The Concept of Pragmatics in Linguistics

Shokhista Kholikul kizi Karshieva

Karshi engineering - economics institute, teacher at the Department of Foreign Languages

Abstract: Pragmatics studies the functional use of linguistic signs in speech. Pragmalinguistics is a scientific discipline that studies the relationship between speech and words, as well as the influence of language on understanding and perception of the world. The article examines the concept of pragmatics in linguistics.

Keywords: Linguistics, a language system, pragmatics, semantics, on communicative process.

Introduction:

Linguistics began to adopt the principles and procedures of pragmatic analysis in the 60s and 70s. 20th century the reasons for the growing popularity of pragmatics during this period can be better understood if we take a look at the recent history of our science.

Traditionally, the task of describing a language system has been assigned to such linguistic disciplines as phonetics (including phonology), morphology, syntax and lexicology. During the period of dominance of structuralist linguistics (late 20s - late 50s of the 20th century), the leading role among these disciplines was first played by phonology, which studies the sound side of language from a functional perspective. Here, effective methods of oppositional and distributional analysis have been formed, which make it possible to build consistent models of the phonological system of the language. They formed a significant complement to the experimental/instrumental methods of phonetics, which had long been used in the study of the articulatory, perceptual and acoustic aspects of sounded speech. Structural methods forced us to look at the organization of the sound side of language in a new way. The rigorous modeling methods developed in phonology were soon mastered and successfully used by morphology, and then lexicology and syntax.

At the end of the 50s, after the appearance of the revolutionary works of N. Chomsky, with the establishment of generativism in linguistics, the dominant position passed to syntax. In the study of language units, attention has shifted from phonemes and morphemes to sentences.

A little later, semantics joined these disciplines, posing a bold challenge to syntax and declaring its right to leadership in the description and explanation of the language system as a whole.

Semantics, having taken shape as an independent discipline, practically did not insist on removing the problems of meaning and meaning completely from the competence of syntax, morphology, and especially lexicology (although in a number of areas the place of lexicology was assigned to semantics, mainly lexical).

For lexical, morphological and syntactic semantics, it is important to analyze the semantic side of the corresponding symbol carriers - different types of words, morphological indicators and categories, phrase and sentence constructions, as well as text. The general semantics of language is constructed as an integral theory of expressed meanings. She is more interested in the mode of existence of linguistic meanings in general, their connection with mental phenomena that arise as a result of neurophysiological processes, with the processes of conceptualization and

categorization of experience, and through them, connection with the physical world, with human objective and practical activity.

Along with linguistic semantics, pragmatics began to take shape with its clearly activity-based approach to language. The word pragmatics goes back to the Greek. πρᾶγμα, b. case πράγματοV 'deed, i.e. and what has been done, and what is being done, and what needs to be done' and πραγματikóV 'capable of business, businesslike, efficient'.

Pragmatics continued the study of meaning, but in an actional manner, and became a kind of rival to semantics. One can argue whether pragmatics should be considered as a special branch of broadly understood semantics, whether, on the contrary, the absorption of semantics into pragmatics should not be considered legitimate, or whether they should be classified as separate, although very closely related, disciplines. All three approaches are justified in their own way. This book will argue for the independent status of pragmatics in relation to semantics.

Linguistic pragmatics, and with it functionalism in grammar and cognitive linguistics, represented an effective counterbalance to both structuralism, which sees in language an immanent, self-contained structure, and the purely formal generative grammar of N. Chomsky and his followers.

F. de Saussure focused on the linguistics of language in a narrow sense (la linguistique de la langue) and assigned the linguistics of speech (la linguistique de la parole) a peripheral position. N. Chomsky declared the only object of linguistic theory to be the linguistic knowledge (competence) of an abstract speaker and took the problems of performance beyond the scope of the generative theory. Structuralism and generativism ignore the person and the factors of the context in which a person carries out linguistic communication [21,471].

In addition, the pragmatic turn meant that now the focus is on living language in action, in all the diversity of its functions and socio-functional options. The abstract, ideal speaker had to give way to a concrete, real speaker, carrying out his communication activities each time in a new setting, in a new communicative-pragmatic space. Pragmatics adopts not just the principle of Anthropocentrism, but also the principle of Egocentrism.

