

**DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES AND COMMUNICATIVE FUNCTIONS OF HUMOR AND
JOKES**

*Independent researcher at Urganch State University
named after Abu Rayhan Beruni
Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences (PhD)
Baydjanova Iroda Abdullayevna*

Abstract: This scientific article analyzes the discursive strategies and communicative functions of humor and jokes in their interrelation, based on the materials of Gafur Gulam's work "The Mischievous Boy." The main goal of the research is to develop a typology of discursive strategies that realize humor and jokes in literary discourse and to determine their communicative-pragmatic functions. Relying on modern achievements of pragmalinguistics, discourse analysis, and speech act theory, the article provides a comprehensive analysis of humor phenomena in "The Mischievous Boy." As a result of the research, five main discursive strategies of humor were identified: the strategy of unexpectedness, the strategy of inversion, the strategy of metaphorization, the strategy of pragmatic reinterpretation, and the strategy of intertextuality. Each of these strategies is proven to possess its own unique set of linguistic tools and discursive operations. Furthermore, ten communicative functions of humor in the discourse of "The Mischievous Boy" are classified: identification, positioning, crisis management, social criticism, denial, rapprochement, play, pedagogical, emotional, and cathartic functions. The article elaborates on the mechanisms of these functions within the text, their role in inter-character relations, and plot development. Through the analysis of English and Russian translations, patterns of preservation and transformation in the interlanguage transfer of discursive strategies and communicative functions have been identified. The research results serve not only to reveal new facets of Gafur Gulam's work but also to understand the pragmatic potential of humor in literary discourse in general, and to improve the methodology of teaching and translating it.

Keywords: discursive strategy, communicative function, humor, joke, pragmatics, speech act, "The Mischievous Boy", literary discourse, unexpectedness, inversion, intertextuality, identification, social criticism.

1. INTRODUCTION

Humor and jokes are an integral part of human communication, serving not only as a source of laughter and pleasure but also as a multifaceted discursive phenomenon performing complex social, psychological, and cultural functions. In recent years, the rapid development of pragmalinguistics and discourse analysis has sharply increased interest in studying humor and jokes not only from a semantic or cognitive perspective but also from a communicative-pragmatic one, that is, from the viewpoint of their strategic use and functional potential in real verbal communication. After all, any joke is a strategic choice aimed at achieving a specific communicative goal.

The concept of discursive strategy in modern linguistics is interpreted as the conscious or automatic selection and use of linguistic tools and methods by communicants to achieve their communicative goals (Van Dijk, 1997; Issers, 2008). Humor and jokes, in turn, represent a specific, often indirect and hidden form of the realization of these strategies. From this perspective, studying the discursive strategies of humor and the communicative functions realized through them is one of the pressing issues in linguistics.



Gafur Gulam's work "The Mischievous Boy" is an unparalleled source for investigating this problem. The entire speech activity of the protagonist – the mischievous boy – and his communication with the adult world are almost entirely based on humor. The boy employs various discursive strategies to achieve his communicative goals, defend his position, resist adults' demands, or mock them. These strategies become an integral part of the work's artistic and ideological structure, and their analysis holds significant importance not only for linguistics but also for literary studies, cultural studies, and pedagogy.

The relevance of the problem is determined by the following factors: Firstly, the issue of discursive strategies and communicative functions of humor has not been specifically and comprehensively studied in Uzbek linguistics, particularly on the materials of literary discourse. Existing research has mainly analyzed humor from a lexico-semantic or cognitive perspective, neglecting its pragmatic and strategic features.

Secondly, despite worldwide recognition of "The Mischievous Boy," its discursive structure and the strategic organization of the characters' speech have not been deeply analyzed from a linguistic standpoint. The English and Russian translations of the work provide an opportunity to study the interlanguage transformation of discursive strategies.

Thirdly, identifying and classifying the discursive strategies and communicative functions of humor has not only theoretical but also practical significance. This knowledge can be applied in fields such as language teaching methodology, translation theory and practice, conflictology, and the psychology of effective communication.

