E-ISSN 2181-1466
9 772181 146004

ISSN 2181-6875
9 772181 687004

@buxdu_uz @buxdu1 @buxdu1 www.buxdu.uz

Научный вестник Бухарского государственного университета
Scientific reports of Bukhara State University

1/2024

BUXORO DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI

BUXORO DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI ILMIY AXBOROTI

1/2024

Shaxriddinov F.F., Ibragimov A.K., Bozorova B.A., Yuldashova R.G.	Oziq-ovqat mahsulotlarini vitaminlar bilan boyitish usullari	103
Бердимурадов Х.Т., Рахмонов Э.К., Абдухалилова М.А., Эркинова Г.У., Шойматова Х.К.	Анализ изменения содержания белка в солоде при замачивании ячменя	110
TILSHUNOSLIK * LINGUISTICS *** ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ**		
Нигматова Л.Х.	Контрастивная лингвистика в современном языкознании	119
Bobokalonov R.R., Atoyeva G.A.	G'arb tilshunosligida til va nutq bahsi	124
Ataboyev N.B., Abdullayeva N.A.	Inglizcha va o'zbekcha diniy matnlar koprus tahlilida islomiy terminlar va iboralar tadqiqi	129
Bobokalonov R.R., Bekmurodova S.M.	Noverbal nutqning neyropsixolingvistik shartlari va sabablari	133
Bobokalonov O.O., Shamsiyeva U.I., Bekmurodova S.M.	Impact of neuropsycholinguistics on French-speaking society	139
Kuldosheva Sh.O.	Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida pretsedent nomlarning qiyosiy lingvokulturologik tahlili	145
Bobokalonov R.R., Boboqulova M.Sh.	Neyropsixolingvistika: lingvistik shaxsni xarizmali insonga integratsiyalash	150
Mayliyeva G.B.	O'zbek va ingliz tillarida sifatning semantik xususiyatlari (T.Drayzerning "Baxtiqaro Kerri" asari 2-bobi tahlili misolida)	156
Bafoyeva N.A.	Abdulla Qodiriyning "O'tkan kunlar" romani toponimiyasining fonetik, leksik-semantik va so'z qurilishi tahlili	161
Bobokalonov R.R., Nurmatova M.F.	Ayollar nutqining lingvodidaktik xususiyatlari	168
Ruziyeva N.X.	Rate of imposition as the main factor of influencing politeness	176
Qosimova N.F., Safarova Z.Z.	Meaning, inference, and the role of maxims in connection with word stress in pragmatics	181
Sharipova D.Sh.	The place of the symbol in the system of tropics	185
Ummatkulova Ch.A.	Utilizing podcasts to enhance students' listening and speaking skills	192
Rasulov Z.I., Xikmatova Sh.U.	Milliy-madaniy xususiyatga ega til birliklari - ekvivalentsiz leksika va realiyalarni tarjima qilish usullari	198
Xolmuxamedov B.F.	Milliy korpusga bo'lgan ehtiyoj	202
Намозова К.Б.	Тўй маросимлари лексикасининг миллий-маданий хусусиятларининг ўрганилиши	207
Rahmatullayev Sh.N.	O'zlashma so'zlar asosida shakllangan antroponimlar	214
Kaxorova N.N.	Reading as psycholinguistic process	218
Холматова В.Н.	Сўроқ тузилмаларнинг коммуникатив мазмунидаги силжишлар	222
Mahmudova N.R.	Gradatsiyaning pertseptiv belgilari konseptual sferada farqlanishi	227
Mehmonova Y.Ch.	Terminologik kollokatsiyalarning xususiyatlari va ularning ishlatilishi	234
Tursunov M.M., Egamova Sh.A.	"Hayot" konsepti yordamida ingliz va o'zbek frazeologik olamini tasvirlash yo'llari	239
Ataboyev N.B.	Korpus lingistikasi: korpus tahlil metodlari yordamida til leksik qatlamining boyishi tadqiqi	244
Valiyeva N.Sh.	Structural aspects of formation and development of chemical terminology	251
ADABIYOTSHUNOSLIK * LITERARY CRITICISM *** ЛИТЕРАТУРОВЕДЕНИЕ**		
Ражабов Д.З., Жамилова Б.С.	Болалар адабиётининг моҳир тадқиқотчиси	257

