

Speech Intention Realized In Literary Discourse

Fayzullayeva Maftuna Odil qizi

Senior Lecturer, Tashkent University of Humanities, Independent Researcher, Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Received: 18 November 2025; **Accepted:** 10 December 2025; **Published:** 14 January 2026

Abstract: The article analyzes the concept of discourse from linguopragmatic and linguocultural perspectives. Through the study of speech acts and speech intention (*intentio*), the communicative and cognitive functions of the text, as well as linguistic and cultural elements in literary discourse, are examined. The research demonstrates the linguistic, cultural, and social aspects of discourse and highlights its role in shaping human perception and understanding.

Keywords: Discourse, literary discourse, speech act, speech intention, linguopragmatics, linguoculturology, communicative process, cultural context.

Introduction: From the last quarter of the twentieth century, world linguistics has increasingly focused on studying any speech structure as a product of linguistic activity from the perspective of interaction between the creator and the perceiver of the text—that is, the author and the recipient. The examination of speech structures as a communicative process led to the emergence of the concept of discourse.

Regarding the relationship between linguoculturology and discourse, it should be noted that discourse, like other linguistic units, is considered one of the main objects of study in this field. V.A. Maslova, the author of the textbook *Linguoculturology*, writes the following in this regard: “Text is the true point of intersection between linguistics and culture. Discourse is a linguistic phenomenon and represents its highest level; at the same time, it is a form through which culture exists and functions.”¹ Discourse is a complex communicative-cognitive phenomenon that involves considering a text within communication, in a dynamic state, in a sociocultural context, under the influence of linguistic and extralinguistic factors, and as a unity of linguistic and non-linguistic information (knowledge of the world and events, thoughts, and values).² All the above-mentioned factors play an important role in understanding, perceiving, and interpreting discourse. The specificity of discourse lies in its ability to figuratively represent the artistic worldview of an alternative reality modeled by the author. In this sense, discourse manifests itself as a type of literary communication, which is one of the most complex

forms of communication.

In the study of a speech structure functioning as discourse, primary importance is given to the linguistic, cognitive, pragmatic, and psychological activity of the individual—namely, the addresser and the addressee; the reality in which the speech act is performed; the direct and indirect interaction between the participants of the speech act; the modeling of the discourse construction process; and the issues of sociocultural information embedded in discourse.³ Literary discourse is a linguistic phenomenon manifested through literary texts; while expressing the author’s aesthetic intentions, it also demonstrates how cultural heritage is reflected in language. In the analysis of literary discourse, not only the linguistic aspects of language but also the cultural and social elements embodied in the text are examined. In this sense, literary discourse constitutes rich material for linguocultural analysis. To fully understand a literary work, it is necessary to take into account the period in which it was created, as well as the culture, traditions, and historical conditions of the people. Each national culture possesses its own system of cultural signs, which are reflected in literary texts and serve as linguistic indicators of national identity. Moreover, the author’s linguistic choices in literary discourse may reflect culture-specific values. Thus, by studying the modifiers used to depict space and time in the language of communication participants, we gain insight into human perceptions of reality, as well as information about a people, their history, customs, and traditions.

Literary discourse is also understood as a set of language practices and texts used to analyze, interpret, and comment on literary and artistic works.

The primary feature of this discourse lies in its focus on explicating the text, uncovering its meaning, identifying the author's intention, examining literary phenomena, and reflecting on the role of a work within society. In addition to traditional explanations and interpretations, literary discourse may include personal reflections that differ from the author's original views.

The main characteristics of literary discourse include:

Text interpretation: explaining complex passages of a literary work, personal viewpoints, symbols, metaphors, and allegories;

Identification of intention: determining the author's purpose and intention in creating the work;

Literary analysis: examining the specific features of the text, such as style, plot, characters, and artistic devices;

Study of social role: evaluating the place and influence of the work in society;

Personal reflection: expressing the analyst's or researcher's individual perspectives on the work.

