

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**ANTHROPOCENTRIC ANALYSIS OF LINGUOCOGNITIVE AND PRAGMATIC
FEATURES OF WOMEN'S SPEECH****Gulrukhsoroy Abdullayeva***Doctorate student of Kokand State University*gulruxsorabdullayeva1206@gmail.com*Kokand, Uzbekistan***Dildorakhon Azizovna Ganiyeva***Professor of Fergana State University**Doctor of Philological Sciences**Fergana, Uzbekistan*

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: women's speech; linguocognitive features; pragmatics; pragmatic barriers; media discourse; gender linguistics; discourse analysis; indirectness.

Received: 01.05.26**Accepted:** 02.05.26**Published:** 03.05.26

Abstract: The analysis is based on qualitative and comparative methods, combining discourse analysis with pragmalinguistic and linguocognitive approaches. Particular attention is given to extralinguistic factors such as social hierarchy, emotional state, and cultural expectations, which often influence speech behavior. The findings show that women's speech frequently involves hesitation, mitigation, and implicit meaning, which can sometimes lead to misunderstanding. However, these features should not be seen as weaknesses, but rather as flexible communicative strategies that help speakers adapt to complex social situations.

Introduction. As a result of scientific and technological development, numerous changes are taking place in the world. The field of linguistics is, of course, no exception. The system-structural approach that dominated for nearly a century has now been largely replaced by anthropocentric linguistics. In recent years, scientific research in world linguistics has been increasingly characterized by a tendency to study language systems within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm.

Toward the end of the last century, pragmalinguistics emerged as one of the leading directions of anthropocentric linguistics. It began to focus on the possibilities of language units realized in connection with factors such as the speech situation, context, speakers' general knowledge about the object of communication, as well as their linguistic skills and competencies. Today, most research is conducted within this paradigmatic framework. The scope of linguistic pragmatics is quite broad, encompassing speech acts, connotation, presuppositional features of speech, pragmatic barriers, deixis, and discourse.

Materials and Methods. Pragmatic barriers, as a subfield of linguistic pragmatics, have been the subject of numerous studies in world linguistics. Scholars such as R.R. Gelgard, L.A. Kiseleva, I.V. Chernigova, Yu.V. Sadovskaya, and others have examined this issue in detail. T.G. Paymurzina defines a pragmatic barrier as an obstacle that arises in the process of communication. In studies conducted within this framework, the terms "communicative error" and "communicative failure" are often used to describe ineffective communication. A dialogue is considered successful when the speaker achieves their communicative goal and mutual understanding is reached between interlocutors. In contrast, communicative failure refers to the negative outcome of communication, when the speaker fails to achieve their intended goal, and unintended negative emotional effects or even confrontation arise during interaction. A communicative error, in turn, denotes flawed communication or communicative ambiguity.

According to L.A. Kiseleva, the emergence of a pragmatic barrier is influenced by several factors:

1. indicators of the intended pragmatic effect;
2. social relations between the speaker and the listener;
3. the scope and nature of the thesaurus (intellectual capacity);
4. the characteristics of the linguistic material.

The concept of a pragmatic barrier is most clearly observed in the communicative interaction between the speaker and the listener. In particular, differences in their knowledge of the world and language are considered a fundamental cause of such barriers. Pragmatic barriers can also be viewed as a type of implicative meaning, distinguished by the fact that they are primarily accessible to the listener. It is important to differentiate pragmatic barriers from subtext: while subtext can be identified through logical analysis of explicit and implicit information, pragmatic barriers cannot be determined through propositional meaning, presupposition, or subtext. Instead, they are revealed through stylistic means, shaped by the speaker's cognitive processes and expressive abilities.

A pragmatic barrier is also regarded as a manifestation of the speaker's communicative behavior and reflects aspects of their inner spiritual world. Thus, speech embodies the speaker's moral and personal identity. This view is also supported in modern linguistic theory, where it is argued that sentences arise in the process of human interaction and therefore inevitably bear traces of the individual. As it is often stated, "language is the home of being, in which the spiritual and psychological world of humanity is reflected."

