

HISTORY OF THE FORMATION OF LINGUOPRAGMATICS AND METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Kamola Hujumova

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article focuses on the historical development of linguo-pragmatic analysis, focusing on its pragmatics and sociolinguistic foundations. He discusses key theories and methodologies, highlighting how this approach reveals hidden meanings and how language influences communication. Also, the article presents examples of practical application of linguopragmatic analysis in various linguistic studies.

Key words: linguopragmatics, sociolinguistics, linguistic communication, theory, analysis, function, context

It is well known that pragmatology developed as an independent field of linguistics in the 1960s and 1970s. In 1970, an international conference was held in the city of Dordrecht on the topic of “Pragmatics of Natural Languages.” In the preface of the collection of papers presented at this conference, edited by Professor M. Bar-Hillel from Tel Aviv University, it was noted that the participants unanimously concluded that “the pragmatic characteristics of communication conducted through natural language should be studied within the framework of linguistic theory, just as its syntactic and semantic characteristics are¹” From this moment, recognized as the “renaissance period” of pragmatics, a true surge in pragmatics emerged within foreign linguistics. Numerous conferences and gatherings on this topic were organized, collections were published, and the scope of scientific research became boundless, with the “Journal of Pragmatics” becoming a truly international publication.²

¹ Bar Hillel Y. So'zboshi. In: Tabiiy tillarning pragmatikasi (tahr. Bar-Hillel Y.)- Dordrecht; Boston; Reidel, 1971.-VII, 231 p.

² Сафаров Ш. Прагматология. Монография. Тошкент – 2008. 56-бет

As the President of Uzbekistan Sh. M. Mirziyoyev emphasized: “It should be especially noted that in our country, thousands of works, the priceless treasures of world literature, have been translated and found a place in the hearts of readers, and a unique creative school of literary translation and translation studies has been established.”³ On the one hand, this is positive, as it proves the importance of the field, the abundance of issues being raised, and the relevance of the chosen direction, which has attracted everyone's attention. On the other hand, we must not overlook that the lack of clarity in the subject of the field, the confusion of principles, and the disordered use of approaches and concepts lead to ambiguous conclusions. It would not be an exaggeration to say that in recent years, almost no linguist has refrained from using the term "pragmatics."

As a result, a peculiar form of pragmatic "fetishism" has emerged, where it is becoming increasingly difficult to find any substantive information regarding the meaning of the term beyond its mere application in research. When the term is used indiscriminately, it inevitably leads to the dilution of the concept it is based on. Therefore, before discussing the pragmatic features of linguistic units and their pragmalinguistic analysis, we should first ask, "What exactly does pragmalinguistics deal with?" "We are compelled to seek answers to questions such as, 'What is the object and subject of its study?' and 'What are the main concepts and principles of pragmatics?' One of the first to attempt to define the subject matter of pragmalinguistics was G. Klaus. In his aforementioned work, he defines pragmatics as 'the science that studies the relationships between signs (Z) and the people (M) who create, transmit, and receive these linguistic signs.'

As seen from this definition, in defining the subject of pragmatics, G. Klaus, like other semioticians (C.S. Peirce, C. Morris, Yu.S. Stepanov), does not stray from the relationship between the sign and the interpreter perceiving it. Even his conclusion that 'pragmatics is primarily a theory that studies the

³Mirziyoyev Sh.M. “Adabiyot, san’at va madaniyat yashasa, millat va xalq, butun insoniyat bezavol yashaydi”, T.: Xalq so’zi, 2018, 07.08.
www.tadqiqotlar.uz

psychological and sociological aspects of linguistic signs' is nothing more than a narrow characterization of the concept of pragmatics." "The object of linguistic-pragmatic analysis, in any case, is language and its characteristics as manifested in the process of communication, encompassing the general category of communication. Despite the diversity of opinions regarding the definition of linguistic pragmatics and the description of its subject, researchers agree on the following core ideas:

- The foundational point of communicative activity analysis is the concept of activity itself;
- Language serves as a means to drive the interaction between participants in communication;
- The realization of linguistic activity is a phenomenon directly tied to the context of communication.

All these aspects can serve as research subjects for the various fields within pragmalinguistics. For example, when examining the linguistic communication system from the perspective of the speaker, the focus shifts to elements such as the content of speech act types, the role of communicative purpose within discourse structure, expression of implicature, presuppositions, and the mental abilities of the communicative participants. When research is conducted from the perspective of the speech addressee, however, the main emphasis is on determining the pragmatic effect of the speech act." "In both of the aforementioned cases, the primary objects of study are the speech act, the information conveyed through it, and how this information is comprehended and interpreted in terms of meaning. Thus, pragmatics can be generally defined as follows: 'Pragmatics is a distinct branch of linguistics that examines the selection and use of linguistic units in communication, as well as the impact these units have on the participants in communication.' These principles are studied in relation to the conditions of communication, viewed as a broader context. This approach to analyzing linguistic phenomena allows for the identification of barriers or limitations present within the given context. The

central idea of linguistic analysis, therefore, is to understand the nature of language concerning its practical application or, in other words, its function. The concept of 'function' serves as the foundation for a pragmatic-linguistic approach to language analysis.

