BRITISH VIEW

MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

Anthropologie, Applied Linguistics, Applied Physics, Architecture, Artificial Intelligence, Astronomy, Biological Sciences, Botany, Chemistry, Communication studies, Computer Sciences, Computing technology, Cultural studies, Design, Earth Sciences, Ecology, Education, Electronics, Energy, Engineering Sciences, Environmental Sciences, Ethics, Ethnicity and Racism Studies, Fisheries, Forestry, Gender Studies, Geography, Health Sciences, History, Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, Labour studies, Languages and Linguistics, Law, Library Studies, Life sciences, Literature, Logic, Marine Sciences, Materials Engineering, Mathematics, Media Studies, Medical Sciences, Museum Studies, Music, Nanotechnology, Nuclear Physics, Optics, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Publishing and editing, Religious Studies, Social Work, Sociology, Space Sciences, Statistics, Transportation, Visual and Performing Arts, Zoology and all other subject areas.

Manuscripts typed on our article template can be submitted through our website here. Alternatively, authors can send papers as an email attachment to editor@britishview.co.uk
Editor Multidisciplinary Journals

PRAGMATICS IN LINGUISTICS: SEARCHING FOR DEFINITION

Ruzibaeva Nigorakhon Raximovna

Senior teacher of Foreign Languages department

Tashkent state university of law

n.ruziboeva@tsul.uz

Abstract: The communicative-pragmatic turn in linguistics signaled a shift in researchers' interests from studying the internal properties of the language system to analyzing the functions of language in the complex structure of human communication, and it also drew attention to the term "pragmatics", which was virtually unknown in the context of linguistics until the middle of the twentieth century. The point of this study is for the author to identify and analyze current interpretations of the term "pragmatics" to describe possible options for pragmatic relationship with other scientific disciplines. For this purpose, the author employs and compares the opinions of various scholars via using descriptive, conceptual and contrastive methods.

Keywords: pragmatics, linguistics, pragmalinguistics, disciplines, science, communication, theory, speech, utterance

INTRODUCTION. The term "pragmatics" was employed in numerous domains of research (such as semiotics, philosophy, sociology, and psychology) until the middle of the twentieth century, resulting in its content becoming exceedingly broad and ambiguous. As a result, determining the location of pragmatics in relation to linguistics and limiting the scope of its activities became required during the emergence and development of linguistically oriented pragmatics. There are three ways to perceive the link between pragmatics and linguistics:

- pragmatics is a distinct field closely related to linguistics;
- pragmatics is a subset of linguistics;
- pragmatics is a subset of linguistics.

Based on extant language literature, the article discusses these three alternatives. In general, pragmatics is proposed as a separate discipline when it emerges as a theoretical path at the junction of two or more sciences [1].

LITERATURE REVIEW. For the emergence and development of linguistic pragmatics in the second half of the 20th century, the results of the development of two scientific directions were of particular importance. Firstly, these were the ideas of the philosophers and founders of semiotics Morris and Pierce that the concept of pragmatics can be defined as a relationship between a sign and its interpreter, that is, the one who creates (produces) and understands this sign [2]. Secondly, it was the theory of speech acts by J. Austin and J. Searle, who first defined the utterance as an action and, accordingly, the process of communication as an active process of interaction [3]. Until that time, the term "pragmatics" was used both in various fields of science (primarily in philosophy, sociology and psychology) and in everyday life, which led to the fact that its content became largely vague and ambiguous.

It is known from the evolutionary history of pragmatics as a scientific direction that it can be considered an integral aspect of numerous fields of science. Depending on the time period and the authors of a particular theory, pragmatics can be understood as:

 1) one of the three components of semiosis, which studies the relationship of signs to the subjects who produce and interpret them [4];

2) the study of patterns, pathologies and paradoxes in the interaction of individuals [5];

3) the study of language as an instrument of action to achieve various goals [6];

4) the universal theory of social interaction [7];

5) specific (institutional) theory of speech behavior [8].