UDC 81.11

RATE OF IMPOSITION AS THE MAIN FACTOR OF INFLUENCING POLITENESS

Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna,
Teacher Department of English Literary and Translation Studies,
Foreign Languages Faculty, Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan
n.x.ruziyeva@buxdu.uz

Abstract. *Linguistic politeness has occupied a central place in the social study of language; even it has been the subject of intensive debate in sociolinguistics and pragmatics. A lot of linguistic scholars have carried out studies on linguistic politeness in a wide range of cultures. As a result, several theories have been proposed on linguistic politeness and have been established as scholarly concept. The major aim of this paper is to review the literature on linguistic politeness as a technical term. It will present some of the most widely used models of linguistic politeness in literature. It also tries to gloss the basic tenets of different theoretical approaches, the distinctive features of one theory versus another. There are some concepts of politeness that will become the subject of discussion of this article. These concepts are proposed by Robin Lakoff, Penelope Brown and Steven Levinson Geoffrey Leech.*

Keywords: *politeness principle, Gricean maxims, Brown Levinson's theory of politeness, Lakoff's pragmatic competence, a face-threatening act, Leech's theory of politeness, a universal Model Person, Leech's central model of PP.*

СТЕПЕНЬ ДАВЛЕНИЯ КАК ГЛАВНЫЙ ФАКТОР ВЛИЯНИЯ НА ВЕЖЛИВОСТЬ

Аннотация. *Лингвистическая вежливость заняла центральное место в социальных исследованиях языка; даже это было предметом интенсивных дебатов в области социолингвистики и прагматики. Многие лингвисты занимались изучением языковой вежливости в самых разных культурах. В связи с этим было предложено несколько теорий лингвистической вежливости и были установлены их научные понятия. Основная цель данной статьи состоит в том, чтобы рассмотреть литературные источники по языковой вежливости как техническому термину. В ней представлены некоторые из наиболее широко используемых моделей. Автор также пытается преобразовать основные принципы различных теоретических подходов, отличительные черты одной теории от другой. Есть несколько концепций вежливости, которые станут предметом обсуждения данной статьи. Эти концепции предложены Робином Лакоффом, Пенелопой Браун и Стивен Левинсон Джеффри Лич.*

Ключевые слова: *принцип вежливости, максимы Грайса, теория вежливости Брауна-Левинсона, теория Лакоффа, прагматическая компетентность, акт угрозы лицу, теория вежливости, универсальная модельная личность, теория вежливости центральная модель PP.*

BOSIM DARAJASI XUSHMUOMALALIKKA TA'SIR ETUVCHI ASOSIY OMIL SIFATIDA

Annotatsiya. *Lisoniy xushmuomalalik tilshunoslikning ijtimoiy tadqiqotlarida markaziy o'rinni egallagan bo'lib, hattoki bu soha sotsiolingvistika va pragmatika sohalarida jadal muhokamalarga turtki bo'lyapti. Ko'pgina tilshunos olimlar turli madaniyatlarda lisoniy xushmuomalalikni tadqiq etish bilan shug'ullanib kelishadi. Shu munosabat bilan tilshunoslikning bir qancha taklif qilingan nazariyalari xushmuomalalik va ilmiy tushuncha sifatida shakllangan. Ushbu maqolaning asosiy maqsadi texnik atama sifatida lingvistik xushmuomalalik haqidagi adabiyotlarni ko'rib chiqishdir. Unda eng ko'p qo'llaniladigan ba'zi modellar namoyish etiladi. Shuningdek, u turli nazariy yondashuvlarning asosiy tamoyillarini, bir nazariyani boshqasidan ajratib turadigan xususiyatlarini bezashga harakat qiladi. Ushbu maqolaning mavzusi bo'ladigan bir nechta xushmuomalalik tushunchalari mavjud. Bu tushunchalar Robin Lakoff, Penelopa Braun va Stiven Levinson Jeffri Lich tomonidan taklif qilingan.*

