

## LINGUOPRAGMATIC ASPECT OF APHORISMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

**Arzimurodova E'zoza**

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

First course master student

### ABSTRACT

The idiosyncrasies of how aphorisms operate in linguistic scientific discourse are examined in the essay. It has been determined that linguistic aphorisms are unique authorial statements that represent the subjective interpretation of linguistic concepts. Differentiating between scientific definitions of language words (i.e., the utterances of the primary nomination) and fictional definitions, which serve the function of secondary nomination, was one of the main goals of the study.

**Key words:** aphorisms, scientific definitions, linguistics, discourse, pragmatics, cognition.

### INTRODUCTION

While fictional definitions emphasize the indirect and peripheral term properties dictated by the author's communicative and pragmatic intent, scientific definitions highlight the fundamental and core aspects of linguistic words. It has been suggested that the definition of language concepts through aphoristic utterances combines semantic, pragmatic, and cognitive elements. According to whether expressive-stylistic or objective-logical information predominates, the research findings discriminate between aphoristic definitions-elucidations and definition interpretations. The definitions-elucidations produced by linguists known as aphoristic utterances are seen to be closer to logical designations or scientific definitions due to their high degree of reference and frequent usage of linguistic terminology.

Definitions and interpretations used often in writing discourse have an associative and metaphorical base. They have therefore been regarded as creating aesthetic meanings of linguistic phrases, which serve to further semantically qualify the concepts they express. Such proverbs serve as examples of anthropological approaches to the study of language phenomena.

The secondary goal was to identify the strategies for conveying linguistic meaning through aphoristic statements. In light of the many ways that language is explained, the following categories of aphoristic definitions have been pointed out: descriptive

definitions, comparison definitions (simile), and definitions based on either semantic opposition or resemblance.

Aphorism as a linguistic phenomenon has always aroused interest of researchers in various fields of study, including psychology, philosophy, literary studies and linguistics [1, p.24]. The wide scope of interpretations of essential features of this phenomenon explains different approaches to its study: structural-functional, linguistic-stylistic, pragmatic, cognitive, intertextual etc.

However, nowadays the lingual status of aphorisms, their categorical features, selection criteria and classification as well as other aspects remain debatable. Some scientists view them as phraseological units [2, p.18], others regard aphorisms as paremiology elements [4, p.131], but the vast majority consider aphorism studies to be a separate branch of linguistics [1, p.23].

Aphorisms have also been extensively studied as idiolect units used by writers. The term "linguistic aphorism" is used in this context to describe the author's uniquely developed word definitions, which symbolically and subjectively transmit a linguistic concept and provide extra information about its common meaning.

Despite the ephemeral nature of aphorisms, academics have come to consensus on the requirements for the genre, which include didacticism, idea generalization, expressiveness, accuracy, communicative clarity, completeness, and memorability.

Particular attention is placed on the semantic, grammatical, structural, and stylistic quirks of these language units when examining linguistic aphorisms from the perspective of how they operate in literary, media, political, and epistolary discourses. However, a particular focus is needed to address the issue of employing aphoristic expressions in scientific paradigms. Aphorism was originally used in a scientific setting as the title of Hippocrates' book of medical observations in Antique times, according to Davis, a distinguished American sociologist of culture. The later aphorism gradually grew to encompass philosophical and moral precepts.

It is still possible to think of the articulation of scientific facts in any field of knowledge as an aphorism today, according to Belarusian linguist Ivanov. Though they emphasize that "expressiveness and imagery bring aphorisms closer to fiction, while their capacity to synthesize thoughts and establish connection between phenomena, along with accuracy and conciseness affiliate them with science", Russian language researchers Fedorenko and Sokolskaya see aphorisms as the intermediary units between literature and science. Though only in part, academics have looked at the use of aphorisms [3, p.48]. Meanwhile, there is great room for improvement in the study of the idiosyncrasies of aphorisms' use in representing linguistic concepts.

Therefore, the goal of this study is to investigate the theoretical underpinnings of the issue at hand and identify the distinctive ways that various writers understand

language concepts by corpus aphorism analysis. Additionally, we want to identify the language utilized and the methods used to render it.

The nominative unit is an aphorism. The Russian school of linguistics' Vereshchagin and Kostomarov, however, advocate distinguishing between nominal and non-nominal information inside an aphoristic statement. An aphoristic statement's denotative meaning is revealed via its nominal information. Aphorisms' non-nominal semantics covers the meanings of its constituent words, which in turn include vast complexity of prior knowledge.

Aphoristic background, according to scientists, is knowledge that is unrelated to an aphorism's nominative semantics. It comprises a variety of connotations with a linguistic unit, such as the author, context, and time and place of its debut.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The descriptive technique has been used to show the key aspects of the definitions as a set of their immanent features in order to solve the research's aims. In order to improve the impartiality of the research findings, a sizable aphoristic corpus from a variety of texts was selected using a targeted sampling strategy. Comparative comparison of aphoristic definitions and dictionary definitions made it possible to identify the essential elements of linguistic phrases and the context in which they are used. The connotative meanings of the studied units were actualized using the cognitive interpretation approach. The qualitative study, shown in the diagrams, allowed for a comparison of the frequency of use of different linguistic aphorism kinds.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Two kinds of information representation—objective-logical and expressive-stylistic—can be identified within the meaning of each aphorism. Only one of the investigated aphoristic components may dominate, whether it be the expressive or conceptual one, as has been seen in each individual example. In order to differentiate between two categories of linguistic aphorisms, we advise using the terms definitions-elucidations and definitions-interpretations in light of the characteristics of delivering content information.

Aphoristic statements are examples of relative interpretations since they define concepts in reference to other words. Since most of the authors of the investigated aphorisms are linguists or writers, their definitions' aphoristic backgrounds varied greatly.

### **CONCLUSION**

This study demonstrated the great variety of aphoristic terminology used to discuss linguistics in scientific discourse. We have reached the following findings after doing study on the characteristics and nature of aphoristic utterances, which are used to define linguistic terminology. The two major kinds of linguistic aphorisms—

definitions-elucidations and definitions-interpretations—are distinguished by the nature of their content. Elucidations usually focus on the denotational meaning of a language phrase and have a more logical and objective nature. Since linguistic concepts are under the purview of science, this kind of aphoristic utterances—which differ from lexicographical fixations of the same terms—can be used in scientific paradigms.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Fedorenko, Nikolay, and Larisa Sokolskaya. *Aphoristics*. Moskva: Nauka, 1990. Print.
2. Gavrin, Sergey. “Aphoristic Phraseology as a Linguistic Category.” *Voprosy Teorii I Metodiki Russkogo Yazyka* 87 (1971): 3-23. Print.
3. Onishchenko, Nataliya. “Logical, Semantic and Functional Peculiarities of Aphoristic Definitions (Based on German Language).” *Visnyk Kharkivskoho Natsionalnoho Universytetu Imeni V. N. Karazina* 896 (2010): 48-54. Print
4. Sharmanova, Nataliya. “Differential Features of Aphorism as a Unit of Paremiology.” *Ukrainistyka*. Ed. Mykola Verboviy. Kryvyi Rih: Vydavnytsvo Kryvorizkoho Derzhavnoho Pedahohichnoho Universytetu, 2002. 131- 135. Print.