

## THE ACT OF PROHIBITION AND ITS COMPONENTS.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10556188>

**Kabilova Nargiza Sulaymonovna**

*Associated professor*

*of the English Linguistics department of BSU,*

*doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology,*

*email: nargisaqobilova7772@gmail.com*

**Hajiyeva Marjona Tolkinovna**

*doctoral student of Bukhara State University.*

*email: [hojiyevamarjona07@gmail.com](mailto:hojiyevamarjona07@gmail.com)*

### **Annotation**

*The English language formulation of general prohibitions, including their classification and distinction from negative orders, is covered in this article. The article employs transformational and comparative methods to analyze common prohibitions. The article's analysis of the differences in meaning between imperatives used to indicate the meaning of prohibitions and the differences in meaning when these imperatives are combined with common prohibitive moods and their tense predicates may be helpful to modern English-speaking users.*

### **Key words**

*general prohibition, directives, negative imperatives, real imperatives, surrogate imperatives, non-verbal directives.*

**INTRODUCTION.** Studies on typological prohibition in global languages have demonstrated that negative morphemes can manifest as verbal forms, free morphemes, or verbal affixes. These studies are valuable sources of information, but their content is descriptive and confined to inhibition theory. In English, prohibitions can take various forms and be expressed in various ways. There is no such thing as a prohibition category in Uzbek. However, the structures that express the meaning of prohibition take on various shapes. We discovered in our article that general English prohibitions are employed with time predicates. English prohibition structures can be expressed in Uzbek using demonstrative sentences, negative imperatives, and passive sentences. Uzbek using passive voice, negative imperatives, and demonstrative sentences. The purpose of our study is to determine the extent to which the meaning of prohibition changes in different structures, particularly in the form of general prohibitionists.

**LITERATURE ANALYSIS AND METHODS.** The article used research papers and articles by linguists such as Michael Donovan, Richard Hudson, Rodney Huddleston, John Searle and Raffaella Zannuttini. M. Donovan thought about the structures of general prohibitions, while R. Hudson thought about the expression of the meaning of prohibition by means of gerunds. Also, R. Zannuttini analyzed the means of expressing the meaning of prohibition in languages belonging to the English and Romano-Germanic language families.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Some syntactic parameters are included in recent typological studies of prohibition by negation, which concentrate on observable changes in the fundamental syntactic structure of negated sentences. The term "prohibitive" was chosen from the imperative literature, and it has also been applied to the constructions that are displayed below. There are a number of prohibitive constructions in both English and Uzbek, the majority of which are frequently found on notices or signs posted in public places. Negative instructions like "Don't talk," "Don't smoke," and the English version of "Don't go outside!" are a few examples. But there are also brand-new phrases known as general prohibitions. For example:

- a) *No smoking in the room!*
- b) *No jumping on the deck!*
- c) *No visitors after 10 pm!*

Negative commands, like "Don't smoke!" are different from these constructions because they lack a second person, a tense, and command morphology. The aforementioned examples blatantly show that they lack a main verb. The activity of receiving "visitors" is prohibited here, even though it isn't stated explicitly verbally. Furthermore, negation with a general prohibitive takes the form "not," as opposed to "no" in negative imperatives. Given that the structural negative form of "not" in English is "no," this demonstrates that "no," which denotes a general prohibition, is more than just an example of structural negation.<sup>94</sup>

Searle defines **directives** as "attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do something" and thus negative directives are, on the contrary, attempts to get the hearer not to do something.

General prohibitors like the examples above is that they apply to everyone in the context of speech, as opposed to some of the individuals in that context of speech differs from the standard imperatives, which only apply to the listener. General prohibitions necessarily seem to have a universal address.

<sup>94</sup> Donovan, Michael. General Prohibition: A New Type of English Imperative. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics.2018

For example:

"No one can jump on the sofa" or "No one jumps on the couch!"

