

PRAGMATIC ASPECTS IN THE STUDY OF PASSIVE CONSTRUCTION

Toshboyeva Munojat Erkinovna

English faculty 1, Department of English Applied Subjects 1

E-mail: munoj_80@mail.ru

Uzbekistan state world languages university

Abstract. *This study provides a comprehensive study of passive designs. The main goal of the study is to establish the pragmatic features of passive constructions in the English language.*

Key words: *passive constructions, comprehensive study, pragmatic features, communicative situation, a generic concept, fragment of the text, special semantics.*

At this stage, we will try to understand the theoretical concept and principles of realizing the pragmatic potential of the passive construction in political discourse. Pragmatics is a field of research in semiotics and linguistics that studies the functioning of linguistic signs in speech. This area does not have clear boundaries; it includes a set of issues that are related to the speaking subject, the addressee, their interaction in communication, and the communication situation [Linguistics 1998: 390]. I.P. Susov believes that pragmatics is a relationship of mutual dependence between the units of the language system and the communicative-pragmatic context of speech and text communication. Context is formed by the presence of participants, time and setting. This area deals with concepts such as communicative intentions, expectations, strategies and tactics [Susov 1990: 125].

In addition, V.N. Komissarov expressed the idea that the information that the recipient perceives when entering into a personal relationship with the text is called pragmatic [Komissarov 2004: 205]. Due to the lack of clear boundaries, pragmatics primarily includes issues related to the communicative situation. The recipient, who perceives information from oral or written discourse, plays a major role in pragmatics. The ability of discourse to produce a communicative effect, to evoke in the recipient a substantive and specific relationship to the communicated information is called the pragmatic aspect of discourse. The term “discourse” is convenient as a generic concept that unites all types of language use [Khalizev 2002: 3].

In modern linguistics, there are a number of approaches that define the problem of discourse. E.S. Kubryakov in the book “Discourse, Speech, Speech Activity”

1. Structural-syntactic approach: discourse is a fragment of the text, that is, the formation of a higher level of sentence

2. Structural-stylistic approach: discourse as the organization of speech, which is characterized by the predominance of associative connections, spontaneity, situationality, high contextuality and stylistic specificity.

3. Communicative approach: discourse is verbal communication (dialogue, conversation) [Kubryakova 2000: 7].

It is worth noting that discourse exists in texts that contain special grammar, special vocabulary, special rules of syntax, and special semantics. To identify individual parameters and levels of discourse, structural theoretical research is used. Some levels of discourse are usually described by the methods of linguistic grammars, that is, systems and rules for the theoretical analysis of sounds, words, syntactic structures, as well as their meanings. Thanks to this, we obtain a phonological and

semantic description of sentences. In the study of special types of discourses such as newspaper news, there is a description of not just structures, but grammatical structures that are typical for a given discourse. A grammatical analysis of the press text also reveals the general orientation of the messages of any journalist or the entire newspaper.

The syntax of a sentence reflects the distribution of semantic roles of participants in an event; this may be the order of words or different functional correlations of elements (subject, object), the use of active or passive voice. In a title like Police kills demonstrator - the police kill a demonstrator, the police occupy the position of a subject, which indicates the role of an agent, a figure. In the passive voice Demonstrator was killed by police - The police are given a less significant role here. There is such an option as Demonstrator killed - The demonstrator is killed, due to which the police appear behind the scenes, syntactic ambiguity arises. It can be understood as describing an event in which the killer was a demonstrator, or generally associating demonstrators with murder. Journalists try to use such downgrading syntactic structures and implicit phrases to hide the negative roles of the ruling elite [T.A. van Dijk 2000: 125].

Yu.S. Stepanov notes that discourse appears in the form of an “alternative world.” In our work, political discourse is of particular interest. To carry out political communication, a special sign system of language is needed, which will be understood as discourse. However, pointing to the statute of the political language, which is located in the national language system, scientists rely on its duality. A.P. Chudinov proposed a definition of political discourse as “a subsystem of the national language intended for political communication: propaganda of ideas, emotive influence of citizens and their subsequent encouragement to political action, development of public consensus [Chudinov 2007: 18].

