

## **Functional - Stylistic Language Standards Analysis and Methodology in Aspect Issues**

**Mukhtorali Zokirov**

Professor of Fergana State University

**Abstract:** The article analyzes the linguostylistic features of the functional styles of the Uzbek language, the normative or non-normative situations in the manifestation of these features on the example of a stylistic norm. The common and different aspects of the stylistic norm among other language and speech norms are shown.

**Keywords:** functional style, linguostylistics, feature, norm, non-normative, universal norm, language norm, speech norm.

### **Introduction**

Адабий тил умумий меъерининг бир кўриниши сифатида қараладиган услубий меъёр тилда белгиланган барча хусусий меъёрларнинг вазифавий услубларда матн талаби ва манфаатидан келиб чиқиб яшаш шакли ҳисобланади. Шунинг учун ҳам меъёр таҳлилига оид адабиётда уни ҳар бир вазифавий услуб доирасидаги фонетик, лексик-семантик ва грамматик ҳодисалардаги меъёрлар ва уларнинг матн услубига таъсиридан излаш керак, деган фикрлар баён қилинади.

It seems that it would be appropriate to call the stylistic standard a discourse standard, rather than a language standard, as opposed to other standards. Because it remains clear from the analysis that it is difficult to determine the methodological norms in any case outside the text. That's why E. Begmatov, taking into account the existence of situations in methodological norms that do not correspond to the literary norm, emphasizes that it "cannot stand alongside the norms of the literary norm determined according to the linguistic spheres": "The stylistic norm, - he says, - is a literary norm, the dialectal norm can appear in such forms as the norm of simple speech»[2.82].

So, when it comes to the norm, first of all, we must remember to observe the rules of the literary language, and we must not forget that the practical aspect of the literary language is wide. If we understand this broad aspect in the sense of functional styles, it becomes easier for us to understand the relationship between style and norm. Therefore, when it comes to methodological standards, their manifestation in functional styles should be the main focus.

### **The main part**

Dividing functional styles in the language into forms of speech - written and oral speech forms - helps us to more clearly imagine the scope of activity and scope of these styles. In addition, the expression of speech in written or spoken form, regardless of the style, can in some sense trigger the emergence of norms in each style in their own ways. For example, let's take novels or folk epics as genre representations of a single artistic text. In order to bring out a large-scale work with a large plot, the writer thinks for a long time, even for years, calmly tries to put each language unit in its place and serve its purpose. Consequently, in the use of language, in most cases, violation of the standard of literary language is not allowed. Even when a restriction is

imposed, a certain artistic-aesthetic goal is foreseen or the requirements for the creation of an artistic work are obeyed.

We observe a different situation in the formation of the text of epics, which is an example of oral creativity. Even though times have changed and all epics belonging to Uzbek folklore have become written texts, even if the storyteller memorizes it and narrates the content of the epic based on the written text, he has the freedom to creatively master and express the text. Naturally, in such a case, conditions are created for violation of the literary norm. Our comparison of a poem written while sitting and thinking and a poem spoken in an artistic manner also proves this point. Although artistic poetry exists as a genre, one of the reasons why it is so rare may actually be the desire to avoid subverting the literary norm.

In addition, let's compare the cases of reading the written statement of any scientific material as it is and verbally stating the content of this text. Between journalists in TV programs, especially in the "Akhborot" program, in the process of reporting a certain event or news, they speak freely in front of the camera and read a prepared text behind the frame, although both of these speeches belong to the same author. , we observe that they differ from each other precisely in relation to the norm.

What has been said indicates that in the process of learning the norm within the framework of task-based methods, their written and oral forms cannot be ignored. Normative violations are mostly observed in oral expression of task-style materials. This, in turn, indicates that oral speech in the Uzbek language has not improved to the required level compared to written speech.

When determining the limits of stylistic standards, we also encounter such considerations: "style is an individual implementation of a general norm" [2, 83]. We can understand this idea in two ways. First, there is a norm determined based on the use of language tools within each functional style, and secondly, the norm of each individual (person) in using language.

