



ЎЗБЕКИСТОН RESPUBLIKASI
ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС ТАЪЛИМ ВАЗИРЛИГИ
АБДУЛЛА ҚОДИРИЙ НОМИДАГИ
ЖИЗЗАХ ДАВЛАТ ПЕДАГОГИКА
ИНСТИТУТИ

ФИЛОЛОГИЯНИНГ УМУМНАЗАРИЙ МАСАЛАЛАРИ

ХАЛҚАРО ИЛМИЙ-АМАЛИЙ
КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ МАТЕРИАЛЛАРИ

ISBN 978-9943-4889-2-2



9 789943 488922

Жиззах - 2021

МУНДАРИЖА

ФИЛОЛОГИЯНИНГ УМУМНАЗАРИЙ МАСАЛАЛАРИ

2021

IV. АДАБИЙ АЛОҚАЛАР ВА ТАРЖИМА МУАММОЛАРИ

Шуъба раиси: филология фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD),
доцент в.б. Дилнавоз Салимова

Котиби: катта ўқитувчи Соҳиб Бойсинов

1.	Улуғбек Ҳамдамов. Кафка ижодида инсон ва давр фожиаси	487
2.	Муқаддас Тожибоева. Мумтоз адабий манбалар XX аср ўзбек адабиётининг собит асоси ва вориси сифатида	490
3.	Дилором Ходжиметова. Элни эрка шоирлари	495
4.	Н. Сыздыкбаев. Неомифологизм в литературе рубежа XX-XXI веков(к постановке проблемы)	497
5.	Nilufar Ruziyeva. Discursive approaches to politeness	501
6.	Abdulhamid Abduvaiyev. Forscha soʻzlar tarkibida qoʻllanilgan -ak affiksi haqida ayrim mulohazalar	505
7.	Parizod Turopova. The power of artistic thinking	508
8.	Aytac İsmayilli. Azərbaycan ədəbiyyatında lirik poema janrının inkişaf xüsusiyyətləri (Nəbi Xəzri yaradıcılığı əsasında)	511
9.	Xurshid Ubaydullayev. Turli tillardagi frazeologik birikmalarni oʻzbek tiliga tarjima qilish xususida	514
10.	Nilufar Ochilova. Ingliz tili idiomalarida “Ot” obrazi tahlili	517
11.	Дилшод Исломов. Дилноза Абдурахмонова. Француз тили стилистиканинг объектлари, фонетика билан боғлиқ томонлари ва олимларнинг илмий қарашлари	520
12.	Моҳира Отабоева. Бадий таржимада таржимон ёндашуви масаласи	524
13.	Sanobar Bozorboyeva. The importance of culture in teaching foreign languages	527
14.	Madina Irsaliyeva. The historical roots of the female image in modern english literature	530
15.	Баҳор Тўраева. Чингиз Айтматов ижодида рамзлар талқини	532

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС ТАЪЛИМ
ВАЗИРЛИГИ**

**АБДУЛЛА ҚОДИРИЙ НОМИДАГИ ЖИЗЗАХ ДАВЛАТ ПЕДАГОГИКА
ИНСТИТУТИ**

**“ФИЛОЛОГИЯНИНГ
УМУМНАЗАРИЙ МАСАЛАЛАРИ”
МАВЗУСИДАГИ**

**ХАЛҚАРО ИЛМИЙ-АМАЛИЙ КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ
МАТЕРИАЛЛАРИ
(1-5-шубалар)**

ЖИЗЗАХ-2021

уЎК: 821.512.133
КБК: 83.3(5Ў)

Мазкур тўплам Абдулла Қодирий номидаги Жиззах давлат педагогика институтида 2021 йил 25 ноябрь куни Вазирлар Маҳкамасининг 2021 йил 2 мартдаги 78-Ф сон фармойиши билан тасдиқланган Ўзбекистон Республикаси Халқаро ва Республика илмий ва илмий-техник анжуманлар режасига киритилган Абдулла Қодирий номидаги Жиззах давлат педагогика институти ўзбек тили ва адабиёти факультети, ўзбек адабиётини ўқитиш методикаси кафедраси томонидан таъкиллаштирилган “Филологиянинг умумназарий масалалари” мавзусидаги Халқаро илмий-амалий анжуман материаллари асосида тайёрланди.

