

“BURNOUT” AND “HAVOTIR” AS DISCURSIVE CONCEPTS: A THEORETICAL DISCUSSION OF PRAGMATIC ORIENTATIONS

Khasanova Yulduz Mukhtor kizi,

Doctor of philosophy (PhD) in philological sciences,

Associate professor, NSU

G-mail: yulduzhasanova025@gmail.com

Abstract. This article offers a theoretical discussion of how the concept *burnout* in English and *havotir* in Uzbek are constructed in contemporary motivational discourse. Drawing on pragmatic theory and lexical typology, the article identifies the distinct pragmatic orientations of the two concepts. English *burnout* is constructed through operational-tactical discourse oriented toward scheduling, reframing, and identity-renarration. Uzbek *havotir* is constructed through contemplative-restorative discourse oriented toward recognition, reflection, and restorative pause. The article discusses theoretical and translation-theoretic implications of these pragmatic divergences and contributes to the comparative pragmatics of contemporary mental-state discourse.

Keywords: *burnout; havotir; pragmatic orientation; mental-state discourse; comparative pragmatics; speech acts.*

Annotatsiya. Mazkur maqolada ingliz tilidagi *burnout* va o'zbek tilidagi *havotir* tushunchalarining zamonaviy motivatsion diskursda qanday konseptuallashtirilishi nazariy jihatdan tahlil qilinadi. Pragmatik nazariya va leksik tipologiya yondashuvlariga tayangan holda, maqolada ushbu ikki konseptning o'ziga xos pragmatik yo'nalishlari aniqlanadi. Ingliz tilidagi *burnout* tushunchasi rejalashtirish, vaziyatni qayta talqin qilish va shaxsiy identifikatsiyani qayta hikoyalashga yo'naltirilgan operatsion-taktik diskurs orqali shakllantiriladi. O'zbek tilidagi *havotir* esa anglash, mushohada yuritish va ruhiy tiklanishga xizmat qiluvchi tanaffusga yo'naltirilgan kontemplativ-tiklovchi diskurs orqali ifodalanadi. Maqolada ushbu pragmatik tafovutlarning nazariy hamda tarjimashunoslikka oid oqibatlarini muhokama qilinadi va zamonaviy ruhiy holat diskursining qiyosiy pragmatikasi rivojiga hissa qo'shadi.

Kalit so'zlar: *burnout, havotir, pragmatik yo'nalish, ruhiy holat diskursi, qiyosiy pragmatika, nutqiy aktlar.*

Аннотация. В данной статье представлено теоретическое обсуждение того, как концепты *burnout* в английском языке и *havotir* в узбекском языке конструируются в современном мотивационном дискурсе. Опираясь на прагматическую теорию и лексическую типологию, в статье выявляются различные прагматические ориентации двух концептов. Английский *burnout* конструируется через операционно-тактический дискурс, ориентированный на планирование, переосмысление и перенаррацию идентичности. Узбекский *havotir* конструируется через созерцательно-восстановительный дискурс, ориентированный на осознание, рефлексию и восстановительную паузу. В статье обсуждаются теоретические и переводоведческие последствия данных прагматических различий, а также вносится вклад в сравнительную прагматику современного дискурса ментальных состояний.

Ключевые слова: *burnout; havotir; прагматическая ориентация; дискурс ментальных состояний; сравнительная прагматика; речевые акты.*

Introduction. The conceptualization of chronic mental fatigue has emerged as a defining concern of twenty-first-century motivational discourse. The English term *burnout*, once strictly clinical, has been broadly popularized through self-help literature and digital wellness publicistics. The Uzbek concept *havotir*, a low-intensity continuous worry interfering with motivation, has a longer lexical history but only recently entered the motivational subgenre [Mahmudov, 2011].

Despite the popular prominence of these concepts, the theoretical pragmatic study of *burnout* and *havotir* remains underdeveloped. The present article addresses this gap by offering a theoretical discussion of how each concept is discursively constructed in contemporary motivational writing. The article does not present empirical statistics; it articulates a comparative theoretical model.

