

ASES
XII. INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCES CONGRESS

CONGRESS BOOK

EDITOR: Prof. Dr. Salimakhon RUSTAMIY

ISBN: 978-625-92363-7-7

AUTHOR(s)	TITLE	PAGE NO
İsmail AYDOĞAN	TÜRK-İSLAM DÜŞÜNCE GELENEĞİNDE AHLAKİ VE ESTETİK BİR EĞİTİM TASAVVURU VE MAVERAÜNNEHİR'DEN GÜNÜMÜZE BİR İŞBİRLİĞİ MODELİ	1
İsmail AYDOĞAN	EDEBİN İNŞASI: AHLAK TERBİYESİNİN FELSEFİ TEMELLERİ VE KLASİK İSLAM PEDAGOJİSİNDE BİR YÖNTEM OLARAK MÜŞAHEDE (GÖZETİM) USULÜ	8
Neslin İHTİYAROĞLU	AHLÂKÎ İDEALDEN YETKİNLİĞE: MODERN EĞİTİM SÖYLEMİNDE “İYİ İNSAN” KAVRAMININ YENİDEN DÜŞÜNÜLMESİ	14
Neslin İHTİYAROĞLU	MODERN EĞİTİM DİLİNDE TERBİYE KAVRAMININ KAYBI: TEORİK BİR DEĞERLENDİRME	20
Deniz DEMİR	CİRİT ALAYLARININ SEMBOLLERİ OLARAK OSMANLI SANATINDA LAHANA VE BAMYA TASVİRLERİ	27
NABIDULLIN AIBOLAT ORDABAYEV CHINGIZ MERKIBAYEV TULEGEN	COGNITIVE SEMANTICS OF COLOUR TERMS: M. AUEZOV’S TEXT AND ITS AMERICAN INTERPRETATION (A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS)	29
GULSAYA KHAIRLAEVA , SAULE ASANBAEVA AIGERIM NURZHANOVA	LINGUACULTURAL LACUNAE IN THE SOCIO-POLITICAL SPACE OF MODERN KAZAKHSTAN AND METHODS OF THEIR COMPENSATORY TRANSLATION	38
ABDRAKHMANOV DAUREN JAKIPBAYEVA AIGERIM KULSHAEVA AINUR	FACTORS OF ENDONORMATIVE STABILIZATION IN PLURICENTRIC LANGUAGES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN IN THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN	44
Komila Gulamjanova	Literary Discourse and Its Theoretical Foundations in Anthropocentric Linguistics	52
Rasulova Munojat Akmaljonovna	AN EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGINS OF THE TERM "DICTIONARY" IN GLOBAL LINGUISTICS	57
Rakhmatova Bahora Ibodulla qizi	PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF LEXICAL UNITS IN CRIMINAL LAW TEXTS	61
Rayimjonov Sayidolim Madaminjon o‘g‘li	“AMALIYOTI ISLOM” ASARI VA UNDAGI ARABIY DINIY TERMINLARNING TAHLILI ANALYSIS OF ARABIC RELIGIOUS TERMS IN “AMALIYOTI ISLAM”	65
Umurzakova Gulchexra Egamberdiyevna	Enhancing Intercultural and Pragmatic Competence	68
Ziyoda Xolberdiyeva Abdurahmanovna	MUNOSIB SHOGIRD SANALGAN XATTOT	72
Qasımova Maya Rəhim qızı	ÜNSIYYƏT ZAMANI MÜRACIƏT FORMALARININ FUNKSIONAL VƏ PRAQMATIK XÜSUSIYYƏTLƏRI	76
Fəridə Səfərəliyeva	FRAZEOLOJİ BİRLƏŞMƏLƏR VƏ ONLARIN İBTİDAİ SİNİFLƏRDƏ TƏTBİQİ	80
Kentayeva Gulmira Ismadiyarovna	XABIB G’AZALLARINING BAYOZLARDAGI MANBALARI VA ULARNING MATNSHUNOSLIK TAHLILI (582-INVENTAR QO‘LYOZMA ASOSIDA)	83
САКИЕВА ГУЛЬЗИРА ИБРАЙМОВА ЛИРА	ҚАЗАҚ БАЛАЛАР КИНОФИЛЬМДЕРІНДЕГІ СЫПАЙЫЛЫҚ МАРКЕРЛЕРІ: МУЛЬТИМЕДИЯЛЫҚ КОРПУСҚА АРНАЛҒАН ТІЛДІК ДЕРЕКТЕР	88
Alimuxamedov R.A.	QADIMGI TURK-MONIY ASARLARIDA QO‘LLANGAN DUO FORMULALARI	93
Nizamova Salomat Usmanovna	G‘ARB INGLIZ ADABIYOTIDA ARXAIK VA ESKIRGAN IBORALARNING SEMANTIK EVOLYUTSIYASI HAMDA ULARNING ZAMONAVIY DISKURSDAGI TRANSFORMATSIYASI	95
Qudratova Muxlisa Izzatilla qizi	INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA VAQT KATEGORIYASINING DISKURSIV REALIZATSIYASI VA MATN TARKIBIDAGI ROLI	100
Mamanazarova Sarviniso Rozibobo qizi	THE ROLE OF KUWAITI LITERATURE AND THE LIFE AND WORK OF LAYLO USMON: A LEXICAL AND THEMATIC ANALYSIS	105
Islombek KHASANOV	HISTORICAL FORMATION AND EVOLUTION OF STYLISTICS IN THE ARABIC LANGUAGE	110
Axmedova Nargiza Shixnazarovna	O‘ZBEK TILIDA IYMON KONSEPTINING IFODALANISHI LINGUISTIC EXPRESSION OF THE CONCEPT OF “IYMON” IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE	111
Azizbek ISAMUTDINOV	FUNCTIONAL FEATURES OF THE DIRECT OBJECT (MAF‘UL BIHI) IN ARABIC	115
Gavhar Rakhmatova Ardasher Sapashev	PECULIARITIES OF ETIQUET LEXICON IN ARABIC AND UZBEK LANGUAGES	
Yakubova Feruza Rashidovna	A CODICOLOGICAL AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL STUDY OF THE MANUSCRIPTS OF “NUZHAT AL-ṬARF FĪ ʿILM AL-ṢARF”	117
Axmedova Nargiza Shixnazarovna	ARAB VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA TEMPORAL MA’NOLI BIRLIKLAR TEMPORAL UNITS IN ARABIC AND UZBEK LANGUAGES	119
ЖАМАНСАРИЕВА ЕҢЛІК	ҚАЗІРГІ ҚАЗАҚ ЕРТЕГІЛЕРІНДЕГІ КЕЙІПКЕР КЕҢІСТІГІНІҢ КОГНИТИВТІК МОДЕЛІ: КОНТЕЙНЕР БЕЙНЕ-СХЕМАСЫ	123