Along with the above, there are other interpretations of the term. Due to such a variety of interpretations of the original term, in the process of the emergence and development of linguistically oriented pragmatics, it became necessary to solve the following tasks:

✓   determine the place of pragmatics in relation to linguistics;

✓   to give a new term a definition within the framework of the theory of language.

In a number of publications, linguists have expressed their opinion on the possibilities of solving these problems, but so far there is no unanimity among them as to what constitutes the specifics of linguistically oriented pragmatics and how it relates to other pragmatic areas. In order to emphasize the features of this new discipline, in parallel with the terms "sociolinguistics", "psycholinguistics", "ethnolinguistics", etc., the term "pragmalinguistics" was created, along with it the designations "linguopragmatics" and "linguistic pragmatics" [9].

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY. Different sources understand the relationship between pragmatics and linguistics differently. The following are possible variations of their relationship and interdependence:

1.   Pragmatics is a field of study that is related to linguistics. The functioning of language in communication is a point of intersection for both disciplines. At the same time, linguistics investigates the link of communication with the language system, whereas pragmatics explores the reliance of communication on the composition and structure of society. As a result, pragmatics can be defined as a relationship between linguistics and sociology. This viewpoint is expressed, for example, in the writings of J. Mey, a Danish scientist who defines pragmatics as "the study of the use of language in communication between individuals depending on the conditions of a specific community". I.P. Susov also believes that pragmatics is a separate discipline: "At this time, I do not rule out the possibility of pragmatics being recognized an autonomous interdisciplinary branch of knowledge, closely related to linguistics" [10].

2.   Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that includes lexicology, morphology, text linguistics, contrastive linguistics, and other topics. It's called pragmalinguistics or linguistic pragmatics in this circumstance. This viewpoint is

currently the most prevalent; it is found in the majority of linguistic dictionaries, textbooks, and guides.

3.   Pragmatics is regarded to be a sub-discipline of linguistics. Text linguistics and semantics are the most common examples of such sections. A broad understanding of semantics is characteristic of J. Lyons, who, according to his own statement, includes in the field of semantics "much that they would study not within the framework of semantics, but within the framework of the discipline that has come to be called pragmatics". At the same time, the scientist emphasizes that it is important for him not to limit the scope of meaning only to what can be analyzed from a conditionally truthful point of view, it is also necessary take into account contextual and subjective aspects of meaning. The domain of meaning thus extended can be understood as the joint domain of linguistic semantics and pragmatics.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS. As an independent discipline, pragmatics is postulated, as a rule, if it, as a theoretical direction, arises at the junction of two or more sciences. Such a direction is, for example, the universal pragmatics of J. Habermas, which combines the ideas and provisions of philosophy, sociology, formal logic and linguistics. Although there is a point of view that Habermas, being a philosopher and sociologist, only used the theory of speech acts to build a model of communication in an ideal society, in our opinion, it is impossible not to admit that Habermas, in his own way, considered and presented the basic concepts of communication (speech actions, communicative rationality, consensus, etc.) and thus made a huge contribution to the study of communication, the development of the theory of speech acts and linguistic pragmatics in general. The task of universal pragmatics (or the theory of communicative competence) is, according to the creator of this direction, "to identify and reconstruct the universal conditions for possible mutual understanding".

Its subject is elementary utterances as pragmatic units of speech and general structures of speech situations. Habermas seeks to reconstruct the system of rules by which a speaker with communicative competence constructs an utterance from

sentences, and to trace how successfully the speaker or listener has transformed sentences into utterances using pragmatic universals. The term "universal pragmatics" should emphasize the difference between his theory and other areas of linguistic pragmatics. While empirical pragmatics aims to study the individual situational conditions for the realization of statements, the goal of universal pragmatics is to reconstruct a universal system of rules by which sentences can be transformed into statements. As a result, Habermas considers it necessary to distinguish between the theory of communicative competence he created from linguistics. In his opinion, there is a fundamental difference between the generation of sentences in accordance with the rules of language (the domain of linguistics) and the use of sentences in accordance with the pragmatic rules that form the infrastructure of speech situations in general (the domain of universal pragmatics).

