ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ ФАНЛАР АКАДЕМИЯСИ МИНТАҚАВИЙ БЎЛИМИ ХОРАЗМ МАЪМУН АКАДЕМИЯСИ

ХОРАЗМ МАЪМУН АКАДЕМИЯСИ АХБОРОТНОМАСИ

Ахборотнома ОАК Раёсатининг 2016-йил 29-декабрдаги 223/4-сон қарори билан биология, қишлоқ хўжалиги, тарих, иқтисодиёт, филология ва архитектура фанлари бўйича докторлик диссертациялари асосий илмий натижаларини чоп этиш тавсия этилган илмий нашрлар рўйхатига киритилган

2022-6/3
Вестник Хорезмской академии Маъмуна
Издается с 2006 года

Хива-2022

Бош муҳаррир:
Абдуллаев Икрам Искандарович, б.ф.д., проф.
Бош муҳаррир ўринбосари:
Ҳасанов Шодлик Бекпўлатович, к.ф.н., к.и.х.

Таҳрир ҳайати:

Абдуллаев Икрам Искандарович, б.ф.д., проф.	*Рўзметов Бахтияр, и.ф.д., проф.*
Абдуллаев Баҳром Исмоилович, ф-м.ф.д.	*Садуллаев Азимбой, ф-м.ф.д., акад.*
Абдуллаев Равшан Бабажонович, тиб.ф.д.,проф.	*Салаев Санъатбек Комилович, и.ф.д., проф.*
Абдуҳалимов Баҳром Абдурахимович, т.ф.д.,проф.	*Сапарбаева Гуландам Машариповна, ф.ф.ф.д.*
Агзамова Гулчехра Азизовна, т.ф.д.,проф.	
Аимбетов Нагмет Каллиевич, и.ф.д., акад.	*Сапаров Каландар Абдуллаевич, б.ф.д., проф.*
Бабаджанов Хушнут, ф.ф.н., проф.	*Сирожов Ойбек Очилович, с.ф.д., проф.*
Бекчанов Даврон Жуманазарович, к.ф.д.	*Сотипов Гойипназар, қ/х.ф.д., проф.*
Буриев Хасан Чутбаевич, б.ф.д., проф.	*Тожибаев Комилжон Шаробитдинович, б.ф.д., академик*
Ганджаева Лола Атаназаровна, б.ф.д., проф.	
Давлетов Санжар Ражабович, тар.ф.д.	*Холлиев Аскар Эргашевич, б.ф.д., проф.*
Дурдиева Гавҳар Салаевна, арх.ф.д.	*Холматов Бахтиёр Рустамович, б.ф.д.*
Дўсчанов Бахтиёр, тиб.ф.д., проф.	*Чўпонов Отаназар Отожонович, ф.ф.д., доц.*
Ибрагимов Бахтиёр Тўлаганович, к.ф.д., акад.	*Шакарбоев Эркин Бердикулович, б.ф.д., проф.*
Жуманиёзов Зохид Отабоевич, ф.ф.н., доц.	
Кадирова Шахноза Абдухалиловна, к.ф.д., проф.	*Эрматова Жамила Исмаиловна, ф.ф.н., доц.*
Қутлиев Учқун Отобоевич, ф-м.ф.д.	*Эшчанов Рузумбой Абдуллаевич, б.ф.д., доц.*
Ламерс Жон, қ/х.ф.д., проф.	*Ўразбоев Ғайрат Ўразалиевич, ф-м.ф.д.*
Майкл С. Энжел, б.ф.д., проф.	*Ўрозбоев Абдулла Дурдиевич, ф.ф.д.*
Мирзаев Сирожиддин Зайниевич, ф-м.ф.д., проф.	*Ҳажиева Мақсуда Султоновна, фал.ф.д.*
Пазилов Абдуваеит, б.ф.д., проф.	*Ҳасанов Шодлик Бекпўлатович, к.ф.н., к.и.х.*
Рахимов Рахим Атажанович, т.ф.д., проф.	*Худайберганова Дурдона Сидиқовна, ф.ф.д., проф.*
Рашидов Негмурод Элмуродович, б.ф.н., доц.	
Рўзибоев Рашид Юсупович, тиб.ф.д., проф.	

