

How to Cite:

Yuldasheva, N. E., Yusupova, S. T., Bakhtiyarov, M. Y., Abdujabborova, M. A., & Abdurashidova, N. A. (2021). Pragmalinguistic aspects of compound nouns in English and Uzbek. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S2), 1431-1438.
<https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS2.1960>

Pragmalinguistic Aspects of Compound Nouns in English and Uzbek

Nargiza Ergashbayevna Yuldasheva

National university of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Sanobar Tursunboyevna Yusupova

Tashkent Institute of textile and light industry, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Mukhtorjon Yakubovich Bakhtiyarov

Uzbek State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Malika Abduvaitovna Abdujabborova

Tashkent Institute of textile and light industry, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Nilufar Abdurashidovna Abdurashidova

Tashkent State Transport University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract--This article describes compound nouns in English and Uzbek, their specific pragmatic aspects. Although the problem of compound nouns in linguistics has been studied by many linguists, there are many unsolved problems in comparing compound words in languages and analyzing them from a pragmalinguistic point of view. The compound word, which has a special place in the richness of language vocabulary, is in fact a convenient way of naming in simple terms the concepts of events that take place in reality, of existing objects. Hence, it can be concluded that the study of semantic, grammatical and syntactic features of language alone is not enough. As a result, the field of "pragmatics" has found its place in linguistics, having its own goals and objectives. In addition, the article also uses analysis from examples from the literature to reveal the pragmatic nature of compound words. However, scientific examples have shown that no sign is a leading factor in determining the nature of compound words.

Keywords---communicative grammar, compound word, linguistics, pragmalinguistic, pragmatic aspects.

Introduction

In world linguistics, the transition from the stage of studying language as a theoretical concept to practical linguistics began in the second half of the twentieth century. At this stage, the concept of language as a natural language differed from artificial language, and its specific features were analyzed in depth when applied in the context of a particular text. We know that in the process of speech not only linguistic units, i.e. words, phrases, compound words, fixed expressions and other compounds form active communication, but also extralinguistic factors such as personality, time and space factor, speech maker actions and facial expressions (De Groot & Nas, 1991; Levelt, 1992). Factors also have a direct impact on the speech process. Hence, it can be concluded that the study of semantic, grammatical and syntactic features of language alone is not enough. As a result, the field of "pragmatics" has found its place in linguistics, having its own goals and objectives (Xu, 2004; Imai & Gentner, 1997).

Method

As S. Levinson describes: "Pragmatics is a field that studies the grammatical (coded) interactions between language and context in a linguistic structure, ... pragmatics is the study of all aspects of latent meaning that semantic theory does not cover, ... analyzes the ability to select sentences appropriately to form a context" (Levinson, 2008). It is clear from these definitions that pragmatism has a wide scope; this area includes the analysis of concepts such as deixis, explication and implication of communication, proposition, intention, presupposition, inference, speech act, discourse. "Pragmatics" is derived from the Greek word *pragma* (*pragma*-action, action), which is actually a philosophical concept. It was also in use before Socrates and was later adopted by philosophers such as J. Locke and E. Kant from Aristotle. Thus a stream of pragmatism emerged in philosophy. The main period of development of this movement is the XIX-XX centuries. Especially in the 20s and 30s of the twentieth century, the ideas of pragmatism began to be significantly promoted. The services of Ch. Pierce, R. Carnap, Ch. Morris, L. Wittgenstein in the widespread dissemination of this propaganda in America and Europe deserve special recognition. Traditional linguistics focuses on the study of linguistic units only from a formal point of view. This view is further reinforced, especially by the semiotic approach to language, which considers the sign to consist only of form. Each of the language levels was analyzed as a closed system. For the reasons that, the relationship of linguistic units to the objective being in which they are expressed has been neglected. It later became clear that such a study of language was one-sided, that form could not be separated from meaning. By reason of, the focus on the semantic side of linguistic units increases. As a result of the intensification of semantic research in linguistics, it has become clear that even the description of linguistic units in terms of form and content does not allow a complete interpretation of language. It is only when linguistic units are studied in relation to context, the situation of speech, that it is possible to understand their meaning correctly (Kifer, 1985). This increases interest in the pragmatic side of linguistic units. In order to understand the information correctly, in addition to the speakers' knowledge of the language, it is necessary to add the listener's knowledge of the world, the social situation in which the sentence is used, the

