

---

## Methodological Bases of Sociopragmatic Study of Literary Text

---

KHALIDA YULDASHEVA

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology Sciences, Karshi State University, Uzbekistan  
Email: x-yuldasheva@mail.ru

---

**Abstract:** This article discusses sociopragmatic analysis, a branch of pragmalinguistics, and the methodological foundations of the sociopragmatic study of literary texts. Sociopragmatism is one of the most important branches of linguistics, which makes its aspects more visible in the literary text. For this reason it is characterized by the high importance of communicative pragmatics and sociopragmatics in text analysis.

**Keywords:** sociopragmatic analysis, communicative pragmatics, sociological aspects, ideologically, phenomena, speaker-producer.

---

### INTRODUCTION

"Pragmatics" (pragma - work, action) is in fact a philosophical concept that was used in pre-Socratic times and later adopted by philosophers such as J. Locke and E. Kant from Aristotle. Thus a stream of pragmatism emerged in philosophy.

The main period of development of this movement is the XIX-XX centuries. Especially in the 1920s and 1930s, the widespread promotion of pragmatic ideas became clear. Special mention should be made of the services of Ch. Pierce, R. Carnap, Ch. Morris, and L. Wittgenstein in the dissemination of this propaganda in America and Europe. Charles Pierce was one of the founders of the philosophical pragmatism that dominated America in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

### THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The main idea of this philosophical system is to study the meaning of the semiotic sign in relation to the results, success of the action performed by this sign. The author of this principle is Ch. Pierce was one of those who argued that the subject matter of communicative activity should be taken into account in the context of sign theory. Pragmalinguistics as an independent branch of linguistics was formed in the 60s and 70s of the last century. In 1970, an international conference on the pragmatics of natural languages was held in Dordrecht. The editor of the collection of lectures read at the conference, Professor I. Bar-Hillel of the University of Tel-Aviv, noted in the "Introduction" that the participants unanimously agreed that the pragmatic features of communication through natural language syntactic and semantic features should be studied within the framework of linguistic theory". From that time onwards, when pragmatics was recognized as the 'Reconstruction Period', there was a real pragmatic rise in foreign linguistics.

A number of conferences and meetings on this topic have been held, collections published, scientific research has no limits, and the Journal of Pragmatics has literally become an international publication. One of the first to determine the subject of pragmalinguistics was G. Klaus. He describes pragmatics as "the study of the relationship between characters and the individuals who create, transmit, and receive these linguistic signs". It is clear from this definition that in defining the subject of pragmatics, G. Klaus, like other semiotics, does not shy away from the relation of sign and its perceptive interpreter, even saying that "pragmatics is primarily a theory that studies the psychological and sociological aspects of linguistic signs". The conclusion is also nothing more than a narrow description of the concept of pragmatics. At the 12th International Conference of Linguists, J. Lyons tried to define the subject of pragmalinguistics and define it:

"Pragmatics describes the use of appropriate linguistic units in communication in order to encourage the listener to accept the transmitted information as the speaker wishes. This pragmatics is concerned with defining the role of linguistic means in interpersonal communication". This definition is based on the relationship between the intended purpose of the linguistic movement and the means to achieve it. The "cause-and-effect" chain forms a plan of speech activity and ensures its realization. The same urges A. Kasher to describe and explain the main purpose of pragmalinguistic analysis as "the rules of human ability that allow the use of 4 linguistic means to achieve a goal".

In order to distinguish pragmalinguistics as an independent branch of linguistics and to determine its object and subject of change, it is necessary to look for factors that ensure the pragmatic value, "value" of the content in different communicative environments. The features of linguistic units that appear in any situation are a reflection of their ontological functional features. Thus, the general definition of pragmatics can be considered

as follows: pragmatics is a separate branch of linguistics, the study of the selection of linguistic units in the process of communication, their application and the impact of these units on the participants of communication. studied. These rules are studied as a context in the broadest sense, in relation to the conditions of communication.

Analysis of linguistic phenomena in this way allows us to identify the barriers and limitations in their use in this or that environment. The main idea of linguistic analysis is to determine the nature of language in relation to its practical application, or in other words, in the context of its function. The very concept of task (function) is the foundation of a pragmalinguistic approach to language analysis. We are convinced that the development of pragmalinguistics in the same direction will narrow the gap between theoretical linguistics and practical communication.

