РЕЧЕВОЙ АКТ КАК ОДИН ИЗ ОСНОВНЫХ АСПЕКТОВ ПРАГМАЛИНГВИСТИКИ

Рахматуллаева Нафиса Абдималиковна

Лингвистика (английский язык) студент 1 курса магистратуры

В Термезском государственном университете

Аннотация: Речевой акт - это часть прагматики, где есть определенные цели помимо слов или фраз, когда говорящий что-то говорит. Речевые действия - это действия, которые относятся к действию, выполняемому произведенными высказываниями. Люди могут совершить действие, сказав что-то. С помощью речевых действий говорящий может передать физическое действие просто с помощью слов и фраз. Говорящим или слушателям легко определить предполагаемое значение высказываний, если они знакомы с типами речевых актов и их функциями. Следовательно, целью данной статьи является анализ речевых актов средствами прагмалингвистики. Для достижения этой цели используются следующие задачи, такие как определение теории речевого акта; классифицировать типы речевого акта; анализировать различные примеры речевого акта. Итак, в этой статье используются описательные и классификационно-аналитические методы. В результате на соответствующих примерах доступным образом анализируются различные типы речевых актов.

Ключевые слова: прагматика, речевые акты, языковой акт, иллокутивный акт, перлокутивный акт.

SPEECH ACT AS ONE OF THE MAIN ASPECTS OF PRAGMALINGUISTICS

Rakhmatullaeva Nafisa Abdimalikovna

Linguistics (English) 1st course student of Master's degree

At Termez State University

Abstract: Speech act is a part of pragmatics where there are certain aims beyond the words or phrases when a speaker says something. Speech acts are acts that refer

to the action performed by produced utterances. People can perform an action by saying something. Through speech acts, the speaker can convey physical action merely through words and phrases. It is easy for the speakers or listeners to determine the intended meaning of utterances if they are familiar with the types of speech acts and their functions. Hence, the aim of this article is analyzing speech acts from the means of pragmalinguistics. In order to achieve to this goal, following tasks are used such as, to define the speech act theory; to classify types of speech act; to analyze different examples of speech act. So, in this article, descriptive and classification and analyzing methods are utilized. As a result, with appropriate examples various types of speech acts are analyzed comprehensibly.

Key words: pragmatics, speech acts, locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act.

Introduction

Actually, speech act is one of the most developing areas of pragmalinguistics. There are various definitions concerned to speech act by different scholars. For instance, a Scottish- American linguist George Yule defined that speech acts as a "study of how the speakers and hearers use language" [6; p.49]. Kent Bach explains that an action in verbal communication has message in itself, so the communication is not only about language but also with action.

There are certain aims beyond the words or phrases when a speaker says something. The British philosopher John Langshaw Austin explains that speech acts are acts that refer to the action performed by produced utterances. In line with this, George Yule states that "speech act is action which is performed via utterances" [6; p.48]. Here, people can accomplish an action by saying something. Through speech acts, the speaker can express physical action barely through words and phrases. The conveyed utterances are primary to the actions performed. In conclusion, speech act is the utterance that happens and act concerns to an action" [6; p. 47].

So, the aim of this article is analyzing speech acts with different examples from the means of pragmalinguistics. In order to achieve to this goal, following tasks are used such as,

-to define the speech act theory;

-to classify types of speech act;

-to analyze different examples of speech act. So, in this article, descriptive, classification and analyzing methods are utilized.

Methodology

One of the well known Australian philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein arised with the idea of "don't ask for the meaning, ask for the use." showing language as a new vehicle for social activity. Speech act theory hails from Ludwig Wittgenstein's philosophical theories. Wittgenstein trusted meaning derives from pragmatic tradition, displaying the importance of how language is used to achieve objectives within specific situations. By following rules to attain a goal, communication becomes a set of language games. Thus, utterances do more than reflect a meaning, they are words designed to get things done. The work of John Austin, particularly his "How to Do Things with Words", guide philosophers to pay more attention to the non-declarative uses of language. The terminology he coined, especially the notions "locutionary act", "illocutionary act", and "perlocutionary act", captured a significant role in what was then to become the "study of speech acts". All of these three acts, but especially the "illocutionary act", is nowadays commonly classified as "speech acts" [3; p.48].

Results and discussion

One of the issues which has not been clarified yet is its classification. In general, speech acts are grouped according to their illocutive and communicative intentions in pragmalinguistics.

The concept of illocutionary acts was introduced into linguistics by the philosopher John L. Austin in his investigation of the various aspects of speech acts. In John Austin's framework, *locution* is what was said, *illocution* is what was meant, and *perlocution* is what happened as a result. For example, when somebody

says ***"Is there any salt?"*** at the dinner table, the illocutionary act (the meaning conveyed) is effectively ***"please give me some salt"*** even though the locutionary act (the literal sentence) was to ask a question about the presence of salt. The perlocutionary act (the actual effect), was to cause somebody to offer salt.

Speech act is an intentionally activity which is carried out in accordance with the accepted rules in the society. Thus, according to John Austin's theory speech acts can be analyzed on three levels:

1) a locutionary act is the performance of a grammatically correct utterance, and hence of a speech act;

2) an illocutionary act - the performance of an act in saying something: offer, promise,etc.

3) a perlocutionary act - is focused on possible responses in speech act. Bringing about of the effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances [4; p.236].

Here, the 1st level could have a neutral intonation. At the 2nd level intention is added. At the 3rd level there should be the result of any act of speech. For example, after greeting the teacher a student says: "***My mom is coming from the country tomorrow"***. From this sentence one can understand the student's intention; he has to ask a permission not to attend a lesson tomorrow.

