



IJTIMOIIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI

ISSN 3060-5059



VOL.3 № 5

2026

INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDAGI DRAMATIK ASARLARDA DIOLOGIK MULOQOTNI VOQEALANTIRUVCHI LEKSIK BIRLIKLAR LINGVOKOGNITIV TADQIQI

Aminaxon Khushmamatova Rustam qizi
“Cyber University” State University, katta o‘qituvchi

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek dramatik matnlarida dialogik muloqot orqali voqeani harakatga keltiruvchi leksik birliklar lingvokognitiv yondashuvda tadqiq qilinadi. Material sifatida A. Qahhor va G. Pinter hamda J. Osborne pyesalari tanlandi. Kontekstual-tahlil va qiyosiy usullar natijasida konfliktni faollashtiruvchi baholovchi, deiktik va pragmatik markerlar tizimi aniqlanadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: drama diskursi, dialogik muloqot, voqealantiruvchi leksika, lingvokognitiv tahlil, pragmatik marker, baholovchi birliklar, deiksis

ЛИНГВОКОГНИТИВНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ, РЕАЛИЗУЮЩИХ ДИАЛОГИЧЕСКУЮ КОММУНИКАЦИЮ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ДРАМАТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

Аминахон Хушмаматова Рустам кизи
Государственный университет “Cyber University”, старший преподаватель

Аннотация

В статье рассматриваются лексические единицы, которые в английских и узбекских драматических текстах событийно организуют диалогическое общение, в лингвокognитивной перспективе. Материалом послужили пьесы А. Каххара, Г. Пинтера и Дж. Осборна. Контекстуально-аналитический и сопоставительный методы выявили систему оценочных, дейктических и прагматических маркеров, активирующих конфликт и продвижение действия.

Ключевые слова: драматический дискурс, диалогическое общение, событийно организующая лексика, лингвокognитивный анализ, прагматический маркер, оценочная лексика, дейксис

A LINGUO-COGNITIVE ANALYSIS OF LEXICAL UNITS ACTUALIZING DIALOGIC COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK DRAMATIC DISCOURSE

Aminaxon Khushmamatova Rustam qizi
“Cyber University” State University, Senior Teacher

Abstract

This article examines lexemes that event-structure dialogic interaction in English and Uzbek drama from a linguo-cognitive perspective. The corpus includes plays by A. Qahhor, H. Pinter, and J. Osborne. Contextual analysis and contrastive procedures reveal a system of evaluative, deictic, and pragmatic markers that intensify conflict, manage attention, and propel plot development.

Keywords: dramatic discourse, dialogic interaction, event-structuring lexicon, linguo-cognitive analysis, pragmatic marker, evaluative lexemes, deixis.

The peculiarity of the language of a dramatic work lies in the fact that action is often realized not through the author’s explanations or extensive descriptive passages, but through the dialogic communication of the characters. “In dramatic works, dialogue does not merely reveal the internal emotional states of the characters. Rather, it serves as the primary linguistic means through which the plot is developed” [12].

Since dialogue is a form of communication connected with stage time and creates the effect of “here and now” in the perception of the listener-spectator, each lexical choice in a dramatic text — even a seemingly simple address or response — possesses a cognitive-pragmatic force that moves the story forward. Therefore, the linguocognitive analysis of lexical units that organize the narrative and activate the dynamics of conflict in drama is becoming a relevant direction in modern discourse research. In this context, the lexicon is viewed not only as a nominative unit but also as a mechanism that activates conceptual structures, directs speech acts, and determines social distance and value assessment between participants [7; 6].

It is essential to emphasize that the linguistic perception of the world is realized on the basis of universal human principles. This is because the human capacity for logical thinking is characterized by commonality, regardless of the part of the world in which a person lives. If such universality did not exist, people living on different continents and speaking different languages would not be able to understand one another, comprehend each other's intentions, or engage in mutual communication [13].

