

SPEECH EFFICIENCY IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Samigova Khushnuda Batirovna
DSc, Professor of the English language
Translation Theory department,
Uzbekistan state world languages university

Annotation. This study explores the comparative rhetoric of speech culture in English and Uzbek, focusing on the linguistic and extra-linguistic factors in dialogic communication. It underscores the importance of mastering rhetoric for fluency, eloquence, and accuracy, particularly in public speaking. Despite substantial research on rhetoric globally, the comparative analysis of English and Uzbek dialogic speech remains understudied. The research emphasizes gender and linguocultural differences, identifying how these elements influence rhetorical styles, strategies, and speech efficiency. It reveals how stylistic devices, cultural nuances, and gender-specific communication shape dialogic rhetoric in both languages. The findings contribute to comparative linguistics and education, with practical implications for teaching rhetoric and language courses.

Keywords: comparative linguistics, rhetoric, dialogic speech, English and Uzbek languages, speech culture, linguocultural factors, gender-specific communication, stylistic devices, public speaking, language teaching.

The comparative study of rhetoric aspect of speech culture in the English and Uzbek languages is very important in increasing and developing learners' knowledge, skills and experience in using the linguistic means referring to these languages. It is too difficult to understand and to justify the specialists, especially the leaders and the heads who cannot express their ideas independently and have not got fluency, eloquence and accuracy in speaking in their mother tongue.¹ Thus idea clarifies the importance of being aware of secrets of speech culture and the art of public speaking nowadays.

Though a lot of scientific researches have been carried out in rhetoric aspect up to date in the world and Uzbek linguistics, this theme has not been studied in the patterns of English and Uzbek dialogic speech as one system. This indicates the necessity of comparative study of gender and linguocultural peculiarities of rhetoric aspect of speech culture, and the linguistic and extra linguistic factors in dialogic rhetoric in the kindred languages.

In linguistics a lot of works on rhetoric were carried out in different languages and remarkable researches by scientists can be considered as a great contribution to linguistics. For instance, A. Judith conducting dialogic rhetoric in English mainly concentrated on revealing the dialectical features of it. C. Patricia Foley studied the significance of permission in rhetoric on the basis of English speech patterns. M.M. Hincks focused on conducting the written speech in rhetoric aspect. L.M. Long, W.A.I. Paton and other scholars devoted their works to reveal other issues related to the English rhetoric².

¹Каримов И.А. Баркамол авлод – Ўзбекистон тараққиётининг пойдевори. Баркамол авлод орзуси. – Т.: Шарқ, 1997. – Б. 15.

² Judith A. The Genre of Logic and Artifice: Dialectic, Rhetoric, and English Dialogues. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Toronto, Toronto university, 1998. – 280 p.; Patricia C. Foley. Paradox and Promise in the Dialogue on Race: a Case Study Analysis of the Dialogues of the Springfield World Class City Commission. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Massachussets, Massachussets University, 1999. – 200 p.; M.M. Hincks. Successful Dialogues: Systematic, Written, and Prominent Self-analysis in College Composition. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Boston, Boston College, 2005. – 170 p.; Long L.M. Associative Rhetoric: Beyond Rhetorical Sensitivity and Individual Rhetoric. – Dissertation for

The types of public speech and linguistic-stylistic means expressed in the orator's speech were studied in A.Kh. Arkhipova's work in Uzbek linguistics. D. Teshabaeva conducted the modern aspects of speech culture on the basis of mass media texts. Scholars such as H. Jalilov, H. Pasulov, S. Svirskiy, A.Y. Mikhnevich, I.A. Krivelev, N. Mahmudov worked out the issue connecting with teachers and lecturers' art of speaking. S. Inomkhujayev, A. Ahmedov, N. Bekmirzaev, H. Jalilov, Y. Mukhibov, E. Mukhibovs' monographic works were devoted to reveal the basis of public speaking. The developing periods of the Eastern art of public speaking was described in S. Inomkhujayev's work. B. Omonov analyzed political speaking skills³.

The gender and linguocultural peculiarities of rhetoric, linguistic and extra linguistic factors of it on the basis of dialogic speech have not been studied in not kindred languages by foreign and Uzbek scholars yet. Thus, it will strengthen the necessity of a new research work on the dialogic rhetoric.

The results of the research and scientific conclusions can be used in carrying out scientific researches in Comparative Linguistics, Translation Studies. The materials of the research can be in great use in defining the national-cultural peculiarities of the languages in Linguistics and Translation Studies. The scientific-theoretical conclusions of the thesis will also serve to further improvement of the teaching and educational process.

