

## INTERJECTIONS IN NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION

*Khaydarova Dilnavoz Rakhimovna*

*Master's Degree student of National University of Uzbekistan*

### Abstract

The paper attempts to clarify the pragmatic features of interjections in non-verbal communication in English and Uzbek languages, depending on the situation of communication and general context. Historically, interjections can be defined in two different points of view: as a part of linguistic sphere, or as a non-verbal communication tool signifying feelings of states of mind. Usage of interjections is particularly important for an adequate perception of paralinguistic tools, body movements, gestures and facial expressions. Fiction literature is a rich source to define more exactly not only the meanings of interjections in non-verbal communication in English and Uzbek languages, but the description of the sphere of these units' functions.

**Keywords:** Interjection, Non-verbal Communication, Emotional State, Context, Paralinguistics.

### INTRODUCTION

Interjection is a part of speech that occurs as an utterance on its own and expresses a wide variety of spontaneous feeling or reaction such as happiness, anger, sadness, interest, curiosity, hurt, annoyance, anxiety, embarrassment, pleasure, hope, etc. Likewise, non-verbal communication occurs without using any oral or written word to convey these information counted above. Non-verbal communication increases understanding of messages and interjections can put more emphasis and reinforcement to the information being said. Process of sending and receiving of message is successful and gets desired results while using both of them accordingly. The ongoing researches about interconnection between non-verbal communication and interjections performs different views and opinions. In this paper, we assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of different approaches that reflect the relationship between non-verbal communication and interjections, and suggest a new analysis which preserves the insights of both. Interjections have a natural and a coded element, and are better analyzed as falling at various points along a continuum between 'showing' and 'saying'. This correlation is characterized in theoretical terms, and some implications of the proposed approach are considered.

### Materials and Methods

*The term "interjection" arises from the Latin inter meaning between" and jacer meaning "throw". They are words or constructions with no real linguistic value but*

*we generally employ them to express feelings or states of mind in daily life situations. We use interjections more in speaking than in writing. Examples in English include ‘wow’, ‘ouch’, ‘oops’, ‘er’, ‘huh’, ‘gee’, ‘ooh’, ‘uh’, ‘aha’, ‘brrr’, ‘shh’, ‘ahem’, ‘psst’. In Uzbek ‘voy’, ‘oh’, ‘eh’, ‘dod’, ‘pisht’, ‘tish’ etc. Interjections may be primary and secondary. Primary interjections are not derived from other parts of speech. Secondary interjections are derived from other parts of speech. They are homonymous with the words they are derived from. They are: ‘well’, ‘now’, ‘here’, ‘there’, ‘come’, ‘why’ etc.*

Historically, interjections have often been seen as marginal to language. Latin grammarians described them as non-words, independent of syntax, signifying only feelings or states of mind. Nineteenth-century linguists regarded them as para-linguistic, even non-linguistic phenomena: “between interjection and word there is a chasm wide enough to allow us to say that interjection is the negation of language” (Benfey 1869: 295); “language begins where interjections end” (Müller 1862: 366). Sapir described interjections as “never more, at best, than a decorative edging to the ample, complex fabric of language”.

The origin of studies about relationship between non-verbal communication and interjections started with ‘The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals’. Darwin (1872) noted that “emission of sounds” was “efficient in the highest degree as a means of expression”, and although the book was largely about facial expression, he made some passing observations about interjections: “Moderate disgust is exhibited in various ways; by the mouth being widely opened, as if to let an offensive morsel drop out; by spitting; by blowing out of the protruded lips, or by a sound as of clearing the throat. Such guttural sounds are written as ach or ugh; and their utterance is sometimes accompanied by a shudder ...”

Contemporary research into the vocal expression of emotions, however, has focused on prosodic properties of the voice rather than on expressive sounds; and the study of emotional expression has been overall dominated by facial, rather than vocal, expression. And here interjections perform the characteristics of non-linguistic means.

Among linguists, interjections and non-verbal communication have generally been a marginal topic because they seem to be at the periphery of the language system (Ameka, 1992). Significant monographs exist in German (Ehlich, 1986; Graf, 2010), Italian (Poggi, 1981) and Russian (Šaronov, 2008), but they have not had much impact on Anglophone linguistics. A number of linguistic works on interjections have appeared in studies on discourse and/or pragmatic markers, e.g. Schiffren (1987: Ch 4), Aijmer (2004), Norrick (2008). The most substantial linguistic works in English have been undertaken by researchers in the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) paradigm, especially the papers in Ameka (1992), and also Wierzbicka ([1991] 2003). Sociologists and anthropologists have made limited but useful contributions, e.g.

