



INVESTIGATING COMMUNICATIVE-PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF GRADATION

Makhmudova Nilufarkhon Ravshanovna

Senior teacher of Andizhan State University, Andizhan, Republic Uzbekistan

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra1469>

ABSTRACT

In this article has been illuminated the communicative-pragmatic functions of gradation in English and Uzbek languages. In the scientific literature, cognitive linguistics is also described as "connected semantics" because it deals mainly with semantics. While linguistic units serve to express objects that exist in the world and the actions that take place, semantics connect the interactions between linguistic units in a real or imaginary world. These relations are studied by linguistic semantics as a separate object of study. One of the important features of cognitive linguistics is that it allows us to see the language in relation to a person, that is, his consciousness, knowledge, processes of thinking and understanding, paying particular attention to how language forms and any language phenomena are associated with human knowledge and experience and how they relate to the human mind how to describe.

KEY WORDS: *English language, Uzbek language, gradation, communicative-pragmatic functions, structural linguistics, cognitive linguistics, semantics, pragmatic influence.*

INTRODUCTION

The object of linguistics is language, which has been studied in different periods, that is, the nature and functions of language from different perspectives. In the last decade, as a result of a new methodological direction of cognition, ie the expansion of research based on the cognitive approach, cognitive linguistics has become one of the fastest growing areas of linguistics.

The emergence of cognitive linguistics is related to the work of American scholars who existed in the second half of the 1970s (Lakoff; Paivio; Taylor et al.). Russian linguists are also successfully working in this field and make a significant contribution to the development of some of his theories (E. Kubryakova; O. Kolosova; A. Baranov; R. Frumkina and others).

METHODS

Numerous works on the interdependence of language and cognition are finding their place in Uzbek linguistics as a new field (D.U. Ashurova, Sh. Safarov, O. Yusupov). Indeed, cognitive linguistics has justified itself as a science.

It is well known that cognitive linguistics deals mainly with semantics, so it is probably also described as "coherent semantics". While language units serve to express the objects that exist in the world and the actions that take place, semantics connects the interactions between language units in the real or imaginary world. These relationships are studied by linguistic semantics. As a branch of semantics, the answer to the question of how an individual can convey a variety of information using words and grammatical rules, the focus of cognitive linguistics is not only the "unity of language form and substance" but more importantly the "unity of language and man" [4, p.35], this is also its difference from structural linguistics. Accordingly, cognitive linguistics is closely related to communicative pragmatics and discourse theory.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Cognitive science is also described as a science that studies the processes of consciousness and higher cognition based on the application of theoretical information models [3, p.264]. One of the important features of cognitive linguistics is that it allows us to see language in relation to man, i.e. his



consciousness, knowledge, thinking and comprehension processes [1, p.81], where the main focus is on language forms and any linguistic phenomena human knowledge and experience focuses on how they are associated with and how they are portrayed in the human mind. Accordingly, it is no exaggeration to say that cognitive linguistics continues the history of the relationship between the science of language and the science of the human psyche (A.A. Potebnya, G. Steinthal, V. Vundt). Because although the sciences of linguistics and psychology are two different social sciences that differ drastically in their methodology, the formation of language is based on certain psychological mechanisms.

While the cognitive approach is one way of interpreting language events using the theory of cognition, it can be said that cognitive linguistics is closely related to psycholinguistics. Because “psycholinguistics as a science is a psychological substantiation of linguistic hypotheses (or in other words, the application of psychological methodology to linguistic theory), while cognitive linguistics is a linguistic substantiation of psychological hypotheses” [5, p. 7].

U.Yusupov defines the tasks of cognitive linguistics as follows: 1) to determine the role of language in the emergence of human knowledge; 2) to understand the processes of categorization of the universe and its objects (forming concepts and dividing them into species), conceptualization (creation of concepts) and naming (nomination); 3) determine the relationship between the conceptual system and the language system; 4) to solve problems related to linguistic and cognitive (conceptual) images of the world. Communicative linguistics is a generalized, infinite science, one of the main tasks of which is to fully describe all the systems of language in the communicative aspect, ie its sound system, grammatical structure [3, p.51-62]. This description is also pragmatic, since the speaker, as the subject who creates the text, conveys to the listener that he understands the world, objects and events, their essence and interaction, in order to achieve the expected pragmatic effect (ie, speech or action by the listener). works. “Pragmatic meaning is not only a description of the subject and its properties, but also a means of expressing the feelings and thoughts that take place in the inner and outer world of the speaker (aimed at the listener). In other words, pragmatic meaning is a set of speech and language units that deliver emotional and intellectual capabilities to the listener, depending on the social and psychological state of the speaker. Pragmatic meaning is always focused on the listener and has a positive or negative effect on the listener's behavior and personality. ”

Accordingly, A.M. Emirova describes the pragmatic meaning as a "speaker-listener" relationship.