Хоразм Маъмун академияси ахборотномаси: илмий журнал.-№6/3 (90), Хоразм Маъмун академияси, 2022 й. – 209 б. – Босма нашрнинг электрон варианти - http://mamun.uz/uz/page/56

ISSN 2091-573 X
Муассис: Ўзбекистон Республикаси Фанлар академияси минтақавий бўлими – Хоразм Маъмун академияси

© Хоразм Маъмун академияси ноширлик бўлими, 2022

МУНДАРИЖА
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ ФАНЛАРИ

Abdujabbarova F. Tog‘ay Murod asarlari tilida qo‘llanilgan metaforalar semantikasi 5
Abdirahimova G. Frazeologizmlar tasnifiga doir 7
Abdurasulova N. Remark va Nabi Jaloliddin asarlarida urush mavzusi tasviri 9
Amirova Z.O. “Heart” va “yurak” konseptlarining kognitiv va lingva-kulturologik xususiyatlari 10
Atadjanova S.R. The role of cognitive and lingusitic factors in improving reading comprehension on the base of illustrated texts 12
Ashirmatova M.J. Agrar sohasi terminologik tizimining rus tilidagi antonimiyasi 14
Ashurova Sh. Sodda gap shaklining ikkinchi darajali bo’lak uyushib kelishiga ko’ra kengayishi 16
Bahodirova G.B. Davlat tilini rivojlantirishda sohaviy leksikaning o‘rni 18
Baxranova D.U. Koreys va o’zbek tillarida ma’no ko’chish hodisasining o'xshash va farqli tomonlari 20
Baxronova M.A. Edgar Allan Po hikoyalarida ruhiy kasalliklar 23
Baxranova M.R., Yandasheva T. Shavkat Rahmon ijodida “Inson” konseptining ifodalanishi 25
Bazarova Sh.Sh. Janubiy Koreya feministik adabiyotining xususiyatlari 27
Eshquvvatova G.N. O‘zbek internet matnida janr turlari 31
Djalilova D.Z. Ahmad Yassaviy hikmatlarida payg‘ambarlar obrazi 35
Gulimmetova S. Abduqayum Yo‘ldoshev qissalarida muhabbat manzaralari 37
Hamdamov U. Oybekning simvolistik she’rlari xususida 39
Ibodullayev S.R. Тил масалаларининг ҳуқуқий таҳлилига доир айрим мулоҳазалар 41
Ismoilov M.I. Synthesis of the etossphere and nosphere - a new qualitative stage of morality 44
Ismoilova M.Q., Nuftillayev B.U. Comprehensive paradigm of literary text analysis linguistics and adaptation to the learning process 46
Khujamberdieva G. Phraseological units with toponymic component in uzbek-english languages 48
Maxmudjonzoda Z.D., Maxmidjonov Sh.D. Ideallikdan tubanlikkacha 49
Mansurova N.A. Marketing va menejment sohasida qo‘llanadigan o‘zbek tilidagi iqtisodiy terminlarining vujudga kelishi va bosqichlari 51
Matnazarov M.M. O‘zbek tilshunosligida toponimika va urbanonimlarning o‘rganilishi 53
Mahmudova N. So’z tarkibidagi morfemalarning sintaktik aloqalari 56
Mirjalilova M.J. Tabiat hodisalari komponentiga ega frazeologik birliklarning stilistik xususiyatlari 57
Nabiyeva I.M. Alber Kamyu va Isajon Sulton asarlarida ijtimoiy hayot va inson konsepsiyasi 59
Olimova D.Z. About the mechanisms that provide understanding of the original text while speaking text in target language 61
Otamuratova M. Xosiyat Rustamova – ko‘ngli osmonlarga intiq shoira 63
Polvanova N.M. O`zbek va ingliz tillarida qo`shma so`zlarning yasalishi, o`xshash va farqli tomonlari 65
Pulatova S.Sh. Somerset Moemning “Oy va sariq chaqa” asarida bosh qahramonning san’at yo’lidagi fidoiyligi tasviri 67
Qo‘ziboyeva G.S. Qadimgi turkiy tilda ko‘plik qo‘shimchalarining ifodalanish 70
Radjapova N.M., Jumaniyozova Sh.Z. Muloqotdagi akt tiplari 72
Rajabboyeva F.R., Bekchonova H.D. Parameters of social linguistic research social linguistic research 74
Rajabov A.U., Jalilova L.J. The depiction of the teenagers`social life in “Harry Potter” 77
Rajabov A.U., Jalilova L.J. The role of psychologism in the development of a literary genre 80
Sabirova D.D., Sultanova D.A. The concept of pronunciation style in modern linguistics 83
Saparova M.R. Xolid Husayniyning “Ming quyosh shu’lasi” (A thousand splendid suns) asarida qo’llanilgan yuklamalarning o’zbek va ingliz tillaridagi leksik-semantik va grammatik xususiyatlari 86
Toshquvatova M.A. Art of the chapter dedicated to the heritage of Alisher Navoi in the epic "Khamsa" 88
Turdiyeva G.A. O’zbek tilshunosligida his-hayajonni ifodalovchi til birliklarining o’rganilishi 91
Tursunov M., Ubaydullayeva M. Ingliz va o’zbek tillarida mubolag’aga asoslangan ba’zi bir frazeologik birliklarning lingvokognitiv tahlili 93
Xamidova T.R. Chet til darslarida qishloq xo`jaligi terminologiyalarning morfologik xususiyatlari 97
Xudoyberganov Y.I., Xo’jayeva Z.X., Qodirova X.B. Fransuz tilidagi zoonim komponentli frazeologik birliklarning strukturaviy tahlili 99
Yakubova M.K. Sociolinguistic significance of variability in language 102
Yuldasheva F.E. Expressions of linguistic politeness 103
Абдуллаева Н.Н. Пословица как жанр дискурса 105
Абдурахмонов А.А. Рангнинг насрий матндаги ижодий ғояни йўналтирувчи жиҳати 107
Абидова А. Инсон руҳий ҳолатини ифодаловчи сифатлар 109
Авезова Г.С. Х.Дўстмуҳаммад “Бозор” романида қаҳрамонлараро муносабат 112
Авлаева С.Б. Неологизмларнинг пайдо бўлиш омиллари 114
Аззамов Ю.Р. Гастрономик дискурснинг лингвомаданий хусусиятлари (таржима аспектида) 116
Алимов Т.А. Абдулла Қодирийнинг ўткан кунлар романи таржимасида категоризация аспектининг ўзига хос хусусиятлари 121

