Investigating of the doctor's speech within the framework of pragmalinguistics

Yunusova Maftuna Shokirovna
Intern-researcher of Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute

Annotation. Following article deals with the term of pragmalinguistics and the methodology of its study. Pragmatics and its entry into linguistics as a separate branch of linguistics have been discussed in detail in the article. Communicative linguistics, the study of speech activity and actions as a language have been analyzed as well.

The principles of differentiation between pragmalinguistics and hidden pragmatics have been revealed in the article. Examples of hidden pragmalinguistics are given in the doctor's speech. Actually, this direction is used together with direct speech-communication terms and explained with examples. Without them, it is difficult for pragmalinguistics to reveal its potential. The article highlights the fact that pragmalinguistics is directly studied as a quality of semiotics and introduced as a separate direction. It was mentioned in our study that speech etiquette is the main tool of pragmalinguistics. In the article, speech etiquette, speech-communication, subject-addressee and pragmalinguistics were interpreted as the object of study of our direct research.

Key words: pragmalinguistics, linguistics, theory of linguistics, linguistic-pragmatics, speech activity, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, ethnolinguistics

Introduction. "Pragmatics" is a branch of semiotics and linguistics that studies the functionality of language units in speech, meaning such thoughts as "work", "action" in Greek. This field was used even before Socrates, and later philosophers such as J. Locke and E. Kant adopted it from Aristotle. In this regard, the stream "Pragmatics" was founded. Over the years, this branch of science has turned into a branch of modern linguistics. Today, "Pragmatics" is being developed, studied and researched as a new field called "Pragmalinguistics".[2]

It is no exaggeration to say that there was no linguist who did not use the term "pragmatics" in the following years. In this place, "What does pragmalinguistics do?", "What is its research object and subject?", "What are the main concepts and principles of pragmatics?" such questions arise.

G. Klaus was one of the first scientists to define the subject of pragmalinguistics in world linguistics. In his work, he defines pragmatics as "the study of the relationship between signs (Z) and the people (M) who create, transmit, and receive these linguistic signs.[3] As can be seen from this definition, when defining the subject of pragmatics, G. Klaus has not moved away from the relationship between the sign and its perceiver - the interpreter, like other semioticians (Ch. Peirce, Ch. Morris, Y.S. Stepanov). Even his conclusion that "pragmatics is primarily a theory that studies the psychological and sociological aspects of linguistic signs" is nothing more than a narrow description of the concept of pragmatics.[4]

---

[2] Кузибоева, Г. С. Ruhiy holat fe'llarining pragmalingvistik tadqiqi / Г. С. Кузибоева. — Текст : непосредственный // Молодой ученый. — 2021. — № 46 (388). — С. 385-387. — URL: https://moluch.ru/archive/388/85491/.

[3] Маслова В.А. Когнитив тилшунослик. – Самарқанд, 2011. – Б. 8

[4] Susov Ivan Pavlovich (1990) " Semiotika i lingvisticheskaya pragmatika" 125-126-betlar

The following scholars in world linguistics have researched this area: O.V Aleksandrova,[6] N.D.Arutyunova,[7] I.A.Bezmenova,[8] G.P.Grays,[9] M.A.Yegorova,[10] M.L.Makarov,[11] Dj.R Ostin,[12] A.G Pospelova,[13] N.I. Serkova,[14] K. Serl,[15] D.Frank[16] and others.

Until the middle of the 20th century, the term "pragmatics" was used in various fields of science (for example, semiotics, philosophy, sociology, psychology), as a result of which its content became very broad and vague. Consequently, during the emergence and development of linguistically oriented pragmatics, there was a need to determine the place of pragmatics in linguistics and to limit the scope of its tasks. The relationship between pragmatics and linguistics can be interpreted in three ways:

1) Pragmatics is a separate science closely related to linguistics;

2) Pragmatics is a part of linguistics;

3) Pragmatics refers to a certain part of linguistics.

These three possibilities have been discussed in the article based on the existing linguistic literature. As a rule, pragmatics is considered an independent science if it appears as a theoretical direction at the intersection of two or more disciplines. When pragmatics is included in linguistics along with its other branches, it is called pragmalinguistics or linguistic pragmatics. This view is the most common today, and it is often presented in linguistic dictionaries, textbooks and manuals of linguistics.

If pragmatics is considered as a specific branch of linguistics, it is often considered an aspect of text linguistics or semantics. In conclusion, a new interpretation is proposed: in addition to systematic linguistics, applied linguistics, interdisciplinary linguistics and other possible departments, communicative linguistics should be distinguished. Pragmatics belongs to communicative linguistics as well as phonetics.