Zanutini coined the term "general prohibitions" in several scientific works. Huddleston and Pullum also mention the term "non-verbal cues" in their work using examples like the one above. But both scholars do not provide an analysis of the structure, only mentioning the existence of "non-verb directives". Seiss (2008) points out the existence of general prohibitions expressed by gerunds as the head noun.<sup>95</sup> For example:

*No swimming!*

*No jumping!*

Scholars call them "No+ DET-ing" type gerunds, but "No+negates the existence of prohibitions such as the common noun ". For example:

"No sharks!"

"No tigers!"

Hudson also mentions the existence of a phenomenon called "No + gerund clause" and argues for mixed nominal and verbal properties for gerunds. In each of these cases<sup>96</sup>, the main focus in their analysis is the use of the term gerund.

Imperatives (prohibitive commands) and tense predicates are constructions that may not have a tense in some languages. To determine whether an imperative has a tense, a distinction must be made between real imperative and surrogate imperative (Rivero 1994). **Real imperatives** are expressed using inflections that differ from any other verbal paradigm. However, some languages do not have separate imperatives, but instead have imperatives that are the same as to be, indicative, or infinitive verb forms. These are **surrogate imperatives**.<sup>97</sup>

Such imperatives occur in time-replacing imperatives, but not in prohibitive imperatives expressed directly by the imperative mood. If there is a strong connection between negation and tense, then we can observe that this connection is reflected in the relationship between negation and the real imperative. We will consider this in the example of sentences with the meaning of prohibition that take general prohibitors and tense predicates.

According to Searle, general prohibitions are directive speech acts. The absence of a tense predicate in general prohibitives is related to referentiality.<sup>98</sup>

<sup>95</sup> Zanutini Raffaella .” Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages”. Oxford University Press.1997

<sup>96</sup> Richard Hudson. "Gerunds without phrase structure. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. 21:579–615. 2003.

<sup>97</sup> Huddleston Rodney and Geoffrey Pullum. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge University Press. 2002.

<sup>98</sup> Searle, John R. "A classification of illocutionary acts." Language in Society, pp. 1-23. Hrakovsky, 1976.

When there is a tense predicate, it is difficult to understand to whom the prohibition is directed. For example:

- a) *No smoking in the room is allowed!*
- b) *No jumping on the deck is allowed!*
- c) *No visitors after 10pm are acceptable.*

The sentences above are almost identical to the sentences given in Example 1, but with the addition of the predicate "is allowed" (or its synonyms). Each of the prohibitions in Example 2 has roughly the same meaning as its corresponding variant in Example 1 (No smoking in the room! No jumping on the deck!) . However, there is a significant pragmatic difference between the sentences in both versions . The sentences in the first example have an additional direct prohibition meaning by the speaker. Thus, "No smoking in the room!" is a direct command, and the speaker is simply conveying knowledge about the world view in context. is consistent with and indifferently conveys the information that the action is prohibited without specifying by whom. general prohibitions cannot be revoked because they are directive speech acts, unlike the form shown in the following examples:

- a) *No jumping on the deck is allowed, but we're going to do it anyway.*
- b) *No jumping on the deck! But we're going to do it anyway.*

Example 3b is well-expressed and in an imperative mood. However, example 3a lacks an imperative mood, and the moods in these examples vary depending on the target audience of the prohibition. The primary distinction is that, in example b, the prohibitive part of the sentence lacks a tense predicate, which makes it more likely to be interpreted as a direct command because of the imperative content's additional semantic force. In example 3a, where the prepositional phrase is examined, such a circumstance does not arise. As a result, Example 3b's imperative mood is stronger than Example 3a's sentence. Because it is readily apparent and has a tendency to be dominant.

### CONCLUSION

In the prohibition category, we are focusing on the use prohibitions and how they differ lexically from other forms of prohibition. Based on the above examples and all the analysis, we came to the following conclusion:

-structures belonging to the category of prohibitions in English can be expressed in Uzbek through demonstrative sentences, negative imperatives and sentences in the passive voice;

- General prohibitions are incompatible with past participles;
- There is no direct positive opposition to general prohibitions ;

-If a tense predicate is added to general prohibitions, the meaning of prohibition is weakened.

