THE PRAGMATIC ASPECT OF LANGUAGE

Rukhsora Abduvaliyeva
Master's Degree Student , National University of Uzbekistan
Named After Mirzo Ulugbek
Shoira Yusupova
Associate Professor , National university of Uzbekistan
Named After Mirzo Ulugbek

Annotation
This article discusses the main concepts that serve as the basis for the emergence and formation of such a discipline as pragmalinguistics . The chronological order ,the names of the researchers and their main ideas that have been developed at the present time.

Key words
pragmatics , linguopragmatics , concept , pragmatism , the speech theory , significance, signification , representer.

Introduction

Pragmatics is a relatively young field of linguistics, the origins of which are connected with the names of such famous Western philosophers as C. Pierce, C. Morris. In their works general ideas were first formulated functioning of signs and sign systems, the basic concepts of semiotics are defined, a distinction is made between syntax, semantics and pragmatics. We will look at, in chronological order, how developed ideas of pragmatics and what's new in this area of knowledge was introduced by foreign linguistics.

Main part

The main principle of pragmatism can be traced in the theory of the sign, created by the founder of semiotics C. Pierce. By C. Pierce, the sign constitutes a trinomial relation. Members are: a) a sign (in the terminology of C. Peirce, representative), understood as a sign means, i.e. a certain quantity that has a physical nature and is capable of replacing anything; b) another produced by this sign a sign localized in the mind of the interpreter and defined as the interpretant of the first sign; c) an object represented by the sign [1].

C. Pierce sometimes called the interpreter meaning (significance, signification). From here follows the main principle of the philosophy of pragmatism: meaning

should be considered in the light of the possible consequences, practical results in terms of choosing actions that lead to success and gain. The interpreter just absorbs those moments that she triedcomprehend the philosophy of pragmatism.

The ideas of C. Pierce were developed by the American semiotician, the creator of the original semiotic theory C. Morris, who introduced into the use of the term "pragmatics" itself.

Ch. Morris's theory of the sign evolved of three parts: 1) semantics, i.e. relations signs to objects; 2) syntactics, i.e. relations between signs; 3) pragmatists, i.e. relationship between signs and speaker.

Pragmatics thus studies the behavior of signs in real communication processes. R. Carnap transformed the theory of the sign C. Morris. The difference between their concepts is as follows: C. Morris has all three dimensions - syntactics, semantics and pragmatics - to a certain extent are equal, in while in R. Carnap semantics appears as a particular aspect of pragmatics, and when this is consistent with the nature of the meanings of the signs of natural human language in the context of their use. Syntactics is isolated from semantics and rather reflect properties of the so-called. formalized languages that are built from logical calculus and the semantic interpretation attributed to it. Being devoid of semantic rules, a formalized language becomes calculus, that is, a purely syntactic, uninterpreted system. And vice versa, adding rules of interpretation to the calculus makes it a semantic system. Thus, Ch. Morris transformations associated with his desire to identify and describe the relationship between semantics, syntactics and pragmatics. Moreover, the broadest concept is pragmatics, within semantics and syntactics, relations between which are also built on the inclusion of a wider concepts of semantics, including syntactics.

Another linguist who played a significant role in the formation of pragmatic ideas in linguistics is the Austrian psychologist K. Buhler.

Language, according to K. Buhler, in the process of functioning binds the sender of the sign, the recipient of the sign and the area of objects and situations (states of affairs). He does three functions. First, the sign as a symbol is correlated with objects and situations. This K. Buhler calls the function representation (representation, Darstellung). Secondly, expressing the internal state of the sender, the sign acts as a symptom. Initially this function was called expression, later the name "expression" was assigned to it (expression, Ausdruck). Thirdly, being facing the listener, controlling him external behavior or internal state, the sign acts as a signal. This function was first called motivation, then the term "appeal" was

International Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities. Finland Academic Research Science Publishers
ISSN: 2945-4492 (online) | (SJIF) = 7.502

Volume-11| Issue-4| 2023 Published: |22-04-2023|

assigned to it (address, Appell). One of the functions can dominate, which does not mean the complete suppression of the other two. It can be assumed that the representative function is in the hands of semantics. As for the expressive and appellative functions, they are mainly should be explored in pragmatics. So Thus, in the works of K. Buhler there is selection and semantics from pragmatics and treating them as interacting but phenomena independent in their functions.

Second Wave of Pragmatics Research came in the period after World War II war. Formation of linguistic pragmatists relied heavily on philosophical ideas and, above all, on the concept of the late L. Wittgenstein. It was his works that largely contributed to the transformation of pragmatics as part of a general semiotic theory into an independent field of research, laid the foundation for powerful flow of modern work on pragmatics.

The main thesis of the principles of L. Wittgenstein: the essence of social activity, just like language, is to follow the rules. The latter are constitutive of activity, since something can be identified as action only on the basis of certain rules [2, p. 402]. At the same time, L. Wittgenstein came to the interpretation of linguistic meaning as usage. Meaning as usage belongs not so much to language as how much for the subject using the language.

