



The Issue of Expression of Human Wishes in Language



Gulibanumu Kebaituli ^a

Article history:

Submitted: 18 March 2021

Revised: 9 April 2021

Accepted: 27 May 2021

Keywords:

*anthropocentric paradigm;
grammatical structure of wishes;
lexical-grammatical units of
wishes;
linguistic expression of human
desires;
pragmatics;
semantics of wishes;
semantics;
syntactic structure of wishes;
wishes;*

Abstract

This article deals with non-linguistic factors such as the expression of human desires in the Uzbek language, the anthropocentric nature of desires, how speakers perceive the world, personal experiences, language skills and knowledge, the age of the speakers, the psyche. The issue of connection with it also analyzes the study of wish sentences in linguistics, especially in Uzbek linguistics, and raises current issues related to the study of these types of sentences.

International journal of linguistics, literature and culture © 2021.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Corresponding author:

Gulibanumu Kebaituli,

Department of Russian and Central Asian Languages, Minzu University of China.

Email address: banumu@163.com

^a Department of Russian and Central Asian Languages, Minzu University of China

1 Introduction

As any type of speech, including wishful speech, is produced by man, it is natural to observe the qualities peculiar to the human. In this sense, every speech is anthropocentric. As N. Makhmudov noted, "Since language is the main component of the human personality" (Mahmudov, 2012), it is a fact that the direct expression of the human personality in language, especially in speech, which is a unit of its syntactic system, does not require proof. Since the last quarter of the last century, the study of linguistic units in the anthropocentric aspect has begun to receive serious attention in world linguistics. The anthropocentric approach to the study of language suggests that language, in addition to systemic features, is also a manifestation of human qualities, that "as long as language is created by man, it cannot be understood and explained without contact with its creator and user" (Kravchenko, 2009; Alpatov, 1993; Vorkachev, 2001; Boldyrev, 2001; Maslova, 2007; Leshchenko, 2014).

The main part

The study of language units from an anthropocentric perspective has clarified not only the relationship between language and man, but also the relationship between language and culture, language and psyche, language and society, and so on. As D. Kudaibergenova notes, "The anthropocentric paradigm is a set of doctrines and methods that studies language not only as a structure, but also as an open system based on communication, studying it in relation to other systems such as society, man, culture, psyche, not analyzing man within language or language within man" (Kudaibergenova, 2019; Makhmudov & Ashirova, 2019; Alavutdinova, 2015). Therefore, it is safe to say that all human speech is anthropocentric. Because not only the systemic nature of language, but also the person, his culture, psyche, etc. are reflected in the speech, which confirms our opinion.

One of these types of anthropocentric speech is desire speech. It is known that Uzbek speakers actively use expressions to express their wishes in speech. The occurrence of a wish is primarily related to the person, the grammatical system of the language he uses, and the lexical structure. In the formation of desire sentences, a person does not put his desires into ready-made speech patterns, but in the process chooses the one from the existing units of language based on how he knows, perceives the world, personal experience, language skills and knowledge. In the process of choosing language units, the characteristics of the human personality are also taken into account. Accordingly, in different languages there are differences not only in the semantic-syntactic structure of desire sentences, but also in the pragmatic, cognitive, national-cultural aspects. For example, it can be observed that the age of language speakers plays an important role in the formation of desire sentences. The majority of preschoolers use expressions in their speech because of their age. Children of this age, unlike adults, try to express their desires openly. For this reason, they make effective use of the verb lexemes, mainly, in the formation of wish sentences. There are many hidden forms of desire in adult speech, and adults do not always express their desires openly. Of course, this is connected with the mentality of the Uzbek nation, national and cultural values. This fact also shows that age is an important factor in the formation of desires (Mahmudov et al., 2019; Cameron & Kulick, 2003).

2 Results and Discussions

We know that desire is first and foremost reflection of a person's desires. However, there are also wishes that directly reflect people's desires, aspirations, modal attitude to reality, mood, age, gender, and so on. In this case, the semantics of wish sentences are complicated by pragmatic factors. For example, *Oh, I wish my pain was relieved!* (*Ох, қанийди дардим енгиллаиса!*) In addition to expressing the speaker's desires, his speech also reflected his state of mind (depression). Such desires are semantically complex, although they have a simple syntactic structure. The presupposition "*My pain is severe, my pain is not relieved*" (*Дардим оғир, дардим енгиллашмаяпти*) provides information about the mood of the speaker (Gibbs, 2003; Désiré, 2002; Rauch & Dallasega, 2020).