Research on this topic usually focuses on the pragmatic nature of dramatic discourse, replica exchange, implicature and presupposition, as well as the study of evaluative and conflict-related language. However, two important gaps can be observed in the existing literature. First, a consistent comparative study of Uzbek and English dramatic texts in terms of lexical units that specifically make dialogic communication happen has not been sufficiently systematized. Second, the phenomenon of “making happen” is often explained in terms of plot theory or stage action, while the cognitive “trigger” function of lexical units — that is, their ability to launch scenarios in the mind of the character and in the perception of the viewer, reset conflict frames, and control attention — has not been sufficiently explored [1; 3].

The linguistic aspects of communication include the structure of language and the processes of its use. Syntax, or sentence structure, is especially important, since word order directly affects the clarity and logical emphasis of thought. For example, the use of active or passive voice can change the object placed at the center of communication. This determines who or what the speaker intends to focus on [7].

The universal and national characteristics of narrative lexis become particularly evident when the dialogues in A. Qahhor's works “Og'riq tishlar” and “Ayajonlarim”, which are close to everyday speech and saturated with a socio-domestic background, are compared with English drama represented by H. Pinter and J. Osborne, whose works are intensified through contradictions, pauses, and half-spoken meanings.

The purpose of this article is to identify and comparatively characterize the linguocognitive mechanisms of lexical units that make dialogic communication happen in Uzbek and English dramatic works. To achieve this goal, the following tasks are addressed: first, operational criteria for the concept of event-generating lexical units are developed; second, evaluative lexis that activates conflict in the selected works and its connection with cognitive frames is analyzed; third, the role of deictic and referential units in “reviving” stage space-time is demonstrated; fourth, the role of pragmatic markers, particularly forms of address, modal units, and discourse particles, in transforming replica exchange into an event is comparatively illuminated. The scientific novelty of the study lies in the fact that the event-generating function of lexical units in dramatic dialogue is explained within the framework of the triad “lexeme — cognitive scenario — pragmatic effect”, and their similarities and differences in Uzbek and English material are systematized on the basis of empirical evidence.

Methods. The research methodology is based on the integration of linguocognitive and pragmadiscursive approaches. Within the linguocognitive approach, the meaning system of lexical units is interpreted in relation to conceptual structures: in communication, characters activate certain concepts and scenarios, thereby reconstructing a “model of reality” in the listener's perception [7; 6]. The pragmadiscursive approach makes it possible to analyze the interactive outcome of lexical choice by taking into account the goal-directedness of replica exchange, speech acts, implicature, deixis, and indicators of social roles [8; 7]. The combination of these two approaches is particularly suitable for dramatic texts, since in the language of drama the “spoken word” is often equated with stage action. Pragmatic phenomena such as evaluation, command, refusal, threat, and irony directly determine plot turns. As empirical material, a selected corpus of dialogic fragments from A. Qahhor's “Og'riq tishlar” and “Ayajonlarim”, as well as H. Pinter's “The Caretaker” and J. Osborne's “Look Back in Anger”, was compiled. The selection criterion was the presence of a lexical “signal” in a replica that causes the development of the event, that is, situations related to conflict intensification, role change, topic shift, redefinition of proximity and distance, or a shift in the focus of stage space-time. In the analysis, the meaning and pragmatic function of the lexical unit in the immediate context were determined using the contextual-semantic method. Then, the functional similarities and differences in Uzbek and English texts were described using the comparative-typological method. Within the framework of discourse analysis, the sequence of replicas, response strategies, “turning points in communication”, and lexical markers that produce these turns were identified [1; 4]. Cognitive analysis, based on the concepts of frame and scenario, was also used to explain which conceptual fields are activated by evaluative and deictic units [3; 6]. These methods correspond to the purpose of the article, since the narrative event is formed not only by the lexical meaning of a single word but also through its connection with context, speech situation, and the knowledge base of the participants.

