ORAL AND WRITTEN CLASSIFICATION OF DISCOURSE IN DISCOURSE LINGUISTICS

Rakhimova Laylo Muminbayevna
Independent researcher of "Interfaculty Department of Foreign Languages",
Urgench State University

Abstract: This article analyzes the classification of spoken and written discourse in linguistics, its linguistic features, contextual features and methods of expression.
Keywords: discourse, oral speech, written speech, texts.

Spoken and written speech perform different functions in society, they use different forms and exhibit different linguistic features. In everyday life, people come into contact with written texts and interpret their meaning in order to achieve their goals. We can never imagine a literate person who does not write or try to write something. Like oral speech, written speech has many forms. For example: a newspaper, a poem, a letter to a friend, an official letter, an instruction leaflet, a literary publication, a public notice, a scientific article, small advertisements are among the types of written speech. It's clear that most people read more of the above-mentioned types of text than they actually write.

As soon as a thought appears in a person's mind, he interprets it and forms a conclusion, before sending it to listeners or referents, he sends it purposefully, taking into account the impact of this information, and this communication is manifested in the form of an appeal. Because it is intended for the listener, because the conversation concerns only one listener, even if another person hears it, even if he is speaking in the same language, he may not understand it. This view focuses on studying discourse issues from a comparative point of view, looking at them in the form of sentences separated from the context of communication and within the context. This research paper considers it preferable to apply this approach. This means that speech analysis includes, on the one hand, the study of linguistic forms and the laws of their distribution, and on the other hand, the consideration of general concepts.

In order for people to understand the meaning of sentences, it is necessary to be familiar with the topic, listen carefully, observe the speaker and, if necessary, reflect, evaluate and analyze the objective and subjective factors of the content of the message. Only then will he send a response to the appeal. In written discourse, this process takes a little longer, and in spoken discourse, it happens in a very short period of time. This is the main feature that distinguishes oral and written discourse from each other. These approaches are reflected in the theories of language and discourse in the linguistic studies carried out to date. Humboldt's thoughts about speech and the importance of the human factor in it can be evaluated as the first form of reference to discourse issues. Discourse analysis is a highly disciplined approach. It includes sociology, psychology, linguistics, philosophy, anthropology and many other such disciplines. These different disciplines tend to focus on different aspects of speech. In the course of research, it will be discussed how speech analysis is related to the structure of social interaction manifested in conversation.

Discourse has played different roles in different social settings. It can have different

meanings and relevance when it occurs in different situations. Because of the general and established conventions of situations, there can also be predictions about who opens, who stops, and who closes. But when speech is more casual among peers, everyone participates to control the speech, and the speech phenomenon appears more complex.

Discourse is traditionally divided into spoken and written speech as a means of conveying information.

The differences between oral and written speech are manifested in:

	Oral speech	**Written speech**
1. Method of expression	A) due to the speed and style of expression, less thinking, planning and pre-organization are involved in speech; B) the oral text, if it is not written down, is transitory. Therefore, it is imperfect, always subject to online editing and negotiation of meaning.	A) writing is a slower activity, so authors have time to develop their ideas into a more complex, coherent and coherent whole with the help of complex lexical and syntactic devices; B) written texts are relatively permanent, which allows them to be studied and consulted. These texts are the product of many drafts, including extensive proofreading and editing. The relative permanence of written texts also allows them to be portable.
2. Context features	C) interlocutors have the same spatio-temporal context. Communication thus shows "on-line" monitoring, which addressee's direct report and many contextual clues are useful (clues such as body language and gestures; auditory cues such as tone changes, hesitations, pauses, etc.).	C) written texts are decontextualized or autonomous because they do not depend on the input of the recipient or other contextual cues. There is no common situation like face-to-face communication. It is necessary to conclude the situation from the text. In addition, words should be conveyed with all their meanings, which are conveyed by paralinguistic signs in the spoken text.

3. Linguistic features.	D) syntax in spoken speech is usually less structured than in written speech; for example, oral speech has incomplete sentences, fragments of speech, and little subordination. E) rare use of metalingual markers. Markers have been replaced by fillers like *'er', 'umm', 'hmmn'* and logical conjunctions *like and, but, then, etc.*	D) in written speech, sentences are better structured with complete and set clauses; E) extensive use of metalinguistic markers to define relations between clauses; for example, time markers such as *when, while*; logical connectives such as *besides, moreover, however*.

In general, in discourse linguistics, it is important to classify spoken and written discourse, to identify similarities and differences between them.

References:

1. Bartlett F. C. Remembering. – London: Cambridge university Press, 1992.
2. Brown G. and Yule G. Discourse analysis. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
3. Stubbs M. Discourse analysis. – Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.
4. Schiffrin D. Discourse Markers. –Cambridge University Press, 1987.
5. Schiffrin D. Approaches to Discourse. Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics.   – Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
6. Fasold R. Sociolinguistics of Language. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.