Тўплам адабиётшунос олимлар, изланиш олиб бораётган ёш тадқиқотчилар ва ўзбек тили ва адабиёти ўқитувчилари ҳамда магистрлар учун мўлжалланган.

Тўпловчи ва нашрга тайёрловчилар:

ЖДПИ доценти, ф.ф. номзоди **Нодира Соатова Исомиддиновна**
ЖДПИ доценти, ф.ф. номзоди **Сурайё Эшонқулова Исомиддиновна**

Бош муҳаррир:

Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти факультети декани, ф.ф.номзоди
доц. в.б. **Сунатулла Сойипов**

Масъул муҳаррир:

Ўзбек адабиёти ўқитиш методикаси кафедраси мудири, ф.ф. доктори, проф.в.б.
Шоира Дониярова

Тақризчилар:

Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти кафедраси мудири, ф.ф. доктори,
проф. в.б. **Усмонжон Қосимов**

Ўзбек адабиёти ўқитиш методикаси кафедраси доценти в.б., ф.ф.ф.д.
(PhD) **Дилнавоз Салимова**

Ўзбек адабиёти ўқитиш методикаси кафедраси катта ўқитувчиси, ф.ф.ф.д.
(PhD) **Паризод Туропова**

Ушбу тўплам Абдулла Қодирий номидаги Жиззах давлат педагогика институти Илмий-техник кенгаши (4-сонли баённомаси, 30 ноябрь 2021 йил) қарори асосида нашрга тавсия этилди.

ISBN 978-9943-4235-3-8

© Жиззах ДПИ, 2021

Таким образом, можно отметить, неомифологизм в литературе рубежа XX-XXI веков служит основой выражения идей и мироощущений писателя, воплощаемых не только в собственно мифологизации, но и в символизации художественного мышления; представляет собой средство обобщения литературного материала; играет роль художественного приема, является свойством композиции, раздвигающим пространственно-временные координаты.

ИСПОЛЬЗОВАННАЯ ЛИТЕРАТУРА:

1. Руднев В.П. Словарь культуры XX века. – М.: Аграф, 1997. – 384 с.
2. Мелетинский Е. Поэтика мифа. – М.: Наука, 1976. – 407 с.
3. Барт Р. Мифология. – М.: Издательство им. Сабашниковых, 1996. – 312 с.
4. Белый А. Символизм как миропонимание. – М.: Республика, 1994. – 528 с.
5. Погребная Я.В. Неомифологизм как тип литературного творчества. Неомифологизм в системе идентифицирующих признаков // Актуальные проблемы современной мифопоэтики: [электронный ресурс] учебное пособие / Я.В.Погребная. 2-е изд. стереотип. – М.: Флинта, 2011. – 177 с.
6. Юнг К.Г. Душа и миф. Шесть архетипов. – М.–К.: ЗАО «Совершенство» – «Port-Royal», 1997. – 384 с.

DISCURSIVE APPROACHES TO POLITENESS

*Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna,
BuxDU o'qituvchisi*

In this article I explored the various approaches to politeness research which have been categorised, or, I would argue, could be categorised, as discursive or post-modern. While some of these theorists would not themselves classify their work as discursive or post-modern, I would suggest that there do seem to be shared characteristics and emphases in their work. This is due partly to the fact that all of them are attempting, in some measure, to go beyond the work of Brown and Levinson (1978/87). I examine the elements which certain theorists such as Geyer (2008), Locher (2004), Christie (2007), Bousfield (2008), Culpeper (2003), Culpeper et al. (2008), Watts (2003), Terkourafi (2001; 2005a; 2005b; 2007), Paramasivam (2007a, 2007b), Haugh (2007) and Arundale (2010) share and those which divide them. In so doing, I hope to map out how discursive or post-modern approaches to the analysis of politeness and impoliteness differ from approaches such as Brown and Levinson's ([1978] 1987) and how such approaches might lead to productive theorising and analysis of politeness and impoliteness. Postmodern approaches to politeness at the moment, in Terkourafi's (2005a: 102) view, seem: "at least in the way they deal with data unable to bring about the paradigm change within politeness studies to which they aspire", but perhaps by drawing attention to some of the ways that theorists have tried to overcome some of these difficulties, it will be possible to map out what a new I would like to thank Jonathan Culpeper in particular for very

