

## PROBLEMATIC AREAS OF PRAGMALINGUISTIC STUDIES

**Mavlyanova Malohat Dilshod qizi**

a teacher, Uzbekistan state world languages university, Tashkent

***Annotation.** The article discusses problematic areas of pragmalinguistic studies, main notions, and the importance of this field.*

***Keywords.** Pragmatics, pragmalinguistics, human factor, communication, lingua pragmatics, speech acts.*

**Introduction.** The current observations show that several pressing issues in this area need to be addressed on a large scale. Pragmalinguistic issues are among those newly emerged necessities of modern linguistic research. The concern is the human factor and the way communication is influenced by this. Human is the center of all democratic reforms, the measuring factor of progress; thus, concomitant human issues stipulate successful communication.

**Main part.** Discussing the problems of Pragmalinguistics, V. Karasik made a distinction between 3 trends: a) controversial (connected to speech acts) b) functional (rhetoric, stylistic), and psycholinguistic (word formation and word usage) [Abdugaffarova, 2019, pp.2-3]. However, according to Y.D. Apresyan, pragmatics is a speaker's attitude to the truth to identity, the content of the message, and to the addressee through language units. He grouped all the definitions of Pragmalinguistics given in scientific sources in the following way:

- definitions related to the priority of human factors.
- definitions based on functional aspects in linguopragmatic research, and contextual conditions, science about the use of a language, science about a language in a context [Abdugaffarova, 2019, p.3].

It was Yu. Stepanov proved that the main category in pragmatics is the category of the subject of speech. This concept leads to important issues: issues on what a speaker is telling and how, reliability of the information, objectivity, prediction of his/her speech, true or incorrect sentences or words, his/her behavior in a social environment, an ability to interpret his objective ideas, or vice versa.

Moreover, it is often defined as a source of any aspect of a sentence, as it is mentioned in the saying “Pragmatics meaning minus truth conditions” [Ashurova, Galiyeva, 2016. p. 130].

There were many controversial ideas about the differences between pragmatics and semantics. According to Gazdar, the distinctions between pragmatics and semantics are obviously seen as coincident with the differences between truth-conditional and non-truth-conditional meanings. The notion of linguapragmatics is defined by D. U. Ashurova in the following way: “Linguapragmatics is one of the trends of communicative linguistics, which in its general sense can be defined as a science studying language factors within the sphere of human activity with an accent on psychological, social and cultural aspects of language functioning” [Ashurova, Galiyeva, 2016, pp. 130-131]. The problems of lingua pragmatics have been dealt with in many works of linguists.

The broadness of pragmatics has led to a significant spread of topics and problems from the point of view of linguistics as follows:

- Pragmatic interpretation of the language and the theory of speech acts;
- Pragmatic parameters of literary communication;
- The text in its dynamics related to creating “I” in a text [Ashurova, Galiyeva, 2016, p.263]

One of the dominant factors is considered to be the *human factor*, the description of language facts in the aspect of the human activity, the relationship between the sign and those, who use it, with an emphasis on sign functions as well as on the psychological, and sociological aspects. Since a person is an object of study in almost all sciences, it is necessary to refer to the conclusions of disciplines such as philosophy and psychology to have a clear understanding of the process of studying the human factor in terminological studies. After all, the latest trends in linguistics are inextricably linked with its intersection at the junction of other disciplines. At the same time, the human factor takes into account the general characteristics of a person: his psyche, will, interests, and motives. In particular, in linguistics, various psychological categories are mastered, which are studied in

harmony. It is important to understand that the specificity of each person can influence the structure of the language, and the scope of its use, to understand the social status of a person from a linguistic point of view. Other definitions emphasize that the functioning aspect of lingua pragmatic investigations is based on their contextual condition, to be more exact, the “science of language usage” and “language in context” [Van Dijk, 1977, pp. 13].

**Conclusion.** Pragmalinguistics studies a lot of questions; however, the most crucial notions of it are communicative situation, pragmatic intention, addresser and addressee, and speech acts. In conclusion, according to the preceding information, it is critical to emphasize that all of these features are not mutually exclusive. Linguopragmatics can be understood from several perspectives depending on the goal of the study. It is important to note that pragmatic linguistics is the science that studies language elements concerning psychological, social, and cultural aspects of human communication.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Alexander, R. (1984). British comedy and humor: Social and cultural background. *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 9(1), 63-83. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43023313>
2. Bloxham, A. (2008, March). British humor dictated by genetics.
3. Brown, P., S. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness. Some Universals of Language Usage*. Cambridge: CUP.
4. Carrell, A. (1997). Joke competence and humor competence. *Humor International Journal of Humor Research*, 10(2), 173-186.
5. University, Poland, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501507106>
6. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: OUP.