The principle of systemcentrism has now ceased to have an exclusive monopoly on an adequate description of language and has made room next to itself for the principles of anthropocentrism and egocentrism. It is probably quite valid to speak of a relation of complementarity between the study of how human language works and the study of how it works to carry out the tasks assigned to it by people in their acts of activity.

Pragmatics cannot but rely on the idea of language as a system of means and rules, but it places emphasis on communicative processes and context-dependent principles for using this system in an infinite variety of diverse acts of linguistic communication. For her, language is not just an established system of signs or a set of its functional variants such as literary language, vernacular, dialects, etc., but a flexible way of sign representation of experience and communicative interaction between members of a given socio-ethnocultural community in any specific situation.

Moreover, it would not be a great sedition to follow Steven Pinker in admitting that this method developed as a result of not only or not so much social as long-term biological evolution of man and represents the most important of human instincts.

Pragmatics is a relatively young discipline, which nevertheless rightfully claims to take its place in the description of language either next to phonetics and phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicology and semantics, or next to linguistics in general.

Defining the subject of linguistic pragmatics presents many difficulties. It is often defined briefly as a discipline that seeks to describe language not in its internal, immanent structure (language structure, Sprachstruktur, le système de langage), but in its use by a person (language in use, Sprachverwendung, l'usage de langage).

In this way, it differs from the linguistic disciplines of the traditional set, which study language rather as a static system. As for linguistic pragmatics, which complemented this set, it includes language not just in speech, speech activity in the production of statements, but in the purposeful subject-practical and cognitive-theoretical socially significant activity of a person as a Subject of communication.

Thus, pragmatics rediscovers for linguistics the basic principles of the general theory of activity and the principles of the theory of communication. She focuses her attention on how, in the words of Émil Benveniste (1902-1976), the "appropriation" of language by a person occurs in specific communicative acts.

The approval of the ideas and principles of general and linguistic pragmatics was the result of a long process of understanding a large number of concepts that specify various aspects of the category of activity. The range of these concepts includes such as action, subject of action, goal, result, means and methods of achieving the goal, conditions, etc. (see Chapter 3) [11].

Pragmatics, in one version or another, focuses on one of these factors, either quite sharply opposing itself to the systemic-structural approach to language, or consciously adhering to the principle of linguocentrism and interpreting language in a broad sense (together with its pragmatic aspect).

Representatives of the first direction assign it a place near linguistics and outside linguistics, so that then pragmatics inevitably finds itself in the sphere of interests of sociology, cultural anthropology, ethnography, etc. Even in the latest literature, linguistics in its standard sense continues to be accused of those "sins" that it allegedly "committed" during the heyday of structuralism and generativism, developing methods for discovering the rigid constructive framework of a language.

But the achievements of this period were necessary for theoretical linguistics itself, and for many related social and human sciences, and for solving problems in the field of automatic processing of natural language and artificial intelligence. The idea of an invariant as an abstract entity, as a kind of guideline, served to explain the essence and nature of the processes of variation in specific manifestations of linguistic objects.

Representatives of the second direction tend to share the views of Wilhelm von Humboldt (Wilhelm von Humboldt, 1767-1835) on language as a creative activity. They include language in socially significant human activities. For them, the distinction between a sentence and an utterance (or speech act) is a distinction between two levels of linguistic analysis of the same linguistic entity, namely the structural (or constructive) level and the functional (or pragmatic) level [13,360].

Conclusion:

A speech act is, in essence, a sentence in action, a sentence in the act of its purposeful use by the subject of speech (more precisely, speech-mental) activity. Discourse is both the process of unfolding communicative interaction and the product of this process. With this approach, pragmatics is included among the linguistic disciplines. Linguistic pragmatics, like cognitive linguistics, interacts with various extra-linguistic disciplines, can borrow ideas and techniques for working with material from them, but interprets them in the interests of linguistics.

References

1. Birner 2013 – *Birner B.J.* (2013) Introduction to pragmatics. Wiley-Blackwell. 326 p. Available at: https://books.google.ru/books?id=9pQ3KPKY1hkC&hl=ru.

2. Bublitz, Norrick 2011 – *Bublitz W., Norrick N.R.* (2011) Introduction: The burgeoning field of pragmatics. In: W. Bublitz & N.R. Norrick (Eds.), *Foundations of pragmatics*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. Vol. 1, pp. 1-22. Available at: https://ru.scribd.com/document/253648973/Foundations-Of-Pragmatics-pdf.

