

## Expressing Of Deixis In Spatial Reference

Ishanjanova Munosibkhon Saidakhmadovna<sup>1</sup>, Mirzayeva Nargizoy Sanjarovna<sup>2</sup>, Dadajonov Oybek Zokirjonovich<sup>3</sup>, Ziyayeva Shokhodat Nurmatovna<sup>4</sup>, Madrakhimova Muborak Abdurasulovna<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Andijan State Institute of Foreign languages, (Uzbekistan)

<sup>2</sup>Andijan Institute of Economics and Construction

<sup>3</sup>Fergana State University, (Uzbekistan)

<sup>4</sup>The Uzbekistan State of the World Languages University

<sup>5</sup>University of World Economy and Diplomacy

**How to cite this article:** Ishanjanova Munosibkhon Saidakhmadovna, Mirzayeva Nargizoy Sanjarovna, Dadajonov Oybek Zokirjonovich, Ziyayeva Shokhodat Nurmatovna, Madrakhimova Muborak Abdurasulovna (2024). Expressing Of Deixis In Spatial Reference. *Library Progress International*, 44(3), 13547-13553.

### Abstract

This article explores the expression of deixis in spatial reference, analyzing how speakers use linguistic elements to position objects and individuals within space. Through a comparative study of various languages, we identify the strategies employed to indicate proximity and distance, as well as their impact on contextual understanding. The findings highlight the significance of spatial deixis in communication, offering insights into its role in human interaction and cognition. By examining how spatial reference shapes meaning-making processes, this analysis aims to deepen our understanding of the underlying mechanisms of spatial expression and its influence on interpretive frameworks. Ultimately, this study contributes to the broader field of linguistics by elucidating the complex interplay between language, thought, and social interaction in the construction of spatial awareness.

**Keywords:** *deixis, spatial reference, proximity, distance, contextual understanding, linguistic strategies*

**Introduction.** M.L.Makarov is considered one of the proponents of the "communicosentric" approach, noting its pragmatic properties, such as presupposition, proposition, reference, expectation, inference, implicature, relevance, when describing the content of the text[1.289]. The referential nature of the text is counted in relation to the theory of Deixis. U.Montagu according to the stanzas, deictic phrases (such as "I", "You", "Here", "Now"), which are considered the subject of research in pragmatics, are significant in revealing the content of the text[2.380-389]. The phenomenon of Deixis attracts special attention in colloquial structures with meanings referring to personality, space, time. From them, the deictic units that represent space (like here, there) evoke a clear idea of a certain spatial range in the spatial reference.

Reference theory has been studied controversially by scientists. The reference generates the composition of the semantic theory, initially using studied by Frege. As a scientist studies semantic theory, he studies it in three ways, determining the order of three elements: sign, meaning and content[3.511]. A character or name reflects content using meaning. The meaning of the word is the name being pronounced, the content is the subject itself. Names with different uses may also have one meaning. For example, the name "Aristotle" means teacher of Macedonski. Nouns come by expressing a clearly existing subject and object in existence. There are also simple names such as "Pegas", "Gogas", "Odysseus", which are claimed to have meaning but not meaning[4.41].

But B. Russell wrote that criticising Frege's semantic theory, he argues that proverbial nouns are poorly used in everyday speech, and that the referent of proverbial nouns cannot be explicitly a singular object or a singular person. The Uzbek linguist Sh.Safarov also noted that if the referent of noble horses is considered a solitary person. We cannot understand in the context that Russell is the author of "Principa matematica", since B.Russell states that he is a co-author in this work[4.260]. From the views of scientists, in the theory of reference, it turned out that noun hide in themselves a certain meaning and meaning, which makes it necessary to study them more broadly in terms of content.

B.Russell uses a propositional logic function to reveal the reference. He says "I met a man" (referring to meeting some specific person here), "I met X and X is a man", while X is replaced by some name — the substance of the

proposition is true, acknowledging that the proposition is false if the name is not applied[4.260].