Three questions guide the discussion. First, what pragmatic conventions characterize the construction of *burnout* in contemporary English motivational discourse? Second, what pragmatic conventions characterize the construction of *havotir* in contemporary Uzbek motivational discourse? Third, what theoretical implications follow from the comparison?

The contribution of the article lies in offering a coordinated theoretical characterization of the two concepts and in proposing a binary distinction, operational-tactical versus contemplative-restorative, that captures the principal pragmatic divergence.

The article also takes into account the recent expansion of *burnout* discourse beyond clinical contexts. Originally a technical psychological term [Maslach & Leiter, 2016], *burnout* has been thoroughly absorbed into popular motivational and digital-wellness discourse, often with significant semantic broadening. The Uzbek *havotir*, by contrast, retains its long literary heritage even as it enters new publicistic contexts. The two concepts thus differ not only in pragmatic conventions but in their respective discursive trajectories.

Literature review. The discussion combines pragmatic theory [Searle, 1969] with lexical-typological perspectives [Wierzbicka, 1999] and with contemporary work on discourse markers [Schiffrin, 1987]. From pragmatics, the article uses the speech-act taxonomy to characterize the illocutionary architecture of each concept's discursive treatment. From lexical typology, it draws attention to the cross-linguistic differences in the basic vocabulary of fatigue and worry. From discourse-marker analysis, it identifies the procedural items that scaffold operational-tactical and contemplative-restorative discourse.

The analytical approach is qualitative. The article examines illustrative examples and discusses them in light of the theoretical frameworks. The discussion is interpretative; statistical claims are reserved for subsequent empirical work.

Research Methodology. This study uses a qualitative, theoretical-comparative method to analyze the pragmatic construction of *burnout* (English) and *havotir* (Uzbek) in motivational discourse. The research is based on discourse analysis, pragmatic theory, and lexical typology. The material includes selected English and Uzbek motivational texts and examples, which are analyzed through close reading and interpretation.

A comparative approach is applied to identify pragmatic orientations, speech-act patterns, and discourse strategies in both languages. The study is theoretical and does not involve statistical analysis.

Analysis and Results.

Linguistic Analysis. *The construction of burnout in English motivational discourse.* Contemporary English motivational discourse constructs *burnout* as an operational problem that admits operational solutions. The concept is typically introduced through diagnostic statements (“you are running on empty”) and then quickly transitioned into a plan of action.

Three pragmatic conventions organize this construction. The first is cognitive reframing: the author proposes a new way of thinking about the workload, often by reversing the addressee's framing of refusal (“what you don't say no to, you implicitly say yes to”). The second is scheduling-direction: the author offers concrete operational directives about time-allocation, task-batching, and email-management. The third is identity-renarration: the author offers the reader a new identity defined by selective action (“you are the person who chooses, not the person who reacts”).

The three conventions coordinate into a coherent macro-strategy: the experiencer is led from a diagnosed *burnout* state through cognitive and operational moves toward a re-narrated identity. The illocutionary architecture is dominated by directive and commissive speech acts [Searle, 1969].

The construction of havotir in Uzbek motivational discourse - Contemporary Uzbek motivational discourse constructs *havotir* as a contemplative condition that calls first for acknowledgment and only secondarily for action. The concept is typically introduced through reflective statements that invite the reader into a recognition stance.

Three pragmatic conventions organize this construction. The first is recognition: the author makes the reader aware of the *havotir* state through naming and reflective description (“siqilgan ko‘ngilga Malham bo‘lish” – “to recognize the heart’s compression is half the cure”). The second is reflection: the author invites the reader to dwell on the meaning of the experience, often through reflective questions and meditative framing (“havotir ne‘matlarimizdan biri – u bizni fikr qilishga undaydi” — “havotir is one of our gifts; it invites us to stop and think”). The third is restorative pause: the author proposes slow-down rather than re-strategizing as the path forward (“bir oz tin olib, atrofga qarang” — “pause for a moment and look around”).