In this above given example, if the teacher understands the student's intention she could respond in different ways: "***Well, I permit you not to attend the lesson" (permission); "How could it be?" "Tomorrow is the most important day" (not clear); No, you can't miss the lesson, ask another person to meet your mother! (cut-off response), etc.***

So, an illocutionary act is a speaker's aim to carry out his purposeful action through a phrase. In this case, a speaker can ask the 2nd person to do something, to ask a question, to persuade, to advise, even to judge.

The illocutionary force is the speaker's intention. Accordingly, the main factor is the intention of the speaker. A speaker can match his illocutive intention in accordance with addresser's response. For instance, speech act which is

commented before could have the following models: the teacher: *"I need you tomorrow".*

Student A: *"My mom is coming tomorrow".*

B: *"My mom will come tomorrow!".*

C: *"If mom doesn't come from the country tomorrow?"*

From the student's responses one can understand that in model A he didn't show his resistance directly, in model B he showed his resistance , in model C he is not sure and he has a doubt. From these responses we see that a speaker can show his illocutive intention using intonation, morphological method, interrogative constructions.

Here another example of the locutionary speech act can be seen in the following sentences:

1. It's so messy in this room.

2. The suitcase is heavy.

The above given two sentences represent the actual condition. The first sentence refers to mess of the room and the second sentence refers to the weight of the suitcase.

Illocutionary act can be the real description of interaction condition. To illustrate:

1. It's so messy in this room.

2. The suitcase is heavy.

Based on the examples above, the first sentence shows a request to clean the room and the second sentence shows a request to lift up the suitcase.

A perlocutionary act is specific to the circumstances of issuance, and is therefore not conventionally achieved just by uttering that especial utterance, and comprises all those effects, intended or unintended, often indeterminate, that some particular utterance in a particular situation cause. For example:

1. It's so messy in this room.

2. The suitcase is heavy.

Based on the example it can be inferred that the first sentence is uttered by someone while cleaning the room and the second sentence is done by someone while lifting up the suitcase.

There are several types of classifications about speech acts in linguistics. According to a widespread opinion, an adequate and useful account of "illocutionary acts" has been provided by student of John Austin, American philosopher, John Searle. John Searle classified them in the following way in his work "Classification of illocutive acts":

•assertives: they commit the speaker to something being the case - **I believe;**

•directives: they try to make the addressee perform an action- *I command you; promise; I sentence you to death;*

•expressives: they express how the speaker feels about the situation- *Thank you; I am sorry for what I have done;*

• declaratives: solutions of certain issues- *You are fired; Don't waste your time on that; I advise you to take my advice"* [4; p.240].

Moreover, N.I. Farmanovskaya grouped 7 types of speech act:

1) Representatives - posts, messages: *"I'm a good guy", the intention of this utterance is to show that the speaker is to make believe the hearer that the speaker is a good guy.*

2) commisives - requirements: *I promise to be on time*

3) directives - orders: *"Could you lend me a pen?"*

4) requests - questions: *"Could you pass me the mashed potatoes, please?"*

5) declaratives - ads: "*Referee: You are out*"

6) contactives - etiquette of speaking *"Hi, Emma. How are things going"* [5; p.1].

Apparently, due to above given classifications speech acts may be also sub-classified as follow:

- according to the intention speech act can be direct or indirect;
- according to the features of messages: informative and uninformative;

- according to relations between speakers speech act is divided into status marked (to order, to demand, to request, to pray); status neutral(to report, to describe, to specify);

- according to social communication Dj. Leech classifies 4 types of speech act: speech act based on competitiveness (to demand, to order); 2) speech acts based on festive occasions (apologies, congratulations, etc.); 3) speech acts based on cooperation(messages, instructions, etc.); 4) speech acts based on conflicts (threatening, harassing, etc.) [3;p.52].

The theory of speech acts is partly taxonomic and partly explanatory. It must systematically classify types of speech acts and the ways in which they can succeed or fail. It must reckon with the fact that the relationship between the words being utilized and the force of their utterance is often biased. For example, the sentence *"This is a pig sty"* might be used non - literally to say that a certain room is messy and filthy and, further, to demand indirectly that it be straightened out and cleaned up. Even when this sentence is used literally and directly, say to describe a certain area of a barnyard, the content of its utterance is not fully established by its linguistic meaning-in particular, the meaning of the word "this" does not determine which area is being concerned to. A major task for the theory of speech acts is to account for how speakers can accomplish in what they do despite the various ways in which linguistic meaning under determines use.

Conclusion

To sum up, speech acts are acts of communication. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses regret. As an act of communication, a speech act succeeds if the audience identifies, in accordance with the speaker's intention, the attitude being expressed. The ability to understand the hidden message of utterance is really important to have. Some words or utterances could be misdirected into something unpleasant if we are not careful. By understanding pragmatics and speech acts we can get clearer understanding of the

utterances. So, in conclusion, in this article speech act theory and its types are defined, analyzed with adequate examples.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1962.
- Bach, K. and R. M. Harnish. Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts,Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. 1979.
- Kalbike Esenova "Pragmalinguistic studies in linguistics" Editions du JIPTO Academie Internationale CONCORDE, 2017.
- Levinson S. "Pragmatics" Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press' New York.1983.19th printing 2008.
- Yu. S. Stepanov. In search of pragmatics problem of subject. Academy of Science .USSR.Literature and language 1981: - T. 40, № 4. – pp 325-332.
- Yule G. Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1996.