The similarities and differences of pragmatic acts revealed through English and Uzbek folk proverbs expressing friendship/enmity

Ergasheva Gulzoda Shermurod kyzi

PhD student of the Namangan Engineering and Technological Institute, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article discusses Speech Act Theory, which is a key concept in pragmatic linguistics. The theory asserts that a sentence is not merely a unit of information, but an action performed by the speaker, aimed at various goals such as asserting, questioning, ordering, apologizing, and more. Developed in the late 19th and 20th centuries, Speech Act Theory was shaped significantly by philosophers John Austin and John Searle. Austin's initial work in the 1950s divided speech acts into three categories: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary acts refer to the actual utterance of words, illocutionary acts represent the speaker's intent behind the utterance, and perlocutionary acts describe the effect the utterance has on the listener. The article further explores how proverbs in English and Uzbek express these acts, emphasizing the importance of context in understanding speech acts.

Introduction: Speech act theory is an important stage in pragmatic linguistics, in which a sentence is interpreted not only as an informative unit, but also as a speaker's action aimed at various goals. Although the roots of this theory appeared in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, it was fully formed in the second half of the 20th century, especially thanks to the work of philosophers such as John Austin and John Searle. According to their teachings, through a sentence we not only report on situations, but also ask, give orders, promise, apologize and perform many other actions. Thus, a speech act is not just a language unit, but also an important tool in human social life.

One of the first to promote the idea of interpreting speech acts formed in the process of communication as separate linguistic units and classifying them by content was Oxford University professor John Austin. He raised this problem in his lectures at the traditional "William James Readings" held at Harvard University in 1955. Later, these lectures were published in 1962 under the title "How to do with words".

METHOD

In grammar, each sentence was classified as either an affirmation, a negation, or a question. Austin showed that the sentence has broader and more complex functions. In his opinion, through the sentence we not only describe a situation, but also establish relationships, carry out various actions in social life.

Austin's view aroused great interest in the fields of linguistics and philosophy. Because this idea shows the need to study language not only logically, but also socially and communicatively.

So, "a speech act is the pronunciation of a certain sentence in a specific communicative environment. The formation of the content of a speech act is the result of the "enrichment" and perception of the meaning of the uttered sentence by the speaker and listener in relation to the text of communication.

J. Austin divides speech acts into 3 parts: locutionary act (act of speaking), illocutionary act (act of influence) and perlocutionary act (act of result).

A locutionary act is related to the linguistic units themselves, their grammatical structure and meaning. In other words, it is the literal meaning of the words

and sentences we say. It includes the phonetic, lexical and syntactic aspects of speech. For example, in the sentence "The weather is hot today", the locutionary act is simply the joint use of the words "today", "weather" and "hot" and their grammatical structure.

An illocutionary act is what we intend by saying the linguistic units presented in the locutionary act. This is the purpose we want to achieve through our words, for example, giving an order, asking, promising, advising, etc. This represents the "force" of the speech.

For example: By saying "It is hot today", we can intend the following:

- Simply stating a fact.

- Advising the listener to wear lighter clothes.

- Asking or urging them to open the window.

As you can see, the same locutionary act can have different illocutionary acts. Perlocutionary act (act of result) is the effect of our words on the listener, that is, the real changes that occur as a result of our words. This is related to how the listener responds to our words or how he acts as a result of them.

According to Searle and Vanderveken, "a perlocutionary act, unlike an illocutionary one, is not a linguistic phenomenon, since it is possible to achieve a perlocutionary result without performing any speech act." J. Leach also notes that perlocution does not fall within the scope of linguistic analysis: "The analysis of perlocutionary results is not part of the task of pragmatics, since the power of pragmatic influence is related to the purpose, not to the result."