According to Dammit, semantic theory studies language relations along with referencing. Only when the relationship is correct does it determine whether the content of the sentence coincides with the authenticity of the meaning, that is, the reality of the meaning in speech, and, according to it, the core of the theory of meaning, which determines the validity of the sentences, is explained by the fact that the "reference theory" constitutes[5.112-227]. The reference theory is defined as the attitude, dependence of the nominative linguistic units included in speech on the object in existence, and the content of the reference phenomenon includes the concepts of the speaker's purpose, emotion, direction of speech, knowledge of interlocutors, intention of linguistic activity[4.38]. The word and other linguistic units serve, above all, to name, express the object and phenomenon being intended for use in speech. Meaning is considered a phenomenon that reflects the relationship of language units with reality, the relationship of reference language units with the object.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS** . The difference in conceptions G.Frege and B.Russell's is that G.Frege believes that noun and sema are synonymous concepts, with nouns revealing the denotative content of an object using meaning. Russell's theory, on the other hand, does not reflect medial content, but solves in it the problems of abstract meaning arising from the discussions of phrases as signs of specific constituents of propositions.

Later S.A.Kripke, in the process of researching the reference, distinguishes it as the text and linguistic intention of the speech of the speaker, and the second – as a linguistic convention [6.340-376].

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** . The pragmatic concepts of reference are studied in the language into semantic, nominative and deictic theories. They differ according to which type of relationship the connection between the language unit and the object being recorded enters.

In semantic theory, reference expands at the expense of nouns with nouns. B.Russell brought to linguistics the idea that proverbial nouns have a latent descriptive property, and argues that their denotation is treated as a single subject[7.260].

In deictic theory, the content of the reference will consist of signs referring to the subject. For example, in the phrase "this book", the statement " This " is considered significant in clarifying the reference. Sh.Safarov acknowledges that the phrase can be used in different cases in relation to different objects and represent different meanings. In this, the fact that referents also change states that they define an object in a certain reality, although they are not exactly an alternative to its meaning[4.38].

In modern linguistics, an intential approach to reference theory is concerned, and it is understood that reference is not a word, but that the speaker refers to exactly the object using expressions in the language. In this case, the act of reference is generated and a specific unit of language contains the reference. The modern view of reference theory is determined by the developing pragmatics. In the current state of this theory, not relying on the category of general cognition, the communicative orientation of the speaker, his attitude towards the context is studied.

In the text, reference is determined on the basis of three factors. a) syntactic, b) meaning-logic, C) pragmatic[8]. According to the syntactic factor, nouns are divided into: referential and nonreferential. They have a referential position and perform filler functions. In the predicate case, the nonreferent is applied and shows not the object, but the qualities inherent in the object. For example: Abdullah Qadiri is a writer. In the example, the noun phrase "writer", while used in a non-productive cross-sectional function, also retains the meaning of the character.

The factor of meaning-logic is related to the belonging of noun expressions to an object: reference refers to a piece of a sentence or to a class of objects, class symbols, to the whole class, to the desired representative of the class, as nonpotential objects belong to a piece of the class. For example: a reference that combines linguistic units in the form of a capital city " Tashkent", a recreation area " Oqtosh", a park " Navoi " into one class is a feature of spatial notification.

Within the types of reference, the pragmatic factor is distinguished by the attitude of the interlocutor to knowledge. In this, the features of predetermines, locality, temporality of this reference occupy a special place in the analysis of the text. The task of local reference is to place the object and subject in a certain space. The local pointing properties of the reference have the following classification:

a) it is clear that both the listener and the speaker have a conversation about a certain space reference: the book is here.

b) to have a conversation about a space known only to the speaker (known only to the speaker, not reflected in the speaker's imagination) is a semi-definite reference: there is a book here.

C) vague reference in a conversation about space unknown to both the listener and the speaker: he had seen the

book somewhere[9.].

1-jadval

Location of speaker and listener by space[9.]:

Speaker	Listener	Reference types
+	+	explicit reference
+	-	semi-definite reference
-	-	uncertain reference.

