THE INTERPRETATION OF THE CONCEPT OF PRAGMATICS IN MODERN RESEARCH

Aziza Shuhratovna Najmiddinova

Independent researcher (PhD) of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. This article discusses the interpretation of the concept of pragmatics in modern research. There is also information about the concept of pragmatics began to be used in semiotic scientific research dedicated to the study of the structure of the linguistic situation.

Keywords: concept of pragmatics, modern research, interpretation language, teach, social, learn, methods, environment, category of relations, pragmatic relations.

ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ ПОНЯТИЯ ПРАГМАТИКИ В СОВРЕМЕННЫХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯХ

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматривается трактовка понятия прагматика в современных исследованиях. Имеются также сведения о том, что понятие прагматика стало использоваться в семиотических научных исследованиях, посвященных изучению структуры языковой ситуации.

Ключевые слова: концепция прагматики, современные исследования, интерпретационный язык, обучение, социальное, обучение, методы, среда, категория отношений, прагматические отношения.

The first stages of the formation of the science of pragmatics in the late 11th and early 20th centuries Ch.Pierce, U.James, D.Dewey. It is based on the philosophical concepts of scholars such as Morris. Initially, the concept of pragmatics began to be used in semiotic scientific research dedicated to the study of the structure of the linguistic situation (as the relationship between the speaker and the listener) in a dynamic procedural aspect, and the term "pragmatics" was introduced into the theory of scientific research by the American scientist Charles Morris. He further developed the views of S.Peirce in this regard and put forward the idea of dividing semiotics as a science that studies linguistic signs into three parts: syntax, which studies the relationship of linguistic signs to each other, semantics, which studies the relationship of linguistic signs to objects, and pragmatics, which studies the relationship between speakers and listeners of language signs. The formation of pragmatics as a separate field in linguistic research is directly related to the linguistic views that emerged in the second half of the 20th century. Yu.S.Stepanov pointed out, "pragmatics is the linguistic problem that has been the object of research of traditional stylistics and ancient rhetoric: it is a science that studies communicative relations in a social context, learning to express one's thoughts more effectively, more figuratively, more accurately, more beautifully, from the set of existing linguistic signs" [Stepanov, 1985:15]. To the formation of linguistic pragmatics, L.Wittgenstein's philosophical concept has had some effect. The peculiarity of this concept is that the scientist singled out subjective factors as one of the important factors in language learning. He also emphasized the need to take into account not only the internal context of the text, but also extra-linguistic situations created by the influence of human activity [Neubert 1978:187]. Today, the term pragmatics is used in a broad sense in linguistic literature. Currently, according to many researchers, the clear boundaries of the concept of linguistic pragmatics are not defined. Its general boundaries can be defined as the entry into function of linguistic symbols in the speech

process, as well as the mutual relations of the thoughts expressed in the speech activity, the speaker and listener relations, and the communicative situation in speech acts. On the other hand, pragmatics is interpreted as a real situation of communication, which implies the selective use of linguistic tools in order to solve communicative tasks [Demyankov 1981;Dudina 1990; Pocheptsov 1980]. Supporters of the third direction in this regard interpreted linguistic pragmatics as a branch of science that studies the specific goal-oriented capabilities of language that affects a person to a certain extent during the speech process. [Marov 1989;Nakhimova 2007; Klaus, 1967; Kiseleva, 1978, 1979]. The general principles of pragmatics were covered in detail in the studies of G. Leech (1983), S. Levinson (1984), N. D. Arutyunova (1985), E. E.Paducheva (1985), I. P. Susov (1999) and others. In this case, there are various classifications of pragmatics, but all of them are based on the general concept that "one of the main features of the linguistic sign is the expression of the relationship between the speaker and the listener" defined by Ch. Morris. Therefore, linguistic pragmatics studies all linguistic phenomena related to the chain "linguistic sign - its user". It includes such complex issues as the subject of speech, the listener (receiver), their mutual relations in the communication process, the influence of the speech situation on these relations as the object of his research. It is recognized in all studies that the most important concept of linguistic pragmatics is the human factor. [Stepanov (1981); Arutyunova (1985); Bulygina (1981); Galperin (2004)].

Therefore, pragmatics envisages the study of all conditions and situations of the use of linguistic signs by mankind. When it is said to use the conditions and situations, it is understood the methods and means of communicative influence on the interlocutor. The study of such conditions can provide rich factual material not only for students of textual pragmatics, but also for studying the transfer of such pragmatic features in translation from the point of view of studying linguistic and non-linguistic, implicit forms of pragmatic influence. Consequently, issues related to the function of lexical units in text and speech led to the formation of the science of text pragmatics, and it began to develop as a science that teaches and researches the rules of using language in the process of speech, choosing words, using them in social relations, and methods of speech influence on speech participants. The broad conception of the subject of pragmatics led to the development of this field in various directions. As a result, the connection of pragmatics with general linguistics, cognitive linguistics, lexicology, and stylistics was determined. At the same time, the role of text pragmatics in the theories of speech act, dixies, and discourse began to be studied separately. As a result, its "internal" branches such as pragmalinguistics, pragmasemantics, pragmastylistics, and text pragmatics emerged. Differences and common aspects of these networks require, first of all, to divide the general subject of pragmatics into separate parts and to study each part in detail.