The practical value of the thesis is determined by the use of its conclusions in teaching the special courses and the aspects such as «The Basis of Speech Culture», «Stylistics», «Foreign Language (English)», «Uzbek Language».

In linguistic dictionaries the word *rhetoric* is interpreted in the following way: «Rhetoric is the aspect that studies efficient and eloquent speech theoretically»⁴.

Ancient times orators expounded this word in this way: «*It is the art that teaches us to be aware of the ways in making people believe in a definite issue*» (Aristotle), «*It is the aspect that trains us to speak correctly*» (Quintilian). Russian scholars gave the following identifications to it: «*It is the art of speaking effectively, persuasively*» (M.V.

Achieving PhD. – Georgia, University of Georgia, 1997. – 287 p.;

Paton W.A.I. Current-Traditional Rhetoric Reexamined. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Michigan, Michigan University, 1990. – 267 p.

³ Арипова А.Х. Нотиклик нуткининг лисоний-услубий воситалари: Филол. фан. номз. ...дис. – Тошкент: ЎзР ФА, Алишер Навоий номидаги Тил ва адабиёт институти, 2002. – 170 б.; Тешабоева Д.М. Оммавий ахборот воситалари тилининг нутқ маданияти аспектида тадқиқи (ЎзР ОАВ мисолида): Филол. фан. док. ...дис. автореф. – Тошкент: ЎзДЖТУ, 2012. – Б. 20-28; Жалилов Ҳ. Ижтимоий фан ўқитувчиларининг нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1987. – 32 б.; Расулов Ҳ., Свирский С. Лекторнинг нотиклик санъати – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1978. – 39 б.; Кривелев И.А. Лекторнинг нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1980. – 15 б.; Михневич А.Е. Лекторнинг нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1979. – 44 б.; Махмудов Н. Ўқитувчи нутқ маданияти. – Т.: Алишер Навоий номидаги Ўзбекистон Миллий кутубхонаси, 2007. – Б. 20-157; Иномхўжаев С. Нотиклик санъати асослари. – Т.: Ўқитувчи, 1982. – Б. 5-124; Аҳмедов А. Нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1967. – 56 б.; Bekmirzaev N. Notqlik asoslari. – Т.: Yangi nashr, 2008. – 140 б.; Бекмирзаев Н. Нотик ва нутқ. – Т.: Наврўз, 2015. – Б. 17-39; Жалилов Ҳ. Нотиклик санъати. – Монография. Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1976. – 77 б.; Мухибов Я., Мухибов Ё. Искусство публичного выступления. Риторика. – Т.: Ўқитувчи, 2011. – 173 б.; Иномхўжаев С. Ўтмиш шарқ нотиклиги. – Т.: Ўзбекистон, 1982. – 38 б.; Б. Омонов. Сиёсий етакчининг нотиклик маҳорати. – Монография. – Т.: Ўзбекистон, 2000. – 91 б.

⁴Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1969. – С. 389.

Lomonosov), «*It is the workmanship that knows how to impress others that can find the way to the heart of mankind, and can lead them towards a speaker's intentions, ambitions*» (N. Koshanskiy, M.M. Speranski)⁵.

The term rhetoric is interpreted in two ways. Mainly rhetoric is referred to a subject that aims to study the basis of public speaking. It is also defined as an aspect that theoretically reveals any kind of expressive and impressive speech.

Linguistic means belonging to different language levels and serving to increase speech efficiency are also determined in this article.

Pronouncing the last vowel of a word longer in Uzbek and stressing each word in the sentence and expressing it politely in English increases the efficiency of speech in both languages. By pronouncing the words *please* and *ўшмумос* longer and louder the persuasion is strengthened. Some consonant sounds are often omitted in Uzbek as the result of pronouncing the last vowel in a word longer (бепақо-о-о, келақо-о-о), but in English this linguistic phenomenon is not used. Accurately and clearly expressed words, phrases expressed with love and care may have a positive impact on listeners in both languages. Stressing each word in English and each syllable separately in Uzbek increases speech efficiency. Using excessing sounds in these languages (*uh...*, *ums...*, *ahs...*, *er...* / *ҳм...*, *э...*), coughing and pausing decrease the quality of eloquency. By stressing addressing words in the sentence one can easily attract a listener's attention to himself/herself in both languages. Stressing not only a syllable and a word but the whole sentence or a text surely would increase the speech efficiency in both languages as well.