Kalit so'zlar: *xushmuomalalik tamoyili, Grays maksimalari, Braun va Levinsonning xushmuomalalik nazariyasi, Lakoff nazariyasi, pragmatik malaka, ijtimoiy obro'ga tahdid akti, xushmuomalalik nazariyasi, universal shaxs modeli, Lich xushmuomalalik tamoyilining markaziy modeli.*

Introduction. Imposition, the last of the three variables, accounts for the degree to which impositions are considered to interfere with the hearer's wants or desire of being self-determined or being approved [1,77]. The degree of imposition is contextually dependent, and it varies cross-culturally. For instance, the degree of imposition changes whether the speaker asks to borrow a pen (low imposition) or to borrow a laptop (high imposition). In addition, the relationship with the other interlocutor can modify the degree of imposition. Variables such as power, distance, and the role of the relationship have an influence on the imposition. In the case of the role of the relationship, the degree of imposition can be decreased due to the existence of a contract or obligation, such as a job contract [14,74].

In the case of requests, Brown and Levinson also differentiated two categories that account for imposition when making a request in proportion to the cost or expenditure, which are services and goods. They classified the cost of services as a time-consuming cost; whereas the cost of goods is related to the material and non-material value of the goods. The analysis of whether there exist differences when making a request for one of this type of items, either at the syntactic or the lexical level, has not been addressed in prior literature, to best of the researcher current knowledge.

Finally, by considering the three social variables – in addition to other contextual factors – speakers choose the use of different strategies to mitigate the impact of the FTA during social interaction [16,48]. The social variables are constrained by cross-cultural differences; the social variables, thus, differentially impact speech acts or FTAs in different cultures. For example, in the case of Japanese, the variable of power takes precedence when formulating the utterance from a morphological point of view. Japanese language uses the honorific-system, which employs particles (suffixes) inserted in words and used to save the face of the hearer. As Fukada and Asato (2003), indicated the honorific system, following the social rules, enables Japanese to express different degrees of deference [18].

Main part. Next, requests should also be assessed depending on request magnitude, or to use Brown and Levinson's term, *Rate of Imposition*. A crucial point to observe is that Rate of Imposition is easily translated into *alignment of interests*:

Rate of Imposition is a term in politeness theory that, in the specific context of requests, expresses the disalignment of interests between Speaker and Hearer in disfavor of Hearer. Again for exemplary purposes we categorize different Rates of Imposition from small to great in the following way: (i) joint task, (ii) small favor, (iii) big favor, (iv) tall obligation, and (v) presumptuous demand. The above degrees of Rate of Imposition represent different degrees of how disaligned (in favor of Speaker) Speaker's and Hearer's goals are, from completely aligned to extremely disaligned. By intuition different Rates of Imposition require appropriate Request Lengths. To say nothing of course doesn't help at all. A direct command is suitable for joint tasks.

Indirectly formulated requests are appropriate for a small favor. While big favors, i.e. such that incur a significant cost to Hearer, often require longer-lasting strategies such as e.g. begging and the like, that can go beyond the length of an individual utterance. In principle, these can even be distributed over a number of distinct interactions.

Request type	**Examples**
Joint task:	Pass me the ball (team mate), let's finish joint project, ...
Small favor:	Open the window, take out the trash, ...
Big favor:	Lend me 500 Euro, pay our restaurant bill, ...
Tall obligation:	Marry me, fund my start up business...
Presumptuous demand:	Give me all your money, be my slave for two years...

Table 1. Different request types ordered by Rate of Imposition (magnitude of the favor).