Pragmatics, often defined as the study of a language in context or the study of how language is used in a speech situation [4, p. 27], claims that its boundaries will completely coincide with the boundaries of linguistics. On the contrary, all the numerous attempts at a detailed presentation of what should relate to the pragmatic sphere, and what to other disciplines, encountered many borderline phenomena, further confirming the vagueness of the term itself [11, p. 6]. It is worth mentioning that the rapid development of pragmalinguistic studies was a kind of reaction to the dogmatism of dualistic views on language.

Ideologically, pragmatics is the opposite of both the structuralism of F. de Saussure, where priority was given to the study of linguistic systemicity (*langue*), rather than the actual use of language in communication (*parole*), and the generative grammar of N. Chomsky, in which the main dominant was the study of a complex of knowledge about the native language (*competence*), while leaving aside numerous problems of language use (*performance*). It is not surprising that, within the leading linguistic concepts, pragmatics was at best defined as a subsection of semantics, at worst - it was assigned a very insignificant role as a “grammar waste basket” [20, p. 6], containing everything that did not find an adequate explanation from the standpoint of formalism and structuralism.

However, the field of pragmatics is not limited to one description of meaning in relation to a static system of knowledge about a language. The pragmatist is generally interested in how, by whom and for what purpose the language is used in the sociocultural context. The process of human communication mediated by language can rightfully be considered the most creative human activity [8, p. 21], in which the interaction between the speaker-producer and the listener-interpreter is not limited to one manipulation of linguistic forms to convey a message, since the way we understand words is certainly associated with the situation in which they are used [13, p. 787]. Thus, we can say that pragmatics studies the dynamic process of generating meanings arising in the interaction of the speaker and the listener in relation to the context (physical, linguistic, social) and depending on the semantic potential of the utterance itself [16, p. 22].

One of the most successful attempts to provide an alternative view of solving the issue of the boundaries and scope of pragmatics has become, in a sense, the prophetic concept of J. Leach. In his opinion, within the framework of general pragmatics (the boundaries of which are determined by the rhetorical model), two main areas of research should be distinguished: the study of general and more specific (particular) conditions for the use of language in communication. Accordingly, the first and second directions correlate with the linguistic and sociological subsections (poles) of pragmatics - pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics. The sphere of interests of the first direction includes linguistic resources that a particular language provides to the user to convey the illocutionary power of utterance. These resources (sources) also include various pragmatic strategies and a wide variety of linguistic forms that can enhance or soften communicative acts [9, p. 600]. The interaction of the speaker and the listener, the addressee and the addressee (both in writing and orally) is considered as a dialogical interaction, where the intention of the first participant in communication is the adequate production of meaning through coding, and the intention of the second (opposite in direction) is the action of interpretation, i.e. e. decoding the message in order to understand the intentions of the speaker.

The need to highlight the sociological component is explained by the obvious fact that, for example, such generally recognized postulates of general pragmatics as the principle of cooperation or the principle of politeness function differently in different cultures and linguistic communities, in different social situations between representatives of different social classes and within them [10, p.10].

Sociopragmatics is important, since utterances in communication express not only the attitude of the speakers to each other and to the utterance as a whole, but also reflect the social relations between them. At the heart of the interpretative actions of the participants in communication is the perception of the social status of the communicators, since the linguistic communities differ in the assessment of the social distance between the speaker and the listener, as well as in the degree of involvement of certain rights and obligations of the parties in a specific communicative act.

According to J. Thomas, if pragmalinguistics approaches grammar in the sense that it studies linguistic forms and their functioning, then sociopragmatics studies relevant social behavior. Speakers should be aware of the consequences of the pragmatic choice they make in communication [9, p. 600]. As a result, J. Leach defines his own approach as “complementary”. Complementarism, opposed to semantism (pragmatics is part of semantics)

on the one hand and pragmatism (pragmatics includes the theory of meaning) on the other, defends the idea that in order to create an adequate and satisfactory model for describing the functioning of meaning in communication, semantics and pragmatics should complement each other [ 10, p. 6-7].

