



**JOURNAL OF ADVANCED
SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH**

ISSN: 0976-9595

Editorial Team

Editorial Board Members

Dr. Hazim Jabbar Shah Ali

Country: University of Baghdad , Abu-Ghraib , Iraq.

Specialization: Avian Physiology and Reproduction.

Dr. Khalid Nabih Zaki Rashed

Country: Dokki, Egypt.

Specialization: Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries.

Dr. Manzoor Khan Afridi

Country: Islamabad, Pakistan.

Specialization: Politics and International Relations.

Seyyed Mahdi Javazadeh

Country: Mashhad Iran.

Specialization: Agricultural Sciences.

Dr. Turapova Nargiza Ahmedovna

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Specialization: Art and Humanities, Education

Dr. Muataz A. Majeed

Country: INDIA

Specialization: Atomic Physics.

Dr Zakaria Fouad Fawzy Hassan

Country: Egypt

Specialization: Agriculture and Biological

Dr. Subha Ganguly

Country: India

Specialization: Microbiology and Veterinary Sciences.

Dr. KANDURI VENKATA LAKSHMI NARASIMHACHARYULU

Country: India.

Specialization: Mathematics.

Dr. Mohammad Ebrahim

Country: Iran

Specialization: Structural Engineering

Dr. Malihe Moeini

Country: IRAN

Specialization: Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology

Dr. I. Anand shaker

Country: India.

Specialization: Clinical Biochemistry

Dr. Magdy Shayboub

Country: Taif University, Egypt

Specialization: Artificial Intelligence

Kozikhodjayev Jumakhodja Hamdamkhodjayevich

Country: Uzbekistan

Senior Lecturer, Namangan State University

Dr. Ramachandran Guruprasad

Country: National Aerospace Laboratories, Bangalore, India.

Specialization: Library and Information Science.

Dr. Alaa Kareem Niamah

Country: Iraq.

Specialization: Biotechnology and Microbiology.

Dr. Abdul Aziz

Country: Pakistan

Specialization: General Pharmacology and Applied Pharmacology.

Dr. Khalmurzaeva Nadira - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Japanese Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Mirzakhmedova Hulkar - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Iranian-Afghan Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Dilip Kumar Behara

Country: India

Specialization: Chemical Engineering, Nanotechnology, Material Science and Solar Energy.

Dr. Neda Nozari

Country: Iran

Specialization: Obesity, Gastrointestinal Diseases.

Bazarov Furkhat Odilovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Tashkent institute of finance

Shavkatjon Joraboyev Tursunqulovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Namangan State University

C/O Advanced Scientific Research,

8/21 Thamocharan Street,

Arisipalayam, Salem

REALIZATION OF COMMUNICATIVE AND PRAGMATIC INTENTION OF HUMOR IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Shakirova Madina Bakhriddinovna

Teacher of Uzbek State World Languages University

Email address:

Khoshimova Fotima Rakhmatillaevna

Graduate student of Uzbek State World Languages University

Email address: fotima.rakhmatillayevna@gmail.com

Abstract: The article is devoted to studies of the realization of communicative and pragmatic intention of humor in English and Uzbek languages. The attention will be focused on the fact that every single nation has its own features, customs, culture, traditions as well as the sense of humor. According to the distinctions and differences between the world pictures of nations one humor can be ridiculous for one culture and foreign for the other one. When it comes to humor, the majority of people start making the mistake of thinking that humor is easy and simple. However, in fact, to make someone laugh with the help of verbal jokes, a person needs more than we think: social, cultural and linguistic elements of every nation. The study employed a qualitative research method. Some jokes were purposively selected from: <https://short-funny.com/>, and from Utkir Khoshimov “Osmondan tushgan pul” (2019). The purpose of the article to study the realization of communicative and pragmatic intention of humor in English and Uzbek languages.

Keywords: pragmatics, humor, joke, verbal humor, discourse, speech, culture, communication, language use, speech acts, communicative intention, speaker, illocutionary act, utterance.

