

Linguopragmatics in the system of linguistic sciences: conceptual analysis

Zulfiya Fizulievna Alikhasanova

Lecturer, Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Received: 24 December 2024; **Accepted:** 26 January 2025; **Published:** 28 February 2025

Abstract: This article is dedicated to a comprehensive analysis of linguopragmatics as a branch of linguistics, exploring the historical development of this field since the 1970s. Various approaches to defining linguopragmatics are systematized, and its relationship with other established linguistic disciplines is examined. Special attention is given to the study of fundamental terminological frameworks and key concepts. As a result, the primacy of the human factor in linguopragmatics and its role in understanding language as a means of communicative interaction is emphasized.

Keywords: linguopragmatics, human factor, communicative unit, means of communicative interaction, pragmatic aspect.

Introduction: Research in the field of linguopragmatics has recently gained increasing relevance. Linguopragmatics as a discipline emerged in the 1970s, influenced by the ideas of J. Austin, J. Searle, H. Grice, Z. Vendler, and others. The formation of linguopragmatics as a linguistic direction is associated with shifts in the general orientation of Western linguistics in the early 1970s, characterized by a transition from viewing language as a formal system detached from its conditions of use to considering language as a means of communicative interaction within a social context. This shift was significantly influenced by Wittgenstein's philosophy of language, marking an essential feature of integrative processes in the humanities.

Literature Review

Key definitions and concepts of linguopragmatics are analyzed through the lens of foundational works by J. Austin, J. Searle, H. Grice, and Z. Vendler, as well as modern perspectives from scholars such as B. Yu. Norman, G. Klaus, Yu. D. Apresyan, E. N. Malyuga, N. D. Arutyunova, and Yu. S. Stepanov.

METHODS

The study employs various methods, including the comparative-analytical method, systematization method, tabular data representation method, and descriptive method.

The late 1970s and early 1980s were marked by an increased focus on the human factor in language, characterized by a sharp rise in interest in the communicative-pragmatic aspects of language use—the structure of communicative acts, the revision and expansion of communicative unit functions, and the adequacy of speech productions in relation to communicative and activity-based needs and intentions of the speaker.

The shift towards the pragmatic aspects of communication required, alongside traditional linguistic semantics, the inclusion of a vast and somewhat undefined area of human knowledge into linguistic science—linguopragmatics, which studies how language is used to achieve communicative goals.

Definitions of Linguopragmatics

A number of scholars have defined linguopragmatics in different ways:

- B. Yu. Norman states that linguopragmatics studies language use, considering age, gender, social status, and professional characteristics of the communicators, as well as the specific conditions and goals of a speech act.
- G. Klaus, in his monograph *The Power of Words*, describes linguopragmatics (or pragmalinguistics) as a branch of linguistics that

examines how linguistic signs function in speech, focusing on the "sign-user" relationship.

- Yu. D. Apresyan offers a broad definition: "Pragmatics refers to the meaning encoded in linguistic units (lexemes, affixes, grammatical forms, syntactic constructions) that reflect the speaker's relationship to:

1. Reality,
 2. The content of the message,
 3. The addressee."
- The Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary defines

pragmatics as a field of research in semiotics and linguistics that studies the functioning of linguistic signs in speech.

- E. N. Malyuga argues that linguopragmatics views language as a tool used by individuals in their activities, focusing on how signs behave in real communication situations and emphasizing their relationship with users.

In general, the various definitions of linguistic pragmatics can be grouped into several categories (see Table 1.1).

Table 1.1

Aspects of the definition of linguopragmatics

№	Author	The main aspect
1	Б.Ю. Норман	• Study of Communication Features – Examines language use considering various factors such as age, gender, social status, and professional characteristics.
2	Георг Клайс	• Relationship Between the Sign and the User – Focuses on the interaction between a linguistic sign and its user.
3	Ю.Д. Апресян	• Speaker's Relationship to Content and Addressee – Emphasizes the meanings conveyed through linguistic units in relation to reality, message content, and the addressee.
4	Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary	• Functional Aspect – Analyzes the pragmatic functions of language in different contexts.
5	E.N. Мalyuga	• Functioning of Linguistic Signs – Studies how linguistic signs behave in speech and how they function in real communication situations.

The data in the table indicate that significant attention in the interpretation of linguopragmatics is devoted to the human factor. Some definitions focus on the study of the effect of linguistic communication, emphasizing the mutual influence of communicants in the communication process.