To convince the Hearer of a tall obligation usually needs strategies that are even more longer-lasting, involve a long preface or even vocal courting for days and weeks. For presumptuous demands, such as presented in Table 2 (one can generally think of them as being threats) linguistic means alone are insufficient, since hardly anybody would give Speaker all her money only because Speaker has made a very long request: one would need more than merely words. This is an important point, since it shows that LP can be used to pay compensation in proportion to the Rate of Imposition, but only up to a specific magnitude. It has not probably gone unnoticed that our understanding of request magnitude as Rate of Imposition disregards other variables crucially important to the evaluation of request magnitude. These include, most importantly, the two other factors P (the perceived difference in power between Speaker and Hearer, or

status) and D (the perceived social distance between Speaker and Hearer, or familiarity) that Brown and Levinson use, together with Rate of Imposition, to determine the Weight of a Face Threatening Act

We have decided to abstract from these variables for modeling purposes: we want to show that when keeping all the other variables constant, the Rate of Imposition of a request determines the amount of LP used by Speaker. Furthermore, on our conceptualization, Rate of Imposition does not have to be a static entity, entirely dependent on what is being requested (e.g. a pen vs. a car) - a point in Brown and Levinson's model that is often criticized, for example by Watts (2003 114; although his criticism mainly concerns the Power and Distance variables, it is easy to extend it onto Rate of Imposition). We want to stress that that the precise calibration of the Rate of Imposition expressed in a request is contingent on a specific interactional context in which Speaker and Hearer are engaged. The important facets of this context are identified by Curl and Drew in their work on requests (2008), when they write about Speakers entitlement to make a specific request to a specific Hearer as well as Speakers understanding of the contingencies related to granting a request (e.g. Speakers evaluation of the likelihood of Hearers granting a request). In consonance with Curl and Drew (2008), we take these factors to influence the Rate of Imposition of a request and bear on the amount of LP used when formulating it. To revert to more general concerns, note that the mapping between Rate of Imposition and amount of LP understood as Request Length displays a clear relationship: the greater the Rate of Imposition of a request type, the greater the Request Length. By taking Request Length as an indicator for Speaker's amount of LP she uses (cf. Section 6), and by assuming that the Rate of Imposition of a request type represents the divergence between Speaker's and Hearer's utility - or in other words their degree of disalignment {then the following relationship emerges: the less aligned interlocutor's goals are in a request type, the more LP is present in a request form used by Speaker. Furthermore, by taking LP as a linguistic commodity or currency, the use of LP constitutes a cost for the Speaker: the more LP she uses, the more costs she incurs. Furthermore, this mapping is in line with the PEP hypothesis, extended by the additional assumption that if the Rate of Imposition of a request is too big, then the use of LP alone does not suffice to forward such a request. In such cases, some extralinguistic material is necessary.

Indirectness and Utterance Length

The way the PEP is formulated requires quantifying linguistic politeness [8,69]. As already noted, we assume that utterance length is positively correlated with the amount of politeness it expresses (operationalized as a number of lexical items; Ostman, 1989). This correlation is of statistical nature ¨ and therefore not infallible, as can be illustrated by the comparison of the following examples:

(4) Pass the salt, honey.

(5) Pass the fucking salt, you fucking idiot.

The reasoning to link utterance length with the amount of linguistic politeness is the following:

speech indirectness (or conventional indirectness; Blum-Kulka, 1987) is one of the commonest ways of expressing linguistic politeness; since indirect utterances tend to be longer than direct utterances, longer utterances tend to be politer than shorter ones. Regarding the first assumption, we are in line with Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987), who take speech act indirectness and linguistic politeness as equivalent [11;87]. This point finds support in empirical studies, mainly Blum-Kulka's research on indirectness and politeness judgments (1987) as well as corpus-based research (e.g. Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil et al., 2013). The second assumption - about the relation between speech act indirectness and utterance length - is based on the view (expressed e.g. by Searle, 1975 or Leech, 1980a) that the more Extralinguistic matter indicates goods or services that can be exchanged for granting a request, as in \Give me all your money. And I will give you my yacht."; it may also involve a threat, e.g. holding Hearer at gunpoint.

11 exponents of indirectness in an utterance, the more indirect, i.e. polite, this utterance is. Again, counterexamples are easy to find where length does not necessarily translate into the amount of indirectness, and hence politeness. Consider examples that Leech provides to show how increasing indirectness increases politeness:

(6) Answer the phone.