psyche of the speakers and other knowledge. The scientific views of the German philosopher G. Klaus, who studied pragmatics as a science that studied the relationship between characters and the creators, transmitters, and receivers of these linguistic characters, logically continue the ideas of Ch. Pierce and Ch. Morris in this field (Safarov Sh., 2008). The views of the linguists of the XXI century J. May and D. Kim on the field of linguopragmatics, its subject and its interaction with other fields are important. In particular, "Linguopragmatics (or pragmatics) is a branch of linguistics and semiotics that studies situations and ways in which context influences meaning. Pragmatics includes the theory of speech act, the process of engaging in communication, the interaction in conversation, and other features related to language in speech mode. In addition to linguistics and semiotics, this field is related to philosophy, sociology and anthropology (Mey, 2001). According to the scientist's theory, any factor affecting the linguistic speech of individuals in a state of live communication is analyzed in depth by the field of linguopragmatics, and it is directly related to other socio-humanitarian fields besides linguistics. A logical continuation of May's view can be seen in Kim's opinion: "It is linguistic pragmatics that solves the problem of the speaker's hesitation in choosing language units in his speech and shows the semantic effect of state, place, time and other factors in context" (Kim & Hall, 2002). Sh.Safarov describes the field of pragmatics as follows: "Pragmatism is a separate branch of linguistics, the scope of which is the study of the selection of linguistic units in the process of communication, their use and the impact of these units on the participants. ... The main idea of linguistic analysis is also to determine the nature of language in relation to its application in practical activities, or in other words, in the context of the function it performs. The concept of task (function) is the basis of a pragmalinguistic approach to language analysis ... " (Safarov Sh., 2008). This theory of the scientist clearly showed the role and function of pragmatics in linguistics.

Discussion

In this section, we aim to evaluate and analyze English compound words according to the types of relationships expressed by the speaker in the communication process. This requires the study of linguistic phenomena that occur at the intersection of functional grammar and linguistic pragmatics, which are now beginning to develop widely (Chang, 2011; Savić et al., 2021; Takahashi, 2015). With this in mind, we will talk about how these terms of communicative grammar and linguistic pragmatics are used in modern linguistics, a brief history of their development and in what sense we use these terms in this dissertation research (Newton & Kennedy, 1996; Incecay & Dollar, 2011). It should be noted that the linguistics used in this regard should not be confused with the "pragmatic linguistics or pragma-linguistics" used by some linguists, including O.S. Akhmanova and A. Idzelis (Safarov Sh., 2008).

As a result of such a practical need, semantics and pragmatics emerged. Without these three aspects of linguistic units, language, which is a means of communication, cannot find its full interpretation. It is understood that syntactic units also have three aspects:

- Syntax
- Semantics
- Pragmatics

Syntax studies the formal relationships of linguistic units, i.e., the relationship between linguistic characters. Syntax works on the basis of syntactic forms (Suryasa et al., 2019). Hence, syntax relies on the syntactic system of a sentence to be studied under the name of traditional syntax sentence fragments. According to syntax, any syntactic unit is interpreted as a generalized essence manifested in different variants in the speech process. Ch. Morris, one of the founders of semiotics, divides semiotics into three:

- Semantics - the doctrine of the relation of the sign to the object in existence;
- Syntax - the doctrine of the relation of a sign to another sign;
- Pragmatics is the doctrine of the relation of a sign to the person who uses that sign, i.e. the speaker (Morris, 1983).

From this it is understood that semantic syntax studies the elements of objective reality reflected in the mind, that is, how proposition is expressed through syntactic devices. In other words, semantic syntax studies the propositional side of devices (Stolneyker, 1986).

The correctness of the two-way communication in the speech process ensures that both parties correctly understand the general meaning of the compound noun used in that speech and the true intent in the context (Aripov, 2021). In this process, both the addressee and the addressee must first know the general content of the joint noun. But its original meaning in the process of speech can be understood only by knowing the context. For example:

We can find six meanings of the word **aksakal** in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language. 1. A white-bearded old man, an old man 2. A local official who in the past was the head of one or more mahallas or villages 3. Nowadays: chairman of village citizens' assemblies and town mahalla committees 4. figurative sense: group or class leader 5. figurative sense: An elderly person who has worked a lot in a field, a hard worker, a manager 6. A form of appeal used by one's peers against the elderly or the elderly.