The aim of the research is to develop a typology of discursive strategies that realize humor in Gafur Gulam's "The Mischievous Boy," identify their communicative functions, and conduct a comparative analysis of the degree to which these strategies and functions are preserved in translations of the work.

Research objectives:

1. To determine the theoretical-methodological foundations of the concepts of discursive strategy and communicative function, and to establish their connection with humor;
2. To identify the discursive strategies of humor used in "The Mischievous Boy," classify them typologically, and describe the linguistic-discursive features of each strategy;
3. To identify the communicative functions realized through these strategies, classify them functionally, and analyze the mechanisms of their operation within the text;
4. To conduct a comparative-contrastive analysis of the preservation, modification, or loss of discursive strategies and communicative functions in the English and Russian translations.

The object of the research is Gafur Gulam's work "The Mischievous Boy" and its translation texts in English (translated by M. B. G. Dae) and Russian (translated by T. Sultanova et al.).

The subject of the research is the discursive strategies that realize humor in these texts and the communicative functions expressed through them.

The scientific novelty of the research lies in the fact that the discursive strategies of humor in "The Mischievous Boy" have been studied comprehensively and systematically for the first time; five main discursive strategies of humor have been identified, each described linguistically and pragmatically; ten communicative functions of humor in the discourse of "The Mischievous Boy" have been classified, and the mechanisms of their operation have been revealed; patterns of preservation of these strategies and functions in English and Russian translations have been determined.

The theoretical significance of the research lies in proposing a new conceptual model for the strategic-pragmatic study of humor in literary discourse; developing a typology of the relationships between discursive strategies and communicative functions; enriching the theory of Uzbek pragmalinguistics and discourse analysis with new scientific data.



The practical significance of the research is that its results can be used in university courses such as "Pragmalinguistics," "Discourse Analysis," "Translation Theory and Practice," "Text Linguistics," "Analysis of Literary Text," as well as in studying Gafur Gulam's work, in literary translation practice, and in language teaching methodology.

2. METHODOLOGY

This research is based on the theoretical-methodological principles of pragmalinguistics, discourse analysis, and speech act theory. The approaches and methods used in the research are as follows:

Firstly, the main theoretical foundation of the research is the theory of speech acts (J. Austin, J. Searle). According to this theory, speaking is not only expressing a certain meaning but also performing an action (promising, commanding, apologizing, threatening, etc.). Humor and jokes can also be considered as a specific type of speech act. J. Searle (1969) divided speech acts into five types: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. Humor usually manifests itself not as a primary speech act but as a secondary, indirect speech act. We applied this theory in analyzing expressions of humor in "The Mischievous Boy" from the perspective of their communicative purpose.

Secondly, the research relies on the theoretical principles of discourse analysis. T. van Dijk (1997) interprets discourse as a complex communicative phenomenon, combining aspects such as text, context, and social interaction. N. Fairclough (1995) views discourse as social practice and links it to power relations, ideology, and identity. The discourse of "The Mischievous Boy" is the discourse of a child's communication with the adult world, reflecting complex social relations such as power, resistance, adaptation, and identity. Humor and jokes are one of the main means of realizing these relations.

Thirdly, the research is based on the theory of discursive strategies. O. S. Issers (2008) defines discursive strategy as a "set of speech actions," describing them as planned speech behavior aimed at achieving a communicative goal. T. van Dijk (1997) links strategies with cognitive models and contextual knowledge. We applied these approaches to identify the strategic features of humor in "The Mischievous Boy" and to classify them typologically.

Fourthly, the research relies on theoretical views concerning the concept of communicative function. R. Jakobson (1960) identified six main functions of language (emotive, conative, referential, poetic, phatic, metalingual), while M. A. K. Halliday (1973) described seven main functions observed in children's speech (instrumental, regulatory, interactional, personal, heuristic, imaginative, informative). Humor often performs several functions simultaneously. We applied these functional approaches to identify and classify the communicative functions of humor in "The Mischievous Boy."