helpful comments he made on an earlier draft of this essay and also Bethan Davies for some very perceptive and constructive comments she made on a later draft, particularly in relation to structure theoretical model might consist of. It might also be argued that it is in the very nature of post-modern or discursive theory to explicitly *not* construct an overarching theory, since, many have argued within critical theory, the days of grand narratives are now at an end. Perhaps, what is most indicative of the discursive or post-modern approach is the sense that theorists are still trying to assemble theoretical models by juxtaposing elements from different approaches and methodologies, and this eclecticism is perhaps more suited to the type of contextualised, qualitative analysis favoured by the discursive approach. Whilst Brown and Levinson's work has influenced research work on politeness since its publication, it has nevertheless been criticised by a wide range of theorists, mostly in a spirit of constructive criticism in order to modify or build on it (Sifianou 1992; Spencer-Oatey 2000a, 2000b). However, there have been a number of theorists who have been far more critical and who have argued for a rejection of some elements or all of Brown and Levinson's model. Critics such as Eelen (2001) have focused on a number of different problems with Brown and Levinson's work, most notably their reliance on speech act theory, the model person/individualism, their model of communication, their definition of politeness, their understanding of the role. Discursive theorists of politeness have tried to develop ways of thinking around and in reaction to the problems which these issues have posed for them.

1. Speech Act theory

Brown and Levinson relied on speech act theory to underpin their model of politeness, and this is a theoretical grounding which has been adopted by many politeness researchers. It should, however, be remembered that Brown and Levinson, in the 1987 edition of their work, also found fault with their earlier use of speech act theory, whilst, nevertheless, not suggesting what could be used in its place. Thus, much work on politeness post-Brown and Levinson has focused especially on apologies and requests, assuming that these speech acts have some simple existence in linguistic form. Quantitative analysis of requests, for example, consists of counting the linguistic realisations of requests found in data. Thus for example, Holmes (1995) decides on what constitutes a compliment for the communities that she analyses and then, based on a large data set, counts the number of linguistic realisations of compliments. Compliments may be paid indirectly or by implication. This type of post-Brown and Levinson work does not acknowledge that requests, compliments and apologies can. It should be noted that Eelen (2001) Mills (2003a), and Watts (2003) deal with these criticisms of Brown and Levinson's model at greater length.

In the type of analysis which relies on traditional speech act theory, the former example where speakers apologise using different linguistic realizations would not be counted in the analysis, (thus giving an incomplete view of the way interactants apologise) and in the latter example where the function of politeness markers differs from its conventional surface usage, this would in fact be counted as an apology (giving a false view of the way that interactants draw on politeness resources in order to be insincere, ironic or impolite).

2. Definition of politeness

Brown and Levinson's definition of politeness is largely focused around the notion of mitigation of face threat, and whilst politeness is clearly used to avoid threatening others' face, it is clear that politeness has many different functions. Ide (1989) focusing on discernment/wakimae has drawn attention to the role that politeness plays in acknowledging the role that each individual has been allocated. For example, if an individual uses a particular honorific, they can be seen to be recognising that the particular context and other participants require them to use a certain deferential form; in so doing they are acknowledging their own position and others' positions in relation to them within the social system.

Culpeper (2005, 2007), Bousfield (2007, 2008) Culpeper, Bousfield and Wichmann (2003) and Bousfield and Locher (2007) have theorised impoliteness in a way which disengages it from its association from politeness. By recognising the difference of impoliteness (i.e. that it is not simply the polar opposite of politeness) they have begun the process of analysing impoliteness in and of itself.