ENHANCING INTERCULTURAL AND PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE

Umurzakova Gulchexra Egamberdiyevna

Doctor of philosophy in philological science

Oriental universitety

https://orcid.org/0009-0000-6379-2592

Abstract

This article examines the deictic function of interjections from a pragmatic and cross-linguistic perspective. Interjections are approached not only as markers of emotional expression but also as linguistic signs that index participants, animate entities, and communicative intentions within discourse. Drawing on theoretical frameworks of linguistic sign theory and deixis, the study analyzes emotional, imperative, and vocative interjections in Uzbek, English, and Russian. Special attention is paid to imperative–vocative interjections used to address humans, animals, and birds, as well as to onomatopoeic forms that activate presupposition through contextual interpretation.

Keywords: interjections, deixis, pragmatics, discourse analysis, cross-linguistic study.

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается дейктическая функция междометий с прагматической и сопоставительно-лингвистической точки зрения. Междометия интерпретируются не только как средства выражения эмоций, но и как языковые знаки, индексирующие участников коммуникации, одушевлённые объекты и коммуникативные намерения в дискурсе. Опираясь на теоретические положения теории языкового знака и дейксиса, в исследовании анализируются эмоциональные, побудительные и вокативные междометия в узбекском, английском и русском языках. Особое внимание уделяется побудительно-вокативным междометиям, используемым при обращении к людям, животным и птицам, а также ономатопоэтическим формам, активизирующим пресуппозицию в процессе контекстуальной интерпретации. Анализ показывает, что междометия функционируют как дейктические средства, указывая на говорящего, адресата или объект, производящий звук, и что их дейктическая сила становится полностью интерпретируемой лишь в рамках дискурсивного контекста.