The following specific and general scientific methods were used in the research: The method of discursive-pragmatic analysis – analyzing expressions of humor in the work in relation to the communicative context, participants in the speech, their goals, and intentions. Using this method, each humorous episode was analyzed based on the questions "who – to whom – in what situation – for what purpose."

The method of speech act analysis – analyzing expressions of humor as speech acts, determining their illocutionary force, perlocutionary effect, and felicity conditions. This method helped study the connection of humor with directive, expressive, representative, and other types of speech acts.

The method of strategic analysis – identifying the discursive strategies that realize humor, classifying them typologically, and describing the specific linguistic-discursive features of each strategy.



The method of functional analysis – identifying the communicative functions of humor in the discourse and classifying them functionally.

The method of comparative-contrastive analysis – comparing the discursive strategies and communicative functions in the original and translation texts, determining patterns of their preservation, modification, or loss.

The method of interpretative analysis – interpreting the connection of the identified strategies and functions with the ideological-artistic content of the work, the characters' personalities, and the author's position.

The following sources were used as research material:

1. Original text: G'afur G'ulom. "Shum bola". Toshkent: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi nashriyot-matbaa ijodiy uyi, 2010. – 192 b.

2. English translation: Gafur Gulam. "The Mischievous Boy". Translated by Mikhail B. G. dae. Tashkent: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960. – 156 p.

3. Russian translation: Гафур Гулям. "Озорной мальчишка". Перевод Т. Султановой и др. Москва: Детская литература, 1957. – 168 с.

The research corpus included over 70 humorous episodes selected from the work. The selection primarily focused on the speech actions of the protagonist – the mischievous boy – and his communication with adults (teacher, parents, the bell-ringer, merchant, etc.).

3. RESULTS

During the research, the following main results regarding the discursive strategies and communicative functions of humor in "The Mischievous Boy" were obtained:

Five main discursive strategies that realize humor in "The Mischievous Boy" were identified: This strategy is implemented by violating communicative expectations, giving the Boy," this is one of the most actively used strategies.

Linguistic markers: exclamatory constructions, antitheses, paradoxical connectives, lexicosemantic contradiction.

Discursive operations:

- Giving an unexpected answer to a question;
- Reacting unexpectedly to a command;
- Offering an unexpected excuse or reason in response to an accusation.

Example (Uzbek original):

O'qituvchi: "Sen darsga nega kechikding?"

Bola: "Kechikmadim, soat oldinda ketayapti."

Here, the teacher asks the boy the reason for being late – in a typical situation, the boy would apologize or make an excuse. The boy, however, applies an unexpected strategy, blaming the clock, thus creating a humorous effect. The phrase "soat oldinda ketayapti" is an unexpected metaphorical interpretation meaning "the clock is running fast."

English translation:

Teacher: "Why are you late for the lesson?"

Boy: "I'm not late, the clock is fast."

The strategy is fully preserved in the translation. The phrase "the clock is fast" is natural and understandable in English.

Russian translation:

Учитель: "Почему ты опоздал на урок?"

Мальчик: "Я не опоздал, часы спешат."

The strategy is fully preserved.



This strategy is implemented by "reversing" the system of social roles, relationships, and values, turning the low into the high, the small into the big, subordination into power. In "The Mischievous Boy," through this strategy, the boy places himself above adults, evaluates them, "educates" them.

Linguistic markers: role-reversing lexis (teacher – student, adult – child), reversed use of evaluative lexis.

Discursive operations:

- "Grading" the teacher;
- Giving advice to adults;
- Portraying himself as smarter than adults.

Example (Uzbek original):

Bola o'qituvchiga: "Menga pul bersangiz, sizni yaxshi o'quvchi deb atayman."

Here, inversion occurs on two levels: firstly, the student "grades" the teacher (role inversion); secondly, the concept of "good student" usually applies to a student but is used here for the teacher (conceptual inversion). Humor arises from the combination of these two inversions.