This can be seen in the following dialogue text example

- *Bo'ldi, do'stim, bo'ldi!*
- *Oqsoqol ro'parasiga turib olib yoqasiga yopishmoqchi bo'layotgan pakana kishining yelkasiga shapatiladi.*
- *Hazilniyam bilmaysanmi, nima balo, Duma! Ma'lim No'g'ayqo'rg'onda maktab ochmoqchi. Katta maktab. Ishonganimdan senikiga opkeldim-da, o'rtoq! (O'tkir Hoshimov. Ikki eshik orasi. B.61.)*
- *Bugun kech bo'ldi, — dedi mahalla oqsoqoli, — erta peshinga chiqaramiz. Har qalay, jon taslim qilganiga ancha kun bo'libdi. Endi ushlab turmay ertaroq joyiga qo'yganimiz ma'qul.*
- *Xo'p, dedi boshi quyi egilgan Bobur, — mahalla nima desa shu. (Nuriddin Ismoilov. Omonat g'or siri. B. 121.)*

Old qatorda o'tirgan sinf oqsoqolimiz muallimga bir nima dedi. «Yoshlik». As for the pragmatic analysis of the above examples, **Aksakal** compound noun used in the three texts given is radically different from each other. We can only distinguish the context in which this word is used. **Aksakal** in the first context corresponds to the definition in the dictionaries. **Aksakal** compound noun used in the second and third texts in the second text expresses the pragmatic meanings of the chairman, leader, manager of the mahalla (Andaniyazova, 2021). In the third text, the pragmatic meaning of the class leader is expressed through the compound noun **Aksakal**. It is clear from these considerations that the expression of the pragmatic meaning of any compound nouns necessarily requires reference to the text. When finding the common meanings of a word, we must not forget that its lingvostylistic, lingvopragmatic aspects are determined by the text (Holland, 1991).

Hence, the function of compound nouns in speech reflects the following features: 1) the tag meaning of compound nouns emerges clearly in a particular context; 2) compound nouns perform different pragmatic functions in different speech situations, i.e. represent different speech acts, inference (presuppositions and implications), intentions; 3) A particular compound noun can perform multiple functions (sociological, didactic, lingvoculturological, pragmatic) and multiple inferences (polyinference) even in the case of a single application in the same context (usually in artistic contexts). Hence, compound nouns are not only a rigid linguistic unit in language structure, but also have many pragmatic features in speech as their specific features appear only in the context of a particular situation in the process of communication of speech subjects (Peniro & Cyntas, 2019). The circumstances in which compound nouns are used by whom and for what purpose determine their “pragmatic potential” in context.

The process of human communication is much more complicated, because it involves not only the vocabulary of the speaker, but also his worldview, factors such as knowledge and skills acquired, social status, time, place and situation in which communication takes place are also important (Spahiu & Kryeziu, 2021). Communication should have any purpose - intention. The speaker and the listener interact directly only to achieve a specific goal. Compound nouns, which are often used by communication participants, also play an effective role in creating the semantic and content integrity of communication, and as a result of this process, communication becomes emotionally sensitive and emotionally colorful. This can be seen in the following example text:

I found out what a Rorshach is. It's the test I took before the operation-the one with the inkblots on the pieces of cardboard. The man who gave me the test was the same one. I was scared to death of those inkblots. (Keyes, 2019)

- Yaxshi...
- Dadam bir zum sukut saqlab turdi-da, qo'shib qo'ydi.
- Oqsoqoldan ham bir xabar olay deb kirsam, Abzidan xat kepti. Toyirjon o'qib berdi.

Oyim hech nimani tushunmadi shekilli, so'radi.

- Kim?

- Abzi! – dedi dadam qandaydir tantanavor ohangda.
- Rashid abzi bor edi-ku! Qozondan xat yozibdi. Hammaga salom aytibdi.
- Voy bechora! – Oyim shodon xitob qildi. – Tirik ekanmi?
- Yurganmish. Butun No'g'ayqo'rg'onga salom aytibdi.
- O'ziyam topilmas odam edi-da! – dedi oyim mamnun bo'lib.
- Ishqilib sog' bo'lsin...

The above passage from the Uzbek fiction can be analyzed pragmatically as follows: 1) this context is neither the beginning nor the end of the text, the dialogue of the dialogue participants is not over yet; an older and middle-aged woman with whom the communication participants are closely acquainted; 2) the woman which is described as "black amma" and a tomboy Bashorat 3) both women are from the middle class; 4) "black amma" has an intention of interest to know the condition of Bashorat's husband; 5) Bashorat has an intention to try to hide the real situation; 6) The people of Nogaykurgan used to call the Bashorat's husband "pocha"; 7) Bashorat's mood rose after "black amma" asked about the situation; 8) This text is not about Nogaykurgan, but about the people there.

