FOUNDATIONS OF PRAGMATISM IN LINGUISTICS AND DEFINING A PRAGMATIC APPROACH IN CONTEXT

Niyazova Gulnorakhon Gulomovna
Teacher of English at the Department of Foreign Languages Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi.
e-mail: niyazovagulnorakhon@gmail.com

Annotation

The article examines the definition of pragmatics in linguistics, language in relation to the relationship between linguistics and pragmatics. The article describes the importance of holding this relationship for the project of a systematic formal approach to the study of language. The author supports the opinion to consider pragmatics as a scientific study of all aspects of linguistic behavior, since pragmatists include models of linguistic actions, linguistic functions, types of conclusions, principles of communication, knowledge bases, attitudes and beliefs, as well as organizational principles of text and discourse.

Keywords: linguistics, pragmatics, situational approach, context-dependent meaning, sociolinguistics, semiotics, contextualization.

Despite its scientific recognition, the concept of pragmatists remains somewhat mysterious and still difficult to define. This applies both to reading in everyday discourse and in a scientific context. However, when we call attitudes and behaviors pragmatic, we mean that they have actual orientation similarities. People who are pragmatic or take a pragmatic approach tend to take a practical, factual and realistic approach to solving pressing problems and solving everyday problems rather than a theoretical, speculative and idealistic approach. In other words, they take a concrete, situational, action-and-use approach rather than an abstract, situationally independent and systems perspective. Taking a pragmatic stance in everyday social gatherings, as well as in political, historical and related discourses, means to pursue related matters with a purpose and purpose, taking into account common sense and right down to the ground. Such an understanding of the pragmatists as an attitude in non-agricultural discourse, obviously, left its traces in the scientific definitions of this term. In general, we can say that in semiotics and philosophy, pragmatic characteristics characterize those theoretical and methodological approaches that are focused on use and context, and not on any system, and that they view use and context as creating significant analytical excess.

While this essentially applies to linguistics in general, there is no generally accepted definition of pragmatists in linguistics that would refer to one single, uniform field of study. In modern linguistics, we can define a narrow and broad way of differentiating between pragmatists (of which the former sometimes refers to the "Anglo-Americans" and the latter to the "continental [European]" tradition of the pragmatists, see Huang 2007: xi). According to the narrow view, pragmatic approaches are understood as the systematic study of what and how people understand when they use language as a means of action in a specific context and for a specific purpose. Thus, the contextual dependence of

meaning is a central component of the more narrowly defined accounts of the pragmatists, which focus on several key issues that can be mapped to related issues in other modules of language theory, such as grammar and semantics. These issues include disproportion / dexism (versus anaphora), assumptions, consequences (versus consequences), and speech actions (versus sentence types), to name just the most prominent topics.

Pragmatism is mainly concerned with communicative action and its relevance in context, examining actions in relation to what is action, what constitutes action, what conditions must be satisfied in order for actions to be successful, and what actions are associated with context. These research questions and the object of research require the adoption of measures in general and communication measures in particular, which should be perceived as relational concepts, appropriate actions and context, corresponding actions and communicative actions associated with communicative actions and interlocutors, and correlating the interlocutors with the fact that they done with words in context. The concept of the constituent parts as a whole requires a clear consideration of the theory of context, the reflection of dynamic processes based on the relationship between the parts and the whole, which goes beyond the clearly delineated framework of the study..

Pragmatism is often conceptualized as the science of using language, the study of context-dependent meaning and the study of the meaning given by the speaker, assuming the presence of language, the user's language and context, on the one hand, and context-independent meaning, on the other. In order to reflect its multifaceted nature, definitions tend to focus not on what is pragmatic and what it does, but what it is not and what it does not do. Most conceptualizations give credit to Charles Morris's definition of "the study of the relationship between signs and interpreters" (Morris 1971: 6) and Austin's distinction between the constative and the performing (Austin 1971). This can lead to words being spoken and spoken. Against this background, the study of invisible meaning (Yul 1996: 127), the science of the uninitiated (Mei 2001: 194), the study of meaning as it "arises in the use of language" (Marmaridu 2000: 1) and the study of linguistic acts and communicative action and their relevance are considered pragmatic. (Bublitz 2009; Van Dijk 2008; Fezer 2004, 2007).

