Some Issues of Pragmalinguistic

Pardayeva Sojida Ahmatovna

Tashkent Institute of Finance, Teacher of Foreign Languages Department

Abstract

Some problems of Pragma linguistics highlighted in this article. It is the study of language use from the viewpoint of the language's structural resources. For instance, it may start with the pronoun system of a language, and examine the way in which people choose different available forms to express the range of attitudes and relationships (such as deference and intimacy). It is a medium where we examine how people convey different kinds of meanings with the use of language or how people express a variety of meaning with variety of people. It is the study of mutual world knowledge. In this sense, the various innovations that have taken place around pragmalinguistics, the developed scientific-theoretical views and research results have attracted linguists, and remain one of the most pressing issues.

Keywords: Pragmalinguistics, language, speaker, hearer, context, speech, diologue, monologue, linguistics.

While the field of pragmatics in its widest sense is constituted of many diverse approaches (without clear-cut boundaries) united by a common functional (social, cultural, cognitive) perspective on language in communication, **pragmalinguistics** (linguistic pragmatics, pragmatic linguistics, internal pragmatics) focuses primarily (though not exclusively) on the study of linguistic phenomena (i.e., code) from the point of view of their usage. As it is impossible to offer an exhaustive definition of pragmatics, it might be easier simply to present a list of the topics studied: deixis, implicature, presupposition, speech acts and aspects of discourse structure. The phenomenon of **deixis** fixes the utterance in the physical and social (**social deixis**, which includes **person deixis** and **attitudinal deixis**) context of its use. Deixis, which may also be used ´self-referentially´ to point to itself, is realized by indexical (deictic) expressions, such as personal and possessive pronouns, adverbials, verbal categories of person and tense, but also by politeness and phatic formulae.

Presupposition represents the amount of information assumed to be known by participants (background knowledge, common ground) and has direct impact on how much is explicitly said and how much remains implicit. Since it is normally not necessary, let alone possible, to be fully explicit, a certain level of balance is strived for by the participants who take into consideration various factors; for example, the medium of writing tends to be more explicit as participants do not share the time and space, often an unknown (general) addressee is projected with whom the amount of the shared knowledge can only be estimated. The theory of **speech acts** concerns the language user´s intention to attain certain communicative goals by performing acts through the use of language. From the stylistic perspective, Austin´s three types of speech act (locutionary, illocutionary, perlocutionary) are of special relevance, since it is esp. the variety of possible illocutions (i.e., uses which language can be put to) which offers innumerable choices. The types of speech acts as proposed by Searle (assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, declarations) are (loosely) associated with certain lingusitic categories (utterance types). Of special significance is the relation between locution (locutionary meaning or propositional

meaning) and illocution (illocutionary meaning, or illocutionary force) as this is not always of the one-to-one type: one locution may have more than one illocution. For example, The dinner is ready may be announcement, invitation, threat, command, etc. Conventionally, this utterance will be interpreted as an invitation to join the table rather than an announcement, hence an example of an **indirect speech act**. The use of indirect illocutions in preference to direct ones is often driven by the need to protect partner´s face (i.e., politeness concerns, esp. in requests and refusals). Similarly, the strategy of **hedging** is used to play down the illocutionary force of utterances (while demonstrating the metapragmatic awareness by explicitly referring to CP maxims) while employing a variety of linguistic manifestations (hedges, mitigators: sort of, kind of, in a sense, I hate to say this, partial agreement before presenting disagreement: Yes, but..., using performatives in business correspondence: *We are sorry to have to tell you...*, etc.). **Weasel words** are used to temper the straightforwardness of a statement making thus one's views equivocal (e.g., *borrow* instead of *steal*, *crisis* instead of *war*); in the pejorative sense they help avoid responsibility for one´s claim (e.g., The results of the experiment appear to be in direct contradiction with the stated hypotheses). Explicit use of performative verbs may cause a shift in formality level and create an atmosphere of authoritative claim (*Sit down, I beg you*).

What is implied can be, and often is, ´strategically manipulated´ with, if not for outright lying, then certainly for attaining our goals in mundane conversational encounters. The **conversational implicature** was proposed as a rational model guiding conversational interaction. Better known as the **Cooperative Principle** (CP), it includes four conversational maxims: quantity, quality, relation, manner. Although presupposed to be adhered to by the participants, the maxims are often deliberately flouted, e.g., in phatic or small talk (quantity), ´white lies´ (quality), humour, irony, teasing, banter, puns (manner), topic shift, seemingly irrelevant remarks whose relevance is implied and may only be disclosed by inference (relation). Some **tropes** (figures of speech) are built on the breach of CP: hyperbole (exaggeration: to wait an eternity), litotes (understatement, esp. that in which an affirmative is expressed by the negative of its contrary: *not bad at all*), tautology (repetition: *War is war, and there will be losers*), paraphrase, euphemism, metaphor and esp. irony (conveys a meaning that is the opposite of its literal meaning: *How nice! said after someone´s I failed another exam*). The maxims of CP are successfully applied in literary stylistics, for example in order to draw ´pragmatic portraits´ of fictional heroes.

References

1. Ashurova D.U., Galiyeva M.R. Text Linguistics. T.: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. P. 250.

2. Ashurova D.U, Galiyeva M.R. Stylistics of literary text. T.: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. P. 91.

3. Gardner H. Using multiple intelligences to improve negotiation theory and practice // Negotiation Journal. October, 2000. – C. 18.