THE PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF COMPLEX SENTENCES

Khodjimatova Mokhinur Erkinjon kizi

1st year graduate student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10348217

ABSTRACT

In this article discusses the relevance of analyzing complex sentences and pragmatic features based on scientific analysis in the educational system and linguistics today, based on theoretical foundations.

Introduction:

At the current stage of the development of linguistics, communicative relations are studied on the basis of anthropocentric principles, and linguistic phenomena and their expressive possibilities are extensively researched. The human factor is becoming an object of research in text linguistics, pragmalinguistics, linguoculturology, psycholinguistics, ethnolinguistics, cognitive linguistics and other areas of linguistics. Particular attention is paid to the deeper study of the text and the personality factor in it.

Literature review:

A number of conferences and meetings on this topic have been held, collections are being published, there is no limit to scientific research, and the Journal of Pragmatics has literally become an international publication. In order for the field of science, which is rapidly developing at this level, to be fully formed and separate its identity, it is inevitable that it will be necessary to determine its subject, basic concepts, and principles[1]. 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 fields of linguistics and its inter-field relations. On the one hand, this is proof that the importance of the field, the number of issues raised, and the relevance of the chosen direction attract everyone's attention. Secondly, it should not be forgotten that the lack of clarity of the subject of the field, the confusion of the principles, the applied principle, causes the chaotic application of concepts and the uncertainty of the conclusions.

Results:

It is no exaggeration to say that the linguist who does not use the term "pragmatics" has not grown old in recent years. As a result, a unique pragmatic situation of "fetishism" has

---

[1] Зильберман Л.И. Лингвистика текста и обучение чтению английской научной литературы. –М., 2008, с. 29.

appeared, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to find any information about its content, except for the use of the term in the conducted studies. If necessary, if the term is used, it will lead to a narrowing of the concept that is based on it. Therefore, before talking about the pragmatic features of linguistic units, their pragmalinguistic analysis, "What does pragmalinguistics do?", "What is its research object and subject?", "What are the main concepts and principles of pragmatics?" we have to look for answers to such questions. J. Lyons tried to define the subject of pragmalinguistics and give its definition at the 12th international congress of linguists in Vienna in 1977. "Pragmatics describes the use of appropriate linguistic units in communication for the purpose of encouraging the listener to accept the transmitted information as intended by the speaker. This means to say that pragmatics deals with determining the role of linguistic tools in interpersonal communication. This definition is based on the relationship between the intended goal in the linguistic act and the means to achieve it. The "reason-motive-objective" chain forms the plan of speech activity and ensures its realization. The same thing prompts A. Kasher to describe the main goal of pragmalinguistic analysis as the clarification and explanation of "rules of human ability 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 it is possible to describe the general situation, the complete picture of the studied phenomenon by means of a multifaceted approach to this issue by "attacking across all borders". In order to find a proof of this, I would like to try to mention and partially explain some definitions given in the pragmalinguistic literature. It is noticeable that American linguists in many cases try to rely on N. Chomsky's teaching in the analysis of every phenomenon related to linguistic activity. Pragmalinguistic studies are no exception. J. Cutts, 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 theory. According to him, the 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 how the speaker and the listener rationally ensure the compatibility of the sentence and the proposition in the text. In this regard, the pragmatic theory is a certain part of the theory of speech activity (performance). Narrowing the scope of pragmalinguistic research to this extent, limiting it only to the activities of speech performance, may be nothing more than leading the theory down a narrow street. In this case, linguistic analysis is separated from its foundation - language. Undoubtedly, the social environment, the situation of communication plays an important role in the occurrence of linguistic activity, and the content of the forming unit is manifested and defined in the text or context. Examples given by J. Cutts: it is correct to use the second words of the pairs "rabbit" and "rabbit" and "dog" and "puppy" ("rabbit", "puppy") in relation to children or by them. But the meanings of caressing and diminution in their content are also known in the text. It is

clear 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, to recognize it as a generalizing field of linguistics.

For example: Z. Schmidt, one of the authors of the "German linguistic encyclopedia", a major specialist in text linguistics, says that the concepts of "pragmalinguistics" and "text linguistics" mean a single meaning, and together they form a general theory of linguistic communication, and this theory, as a field of communicative linguistics, indicates that it intends to prove that it covers both textual grammar and traditional grammar.