### LIST OF REFERENCES:

1. Sulaymonbekovna, Q. N., & Raimovna, I. G. (2021). Cognitive dissonance and pragmatic influence. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 11(10), <https://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:aca&volume=11&issue=10&article=136>.
2. Sulaymonovna, Q. N., & Orifjonovich, O. A. (2022). Konseptual metaforalarning lingvomadaniy hamda kognitiv xususiyatlari va til taraqqiyotida tutgan orni. *Scientific Impulse*, 1(3), 594-600. <http://nauchniyimpuls.ru/index.php/ni/article/view/1055>
3. Kobilova, N. Literary Psychology and the Principle of the Epic Image. *JournalNX*, 7(02), 306-309. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/342765-literary-psychology-and-the-principle-of-1cb9cf8a.pdf>.
4. Hikmatovna, A. N., & Kobilova, N. S. (2021). Sociocultural aspects of "linguoculture" clothing" in English and Uzbek languages, *Electronic journal of actual problems of modern science. education and training*, 18-21. <https://khorezmscience.uz/article/1635783818.pdf>
5. Sulaymonbekovna, I.G.R.Q.N. (2021). Cognitive dissonance and pragmatic influence, *Academia: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 902-908. <https://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:aca&volume=11&issue=10&article=136>
6. Donovan, Michael. *General Prohibition: A New Type of English Imperative*. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics.2018
7. Richard Hudson. "Gerunds without phrase structure. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 21:579-615. 2003.
8. Huddleston Rodney and Geoffrey Pullum. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press. 2002.
9. Searle, John R. "A classification of illocutionary acts." *Language in Society*, pp. 1-23. Hrakovsky, 1976.
10. Zanuttini Raffaella ." Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages". Oxford University Press.1997



11. Saidova Zulfizar Khudoyberdievna Questioning techniques in teaching English // Достижения науки и образования. 2018. №5 (27). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/questioning-techniques-in-teaching-english>.
12. Saidova Zulfizar Khudoyberdievna Implementation of some techniques in developing reading skills in English classes // Достижения науки и образования. 2018. №5 (27). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/implementation-of-some-techniques-in-developing-reading-skills-in-english-classes>.
13. Saidova, Z. (2022). ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА И НЕДОСТАТКИ МОДУЛЬНОЙ ОБЪЕКТНО-ОРИЕНТИРОВАННОЙ ДИНАМИЧЕСКОЙ ОБУЧАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЫ (MOODLE) В СИСТЕМЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (*buxdu. Uz*), 8(8).
14. Saidova, Z. X. Implementation of some techniques in developing reading skills in English classes., Достижениянауки и образования № 5 (27) Россия-2018. стр. 59-60.
15. Saidova, Z. (2022). ПРЕИМУЩЕСТВА И НЕДОСТАТКИ МОДУЛЬНОЙ ОБЪЕКТНО-ОРИЕНТИРОВАННОЙ ДИНАМИЧЕСКОЙ ОБУЧАЮЩЕЙ СРЕДЫ (MOODLE) В СИСТЕМЕ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (*buxdu. Uz*), 8(8).
16. Saidova Zulfizar Khudoyberdievna Model training method: classes in the form of buseness games, lessons such as lesson-court, lesson auction, lesson-press Conference // Достижения науки и образования. 2018. №5 (27). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/model-training-method-classes-in-the-form-of-buseness-games-lessons-such-as-lesson-court-lesson-auction-lesson-press-conference>.
17. Saidova, Z. (2022). ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИИ И СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ, ВЫРАЖАЮЩИХ ПСИХИЧЕСКОЕ СОСТОЯНИЕ ЧЕЛОВЕКА. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (*buxdu. Uz*), 8 (8). ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (*buxdu. Uz*), 8(8).
18. Saidova, Z. K. (2023). THE FUNDAMENTAL TYPES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS. Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities, 11 (2), 517-522.
19. Khudoyberdievna, S. Z. (2018). Questioning techniques in teaching English. Достижения науки и образования,(5 (27)), 60-61.
20. Naydarov Anvar Askarovich, & Saidova zulfizar Khudoyberdiyevna. (2021). EMOTIONAL CONCEPTS IN ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN

PHRASEOLOGY. *Conferencious* Online, 33-37.