Results. The results of the analysis show that in the selected Uzbek and English dramatic works,

lexical units that make dialogic communication happen can be grouped into three main functional clusters: evaluative-conflictogenic lexis, deictic-referential lexis, and pragmatic-interactive markers. All three clusters determine at what point and through what mechanism the event moves forward in dramatic dialogue, although their density and typical realization differ in Uzbek and English material. Therefore, the same pragmatic situation can give rise to different discourse intentions in English and Uzbek cultures [11]. This can be observed in the following examples. The first cluster includes evaluative-conflictogenic lexical units. In Qahhor's drama, evaluation is often associated with the frame of socio-domestic norms and is manifested in the form of characters controlling, blaming, or justifying one another through concepts such as "humanity", "shame", "respect", and "face". In "Og'riq tishlar", the escalation of the marital situation often occurs not through direct insults, but through evaluative appeals, sarcasm, or units reminiscent of "indecenty". Such lexis activates the "norm violated" scenario in the listener's mind, causing justification, objection, or counterattack in subsequent lines.

For example:

М а р а с у л. Ҳой, тинчлик борми, йўқми?

Н а с и б а. Ахир бола касал-ку.

М а р а с у л. Касал бўлса йиғлатмагин, касал бўлмайди.

Н а с и б а. Қанақа одамсиз!

М а р а с у л. Ёе, тилинғиз ҳам чиқиб қолиптими? (Уйга киради.)"

In this dialogue fragment, conflict intensification occurs not through open insult, but through evaluative and pragmatically loaded lexical units. In particular, Marasul's replica "Касал бўлса йиғлатмагин, касал бўлмайди" is semantically constructed as a simple cause-and-effect statement, but pragmatically it embodies an implicit evaluation that denies the woman's maternal responsibility and accuses her of ignorance. Through this replica, the frame of "incompetence in childcare" is activated in the interlocutor's mind. As a result, Nasiba's emotional-evaluative reaction "Қанақа одамсиз!" occurs. This unit is not a direct insult, but it has the character of a moral-normative evaluation, rejecting the interlocutor's behavior on the basis of the concept of "humanity".

At the next stage of the dialogue, Marasul's reply "Ёе, тилинғиз ҳам чиқиб қолиптими?" further intensifies the dynamics of the conflict. This unit represents an implicit judgment reflecting patriarchal social norms in linguistic and cognitive terms. In it, the very fact that a woman responds or objects is interpreted as a "violation of the norm". Although the construction "Тилинғиз чиқиб қолиптими?" semantically indicates discursive activity, pragmatically it activates a scenario of disobedience, excess, and disrespect. Thus, the event-generating force in the dialogue is manifested precisely through evaluative lexis and implicit social norms. Each evaluative unit between the replicas provokes the next discursive reaction, ensuring the gradual development of the dramatic conflict.

In A. Qahhor's "Ayajonlarim", evaluative units often invoke frames of kinship and intergenerational relationships. Scenarios of respect and duty are activated around the concept of "mother", whereby each evaluative word in the dialogue secretly deepens the conflict.

For example:

Bo'ston. A!.. (She becomes depressed and faints.) Hali shunaqami!..

Karimjon. Shunaqa bo'lgan edi...

Bo'ston. Nega menga aytmding?

Karimjon. Ayajon, siz aytgani qo'ysangiz ekan!..

In this dialogue fragment, the event-generating lexical units are closely related to the frames of intergenerational relations and family hierarchy. In particular, the address unit "Ayajon", which forms the pragmatic center of the dialogue, functions not only as a nominative means of expressing kinship but also as a linguocognitive marker activating the concepts of respect, obedience, and family duty. This unit creates the scenario "mother is a person who should be respected" in the listener's mind and forms a strong pragmatic background for the interpretation of subsequent replicas.

Although Bo'ston's reply "Nega menga aytmding?" is superficially a simple question, it implicitly contains an assessment of the child's failure to fulfill his duty to his mother. Through this reply, the frames of "violation of family trust" and "exclusion of the mother" are activated. Therefore, the question functions not only as a request for information but also as a hidden accusation.

Karimjon's reply "Ayajon, siz aytgani qo'ysangiz ekan!.." does not bring the conflict to the level of open confrontation, but rather deepens it pragmatically. Although the respectful address unit in the sentence outwardly preserves the strategy of politeness, the construction "if only you would stop what you

are saying” communicatively expresses objection and hidden resistance aimed at stopping the dialogue.

