



UDK: 101.83.11(106)

Aminaxon XUSHMAMATOVA,
Texnologiya, menejment, kommunikatsiyalar instituti o'qituvchisi
E-mail: aminaxon.xushmamatova@gmail.com

Renessans ta'lim universiteti dotsenti, f.f.d. N.Xursanov taqrizi asosida

PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF DIALOGIC COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK DRAMATIC DISCOURSE

Annotation

This article is devoted to the comparative linguopragmatic analysis of dialogic communication in dramatic works written in two unrelated languages - English and Uzbek. It aims to reveal the similarities and differences in dialogic discourse across these languages and cultures. The study also focuses on the expression of communicative intent between dramatic characters and examines how pragmatic situations emerge through linguistic means in the speech of both the addresser and the addressee.

Key words: drama, discourse, dialogue, pragmatics, irony, implicature, speech acts.

ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ ДИАЛОГИЧЕСКОГО ОБЩЕНИЯ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ДРАМАТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

Аннотация

Данная статья посвящена сравнительному лингвопрагматическому анализу диалогического общения в драматических произведениях, написанных на двух неродственных языках - английском и узбекском. Целью статьи является выявление сходств и различий в диалогическом дискурсе в этих языках и культурах. Исследование также фокусируется на выражении коммуникативного намерения между драматическими персонажами и изучает, как прагматические ситуации возникают с помощью языковых средств в речи как адресанта, так и адресата.

Ключевые слова: драма, дискурс, диалог, прагматика, ирония, импликатура, речевые акты.

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARI DRAMATIK DISKURSIDA DIOLOGIK MULOQOTNING PRAGMATIK JIHATLARI

Annotatsiya

Mazkur maqola qardosh bo'lmagan tillar, xususan, ingliz va o'zbek tillarida yaratilgan dramatik asarlardagi muloqotning diologik shaklini lingvopragmatik jihatdan chog'ishtirma planda tadqiq qilishga qaratilgan bo'lib, dramatik asarlardagi diologik muloqotning tillar ham madaniyatlararo o'xshashligi va farqlarini qiyosiy jihatdan ochib berishni maqsad qiladi. Shuningdek, drama qahramonlari o'rtasidagi kommunikativ maqsadning ifoda plani, lisoniy vositalar orqali adresant va adresat nutqidagi pragmatik vaziyatning yuzaga kelishi ham tahlilga tortilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: drama, diskurs, dialog, pragmatika, kinoya, implikatura, nutq akti.

Introduction. It is essential to emphasize that the perception of the world of language is realized based on universal human principles. This is because the human capacity for logical thinking is characterized by commonality, regardless of which part of the world a person inhabits. If such universality did not exist, people living on different continents and speaking different languages would not be able to understand one another, comprehend each other, or engage in mutual communication [6]. A clear illustration of this can be found in the various forms of speech - particularly in the deeper examination of monologue, dialogue, and polylogue. Through dialogues, pragmatic elements such as social relationships between dramatic characters, speech strategies, implicit meanings, humor, and irony are conveyed. Dialogic communication has been studied by M.M. Bakhtin and A.A. Leontyev as a fundamental form of interpersonal interaction [1,7]. Pragmatics, on the other hand, has been thoroughly explored by scholars such as H.P. Grice, J.R. Searle, J.L. Austin, and

S. Levinson through the analysis of speech acts, implicature, presupposition, and context-based meanings [8]. In dramatic discourse, these theories are particularly applied to express the socio-psychological tensions between characters.

A.A. Leontyev considered dialogic speech as a form of communicative activity, placing particular emphasis on the speakers' communicative intentions and responsive reactions. He analyzed speech activity in communicative situations and regarded dialogic speech as a crucial tool for interaction. According to Leontyev, "dialogic speech is often unplanned, situational in nature, and requires an understanding of the real or imagined context in which it occurs. Moreover, dialogic speech is usually reactive in character" [7]. Dialogue, as one of the forms of speech, directly addresses the interlocutor with each utterance [3].

According to linguist N. Khursanov, in dramatic works, dialogue does not reveal the internal emotional states of the characters. Rather, it serves as the primary linguistic means through which the plot is developed [5]. Dialogic

speech represents a simple speech act, whereas monologic speech constitutes a complex speech act. The defined features of dialogic and monologic speech play a crucial role in identifying their communicative characteristics [13]. Based on the above considerations, it can be emphasized that dramatic dialogue is characterized by its brevity. It typically expresses only the most essential elements needed to continue the conversation. Events are rarely elaborated in detail, and the dialogue consists of question-answer sequences, debates, various actions, and exchanges of thoughts.

As an example, this article presents a comparative analysis of selected dialogues from Uzbek and English dramatic works, including Abdulla Qahhor's "Ayajonlarim" and other plays.

Shakar. "Ana undan keyin biz kirib boramizu, gapni sovugan joyidan boshlaymiz. Nima dediyar, bolam?"

