

THE INTERRELATIONSHIP OF PRAGMATICS AND COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS WITH LINGUOSEMIOTICS

Sadbarkhon Erkinovna Nurmatova

Lecturer at Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

Annotation: This article examines the interrelationship between pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and linguosemiotics in contemporary linguistic research. It analyzes language as a system of signs, a means of communication, and a reflection of human cognition. The study highlights the theoretical foundations of linguosemiotics and explores how pragmatic and cognitive approaches contribute to understanding the mechanisms of meaning construction. Particular attention is given to speech act theory, implicature, relevance theory, conceptual metaphor, frame semantics, and conceptual integration. The article demonstrates that the integration of these disciplines provides a comprehensive explanation of linguistic meaning, interpretation, and communication. It also emphasizes the significance of this interdisciplinary approach for discourse analysis, intercultural communication, media studies, and modern linguistic research.

Keywords: Pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, linguosemiotics, semiotics, sign system, communication, meaning construction, speech act, implicature, relevance theory, conceptual metaphor, frame semantics, conceptual integration, cognition, discourse.

The need for a comprehensive study of linguistic phenomena in modern linguistics has intensified the integration of such disciplines as pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and linguosemiotics. These fields examine not only the grammatical and lexical properties of language but also its nature as a system of signs, a means of communication, and a reflection of human cognition. Therefore, the relationship



between pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and linguosemiotics provides a deeper understanding of the semantic and functional essence of language.

Linguosemiotics is a discipline that studies language as a system of signs. It analyzes how linguistic units convey meaning, how they interact with other signs, and what functions they perform in communication. Every linguistic unit serves as a sign that transmits specific information. Words, phrases, texts, and even speech situations possess semiotic content through which people exchange information.

Pragmatics, in turn, investigates the use of linguistic units in real communicative situations. This field emphasizes that the meaning of linguistic signs is not limited to their lexical or grammatical content but is also shaped by the speaker's intentions, communicative context, and situational factors. While linguosemiotics explains language as a system of signs, pragmatics examines how and why these signs are used in specific circumstances. The same word or sentence may convey different meanings in different contexts, illustrating the pragmatic nature of linguistic signs. Cognitive linguistics explores the relationship between language and thought. According to this approach, language reflects knowledge, concepts, and mental structures formed in the human mind. As individuals perceive and interpret reality, they develop conceptual frameworks that are expressed through language. From a linguosemiotic perspective, these concepts are represented by signs. Therefore, understanding the meaning of linguistic signs requires consideration of the cognitive processes underlying human thought.

The connection between pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and linguosemiotics becomes particularly evident in the mechanisms of meaning construction. Linguosemiotics studies the structure and meaning of signs, cognitive linguistics explains how meaning is formed in the mind, and pragmatics analyzes how meaning is interpreted in communication. Consequently, the meaning of linguistic units emerges through the interaction of three factors: the sign system, human cognition,



and communicative context.

Metaphor, metonymy, and other figurative devices provide vivid examples of this interdisciplinary relationship. Cognitive linguistics views metaphor as a fundamental mechanism of human thought. Linguosemiotics studies metaphorical expressions as specific sign systems, while pragmatics examines their communicative functions and persuasive effects in particular contexts. Thus, a single linguistic phenomenon can be explained comprehensively through different theoretical perspectives.

Today, the interrelationship among pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and linguosemiotics plays a crucial role in discourse analysis, intercultural communication, media studies, and advertising language research. Every text or communicative event is organized as a system of signs, interpreted through human cognition, and directed toward a communicative purpose. Linguosemiotics reveals the sign-based nature of language, cognitive linguistics explains the mental processes behind these signs, and pragmatics clarifies their functions in actual communication. The integration of these disciplines contributes significantly to understanding the complexity of language, explaining meaning-making processes, and scientifically investigating contemporary communication.

The idea that the meaning of linguistic signs cannot be explained solely through their internal systemic relations gradually gained acceptance among linguists during the second half of the twentieth century. Although Ferdinand de Saussure's distinction between *langue* and *parole* was fundamental, understanding real communication required attention to speech acts, context, intention, and social interaction. This necessity led to the emergence of new paradigms—pragmatics and cognitive linguistics.

Pragmatics established its foundations as an independent discipline through John Austin's 1962 work *How to Do Things with Words*. Austin developed Speech Act

Theory, demonstrating that speaking itself constitutes an action. He distinguished between the locutionary act (the act of saying something), the illocutionary act (the action performed through speaking, such as requesting, ordering, or promising), and the perlocutionary act (the effect on the listener). His student John Searle further developed this theory in 1969 by differentiating direct and indirect speech acts and proposing sincerity conditions necessary for successful communication.

In 1975, Paul Grice introduced the Cooperative Principle and the theory of conversational maxims, shedding new light on the communicative dimension of pragmatics. Violations of the maxims of quality, quantity, relation, and manner give rise to implicatures, enabling listeners to infer meanings beyond the literal content of utterances. This concept is particularly important for linguosemiotics because signs convey not only their explicit meanings but also a network of implied interpretations.

Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson's Relevance Theory (1986) integrated cognitive and pragmatic perspectives. They argued that communication is fundamentally a cognitive process based on two principles: cognitive relevance (achieving maximal cognitive effects with minimal processing effort) and communicative relevance. For linguosemiotics, relevance theory demonstrates that signs communicate not only their conventional meanings but also contextually relevant meanings required for successful interpretation.

Cognitive linguistics emerged as an independent paradigm in the 1970s through the works of scholars such as George Lakoff, Charles Fillmore, Leonard Talmy, and Ronald Langacker. This approach views language not as an autonomous formal system but as a manifestation of human cognitive abilities, including categorization, conceptualization, and metaphorical thinking. Lakoff and Mark Johnson's Conceptual Metaphor Theory (1980) showed that metaphors such as *LIFE IS A JOURNEY* and *TIME IS MONEY* are not merely linguistic expressions but



fundamental structures shaping human thought and understanding.

Charles Fillmore's Frame Semantics, developed between 1982 and 1985, is especially significant for linguosemiotics. A frame is a cognitive structure activated by a word or expression, encompassing associated knowledge, experiences, and expectations. For example, the frame *restaurant* automatically activates concepts such as *menu*, *waiter*, and *bill*. From a linguosemiotic perspective, a sign not only carries semantic meaning but also activates a broader cognitive framework that contributes to communication.

The relationship between pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and linguosemiotics manifests itself in three principal dimensions. First, linguistic meaning is both compositional and context-dependent; it is constructed through the interaction of signs, cognitive processes, and contextual factors. Second, the problem of intention and interpretation can be explained by combining Charles Peirce's concept of the interpretant with Gricean implicature and relevance theory, revealing the pragmacognitive mechanisms of sign interpretation. Third, sign systems operate not only within individual cognitive structures but also within broader sociocultural and cognitive frameworks.

Since the second half of the twentieth century, linguistics has increasingly developed into a set of interconnected disciplines. Among these, pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and linguosemiotics occupy a special place. Although they initially evolved with different methodologies and research objectives, their integration is now recognized as both inevitable and scientifically productive.

Charles Morris originally defined pragmatics as the third component of semiotics, alongside syntax and semantics, describing it as the study of the relationship between signs and their users. This definition firmly situated pragmatics within the broader semiotic framework from the outset.

Subsequently, Austin's Speech Act Theory and Searle's refinements established



pragmatics as an independent discipline. In this framework, every utterance simultaneously possesses locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary force, directly connecting pragmatics with semiotic theories of signs.

Similarly, Grice's Cooperative Principle and the notion of implicature introduced a more complex semiotic problem: the distinction between the meaning encoded in a sign and the meaning intended by the speaker. Addressing this issue requires the combined insights of both semiotic and cognitive approaches.

Cognitive linguistics, as developed by George Lakoff, Mark Johnson, and Ronald Langacker, links linguistic structure to human cognition and perception. Central concepts such as schemas, frames, metaphors, and conceptual integration are inherently semiotic because they explain how linguistic signs are mentally represented.

According to Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner's Conceptual Blending Theory, new meanings emerge through the integration of multiple mental spaces. Semiotic interpretation of this process suggests that linguistic signs generate contextually constructed networks of meaning beyond their primary semantic content. Thus, cognitive linguistics explains the semiotic triad of sign, meaning, and interpretation through internal mental mechanisms.

Furthermore, Eleanor Rosch's Prototype Theory and the problem of categorization possess a distinctly semiotic character. The meanings of linguistic categories are not rigidly bounded but are organized according to principles of family resemblance, as proposed by Ludwig Wittgenstein. This aligns with the semiotic understanding of the arbitrary relationship between sign and referent.

Linguosemiotics itself analyzes linguistic sign systems based on the semiotic theories developed by Charles Sanders Peirce, Ferdinand de Saussure, and their followers. According to Peirce's triadic model of the sign—representamen, object, and interpretant—every linguistic unit refers not only to its object but also to the



mental interpretation formed by the receiver.

References

1. Austin John Langshaw. *How to Do Things with Words*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
2. John Searle. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
3. Paul Grice. “Logic and Conversation” // *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 3. – New York: Academic Press, 1975.
4. Dan Sperber, Deirdre Wilson. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
5. George Lakoff, Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
6. Charles Fillmore. “Frame Semantics” // *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. – Seoul: Hanshin Publishing, 1982.
7. Ronald Langacker. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 1. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.
8. Gilles Fauconnier, Mark Turner. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. – New York: Basic Books, 2002.
9. Charles Sanders Peirce. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931–1958.
10. Ferdinand de Saussure. *Course in General Linguistics*. – New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
11. Charles Morris. *Signs, Language and Behavior*. – New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946.