



# FAN, TA'LIM VA AMALIYOT INTEGRATSIYASI

ISSN: 2181-1776

Dusmetova Maksuda Matnazarovna<sup>1</sup>  
Dusmetova Saodatjon Murodovna<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Senior teacher UrSU

<sup>2</sup>Masters student UrSU

## TYPES OF APPROACHES TO STUDYING PRAGMALINGUISTICS

**Annotatsiya.** Ushbu maqolada pragmalingvistikani o'rganishdagi bir qancha metodlar hamda uning lingvistikaning boshqa tarmoqlari bilan aloqadorligi atroflicha o'rganiladi va tahlil qilinadi.

**Tayanch so'zlar:** pragmatika, yondashuv, tadqiqot, bog'liqlik.

**Аннотации.** В данной статье исследуется и анализируется ряд методов изучения прагмалингвистики и ее связи с другими отраслями лингвистики.

**Ключевые слова:** прагматика, подход, исследование, связь.

**Annotation.** The article deals with the types of approaches to studying methods of pragmalinguistics and its association with the subcategories of linguistics.

**Keywords:** pragmatics, approaches, researches, association.

Introduction. "Pragmalinguistics" or the occupation with pragmatic aspects of language can be important where computational linguists or artificial intelligence researchers are concerned with natural language interfaces to

computers, with modelling dialogue behavior, or the like. . What speakers intend with their utterances, how hearers react to what they hear, and what they take the words to mean will all play a role of increasing importance when natural language systems have matured enough to cope readily with syntax and semantics. Asking a *sensible* question to a user or giving him a *reasonable* response often enough depends not only on the "pure" meaning of some previous utterances but also on attitudes, expectations, and intentions that the user may have. These are partly conveyed in the user's utterances and have to be taken into account, if a system is to do more than just give factual answers to factual requests.

Thus someone who wants to construct a natural language system might look at Mey's book *Pragmalinguistics* with some expectations as to what he should consider or what guidelines he should follow, or maybe just to find out what the current state of the art in pragmatics is. However, he will find little of that in this book. *Pragmalinguistics* is a collection of articles dealing with many different things—some of the articles could instead of being called *pragmatic* or *pragmalinguistic* be labelled *sociolinguistic*. Most authors that have contributed to this volume are located in Scandinavia, and thus maybe it gives a good impression of the concerns of North European linguists.

**Literature review.** One of the most dynamically developing directions in modern linguistics is pragmalinguistics. The researchers interpret various aspects of pragmatic linguistics. According to Y.D Apresyian, the pragmatics is speaker's (1) true nature; 2) the content of the communication; 3) written convention of the addressee in any language unit (lexema, affix, grammatical syntax). In general, the definitions of linguistic pragmatics in scientific literature can be grouped as follows: 1) explanations that overpass human factor; 2) the definitions of the functional aspect of linguopragmatic researches, their contextual condition: "science of language use", "language in context"; 3) definitions that focus on studying the effectiveness of language interaction in the context of communicative interaction; 4) definitions that distinguish an interpretive aspect of the speech that is reflected in any communicative context. The interpretation here is pragmatic meaning of the word [1,78].

**Research methodology.** Pragmatics means "action" in Greek. Hence, its



subject is the language in use. In philosophy and psychology, this term is used to refer to action, practice. Linguistic pragmatics is a language that is studied as a means of “use within itself, not for itself”. At present, pragmatics is an inter-sectoral branch, as well as a wide range of logical-philosophical, sociological, psychological, ethnographic, and even cybernetic trends along with all aspects of linguistics. The general theoretical objectives of pragmatics include the development of cognitive modeling, memory modeling, and the model of communicative interaction and models of language use in specific socio-cultural situations. In fact, pragmalinguistics is not yet fully formulated as a science. However, it is clear that its language presence is a research oriented one. This is the need to put human factor first in linguistic research. This idea comes from the idea that it begins with semiotics. Semiotics (Greek symbol) is a science discipline that studies the structure and use of various character systems in the storage and delivery of information. It includes systems that relate to human society, nature, or human beings. In general, knowledge of the language is based on its system structure, i.e. acquisition of grammatical rules, understanding of lexical meaning of words, ability to compose sentences on the basis of syntax, etc. is understood. This is a requirement for traditional linguistics.

