

THE SOCIOPRAGMATIC DESCRIPTION OF SPEECH IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK DRAMA

Sabina Komil qizi Jo'rayeva

Abstract. A sociopragmatic analysis of speech in Uzbek and English drama is presented in this article, which looks at how language in these two different linguistic traditions reflects social dynamics, power structures, and cultural standards. The study contrasts the sociopragmatic roles of language in classical and contemporary plays from both English and Uzbek literature by concentrating on the pragmatics of speech acts. The study investigates how language serves as a medium for identity construction, social roles, and power negotiation by drawing on the works of well-known English dramatists like William Shakespeare, Oscar Wilde, and Harold Pinter, as well as traditional Uzbek playwrights like Hamza and Fitrat and current Uzbek theater artists. The article explores how gender and power are conveyed via speech acts and emphasizes the role that speech plays in creating social hierarchies through both formal and informal language usage. It also examines how individual and collective identities are portrayed differently, as well as how the conversation around gender roles in contemporary play is changing. Uzbek drama is more in line with communal values and respect for social hierarchies, whereas English drama frequently emphasizes individualism and the questioning of established norms. According to the analysis, language serves as a vehicle for social transformation and cultural expression in addition to communication, reflecting the changing dynamics of both Uzbek and English cultures.

Key words: Sociopragmatics, speech acts, English drama, Uzbek drama, power structures, social identity, gender roles, language and society, Shakespeare, Hamza, modern theatre.

Introduction. The idea of sociopragmatics is essential to linguistics in order to comprehend the social aspects of language. It looks at how social elements including status, authority, cultural norms, and contextual contexts affect speech acts. In order to provide a comparative examination of how language functions within these two different cultural and social settings, this essay will examine the sociopragmatic aspects of speech in both English and Uzbek drama. Drama is a literary genre that reflects and critiques the social conditions of its times in addition to telling a story. We can learn more about the social structures, values, and ideologies that influence communication in both Uzbek and English communities by analyzing the language utilized in these dramatic works.

It is impossible to overestimate the significance of speech in theater since it is the main means by which characters convey their feelings, ideas, and social roles. Character speech in Uzbek and English plays provides a glimpse into the

historical and cultural circumstances of the eras by reflecting the class stratification of their respective cultures. These tragedies' intricate interactions between language, power, identity, and social relationships are revealed through sociopragmatic analysis.

The study of pragmatics and sociolinguistics are combined in the multidisciplinary field of sociopragmatics. In general, pragmatics is the study of language use in context, emphasizing how speakers express meaning that goes beyond the literal interpretation of words. However, sociopragmatics goes one step further by taking into account the social aspects of communication, namely how social factors like class, gender, age, and power influence how speech actions are conducted.

Any utterance with a communication purpose, such as a request, promise, query, or demand, is referred to as a speech act. According to sociopragmatics, a speech act's meaning is influenced by both the social context in which it is generated and the words used. This encompasses elements like the speaker-listener dynamic, the situation's formality, and the social conventions that regulate communication. Language is especially important in dramatic works because it enables playwrights to use conversation to build characters and move the plot along. The power relationships, social class differences, and cultural norms that exist in their society are frequently reflected in the characters' speech. We can discover the underlying social and cultural norms that shape communication by examining the language employed in drama.

There are many instances of how language is employed to portray social relationships, power dynamics, and character identities in English drama, both ancient and contemporary. English drama has continuously addressed the sociopragmatic aspects of language, from William Shakespeare's plays to more recent authors like Oscar Wilde, Harold Pinter, and Tom Stoppard. English playwrights depict social relationships in complex ways by carefully choosing their language, tone, and register.

Shakespearean Drama. The way that characters from various social groups use language in Shakespeare's plays demonstrates the sociopragmatic function of language. For instance, the vocabulary of the porter and other lower-class characters in *Macbeth* is more informal and earthy, but Macbeth, a nobleman, uses formal, measured language that reflects his elevated standing. The social hierarchy and power dynamics at work are highlighted by the contrast between these linguistic registers. Additionally, the use of soliloquies, like in *Macbeth* or *Hamlet*, gives the audience a view into the inner thoughts of people, exposing their moral quandaries and psychological states. This stands in contrast to the outward social interactions where characters establish their dominance and fulfill social roles through words.

