



*Matkarimova Ashurxon Ismoilovna,
associate professor at Andizjan state institute
of foreign languages*

“RESPECT” IS AS ONE OF THE TYPES OF SPEECH ACT

Abstract

This article is devoted to some issues related to the problems of “respect” in communication and its role in sociolinguistics as one of the types of speech act.

Keywords: concept, linguistics, language, nation, communication, interact, addressee, respect, language means, phenomena.

In world linguistics, the scope of research focused on the study of language units in relation to the human factor is broadening.

In particular, in modern linguistics it is important to linguistically name the phenomena that take place in reality, to study the linguopragmatic features of the semantic field of “respect”, which is one of the main means of their communicative realization. It is also urgent for today’s linguistics to prove that paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations, which are important in determining the systemic characteristics of language and its levels in the field system, are formed in the combination of cognitive and communicative activities.

It is known from the history of world linguistics that linguistic means that express the semantic field of “respect” are divided into different groups depending on what type of person we are talking about: there are linguistic means that glorify women, men and children. Given the division into such groups, they can be said to be functional-pragmatic types of language tools. The economic, social and political processes taking place in the life of our people are, first of all, reflected in the word stock of the language. As a result, our

language is enriched with new concepts and terms and expressions that express them. Particular attention is paid to research aimed at revealing the pragmatic, culturological features of language tools, which represent the semantic field of “respect” in such processes.

The need to increase the effectiveness of reforms in the spiritual sphere in our country requires enhancing the work in this direction to a qualitatively new level. The means that make up the semantic field of “respect” are also an integral part of human speech acts and it is natural that there is a growing interest in studying its place in the communication process. Indeed, “in today’s era of globalization, it is natural that every nation, every independent state gives priority to ensuring its national interests, in this regard, first of all, the preservation and development of their culture, ancient values, mother tongue”¹. In carrying out this general task, the question of determining the expression of “respect” through verbal and nonverbal methods is pending. The main task is to express respect for the specially adapted forms of language means that make up the semantic field of “respect”, for example: -s: *dadamlar keldilar* (*Dad has come*); non-specific forms also represent respect in the process of performing another task: for example, saying a name is in fact a sign of a formal attitude, but it also represents respect – *Ahmad Ulugovich!* The factors determining this position have not been studied in a monographic way.

The concept of national identity is the sum of the needs of socio-philosophical, cultural and political interests of each nation, people, past and present values, traditions, language, culture, belonging to a particular state. It is well known that language is associated with a great social need from the perspective of its origin. People who

¹ Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти Ш. М. Мирзиёевнинг. “Ўзбек тилининг давлат тили сифатидаги нуфузи ва мавқеини тубдан ошириш чора-тадбирлари тўғрисида” ги ПФ-5850-сон Фармони. Манба: URL: <http://lex.uz/docs/4561730>

make up a society can only live by saying something to each other, expressing opinions, conveying, as well as interacting with each other in some way. In this process, they address each other with linguistic means expressing respect and non-verbal tools in a way that is specific to women, men, and children, depending on their career status, reputation, and occupation.

The historical development of society, the allocation of labor has gradually led to the division of people into separate groups and strata, and each group, class has its own forms of addressing. For example, mutual “respect” between the common people and the aristocracy, the glorification of the individual, and as a result developed and formed the means of language that form the semantic field of “respect” for the person’s status, reputation, profession. Language means of “respect” began to have their own characteristics in different regions where the same language is spoken.

The relation of language phenomena to the social factor is established by European linguists¹. Later, to this phenomenon was paid attention in Russian and Uzbek linguistics. Views were expressed on the role of addressing and honour in the speech process in the works of such scientists as N. I. Filicheva, A. A. Ufimtseva, N. Khomsky, G.S.shchur, A. Vezhbitskaya, V. V. Babaytseva, N. S. Valgina, V. V. Kolesov². The role of gestures in the process of

¹ Швейцар А. Д. Современная социолингвистика. Теория, проблемы, методы. – М.: Наука, 1976. – 176 с. Швейцар А. Д., Никольский Л. Б. Введение в социолингвистику. – М.: Наука, 1978. – 216 с.