E.I. Sheigal believes that there is a special political sociolect. Based on this definition, the concepts can be divided and combined as “languages of politics” and “political language”. Being a professional sublanguage, it must strive for accuracy of designation [Sheigal 2000: 312]. It should be taken into account that the political sociolect does not contain specific vocabulary. Here it can be noted that political language can be considered as a functionally determined language and jargon, determined by a group’s ideology characteristic of it. Due to pragmatic features and the addressee factor, political language contributes to the organization of a political institution, the main goal of which is to maintain and consolidate power. The central element of political discourse is the linguistic personality, that is, a specific political figure.

The structure of discourse is viewed differently by scholars. It is represented as an exchange of speech actions, phases of linguistic interaction [Makarov 2003: 174–182]. From another point of view, the problem is that known attempts to create a structure of discourse are often confused in one typology of a unit of speech and a unit of discourse. Therefore, according to T.A. van Dijk, neither a text nor a statement are units of discourse; their role is played by communicative events and communicative acts. In communicative events, the speaker and listener, their personal and social characteristics, and other aspects of the social situation are taken into account. A significant element of discourse is a speech event, which is a completed verbal communication, a conversation, which corresponds in speech to a macro-dialogue or text [T.A. van Dijk 2000: 340].

A speech event means that people use language to convey an idea or belief or express an emotion. Thus, examples of a speech event are oral and written discourses: negotiations, telephone conversations, conversations with a doctor, texts of letters [ibid]. The minimal unit of discourse is considered to be a rethought speech act, which is the speech interaction of the speaker and the listener to achieve certain perlocutionary goals of the speaker by constructing discursive meaning in the course of communication. A speech act consists of aspects of the addresser and addressee,

illocutionary, denotative, locutionary, intentional, situational, contextual, metacommunicative aspects and unfolds according to a certain cognitive scenario, taking into account pragmatic presuppositions. A speech act seems quite adequate to designate a minimal unit of discourse, since, on the one hand, the cognitive-discursive approach provides its new interpretation, sufficiently adequate for discourse analysis, on the other hand, the long-term tradition of use in scientific literature makes it a convenient means of linguistic description. There are doubts that pragmatics is an independent direction, that the pragmatic aspect is neither separated from linguistics nor added as a new component.

Pragmatics is the essence of linguistic research. Based on the general, speech acts are the subject of linguistic pragmatics [Bulygina 1981: 339]. Charles Morris believed that pragmatics is the relationship of signs to those who interpret them. In the following, we may notice that the terms “syntactics”, “semantics” and “pragmatics” have ambiguities, which complicates the understanding of the problem in this area. C. Morris further proposed to understand “pragmatics” as the study of “the origin, uses, and effects of signs” [Bulygina 1981: 218]. The term “pragmatics” was first proposed by Charles Morris. R. Carnap's definition had similar features to the early formulation of Charles Morris: “If the study makes explicit reference to the speaker or person using the language, then we are dealing with pragmatics” [ibid.]. R. Carnap believed that pragmatics uses an empirical research method. In further development, one can see the emergence of “formal pragmatics”, where attention is focused on deictic expressions; based on this concept, language is presented in the form of an interpreted system, the meaning of which lies in the attribution of denotation to each expression belonging to this system. For a long time, the study of indexical elements was considered the main task of pragmatics, and the tasks of pragmatics also include the study of speech acts. Philosophers such as J. Austin, J. Searle, and G. Grice took part in the development of the theory of speech acts. The main unit in the theory of speech acts is the performance of a certain kind of action, such as a request, statement, question, order, expression of gratitude, apology, congratulations, and so on.

Such actions are called illocutionary acts, which are contrasted with perlocutionary ones [Stepanov 1981: 280]. J. Yule believes that the illocutionary act is carried out through the communicative force of the utterance, which is also known as illocutionary force [Yule 1996: 48]. When considering the perlocutionary act, it was noticed that it changes the state, behavior of the addressee, influencing the addressee. In illocutionary acts, the purpose of which may be a perlucutive effect (a message about something or a statement intended to convince the interlocutor of something) an illocutionary act represents the actual speech act, clearly limited from the perlucutive [Yule 1996: 70]. Illocutionary force can be expressed using grammatical means (mood, special interrogative sentence structure, intonation), but the explicit expression of illocutionary force is not limited to this.