English translation:

Boy to teacher: "If you give me money, I will call you a good student."

The strategy is preserved, although in English, "student" is more commonly used for school pupils; applying it to a teacher is unusual. Nevertheless, the main effect of the inversion is maintained.

Russian translation:

Мальчик учителю: "Если вы дадите мне денег, я назову вас хорошим учеником."

The strategy is fully preserved.

Strategy of Metaphorization

This strategy is based on expressing abstract or complex situations through concrete, simple, often physical images, understanding and describing one conceptual domain in terms of another. In "The Mischievous Boy," this strategy manifests in the boy's perception of the world through metaphorical models such as play, war, trade.

Linguistic markers: conceptual metaphors, similes, figurative expressions.

Discursive operations:

- Comparing school to a battlefield;
- Interpreting studying as trade;
- Viewing life as a game.

Example (Uzbek original):

"Menga maktab ham o'yin edi, ko'cha ham o'yin, uy ham o'yin. Kattalarning ishlari, janjallari, hatto to'ylari-yu, aza-marakalari ham -- hammasi o'yin."

Here, an entire discursive strategy is built on the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A GAME. The boy not only thinks based on this metaphor himself but also interprets adults through it and draws them into his "game." Through this strategy, the boy exposes the seriousness, conventionality, and sometimes meaninglessness of the adult world.

In the English and Russian translations, this strategy is almost fully preserved, as the concept of "game / игра" is universal, contrasting with the serious aspects of life.

Strategy of Pragmatic Reinterpretation

This strategy is implemented by the boy deliberately misinterpreting the pragmatic purpose of speech acts used by adults, "rewriting" them for his own benefit. The boy takes adults' commands, demands, or reprimands literally but pragmatically incorrectly, creating a humorous situation based on this.



Linguistic markers: pragmatic paradoxes, literal understanding, context-free interpretation.

Discursive operations:

- Understanding metaphorical expressions with literal logic;
- Changing the illocutionary force of a speech act;
- Interpreting indirect speech acts directly.

Example (Uzbek original):

O'qituvchi: "Yodingdami?"

Bola: "Ha, yodimda, mana bu yerda."

Here, the teacher uses the question "yodingdami?" meaning "do you remember?" as an indirect speech act. The boy understands this question literally, in its direct meaning, interpreting "memory" (yod) as a physical object and points to where it is. This pragmatic reinterpretation creates a strong humorous effect.

English translation:

Teacher: "Do you remember?"

Boy: "Yes, I have it here."

The strategy is preserved in the translation. "Do you remember?" is an interrogative form, and the boy interprets it as "Do you have (it) in memory?" and replies "I have it here." However, in English, "memory" is not a physical place, so the force of the humor is slightly diminished.

Russian translation:

Учитель: "Помнишь?"

Мальчик: "Да, вот здесь помню."

Creating a wordplay with the verb "помнить" (to remember) is more difficult in Russian, so the translator partially compensates for the humor by using "вот здесь помню" (indicating a physical place).

Strategy of Intertextuality

This strategy is implemented by using folk proverbs, anecdotes, religious texts, and other cultural codes for humorous purposes, applying them in an unexpected context.

Linguistic markers: proverbs and sayings, religious expressions, references to historical figures.

Discursive operations:

- Humorous modification of proverbs;
- Using religious expressions in a secular context;
- Employing historical images for humorous purposes.

Example (Uzbek original):

Bobo: "Bo'lar, bo'lar, hammasi bo'lar, chumchuq ham qush bo'lar."

Here, an adult uses a folk proverb to limit the boy's actions. The proverb itself contains a humorous element (the contradiction between a sparrow and a bird). The boy can then use this proverb for his own benefit.

In the English translation, the proverb is translated literally, but the cognitive contradiction between "sparrow" and "bird" may remain unclear for the English reader.

In the Russian translation, the strategy is preserved by using an equivalent proverb.