² Филочева Н. И. Синтаксическое поле. – М.: Наука, 1977. – 204 с.; Уфимцева А. А. Опыт изучения лексики как системы. – М.: Изд-во АН, 1962. – 288 с.; Хомский Н. Синтаксические структуры. Новое в лингвистике. Вып. 2, – Москва, Наука, 1962. – 412 с.; Щур Г. С. Теория поля в лингвистике. – М.: Наука, 1976. – 256 с.; Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство лексики и прагматики. – М.: Наука, 2001. – 288 с.; Вежбицкая А. Семантические универсалии и описание языков. Пер. с англ. Шмелова А. Д. – М.: 2001. –

addressing and addressing in children's language is studied in the dissertation of AG Gadjieva¹.

While the social significance of addressing in relation to dialogic speech was studied by H. Doniyorov, B. Yuldashev, form of addressing, communication etiquette and stable speech habits were studied by S. Muminov, Sh. Rahmatullaev compared the existing forms of addressing in Uzbek with those in Russian².

A. Gulamov and Sh. Rahmatullaev paid special attention to the aspects of some morphological units expressing respect, in particular, the plural affix -s³. Scholars such as N. K. Dmitriev, E. V. Sevortyan, A. N. Kononov, F. Abdullaev, K. Nazarov have commented on the fact that the meaning of respect can be expressed

568 с.; Бабайцева В. В., Максимов Л. Ю. Современный русский язык. Ч. 3. Синтаксис. Пунктуация. – М.: Наука, 1987. – 256 с.; Валгина Н. С. Синтаксис современного русского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, 1991. – 416 с.; Колесов В. В. Язык города. – М.: Высшая школа, 1991. – 192 с.

¹ Гаджиева А. Г. Лингвистический анализ детской речи (на материале азербайджанского языка). Автореф. ... канд. дисс. филол. наук. – Баку, 1989. – 24 с.

² Дониёров Х. Қипчоқ диалектарининг лексикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1979. – 111–112 б.; Йўлдошев Б. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тилида фразеологик бирликларнинг функционал-услубий хусусиятлари: Филол. фан. докт. дисс. ... автореф. – Тошкент, 1993. – 49 б.; Мўминов С. М. Ўзбек мулоқот ҳуққининг ижтимоий-лисоний хусусиятлари. Филол. фан. д-ри ... дисс. автореф. – Тошкент, 2000. – 57 б.; Исқандарова Ш. М. Ўзбек нутқ одатининг мулоқот шакллари. Филол. фан. номз. дисс. автореф. – Самарқанд, 1993. – 24 б.

³ Ғуломов А. Ўзбек тилида кўплик категорияси. – Тошкент, 1944. – 56 б.; Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳурмат формаси // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. – Тошкент, 1973. № 1. – Б. 28–30. Зикриллаев Ф. Ўзбек тили морфологияси. – Бухоро, 1994. – Б. 23.; Зикриллаев Ф. Фёълнинг шахс, сон ва ҳурмат категорияси системаси. – Тошкент, Фан, 1990. – 111 б.; Зикриллаев. Г. Семантико-функциональное исследование системы предикативных категорий узбекского глагола. Автореф. дисс. ... докт. филол. наук. – Ташкент, 1990. – 54 с.

through possessive affixes¹. A. Khojiev, S. Usmanov, R. Kungurov, Y. Tojiev, R. Ikramova² enumerated the meaning of respect among some means of modal meaning and called it “modal form”, “subjective form of assessment”, “tools of miniaturization”. It appears that the morphological means of expressing respect have been studied blended with other category means. G. Zikrillaev studied it by linking it to the category of person-number within the group of verbs³. H. Khojieva studied the means of expressing the meaning of respect as a whole, and found that these means are not only mutually meaningful, but also ambiguous and economical⁴.

B. Yusupov expresses his thoughts about the features of the meaning of respect in the framework of pronouns. In addition,

¹ Дмитриев К. Н. Категория принадлежности. ИСГТЯ, 4. II.– М.: 1956.– С. 22; Севортян. Э.В. К проблеме частей речи в тюркских языках // Вопросы грамматического строя.– М.: 1960.– С. 146.–154.; Кононов А. Н. Грамматика современного узбекского литературного языка.– М.: 1960.– С. 130.; Абдуллаев Ф. К вопросу о генезисе притяжательных и падежных аффиксов // Вопросы узбекского языка и литературы.–Ташкент, 1961.– С. 30–31; Назаров К. Притяжательные аффиксы в узбекских народных говорах: Автореф. ... канд.дисс филол. наук.–Ташкент, 1963.– 29 с.

