

---

## Problems of Dialogue and Dialogic Speech in the Aspect of Linguistic Pragmatics

---

*Pardayeva Sojida Ahmatovna*

*Teacher, Foreign Languages department, Tashkent Financial Institute, Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

---

**Abstract:** Nowadays, great attention is given to learning a foreign language by majority of people. We focus only on a spoken language, conversation or how people speak or express their desire when they communicate with others. People express their feelings, desires, point of views and variety of things about their culture, society and so on. The main problems of pragmalinguistics are discussed in this article.

**Keywords:** language, speech, pragmalinguistics, cognitive, cultural study, communication, concept, terminology.

---

Pragmalinguistics highlights the language used in speech. It is the study of language use from the viewpoint of the language's structural resources. For instance, it may start with the pronoun system of a language, and examine the way in which people choose different available forms to express the range of attitudes and relationships (such as deference and intimacy). It is a medium where we examine how people convey different kinds of meanings with the use of language or how people express a variety of meaning with variety of people. It is the study of mutual world knowledge. It is the only discipline where we study the real role of persons in language use. In studying the use of language, the role of speaker and hearer, the role of the context, the amount of relative quality of language which is used and the relative distance between the speaker and the hearer is important.

C. Morris established the differences between syntactics, semantics and pragmatics. Syntactics explores formal connections between linguistic signs, semantics establishes a correspondence between the state of things in the world and their verbal description, while pragmatics deals with the use of language to influence communicants in the process of their communication, i.e. communicative activity [Morris, 1983: 42]. Or, in other words, if syntax explains how a statement is arranged, how a person speaks (in terms of external forms of language), and semantics shows what he says, then pragmatics seeks to reveal under what conditions and for what purpose a person speaks in this case [Gak, 1982: 11].

The emergence and development of pragmatics is associated with the study of speech activity, with the analysis of the mechanisms of speech, with the social aspects of speech acts, [on this see: Montague, 1968; Stalnaker R.C., 1972; Cooper, 1974; Fillmore, 1974; Fraser, 1977; Griffin, 1977; Smith and Wilson, 1979; Levinson, 1983, etc.] Special attention, according to Z.Ya.Turaeva deserve pragmatic factors of a wide range, for example, such as: the social and individual psychological characteristics of the participants in the act of communication, the presupposition of the general fund of knowledge about the world, etc. [Turaeva, 1986: 126].

M.A. Krongauz understands pragmatics as a cognitive, social and cultural study of language and communication [Krongauz, 2001: 349]. A distinctive feature of pragmatics as one of the

---

categories of semiotics is that at the center of it is the personality of the speaker himself. Therefore, pragmatics is extremely sensitive to any changes that occur with this personal sphere of the speaker, it is formed by the subjective principle that each speaker brings to the communication process. To designate the personal sphere of a participant in communication in linguistic pragmatics, the terms “negative” (individual) person and “positive” (public) person are used, i.e. the desire of an individual to be part of a social group, to follow the norms and rules established in it, to receive approval and support from other members of this group [Yule, 1996].

One of the interesting modern of pragmatics was developed by Yu.S. Stepanov. He defines it as a discipline whose subject is the text in its dynamics - a discourse correlated with the main subject, with the "Ego" of the entire text, with the person creating the text [Stepanov, 1981]. Linguists talk about a special functional-pragmatic paradigm, in which the problem of language learning in action is brought to the fore, and the text in dynamics (generation and understanding) becomes the main unit of research [Baranov, 1993: 3].

Semantics, paradigmatics, syntactics and pragmatics form an inseparable unity, and the common property of the language - its subjectivity - is recognized as a link. The center of the subjectivity of language is the category of the subject, considered as the central category of modern pragmatics.

The pragmatic component neutralizes impersonal language structures in communication and allows the speaker to appeal to those structures that are most appropriate for a given communicative environment.

Semantics manifests the relationship of signs to what they mean, pragmatics - the relationship of the addresser to the signs that semantize what was said. Since the relationship of signs to the designated is also determined by the experience, knowledge, and representation of those speaking about reality, i.e., it is an “emanation” of the human spirit [Humboldt, 2000: 49], it became possible to study the semantic potential through the prism of pragmatics. The semantics of language units is established as a result of identifying the pragmatic range of these units in real speech use, within a variety of speech contexts. The introduction of human characteristics to the semantic level allows us to talk about the pragmatic aspect of linguistic semantics. Linguistic meanings are pragmatic through and through: with a person, with a speech situation, not some especially highlighted expressive elements are associated in the language, but the meaning of a huge number of words and grammars. Linked to pragmatics and reference. All meanings are subjective, anthropocentric and ethnocentric [Paducheva, 19976: 5 - 6].

The pragmatic orientation of the semantics of language units is especially clearly manifested in the conditions of their functioning in a phatic dialogue. Phatic dialogic speech is characterized by the absence of informatively important information for communicating and serves to establish social contact of the latter. This fact determines the special pragmatic load of the replicas of the phatic dialogue and the desire of the communicants to be as polite as possible. I.T. Piirainen distinguishes between a “negative form of politeness”, which is aimed at courtesy and unloading of a dialogue partner, and a “positive form of politeness”, manifested in the expression of sympathy, attention and curiosity towards the interlocutor [Piirainen, 1996: 101].

