THE STUDY OF SPEECH ACT AS A UNIT OF DISCURSIVE ACTIVITY

BUZRUKOVA MAKHINA MUKHAMADKHONOVNA,
Affiliation: PhD student, Samarkand State University
E-mail: s-bahodirhon@samdu.uz

ABSTRACT:

The article discusses the key provisions of the theory of speech acts. The author traces the formation of the theory of speech acts as a science. Presented the main classifications and models of speech acts. The author offers an extended view the concept of speech act. A speech act is interpreted as the production of a specific sentence for realization of a certain communicative intention in certain communication conditions.

KEYWORDS: speech act, act of reference, act of predication, locative act, illocutionary force, illocutionary act, intention, addressee, addressee, perlocutionary act

INTRODUCTION:

Scholars have long debated the separation and classification of units of discursive activity and communication systems. The views expressed as a result of this discussion and debate vary. In particular, while the Ukrainian linguist P. V. Zernitsky's speech favored the study of structures as "episodes" (Zernitsky 1990), the Uzbek linguist M. Hakimov argues that the units of linguistic pragmatism should be "informema" and "pragmema" (Hakimov 2013: 36). Dutch scientist T. A. van Dyke, on the other hand, prefers to analyze discourse into micro- and microstructures (Dyke 1989: 46-48). British scientists J. Austin and J. Serles took a completely different path in the analysis of the communication system, choosing the speech act as the basic unit of this system (Austin 1962; Searl 1975).

The author of the work "Pragmalinguistics" according to Sh. Safarov,

"The existence of language is related to the way people perform speaking or writing. In the process of performing these actions, linguistic units demonstrate the ability to express content in addition to the original meaning, such as affirmation, command, warning, and promise. These meanings are the result of the speech activity performed by the speaker. Thus, a speech act is a linguistic appeal of the speaker to the listener in a certain environment, for a specific purpose"(Safarov 2008: 71).

Speech act is an event that has become one of the main categories of pragmatics. But it is difficult to reach a consensus on the interpretation of this phenomenon. Sociolinguist D. Haymes, who advocated discursive analysis, in it's theory, speech act is not a central concept but one of the stages of analysis (Hymes 1974). In another model of discourse, it is the smallest unit of analysis (Sinclaire, Coulhard 1969). Recognizing that the pragmatic branch of linguistics also has units of influence and control, Uzbek scholars believe that "the concept of a speech act alone is not enough to study linguistic units in a linguopragmatic direction" (Aznaurova 1988: 13; Hakimov 2013: 136).

By now, most pragmalinguists are accustomed to placing the concept of "speech act" at the center of discursive analysis. D. Crystal, who describes the speech act as the "foundation" of pragmatics argues that "speech act theory is a direction that analyzes the speech structure in relation to the behavior of the speaker and listener during interaction". According to him, a speech act is not a simple action, but a "communicative activity"

performed by the interlocutors (Crystall 2008: 446).

In order for a discursive structure to have the status of a speech act, it must be "an example of purposeful speech activity performed in accordance with the principles and rules of speech behavior adopted in a particular community" (Arutyunova 1998: 412). From this definition, it is clear that the main indicators of a speech act are intentionality (having a purpose) and conventionality (following principles and rules). That must be the reason. The study of the principles and rules of interpersonal communication has become an important aspect of the theory of speech acts. Indeed, the set of rules of communication plays an important role in the formation of the content of the speech structure. In the theory of speech acts, "the linguistic or speech structure is interpreted as an activity" (Matveeva 2013: 56), the principles that systematize this activity should not be overlooked.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

The main source of the theory of speech acts as a separate doctrine is the English logician J. Austin's How to Do Things with Words.

J. Austin, who sought to prove that the content of a speech act constitutes a set of linguistic and non-linguistic factors. In creating his theory, he first begins to define the relationship between affirmation and performance structures. Sensing that there is no strict boundary between these types of speech movements, the author is convinced that the nature of activity possesses not only performatives but also all types of structures (Austin 1962).

J. Austin, interested in the structure and discursive activation of the speech act. Austin then argues that at the heart of his theory is the principle that connects the speaker's speech

creation with a communicative goal, that is, intentionality. The scholar distinguishes the locutive, illocutive, and perlocutive stages, emphasizing that the speech act has a three-stage structure.