"Received Pronunciation is a standard form of pronunciation of British English based on the speech of the educated population of the south of England; used as a pronunciation standard" [9]. Thus, it is RP, as a standard pronunciation, that is taken as the basis for determining phonetic, semantic and syntactic differences in other regional and social dialects of the English language. Nevertheless, one of the most common views on RP sees it as a social dialect.

However, when it comes to the term 'standard', the following points made by various linguists should be taken into account:

1) speech is standard when it is common in everyday use among people;

2) speech cannot be accurately measured and there is no absolute standard for pronunciation. Pronunciation varies from region to region, from class to class, and from individual to individual, subject to regional, social, and individual differences accordingly. There are only options that are acceptable in the country, and those that are not acceptable. In other words, the standard pronunciation is not fixed and unchanged [1;18-23]. The norm and its variability are in a state of constant interactions and condition each other.

At the same time, variability, being an integral property of the norm, does not lead to the emergence of a new entity, but only introduces some changes into the existing one while maintaining its main characteristics. For example, the well-known phonetician D. Crystal holds the point of view that standard English is a variety of the English language, a combination of linguistic components that perform a specific function that is different from other ones. You can call it an English dialect or English of a special type, as it lacks any regional cultural background [4;101].

According to R. Shay and D. Preston, all types of regional pronunciations are variants of the standard pronunciation, and the dialects themselves cannot be considered as non-standard varieties of the language, because they contain standard and non-standard variants within themselves [6; 1976]. There is no consensus among scholars on how to classify English territorial dialects, since their boundaries are inconsistent, and the language standard, in turn, has a huge impact on their phonetic and lexical structure. Among the main reasons for regional variation, the following stand out: the vastness of the territorial distribution of the language, the influence of local dialects, the change in the social base of native speakers of the literary language and the temporary preservation of the former local speech skills associated with it, and others. Norm and territorial variants not only coexist, but also interact. The factor of territorial variability of the literary norm depends on the historical period in the development of the literary language, as well as on the modern language situation.