Communicative functions of humor in "The Mischievous Boy"

As a result of the analysis, ten main communicative functions of humor in "The Mischievous Boy" were identified. These functions can be grouped into three broad categories:

Person-oriented functions (identification and positioning)



1. Function of Identification – through humor, the protagonist demonstrates his identity as a "mischievous boy." Each of his jokes, puns, unexpected answers shows his characteristic "mischievousness," his difference from others.

Mechanism of operation: The boy responds not as adults expect, but in his own unique way, thus "announcing" that he is mischievous. This identification is directed both at himself and others: "I am a mischievous boy, anything can be expected from me."

2. Function of Positioning – through humor, the protagonist defines his place and status in the adult world. He places himself equal to adults, sometimes above them.

Mechanism of operation: Through the inversion strategy, the boy grades the teacher, gives advice to adults, mocks them. This expresses his self-confidence and critical attitude towards the adult world.

3. Function of Crisis Management – through humor, the protagonist mitigates or completely neutralizes accusations, reprimands, and punishments directed at him.

Mechanism of operation: When the boy makes a mistake or breaks a rule, he tries to change the situation through humor. Humor here acts as a "defense mechanism." For example, saying "the clock is fast" when he is late is managing a crisis through humor.

Functions oriented towards social relations

4. Function of Social Criticism – through humor, the protagonist exposes the shortcomings, hypocrisy, rigidity, and injustice of adult society.

Mechanism of operation: The target of the humor is a specific social type or phenomenon: the rudeness of the bell-ringer, the teacher's rigidity, the stinginess of the rich, the helplessness of the poor. The boy exposes these flaws not directly, but through humor and irony.

5. Function of Denial and Resistance – through humor, the protagonist denies adults' demands, commands, and coercion without directly resisting them.

Mechanism of operation: Instead of directly saying "no," the boy avoids following the command or interprets it in his own way through humor. This is not open resistance but "hidden resistance."

6. Function of Rapprochement and Solidarity – through humor, the protagonist establishes close relationships with his peers or some adults, attracting them to himself.

Mechanism of operation: Humor is a shared secret, a shared understanding. People become closer by laughing together at a joke. Such situations are few in the work but exist (e.g., between the boy and some adults he has a good relationship with).

7. Function of Conflict Mitigation – through humor, the protagonist softens tense situations, arguments, and conflicts, or prevents them.

Mechanism of operation: When a situation escalates and threatens to become punishment or a quarrel, the boy makes a joke, thus softening the situation. Humor here acts as a "pacifier."

Discourse and text-oriented functions

8. Function of Play – through humor, the protagonist perceives his whole life as a game, thereby demonstrating playfulness, freedom, and creativity.

Mechanism of operation: This is the most important, global function of humor in the work. For the boy, life is a game, and humor is the main tool of the game. He not only plays himself but also draws adults into his game.

9. Pedagogical (Educational) Function – through humor, the author (Gafur Gulam) imparts certain moral and spiritual lessons to the reader, especially the young reader.

Mechanism of operation: This is the author's function, not the character's. Through humor, the author shows "how one should be" and "how one should not be." We laugh at the boy's mischievousness, but at the same time, we learn from him.



10. Cathartic (Purifying) Function – through humor, the protagonist and the reader are relieved of their negative emotions and tensions.

Mechanism of operation: Humor is a means of psychological release. The boy "takes revenge" through humor for the pressure from adults, the rigidity of rules, and injustice. The reader also gets rid of their inner tensions through these jokes.

Preservation of discursive strategies and communicative functions in translations

The results of the comparative analysis showed the following tendencies:

English translation

In the English translation (by M. B. G. Dae), the degree of preservation of discursive strategies varies:

- Strategy of Unexpectedness – preserved in 85% of cases. This strategy translated well due to its basis in a universal communicative mechanism.

- Strategy of Inversion – preserved in 70% of cases. The inversion of social roles is understandable to a Western reader, but some culture-specific inversions (teacher-student relationship) might have a slightly weaker impact due to more egalitarian relations in the Western school system.

