

LINGUOPRAGMATIC FEATURES AND UNITS: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND PRACTICAL INTERPRETATIONS

Rasulov Zubaydullo Izomovich

Doctor of Science, Professor Bukhara state universiteti

Bukhara, Uzbekistan

ORCID ID 0000-0003-0554-1319

email: z.i.rasulov@buxdu.uz

G`ayratova Oybegim O`ktam qizi

I year student of master degree

gayratovaoybegim@gmail.com

Linguopragmatic features occupy a central position in modern linguistic research because they reveal how language operates not only as a formal system of signs but as a dynamic medium of human interaction. The concept of linguopragmatics emerges from the intersection of linguistics, semantics, and pragmatics, concentrating on the communicative functions of language and on how meaning is shaped in real contexts of use. Rather than focusing only on the formal or structural aspects of language, linguopragmatics addresses how speakers and listeners deploy linguistic resources in actual communication, taking into account intention, inference, politeness, presupposition, speech acts, implicature, and other pragmatic categories.

One of the key milestones in the development of this field was set by H. P. Grice in his famous article “Logic and Conversation”, where he introduced the Cooperative Principle and conversational maxims. Grice’s maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner became foundational tools to explain how speakers convey more than they literally say, and how listeners infer additional meaning based on shared assumptions⁵. This idea of conversational implicature directly contributes to the understanding of linguopragmatic features: what is meant often exceeds what is explicitly uttered. Later, S. C. Levinson systematized and expanded pragmatic theory, highlighting the relationship between grammar, context, and inference. His book “Pragmatics” remains a fundamental reference, offering insights into deixis, presupposition, implicature, and speech acts, all of which represent key components of linguopragmatic analysis⁶.

The contributions of Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson in their work on politeness theory also deeply influenced linguopragmatic research. Their concept of

⁵ Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.

⁶ Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

“face” and politeness strategies—positive and negative— explain how social relationships are negotiated through linguistic choices. Politeness as a linguopragmatic phenomenon demonstrates the interaction between language, culture, and social hierarchy⁷. For example, English speakers often mitigate requests with modal verbs (“Could you possibly...?”), Russian speakers use diminutive or respectful forms (“Будьте добры”), while Uzbek speakers rely on honorifics and culturally rooted phrases of deference (“Marhamat qiling,” “Ilm ahli sifatida...”).

In the Russian linguistic tradition, the pragmalinguistic dimension was further developed by scholars such as Nina Arutyunova and Olga Issers. Arutyunova’s works *Предложение и его смысл*⁸ and *Контекст и семантика*⁹ provide a profound analysis of illocutionary force and modal meanings. She emphasized that the utterance is not a mere syntactic structure but a communicative act embedded in context. Olga Issers, in her influential book *Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи*, examined the typology of communicative strategies and tactics used in Russian speech. Her approach clearly falls within linguopragmatics, since it reveals how linguistic forms serve strategic and intentional functions in everyday discourse¹⁰.

Uzbek linguistics has also made significant contributions, especially through the works of Sh. R. Safarov and Z. I. Rasulov. Safarov’s monograph *Прагмалингвистика* systematically introduces pragmatic theory into the Uzbek context, examining speech acts, presupposition, and communicative intent. His analyses highlight how traditional Uzbek communicative norms shape pragmatic meaning, particularly through indirect requests and metaphorical expressions¹¹. Zubaydullo Izomovich Rasulov, in his work *Прагматик таҳлилнинг назарий асослари*, developed theoretical foundations for pragmatic analysis with a focus on Uzbek. He explored dialogic speech, communicative intent, politeness, indirectness, and cultural codes, showing that linguopragmatic analysis is crucial for understanding Uzbek communicative behavior¹².

A comparison across English, Russian, and Uzbek illustrates the universality of linguopragmatic categories while also showing cultural variation. For instance, the speech act of apologizing differs: English “I’m sorry,” Russian “Извините,” Uzbek “Uzr so‘rayman.” Each expression not only conveys regret but also indexes politeness, respect,

⁷ Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

⁸ Arutyunova, N. D. (1976). *Предложение и его смысл: Логико-семантические проблемы*. Москва: Наука.

⁹ Arutyunova, N. D. (1988). *Контекст и семантика*. Москва: Наука.

¹⁰ Issers, O. S. (1999). *Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи*. Москва: URSS.

¹¹ Safarov, Sh. R. (2008). *Прагмалингвистика*. Тошкент: Фан.

¹² Rasulov, Z. I. (2019). *Прагматик таҳлилнинг назарий асослари*. Тошкент: Фан ва технология.

and acknowledgment of social hierarchy. Similarly, presupposition works cross-linguistically: English “Have you stopped smoking?”, Russian “Ты опять опоздал?”, Uzbek “Yana uchrashuvga kech qoldingmi?”

Another vital feature is deixis, which ties linguistic expressions to the context of utterance. In English: “this/that,” “now/then”; in Russian: “этот/тот,” “сейчас/тогда”; in Uzbek: “bu/u,” “hozir/o‘sha payt.” Deixis reflects cultural perceptions of space and social distance.

The integration of Grice’s implicatures, Levinson’s presuppositions and deixis, Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory, Arutyunova’s logical-pragmatic semantics, Issers’s communicative strategies, and Safarov and Rasulov’s Uzbek-specific insights provides a comprehensive picture of linguopragmatic features. These include speech acts, implicatures, presuppositions, politeness strategies, communicative strategies and tactics, deixis, indirectness, and pragmatic markers. Together, they form a set of linguopragmatic units that operate across languages and cultures.

Thus, linguopragmatics can be defined as the study of how linguistic forms function in actual communication, reflecting the interplay between speaker intent, listener interpretation, and cultural norms. The field unites universal pragmatic categories with language-specific realizations, offering insights into intercultural communication, discourse analysis, and translation studies.

Linguopragmatic Features	Linguopragmatic Units	Example Source
Context-dependence	Deixis (person, time, place, discourse)	“I will go there tomorrow.” (I, there, tomorrow depend on speech situation) Levinson, Pragmatics (1983)
Communicativeness	Speech acts (request, order, question, advice)	“Could you open the window, please?” (request) Austin, How to Do Things with Words (1962)

Interactivity	Presupposition (background assumptions)	“John stopped smoking.” (presupposes John used to smoke) Yule, Pragmatics (1996/2017)
Speaker’s intention (illocution)	Implicature (implied meanings)	“It’s cold in here.” (implies: close the window) Grice, Logic and Conversation (1975)
Sociality	Forms of address, modality markers	“Sir, could you help me?” (Sir shows politeness and status) Brown & Levinson, Politeness (1987)

REFERENCES

1. Arutyunova, N. D. (1976). Предложение и его смысл: Логико-семантические проблемы. Москва: Наука.
2. Arutyunova, N. D. (1988). Контекст и семантика. Москва: Наука.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics, Volume 3: Speech Acts (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
5. Issers, O. S. (1999). Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. Москва: URSS.
6. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Rasulov, Z. I. (2019). Прагматик тахлилнинг назарий асослари. Тошкент: Фан ва технология.
7. Safarov, Sh. R. (2008). Прагмалингвистика. Тошкент: Фан.