As S. Levinson describes: “Pragmatics is a field that looks at the linguistic structure and studies the grammatical (coded) interactions between language and context, ... pragmatics is the study of all hidden aspects of meaning that semantic theory does not cover, ... analyzes the ability to select sentences appropriately to form a context ”[6, P.9-24]. It is clear from these definitions that pragmatics is a broad field; this field includes the analysis of concepts such as dexterity, communicative explicaturia and implicature, proposition, intention, presupposition, infertility, speech act, discourse. Zero “Linguopragmatics (or pragmatics) is a branch of linguistics and semiotics that studies the situations and ways in which context influences meaning. Pragmatics includes the theory of speech act, the process of engaging in communication, interaction in conversation, and other features related to language in speech mode. In addition to linguistics and semiotics, this field is also related to philosophy, sociology and anthropology ”[3, P.148].

Sh.Safarov clearly showed the role of pragmatics in linguistics and described the field of pragmatics as follows: “Pragmatism is a separate branch of linguistics, the study of the selection of linguistic units, their use and the impact of these units on the participants of communication. ... The main idea of linguistic analysis is also to determine the nature of language in relation to its application in practical activities, or in other words, in the context of the function it performs. The concept of task (function) is the basis of a pragmalinguistic approach to language analysis ... ”[4, P.78]. Thus, the context in the process of communication, such as discourse, speech act theory, deixis, which is defined as the activation of language in a specific time (time interval), can be justified in the study of pragmalinguistics.

According to D. Kim, “It is linguistic pragmatics that solves the problem of hesitation of the speaker in the choice of language units in his speech and shows the semantic effect of state, place, time and other factors in the context” [5, P.328-332].

At the heart of linguopragmatics lies the concept of speech act. This notion is primarily related to the speaker's specific intention (goal) that arises in the speech process. In any communication process, linguistic units have a tag meaning in addition to their lexical meaning, i.e., linguistic units represent the ability to express meanings in speech such as please, command, confirm, report, mention, warn, promise. “A speech act is a linguistic appeal of a speaker to a listener in a certain environment, for a specific purpose, the pronunciation of a certain



sentence in a specific communication environment” [6, p.80-81].

The term pragmatics was introduced to linguistics in the 60s and 70s of the twentieth century by linguists such as Ch. Pierce, R. Carnap, Ch. Morris, L. Wittgenstein, and was interpreted as a specific branch of linguistics.

Any communication (verbal communication) sent by the subject of speech always assumes a certain effect on the addressee, his consciousness and behavior. The effectiveness and degree of speech effect largely depends on the choice of linguistic means by which the speaker exerts this effect. Such tools include graduality indicators. Accordingly, it is necessary to determine the impact of linguistic gradation and to determine the indicators of graduality that perform this communicative-pragmatic function.

The following types of speech effects using graduality indicators were identified: influencing the addressee in order to form a figurative image of a particular event, object, sign, etc., persuading the addressee (accuracy of information, in performing a particular action, etc.).

As noted above, persuasion of the addressee can be accomplished by presenting a rational assessment or reasoning through a direct appeal to the mind (reason). Here is an example of the authenticity of the reported information:

1. I wouldn't stay with you, though, if you didn't marry me," Carrie added reflectively. "I don't want you to," he said tenderly, taking her hand. She was extremely happy now that she understood. She loved him the more for thinking that he would rescue her so. As for him, the marriage clause did not dwell in his mind. He was thinking that with such affection there could be no bar to his eventual happiness. (Theodore Dreiser, *Sister Carrie*)

2. How could she deny that credit to his assertions in one instance, which she had been obliged to give in the other? He declared himself to be totally unsuspecting of her sister's attachment; and she could not help remembering what Charlotte's opinion had always been. (Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*)

'There is no giving any more.' In some bedrooms where intercourse had not been wholly discontinued prophylactics had appeared for the first time, variously explained by a trivial infection or a sudden sensitivity, but in all cases made out to the unknowing partner as just a minor precaution not the membrane between life and death. (Bennet Alan, *The Laying on of Hands*)

CONCLUSION

For comparison, we give an example in which the level of the sign represented by the revolutionary lexeme is increased. Here, too, persuasion is intended, but the means is different - the highest level of the character is realized by means of an expressive indicator, by acting on the emotional sphere of the addressee (forming awe).

REFERENCES

1. Kartushina E.A. *Scenario as a method of comparative phraseology* / Ed. A.A. Aminova, S.G. Vasilyeva. *Comparative philology and polilingualism - Kazan: RIC "School", 2002. - 145 p.*
2. Kim D. et al. *The Role of an Interactive Book Reading Program in the Development of Second Language Pragmatic Competence // The Modern Language Journal. Vol. 86, № 3, 2002. - P. 328-332.*
3. Kolshansky G.V. *The logic and structure of the language. - M.: Nauka, 1965. - 162 p.*
4. Kubryakova E.S. *The initial stages of the formation of cognitivism // Linguistics - Psychology - cognitive science. - M., 1994. VY No. 4. - p. 35-36.*
5. Kubryakova E.S. *On cognitive linguistics and semantics of the term "cognitive". Bulletin of Voronezh. Gos. Univ., Series: Linguistics and Intercultural Communication. - Voronezh, 2001.- p. 7.*
6. Levinson S.C. *Pragmatics. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. - 210 p.*