It is known that in the formation of a person as a person, together with a number of factors, the uniqueness of the use of language is taken into account. Because the ability to use the mother tongue embodies many of its qualities. Although the use of literary norms of the language is required for the users of a certain work, under the influence of the social environment in which he was brought up, he naturally forms his own norms. Just as one thing in nature is not exactly like another, it is difficult in practice for one person's speech to follow another person's or their literary standards exactly. Nevertheless, the aspiration to universal culture of the language requires compliance with these norms. The progress of the culture of each person or nation leads to its perfection in this regard.

The other side of the issue is the formation and expansion of social relations, spheres of activity in the life of each nation, and consequently, the emergence of specific ways of using the language in these directions, as a result of which language elements are distributed among these spheres and directions. As a result, specific functional styles of language use emerge. As the society progresses, the number of these styles and their limitations at all levels of the language become more and more clear.

Understanding the intricacies of the stylistic norm is somewhat difficult compared to the understanding of other specific norms in the literary language norm system. The reason for this is prof. E. Begmatov commented as follows: "It is known that norms according to language fields have their own material, that is, their own linguistic units. For example, phonetic norms - phoneme, graphic norms - grapheme, morphological norms - morpheme, lexical norms - word (lexema), syntactic norms - phrase, sentence; word formation norms - such as new words and word forms. Are there such material and compounds in the methodological norms? At first glance, each style seems to have its own independent tools. In fact, we see the absence of such tools" [2.78-79].

Therefore, the fact that the language tools that express the standard in the fields of the Uzbek language are not clearly visible within the framework of the methodological standard makes it

difficult for us to understand and understand it as a separate standard. But, regardless of this difficulty, in order to have a clear idea about the methodological standard, can we count it among the standards of the literary language, is it considered a form of special standards among the general standard, and if it is considered, what is its position among the special standards and its service in the improvement of Uzbek speech culture we will have to find answers to the questions of what it will consist of.

So, what exactly is a methodological standard and how should we understand it? In a certain speech situation, regardless of whether it is oral or written, the ability of the speaker and writer to apply and selectively use language units based on their intention and scope, the topic and content of the speech, creates methodology. The individual need of the speaker or writer to use these units selectively creates their own style, if considered in a wider framework, the use of these elements in certain areas of social life creates functional limitations, which are increasingly characteristic of these areas, and consequently, functional - functional styles.

Each tool in the language can be a material for the formation of a style. In other words, each language unit can be a methodological tool in the speech process. Their normative level is determined by the speech process and situation, as in other language norms.

The above can be said to be the first step in understanding the methodological norm. At the next stage, it will be necessary to clarify the issue of whether to consider it as one of the private standards within the general standard of the literary language. "In linguistics, rather than considering the concept of style as a criterion for speech, it is better to evaluate it as a phenomenon related to the language itself, to language norms, and accordingly, to equate style with real norms as well as concrete norms. Real norms related to style are called stylistic norms. Stylistic norms are noted along with phonetic, morphological, pronunciation, orthographic, syntactic norms of the language in the given sense" [2.78].

Regardless of how carefully the scientist expresses his opinions, there are reasons to consider the methodological standard among the above-mentioned standards of literary language. Let's not forget that it is realized only in the speech process. Basically, which of the phonetic, pronunciation, orthographic, lexical or grammatical norms recognized above as language norms are formed outside of speech? It is only when the question is posed in this way that the understanding of the matter becomes somewhat clearer.

It is also important to understand the common and at the same time different aspects of the methodological standard with other private standards. For example, if each linguistic unit, say, any morphological unit, is the object of both morphological and stylistic norms, how can they be distinguished from each other? When the problem is put in this way, it becomes clear that it is much more difficult to determine methodological norms than to determine morphological normative cases. Moreover, it is not easy to notice when the morphological norm is violated and when the methodological norm is violated.

The stylistic norm is closely related to other norms of the literary language, at the same time, each of them has its own special characteristics. This is the basis for us to consider the methodological standard as a separate and special form of the general standard of the Uzbek literary language.

Along with recognizing that the stylistic standard is a form of the general standard of the literary language, it is also necessary to mention that it is not in the same position as other specific standards. Because stylistic norms are the form of living of all private norms defined in the language based on the requirements and interest of the text in functional styles. Therefore, in the literature on the analysis of norms, it is stated that it should be sought in the norms of phonetic, lexical-semantic and grammatical phenomena and their influence on the style of the text.