This means that such desires, in addition to the communicative purpose of the speaker, also reflect his personal qualities (psyche, attitude to reality, social status, etc.). This also indicates the need to study the desires in relation to the person who created them. In linguistics, the issue of the expression of human desires in speech has been studied in various aspects. In particular, the semantic-structural aspects of desire have been studied in recent years in anthropocentric aspects.

In Uzbek linguistics, wish words, although not called by that name, were first described by Fitrat. Fitrat called such statements *wishful thinking* (*мулак зан*). He wrote: "The purpose of speech is not only to express a thinking,

but also to make it possible or impossible for something to happen that is called a wish sentence. Sentences with the verbs imperative, interjection, and incitement are called "wishes." Such as, *Синамаган отнинг сиртидан ўтма. Отанг боласи бўлма, одам боласи бўл! Шу хатни ўқуб берсангиз-чи!* The form of the conditional verb used for "hope" is also the "wish" when the sentence is a participle. *Кўнгли тилаган муродга етса киши!* The words that begin with the Persian words "I wish I could" are also "wish sentence": *Кошки меним сўзимни тингласа. Шоятким қолсангиз (Bobir)* (Fitrat, 2006). Apparently, Fitrat gave the first information about the essence and syntactic structure of wish sentences.

However, in Uzbek linguistics, wish sentences have not been studied as a separate type of speech for many years. Only in 1995, in the textbook of N.Mahmudov, A.Nurmanov "Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language" (Mahmudov: 1995, pp. 46-47), wish sentences were separated as a separate type of speech according to the purpose of expression, and only after that in the higher education institutions, educational literature of the direction, in school textbooks, wish sentences began to be given as a separate type of speech.

The textbook "Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language" gives a brief overview of the semantic-syntactic structure of wish sentences, which states that desire is formed by verb forms with the affix *-sa* in the cut function, *K/f. -sa / style* construction model is shown (Mahmudov, 1995; Kortenkamp & Moore, 2001; Santiago & Lynn, 2020). It should be noted that before this work in Uzbek linguistics, desire sentences were not separated as a separate type of sentence, but in the morphological (*-sa* conditional, command-desire forms), syntactic (positive, command, in emotional sentences). For example, in A.Gulyamov's "Verb", A.Khojiev's "Verb", "Incomplete verb" the expression of the meaning of desire through conditional and imperative tendencies of the verb is mentioned (Gulomov, 1964; Khudaybergenova, 2020; Hojiev: 1973).

M. Sodikova's book "Verb Stylistics" also shows the expression of desire through the affixes of the conditional and imperative moods of the verb, as well as the units of *кошки, қани (қани эди, қани энди)* (Sodiqova: 1975, p. 11). In general, all works on the study of verbs express the idea that the meaning of desire is expressed through the indicators of conditional and imperative tendencies (Aglamova, 1966; Uzbek grammar, 1975; Shoabdurahmonov, 1980; Tursunov, 1991). The issue of expression of desire in the speech was also mentioned by S. Solikhojaeva. In her study, "Emotional Sentences in Modern Uzbek", the scholar provided information on the expression of desire in emotional sentences, although she did not classify wish sentences as a separate type of speech (Salikhodjaeva, 1981).

In D. Lutfullayeva's research on "Denial and formal-semantic inconsistency in affirmative statements", desire sentences are also distinguished as a separate type of speech. The main focus of the study was on the expression of affirmation and denial in wish statements (Lutfullayeva: 1997, p. 21). In M. Bazarova's research on "Linguistic features of speech units expressing the content of positive wishes in the Uzbek language (based on prayers and speech etiquette)" the words expressing positive wishes were selected and linguistically analyzed. In this work, the scholar focused on the analysis of prayers and speech etiquette (Bazarova, 2007; Linebarger et al., 1983; Gupta, 2007; Friederici, 1982). Anthropocentric approaches to the study of linguistic units have emerged in world linguistics since the last quarter of the last century. As a result, syntactic units were studied in cognitive, pragma linguistic, lingvoculturological, and sociolinguistic aspects. Wish sentences has also been studied in cognitive, pragmatic aspects. In particular, in the study of Ye.Yu. Makeeva "Functional-semantic field as a means of representation of the concept of "wish" in English (in synchrony and diachrony)" the expression of desire is analyzed in cognitive aspect, synchronous and diachronic directions (Makeeva: 2006, p. 23). The concept of "wish" was also studied in S.V.Masterskikh's work «Концепт «желание» в сопоставительном плане (на материале глагольных лексем русского, английского и немецкого языков) », but in this work the verbs expressing desire are comparative-typological (Masterskikh, 2004; Ali et al., 2019; Ekasani, 2016).