As reference is viewed as a concept within pragmatics, it is not devoid of the following semantic contradictions: these are known/unknown to the speaker, alternative/imperfect analysis, etc.k. For this reason, the means of reference implementation almost every time form the core of the deictic and egocentric elements in the language. For example, in French, there is one concept "ici" to indicate a more recent space, and two concepts "là", "là-bas", when referring to a distant space. While these deictics clarify the imagination according to the distance/proximity of the spatial reference, such raves of space as "dehors", "dedans", "là-bas" in terms of visibility and invisibility, "ici" rave will also be invisible space to the listener outside the limits of emotional perception if space is referred to in a telephone conversation.

The author's participation in the text refers to the participation of the listener as well. Consequently, the speaker's point of view in any text arises as a result of the syntactic and semantic relations of elements in the language. In this, deictic units occupy a special place, they are directly involved in the reference. That is, they are used to indicate the similarity of parts of personality, tense, space.

When classifying diactic units, they are compared to other words that express full meaning, and then their function in context is analyzed.

Words expressing the full meaning form a proposition in a sentence, with the deictic units applied within that proposition, serving to reveal the speaker's hidden goals.

Another of the peculiarities of deixis is their arrival in different tasks in the structure of speech. U.Kuain calls this a mixed display. The scientist notes that in this, the object being shown and the reference in the deictic expression are incompatible. Miller clarifies the mixed showing by giving the following example. From the restaurant's office: "where did he go?" he asked. In this example, the scientist points out that " he " refers not to a person, but to an ordered dish, that is, to something[10.83]. As we know, the use of deictic signs in speech serves as a reference to some information related to the internal purpose of the referent. The mixed display above, on the other hand, is certainly not understood in the composition of a particular sentence, but in the context of the text.

The speech process is a complex phenomenon that requires the speaker to correctly understand the perceived event in order to correctly apply the act of speaking. Dj.Austin argues that " the more thoughts there are in the process of speaking, the more action will take place. We commit certain actions, and by committing actions, we divide the content into groups. These, of course, are performed intact. By saying something, we do something, which includes sounds, word devices, Bayonet meanings that have certain content and reference." [10.83]

A.Doroshenko distinguishes four types of semiological structure according to the presence of the speaker's "I" in the content of speech. These are: the act of speaking(locus), the proposition, the intention of the speaker(illoclusia), and the oratory effect (perlocusia). Dj.Austin, on the other hand, divides the substantive structure of expression into three types: the act of articulation, the intention of the speaker, and the oratory effect. The scientist delimits the propositional Act by considering it not to belong to the structure of the pragmatic act. The terms locus, localization are considered significant in pragmatic theory. In this case we believe that the Dj.Austin classification is appropriate.

Yu.Stepanov admits that the locus follows the trinity as "I", "here", "now". The process of speech communication consists of a central "i" and the speaker's "I" from a spatial, temporal relation. "I" is considered a subject of speech, but participates in the speech process under its own name, from which the word " I " is considered an authoritative word in reference application. "Here" is defined as the place of the subject defining his "I", "now" as the time of speech of the object defining his "I". These three basic word markers alternate in their initial function with a simple indicative. Locus signs can also be called index-signs" . From the opinions of the scientist, M.Hakimov is included among the pragmatic concepts of the locus and recognizes the "I" of the subject of speech and the expression of unity in space and time[11.25].

The subject consciousness is considered the main form in determining the referential status in the text. For the

realization of the concept that occurs in the mind in the text, all linguistic phenomena also give rise to the need to use the phenomenon of Deixis. This is clarified by (a) the definition of the addressee relation to Deixis in texts, (B) the relation of the Deixis of space and time in texts, (C) the phenomenon of grammaticalization, that is, the taking of a grammatical form so that the speech structure has full content.

The analysis of the text, especially the artistic text, from a communicative point of view is associated with some difficulties, since in the artistic text some acts of oral speech do not apply in their original way. They are replaced by referents. From this it can be seen that reference theory is inherent in narrative (the original use of the acts of oral speech) linguistics, since, above all, the equality of the meanings of the specified objects in the speech act constitutes one of the main conditions in the connection of parts of the text.