Suffix *-cuз*, second person singular expressing the meaning of respect, negative meaning forming suffix *-май*, interjections such as *-ми*, *-чи* are constantly used in Uzbek dialogic rhetoric. But in English this linguistic phenomenon is expressed by the usage of negative and interrogative forms of modal verbs in sentences (*could you, couldn't, will you, won't you*). Adding diminutive and affectionate suffixes to a person's name also has an impact on the expressiveness of speech (*Ann+ie* / *Жавлон+жон*) in both languages. Expressiveness is increased by adding to a listener's name the suffixes such as *-жон*, *-хон*, *-бек* that express the meaning of respect in Uzbek. But in English adding to a person's name words such as *Mr.*, *Mrs.*, *Miss* expressing the same meaning would increase speech efficiency. This linguistic phenomenon is interpreted with the fact that the Uzbek language is considered to be in a group of agglutinative languages and English is included into the analytical languages group. Thus in major cases suffixes are mainly added to a word in Uzbek, meanwhile in English this linguistic phenomenon is seldom used.

Adding diminutive and affectionate affixes, possessive pronoun of the first person singular to the words expressing relatives such as *ака*, *она*, *ука* (brother, sister) in Uzbek as well as using them before names (*Ботир+жон укам*, *опоқи+жон*) surely increases effectiveness of speech. The words of relatives in this language are even used to unfamiliar people, but in English they are only used to relatives (*auntie, daddy*).

⁵ Габуниа З., Башиева С. Риторика как часть традиционной культуры. – Нальчик, ЭЛЬФА, 1993. – С. 3-77.

In dialogic rhetoric personal pronouns have a significant role. Using the plural forms of the pronoun *you / siz* is positively approved in rhetoric aspect of both languages.

In researched languages any kind of word can be used as a basic word (word that can be a reason in impressing a person). Using the auxiliary verb *do* or the word *just* before the main verb in English, adding the adverbs and adjectives such as *жуда, қаттиқ, роҳа* to the verbs in Uzbek increases efficiency of speech. In Uzbek repeated words (*қани-қани, олинг-олинг, келинг-келинг*) have significance in speech expressiveness, but in English this linguistic phenomenon does not exist. Equivalents for this kind of words in English can be a word, a word combination or a phrase (such as *welcome, help yourself*). Using unnecessary words (such as *well, so, just / анаҳа, тавба, астаффуриллоҳ*) repeatedly in dialogic rhetoric in both languages decreases effectiveness of the communication.

In dialogic rhetoric except a word a word combination, a sentence and a text can also be used as a basic linguistic unit in persuading, involving, reassuring a person in a certain issue in both languages. In researched languages efficiency can be increased by different means in declarative, interrogative, imperative, exclamatory sentences, rhetoric questions and conditional subordinate clause. Stressing the addressing and introductory words in these languages one can strengthen the effectiveness of speech. Interrogative sentences are considered to be more effective during communication process rather than declarative sentences. Unlike the English the Uzbeks often use advising words in the texts while making an impact on a listener.

Relative words are mainly expressed in Uzbek (as *опоқижон, амакижон, укажон*) while words of respect in English (as *sir, Mrs., dear*) increase speech efficiency by stressing addressing words. This linguistic phenomenon depicts the differential sides of dialogic rhetoric in these languages.

The significance of stylistic devices such as metaphor, metonymy, epiphora, repetition, hyperboly, alliteration, inversion, paraphrase, gradation, antithesis, litote, epithet, ellipsis, oxymoron, simile in dialogic rhetoric are revealed and scientifically approved with the help of speech patterns in both languages.

For instance, **simile** is a stylistic device that expresses similarity and exaggerates the same quality of an object comparing to the second one. This linguistic phenomenon is based on the likeness between two objects or happenings⁶. It is expressed by adding the conjunctions *like, as* in English and suffixes *-дек, -дай* are added to the part of speech such as noun and pronoun in Uzbek. As well as the words *эъё, каби сингари, монанд* are used in simile. For example:

Alan blew the pipe. Robin then repeated Alan's music and corrected some parts of it. Then Alan began again. Robin used the same tune.

⁶ Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. 5 жилдли. – Т.: «Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси» Давлат илмий нашриёти, 2008. Ж. 5. – Б. 185; Шомаксудов А., Расулов И., Қўнғуров Р. Рустамов Х. Ўзбек тили стилистикаси. – Т.: Ўқитувчи, 1983. – Б. 239.