Ключевые слова: междометия; дейксис; прагматика; дискурс-анализ; сопоставительное исследование

Annotatsiya

Mazkur maqolada undov so‘zlarning deyktik funksiyasi pragmatik va qiyosiy-lingvistik nuqtayi nazardan tahlil qilinadi. Undov so‘zlar nafaqat emotsional ifoda vositalari, balki nutq jarayonida ishtirokchilarni, jonli obyektlarni hamda kommunikativ niyatlarni indekslovchi til birliklari sifatida talqin etiladi. Til belgisi nazariyasi va deyksisga oid nazariy yondashuvlarga tayangan holda, tadqiqotda o‘zbek, ingliz va rus tillaridagi emotsional, buyruq-undov va murojaat (vokativ) undovlar tahlil qilinadi. Xususan, insonlar, hayvonlar va parrandalarga murojaatda qo‘llaniladigan buyruq-vokativ undovlar hamda kontekstual talqin orqali

presuppozitsiyani faollashtiruvchi taqlidiy (onomatopoeik) shakllarga alohida e'tibor qaratiladi. Tahlil natijalari undov so'zlar so'zlovchi, tinglovchi yoki tovush manbasiga ishora qiluvchi deyktik vositalar sifatida faoliyat yuritishini hamda ularning deyktik kuchi faqat nutqiy kontekst doirasida to'liq namoyon bo'lishini ko'rsatadi.

Kalit so'zlar: undov so'zlar; deyksis; pragmatika; diskurs tahlili; qiyosiy tadqiqot.

It is well established that a word is not merely a conventional sign expressing a concept, but also a linguistic unit that reflects the national and cultural characteristics of a particular ethnos. Interjections are not an exception in this regard. As linguistic units, they embody both emotional and cultural meanings embedded in language use[1].

Interjections not only convey a speaker's emotional state but also directly point to the experiencer of that state and, indirectly, to the cultural context in which the utterance occurs. In such cases, interjections perform a **deictic function**, linking language to participants in discourse.

Interjections are signs directly connected with the human subject who produces them. Gorskiy (as cited in Russian linguistic tradition) classifies signs into two major groups:

1. signs that have a causal or determinative relationship with the object they denote;
2. signs that do not possess such a determinative relationship[2].

Maslova (2008) defines a sign as *"a perceptible entity that provides the perceiver with information both about itself and about another entity beyond the sign itself"* (p. XX).

Similarly, Panfilov (1977) emphasizes that a sign is a materially perceivable object—an event, phenomenon, or action—that functions in cognition and communication as a representative of other objects, their properties, or relations, and serves to transmit information or knowledge[3].

Thus, language as a system of signs not only denotes referents but also describes and points to them. This pointing function constitutes the essence of **deixis**[4].

The deictic nature of interjections becomes especially evident in emotional discourse. Consider the following example:

– Ой, я так беспокоилась! ... Вы мой спаситель. (Vishnevsky, *Repetition of Fate*)

In this passage, the interjection *Ой* not only expresses an emotional reaction but also points to the experiencer of the emotion—a human participant in the discourse. The interjection thus functions as an indicator of **personal deixis**.

According to Davlatova (2018), emotive interjections such as *oh, eh, e, voy, ohho, ura, dod,* and *aw* directly express the speaker's emotional state. Their deictic function is determined by the type of emotion they index[5].

This is also evident in English discourse:

[1] Худойберганова Д. Матннинг антропоцентрик тадқиқи. –Тошкент: Фан, 2013. – Б. 48.
[2] Горский Д.П. Логика. – М., 1963. – С. 14–15.
[3] Qarang. Nurmonov A. Struktur tilshunoslik: ildizlari va yo'nalishlari. – Andijon, 2006. – 182 b.
[4] Панфилов В.З. О гносеологических аспектах проблемы языкового знака // Вопросы языкознания. – М., 1977. - № 2. – С. 3–14.
[5] Давлатова Р. Ўзбек тилининг дейктик бирликлари. Филол.фан.докт. (DSc) ... дисс. автореф. Тошкент, 2020. – Б. 85.

"Aw,honey," saidStanton.(Furnas, *Primary Colours*)

Here, *aw* indicates emotional involvement and indexes the speaker's subjective stance toward the addressee.