### **Principles and rules of effective communication or sociopragmatic analysis basics**

The effectiveness of communication depends on the observance of certain rules and principles of conduct. The peoples of the world have written thousands of proverbs on communication etiquette and responsibility, and countless rare works have been written on the subject. Examples of such cultural monuments as the masterpieces of Eastern national culture, such as "Qutadgu bilig", "Qobusnoma", "Hibbatul haqoyiq", the works of great thinkers Kaykovus, Yusuf Khos Hajib, Ahmad Yassavi, Ahmad Yugnaki, Alisher Navoi, Sufi Alloyar.

Let us recall the following points from Kaikovus in "Qobusnoma": " Even if you know the word and the profession well don't break a word, describe it correctly and say it in one color: a wise word to wise men, simple words to ordinary people, so that it is fit for purpose and do not burden the hearer, otherwise they will not even hear your words with evidence and documents. then speak according to their consent, and you will be safe".

Most importantly, these traditions continue to this day, and issues such as speech responsibility, communication etiquette, and conversational culture have been a constant focus of Uzbek scholars.

Forming stylistic tropes and figures is a difficult task without deviating from the principles of communication. Consequently, the violation of the principle of quality leads to the formation of verbal narrative actions such as sarcasm, sarcasm

1) Navoi: Instruction! (He takes the ring and watches.) Precious ring. A ring worth a reward for adult service. Please!

2) Hussein: I wish other emirs also knew the language of Awam? I wish there were gossipers even if they know their guilt! (A mockery of Majididdin)

So, the rules that ensure the effectiveness of communication are different.

Grays is not limited to the two pairs separated.

We know that the concept of the "human factor" is also used in structural linguistics, but structuralists interpret this concept as referring to the "ideal speaker in the same speech context" and associate it with the definition of "linguistic ability".

In the pragmalinguistic interpretation, the concept of the "human factor" takes on a completely different meaning. Just as the conditions of communication are different, so are the "perceptions of the speaker and the listener, the purpose, the basis, the means of communication, the specific forms of behavior, the subject of expression, the characteristics of the interlocutors' relationship"

Also, these types of social characteristics are divided into stable (permanent) and variable groups. It is for these features that the personal and social characteristics of the speaker are more important for pragmalinguistic analysis than for the notion of the "ideal speaker-speaker." Among the constant and variable features associated with the human factor, which is activated in the process of verbal communication, Professor VV Bogdanov includes the followings:

1) linguistic ability;

2) belonging to a particular nationality;

3) socio-cultural status (belonging to a particular social group, profession, position, education, place of residence, marital status);

4) biological and physiological indicators (sex, age, health, presence or absence of physical defects);

5) psycho-psychological type (temperament, pathological indicators);

6) mood swings (mood, temporary knowledge, goals and interests);

7) constant tastes, interests and habits;

8) appearance (dress, demeanor, behavior).

It is obvious that the characters included in this series are not the same in terms of their content and function. Their influence on the content of speech is also different. In particular, if we take the sign of linguistic ability, it is a key factor in meaningful speech activity. It is clear that a person who does not know the language cannot perform this activity, but different people have different levels of language proficiency. It is desirable that the level of language proficiency be relatively uniform in order for communication to flow smoothly and for interlocutors to interact. Also, keep in mind that a high level of knowledge of the language coding system is not enough for communication to be effective.

This effect can only be achieved if the above-mentioned sociopragmatic principles and rules are fully followed. Therefore, would it be appropriate to interpret the concept of "linguistic ability" in a broad sense, describing it as "the ability to use the principles of linguistic code and communication, the rules of social activity"? In my opinion, it is wrong to separate the concepts of "linguistic ability" and "pragmalinguistic ability" used in recent years, and to give rise to the idea that they are based on differentiated phenomena.