«Enough!» he said. «You can play the pipes. Now we will try something else». He got up to fight... «Robin Oig», he said. «You are a great piper! You are much better than me. I think I am better with the sword than you. But if we fought, **I could not kill a good piper like you!**»

The quarrel had now ended. All night they played and ate and drank⁷.

Филҳол эрини ийдириш йўлини тутиб, унга илиқ муомалада амр берди:

– Барака топгур, ҳалиям бўлса қўғирчоқ одам опчиқиб ўрнатинг. Сиздан нима кетди? **Карнайчидан бир пуф дегандай гап-ку, ахир!** Бир сафар хўп деяқолинг?!..

Расул ака гапни кўнам чўзиб ўтирмай, унинг амрини вожиб қилишни афзал билди:

– Хўп, қўғирчоқ одамни шу бугуноқ қўндириб қўяман⁸.

In the former example the sentence *I could not kill a good piper like you* was used to persuade the listener to calm down. In the latter pattern the sentence *Карнайчидан бир пуф дегандай гап-ку, ахир* was used in persuading the listener.

All sounding means that are not excepted as linguistic units, and have a significant importance in transferring information to the members of communication are called *paraphonetic means*. For instance, pronouncing a sound in a very soft tone in dialogic rhetoric one can obtain a suspected results of communication. Here is the speech:

«Wormtail will get us drinks», said Snape. «I am not your servant!» he squeaked, avoiding Snape's eye. «Really? I was under the impression that the Dark Lord placed you here to assist me.» «To assist, yes – but not to make you drinks...» «I had no idea, Wormtail, that you were craving more dangerous assignments», said **Snape silkily**. «This can be easily arranged: I shall speak to the Dark Lord.» Wormtail hesitated for a moment... within seconds he was back, bearing a dusty bottle and three glasses upon a tray⁹.

– Тўйда сени Ёқуб кўрган экан, – деди йиғи аралаш онам. – Тегмасанг бўлмайди.

– Нега ахир? Ким экан мени мажбурлаб хотин қилиб оладиган?..Мен тегмайман унга!

... Ёқуб кириб келди.

– Сиз... сиз..., – дея олдим титраб-қақшаб...

– Ўзингизни босинг, Латофатхон, – деди Ёқуб... – Қўрқманг, – **дея секин товушда юпата бошлади у мени...** – Сизни бир кўришдаёқ ёқтириб қолдим... Мана шу ҳовли-жойни сенинг номингга расмийлаштираман. Шу жой сеники! Тагинда машина, истаган жойингга олиб боради...

⁷ Stevenson R.L. Kidnapped. – England: Longman, 1993. – P. 84.

⁸ Аббос Саид. Беш кунлик дунё. – Т.: Шарк, 1996. – Б. 26.

⁹ Rowling J.K. Harry Potter. – New York: Scholastic inc., 2005. – P. 24.

...охири шоҳона ҳаёт ҳақидаги ваъдалар таъсирида бўшаидим, Ёқубники бўлдим...¹⁰

Pronouncing sounds softly in a mandative tone, expressing phrases in a begging and pleasing tone are also approved in the rhetoric aspect of both languages. Unlike in English, adding vowel sounds such as *-a*, *-e*, *-я*, *-ю* to the end of the last word surely increases the persuasiveness of speech in the Uzbek language.

Different approaches of local and foreign scholars to the term *gender* are theoretically analyzed in this paragraph. From our point of view the linguistic term *gender* is a reflection of men and women's world of view, culture and etiquette in their speech and language. In this paragraph the linguistic means that have a significant role in decreasing effectiveness of women's speech are analyzed in English and Uzbek.

In both languages women achieve a speech efficiency by pleasing, asking politely (*Please, Geordie, just for me, Geordie / Ҳамида бону ёшли кўзларини Ҳумоюнга тикди. Йиғлаб илтижо қилди: «Бу қандай кўргулик?»*). They use repetition, exclamatory sentences in their speech (*will you enter... will you be there... Geordie... please, Geordie / ...мусулмонлар! Бу қандай кўргулик? Мен боламни хавф-хатарга қандай ташлаб кетгаймен, мусулмонлар!; Will you be there, Geordie? / Наҳотки Ҳиндустонни бутунлай тарк этсак? Please, Geordie! / Илтимос, асалим!*). Expressiveness is gradually increased in their speech (*You must win. You must beat that Weber. I shall wish it with all my heart! I want you to win, Geordie / ...менинг дилимда қанча орзулар бор эди... Зора ўғлимиз ҳам шу мамлакатга чин фарзандлик хизматини қилса. Наҳотки бу орзулар бари пуч чиқса!*).