The compound noun in this communication situation is Nogaykurgan. In this example, Nogaykurgan is the place name, in which case it refers to the addressee's place of residence, i.e. Rashid Abzi first lived in Nogaykurgan and then disappeared without a trace having an effect. There are several reasons for this: first, Rashid Abzi, who is not of Uzbek descent, leaves his place and returns to his homeland. Then his reappearance in the play quickly catches the attention of the readers; secondly, the components of this compound noun are the linguoculture that represents the true Uzbek toponym.

Conclusion

Moreover, since this compound noun, which retains the relationship between the components in its content, refers to a place in the context, this compound noun acts as a discourse dexterity in the context. It is no coincidence that pragmatics has received increasing attention at a time when the study of semantic issues has intensified. Due to the fact that the scope of the semantics has been greatly expanded, it has had to be made a little easier, to get rid of the context-related part of the meaning. As a result, pragmatics was separated from semantics. Context and speech situation form the basis of pragmatic research. This is why there is a growing need for pragmatics where the speech situation or context is necessary for the proposition expressed by the syntactic device to be understood by the speakers.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper.

References

- Andaniyazova, D. R. (2021). Literary-aesthetic function of Turkic onomastic units in literary text. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 7(5), 356-361. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v7n5.1929>
- Aripov, M. P. (2021). Semantics of wishes/applause/prayers associated with religious terms. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 7(4), 274-278. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v7n4.1808>
- Chang, Y. F. (2011). Interlanguage pragmatic development: The relation between pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence. *Language Sciences*, 33(5), 786-798. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2011.02.002>
- De Groot, A. M., & Nas, G. L. (1991). Lexical representation of cognates and noncognates in compound bilinguals. *Journal of memory and language*, 30(1), 90-123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X\(91\)90012-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(91)90012-9)
- Holland, A. L. (1991). Pragmatic aspects of intervention in aphasia. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 6(2), 197-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0911-6044\(91\)90007-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0911-6044(91)90007-6)
- Imai, M., & Gentner, D. (1997). A cross-linguistic study of early word meaning: Universal ontology and linguistic influence. *Cognition*, 62(2), 169-200. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277\(96\)00784-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(96)00784-6)
- Incecay, V., & Dollar, Y. K. (2011). Foreign language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 3394-3398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.307>
- Kifer F. (1985). The role of pragmatics in linguistic description. New in zarubejnoj linguistics. Vyp. XVI.
- Kim, D., & Hall, J. K. (2002). The role of an interactive book reading program in the development of second language pragmatic competence. *The modern language journal*, 86(3), 332-348.
- Levelt, W. J. (1992). Accessing words in speech production: Stages, processes and representations. *Cognition*, 42(1-3), 1-22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(92\)90038-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(92)90038-J)
- Levinson S.C. (2008). Pragmatics. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: an introduction.
- Morris Ch.U. (1983). Basic theories of signs. Semiotics.
- Newton, J., & Kennedy, G. (1996). Effects of communication tasks on the grammatical relations marked by second language learners. *System*, 24(3), 309-322. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(96\)00024-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(96)00024-3)
- Peniro, R. ., & Cyntas, J. . (2019). Applied linguistics theory and application. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 3(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v3n1.7>
- Safarov Sh. (2008). Pragmalinguistics. Monograph. - T .: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan.
- Savić, M., Economidou-Kogetsidis, M., & Myrset, A. (2021). Young Greek Cypriot and Norwegian EFL learners: Pragmalinguistic development in request production. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 180, 15-34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.04.006>
- Spahiu, I., & Kryeziu, N. (2021). Grammatical mistakes of Albanian students in learning English as a foreign language. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 814-822. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS3.1366>
- Stolneyker R.S. (1986). Pragmatics. Novoe v zarubejnoj lingvistike. Vyp. XVI, M.

- Suryasa, I.W., Sudipa, I.N., Puspani, I.A.M., Netra, I.M. (2019). Translation procedure of happy emotion of english into indonesian in kṛṣṇa text. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(4), 738–746
- Takahashi, S. (2015). The effects of learner profiles on pragmalinguistic awareness and learning. *System*, 48, 48-61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.004>
- Xu, Z. (2004). A method based on linguistic aggregation operators for group decision making with linguistic preference relations. *Information sciences*, 166(1-4), 19-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2003.10.006>