In the history of linguistics, the study of issues related to human speech activity is gaining significant scientific and theoretical importance. Linguistic-pragmatics began to form under the influence of philosophical ideas. A person should be able to choose and express them in the way of his goal, while knowing all the semantic sciences of the language. Linguistic pragmatics studies these same aspects of language. The formation of linguistic pragmatics began by distinguishing the problems of semantics and pragmatics.

Undoubtedly, the main purpose of the communication process is to transmit and receive information. It must be for this reason that, based on all the definitions given by different authors to the phenomenon of communication, there is an interpretation of social communication as mutual "information-meaning cooperation" performed by people through symbols. But the purpose of communication is not limited to simple information exchange, information transmission is expected to influence the "partner", convince him of something, subjugate him, and encourage him to act. In addition, as the semioticians themselves admit, we know that symbols, which are a means of communication, are used by the speaker to express desire, liking

[6] Александрова О.В. Единство прагматики и лингвопоэтики в изучении

текста художественной литературы / О.В. Александрова // Проблемы семантики и прагматики: Сб. науч. тр. – Калининград, 1996. – С. 3-7.

[7] Арутюнова Н.Д. Истоки, проблемы и категории прагматики. / Н.Д. Арутюнова,Е.В. Падучева // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – М., 1985. – Вып.16: Лингвистическая прагматика. – С.5-30

[8] Безменова И.А. Некоторые проблемы теории речевых актов / И.А. Безменова, В.И. Герасимов // Языковая деятельность в аспектелингвистической прагматики: Сб. обзоров. Сер. Теория и история языкознания / Отв. ред. В.И. Герасимов. – М., 1984. – С. 146-222.

[9] Грайс Г.П. Логика и речевое общение / Г.П. Грайс // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – М., 1985. – Вып. 16: Лингвистическая прагматика. – С. 217- 237.

[10] Егорова М.А. Контрастивно-прагматический анализ способов реализации просьбы (британская, американская, русская традиции): Дис. … канд. филол. наук / М.А.Егорова. – Воронеж, 1995. – 181 с.

[11] Макаров М.Л. Основы теории дискурса / М.Л. Макаров. – М.: ИТДГК«Гнозис» 2003. – 280 с.

[12] Остин Дж..Р. Слово как действие / Дж..Р. Остин // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – М., 1986. – Вып. 17: Теория речевых актов. – С. 20-129.

[13] Поспелова А.Г. Косвенные высказывания / А.Г. Поспелова // Спорные вопросы английской грамматики. – Л., 1988. – С. 141-153

[14] . Серкова Н.И. К истории понятия "прагматика" / Н.И. Серкова // Методы лингвистических исследований: Межвузовский сборник научных трудов. –Хабаровск, 2000. – Ч.2. – С. 4-12

[15] Серль Дж. Р. Классификация иллокутивных актов / Дж. Р. Серль //Зарубежная лингвистика: Пер. с англ. / Общ. ред. В.А.Звегинцева, Б.А.Успенского, Б.Ю.Городицкого. – М., 1999. – Вып.2. – С.229-253.

[16] Д. Франк // Зарубежная лингвистика: Пер. с англ. / Общ. ред. В.А.Звегинцева, Б.А.Успенского, Б.Ю.Городицкого. – М., 1999. – Вып.2. – С.254-264.

someone or something, displeasure, admiration and other emotional feelings. Only when the same aspects of linguistic communication are taken into account, it is possible to imagine that the parts of the semiotic system have a dynamic relationship with each other.

The variety of tasks performed in the process of linguistic communication is recognized by many. Opinions also vary about the amount of work that can be done.[5] Therefore, V. Robinson said that the linguistic system has the ability to perform fourteen different tasks in the process of communication. However, it is difficult to categorize all the tasks that the author distinguishes, because these tasks are the result of actions performed at different stages. For example, if we compare the tasks of "expressing affect (feelings)" and "determining the source of emotional state, personality" distinguished by V. Robinson, we conclude that it is impossible to place them in a single classification line. A person who uses linguistic signs in communication is in a certain emotional mental state; his social origin and culture are reflected in his actions. Including these types of characteristics of the participants of the dialogue in the list of tasks performed by the linguistic system will make this list infinite and cause the scientific analysis to be ineffective.

