

INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPT OF PRAGMATICS IN MODERN FOREIGN
AND NATIONAL STUDIES

PRAGMATIKA TUSHUNCHASINING HOZIRGI ZAMON XORIJIY VA MILLIY
TADQIQOTLARDAGI TALQINI



Mirzayev Djasur Jaxonovich

Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti Ingliz filologiyasi kafedrasasi o'qituvchisi Samarkand state institute of foreign languages Teacher of the department of English Philology
E-mail: djasur.mirzaev@mail.ru Phone: +998 91 535 89 30

Abstract. this article emphasize on pragmatics in modern and traditional studies as well as given several notions concerning interpretation of the concept of pragmatics from prominent linguists who contributed in this sphere.

Keywords: *pragmatics, internal, pragmalinguistics, pragmasemantics, pragmastylistics, connotative-pragmatic.*

Annotatsiya. ushbu maqolada zamonaviy va an'anaviy tadqiqotlarda pragmatikaga alohida e'tibor qaratilgan bo'lib, ushbu sohaga hissa qo'shgan taniqli tilshunoslarning pragmatik tushunchasini talqin qilish bo'yicha bir nechta fikrlar keltirilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: *pragmatika, ichki, pragmalingvistika, pragmasematika, pragmastilistika, konnotativ-pragmatika.*

Аннотация. в этой статье особое внимание уделяется прагматике в современных и традиционных исследованиях, а также приводится несколько мнений относительно интерпретации понятия прагматики выдающихся лингвистов, внесших свой вклад в эту область.

Ключевые слова: *прагматика, внутренняя, прагмалингвистика, прагмасемантика, прагмастилистика, коннотативно-прагматика.*

INTRODUCTION (KIRISH). During the first quarter of the 20th century, foreign languages received more attention in our nation since knowing foreign languages is still necessary and a sign of development in an era of globalization and integration. As our president, Sh.M. Mirziyoyev "today, perhaps, there is no need to underestimate the importance of excellent knowledge of foreign languages for our country, striving to take a worthy place in the world community, for our people, building their great future in harmony, cooperation with our foreign partners" [1]. From this perspective, pragmatics is a relatively new field of linguistics that studies

human speech activity, including its goal, content, and modes of verbal and nonverbal expression in written and oral texts. It also looks at how these expressions are used in oral and written communication, their role in the speech act, the impact they have on communication, and how different relations between the speaker and the listener are expressed in linguistic signs. Though there have long been hypotheses on the characteristics of linguistic signs, a pragmatic approach to the study of linguistic phenomena started to take shape in the 1970s and is still a topic of debate in the scientific community.

MATERIALS AND METHODS / (ADABIYOTLAR TAHLILI VA METOD). The late nineteenth and early twentieth century saw the beginnings of the development of pragmatics as a science. It is founded on the philosophical ideas of scientists like Morris, Ch. Morris, U. James, D. Dewey, and Ch. Pierce. The American scientist Charles Morris introduced the term “pragmatics” into the theory of scientific research. The concept of pragmatics was first used in semiotic scientific research devoted to the study of the structure of the linguistic situation (as a speaker and listener relationship) in a dynamic procedural aspect. The idea of splitting semiotics, the science of studying linguistic signs, into three sections arose from the further development of Ch. Pierce’s views on this matter: pragmatics, which studies the relationship between speaker and listener and linguistic signs, semantics, which studies the relationship between linguistic signs and objects, and syntax, which studies the relationship between linguistic signs. The development of pragmatics as an independent area of linguistic study is closely associated with developments in linguistic theory during the latter part of the twentieth century. According to Stepanov, “pragmatics is a science that studies in a social context linguistic problems that were the object of study of traditional stylistic and ancient rhetorical sciences: communicative relations that learn to selectively express their opinions from a set of existing linguistic features in more expressive, imaginative, appropriate to the communicative situation, more accurate, beautiful linguistic means” [2]. The philosophical idea of Wittgenstein had some positive effects on the development of language pragmatics. The scientist's identification of subjective aspects as one of the most crucial elements in language acquisition makes this approach distinctive. He also emphasized the need of considering circumstances outside of the text that result from human behavior in addition to the internal context of the text [3]. In linguistic literature, pragmatics is now a commonly used term. The majority of researchers currently contend that the idea of linguistic pragmatics lacks clearly defined bounds. Its broad definitions include the incorporation of linguistic elements into a speech act's function, the relationship between ideas expressed during speech activity, the speaker-listener dynamic, and the communicative context of speech acts. However, pragmatics is understood as an actual communicative scenario where the selective use of language tools is necessary to address communicative issues [4]. In this respect, proponents of the third trend understood linguistic pragmatics as a field of study that focuses on particular language talents that influence an individual during speech.