(7) I want you to answer the phone.

(8) Will you answer the phone?

(9) Can you answer the phone?

(10) Would you mind answering the phone?

(11) Could you possibly answer the phone (Leech, 1983: 108).

On Leech's reasoning, (8) is politer than (7) because using the interrogative instead of the affirmative increases optionality and in this way makes the utterance more indirect; this is so, despite the fact that utterances (8) (consisting of 5 lexical items) is shorter than (7) (consisting of 7 lexical items). But here too, there is empirical evidence that utterance length, although not infallible, is a stable predictor of how indirect,

and hence polite, an utterance is judged to be. This evidence comes mainly from corpus studies [4] and studies of communication in online communities [2,96]. The statistically robust correlation between length and indirectness in our view explains the results obtained by Ostman (1989), who set out to verify Haiman's ¨ famous proposal that the social distance between interlocutors corresponds to the length of the message, referential content being equal" [1,67]. An artificial language experiment led Ostman to the more general conclusion that longer messages are consistently interpreted as more" formal, and hence more polite, than their shorter equivalents with the same semantic content. Last but not least, the decision to use utterance length as an index of the amount of politeness is motivated by the modeling and experimental logistics. Particularly in behavioral experiments, the operationalization of politeness as scale that is easy to measure should prove to be of great benefit. In this respect, it is a better, though perhaps cruder, measure than e.g. the cognitive interpretation of indirectness-qua-politeness as the relative length of the inferential path needed to arrive at an utterance's illocutionary force". We need to stress here that such an operationalization is solely based on probabilistic considerations (i.e. that on average politer utterances tend to be longer than their less polite equivalents) and not on the conviction that there is some direct causal link between length and politeness. For example, we do not believe that politeness is explained by a higher cost of producing longer utterances: it may be true that producing (2) is energetically more costly than (1), but this difference is negligible and cannot explain the difference in politeness effect between the two utterances [5]. Before engaging in modelling LP, we must address one more important concern, which can be expressed by the question: Are there linguistic forms that are inherently polite? The view that gives the affirmative answer to this question - found e.g. in Brown and Levinson 1987), some of whose ideas we adopt - has been a target of severe criticism by more recent politeness research (see for example Watts's lengthy discussion of formulaic and semi-formulaic expressions of LP; 2003: 168-200). In our case, not just the sources we cite but, more importantly, the operationalization of LP as the degree of indirectness and utterance length strongly suggests that we, just like Brown and Levinson, give the affirmative answer to the question spelt out above. However, in the point Zahavi and Zahavi (1997), who point to the relationship between utterance length and Politeness in contraposing human language use to animal communications [17,56]. Current uses may lead to changing future beliefs about LP; we could even imagine that speech act directness and utterance shortness become positively correlated with the degree of LP. Even then, the Politeness Equilibrium Principle will hold and the model that we present in the forthcoming sections will work, and it will continue to work as long as the two requirement are met:

• politeness is measurable, i.e. the form of an utterance is able to lead us to reliable beliefs about the degree of politeness it expresses; and

• measures of politeness enjoy at least some degree of intersubjectivity, i.e. interactants are able to form similar evaluations of how much politeness is expressed in an utterance.

However, at least in English, the link between indirectness (and hence utterance length) and politeness is extremely robust, to the point of being codified in prescriptive grammars of the English language [7,88].

Unlike many facets of language - phonology, syntax, semantics or even pragmatics - linguistic politeness has attracted little attention of evolutionarily minded researchers. We think that lack of interest - apart from a few isolated attempts - is not dictated by a peripheral status of LP for the description of language, and specifically for language evolution. LP is a universal characteristic of languages but such that is subject to a lot pressure of cultural background, and hence could be a very attractive area for evolutionary modeling. Next, LP is first and foremost a set of interactional strategies, and hence should be easily translated into game-theoretic terms. We think that the biggest obstacle to an evolutionary approach to LP springs from the problem of defining fitness related consequences of using LP. Note that this problem does not arise with reference to linguistic communication as such - it is easy to see that the transfer of honest information decreases the fitness of the communicator and increases fitness of the receiver. In the case of LP, it is not easy to see what politeness does, in terms of fitness - in particular, the cost of using LP is an open question [13,5].

