



PRAGMEMA AND INFORMEMA AS CONSTITUENT UNITS OF LINGUOPRAGMATICS

Rakhmatullaeva Nafisa Abdimalikovna ¹

¹ Linguistics (English) 1st course student of Master's degree

At Termez State University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4715423>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 19th April 2021

Accepted: 21st April 2021

Online: 23rd April 2021

KEY WORDS

pragmatics,
linguopragmatics,
ambiguity

ABSTRACT

Pragmatics is the way we pass on the meaning through the communication. The meaning incorporates verbal and non-verbal components and it changes agreeing to the setting, to the relationship between utterers, too to numerous other social variables. Its energetic development makes English an universal language that interfaces individuals all around the world. In this article, we will attempt to depict conceivable approaches to the depiction of pragmatology as a framework of science of phonetics and its tasks and viable part of pragmemas.

One of the most notable direction of linguistics in the XXI century is a linguopragmatics in both structure and logical meaning. This issue should be viewed and analyzed from multiple standpoints. Scholars explain pragmatology in different ways. According to M. Ariel - Pragmatics derives from Latin pragmaticus from the Greek πραγματικός (pragmatikos), meaning amongst others "fit for action", which comes from πρᾶγμα (pragma), "deed, act", and that from πράσσω (prassō), "to pass over, to practise, to achieve". [1, 6]

Main body:

Looking at the origin of the term, Charles Morris coined the first modern determination of pragmatics, and since then many other specialists have continued to conceptualize this field of linguistics. Ch. Morris originally illustrated pragmatics as "...the discipline that studies the relations of signs to interpreters, while semantics studies

the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable" [12, 30].

In a contemporary, communication-oriented terminology, we favour to talk about "messages" and "language users" in contrast to traditional linguistics, which first and foremost centralizes on the elements and structures (such as sounds and sentences that the language users produce, pragmatics focuses on the language-using humans. Put differently, pragmatics is interested in the process of producing language and in its producers, not just in the end-product, language.

The appropriate scope of pragmatics would then be what Chomsky has called performance, that is to say, the way the individual goes about using language.

This concrete linguistic practice would be differentiated from an abstract competence, understood as the user's knowledge of the language and its rule. This



perspective is neatly caught by Katz who states: “Grammars are theories about the structure of sentence types, Pragmatics theories, in contrast, ... explicate the reasoning of speakers and hearers [7,5].

Kasper gave definition to the term as “the study of people’s grasp and output of linguistic action in context” [8, 3]. Here, there are comprised the words action and context, two crucial elements of speech acts in language. Kasper utilized the term linguistic action which outlines the capacity of the learner to produce an utterance. He also put emphasis on comprehension as well as production, a differentiation that is principally appropriate for second language learners’ daily lives.

D. Crystal described pragmatics as:

... the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication.” [5, 240]

This definition performs a practical analysis from the users’ point of view. They consider different choices, depending on the social interaction of their communication, when using the target language. The assumption of choice leads to another effective aspect for language learners, clearly the outgrowth of the ability to make the proper choice in various pragmatic elements. D. Crystal reckoned “pragmatics as the study of the communicative action in its sociocultural context”. Hence, it can be said that individuals have some sort of pragmatic competence which allows them to use language in different and concrete situations, in varying contexts. Therefore, pragmatic competence is mainly scrutinized at the social level within the limits of speech acts and

social acts, interactions or at the interactional level.

Due to the S. Levenson “Pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language” [10,9] this definition is today commonly utilized.

Moreover, the researchers illustrate various aspects of pragmatic linguistics. According to Y.D. Apresyan, the pragmatics is speaker’s (1) true nature; 2) the content of the communication; 3) written convention of the addressee in any language unit (lexema, affix, grammatical syntax). In general, the definitions of linguistic pragmatics in scientific literature can be grouped as follows: 1) explanations that overpass human factor; 2) the definitions of the functional aspect of linguopragmatic researches, their contextual condition: “science of language use”, “language in context”; 3) definitions that focus on studying the effectiveness of language interaction in the context of communicative interaction; 4) definitions that distinguish an interpretive aspect of the speech that is reflected in any communicative context. The interpretation here is pragmatic meaning of the word [2, 78].

In addition, linguopragmatics is a branch of linguistic researches which considers the utilization and intercourse of language units in definite communicative pragmatic areas as an object. If there is a close interaction between a speaker and a listener, the venue of the speech act, time, its goals and awaited results are also estimated to be momentous.

The notion of linguapragmatics is interpreted by D. U. Ashurova in the following way: “Linguapragmatics is one of 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” [3,60].

Common sense seems to dictate that the object of any science is investigated from three points of view: the internal state of the object, its associative ability and its usefulness to human. G.G.Matveeva states that Pragmalinguistics is a linguistic discipline, based on the anthropocentric principle. It takes its place in the system of linguistic disciplines, and its object is to study the conditions and manifestations of verbal communication, and with the practical role of identifying the speech portrait of a person.