The study of pragmatics includes an examination of all the conditions and scenarios in which people use language signals. The use of appropriate, sufficient language methods to exert a communicative influence on the other party is known as the use of conditions and situations. In addition to offering a wealth of factual material for the study of linguistic and non-sexual, implicit forms of pragmatic impact, the examination of such settings can benefit students researching the transfer of these pragmatic features in translation. As a result, the problems associated with integrating lexical units into speech and text functions gave rise to the field of textual pragmatics,

which is now a scientific discipline that studies and teaches speech act regulations, word choice, public relations applications, and the impact of speech patterns on speech participants. The fact that pragmatics has taken diverse paths in its development can be attributed to its broad conception. This reveals the relationship between pragmatics and the fields of lexicology, stylistics, cognitive linguistics, and general linguistics. This marked the beginning of the independent study of textual pragmatics' place in the theories of speech act, deixis, and discourse. Consequently, he developed his own "internal" branches, including textual pragmatics, pragmalinguistics, pragmasemantics, and pragmastilistics.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS (MUHOKAMA VA NATIJALAR). In the years that followed, data articulated at the word level started to be examined from the perspective of linguistic unity's introduction into the task in a wide context. At this time, an extra (connotative) meaning—a pragmatic meaning—began to be understood in relation to the communicative aim, attitude, action, and their affective, voluntative, appellative, relational, and aesthetic functions—all of which are represented by a language unit [5]. Studying a word's expressive, emotional, and evaluative connotative meaning—that is, its pragmatic meaning—became necessary when a speaker or author wanted to draw the reader's or listener's attention, engage them in conversation, pique their interest, or, on the other hand, divert, excite, persuade, or deceive. Thus, pragmatic and communicative demands are what lead to the usage of the word's new meaning. It is not always possible to grasp the connotation—the true meaning of a given thought—through the examination of lexical and semantic methods. Research has shown that a wide range of extralinguistic elements, including context, prior knowledge, communicative presuppositions, distance between interlocutors, and many more, greatly influence the formation of connotative-pragmatic meaning when analyzing pragmatically conveyed speech or text. It is challenging to promote a word simultaneously so that context and the entrance of a word into a semantic variant can both reveal an inferred additional meaning. The semantic meaning of the word ultimately takes precedence over its grammatical components [6]. The impact of the lexical meaning on the addressee (listener or reader), which implies the accomplishment of the intended purpose, is supported by the author or speaker in an additional, frequently non-standard (odd) meaning. This approach is carried out by applying the word's pragmatic semantic meaning options. The qualities of the addressee (listener or reader), the consistency of prior information, and extralinguistic elements like the specifics of the speech context must all be considered during this process. These are, of course, external pragmatic elements of a lexical unit that have an impact at a particular contextual level. In the meanwhile, a word with a second (connotative) meaning may have pragmatic elements as well as semantic elements. This circumstance is more obvious when the word has associative indications or when analogy is used. We can utilize these antecedent names as analogues for naming other people since, for instance, the expressive and evaluative pragmatic components of names like Don Juan and Gargantua (naive, effeminate) are related with the names of well-known characters in French literature. The communicative and functional paradigms of linguistics have advanced due to the use of pragmatic meaning (connotation) in speech and the development of principles for identifying extra, frequently implicit (non-verbal) communicated meanings. This idea started to be applied in a broader sense than in the past because of the pragmatic connotative speech, which is represented through word usage and linguistic units. This is the study of the meaning implied on a large scale of speech and text, and it is a complicated and fruitful field of research. Frequently, it seems that a pragmatic interpretation—one that is implied—may emerge

even beyond the supplementary interpretation. According to conventional research, the author's creative intentions give rise to both implicit meaning—which is not included in the word's semantic structure—and the connotation that the speaker implied but left unsaid. These goals also involve context, though it is acknowledged that this context is based on a small sample of texts [7].