A distinctive feature of denotative words in reference is that, whether the concept represented by the word remains virtual or actualized in speech, despite this, their semantics evokes a clear subjective imagination in those who know that language. A distinctive semiological feature of such words is the interrelation of the sign form by significate and denotate, along with the real event.

French scientist E. Benveniste points out that "realism" in the relationship between "I" and "you", which is merely "speech realism", states that "I" can only be identified in the process of speech, not in terms of objects such as the noun marker. "I" — denotes the person who executes "I", he admits [16.262].

Given the very broad meaning of "I", "you", "now", "here" and similar sign combinations, the speaker in "I", the listener in "you", the time when the event "now" occurred, "here" is built on the concept of referring to the space in which the person or object is located, but such signs form neither an extended nor typified concept in their content. Pronouns, rhymes do not form a single referent, since the number of "I" referents refers to the infinite number of individuals who can be subjects of a speech relationship at the same time. But it is not correct to say that such "empty" words have no meaning in the language system [17.206]. In contrast, the deictic units denoting "I" — the subject of speech, "you" — the listening person, "now" — the time of the event, "here" — the space are generalized according to the sign of the sign. An object with a denotative relation that forms the meaning interacts with its deictics that refer to it. According to this, the deictic units and their referents can only be defined in the specific case in a concurrent speech relation. For example: here, there, outside, without text, the objective position of the utterances, such as inside, cannot be shown. But in addition to the text from the deictic units, such concepts as "here" — the space in which the speech is being made, "there" — the space in addition to the speech of the speaker, are also understood. The category of spatial display units: (a) semantic, (b) differentiated according to their functional-structural character, and expressed through position patterns and display pronouns in the underlying microsystem, has been determined by multiple linguists [18.208].

A. Ufimtseva notes that the commonality in the semantics of these two microsystems is that they are all characterized by the fact that individuals and objects move away from the center of the speech space, divided into objects located "near" and "far" [17.206]. While the scholar states that the raves "here" and "there" are characterized according to their above properties, but no objective space expresses distancing: "here" says that the space in which the speaker exists, "there" denotes the space in the listener's circle. In his view, both deictic units are applied not to far/near, but to the clarification of the spaces in which the speaker and the listener exist. It can be seen from this that such spatial reference units interact with different loci in the text, limiting themselves to the general meanings of spatial expressions to form their referents. Lexically-semantically delimitation of deictic units in spatial reference has been defined in the following expressions of meaning [17.206].

1) presentative meaning in French, *“Monsieur le directeur, voilà les petits Pasquier. — Bien, dit le gros homme. Charge-toi du plus jeune. Je vais m’occupe de l’autre.”* [19.74]. In Uzbek, — *G’anishev meni mana shu yerda ot [20.20]!* Display in French as part of pronouns *voici, voilà*, in Uzbek *y ep, oy ep, uy ep, yua ep* co-applicator with adverbs *mana, ana* the words spatial presentative meaning demonstrate a property. In examples *voici* and *mana uy epda* the M. Dykes have meant such a thing. 2) a clear point on the surface: in French, — *Des meubles? reprit-elle. Ceux qui sont ici? Oui, oui, je vois ce que c’est* [19.114]. In Uzbek, — *Ra’noxon kelinim Shomurodga yalakat danakdek yopishib olgan ekan. Vokzalga borganda bo’yniga chirmashib oldi. Qani qo’yib yuborsa. Yakkash meniyam obketing, deb chirqillaydi. O’zim-ku, Kimsanim bilan xuddi shu yerda xayrlashganim esimga tushib yuragim ob bo’lib ketyapti. Ilojim qancha? Kelinimni yupatdim!* [21.154] In French and Uzbek, the spatial deictics representing the close refer to the exact point of the speaker space as it takes logical stress in the examples. 3) space bounded by the colloquial state: in French, *“Désiré, fis-je, elle est là!”* In Uzbek, — *Nima qilamiz, qizg’aldoqmi, tog’mi? — Shu yerda qolovramiz, tog’da nima bor, quruq tosh-da? — Murodali aka hammaning*

*nomidan gapirdi*[22.34]. As reflected in the examples, the spatial limit of the speaker, the listener, is determined in relation to the time and the state of speech in which the conversation takes place.

