PRINCIPLES OF PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS

Makhmudova Nigoraxon Boykozi kizi
Basic doctoral student in Namangan state university

Annotation: This article focuses on pragmatic analysis and its principles. It also presents some opinions on the history of the formation of pragmatic linguistics and its role in linguistics. These two polar interpretations of pragmatics are constantly striving towards each other, and the descriptions given to the concept of pragmatics in various studies seem to complement and clarify each other. As noted in various works, pragmalinguistics is the science of the language system that deals with the use of language, activated in a speech situation (context), the science that studies language from the perspective of the intended purpose, the theory that describes speech acts, the theory of conversational (oral) speech analysis, the field that studies linguistic means that express interpersonal relationships, etc.

Key words: Pragmatic analysis, pragmatic linguistics, linguistics, principles, development, Russian linguists, significance.

Pragmalinguistics as an independent direction of linguistics was formed in the 60s-70s of the last century. In 1970, an international conference on the topic "Pragmatics of Natural Languages" was held in Dordrecht. As the editor of the collection of lectures delivered at this conference, Professor of Tel Aviv University M. Bar-Hillel, noted in his "Foreword", the participants of the conference unanimously concluded that "the pragmatic features of communication carried out through natural language should be studied within the framework of linguistic theory, just like the syntactic and semantic features of this communication." From this very moment, which is recognized as the "period of rebirth" of pragmatics, a real pragmatic upsurge has occurred in foreign linguistics.

A number of conferences and meetings on this topic have been held, collections have been published, scientific research has no limits, the Journal of Pragmatics has literally become an international publication. In order for such a rapidly developing field of science to fully develop and develop its own identity, it is inevitable that it will be necessary to define its subject, basic concepts, and principles. Unfortunately, despite the efforts of a number of researchers, this problem has not yet been solved, and there is still no end in sight to the opinions expressed about the place of pragmatics among other areas of linguistics and its inter-disciplinary relationship. On the one hand, this is good evidence that the importance of the field, the abundance of issues raised, and the relevance of the chosen direction are attracting everyone's attention. Secondly, it should not be forgotten that the lack of clarity of the subject matter of the field, the confusion of principles, the chaotic application of the principles and concepts referred to, and the uncertainty of conclusions can lead to.

It is no exaggeration to say that in recent years there has been almost no linguist who does not use the term "pragmatics". As a result, a kind of pragmatic "fetishism" has emerged, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to find any information about the content of the term in the research carried out, except for its use. Whether it is necessary or not, the term is used, and the concept underlying it is brought to a narrowing. Therefore, before talking about the pragmatic

properties of linguistic units and their pragmalinguistic analysis, we are forced to seek answers to such questions as "What does pragmalinguistics deal with?", "What is its object and subject of research?", "What are the main concepts and principles of pragmatics?" J. Lyons at the 12th International Congress of Linguists (Vienna, 1977) tried to define the subject of pragmalinguistics and give its definition. "Pragmatics describes the use of linguistic units in communication in order to induce the listener to perceive the transmitted information in the same way as the speaker intended. This means that pragmatics deals with determining the role of linguistic means in interpersonal communication." The basis of this definition is the relationship between the intended goal in linguistic action and the means of achieving it. The chain "reason-motive-objective" forms the plan of speech activity and ensures its realization. The same thing prompted A. Kasher to describe the main goal of pragmalinguistic analysis as "the clarification and explanation of the rules of human abilities that ensure the use of linguistic means to achieve the set goal." When we compare the definitions given to pragmalinguistics, we notice that all of them lack completeness in covering the subject of this field, and in some cases, one definition casts a kind of "shadow" on the content expressed in the other. Perhaps, by taking a multifaceted approach to this issue, it is possible to describe the general situation, the complete picture of the phenomenon under study, by "attacking along all borders". In order to find evidence of this, I would like to recall and partially explain some definitions given in the pragmalinguistic literature. It is noticeable that American linguists often try to rely on the teachings of N. Chomsky in the analysis of each phenomenon related to linguistic activity. Pragmalinguistic research is no exception. J. Katz, who studied the relationship between the content of the proposition and the manifestation of the communicative purpose (illocution) based on the performance of speech acts, sees the subject of pragmatics in the opposition of linguistic ability and speech performance, activity, in Chomsky's doctrine.

In his opinion, pragmatic theory makes it possible to limit the meaning of sentences according to their pronunciation in a certain environment (context). "Grammar is the doctrine of the structure of sentence types, while pragmatics, on the contrary, does not deal with the construction of linguistic structures, their grammatical properties and relationships. Pragmatic theories study the rational provision of the correspondence of the sentence sign and proposition in the text by the speaker and the listener. Accordingly, pragmatic theory is a certain part of the theory of speech activity (performance)." Narrowing the scope of pragmalinguistic research to such an extent, limiting it only to speech performance, would be nothing more than leading the theory into a narrow street. In such a case, linguistic analysis becomes separated from its foundation - language. Undoubtedly, the social environment, the situation of communication play an important role in the emergence of linguistic activity, and the content of the unit being formed is revealed and determined in the text or context. The examples given by J. Katz: the second words of the pairs "rabbit" and "bunny" and "dog" and "puppy" ("rabbit", "puppy") are used in relation to children or by them. However, the meanings of petting and belittling in their content are also known to the text. It is evident that these meanings have a linguistic character and have a lexical or morphological means of expression. German scientists prefer to interpret the field of pragmatics in a broad sense, recognizing it as a generalizing field of linguistics. For example, Z. Schmidt, one of the authors of the "German Linguistic Dictionary", a major expert in text linguistics, states that the concepts of "pragmalinguistics" and "text linguistics" have a single meaning and that together they form a general theory of linguistic communication, and that this

theory, as a branch of communicative linguistics, also covers text grammar and traditional grammar.