Modern English Drama. Language frequently serves to show the intricacies of social interaction and to critique societal standards in contemporary English drama. One of the best examples is seen in Oscar Wilde's *The Importance of*

Being Earnest, where individuals negotiate Victorian social norms with repartee, humor, and irony. The vocabulary used in the play shows the absurdity and hypocrisy of the strict social norms of the day, which are satirized throughout the play. To illustrate the performative aspect of social interaction, the characters frequently use indirect speech acts, such as sarcasm or understatement, to communicate meaning without expressing it directly.

Similar existential strain and communication failure are depicted through language in Harold Pinter's works. Pinter emphasizes the alienation his characters feel and evokes a sense of unease through his use of pauses, broken speech, and ambiguity. The conversation between the characters in *The Caretaker*, for instance, shows the power struggles and ambiguities in their relationships, with one speaker attempting to use speech to exert control over the others. The breakdown of conventional social institutions and the loneliness of the contemporary individual are reflected in Pinter's work through the sociopragmatic function of language.

The Sociopragmatic Description of Speech in Uzbek Drama. With its strong roots in Central Asian history and culture, Uzbek play also uses language to represent moral standards, social hierarchies, and societal ideals. Language use in Uzbek dramatic works is heavily impacted by cultural values such as collectivism, respect for elders, and the value placed on family and community. Speech is a means of communicating social positions, power dynamics, and cultural identity in everything from the classical plays of Hamza and Fitrat to the modern Uzbek playwrights.

Classical Uzbek Drama. The vocabulary used in classic Uzbek play, like Fitrat's *The Children of the Steppes* or Hamza's *The Birth of a New Nation*, is deliberately constructed to represent the ideals of Uzbek civilization. Aristocratic figures frequently use formal, ceremonial speech to emphasize their power and social standing. Common people's vocabulary, on the other hand, is more straightforward and informal, reflecting their lower social status. These language decisions uphold the hierarchical structure of Uzbek society and draw attention to the social gap between various strata.

In these works, language serves as a means of expressing morals and ideologies in addition to being a medium for communication. Speeches by the characters that promote equality, social justice, and the value of tradition frequently reflect the social conflicts of the era. Honorifics and polite words are frequently used, particularly when speaking to elders or other authority figures, which emphasizes the culture's value of hierarchy and respect.

Modern Uzbek Drama. While continuing to draw from traditional values, contemporary Uzbek play has started to examine more intricate social themes, such as the place of women in society, the difficulties of modernization, and the conflicts between personal preferences and social norms. Contemporary dramatists such as Shukhrat Ahmadov and Abdulla Qodiriy explore the changing

social structure of Uzbekistan, employing language to convey people's internal emotional struggles as well as the external stresses they encounter.

Speech frequently reflects the changing dynamics of Uzbek society, where the conventional patriarchal order is being challenged and remade, in these contemporary plays. For instance, as witnessed in the plays of modern female writers, the language of female characters may question traditional gender roles. Another important way to represent the diversity of Uzbek society and its many social strata is through the use of regional dialects and colloquial expressions.

