



PRAGMATIC SEMANTICS: LINGUISTIC MEANING AND COMMUNICATIVE CONCEPT

Tlektesov Farit Mukhambetovich

Nukus State Pedagogical Institute,

2nd-year PhD Student

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17596212>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 10th November 2025

Accepted: 11th November 2025

Online: 12th November 2025

KEYWORDS

The foundation of pragmatic semantics is based on the following theoretical sources

ABSTRACT

Language is the most important communicative tool of human thought and social life. In linguistics, semantics has long been formed as a central direction that studies the meaning of words, word combinations, and sentences. However, it later became clear that meaning cannot be explained only through the structural or syntactic properties of language. At this point, pragmatic semantics emerged - that is, a direction that studies meaning in relation to the speech situation, the intentions of the speaker and listener, and the context. Pragmatic semantics explains the meaning of language units through the conditions of their use. It takes into account the speaker's intention, communicative purpose, and social role. Therefore, this direction led semantics to a "human-centered" direction of analysis.

Language is the most important communicative tool of human thought and social life. In linguistics, semantics has long been formed as a central direction that studies the meaning of words, word combinations, and sentences. However, it later became clear that meaning cannot be explained only through the structural or syntactic properties of language. At this point, pragmatic semantics emerged - that is, a direction that studies meaning in relation to the speech situation, the intentions of the speaker and listener, and the context. Pragmatic semantics explains the meaning of language units through the conditions of their use. It takes into account the speaker's intention, communicative purpose, and social role. Therefore, this direction led semantics to a "human-centered" direction of analysis.

In linguistics, semantics studies the meanings in a system of signs, while pragmatics studies how people use those signs. When these two approaches intersect, pragmatic semantics emerges. The American semiotician Charles Morris (1938) divides the semiotic system into three levels: Syntactics - the relationship between signs; Semantics - the study of signs and their meaning; Pragmatics - the study of the relationship between signs and users. Thus, semantics analyzes the internal meaning of language, while pragmatics analyzes meaning in the process of practical use. Pragmatic semantics combines these two directions, turning "meaning" into a dynamic element of the speech act.

The foundation of pragmatic semantics is based on the following theoretical sources:

Speech act theory (J. L. Austin, J. Searle) Austin put forward the concept of performing actions through words in his work "How to Do Things with Words" (1962). Searle divided

speech acts into locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary forms. Cooperative principle (H. P. Grice, 1975). Grice created the theory of implicature to explain hidden meanings in speech. This theory is based on the cooperation between the speaker and the listener. Pragmatic simplification (G. Leech, 1983). Leech in his work "Pragmatics Principles" linked the principles of politeness, pragmatic meaning and speech strategy. Discursive semantics (Levinson, 1987; Sperber and Wilson, 1995). This direction interprets meaning as a phenomenon that is formed in the process of discourse, that is, continuous communication. These theoretical foundations defined the linguistic, psychological, and social foundations of pragmatic semantics.

Traditional semantics studies the lexical meaning of a word, that is, it expresses the general meaning in the language. Pragmatic semantics analyzes the meaning that depends on the context. For example: "Will you close the door?" This sentence is grammatically used as an interrogative, but pragmatically it is used as a request or command. Therefore, meaning is not only a syntactic structure, but also the communicative intention of the speaker.

Context is a decisive factor for pragmatic semantics. It includes the following types: Situational context - the place, time, situation in which speech occurs; Cultural context - the customs, moral standards of the people; Psychological context - the mental state of the speaker and listener; Linguistic context - the preceding and following parts of the text. These factors determine the true meaning of the word. Therefore, the same word has a completely different semantic effect in different contexts: "Good!" - (it can convey the meaning of praise, criticism, sarcasm or indifference).

Presupposition is information that is hidden in a sentence, but known to the participants in the speech. "Ali came again." → "Ali came before" (presupposition). Implicature is the hidden pragmatic meaning that arises from the speaker's intention: "It is cold today." → "Close the window" (implicature). These phenomena are the central units of analysis of pragmatic semantics.

According to the teachings of J. L. Austin and J. Searle, each speech act consists of three parts: Locutionary act - a statement expressed in grammatical form; Illocutionary act - the speaker's intention (command, request, suggestion, advice, etc.); Perlocutionary act - the effect produced in the listener (agreement, surprise, persuasion). Illocutionary meaning is the central concept of pragmatic semantics. For example: "Open the window." → Command (strong illocutionary force), "Please, open the window." → Request (weakened illocutionary force) Thus, pragmatic semantics analyzes not only meaning, but also the force of expression (force).

