

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36719/2706-6185/21/14-18>

**Khatira Suleymanova**  
Azerbaijan University of Languages  
Doctor of Philosophy in Philology  
khatirasuleymanova24@gmail.com

## THE ESSENCE OF THE PRAGMATIC APPROACH IN LINGUISTICS

### Abstract

The present article deals with the essence of the pragmatic approach in linguistics. Pragmatics deals with the relationship of signs to the person using the language. The main concepts of pragmatics are the subject, the addressee, the subject of communication, and the communicative setting. The object of pragmatics is the relationship between linguistic units and the conditions for their use in a certain communicative-pragmatic space. The task of pragmatics is to establish patterns of use of linguistic means in communication for a targeted impact on the addressee. The central concept in pragmatic studies is "communication". It is typical for pragmatics to consider speech communication not as an end in itself, but as a component in the structure of human activity.

**Keywords:** *pragmatics, semantics, sign, speech, information*

**Xatirə Süleymanova**  
Azərbaycan Dillər Universiteti  
filologiya üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru  
khatirasuleymanova24@gmail.com

### Dilçilikdə praqmatik yanaşmanın mahiyyəti

#### Xülasə

Bu məqalə dilçilikdə praqmatik yanaşmanın mahiyyətindən bəhs edir. Praqmatika işarələrin dildən istifadə edən şəxslə əlaqəsi ilə məşğul olur. Praqmatikanın əsas anlayışları subyekt, dinləyən, ünsiyyət subyektini və kommunikativ mühitdir. Praqmatikanın obyektini dil vahidləri və onların müəyyən kommunikativ-praqmatik məkanda istifadəsi şərtləri arasındakı əlaqədir. Praqmatikanın vəzifəsi dinləyənlə məqsədyönlü təsir göstərmək üçün ünsiyyətdə linqvistik vasitələrdən istifadə nümunələri yaratmaqdır. Praqmatik tədqiqatlarda mərkəzi anlayış "ünsiyyət"dir. Praqmatiklər üçün nitq ünsiyyətini özlüyündə bir məqsəd kimi deyil, insan fəaliyyətinin strukturunun tərkib hissəsi kimi nəzərdən keçirmək səciyyəvidir.

**Açar sözlər:** *praqmatika, semantika, işarə, nitq, məlumat*

#### Introduction

The English language has a rich vocabulary that we use when we describe our feelings, objects, and phenomena of the world around us, state our requirements or try to prove something. However, an important factor in speech activity is not only what we say, but also why we say it. What determines the choice of a particular lexical unit in the process of communication? Pragmatics is looking for answers to this question.

Unlike other branches of linguistics (phonology, semantics, grammar, etc.), which consider language as a static system, pragmatics approaches the study of language from the point of view of its dynamics, i.e. application in practice, in real communicative conditions. Pragmatics is faced with the task of identifying the internal patterns that govern the adequate use of a particular lexical unit in each specific communicative act. The pragmatic aspect of the consideration of linguistic material determines the relevance of the study.

By Ch.Morris's definition, pragmatics deals with the relationship of signs to the person using the language. In other words, pragmatics studies the behavior of signs in real communication

processes. Since the interpreters of most signs are living organisms, a sufficient characteristic of pragmatics would be to indicate that it deals with the biotic aspects of semiosis, in other words, with all the psychological, biological, and sociological phenomena that are observed in the functioning of signs". The sign theory of C. Morris is fully presented in his work "Signs, Language and Behavior". For Morris, it is important to establish the signal, the communicative meaning of the sign, and not its purely cognitive meaning, although he does not completely deny it (as applied, for example, to art) (Morris, 1946: 356).

The main concepts of pragmatics are the subject (the sender of the text), the addressee (the recipient of the text), the subject of communication, and the communicative setting. The pragmatics covers the following issues:

-in everyday speech, on the one hand, the attitude of the speaker to what and how he says: truth, objectivity, the presupposition of speech, its sincerity or insincerity, its adaptation to the social environment and to the social position of the listener, etc., on the other hand, interpretation of speech by the listener: as true, objective, sincere or, on the contrary, false, doubtful, misleading;

-in artistic speech - the attitude of the writer to reality and to what and how he depicts: his acceptance and rejection of reality, admiration, irony, disgust; the reader's attitude to the text and, ultimately, to the entire work as a whole: its interpretation as objectively sincere or, on the contrary, as misleading, mystifying, ironic, parodic, etc (Stepanov, 1981: 326).

The object of pragmatics is the relationship between linguistic units and the conditions for their use in a certain communicative-pragmatic space in which the speaker/writer and listener/reader interact, and for the characteristics of which specific indications of the place and time of their speech interaction, goals and expectations associated with the act of communication are important.

The task of pragmatics, therefore, is to establish patterns of use of linguistic means in communication for a targeted impact on the addressee. Consequently, the subject is the connecting link in the pragmatic realization of the statement, and the addressee largely determines its interpretation.