The main task of pragmalinguistics is to answer three questions:

1. Why do communicants begin their verbal communication?
2. Why is a verbal communication of communicants realized in this particular way?
3. How do communicants act in a speech communication? [11,25]

The main task of the pragmalinguistics is to scrutinize the language in terms of pragmalinguistic role. In other words, language is considered to be as a tool which affects on people's minds, behavior. Particularly, much attention is paid to the factors where a speaker detects and selects the best options to send his communicative intention; situations which influence on understanding communicative aim of a sentence. Such obstacles form the subject of pragmalinguistics. To sum it up, we may consider pragmalinguistics as a branch which regulates human behavior. Therefore, the purpose of linguopragmatics is to study the usage of language signs in accordance with the speaker's intentions. Well, we can categorize the following tasks:

- to determine the speaker's purpose in the process of communication;
- to clarify the choice of tools and reasons to express his opinion;

Hence, pragmatics arises the question of situational interpretation which, in its turn, presents the notion of a communicative - pragmatic situation. The communicative-pragmatic situation is conceived as a complex of external conditions and circumstances of communication. According to E.S.Aznaurova the communicative pragmatic situation can be presented by a chain questions: “who -what-where - when - how - why - to whom” [4,38]. The most relevant parameters of the communicative- pragmatic situation in the context of communication are:

- circumstances and place of the communicative act;
- the subject and aim of communication;
- social, ethnic, individual, characteristics of the communicants;
- role and personal relations between the communicants.

In the process of discourse analysis the role of intentional factors as well as those of linguistic personality should be particularly emphasized.

Pragmalinguistics do not have a clear form. It encompasses a set of issues related to the utterer and the listener, their interaction in the speech process. Linguopragmatics includes a realistic expression of social activity. Uzbek linguistics has conducted some scrutiny on the pragmatic aspects, the relationship between the speaker and the listener, the interaction of participants in the speech act, and their influence on ethical emotions. The problems of linguistic pragmatics does not have their own definition. As a part of pragmatics and a part of the linguistic science, the word pragmaling seems to be a natural thing to say about the category of units.

There are two pragmalinguistic units:

1. Informema.
2. Pragmema.



Pragmalingvistic units are directly affected by language units and functional language areas. The pragmats come into opposition with the information-gathering function. Pragmemas are always pragmatic information carriers.[9,56]

“The police are barking up the wrong tree as usual-Idiom”

a) They suspect somebody who has nothing to do with the crime- pragmema.

b) they are barking to the tree-informema

The ambiguity of these interesting word-groups may lead to an amusing misunderstanding, especially for children who are apt to accept words at their face value.

Here, it is given another actual example in order understand significance of linguopragmatic competence:

Father: *How many times do I have to tell you to brush your teeth? (to his son who forgot to brush his teeth before going to bed)*

Son: *Five times*

Misunderstanding the speaker's intention may precede to a breakdown in communication. In this example an order to do something is issued by the father to his son. It would be hilarious to interpret the intent of the speaker as asking for information. In this example, *Five times* is informema, If son understands this question as *“he should brush his teeth before going to bed”*, it will be pragmema.

From the above given definitions and examples ,it is obvious that pragmatics plays crucial role in communication and other text types as well. What does pragmatics have to propose us that cannot be found in good old-fashioned linguistics. What do pragmatic methods give “in the way of greater comprehension of how the human mind works, how humans communicate how they govern one another. and in general, how they utilize language? The worldly answer is pragmatics is indispensable if we desire a

more sufficient , deeper and generally more equitable account of human language behavior.

A more practical answer would be: outward of pragmatics, no understanding; sometimes, a pragmatic account is the only one that makes sense, as in the following example, borrowed from David Lodge's *Paradise News*:

- *I just met the old lrishman and his son, coming out of the toilet.*
- *I wouldn't have thought there was room for the two of them.*
- *No silly, I mean I was coming out of the toilet. They were waiting.[6,65]*

How do we know what the first speaker meant? Linguists usually say that the first sentence is ambiguous, and they surpass at making such sentences :

Flying planes can be dangerous

or:

The missionaries are ready to eat

In order to show what is denoted by “ambiguous”: a word, phrase, or sentence that can mean either one or the other of two (or even several) things. Hence, it is vital to know all meanings of each word in context.

Conclusion

To sum up, it can be concluded that, according to above mentioned statements and examples, it is essential to note that all these aspects are by no means incompatible. Linguopragmatics can be defined as one of the most essential field of modern linguistics. Furthermore, it can be interpreted from different viewpoints, and It should be emphasized that pragmalinguistics is the science studying language factors in accordance with the psychological, social and cultural aspects of human. In short, if any utterance understood from pint of view of linguopragmatics, it does not occur any misunderstanding and hilarious situations in communication.



REFERENCES:

1. Ariel Mira.(2010). Research survey in linguistics. Cambridge University Press
2. Apresiyani Y.D. “Connotation as part of the pragmatics of the word” Selected works I, II: Integral description of the language and lexicography system, 995.
3. Ashurova D.U., Galiyeva M.R. Text linguistics. T.: Turon-Iqbol, 2016. P. 223.
4. Азнаурова Э. С. Прагматика слова. –Ташкент: Фан, 1988.
5. Crystal, D. 1985. A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
6. David Lorge “Paradise News” London:Secker and Warburg.1991.
7. Jacob L. Mey, . “Pragmatics” Blackwell Publishing,2nd edition, UK ,2001.
8. Kasper, Gabriele. 1993. Interlanguage Pragmatics. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press, Incorporated.
9. Киселева Л.А. Вопросы теории речевого воздействия. –Л.: Изд-во ЛГУ, 1983.
10. Levinson .S “Pragmatics” Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press’ New York
11. Matveeva,G.(2011). Pragmalinguistics in the System of Linguistic Science
12. Morris, C., 1938, “Foundations of the Theory of Signs”, in Carnap, R. et al. (Eds.) International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, 2:1, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.