As the number of authors increases, we are witnessing a growing diversity of definitions and conflicting opinions. Over the past 60-70 years, the scope and scope of pragmatics have expanded so much that it is becoming increasingly difficult to come to any conclusion about a single theory and its boundaries. In addition, the development of pragmalinguistics is also being contributed by such fields as cognitology, cultural anthropology, philosophy, logic, sociology, activity theory, and other fields of linguistics as sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, and text theory. The question of what should constitute the subject of pragmalinguistic research still remains relevant. Some definitions that interpret pragmatics in a narrow sense have been given above. The same narrowing of the scope of pragmatic research can be observed in the thoughts of some philosophers. W. Montague, P. Strawson and others consider pragmatics as a subject of research that consists in describing the content of deictic expressions ("I", "you", "here", "there", "now", "at that time", etc.). It is known that it is difficult to determine the referent of these units without a text. The smallest text (minimum context) that clarifies their meaning takes into account the speaker, listener, time, space, register, style, type of speech act, etc. The broad interpretation of pragmatics is manifested in the inclusion of types of purposeful human actions in its scope of research. These two polar interpretations of pragmatics are constantly striving towards each other, and the descriptions given to the concept of pragmatics in various studies seem to complement and clarify each other. As noted in various works, pragmalinguistics is the science of the language system that deals with the use of language, activated in a speech situation (context), the science that studies language from the perspective of the intended purpose, the theory that describes speech acts, the theory of conversational (oral) speech analysis, the field that studies linguistic means that express interpersonal relationships, etc.

The Russian linguists N.D. Arutyunova and Yu.S. Stepanov proposed to consider pragmatics as a theory that studies the subjective characteristics of artistic communication, the ways of expressing the "I" of its creators in the text. There are also those who consider pragmatics as a science (theory of speech influence) that determines the power of influence contained in the linguistic unity of the speaker's attitude to reality, the content of information and the addressee (listener, reader). The Dutch scientist T.A. van Dijk and his followers believe that the goal of pragmatics is to theoretically illuminate the issue of the "suitability" of linguistic speech devices for a communicative situation. The main task of this theory is to study the problems of creating the cognitive content of speech acts, preserving them in memory, and using the language system in a given socio-cultural environment, and at the same time forming a communication model. Thus, attempts to define the subject of pragmalinguistics continue, and there are many definitions given to this field, but none of the above definitions can claim to be general enough to reflect the content of the basic concepts related to this field of linguistics.

In order to distinguish pragmatics as an independent branch of linguistics and to determine its object, subject, it is necessary to search for factors that ensure the manifestation of the pragmatic value, "value", and content of linguistic units in various communicative environments. The signs of linguistic units that appear in any conditions are an example of their ontological and functional (functional) properties. The methodology of pragmatics research, firstly, must have its own philosophical basis, and secondly, it must create the possibility of determining these same

properties (ontological and functional). The basis of such a methodology can, of course, be the principle of activity or the philosophy of activity in general. The acceptance of the category of activity as the main methodological principle in linguistic research makes it possible to obtain more detailed knowledge about the components of the communicative system, their structure, linguistic and non-linguistic essence. The illumination of the communication process from the point of view of the principle of activity, along with the theoretical clothing of pragmalinguistics, paves the way for finding evidence proving the connection between knowledge of the world and linguistic activity. Speech communication, which requires the exchange of information, is the result of the interaction of emotional and rational (rational) cognitive actions.

REFERENCES
1. Kipchakova, Y. (2021). Methodological And Didactic Aspects Of Information And Intellectual Culture In The Education Of A Developed Generation. Economy and Society, (6-1), 156-159.
2. Kipchakova, Y. X., & Kodirova, G. A. (2020). Innovative Technologies In Modern Education. Theory and Practice of Modern Science, (5), 29-31.
3. Kipchakova, Y., Makhmudova, M., & Umarova, Z. (2021). Maktabgacha Yoshdagi Bolalar Mekhnatining Yoziga Khos Khususiyati. Student Bulletin, (22-7), 9-10.
4. Kipchakova, Y., Soibjonova, Sh., & Abdukayumova, S. (2021). The Educational Potential of Testing Technologies. Student Bulletin, (22-7), 11-12.
5. Botirova, N. (2020). The Educational Potential of Testing Technologies. Professional Education and Society, (3), 68-71.
6. Botirova, N. D. (2019). The Development of Productive Thinking in Younger Students. Humanitarian Treatise, (61), 4-6.