LINGUISTIC AND EXTRALINGUISTIC REASONS FOR THE USE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE INCLUSIONS

S. Tashpulatova [1]

Abstract:
The purpose of the article is to study the structure and functions of foreign language inclusions in the texts of modern English-language poetry and prose as well as, to describe the place of foreign language inclusions in the paradigm of knowledge about language contacts.

Key words: inclusions, bilingualism, transparency, semantic components, lexical interference

In modern society, any language undergoes changes under the influence of the environment, unless there is a special restriction on borrowing from above. In the conditions of "globalization" English is becoming the language of business contacts and international communication. It is considered normal to speak English as well as your native language. In literary works, a similar situation of bilingualism remains: modern postmodernism assumes variability and mosaicism in the literary text, the use of foreign language inclusions. The purpose of this article is to consider the functioning of foreign language inclusions in literary texts. Foreign language inclusions are understood as an open and replenished series of language phenomena (from a phoneme, morpheme or word to a text passage) surrounded by elements of the English language. Social conditions for the development of language contacts and the appearance of foreign language inclusions in the speech of monolinguals and bilinguals are determined by the need for communication between representatives of different ethnic groups who enter into intensive connections with each other for various reasons, often remaining outside the scope of linguistics as such; due to intensive migration and integration processes, business contacts, tourism, etc. [4]

The main reason for the use of foreign language inclusions, according to L.P. Krysin and E. Richter, is the need for naming things and concepts. In many cases, the reasons for the use of borrowings coincide with the reasons for the use of inclusions, such as, the elimination of polysemy of the original linguistic unit in the receiving language the desire to "strange" speech, the desire to express solidarity with any social or linguistic group, to convey one's attitude. And if a monolingual prefers to change the register of speech, the level of its formality, the bilingual will use a word in another language. The reason for using an inclusion may be the absence of this concept in the recipient language, which leads to the need to use a lexical unit of another language:

[1] *Sayfura Tashpulatova Bakhodirovna, Assistant teacher of Tashkent International KIMYO University*

"Its centerpiece was a sand pit in which stood a ten-foot-high wooden pole called the malkhamb".

In the example, the inclusion malkhamb - "a wooden pole used in a traditional sport in India" has only a conditional correspondence in English: wooden pole, which leads to the need to enter a word of another language. Often in the future these units are fixed in the language and recorded in dictionaries as they are mastered. This was the case, for example, with the Russian words tsar, cossack, perestroika and others. It happens that a phenomenon that has arisen requires immediate fixation in a language; a unit for it has not yet arisen in one language, but exists in another. Currently, this process is especially active thanks to the Internet. In our opinion, this is the reason for the spread of such words among monolinguals. [1]

In the same way, borrowing or interspersing of units occurs if a unit of a "foreign" language objectively expresses the desired concept more briefly or more accurately. There is a tendency to save language resources while maintaining maximum objective accuracy and transparency of semantic components. For example, the word Wanderlust was adopted from German into English to express "a strong desire for wanderlust," and the word bakku-shan from Japanese means "a girl who is only beautiful from behind, until the moment she turns towards you." Instead of a descriptive phrase, a more semantically accurate word in another language is taken. The connotation of the element in the source language also plays a role. [5] The use of a word in the native language that does not carry the necessary positive or negative connotation reduces the potential of the utterance, so preference is given to a unit of another language. Also, when two concepts coexist in parallel in one statement, one of which is in the native language, and the second is an inclusion, most likely the foreign language word will differ in some semantic shade. The use of a foreign lexical unit often creates the desired stylistic effect, emphasis, automatically highlighting the desired passage. A foreign word seems preferable to one's own, creating the effect of novelty, or emphasizing the speaker's knowledge, the prestige of the language, and so on. This may be the communicative relevance of a foreign language concept: when the concept affects relevant areas of human activity, its significance also increases, as happened with business terminology in the Russian language. If we talk about terminological vocabulary, then often the authors of scientific works cite foreign terms without translation in order to maintain maximum accuracy of the designated term and to internationalize it.

Sometimes an alien element also serves to differentiate the audience into "us" and "strangers" for whom the interspersed element will remain opaque. Such cases of use are rare for borrowings, but are more common in the case of foreign language inclusions, since borrowings are part of the lexical system of the language and can usually be understood by all native speakers, regardless of their mono- or bilingualism. [2] The necessary distinction in the case of borrowings may not occur; they will also be recognized by a monolingual audience. The use of foreign language inclusions for delimitation is typical mainly for bilinguals. Among the purely social reasons is the spread of a foreign word after its use by some authoritative persons, the prevalence of people of the ethnic group from whose language the inclusion is made. In the case of written inclusions, there is a phenomenon of national (ethnic) literature, where inclusions are often used to describe the life and realities of a given ethnic group. Language contacts of various kinds lead to the appearance of foreign language elements in the language, so it was necessary to determine which process

resulted in inclusions. Foreign language inclusions are the result of a code-switching process, while borrowings are classified as lexical interference. The basis for attributing foreign language inclusions to the process of code switching is that inclusions in most cases do not affect the system of the language into which they fall. Foreign language inclusions may be the result of code mixing. We consider code mixing to be a subtype of code switching, in which intraword elements and sub-sentence level elements are interspersed.

Available research classifications of foreign language vocabulary are distinguished by the variety of criteria chosen for combining vocabulary into groups. For this reason, the work substantiates the choice of the concept of "foreign language inclusions" and its connection with other phenomena: xenonyms, barbarisms, exoticisms, realities and others. Researchers pay great attention to the sign of mastery, highlighting, first of all, borrowings, barbarisms and foreign language inclusions. [3] The inclusions are close to barbarism, so in many cases it is difficult to make a clear distinction between these phenomena. The criteria for distinction remain the vocabulary consolidation of barbarisms and the lack of consolidation of foreign language inclusions, as well as the greater mastery of barbarisms.

In conclusion, realities and foreign language inclusions are similar phenomena, so it was important to also determine the boundaries of these concepts. Realities and exoticisms in the text can function, appearing as foreign language inclusions, but they can also be expressed in words of the receiving language, and inclusions may not be realities and lacunae.

References:

[1].   Kachru B.Meaning in Deviation: Toward Understanding Non-Native English Text / Braj B. Kachru // The Other Tongue: English across Cultures. Edited by Braj B.Kachru. – 2nd edition. – Chicago: University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 1992. – p. 29

[2].   Myers-Scotton C. Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural Factors in Codeswitching / C. Myers-Scotton // Language in Society. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. - Vol. 22, No. 4. –p. 475

[3].   Nelson C.L. My Language, Your Culture: Whose Communicative Competence? / Cecil L. Nelson // The Other Tongue: English across Cultures. Edited by Braj B.Kachru. – 2nd edition. – Chicago: University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 1992. – p. 26.

[4].   Platt J. Weber H. Ho Mian Lian the New Englishes / John Platt, Heidi Weber, Ho Mian Lian. – London:Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984. – 236 p.

[5].   Scotton C.M. Bilingual strategies: The social functions of code-switching / C.M. Scotton, W. Ury // Linguistics. – 1977. - №193. - p. 50.