Babaytseva (2010) distinguishes three major types of interjections:

1. **emotional-evaluative** (e.g., *Ух ты!*, *Вот те на!*);
2. **emotional-imperative** (e.g., *Т-ш-ш!*, *Цыц!*);
3. **etiquette formulas** (e.g., *Спасибо!*, *Не за что*).

Imperative interjections demonstrate a particularly strong deictic function, as they not only express emotion but also regulate behavior:

*-Ш-ш-ш,*whispered Mariam.(Hosseini, *A Thousand Splendid Suns*)

The interjection *ш-ш-ш* indexes both the speaker as an intentional agent and the addressee as the target of the command, signaling the need to stop an action.

In languages of different typological systems—Uzbek, English, and Russian—the deictic function is especially salient in imperative–vocative interjections used to call or drive away animals and birds:

- **Uzbek:** *beh-beh, tu-tu, chu, cho', qurey-qurey, ma*
- **English:** *baa, bow-wow, quack, moo, meow, oink, cock-a-doodle-doo*
- **Russian:** *кис-кис, давай, но*

These interjections possess deictic force because they directly index the intended target of the utterance (animal or bird). For instance, Uzbek *tu-tu* points to a chicken, while English *cock-a-doodle-doo* indexes a rooster. In literary discourse, onomatopoeic interjections may simultaneously activate deixis and presupposition:

Dupur-dupur-dupur…(Murod, *Ot kishnagan oqshom*)

The reduplicated form conveys the sound produced by galloping horses. From the context, the presupposition *"The horses' hooves produced a 'dupur-dupur' sound"* is inferred. While the presupposition disappears outside the context, the interjection itself continues to index the sound-producing object, thus retaining its deictic function. When imperative–vocative interjections are used to address people, they create **personal deixis**, which becomes fully interpretable only within context:

–Menga, o'rgatma, o'v! (Hoshimov, *Dunyoning ishlari*)

– Эй, ты!(Hosseini, *The Kite Runner*)

"Hey! Why you got to put cuffs on me?"(Major, *Dirty Bird Blues*)

In these examples, interjections such as *o'v, эй,* and *hey* index the addressee and simultaneously express the speaker's evaluative attitude, often carrying a negative pragmatic coloring. In Uzbek linguistic culture, interjections such as *ey, hov, hoy, hay, hey,* and *huv* may function as substitutes for personal names in spousal communication. This usage reflects traditional norms of politeness and speech etiquette. As noted by G'ulomov (1996), such interjections may either precede vocatives or function independently as forms of address, thereby assuming a deictic role[6].

[6] Ғуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. − Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1987. − Б. 151.

Importantly, the use of these interjections does not necessarily imply negative evaluation; rather, their pragmatic interpretation depends on context and communicative intent. Karimova's (2015) observations indicate cross-cultural differences in the use of curses and vulgarisms. In English, vulgar expressions such as *Damn!* and *Hell!* are classified as interjections and frequently replace traditional curse formulas. In Uzbek, by contrast, curses and insults often appear as sentence-like units or in combination with interjections (e.g., *Voy la'nati!*, *He bachchag'ar!*)[7].

Conclusion

The analysis demonstrates that interjections in discourse generate multiple types of deixis:

1. **personal deixis**, referring to human participants;
2. **animate deixis**, referring to animals and birds through imperative–vocative forms.

Thus, interjections function not only as markers of emotional expression but also as pragmatic devices that anchor utterances to participants, objects, and cultural norms within communicative contexts.

Reference

1. Худойберганова Д. Матннинг антропоцентрик тадқиқи. –Тошкент: Фан, 2013. – Б. 48.

2.Горский Д.П. Логика. – М., 1963. – С. 14–15.

3.Nurmonov A. Struktur tilshunoslik: ildizlari va yo'nalishlari. – Andijon, 2006. – 182 b.

4. Панфилов В.З. О гносеологических аспектах проблемы языкового знака // Вопросы языкознания. – М., 1977. - № 2. – С. 3–14.

5.Давлатова Р. Ўзбек тилининг дейктик бирликлари. Филол.фан.докт. (DSc) ... дисс. автореф. Тошкент, 2020. – Б. 85.

6. Ғуломов А., Асқарова М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. − Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1987. − Б. 151.

7.Karimova Z.G'. Ko'rsatilgan tadqiqot. − B. 16-17.

[7] Karimova Z.G'. Ko'rsatilgan tadqiqot. − B. 16-17.