Searle divides speech acts into five types: Assertives - state a fact; Directives - command, request, advice; Commissives - promise, guarantee, obligation; Expressives - express feelings; Declaratives - create legal or social change. In each type, semantic meaning is combined with pragmatic intention.

Deictic units (I, this, that, there, now) have a variable meaning depending on the context. For example, "I" always refers to the speaker, and "this" always refers to the current location. Thus, deixis is a contextual mechanism of language. Modal words ("maybe", "probably", "certainly") introduce the speaker's subjective assessment into the meaning. They are studied as an attitudinal component of pragmatic semantics. Cognitive semantics studies meaning as a

conceptual model in the mind. Pragmatic semantics answers the question of how this model is used. Thus, cognitive semantics is an internal process, pragmatic semantics is an external one.

Lexical semantics defines the lexical boundaries of the meaning of a word. Pragmatic semantics shows how this meaning changes in context. For example, the word “light”: “light load” — physical weight; “light behavior” — moral assessment (pragmatic meaning). Discourse, as a continuous form of communication, consists of pragmatic units. Therefore, pragmatic semantics forms the microstructural basis of discourse analysis. In Uzbek linguistics, issues of pragmatics and semantics have been actively studied since the 1990s. The following scholars have made significant contributions to this area: N. Mahmudov - revealed the semantic-pragmatic nature of the language in his work “Language System and Speech”. D. Khudoyberganova - analyzed speech acts in the Uzbek language in his work “Pragmatic Meaning and Communicative Intention” (2010). M. Jo’raev - conducted research on speech acts and their illocutionary types in the Uzbek language. A. Nurmonov - sheds light on the relationship between semantics and pragmatics in the connection between language and thought. In the example of the Uzbek language: “Please, come in.” This is grammatically a command, but pragmatically it means respect and invitation. This example reveals the cultural pragmatics of the Uzbek language: the social distance between the speaker and the listener, indicators of etiquette, and respect determine the meaning.

In teaching foreign languages, grammatical correctness is not enough; pragmatic competence — that is, knowing when, to whom, and how to speak — is also important. For example, the English expression “Could you open the window?” is a question in literal translation, but pragmatically it is a request. Pragmatic semantics helps to preserve cultural connotations in translation. “I can’t say no to you” — in English, “I can’t say no to you” — in a pragmatic sense, it means “I can’t refuse you,” and “I like you.”

Pragmatic semantics is a modern direction in linguistics that analyzes meaning in relation to context, intention, and situation. It takes semantic analysis to a new level, interpreting meaning as a dynamic, subjective, and social phenomenon. The importance of this direction is that it allows us to study language units not only at the system level, but also in a real speech situation. For Uzbek linguistics, pragmatic semantics creates an opportunity to involve national culture, speech etiquette, and communication traditions in linguistic analysis. In the future, it is necessary to deeply study cultural codes, evaluative units, implicatures, and discursive contexts in the pragmatics of the Uzbek language.

References:

1. Morris, C. (1938). Foundations of the Theory of Signs. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
2. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford University Press.
3. Searle, J. (1969). Speech Acts. Cambridge University Press.
4. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. Harvard University Press.
5. Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. Longman.
6. Levinson, S. C. (1987). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
7. Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). Relevance: Communication and Cognition. Oxford.
8. Mahmudov, N. (2005). Hozirgi o‘zbek tili. Semantika va pragmatika masalalari. Toshkent: O‘zMU nashriyoti.
9. Xudoyberganova, D. (2010). Pragmatik ma’no va kommunikativ niyat. Toshkent: Fan.

10. Jo'raev, M. (2018). Nutq aktlari va ularning o'zbek tilidagi ifodalanishi. Samarqand: SamDU nashriyoti.
11. Nurmonov, A. (2021). Til va tafakkur: Semantik tizimlar o'zaro aloqasi. Toshkent.
12. Levinson, S. (2017). Interaction and Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
13. Mamajonov, M. (2020). Tilshunoslikda pragmatik yondashuvlar. Farg'ona: FDU nashriyoti.

