

THE CONCEPT AND ROLE OF PRAGMATICS IN LINGUISTICS AND IN OUR LIFE

MUMINOVA MAMURA MASHRABOVNA

Uzbekistan State World Languages University The Department Of Linguistics(English) The Second Course Master Degree Student

Abstract

This article is intended for language linguistics learners and teachers. It includes access to the plan, introduction, the main section, the summary and the list of literature used. The article gives linguistics teachers and learners an overview about the main functions and role of pragmatics in linguistics. This article contributes to the improvement of linguistic knowledge and enriches literary acquisition of both teachers and students.

Keywords: Linguistic pragmatics, linguo-philosophical foundations, communication, Ludwig Wittgenstein, "TractatusLogico-Philosophicus", semantics, discourse

Introduction

Linguistic pragmatics is a topic that everyone who comes across this topic will take a lot out for themselves, for example, they will pay attention to how they communicate with a person, that is, to your communication, and you will look from the other side at how your friends, your colleagues, and of course the focus will be on your family style of communication.

Through familiarity with this course, you can discover certain patterns and interesting cases and thereby improve your communication skills. The linguo-philosophical foundations of a pragmatist, of course, sound a little scary, but I will try to present it in an accessible form so that it would be interesting for you to read my research work on this topic.

Linguistic pragmatics refers to the direction of the development of linguistics, which is part of the circle of disciplines associated with a paradigm that has shifted the focus from the study of language as the permanent essence of a thing-for-itself as speech. Although, Linguistic

pragmatics is attributed to the time of its origin in 1970, when the first International Symposium on Pragmolinguistics was assembled, but in fact the linguo-philosophical foundations of pragmatics were developed back in the 30s by such a famous philosopher of language as Ludwig Wittgenstein, unfortunately, during his lifetime, his works were not published, and a book was published posthumously called "TractatusLogico-Philosophicus", which outlines very interesting principles of approach to the study of languages.

In his writings, ordinary everyday speech was called natural speech. It turned out, as it were, that it was not natural speech that had been studied before him, and by this he encouraged scientists and suggested considering speech as a natural language. He considered natural speech to be a direct approximation to a person, and the first position that he put forward was the priority of speech over language. This, of course, was quite a revolutionary statement for the 30s. The 1930s is the era of the dawn of structuralism.

In the era of structuralism, scientists did not study, and were not interested, it was only a residual state of the language, it was treated as something secondary, and only Ludwig Wittgenstein put forward the priority of speech over language. Wittgenstein's philosophical approach changed the essence of the statement into a characterization from the point of view of logic. If we take the classical logic of Aristotle, then any judgment was characterized in terms of truth or falsity. And so it was customary to calculate whether this judgment is true in the event that there was a correspondence in objective reality or not. According to the main characteristics of the judgment and according to the traditional approach, the person as such fell out and was not required to characterize statements. Ludwig Wittgenstein proposed that the main characteristic of a statement, well, respectively, of a speech is not to consider truth and untruth, but the sincerity and insincerity of a person and put forward the idea - it doesn't matter if this is a true or false statement, it matters whether it is sincere or not. And in order to carry out the action of this statement as sincere and insincere, it had to be correlated not with objective reality, but it had to be correlated with the inner mental world of a person. That is, each statement of a person had to correspond to his mental state. Wittgenstein's formula is deciphered as, the statement a person is a correspondence between a person and a statement, which means that the statement is true.

There is no correspondence between the person and the statement, which means that the statement is false. The uniqueness of this philosophy lies in the fact that a person was introduced into this operation, and we remember that in classical logic a person was not introduced in any way into the characterization of an utterance. This was the most important virtue of Wittgenstein's philosophy. And it seems, you will say, well, here it is reliable and not reliable, what's wrong with that? and this manifested the wonderful philosophy of Wittgenstein and the general attention that is directed to the basis of this philosophy, the person was introduced into the characterization of statements, he was the central and initial attribute for the analysis and characterization of statements. Wittgenstein's philosophical speech defined primarily not as a structure or system, but as an action. We are used to that language, this system and structure. Yes, this is a good and wonderful property of language, but he suggested approaching language as a human activity. This type of human activity is an action. Namely, it is a tool that person uses for achieving a specific goal. Concepts that arose on the basis of philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein called instrumental concepts. John Austin said that speech is action, and here is his wonderful phrase - "To say something means to do an act." we are used to treating speech as something simple, but if you look closely and deliberately at the whole structure and system, you will find that speech is actually a very difficult part, because when we speak, we not only make sounds, but convey our feelings, our ideas and our relationship to something, that is, as the philosopher said, we perform an action. In accordance with the ideas Wittgenstein,

Austin and all representatives Oxford School, say it means do something and if we will consider our speech as that we do things, not just shake the air, speak something, I think it will give us a new look at our speech, at our speech behavior and verbal behavior surrounding us. The title of John Austin's book "How to do things with the help of words" fully reflects the linguo-philosophical approach of this school, the next fundamental linguo-philosophical approach was to change the attitude to the semantics of the word, if someone asks the meaning of the word, then we will immediately say this is a set of certain signs that displays the essence of objects and so on.

