PRAGMATISM AS A LINGUISTIC DISCIPLINE AND ITS PLACE AMONG OTHER SCIENCES

Shaxzodaxon Sanakulova Sheraliyevna
Samarqand shahar 35-maktab, Maxmud koshgari 50
Tel:(91) 5452396
Ilmiy raxbar ismi: **Suleymanova Nargiza Mardonovna**

Annotation: Until the mid-20th century, the term "pragmatics" was employed by different fields of research (such as semiotics, philosophy, sociology, psychology), which made the content of the term very wide and ambiguous. Due to the emergence and development of linguistically oriented pragmatics, it became necessary to define the place of pragmatics in relation to linguistics and to determine the range of tasks it serves to accomplish. There are three ways to interpret the relationship between pragmatics and linguistics: 1) pragmatics is a separate discipline closely related to linguistics; 2) pragmatics is a branch of linguistics; 3) pragmatics belongs to a certain branch of linguistics. The article discusses these three possibilities with reference to the existing literature. Pragmatics is postulated as a discipline of its own, if it is developed as a cross-disciplinary theoretical approach. When considered among other branches of linguistics, it is referred to as pragmalinguistics or linguistic pragmatics. Nowadays, this is the most widespread point of view found in many linguistic dictionaries and handbooks. Those who view pragmatics as part of a certain branch of linguistics, usually attribute it to text linguistics or semantics. In conclusion, the author proposes another interpretation: in addition to core linguistics, applied linguistics, interdisciplinary linguistics and other possible subdivisions, it is expedient to distinguish communicational linguistics. Pragmatics makes part of it, alongside with phonetics.

Keywords: pragmatics, communication, linguistics, classification, pragmalinguistics

INTRODUCTION: The communicative-pragmatic turn in linguistics marked a shift in the interest of researchers from studying the internal properties of the language system to analyzing the functions of language in the complex structure of human communication, and also drew the attention of scientists to the term "pragmatics" itself, which was practically not used in linguistics until the mid-twentieth century. The rapid development of linguistic pragmatics led to the fact that the field of study of this new science began to include everything that goes beyond the framework of traditional systemic linguistics, which rapidly expanded the scope of its object and made its

boundaries very vague. To this day, the question of the relationship between pragmatics and linguistics remains controversial.[1] The author of this article aims to identify and analyze the currently existing interpretations of the term "pragmatics", to describe possible variants of the relationship of pragmatics with other scientific disciplines and to offer his own version of a scheme illustrating the position of linguistic pragmatics within the framework of linguistic science. Without claiming to have a final solution to the above-described set of problems, the author hopes that the presented point of view will contribute to the development of a fruitful discussion on this matter.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: 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 its content becoming largely vague and ambiguous.[2]

From the history of the development of pragmatics as a scientific direction, it is known that it could be considered as a component of various branches of science. Depending on the time period and the authors of a specific theory, pragmatics can be understood as:

1) one of the three components of semiosis, within the framework of which the relationship of signs to the subjects producing and interpreting them is studied.

2) the study of patterns, pathologies and paradoxes of interaction between individuals (the psychotherapeutic pragmatics of Pavel Vaclavik.

3) the study of language as an instrument of action for achieving various goals (linguo-philosophical pragmatics, based on the theory of speech acts of J. Austin and J. Searle)

4) the universal theory of social interaction (socio-philosophical pragmatics of J. Habermas)

5) the specific (institutional) theory of speech behavior (functional pragmatics of Konrad Ehlich and Jochen Rehbein).

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 problems:

1) to determine the place of pragmatics in relation to linguistics;

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

[1] Красина Е.А. (2016) Дискурс, высказывание и речевой акт // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Лингвистика. 2016. Т. 20. № 4. С. 91—102. [Krasina E. (2016). Discourse, Statement and Speech Act. Russian Journal of Linguistics, 20 (4), 91—102. (in Russ.)]

