

## CONTRASTIVE PRAGMATICS AS A NEW DIRECTION IN LINGUISTICS

Gulnoza N. Shodieva

Master student of Samarkand Institute of foreign languages

### Abstract:

Pragmatics, as the science of language use, cannot ignore the variability of language resources from which choices have to be made, both when producing utterances, and when interpreting them. Contrastive pragmatics is closely associated with the use of parallel and comparable corpora for studying the similarities and differences between languages. ... As a result, many contrastive studies nowadays are doubly contrastive in that they compare pragmatic phenomena across both genres and languages. The present article deals with different ways of speaking in different communities. The findings suggest that the status and role of the situation affect the speakers' choices and semantic formulas are of great importance.

**Keywords:** Contrastive pragmatics, comparative studies of communication, communication units, different communities, requests and apologies.

### Introduction.

Awareness of language or language competency has greatly changed from the focus of language itself as form and structure to language use as pragmatics. Accordingly, it is widely accepted that different cultures structure discourse in different ways. Moreover, studies have shown that this holds for discourse genres traditionally considered as highly standardized in their rituals and formulas. We have recently seen a broadening of pragmatics to new areas and to the study of more than one language. The contributions deal with pragmatic phenomena such as speech acts, discourse markers and modality in different language pairs using theoretical approaches such as politeness theory, Conversation Analysis, Appraisal Theory, grammaticalization and cultural textology. Also discourse practices and genres may differ across cultures as illustrated by the study of TV news shows in different countries. Contrastive pragmatics also includes the comparative study of pragmatic phenomena from a foreign language perspective, a new area with implications for language teaching and intercultural communication.

### Main part:

Current linguistic research paradigms characterized by being focused on anthropocentric and Cross disciplinary issues. Since the beginning of the 1970s, structural description of languages gave way to conducting multi paradigmatic research of practical communication and studying the conditions of using linguistic means by the speakers in intra- and intercultural communication. Then linguo pragmatic direction of their analysis has been formed under the influence of linguo-philosophic (J. Austin, J. Searle, J. Habermas), semiotic (Ch. Morris, Ch. Peirce), and socio- pragmatic (S. Ervin-Tripp) ideas. At the early stage of its development, linguistic pragmatics was oriented towards identifying universal features of the communication process. The primary goals of that included the description of the basic communication unit structure, classification of speech acts characterization of conditions required for successful speech act performance and etc. However, it has soon become clear that

- In different societies, and different communities, people speak differently.
- This difference in ways of speaking are profound and systematic (Wierzbicka 1991, p.69).



Thus, we are now witnessing and move away from overwhelmingly monolingual and monocultural research paradigms to a type of research which find it objectives in the multilingual and multicultural interaction of speakers from different national, ethnic, and racial backgrounds. Comparative studies of communication and communication units can be conducted, on the one hand, as a part of studying the process of second language acquisition, on the other hand, at the part of contrastive linguistics.

The former focuses on the problem encountered by a second language speaker, describing major communication mistakes and explaining the nature of its origins. As a rule, data for the comparison comes from a native language and so called Inter language - the language systems developed by the Luna on his or her path to acquire the target language (non -native language) (Trosborg 1995, p. 53). During the last two decades Inter language pragmatics has been developed intensively, a considerable number of languages being compared. The most significant contribution to the development of this trend was made by the project "Request an Apologies: a cross cultural study of speech act realization patterns". The aim of the project was to establish a database of speech act realizations, especially of request and apologies, across eight different languages or language varieties (Australian English, American English, British English, Canadian French, Danish, German, Hebrew, Russian), to analyze the different communicative strategies across these languages and to pinpoint areas of pragmatic mismatches. The main results of the research activity carried out by the project group were published in 1981 within the project they developed a certain methodology for data collection and data analysis. The methodology has been widely applied in further research to other languages.

The second direction of comparative studies includes the pragmatic aspects into the general contrastive description of two or more languages. Contrastive analysis belongs to the priority trends of the modern linguistic research. It allows to identify similarities and differences between the compared languages, both structural and functional, which on top of everything else can further serve as a basis for typological generalizations. However, that can be witnessed a tendency to involve all the levels of language as well as the maximum number of linguistic phenomena in the comparison, which can hardly be established for each language pair. At the present time we can state that one of the least explored linguistic areas is a communicated pragmatic level. This has been highlighted by many linguists.