The locutive act ("locution") consists of pronunciation, and the structure has a phonetic, lexical-grammatical and semantic structure. This act also has its own meaning.

The illocutive act is subject to existing rules, and their observance affects the effectiveness of communication. The content of this act reflects the plan of the speaker, and this plan is the basis for the purposeful passage of the lecture. Please note that the expression of pragmatic meanings such as offer, promise is related to the realization of this communicative goal. The rules involved in the occurrence of an illocutive act are ethnocultural in nature. For "in the languages of the world there are special formal means which directly or indirectly refer to the illocutive function of the act of speech" (Serl 1986: 195).

The perlocutive act serves to target the addressee. This act has certain consequences and its content has a pre-planned purpose. As J. Austin himself points out, "when we say something, often and it has become the norm, our words affect our feelings, our thoughts, and the response of the audience ... and this can be done purposefully" (Austin 1962: 101).

It should be noted that the listed acts (locutive, illocutive, perlocutive) are performed simultaneously, in the same place and time. Their differentiation is of a formal nature, and only and only in their integrity does a true discursive-communicative unity, that is, a speech act, be formed. The speaker who performs the locutive act immediately becomes the executor of the illocutive act, that is, he asks a question and answers it, informs, persuades, or warns; please or demand, criticize or praise, and etc. It refers to a performative illusion in the performance of such actions.

For example: Please return the book to the library.

It is very difficult to distinguish between illocutive and perlocutive acts. True, this may sometimes be made possible by semantic differences between illocutive and perlocutive verbs. For example, illusion is clearly manifested when the verbs to warn, to demand, to beg, to persuade, to compel, to amaze perform a performative function. However, this criterion does not apply uniformly in all cases.

Patterns of illocutive and perlocutive acts in English can be distinguished by the use of prepositions (Austin 1986: 103):
a). In saying x I was doing y = I did y;
"Speaking of x, I did it";
b). By saying x I did y = I was doing y
"I did 'y' through x speech act"

In the first of these examples, the preposition in promotes the execution of an illocutive act, while in the second case, the preposition by serves as a means of forming a perlocutive act.

J. Serl introduced the concept of "illocutive act" as well as the concept of "illocutive task." In the theory of speech acts, special attention was paid to the illocutive aspect of speech actions. He introduced a number of innovations into his own teacher J. Austin's theory. This applies primarily to the structural structure of the speech act, the conditions of effectiveness, and the classification of illocutive acts. In the later stages of development of the theory, all of the propositions are based on the teachings of Serl.

The scientist describes the structure of the speech act in a new way (Serl 1986):
1) Act of locutation (but excludes the semantic part from it);
2) Act of proposition;
3) Illusions;
4) Perlocutive act.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

It is known that the expression of proposition states the event in reality and when it will take place. An act of proposition consists of two parts, a reference referring to an object or person and a predicate indicating what attribute is attached to the referent.

A single proposition can serve as a reference point for several speech acts that differ in their illocutive purpose. For example, compare:
a) Does Gulnara go to the exam?
b) Gulnara went to the exam.
c) Gulnara is going to the exam!
g) If only Gulnara had passed the exam!
d) We would be happy if Gulnara passed the exam!

The referent of these speech structures is Gulnara and she is given a unique feature - "passing the exam". Although the structures are bound to a single proposition, they have different illusions. These two components of the structures can be studied separately.

The illocutive function of a speech act is determined by the context. The interlocutors are also obliged to identify the pragmatic context in which this speech act takes place, in addition to referring to the knowledge base known to them in order to understand the information being conveyed. According to T. A. van Dyke, the concept of "pragmatic context", which is based on important methodological principles, is the product of theoretical and cognitive abstraction of different types of situations (Dyke 1989: 19).

J. Serl in his co-authored work with D. Vanderveken, notes that speech acts have seven characteristics (Serl, Vanderveken 1985):
1) Illocutive purpose;
2) The method of achieving the illocutive goal;
3) The degree of intensity of the illocutive target;
4) Condition of proposition content;

5) Conditions of preparation;

6) The condition of honesty (the mental state of the speaker in the environment of the speech act is determined);

7) The degree of intensity of honesty.

Thus, the description of the "speech act", which is the basic concept of the theory of speech acts, is as follows: "The minimum unit of communication is not speech or any other structure, but affirmation, message, acts" (Serl 1986: 220). He, like his mentor, believes that out of the process of speaking, a person performs actions that pursue a specific non-objective purpose (such as speaking, responding, reporting, warning, and criticizing).