4) place of residence of participants in speech: in French, *Je m'assis délicatement sur le canapé garanti dix ans. D'ici peu, j'appellerais Eleanor à New York et je lui arracherais une invitation*[23.40]. In Uzbek, — *Xoy, belingda belbog'ing bormi o'zi, yigitlarimiz u yoqda qorga botib yuribdi. Sen bu yerda ketingni tanchaga tiqib yotibsan, endi bir juft etikniyam ayaydigan bo'ldingmi, nodon, — deb baqirgan edi, o'shanaqa qilg'iliq qilganlar ham topgan-tutganini olib chiqdi*[21.156]. The examples cited are in French *d'ici* in Uzbek *u yoqda, bu yerda* spatial deictic units refer to referents representing the habitat in the earlier part of the text.

Ch.Fillmore, on the other hand, identified three aspects of the use of these types of deictic symbols, the pronoun and the rhyming.

1) words that directly indicate that the objects are "near" or "far away", as sign-gestures: *Uni bu yerga qo'ying, bunisini u yerga.* (imo-ishora bilan ko'rsatish)

2) despite the fact that it is a given state or beyond, a certain information in itself, as a symbol(sign) that holds knowledge: *Boshliq shu yerdami?* (Telefondagi suhbatdan)

3) as indicating a whole relationship of parts of the speech process: *Qo'limni sekin bo'shatdim-u, o'sha zahoti ko'nglimga yana g'ulg'ula tushdi: poyezd kelib qolsa-chi? Bosib ketadi-ku! Husan buvam bilan Oqsoqol buvaga xuddi shu yerda ajina daf qilgan-da*[21.22].

In the application of the Ufimtseva space-indicative "here" and "there" statements, these two different points of view determine their following tasks, regardless of their meanings and functional aspects.

1) the main function of this word-sign is the subjective deactic separation of objects at the level of distance from the center of speech.

2) the broad meaning volume of pronouns and rhymes is determined by reference connectedness, changing from one same state to another, the nominator does not form the same sequential meaning structure, similar to that in Word characters. The nondeictic use of " here "and" there " rhymes is explained by their role as substitutes .

But it seems to us that, although from a semantic point of view, pronouns and raves have the role of substituents, in spatial reference pragmatically it serves to acquire a deactic meaning by reflecting the meaning of the sign.

In the context of the text, spatial expressions are inextricably linked with the reference mechanism. Spatial reference is characterized by the attitude of the expression reflected in speech to being. Since under the concept of reference it is understood that the exact observation and memory or imagination of the subject with the sensory organs of a person reflects this subject, it is necessary to take into account that the linguistic forms of units that reflect the subject in human perception are different. Also, spatial reference is illuminated by indexed words when delimiting various variable factors. In French, space is used to represent units. In his scientific research, Protasova places a special emphasis on the fact that " ici " (here) adverbs are units that refer to place in the real sense[22]. "Ici" (here) is understood as a word that has a deictic adverb content core and surrounds its periphery. The colloquial dialogue and textual discussions of these contents here encourage adverb to perceive the macro and micro world of people as an enveloping expression. This is the first function of the deictic adverb is the physical spatial representation. O.Seliverstova points out that the meaning of space is broad in modern linguistics, treating space as a concept that refers to the shell of human activity. The scientist admits that the concept of space applies not only as a physical space, but also to other state spaces, such as a function system space, such as "school", "enterprise"[23.142-150].

In French, "ici"(here) makes it easy to describe and perceive the state of activities in a metaphorical space. A.Ivanova believes that " ici " (here) refers to some global semantic space series as a category of space in speech and text. The anaphoric function of pronoun pointing words expands not only the spatial location, but also the range of words exchanged in the text and contributes to the change in their basic meanings[24.67-71].

The referential content of the B.Protasova "ici" (here) clarifies the possibilities of expressing the following semantic meanings according to the spatial relation: a) tense, b) case, s) social, g) textual, d) colloquial. This classification of the scientist indicates that the main task of these deictic meanings is to closely connect the connections of space between the referent and the sign of sign in the text[25].