It is well-known that the wishes of the speaker are also reflected in the wish sentences. Linguists have also focused on this issue. In particular, M.K.Gusarenko's study «Дискурсивные разновидности, перлокутивная прагматика и пропозициональные характеристики речевого акта пожелания в современном русском языке» showed that the desire to express the wishes of the speaker through a speech act (Gusarenko, 2005). D.F. Komorova's study «Прагмалингвистические особенности пожелания в немецком и русском языках» also noted the expression of the wishes of the speaker (Komorova, 2005). In Turkish studies, it is said that desire is also expressed in syntactic devices that express wishes. For example, in the research work of K.E.Gadjieva and A.A.Abdulin, the expression of desire was expressed in wishful speech labels (Gadjieva, 1989; Abdulin, 2006).

3 Conclusion

An analysis of the scientific sources on the statements of desire shows that in world linguistics such words are studied as a separate object of study in structural-semantic, pragmatic, cognitive, linguocultural aspects. In Uzbek linguistics, the semantic-syntactic and pragmatic features of wish sentences should be studied separately. So, as long as the wish sentences are created by man, they are, of course, anthropocentric. While the syntactic structure of desire sentences is determined by the grammatical structure of a particular language, the semantic and pragmatic structure is formed by the lexical-grammatical units that express desire, as well as the communicative purpose of the speaker, personality traits, and speech situation.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper.