In general, we adhere to a much broader point of view and understand pragmatics as the scientific study of all aspects of linguistic behavior. In particular, pragmatists include models of linguistic actions, linguistic functions, types of inferences, principles of communication, foundations of knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, and organizational principles of text and discourse. Pragmatists are concerned with meaning in context, which, for analytical purposes, can be viewed from different points of view (speaker, recipient, analyst, etc.). It bridges the gap between the system side of the language and the use side and binds both sides at the same time. Unlike syntax, semantics, sociolinguistics, and other linguistic disciplines, pragmatists are determined by point of view rather than by the object of study. The former precedes (actually creates) the latter. Researchers in pragmatic fields work in all areas of linguistics (and beyond), but with a special perspective that makes their work pragmatic and leads to new conclusions, as well as to rethink old conclusions. The center of pragmatic action (from the Greek pragma 'act') is linguistic action (and interaction); it is the center around which all accounts in these reference books revolve. Pragmatists are primarily concerned with communicative activities

in any context. The multidimensional research paradigm of the pragmatists has given new directions and perspectives in the arts and humanities, philosophy, cognitive science, computer science, and social sciences. Pragmatic approaches are used in the field of information technology and social sciences, especially in the fields of economics, politics and education.

From a pragmatic point of view, the use of language and its use in interaction are primary, in contrast to language as a system of signs or a set of rules. A pragmatic perspective studies not only individual words, sentences or even individual texts, but also entire speech events or language games in a real social context, taking into account both the current state of affairs and its relationship with previous and subsequent actions. She rejects the localization of language in a limited segment of acts of speech, understanding and response, or within the framework of the individual's consciousness. It displaces the view of language as an abstraction without changes in the speaker, region or time of the language as an uncultured, non-social, static, impersonal fact, independent of context and discourse. Pragmatism goes beyond the perspective of written texts with their carefully grouped grammatical sentences, encompassing everyday conversations and the "clutter" of language in real-world embodied human contexts, where participants with personality, feelings and goals interact in complex ways with physical objects and other actors within institutions and communities.

The fact that pragmatism overcomes any narrow emphasis on language as a system of signs or a set of rules, of course, does not mean that the pragmatist (unlike other scientific disciplines) tries to describe language without using a systematic level of theoretical abstraction. Ultimately, and in order to create and provide a solid scientific foundation, pragmatists, like any other scientific theory, must make the transition from the token level to the type level. For a pragmatic researcher, specific linguistic events (and their contexts) are meaningful only if their properties and limitations can be integrated under similar conditions into the general concept of language and communication. While pragmatists are at the level of other scientific theories in this regard, they surpass them in various ways, in particular by adopting a constructivist perspective that allows new contextual, situational, and cognitive variables to be included. Thus, a pragmatic description of a language means going beyond the description of a language as an autonomous, limited type of principle and taking into account extra-linguistic phenomena and conditions arising from the context and the specific situation of using the language. The transformation of contextual and related conditions into prototypical conditions (and thus theorizing them) is a pragmatic excess. If pragmatism is more of a perspective or orientation to the use of language than a specific theory or a specific research object, then data scientists become of great importance. In linguistic research, as Saussure understood, it is the point of view that determines the object, and not vice versa. In a tradition that grew out of natural language philosophy, intuition and the occasional observation of individual writers provide material for analysis. Introspection counts as data. All early work on speech acts, assumptions, and inferences was based on introspection and invented examples in imaginary contexts (Austin, Searle, Strawson, and Gries).

Other traditional areas of pragmatic research have been based on authentic evidence from the outset. Indecision / dexicality, discourse markers, particles and the like are ubiquitous in texts, and therefore examples for study are easy to collect. As the corpus of spoken language became more accessible and

reliable, the problem of evidence versus introspection became itself. Scientists no longer needed to guess about the distribution and frequency of language subjects. One can start with a small pre-selected corpus representing a specific set of elements or interactions to determine the range of functions for a particular linguistic characteristic, before proceeding with a general search in the large corpus to determine the distribution and frequencies in the corpus as a whole; a small corpus representing specific contexts for thorough qualitative analysis. In contrast, large corpus studies can provide impetus for research by illustrating a range of subjects or contexts not found in a small corpus and proposing hypotheses for testing. For statistical purposes, it is probably always better, since scientists tend to correlate frequency with typology (more often this is more typical). On the other hand, the growing interest in multimodal data and description in speech interaction research has brought researchers back to a small, carefully annotated corpus. By their very nature, studies of prosody, gaze, gesture and details of interaction with objects in a particular physical setting must be based on a narrow recording and transcription of a particular event: The large corps is extremely difficult to manage under these circumstances..

Many pragmatists believe that linguistic data should be as authentic as possible, captured in real life contexts, where something is at stake for the participants. But the whole question of recording, often with video cameras as well as microphones, raises the spectrum of the Observer's paradox. How natural is linguistic interaction when a technical apparatus is required to record it? Some pragmatic scholars believe that the use of language should be understood in terms of ingrained practice as part of the social world. In it, listening and speaking are forms of action, in accordance with the interpretation of the production and reception of speech as embodied social facts (Hanks 1996), as well as practice as joint implementation of things, ways of communication, beliefs and values, depending on participation in the activity (Wenger 1998 ; Eckert 2000). Conceptualizing speech and listening from a practice perspective allows the participant to naturally acquire non-verbal behaviors, including gaze, posture, and gesture in face-to-face communication (Goodwin 2003). This has implications for what counts as data, how much context should be considered, what should be recorded, and how much detail.