<https://conferencious.com/index.php/conferences/article/view/55>.

21. Askarovich, H. A. (2021). EXPRESSION OF CONNOTATIVE MEANING IN GRAPHIC MEANS. *International Engineering Journal For Research & Development*, 6 (TITFL), 91-94.

22. Haydarov, A. (2020). Methodological features of graphic tools. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 5.

23. Askarovich, H. A. (2022). SOME COMMENTS ON THE STYLISTIC REPETITION. *JournalNX-A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal*, 8 (1), 87-91.

24. Haydarov, A. (2020). Methodological features of graphic tools. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 5.

25. Haydarov, A. A. (2023). RHYME AS A PHONETIC STYLISTIC DEVICE. *Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities*, 11(2), 419-422.

26. Gadoeva, M. I., Umurova, X. X., & Vaxidova, F. S. (2019). THE EXPRESSION OF THE MEANING OF THE CATEGORY OF INDEFINITENESS IN NOUNS AND PRONOUNS IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES. *Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology*, 1(10), 227-237.

<https://namdu.researchcommons.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1819&context=journal>.

27. Umurova, X. Semantic Properties of the Terms of Wedding Ceremony Used in Bukhara Dialect. *JournalNX*, 6 (09), 58-62.

28. Umurova, K. (2022). Linguacultural Features of Weddings In Uzbekistan And United Kingdom. *Центр научных публикаций (buxdu.uz)*, 26(26).

29. Toirova, U. (2021). The interpretation of zoosemy through the symbol of Monkey in the stories of N.Eshonqul "Maymun yetaklagan odam(The Man Leading the Monkey) and W.W.Jacob's "The Monkey's Paw" Toirova Umida Sobirovna A teacher of English literature department Bukhara. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 1(1). ИЗВЛЕЧЕНО ОТ [http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals\\_buxdu/article/view/1952](http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/1952).

30. Toirova, U. (2022). ВЕРНОСТЬ В ИСТОРИЯХ "КАРАКО'З МАДЖНУН" С.АХМАДА И "ХАТИКО" ПАМЕЛЛЫ СТАРШЕР В ЗООСЕМА "ИТ". *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 15(15). ИЗВЛЕЧЕНО ОТ [http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals\\_buxdu/article/view/6888](http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/6888).

31. Kasimova, R. N. R., & Axmedova, M. F. (2020). STYLISTIC ISSUES IN THE NOVEL "IF TOMORROW COMES" BY SIDNEY SHELDON. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (5), 68-70. [403 - Forbidden: Access is denied. \(elibrary.ru\)](#).
32. Kasimova, R. R. (2016). Description of Ceremonial Ethnographisms in English Translation of "Alpomish". *International Journal of Central Asian Studies.-Korea*, 20, 55-74.
33. .I., G. ., & qizi, S. C. B. . (2023). O'ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDA NUTQ FE'LLARINING FUNKSIONAL-KOGNITIV TADQIQI. Integration Conference on Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes, 263-265. Retrieved from <https://conferenceseries.info/index.php/online/article/view/1064>
34. Ibragimovna, G. M. (2023, May). SO'Z YASALISHI TALQINI. In Integration Conference on Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes (pp. 35-39).
35. Ibragimovna, G. M., & Baxtiyorovna, Y. L. (2023, May). OLAM MANZARASI TASVIRIDA SOMATIZMLARNING ROLI. In Integration Conference on Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes (pp. 40-44).
36. Ibragimovna, G. M., & Nargiza, Q. (2023, May). MATAL VA MAQOLLARDA SOMATIK BIRLIKLAR IFODASI. In Integration Conference on Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes (pp. 25-28)