Uzbek linguists, when identifying pragmatic barriers, primarily consider the listener's perspective, often overlooking the speaker's viewpoint. However, this phenomenon is also shaped by the individual characteristics, cognitive abilities, and psychological state of the speaker. This is particularly evident in women's speech, where factors such as fear of the interlocutor, lower social status, lack of authority, or respect may prevent them from expressing their thoughts clearly and independently. This gives rise to a pragmatic barrier from the speaker's side.

The following excerpt illustrates this clearly:

Enakhon looked at the bride. Although the bride understood from Enakhon's glance the meaning of "Go ahead, speak, what do you say?", she remained silent, considering it inappropriate to initiate the conversation in front of her mother-in-law. After that, Enakhon was compelled to say something.

As seen in this passage, the woman has much to say to her interlocutor, yet the presence of her mother-in-law restrains her from expressing her thoughts openly. In Uzbek culture, respect for elders—especially in-laws—has long been a deeply rooted tradition, discouraging speaking excessively in their presence and encouraging modesty, sometimes even conveying necessary messages indirectly through others. This cultural norm is reflected in the example above and represents a pragmatic barrier from the speaker's perspective.

In the analyzed passage, we can observe the emergence of a pragmatic barrier in women's speech. The woman experiences difficulty expressing her thoughts in front of her husband due to a psychological factor—fear. Her hesitant and fragmented speech, in turn, contributes to the formation of a pragmatic barrier on the part of the male interlocutor as well. Because of her uncertainty and indirectness, the husband is initially unable to clearly understand her intentions and meaning.

Such communicative situations are not unique to Uzbek discourse; they are also reflected in English literary works. For instance, in *Pride and Prejudice*, the character Charlotte Lucas often expresses herself cautiously and indirectly in conversations involving social

hierarchy and marriage expectations. Her restrained speech reflects both respect for social norms and fear of judgment, which creates a subtle pragmatic barrier between interlocutors.

Similarly, in *Jane Eyre*, the protagonist Jane frequently suppresses her true emotions in conversations with Mr. Rochester due to differences in social status and internal conflict. This restraint leads to moments of misunderstanding and emotional tension, illustrating how psychological and social factors interfere with clear communication.

Another relevant example can be found in *The Great Gatsby*, where Daisy Buchanan's speech is often ambiguous and emotionally constrained. Her inability to openly articulate her feelings results in communicative uncertainty, which creates a pragmatic barrier between her and other characters, particularly Gatsby.

In all these examples, women's speech demonstrates the presence of pragmatic barriers shaped by fear, respect, emotional vulnerability, and social constraints. These features are reflected linguistically through hesitation, indirectness, and incomplete expression of thought.

Results and Discussion. Observations show that pragmatic barriers arising under the influence of extralinguistic factors become especially noticeable in women's speech. Even when women possess a sufficiently developed vocabulary, their ability to utilize it effectively may be limited by psychological and social conditions. As a result, expressive means reflecting hesitation and emotional restraint are frequently observed in spoken discourse.

In order to deepen the analysis of pragmatic barriers in women's speech, it is essential to examine authentic examples from literary discourse. Direct quotations reveal how linguistic choices, hesitation strategies, and implicit meanings function in real communicative contexts across different languages.

In Uzbek literature, pragmatic barriers are often shaped by respect and social hierarchy. In *O'tkan kunlar*, Kumush's speech frequently reflects restraint and indirectness. In one episode, instead of expressing her feelings openly, she uses softened and incomplete expressions when addressing Otabek. Although exact wording varies across editions, her speech typically follows a pattern of mitigation, where declarative statements are replaced by elliptical or interrogative forms. Linguistically, this can be interpreted as a strategy of negative politeness, where the speaker avoids imposing or asserting strongly. The pragmatic barrier here arises because the intended meaning must be inferred rather than directly decoded, increasing the risk of partial understanding.

A clearer example of emotionally constrained speech can be observed in Russian literature. In *Crime and Punishment*, Sonya Marmeladova says to Raskolnikov: "What would I be without God?"