There is another type of statement containing explicit indicators, which J. Austin called performative (statements equivalent to action). The performative is one of the central concepts of pragmatics [<http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/372c.html>]. The performative enters the context of life events, creating a social, communicative or interpersonal situation that entails certain consequences. Examples of performatives include declarations of war, declarations, wills, oaths, oaths, apologies, administrative and military orders. To say “I swear” means that a person binds himself with an oath.

The action corresponding to the performative is carried out by the speech act itself. Thus, an oath is impossible without pronouncing its text. In this sense, performatives are self-referential. In speech act theory, there are indirect and direct acts. In a direct act, the speaker literally expresses his thought; in an indirect act, the speaker wants to say something more than he says. The speech act, in the understanding of J. Austin, is divided into three levels: locutionary, illocutionary and perlucutive

act. J. Searle continued the works of his teacher. He made significant changes to the theory of speech acts. It is worth highlighting his proposed model of the structure of a speech act, where distinctions were made.

- 1) the act of utterance (locution), removing the semantic component from here;
- 2) propositional act;
- 3) illocutionary act;
- 4) perlocutionary act.

A propositional act reports a state of affairs in the world in the past, present, or future. Proposition is carried out in two private acts - the act of reference and the act of predication [<http://homepages.tv>: 2015].

Many researchers consider pragmatics as a part of grammar that has rules or so-called strategies for the necessary interpretation of remarks in a conversation [Yule 1996: 90]. The following factors in this interpretation are identified, such as the motivation of statements and conversation strategies and classes of speech means. Earlier in our work it was mentioned that the delivery of this or that information is a key feature of political discourse. Probably, in the early stages of language development, information was used as a means of manipulation [Issers 1996: 71]. The study of manipulation dates back to the work of psychologists, sociologists, and political scientists. Manipulation is assessed by scientists as an influence that encourages a person to do something (report information, commit an act, change his behavior) unconsciously or contrary to his own desire, opinion, intention [Troshina 1990: 72]. Influence within the framework of institutional communication can be exercised through agitation, propaganda, demagoguery, persuasion, suggestion and suggestion, neurolinguistic programming.

Speech manipulation is a type of linguistic influence that is used to covertly introduce into the recipient's psyche goals, desires, intentions, relationships or attitudes that do not coincide with those that the addressee currently has [Veretenkina 1999: 99]. A tool of speech manipulation is understood as any verbal sign that, in a certain context and sense, can have the necessary impact on the addressee. It is natural for a person to use a word to influence his interlocutor, whether consciously or not. The true meaning of speech manipulation lies in its purposeful use; in order to successfully carry out this process, the sender must be able to use manipulation tools. Functioning at the grammatical level, the possibilities of morphology and syntax can be used.

Among morphological means, it is necessary to note the use of passive voice instead of active voice. The principle of its operation is similar to the lexical tool of speech manipulation, such as nominalization, leave the responsible person (persons). For example, (23) ... Arab Australians and Muslim Australians from other backgrounds began to be subject to a highly increased level of violence and even assault in public places. In this sentence, the subject of the action is not mentioned, remains behind the scenes due to the passive voice: began to be subjected, that is, "began to be subjected," but who the agent is is unknown. Nominalization, which allows one to exclude from the description the most important aspects of the situation being described (implicitly conveying information regarding the actors of the situation, the consequences of certain actions), is manipulative in nature [Baranov 2007: 130]. The choice of active or passive voice may have an implicit effect on the addressee's perception of causal relationships. The grammatical form turns out to be decisive in the perception and understanding of the situation. In the active voice the attention is focused on the agent, in the passive voice on the patient [<http://siberia-expert.com/>].

The passive voice form hides the origin of the process from the outside. The form of the active voice, on the contrary, directly expresses the process itself, since the process is inseparable from the

agent, the latter, as a rule, is expressed explicitly [Stehling 1978: 23]. G.N. Govorova argues that the passive is vague, thereby introducing uncertainty [Govorova 2006: 21-22]. To the means of manipulation A.A. Osipova refers to the replacement of the subject of the action as mistakes were made. The syntactic position of the subject of the action is filled, but this does not indicate the indication of a real subject [Osipova 2006: 25]. It is worth noting that the tools of speech manipulation in political discourse are present at all levels of language - phonographic, lexical and grammatical.

Speech manipulation within political discourse is considered a multidimensional phenomenon. The main task of political discourse is to manage public opinion. Studying the mechanism of manipulation using linguistic means helps to avoid the psychotechnical effect of speech manipulation, or, as modern linguists write, speech demagoguery, speech aggression or even speech violence. In our study we will adhere to John Austin's theory of speech acts. To produce utterances, three acts must be adhered to.

