



PRAGMATICS AS A NEW BRANCH OF LINGUISTICS

Abdukarimov Valixon¹

¹ National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Foreign philology faculty 2nd year student.

Gmail: valixan.politics.gov@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4959074>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 01st June 2021
Accepted: 05th June 2021
Online: 10th June 2021

KEY WORDS

Pragmatics, philosophy, implicature, implication, word, meaning.

ABSTRACT

The following article focuses on the new branch of linguistics called Pragmatics. We used different sources and give different definitions to the term Pragmatics. The article gives information about what Pragmatics is and to make it easier to understand we used various examples of everyday English

INTRODUCTION

The end of the last century was a new period of development for linguistics. It was the period when new philosophical approaches of analyzing languages were introduced to the science of linguistics. Pragmatics can be a clear example of such methodologies.

DISCUSSION

First of all, we have to define the meaning of the term pragmatics and look at the history of this new branch of linguistics. One of the leading theorists, Deirdre Wilson, suggests that there are three approaches as Pragmatics can be regarded as a field of philosophy: an attempt to answer specific questions about what a term means, in the particular concern to what a word mean and what the speaker means while stressing this word. Alternatively, it can be seen as an extension of grammar used to codify interactions between sentence meaning and

context. On this approach to the definition Pragmatics belong to linguistics. Simply explaining Pragmatics is a new branch that can be defined as the study of the language in use or study of the invisible meaning of utterances. The modern using of pragmatics has to be attributed to philosopher Charles Morris, who supported the theory that the general shape of a science of signs, or semiotics as Morris preferred. Alongside the semiotics, Morris distinguished three related branches of inquiry: **syntactics** (or **syntax**) which is the study of the “formal relations of signs to each other”, **semantics**, the study of “the relations of signs to the other objects to which signs apply” and **pragmatics**, the study of “the relation of signs to the speaker and the listener”.

According to philosopher Paul Grice, there are four fundamentals, especially among those who focus on communicative use of language.



1. Communication includes a certain intention which is realized when being recognized by the addressee
2. The addressee needs to infer to this intention from the utterance a form of inference to the best explanation.
3. Communication is governed by principles or maxims. It is usually assumed that these principles derive from more general principles of rationally or cognition. Griceans, no-Griceans and relevance theorists propose differing principles.
4. There is a difference between what a speaker says and what he implicates, which are both aspects of speaker meaning.

We will try to explain the distinction between what speakers say and what they implicate.

Implicature

The central fact for pragmatics is cases in which a speaker conveys different meaning of the word or phrase he uses. We can give many examples

A: Would you like a cup of coffee?

B: I have already had one.

In the example given above the speaker is answering the question, but if we look at the words the speaker B used we can understand that he provided a negative answer. B stated that he had a cup of coffee, but he neither said that he did not want another cup of coffee nor that he wanted. According Paul Grice's famous lectures called "Logic and Conversation" 1967, B urged that he did not want the proposal in spite of using direct negative words.

An implicature is an implication that the speaker wants to intend, according to the simplest definition: it is a logical meaning which is not directly given by the words used by the speaker. If we make a true distinction between what a speaker says and what he conveys, we can make examples everywhere. One example given by Grice is particularly famous. A professor is asked to provide his student, who is a candidate for a philosophy job with a recommendation letter and he writes the letter:

Dear Sir, Jones's command of English is excellent, and his attendance at tutorials has been regular.

Yours etc.

It can be clearly seen that the professor implicates that his student is not good at philosophy because if he had a different opinion about him, the letter would be longer and contain more positive and descriptive adjectives. The professor does not use any negative adjectives, but the size of the letter and the range of vocabulary points at this fact.

CONCLUSION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Pragmatics is a new branch so it has not been fully learnt, but the fact is that we have been paying more attention to the meaning of the words, its function in the sentence, but we have been taking the speakers aim the listeners' perception for granted. If there were not a speaker and a listener, the conversation would never exist and the words would not be actualized.

References:

1. Nicholas Allot – "Key Terms in Pragmatics" 2010



2. Шаҳриёр Сафаров – “Прагмалингвистика”, Тошкент 2008
3. Stephen C. Levinson – “Pragmatics”, Cambridge university press 1983