In Uzbek, when the reference to space stops in the singular, the emphasis is on the place-raves, as in French. But in Uzbek, the raves referring to a more recent space are different, differing from each other in subtle edges of meaning. For example: the rhymes " here " and " over here " refer to a more recent space. Since this type of adverb is a joint adverb, it is intended to focus on the display pronouns that they contain. In Uzbek grammar,

this is shown to be ambivalent according to the meanings of the same demonstrative pronouns[26.339]:

- (a) concrete show pronouns: that, those,
- (b) non-concrete demonstrative pronouns: he, it.

In Uzbek language, a reference to space is made up of concrete demonstrative pronouns—this land, represented by that land joint rhymes, is understood as a space known in advance to the speaker and the listener. For example, *Mana, Anya mendan yoshi katta, u ham yolg'iz, uning ham qizi Rossiyaga turmushga chiqib ketib qolgan. "Kel", desa, ham bu "yo'q" deydi. Shu yerda tug'ildim, shu yerda yashadim, shu yerda o'laman, deydi, qurmag'ur*[27.7]. From this example, a space is envisaged here, which is known to both the speaker and the listener at the same time. *Ustozlar taklifi va qistovi bilan o'sha yerda o'qituvchi bo'lib qoldim*[27.178]. In this example, a previously known space is meant there, which was previously mentioned in the text.

The spatial ravines representing the concrete mean are dual according to distance and close-distance of time, and in representing the position are as follows:

- a) the same land is a reference to a recent space to the speaker of ravishi: I stand here (the space in which the speaker is showing or the space in which the speaker spoke about the same place before and reminds at the same time),
- b) that land is a reference to a distant object or space from the speaker of the ravishi: go there. In this example, there are two types: 1) the previously spoken space i.e. to remind it now, 2) the meanings of pointing by hand or head to a space far beyond the speaker are understood[28.26].

Concretely non-demonstrative pronoun joint rhymes are distinguished by referring to an indefinite space.

This is applied to indicate the space near the speaker, which is known only in the process of speaking, without prior knowledge of the adverb of space: *Kecha yana bir voqea bo'ldi. Tongotar payti Krasnogorsk degan qishloqqa kirib bordik. O'rischasiga Qiziltog' degani ekan. Bu yerda tog'ning o'zi yo'q* [29.210].

The pronoun it also indicates a space away from the speaker, which is known in the process of articulation but does not exist at the time of articulation: *Endi u yerda bolalarning bir o'zlari turishlari nojoiz*[28.202].

The referents of the space daisy, as seen in both languages, are defined in the text. The deixis of space comes in the text with reference to spatial references. The broader study of diactic units is central to the full coverage of spatial reference relationships to spatial deictic units.

**Conclusions.** The study of semiological structures in speech, as articulated by A. Doroshenko and J. Austin, highlights the nuanced interplay between the speaker's self-reference and the communicative context. The classifications presented—focusing on the act of speaking, the speaker's intention, and the resulting oratory effect—underscore the importance of pragmatic elements such as deixis in understanding language use. The contributions of scholars like Yu. Stepanov and M. Hakimov further elaborate on the spatial and temporal dimensions of speech, emphasizing the roles of "I," "here," and "now" as essential components of communicative acts.

The analysis reveals that spatial deixis not only serves to anchor the speaker and listener within a shared context but also shapes the referential landscape of discourse. By examining the specific functions of deictic units across languages, including French and Uzbek, we see how they facilitate the connection between linguistic signs and their meanings in context.

Overall, this study into deictic expressions enriches our understanding of linguistic pragmatics and the intricate ways in which language constructs meaning within specific contexts.