It seems that it would be appropriate to call the stylistic standard a discourse standard, rather than a language standard, as opposed to other standards. Because it is clear from the analysis that it is difficult to determine the methodological norms in any case outside the text. That's why E.

Begmatov, taking into account the existence of situations in the methodological norms that do not correspond to the literary norm, emphasizes that it "cannot stand alongside the norms of the literary norm determined according to the linguistic spheres." "The stylistic norm," he says, "can be manifested in such forms as the literary norm, the dialectal norm, the norm of simple speech" [2.78].

## Conclusion

So, when it comes to the norm, first of all, we must remember to observe the rules of the literary language, and we must not forget that the practical aspect of the literary language is wide. If we understand this broad aspect in the sense of functional styles, it becomes easier for us to understand the relationship between style and norm. Therefore, when it comes to methodological standards, their manifestation in functional styles should be the main focus.

## References

1. Зокиров, М., & Зокирова, С. (2010). ТИЛ ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИЯСИНИНГ МОҲИЯТИ ҲАҚИДА УМУМИЙ ТУШУНЧА. *Известия ВУЗов (Кыргызстан)*, (6), 10-11.
2. Zokirov, M. (2007). Lingvistik interferensiya va uning o'zbek-tojik bilimimizda namoyon bo'lishi. *MDA.–Toshkent*.
3. Зокиров, М. Т. (2015). Об общей характеристике билингвизма. *Ученый XXI века*, (7-8 (8-9)), 24-27.
4. Isomiddinov, F., & Zokirov, M. (2023). Friendship of Jomi and Navoi as Symbol of Friendship of the Tajik and Uzbek People. *Texas Journal of Philology, Culture and History*, 18, 38-40.
5. Zokirov, M. T. (2007). Lingvistik interferensiya va uning o'zbek-tojik bilingvizmida namoyon bo'lishi. *Fil. fn ilmiy darajasini olish uchun taqdim etilgan dissertatsiya*.
6. Zokirov, M. T., Zokirova, S. M., & Dadabayeva, S. S. (2021). About The Influence Of The Uzbek Language In Rishtan Tajik Dialects Of Ferghana Region. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(4).
7. Zokirov, M. T., & Zokirova, S. M. (2020). About Lexical-semantic Interference in the Speech of Tajiks, Living in Fergana Region of the Republic of Uzbekistan. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, 12(3), 10-11.
8. Zokirov, M. T., & Dadabayeva, S. S. (2020). ABOUT THE ROLE OF LANGUAGES CONTACTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANGUAGES. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (4), 687-691.
9. Zokirov, M. T., & Zokirova, S. M. (2020). Contrastive analysis at the phonetic level. *Academic Leadership (Online Journal)*, 21(05), 163-169.
10. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). About Grammatical or Morph syntactic Interference. *European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science*, 4, 768-773.
11. Turdaliyevich, Z. M. (2022). Actual Problems of Bilingualism in a Multi-Ethnic Environment. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, 13, 17-23.
12. Zokirov, M. T. (2019). About the general characteristic of bilinguism. *Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology*, 1(10), 260-265.
13. Исомиддинов, Ф., & Зокиров, М. (2023). БИР ДАРАХТНИНГ ИККИ ШОҲИ. *BARQARORLIK VA YETAKCHI TADQIQOTLAR ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 3(5), 24-27.
14. Зокиров, М., & Исомиддинов, Ф. (2021). БИЛИНГВ НУТҚИДА ФОНЕТИК ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИЯНИНГ НАМОЁН БЎЛИШИ ХУСУСИДА. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, (6), 26-26.

