

THE MAIN AREAS OF INVESTIGATION OF PRAGMALINGUISTICS

Abdugaffarova G.A.

*Abdugaffarova Gulkhayo Abdugaffar qizi - EFL Teacher,
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AS INTEGRATED COURSE № 1,
UZBEKISTAN STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY, TASHKENT, REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN*

Abstract: *the article deals with the Pragmalinguistics, as the modern trend of Linguistics and its main fields of the research. Pragmalinguistics is the science studying the language in its relation to its users. There are different scholars, who provide definitions to the science.*

Keywords: *pragmalinguistics, Linguistics, language, use, scientist, definition, literary, communication, verbal.*

At the beginning of 70th years of the XX century, the interest and investigation on linguistics changed a lot. The linguists moved their attention from systematic-structural point of language to language in action and situation. In other words, the attitude to language as a formal system transferred to the language as a communicative unit. As the result of abovementioned points, new fields of linguistics appeared such as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, communicative linguistics, text linguistics, linguapragmatics.

As the text is a means of communicative interaction, pragmatics is one of main text parameter. Different scholars present various assumptions on pragmatics. According to the definition presented in Encyclopedic dictionary of Linguistics, pragmatics-(greek pragma, pragmatos-action) the area of investigation in semiotics and linguistics, which studies different functions of language signs in speech. The term “pragmatics” firstly used by Ch. U. Morris in 30s of XX century as one of three branches of semiotics [4]. He defined pragmatics as the relation of signs to its users: Pragmatics is defined as the science of the “relation of signs to their interpreters. ... Since most, if not all, signs have as their interpreters living organisms, it is a sufficiently accurate characterization of pragmatics to say that it deals with the biotic aspects of semiosis, that is, with all the psychological phenomena which occur in the functioning of signs [4]. As mentioned above, pragmatics studying the users and the effects of signs, has inspired major trend in linguistics.

There were various explanations of the relation of signs to its users. It is unavoidable to say that there are still confusions and vagueness concerning the topic of “pragmatics”. Pragmatics doesn't have definite outline, it includes questions connected with the addresser and addressee, communicative situation. As it is stated in the dictionary, it is studied the following points in connection with the subject of speech:

- Explicit and implicit aims of the utterance (a message of some information or opinion, question, order, request, advice, promise, apology, greeting, complaint, etc)
- The rules of discourse according to the principles of recommended structure of speech on basis of adequate norms as to send true information, with maximum quality.
- The reference of addresser which expresses the language toward realia
- The evaluation of the speaker on basis of general background language, outlook, interests, attitudes and psychological state and others.

There were various interpretations presented by a lot of scholars. Different assumptions define pragmalinguistics from various angles.

T. van Dijk differentiated three aspects: syntax, semantics and pragmatics and described pragmatics in the following way: “Whereas the aims of syntax and semantics and their place in the grammar are relatively clear, the tasks of Pragmatics and - its contribution to linguistic theory are by no means decided issues. Pragmatics, not unlike semantics fifteen years ago, has become the waste-paper basket of the grammarian, although it is possible relevance is no longer denied. The situation, however, is different for pragmatics from what it was for semantics. With the possible exception of contextual semantics, pragmatic theory has hardly drawn inspiration from logic. It draws mainly upon philosophy of language and the theory of Speech Act in particular, as well as the analysis of conversations and of cultural differences in verbal interaction as viewed in the social sciences. As the third major component of any semiotic theory, pragmatics would have the task of studying `the relationships between signs and their users” [3].

Discussing the problems of pragmalinguistics, V. Karasik made a distinction of 3 trends: a) controversial (about speech acts) b) functional (rhetoric, stylistic) and psycholinguistic (word-formation and word usage). However, according to Y.D. Apresyan, pragmatics is a speaker's attitude to the truth to identity, content of the message and to the addressee by means of language units [2]. He grouped all the definitions of pragmalinguistics given in scientific sources in the following way:

- definitions related to priority of human factors
- definitions based on functional aspects in linguopragmatic researches, and contextual conditions, science about the use of a language, science about a language in a context
- definitions, where much attention is paid to the effective interactions between communicants while speaking; the language in relation to relationships affect each to focus on the study of the efficiency of the

- definitions where interpretative aspect of speaking is considered separately in any communicative context.

It was S. Stepanov who proved that the main category in pragmatics is the category of the subject [2]. This concept leads to the important issues: issues on what a speaker is telling and how, reliability of the information, objectivity, prediction of his speech, true or incorrect sentences or words, his behavior in social environment, an ability to interpret his objective ideas, or vice versa.

Moreover, it is often refined as a source of any aspect of a sentence, as it is mentioned in the saying "Pragmatics meaning minus truth conditions" [1]. There were many controversial ideas about the differences of pragmatics and semantics. According to Gazdar, the distinctions of pragmatics and semantics are obviously seen as coincident with the differences between truth conditional and non-truth conditional meaning [1].

The notion of linguapragmatics is defined by D. U. Ashurova in the following way: "Linguapragmatics is one of trends of communicative linguistics, which in its general sense can be defined as a science studying language factors within the sphere of human activity with an accent on psychological, social and cultural aspects of language functioning" [2].

The problems of linguapragmatics have been dealt with in many works of linguists. The broadness of pragmatics has led to a significant spread of topics and problems from the point of view of linguistics were as follow:

- Pragmatic interpretation of the language and the theory of speech acts [2];
- Pragmatic parameters of literary communication
- The text in its dynamics related with creating "I" in a text [2].

One of dominant factor is considered to be the human factor, the description of language facts in the aspect of the human activity, the relationship between the sign and those who use it, with an emphasis on sign functions as well as on the psychological, sociological aspects.

Other definitions emphasize that functioning aspect of linguapragmatic investigations is based on their contextual condition, to be more exact, "science of language usage" and "language in context" [3].

The most developed area of linguapragmatics is the theory of speech acts, which is associated with the names of such philosophers of language, as J.L. Austin, J.R. Searle and others. The theory of speech act is interesting with its direction to search for communicative parameters of the language, providing not an abstract exchange of information, but the real process of communication, emerging from many components, which include informative content and impact on the partner, management of his activity [5].

Pragmalinguistics studies a lot of questions, however, the most crucial notions of it are communicative situation, pragmatic intention, addresser and addressee, speech acts.

In conclusion, according to above mentioned statements it is essential to note that all these aspects are by no means incompatible. Linguopragmatics can be interpreted from different angle. It should be stressed that pragmalinguistics is the science studying language factors in accordance with the psychological, social and cultural aspects of human.

References

1. *Ashurova D.U., Galiyeva M.R.* Stylistics of literary text. T.: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. P. 130.
2. *Ashurova D.U., Galiyeva M.R.* Text linguistics. T.: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. P. 223.
3. *Dijk T.A. van.* Text and Context. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. London: Longman, 1977. P. 13.
4. *Galperin I.R.* Stylistics. Москва. Высшая школа, 1981. 334 с.
5. *Searle J.R.* A classification of illocutionary acts. London: Language in Society, 1976.