Linguistic ability is a phenomenon that provides linguistic communication, so this concept includes the ability to know the laws of the language system and communication system, to use them in practice. Prof. Many of the

traits listed by V.V. Bogdanov are personal qualities of communicators, which are biophysiological and psychological in nature. For example, people who are talkative and quick to communicate are different from people who are talkative. Typically, choleric and sanguine people are aggressive and communicative, while melancholic and phlegmatic people are characterized by low self-esteem and difficulty communicating with strangers. No matter how important the qualities of communicators are in the communication system, the social role of the communicators is at the heart of this system. This characteristic of the participants of the dialogue "serves as a factor that objectively and subjectively influences the level of implementation of the speech activity".

Sociologists have long been concerned with the problem of social stratification. P. Sorokin, a Russian-born sociologist who was exiled to America during the Soviet era, interprets the concept of "social stratification" in terms of dividing certain groups of people into lower and upper classes: "The essence of this (stratification - Sh.S.), "writes P. Sorokin, - rights and privileges, responsibilities and duties, unequal distribution of judgment and authority in this or that community".

Scholars such as G. Maine, M. Weber, T. Parsons, T. Shibusaki, and R. Turner, who have dealt with the problem of social stratification in detail, have made a significant contribution to the theoretical study of this phenomenon. The same scholars propose to distinguish between the concepts of social status and social role. Professor of St. Petersburg University V.F. Serjantov believes that social status is determined by "the role of each individual in the overall structure of society. An individual's social status is determined by his or her place in society and in the community. Indicators that differentiate a person's social status are his or her occupation, source of income, wealth, and education. The inequality of these indicators creates a social distance between individuals (or groups) that provides a hierarchy of community structure. The stratification of individuals on one or another frontier of social distance is the uneven distribution of privileges in society (ruler-servant, chief-servant, intellectual-illiterate, etc.).

Thus, the activation of sociopragmatic principles and rules in the text serves to achieve the purpose of communication. In applying these principles and rules, it is necessary to proceed from the state of the social environment and the state of speech, the character that determines them. The state of communication is assessed in terms of a specific social group, a norm that is specific to the culture. The norm defines the patterns of social behavior adopted in a particular society, it governs the choice of linguistic means based on generally accepted rules. The norm is the cornerstone for the practice of the principle of respect, and the expression of the communicative goal determines the form. Interestingly, the norms that govern the use of language units themselves follow general axiological guidelines. Assessment guidelines are often culturally specific. For example, in American culture, if someone suddenly falls, you can ask: Are you ok? to ask how they are doing. But the phrase is translated into Uzbek as "Is everything alright?" If we translate it like this, we will laugh at the fallen person and insult him. According to the norms of our culture, "Nothing happened? Does it hurt? Can I help you?" It is appropriate to ask such questions.

If the attitudes of the participants are asymmetrical, it is usually necessary to strictly follow the rules of communication. The communicator in the subordinate position must strictly follow the rules of speech choice. For example, a subordinate must clearly state his or her complaint to his or her boss or boss. Otherwise, "Why are you making so much noise? Speak more clearly!" it is not uncommon to receive such a rebuke. It is also known what it means to speak back to the boss, to interrupt him. In general, the alertness of a person who is supposed to be submissive to someone is nothing more than a departure from the principle of respect in communication. It is not in vain that the proverbs "It is better to speak naturally, it is better not to be silent" or "Do not hurry with words, hurry with deeds" have not appeared. It is the right of the upper class to talk a lot, to disclose information in detail, and it is better for the subordinate to "listen." Therefore, silence can be distinguished as a separate speech act and through it a number of communicative purposes can be expressed.

Silence serves as a kind of linguistic symbol in communication and can be a means of expressing various speech actions. In addition to keeping silent in communication, it is also an example of purposeful action. An example of this is the conversation between the protagonists of the novel "Mekhrobdan chayon":... Rano said that his father had gone to the wedding.

Anwar smiles

- *the two of us were left alone in a three-story house. what happiness is this. I'll be chaining the gate.*

- *Yes ... come in chains ...*

Although the relationship between Anwar and Rano is asymmetrical, this equality is not fully reflected in communication. The rules of Uzbek speech etiquette are unique: girls' speech is formed and practiced within the framework of chastity and ethics.

In conclusion, just as the world is diverse and the events that take place in it are diverse, so are the situations in which communication takes place. They occur in different contexts and environments, and the relationships of the participants in the dialogue do not have the same social status. It is this diversity that forms the sociopragmatic indicators of the communication system, the social dexterity shell.