3. Definitions of discourse and post-modernism

Discourse and post-modernism are both terms about which there is a great deal of theoretical debate (Mills 1997) Furthermore, to add to the complexity of describing post-modern and discursive approaches to politeness, many of the theorists I refer to in this essay do not themselves consider their work or analytical approach to be post-modern or discourse-oriented. Here, I map out a range of definitions of these terms.

There has been a discursive term in politeness research. By this, I mean that theorists are no longer content to analyse politeness and impoliteness as if they were realised through the use of isolated phrases and sentences. It is clear that politeness and impoliteness are, amongst other things, judgements about linguistic phenomena and judgements are generally constituted over a number of turns or even over much longer stretches of interaction. Furthermore, theorists who take a discursive approach generally are concerned with issues of context. Thus, discursive theorists do not focus on politeness at the level of the phrase or sentence, and do not assume that politeness is in some sense inherent in the words used. Discursive theorists such as Foucault (1972, 1978) and Critical Discourse theorists such as Fairclough (1995) and Wodak and Chilton (2005) have demonstrated that the resources available to interactants are shaped by social forces. By seeing discourse as Foucault does as a system of "regulated practices that account for a number of statements" (Foucault 1972: 80) the discursive theorists need to move to analyse the unspoken rules whereby certain utterances are for example seen as appropriate. Thus, it is important to analyse these discursive constraints on individuals, rather than assuming that interactants necessarily simply make fully conscious decisions about what politeness norms to adhere to. Thus, the focus on discourse has two impacts on theorising, one is a concern with the variability of the function and meaning of elements accordingly to the context, and the other is a wider political concern for the way in which discourse structures the possible range of expression available to individual interactants.

The term post-modern is used in a variety of ways; within the American context often equating with post-structuralism, whereas in Britain it is used to refer to works

by those such as Baudrillard and Lyotard, who have moved beyond post-structuralist theory (theorists such as Foucault, Derrida and Kristeva) and have questioned the very basis on which arguments. By no means all discursive theorists take up this position in relation to discourse, and not everyone focuses so much on institutional constraints on the individual politics can be established.

Bousfield (2008) tries to move beyond the focus on individual utterances by focusing on activity types or discourse roles available to interlocutors, suggesting that the roles which we inhabit or are allocated and the discursive repertoires available to those roles determine in large measure the levels and types of politeness and impoliteness that are used. Discursive theorists tend to view face differently to Brown and Levinson. Indeed, many return to Goffman's more process-oriented view of face, and criticise Brown and Levinson for the static nature of their characterisation. Bousfield (2008: 42) suggests that face is "internally expected and externally realised in interaction, requiring in actuality some fine tuning or outright re-modification/manipulation". Terkourafi (2007: 47) suggests that "there is no faceless communication" arguing that "all linguistic expressions do 'information work' and 'facework' at the same time all the time" Geyer suggests the term 'interactional face' to capture this notion that face is not fixed but achieved within interaction; as she remarks (2008: 51): the analysis based on this conceptualisation will probably not produce a clear categorical understanding of politeness in isolated sentences. Instead, what this notion of face can capture is the moment-by-moment management of multiple faces constructed and displayed in discourse. Arundale (2010) also, in his development of Face Constituting Theory draws on Conversation Analysis to develop a notion of politeness and face as something which is an interactional achievement, rather than an abstracted entity or set of agreed norms. Face in this model particularly becomes a relational phenomenon and not a property of utterances as such.