² Ҳожиёв А. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида форма ясаилиши.– Тошкент, 1979.– 80 б.; Усмонов С. Ўзбек тилида сўзларнинг грамматик формалари. // Низомий номидаги ТДПИ илмий асарлар.– Тошкент, 1964.– 42-китоб.–Б. 126–127; Қўнғуров Р. Субъектив баҳо формаларининг семантик ва стилистик хусусиятлари.– Тошкент, Фан, 1980.–165 б.; Тожиёв Ё. Ўзбек тили морфемикаси.– Тошкент, ТошДУ, 1992.–68 б.; Икромов Р. Ўзбек тилида отларнинг синтетик, аналитик ва функционал формалари.– Тошкент, Фан, 1985.– 120 б.

³ Зикриллаев Ф.Н. Феълнинг шахс, сон ва ҳурмат категорияси системаси.– Тошкент, Фан, 1990.– 111 б.

⁴ Ҳожиёва Ҳ. Я. Ўзбек тилида ҳурмат майдони ва унинг лисоний нутқий хусусияти. Филол. фан. номз. ... дисс.– Самарқанд, 2001.– 150 б.

on the aspects of the semantics of respect related to pronouns, K. E. Maitinskaya dwells on the use of pronouns in non-relative languages. M. S. Uzina wrote about the fact that pronouns in Persian express respect¹. D. Hakimov's article "Lexical and semantic features of the pronouns *siz* and *sen*"² complements the existing views about the expression of the meaning of respect in the Uzbek language through pronouns.

Sh. B. Sadikova studies the meaning of respect as a lexical-grammatical category as a socio-linguistic phenomenon. The meaning of respect is genetically classified and divided into original and relative types of respect. The structure, meaning, function and forms of the means that make up the category of respect are analyzed³.

The application of the concept of syntactic field in grammar is artificially (theoretically) associated with attempts to model the relationships between syntactic structures that actually exist in the minds of language users. In the division of syntactic fields it is necessary to have a set of linguistic means that are expressively different, but partially or completely consistent in the content plan, that is, have common invariant semantic features. Also, semantic invariance, functional closeness, leads to a functionally collaborative relationship in a particular syntactic field. The approximate syntactic models in the field plan form a field and serve the general area of

¹ Юсупов. Б. «Местоимения в староузбекском литературном языке» (XV–XVI вв.), – Ташкент: Фан, 1991. – 142 с.; Майтинская. К. Е. Местоимения в языках разных систем. – М.: 1969. – 153 с.; Узина М. С. О местоименном функционировании вежливых эквивалентов местоимений *баңдэ* и *инджанэб* в современном персидском языке // Теория и типология местоимений. – М.: 1980. – 128 с.

² Хакимов. Д. *Сиз ва сен олмошларининг лексик-семантик хусусиятлари* // *Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти*. – Тошкент, 2003. – № 5. – Б. 77–79.

³ Содиқова Ш. Б. *Ўзбек тилида хурмат категорияси. Монография*. – Тошкент, 2010. – 128 б.

the language. It is well known that in the semantic field words do not enter into internal relations and connections as a whole with the sum of all their fields, but with their separate meanings. Meaning can be viewed as a differential-semantic feature of words or a set of components. In solving the problem of the semantic connection of words in the field, it is necessary to consider the following: if the meanings of the words have a common part (the sets intersect), the two words are considered to be related to each other. In this case, the meanings in the semantic field must be interspersed with the general components, i.e., the parts that are in zero, equivalent, and specific opposition. If the relationship between the sets corresponds to four types of opposition, then the opposition between the elements of the set is only zero and disjunctive. In semantic fields, the relationship of polysemantic word meanings has a special place. It is now said that polysemous word meanings form an interconnected and interdependent microsystem, and that within a polysemous word there can also be semantic homonymy, i.e., meanings that are not part of a common semantic¹. F. A. Litvin argues that the meanings of polysemantic words can include the following three types of relationships: intersection, addition, semantic homonymy². It should be noted that only intersecting and joining relations unite meanings into one semantic field. Semantic homonymy, on the other hand, divides itself into different areas. Accordingly, Professor Sh. Iskandarova says that the relationship of intersection and joining is important for the study of polysemous words as a semantic structure of the field, the “scope of concepts”. The polysemy of a word, both through

¹ Искандарова Ш. М. Ўзбек тили лексикасини мазмуний майдон сифатида ўрганиш (шахс микромайдони). Филол. фан. д-ри. ... дисс.– Тошкент, 1999.– 238 б.