Women of the both nations try to express their speech politely and softly, this way expressiveness in their speech is increased. In persuading they use terms of endearment, praising words (*laddie* – йигитча, *darling* – азизам, *you are very beautiful tonight* – сиз бугун жуда ҳам гўзалсиз каби). While using terms of endearment English women in major cases use noun phrases, Uzbek women use verbal phrases additional to noun phrases (such as *my love, sweet, honey / жоним, айланай, ўргилай*).

They often use paralinguistic means such as crying, pleasing (*«Have a mercy on me», she said cring / Ҳамида бону ёшли кўзларини Ҳумоюнга тикди. Йиғлаб илтижо қилди...*).

They also achieve a speech efficiency by giving advice (*You must be very gentle, David. Now you must try to bring each other happiness. Marriage is full of difficulties, David / Болам, укаларингга доим ибрат бўлгин, сен каттасан, уларни доимо тўғри йўлга бошлагин, жон болам. Мен энди кексайиб қолдим...*). This linguistic phenomenon is mostly used in Uzbek women's speech. They make very long sentences while giving advice and express their speech in whole texts. They remind the patterns taken from narrated stories and the religious book Hadis (such as *Ҳадисда шундай дейилган..., Қуронда бундай деб ёзилган...*). Meanwhile the English women make shorter sentences, they just speak to the point.

¹⁰Ибодинов А. «Латофат» дўкондаги қатл. – Т.: Шарқ, 2001. – Б. 106.

In dialogic rhetoric praying for the sake of a listener is mostly used by Uzbek women (such as *Худо хайрларингизни берсин, умринг узоқ бўлгур, барака топ*). This linguistic phenomenon is mostly used in older women's speech. English women rarely use these kind of phrases (such as *God bless you*).

English women try to make an impact on men by being angry and irritable. They can use *Black English* and foul language (*Hell with it. The hell with them*). Meanwhile Uzbek women mostly use cursing in their speech (*Қирон келсин илоё, ўша немисларга! Тур ўрнингдан-е. Э, башаранг қурсин*).

Moreover the Uzbek women make their speech more efficient by using phrases such as “*одамлар, қўшнилар нима дейди?*” (What do other people, neighbours say about it?). This linguistic phenomenon is not used by English women, in these cases they can use the phrase *shame on you*.

The men of both nations possess speech efficiency by bequesting and promising (*that is my last will... / бу менинг сенга қилган васиятим, ёдингда бўлсин... ; I promise... / ваъда бераман...*). They avoid of being sly, try to speak honestly, give real facts in their speech, they remind about financial support to a listener. This way they have an impact on their listeners (*I will pay for it..., I will support you financially..., I will loan the money, you needn't worry about taking it, I will help you / Мен турибман буёғизга..., мен тўлайман..., шу ишни қилсанг минг сўм бераман*).

In the relations between men and women the English men become too romantic; they can produce effect on women by singing a song or reading a poem (*«Oh my love is like a red red rose, That is newly sprung in June: O my love is like the melody, That is sweetly played in tune!»*¹¹). English men use a very wide range of their lexics while making women believe in their love (such as *you are my love, darling, I love you*). Though there are so many endearing words in Uzbek, Uzbek men are a little bit timid in making their lover believe in the love. They don't speak openly about their love.

English men widely use pleasing sentences while talking to women. Uzbek men prefer to be a bit proud in this situation and they don't use linguistic units that have a pleasing meaning.

In persuading English men frequently remind their listeners to behave like an English gentleman (*It is not the way of a gentletman; you ought never to offer your dirty money to a Highland gentleman*), meanwhile Uzbek men persuade, reassure a listener by reminding the characters of Uzbek men such as being confident, couragious and speaking only once (*Эркак киши битта гапирди, йигитлик сўзим..., сен эркаксан, эркакка ўхшаб гапир*).

Uzbek men always take into consideration the opinions and the interests of people, neighbours around them and remind the importance of them in their speech (*Одамлар, эшитганлар нима дейди?*). This linguistic phenomenon is not used by English men.