In the following years, the information expressed at the word level began to be studied from the point of view of the linguistic unit entering into a function in a wider context. In this place, the communicative goal, attitude, action represented by the linguistic unit and their emotive, volitional, appellative, relational and aesthetic functions were interpreted as additional (connotative) meaning, pragmatic meaning (Arnold, 1990: 8). Researching the expressive-emotional-evaluative connotative meaning of a word or phrase, i.e. pragmatic meaning, in an attempt by the speaker or the author to attract the attention of the listener or reader, to have a communicative effect on them, to interest them, to engage their thoughts or, on the contrary, to distract, excite, excite, convince or deceive the need arose. Thus, the use of the additional

meaning expressed by the word occurs due to communicative-pragmatic needs. The analysis of lexical-semantic means does not always provide an opportunity to understand the real meaning of a concrete idea, i.e. connotation. Research shows that context, background knowledge, communication presupposition, distance between interlocutors and many other extralinguistic factors have a great influence on the emergence of connotative-pragmatic meaning when studying a pragmatically expressed speech or text. It is difficult to understand the meaning of the intended additional meaning not only through the introduction of the word into the semantic variation, but also through the context. In this case, the grammatical components of the word meaning are secondary to the semantic meaning (Apresyan, 1995, 140-141). The author or speaker uses the lexical meaning in an additional, often non-standard, unusual sense to influence the addressee, listener or reader, and implies the achievement of the intended goal. This process occurs due to the pragmatic use of the semantic meaning of the word. This process requires taking into account extra linguistic factors such as characteristics of the addressee (listener or reader), uniformity of background knowledge, and specific features of the speech situation. Naturally, such factors are the external pragmatic components of the lexical unit that act at a certain context level. At the same time, pragmatic components can be part of the semantic structure of the word, which has an additional connotative meaning.

This situation is more noticeable when the associative signs of the word are present or when anology is made. For example, the expressive evaluative pragmatic components of names such as Gargantua and Don Juan are associated with the names of famous characters in French literature, and we can use these precedent names as analogues to name other people. Application of pragmatic meaning connotation in speech process and definition of additional, often implicit non-verbally expressed meaning principles led to further development of communicative-functional paradigm in linguistics. The research of the pragmatic connotative meaning expressed by words and linguistic units at the scale of speech and text is complicated and has caused this concept to be used in a wider sense than before. Often, pragmatic meaning, implicitly expressed meaning, additional meaning can occur outside the boundaries. In traditional studies, although connotation (pragmatic, implicit meaning) is not included in the semantic structure of the word, it is recognized that it is based on the text, which arises due to the author's creative goals, in which the context is involved, but this context is limited (Akhmanova, 1972; Galperin, 1981; Arnold, 1990). Today, additional meaning (pragmatic, connotative meaning) in the semantic structure of the lexical unit is being researched on the basis of contexts that create connotation, separate words expressing meaning, word combinations, phraseological units, phrases, proverbs. Thus, on the basis of pragmatic analysis, internal and external pragmatic signs of connotative meaning are determined. Internal signs of connotation are associated with the presence of pragmatic components in the structure of word content. External pragmatic signs are determined by extralinguistic factors such as the situation of communication in a concrete communicative act, the character of the relationship between the interlocutors, the proximity of their background knowledge to each other, and the presupposition of communication. Accordingly, different types of connotation are distinguished: on the one hand, the connotation that is expressed through a word and expands its semantic structure, and on the other hand, the connotation that is expressed through the text and creates a meaning.

REFERENCES

1. Богданов В.В Лингвистическая прагматика и ее прикладные аспекты..В. Бондарко, Л.А. Вербицкая и др. Прикладное языкознание. - СПб.: Изд-во С-Петербург. ун-та, 1996. - с.268-275) 2.Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. М.:Советская энциклопедия, 1990.-709 с.

2. Остин Дж. Слово как действие // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. XVII: Теория речевых актов. М, 1986.

3. Падучева Е.В. Высказывание и его соотнесенность с действительностью. М-, 1985.

4. Почепцов Г.Г. Прагматика предложения // Иванова И. П., Бурлакова В. В., Почепцов Г. Г. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. М.,, 1981.

5. Сафаров Ш.С.Прагмалингвистика. Т.2008, 285 б.

6. Серль ДЖ. Что такое речевой акт? В кн.: Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 17.М.: Прогресс, 1986. С.151-169.

7. Сусов И.П. Языковое общение и лингвистика // Прагматические и семантические аспекты синтаксиса. Калинин, 1985.