LIST OF USED LITERATURES:

1. Ruziyeva N. (2020). FACE CONCEPT IN THE CATEGORY OF POLITENESS. European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements, 1(4), 15-20.
2. Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna (2021).The category of politeness in different linguocultural traditions. ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL 11 (2), 1667-1675
3. G'ayratovna, R.M. . (2021). Semantics of euphemistic and dysphemetic units. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 243-246.
4. Ruslan Rajabmurodovich Radjabov. (2021). THE FRENCH FUTURE: MODALITY IN ENGLISH. Emergent: Journal of Educational Discoveries and Lifelong Learning (EJEDL), 2(06), 60-67.
5. Sobirovich, S. R. (2021). Ethymological Doublets Between French Verbs And Their Use. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 13.
6. Imamkulova Sitora Anvarovna. (2021). Cognitive Int Intensification. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 1

7. Nurullayevna, S. N. . (2021). The techniques of explicit grammar instruction. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 281-284.
8. NarzullayevaFiruza. "English Phraseological Units With Somatic Components". CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE, Vol. 1, no. 1, Oct. 2020, pp. 29-31,
9. Yulduz, Mehmonova. "Lexico-grammatical Parts of Speech Expressing the Indefiniteness of the Subject." JournalNX, vol. 7, no. 1, 2021, pp. 323-327.
10. Bakhtiyorovna, I. F. . (2021). Translation of linguocultural peculiarities in hafiza kochkarova's translations. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 12, 247-249. Irgasheva Feruza Bakhtiyorovna. (2021). INTEGRATION OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE INTO THE TRANSLATION PROCESS . CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE, 2(1), 32-34.

FORSCHA SO‘ZLAR TARKIBIDA QO‘LLANILGAN -AK AFFIKSI HAQIDA AYRIM MULOHAZALAR

*Abdulhamid Abduvaliyev Abdumo‘minovich,
JDPI katta o‘qituvchi*

O‘zbek tilining besh tomlik izohli lug‘atida jami 234 ta forscha -ak qo‘shimchasi yordamida yasalgan forscha-tojikcha so‘zlar mavjud. Bu qo‘shimcha o‘zbekcha so‘zlarda asosan ot so‘z turkimiga tegishli so‘zlarga qo‘shiladi. Forscha so‘zlarda -ak qo‘shimchasi forscha fe‘llarga ham qo‘shilib kelgan. Bunday so‘zlar, ya‘ni forscha fe‘llarga qo‘shilgan so‘zlar 50 dan ortiq so‘zni tashkil etadi. Shuningdek, lug‘ atda *bodbezak* (294), *bodparrak* (295), *bodrezak*, *bodbarak* (297) kabi so‘zlar ham uchraydi. Shundan *bodbezak* (bod+bez+ak) shaklida hosil qilingan bo‘lib, so‘zi *bezidan* “esmoq” va -ak qo‘shimchasi orqali yasalgan bo‘lib “kuchsiz shamol esishi” ma‘nosini ifodalaydi. *bodparrak* esa “shamol yordamda aylanadigan kichik parrak yoki ventilyator” ma‘nosida ishlatiladi. *Bodrezak* so‘zida esa bod - “shamol”, rez esa “to‘kmoq” ma‘nosidagi rextan fe‘li yordamida hosil qilingan bo‘lib, “shamol yordamida to‘kiladigan” ma‘nolarida qo‘llangan.

O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ atida tarkibida -ak affiksi qatnashgan quyidagi so‘zlar berilgan:

- a) otdan kichraytirish va o‘xshatish ma‘nosini ifodalovchi ot yasaydi: *bargak*, *ichak*, *yo‘lak*;
- b) otlardan o‘xshatish, holat, tur bildiruvchi sifatlar yasaydi.: *murg‘ ak* (*bola*), *qirmizak* (*olma*), *g‘ alvirak* (*yong‘ oq*);
- c) yakka yoki takrorlangan taqlidiy so‘zlardan ot yasaydi: *varrak*, *guldurak*, *qarsak*, *bizbizak*, *davdarak* kabilar.

Yuqorida so‘zlarning qaysi ma‘noda kelishi haqida to‘g‘ ri ma‘lumot berilgan. O‘zbekcha so‘zlar bilan kelganda yuqoridagi fikrlarga qo‘shilishimiz mumkin. Ammo o‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ atida o‘zbekcha so‘zlardan tashqari forscha -ak qo‘shimchasi bilan kelgan so‘zlar mavjud. Chunki fors tili’ i fa’ otlarga qo‘shilibgina qolmay, balki fe‘l, sifat va hatto ayri