The first act is called locutionary, where the statement must be provided with meaning and correlated with reality; the locutionary act is the main act of the statement. We can notice that we do not just produce well-formed utterances, we form utterances with a specific function [Yule 1996: 88]. I've made some coffee can be expressed for different purposes. These utterances are created for a specific purpose when the speaker expects a certain result; this is a perlocutionary act. The listener's understanding of our intention is called the perlocutionary effect. J. Searle believes that there are about twelve linguistically significant parameters for establishing the types of illocutionary acts. Among them, the most important three are:

1. Illocutionary point,
2. Direction of fit
3. Pronounced psychological state. The illocutionary target, being the most important part of illocutionary force, represents the point or purpose for a particular type of illocution.

Expressives express a mental state specified by the condition of sincerity regarding the state of affairs, which is determined within the framework of propositional content. Power: complain, blame. Mental state: desire to express one's mental state. This speech act depends on the experience of the speaker. Direction of adaptation: words - world. Speaker orientation. In the propositional content of an expressive, some predicate is attributed to the subject, which can be either the speaker (so when we say sorry for being late, we are talking about our own lateness) or the hearer (so when we say Thank you very much for your assistance, we mean action performed by the addressee of the utterance). Expressives are especially characterized by phraseologized means of expression, speech clichés specific to each language, the Uzbek excuse form of the imperative mood of the verb excuse with its English equivalent Sorry, an adjective form with the meaning distressed, or the English Thanks and the functionally equivalent Uzbek idiom thank you. Declarations are the purpose of making changes by an authorized person to the status of the indicated object, changing the state in the structure of public institutions (baptizing, declaring husband and wife, ordaining students). There is no power, mental state: the speaker takes responsibility, direction of adaptation: based on social convention. Orientation to the addressee [Paducheva 1986: 200].

Conclusion

When considering the reasons for using the form of active or passive voice, we came to the conclusion that it depends on the component of the sentence from which we are starting. The category of passive voice is grammatical and is studied in a functional aspect, which allows us to consider the relationship and interaction of multi-level elements of morphological, syntactic, lexical, expressing voice semantics from the position of functional-semantic fields; the complex interaction of grammar

and vocabulary is revealed in the example of the grammatical category of voice, which always represents a certain field, it follows that voice is a complex of functional-semantic fields, where the fields are united by a common feature - 45 characteristics of the action in its relation to the subject and object; when considering the passive and the active, we noticed a peculiarity that in the active construction the subject takes first place, then in the passive the object takes the place of the subject; from this we can conclude that passivity is always associated with the departure of the subject from the position of the first rank. The functional-semantic field is a hierarchical structure and is divided into center (core) and periphery. The active/passive opposition represents the core of the functional-semantic field.

The structure of functional-semantic fields is characterized by the unclear boundaries between the central part and the peripheral part, the ability to move from the center to the periphery, in connection with which certain difficulties arise in the distribution of linguistic means to a certain level of the structural hierarchy of the field. Being a section of semiotics, pragmatics is a section that studies the signs of speakers. It was revealed that the main task of pragmatics is the theory of speech acts, which contains the necessary units such as a request, statement, question, and so on; in the future, the passive voice was examined through the prism of speech acts to identify the essence of voicing relations in the English language. The choice of passive voice may have a hidden effect on the addressee's perception of causal relationships. It was found that political discourse is characterized by passive constructions, since the form of passive voice hides the creation of the process from the outside, creating a vague character, introducing uncertainty. The passive voice helps manage public opinion, thereby preventing speech demagoguery or verbal aggression.

1. Reference

1. Yule G. Pragmatics. – Oxford, 1996
2. Blokh M. Ya. Theoretical grammar of the English language (in English): Textbook. Ed. 3rd M.: Higher School, 2000.-381 p. [text].
3. Bondarko A.V. Introduction. Foundations of functional grammar // Theory of functional grammar: Introduction. Aspectuality. Temporal localization. Taxis / Rep. ed. A. V. Bondarko. - Leningrad: "Science", 1987. - 5-39 s [text].
4. Bondarko A. V. Grammatical category and context. D.: "Science." Leningrad branch, 1971.-116 [text].