In linguistics, an analysis of definitions proposed for linguopragmatics reveals that one of the central issues addressed is communication between the speaker and the listener, the speaker's influence on the listener, that is, speech activity itself. Given its universal nature and significance in social life, communication is unavoidable; from the perspective of the occurrence of the thinking process, speech activity undoubtedly represents one of the most essential and fundamental forms of human activity and is regarded as its highest manifestation. During speech activity, the manner in which influence is exerted by the speaker depends on the intended goal. Indeed, depending on the purpose for which the listener is to be influenced, linguistic means are selected from the speaker's cognitive and memory resources and realized in speech; at the same time, the process of speech activity is initiated. As noted, "purpose sets action in motion ... purpose gives meaning to action." Purpose, or intention, is "the force that sets action in motion."⁶ For this reason, intention is regarded as one of the central issues of linguopragmatics. To understand what speech intention is, it is necessary to take into account not only the speaker's internal cognitive resources but also various external pragmatic and communicative situations that exert influence on the speaker. E. S. Aznaurova explains this through the following chain of questions: "Who – to whom – what – where – when – why – how?" The first two elements relate to the participants of communication, namely, the addresser

and the addressee, and are connected with their social and ethnic characteristics. The addresser is the creator of the speech act; their aim is to realize their intentions and make them known to the listener or recipient.⁷ Professor of Philosophy R. Jackendoff approaches the term intention from a philosophical perspective and offers the following explanation: "I was puzzled by what the word intention actually means—that is, how people would think in situations when they are told to intend something toward someone. If that were the case, I would be studying not the maximal aspects of truth, but rather the concept of the human

being. When we express our intentions toward others, what is happening in their minds at that moment does not concern me."⁸ In the New Dictionary of Methodological Terms and Concepts, speech intention (from Latin *intentio* – "intention") is defined as the speaker's aim to convey a communicatively relevant idea through speech means, similar to a speech act. At the core of speech intention lie the motive and purpose—that is, the factors that prompt speech activity—as well as the speech utterance itself.⁹ We have decided to use the research findings of A.A. Leontiev, D.U. Ashurova, M.R. Galiyeva, and R. Jackendoff as methodological guidelines for a systematic study of speech activity and speech intentions.

First, focusing on A.A. Leontiev's research on speech intention, he defines speech intention as follows:

"Like other linguistic phenomena, a speech act is characterized by its intended goals and tasks (as a whole relative to the activity and within the range of objectives oriented toward the activity). Therefore, when discussing speech acts, one can first address the factors interpretable in terms of speech intentions or speech purposes, and second, the factors that facilitate the realization of these intentions. Naturally, the speech purpose can only be compared to the act as a whole from the psychological significance of the activity, rather than solely to the content of the speech act."

Leontiev also emphasizes that factors such as the language in which the speech act is realized, semantic choice, or the re-selection of speech acts (particularly in multilingual contexts) are not directly related to speech intention itself but belong to the process of implementing the intention. This implies that speech intentions do not indicate the semantic state of verbal expression; rather, they emerge as a structured plan based on the speaker's subjective "thoughts" and are realized through the final selection of lexemes and combinations in speech performance.

Leontiev further identifies two groups of factors related

to speech intentions: those that generate intentions and those that enable their realization.

Factors generating speech intentions:

1.Motivation 2.Environmental afferentation 3.Specific experience 4.The task of the action

Factors enabling the realization of speech intentions:

1.Language 2.Level of language proficiency 3.Functional-stylistic features 4.Sociolinguistic factors 5.Affective factors 6.Individual speech experience 7.Speech context 8.Speech situation. 10

Above, we examined A.A. Leontiev's concepts of speech intention, as well as the factors that generate and enable their realization. Detailed analyses of these processes will be fully presented in the research.

Attention-attracting intention (compulsion to attract attention).

This type of intention has been studied by scholars such as B.A. Larin, R. Jakobson, and I.V. Arnold. It is associated with activating the speaker and with "de-automation." According to Gavarnyuk, "Activation refers to the use of unusual, de-automated linguistic units employed to engage the listener."¹¹ In addition, speech intentions can also be classified as:

The intention to arouse the learner's interest

The intention to produce an emotional effect

The intention to activate knowledge structures in accordance with conceptual information

The intention to develop the learner's creativity

The intention to re-express the depiction of the conceptual world

In summary, the way speech intention is employed directly affects the duration and quality of future communication with the listener. Speech intention thus serves as a "bridge" between the speaker and the listener.