 The analysis of context-sensitive meaning is at the heart of the pragmatic approach, and for this reason context is one of its key research objects. Theory, practice, and implementation of context are also relevant to various fields of research ranging from philosophy and computer communication to cognitive science, in particular dialogue management, artificial speech production, artificial intelligence, knowledge dissemination, robotics and information technology. The heterogeneous nature of the context and the dependence of the concept itself on the context made it nearly impossible for the scientific community to agree on one common definition or theoretical perspective, and often only one minor aspect of the context is described, modeled or formalized (cf. Ackman et al. 2001; Blackburn et al. 2003; Bouquet and others 1999). Due to its multifaceted nature and inherent complexity, the context is no longer considered an analytic simple set, but is viewed from the point of view of the whole part as an entity containing subobjects (or subcontexts). A layered view of context contains a number of different perspectives. First, the context is conceived as a frame of reference, the task of which is to delineate content, delimiting it, and at the same time to be delineated and limited by

less close boundaries to each other. The nature of the relationship between different frames is a structural whole made up of interconnected frames (Hoffman 1986). The script based on the Gestaltic-psychological figure dominates the psychological and psycholinguistic aspects of the context. It is also accepted in cognitive pragmatists, which is reflected in the theoretical concept of context as a bow, figuratively speaking. The individual layers are interconnected, and the order of their inclusion corresponds to the order of their availability (Sperber and Wilson 1995), which is reflected in the inference and other types of reasoning.

Second, the context is seen as a dynamic construct that is organized internationally through and through communication. This view is prevalent in ethnometology (Garfinkel 1994; Goodwin and Duranty 1992; Gerritaghi 1984), inter-action sociolinguistics (Gumperz 1996, 2003), and sociopragmatics (Bublitz 2009; Fetzer 2007, Schmidt 2003), where the context is given the dual status of process and product. Dynamic perspectives are based on the premise of indecisive social action and collaborative context-building. In paradigms focused primarily on quality, context is inextricably linked with adjacency pairs, conditional relevance and a system of rotation at the micro level, as well as with an institution at the macro level, the order of which is determined using context-independent and contextual-context-context sensitive constraints and requirements.

In linguistics, a language is usually learned independently, taking into account the use of the language, but not for the user of the model. The language system contains constitutive subsystems of phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. They can be assigned the status of stand-alone modules, as is the case with formal paradigms. They can be viewed as coherent subsystems, as in the case of systemic functional grammar (Gallidey 1994), or as dialectically related subsystems with fuzzy boundaries, such as the cognitive paradigm (Givin 1993, 2005), where the use of language is dialectically related to the language system and user of the model. Language is seen as a dynamic construct that changes through structured use in a context in which the grammatical and pragmatic aspects of the interface are interpreted (Ariel 2008: 257-259). The dialectical connection between the constitutive subsystems of the language requires an explicit adaptation of pragmatic interfaces. A pragmatic approach to the object to be considered does not presuppose the isolation of the object, but its connection with the conditions of its use and with the user.

REFERENCES

1. Whitsith, Sam, (2007). Criticism of the concept of semantic prosod. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics 10 (3): 283-305.
2. Maynard, Carson and Cheryl Leicher, (2007). A pragmatic abstract of the academic oral corpus for pedagogical purposes.
3. Maynard, Carson and Cheryl Leicher (2007). A pragmatic abstract of the academic oral corpus for pedagogical purposes.
4. Andersen, Giselle (2001). Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic variations. Relevance is a theoretical approach to the language of adolescents. Amsterdam: Benjamin.
5. Sadock, Gerld M. (1977). Aspects of linguistic pragmatists. In Rogers et al. (eds.), 67-73

6. Leach, Jeffrey. (1983). The principles of pragmatism. London: Longman.

7.   Kadmon, Nirith. (2000). Formal Pragmatists: Semantics, Pragmatics, Assumptions, and Focus.

8. Adolf, Svenya (2008) Corpus and context. Study of pragmatic functions in colloquial discourse.

9. Kadmon, Nirith. (2000). Formal Pragmatists: Semantics, Pragmatics, Assumptions, and Focus. Oxford: Blackwell

10. Leach, Jeffrey. (1983). The principles of pragmatism. London: Longman.

11. Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). Pragmatics, Cambridge.