Below, we will examine pragmalinguistic analysis using examples from Abdullah Qodiriy's novel "O'tkan Kunlar"(Days Gone By)." *"Uylanishdek nozik ish dunyoda bo'lmas. Uylanganingdan keyin xotining yaxshi chiqsa berdi hudo, agar yomon chiqsa bundan ortiq balo bo'lmas"*⁴.

"The main meaning of this statement is to express thoughts on marriage and its consequences. This phrase can serve various pragmatic purposes in conversation, such as encouraging young people to think carefully before deciding to marry, joking about someone's spouse, or giving advice based on personal experience. The context of the statement is centered on marriage and the unexpected outcomes of family life, suggesting that marriage can lead to two possible outcomes: happiness or suffering. In this context, the phrase may reflect a person's hopes and fears regarding their spouse in marriage.

The second part of the statement ('nothing could be worse') is conveyed with irony."The text subtly suggests that the success of a marriage largely depends on the wife's character, as it does not discuss the role or character of the husband. This omission implies that the wife's character is the decisive factor in the success or failure of the marriage, presenting an asymmetrical view of responsibility within marital dynamics. When analyzed pragmatically, the statement conveys deeper meanings beyond a simple thought on marriage. The speaker's experience, tone, context, and the listener's perception of the statement all play a significant role in its interpretation.

The text represents a linguopragmatic expression reflecting deep skepticism about marriage, structured to emphasize the extreme outcomes marriage can produce. Analysis reveals that the speaker's word choice is intentional, designed to evoke caution and highlight potential risks in marriage."

⁴ Abdulla Qodiriy. O'tkan kunlar. "Sharq" nashriyoti. Toshkent. 2017, 11-bet
www.tadqiqotlar.uz

“Marg'ilonda shunday kelinimiz bor ekan bilmay yurgan ekanmiz”⁵.

"This statement indicates that the bride possesses qualities or achievements that were previously overlooked or undervalued. The use of the word 'shunday' (such) emphasizes the significance or worthiness of these qualities. The repetition of 'ekan' (is) expresses a process of agreeing with this understanding, suggesting that the speaker is acknowledging this new realization.

This linguistic choice heightens the sense of recognition regarding the unexpectedness of this acknowledgment. In the sentence 'Marg'ilonda shunday kelinimiz bor ekan bilmay yurgan ekanmiz' (We had no idea that we had such a bride from Margilan), there is an expression of astonishment and possibly regret for not recognizing the bride's qualities earlier. This reflects cultural meanings associated with family relationships and the roles of family members. The statement serves to acknowledge and emphasize the importance of the bride's character or achievements within the family or society.

In conclusion, we can say that the development of pragmalinguistics in this direction somewhat narrows the 'gaps' that exist between theoretical linguistics and practical communication.

Consequently, the broader conceptualization of pragmalinguistic analysis methods demands the advancement of this field. Linguopragmatic analysis, as a branch of linguistics, allows us to understand the meanings of texts or sentences, how they are perceived, and how they change depending on the context. This analytical method enables the identification of linguistic units and their pragmatic functions. Linguopragmatic analysis methods facilitate the study of how linguistic units are utilized within context and their meanings. These methods help identify the speaker's intentions, implications, cultural and social contexts, as well as the emotional impact of linguistic tools. Through linguopragmatic analysis, not only the lexical meaning of language but also the subtle distinctions in its interpretation are explored.

⁵ Abdulla Qodiriy. O'tkan kunlar. "Sharq" nashriyoti. Toshkent. 2017, 11-bet
www.tadqiqotlar.uz

REFERENCES:

1. Abdulla Qodiriy. O'tkan kunlar. "Sharq" nashriyoti. Toshkent. 2017, 11-bet
2. Abdulla Qodiriy. O'tkan kunlar. "Sharq" nashriyoti. Toshkent. 2017, 11-bet
3. Bar Hillel Y. So'zboshi. In: Tabiiy tillarning pragmatikasi (tahr. Bar-Hillel Y.) Dordrecht; Boston; Reidel, 1971.-VII, 231 p.
4. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. Монография. Тошкент – 2008. 56-бет
5. Mirziyoyev Sh.M. "Adabiyot, san'at va madaniyat yashasa, millat va xalq, butun insoniyat bezavol yashaydi", T.: Xalq so'zi, 2018, 07.08.
6. Гносеологический и прагматический анализ языка. М.: Прогресс, 1967. — 216 с
7. Гносеологический и прагматический анализ языка. М.: Прогресс, 1967. — 210 с
8. Сафаров Ш. Когнитив тилшунослик.- Жиззах: Сангзор, 2006.-91 б.
9. Азнаурова, Э. С. Автореферат дис. на соискание ученой степени доктора филологических наук. 10.02.04 / Моск. гос. пед. ин-т иностр. яз. им. Мориса Тореза. - Москва : [б. и.], 1974. - 35 с.
10. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. Монография. Тошкент – 2008. 58-бет
11. Hujumova K. Kamola TARJIMASHUNOSLIKDAGI YANGI YONDASHUVLAR: TARJIMASHUNOSLIKDAGI YANGI YONDASHUVLAR //Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики. – 2022. – Т. 4. – №. 4.
12. Hujumova K. O. LANGUAGE AS A MEANS OF COMMUNICATION AND THE KEY FEATURE OF TRANSLATION IN TEACHING //Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal. – 2024. – Т. 5. – №. 03.