GENERAL PROHIBITION AND ITS COMPONENTS

Qobilova Nargiza Sulaymonovna
teacher of the Department of English Linguistics of BSU,
Doctor of Philosophy in Philology(PhD)
Hojiyeva Marjona Tolkinovna
master student of the Department of English Linguistics of BSU

Annotation *: This article provides information on the English language expression of general prohibitions relating to categories of prohibitions and how they differ from negative orders. In the article common prohibitions are analyzed using transformational and comparative methods. Modern English-speaking users may find the article's analysis of the differences in meaning between the imperatives denoting the meaning of a prohibition and the differences in meaning when used in conjunction with the common prohibitive moods and their tense predicates useful.*

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

Recent typological analyses of prohibition by negation take into account some syntax-related factors and concentrate on clearly observable parametric changes in the fundamental syntactic structure of negated sentences. While making research we tried to analyze difference between negative imperatives and general prohibitions and their components. In our thesis research papers and articles by linguists like Michael Donovan, Richard Hudson, Rodney Huddleston, John Searle, and Raffaella Zannuttini were cited. M. Donovan considered the general prohibitions structures, and R. Hudson considered how gerunds could be used to convey the meaning of a prohibition. R. Zannuttini also examined how the Romano-Germanic and English language families express the meaning of prohibition. From the literature on imperatives, we chose the term "prohibitive" and added it to the constructions listed below. Prohibitive constructions can be found in both English and Uzbek, the majority of which are frequently used in announcements or signs that are displayed in public. Negative commands include things like "Don't smoke," "Don't talk," "Don't go out!" and others. General prohibitions are a new term that has emerged, though.

1.a) The room is a no-smoking zone!

b) Don't jump up and down on the deck.

c) After 10 p.m., no visitors allowed!

Negative commands, like "Don't smoke!" differ from these constructions in that they do not use command morphology, a second person, or a tense. In the aforementioned examples, the absence of a main verb is evident. Here, the activity of "visitors" is prohibited even though no explicit verb is stated on the surface. Additionally, the form of negation with general prohibitive is not" rather than 'no' in negative imperatives. This demonstrates that 'no', denoting a general prohibition, is not merely an example of structural negation since the structural negative form in English is 'not'.

Negative directives, on the other hand, are attempts to persuade the listener not to do something, according to Searle's definition of a directive as "attempts by the speaker to get the hearer

to do something prohibitions in general, such as the examples given above is that they apply to everyone in the speech context, as opposed to just some of the people there.

The standard imperatives, which only apply to the listener, are different. It appears that general prohibitions must have a universal address.

The phrase "general prohibitions" was first used by Zannutini in a number of academic works. Using instances similar to the one above, Huddleston and Pullum also use the term "non-verbal cues" in their writing. However, neither scholar analyzes the structure; they only note the presence of "non-verb directives." Seiss (2008) draws attention to the fact that gerunds can function as the head noun to express general prohibitions as follows:

No swimming!

Never jump!

Researchers refer to these as "No DET-ing" type gerunds, but "No" denies the existence of restrictions like the general noun ". In addition, Hudson makes reference to the "No gerund clause" phenomenon and makes the case for gerunds to have both mixed nominal and verbal properties. The use of the word gerund is the primary topic of discussion in each of these cases.

Constructions like imperatives (prohibitive commands) and tense predicates might not have a tense in some languages. Real imperative and surrogate imperative must be distinguished in order to determine whether an imperative has a tense (Rivero1994). In contrast to any other verbal paradigm, real imperatives are expressed using specific inflections. Some languages, however, only have imperatives that are the same as to be, indicative, or infinitive verb forms. These are substitute imperatives, which don't appear in prohibitive imperatives that are expressed explicitly in the imperative mood but do in time-replacing imperatives. If there is a strong relationship between negation and tense, we can see that this relationship is reflected in how negation and the real

imperative are related. We'll take sentences with the meaning of prohibition that take general prohibitions and tense predicates as an example of this.

General prohibitions are directive speech acts, in Searle's view. Preferentiality is correlated with the absence of a tense predicate in general prohibitive. It can be confusing to determine who the prohibition is intended for when the predicate is tense.

We are concentrating on the use of general prohibitions and how they differ lexically from other types of prohibition in the category of restriction. We arrived at the following conclusion after considering the analysis and the aforementioned examples:

In Uzbek, demonstrative sentences, negative imperatives, and sentences in the passive voice can be used to express structures that in English fall under the category of prohibitions;

- The use of past participles with general prohibitions is incompatible; - There isn't any overtly hostile opposition to blanket bans;

General prohibitions lose their meaning if a tense predicate is added to them.

LIST OF REFERENCES:

1. Kabilova, N.S (2016). LITERARY REVIEW OF SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY IN THE NOVEL "MARTIN EDEN". World Science, 4(3 (7)), 52- https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=25619815

2. Vakhidova.F.S. (2022). The Usage of Pilgrimage Tourism Terms in the English Language. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION, 1(4), 66–70. http://inter-publishing.com/index.php/IJISE/article/view/170

3. Donovan, Michael. General Prohibition: A New Type of English Imperative. University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics.2018

4. Richard Hudson. "Gerunds without phrase structure. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. 21:579–615. 2003.

5. KOBILOVA NARGISABEGIM SULAYMONBEKOVNA BENEFITS OF USING SONGS IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES TO YOUNG LEARNERS https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=35081671

6. . Rasulov, Z. I., & Saidov, K. S. (2022). Linguistic Economy as an Inseparable Law of Language Evolution. Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes, 8–12. https://uniwork.buxdu.uz/resurs/14162_1_B0C234AB2BF7FF280FE2B272EAEA790F05DDC162.pdf

7. Umidullayevna, Saidova Mukhayyo. "SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH POETIC TERMS IN LITERARY DICTIONARIES." RESEARCH AND EDUCATION 1.1 (2022): 38-46.https://researchedu.org/index.php/re/article/view/682

8. Саидова, Мухайё. "Inglizcha poetik terminlarning o'zbek tilida berilishida shakl va mazmun munosabati." ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz) 13.13 (2022).https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/6714

9. Saidova, M. U. The problem of studying literary terms on figurative language.https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=ru&as_sdt=0,5&cluster=9219256601546054307

10. Saidova, M. U. (2020). LEXICOGRAPHIC AND ETHYMOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONCISE OXFORD DICTIONARY OF LITERARY TERMS BY.https://namdu.researchcommons.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2723&context=journal