INTRODUCTION

Humor is deeply rooted in the social and cultural memory of people and covers countless spheres of life as public, private, religious, political and so on. Humor is a complex and universal human phenomenon. Since the earliest times, it has performed an essential role in human interaction (Kao, Levy & Goodman, 2015). In addition, human beings are the only species that laughs (Ashipaoloye, 2013). Humor research draws upon a wide range of disciplines: anthropology, linguistics, medicine, psychology, philosophy, sociology and women's studies. The field of the linguistics of humor is in many ways still in its infancy (Attardo, 2014).

Before discussing how humor is integrated in the socialization process, it must be noted, as Holmes (2000) does, that “all utterances are multifunctional (...) Hence, a humorous utterance may, and typically does, serve several functions at once” (p. 166). In fact, as Priego- Valverde (2003) argues, humor can be used to “do” almost anything. Obviously, the functions of humor vary in relation to the setting. Studies have focused primarily on workplace humor, conversations among friends, and classroom discourse.

The most obvious function of humor is to create solidarity among the participants. Crucially, humor may function as a tool to challenge authority because of one of its features. Essentially, this consists of the ability to discount one’s remarks

as having been uttered non- seriously. This option is called decommitment (Attardo, 1994, p. 325–326; Kane, Suls, & Tedeschi, 1977) and provides the opportunity to test behavior that might be socially or interactionally “risky” (Emerson, 1969).

The study thus intends to empirically examine the different ways in which humor is manifested linguistically in the written discourse and how it is rhetorically structured, analyzing the pragmatic function it plays, the process how the language is manipulated, how its interpretations are arrived at, and what humorous effects result from the social interaction.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

In passing, and without any serious discussion, Greimas (1966) mentioned that some jokes functioned by switching isotopies. Several European scholars adopted this model, which was soon enriched by the use of narrative functions, such as the idea that jokes consisted of three functions: the first one setting up the story, the second one introducing an incongruity, and the third one resolving it with the punch line.

Despite broad adoption in Europe, the model suffered from a lack of clear definition of the core concept of isotopy and was largely abandoned in favor of script- based models that were richer and more flexible, semantically and pragmatically. However, a recent synthesis (Al- Jared, 2017) shows that there is still some vitality attached to the model.

J. Leech, the author of the well- known book "Pragmalinguistics" relies on sociolinguistic indicators to distinguish groups of speech acts, and classifies them according to "how they are related to the purpose of ensuring politeness and establishing this environment" (Leech 1983: 104).

Furthermore, the semantic- script theory of humor (SSTH) emerged, proposed by Victor Raskin, in 1985. Raskin's book was extremely successful, for two main reasons: first, it was the first coherent, book- length treatment of the semantics of humor; second, it linked the linguistic treatment of humor to the broader field of humor research, by providing a thorough review of the literature and a clear epistemological position within the field of linguistics. Humor studies provide the questions, and linguistics provides the answers (Attardo, 2017).

The idea that jokes and humor at large are a violation of the cooperative principles, or of one of the maxims, is not new, but Raskin, and later Attardo (1994), integrated it within the linguistics of humor. There has been some scattered opposition to this view, essentially attempting to deny the reality of the violation. The most significant of these is by Goatly (2012, p. 235), who suggests considering humor as a short- term violation (Attardo 2017).

From the point of view of Attardo, cognitive linguistics offers great promise to solve genuine problems in humor research. For example, it has been repeatedly noted that the literalization of metaphors can be humorous. There have been several studies on metaphors and humor. However, none has answered the seemingly basic question of why some metaphors are humorous and some are not. Obviously, this kind of question can be tackled best from within a cognitive approach. The strong emphasis on embodiment and on the psychological reality of the theoretical models should also

favor interdisciplinary research straddling psycholinguistics and cognitive approaches (e.g., Coulson & Kutas, 2001).

