

RESEARCH ARTICLE

# The Formation and Theoretical Foundations of Linguopragmatics In Uzbek Linguistics

**Khasanova Yulduz Mukhtor kizi**

Dr. (PhD) in Philology, Associate Professor at Navoiy State University, Uzbekistan

**VOLUME:** Vol.06 Issue05 2026

**PAGE:** 148-151

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Philological Sciences, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

## Abstract

The article examines the philosophical and linguistic origins of linguopragmatics, its formation in Western linguistics, and its reception and adaptation in Uzbek linguistics. The views of classical theorists (J. Austin, J. Searle, S. Levinson, J. Mey, G. Yule) are compared with the research of Uzbek linguists (Sh. Safarov, M. Hakimov, N. Mahmudov). Three main stages in the formation of linguopragmatics as an independent direction in Uzbek linguistics are identified.

## KEY WORDS

Linguopragmatics, speech act theory, deixis, context, Sh. Safarov, M. Hakimov, Uzbek linguistics.

## INTRODUCTION

Linguopragmatics, defined broadly as the study of language use in context, has become one of the most rapidly developing branches of modern linguistics. Its emergence as a distinct discipline marked a fundamental shift in linguistic thought: the focus moved from language as an abstract formal system to language as a social and cognitive activity carried out by speakers and addressees in concrete communicative situations [5, 4-6; 8, 1-6].

In Uzbek linguistics, the systematic study of pragmatic phenomena began in the late 1990s and early 2000s, reaching its full institutional recognition with the publication of Sh. Safarov's monograph *Pragmalingvistika* (2008) and M. Hakimov's textbook *O'zbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari* (2013). These works established linguopragmatics as a legitimate sub-field within Uzbek philological scholarship, synthesizing Western theoretical foundations with the specifics of the Uzbek linguistic and cultural context [10, 8-12; 11, 3-25].

The present article aims to trace the formation and theoretical foundations of linguopragmatics in Uzbek linguistics. The

study has three objectives: (1) to identify the philosophical and linguistic origins of pragmatics as a discipline; (2) to outline the contributions of major Western theorists whose works became foundational for Uzbek pragmatic research; and (3) to analyze how Uzbek linguists have received, interpreted, and adapted these foundations to the study of the Uzbek language.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The philosophical roots of pragmatics are traceable to C. S. Peirce's semiotic theory and to C. W. Morris's tripartite division of semiotics into syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, the latter being defined as the study of the relations between signs and their interpreters. The modern linguistic discipline of pragmatics, however, emerged primarily from the ordinary language philosophy of J. L. Austin and J. R. Searle, who reframed utterances as actions rather than as descriptions of states of affairs [1, 1-12; 3, 22-71].

The 1971 Dordrecht conference *Pragmatics of Natural Languages*, edited by Y. Bar-Hillel, marked a watershed

moment, as participants reached consensus that the pragmatic features of natural-language communication must be studied within linguistic theory on the same footing as syntactic and semantic features [12, 99-100]. Subsequent foundational textbooks by S. Levinson (1983), G. Yule (1996), and J. Mey (1993, 2001) consolidated pragmatics as a teachable and researchable field [5, 1-35; 8, 3-7; 9, 5-9].

In the Russian-language linguistic tradition, which has strongly influenced Uzbek scholarship, the contributions of N. D. Arutyunova, Yu. S. Stepanov, and G. V. Kolshansky shaped the early reception of Western pragmatic ideas, with particular emphasis on the role of the subject of speech and the anthropocentric paradigm in language. Within Uzbek linguistics proper, Sh. Safarov's *Pragmalingvistika* (2008) provided the first comprehensive monograph in the field, while M. Hakimov's *O'zbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari* (2013) offered the first systematic textbook [10; 11]. N. Mahmudov's *Tilning tilsimi tadqiqi* (2017) extended the anthropocentric approach to Uzbek discourse [13, 78-179].

## **METHODS**

The present study employs historical-analytical, comparative-typological, and descriptive methods. The historical-analytical method is used to trace the genealogy of pragmatic ideas from Peirce and Morris through Austin and Searle to contemporary Uzbek scholarship. The comparative-typological method allows juxtaposing the treatments of pragmatic categories in Western and Uzbek traditions. The descriptive method serves to characterize the conceptual content of the key works under discussion.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The analysis identifies three main stages in the formation of linguopragmatics in Uzbek linguistics, each shaped by a distinct set of Western theoretical influences and local scholarly priorities.

### **1. The Philosophical and Linguistic Origins**

The earliest stratum of pragmatic thought belongs to the philosophy of language. J. L. Austin, in his posthumously published lectures *How to Do Things with Words* (1962), argued against what he called the descriptive fallacy, namely the assumption that the principal function of language is to describe states of affairs. Austin opened the lectures with characteristic modesty: "What I shall have to say here is neither difficult nor contentious; the only merit I should like to

claim for it is that of being true, at least in parts" [1, 1]. He proceeded to distinguish performative from constative utterances, and ultimately to develop the triad of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts that became the cornerstone of speech act theory [1, 94-108].

J. R. Searle, in *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (1969), systematized and extended Austin's framework. Searle explicitly positioned his project within the philosophy of language rather than linguistic philosophy: "The philosophy of language is the attempt to give philosophically illuminating descriptions of certain general features of language, such as reference, truth, meaning, and necessity" [3, 4]. His subsequent taxonomy of illocutionary acts (1976) distinguished five basic types: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations [4, 1-23]. This taxonomy became the standard reference point for all subsequent speech act research, including in Uzbek linguistics.

