

LINGUISTIC AND STYLISTIC FEATURES OF HUMOROUS DISCOURSE BASED ON JOKES IN ENGLISH

Mukhabbat Salayeva¹, Gavkhar Eshchanova¹, Mukhayyo Atadjanova²

¹*Urgench State University, Urgench, Uzbekistan*

²*Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.*

¹*Corresponding author: atadjanovamukhayyo@gmail.com*

Keywords. Discourse, humorous discourse, joke, linguistic and stylistic form, anecdote

Abstract. The article examines the linguistic and stylistic features of the humorous discourse based on jokes in English and identifies the distinctive features of the discourse, which are attributed to playful personal and everyday discourse. Morphological features are also numerous, among which the use of a large number of phrasal verbs stands out, which makes the text of the joke more colloquial; the use of neologisms is also noted in order to impress the interlocutor with an unusual, contrary to all norms word-the denouement of the joke. The method of statistical analysis of syntactic means revealed that simple sentences predominate in jokes.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the general sense, discourse (fr. discours) is speech, the process of linguistic activity. Discourse is a multi-valued concept.

In the history of classical philosophy, it was used to characterize the sequential transition from one discrete step to another, and the deployment of thinking expressed in concepts and judgments, as opposed to the intuitive grasp of the whole to its parts. In the modern French philosophy of postmodernism, it is a characteristic of a special mentality and ideology, which are expressed in a text that has coherence and integrity and is immersed in life, socio-cultural, socio-psychological, and other contexts.

The first studies of the internal organization of discourse date back to the border of the 50s of the 20th century, when works appeared entirely focused on constructions consisting of more than one sentence - "complex syntactic whole" and "super-phrasal units". In Russian linguistics, the logical-grammatical relations between related statements forming a super-phrasal unity in speech have been studied mainly [Figurovsky, 1974:109]. The term "complex syntactic whole" was used by L.V. Shcherba was already in the 1920s in relation to a single complex utterance combining various types of syntactic connection of components (composition, subordination, isolation,

introductory constructions, etc.): [Shcherba, 1974:97]. By the end of the 80s of the twentieth century, discourse began to be understood as a complex communicative phenomenon, a complex system of knowledge hierarchy, including, in addition to the text, also extralinguistic factors (knowledge about the world, opinions, attitudes, goals of the addressee, etc.) necessary for understanding the text.

In addition, there are also other traditions of understanding discourse, in particular, the tradition coming from M. Foucault, associated with the inclusion of power relations and ideology in the context of considering discourse, in the field of which discourse acquires a particular social meaning. In this case, discourse is often understood as "the general idea that language is structured according to patterns that determine the statements of people in various spheres of social life. Well-known examples are "medical discourse" or "political discourse".

There is no clear and generally accepted definition of "discourse", however, it should be noted this term has gained wide popularity in recent years.

The interdisciplinary field of study and the corresponding branch of linguistics that studies discourse are both referred to as discourse analysis or discourse studies. Although language interaction has been the subject of such disciplines as rhetoric and oratory for centuries, and later followed by stylistics and literary studies, discursive analysis has only been

¹ atadjanovamukhayyo@gmail.com

formed as a scientific direction in recent decades. This happened against the background of the prevailing linguistics for most of the 20th century. F. de Saussure believed that the true object of linguistics is the language system (as opposed to speech), and N.Chomsky urged linguists to study linguistic "competence" and abstract from the issues of language use. Recently, however, cognitive attitudes in the science of language are beginning to change and the opinion is gaining strength, according to which no linguistic phenomena can be adequately understood and described outside of their use, without taking into account their discursive aspects. Therefore, discursive analysis becomes one of the central sections of linguistics.

Thus, based on the definitions considered, it can be concluded that in modern linguistics, the text is understood as an abstract, formal construction, and discourse is understood as various types of its actualization, considered from the point of view of mental processes in connection with extralinguistic factors.

Humorous discourse is characterized by a special laughing attitude to the reality, which is expressed in combination in the action or thought of the object of influence with a field of possibilities that are fundamentally not inherent in it (A.V. Nechaev). Understanding depends on the perception of this combination and on the assessment of the subjective position expressed by this ridiculous attitude. Humor allows you to reduce social distance, is a means of group identification. The distinguishing function of humor function allows you to set the boundary between "us" and "them". It is carried out through the appeal of communicating participants to common values. Humor reflects cultural values and, by promoting intra-group cohesion, is itself a cultural value. A special case of intra-group identification through humor is national humor, by which we mean humor, understandable and shared by most representatives of this culture. The linguistic and cultural features of humor are reflected in the works of M.M. Bakhtin, V.I.Zelvis, V.I.Karasik, T.Cohen, M.A.Kulinich, O.A.Leontovich, D.S.Likhachev, V.Heller.