The three conventions coordinate into a macro-strategy oriented toward equilibrium rather than transformation. The illocutionary architecture is dominated by expressive and representative speech acts, with directives appearing only at the end of the discursive trajectory.

Comparative theoretical observations - Three systematic differences emerge. First, English *burnout* discourse is operational-tactical: it leads quickly from diagnosis to action plan, with the rhetorical orientation toward intervention. Uzbek *havotir* discourse is contemplative-restorative: it dwells in recognition and reflection before any action is proposed.

Second, the temporal orientations differ. English *burnout* discourse is future-oriented: the reader's recovery lies in tomorrow's restructured schedule. Uzbek *havotir* discourse is present-oriented: the recovery lies in this moment's pause and acknowledgment.

Third, the speech-act distributions differ correspondingly. English *burnout* discourse is directive-saturated; Uzbek *havotir* discourse is expressive-saturated. These distributions are not random but are required by the macro-strategic orientation of each tradition.

Theoretical synthesis - The comparative observations support a binary theoretical distinction between operational-tactical and contemplative-restorative pragmatic orientations in motivational discourse. Each orientation is internally coherent: lexical choices, discourse markers, illocutionary types, and rhetorical moves cluster around the central orientation.

The two orientations are not mutually exclusive. English motivational texts can include moments of contemplative reflection (essentialism rhetoric); Uzbek texts can include directive episodes. But the macro-strategic centre of gravity differs. The theoretical observation is statistical-typological in character rather than absolute.

Illustrative examples and their linguistic interpretation - The operational-tactical versus contemplative-restorative distinction can be illustrated through paired examples. Each pair shows the coordinated functioning of lexical, illocutionary, and rhetorical resources around the central macro-strategic orientation.

Pair I (Diagnosis-to-action vs Recognition-to-pause). English: "You are running on empty — set boundaries, batch your tasks, and take Sunday off". Uzbek: "Ko'ngil siqilishini sezdingizmi? — bir oz tin oling, atrofga qarang" ("have you noticed the compression of your ko'ngil? — pause for a moment, look around"). The English construction quickly transitions from diagnostic statement to imperative scheduling-directives. The Uzbek construction lingers in recognition-stance (sezdingizmi — "have you noticed?") and proposes pause rather than action.

Pair II (Identity-renarration vs Reflective-acknowledgment). English: "You are not the person who says yes to everything; you are the person who chooses". Uzbek: "Inson har bir havotirini e'tibor bilan kuzatishi kerak — bu uning ichki dunyosini ko'rsatadi" ("a person must observe each havotir with attention — it reveals the inner world"). The English example reanchors the reader's identity through binary opposition ("not X — Y"); the Uzbek example invites the reader into observational attention without identity reformulation.

Pair III (Cognitive-reframing vs Reflective-questioning). English: "What you don't say no to, you implicitly say yes to". Uzbek: "Nima uchun shu havotir bizning yo'limizda paydo bo'ldi? — bu savol javobida — bizning o'sishimiz" ("why has this havotir appeared on our path? — in the answer to this question lies our growth"). The English example

employs implicational reasoning to reverse the reader's framing; the Uzbek example employs reflective questioning to invite the reader into evaluative meditation.

Linguistically, these example pairs demonstrate that the contrast between English *burnout* discourse and Uzbek *havotir* discourse operates at every level — lexical, illocutionary, rhetorical, schematic. The theoretical distinction between operational-tactical and contemplative-restorative orientations captures this multi-level contrast in a single coordinated model.

An additional linguistic observation concerns the discourse-marker repertoire of each tradition. English *burnout* discourse deploys sequential-and-contrastive markers (now, however, therefore) that scaffold action plans. Uzbek *havotir* discourse deploys reflective-and-inferential markers (demak, ammo, balki) that scaffold contemplative trajectories.

