

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 05 Volume: 85

Published: 30.05.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Aslam Qarshiboyevich Usmonov
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute
Teacher

Umida Baxtiyorovna Usmonova
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute
teacher

LINGUOPRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE EQUIVALENT

Abstract: The article highlights the linguopragmatic feature of binders. The pragmatic actualistic meaning that arises through the use of suffixes in the text is examined on the basis of examples and scientifically analyzed.

Key words: conjunction, pragmatics, method, parts of speech, meaning, attitude, concern, syntax, speech, sentence.

Language: English

Citation: Usmonov, A. Q., & Usmonov, U. B. (2020). Linguopragmatic characteristics of the Uzbek language equivalent. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 05 (85), 855-858.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-05-85-158> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.05.85.158>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

UDC 808.5

Just as there has been a period of rise in the history of every science, it is inevitable that there will be stages of crisis. The history of the development of languages in history dates back to the distant past. In modern linguistics "Pragmalinguistics" is considered one of the most relevant areas of linguistics, which occupies a solid place. Linguistics has long been preparing to enrich the knowledge of empirical analysis with other ideas and actions. In the twentieth century, linguistic analysis directions based on the methodology, which included such philosophical ideas as empiricism, phenomenology, constructivism, emerged. One of such directions, of course, is pragmalinguistics.[1]

The analysis of the pragmalinguistic nature of language tools is one of the notable issues of linguistics. Therefore, a number of studies on the basis of linguopragmatic analysis in Uzbek linguistics[2] came to the field in the following years. Sh.Safarov in the work of "Pragmalinguistics", said: "pragmatics is considered a relatively new field, in which the attitude of the language to its users is studied. In the process

of communication, the speaker sets a certain goal before him in expressing his opinion. This goal is an expression from the understanding, understanding that equates the speaker. If the language is common, compulsory for how much social, colloquial and equilateral, then speech is also so common, compulsory and social for them".

It is necessary that at least two people are involved in the process of information exchange. The act of communication of one participant, of course, requires an act of response: the question does not remain unanswered, please, requires consent, denial, threat, attitude to thought. A person who occurs in the process of speech communication attitude cannot be without an object, because subject and object are interrelated and cannot support them without a fork. Let's focus on the text below: — *Olloh shohid, yurt saodati yo'lidagi xizmatlaringiz afg'onlarni baxt yo'lga olib chiqq'ay. — Shunday deng... U holda yoshlaringiz nimani istaydi? — Yoshlarmi? — Tarzi ko'zini amirdan uzib, soqolini siladi. — To'g'risini aytib, qahrimdan cho'chimang. Menga haq gap lozim. — Yoshlar Afg'onistonni mustaqil ko'rishni istaydilar. Qulay fursat o'tib ketyapti, davlatpanoh. — Fursat hali kelgani yo'q. — Fursat almon vakolasi*

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

bilan birga kelgan edi. — Shundaymi?.. Fursatni boy berganimga nima sabab ekan? Qo‘rqdimmi? — Yo‘q, ulug‘ amirim, sababi boshqa: yiliga oladiganingiz ikki million to‘rt yuz ming rupiy va muhoribadan so‘ng berilguchi ellik million rupiy... Amir xona to‘ridagi kursi tomon ko‘z tashladi. Tarzi aytgan mustaqillikni va ellik millionni talab qilib yozilgan maktub o‘sha yerda turibdi.

In the excerpt, the person attitude that occurs in the process of speech communication does not arise only with lexical units. Personality there is also “share” of units in which pragmatics is an object of study in the emergence of a relationship. That is, the meanings of language units are also played by elementary (colloquial act - linguistic act, any elemental meaning that the speaker refers) [3], which occurs only during the time of speech communication. It is known that the conjecturers serve to connect in the sentence some simple sentences in the composition of the compound sentences, the organized parts, to form a syntactic-semantic relationship. Their appropriate, purposeful application in the process of speech can prevent stylistic incontinence, which can arise. And their use in speech is associated with the occurrence of pragmatic (derivative) meanings.