Indeed, the fact that the speaker realizes the content of the proposition with some illusory purpose forms the speech act. Accordingly, J. Serl represents the semantic structure of the speech structure in the form of the formula F (P). Here, P is defined as an indicator of proposition, and F is defined as an indicator of illocutionary power, indicating how the proposition is applied, demonstrating how an illocutive act is performed by the speaker "speaking" (Serl 1986: 156-157).

CONCLUSION / RECOMMENDATION:

From what has been said, it appears that the root of the difference in J. Austin and J. Serle's theoretical views is not so deep. We can see this by comparing the models proposed by these two scientists (see table 1):

Table 1. Speech act structure

J. Austin Theory	J. Serl theory
Locative act	Pronunciation act
a) phonetic act	
b) fatal act	
c) retic act	Act of proposition
Reference act	
Predication act	
Illocutive act	Illocutive act
Perlocutive act	Perlocutive act

In addition, J. Serl followed the path of distinguishing semantic and pragmatic meanings and proved which of the linguistic expressions belonged to propositional or pragmatic content. Although the differentiation of indicators in this context has led to a contrast between semantics and pragmatics, it helps to define the content of speech structures and group them. It is also known to have been stated by J. Austin, some ideas on distinguishing the semantic and pragmatic aspects of speech acts but such distinguishing cases were noted in the internal structure of the locus. In general, it is difficult to find any definitive definition of the concept of an illocutive act in J. Austin's theory. He gives examples of speech acts of various contexts, and explains them, noting that the actions performed in each language have their own distinctive classification features (Austin 1986). His student, on the other hand, considers the illocutive act to be the smallest unit of the communication system. "The smallest unit of verbal communication is not a linguistic sign, nor a word, nor a linguistic structure, nor even a copy of a sign, word, or sentence, but the pronunciation of that definite copy in the process of activating a speech act" (Serl 1986: 152).

The goal of communication aimed at the speaker's understanding of the listener is the most important aspect of the illusion. The illocutive act is aimed at achieving one goal or another, and that goal is not "to convey to the listener only the meaning of proposition" (Horn 2004: 22). The essence of the illocutive act is manifested in the will of the speaker. For this reason, western pragmalinguists prefer to focus on the pragmatic content, the intended purpose of the speaker, rather than on the semantic content of the speech structure (Pocheptsov 1986: 71).

The founders of the theory of speech acts also considered the results and

effectiveness of this or that act. The success of a speech act depends on the fulfillment of a number of conditions.

In particular, the speaker must follow generally accepted rules, namely:
a) Must have the required position;
b) Take into account the specific situation;
c) Pronounce the required linguistic units.

In one of his recent works, J. Austin mentions three factors that lead to inefficiency:
1) Non-compliance with the rules;
2) Misuse;
3) Non-compliance with the received obligation.

J. Serl interprets this problem a little differently as well. In his opinion, it does not matter whether the speech action achieves its goal or not, the main thing is that the information reaches the addressee. The scholar, who believes that sincerity is an indicator of the effectiveness of verbal action, lists nine conditions (Serl 1986):
1) Entry and termination of communication in accordance with the rules;
2) Separation of propositional meaning;
3) Prediction of the performed action;
4) Preparation for equal dialogue;
5) Not to deviate from the course of events;
6) Sincerity of the speaker's intention;
7) The plan of the speaker to convey his intentions to the listener;
8) Adaptation of the speaker to the communication environment;
9) To form the structure in accordance with the semantic norms of a particular language.

Apparently, almost all of the conditions that J. Serl distinguishes are non-linguistic in nature, with only the latter mentioning the linguistic form that forms the speech structure. From this it can be concluded that the effect of verbal actions is mainly related to factors of nonlinear appearance. In order to fully interpret this conclusion, please compare the semantic structure of the expression of a pragmatic function with that of a promised speech actinic (see Table 2).

2 - Table

Semantic Rules	Promise Act	Please Act
Propositional Content Rule	The speaker performs the expected action	The listener performs the expected action
Preparatory rule	The listener wants (or does not want) the expected action to be performed by the speaker	The speaker wants the listener to be close to him and the request to be performed without words.
The rule of sincerity	The speaker is ready to perform the promised action	The speaker waits for the requested action to be performed.
Substantive rules	This speech act is taken as a promise to fulfill the obligation taken by the speaker.	The speech structure pronounced by the speaker is the desire to motivate the listener to a certain action.