True, according to I.P. Susov, this approach led to the pragmatization of linguistic meaning as a whole and in essence meant that it was taken out of the bounds of linguistic semantics, and that semantics was involuntarily deprived of its object [3]. Based on a philosophical concept L. Wittgenstein and his ideas of use language, social context, extralinguistic situation, scientists began to develop and develop various areas and aspects linguopragmatists, united by the installation on the functioning of the language in real acts of speech and situations of communication.

G. Grice following L. Wittgenstein, he continues to study linguistic meaning, and the theory that he developed, called the "theory pragmatic meaning. G. Grice came to the idea that communication is subject to fairly strict laws and at the same time it is ordered in a certain way. In particular, speaking is one of the types of purposeful and rational behavior. And thus, it is precisely in the way communication proceeds, how social prescriptions are observed or not observed, that the keys to the interpretation of meanings are found statements, especially implicit, not expressed literally. G. Grice postulates organizing communication and using participants in the dialogue Principle of Cooperation, which is expected of all communicants, if for them the purpose of communication is the most effective

transfer of information. It is formulated as follows: "Your contribution to this dialogue step should be requires a jointly adopted goal (direction) of this dialogue" [4, p. 221].

As a result the ideas of G. Grice allowed the pragmatist to more related to communication and consider the role of communicators.

In the 1960s–1970s representatives of the Oxford School J. Austin and J. Searle turned to the study of natural language. As a result, the focus of attention of linguistic research was a person with its characteristics and goals, which it pursues in the process of communication. The theory that was developed by J. Austin and J. Serlem, was called the "theory of speech acts".

Composite Components speech act, according to J. Austin, are a locutionary act (the act of pronouncing something), illocutionary act (the act that we perform when pronouncing something) and perlocutionary act (the implementation of certain effects, intentional or unintentional, through this statement) [5, p. 22-26]. J. Searle highlights as a separate type of speech act expressives whose illocutionary purpose is to "express the psychological state specified by the condition sincerity about the state of affairs, defined within the propositional content" [6, p. 155].

In general, in our opinion, the above, theories that develop certain aspects of linguopragmatics can be defined as the study of language in use (language in use, Sprachverwendung, l'usage de language) [7].

The problem of the status of pragmatics and the disciplines associated with it has been covered in works by S.K. Levinson. He also characterizes the subject of pragmatics in the traditional for the Anglo-Saxon thought plan, namely as the study of language usage (language usage). Noting the incompleteness of this definition, he critically analyzes one definition after another, which relate to different possible major research objects of pragmatics. Ultimately, S. Levinson's attention is drawn to the contextual, discursive, pragmatic meanings of linguistic objects used in communication. Thereby pragmatics approaches semantics and sociolinguistics, partly psycholinguistics, but does not merge with them. She must viewed as a linguistic discipline within an integrated theory language.

J.N. Lich, like L. Wittgenstein, includes pragmatics in linguistics. She, in his opinion, studies the statements, which receive values in situations. He recognizes the strongest influence on the formation of a pragmatic approach behind the treatment of meaning in terms of illocutionary power by J.L. Austin and J.R. Searle and in terms of colloquial implicature of G.P. Grice.

Language as a communication system includes language as a formal system (grammar in the broadest sense words) and complementary to her pragmatism. Unlike grammar, pragmatics is axiological (goal-directed) and evaluative. However, J. Leach considers it legitimate and necessary to converge between grammar and rhetoric.

J. Leach builds his "formal-functional paradigm" in the form of a set of postulates that fix the differences between the formal and functional components. The theory of meaning (and in fact everything language) is, according to J. Leach, who here follows J.L. Austin and J.R. Serlu, part of the theory of activity. Therefore, meaning is defined in terms of describing what that speakers as creators of speech acts produced in relation to the listeners. Concerning the question of the relationship between semantics and pragmatics, J. Leach takes "complementary" position. In general pragmatics, he distinguishes between pragmalinguistics, closer to grammar, and sociopragmatics, closer to sociology.

Conclusion

So, we have considered the main theories, on the basis of which new concepts in pragmalinguistics were formed and are currently being developed by foreign and domestic authors. In general, the main specific feature of this discipline is that the focus is on the dynamic of the beginning, namely the communicative activity carried out by a person in certain social and interpersonal conditions, with certain motives and goals, using special language means inventoryed and modeled in their relationship to each other by system-structural linguistics.

REFERENCES:

1. Austin J.L. "Word as an action. New in foreign linguistics. "The theory of speech acts" / 1986

2. Grice H. Logic and Conversation // Syntax and Semantics. Vol.

3: Speech Acts. N.Y., 1975.

3. Pierce Ch.S. "Logical foundations of the theory of signs" / transl. from English. V.V. Kiryushchenko, M.V. Kolopotina. SPb., 2000.

4. Wittgenstein L "Selected works"/ transl. from English and german by V.M.Rudnev. , 2005

5. Глушко О.Б. Прагматические аспекты исследований по прагматике // Филологическиенауки. Вопросы теории и практики: в 2 ч. Тамбов, 2008. № 1 (1). Ч. 1. С. 71-73.

6.   Грайс Г.Ф. Логика и речевое общение // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М., 1985. Вып. 16. С. 217-237.