
- 5) Direct interaction of communicants;
- 6) The presence of a common situational context and perceptive base among the interlocutors;
- 7) Interaction of verbal components of a communicative act with nonverbal ones;
- 8) The influence of extralinguistic factors on the linguistic content of the dialogue.

In connection with the above features, a number of phenomena characteristic of colloquial speech arise, which are reflected at all levels of the language:

- 1) Phonetic deformation of high-frequency lexical units in the speech stream;
- 2) Active functioning of non-significant and semi-significant words;
- 3) Frequent use of the nominative/common case of the topic;
- 4) Stylistic heterogeneity of the vocabulary used in the process of communication;
- 5) Violation of lexical and grammatical compatibility, explained by the primary attention of the interlocutors to the content rather than to the form;
- 6) Preference of colloquial lexemes to their neutral synonyms;
- 7) The use of colloquial word-formation resources;
- 8) The predominance of simple syntactic constructions.

The leading role of intonation in the expression of topic-rhematic relations; the influence of this factor on the order of words in Kazakh language (the introduction of lexemes containing new

information at the beginning of the utterance is a trend opposite to the existing one in written speech).

Ellipsis as the absence of grammatically and semantically necessary units, made up for by the presence of a common communication situation. In general, simpler means are used to express certain meanings in colloquial speech than in a codified language.

The linguistic datum «speech communication» is largely formed by non-linguistic factors and constructs non-linguistic entities: relationships, action, state, emotions, knowledge, beliefs, etc. Therefore, the success of speech communication and failures do not always depend on the choice of language forms by speakers. Communicative failures are the failure of the initiator of communication to achieve a communicative goal and, more broadly, pragmatic aspirations, as well as the lack of interaction, mutual understanding and agreement between the participants of communication [8, 85].

The linear deployment of the dialogue (or polylogue) is due to different, but at the same time interrelated factors, linguistic and extralinguistic processes. Therefore, the search for the causes of communicative failures should be conducted in different areas: in the socio-cultural stereotypes of communicants, in their background knowledge, in differences in communicative competence, in the psychology of gender, age, personality. In addition, of course, the distance of participants, the presence of strangers, communication through notes, letters, a pager, or by phone can have a negative impact on the outcome of speech communication. An important role is played by all the features of the development of the speech situation, up to the state of the communicants and their mood.

Colloquial vocabulary is characterized by an emotional and expressive variety. There are actually colloquial lexical units intended for use in casual communication and words that receive colloquial coloring in separate meanings. Colloquial coloring is organically combined with various expressive assessments. An interesting feature of colloquialism is the diffuseness of lexical meaning. There are dozens of verbs and nouns with blurred meanings, the commonality of which is held on one or another expressive seme, while the conceptual basis is broad and uncertain: *to play «quickly and energetically do something»*; *junk, not a person (not an employee / manager / car / chair / book / task / pasta, etc.)*. The formation of «super-meaningful words» emphasizes the primacy of the subjective principle. They are joined by "sponge words" (normal, simple, empty), capable of replacing many more precise words. The lexicon of the literary-conversational style is structured in an organized manner. This organization manifests in various systematic associations, such as thematic word groups that mirror aspects of everyday life. Thematic organization of literary-conversational vocabulary is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Thematic cluster of terms

№	Thematic group	Words and expressions
1	Computer and internet vocabulary	Network, Internet, download, upload, install, post, rewrite, record, drive
2	Computer slang and specialized meanings	Crash, hang, demolish. Throw away, fill, stuff
3	Computer game technology	Flying, walking
4	Money and finance vocabulary	Ten, fifty, hundred, five hundred, piece, money, penny, pennies, finance, coins,
5	Money related actions	Split (to exchange a large bill for smaller bills), squander.

The literary-conversational vocabulary is systematically organized into thematic groups reflecting everyday activities such as technology, computer and finance. Many ordinary words develop specialized meanings within these contexts, especially in computer-related communication. Several thematic groups, including layers of colloquial vocabulary, reveal the thought processes underlying the naming and evaluation of the constituent parts of reality. This principle extends to lexical-semantic groups whose peripheral elements are closely related to expressiveness and colloquial language. For example, in the group of verbs describing «movement in space and changes in position», we find colloquial terms that convey intense expressiveness: *to gasp, to clap, to knock,*

to rumble, to rush, to spin, to writhe, to spit, to wave, to fall, to twitch, to collapse, to shrink, to slap, to shake, to slap, to dodge, etc.