The question of what constitutes the subject of pragmalinguistic research is still relevant. Above are some definitions that interpret pragmatics in a narrow sense. The narrowing of the scope of pragmatic research in the same direction can be felt in the thoughts of some philosophers[2]. U. Montague, P. Strawson, etc. consider the subject of pragmatics to be the description of the content of deictic expressions (such as "I", "you", "here", "there", "now", "at that time"). . It is notoriously difficult to determine the referent of these units without text. The smallest text that clarifies their meaning (minimum context) takes into account the speaker, listener, time, space, register, style, type of speech act. The wide-scale interpretation of pragmatics is reflected in the inclusion of purposeful types of human action in its scope of research. These two polar interpretations of pragmatics always tend towards each other, and the descriptions given to the concept of pragmatics in different studies seem to complement and clarify each other. It is noted in various works that pragmalinguistics is a science of the language system that is engaged in the use of language, activated in a speech situation (context), a science that studies language from the point of view of a planned goal, a theory describing speech acts, a theory of conversational (spoken speech) analysis, interpersonal relations the field that studies expressive linguistic means, etc.

Russian linguists N.D.Arutyunova, Yu.S.Stepanov proposed to consider pragmatics as a theory that studies the subjective characteristics of artistic communication, the methods of expressing the "I" of its creators in the text. There are also those who imagine pragmatics as a science (speech effect theory) that determines the influence of the speaker's attitude to reality, information content, and the addressee (listener, reader) from the content of the linguistic unit. Dutch scientist T.A. van Dijk and his followers believe that the goal of pragmatics is to theoretically clarify the issue of "suitability" of linguistic speech devices for the communication situation. The main task of this theory is to study the problems of creating the cognitive content of speech acts, keeping them in memory, and using the language system in a certain socio-cultural environment, thus forming a communication model[3]. Attempts to define the subject of pragmatic analysis continue, the definitions given to this field are also diverse, but none of the above-mentioned definitions can claim to be general enough to reflect the content of the main concepts of this field of linguistics.

Discussion:

---

[2] Kharatova, S. (2023). Technologies for organizing classes using interactive techniques in english lessons. *International Bulletin of Medical Sciences and Clinical Research*, *3*(5), 21-24.
[3] Hakimov M. Syntagmatic and pragmatic features of the Uzbek scientific text. Philol.s.c...dis. -Tashkent, 1993, p. 7.

In order to distinguish pragmatic linguistics as an independent field and to determine its object and subject, it is necessary to search for factors that ensure the manifestation of the pragmatic value, "value", and content of linguistic units in different communicative environments. The signs of linguistic units that appear in any conditions are examples of their ontological and task (functional) properties. Pragmatic research methodology, firstly, should have its own philosophical basis, and secondly, it should make it possible to determine the same features (ontological and functional). Without a doubt, the principle of activity or the philosophy of activity in general can serve as the basis of such a methodology. The adoption of the category of activity as the main methodological principle in linguistic research makes it possible to gain more detailed knowledge about the components of the communicative system, their structure, linguistic and non-linguistic essence. Illumination of the communication process from the point of view of the principle of activity, in addition to putting a theoretical dress on pragmalinguistics, prepares the ground 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 cognitive actions.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, it can be said that complex sentences are not only a product of scientific expression, but also a product of the speech activity of the speaker. It is the highest level of the language system that performs an important function in the communicative process. Complex sentences are a context that ensures the real use of language in speech, in which the human factor takes the main place. At the same time, it is important for the text to be complete, perfect, high in terms of artistic content, and use of each unit in its place. The above comments revealed that the research of pragmatic analysis of complex sentences is one of the urgent issues of linguistics.

References:

1. Hakimov M. Syntagmatic and pragmatic features of the Uzbek scientific text. Philol.s.c...dis. -Tashkent, 1993, p. 7.
2. Hakimova M.K. Lexical units with meaning of time in Uzbek language and their possibilities of text formation. Philol.s.c...dis. -Fergana, 2004, p. 103.
3. Kharatova, S. (2023). TECHNOLOGIES FOR ORGANIZING CLASSES USING INTERACTIVE TECHNIQUES IN ENGLISH LESSONS. *International Bulletin of Medical Sciences and Clinical Research*, *3*(5), 21-24.
4. Shamsiddinov H. Functional-semantic synonyms of words in the Uzbek language. philol.s.c...dis.-Tashkent, 1999, p. 187.
5. Қаранг: Şerif Aktaş Edebiyatta üslup ve problemleri. –Ankara, «Akçağ», 1993,46.s
6. Зильберман Л.И. Лингвистика текста и обучение чтению английской научной литературы. –М., 2008, с. 29.
7. Лотман Ю.М. Структура художественного текста. –Москва, 1970, с.67.