## CONCLUSION

Ignoring sociopragmatic signs leads to a violation of the principle of coherence of speech. In a recent article, Professor N.Mahmudov reiterated that in order to ensure the quality of speech, the speaker should not ignore the content of the speech, the characteristics of the listener, his social status, level of cultural enlightenment, in addition to the content he wants to express. The scientist explained to the little ones the consequences of not meeting the requirements of the principle of unity: “Soglikda ko’rishaylik! Omon bo’lsak, albatta, ko’rishamiz!” He explained that there is a tendency to teach formal communication sentences such as. Indeed, the state of speech, the social status of the interlocutors, and the moral and spiritual characteristics of the speech they perform are important features of the communication system. One of the urgent tasks of pragmalinguistics is to study them as a whole.

## REFERENCES

1. 1.Shahriyor Safarov. Pragmalingvistika. Toshkent, 2008.
2. 2.Marufjon Yo’ldoshev. Badiiy matn lingvopoetikasi. Toshkent, 2008.
3. Mamajonov A. Abdupattoev M. Matn sintaksisi. Farg’ona, 2002.
4. Hakimov M. K. O'zbek tilida vaqt ma'noli lug'aviy birliklar va ularning matn shakllantirish imkoniyatlari. Farg'ona, 2004.
5. 5.Qo'ng'urov R. Begmatov E. Tojiyev Y. Nutq madaniyati uslubiyat asoslari. Toshkent, 1992.
6. Nurmonov A. Mahmudov N. Ahmedova A. So'lixojayeva S. O'zbek tilining mazmuni sintaksisi. Toshkent, 1992.
7. Nurmonov A. Hakimov M. Lingvistik pragmatikaning nazariy shakllanishi. O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. 2001.
8. Abduraxmonov X. Mahmudov N. So'z estetikasi. Toshkent, 1981.
9. O'rinboyev B. Qo'ng'urov R. Lapasov J. Badiiy matnning lingvistik tahlili. Toshkent, 1990.
10. Lapasov J. Badiiy matn va lisoniy tahlil. Toshkent, 1995.
11. Александрова О.В., Кубрякова Е.С. Дискурс. В кн.:
12. Категоризация мира: время, пространство.- М., 1991.
13. Алпатов В.М. Система личных местоимений 1-го и 2 - го лица в современном японском языке // Теория и типология местоимений. М.: Наука, 1980.
14. Алпатов В.М. Япония: язык и общество. М.: Муравей, 2003.
15. Андреева Е.С.Диалектика текста. Опыт логиколингвистического синтеза. - М.: УРСС, 2001.
16. Апресян Ю.Д. Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка. - М.: Наука, 1974.
17. Апресян Ю.Д. Дейксис в лексике и грамматике и наивная модель мира // Семиотика и информатика. 1986, вып.
18. Арзикулов Х. Речевая система и её модели (на материале французского языка). Автореф. дисс. ... докт. филол. наук. - СПб.: СПб. у-т, 1994.
19. J.Lich. Sotsiopragmatika. 1992
20. S.Levinson. Lingvistika.1994
21. G.Kasper . Progmalingvistika. 1992
22. Абитова, А. Р. Социопрагматика текста «поток сознания» (на материале современной немецкой прозы) Текст.: дисс. . канд. филол. наук / А. Р. Абитова. Пятигорск, 1999. - 217 с.
23. Авганова, Н. А. Об одном виде связи между предложениями в тексте Текст. / Н. А. Авганова // Вопросы теории английского языка: сб. тр. -Вып. 2. -М.: МГПИ им. В. И. Ленина, 1975.-С. 108-118.
24. Авганова, Н. А. О контекстной зависимости предложений, объединенной оценочной связью Текст. / Н. А. Авганова // Вопросы теории английского языка: сб. тр. Вып. 2. -М.: МГПИ им. В. И. Ленина, 1975(a). - С. 179-186.
25. Juraev, Z. M., & Masalieva, O. M. (2020). Eleven Ahmad Pilgrimage And Seal And Flag Of Victory. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 2(12), 43-50.