It is known from the history of the development of pragmatics as a scientific direction that it could be considered as a component of various fields of science. Depending on the period and the authors of a certain theory, pragmatics can be understood as follows:

1) One of the three components of semiosis, within which the relationship of signs to the subjects that create and interpret them is studied;[19]
2) Studying patterns, pathologies and paradoxes in interpersonal relationships;[20]
3) Studying language as a tool of action to achieve various goals;[21]
4) Universal theory of social interaction;[22]
5) Specific (institutional) theory of speech behavior nutqiy.[23]

In addition to the above, there are other interpretations of the term. Due to such diverse interpretations of the original term, the need to solve the following tasks arose during the emergence and development of linguistically oriented pragmatics:

1) Determining the place of pragmatics in relation to linguistics;
2) Defining a new term within the framework of language theory.

In order to emphasize the specific features of this new science, the terms "pragmalinguistics", "linguopragmatics" and "linguistic pragmatics" were used in parallel with the terms "sociolinguistics", "psycholinguistics", "ethnolinguistics" and others. Different interpretations began to be noted by scientists.

In pragmalinguistics, a distinction must be made between functional pragmalinguistics and implicit pragmalinguistics. In functional pragmalinguistics, the speech activity of the sender of the text is studied by deliberate, deliberate selection, and in implicit pragmalinguistics, the actualization of the speech behavior of the sender is studied by the intuitive habitual selection of speech signals. Such a division, of course, only makes sense for research purposes, and yet it is useful because it leads to important practical implications.

To prove our point, it is enough to cite a story that gives a good idea of hidden pragmalinguistics in Eastern medicine.

One day, Luqmoni Hakim was walking on the street and saw a girl walking in front of him spitting blood from time to time. When Hakim entered the girl's house, he followed her and said to the girl's father: "Your daughter is in incurable pain, unfortunately, there is no way to treat it". The girl was still listening to his words behind the door. Suddenly, his heart was pounding, he fell down trembling and fainted. So, as a result of this one word, the girl suffered mental illness and passed away.

One day, the girl's father Luqmoni met Hakim. Then the father said: "Taqsir, how did you know that my daughter was ill?" he asked. Luqmoni Hakim said: "I saw your daughter spitting blood profusely while

---

[5] Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. Monografiya. Toshkent. nashriyoti, 2008-yil, 318- bet.

[19] Charlz Morrisning "Semiotik pragmatikas"i (1938, 1939)

[20] Pavel Vatslavikning psixoterapevtik pragmatikasi. Vaclavik, Bivin, Jekson 2000

[21] (J. Ostin va J. Searllarning nutq aktlari nazariyasiga asoslangan lingvofalsafiy pragmatika) (qarang: Ostin 1962; Searle 1969, 1979; Searle, Vanderveken 1985)

[22] J.Habermasning sotsiofalsafiy pragmatikasi. Habermas 1971, 1981, 1984, Habermas 2003;

[23] Konrad Elich va Jochen Rehbeinning funktsional pragmatikasi) (qarang, masalan, Ehlich, Rehbein 1986; Rehbein, Loning 1995).

walking on the street". Hearing this answer, the old man made a bet and hit his forehead. Then, when he regained consciousness, he said: "Hey, my daughter ate shotut that day, the spit you saw was shotut juice!" - he said. Hakim knelt before the old man and apologized: "You taught me and the last generations of us an unforgettable lesson. With one word, it is possible to kill a healthy person or send a patient to his feet.

It seems that a doctor should be extremely careful when communicating information about a dangerous disease to the patient and his relatives, otherwise it will have a negative effect on the patient's psyche and health. Professor A. Omonturdiev indicated that often, not revealing the reality is caused by a certain culture of behavior and morals. When this principle is violated, the speech becomes naked, separated from its ornamentation and expression, loses its effectiveness, and arouses hatred and anger in the listener. In general, hidden pragmatics is important from the point of view of the formation of the doctor's cultural communication, without denying the role of other factors. It is necessary to say that the doctor's communication culture must be developed together with professional skills and competencies from the period of medical education. The examples of implicit pragmalinguistics above are examples of those presented in the text.

Speech etiquette requires the attention of the sciences: pragmalinguistics, cross-cultural or comparative pragmatics, sociology, psychology and related sciences are considered as its object. The total of speech acts constitutes speech activity. In the process of a speech act, a speech message is transmitted from one or more participants of communication to another or other communication participants. This is a communicative feature of the speech act, the essence of which is the transfer of information, its mutual exchange. Linguistic pragmatics does not have clear contours, it includes a set of issues related to the speaking subject, the addressee, their interaction in communication, and the situation of communication.

Ibn Sina carelessly laid the ruler on the bed like a normal patient, held his vein and shook his head, then put his hand on his stomach and tried to beat him and made him stand up.

"First of all, I will analyze the discharge from your body, and then I will tell you what is wrong with you," he said.[24]

Through this text, it is possible to know that Ibn Sina's patient is seriously ill from his communication and shaking his head. In this context, Ibn Sina's words "I will tell you later" can be understood that the patient had a serious illness. Paragmalinguistics deals with problems related to such a speaking subject, addressee, their interaction in communication, communication situation.