Speech acts- towards macropragmatics. The three brief subsections above have shown that deixis, presupposition and implicature make their distinctive micropragmatic contributions to understanding how an utterance is built, what its referents are and how they are encoded, what assumptions are made before the utterance is produced, what effects can be expected after it has been produced and what inferential processes determine these effects. They partake in the process of enacting goals of the utterance, from the speaker’s intention to realize its envisaged function via application of specific indicators of force, to the hearer’s successful recognition of this function and its results. A procedure this complex needs a controlling, ‘umbrella’ parameter of description. It needs a conceptual tool that is able to cover both speaker and hearer related aspects of the utterance function, and, while doing so, draw upon and thus systematize the particular contributions from deixis, presupposition, and implicature in order to make them fit for macropragmatic work at the discourse level. The concept of the speech act seems an excellent theoretical candidate to take up this task.

The orientation of speech acts to both parties of a verbal exchange, as well as to its linguistic matter, is visible at a glance from the traditional distinction between the locutionary, the illocutionary, and the perlocutionary aspects of a speech act. While the locutionary aspect is the most ‘objective’ since it concerns the stable language form of the utterance, the illocutionary and perlocutionary aspects involve a dynamic negotiation of meaning between the speaker and the hearer. In saying “It’s hot in here” a speaker may be producing an (implicit) illocutionary act requesting the hearer to open the window, and the perlocutionary act (effect) might be that the hearer indeed opens it, but it might also be that he or she turns on the air-conditioning instead. Thus, the illocutionary-perlocutionary relation not only mirrors the complex process of meaning evolution as sketched at the beginning of this subsection; it also inscribes in the distinction between explicit and implicit ways of communicating a speech act. Consequently, it invokes the notions of deixis, presupposition, and implicature, since they all situate themselves at some specific yet different points of the conceptual axis which links ‘what is said’ with ‘what is effected’.

The classificatory, controlling power of the speech act is further reflected in its network of felicity conditions, i.e. the conditions that underlie a successful, logical, ‘felicitous’ production of different acts. For example, a speaker cannot make a successful order if he or she does not sincerely want the order to be followed, or if he or she deems the hearer incapable of following it. These two felicity conditions are excellent illustrations of the connection that holds between the concepts of the speech act and the other ‘micropragmatic’ concepts – a relation we have postulated at the beginning of this subsection. The speaker’s awareness of cognitive and social context obtaining at the moment of producing a speech act gives rise to pragmatic presuppositions underlying the utterance that contains this act. Then, once the act is accomplished, the speaker’s presuppositions can be assessed against the effectiveness of implicatures they helped to create.

From the perspective of micropragmatic analysis oriented toward the speech act characterization of the function of the utterance, as well as the macropragmatic



perspective of the discourse, a rigid distinction between semantic and pragmatic presupposition seems far from necessary. It offers little explanatory power compared to an integrated, global view of presupposition as a concept which should be studied against the utterance and discourse goals it serves. Such a view is quite naturally pragmatic, because even though there are specific lexical items associated with specific assumptions, their descriptive capacity does not expire within the structural boundaries of the linguistic expression. On the contrary, their significance goes much beyond as they are able to combine with primarily experiential premises and thus successfully contribute to a network of contextual, often non-linguistic beliefs making up the entire load of knowledge shared by the speaker and the hearer.

**Conclusion.** Ultimately, there are two types of intentions in language communication: 1) the speaker's initial approach; 2) a suddenly emerged situation later. It should also be noted that the intent is adaptive, inconstancy. In the end, it is lawful for each of the participants to have their own objective in each particular situation and to try to harmonize the story with their own approach. The reason is that each participant has the goal of speaking effectively. Thus, the bases for describing the concept of the participatory approach can be summarized as follows: 1) the aim of the intentional intentions is direct and indirect; 2) implication and explicit intensities due to introspection or intentional representation of the intention during the conversation; 3) intentional (mentally) intentions, which are carried out due to the motivation of any actors to act; 4) positive and negative intensities in terms of emotional impact on participants; 5) intensification of the short-term or event-related events, due to the cause of development or development. Thus, intention is an important factor that stimulates the realization of any cooperative situation

#### References:



1. Apresiyani Yu.Yu. Connotation as part of the pragmatics of the word // Selected works I, II: Integral description of the language and lexicography system. M., 1995.
2. Formanovskaya N.I. Speech communication: communicative and pragmatic approach. M., 2002.
3. Susov I.P. Prolog structure of utterance // Linguistic communication and its units: collection of scientific papers. Kalinin: 1986. 7-11 p.
4. Austin J.L. (1962) How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.
5. Morris C.W. (1938) Foundations of the theory of signs. University of Chicago Press.
6. Grice H.P. (1975) Logic and conversation. In P.Cole and J.L. Morgan (Eds), Syntax and semantics, Academic Press.