Sociopragmatic Differences in English and Uzbek Drama. Sociopragmatic differences between English and Uzbek drama reflect the deep cultural, historical, and communicative traditions of each society. These differences are visible in the way characters use language to express politeness, establish social hierarchy, navigate gender roles, and manage interpersonal relationships on stage. One of the main distinctions is the expression of individual identity versus collective belonging. English drama, especially from the Renaissance period, often centers on individual struggle and self-expression. For instance, in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, the protagonist's famous soliloquy "To be, or not to be..." is a direct, introspective exploration of his inner conflict—something that highlights the individualistic nature of English drama. In contrast, Uzbek drama historically focuses more on community values and the collective good. A character in Hamza's plays might say: "Yurt uchun jonim fido bo'lsin" (Let my life be sacrificed for the homeland), which reflects collectivist values and national duty rather than personal emotion. In terms of politeness strategies, English characters often use hedging (e.g., "I think," "maybe," "perhaps") to soften their speech. For example, a line like "I wonder if you could help me" reflects a desire not to impose. Uzbek speakers, however, show politeness through deference and honorifics. In classical Uzbek drama, a character might say: "Aka, sizga yuk bo'lib qolmadimmi?" (Brother, I hope I haven't become a burden to you?), which shows humility and respect toward the addressee. Another key difference is how speech reflects social hierarchy. In English drama, hierarchy is often expressed subtly through tone or vocabulary. A noble character might speak in elaborate, poetic language, while a servant uses simpler, more colloquial speech. For example, in *King Lear*, the king uses grand language to assert authority, while his fool speaks in riddles and wit to challenge power indirectly. In Uzbek drama, hierarchy is more linguistically explicit. Terms such as "otaxon" (respected elder), "hazrat", or "domla" (religious or academic figure) are used to directly signal respect. Younger characters may bow verbally by saying "Sizing duoyingiz kerak" (I need your blessings), reinforcing vertical social order.

Gender roles are also sociopragmatically encoded in both traditions. In classical English drama, women often speak in emotional, dependent, or romantic tones. However, modern playwrights like Caryl Churchill give female characters strong, confrontational voices. In her play *Top Girls*, female characters openly discuss career ambition and societal expectations. Meanwhile, in traditional

Uzbek drama, female characters are typically polite, reserved, and avoid direct confrontation. For example, a woman might say: “Erkaklar bilan bahslashish bizga yarashmaydi” (It doesn’t suit us to argue with men). But in contemporary Uzbek plays, like those of Muhammad Ali, women are portrayed as more assertive: “Endi jim turmayman!” (I will no longer stay silent!), showing a shift in gender dynamics.

When it comes to pragmatic markers, English characters often use fillers like “you know,” “well,” or “I mean” to manage conversation flow or express uncertainty. In Pinter’s *The Caretaker*, characters frequently interrupt themselves and use vague language, creating ambiguity and psychological tension. In Uzbek, pragmatic particles such as “ku”, “da”, or “axir” add emotional color and stress specific points. For instance, “Aytdim-ku, bo‘lmaydi!” emphasizes prior warning and frustration, while “Axir bu siz uchun” softens a request by adding reason and appeal.

Even disagreement is expressed differently. In English plays, characters may use sarcasm, irony, or understatement. For example, in Wilde’s *The Importance of Being Earnest*, the characters often critique social norms with witty, ironic speech. In Uzbek drama, disagreement is often indirect to avoid offending others. A character may respond to a suggestion with “Balki boshqacharoq qilgan ma’quldir” (Perhaps it would be better to do it differently), which subtly disagrees without confrontation.

Cultural Values in English and Uzbek Drama

Individualism is a key value in English drama. In works like Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, the protagonist reflects deeply on personal identity, highlighting the importance of the individual’s inner conflict and self-expression.

Respect for elders is another important cultural value in Uzbek drama. Characters consistently express deference to older generations, following traditions that emphasize the wisdom and authority of their elders. In English drama, freedom of expression is celebrated. Plays like *The Importance of Being Earnest* by Oscar Wilde feature characters who openly express their thoughts, reflecting a cultural appreciation for individual opinion and open dialogue.

Family honor is a strong cultural value in Uzbek drama. Characters often take great care to preserve the family’s reputation, and much of the drama centers around maintaining or defending the family’s name. In Uzbek drama, obedience to authority is a key value, particularly within familial and social structures. The younger characters often show respect to elders or authority figures, reinforcing the hierarchy present in society.

