


CLASSIFICATION OF SPEECH ACT IN COMMAND SENTENCE		Linguistics Keywords: simple sentence, speech act classification, verdictive, except, expositive, command sentence, communicative unit.
Khujamkulova Makhbuba Bobonazarovna	Teacher of National University of Uzbekistan. City Tashkent, Uzbekistan.	
<p style="text-align: center;">Abstract</p> <p>Pragmalinguistics has a number of unique concepts, methods of analysis, which, in turn, created the basis for the emergence of new terms in the dictionary of Uzbek linguistics. In particular, the concept of a speech act represents a statement of the relationship of acts of mutual meaning that occur in the process of communication between people and is a phenomenon related to pragmalinguistics. Pragmatic analysis of simple sentences automatically appeals to the communicative units of language. The theory of speech act and the similarities and differences between linguistics. The paper deals with the interconnection of communication and pragmatics relations and classification of speech act in command sentence in the Uzbek language.</p>		

Pragmalinguistic analysis of simple sentences in Uzbek language enriches the scientific and theoretical conclusions obtained in traditional linguistics with the help of modern methods of linguistic analysis. The result shed more light on the nature of language units (including syntactic characters). A number of Uzbek linguists, including M.Khakimov, Sh.Safarova linguists have commented on the descriptions of pragmalinguists J.Austin, J.Serl, and others on the classification of speech acts in their works. For example, Sh.Safarov cites the classifications of scholars such as J.Austin and Kate Allan J.Searl on the theory of speech act and the similarities and differences between them (Examples by the author).

Consider the classification of speech acts grouped by J. Austin:

1. Verdicatives. Judgment, decision-making.
2. Exertives. The meanings of command, coercion, advice, warning, using their right, domination, are expressed. Do your homework.
3. Commissives. Promises represent obligations, such as taking on an obligation.
4. Behabitivists. Behavior in the community, ethical-aesthetic content.
5. Expositives. It is the verbal acts that occur in the process of interpreting, affirming, and explaining one's point of view. I unanimously approve the decision.

J. Sirl's classification of speech acts differs somewhat from J. Austin's views:

1. Assertives (verbal verification of information): London - the capital of England;
2. Directives (speech acts that motivate the listener);
3. Commissions (speech acts in the context of making a commitment);
4. Declarations (verbal acts of change in reality);
5. Espressives (speech acts used in ceremonies such as congratulations, condolences).

Linguist Sh. Safarov also classifies the following types of speech acts of Kate Allan:

1. Comperative (verbal actions such as command, question, demand, request. In this case, the illocutive goal does not correspond to the social goal);
2. Convival (illocutive and social purpose are mutually compatible. Suggestions, congratulations, congratulations, words of thanks);
3. Collaborative (illocutive goal does not depend on social goal. For example, affirmation, reporting, announcement, reporting, etc.);
4. The collective illocutive goal and the social goal are mutually exclusive. (E.g., threats, accusations, swearing, cursing, etc.).

Another type of communicative type, command sentences, express the listener to do something – to do something, to insist, and other related meanings [18; 1987]. A.N. According to Kononov's purpose, he divides the types of sentences into four types (verb, interrogative, modal, prepositional) and includes command sentences in modal sentences. The cut of the command sentence comes with verb tenses or words that express the command tone [5; 1960]. Command sentences represent a variety of semantic aspects, from strict commands to requests and exhortations [5; 1960].

In traditional linguistics, the following semantic types of command sentences are classified: 1) pure command; 2) command–and–control; 3) order-request; 4) command-consultation; 5) command–wish; 6) such as command–call [10; 2007].

Also, in the “Grammar of the Uzbek language” there are such semantic types of command sentences as desire, surprise, care, encouragement, suspicion, excitement, and anger [17; 1976]. The semantic, structural aspect of the command sentence has been studied in the stages of language, but its pragmatic aspects have not yet been studied in Uzbek linguistics.

A. Nurmonov and N. Mahmudov describe command statements as active in motivation and modality of the second person, inactive in relation to the information of the first person [7; 1995]. In previous chapters, we have described the differences between communicative units and also mentioned their similarities to each other. When we analyzed from a pragmatic point of view, we also mentioned that command statements are informative.

According to him, if the information of the first person is present in the sentence, the order can also be found in the sentence. For example: Take your passport (the order says – inform you not to go there without a passport).