The lexical system of literary-colloquial style is characterized by a rich synonymy covering all parts of speech. Colloquial words can also be grouped based on shared expressive qualities. For instance, a substantial collection of words derives figurative meanings from perceived similarities between animals and humans (a zoosemantic metaphor reflecting the distinctiveness of everyday imaginative thought). Examples include sheep, pig, cow, hippo, gorilla, beetle, hare, cat, cuckoo, rat, chicken, fox, bear, rooster, eagle, nightingale, hawk, etc., all used to describe people. Another illustration involves a set of synonyms for a very tall person, which includes colloquial terms whose stylistic nuances are unified by a shared perception of height. The selection of a particular term is guided by the speaker's emotional attitude. It is noticed that the number of negative ratings is more than positive. A variety of negative emotional assessments are conveyed, in particular, by colloquial synonyms nominating a stupid person: a fool, a blockhead, a dullard, a blockhead, a half-wit, a stuffed, a stupid head / head, a garden/ spruce/oak head. Stylistically homogeneous series of phraseological units are formed in the language.

Conversational synonymy is closely related to antonymy. Developed synonymy and antonymy act as the main ways of organizing the lexical system of literary and colloquial style. Diverse system-paradigmatic associations of lexical units allow us to convey the finest emotional, parametric, evaluative characteristics of the designated.

In the lexico-semantic system of conversational style, verbs of intellectual activity and speaking, as well as verbs of movement, movement, and specific physical action play an important role. In the next table, verbs in the lexico-semantic system of conversational style are shown.

Table 2. Verbs in the lexico-semantic conversational style

Lexico-semantic system of conversational style		
Verbs of intellectual activity	Verbs of speaking	Verbs of movement
To think, to know, to understand	To speak, to say	To go, to move, to do, to give
Syncretic verbs (polysemous verbs)		
To speak	To say	
To ask, to advise, to warn, to name, to transmit, to repeat		
Most common neutral literary verbs in colloquial speech		
To be, to speak, to know, can, to say, to go, to want, to understand, to do, to see, to give, to read, to think		

The table presents the organization of verbs in the lexico-semantic system on conversational style. It demonstrates that conversational vocabulary is structured into semantic groups based on communicative functions and everyday human activity. The central position in the table is occupied by the conversational style system, which includes three main groups of verbs: verbs of intellectual activity, verbs of speaking, verbs of movement. An important feature shown in the table is the polysemantic and syncretic nature of conversational verbs. Many commonly used verbs possess broad meanings and can replace more specific lexical units depending on the communicative situation. In particular, the verbs *to say* and *to speak* may express meanings such as *to ask, to advise, to warn, to name, to transmit, to repeat*. This semantic flexibility makes conversational speech more dynamic and context-dependent.

Stylistically homogeneous word-formation nests support lexical consistency, in which both the original and derived components are marked with colloquiality. There are also such nests in which colloquial units are only part of the general linguistic composition. Therefore, in the nest with the original word miracle, there are many colloquial derivatives with the evaluation suffix. Beyond the limits of colloquialism, the words miraculous, miracle-working remain.

As part of the synonymic series, word bunks are widely distributed, organized according to the scheme: producing neutral word derived suffix colloquial expressive word. On the basis of one-suffix

formations, groups of nominations with a common emotional and evaluative value are formed. The morphological picture of the conversational style of speech is very peculiar. There is a smaller proportion of nouns and an increased proportion of pronouns, verbs, but especially particles. The most important part of speech is the verb, although the verbal paradigm of formation in the colloquial style is selectively in demand. Personal forms are preferred here and participles and adverbial participles are extremely rare - word forms with a book style coloring. The use of the verb infinitive form is peculiar. This static form in the target meaning can be replaced by the personal form of the verb (I'll go see, I think I'll see). A specific feature of the style is "hybrid types of words, first of all, predicatives can be dismissed to them - unchangeable words with the meaning of the state: it's a pity, it's time, it's insulting, funny, nothing, little by little. Pronominal adverbs (there, from there, here) play a particularly prominent role in colloquial style. Being intended as situational and contextual substitutes for full-meaning words, they fit perfectly into colloquial utterances, simplifying and shortening them.

The pragmatic dimension of any text holds significant weight. Within the act of communication, this refers to a speaker's capacity to strategically choose linguistic elements to align with their ultimate goal. This involves decisions such as which words to emphasize, the intended degree of influence on the listener, and consequently, how to motivate the addressee to act. It also encompasses the speaker's effort to project a particular image or persona through their speech to those around them. From a scholarly perspective, this can be understood as the accurate interpretation and appropriate reception by the addressee of information encoded in various ways within a text.

Beyond the categorization of texts into microtexts (e.g., references, telegrams, newspaper articles, letters) and macrotexts (e.g., multi-volume novels, books with prefaces and summaries), two additional analytical approaches exist:

- a) volumetric-pragmatic analysis;
- b) contextual analysis.