For example: After we say "It is hot today," the listener may open the window, the listener may put on lighter clothes, the listener may agree with us or object. A perlocutionary act may not correspond to our intention, because it depends on the understanding and reaction of the listener. So, a locutionary act is what we say, an illocutionary act is what we intend by saying the sentence, and a perlocutionary act is what happens as a result. In our research work, we tried to show these speech acts through proverbs expressing the concepts of friendship and hostility in English and Uzbek. From the above information, it can be concluded that according to Austin's classification, speech acts are divided into 3 types: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. Searle, on the other hand, paid special attention to the types of illocutionary acts in his classification of speech acts. So, if the proverbs we highlighted in Chapter 2 are in the locutionary form, in this chapter we will analyze perlocutionary acts using their illocutionary, internal types and contexts.

According to Searle's classification, we will analyze the way proverbs express speech acts.

1. Assertive, stating, confirming speech acts. In this case, the speaker expresses confidence in the truthfulness of his words. Proverbs such as "A friend in need is a friend indeed" in English, and "A friend is a friend in hard times" in Uzbek confirm that the true test of friendship is in difficult times.

2. Directives: Speech acts that encourage the listener to perform an action. Command, request, advice, etc. The proverb "Keep your friends close, but your enemies closer" in English expresses this act. There are also many proverbs in Uzbek that express this act, for example, "Do'sti köp bilan siyaslah, Do'sti oz bilan sirlash", "Do'stga lola bo'l, Yovga jala bo'l" and others.

3. Commissives: Speech acts that express the speaker's commitment to perform a task in the future. Making a promise, swearing, etc. are part of this act. We cannot give an example of a proverb that expresses this structure in terms of content in either English or Uzbek, but proverbs can be used to express a purpose in context.

4. Expressives: Speech acts that express the speaker's feelings about a situation. Gratitude, regret, congratulations, etc.

5. Declarations: Speech acts that change the world with the utterance of words. Announcing a marriage, firing a job, etc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The importance of context in pragmatics is so strong that if there is no context, the meaning can be interpreted differently. Speech acts such as swearing, thanking, or declaring, as listed in Searle's classification above, are revealed precisely through context. Below, we will examine some of the proverbs expressing the concepts of friendship/enmity in English and Uzbek in context and carry out their pragmatic analysis.

Below, we will determine the illocutionary act of the proverb "Keep your friends close and your enemies closer" in context taken from the COCA (Corpus of Contemporary American English): "Am I supposed to just stay at home and raise this child with Barbara while you go cowboying off all the time? It won't always be like this. After reunification... Nothing will be different. Unless you stop being... Me? Hey, Jim. I have to go. We'll talk after. If there is an after. Oh, yeah?! Oh-ho! Oswald, where the hell is Nygma? Shouldn't we have left the city already? Ms. Kean, this may come as a surprise, but building a submarine from scratch by yourself takes time. Patience. Easy for you to say. You're not a walking egg timer. Tell him to get a move on. And why, exactly, are you hosting Gordon's gangland get-together? Keep your friends close and

your enemies closer, my dear. If we're really going to leave Gotham, we need to keep Gordon happy. You know all about that, don't you? It was a momentary slip. The world was on fire. Jim, it's your show. Mi casa, su casa. I'll make this short. Gotham is running dry. Our supply of clean water will only last a few more months. So you have a choice. You can keep killing each other, fighting over what little water is left, maybe eke out a few more months, then die. Or... we can all agree right now to an immediate cease-fire. The government will not annex a war zone. If we can show them that we deserve to rejoin the mainland, supply chain will be restored and we will all survive until reunification. That's the choice. "

We will analyze the use of the proverb "Keep your friends close and your enemies closer" in the given text based on Searle's classification of speech acts.

This proverb is said by Barbara Keene in relation to Jim Gordon. The context is that Barbara is explaining that Gordon has arranged a meeting with the criminal gangs. Her purpose is to emphasize that if they want to leave Gotham, they need to please Gordon.

The function of the proverb in this context is to give strategic advice. Barbara recommends the importance of maintaining relationships with Gordon, even with his enemies.

According to Searle's classification of speech acts, the use of this proverb corresponds to the Directive speech act. As we have already noted, the characteristics of directive speech acts are to encourage the listener to perform an action, which can be expressed in the form of an order, a request, advice, a suggestion, a warning, etc.