In several definitions, the interpretative aspect of pragmatic studies of speech productions is highlighted, appearing in different communicative contexts. According to N.D. Arutyunova, the object of interpretation is what is referred to as the pragmatic meaning of an utterance.

Thus, the human factor is the fundamental concept in the interpretation of linguopragmatics. It is also important to note the existence of different text interpretations (both oral and written), which depend on upbringing, education, mentality, worldview, and perception of reality. Other definitions emphasize the functional aspect of linguopragmatic studies, their

contextual dependence, and describe linguopragmatics as the "science of language use" or the "science of language in context".

Linguopragmatics studies language in its pragmatic function, considering it as a means of influencing human behavior and consciousness in the communication process. Particular importance is given to factors that determine the choice of communicative expression variants, as well as conditions that facilitate the understanding of the communicative purpose of an utterance. These aspects form the core research area of linguopragmatics.

Linguopragmatics is closely connected with various disciplines and fields of knowledge, enabling a comprehensive understanding of language use for communication and shaping the perception of the world. Consequently, it helps to better understand the nature of human communication (see Table 1.2).

Table 1.2

Connection of linguopragmatics with other areas of knowledge

№	Направление/Область знания	Связь с лингвопрагматикой
1	Psycholinguistic	study of cognitive processes and their impact on understanding and use of language in context
2	Social linguistics	analysis of social factors influencing language behavior and communication.
3	Ethnolinguistika	Research into cultural aspects of language and their influence on pragmatic norms and communication
4	Philosophy of language	consideration of philosophical aspects of meaning, truth and context in language
5	Semiotika	study of signs and symbols, used in communications, and their pragmatic meaning
6	Cognitive linguistics	study of mental processes associated with understanding and production of speech
7	Communication sciences	analysis of processes of information transfer and interaction between people.
8	Applied linguistics	development of methods and technology for practical application of knowledge about language.
9	Information	development of algorithm and system for processing natural language and analysis of pragmatic aspects
10	Pedagogika	application of lingvopr pragmatic knowledge to improve language teaching methods.

Linguopragmatics studies the use of language in specific communicative situations, as well as the influence of context, sociocultural factors, and communication goals on the interpretation and understanding of linguistic expressions. It examines how an individual uses language to achieve their goals, express intentions, beliefs, emotions, and interact with others through language.

The relationship between linguopragmatics and cognitive linguistics lies in the fact that both disciplines study the use of language for communication and the cognitive mechanisms underlying this process. Within cognitive linguistics, research focuses on how thinking, perception, and understanding of the world shape the structure of language. Meanwhile, linguopragmatics explores how these cognitive processes manifest in human speech behavior across different contexts.

The connection between linguopragmatics and sociolinguistics is determined by the influence of social factors on language use in various contexts. This includes the study of differences in communicative strategies depending on social status, age, gender, and other factors.

Linguopragmatics also investigates how psychological processes affect the understanding and use of language. This includes the study of cognitive mechanisms underlying communication skills, such as perception, memory, and attention. Additionally, it examines differences in communicative styles and norms across cultures, helping to distinguish universal

aspects of language and communication from those that depend on cultural context.

Linguopragmatics encompasses a wide range of questions concerning the speaker, the addressee, and their interaction in the communication process, as well as the conditions under which communication takes place. The fundamental postulate of this discipline aligns with J. Austin's assertion that "A word is an action."

One of the key directions in linguopragmatics is the study of the process of acquiring and applying linguistic material, which considers a specific type of semantic relationships between linguistic units in language, speech, and speech activity. Scholars define these relationships in terms of:

1. Paradigmatic (represented by the implicit paradigm of the language system),
2. Syntagmatic (explicit syntagmatic structure in speech), and
3. Pragmatic (purposefully organized speech act of an individual, containing an evaluative-predicative core of a judgment).

All of the above is directly related to pragmatics. The semantic aspect, which is closely tied to epistemology (the cognitive universe that has national-language variations), is considered the leading aspect and predetermines the content of other aspects.

Another direction of linguopragmatics is the study of communication postulates, i.e., the principles or rules

of normal human communication.

The term "communicative postulates" was introduced into scientific discourse by H.P. Grice. Communicative postulates or maxims represent behavioral rules concerning speech, based on the principle of cooperation, collaboration, and specific regulations.