As we know, a speech act is the utterance of a specific statement in a particular communicative context. The formation of the meaning of a speech act results from the enrichment and perception of the uttered statement by both the speaker and the listener in relation to the communicative text. As John Searle notes in this regard:

"A unit of linguistic communication is not, as often assumed, a symbol, word, or sentence, nor even a sign of a symbol, word, or sentence, but rather the

creation and application of the symbol, word, or sentence in the process of performing a speech act."¹² More precisely, a speech act is "the creation and use of a sentence sign in a specific context, and speech acts constitute the primary and minimal units of linguistic

communication" (Searle 1969:16). Consequently, for speech act theory, a sentence is not a foundational unit to be used as pre-existing "material." On the contrary, a sentence emerges as a phenomenon precisely in the process of linguistic communication. Therefore, the meaning of a speech act is fully linked to the speaker's communicative intention.

Searle's view that a speech act should be regarded as the basic, foundational unit of the communication system can be fully endorsed. However, we object to interpreting the speech act merely as a phenomenon that segments discourse (the communicative text) rather than one that constitutes or structures it. In linguistic analysis, special attention should be paid to the creative potential of linguistic phenomena. The speech act is no exception; it also performs functions essential for text construction and the organization of discourse, which is a complex communicative unit.

To determine these functions of a speech act, one must refer to an analysis of intention, that is, an analysis aimed at identifying the purpose of the speech act. In intensional analysis, the aspects of speech activity occurring in the communicative process are examined in relation to the speaker's goals and desires. Typically, proponents of this analytical approach (Searle 1983) treat each speech act as a unit with a single purpose, or a single intention.

During the formation of communicative intention, the speaker (or author) selects units from the synonymic field according to specific principles. The issue of selection thus arises as both a cognitive and a communicative problem, since linguistic units, when activated in speech, perform not only a communicative but also a cognitive function in revealing the pragmatic dimension of the speech act.¹³

It is evident that the use of a particular synonymic form by the speaker or author in the course of speech is determined by the activation of a specific cognitive-functional model, in accordance with their communicative intention and linguistic competence. The combination of communicative intentions expressed through various lexemes, grammatical forms, and syntactic structures constitutes the intensional content of the message.¹⁴

When considering the linguistic means that explicitly express intentionality in speech, it should be noted that their lexical-semantic field is very extensive. A distinctive feature of this type of verbs is that they are applied to a specific component within a sentence, require semantic expansion, and characteristically give rise to formulaic sentences. The formation of phraseological units with intensional semantics arises not from the logical foundation of individual lexemes,

but from the integration of multiple lexemes.

One of the peculiarities of intensional verbs is that their meaning depends on distributive properties. In Uzbek, the grammatical means that explicitly express intentionality include future tense verbs, imperative and optative forms, conditional and purpose clauses, as well as purpose-dependent subordinate clauses.¹⁵

Determining whether tense markers, as polysemantic units, are used to express communicative intention or perform another pragmatic function requires consideration of the full context. For example:

Elchin waited for a knife to be plunged beneath his chest. Instead, Asadbek's voice came from the darkness.

"Yes, master, have you returned safely?" There was no hint of threat or menace in Asadbek's voice. Elchin felt relieved. Realizing that his anxiety was unfounded, he turned toward the source of the voice and greeted him.

"You could have just said 'I have arrived,' master," Asadbek replied in acknowledgment.

"After all, I am not a stranger to you. We were brothers, right?"

Elchin understood that Asadbek meant, "I am the one who will protect you from being shot." His eyes adjusted to the darkness, and he noticed the shadow of a person standing by the left side of the house and another leaning against the wall. He could not understand why the meeting was taking place in the dark. "I thought the elder should know about the brother returning from prison," Elchin said in a

"Had I known you were coming, I would have flown there," came a tone now tinged with sarcasm. Then the tone sharply changed: "Master, let us speak frankly and without pretense. I bear no responsibility for your wife's death. You used to embellish my feasts," — this sentence, naturally, does not convey intention, but rather indicates an unavoidable situation in a specific context.

The imperative and optative moods in Uzbek are among the most productive grammatical means that explicitly express intention. The imperative or optative verb indicates the speaker's command, desire, or encouragement for an action, and each semantic nuance is characterized by a specific intonation.¹⁶ The speaker's encouragement of action is directly addressed to the second person. Therefore, the primary form of the imperative and optative moods is the second person (singular and plural):

"My servants are lying about in a mess. None of them could do better than you. You... just mind your own business. Do not meddle in other matters."