The proverb "Keep your friends close and your enemies closer" corresponds to these characteristics. By using this proverb, Barbara is advising Gordon to take a certain action, that is, to be close to her enemies. Her goal is to change Gordon's behavior and influence his strategic thinking.

If we compare it with other speech acts, in this case there is no Assertive speech act, because Barbara is not confirming or stating anything. Although she is assessing the situation, the main goal is to give advice. There is also no Commissive speech act, because Barbara is not promising any future action. There may be elements of an Expressive speech act (e.g., concern), but the main purpose is not to express feelings, but to give advice. There is also no Declaration speech act, since no situation is changing with the use of the proverb.

Let's look at another context: "alone (m) (m) Live by the gun(m) Die by the gun(m) In the line(m) That's how the west was won(m) Live by good(m) Die by good(m) In the line(m) That's how the west was won(m) West was won yeah(m) I don't wan na start a war anyways (m) (m) Oh oh ah ah ah(m) Yeah yeah(m) Live by the gun(m) Die by the gun(m) In the line(m) That's how the west was won(m) Live by gun(m) Die by gun(m) In the line(m) That's how the west was won(m) Live by the gun(m) Die by the gun(m) In the line(m) That's how the west was won(m) Live by the gun(m) Die by the gun(m) In the line(m) That's how the west was won(m) West was won(m) West was won(m) Ay ay ayYes! Yes, fuck yeah. Oh, A friend in need is a friend indeed but a friend with weed is better. Listen, no hiphop or rap jokes tonight alright. I'm very sensitive about this shit. Anyways, we have a little confession to make. We didn't think anybody was gon na show up so we decided that we would tweet out that JR Jones was playing with us tonight. And I found out he's not even in town. Aah. Come on. What. What. Boo! Fuck this. Hey, relax alright. It's all good, it's all good' cause guess what? We're playing some old songs tonight. And we're definitely gon na play a few new ones. Here's a new one. It's called Black Roses. (m) All you'll ever get is black roses (m) (m) All you'll everHey… "

In this isolated context, the proverb "A friend in need is a friend indeed" is used, and according to the context, the band, worried about the potential low attendance at their concert, falsely spread a rumor on social media that famous musician JR Jones would be performing with them. When the rumor is later exposed, they use the phrase "A friend in need is a friend indeed but a friend with weed is better" to defuse the situation and reduce the anger of the audience.

In this context, the proverb serves several purposes, including defuse the situation: Instead of apologizing to the audience for spreading false news, the band is trying to lighten the situation and make it seem funny; Changing the concept of friendship: The next part of the proverb ("but a friend with weed is better") aims to change the traditional concept of friendship and give it an unconventional, humorous meaning. Through this, the group is trying to justify their behavior, divert the audience's attention; Also, maintaining the relationship: The group aims to maintain the relationship with the audience, soothe their anger, and continue the concert.

According to Searle's classification of speech acts, the use of this proverb mainly corresponds to expressive and partly assertive speech acts. The expressive aspect is that by citing the proverb, the group is expressing their attitude, that is, they are taking the situation lightly, are prone to humor. They are also trying to change the audience's attitude, arouse positive emotions in them.

The assertive aspect is that the first part of the proverb ("A friend in need is a friend indeed") confirms the traditional concept of friendship. But the next part changes this affirmation and puts forward a new, unconventional idea. Compared to other speech acts, there is no directive speech act, because the group is not urging anyone to take any action. There is no commissive speech act, because the group is not promising to do anything in the future. There is no declaration speech act, because no situation is directly changed by the use of the proverb.

Next, let's analyze the proverb from the context given in Uzbek: — I couldn't find another dish.

— Yes, mug'ombir-yeah, please bring it, fill it up, you are also from the adults. How much money did I give you that day? You know, they say, "A friend who is responsible never leaves."