From a linguocognitive point of view, the power of evaluative units in this dialogue is manifested precisely in their implicit character. The characters do not use open insults or sharp accusations, but the dynamics of emotional tension and conflict gradually increase through lexical units related to the concepts of kinship and respect. As a result, sociocultural norms concerning the “mother-child” relationship become one of the main cognitive mechanisms of dramatic events.

In the English material, particularly in Osborne’s play, evaluative vocabulary is more closely associated with concepts of social identity, class position, and personal honor. Sharp epithets, derogatory remarks, and sarcasm accelerate the exchange of retorts and bring the conflict into an open dynamic. For example, in “Look Back in Anger”:

Jimmy: God, how I hate Sundays! It’s always so depressing, always the same. We never seem to get any further, don’t we? Always the same ritual... Our youth is slipping away. Do you know that? Cliff: (throws paper down) What’s that?

Jimmy: (casually) Oh nothing, nothing. Damn you, damn both of you, damn them all.

Cliff: Let’s go to the pictures...

In this dialogue fragment, evaluative lexical units are an important tool for revealing the inner state of the characters and intensifying the dramatic conflict. Negative evaluative units such as “I hate Sundays”, “so depressing”, and “always the same” used in Jimmy’s speech create a mood of boredom, depression, and dissatisfaction with life. Through these lexical devices, not only the personal feelings of the character are expressed, but also his place in society and dissatisfaction with social life.

In particular, the repeated use of the unit “always the same” has important linguocognitive significance. This repetitive construction activates the frame of sameness, stagnation, and hopelessness in the listener’s mind. The sentence “Our youth is slipping away” further intensifies the emotional background of the conflict. Here, the metaphorical unit “slipping away” conceptualizes youth as a value that is gradually disappearing and creates images of unfulfilled dreams and lost opportunities. As a result, a simple conversation gradually turns into a discourse of social and existential discontent. The conflict takes a more open form in Jimmy’s line “Damn you, damn both of you, damn them all.” Here, the repeated unit “damn” acts as a powerful evaluative and expressive means. This unit transforms the hero’s inner anger into a form of open verbal aggression, intensifying the exchange of lines. At the same time, Jimmy’s discontent appears to be directed not only at his interlocutors but also at society. This reveals the concepts of social alienation and class discontent in the play. In Pinter, evaluation is often given not in the form of direct insults, but through vague, half-spoken, semantically “closed” units. This reinforces the scenario of danger and discomfort in the dialogue, forcing the viewer to fill in the presupposition. As a result, the story develops due to the effect of “something left unsaid”: evaluative lexis acquires event-generating power through the mechanism of implicature production.

For example:

Aston. Just plug in here.

Davies. Right, mister. (Aston goes towards the door)

(Anxiously) What do I do?

Aston. Just switch it on, that’s all. The fire’ll come on.

Davies. I tell you what. I won’t bother about it.

In this dialogue fragment, evaluative meaning is not expressed through open insults or sharp expressive units, but through ambiguous and pragmatically “closed” replicas. The communicative style characteristic of “The Caretaker” creates dramatic tension precisely through implicitness and half-expressed meanings. Although the outer layer of the dialogue seems to depict an ordinary everyday situation, beneath the exchange of replicas a feeling of discomfort, distrust, and hidden anxiety is formed.

Aston’s short, simple lines, such as “Just plug in here” and “Just switch it on, that’s all”, seem semantically neutral. However, their laconic and emotionally cold form creates a sense of distance and alienation in the conversation. Davies’s anxious question “What do I do?” shows that he feels uncomfortable and insecure. Here, evaluative meaning is not directly expressed, but the communicative situation activates the frames of “danger” and “unknown” in the listener’s mind. In particular, Davies’s line “I won’t bother about it” has significant linguocognitive value. Although this unit is superficially a simple form of refusal, pragmatically it expresses hidden fear, distrust, and caution. Although the hero refuses to use an electrical device, in fact, the line reveals his internal psychological state and alienation from the environment. Thus, in Pinter’s dramatic discourse, the story often develops not through an openly stated

thought, but through “unspoken” meaning, silence, and implicature. From a linguocognitive point of view, in this dialogue, evaluative lexis acquires event-generating power through the mechanism of implicature formation. The viewer or reader is forced to independently fill in the hidden meaning between the replicas. As a result, dramatic tension arises precisely through semantic ambiguity and communicative inadequacy.