In linguistics, the following are studied in connection with the subject of speech:

1) Explicit and implicit goals of the statement (according to Austin, "descriptive forces"), for example, conveying some information or idea, question, command, request, advice, promise, apology, greeting. , complaint;

2) Types of speech tactics and speech behavior;

3) The rules of the conversation, which recommend the establishment of verbal communication in accordance with the accepted goal and direction of the conversation, following the principle of cooperation, for example, sufficiently normalizing the reported information (the maximum amount), reporting only;

4) The attitude of the speaker or the pragmatic meaning of the sentence: indirect meanings of the sentence, allusions, blunt words;

5) Address of the speaker, assigning linguistic expressions to objects of reality arising from the intention of the speaker;

6) Pragmatic assumptions: assessment of the speaker's general fund of knowledge, specific awareness, interests, thoughts and views, psychological state, character traits and ability to understand the addressee;

7) The speaker's attitude to what he reported:

a) Assessment of the content of the statement (its truth or falsity, irony, significance, carelessness);

b) The speaker focuses on the interested person or empathy;

c) Organizing the speech according to the most important thing in the message.

It is believed that the basic units of the pragmatic domain are words or speech acts, but the distinction between these units and sentences is not as important as between units at other levels. Researchers, as a rule, agree to consider sentences as communicative variants of sentences that constitute the syntactic level in most cases.

---

[24] M.Osim. "Ibn Sino qissasi".,T-2018-y.68-b

At the same time, although there is undoubtedly a close relationship between clauses and sentences, it would be a mistake to define them completely. Statements are communicative units, the most important feature of which is goal setting, and sentences are grammatical units.

Based on our completed and studied prohibitions, we witnessed the rapid entry of this direction of linguistics into Uzbek linguistics. However, its differences related to semiotics, and syntax have not been fully revealed yet. Language-speech, object-subject communication, all these are terms related to pragmalinguistics. Pragmalinguistics reveals the influence of the subject on the object through texts. Because of this, speech and speech etiquette are the engine of this field. Pragmalinguistics is mainly related to textual studies and its meanings are revealed in the text. This field has aroused and continues to arouse the interest of many scientists. So, in the doctor's discourse, pagmalinguistics is related to speech communication and speech etiquette. The use of this direction in the doctor's speech has not yet been fully studied in Uzbek linguistics. Therefore, in our article, we talked about the doctor's speech and pragmalinguistics. We will try to study this process more widely and scientifically.

References

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Истоки, проблемы и категории прагматики // – Москва, 1985. – С.5-30
2. Александрова О.В. Единство прагматики и лингвопоэтики в изучении текста художественной литературы // – Калининград, 1996. – С. 3-7.
3. Безменова И.А. Некоторые проблемы теории речевых актов // Отв. ред. В.И. Герасимов: – Москва, 1984. – С. 146-222.
4. Грайс Г.П. Логика и речевое общение // Вып. 16: Лингвистическая прагматика, – Москва,– 1985. – С. 217- 237.
5. Jürgen Habermas Public space and political public sphere – the biographical roots of two motifs in my thought. // – Habermas 2004. – С. 12-17.
6. Егорова М.А. Контрастивно-прагматический анализ способов реализации просьбы (британская, американская, русская традиции): Дис. … канд. филол. наук // – Воронеж, 1995. – 181 с.
7. Кузибоева, Г.С. Ruhiy holat fe'llarining pragmalingvistik tadqiqi // – Молодой ученый. – 2021. – № 46 (388). – С. 385-387.
8. Маслова В.А. Когнитив тилшунослик. – Самарқанд, 2011. – Б. 8
9. Макаров М.Л. Основы теории дискурса //– Москва: ИТДГК «Гнозис» 2003. – 280 с
10. Остин Дж..Р. Слово как действие– Москва, – Вып.: Теория речевых актов. – 1986. С. 20-129.
11. Поспелова А.Г. Косвенные высказывания //– Ленинград, 1988. – С. 141-153
12. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. Monografiya. Toshkent nashriyoti,2008-yil,318- b.
13. Susov I. P. Semiotika i lingvisticheskaya pragmatika // – Москва, 1990. В. 125-126
14. Серкова Н.И. К истории понятия прагматика // Методы лингвистических исследований: Межвузовский сборник научных трудов. –Хабаровск, 2000.– С.4-12
15. Серль Дж. Р. Классификация иллокутивных актов // – Москва., 1999. – Вып.2. – С.229-253