Understanding humor depends on three factors: the communication situation, the sender, and the recipient of the message. The sender and recipient of the message are complex variables, the value of which is determined by many factors, including their participation in the creation of the communication situation itself. The result of a humorous act is a change in the participants' level of understanding of the situation.

The laughing attitude that the sender of the message demonstrates and the recipient shares, perceiving this laughing attitude and evaluating the subjective position of the sender of the message, requires awareness by all participants in communication, therefore the subject of the relationship signals this. A laughing attitude implies the presence of a kind of error, while the recipient of the message must understand that it is "deliberately said so", otherwise he can evaluate the corresponding expression simply as an inaccuracy or inaccuracy, and a communicative failure will occur. Therefore, the use of a laughing attitude is signaled by special markers.

- the communicative intention of the communication participants to get away from a serious conversation;
- the humorous tone of communication, i.e., the desire to shorten the distance and critically rethink current concepts in a mild form;

- the presence of certain models of humorous behavior accepted in this linguoculture.

Anecdote (in English, it corresponds to the variant "joke") - fr. anecdote — a tale, a tall tale; from Greek. "τὸ ἀνέκδοτον" - unpublished, lit. "unpublished"[Karasik V.I. (1997)] is a short funny story, usually of a narrative nature, that is, passed from mouth to mouth.

V.I. Karasik considers an anecdote as a stable form of narration characterized by features that distinguish this type of text from related types. At its core, this speech genre refers to conversational communication, which is characterized by combining the situation-topic with the situation of current communication [Karasik:1997]. In other words, an anecdote is characterized by a combination of the current real situation of communication and a fictional one. At the same time, the sender and recipient of the message identify certain points of contact between the real current situation/discourse and the fictional situation in the joke. This creates a special intertext – a current/fictional discourse.

2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Most often, an anecdote is characterized by an unexpected semantic resolution at the very end, which gives rise to laughter. It can be a play on words, or modern associations that require additional knowledge: social, literary, historical, geographical, etc. Jokes cover almost all spheres of human activity. In most cases, the authors of the jokes are unknown.

The texts of jokes usually consist of two parts: the beginning (introduction) , which introduces the listener to the content plan, informs the topic, creates

intrigue, and a certain tension of expectation; and the end (denouement). The denouement of an anecdote, regardless of the length of the whole text, should always be brief, unexpected, and often paradoxical, which usually makes the anecdote funny.

Jokes can be categorised into various themes, such as politics, gender dynamics, celebrities, music, literature, education, religion, military, cultural differences, and more.

According to the structure, English jokes can be conditionally divided into:

dialogue-based jokes. Such anecdotes are mostly constructed from several replicas without remarks.

short jokes. These are various anecdotes.

pun jokes (jokes based on wordplay)

3. METHODS

The texts of jokes are characterized by a number of lexical features. The main part of the texts of jokes is represented by common vocabulary (office, cucumber, doctor, English teacher, wife, minute), which, however, is influenced by the specifics of the type of text. Thus, the belonging of an anecdote to the narrative genre explains the presence of colloquial vocabulary and constructions in the texts

The belonging of the joke to the colloquial genre and its widespread use by all ages and social groups explains the presence of slang in the texts: peace out, homey, bloke.

English jokes in most cases are based on ambiguity and wordplay (puns), which is the greatest difficulty for the translator. For example: Hey, man! Please call me a taxi. Another vivid example of wordplay: DINER: Waiter! Will my hamburger be long? WAITER: No. It will be round and flat, sir. The comic nature of the situation lies in the fact that each of the readers interprets the word in his own way.

And finally, in many texts of jokes, there is such a phenomenon as speaking surnames. As a rule, the heroes of the joke are endowed with names that allow you to build a comic situation on the play of words, for example:

In this case, the whole comic anecdote is based on the name of the hero. Quite a logical answer of the hero to the question "Could you tell me your name?" (Will you tell me your name?) it is the cause of comic misunderstanding and conflict between the characters of the joke, which causes laughter from the listener of the joke. The second name, in turn, is involved in a play on words: "Will Knot" is perceived by the hero as a refusal to give his name, which contributes to the

comicality of the situation. Such lexical features are inherent in the texts of jokes.