15. Zokirov, M. (2023). On the Terminological Apparatus of Language Contacts in Modern Linguistics. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education* (2993-2769), 1(6), 69-73.
16. Zokirov, M. T. (2023). Linguistic Abilities and Their Neuropsychological Support. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education* (2993-2769), 1(8), 59-62.
17. Бердиалиев, А., & Зокиров, М. (2019). ЛИНГВИСТИК ИНТЕРФЕРЕНЦИЯ ВА УНИНГ ЎЗБЕК-ТОЖИК ТИЛЛАРИ КОНТАКТИГА АЛОҚАСИ. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, (6), 21-21.
18. Umarjonova, G. (2023). GLEICHWERTIGKEIT DER SOMATISCHEN PHRASEOLOGIE MIT DER SPRACHE DES KOMONENTENHANDBUCHS IN DEUTSCH UND USBEK. *International Bulletin of Applied Science and Technology*, 3(5), 56-61.
19. Умаржонова, Г. (2023). НЕМИС ВА ЎЗБЕК ТИЛЛАРИДА СОМАТИК ФРАЗЕОЛОГИК БИРЛИКЛАРНИНГ ЭКВИВАЛЕНТЛИК ХОДИСАСИ (“HAND–ҚЎЛ” КОМПОНЕНТИ МИСОЛИДА). *Евразийский журнал академических исследований*, 3(5), 44-49.
20. Арслозода, А. Р., & Умаржонова, Г. М. (2023). ИНГЛИЗ ТИЛИ АСОСИДА НЕМИС ТИЛИГА ЎҚИТИШНИНГ АЙРИМ ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ ҲАҚИДА. *Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры*, 3(4), 184-188.
21. Умаржонова, Г. М. (2021). On the issues of the study of the functional content of phraseological units with the components “hand “–“қўл” in the contemporary German and Uzbek languages. *ИКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ, ИСКУССТВОВЕДЕНИЕ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ: СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ВЗГЛЯДЫ И НАУЧНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ*, 66-70.
22. Umarjonova, G. (2019). On the issues of the study of the functional content of phraseological units with the components “hand “–“қўл” in the contemporary German and Uzbek languages. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, 2(4), 145-148.
23. Umarjonova, G. M. (2023). CLASSIFICATION OF GERMAN LINGUISTS BY PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS. *Open Access Repository*, 4(2), 595-600.
24. Умаржонова, Г. М. (2023). Фразеологизмлар луғатини яратишнинг назарий тамойиллари. *Barqarorlik va yetakchi tadqiqotlar onlayn ilmiy jurnali*, 3(2), 447-450.
25. Umarjonova, G. M. (2023). Cognitive Linguistics and its Basic Concepts in the Study of Somatic Phraseological Units. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education* (2993-2769), 1(8), 72-77.
26. Умаржонова, Г. (2019). ЗАМОНАВИЙ НЕМИС ВА ЎЗБЕК ТИЛЛАРИДА “HAND “–“ҚЎЛ” ФРАЗЕОЛОГИК БИРЛИКЛАР ФУНКЦИОНАЛ МАЗМУНИНИНГ ТАДҚИҚИ МАСАЛАСИ. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, (4), 33-33.
27. Умаржонова, Г. М. (2021). ТИЛЛАРДА СОМАТИК СЎЗЛАР ИШТИРОКИДАГИ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЗМЛАРНИНГ ШАКЛЛАНИШИ. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, (3), 43-43.
28. Umarjonova, G. (2021). Тилларда соматик сўзлар иштирокидаги фразеологизмларнинг шаклланиши (The formation of fraseological inits with somatic words in languages (Based on the words" hand", " қўл...)) ФарДУ. *ИЛМИЙ ХАБАРЛАР-НАУЧНЫЙ ВЕСТНИК. ФерГУ*, 239-241.
29. Умаржонова, Г. М. (2021). Фразеологизмларда “қўл” соматизми “меҳнат воситаси” сифатида. *И культурология, искусствоведение и филология: современные взгляды и научные исследования* (pp. 66-70).



30. Umarjonova, G. (2021). Semantic classification of the phraseological units with the component “hand-қўл” in german and uzbek languages. *THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE Учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука*, 11, 676-679.
31. Umarjonova, G. (2022). Functional content of phraseological units with the component “hand “-“қўл” in german and uzbek. *Oriental Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(04), 84-92.
32. Mukhtorovna, U. G. (2022). Somatic Phraseologies with “Hand””–“QOL” Component, Expressing Diligence in German and Uzbek Languages. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, 14, 68-71.