This short utterance is structurally simple but pragmatically dense. The sentence functions not merely as a rhetorical question but as an implicit confession of dependence and moral positioning. Sonya avoids direct argumentation, instead relying on emotionally charged, indirect expression. From a linguistic perspective, this reflects ellipsis, modality, and presupposition, where the deeper meaning (“I have no strength without faith”) is not explicitly stated. The pragmatic barrier emerges because the listener must reconstruct the intended meaning through shared emotional and cultural knowledge.

Similarly, in *Anna Karenina*, Anna’s speech often contains hesitation and suppressed intent. For example: “I wanted to tell you... but perhaps it is better not to.” This utterance demonstrates self-interruption and aposiopesis (intentional breaking off of speech). Linguistically, it signals an internal conflict between the desire to communicate and the fear of consequences. The pragmatic barrier here is generated by incomplete propositional content, forcing the interlocutor to interpret what remains unsaid. Such structures are typical in emotionally tense discourse and often lead to misunderstanding or ambiguity.

In English literature, similar mechanisms can be observed. In *Pride and Prejudice*, Charlotte Lucas states: “Happiness in marriage is entirely a matter of chance.” At the surface level, this is a declarative statement; however, pragmatically it encodes resignation and social realism. Charlotte avoids explicitly expressing her personal dissatisfaction, instead generalizing her view. This is an example of pragmatic generalization and indirect self-expression, where personal stance is masked as universal truth. The pragmatic barrier arises because the emotional subtext is only partially accessible to the interlocutor.

Another illustrative case appears in *Jane Eyre*, where Jane says:

“I am no bird; and no net ensnares me.”

Although this seems like a direct statement, it is metaphorical and context-dependent. The utterance functions as a figurative assertion of independence, requiring interpretive effort from the listener. The pragmatic barrier here is not due to hesitation but due to semantic density and metaphorical encoding, which may obscure immediate comprehension.

From a comparative linguistic perspective, these examples reveal several key mechanisms through which pragmatic barriers are realized:

- Ellipsis and incompleteness (Uzbek, Russian): meaning is partially omitted, requiring inference.
- Rhetorical and indirect structures (Russian, English): emotional states are expressed implicitly.

- Politeness strategies and mitigation (Uzbek, English): speakers soften their statements to conform to social norms.
- Metaphorical and figurative language (English): meaning is encoded symbolically rather than directly.

Importantly, while Uzbek examples tend to emphasize respect-based silence and deference, Russian discourse highlights psychological tension and moral conflict, and English texts often foreground individual stance expressed through indirect or figurative language.

Thus, the integration of direct quotations demonstrates that pragmatic barriers are not merely abstract theoretical constructs but observable linguistic phenomena embedded in real discourse. They arise at the intersection of language structure, speaker intention, and socio-cultural context, making them a crucial object of study in modern pragmalinguistics.

Conclusion. In conclusion, the formation of pragmatic barriers in women's speech is influenced by a number of factors, including:

1. deviation from orthoepic norms;
2. inappropriate or imprecise word usage;
3. the use of individual occasionalisms;
4. insufficient knowledge or misinterpretation of the subject of speech;
5. social relations between the speaker and the listener, including regional and cultural differences;
6. various psychological changes occurring in women's mental state.

References:

1. Baker, P. (2006). Using corpora in discourse analysis. Continuum.
2. Cowie, A. P. (1998). Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications. Oxford University Press.
3. Dobrovol'skij, D., & Piirainen, E. (2005). Figurative language: Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives. Elsevier.
4. Kunin, A. V. (1996). Kurs frazeologii sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka [Course in phraseology of modern English]. Vysshaya Shkola.
5. Litosseliti, L. (2006). Gender and language: Theory and practice. Hodder Arnold.
6. Oxford University Press. (2010). Oxford dictionary of English idioms (3rd ed.).
7. Turdaliyeva, M. (2007). O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati [Phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language]. Fan Nashriyoti.
8. Vinogradov, V. V. (2001). Фразеологический словарь русского языка [Phraseological dictionary of the Russian language]. AST Press.