In both languages religious words and phrases, wishing good wishes, praying for the sake of a listener, advising are used (*God bless you..., be healthy... / умрингдан*

¹¹ Walker D. Geordie. – UK: Nelson, 1992. – P. 63.

барака топ..., Аллоҳим ўз паноҳида асрасин..., доимо иноқ бўлинглар, бир-бирингизни қўллаб-қувватланглар...). But this linguistic phenomenon is mainly used in Uzbek men's speech.

Different lifestyle, religion, culture and other factors that are related to these both nations reflect the existence of national gender peculiarities in dialogic rhetoric.

On the basis of the research analysis we come to the following conclusions:

In the West the art of speaking was initially formed from the speeches of sophists (teachers), but in the East it began from the speeches of preachers (people reading a king's verdict to public). Rhetoric has historical development stages, it is considered to change constantly.

Though rhetoric is interpreted as public speech, any kind of speech, including dialogic speech can be a studying object of rhetoric.

As rhetoric studies the ways of achieving speech efficiency, it depicts the means that serve to increase the efficiency of the English and Uzbek dialogic speech. In Uzbek in majority cases suffixes are added to the words in achieving speech efficiency but in English this linguistic phenomenon is expressed by adding certain words to another word. In English the words expressing respect, in Uzbek the words with relative meaning are mainly used.

Expression of stylistic devices has a significant role in dialogic rhetoric. Stylistic devices such as metonymy, anaphora, epiphora, inversion, paraphrase, hyperboly, ellipsis, gradation, antithesis and other stylistic devices, phraseological units are used in speech according to the aim of speech in both languages.

In dialogic rhetoric there are different and common sides in English and Uzbek men and women's speech. The impact of western and eastern culture on forming these languages is reflected on dialogic rhetoric too.

Praying for the sake of a listener, bequeathing, advising, swearing, promising, pleasing, reminding about financial support and names of dishes, endorsing, reminding the laws, rules and peoples opinion, making people feel sorry, telling lies, caressing, respecting, praising, speaking on religious topics are considered to be the most frequently used topics in dialogic rhetoric. The usage frequency of the linguistic means referred to these topics in the researched languages differ from each other.

In the dialogic rhetoric of both languages linguistic means that express negative meaning are used in foul language, while insulting, cursing, frightening, threatening. English speaking women in majority cases use foul language, in Uzbek women's speech cursing is constantly expressed.

Variety of the following factors such as living conditions, geographic location, history, religious beliefs, culture, customs and traditions, national values, national character, national food, educational and upbringing basic principles, internal rules and laws of the area they live in and other factors are considered to be the main reasons for existence of national peculiarities of dialogic rhetoric in both languages. As well as it depends on how these two nations interpret the concept *culture*. This phenomenon approves once again the existence of connection between language and culture.

References

1. Каримов И.А. Баркамол авлод – Ўзбекистон тараққиётининг пойдевори. Баркамол авлод орзуси. – Т.: Шарқ, 1997. – Б. 15.
2. Judith A. The Genre of Logic and Artifice: Dialectic, Rhetoric, and English Dialogues. – Dissertation for Achieving PhD. – Toronto, Toronto university, 1998. – 280 p.;
3. Арипова А.Х. Нотиклик нутқининг лисоний-услубий воситалари: Филол. фан. номз. ...дис. – Тошкент: ЎзРФА, Алишер Навоий номидаги Тил ва адабиёт институти, 2002. – 170 б.
4. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1969. – С. 389.
5. Габуния З., Башиева С. Риторика как часть традиционной культуры. – Нальчик, ЭЛЬФА, 1993. – С. 3-77.
6. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. 5 жилдли. – Т.: «Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси» Давлат илмий нашриёти, 2008. Ж. 5. – Б. 185; Шомаксудов А., Расулов И., Қўнғуров Р. Рустамов Ҳ. Ўзбек тили стилистикаси. – Т.: Ўқитувчи, 1983. – Б. 239.
7. Stevenson R.L. Kidnapped. – England: Longman, 1993. – P. 84.
8. Аббос Саид. Беш кунлик дунё. – Т.: Шарқ, 1996. – Б. 26.
9. Rowling J.K. Harry Potter. – New York: Scholastic inc., 2005. – P. 24.
10. Ибодинов А. «Латофат» дўконидаги қатл. – Т.: Шарқ, 2001. – Б. 106.
11. Walker D. Geordie. – UK: Nelson, 1992. – P. 63.