When analyzing the three possibilities described above for interpreting the relationship between pragmatics and linguistics, it can be seen that at present most researchers are of the view that linguistic pragmatics or pragmalinguistics should - in accordance with its name - be included in the field of linguistic studies and is thus, one of the linguistic disciplines. This opinion is based largely on the definitions of the subject of linguistics as a science, presented in modern linguistic dictionaries and encyclopedias. It can be seen that at present an important task of linguistics is the study of the functioning of language in communication. For a modern linguist, the connection of a language with its native speakers is important: "Linguistics is included in the totality of the humanities that study a person and human society, and is specifically associated with them". Foreign scientists put the connection of the language system with its implementation in communication at the center of their definitions: "Linguistics is a scientific discipline, the purpose of which is to describe language and speech in all theoretically and practically important aspects and in all possible relationships with borderline disciplines"; or: "Linguistics is a scientific discipline that deals with the description and interpretation of language, languages and linguistic communication". Thus, pragmatics as a communicative discipline

solves one of the particular tasks of linguistics and should be included in its composition.

This interpretation is fundamentally different from the views of structuralists, who excluded the communicative aspect from linguistic analysis. According to F. de Saussure, "a language other than speech is a subject accessible to independent study. We do not speak dead languages, but we can perfectly master their mechanism. As for the other elements of speech activity, the science of language can do without them; moreover, it is possible at all only on the condition that these other elements are not mixed with its object". After the "pragmatic turn", the situation changed, which significantly influenced the views of scientists regarding the subject of linguistics.

There is an opinion that at present we can talk about two directions in linguistic pragmatics, or two schools. Representatives of the Anglo-American school consider pragmatics as one of the main components of linguistic theory, along with phonology, morphology and other basic disciplines. Adherents of the European Continental School believe that the subject of pragmatics is not limited to the linguistic component, but also includes the social, cultural and emotional aspects of communication.

At the same time, the very fact of classifying pragmalinguistics as a linguistic discipline does not completely solve the problem of its classification. The second controversial issue concerns the position of pragmatics in relation to other particular disciplines of linguistic science. The list of private disciplines of linguistics and their classification differ significantly among different authors both in terms of their degree of detail and in the composition of subsections. At the same time, it cannot be said that a large number of researchers sought to create such a classification. If pragmatics is understood as a systemic discipline, then it is opposed to such areas of linguistics as phonology, morphology, lexicology, and syntax. In this regard, the question arises whether in the structural hierarchy of the language, along with generally recognized levels, such as phonological, morphological, lexical and

syntactic, a pragmatic level should also be distinguished. The solution to this issue depends largely on what is meant by the language level. Traditionally, this term is associated with a certain part of the language system, "which is characterized by an inventory of units constituting a given level and certain relationships between them".

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATIONS. In accordance with this definition, the existence of a language level is associated with the existence of specialized language elements that constitute this level. However, the field of pragmatics does not have such a specific unit. There is an opinion that the main units of the pragmatic sphere are statements or speech acts, but the differences between these units and sentences are not as significant as between units of other levels. Researchers, as a rule, agree that utterances in most cases can be considered as communicative variants of sentences that constitute the syntactic level. At the same time, it should be recognized that communicative linguistics, which has been rapidly developing in recent years, is also in its infancy, and linguists in the course of the discussion have yet to define this subdiscipline, determine its subject and tasks.

REFERENCES

1.   Brown, Gillian and George Yule (1983). Discourse Analysis (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2.   Morris, Charles W. (1938) Foundations of the theory of signs. Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press.

3.   Searle, John R. (1969). Speech acts. An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

4.   Senft, Gunter (2014). Understanding Pragmatics. London: Routledge.

5.   Verschueren. Jef (1999). Understanding pragmatics. London: Arnold.

6.   Van Dijk, Teun Adrianus (1998). Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach. London: Sage.

7.   Wierzbicka, Anna (2003/1991). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

8.   Leech, Geoffrey (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London/New York: Longman.

9.   Mey, Jacob L. (2001) Pragmatics: An introduction. Oxford: Blackwell.

10.   Susov I.P. Lingvisticheskaja pragmatika. Vinnica: Nova knyga, 2009.