Goffman (1981), Kockelman (2003). Overall, the literature on interjections and emotion can be characterized as sparse and scattered.

### **Results and Discussions**

During the 19th century, despite a growth in the empirical adequacy of grammars, the emotion-expressive view of interjections became even more prominent. This was thanks to two popular concerns. First, there was the search for psychological counterparts of linguistic phenomena. The idea that language reflects a speaker's mental processes was much older, but now concepts borrowed from the new and rapidly developing discipline of psychology stimulated linguists to take the psychological basis of words and sentences much more seriously. The meaning of words became generally identified with events in the mind of the speaker: concepts or representations. For interjections, there were no corresponding concepts or representations available. The most plausible alternative was to assume that the mental occurrences reflected by this word class were emotions.

Secondly, there was the increased involvement in theories on the origin of language. Language was frequently assumed to have developed from natural emotional cries, and interjections were regarded as grandparents of those first words.

In Gardiner's general linguistic work, the model is not the most prominent issue, compared to his central theme, the distinction between speech and language. But within the theory of speech, the subject is of considerable importance; it is extensively discussed twice, in two subsequent chapters of his book. Jakobson became famous for his achievements in almost every area of linguistics. His theory of language functions became very well-known, but the same is true of quite a few other new ideas he launched. Within the work of the psychologists Révész and Duijker, the discussion of language was restricted to only one episode in their careers. In Révész's case, however, the involvement in the problem of language origin was closely related to his general developmental approach in psychology, and also to his general endeavour to extend the area of psychology to the higher products of human culture. For example, he also published on the psychology of creative art, and in his book on the origin of language, parallels are drawn between language and music. So his linguistic work is not an accidental side-issue. Moreover, Révész considered his book on the origin of language to be his most successful work. Duijker was Révész' pupil and eventually became his successor as director of the Amsterdam Laboratory of Psychology. His book about extralingual elements in speech was his thesis. It appeared in the same year as Révész' *Ursprung und Vorgeschichte der Sprache*. Their simultaneous focus on language cannot be accidental, given their close professional relationship. On the other hand, the books are very dissimilar, and they hardly refer to each other. They share the broad perspective on language and its relation to other types of communication, but Révész' developmental approach is entirely lacking in Duijker's work. Their models of

language functions also differ considerably. After his thesis, Duijker was mainly involved in general psychology. He developed a five-fold division of the discipline, which became very influential in the organization of departments of psychology. Duijker returned to linguistics only very late in his career, when he was inspired by new developments in psycholinguistics.

### **Conclusion**

As the last word, many scientists define interjections in different ways and give their own definitions. Non-verbal communication assists to understand the language and interjections emphasize the information. Utilizing nonverbal communication and interjections together gives the opportunity to send and receive different information effectively. From history, when people communicate without any language, interjections effectively assist and they have been integrated for centuries in order to give emotional colorfulness to speech. That's why we assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of different approaches that reflect the relationship between non-verbal communication and interjections, and suggest a new analysis which preserves the insights of both.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.
2. Essberger, J. (2009). Interjections. Retrieved February 10, 2009 from <http://www.englishclub.com/grammar/interjections.htm>.
3. Fodor, J., Fodor J., & Garrett, M. (1975). The psychological unreality of semantic representations. *Linguistic Inquiry*, Fall: 515-531.
4. Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell, 233-235.
5. Li, Conghe. (2005). A cognitive-pragmatic account of interjections. *US-China Foreign Language*, 65-70.
6. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (2003). Essex: Pearson Longman, 78-81.
7. Jakobson, Roman. 1960. 'Linguistics and poetics.' In: *Style in language*. Ed. by T.A. Sebeok. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 350-377.
8. Popper, Karl. 1972. *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach*. Oxford: Clarendon, 45-54.
9. Yoshida, K., Kamiya, M., Kondo, S. & Tokiwa, R. (2000). *Heart to heart: Overcoming barriers in cross-cultural communication*. Tokyo: Macmillan Language House, 133-136.
10. Wierzbicka, A. (1992). The semantics of interjection. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18, 159-411, 111-192.
11. Wilkins, D. (1992). Interjections as emotions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18, 119-158.