#### REFERENCE:

1. Makarov M.L. Foundations of Discourse Theory. — Moscow: Gnosis, 2003. — P. 280.
2. Pavilyonis R. Understanding Speech and the Philosophy of Language. In: New Developments in Foreign Linguistics. Vol. XVII. — Moscow: Progress, 1986. — P. 380-389.
3. Frege G. Logic and Logical Semantics: Collection of Works. — Moscow: Aspect Press, 2000. — P. 511.
4. Safarov Sh. Semantics. — Tashkent: Uzbekistan National Encyclopedia, 2013. — P. 41.
5. Dammit M. What is the Theory of Meaning. In: Philosophy. Logic. Language. — Moscow: Progress, 1987. — P. 127-212.
6. Safarov Sh. Semantics. — Tashkent: Uzbekistan National Encyclopedia, 2013. — P. 38.
7. Kripke S. Identity and Necessity // New Developments in Contemporary Linguistics. Vol. 13: Logic and Linguistics (Problems of Reference). — Moscow: Raduga, 1982. — P. 340-376.

8. Russell B. Selected Works // Introductory Article by V.A. Suvorcev; Translated from English by V.V. Tselisheva, V.A. Suvorcev. — Novosibirsk: Siberian University Press, 2009. — P. 260.
9. N.D. Arutyunova. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. <http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/411a.html> (Accessed: 04.04.2019).
10. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary <http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/411a.html> (Accessed: 04.04.2019).
11. Austin J. The Word as Action. NZL. Vol. XVII. — Moscow: Progress, 1986. — P. 83.
12. Hakimov M. Foundations of Uzbek Pragmalinguistics. — Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2013. — P. 25.
13. Benvenist E. General Linguistics. — Moscow: URSS, 2002. — P. 262.
14. Ufimtseva A.A. Types of Verbal Signs. — Moscow: Nauka, 1977. — P. 206.
15. Shermatov A. The Expression of Deixis in English Scientific-Technical Texts: Philol. Sci. Candidate Thesis Abstract. — Tashkent, 2008.
16. Georges Duhamel. The Notary of Le Havre. — Merrure de France, 1933. — P. 74.
17. Togay Murod. The Fields Left by My Father. — Tashkent: Sharq, 1994. — P. 24.
18. Georges Duhamel. The Notary of Le Havre. — Merrure de France, 1933. — P. 74.
19. O'tkir Hashimov. Between Two Doors. — Tashkent: Sharq, 2012. — P. 154.
20. Ulughbek Hamdam. Balance. — Tashkent: Sharq, 2007. — P. 34.
21. Christine Arnothy. A Tailored Paradise. — Paris: Editions Grasset & Faquelle, 1983. — P. 40.
22. Protasova B.B. Spatial Deixis in French and Buryat Languages. [www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/6-2/39.html](http://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/6-2/39.html) (Accessed: 07.03.2020).
23. Seliverstova O.N. The Concepts of "Multiplicity" and "Space" in Syntax Semantics // Izv. RAN. Ser. Lit. and Lang. Vol. 42. No. 2, 1983. — P. 142-150.
24. Ivanova A.N. The Words "There" - "Here" in Written and Oral Speech // Russian Language in School No. 1 — Moscow, 1990. — P. 67-71.
25. Protasova B.B. Spatial Deixis in French and Buryat Languages. [www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/6-2/39.html](http://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/6-2/39.html) (Accessed: 07.03.2020).
26. Uzbek Language Grammar. — Tashkent: Fan Publishing House, 1975. — P. 339.
27. Hamroev M.A. Functional-Semantic Features of Demonstrative Pronouns in Modern Uzbek Language. — Tashkent, 2009. — P. 26.
28. Abdullah Qahhor. Horror. — Tashkent: Sharq, 2012. — P. 210.
29. Rahmanova, G., & Ekşi, G. (2023). English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Uzbekistan: Views on Effectiveness, Career Prospects and Challenges. **World Journal of English Language**, 13(5), p458. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n5p458>
30. Rahmanova, G., Ekşi, G., Shahabitdinova, S., Nasirova, G., Sotvoldiyev, B., & Miralimova, S. (2024). Enhancing Writing Skills with Social Media-Based Corrective Feedback. **World Journal of English Language**, 15(1), p252. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n1p252>
31. Rahmanova, G., & Shahabitdinova, S. (2024). English Language Policy And Language Planning In Uzbekistan Context: Challenges And Considerations. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(6), 3043-3046.