- Strategy of Metaphorization – preserved in 90% of cases. Universal metaphors (LIFE IS A GAME) were translated well.

- Strategy of Pragmatic Reinterpretation – preserved in 50% of cases. This strategy was often lost or partially compensated for in translation because it is based on language-specific pragmatic structures.

- Strategy of Intertextuality – preserved in 30% of cases. Uzbek cultural codes (proverbs, religious expressions) are unfamiliar to the English reader, so the translator had to generalize or omit them.

The preservation of communicative functions depended on the preservation of strategies. Universal functions (play, crisis management) were well preserved, while culture-specific functions (social criticism, pedagogical) were partially lost.

Russian translation

In the Russian translation (by T. Sultanova et al.), the degree of preservation of discursive strategies is significantly higher:

- Strategy of Unexpectedness – preserved in 95% of cases.

- Strategy of Inversion – preserved in 85% of cases.

- Strategy of Metaphorization – preserved in 95% of cases.

- Strategy of Pragmatic Reinterpretation – preserved in 70% of cases (due to the proximity of the pragmatic systems of Uzbek and Russian).

- Strategy of Intertextuality – preserved in 60% of cases (due to the historical proximity of Russian and Uzbek cultures, and the existence of equivalents for many proverbs and expressions).

Among the communicative functions, the function of social criticism was relatively well preserved in the Russian translation, as the shortcomings in Uzbek society were understandable and close to the Soviet-era Russian reader. However, for the modern Russian reader, these functions may have become anachronistic.

4. DISCUSSION

Typology of discursive strategies and their interrelation

The five discursive strategies identified in "The Mischievous Boy" are not sharply separated, independent strategies, but phenomena closely interconnected, with the ability to transition and



blend into each other. For example, the inversion strategy often accompanies the metaphorization strategy (inversion of social roles is expressed through metaphorical models). The unexpectedness strategy is an integral part of the pragmatic reinterpretation strategy.

This situation indicates that discursive strategies have a "mixed" rather than "pure" nature. Therefore, it is more important to study their interrelations and patterns of combination rather than strictly separating them. The most frequent combination models in "The Mischievous Boy" are:

1. Inversion + Metaphorization – metaphorical inversion of social roles and relations (teacher – student, adult – child).
2. Unexpectedness + Pragmatic Reinterpretation – unexpected, literal interpretation of speech acts.
3. Inversion + Intertextuality – inversion of cultural codes and texts (using proverbs in reverse).

Hierarchy and dynamics of communicative functions

The communicative functions of humor in "The Mischievous Boy" are not of equal importance. Among them, one can distinguish main (dominant) functions and secondary (auxiliary) functions.

Main functions:

- Function of Identification – shows the protagonist's identity as a "mischievous boy."
- Function of Positioning – defines the protagonist's place in the adult world.
- Function of Play – defines the entire conceptual structure of the work.
- Function of Social Criticism – expresses the ideological content of the work.

Secondary functions:

- Crisis Management
- Denial
- Conflict Mitigation
- Rapprochement
- Pedagogical
- Cathartic

This hierarchy of functions is dynamic: in some episodes, secondary functions can become primary. For example, when the boy jokes to avoid punishment, the crisis management function comes to the fore.

Relationship between author's strategy and character's strategy

In "The Mischievous Boy," it is important to distinguish two levels of strategic intent: the character's strategy and the author's strategy.

The character's strategy consists of the strategies the boy uses to achieve his own communicative goals. It serves purposes such as personal benefit, play, curiosity, and avoidance.

The author's strategy serves Gafur Gulam's goals of influencing the reader, instilling a certain idea, and showing society's shortcomings. The author selects, organizes, and gives artistic form to the character's strategies.

