УДК 81'373.4

THE REALIZATION OF TYPES OF SPEECH ACT AT LANGUAGE LEVELS

Matkarimova Ashurxon Ismoilovna

Associate professor at Andizhan state institute of foreign languages

Annotation

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. And also, the specific linguistic feature of each means, i.e. its similarities and differences with other means in the field, is divided into lexical-thematic groups.

Key words

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

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

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 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 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.

Literature review. The relation of language phenomena to the social factor is established by European linguists [21.22]. 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.Kolesov [19.18.20.23.3.4.1.12.2.11]. The role of gestures in the process of addressing and addressing in children's language is studied in the dissertation of A.G.Gadjieva [5].

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 Russian [6].

Research methodology. 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 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 semantic [8. 9].

F.A.Litvin argues that the meanings of polysemantic words can include the following three types of relationships: intersection, addition, semantic homonymy [13]. 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 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 variants [8. 9].

E.V.Kuznetsova 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 text [12].

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" [15].

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.Kulthard distinguished transaction as the highest unit of the communication system, implying that this unit contained the smallest units of the system [16.17]. However, this distinction in the 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.

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

Analysis and results. 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.

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. Ниҳоят, Улуғбек қиличи ўткир чиқиб, мағрибдан машриққача қанот ёзган ҳудудсиз салтанат хиёл осойиш топган эди, тожу тахт валиаҳди шаҳзода Абдуллатиф ўз падари бузрукворига қарши шамшир кўтариб чиқди. (*Eventually, Ulugbek's sword came out sharp, and the boundless kingdom, which spread its wings from west to east, found peace*). Ражаб ойининг бошларида аълоҳазратлари лашкар тортиб Жайҳун томон отланишга мажбур бўлди (At the beginning of the month of Rajab, His Majesty was forced to draw an army and march towards Jaihun. Аммо давлатпаноҳ Жайҳун бўйларида лашкар тортиб турганида дорулмулкда содир бўлган фитналар уни Самарқандга қайтишга мажбур этди [7]. (*However, when the state was drawing troops to the shores of Ceyhan, the conspiracies in Dorulmulk forced him to return to Samarkand*).

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 Turkmens"[14].

Ҳаммаёқ қий-чув бўлиб кетди.

- Худога топширдим, болам!

- Тезроқ келинг, дадаси [24].

(*There was a commotion everywhere.*

"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*" (*дадаси*).

- Бизни кутдирма, ўғлим.

Отабек мағлуб бир боқиш билан бу сўзни айткучи отасиға қаради ва ялинчоқ бир оҳангда жавоб берди:

- Мен сизларнинг орзуларингизни бажаришка агар хурсандчилигингиз шу билан бўлса ҳар вақт ҳозирман. Аммо бир бечораға кўра-била туриб жабр ҳам хиёнат... Ҳожи ўғлининг мақсадиға дарров тушуна олмади ва сўради:

- Кимга, хотинингғами?

- Йўқ, сизнинг оладирған келинингизга. Ўғлингизнинг вужуди билан орзуингизни қондириш осон бўлса ҳам келинингиз қаршисида мени бир жонсиз ҳайкал ўрнида тасаввур қилингиз [25].

(*"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.

Conclusion. In conclusion, the national mentality, communicative character, politeness and national specificity in Uzbek and English culture are 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. Бабайцева В.В., Максимов Л.Ю. Современный русский язык. Ч.3.Синтаксис. Пунктуация. – М.: Наука, 1987. – 256 с.

2. Валгина Н.С. Синтаксис современного русского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, 1991. – 416 с.

3. Вежбицкая А. Понимание культур через посредство лексики и прагматики. – М.: Наука, 2001. – 288 с.

4. Вежбицкая А. Семантические универсалии и описание языков. Пер. с англ. Шмелова А.Д. – М.: 2001. – 568 с.

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

6. Дониёров Х. Қипчоқ диалектларининг лексикаси. – Тошкент: Фан, 1979. - 111-112 б.

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

8. Искандарова Ш.М. Ўзбек нутқ одатининг мулоқот шакллари. Филол. фан. номз. дисс автореф.. – Самарқанд, 1993. – 24 б.

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

10. Йўлдошев Б. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тилида фразеологик бирликларнинг функционал-услубий хусусиятлари: Филол. фан. докт. дисс... автореф. –Тошкент, 1993. – 49 б.

11. Колесов В.В. Язык города. – М.: Высшая школа, 1991. – 192 с.

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

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

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

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

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

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

18. Уфимцева А.А. Опыт изучения лексики как системы. – М.: Изд-во АН, 1962. – 288 с.

19. Филичева Н.И. Синтаксическое поле.– М.: Наука, 1977. – 204 с.

20. Хомский Н. Синтаксические структуры. Новое в лингвистике. Вып.2, – Москва, Наука, 1962. – 412 с.

21. Швейцар А.Д. Современная социолингвистика. Теория, проблемы, методы. – М.: Наука, 1976. –176 с.

22. Швейцар А.Д., Никольский Л.Б. Введение в социолингвистику. –М.: Наука, 1978. –216 с.

23. Щур Г.С. Теория поля в лингвистике. – М.: Наука, 1976. – 256 с.

24. Ҳошимов Ў. Икки эшик ораси. – Т.: "Шарқ", 1996. – Б. 110.

25. www.ziyouz.com kutubxonasi Қодирий А. роман "Ўткан кунлар". – Б.73.