The theme of social class is explored in many English plays. In works like *Pride and Prejudice*, characters’ social standing greatly influences their relationships, and much of the drama centers on the barriers and conflicts caused by social distinctions. In Uzbek drama, community is highly valued. Characters often express a sense of responsibility for the collective well-being, highlighting the idea that personal actions impact the greater society. Self-reflection is an

important value in English drama, especially in works by Shakespeare. Characters often engage in deep introspection, questioning their purpose, desires, and actions in the context of their society. Sacrifice for the common good is a recurring theme in Uzbek drama. Characters frequently make personal sacrifices for the benefit of their family or society, reinforcing the importance of selflessness for communal harmony.

Another key difference lies in the role of social hierarchies. While both English and Uzbek dramas reflect social stratification, the way these hierarchies are represented linguistically differs. In English drama, especially in classical works like Shakespeare's, class distinctions are often evident through the formality or informality of speech. In modern plays, the breakdown of traditional social structures is a common theme, with language reflecting the disintegration of class-based distinctions. In Uzbek drama, however, social hierarchies are more deeply embedded in cultural norms, and respectful language is a constant feature, especially when addressing elders or figures of authority. The use of honorifics and formal speech reflects the importance of maintaining these social distinctions.

Although language is used to examine gender and power concerns in both English and Uzbek drama, speech acts are done differently depending on cultural views on gender roles. Language is frequently employed in English drama to subvert gender stereotypes and give female characters more agency, especially in the feminist plays of contemporary playwrights. Gender roles are more strictly established in Uzbek drama, on the other hand, and speech frequently reflects the patriarchal social system. The language of female characters is changing to represent increased agency and independence, and new works in contemporary Uzbek play are starting to challenge these established gender stereotypes.

The sociopragmatic study of Uzbek and English drama demonstrates how language reflects cultural norms, power dynamics, and social positions. Uzbek drama stresses solidarity and respect for societal hierarchy, whereas English drama frequently uses speaking acts to highlight individualism and personal struggle. In both traditions, playwrights question social norms and build relationships through words. Characters' feelings, status, and intentions are communicated through the use of pragmatic indicators, speech styles, and politeness techniques. While contemporary Uzbek drama examines gender equality and individual rights, classical Uzbek drama emphasizes harmony and duty. English plays also reflected social change as they transitioned from formal speech to more realistic, fractured conversation.

References:

1. Alimdjanovna, K. M. (2023). DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS' CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS IN ENGLISH CLASSES. European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies, 3(05), 125-127.

2. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
3. Azamova, A., & Erdanova, Z. (2024, May). LINGUISTIC FEATURES AND FUNCTIONS OF COLLOQUIAL WORDS. In *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit* (pp. 229-230).
4. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Anchor Books.
7. Gulomova, R. (2023). EVOLUTIONARY HISTORY OF CURSING. *Journal of Advanced Scientific Research* (ISSN: 0976-9595), 3(12).
8. Hilola, X. (2025). INNOVATIVE APPROACHES AND ACQUISITION METHODS IN LANGUAGE LEARNING. *TANQIDIY NAZAR, TAHLILIY TAFAKKUR VA INNOVATSION G 'OYALAR*, 1(7), 396-398
9. Kadyrova, G. (2018). *Linguocultural Features of Uzbek Speech Etiquette*. Tashkent.
10. Kasimov, Sh. (2005). *Adabiyotda til va uslub masalalari*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi.
11. Kupaysinovna, S. G. (2020). THE ROLE OF ENGLISH TEACHER IN A MODERN CONTEXT. *Проблемы науки*, (7 (55)), 64-65.
12. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
13. Muhtashamova, P. Z. (2019). THE USE OF ICT IN THE ENGLISH CLASS. *Наука и образование сегодня*, (6-1), 87-89.
14. Rashidova, G. (2024). USING COMMUNICATIVE ACTIVITIES THROUGH APPROACHES IN TEACHING MODERN ENGLISH. *TAMADDUN NURI JURNALI*, 5(56), 471-474.
15. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press.
16. Sultonova, M. (2024). The significance of critical thinking in learning languages. *O 'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti konferensiyalari*, 443-446.
17. Xujaniyazova, H. (2024). YURIDIK RITORIKADA MADANIYATNING AKS ETISHI. *TAMADDUN NURI JURNALI*, 6(57), 228-230.