A significant part of the texts of jokes is simple sentences. (Now that's quite a coincidence) This is explained by the narrative nature of anecdotes: the presence of simple syntactic constructions is characteristic of colloquial texts. However, since in this work we are dealing with written versions of anecdotes, there are also complex sentences. In complex sentences, I would like to highlight complex sentences with direct speech. The inclusion of character replicas in the texts of jokes gives the listener the opportunity to imagine the situation. For example: «Haven't I been telling you for the last hour that I'll be ready in a minute?»

This sentence exhibits a complex structure with various types of subordination. It consists of two simple sentences: "Have I not been telling you for the last hour" and "that I will be ready in a minute?" Of which the first and second are connected by a subordinate bond using the union that; the second sentence is a secondary, two-part circumstantial subordinate of the cause (I – subject, expressed by the pronoun will be ready – predicate, expressed by the verb), the first - the main sentence is two-part (I – subject, expressed by the pronoun, been telling – predicate, expressed by the verb). I would also like to note the high occurrence of interrogative sentences in the texts. Their frequency is due to the fact that many anecdotes have a question-and-answer structure, which contributes to a more effective establishment of contact with the interlocutor: the narrator asks the interlocutor a "tricky question", which the interlocutor tries to answer using all his wit, and then the narrator says the correct answer, which most often strikes with its surprise and illogicality, creating thus the comic effect. For example:

What is the longest word in the English language?
»Smiles«.

In this case, the first remark, which is an interrogative sentence, will invariably make the interlocutor think about trying to come up with his answer. The more unexpected the correct answer sounds for the interlocutor, which is a transcript of this answer. Because there is a mile between its first and last letters!

The following example resembles a Russian joke with the phrase "You can't execute pardon" - because the meaning in it changes depending on where to make a logical pause:

An English teacher wrote these words on the whiteboard: "woman without her man is nothing". The teacher then asked the students to punctuate the words correctly. The men wrote: "Woman, without

her man, is nothing." The women wrote: "Woman! Without her, man is nothing."

This example also vividly illustrates the difference between male and female logic: everyone placed a logical emphasis in such a way that a representative of their gender was in a winning position (men wrote: "A woman, without her man, is nothing; women: A woman! A man is nothing without her!").

These are the main syntactic features inherent in the texts of jokes.

Let's consider the most characteristic morphological techniques inherent in the texts of jokes.

One of which is the use of a large number of phrasal verbs, which is explained by the focus of jokes on oral speech phrasal verbs: to spank, to stand up and yell.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the above, the analysis of English - language anecdotes revealed the following:

- lexical features of anecdotes are characterized by commonly used words, proper names, and words with emotional and evaluative vocabulary.

- as the most striking lexical features of anecdotes, one can single out wordplay.

Having considered the concept of discourse, we concluded that discourse is more focused on studying

the dynamic nature of the object being studied and includes, in addition to the text, such extralinguistic factors as the addressee's life experience and knowledge, the relationship of communicants, the conditions in which communication takes place.

REFERENCES

- Karasik V.I. (1997) Anecdotal Kak subject lingvisticheskogo izucheniya // genre rechi. - Saratov: Izdatelstvo Gosunts "Kolledj",. - S. 144-153
- Karasik V.I. (2000). O tipax diskurs // Yazikovaya lichnost: institucionalniy I personalniy diskurs: SB. nauch. TR. Volgograd: Peremena, - S.5-20.
- Karasik V.I. (2007). Yazikovie klyuchi. - Volgograd: Paradigm. - 520 P.
- Karasik V.I. (2002). Yazikovoy Krug: lichnost, concept, diskurs. - Volgograd: Peremena, - 477 P.
- Tshorina Yu.V. (1999) Rechevie janri komicheskogo // genre rechi. Sbornik statey. VIP.2-Saratov. Izdatelstvo Gosunts "Kolledj",. - S.146-157
- Boxer, Diana, (1997) Cortés-Conde, Florence from bonding to beating: Conversational joking and identity display / / Journal of pragmatics 27,
- Norrick, Neal R. (1994). Involvement and joking in conversation // Journal of pragmatics 22,
- Raupova L.R. (2012) Sociopragmatic study of polepridicative units in dialogical discourse. Dsc dissertation. Tashkent,.