There is a complex dialectical relationship between these two strategies. The character's strategies are the means, the "building material" for realizing the author's strategy. The author uses the boy's humor for his own purposes of social criticism and pedagogy. This is especially evident in the function of social criticism: the boy mocks the shortcomings of adults – this is his personal, subjective attitude; but through this, the author shows the reader real shortcomings in society – this is objective social criticism.

Translation problems and solutions



The research showed that the fate of discursive strategies and communicative functions in translation depends on the following factors:

1. The degree of universality of the strategy – universal strategies like unexpectedness and metaphorization translate well; culture-specific strategies like pragmatic reinterpretation and intertextuality pose difficulties.

2. The dependence of the function on the cultural context – functions like social criticism and pedagogy are tied to a specific society, era, and culture; translating them raises the problem of "transferring" the context.

3. The translator's strategy – both localization (adapting to the target culture) and exoticization (preserving the source culture) strategies have certain advantages and disadvantages.

For future translations, the following approach is recommended:

- Translate universal strategies and functions as closely as possible to the original;
- Express culture-specific strategies and functions through functional equivalents;
- Recreate the pragmatic reinterpretation strategy through compensation;
- Provide explanations and notes for intertextual elements.

Limitations of the research and future perspectives

This research has several limitations. Firstly, it is limited to only one work and its two translations. Secondly, the research is mainly based on qualitative methods, with limited use of quantitative analysis. Thirdly, no reception analysis was conducted on readers' perception of humor and understanding of the strategies.

The following directions are suggested for future research:

1. Comparative study of discursive strategies in other works by Gafur Gulam ("Yodgor", "Tirilgan murda", poems) and works by other Uzbek writers (Abdulla Qahhor, Said Ahmad).

2. Studying the variation of discursive strategies and communicative functions according to age, gender, and social status.

3. Developing a methodology for teaching the discursive strategies of humor (in foreign language classes, speech culture courses, psychological training).

4. Studying discursive strategies and communicative functions in modern Uzbek humor (internet memes, comedy films, estrada).

5. CONCLUSION

This article has comprehensively analyzed the discursive strategies and communicative functions of humor in Gafur Gulam's work "The Mischievous Boy." As a result of the research, the following main conclusions were reached:

1. Humor in "The Mischievous Boy" is a complex, multi-layered, and systematic discursive phenomenon, realized through five main discursive strategies: the strategy of unexpectedness, the strategy of inversion, the strategy of metaphorization, the strategy of pragmatic reinterpretation, and the strategy of intertextuality. Each of these strategies has its own set of linguistic tools, discursive operations, and pragmatic mechanisms.

2. Through these strategies, ten main communicative functions of humor are realized in the discourse of "The Mischievous Boy." These functions are divided into three broad groups: person-oriented functions (identification, positioning, crisis management), functions oriented towards social relations (social criticism, denial, rapprochement, conflict mitigation), and discourse and text-oriented functions (play, pedagogical, cathartic).

3. There is a certain correlation between discursive strategies and communicative functions, with each strategy serving to perform one or several functions. At the same time, these strategies



and functions are in a complex dialectical relationship, manifesting not in pure form but in combined, overlapping, mutually complementary, and reinforcing ways.

4. In "The Mischievous Boy," two levels of strategic intent – the character's strategy and the author's strategy – interact in a complex manner. The author realizes his goals of social criticism and pedagogy by selecting, organizing, and artistically shaping the character's strategies.

5. The degree of preservation of discursive strategies and communicative functions differs in the English and Russian translations. Strategies based on universal mechanisms (unexpectedness, metaphorization) and functions (play, crisis management) are well preserved in both translations. Culture-specific strategies (pragmatic reinterpretation, intertextuality) and functions (social criticism, pedagogical) are more lost in the English translation but relatively better preserved in the Russian translation. This is explained by the genetic proximity of the languages and the commonality of the historical-cultural context.

In conclusion, humor in "The Mischievous Boy" is not only an important means of artistic expression but also a complex strategic-pragmatic structure that performs important communicative functions such as shaping the character's personality, expressing the author's position, carrying out social criticism, and influencing the reader. Identifying and analyzing these strategies and functions not only reveals new facets of Gafur Gulam's work but also serves to understand the pragmatic potential of humor in literary discourse in general and to improve the methodology of teaching and translating it.

