

TERMINOLOGICAL TERMS OF MODERN PRAGMALINGUISTICS IN THE EXAMPLE OF ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND SPANISH LANGUAGES

Bakhramova Dilovarxon

Teacher of

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. The main categories and units of pragmatics are explored, the specifics of the relationships between related pragmatic phenomena are revealed. The focus is on such concepts as pragmatic potential, pragmatic, communicative and perlocutionary effect, communicative competence, linguistic and speech pragememes. The position on the importance of terminological justification of the main categories of modern pragmalinguistics is defended due to the lack of a unified approach to determining their content.

Keywords: Pragmalinguistics, linguistic, phenomena, pragmatic,

Techniques and methods of pragmalinguistic research have gained widespread recognition in recent years. They not only make it possible to analyze and systematize the material being studied, but also help to determine the internal organization and specifics of the interaction of linguistic phenomena, to reveal the mechanism for selecting linguistic means and methods of targeted influence on the recipient. However, the lack of a unified approach to determining the linguistic status of pragmatics and the difficulty of establishing its boundaries have led to the emergence of very diverse points of view on what characteristics of linguistic phenomena are actually pragmatic. Thus, there is an urgent need to identify and terminologically justify the main categories and units of pragmatics, which most modern researchers in one way or another operate in this field. At the same time, under the categories of pragmatics, like many other authors, we understand abstract concepts that reflect the most general pragmatic, regulatory properties and patterns of language and speech. Among them, first of all, I would like to point out the pragmatic effect and pragmatic potential, i.e. on those terms that are most often found in works devoted to pragmatic research.

Having considered various approaches to defining the pragmatic effect, we came to the conclusion that this category is interpreted ambiguously by linguists. In particular, this is expressed in a mixture of concepts such as pragmatic effect, communicative effect and perlocutionary effect. To clarify the essence of this phenomenon, it is necessary to establish the content of each of the above categories.

The communicative effect, in our opinion, is the broadest of the three concepts listed above. It can be characterized as a kind of “understanding effect,” which depends on whether communication took place at all and how much the communicants understood each other. As a rule, the communicative effect is considered positive if the communication took place and the recipient realized the intention of the addressee, otherwise they speak of communication failures and failures.

With regard to the perlocutionary effect, or the effect of the statement on the addressee, it should be noted that it can be of several types: intentional, planned (or target, potential) and unintentional (or real, actual). They may coincide if the intentional perlocutionary effect reaches full implementation



(positive perlocutionary effect), or they may not coincide, i.e. in a specific speech situation, a perlocutionary effect occurs that is directly opposite to the planned one (negative perlocutionary effect).

As for the pragmatic effect, or the effect of targeted action and influence, it is always intentional, since the sender of the statement, in accordance with his intention, purposefully uses special techniques and selects special means to influence the recipient. Therefore, it seems to us more appropriate to use the concepts of achieving a pragmatic effect or not achieving a pragmatic effect, bypassing the terms positive or negative pragmatic effect. The pragmatic effect of an utterance is considered achieved if the speaker's intention towards the addressee is fully realized in the course of this communication.

So, on the one hand, the difference between the pragmatic effect and the unintentional perlocutionary effect is quite obvious, but on the other hand, it seems to coincide with the target perlocutionary effect. However, the pragmatic effect includes not only the plan of communicative influence on the addressee (perlocution), i.e. the practical result that the sender of the text achieved in accordance with his intention, but also the plan of action (illocution), which in turn implies the identification of the addresser's illocutionary attitude and the selection of special means and techniques of influencing the recipient.

It is noteworthy that at present, most scientists share the point of view that influence is accompanied by any communication, since the transfer of certain information in the process of communication does not happen just like that, but in order to achieve the goal. At the same time, in psychology, two main types of influence are most often distinguished - suggestion and persuasion. Persuasion is usually understood as a method of influencing the consciousness of a person through appealing to his own critical judgment, i.e. the persuasive effect is realized through logical, rational proof of truth.

As for the suggestive influence, its psychological nature is still not fully understood. True, despite the disagreements, suggestion, as a rule, is associated with uncritical perception and assimilation of information, highlighting those circumstances in which the object of influence does not realize that he is such. Such situations, according to P.B. Parshin, determined the great popularity of such a category as linguistic manipulation, when the manipulated not only does not realize the influence, but also acts as a result to his own detriment [1]. Manipulative specificity, in the understanding of V. A. Dauletova, is expressed in the provision of speech influence on the addressee "in order to make cognitive changes in his picture of the world, which will entail the regulation of the dispositions and activities of the addressee in favor of the addressee" [2, p. 3 – 4].

Communication is undoubtedly a multifaceted and very complex phenomenon, and the success of communication is a complex and contradictory phenomenon, which is influenced in one way or another by not only linguistic, but also extralinguistic factors in their entirety. Among the latter, as a rule, there are such as situational, linguogeographical and social factors, psychological characteristics, emotional state of the addresser and recipient, author's tastes, etc.

As for linguopragmatic factors, then, according to our position, the choice of a particular linguistic unit in order to most effectively influence the addressee is primarily influenced by its pragmatic potential, which we understand as the possibility of updating in speech not only the categorical meanings inherent in linguistic units as elements of the language system, but also those implicatures that can appear during the interaction of language with the speech environment, thereby contributing to the achievement of a certain pragmatic effect.