The situation of phatic communication, leaving aside everything that is of vital interest to those who communicate, serves certain socio-psychological goals. Depending on the situation of communication, the following functional varieties of the communicative goal of phatic dialogue can be distinguished:

- *the desire for verbal communication as a manifestation of human socialization;*
- *psychological impact on the emotional state of the recipient [Lznabaeva, 1985: 85].*

The choice of the topic of the phatic dialogue depends on the purpose of the phatic speech. The desire for socially oriented communication determines the greatest variation in the topics of dialogic interaction of this kind. Obviously, the topic of the dialogue must be acceptable to both participants. In the UK, for example, at present, the range of topics of phatic communication includes the weather, sports, transport punctuality, gardening, wildlife [Drazdauskene, 1970: 8; Aznabaeva, 1985: 87; Emelyanova, 2001: 71], these themes are mainly characteristic of phatic dialogue in other countries as well.

Yu.A. Egorova, analyzing the pragmalinguistic aspect of communicative contact [Egorova, 2002: 7]; Language interaction can also take place in the form of an informational dialogue. The pragmatic goal of this dialogue genre is to solve some information problem, and therefore its pragmatic and communicative goals coincide. Researchers note that the information dialogue is the main type of communication between a person and a computer [Kibrik, 1985: 5]; the term "erotematic dialogue" is also used, built on the principle of questions and answers. However, if the computer program is imperfect, the dialogue can be realized as a pseudo-dialogue and a phatic conversation [Mashbits et al., 1989: 22]. Such an orientation determined the methodological aspect of the study of the information dialogue "student - computer" in the study of foreign languages with the prevailing position of the game moment [Isaeva, 1992].

Unlike phatic genres of dialogic communication, the exchange of remarks in the informational dialogue is always aimed at changing the informational state of the communicants after each next remark. Therefore, one of the main aspects of the analysis of this form of interpersonal interaction is the movement of information updated in the process of exchanging remarks.

Researchers distinguish between two fundamentally different types of information movement: macro- and micro-movement. Macromovement is a global movement of information from one participant in communication to another and back in a dialogue, considered as a sequence of a number of remarks, the author of which is one or another communicant [Dsbrenne, Naryani, 1983; Dinenberg, 1985].

Micromotion is the direction of information within a single speech act, addressed from a specific speaker to certain listener [Savvina, 1985: 27]. A practical application of the theory of information flow in the information dialogue was the study of the dialogic nature of scientific communication [Glazman, 1969; Slavgorodskaya, 1982; Ilyin, 1992], as well as ways and means of creating a dialogic effect in a scientific text [Zotov, 1991].

The pragmatic boundaries of speech use, in turn, are determined by the intention of the speaker. Based on this, it is more expedient, in our opinion, to study the pragmatic potential of the language in dialogic speech, reflecting the clash of intentions of the two participants in the dialogue. At the same time, it is important to answer the question: what application can the process of collision of intentions of participants in dialogical communication find in the study of specific linguistic material, what are their communicative intentions, how do they manifest them and how adequately interpret them in the process of communication with each other? The relevance of the study of dialogic speech in the pragmatic aspect, therefore, is beyond doubt.

The essence of an individual element of a dialogical remark is determined by its place in the overall communicative process. The semantics of the utterance of a speech act can only be established in communication. In this regard, the analysis of dialogic speech in the

communicative-pragmatic aspect is relevant, since many of the characteristics of its components are predetermined precisely by their communicative function.

Ultimately, there are two types of intentions in language communication: 1) the speaker's initial approach; 2) a suddenly emerged situation later. It should also be noted that the intent is adaptive, inconstancy. In the end, it is lawful for each of the participants to have their own objective in each particular situation and to try to harmonize the story with their own approach. The reason is that each participant has the goal of speaking effectively. Thus, the bases for describing the concept of the participatory approach can be summarized as follows:

- 1) the aim of the intentional intentions is direct and indirect;
- 2) implication and explicit intensities due to introspection or intentional representation of the intention during the conversation;
- 3) intentional (mentally) intentions, which are carried out due to the motivation of any actors to act;
- 4) positive and negative intensities in terms of emotional impact on participants;
- 5) intensification of the short-term or event-related events, due to the cause of development or development. Thus, intention is an important factor that stimulates the realization of any cooperative situation.

Neither general pragmatics nor linguistic pragmatics examine its objects of investigation in isolation but rather focus on their conditions of use, the connectedness with their surroundings, and the necessary and sufficient conditions which assign the object, e.g. intentionality, rationality, model use or action, the status of a particular object and make it count as that object. While general pragmatics concentrates on the analysis of these fundamental premises of practical action, identifying their necessary and sufficient conditions, linguistic pragmatics establishes the explicit connection between those foundations and their language-specific and language-use specific constraints and requirements.

### References

1. The World Book Encyclopedia Dictionary. Volume k-z, Chicago: Copywrite, 1964.-P. 2018.
2. Sageder D. Terminology Today: A Science, an Art or a Practice? Some Aspects on Terminology and Its Development Brno Studies in English Volume 36, No. 1, 2010.
3. Lars Gurmund. The Problem of Correct Symbolist. –London, 1930. – P. 141.
4. Хаютин А.Д. Термин, терминология и номенклатура. – Самарканд, 1971. – 214 с.