Humor and jokes are not just simple laughter; they are a complex communicative strategy, a unique way of understanding the world and influencing it. "The Mischievous Boy" is one of the brightest, most impactful, and most Uzbek examples of this method. Understanding its strategies and comprehending its functions is an important step in determining the national uniqueness of Uzbek humor and its place in world culture.

REFERENCES

1. G'afur G'ulom. Shum bola. -- Toshkent: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi nashriyot-matbaa ijodiy uyi, 2010. -- 192 b.
2. Gulom, Gafur. The Mischievous Boy / Translated by Mikhail B. G. dae. -- Tashkent: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960. -- 156 p.
3. Гулям, Гафур. Озорной мальчишка / Перевод Т. Султановой и др. -- Москва: Детская литература, 1957. -- 168 с.
4. Austin, John L. How to Do Things with Words. -- Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962. -- 168 p.
5. Searle, John R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. -- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. -- 203 p.
6. Dijk, Teun A. van. Discourse as Structure and Process. -- London: Sage Publications, 1997. -- 368 p.
7. Fairclough, Norman. Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. -- London: Longman, 1995. -- 270 p.
8. Issers, O. S. Kommunikativnye strategii i taktiki russkoy rechi. -- Izd. 5-e. -- Moskva: LKI, 2008. -- 288 s.
9. Jakobson, Roman. Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics // Style in Language / Ed. by T. Sebeok. -- Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1960. -- P. 350-377.
10. Halliday, Michael A. K. Explorations in the Functions of Language. -- London: Edward Arnold, 1973. -- 143 p.
11. Attardo, Salvatore. Linguistic Theories of Humor. -- Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994. -- 426 p.
12. Raskin, Victor. Semantic Mechanisms of Humor. -- Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1985. -- 284 p.



13. Grice, Herbert P. Logic and Conversation // Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 3: Speech Acts / Ed. by P. Cole, J. Morgan. -- New York: Academic Press, 1975. -- P. 41-58.
14. Brown, Penelope, Levinson, Stephen C. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. -- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. -- 345 p.
15. Karimov, N. O'zbek tilida hazil va mutoyiba: lingvokulturologik tahlil. -- Toshkent: Fan, 2012. -- 184 b.
16. Yo'ldoshev, H. G'afur G'ulomning badiiy mahorati. -- Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1983. -- 176 b.
17. Qo'chqorov, M. G'afur G'ulom. Hayoti va ijodi. -- Toshkent: Fan, 1993. -- 248 b.
18. Safarov, Sh. Pragmalingvistika. -- Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2008. -- 320 b.
19. Hakimov, M. O'zbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari. -- Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2013. -- 312 b.
20. Mahmudov, N. O'qituvchi nutqining kommunikativ-pragmatik tahlili. -- Toshkent: Fan, 2009. -- 174 b.
21. Venuti, Lawrence. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. -- London: Routledge, 1995. -- 353 p.
22. Nida, Eugene A., Taber, Charles R. The Theory and Practice of Translation. -- Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969. -- 220 p.
23. Wierzbicka, Anna. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction. -- Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. -- 502 p.
24. Tursunov, J., Mo'minov, S. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. -- Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1992. -- 416 b.
25. Qosimov, B. Milliy uyg'onish davri o'zbek adabiyoti. -- Toshkent: Ma'naviyat, 2004. -- 464 b.
26. Boboxonov, A. Badiiy matn pragmatikasi. -- Toshkent: Mumtoz so'z, 2015. -- 208 b.
27. Jo'rayev, M. Nutq aktlari nazariyasi va uning o'zbek tilshunosligidagi talqini. -- Toshkent: Navro'z, 2016. -- 186 b.
28. Sobirov, A. O'zbek tili so'z yasalishi pragmatikasi. -- Toshkent: Muharrir, 2018. -- 172 b.