Discussion. The results obtained expand the possibilities of linguocognitive interpretation of dramatic discourse and show that the “realization” function of lexical units actually operates through a three-level mechanism: lexical selection activates a conceptual frame, the frame determines the pragmatic force of the speech act, and the pragmatic force moves the story forward by creating a turning point in the exchange of replicas. These conclusions are consistent with views on the unity of meaning and conceptualization in cognitive linguistics, since the lexicon is interpreted not merely as the “name of a thing”, but as a means of encoding the structure of experience [2]. In particular, the idea of the “entry point into the frame” is important in explaining the conflict-generating nature of evaluative units: a single evaluative word evokes in the listener the concept of norm, duty, honor, or territory, thereby practically forcing the further course of communication. From a pragmatic point of view, lexical markers in dramatic dialogue appear to be closely connected with the system of speech acts. Within the framework of speech act theory, acts such as orders, threats, promises, accusations, and apologies are usually explained by grammatical and intonational signs. However, the material analyzed in this study reveals that lexical units — particularly evaluative epithets, formulas of address, and modal softeners — are precisely what “calibrate” illocutionary force [8].

Conclusion. The study showed that lexical units that make dialogic communication happen in English and Uzbek dramatic works are systematically grouped into three clusters: evaluative-conflictogenic lexis, which activates conflict scenarios and determines plot dynamics; deictic-referential units, which build the space-time of the scene within the dialogue itself and provide a “real” basis for the event; and pragmatic-interactive markers, which create turning points by controlling the exchange of replicas. The comparative analysis showed the dominance of strategies of hidden escalation through normative-etiquette frames in the Uzbek material, and cognitive tension through open evaluation or ambiguity in the English material. The results have theoretical and practical significance for the teaching and translation of dramatic discourse, as well as for the development of cognitive models of dialogic speech. In future research, it would be advisable to examine the interaction of authorial style, genre type, and staging factors with the event-generating function of lexical units on the basis of a larger corpus.

REFERENCES

1. Grice H.P. *Studies in the Way of Words*. — Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989. — 406 p.
2. Кубрякова Е.С. *Язык и знание: На пути получения знаний о языке*. — Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. — 560 с.
3. Lakoff G. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. — Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987. — 632 p.
4. Levinson S.C. *Pragmatics*. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. — 420 p.
5. Mahmudov N. *Til va nutq madaniyati*. — Toshkent: O‘qituvchi, 2007. — 256 b.
6. Pinter H. *The Caretaker*. — London: Methuen, 1960. — 96 p.
7. Safarov Sh. *Pragmatika*. — Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy ensiklopediyasi davlat ilmiy nashriyoti, 2008. — 272 b.
8. Searle J.R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. — 203 p.
9. Khushmamatova A. *The Linguistic-Cognitive Aspects of Dialogical Communication* // *International Scientific Journal of Biruni*. — 2025. — Vol. 4. — Issue 2. — ISSN 2181-2993.
10. Виноградов В.В. *О языке художественной литературы*. — Москва: Наука, 1980. — 360 с.
11. Xushmamatova A. *Ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi dramatik asarlar nutqida nutqiy intensiyaning lingvokulturologik xususiyatlari* // *Scienceproblems.uz Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari*. — 2025. — No. S/9(5). — ISSN 2181-1342.
12. Khursanov N.I. *Dramatik diskurs: kognitiv, pragmatik, lingvokulturologik tavsif: monografiya*. — Toshkent: “EXISTENTIUM-PRINT”, 2025. — 250 b.
13. Khursanov N.I. *Pragmatic Analysis of Uzbek Phraseological Units* // *Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences*. — 2024. — Vol. 1. — Issue 7. — P. 148–154.