² Литвин Ф. А. Многозначность слова в языке и речь.– М.: Высшая школа, 1984.

its basic meaning and in its addition, always lies at the center of the semantic field they create, and all other meanings are directly or indirectly subordinated to it. Although the proposal to take its main meaning as a semantic invariant of a polysemous word among the explanations of common meanings is introduced by most scholars, it is only one of the lexical-semantic variants of the word and its use in speech negates other variants¹. Kuznetsova E. V. examining the lexicon of the verb, the invariant of the polysemous word suggests that it be called a “generalized meaning,” considering it necessary to obtain a separate modification of it rather than a simple general meaning as a “semantic standard”.

Generalized meaning is the basic specific meanings that arise on the basis of the development of their content in a given situation. General meaning as a separate lexical-semantic variant differs from the main meaning in terms of semantic structure and text type (general meaning occurs in a broader text than the specific meaning), and differs from other secondary meanings in its proximity to the main definite meaning and its special role in the secondary synonymous paradigm. The peculiarity of the semantic fields that make up the meanings of a polysemous word is that they relate to a single word as a unit of expression plan. But with the means of the plan of expression, the particular meanings of the polysemous word must also be differentiated. The main means of this distinction is text².

“Verbal communication is a process of interaction of the speaker and listener (communicators) activities, information, interests, abilities, knowledge, skills, abilities, combined with linguistic and non-

¹ Искандарова Ш. М. Ўзбек тили лексикасини мазмуний майдон сифатида ўрганиш (шахс микромайдони). Филол. фан. д-ри. ... дисс. – Тошкент, 1999. – 238 б.

² Кузнецова Э. В. О статусах слова. Исследования по семантике. – Уфа, 1983.

linguistic means, effective and multi-faceted, multifaceted pragmatic value. At first glance, the separation of large-scale macro units of a verbal communication system seems like a simple task. In practice, however, the problems encountered in performing this task are more complex. The difficulty of distinguishing a macro-unity is that it is in a hierarchical structure and the relationships of the parts that make up this hierarchy have structural, semantic, cognitive features¹.

Sh. Safarov emphasizes that the knowledge of objects and events in reality, in other words, the formation of consciousness is a process that goes through several stages, and agrees with the views of D. P. Gorsky: “Knowing and perceiving objects and events in reality is a complex activity that involves a number of logical and spiritual actions. The first stage of this activity is, of course, the act of separating a particular object from a series of other objects. To distinguish one object from another, it is necessary to find its distinguishing features. In the next stage, the emotional symbol of the object is formed based on the comparison of the distinguishing features. In the next step, similar aspects of the symbol that appears in memory with other symbols stored in memory are explored. Finally, an important step in knowing reality is the act of generalization”².

The formation of the macro-unity of the communication system is based on semantic and content integrity. This wholeness is a cognitive-linguistic phenomenon, which is called a *transaction*. J. Sinker and M. Culthard distinguished transaction as the highest unit of the communication system, implying that this unit contained the smallest units of the system³. However, this distinction in the

¹ Тоирова Г. И. Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси. Ўқув луғати. – Тошкент, 2016. – 59 б. – Б. 26.

² Сафаров Ш. Когнитив тилшунослик. – Жиззах: Сангзор, 2006. – Б. 15.

³ Sinclair D., Coulthard M. Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by Teachers and Pupils. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1975.

unity of the communication system is nothing more than an approach to the analysis of this system in the form of a “phrase and a higher level of speech.” In this case, it is natural that the researcher’s attention is drawn mainly to the formal relationships of linguistic units that occur in parts of the text and in the oral speech process. In the analysis of the unity of communication, it is impossible not to take into account the relationship between formal and functional features, as well as the content indicators that form on the basis of this relationship. The communicative content that is purposefully expressed and the informative content that is formed in the listener’s perception (perception) without being related to the speaker’s desire do not contradict each other, on the contrary, they become a factor that ensures the effectiveness of communication.