In this paper, we suggest a conceptualization in which LP function as a verbal tool for Speaker to contribute expenses (emotional debt, paying face, etc.) for accommodating Hearer's Rate of Imposition. In our view, such a conceptualization is pragmatically realistic; in contrast to van van Rooy's idea of politeness as handicap (2003), it seems to capture the motivational dynamics of conversational interaction. It is then very promising that we have managed to successfully translate this conceptualization into game-theoretic terms and present it in a mathematically sound model. This is of course just the first step in explicating the evolutionary nature of LP. The model

***REFERENCES*:**

1. Brown, R., Levinson S. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge [Text] / R. Brown. - P. 312-318.

2. Касымова, Н. Ф. (2011). Асимметрия при переводе интеррогативов с вопросительным словом what (на материале английского, русского и узбекского языков). Вестник Челябинского государственного университета, (11), 70-73.

3. Xafizovna , R. N. . (2023). The Study of Context: From Static to Dynamic. Miasto Przyszłości, 32, 242–246.

4. Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna, & Akhmedova Shahnoza Murodilloyevna. (2022). The study of culture in cultural studies. Conferencea, 276–278.

5. Nafisa K. Cognition and Communication in the Light of the New Paradigm //European journal of innovation in nonformal education. – 2021. – Т. 1. – №. 2. – С. 214-217.

6. Safarova, Z. (2023). Tarbiya romanlarining badiiy adabiyotdagi genezisi va o‘rni. Центр научных публикаций (buxdu. uz), 40(40).

7. Xafizovna, R. N. . (2022). Linguistic Politeness Theory Review: Yueguo Gu, Sachiko Ide, Shoshena Blum Kulka, Bruce Frasher and William Nolen, Hornst Arndt and Richard Janney. Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT, 2(5), 145–152.

8. Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna, & Xolova Madina Boboqulovna. (2022). Politeness In Literary Works: An Overview. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 7, 200–206.

9. Xafizovna, R. N. (2022). On Linguistic Politeness Theory: Robin Lakoff's Theory of Politeness, Brown and Levinson's Theory of Politeness, Geoffrey Leech's Theory of Politeness. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture, 3(6), 66-74.

10.Ruziyeva N. (2020). Face concept in the category of politeness. European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements, 1(4), 15-20.

11.Zokirova N. S. Discursive ontology of (literary) translation. innovative development in the global science, Boston, USA. – 2022.

12. Zokirova, N. (2023). Tarjimada lingvokognitiv dunyo manzarasi, lingvistik ong va lingvistik anglashning o''zaro munosabatlari. Центр научных публикаций (buxdu.Uz), 29(29).

13.Xafizovna, R. N. (2022). Discourse Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Literary Work: Speech Acts and Politeness Strategies. Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity, 5, 123-133.

14.Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna (2021).The category of politeness in different linguocultural traditions. Academicia: an international multidisciplinary research journal 11 (2), 1667-1675

15. Safarova, Z. (2022). J.K Roulingning "Garry Potter va afsonaviy tosh" asarida yetim obrazlar tasviri. Центр научных публикаций (buxdu. uz), 14(14).

16.Fayziyeva Aziza Anvarovna. (2022). Conceptual metaphor universals in English and Uzbek. JournalNX - A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, 8(04), 54–5.

17.Xaydarova, L. (2023). The description of social life and the usage of syntactic stylistic devices in the novel "Hard times" by Charles Dickens . Центр научных публикаций (buxdu.Uz), 31(31).

18.Bruno Staszkiewicz Garcia. Purdue Universit The importance of Power, Distance, and Imposition on Spanish verb forms in requests. 2018. Open Access Theses. 1457. https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/open_access_theses/1457.