Textual segmentation can be either fundamental or supplementary, objective or subjective. The objective pragmatic division of a text typically comprises the following core units: the title, the opening; the largest unit being a volume or book; followed by divisions into sections, chapters, paragraphs, complex phrasal units, and complex syntactic units [9, 58].

A complex phrasal unit represents the smallest textual segment. N.A. Kupina identifies an even more granular unit: the sentence. In Kupina's framework, textual units include the sentence, complex syntactic wholes, fragments, sections, paragraphs, chapters, and volumes [10, 69]. N.A. Kupina further distinguishes between units of text analysis and actual textual units, classifying independent textual units (e.g., sentences, complex syntactic structures) and non-independent textual units (e.g., allophones, morphemes, words, phrases), as well as compositional and graphic textual units (e.g., accent, intonation, lines, stanzas). In pragmatic analysis, when identifying and describing compositional blocks, particular attention is given to intra-textual segmentation, specifically the topic, the introduction (including the opening and exposition), the main body (comprising multiple blocks), and the conclusion.

I.R. Galperin refers to this type of textual breakdown (i.e., the separation of preface, introduction, and conclusion) as optional segmentation. These textual components exhibit characteristics of both volumetric-pragmatic and context-variant analysis. Their influence on the reader is often limited, as they are set apart from the main text by the title and primarily represent the author's personal reflections on the work's overall content [11, 42].

Conclusion

Colloquial speech occupies a distinct place within the spectrum of language usage. It demonstrates particular characteristics across all linguistic dimensions, leading some scholars to consider it a separate linguistic framework. Importantly, everyday spoken language functions as a specific variant of formal language, rather than being merely informal or ungrammatical. It is a misconception to conflate the distinctive attributes of colloquial speech with simple errors in speech that require rectification. This misconception underscores a significant element of effective communication: when employing informal language, it is unwise to strive for the rigidity of written

discourse. Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge that actual mistakes may arise during spoken exchanges, although these should be distinguished from the inherent qualities of colloquial communication.

From a historical perspective, the evolution of the spoken language variant has been influenced by the way individuals engage linguistically in varying real-world contexts, driven by the dynamics of interpersonal communication. The intricacies of human cognition are mirrored in the diverse forms and structures of verbal interaction. When individuals communicate verbally, they invariably convey their identities, and this act of self-revelation plays a fundamental role in fostering connections with others.

References

1. Zemskaya E.A. Russkaya razgovornaya rech': lingvisticheskij analiz i problemy obucheniya. - 2-e izd., pererab., dop. M.: «Russkij yazyk», 1997. 226 s.
2. Vinogradov V. V. O teorii hudozhestvennoj rechi. M., 1991. 240 s.
3. Matveeva T. V. Funkcional'nye stili v aspekte tekstovyh kategorij. M., 2000. 172 s.
4. Khalizev V.E. Teoriya literatury. M.: Akademiya, 2009. 438 s.
5. Kagan M.S. Filosofiya kul'tury. Sankt Peterburg, 1996. 416 s.
6. Zolotova G.A. Kommunikativnye aspekty sintaksisa. 6-e izd. M.: URSS, 2010. 368 s.
7. Vsevolodova M.V. Teoriya funkcional'no-kommunikativnogo sintaksisa. M.: URSS, 2016. 656 s.
8. Shalabaev B. Korkem proza tili. Almaty: Bilim, 1994. 124 b.
9. Turaeva Z. Ya. Lingvistika teksta. M.: Prosveshenie, 1996. 107 s.
10. Kupina A.N. Lingvisticheskij analiz hudozhestvennogo teksta. M., 1980. 192 s.
11. Gal'perin I. R. Tekst kak ob'ekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya. M.: Nauka, 1991. 183 s.

Әдебиеттер тізімі

1. Земская Е.А. Русская разговорная речь: лингвистический анализ и проблемы обучения. - 2-е изд., перераб., доп. М.: Русский язык, 1997. 226 с.
2. Виноградов В. В. О теории художественной речи. М., 1991. 240 с.
3. Матвеева Т. В. Функциональные стили в аспекте текстовых категорий. М., 2000. 172 с.
4. Кхализев В.Е. Теория литературы. М.: Академия, 2009. 438 с.
5. Каган М.С. Философия культуры. Санкт Петербург, 1996. 416 с.
6. Золотова Г.А. Коммуникативные аспекты синтаксиса. 6-е изд. М.: УРСС, 2010. 368 с.
7. Всеволодова М.В. Теория функционально-коммуникативного синтаксиса. М.: УРСС, 2016. 656 с.
8. Шалабаев Б. Көркем проза тілі. Алматы: Білім, 1994. 124 б.
9. Тураева З.Я. Лингвистика текста. М.: Просвещение, 1996. 107 с.
10. Купина А.Н. Лингвистический анализ художественного текста. М., 1980. 192 с.
11. Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. М.: Наука, 1991. 183 с.