3. Goddard, Schalley 2010 – *Goddard C., Schalley A.C.* (2010) Semantic Analysis. In: N. Indurkhya & D.F.J. Chapman (Eds.), *Handbook of natural language processing. 2nd edition*. Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 93-120. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289220287_Semantic_Analysis.

4. Griffiths 2006 – *Griffiths P.* (2006) *An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh University Press. 193 p. Available at: https://studylib.net/doc/8257712/an-introduction-to-english-semantics-and-pragmatics--edin....

5. Jorgensen, Phillips 2002 – *Jorgensen M.W., Phillips L.* (2002) *Discourse analysis as theory and method. 1st edition*. SAGE Publications Ltd. 230 p. Available at: https://archive.org/stream/DiscourseAnalysisAsTheoryAndMethodMarianneJorgensenLouise Phillips/Discourse%20Analysis%20as%20Theory%20and%20Method%20-%20Marianne%20Jorgensen%20&%20Louise%20Phillips_djvu.txt.

6. Kharkovskaya, Ponomarenko, Radyuk 2017 – *Kharkovskaya A.A., Ponomarenko E.V. and Radyuk A.V.* (2017) Minitexts in modern educational discourse: Functions and trends. *Training, Language and Culture*. No 1(1), pp. 62-76. DOI: 10.29366/2017tlc.1.1.4. Available at: http://rudn.tlcjournal.org/archive/1(1)/1(1).pdf.

7. Ledeneva 2018 – *Ledeneva S.* (2018) Advertising as specific discourse type: ontology and functional pragmatics. *5th International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts SGEM 2018, www.sgemsocial.org, SGEM2018 Conference Proceedings, 26 August-1 September 2018, Albena (Bulgaria), Vol. 5 Science & Society, issue 3.6 Language & Linguistics,* pp. 3-10. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5593/sgemsocial2018h/31/s10.001

8. Leech 2016 – *Leech G.N.* (2016) *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge. 249 p. Available at: https://books.google.ru/books?id=2uWXCwAAQBAJ&hl=ru.

9. Searle 2007 – *Searle J.R.* (2007) What is language: some preliminary remarks. In: I. Kecskes and L.R. Horn (Eds.), *Explorations in pragmatics: Linguistic, cognitive and intercultural aspects*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 7-37. Available at: https://ru.scribd.com/doc/80676007/Explorations-in-Pragmatics-Linguistic-Cognitive-and-Intercultural-Aspe.

10. Verschueren 2009 – *Verschueren J.* (2009) Introduction: The pragmatic perspective. In: J. Verschueren & J.-O. Östman (Eds.), *Key notions for pragmatics*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: PA; John Benjamins, pp. 1-27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.1.01var.

11. Бенвенист, Эмиль. Общая лингвистика. М., 1974.

12. Богданов, В.В. Лингвистическая прагматика и её прикладные аспекты // Прикладное языкознание. СПб, 1996. С. 268—275.

13. Гак, В.Г. Прагматика // Русский язык: Энциклопедия. 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. М., 1997. С. 360—361.

14. Грайс, Г.П. Логика и речевое общение // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 16: Лингвистическая прагматика. М., 1985. С. 217—237.

15. Грайс, Г.П. Значение говорящего, значение предложения и значение слова // Философия языка / Ред.-сост. Дж.Р. Сёрл. М., 2004. С. 75—98.

16. Звегинцев, В.А. Язык и лингвистическая теория. М., 1973.

17. Звегинцев, В.А. Прагматика, семантика и естественный язык // Звегинцев, В.А. Мысли о лингвистике. М., 1996.

18. Кифер, Ференц. О роли прагматики в лингвистическом описании // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 16: Лингвистическая прагматика. М., 1985. С. 333—348.

19. Кронгауз, М.А. Семантика. М., 2001.

20. Лакофф, Джордж. Прагматика в естественной логике // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 16: Лингвистическая прагматика. М., 1985. С. 439—470.

21. Петров, В.В. Философия, семантика, прагматика // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 16: Лингвистическая прагматика. М., 1985. С. 471—476.

22. Сёрл, Дж.Р. Введение // Философия языка / Ред.-сост. Дж.Р. Сёрл. М., 2004.