It is quite clear that there is a need of supplementing the existing lack of knowledge concerning their peculiarities of communication behavior in different language communities in accordance with the above mentioned requirements for pragmatic research in linguistics. The aim of such research is to identify similarities and differences in functioning of the utterances that realize pragmatic intention of the major speech acts belonging to each of the illocutionary types and to define prototypical and peripheral means expressing them in each of the compared languages.

The most efficient way to fulfill these objectives is to combine both approaches to the comparative study of speech behavior exhibited by representatives of different cultures. On the other hand, the best practice for gathering and analyzing the data developed within these approaches can be used. on the other hand, it will help to develop more useful and compelling message for description of the phenomena under the study.

it is in the direct communicate if interaction at a given moment of time, in a given communication space where varying degrees of socio- cultural, age -specific, gender, linguistic and other peculiarities of individual interlocutors are revealed. Being representatives of a certain linguo-sociocultural, interlocutors are the bearers of moral and ethical norms, as strategies of verbal and non-verbal behavior customary for the given culture.

**Communication behavior peculiarities are defined by the following groups of factors:**

1. Socio-pragmatic; 2. Cultural; 3. Situational; 4. Linguistic.

Socio-pragmatic factors are connected with the personality of interactants and reflect their position in the social sphere. Here belong various characteristics of communicating individuals, first of all, the following:

- Social status of interlocutors, their belonging to a certain social group, profession, position, education level, family status, etc.; relations between interlocutors can be symmetric and asymmetric;
- Social distance between interlocutors: zero, neutral or close relations;
- Bio-physiological characteristics of interlocutors, first of all, their sex and age;
- Nationality;
- Psychological type of interlocutors, their temperament, extrovert or introvert orientation, elements of pathology.
- Language competence, knowledge of a certain language code that interlocutors use in verbal interaction.
- Degree of acquaintance between interlocutors.

Cultural factors are connected with cultural specifics of the society where interlocutors belong to. These factors are expressed in traditions, customs and cultural norms. The most important factors are the following:

- Norms of etiquette, general traditional rules dictating behavior patterns in a society,
- Norms of politeness that regulate relations between interlocutors in a given situation. The notion of politeness is undoubtedly connected very close with the notion of speech etiquette. However, in our opinion, it would be a mistake to equate these two notions. While speech etiquette defines the rules of behavior and consequently the use of appropriate linguistic expressions in certain given situations, politeness is different at mutually respectful treatment between interlocutors. These rules of etiquette are not equal to the moral rules.
- social stereotypes as standardized opinion on certain social groups or representatives of these groups;
- situational factors belong directly to the situation in which communication takes place. They are the following:
  - time and place of event
  - connection of speech act with other utterances
- Current psychological state of interlocutors, their mood, current knowledge, objectives and interests, etc.

Linguistic factors are connected with the specifics of systematic structural organization of language the most important linguistic factors are:

- set of grammatical category specific for a given language;
- specifics of organizing national discourse;
- frequency of use of certain language means in communication .

Many of the afore-mentioned factors bear national specifics.

**Conclusion:**

Pragmatics refers to how words are used in a practical sense. ... For example, words that attempt to explain abstract concepts-freedom, beauty-have no meaning in and of themselves. Instead, someone who looks at pragmatics would attempt to understand how they are being used in a given, concrete,

practical situation. Pragmatics is the study of meaning in language in a particular context. This includes the place where the thing is said, who says it, and the things that you have already said. Also, pragmatics studies how people speak when they both know something. Contrastive pragmatics concerns itself with the comparison of these principles between cultures. It is not confined to the study of a certain pragmatic principle.

### References:

- 1) Austin, John L. 1940. "The Meaning of a World". The Moral Sciences Club of the University of Cambridge and the Jowett Society of the University of Oxford.
- 2) Austin, John Lagshaw. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 3) Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman.  
<http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ijel/article/view/55217>  
[https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/tfg/2018/196106/Jimenez\\_Adria\\_TFG.pdf](https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/tfg/2018/196106/Jimenez_Adria_TFG.pdf)  
<https://quizlet.com/250695457/contrastive-pragmatics-flash-cards/>