[2] V., Kotorova, E.G. (2015). Contrastive study of speech behavior patterns. Speech genres, 2, 27–39. (In Russ.)]

PRAGMATICS AS AN INDEPENDENT DISCIPLINE

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 (also called formal in the author's later works) pragmatics of J. Habermas, which unites 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 acts, 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 of possible mutual understanding[3]". 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 with the help of pragmatic universals. The term "universal pragmatics" should, according to the author, emphasize the difference between his theory and other areas of linguistic pragmatics. While empirical pragmatics sets the task of studying the individual situational conditions for the realization of utterances, the goal of universal pragmatics is to reconstruct a universal system of rules by which sentences can be transformed into utterances. As a result, Habermas considers it necessary to distinguish the theory of communicative competence he created (also called "universal pragmatics") from linguistics.[4] In his opinion, there is a fundamental difference between the generation of sentences in accordance with the rules of language (the area of competence of linguistics) and the use of sentences in accordance with pragmatic rules that form the infrastructure of speech situations as a whole (the area of competence of universal pragmatics).

When analyzing the three above-described possibilities for interpreting the relationship between pragmatics and linguistics, it can be seen that at present the majority of researchers adhere to the viewpoint that linguistic pragmatics or pragmalinguistics should be — in accordance with its name — included in the field of linguistic research and is, therefore, one of the linguistic disciplines. This opinion is

---

[3] Komarova, Z.I. (2014). Methodology, method, technique and technology of scientific research in linguistics: study guide. 3rd ed. Moscow: Flinta. (In Russ.)]

[4] Lingvisticheskaya pragmatika (Linguistic pragmatics). Vinnitsa: Nova knyga. (In Russ.)]

based, in many respects, 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 considered to be the study of the functioning of language in communication.

CONCLUSION: An analysis of different points of view on the subject and tasks of pragmatics as a scientific discipline shows that there is no consensus among scientists regarding which global scientific direction (semiotics, philosophy, psychology, etc.) pragmatics is a part of. In the middle of the 20th century, pragmatics began to be included in linguistics, in which case this discipline is called linguistic pragmatics or pragmalinguistics. The following conclusions can be made regarding the position and content of linguistic pragmatics.

In accordance with the purpose of the article, the above scheme illustrates the author's point of view on the position of pragmalinguistics in relation to other linguistic disciplines. The author does not claim to cover all (or most) areas of linguistics in this scheme. Apparently, there can be no unambiguous solution regarding the delimitation and classification of particular disciplines within linguistics, since there are many opinions regarding the possibilities of the hierarchical organization of such a classification. The proposed solution is only one of the possible ones. At the same time, it should be recognized that communicative linguistics, which has been rapidly developing recently, is also in the process of formation, and linguists have yet to define this subdiscipline, determine its subject and tasks in the course of the discussion.

List of used literature:

1. Krasina E.A. (2016) Discourse, utterance and speech act // Bulletin of Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series: Linguistics. 2016. Vol. 20. No. 4. Pp. 91-102.

2. Lyons D. Linguistic semantics. Introduction. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2003. [Lyons, J. (2003). Levitskiy Yu.A. Text linguistics. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 2006. [Levitskiy, Yu.A. (2006).

3. Lingvistika teksta (Text linguistics). Moskva: Vysshaya shkola. (In Russ.)]

4. Norman B.Yu. Linguistic Pragmatics. Based on Russian and Other Slavic Languages. Minsk: BSU, 2009. [Norman, B.Yu. (2019).

5. Kotorova, Elizaveta (2019). Pragmatics among Linguistic Disciplines: Problems of Definition and Classification. Russian Journal of Linguistics, 23 (1), 98—115. doi: 10.22363/2312-9182-2019-231-98-115.

6. Senft, Gunter (2016). Pragmatics. In Klaus Bruhn Jensen, Robert T. Craig, Jefferson Pooley und Eric W. Rothenbuhler (eds.) The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley, 1586—1598. doi:10.1002/9781118766804.wbiect165.