We can say that in a pragmatic aspect, communicative types can reflect different goals depending on the speech situation. Darak, we have systematized the classification of speech acts

of interrogative sentences. Not all types of speech acts are appropriate for command statements. Summarizing the classifications of speech acts of J.Serl, K.Allan, J.Lich, we systematize the classification of speech acts of command sentences:

1. Verdictive – This type of sentence in the context of sentencing is specific to the sentence: to be sentenced to three years in prison.

2. Exertive – in the situation addressee is dominant, the use of his right, position, order, warning, coercion, expressing the content of the order: Write the application. You are free. Let this situation not happen again.

3. Expositive – command statements, which express the content of the judgment by means of interpretation, description: Tomorrow is the day of repayment of the debt. Don't forget to congratulate your mom on the tenth.

4. Directive – a command, a question, a please, a warning. This type of command sentence involves speech acts that motivate the listener to action: Why don't you say it knowingly? Do the task on time. Take care of household chores.

5. Expressive – command words used in the context of wishes, congratulations, prayers and other positive content (this can include almost ready-made linguistic units used mainly in events such as ceremonies, rituals, condolences). Darak can also be used in interrogative sentences: “Accept my condolences”, “See many such young people”.

In such a grouping of command sentences according to the classification of verbal action, it is natural that these classifications should not be free from errors and omissions, as they are the result of our approximate conclusions and observations. Because the possibilities of language are so broad in a speech situation, speech realities may require different descriptions and classifications in different situations.

References

1. Аҳмедова Н. Ўзбек тилида мурожаат бирликларининг семантик-коннотатив тадқиқи: Филол. фанлари номз. ...дисс. –Т., 2008.
2. Грамматика русского языка, т.-II, кн.-1, § 420
3. Исмагуллаев Ҳ. Кузатилган мақсадга кўра гап турларининг баъзи интонацион хусусиятлари. –Тилшунослик ва адабиётларга оид тадқиқотлар. Ташкент. 1965.
4. Колшанский Г.В. Коммуникативная функция и структура языка. М., 1984.
5. Кононов А.Н. Грамматика современного узбекского литературного языка. Издательство академии наук СССР Москва.Ленинград.1960.
6. Лутфуллаева Д.Е. Тасдиқ гапларда инкор ва шаклий-мазмуний номувофиқлик. Филол. фанлари номзоди ...дисс. автореф. –Тошкент, 1997.

7. Махмудов Н., Нурмонов А. Ўзбек тилининг назарий грамматикаси (синтаксис). – Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1995.
8. Нурмонов А. Гап ҳақидаги синтактик назариялар. –Ташкент. 1988.
9. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. –Ташкент.2008.
10. Сайфуллаева Р., Менглиев Б., Боқиева Г., Қурбонова М., Юнусова З., Абузалова М. Ҳозирги о'збек адабий тили. Т. 2007.
11. Сулаймонов А. Ифода мақсадига кўра гап турлари. Самарқанд университети асарлари, янги серия. 91-чақирик. Фил.фак. Ўзбек тили кафедраси. Самарқанд. 1959.
12. Ҳожалиев И. Коммуникатив имконият структураси. Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. 2001. 6-сон.
13. Хомидова М.Ф. Бадиий матн перцепциясида матн интертекстуаллик. Филол.фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD) дисс. Тошкент – 2021.
14. Яндашова Т.Р. Ўзбек ва инглиз тилларида “гўзаллик” концептининг ифодаланиши ва лингвопоэтикаси. Филол. фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD) дисс. Тошкент – 2021.
15. Қурбонова М.М. Абдурауф Фитрат ва ўзбек тилшунослиги. Методик қўлланма. Тошкент. Университет.1997.
16. Қурбонова М., Сайфуллаева Р., Боқиева Г., Менглиев Б. Ўзбек тилининг структурал синтаксиси; Тошкент, 2004.
17. Ўзбек тили грамматикаси.Птом.ЎзССР Фан.Тошкент-1976.Б.109
18. Ғуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили.Ўқитувчи.Тошкент.-1987.Б.62.
19. Ҳакимов М.Ҳ. Ўзбек тилида матннинг прагматик талқини. Док. дисс. Ташкент-2001.
20. Austin, John L., A plea for excuses, «Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society»; reprinted in J.O.
21. Armson and G.J. Warnock (eds.), Philosophical Papers, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1956, pp.175-204.
22. Austin, John L., How to Do Things with Words, Clarendon, Oxford 1962.
23. Searle, John R., Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1969.
24. Searle, John R., «IndRussell, Bertrand, On denoting, «Mind», 14, 1905; reprinted in T.M. Olshewsky (ed.), Problems in the Philosophy of Language, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York 1969, pp. 300-311.
25. Searle, John R., Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1969.