And we also know that the lexical meaning of words is recorded in only dictionaries of any language. From pragmo-linguistics, from under the theory of meaning, a denotative support was derived, and a communicative support was introduced. And, accordingly, the meaning of not only

a word, but also any linguistic unit was determined as its meaning in the context. The famous expression of Virgenstein "Do not ask me what the word means, ask rather how it is used." It was very interesting, and at the same time, the approach was revolutionary at that time.

The meaning of any language unit was determined based only on the context. That is, a communicative rather than a denotative support was introduced under the theory of meaning. The very term "Pragmatic linguistics" is of course the reference word "pragma" from the Greek pragma-action. This name fully reflects the spirit of this direction, which is focused on the interpretation of speech as a specific action. Linguistic pragmatics, this science studies, first of all, the conditions for using the language by a person as a communicant in acts of verbal communication. The focus is on how we use the language in what prerogatives and for what purposes and conditions.

The terms of language use are divided into several parts, as the "context" is known as the linguistic terms. "consituation" is extralinguistic conditions, and "co-empiric" is what we call background knowledge. I think here it is necessary to mention the rather actively used term "discourse", which includes all three of the above conditions.

Recalling the final definition of discourse Nina Davydovna Aryutinova, Discourse is speech immersed in life, it's not just taking a language unit and arguing it, if we decompose a word into morphemes, if we again decompose a sentence and decompose it into sentence members, then how do we divide words into morphemes, then how we divide the utterance of a sentence into separate members does not include a person and does not take into account the situation in which this sentence or this word is pronounced, does not take into account the purpose in which the speaker pursues pronouncing this phrase, and discourse as a speech immersed in life offers to consider language units from the point of view of using them and immersing in life, that is, to find out again why it is said and for what purposes or conditions it is said, and most importantly, by whom it is said.

That's what's important for linguistic pragmatics. And it doesn't matter how many members of the sentence we single out or use how many morphemes in this word. The main figure of verbal communication and the main figure of communication and the main figure of speech and language is person and whom in this case we call a communicant. A communicator is a person participating

in direct verbal communication, of course, we also take into account the main forms of communication, this is oral and written speech, if we are talking about oral speech, then communicants are speakers and one who produces speech and naturally listens.

If we are talking about written speech, then we are talking about the writer, that is, who creates the text or this written speech produces and we are talking about the reader for reader about those who will read this text and interpret it, but in addition to the main actors of speech communication and speech communication of the speaker and listener, writer and reading, of course, especially oral speech communications after all, there are third parties who are present, for example, if two people are talking between them, or standing next to someone third or more, let there be two or three people, this will be third parties who may not take part directly in communication, but nevertheless their presence can be quite strongly influence verbal communication, and that is, the third is a rather serious communicative pragmatic factor affecting the implementation of verbal communication, so you yourself will agree that two people will communicate differently if there is a third. This is a very significant factor if we take as an example, for example, like a dad who has to reprimand his son for some kind of offense in the presence of, for example, a friend of his son, he will do it in a completely different way than if they will be alone and I think that both the choice of lexical means and the choice of communicative intentions will be completely different, so it is no coincidence when you want to parents, bring a friend or girlfriend with you knowing that with them you probably won't be scolded so much, that is, such a communicant's status as a third person is a rather significant pragmatic factor that seriously affects the implementation of verbal communication and characterization of verbal communication, this factor must be taken into account.

A third person may find this conversation for himself, for example, very interesting or touching him and try to get involved in this conversation, that is, as we know in verbal communication, the role of the speaker and listener is constantly moving from one to the other, at first he is the speaker, then he speaks the second, and the first becomes the listener. Role reversal is generally typical for oral speech, and so this is the third communicant of those present, he can also join the conversation. The main participants are speakers and listeners. If we are talking about the speaker, in addition to the fact that he produces this speech and he is purposeful and he determines the function of his speech.

It can be concluded that many pragmatic factors are generally tied to him, if you look at the initial or prototypical situation of verbal communication, it is carried out in the coordinates "I", "you", "here" and "now". Most of our communication takes place precisely in these coordinates, we talk with someone defining for ourselves the addressee of our speech and he must be here and he must also be in time combined with you, that is, the speaker, that is, these four coordinates of any communicative situation "I am the speaker" and "you are the listening addressee of the speech", "here" and "now" here they must be respected. And this situation for communication is called canonical or prototypical, that is, initial. And the fact that it is a prototype allows you to change some parameters of this situation, for example, the situation of talking on the phone, we observe the parameters, again, we have speakers and we have a listener, we have a time for which we match now which we are talking now. And the parameter place there does not match with us because the speakers and the addressee of his listener are in different places, but in general, if we dwell on the parameters of this speech situation in detail, then our modern technologies, communicative developments, the conditions of communication, of course, lead to the fact that the prototypical parameters are blurred, so returning to the speaker to the main subject of speech communication, it is with him that the determination of all these parameters is connected, it is he who chooses the addressee, it is he who chooses the place, it is he who chooses the time.

REFERENCES

1. Asiado, T (2009). J. L. Austin How to do things with words. English Philosopher of Language, Linguistic Philosophy.
2. Barron, Anne. (2003). Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics. Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
3. Beard, Colin. (2006). Experiential Learning : A Handbook of Best Practice for Educators and Trainers. London: Kogan Page, Limited.
4. Brown, H. Douglas. (2007). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New York: Pearson Education.
5. Cross, Kevin. (2009). Speaking Fluency Through Culture. Unpublished paper. SIT Graduate Institute. Brattleboro, VT.