### **2. The Classical Pragmatic Agenda**

S. C. Levinson's *Pragmatics* (1983) gave the field its first comprehensive textbook. Levinson organized the discipline around five central topics: deixis, conversational implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and conversational structure [5, vii-x]. The chapter on deixis defined the phenomenon as the way in which "features of the context of utterance or speech event" are encoded grammatically or lexically, and proposed the now-canonical five-fold classification into person, place, time, social, and discourse deixis [5, 54-96].

G. Yule's *Pragmatics* (1996) offered a more accessible introduction, opening with the famous definition: "Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said" [8, 3]. J. Mey's *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (1993, 2nd ed. 2001) emphasized the societal dimension, defining pragmatics as the study of "the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society" [9, 6]. These three textbooks together constitute the canonical reference set for the field as taught in universities worldwide, including in Uzbekistan.

### **3. Reception and Adaptation in Uzbek Linguistics**

Uzbek linguopragmatics took shape through three successive stages. The first stage, in the 1990s and early 2000s, involved the translation and selective integration of Russian and Western pragmatic concepts into existing structuralist and

stylistic frameworks. During this period, the foundational vocabulary of pragmatics, including *nutqiy akt* (speech act), *deyxis*, *presuppozitsiya*, and *implikatura*, entered Uzbek scientific discourse [12, 99-101].

The second stage, marked by Sh. Safarov's monograph *Pragmalingvistika* (2008), established linguopragmatics as a coherent disciplinary field with its own object, methods, and theoretical apparatus. Safarov synthesized Austin, Searle, Grice, Levinson, and van Dijk into a unified treatment, while addressing specifically the pragmatic categories observable in Uzbek discourse [10, 28-194]. The third stage, consolidated by M. Hakimov's *O'zbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari* (2013), produced the first systematic textbook for Uzbek university students, covering speech act classifications, pragmatic categories, and discourse-pragmatic analysis with extensive Uzbek-language material [11, 41-167].

Parallel and subsequent developments include N. Mahmudov's *Tilning tilsimi tadqiqi* (2017), which embedded pragmatic analysis within the broader anthropocentric paradigm of Uzbek linguistics [13, 78-179], and a growing body of doctoral dissertations applying pragmatic methods to various genres of Uzbek discourse including literary prose, media texts, legal language, and political rhetoric [14, 152-160]. The discipline thus moved from translation and borrowing to genuine local theoretical production.

### CONCLUSION

The formation of linguopragmatics in Uzbek linguistics represents a distinctive case of academic disciplinary transfer and adaptation. Three main conclusions follow from the present analysis.

First, Uzbek linguopragmatics rests on a triple theoretical foundation: the Anglo-American philosophy of language (Austin, Searle), the British and American classical pragmatic textbook tradition (Levinson, Yule, Mey), and the Russian-language anthropocentric tradition (Arutyunova, Stepanov, Kolshansky). The Uzbek scholars Safarov, Hakimov, and Mahmudov have synthesized these three streams into a coherent local research program.

Second, the development of the discipline has proceeded in three stages: (1) the selective integration of foreign concepts (1990s and early 2000s); (2) the consolidation of a monographic and textbook tradition (Safarov 2008, Hakimov 2013); and (3) the emergence of original empirical research on Uzbek-language material (2010s and 2020s). Each stage

added depth to the field while gradually shifting the center of gravity from theoretical borrowing to local investigation.

Third, the current research agenda of Uzbek linguopragmatics includes the pragmatic analysis of speech acts in Uzbek literary, media, and legal discourse, the typology of deictic categories in Uzbek, the study of subtext (*tagma'no*), and intercultural-pragmatic comparison. These directions both extend the classical pragmatic agenda and contribute distinctively Uzbek elements, such as the elaborate treatment of indirect meaning and social deixis, to the international discussion.

### REFERENCES

1. Austin J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962. – 1-166 pp.
2. Peirce C. S. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Vols. 1-8. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931-1958. – pp. 227-308 (Vol. 2).
3. Searle J. R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 1-203 pp.
4. Searle J. R. *A Classification of Illocutionary Acts // Language in Society*, 1976. – Vol. 5, No. 1. – pp. 1-23.
5. Levinson S. C. *Pragmatics*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 1-420 pp.
6. Lyons J. *Semantics*. Vol. 2. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. – pp. 636-724.
7. Grice H. P. *Logic and Conversation // Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts / Ed. by P. Cole, J. L. Morgan*. – New York: Academic Press, 1975. – pp. 41-58.
8. Yule G. *Pragmatics*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. – 1-138 pp.
9. Mey J. L. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. – 1-392 pp.
10. Safarov Sh. *Pragmalingvistika*. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Entsiklopediyasi, 2008. – 1-300 b.
11. Hakimov M. X. *O'zbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari*. – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2013. – 1-200 b.
12. Vosiljonov A. B. *Pragmalingvistika va uning tahliliy shakllanish tarixi // Science and Innovation*, 2022. – Vol. 1, Issue 8. – pp. 99-103.

- 13.** Mahmudov N. M. Tilning tilsimi tadqiqi. – Toshkent: Mumtoz soʻz, 2017. – 1-221 b.
- 14.** Nazirqulova D. Z. Oʻzbek mediadiskursining lingvopragmatik xususiyatlari: nutq aktlari tahlili // UzSWLU Conference Proceedings, 2025. – Vol. 1, No. 6. – pp. 152-160.
- 15.** Eshdavlatova A. Z. Pragmalingvistika va uning shakllanish tarixi // International European Conference Proceedings, 2023. – pp. 408-411.