Thus, the study of sociolinguistic aspects makes an important contribution to understanding the essence of the linguistic phenomenon of variability. Variation is a fundamental property of a language as a system and its phonological subsystem in particular. In the language system itself, there are already several ways of expressing the same content. Determination of the most correct variant for a given situation is included in the tasks of the norm. Variability is inherent in the norm due to historical variability, but at the same time, the norm also acts as a limiter to the processes of variation and determines the boundaries of variability and the inventory of options. All of the above is proved by the fact that British English is not a homogeneous, monolithic state, but includes a wide range of dialects.

REFERENCES:

1. Бабушкина Елена Алексеевна Фонетическая вариативность речи и норма произношения // Вестник БГУ. 2010. №11 С.18-23.

2. Трусова И. С. Литературный язык и нелитературные варианты национального языка. – Владивосток: Изд-во МГУ им. адм. Г.И. Невельского, 2006.

3. Хомутова Тамара Николаевна Теория языковой вариативности: социолингвистический аспект // Вестник ЮУрГУ. Серия: Лингвистика. 2005. №11 (51) С.28-34.

4. Crystal, David English as a global language / Cambridge ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 2001. - XII, 150 p.

5. Labov W. The study of language in its socila context // Sociolinguistic patterns. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA, 1972. p. 183-259

6. Preston Dennis A., Shuy Roger W. Varieties of American English. USIA, Washington, DC. 1976

7. Trudgil P. Language in the British Isles. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1984. – 587 p.

8. http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/receivedpronunciation?q= received+pronunciation

UDC 808.5

EXPRESSIONS OF LINGUISTIC POLITENESS

F.E. Yuldasheva, assistant teacher, Bukhara State University, Bukhara

Annotatsiya. *Ushbu maqola lingvistik xushmuomalalik sohasini va ingliz ilidagi xushmuomalalik formulalarining tarjima qilinishini o'rganadi. Lingvistik xushmuomalalik ifodalarini ingliz tiliga tarjima qilishga harakat qilinadi va me'yoriy va lingvistik xatti-harakatlarning aksi sifatida xushmuomalalik tushunchasi ta'riflanadi va muhokama qilinadi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *lingvistik xushmuomalalik, tarjima qilish qobiliyati, lingva-pragmatik, ijtimoiy qadriyatlar, tilga xos, madaniyatga xos.*

Аннотация. *В данной статье исследуется область языковой вежливости и переводимость формул вежливости на английский язык. Предпринимаются попытки перевода выражений лингвистической вежливости на английский язык, а также определяется и обсуждается понятие вежливости как отражения как нормативного, так и языкового поведения.*

Ключевые слова: *языковая вежливость, переводимость, лингвопрагматика, социальные ценности, языковая специфика, культурная специфика.*

Abstract. *This article investigates the area of linguistic politeness and the translatability of politeness formulas in English. Expressions of linguistic politeness are attempted for translation into English and the concept of politeness as a reflection of both normative and linguistic behavior is defined and discussed.*

Key words: *linguistic politeness, translatability, lingua-pragmatics, social values, language-specific, culture-specific.*

Politeness is the practical application of good manners or etiquette so as not to offend others. It is a culturally defined phenomenon, and therefore what is considered polite in one culture can sometimes be quite rude or simply eccentric in another cultural context. While the goal of politeness is to refrain from behaving in an offensive way so as not to offend others and make all people feel relaxed and comfortable with one another, these culturally defined standards at times may be manipulated. The relevance of the study is due to the growing interest of linguists in the problems of interpersonal verbal interaction and the psychology of speech behavior of native speakers. Much attention is paid to the study of speech etiquette, the functioning of conventional phrases and the degree of their clichés, especially in cultural and comparative terms. However, these aspects are only the essence of explicit or conventional politeness (R. Ratmayr). Implicit or individual politeness, consisting in respecting the maxim of politeness, implemented by various strategies of courtesy and diplomacy, has not been studied enough and, undoubtedly, should be the object of closer attention of linguists.

There has been a great deal of interest in politeness in pragmatics, and just as definitions of pragmatics vary, so too do definitions of politeness. Not only is the term used in different ways, but the term itself is not defined. Indeed, as Watts, Ide and Ehlich (1992a: 3) observe: "One of the oddest things about politeness research is that the term "politeness" itself is either not explicitly defined at all or else taken to be a consequence of rational social goals such as maximising the benefit to self and other, minimising the face-threatening nature of a social act, displaying adequate proficiency in the accepted standards of social etiquette, avoiding conflict, making sure that the social interaction runs smoothly, etc[1].