The addressee, like the subject, enters into communication not as a global personality, but in a certain aspect, role, or function corresponding to the aspect of the speaker. The role of the addressee determines not only the social and etiquette side of speech but also makes the speaker take care of its organization.

The selection of linguistic means by the subject, along with the tasks of the nomination, is based on certain goals - to present the subject of communication in the light it needs. The totality of these goals is the communicative-pragmatic setting of the subject of speech (it can also be of a generalized, collective nature) (Fromkin, Rodman, Hyams, 2003).

A communicative-pragmatic attitude is a purposeful selection of linguistic means by the subject of speech in order to have a certain impact on the addressee. The pragmatic attitude is realized in speech. It is based on the nature of the relationship between the subject and the addressee. The subject and the addressee may coincide, be close, or diverge in socio-ideological, professional, or personal terms. Their attitude to the subject of the message may also be different. In the process of implementing a communicative attitude by linguistic means, the subject of speech takes into account various factors, including the volume and nature of the addressee's information about the subject of communication, the conditionality of the attitude towards the subject by his knowledge and beliefs, various value criteria, the attitude towards the subject himself, etc (Martin, Matthiessen, Painter, 1997).

Characterizing the specific tasks and problems of pragmatic studies of natural languages, E.V. Paducheva notes that gradually expanding, they show a tendency to blur the boundaries between linguistics and related disciplines (psychology, sociology, and ethnography), on the one hand, and neighboring sections of linguistics (semantics, rhetoric, stylistics), on the other (Paducheva, 1985: 4).

The totality of such factors as the relationship of meaning with extralinguistic reality, speech context; the communicative setting that connects the utterance with the changing participants in

communication - the subject of speech and its recipient, the fund of their knowledge and opinions, the situation (place and time) in which the speech act is carried out, forms a mosaic of a broadly understood context, which just opens the entrance to the pragmatics of related disciplines and provides it with a synthesizing mission.

As a rule, in modern linguistics, there are two approaches to the study of language features within the framework of pragmatics. Representatives of the first explore the pragmatic potential of linguistic units (texts, sentences, words, as well as phenomena of the phonetic-phonological sphere) and, setting the boundaries between semantics and pragmatics, deal with linguistic meanings. Representatives of the second direction study the interaction of communicants in the process of linguistic communication. The presence of a pragmatic component in the lexical meaning of a word is a linguistic manifestation of pragmatics, and the implementation of this component occurs in speech and is manifested in the application of a pragmatic attitude, which is based on the nature of the relationship between the subject and the addressee.

Thus, there is reason to talk about pragmatics as part of the substantive substance of the linguistic essence (pragmasemantics) and about pragmatics in the traditional sense as communicative properties manifested in certain contexts of use (Gorshunov, 1999: 5).

The second direction merges with the theory of speech acts formulated by J.Austin. The main unit in this case is a "speech act" - a quantum of speech that connects a single intention ("illocution"), the completed minimum segment of speech, and the result achieved. According to the theory of speech acts, "the minimum unit of human communication is not a sentence or other expression, but an action - the performance of certain acts, such as a statement, a question, an order, a description, an explanation, an apology, gratitude, congratulations, etc" (Sorl, 1986: 195-222).

The ideas of J.Austin were developed in the work of J.Searle "Speech Acts", in which speaking is considered as the performance of certain actions, and speech acquires a performative character in order to make changes in the environment of the speaker, or in the way of thinking of the interlocutor. This led to the introduction of the concept of "illocutionary intention of the speaker", and the speech act began to be considered as an "illocutionary act", that is, a socially determined act of speech production. When making contact, the speaker can achieve various goals: from receiving or transmitting any information to expressing feelings, desires, reluctance, doubts, and delight. The "illocutionary intention" of the speaker is what the speaker is trying to convey with the help of language, and accordingly, the essence of the communication process is to unravel this intention (Searl, 1969: 203).

In linguistics, the theory of speech acts is at the intersection of pragmatics and semantics: on the one hand, the meaning of the statement is considered separately from the factors of the speaker, the listener, and other parameters of communication, which links the theory of speech acts with semantics, on the other hand, the meaning is the main component of the speech act, which, undoubtedly indicates a connection with pragmatics.

The existence of pragmatic meaning is recognized by many linguists, and the term "pragmatic meaning" has become firmly established in linguistic usage. However, the status of the meaning, its place, and share in the content substance of the word, the content of the pragmatic meaning (aspect) are interpreted in different ways and are the subject of sharp controversy, and disputes are caused by referring the meaning to the field of semantics or pragmatics. If in semantics the meaning is considered an integral property of the units of the language that exist in their relation to the objects of reality, then pragmatics studies the language in speech in the process of communication, and the meaning correlates directly with the participants in communication.

