

Scientific-Theoretical Views of Pragmalinguistic

Pardayeva Sojida Ahmatovna¹

¹ Tashkent State University of Economics, 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, dialogue, 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.

In world linguistics, a number of fundamental studies are being conducted to identify the social factors influencing the development the presentation of dialogic speech as a type of speech activity that has a communicative and functional-pragmatic orientation. This made it possible to prove that, like any other activity, speech activity is regulated by certain rules. The dissertation systematizes and describes ten main extralinguistic principles of English dialogical speech constitution, and an attempt is made to analyze the interaction of the selected principles, the degree of their significance for organizing a conflict-free dialogue, as well as the features of speech means of their expression. This study identifies and systematizes in a new way the factors that contribute to the actualization of the personal characteristics of communicants in the dialogue, and analyzes the influence of the communicative situation on the actualization of the personal properties of the participants in the dialogue and their choice of speech means of influencing the interlocutor.

The complex use of modern research methods, including as the main ones: the hypothetical-deductive method, the method of semantic-syntactic description of statements of various types, the method of contextual analysis, as well as elements of propositional, intentional and actor-speech analysis.

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 linguistic 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.

The main distinction between language and speech is in the following:

- 1) language is abstract and speech is concrete;
- 2) language is common, general for all the bearers while speech is individual;
- 3) language is stable, less changeable while speech tends to changes;
- 4) language is a closed system, its units are limited while speech tends to be openness and endless.

It is very important to take into account these distinctions when considering the language and speech units. There are some conceptions according to which the terms of "language levels" are substituted by the term of "emic level" while the "speech levels" are substituted by "ethic levels". Very often these terms are used interchangeably. The lowest level in the hierarchy of levels has two special terms: phonology and phonetics. Phonology is the level that deals with language units and phonetics is the level that deals with speech units. The lowest level deals with language and speech units which are the smallest and meaningless. So, the smallest meaningless unit of language is called phoneme; the smallest meaningless unit of speech is called phone. As it's been said above the language units are abstract and limited in number which means that phonemes are abstract and that they are of definite number in languages. The speech units are concrete, changeable and actually endless. This means that language units (phonemes) are represented in speech differently which depends on the person that pronounces them and on the combinability of the phoneme.

Phonemes when pronounced in concrete speech vary from person to person, according to how he has got used to pronounce this or that sound. In linguistic theory it is explained by the term "idiolect" that is, individual dialect. Besides, there may be positional changes (combinability): depending on the sounds that precede and follow the sound that we are interested in the pronunciation of it may be different, compare: low and battle. The sound "l" will be pronounced differently in these two words because the letter "l" in the first word is placed in the initial position and in the second word it stands after the letter "t". So we face "light" (in the first word) and "dark" version (in the second case). These alternants are said to be in the complimentary distribution and they are called allophones (variants, options or alternants) of one phoneme. Thus allophone is a variant of a phoneme. The second level in the hierarchy of strata is called morphological. There's only one term for both language and speech but the units have different terms: morpheme for language and morph for speech. This level deals with units that are also smallest but in this case they are meaningful. So the smallest meaningful unit of language is called a morpheme and the smallest meaningful unit of speech is called a morph. The morphs that have different forms, but identical (similar) meanings are united into one morpheme and called "allomorphs". The morpheme of the past tense has at least three allomorphs, they are. /t/, /d/, /id/ - Examples: worked, phoned and wanted. The variant of the morpheme depends on the preceding sound in the word. The third level is lexicological which deals with words. Word may be a common term for language and speech units. Some linguists offer specific terms for language and speech: "lexeme" for language and "lex" for speech.

The correlation between "lexeme" and "lex" is the same as it is between "phoneme" and "phone" and "morpheme" and "morph". "Lexeme" is a language unit of the lexicological level which has a nominative function. "Lex" is a speech unit of the lexicological level which has a nominative function. Thus, both lexeme and lex nominate something or name things, actions phenomena, quality, quantity and so on. Examples: tree, pen, sky, red, worker, friendship, ungentlemanly and so on. An abstract lexeme "table" of language is used in speech as lex with concrete meaning of "writing table", "dinner table", "round table", "square table", and so on. There may be "allolexes" like allophones and allomorphs. Allolexes are lexes that have identical or similar meanings but different forms, compare: start, commence, begin. To avoid confusion between "morpheme" and "lexemes" it is very important to remember that morphemes are structural units while lexemes are communicative units: morpheme are built of phonemes and they are used to build words - lexemes. Lexemes take an immediate part in shaping the thoughts, that is, in building sentences. Besides, lexemes may consist of one or more morphemes. The lexeme "tree" consists of one morpheme while the lexeme "ungentlemanly" consists of four morphemes: un - gentle - man - ly.

The next level is syntax - minor which deals with sentences. The term "Syntax - minor" is common one for both language and speech levels and their unit "sentence" is also one common term for language and speech units. The linguistics hasn't yet worked out separate terms for those purposes. The abstract notion "sentence" of language can have concrete its representation in speech which is also called "Sentence" due to the absence of the special term. Example: "An idea of writing a letter" on the abstract language level can have its concrete representation in speech: John writes a letter. A letter is written by John. Since one and the same idea is expressed in two different forms they are called "allo - sentences". Some authors call them grammatical synonyms. Thus, sentence is language and speech units on the syntax - minor level, which has a communicative function. In the same way the level syntax - major can be explained. The unit of this level is text - the highest level of language and speech. "Syntax- major" represents both language and speech levels due to the absence of separate term as well as "text" is used homogeneously for both language and speech units.

The language and speech units are interconnected and interdependent. This can easily be proved by the fact that the units of lower level are used to make up or to build the units of the next higher level: phones are used as building material for morphs, and morphs are used to build lexes and the latter are used to construct sentences. Besides, the homonyms that appear in the phonetical level can be explained on the following higher level, compare: - "er" is a homonymous morph. In order to find out in which meaning it is used we'll have to use it on the lexicological level; if it is added to verbs like "teacher", "worker" then it will have one meaning but if we use it with adjectives like "higher", "lower" it will have another meaning. Before getting down to "the theoretical grammar" course one has to know the information given above.

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.
4. Graham J.L., Mintu A.T., Rodgers W. Explorations of negotiation behaviours in ten foreign cultures using a model developed in the United States // Management Science. Vol.40, № 1. - January, 1994.
5. Karaulov Yu.N., 2004. Russian Language and Linguistic Personality. Moscow: Editorial URSS. Pp. 245 (in Russian).
6. Schweitzer M.E., DeChurch L.A. Linking frames in negotiations: gains, losses and conflict frame adoption, 2001.