

---

## NATIONAL-CULTURAL ASPECTS OF THE REQUESTIVE SPEECH ACT

Buzrukova Makhina Mukhamadkhonovna,

### Abstract:

The article discusses the national-cultural features of requested speech act. Directive speech acts are usually described by being divided into three groups. These are prescriptive structures that have the content of ordering an action to be performed, requestives - actions that are requested to be performed in favor of the speaker (but this action is not an obligation to be performed). Finally, the third group consists of suggestive speech acts with counseling content.

### Introduction

Obviously, speech structures with a requestive content belong to the group of requestives. Request consider the benefit of the speaker or listener. The addressee is responsible for the requested action and the final decision is made by him.

Researchers have become accustomed to dividing the occurrence of a requestive speech act into several stages. E. Rintell describes these stages as follows: 1) the beginning of communication; 2) to appeal; 3) to beg (Could you do me a favorite?); 4) substantiation of the request; 5) the request itself [Rintell 1982: 19]. According to S. Blum-Kulka, the request consists of three parts: 1) to attract attention; 2) auxiliary actions; 3) the occurrence of the request. Auxiliary actions include the beginning and continuation of communication, as well as the substantiation of the request, the promise, and the threat [Blum-Kulka, Kasper 1989]. Although there are some differences in the views of scholars, they all base the proposition of request on the basis of a speech act and view it as a means of supporting or assisting the initiation of communication, substantiation of request, and other communicative actions. Auxiliary actions complement the main speech act and soften or, conversely, amplify the tone of the request.

Requested speech act requires a certain amount of effort from the addressee as it is a part of the directives, the speaker uses additional linguistic means to give him a choice. Exactly, these additional linguistic means are to form speech acts. These speech acts, which serve as a support, take on a different appearance in linguistic cultures, and the scope of their application is also not uniform.

In addition to the basic and auxiliary means, requestive speech act also has elements that strengthen or weaken the communicative goal (downgrader strategies). These elements have lexical-phraseological and syntactic properties.

Lexical-phraseological means of strengthening the communicative purpose are:

- 1) Signs of respect - Please...;
  - 2) Units that represent the speaker's point of view - I'm afraid; I wonder / think / believe / suppose;
  - 3) Forms of appeal;
  - 4) Retarding expressions - a bit; a little; less;
- Syntactic units that capable to performing the above function:
- 1) Conditional clauses;
  - 2) Aspectual meaning of duration - I'm wondering if...; I wonder ....;
  - 3) The use of the past tense form instead of the present tense - I wanted to ask you;

We think that one of the most convenient ways to distinguish the isomorphic and allomorphic indicators of this phenomenon is to determine the stages and levels of activation of the strategies listed above in the analysis of the situation of the speech act in English and Uzbek linguocultures.

In the process of interlinguistic comparative study of a requestive speech act, there are many questions that remain in need of explanation within the framework of traditional linguistics. In order to study the problems associated with the activation of the requestive speech act in the communication system of non-mutually exclusive linguistic cultures, we must first remember the general laws of formation of speech structures in the compared languages. This is because the linguistic, ethnocultural and socio-cultural indicators of communication are equally important in the study of the discursive activity of each language speaker.

## REFERENCES

- 1) Blum-Kulka S. Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? // Journal of Pragmatics, 1987. Vol.II. – P. 131-146.
- 2) Rintell E. Sociolinguistic Variation and Pragmatic Ability: A Look at Learners // International Journal of the Sociology of Language. – 1982. –Vol.27. – Pp. 11-34.