Another difficulty is pointed out by Kasper (1994: 3206), noting the different meanings of the term in ordinary parlance and pragmatics. In the former, … 'politeness' refers to proper social conduct and tactful consideration for others, whereas in the latter,… 'politeness' as a technical term in linguistic pragmatics refers to a broader, substantially more democratic concept. Since the object of pragmatic inquiry is linguistic action, 'politeness' as a pragmatic notion refers to ways in which linguistic action is carried out – more specifically, ways in which the relational function in linguistic action is expressed [2].

LoCastro (1990: 252) points out that the term "politeness" is frequently confused with related folk terms like "etiquette" and "manners" and it has folk meanings that are not clearly distinguishable from its more technical or formal meanings. Indeed, the definition of "polite" in Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary (1987) is in line with the folk meaning of the term, in the sense of referring to good manners and social correctness [4].

Politeness is not only viewed from the speaker, but it also viewed by the interlocutor. It makes many experts has different perceptions about politeness. Leech (1983) stated that politeness is one of pragmatic perspective. He begins by establishing two pragmatic systems: pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. Pragmalinguistics includes the speakers' intentions and illocutionary acts. Hence, it refers to the more linguistics application of politeness. Meanwhile, sociopragmatics refers to how the speaker wants to be perceived socially.

Moreover, politeness could be defined as means of expressing that are used in conversation that has specific roles depending on the participant. Fraser and Nolen (1990) define politeness as a conversational contract that has a set of rights and obligations that participants must follow and can be negotiated and rearranged during a conversation. It meant that the conversational contract is based on the expectations of the members involved in a conversation and determined by the participants. Someone who is polite has good manners and behaves in a way that is socially correct and considerate of other people's feelings. Polite describes things that you say or do simply because it is socially correct to do or say them, rather than because you mean them sincerely [5]. (Collins COBUILD English Language Dictionary, 1987: 1109)

Asking other people to do things is known as making a request. Requests take many different forms and may be very polite, moderately polite or not very polite (rude). When a speaker wants the interlocutor to commit to some future action, it means of a request. According to Svartvik cited in Marzita (2009) request can be mentioned as the act to ask your hearer whether he is willing or able to do something". In politeness patterns in request, there are two types of request. The first one is syntactic realization, and the second one is lexical realization. In Britain "politeness" is typically used to describe negative politeness, which is presumed to be "a good thing." In this respect, I believe that the Japanese translation of "politeness," teinei, also has a similar connotation. According to Hori (1986), the Japanese concept of "being polite" includes only negative politeness. These views of politeness coincide with what Watts et al. (1992a) have termed "first-order" politeness in their scheme in which they distinguish between the folk and pragmatic definitions of the term, the latter being "second-order" politeness in their classification [6]. Second-order politeness is located within a theory of social behaviour and language use, and is not equated with any moral or psychological disposition towards being nice to one's interlocutor. It is in this pragmatic sense that I will use the term. For the purpose of this study, I take politeness to refer to the use of communication strategies intended to maintain mutual face and to achieve smooth communication, taking into account human relationships [7]. The promoting and maintaining of

politeness calls for displays of appropriate behaviour. What is considered to be appropriate varies from situation to situation and culture to culture, while personal values and tastes may also influence judgements of appropriateness.

In the set of speech strategies for implementing the principle of politeness, proposed in the Brown - Levinson theory, two basic types can be distinguished - propositional and modus strategies. Propositional strategies prescribe the expression of some content (proposition), for example, attention to the interests of the addressee, an indication of extraordinary circumstances, etc., which can be done using speech etiquette formulas as well as in any form. Fashionable strategies determine how to convey arbitrary content that is commensurate with the requirements of politeness. Propositional and modus strategies stand out in strategies and positive, politeness and negative. The whole space of polite communication is divided into two areas: the establishment and maintenance of friendly relations, on the one hand, and the mitigation of damage caused by various speech acts to the "face" of the addressee, on the other. The use of various mitigating strategies is required only in the second case. The establishment of friendly relations is achieved through the action of positive maxims, which have less weight compared to negative maxims. The field of negative politeness, on the contrary, is tightly regulated by all maxims. It can be concluded that the Principle of Politeness to a greater extent functions precisely in the field of negative politeness, where mitigation and compensation of damage from various speech acts are required.