The combination of communicative and informative content ensures the integrity of the macro unit of the communication system. It is now recognized that only discourse has such a feature of integrity¹.

Discourse (French *discours*), widely used in Western linguistics, was originally analyzed as a higher level of language than the sentence. V. A. Zvegintsev, who noted the influence of “centrifugal force” in linguistic activity, called the discourse “a linguistic region hidden behind the clouds”².

Discourse is a process of expression of opinion, material realization of written or oral form of linguistic possibilities, joint use of linguistic and non-linguistic means, a set of linguo-ethno-psycho-situational factors.

Linguistic means that express respect in every language have emerged as a result of historical, cultural development. The forms

¹ Stubbs M. *Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language.* – Oxford Univ. Press, 1983.

² Звегинцев В. А. *Язык и лингвистическая теория.* – М.: МГУ, 1976.

of expression of the concept of respect, the means of expression, are the product of a particular historical process. The fact that respect is related to language development, communicative attitude, form of expression, and manifestation characteristics requires its study as a semantic field. Language means expressing the semantic field of respect are manifested in the socio-linguistic situation, in the linguistic concepts that have morphological, syntactic, lexical means in terms of speech expression, the event that takes place in the process of communication.

We know that every work of art brings with it many innovations in our spiritual life. They teach the reader a new look at what is going on in life, arming him with a new idea. Everyone expresses their opinion differently. By saying this “new word or phrase” he realizes his purpose through the existing lexical-expressive means. But any new meaning does not always lead to the emergence of new words, phrases, expressive structures. However, as a result of various research, new words or new content can be discovered on their own. These are traditional means of artistic representation, which help to accurately embody in the imagination of the reader-listener the quality, character, shape and style of the created image or scenery. For example: Valodat va nasabi: valodati sekkiz yuz sekson ikkida, Hisor viloyatida edi. Sulton Mahmud mirzoning ikkinchi o'g'lidir. Sulton Mas`ud Mirzodin kichik, Sulton Ali mirzo va Sulton Husayn va Sulton Vays mirzodinkim, xon Mirzo bilan mashhurdir, ulug' onasi Pashabegim edi. (*The origin: was born in 882 in Hisar province. He is the second son of Sultan Mahmud Mirza. Sultan Mas'ud Mirza was the youngest, Sultan Ali Mirza and Sultan Husayn and Sultan Weiss Mirza were famous with Khan Mirza, and his great mother was Pashabegim*).

Shakl va shamoyili: ulug' ko'zluk, ko'ba yuzluq, o'rta bo'yliq, turkman chehraliq, malohatliq yigit edi. (*Appearance: he was a hand-*

some young man with big glasses, a big face, a medium height, a Turkmen face).

There are also linguistic means used in relation to a person in power, which are among the sentences that form the basis for a secondary nomination. First of all, respect should be distinguished from flattery. Because they can be positive or negative. Respect is positive, for all languages have a set of tools that make up a particular system. We called that set of linguistic means as the semantic field. Nihoyat, Ulug'bek qilichi o'tkir chiqib, mag'ribdan mashriqqacha qanot yozgan hududsiz saltanat xiyol osoyish topgan edi, toju taxt valiahdi shahzoda Abdullatif o'z padari buzrukvoriga qarshi shamshir ko'tarib chiqdi. (*Eventually, Ulugbek's sword came out sharp, and the boundless kingdom, which spread its wings from west to east, found peace*). Rajab oyining boshlarida a'lohazratlari lashkar tortib Jayhun tomon o'tlanishga majbur bo'ldi (*At the beginning of the month of Rajab, His Majesty was forced to draw an army and march towards Jaihun. Ammo davlatpanoh Jayhun bo'ylarida lashkar tortib turganida dorulmulkda sodir bo'lgan fitnalar uni Samarqandga qaytishga majbur etdi*¹). (*However, when the state was drawing troops to the shores of Ceyhan, the conspiracies in Dorulmulk forced him to return to Samarkand*).