The theory of speech acts plays an important role in the study of communication systems. Indeed, this theory takes into account factors such as the illocutive purpose, the intentions of the interlocutors, and their mental state, and social status, level of knowledge and communication environment. A pragmatic analysis of discursive activity accepts a speech act as a speech structure with an intentional character. In such an approach, the goal of pragmatic analysis of discourse is to describe the units that make up the context of communication. Because "the influence of these factors on the knowledge applied by the participants of communication in the process of discursive activity is unique" (Juchkov 2004: 18).

It is well known that in a normative communication environment, the speaker, while performing an illocutive act, seeks ways

to link his or her speech movement with other actions. Such "binding" actions have been termed "linguistic act" in linguistics (Stubbs 1983: 149). These acts are performed at two levels, semantic and pragmatic. For this reason, locutive and illocutive discursive acts are distinguished.

CONCLUSIONS:

In our opinion, the most concise and easy-to-use classification of speech acts is formed by G. G. Pocheptsov. In his textbook Theoretical Grammar of the English Language, published in 1981, the scientist notes the interdependence of structural, semantic and pragmatic aspects of speech, emphasizing the communicative intention, the goal of which is the implementation of a specific linguistic communication function. Ensures the execution of various speech acts related to the speaker's intuition. Different events differ in their illocutive capacity. In relation to these differences, the following speech acts are distinguished (Pocheptsov 1981: 164-291): 1) constitutive (affirmative); 2) promissive (promise); 3) menasiv (threat); 4) performance (congratulations, thanks, apologies, appointment); 5) the directive comes in two forms: injunctive (command) and requisitive (please); 6) quantitative (interrogative pronouns).

Thus, speech acts have been the object of pragmalinguistic research for many years. Research is underway to systematize the theoretical views on the classification of speech acts and to find a methodological basis for their application in practice.

REFERENCES:

1) Arutyunova N.D. Discourse // Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. / Ch. ed. V.N. Yartseva, - M.: Sov. Encyclopedia, 1998 . - P. 136-137.

2) Austin J. L. Word as an action // New in foreign linguistics. Issue 17. The theory of speech acts. - M.: Progress, 1986.- P. 22-130.

3) Aznaurova E. S. Pragmatics of the artistic word. - T.: Science, 1988

4) Crystal D. A dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. (5th ed.). – L.: Blackwell, 2008. – 529 p.

5) Hakimov M. Fundamentals of pragmalinguistics of the Uzbek language. - T.: Akademnashr, 2013. – 174p.

6) Horn L. Implicature // the Handbook of Pragmatics. – Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2004. – P. 3-28.

7) Hymes D. Foundations in socilinguistics: an ethnographic approach. – London: Tavistock Publications, 1974. – 238 p.

8) Juchkov D.O. Threat speech act as an object of pragmalinguistic analysis: dis. ... Cand. philol. sciences. - Voronej, 2004 . - 178 p.

9) Matveeva G. G., Lenets A. V., Petrova E. I. Foundations of pragmalinguistics. - M.: Flikta - Science, 2013 . - 232 p.

10) 10 . Pocheptsov G. G. Proposal. In the book: Ivanova I. P., Burlakova V. V., 9. Pocheptsov G. G. Theoretical grammar of modern English. - M.: Higher school, 1981 . - P. 164-281.

11) Pocheptsov G. G. Foundations of the pragmatic description of language. - Kiev: Higher school, 1986 . - 116 p.

12) Safarov Sh. Pragmalinguistics. - T.: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan, 2008. - 300 p.

13) Searle J. Classification of illocutionary acts // New in foreign linguistics. Issue 17. The theory of speech acts. - M.: Progress, 1986 . - P. 170-194.

14) Sinclair J., Coulthard R.M. To Searle J.R. Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philisophy of Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 120 p.

15) Searle J.R., Vanderveken D. Foundations of Illocutionary Logics. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. – 227 p.

16) Stubbs M. Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language. – Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1983. – 272 p.

17) Teun A. Van. Dijk. Tongue. Cognition. Communication. - M.: Progress, 1989. - 312 p.

18) Zernitsky P.V. Four-dimensional space of speech activity // Language, discourse, personality: Interuniversity. Sat. scientific. tr. / Tver, 1990.134 p.