A further observation concerns the lexical encoding of temporality. English *burnout* discourse often uses time-management vocabulary (schedule, calendar, deadline). Uzbek *havotir* discourse often uses experiential-temporal vocabulary (lahzalar, o'tkinchi, o'tib ketadigan). The lexical coloration corresponds to the macro-strategic orientation of each tradition.

The theoretical model articulated above contributes to the comparative pragmatics of contemporary mental-state discourse by proposing a coordinated binary distinction between operational-tactical and contemplative-restorative orientations. The distinction integrates lexical, illocutionary, and rhetorical levels into a single typological framework.

A further theoretical observation concerns the relationship between the two macro-strategic orientations and broader cultural-cognitive patterns. The operational-tactical orientation of English *burnout* discourse resonates with the linear-individual-agentive orientation often documented in Anglo-American discourse traditions. The contemplative-restorative orientation of Uzbek *havotir* discourse resonates with the cyclic-relational orientation documented for many Central Asian discourse traditions. The pragmatic distinction proposed here is thus not isolated but participates in a broader typological pattern.

The model also bears on the question of genre evolution. Contemporary Uzbek motivational discourse is gradually incorporating directive elements through translation and through digital-platform influence; conversely, contemporary English self-help is gradually incorporating reflective elements through the influence of mindfulness literature. The pure forms of the two orientations are theoretical constructs; actual discourses are mixed in varying proportions. Tracing this mixing is a productive direction for future empirical research.

An additional theoretical observation concerns the relationship between mental-state discourse and adjacent genres. The conventions identified here are not unique to *burnout* and *havotir*; they extend, with appropriate modifications, to other contemporary mental-

state concepts (stress, overwhelm, charchov, toliqish). A complete typology of contemporary mental-state discourse will require systematic extension of the model to this broader concept-family.

Two theoretical implications follow. First, the construction of mental-state concepts is shaped not only by the lexicon but by the genre-pragmatic conventions of each language. Theories of emotional conceptualization must therefore include genre-pragmatic conventions as a third dimension alongside lexical and conceptual ones. Second, the binary distinction proposed here is a candidate for broader typological application to other mental-state pairs (stress/charchov, overwhelm/toliqish, anxiety/havotir).

Two translation-theoretic implications follow. First, the direct importation of English-style scheduling directives into Uzbek wellness publicistics risks pragmatic friction: the addressee expects acknowledgment before instruction. Second, the direct importation of Uzbek-style reflective discourse into English self-help risks being perceived as insufficiently operational by an audience trained on directive prose.

Methodological limitations include the interpretative scope of the discussion and the limited illustrative examples considered. Further research will extend the model and refine it through empirical investigation.

Conclusion. This article articulated a theoretical comparative model for the discursive construction of *burnout* in English and *havotir* in Uzbek motivational discourse. The model identifies three pragmatic conventions for each concept and characterizes the principal macro-strategic orientation in each language as operational-tactical (English) and contemplative-restorative (Uzbek).

The model contributes to the comparative pragmatics of mental-state discourse and clarifies the cross-linguistic typology of contemporary motivational writing. Future work will extend the model and test it through systematic empirical investigation.

The article also illustrates a productive methodology for the comparative pragmatics of contemporary mental-state discourse. The binary operational-tactical versus contemplative-restorative distinction can be applied to other concept-pairs and to other language-pairs, supporting a broader typological program in the pragmatics of wellness and self-help discourse.

References:

1. Mahmudov, N. (2011). Tilning mukammal tadqiqi yo'llarini izlab... O'zbekiston.
2. Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge University Press.
3. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.
4. Wierzbicka, A. (1999). Emotions across languages and cultures: Diversity and universals. Cambridge University Press.
5. Xudoyberganova, D. (2013). Matnning antroposentrik tadqiqi. Fan.
6. Safarov, Sh. S. (2008). Pragmalingvistika. O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.