Today, individual words, phrases, phraseological units, phrases, and proverbs are used to study the semantic structure of a lexical unit—the circumstances that generate in its structure what we term an extra meaning or a pragmatic, connotative meaning. Thus, internal and exterior pragmatic indications of connotative meaning are identified based on a pragmatic analysis. The presence of pragmatic elements in the word content's structure is linked to the internal connotation indicators. However, extralinguistic factors like the context of a given communicative act, the nature of the relationship between the interlocutors, their background knowledge—that is, their knowledge—and their proximity to one another—as well as the presuppositions of communication—determine external pragmatic signs. As a result, connotations might be of two different kinds: those that are expressed by the word itself and broaden its semantic structure, and those that are expressed by the text and create a rhythm. The development of practical communication skills results from studying text and speech from a pragmatic perspective. These skills include conforming to communication norms, taking into account the interlocutor's personality and background knowledge, mastering speech etiquette rules in the process of communication, and understanding the cultural organization of the communication process. Conversely, pragmatics sets guidelines and standards for the efficient application of linguistic resources. For the first time in linguistics, E.S. Aznaurova's research theoretically supported the fundamentals of linguistic and pragmatic word analysis based on the fundamentals of a communicative and pragmatic situation. The scientist stresses the following among them:

- the context and location of the communication act;
- the subject and goal of the communication;
- the moral and personal qualities of the communication participants;
- the dynamics between the participants in the dialogue [8].

Linguistic pragmatics, according to Y.D. Apresyan, is a novel idea within the framework of the so-called linguistic unity (lexeme, affix, grammar refers to a speaker's attitude toward the environment, information content, listener (reader), and syntactic construction [6]. For instance, “the pragmatic meaning that the word represents has a negative characteristic, even though the meanings of the French words initiator, innovator, and educator have zero pragmatic characteristics, this word has a connotative meaning of initiator of some bad (negative) deed”. As a result, the semantics of the word get a new pragmatic meaning, or a new shade of meaning. Y.D. Apresyan claims to have added more symbols to the dictionary definition, including polite, vulgar-rude, ironic, affectionate, disapproving, harsh, dismissive, pragmatic and stylistic signs like humorous, the euphemistic promises introducing. [6]. As a result, research on the expressive and affective effects of language units conveying pragmatic meaning was able to take a new and pragmatic turn. Referencing the text is necessary when analyzing the pragmatic (connotative) potential (degree of influence) of any linguistic unit in speech (text) and when identifying the pragmatic elements that have been expressed in written or oral speech. Through the investigation of linguistic phenomena in the text's structure through different speech segments, the reader is assisted in understanding additional information expressed in a word, phrase, or sentence in

context through the use of creative intuition (feeling, perception). The introduction of linguistic units into such a function in a sentence, text, or context is understood as both the process by which human thought generates new artificial units and their comprehension, as well as a way to expose their meaning in the surrounding environment of words. Pragmatic study is based on egocentric words since they indicate a speaker's level of linguistic proficiency. Simultaneously, the word's "dictionary" meaning establishes the content of what is being said, while the contextual meaning reveals the degree to which the feature—such as purposefulness or attitude toward certain subject—is reflected in the material. Because of this, the speaker's pragmatic experience—which includes cognitive knowledge and communicative objectives—is reflected in the semantic-syntactic structure of thought as a whole.

CONCLUSION (XULOSA). Linguistics emphasizes that the degree to which communicants employ linguistic means—which are described as linguistic, extralinguistic, and encyclopedic information—during the communication process relies on the extent of their prior knowledge.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Mirziyoev Sh. Adabiyot va san'at, madaniyatni rivojlantirish xalqimiz ma'naviy olamini yuksaltirishning mustahkam poydevoridir mavzusida O'zbekiston ijodkor ziyolilari vakillari bilan uchrashuvdagi ma'ruzasi // Xalq so'zi. 2019 yil, 4-avgust.
2. Степанов, Ю.С. В поисках прагматики (проблема субъекта) // Известия АН СССР, Серия литературы и языка, т.40 . -М., 1981.- №4.-Р. 330-331.
3. Нойберт А. Прагматические аспекты перевода // Вопросы теории перевода в зарубежной лингвистике. – М.,1978. – Р. 185-202.
4. Демьянков, В.З. Прагматические основы интерпретации высказывания. // Известия АН СССР. Серия лит-ры и языка.1981. Т.40. - № 4. - Р. 368-377.
5. Арнольд, И.В. Импликация как прием построения текста и предмет филологического изучения // Вопросы языкознания, 1982.- №4.-Р. 83-91.
6. Апресян Ю.Д. Дейксис в лексике и грамматике и наивная модель мира// Семиотика и информатика. 1986, вып. 28.-Р. 5-33.
7. . Гальперин, И.Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2004. - 144 р.
8. Азнаурова, Э.С. Прагматика художественного слова Текст. / Э.С. Азнаурова. Ташкент: Фан, 1988. - 121 р.