In accordance with the rules of the palace law, the author selects and uses the necessary text for the same text from the father and son microfield:

son – prince – Abdullatif – valiahd (successor);

father – king – Ulugbek – padari buzrukvor (the great father) – governor

This shows that Abdullatif is an ungrateful, ignorant son who cannot rise to the level of the Crown Prince, who puts his own interests above those of the country, and that Ulugbek is a real governor who puts the interests of the people and the state in any case.

¹ Ёқубов О. Улуғбек хазинаси. – Т.: 1994. – Б. 4.

The culture of a well-rounded person, his thinking, his attitude, his way out of the situation stand out. In the process of interpersonal and interpersonal relationships, conscious reliance on an abnormal social situation or event is an important stage of maturity in self-improvement, realization, management, evaluation, self-command, respect, honor, glorification, politeness, and flattery.

It is recognized that respect can be studied by G. N. Zikrilaev as a functional-semantic field or grammatical-lexical field, in which case the morphological means expressing it form the core of this field¹. However, in the works of the scientist, the expression of respect through the essence of noun and adjective is not analyzed. The joint use of different categories of means of respect in speech (speech) is not described (there are several examples of the use of verbs with nouns). The expression of respect by phonetic and non-linguistic means, the contribution of auxiliary words in its expression is not mentioned at all. Furthermore, there is no idea that there are meanings that are inextricably linked with respect and that it is appropriate to treat them with respect. If we say that the category is based on a common meaning for the means, then it is important both theoretically, practically and methodologically to study such meanings, that is, to combine all the common meanings into one category, system or field. The nature and means of expression of the meaning of respect allow us to say that in modern Uzbek there is a category of respect or a field of respect. However, given the positive personal attitude of respect, the fact that in the Uzbek language this attitude is different from respect, as well as the presence of means of expressing a negative attitude, it must be acknowledged that the boundary of respect falls into a wider category or level. In other words, it seems reasonable to

¹ Зикриллаев Г. Феълнинг шахс, сон ва ҳурмат категориялари системаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1990. – 111 б.

assume that there is a field of personal attitude in the modern Uzbek language¹.

Differences in the habit of communication between women and men are observed at almost all levels of the language system. Firstly, we will talk about the units in the stages of the communication process.

“Ancient Turkic peoples considered treating one’s name with respect a sign of respect and esteem for that person. The main way of such respect is not to call a person by name. Accordingly, among most of the Turkic peoples, there were customs that young people could not call the elderly people by their names, and the wife could not name the husband, and the husband could not name the wife. Such a custom, especially for women, was strictly adhered to in terms of etiquette. For example, in the past, in many families in Fergana, it is still common for a woman to call her husband by the name of one of her children (mostly the eldest child) and to use expressions such as “my son’s father”, “my husband”, “my master”. When a husband speaks of his wife, it is accustomed that he uses the words such as “your bride,” “your daughter,” “your sister,” and “my family.” “It’s very common in many nations around the world, including Armenians and Koreans, Georgians and Azerbaijanis, Kazakhs and Turkmen”².

Наммайоқ қий-чув бо’либ кетди.

– *Xudoga topshirdim, bolam!*

– *Tezroq keling, dadasi*³.

(There was a commotion everywhere.

¹ Ҳожиева Ҳ. Я. Ўзбек тилида ҳурмат майдони ва унинг лисоний нутқий хусусияти. Филол. фан. номз. ... дисс.– Самарқанд, 2001.– Б. 87

² Мўминов С. М. Ўзбек мулоқот ҳуққининг ижтимоий-лисоний хусусиятлари. Филол. фан. д-ри ... дисс. автореф.– Тошкент, 2000.– 57 б.

³ Ҳошимов Ў. Икки эшик ораси.– Т.: “Шарк”, 1996.– Б. 110.

“I trust you to God, my son!”

“Come quickly, the father.”)

In this example, we see respect for a man by a woman referring to her husband as *“the father”* (*dadasi*).