Elchin realized from Asadbek's sharp tone that he had mounted a horse of anger.

"You are not a beast. You did not come here sniffing around. You have been gnashing your teeth."

"Brother Bek..." — Elchin tried to deflect the conversation by saying, "I have no ill intention," but Asadbek did not allow it.

"Silence your voice! I am speaking; do not overstep your limits, boy! Forget that your wife was killed and that you were wandering around there. But do not forget your brother Asadbek! Thank God, he is alive. If he were to die, even from his grave I would not rest. Who is around you?"

Such open questioning had not been expected by Elchin. Trying to delay his response, he moved into the bushes:

"My parents have passed away, may God bless them..."

"Do not hesitate! You know whom I am asking about. Do not play cat-and-mouse with me. Small fish are always prey for larger ones. You are flies; I am the eagle. Any difference?"

"There is a difference," thought Elchin. "Unfortunately, the eagle cannot eat the fly."

Syntactically, the components of this construction are linked as two parts: a simple verb-predicate and a complement with purposive connotation. In sentences where this construction is used, the semantic content is shaped differently according to the referential situation and existing connotations and implications. That is, the desire to perform an action should indicate the probability of its realization. "Probability," in turn, relates to the modality of the construction.

It can thus be concluded that the present continuous tense in Uzbek implicitly expresses optative semantics and can be interpreted as an integral part of implementing near-future plans controlled by the subject. In this passage, the intensional aspect of the message content is manifested primarily in the emphasis on the outcome of the planned near-future action and the concretization of that outcome.

This analysis further confirms that verbs with intensional nature require additional means to perform their full functional role; otherwise, they cannot serve as expressions of intentionality. In other words, the functional demands of the category of intentionality cannot be met independently by the verbs. Consequently, when analyzing a text, one must consider the entire context to determine whether communicative intentions expressed through various lexemes, grammatical forms, and syntactic constructions serve to convey intention in communication or fulfill another pragmatic function.

The final conclusion is that the combination of communicative intentions expressed through diverse lexemes, grammatical forms, and syntactic constructions constitutes the intensional content of the message.

REFERENCES

1. Arutyunova, N.D. Language of Purpose. In Logical Analysis of Language: Models of Action. Moscow, 1992, p. 14.
2. Azimov, E.G., Shchukin, A.N. New Dictionary of Methodological Terms and Concepts (Theory and Practice of Language Teaching). Moscow: IKAR Publishing, 2009, p. 251.
3. Hakimov, M.H. Pragmatic Interpretation of Text in Uzbek. PhD dissertation abstract in Philology. Tashkent, 2001, p. 48.
4. [http:// www.krugosvet.ru](http://www.krugosvet.ru): Discourse.
5. Gavarnyuk, B. Tasks of Literary Language and Its Culture. Prague Linguistic Circle. Moscow: IIPORPEC, 1967, p. 355.
6. Jackendoff, R. Language, Consciousness, Culture: Essays on Mental Structure, 2007.
7. Klyuev, E.V. Speech Communication. Moscow, 2002, p. 18.
8. Leontev, A.A. Moscow: Nauka Publishing, 1974, pp. 24, 30–36.
9. Mansurov, R. Pragmatic Intentions and Their Verbalization in Different Types of Texts (on the Materials of English Language). Bulletin of Science and Practice, Vol. 6, No. 7, 2020, p. 438.
10. Maslova, V.A. Linguoculturology. A Textbook for University Students. Moscow: Academic Publishing Center "Academia," 2001, p. 74.
11. Nurmonov, A., Mahmudov, N. History of Uzbek Linguistics. Tashkent: Kamolot-Qatortol, 2000, p. 172.
12. Rodionova, A.V. Linguistic Means of Expressing the Intentional Direction of Text. Language. Text. Discourse. Scientific Almanac, Stavropol, 2009, No. 7, pp. 337–341.
13. Safarov, Sh. Pragmalinguistics. Tashkent: State Scientific Publishing House of the National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2008, p. 286.
14. Suprun, A.E. Lectures on the Theory of Speech Activity. Minsk, 1996, p. 64.
15. Tursunov, U., Mukhtorov, Zh., Rahmatullaev, Sh. Modern Uzbek Literary Language. Tashkent, 1965, p. 327.