Making a terminological distinction, J.Leach for semantics defines by meaning the absolute meaning that is transmitted in a morphosyntactic and phonological way. The pragmatic meaning, which is not always derived from the meaning of its constituent units, but is the goal of the statement, requiring a situational context and knowledge of the generally accepted rules of language use for its understanding, receives the definition of intention.

In many studies on pragmasemantics, the pragmatic component is equated with the traditionally singled-out connotative component. So, according to the concept of L.A. Novikov, in the meaning of the word, in addition to the conceptual, structural, and sigmatic meanings, it is necessary to single out the pragmatic meaning that arises as a result of the attitude of the speakers both to the subject of designation and to signs - words. At the same time, the pragmatic meaning is represented by emotional-evaluative and expressive connotations and stylistic characteristics of the word. The essence of pragmatics, according to the author, is embodied in the assessment, which is assigned the organizing principle (Ostin, 1986: 88). Such a reduction of pragmatics to an emotional-evaluative segment raises objections from those linguists who expand the pragmatic content of a word by including sociolinguistic features in it.

If we adhere to this point of view, then the selection of the pragmatic component allows us to make the following comparison. When correlating pragmatic components with the content of the concept (intention), we note the restriction on the use of the word in certain situations of communication, dictated by its denotative orientation. The denotative specificity of converses in some cases limits their use to certain situations. For example, when communicating with a person of a higher social status or older age, it is supposed to be inappropriate to use the word "nix" ("no!" (refuse, reject) is quite acceptable in this situation. Implication-pragmatic components imply the identification of associations associated with cultural, domestic, and social parameters of knowledge. Pragmatic components that correlate with emotional ones are most pronounced since words of this type have an evaluative function at the level of the lexical system (Carter, McCarthy, 2005).

In our study, following E.G. Belyaevskaya, we understand the pragmatic aspect as part of the lexical meaning, expressing information about the communicative situation. In the pragmatic aspect, the following subtypes can be distinguished: 1) information about the relationship of "time and place" of the participants in the situation; 2) information about the participants in the situation and about the given linguistic community; 3) information about the content of the discourse; 4) information about the style of the communicative situation.

Information about the time and place of the communicative situation can be expressed using the meaning of the word, which indicates the position of the speaker (it is usually taken as the zero point in the description of the communicative situation). The temporal element transmitted by the pragmatic aspect of the meaning is established indirectly (a direct indication of the time occurs with the help of grammatical means and the denotational meaning of such words as "yesterday", "now", "tomorrow", etc.). Indirect words may change over time, and in special cases may fall into disuse or become archaic.

Information about the participants in the situation is transmitted using the language they use. It may indicate their social origin, position, level of education, etc. The pragmatic aspect of a word can also convey information about the social system of a given language community, ideology, religion, etc.

The content of discourse indicates how the addresser (speaker or writer) interacts with the addressee (listener or reader). Content types are based on the social or family roles of the participants in the communicative situation. Due to the peculiarities of the pragmatic aspect, a word may be suitable for use in one content and be unacceptable in another.

Style determines the general type of communicative situation, which, according to the principle of formality, is divided into formal, neutral, and informal. Style correlates with content, defining each specific communicative situation. Almost every word in the language is stylistically marked, i.e. contains pragmatic information about the style in which it can be used (Belyaevskaya, 1987: 41-43).

### Conclusion

When analyzing a communicative-pragmatic situation, priority is given to pragmatic components that encode social status, professional parameters, age, gender, ethnicity, a certain emotional intention and evaluative attitude of the speaker, and the tone of the situation.

Thus, the central concept in pragmatic studies is "communication". It is typical for pragmatics to consider speech communication not as an end in itself, but as a component in the structure of human activity.

### References

1. Morris, Ch. (1946). Signs, language and behavior. New York, 365 p.
2. Stepanov, YU. (1981). V poiskakh pragmatiki (Problema subyekta). Izv. AN SSSR. Ser. lit. i yaz. T.40. №4, s.325-332.
3. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., Hyams, N. (2003). An Introduction to language. 7th edition. USA, Thomson: Heinle.
4. Martin, J., Matthiessen, C., Painter, C. (1997). Working with functional grammar. London: Edward Arnold.
5. Paducheva, Ye. (1985). Lingvisticheskaya pragmatika. Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike. Vyp. 16, pod red. Ye.V.Paduchevoy. M., s.3-42.
6. Gorshunov, YU. (1999). Pragmatika abreviatury. M.: Prometey, 183 s.
7. Sorl, Dzh. (1986). Kosvennyye rechevyye akty. Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike. M., Vyp. 17, s.195-222.
8. Searl, J. (1969). Speech acts. Cambridge, 203 p.
9. Ostin, Dzh. (1986). Slovo kak deystviye. Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike. Vyp. 17, s.22-130.
10. Carter, R., McCarthy, M. (2005). Cambridge grammar of English. Spoken and written grammar of English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Belyayevskaya, Ye. (1987). Semantika slova. M.: Vyssh. shk.

Received: 17.01.2023

Accepted: 02.03.2023