Besides, corpus linguistics has had a very significant impact on the field of linguistics, unmatched in humor studies, where corpus-based studies are rare.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As humor constitutes a complex and paradoxical phenomenon, it needs pragmatic analyses in order to investigate the multiple layers of meanings it carries. The analysis first considered the major proponents of 'speech act theory' and their ideas about meaning assignment. This opened up the possibility of there being a difference between the meaning of certain words and what the speaker intended to convey by using those words. Grice (1957) and Dascal (1985) regarded this as humorous intent and that jokes depend on the existence of these sociopragmatic devices that make indirectness possible. These can be discovered from three different levels of meaning: (a) sentence meaning: understanding a speaker's words (b) utterance meaning: understanding those words in their specific reference in the context of the utterance, (c) speaker's meaning: the speaker's intention of uttering those words in that context. Speaker's meaning can be conveyed in two different ways: directly or indirectly. It is direct when it is identical to the utterance meaning; in this case pragmatic interpretation can be seen as the 'endorsement' of the utterance meaning by the listener. It is indirect when it is different from the utterance meaning, and the pragmatic interpretation is constructed by drawing on the cues in the context and by using the utterance meaning as a starting point.

There are four main types of humorous intents that are in accordance with Searle's (1985) types of speech acts: (a) to assert, conclude, describe-representatives, (b) to promise, offer- commissives, (c) to request, question, order-directives, and (d) to thank, apologize- expressives.

Furthermore, types of humorous intents under this category include affirming, alleging, announcing, answering, attributing, claiming, classifying, concurring, confirming, conjecturing, denying, disagreeing, disclosing, disputing, identifying, informing, insisting, predicting, ranking, reporting, stating, stipulating. Some other humorous intents found in the jokes covered: agreeing, guaranteeing, inviting, offering, promising, swearing, and volunteering. Other humorous intents workable in the jokes are advising, admonishing, asking, begging, dismissing, excusing, forbidding, instructing, ordering, permitting, requesting, requiring, suggesting, urging, and warning. Another types of humorous intents in the jokes relate to apologizing, condoling, congratulating, greeting, thanking, accepting.

Moreover, performing a speech act, in particular an illocutionary act, is a matter of having a certain communicative intention in uttering certain words; on this occasion, it is humorous intent. Such an act succeeds, if the audience recognizes that intention. It follows that people must choose their words in such a way that their utterances make the humorous intention recognizable. As it was mentioned above, speaker's meaning can be conveyed either directly or indirectly. Jokes systematically exploit indirectness; they point to a preferred meaning and this must be done indirectly.

To illustrate these ideas, the analysis of several brief jokes are given:

- *I met a microbiologist the other day.*

He was much bigger than I expected.

The jokes are mainly based on word play, thus 'micro-' is a prefix meaning 'little' and the type of current humorous intent, according to Searle's (1985) types of speech acts, is representative as the speaker asserts, concludes, or describes the 'microbiologist'. Besides, the joke includes indirectness in the first sentence.

Respectively, the next example of brief joke is also based on the word play:

Dentist: "Oh Lord, I've never seen such a huge cavity - cavity."

Patient: "Yeah, you don't have to say it twice."

Dentist: "I didn't. It was an echo."

'Cavity' in English is considered to be polysemous, besides cavity in the mountain which is defined as an empty space within a solid object, the word has the meaning 'cavity in the tooth' namely a decayed part of a tooth. The type of the intention of this humor is also representative.

In contrast, the next joke contains directive type of humorous intention:

A man goes to the lawyer: "What is your fee?"

Lawyer says: "1000 US dollars for 3 questions."

Man: "Wow - so much! Isn't it a bit expensive?"

Lawyer: "Yes, what is your third question?"

As the example is based on questions and interrogation, the intent type is called directive. Speaker's meaning is conveyed indirectly, thus until reading the last question of the lawyer it is impossible to understand what does the lawyer mean with the first and the second questions. It means that indirectness plays a significant role in making humorous context.

Uzbek humors is distinguished by its uniqueness and richness in national colorings. The following humorous text (short story "Guruch operatsiyasi") is extracted from "Osmondan tushgan pul" (2019) by Utkir Khoshimov:

Said Ahmad aka devzira guruch tanlashga usta. Bir gal azza-bazza Qo'qon bozoriga kirib, Cho'ng'araning guruchidan xarid qildik: Said Ahmad aka 30 kilo, men 30 kilo. Mezbonlar guruch solingan qog'oz qoplami vagonga chiqarib berishdi. Poyezd jilganidan so'ng ustoz bilan alla-pallagacha gurunglashib o'tirdik. Keyin uxlab qopman.