Currently, three different, partially traditional approaches to the study of pragmatics exist, which are not only related to linguistic philosophy but also to formal logic and linguistic semantics. These approaches differ based on their perspectives on the nature of meaning.

However, the existing variety of directions in linguistic pragmatics cannot be limited to a single or a few traditions. They are united by several fundamental ideas:

1. The key concept for adequately describing linguistic communication is the concept of activity.
2. Language serves as a means of dynamic interaction between communicators.
3. The functioning of language is closely related to the situational context of its use.

In discussing the object of pragmatics, two concepts have emerged, as examined by Yu.S. Stepanov. On the one hand, he acknowledges that linguopragmatics has its own subject matter, focusing on "the selection of linguistic means from the available repertoire for optimal influence". On the other hand, pragmatics in its "pure" form studies the same issues that semantics and syntax explore in a "hidden" manner.

This discipline covers the analysis of explicit and implicit goals of an utterance, the speaker's internal attitudes, and the listener's readiness to contribute to achieving the intended meaning. Additionally, it examines various types of communicative behavior, including:

- Speech strategies and tactics,
- Rules for conducting dialogue to enhance communication effectiveness,
- The use of so-called "indirect" speech acts,
- Various language play techniques.

"Pragmatics concerns both the interpretation of utterances and the choice of their form in specific conditions."

This definition encapsulates two perspectives on the pragmatic aspect:

1. The speaker's position (choice of form).
2. The listener's position (interpretation of the utterance).

The key concepts that form the basic terminological framework are categorized as follows:

- Participants in communication (addresser, addressee).
- Key components of communication (intention, speech act, context, communicative situation, deixis, implicature, inference, presupposition, presuppositional triggers).
- Communication strategies (communicative strategy, communicative tactics, cooperative principle, Grice's maxims, implicit contract, scripts, frames, felicity conditions).
- Types of speech influence (politeness, irony, metaphor, perlocution, empathy).
- Competencies (pragmatic competence, communicative competence, contextual adaptation).
- Types of meaning (implicit, explicit).
- Linguistic phenomena (discourse, polysemy, connotation).
- Contextual elements (context, conventionality).

These concepts develop the basic terminological framework for analyzing linguistic communication in a pragmatic aspect.

Thus, linguopragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies linguistic phenomena from the perspective of their use in specific communicative situations. Unlike other branches of linguistics, which focus on language structure, linguopragmatics investigates:

- The use of linguistic means to achieve specific goals in communication.
- Differences in language usage across various cultures and contexts.

For example, in one culture, certain forms of politeness may be obligatory, whereas, in another culture, they may be considered excessive.

REFERENCES

- Апресян Ю.Д. Прагматическая информация для толкового словаря // Прагматика и проблемы интенциональности. – М. 1988.
- Арутюнова Н.Д. Истоки, проблемы и категории прагматики. / Н.Д. Арутюнова, Е.В. Падучева // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – М. 1985. Вып.16: Лингвистическая прагматика. – С.357.
- Гак В.Г. Язык как форма самовыражения народа // Язык как средство трансляции культуры / Отв. ред. М.Б. Ешич. – М. 2000. – С. 54-68.
- Грайс Г.П. Логика и речевое общение / Перевод с англ. Туrowsкого В.В // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. ХВИ. – М.: Прогресс, 1985. – С. 217-237.

Клаус Г. Сила слова. – М.: Прогресс, 1967. – 209 с.

Колшанский Г.В. Функции паралингвистических средств в языковой коммуникации // Вопросы языкознания. – №1. – 1973. – С. 16-25.

Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / Гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. – М.: Сов. Энциклопедия, 1990. – 685 с.

Малюга Е.Н. Англоязычный профессиональный жаргон в деловом дискурсе // Научный вестник Воронежского государственного архитектурно-строительного университета. Серия: Современные лингвистические и методико-дидактические исследования. 2010. – № 2 (14). – С. 11-17.

Норман Б.Ю. Лингвистическая прагматика (на материале русского и других славянских языков): курс лекций / Б.Ю. Норман. – Минск. 2009. – 183 с.

Остин Дж. Слово как действие // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 17: Теория речевых актов. – М., 1986. – С. 22-129.

Степанов Ю.С. В поисках прагматики: Проблема субъекта // Изв. АН СССР. Сер. лит. и яз. Т. 40. – № 4. – 1981. – С. 340-355.