References

- Abdulín, A.G. (2006) Ethical expressions in the modern Tatar literary language: Author's abstract. diss. ... Cand. philol. sciences. - Kazan.
- Aglamova, M. (1966) Ways of expressing imperative and desirability in the Turkic languages: Author's abstract. diss. ... Cand. philol. Sciences. - Tashkent.
- Alavutdinova ganievna, n. (2015). Place of professor ayyub gulomov in forming of morphological viewpoints in uzbek linguistics of xx century. *Electronic turkish studies*, 10(12).
- Ali, K., Fatima, S., & Chandio, R. (2019). Stylistic Analysis of Charles Lamb's Essay Dream Children-Reverie. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 5 (6), 68-77. <https://doi.org/10.21744/ijllc.v5n6.760>.
- Alpatov, Y. M. (1993). On the Anthropocentric and Systemcentric Approaches to Language. Questions of linguistics. 3, 15—26..
- Bazarova, M.M. (2007) Linguistic features of speech units expressing the content of positive desires in the Uzbek language (based on prayers and speech etiquette): Philol. fan. nomz. ... Diss. avtoref. - Tashkent.
- Boldyrev, N.N. (2001) Anthropocentricity of language from the standpoint of different cultures // Proceedings of the III Intern. scientific. conf. "Philology and Culture". At 3 o'clock - Tambov. Part 1. - pp. 15-20.
- Cameron, D., & Kulick, D. (2003). Introduction: Language and desire in theory and practice. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309\(02\)00047-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0271-5309(02)00047-2)
- Désiré, L., Boissy, A., & Veissier, I. (2002). Emotions in farm animals:: a new approach to animal welfare in applied ethology. *Behavioural processes*, 60(2), 165-180. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357\(02\)00081-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-6357(02)00081-5)
- Ekasani, K. A. (2016). The analysis of english-indonesian exclamative clauses in the novel entitled the adventures of tom sawyer by mark twain and their indonesian version entitled petualangan tom sawyer translated by djokolelono. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 2(1), 16-28.
- Fitrat, A. (2006) Selected works. An experiment on the rules of the Uzbek language. Second Book: Nahv. - Tashkent: Manaviyat. - 204 p.
- Friederici, A. D. (1982). Syntactic and semantic processes in aphasic deficits: The availability of prepositions. *Brain and Language*, 15(2), 249-258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(82\)90059-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(82)90059-1)
- Gadjieva, K.E. (1989) Linguistic aspect of speech etiquette of native speakers of Russian and Azerbaijani languages: Author's abstract. diss. Cand. philol. sciences. - Baku, 1989.
- Gibbs Jr, R. W. (2003). Embodied experience and linguistic meaning. *Brain and language*, 84(1), 1-15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X\(02\)00517-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X(02)00517-5)
- Gulomov, A. (1964) Verb. - Tashkent: UzFA Publishing House.
- Gupta, N. (2007). A functionally graded syntactic foam material for high energy absorption under compression. *Materials Letters*, 61(4-5), 979-982. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matlet.2006.06.033>
- Gusarenko, M. K. (2005). Diskursivnye raznovidnosti, perlokutivnaya pragmatika i propozitsionalnye kharakteristiki rechevogo akta pozhelaniya v sovremennom russkom yazyke [The discursive varieties, perlocutionary pragmatics and propositional characteristics of the speech act of wish in modern Russian]: abstract for PhD in philological sciences: 10.02. 01
- Hojiev, A. (1973) Verb. - Tashkent: Fan.
- Khudaybergenova, Z. (2020). Türkiye Türkçesi ve Özbek Türkçesindeki ek eylemler üzerine.
- Komorova, D.F. (2005) Pragmalinguistic features of wishes in German and Russian: Diss.... Cand. philol. sciences. - Tomsk.
- Kortenkamp, K. V., & Moore, C. F. (2001). Ecocentrism and anthropocentrism: Moral reasoning about ecological commons dilemmas. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21(3), 261-272. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jevp.2001.0205>
- Kravchenko, A. V. (2009). The experiential basis of speech and writing as different cognitive domains. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 17(3), 527-548.
- Kudaibergenova, D. T. (2019). Compartmentalized Ideology: Presidential Addresses and Legitimation in Kazakhstan. In *Theorizing Central Asian Politics* (pp. 145-166). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Leshchenko, O.I. (2014) Anthropocentricity as a universal principle of organizing the linguistic picture of the world // Svitoglyad - Philosophy - Religiya: collection of scientific works. Issue. 5. - pp. 171-179.
- Linebarger, M. C., Schwartz, M. F., & Saffran, E. M. (1983). Sensitivity to grammatical structure in so-called agrammatic aphasics. *Cognition*, 13(3), 361-392. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(83\)90015-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(83)90015-X)

- Mahmudov, K. T., Gurbanov, A. V., Guseinov, F. I., & da Silva, M. F. C. G. (2019). Noncovalent interactions in metal complex catalysis. *Coordination Chemistry Reviews*, 387, 32-46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccr.2019.02.011>
- Mahmudov, N & Nurmonov, A. (1995) Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Teacher.
- Makhmudov, E. A., & Ashirova, E. A. (2019). Japan's Practice in the Tourism Development of Uzbekistan. *Journal of International and Advanced Japanese Studies*, 11, 121-138.
- Maslova, V. A. (2007). Homo Lingualis in Culture: Monograph. *M: Gnozis*.
- Masterskikh, S.V. (2004) Concept "desire" in a comparative plan (based on the verbal lexemes of the Russian, English and German languages): Avtoref. diss. Cand. philol. sciences. - Tyumen.
- Rauch, E., Linder, C., & Dallasega, P. (2020). Anthropocentric perspective of production before and within Industry 4.0. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 139, 105644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2019.01.018>
- Santiago-Avila, F. J., & Lynn, W. S. (2020). Bridging compassion and justice in conservation ethics. *Biological Conservation*, 248, 108648. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108648>
- Shoabdurahmonov, S. M. (1980) Modern Uzbek literary language. Part 1. - Tashkent: Teacher.
- Tursunov, U., Mukhtorov, J., Rahmatullaev S.H. (1992) Modern Uzbek literary language. - Tashkent: Teacher.
- Uzbek grammar. Part 1. - Tashkent: Fan, 1975.
- Vorkachev, S.T. (2001) Linguoculturology, linguistic personality, concept: the formation of an anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics // *Philological sciences*. - M. –№ 1.