Bir mahal g'alati shatir-shutur tovushdan uyg'onib ketdim. Said Ahmad aka maykachan bo'lib o'rindiqa o'tirib olgan. Oldida ikkita qop. Mening qopimdagi guruchdan hovuchlab-hovuchlab oladi-da, o'zining qopiga soladi. Qarasam, guruchimning barakasi uchib ketadigan.

- Hormang, ustoz? - dedim. - Nima harakat?

- Uyg'ondingmi? - dedi oqsoqol kiroyi mehr bilan. - Uxlayver, bolam, charchagansan, uxlayver. - Shunday deb yumushini bamaylixotir davom ettiraverdi. - Men bilan ishing bo'lmasin, - dedi tushuntirib. - Odamning yoshi bir joyga borganidan keyin shunaqa ekan. Yarim kechadan keyin esim jinday kirarli-chiqarli bo'lib qoladi. Nima qilayotganimni o'zim bilmayman.

Hayron bo'ldim.

- *Esingiz kirarli-chiqarli bo'lsa, nega o'zingizning guruchni mening qopimga solmaysiz-da, menikini o'zingizning qopingizga solasiz?*

Said Ahmad aka xotirjam qarab qo'ydi.

- *Unda sapsem jinni bo'laman-ku, bolam!*

Analyzing the next Uzbek humorous story, various intents of humor can be observed by readers. When the first speaker says “- *Hormang, ustoz? or Nima harakat?*” he wants to know what is his fellow doing. As well as the first speaker the second one also replies in imperative way “- *Uxlayver, bolam, charchagansan, uxlayver*”, and this type of humorous intention is also considered to be directive type in accordance with Searle’s (1985) types of speech acts. Next lines contain representatives “- *Odamning yoshi bir joyga borganidan keyin shunaqa ekan. Yarim kechadan keyin esim jinday kirarli-chiqarli bo'lib qoladi. Nima qilayotganimni o'zim bilmayman*” and directives “- *Esingiz kirarli-chiqarli bo'lsa, nega o'zingizning guruchni mening qopimga solmaysiz-da, menikini o'zingizning qopingizga solasiz?*”. The ridiculous conclusion is made by the reader as the story’s humorous meaning is conveyed indirectly and implicitly.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the article describes the ways of achieving the pragmatic and communicative goals of humor in English and Uzbek. Humor, its function, role, purpose as well as its realization were highlighted in the article. The studies and research results of several scientists on humor’s pragmatic and communicative intention were highlighted. The pragmatic and communicative intention of humor, the process of how language is manipulated, and how its implement is carried out were analyzed using English and Uzbek humorous contexts. However, the main problems of achieving successful realization of communicative and pragmatic intention of humor in English and Uzbek remaining still unexplored.

REFERENCES

1. Ashurova, D. U., and M. R. Galiyeva. "Text linguistics." Tafakkur qanoti. Tashkent (2012).
2. Attardo, Salvatore. "Humor in language." Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics. 2017.
3. Attardo, S. (2008). Semantics and pragmatics of humor. Language and Linguistics Compass, 2(6), 1203-1215. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00107.x>
4. Bell, N. D. (2007a). How native and non-native English speakers adapt to humor in intercultural interaction, Humor: International Journal of Humor Research, 20(1), 27-48,
5. Modiry Rad, M. (2022). Analysis of English Joke Structures: A Socio-Discoursal Perspective. International Journal of Language and Translation Research, 2(1), pp. 69-82.
6. Rochmawati, Dyah. "Pragmatic and rhetorical strategies in the English- written jokes." Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics 7.1 (2017): 149- 159.
7. Ross, A. (1998). The language of humor. Routledge.

8. Safarov, Shaxriyor. "Pragmalingvistika." Toshkent: "O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi 320 (2008).
9. Xalima, Abasxanova. "ADVANTAGES OF APPLICATION OF INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRESCHOOL EDUCATION." Universum: texnicheskiye nauki 12-6 (93) (2021): 93-95.
10. Wilson, M. (2018). More funny, more money. Affirm Press.