АУЫЗЕКІ СӨЙЛЕУ ТІЛДІҢ АРНАЙЫ ҚОСЫМША ЖҮЙЕСІ РЕТІНДЕ

КУЩАНОВА А.Н.^{1*} , ЭКИДЖИ М.² , ТӨЛЕГЕНОВА Г.Ф.¹ 

*Кущанова Айнур Нурасловна¹ – PhD, Қ.Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өңірлік университеті, Ақтөбе қ., Қазақстан

Е-mail: ainur.kuchshanova@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1730-2032>

Экиджи Метин² – PhD, профессор, Эгей университеті, Измир қ., Түркия

Е-mail: metin.ekici@ege.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9400-8462>

Төлегенова Гүлмира Ғанибетқызы¹ – Гуманитарлық ғылымдар магистрі, Қ.Жұбанов атындағы Ақтөбе өңірлік университеті, Ақтөбе қ., Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Ауызекі сөйлеу тілі – негізінен дайындықсыз, бейресми қарым-қатынас жағдайларында тікелей араласу арқылы ауызша түрде қолданылатын тілдің бір түрі. Ауызекі сөйлеу тілінің негізгі саласы – бейресми ортада өтетін күнделікті қарым-қатынас. Ауызекі сөйлеу тілі синтаксисін зерттеу – қазіргі лингвистикадағы ең өзекті мәселелердің бірі. Ауызекі сөйлеу тілі лингвистикасы саласы ғалымдардың ерекше назарын аудартуда, себебі бұрын ауызекі сөйлеу тілі тәуелсіз лингвистикалық объект ретінде қарастырылмай, тек жазба тілге қарама-қарсы стандартты емес тіл формасы ретінде қарастырылған. Тілдік құзыреттіліктің маңызды талабы – тілдің функционалдық түрлерін ажырата білу, олардың кез келгенін еркін қолдану және коммуникациялық тапсырмаларға сәйкес қай тілдік түрді таңдау керектігін анық түсіну. Ауызекі сөйлеу сияқты әдеби емес тіл формасы мен әдеби тіл арасындағы негізгі айырмашылықтардың бірі – көп жағдайда тілдің әртүрлі нұсқаларын ажырату қиын болуы.

Түйін сөздер: ауызекі сөйлеу, заманауи лингвистика, синтаксистік ерекшеліктер, лингвистикалық және экстралингвистикалық процестер, сөйлеу мәдениеті.

РАЗГОВОРНАЯ РЕЧЬ КАК ОСОБАЯ ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ПОДСИСТЕМА

КУЩАНОВА А.Н.^{1*} , ЭКИДЖИ М.² , ТӨЛЕГЕНОВА Г.Ғ.¹ 

*Кущанова Айну́р Нура́словна¹ – PhD, Актюбинский региональный университет имени К.Жубанова, г. Ақтобе, Қазақстан

E-mail: ainur.kuchshanova@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1730-2032>

Экиджи Метин² – PhD, профессор, Эгейский университет, г. Измир, Турция

E-mail: metin.ekici@ege.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9400-8462>

Төлегенова Гүлмира Ғанибетқызы¹ – Магистр гуманитарных наук, Актюбинский региональный университет имени К.Жубанова, г. Ақтобе, Қазақстан

E-mail: gtolegenova85@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1061-6538>

Аннотация. Разговорная речь – это разновидность языка, которая реализуется преимущественно в устной форме в ситуации неподготовленного, непринужденного общения с непосредственным взаимодействием собеседников. Основная сфера реализации разговорной речи – повседневное общение, происходящее в неформальной обстановке. Проблема изучения синтаксиса разговорной речи является одной из наиболее актуальных проблем современной лингвистики. Лингвистика устной речи как область лингвистики получила пристальное внимание ученых, поскольку ранее устная речь не рассматривалась как самостоятельный лингвистический объект, а противопоставлялась письменной речи лишь как ненормативная форма языка. Важным требованием культуры владения языком является требование различать его функциональные разновидности, свободно пользоваться любой из них, четко представляя, какую из разновидностей языка следует выбрать в соответствии с задачами общения. Одно из фундаментальных отличий такой нелитературной формы языка, как разговорный язык, от литературного языка заключается в том, что в большинстве случаев трудно различить разновидности языка.

Ключевые слова: разговорная речь, современная лингвистика, синтаксические особенности, лингвистические и экстралингвистические процессы, культура речи.