To conclude, we can say that in a sense, as suggested by Mills (2009: 1058) "cultural norms are mythical; the nation, whatever we take that to mean, cannot speak with one voice, according to one view of what is appropriate or inappropriate [8]. At any one time, there will be a range of different norms or notions of appropriateness circulating within the Communities of Practice and within the culture as a whole." In the process of social interaction, people communicating inter-culturally produce polite, impolite and neutral utterances [10]. But when people of different cultures communicate with each other, they employ different codes of politeness which leads to cultural differences.

REFERENCES:

1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987), Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2. Lakoff, R. (1973a), „The Logic of Politeness; or Minding Your P"s and Q"s", Chicago Linguistics Society, 8: 292-305.

3. Mills, S. & Kadar, D.Z. (2011), Politeness in East Asia, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

4. Расулов, З. И. (2010). Принцип контекстуального анализа эллиптических предложений (на материале английского языка). Вестник Челябинского государственного университета, (21), 91-94.

5. Erkinovna, Y. F. Negative Politeness. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, *7*(6), 1249-1255.

6.Yuldasheva Feruza Erkinovna. (2021). Politeness markers in spokenlanguage. *Euro-Asia Conferences*, 37–40.

7. Yuldasheva Feruza Erkinovna. (2022). The Principle of Politeness in the English and Uzbek Languages. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 6, 65–70. Retrieved from https://www.geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/799

8. Zarina Habibovna Usmonova. (2021). The peculiarity of fantastic works (on the example of the works of Ray Bradbury, Isaac Asimov and Stephen King). European Scholar Journal, 2(4), 499-503.

9. Usmonova, Z. H. (2016). Ingliz va o'zbek tillarda so'z birikmalarining grammatik xususuyati va sintaktik (binar) tahlili. International scientific journal, (4 (2)), 58-60.

УДК 808.5

ПОСЛОВИЦА КАК ЖАНР ДИСКУРСА

Н.Н. Абдуллаева, преподаватель, Бухарского государственного университета, Бухара

Annotatsiya. *Maqolni nutq janri deb hisoblagan holda, biz maqolning bir-birini to'ldiruvchi ikki tamoyili: o'ziga xoslik va uning boshqa janrlardan farqli tomonlarini ko'rsatishimiz kerak bo'ladi. O`ziga xoslik tamoyili sifatida maqolning mavzu mazmuni, uslubi va tuzilishi jihatidan o`ziga xos omillarini qayd etishimiz lozim. Bu omillar maqol nutqining janrini aniqlashga imkon beruvchi me'yor, qoidalarni tashkil etadi. Farq qiluvchi tamoyiliga ko'ra esa maqolni boshqa janrlardan, xususan, turdosh janrlardan ajratib turuvchi mustaqil janr ekanligini asoslab berish zarur. Tafovut, shuningdek, janrlarni belgilovchi omillar, ya'ni tematik mazmun, uslub va tuzilishga ko'ra ham amalga oshiriladi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *til, nutq akti, nutq, ko'p sonlilik, xilma-xillik, cheklovlarning o'zgaruvchanligi, turmush tarzi.*

Аннотация. *Рассматривая пословицу как жанр дискурса, мы должны доказать, что пословица есть условность, заключенная между двумя взаимодополняющими принципами: принципом тождества и принципом различия. В качестве принципа тождества необходимо отметить характерные факторы пословицы с точки зрения ее тематического содержания, стиля и структуры. Эти факторы составляют нормы, правила, позволяющие определить жанр пословичного дискурса. По принципу различия необходимо обосновать, что пословица является самостоятельным жанром, отличая ее от других жанров, в частности родственных жанров. Различие также проводится по факторам, определяющим жанры, а именно по тематическому содержанию, стилю и структуре.*

Ключевые слова: *язык, речевой акт, речь, множественность, неоднородность, вариативность ограничений, образ жизни.*

Abstract. *Considering a proverb as a genre of discourse, we must prove that a proverb is a convention between two complementary principles: the principle of identity and the principle of difference. As a principle of identity, it is necessary to note the characteristic factors of a proverb in terms of its thematic content, style and structure. These factors make up the norms, rules, allowing to determine the genre of proverbial discourse. According to the principle of difference, it is necessary to substantiate that the proverb is an independent genre, distinguishing it from other*