The relations that arise within the framework of communication are diverse and have a certain informational content. As correctly emphasized in the theoretical literature, “any way of expressing an opinion or an idea is a context of different types, but also under the concept of a method of expressing an idea through verbal or nonverbal means, the meaning of the context is understood.” [4]

Pragmatics as one of the theoretical and practical branches of linguistics studies the process of speech, which embodies the social activity of a person, studies the concepts associated with communicative intent, manifested by the influence of a speech situation. Pragmatics studies the relationship of speech act directly with the text. The relationship between the speech act and the text is considered to be the main learning object of pragmatics.[5] Example: *Eronda musulmonlar arabcha o‘zlashmalarni qo‘llashni afzal bilsalar, musulmon bo‘lmaganlar va “fors sof tili jonkuyarlari” sof forsha so‘zdan tuzilgan iboralarni qo‘llashga urinadilar.* In the quoted text, and equally connecting grammatically connecting the organized piece. The same sentence va content can be interpreted so as an organized fragmented joint sentence in which the predicate is involved: *Eronda musulmonlar arabcha o‘zlashmalarni qo‘llashni afzal bilmoq*, (1-sum of colloquial meaning). *Musulmon bo‘lmaganlar va “fors sof tili jonkuyarlari” sof forsha so‘zdan tuzilgan iboralarni qo‘llashga urinadilar.* (2- sum of colloquial meaning). 2-sum of colloquial meaning of sentence and equal binder expressed the meaning of communion. That is, *Musulmon bo‘lmaganlar (bilan birgalikda) va “fors sof tili jonkuyarlari” sof forsha*

so‘zdan tuzilgan iboralarni qo‘llashga urinadilar. This aspect is one edge of the influence of the meaning of the sentence on the connector participating in the sentence.

It is known to us that when an organized piece is connected by means of a counting tone, it is sometimes possible to apply fastening fasteners to its place. For example: *Daftar, kitob sotib oldim.* Guess: *Daftar va kitob sotib oldim.* Organized pieces are attached with the help of fasteners, as they can connect with the intonation itself, without a fastener.[6] Now we focus our attention on the above sentence. In Iran, if Muslims prefer to use arabic, non-muslims and “Persian pure language creatures” will try to use phrases made up of pure Persian words. In this galactic analysis, we analyze from the sentence and by lowering the predicate (without using it in the speech). *Eronda musulmonlar arabcha o‘zlashmalarni qo‘llashni afzal bilmoq*, (1- sum of colloquial meaning), *Musulmon bo‘lmaganlar, “fors sof tili jonkuyarlari” sof forsha so‘zdan tuzilgan iboralarni qo‘llashga urinadilar.* (2- sum of colloquial meaning).

The meaning, like “together with”, connected to it by the declension of the predicate, is lost, and instead of it, the meaning of “separating, approval” is understood. In fact, so, we can see by analyzing the organized parts that come in the sentence, taking them separately. The head piece in the sentence has namely organized. Muslims who have the sum of the first colloquial meaning, those who have the sum of the second colloquial meaning (having the Union) are non-Muslims and are considered “pure language creatures of Persia”. As we connect through the Union-eater and binder, it is understood that the meaning of “non-Muslims and together with them, in addition to non-Muslims, (separately) “Persian pure language creatures” also try to apply phrases made up of pure Persian words. If the opposite case and the binder are reduced, then in the context of the meaning of the non-Muslims compound in the sentence there may also be “pure Persian language creatures”, in the case of which it is taken into account, it is possible to distinguish exactly the meaning of the meaning of non-Muslims. Non-Muslims, like “pure language creatures of Persia”. This aspect depends on the communicative intention of the speaker, what kind of Speech Act the binder is generating in the sentence. The perception that such a speech act in the context of speech is on the connecting surface, the perception of the content is also associated with the linguistic ability of the listener.

Any language unit, including connoisseurs that are part of auxiliary words, also acquires a pragmatic, derivative meaning in the speech process. In fact, conjunctions are auxiliary words that are used to express some simple sentences in the composition of a compound sentence, as well as various relationships between complex simple sentences with an organized

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

unit.[7] With textual demand, they can also earn various pragmatic, derivative meanings. For example:

In the fairy tale it is said about the stork and the old man. In the sentence is the addition of a word that is connected equally with the help of a stork and an old man and a binder. The colloquial meaning, known to the suffixes and the suffixes Equinox, is a combination, equality. This is our vision with the help of determining one of the units in the composition of the compound (Stork and old man). For example: in a fairy tale it is said about a stork and the old man who hunted it. The fact that the speaker expresses his speech in such a form can lead to the fact that the communion, equality, which is perceived above the listener and the connecting person, can infect the actualistic meaning. Now the listener perceives the active content of speech not in the form of a stork and an old man (an old man with a stork), but in the form of an old man who hunts a stork. In order to determine whether the link to the meaning of the suffixes has not really been affected, too, we will analyze the word suffixes used in the above speech by expressing them in a non-connecting way. 1) Stork and Old Man 2) Stork and the old man who hunted him. Even when the first word suffix is used in the style of stork, old man (that is, in a fairy tale it is said about Stork, old man), the meaning of equality (it can be weakened) does not burn. The second word suffix stork, in the form of the old man who hunted it, does not have the meaning of equality in expression by the speaker, but creates the meaning of approval. And in the occurrence of the pragmatic meaning of the predicate, it is important not only with the colloquial process, but also with the intention of the speaker, the awareness of the listener from the elements of speech.

Sh. Bobojonov expresses the following thoughts about the occurrence of the colloquial meaning:

“colloquial meaning occurs only in a certain colloquial process, in accordance with the conditions of speech and the communicative intention of the colloquialist in a certain syntactic blockade.”[8] although the linguist refers to the lexical colloquial meaning (the colloquial case of sememe) in this place, we think that such cases are equally conjoined to all units of speech (including pragmatic units).

Hence, in the interpretation of pragmatic meaning, the desire to consistently distinguish between language and speech dictates the separation of stable linguistic and transitive colloquial aspects inherent in each word. Since speech phenomena have an infinite and colorful nature, they cannot be an object of lexical interpretation.

The process of speech, the speech activity of a person, its coloring (for example: spiritual, physiological, social, spiritual, cultural, etc.) since it is a social and natural activity, in pragmatics, speech activity is studied in conjunction with the rest of the dozen aspects of human activity. Therefore, if the structure (system) linguistics studies the language system, the language system, pragmatics studies the diskurs (communication, mutual-exchange, communication, communication-interference, colloquial) system. Simply put, speech communication as a holistic system is a science that studies the process in harmony with all linguistic and non - linguistic factors, in cooperation. Therefore, pragmatics itself reveals itself from standing at the intersection point of dozens of disciplines related to speech and morality, human behavior, spiritual activity.[9]

In conclusion, it can be concluded that the pragmatic variety of connotations is understood and understood by the speaker and the listener only when there is a common basis for them.

References:

1. Safarov, Sh. (2008). *Pragmalingvistika*. (p.10). Toshkent: ŷzMJe.
2. Xakimov, M. (2001). *ŷzbek tilida matnning pragmatik talkini*: Filolog. fan. d-ridas-si. Toshkent.
3. Mahsumova, S. (2015). *Jerkin Voŷidov asarlari lingvopragmatikasi*. (p.130). Toshkent.
4. Xakimov, M. (2013). *ŷzbet pragmalingvistika asoslari*. (p.176). Toshkent: Akademnashr.
5. Myrkin, I. Ja. (1976). *Tekst podtekst i kontekst*. (p.91). Moscow: №2.
6. Nurmonov, A., & Xakimov, M. (2001). *Lingvistik pragmatikaning nazarij shakllanishi*. ŷzbek tili va adabijoti, 4-son, p.55.
7. Gulomov, A., & Askarova, M. (1987). *Xozirgi ŷzbek adabij tili.Sintaksis*. (p.256). Toshkent: ŷkituvchi.
8. Shoabdurahmanov, Sh., et al. (1980). *Xozirgi ŷzbek adabij tili, 1-kism*. (p.424). Tashkent: ŷkituvchi.
9. (2004). *Karang: Bobozhonov Sh. Semema, uning nutkij vokelanishi va izohdi lugatdash talkini*: Filol. fan. nomz. ...dis. avtoref. (p.26). Samakand.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

10. Safarov, Sh., & Toirova, G. (2007). *Nutkning jetnosociopragmatik taxlili asoslari. Y'kuv k'y'llanma.* (p.39). Samarkand, SamDChTI nashri.
11. Farxodjonqizi, F. N., & Dilshodjonugli, N. S. (2020). Innovative processes and trends in the

educational process in Uzbekistan. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(4), 621-626.