– *Bizni kutdirma, o’g’lim.*

Otabek mag’lub bir boqish bilan bu so’zni aytkuchi otasig’a qaradi va yalinchoq bir ohangda javob berdi:

– *Men sizlarning orzularingizni bajarishka – agar xursandchilig’ingiz shu bilan bo’lsa – har vaqt hozirman. Ammo bir bechoraga ko’ra-bila turib jabr ham xiyonat... Hoji o’g’lining maqsadig’a darrov tushuna olmadi va so’radi:*

– *Kimga, xotiningg’ami?*

– *Yo’q, sizning oladiring’an kelingizga. O’g’lingizning vujudi bilan orzuingizni qondirish oson bo’lsa ham kelingiz qarshisida meni bir jonsiz haykal o’rnida tasavvur qilingiz¹.*

(«Don’t keep us waiting, my son).”

Otabek looked at his father, who said this with a defeated look, and replied in a begging tone: – I am always ready to fulfill your dreams – if you are happy with it. But clear oppression towards a poor person is also a betrayal ...

Haji could not immediately understand his son’s purpose and asked:

“To whom, your wife?”

“No, to your soon-to-be bride.” Imagine me instead of a lifeless statue in front of your bride, even if it is easy to fulfill your dream with your son’s body).

However, in this example, the word *“your bride”* shows Otabek’s indifference to Zaynab.

In conclusion, the national mentality, communicative character, politeness and national specificity in Uzbek and English culture are

¹ URL: <http://www.ziyouz.com> kutubxonasi Қодирий А. роман “Ўткан кунлар”. – Б. 73.

reflected in the psycholinguistic influence of the addresser on the addressee in the communication situation of the representatives of both peoples. Speech etiquette is the most important factor in expressing respect.

References:

1. Абдуллаев Ф. К вопросу о генезисе притяжательных и падежных аффиксов // Вопросы узбекского языка и литературы. – Ташкент, 1961. – С. 30–31.
2. Бабайцева В. В., Максимов Л. Ю. Современный русский язык. Ч. 3. Синтаксис. Пунктуация. – М.: Наука, 1987. – 256 с.
3. Валгина Н. С. Синтаксис современного русского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, 1991. – 416 с.
4. Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство лексики и прагматики. – М.: Наука, 2001. – 288 с.
5. Вежбицкая А. Семантические универсалии и описание языков. Пер. с англ. Шмелова А. Д. – М.: 2001. – 568 с.
6. Гаджиева А. Г. Лингвистический анализ детской речи (на материале азербайджанского языка). Автореф. ... канд. дисс. филол. наук. – Баку, 1989. – 24 с.
7. Гуломов А. Ўзбек тилида кўплик категорияси. – Тошкент, 1944. – 56 б.
8. Дмитриев К. Н. Категория принадлежности. ИСГТЯ, 4. II. – М.: 1956. – С. 22.
9. Дониёров Х. Қипчоқ диалектларининг лексикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1979. – 111–112 б.
10. Ёқубов О. Улуғбек хазиnasi. – Т.: 1994. – 4 с.
11. Звегинцев В. А. Язык и лингвистическая теория. – М.: МГУ, 1976.
12. Зикриллаев Ф. Фельнинг шахс, сон ва ҳурмат категориялари системаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1990. – 111 б.

13. Зикриллаев Ф. Ўзбек тили морфологияси. – Бухоро, 1994. – 23 б.
14. Зикриллаев. Г. Семантико-функциональное исследование системы предикативных категорий узбекского глагола. Автореф. дисс... докт. филол. наук. – Ташкент, 1990. – 54 с.
15. Икромов Р. Ўзбек тилида отларнинг синтетик, аналитик ва функционал формалари. – Тошкент, Фан, 1985. – 120 б.
16. Искандарова Ш. М. Ўзбек нутқ одатининг мулоқот шакллари. Филол. фан. номз. дисс автореф.. – Самарқанд, 1993. – 24 б.
17. Искандарова Ш. М. Ўзбек тили лексикасини мазмуний майдон сифатида ўрганиш (шахс микромайдони). Филол. фан. д-ри. ... дисс. – Тошкент, 1999. – 238 б.
18. Йўлдошев Б. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тилида фразеологик бирликларнинг функционал-услубий хусусиятлари: Филол. фан. докт. дисс... автореф. – Тошкент, 1993. – 49 б.
19. Кононов А. Н. Грамматика современного узбекского литературного языка. – М.: 1960. – 130 с.
20. Кузнецова Э. В. О статусах слова. Исследования по семантике. – Уфа, 1983.
21. Колесов В. В. Язык города. – М.: Высшая школа, 1991. – 192 с.
22. Қўнғуров Р. Субъектив баҳо формаларининг семантик ва стилистик хусусиятлари. – Тошкент, Фан, 1980. – 165 б.
23. Литвин Ф. А. Многозначность слова в языке и речь. – М.: Высшая школа, 1984.
24. Майтинская К. Е Местоимения в языках разных систем. – М.: 1969. – 153 с.
25. Мўминов С. М. Ўзбек мулоқот ҳулқининг ижтимоий-лисоний хусусиятлари. Филол. фан. д-ри ... дисс. автореф. – Тошкент, 2000. – 57 б.
26. Назаров К. Притяжательные аффиксы в узбекских народных говорах: Автореф. ... канд. дисс филол. наук. – Ташкент, 1963. – 29 с.

27. Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳурмат формаси // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти.–Тошкент, 1973.– № 1.– Б. 28–30.
28. Сафаров Ш. Когнитив тилшунослик.– Жиззах: Сангзор, 2006.– Б. 15.
29. Севортян Э.В. К проблеме частей речи в тюркских языках // Вопросы грамматического строя.– М.: 1960.– С. 146.–154.
30. Содиқова Ш. Б. Ўзбек тилида ҳурмат категорияси. Монография.– Тошкент, 2010.– 128 б.
31. Sinclair D., Coulthard M. Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by Teachers and Pupils. – London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1975.
32. Stubbs M. Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language.– Oxford Univ. Press, 1983.
33. Тоирова Г. И. Ўзбек прагмалингвистикаси. Ўқув лугати.– Тошкент, 2016.– 59 б.– Б. 26.
34. Тожиев Ё. Ўзбек тили морфемикаси.– Тошкент, ТошДУ, 1992.–68 б.
35. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти Ш. М. Мирзиёевнинг “Ўзбек тилининг давлат тили сифатидаги нуфузи ва мавқеини тубдан ошириш чора-тадбирлари тўғрисида” ги ПФ-5850-сон Фармони. Манба: URL: <http://lex.uz/docs/4561730>
36. Узина М. С. О местоименном функционировании вежливых эквивалентов местоимений бандэ и ин джанэб в современном персидском языке // Теория и типология местоимений.–М.:1980.–128 с.
37. Уфимцева А. А. Опыт изучения лексики как системы.– М.: Изд-во АН, 1962.– 288 с.
38. Усмонов С. Ўзбек тилида сўзларнинг грамматик формалари // Низомий номидаги ТДПИ илмий асарлар.– Тошкент, 1964.– 42-китоб.– Б. 126–127.
39. Филочева Н. И. Синтаксическое поле.– М.: Наука, 1977.– 204 с.

40. Хакимов. Д. Сиз ва сен олошларининг лексик-семантик хусусиятлари // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. – Тошкент, 2003. – № 5. – Б. 77–79.
41. Хомский Н. Синтаксические структуры. Новое в лингвистике. Вып.2, – Москва, Наука, 1962. – 412 с.
42. Ҳожиёва Ҳ. Я. Ўзбек тилида ҳурмат майдони ва унинг лисоний нутқий хусусияти. Филол. фан. номз. ... дисс. – Самарқанд, 2001. – Б. 87. – 150 б.
43. Ҳожиёв А. Ҳозирги ўзбек тилида форма ясалиши. – Тошкент, 1979. – 80 б.
44. Ҳошимов Ў. Икки эшик ораси. – Т.: “Шарк”, 1996. – 110 б.
45. Щур Г. С. Теория поля в лингвистике. – М.: Наука, 1976. – 256 с.
46. Швейцар А. Д. Современная социолингвистика. Теория, проблемы, методы. – М.: Наука, 1976. – 176 с.
47. Швейцар А. Д., Никольский Л. Б. Введение в социолингвистику. – М.: Наука, 1978. – 216 с.
48. Юсупов Б. «Местоимения в староузбекском литературном языке» (XV–XVI вв.), – Ташкент: Фан, 1991. – 142 с.
49. URL: <http://www.ziyouz.com> kutubxonasi Қодирий А. роман “Ўткан кунлар”. – 73 р