The young man turned pale a little. The thought, "What if the chairman asks for the extra money he gave me?" began to cross his mind. Lost in such thoughts, he stammered, as if he hesitated a little: "The money you gave me was four thousand three hundred soums, chairman," he replied. "Couldn't you say five thousand, Galvars!" "I swear to God, chairman. I counted the money you gave me one by one. It was four thousand three hundred soums, to be sure." The chairman and those around him burst out laughing. The young man stood awkwardly holding the oil container and looked at the chairman, not realizing anything. "Okay," the chairman said, "let it be as you say. Your monthly salary is set at four thousand three hundred soums." "Eh," the young man said after a long time, getting to the point, "if you had whispered that to me, I would have said that you had six thousand soums." The young man's face was flushed and his mouth was red.

— Oh, you simple-minded Mogambier, what's wrong with four thousand? You worked all summer, combing cotton, barely earning seven hundred a month. And then, in the winter, you would beg to have your teeth cleaned. Now, wouldn't it be nice if four thousand three hundred went into your pocket every month!

No one thought these words were a joke because the chairman spoke seriously without laughing. The young man himself would sometimes blush and sometimes turn pale, as if he regretted what he had said.

— Hey, let's set your monthly salary at five thousand, not six thousand. Do you agree, director?!

When we analyze the use of the proverb "A friend with a reckoning is inseparable" (A friend with a reckoning is inseparable/A friendship with a reckoning is indestructible) in the given text based on Searle's classification of speech acts, the main content is that in the conversation between the chairman and the young man, the chairman mentions the money he gave the young man earlier and at the same time cites the proverb "A friend with a reckoning is inseparable". Later, this money is defined as the young man's monthly salary.

Here, the proverb performs two functions: Reminding the past relationship: The chairman reminds the young man through the proverb that they had a monetary relationship before, which shows the level of their relationship (close to friendship). Also, defining the future relationship: By citing the proverb, the chairman is supposedly emphasizing that the relationship between them will be clear and transparent in the future, and will be built on the basis of calculation. Here, the proverb also performs the function of defining the basis for future monthly salary relationships.

According to Searle's classification of speech acts, the use of this proverb corresponds more to assertive and partly commissive speech acts.

The assertive aspect is that by citing the proverb, the chairman confirms the past and present situation, that is, he states that there is a certain relationship between them and that this relationship is based on calculation. The commissive aspect is that through the proverb, the chairman determines the form of future relationships, that is, relationships that will arise through the payment of a monthly salary. Although there is no direct promise here, the proverb serves the function of expressing future obligations.

In this case, if we compare it with other speech acts, there is no directive speech act, because the chairman is not urging anyone to take any action. There may be elements of an Expressive speech act (for example, expressing friendliness), but the main purpose is not to express feelings, but to confirm the situation and determine future relations.

CONCLUSION

Speech Act Theory presents a comprehensive way of analyzing language, focusing not just on the meaning of sentences but on their communicative function in social contexts. The division of speech acts into locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary categories helps in understanding the complex dynamics of communication. Through the analysis of proverbs in both English and Uzbek, it is clear that these acts function in various ways to convey meaning, influence listeners, and shape social relationships. Context plays a crucial role in interpreting the illocutionary force of utterances, making the theory a valuable tool in the study of language in its social and communicative context.

REFERENCES

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Harvard University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge University Press.

Vanderveken, D. (1990). Meaning and Speech Acts: Volume 1: Principles of Language Use. Cambridge University Press.

Leach, J. (1983). The Pragmatics of Speech Acts. Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). Foundations of Illocutionary Logic. Harvard University Press.

Givón, T. (1995). Functionalism and Grammar. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1975). Unmasking the Face: A Guide to Recognizing Emotions from Facial Clues. Prentice-Hall.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life. In Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication (pp. 35-71). Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Agha, A. (2007). Language and Social Relations. Cambridge University Press.

Kuno, S. (1973). The Structure of the Japanese Language. MIT Press.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatics in Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Bolinger, D. (1977). Meaning and Form: Lexical and Grammatical Semantics. Longman.

Ladd, D. R. (1996). Intonational Phonology. Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (1996). A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory. Cambridge University Press.