Umidaxon. "Xo'p, ayajon, siz nima desangiz shu" [12].

In this dialogue, speech acts are manifested in the form of requests and suggestions. Politeness markers such as "bolam" and "xo'p, ayajon" reflect social hierarchy and cultural norms of respect. The daughter's phrase "siz nima desangiz shu" illustrates obedience to parents, highlighting the importance of parental opinion for the child or the desire to seek their approval.

Dialogues in Uzbek dramas often include various speech acts, which may simultaneously express irony, reproach, subtle respect, and obedience. A clear example of this can be found in Abdulla Qahhor's play "Og'riq tishlar", where such pragmatic features are vividly reflected in the dialogues.

Marasul: "(Bolani berib) ushlang, siz ham bormay qo'ya qoling."

Nasiba: "O'zingiz ayttingiz-ku?"

Marasul: "Qachondan beri men nima desam shuni qiladigan bo'lib qoldingiz?"

Although ironic and admonishing speech acts are present in this exchange, the man's use of the respectful form of address ("siz") also indicates a tone of mild politeness. The woman's response contains a subtle criticism, while the man's reply conveys an indirect reproach rather than a direct accusation.

In English dramaturgy, the second half of the twentieth century is marked by a modern and psychologically profound representation of communication. In particular, the works of Harold Pinter and John Osborne exhibit significant pragmatic features on the level of dialogue. Through dialogue, these playwrights not only facilitate the exchange of information between characters, but also reveal internal conflicts, psychological tensions, and the broader pressures and instability present in society. One of the English linguists, J. Austin, in his analysis of subtle semantic aspects of speech acts in dramatic discourse, substantiates the existence of a micro-pragmatic framework of speech. In supporting his argument, he offers the following example: "If I were to say to a couple on public transport, 'I now pronounce you husband and wife,' it would evoke nothing but the impression that I am insane" [16].

As an example:

Jimmy: "Why do you always look so bored? Do I bore you? Why don't you just leave me?"

Alison: "I'm still here, aren't I?"

In the dialogue from John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*, the questions posed by Jimmy function as expressions of accusation, complaint, and sarcasm rather than genuine inquiry. Alison's response, on the other hand, carries the implicature "I haven't left you yet," implying her continued presence despite the underlying tension.

Davies: "You said I could stay. You promised."

Aston: "I didn't say how long" [11].

This dialogue from "The Caretaker" reflects Harold Pinter's characteristic minimalist style. Aston's response is conveyed through implicature, indicating that the offered help is temporally limited. In *The Caretaker*, the dialogues appear short, disjointed, and often lack a clearly defined purpose. The interactions among Davies, Aston, and Mick reveal psychological tension, social isolation, and the ambiguity of human relationships rather than straightforward, realistic exchanges.

Davies: I could do with a bit of air. It's... it's close in here.

Aston: I could open the window.

Davies: No, no... well... I didn't mean...

Aston: You don't want me to open it?

Davies: No, no... do as you like, mate... I was just saying...

Although on the surface the dialogue concerns the weather, at a deeper level Davies is unable to articulate his desires directly. Pinter portrays the ambiguity of human psychology through pauses, ambiguity, and subtext within the communication.

In contrast, Osborne's character Jimmy Porter exposes social indifference, class division, and interpersonal alienation through his monologic speeches and ironic dialogues.

Jimmy: Why do you always have to be so silent? If you could even shout or something.

Alison: I have nothing to say.

Jimmy: That's right. You've got nothing to say. You're not human, are you? [10]

In this dialogue, Jimmy turns his wife's silence into a tool of provocation, attempting to compel her to respond emotionally. The dialogue is predominantly one-sided and pragmatically marked by illocutionary force - expressing accusation, appeal, and sarcasm.

Helena: I came to take Alison home.

Jimmy: Home? Which home? Her spiritual home or her rich father's house?

In this example, Jimmy conveys strong social irony through language. By employing the word "home" with a double meaning, he draws attention to the class-based tensions within society.

Dialogic communication in English and Uzbek dramatic discourses is expressed through distinct pragmatic means. Uzbek dramas emphasize social etiquette, politeness, and honorific forms, while English dramas often feature explicit speech acts, implicature, sarcasm, and intense psychological pressure. These differences reflect the cultural norms, communicative values, and dramatic traditions of the two nations. (See Table 1 for illustration.)

Feature	Uzbek Dramaturgy	English Dramaturgy
Expression of Respect	Strong use of honorifics (ayajon, bolam)	Less formal, informal address (mate)

Humor and Irony	Indirect, softened tone "Qachondan beri men nima desam shuni qiladigan bo'lib qoldingiz?"	Direct, sharp "Why do you always look so bored? Do I bore you?"
Implicature	Less frequently employed "O'zingiz aytgiz-ku?"	Widely used "I didn't say how long"
Speech Acts	More polite, euphemistic and indirect (istihola, muloyimlik)	Accusation, blame, psychological pressure

Table – 1.