At the same time, the pragmatic constant (constant pragmatic, regulatory, control information aimed at mandatory implementation in speech) is not opposed to pragmatic potential, which is typical for many works in the field of pragmalinguistics, but is considered as a component of this potential along with the pragmatic variable (our term), those. that linguistic information that can become pragmatic depending on the needs and goals of the speech act. This approach allows us to reveal the specifics of the dialectical unity that represents the meaning of a linguistic unit in speech.

Issues related to such categories as pragmatic potential, pragmatic constant and pragmatic variable cannot be considered without touching on the basic units of pragmalinguistics, which primarily include pragememes and informemes. Informemes are units of different levels of language that serve to convey informative content, for example: una mesa - table; una mesita – table (parametric data); uña de caballo (lit.: horse claw; FE) - coltsfoot.

Pragememes are understood as carriers of pragmatic content. Among them, there are linguistic pragememes, which are carriers of constant pragmatic information, i.e. contain a pragmatic constant (cf.: hermoso - wonderful, terrible - terrible), and speech pragememes, which become carriers of pragmatic information due to the actualization of the pragmatic variable, i.e. potential pragmatic information. Compare: un roble – oak (tree name) is an informeme, i.e. a unit of language that serves to convey informative content, however, in a certain situation, this linguistic unit can realize its pragmatic potential and carry additional meanings, i.e. become a speech pragememe. It is interesting that when the words oak and un roble function in English and Spanish, different pragmatic potential can be actualized. Thus, in the Spanish language only positive meanings appear (strong, strong, healthy), but in the English language it is also possible for a negative assessment to appear (stupid, insensitive person).

It seems necessary to point out the fact that both informemes and linguistic pragememes can realize their pragmatic potential and move into the category of speech pragememes, for example: 1. It was a fun holiday. 2. Yes, a fun holiday, nothing to say! In the first case we have a linguistic pragememe, in the second – a speech one. There is no doubt that linguistic pragememes are primarily means of expressing linguopragmatic categories, for example, categories of intensity, modality, evaluation, etc. The perception of most linguistic pragememes, which are an integral part of the language system and contain a pragmatic constant, is based on both the collective subjective concept of the norm (cf.: good concert < excellent concert) and the subjective perception of reality by the individual (cf.: wonderful concert, excellent concert), which determines the different pragmatic effect of utterances in different communicative situations and allows us to consider the pragmatic constant as one of the components of pragmatic potential.

Speaking about the basic units and categories of pragmatics, we cannot ignore the question of the pragmatic function of language. Of course, the recognition of the communicativeness of language as its essential characteristic, explicitly or covertly presented in the vast majority of works, makes it possible to bring together such frequently identified functions of language as expressive, constructive, accumulative, etc. In this sense, the essence of language as a means of human communication is truly determined by its communicative function, if by the word “function” we mean role, purpose. But, considering the individual components of the communicative function of language, it should be recognized that the pragmatic function, which implies the purposeful influence of a linguistic sign on the addressee in a particular communicative situation, occupies its special place among them. In addition, we can talk about its varieties, which include the following functions: stylistic, cumulative, directive, summarizing, evaluative and contact-establishing. At the same time, many linguistic units in the process of communication are characterized by the interaction of several functions.



As we see, the categories and units of pragmatics are numerous and diverse, but they are not isolated, but intersect and mutually condition each other. Thanks to this relationship, they represent an integral system, and not just an arithmetic sum, determining both the rather heterogeneous nature of linguistic phenomena considered by pragmatics, and the variety of methods of pragmatic analysis applied to them.

REFERENCES:

1. Parshin P.B. Speech influence // Encyclopedia "Around the World".
2. Dauletova V.A. Verbal means of creating a self-image in political discourse (English biographical prose): abstract. dis. ...cand. Philol. Sci. Volgograd, 2004. 22 p.
3. Kiseleva L.A. Questions of the theory of speech influence. L., 2008. 160 p.
4. Mankova L.A. Speech impact of newspaper headlines (based on the material of the Crimean press) // Culture of the peoples of the Black Sea region. 2008. No. 3. P. 192 – 195.
5. Lem S. Philosophy of chance. M., 2005. 767 p.
6. Bazhenova I.S. Emotions. Pragmatics. Text. M., 2003. 391 p.
7. Bergelson M.B. Intercultural communication as interaction of linguocultural models. 2008. URL: http://www.ffl.msu.ru/.../1_2008_bergelson.pdf (date of access: 01/20/2010).
8. Hymes D. On Communicative Competence // Sociolinguistics / Ed. by J. B. Pride and J. Holmes. Harmondsworth, 2002. pp. 269 – 293.
9. Habermas Ju. Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns (2 vols.) Frankfurt, 2001. Vol. I. 534 p.
10. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary / ch. ed. V.N. Yartseva. M., 2000. 685 p.
11. Portolés J. Pragmática para hispanistas. Madrid, 2004. 365 p.
12. Kudryashov I.A. The problem of identifying indirect expressive acts in dialogical discourse // Language, consciousness, communication. M., 2005. Issue. 30.
13. Шамурадова, Н. (2021). COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK PROVERBS (USAGE OF PARTS OF BODY). *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 4(1-1).
14. Shamuradova, N. (2021). USAGE OF PARTS OF BODY IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH IDIOMS. *Мир исследований*, 2(2).
15. Mizrobovna, O. M. (2023). SYNTACTIC SEMANTICS OF THE INFINITIVE IN THE POSITION OF NON-NUCLEAR DEPENDENT COMPONENT. *Open Access Repository*, 9(11), 163-166.