Abdulla Qahhor's plays "Og'riq tishlar" and "Ayajonlarim" also demonstrate rich pragmatic dimensions in their dialogues, similar to those found in the works of Pinter and Osborne. For instance, in "Og'riq tishlar", although the conversations between the elderly women appear light and superficial on the surface, they conceal symbolic meanings behind the motif of toothache, subtly addressing family relationships and offering social criticism.

Fotima: Shu tishdan o'ldim-a, bolam, tish emas – jonimni oldi.

Nasiba: Yana og'riydimi? Kecha og'riq qoldiruvchi bergandim-ku...

In this dialogue, although the elderly woman refers to a toothache, she is in fact implicitly expressing her feelings of loneliness and neglect. The daughter-in-law, however, focuses solely on the physical symptom in her response. This is a clear example of pragmatically rich communication based on implicature rather than direct speech.

In "Ayajonlarim", social class, moral values, and generational differences are revealed through irony, sarcasm, and passive aggression in the dialogues. Similarly, in Qo'chqor Norqobil's play "Biz ham odammiz", social inequality, the devaluation of laborers, and broader issues of humanity are vividly portrayed through dialogue. The characters frequently attempt to assert their rights verbally, but these speech acts are often ignored - indicating a communicative imbalance within the dramatic discourse.

Qahramon: Biz ham odammiz-ku! Nimaga hammamiz hayvondek ishlashimiz kerak?

Boshliq: Ish kerakmi – jim bo'lib ishlaysan. Gap ko'p bo'lsa – chiqib ketaver.

Here, the social structure is reinforced through speech. The character voices their personal truth, yet the response takes

the form of threatening silence and coercive pragmatic force. In this instance, the communication becomes one-sided, highlighting an imbalance of power within the dialogue.

One more example:

Ishchi: Nega u doim dam oladi, biz esa to'xtamasdan ishlaymiz?

Yordamchi: Chunki ularning familiyasi boshqa.

In this conversation, social injustice is pragmatically conveyed through irony in a powerful manner. The dialogue is brief, yet semantically rich and multilayered.

The existence of language is closely tied to the actions of speaking or writing performed by individuals. During the execution of these actions, linguistic units - primarily the sentence convey not only their literal meanings but also additional functions such as asserting, commanding, warning, and promising. These meanings emerge as a result of the speaker's communicative activity. Thus, a speech act is a speaker's linguistic address to a listener, performed within a specific context and with a particular communicative intent [14].

In a speech act, the communicative intent can be expressed in various forms. In this process, implicature, irony, figurative expressions, and paretias serve as the primary means.

Conclusion. In conclusion, while English dramaturgy tends to emphasize subtext and psychological ambiguity in its dialogues, Uzbek dramaturgy more often foregrounds symbolic language, social justice, and intergenerational conflict. In both literary traditions, dialogue functions not merely as a means of communication, but also as a vehicle for the playwright's social critique and the articulation of the central dramatic message.

REFERENCE

1. Bakhtin, M.M. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. 1984 edition.
2. Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics (Vol. 3).
3. Hasanova, G.X. Dialogik nutqda noverbal vositalarning o'rni va ularning pragmatik xususiyatlari. Fil.fan.PhD diss. Avtoreferat. Farg'ona, 2023.
4. Jo'raev, M. (2018). Pragmatik tilshunoslik asoslari. Toshkent: Fan.
5. Khursanov N.I. Dramatik diskurs: kognitiv, pragmatik, lingvokulturologik tavsif. Monografiya/Toshkent.: "EXISTENTIUM-PRINT" nashriyoti. 2025. 250 b.
6. Khursanov N.I. Pragmatic analysis of uzbek phraseological units. Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences. 2024. Vol 1. Issue 7. - pp. 148-154.
7. Leontyev, A.A. (2006). Psixolingvistik birliklar va nutqiy ifoda yuzaga kelishi. – pp. 54–55.
8. Levinson, S. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Norqobil, Q. (1987). Biz ham odammiz. Toshkent: Adabiyot va san'at.
10. Osborne, J. (1956). Look Back in Anger. London: Faber & Faber.
11. Pinter, H. (1960). The Caretaker. London: Methuen.
12. Qahhor, A. (1958). Ayajonlarim. Toshkent: G'afur G'ulom nashriyoti.
13. Raupova L, Khursanov N, Khursanova L, Polatova S. Development of world modern linguistics and discourse interpretation in it. InE3S Web of Conferences 2023 (Vol. 413, p. 03023). EDP Sciences.
14. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. – Toshkent. 2008. – b. 77.
15. Searle, J.R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.
16. Хурсанов Н.И. Драматик дискурса вербал ва невербал компонентлар муносабати (ўзбек ва инглиз тилларидаги асарлар мисолида). Филол.фан.фал.д-ри. Дисс. авто-реф. – Андижон. 2022. 56 б.