THE LINGUOPRAGMATIC FOUNDATIONS OF SUFI POETICS

Mo'minov Aziz Baxriddin o'g'li,
Master's Student, International Innovation University

Annotation. *This article examines the formation of linguopragmatics as an independent field of modern linguistics and its methodological potential for the study of Sufi poetics. It offers a comparative analysis of the views of foreign scholars (J. Austin, J. Searle, Ch. Morris, S. Levinson, J. Mey, G. Leech, G. Yule) and Uzbek linguists (Sh. Safarov, M. Hakimov, A. Nurmonov). Pragmatic categories such as speech acts, implicature, presupposition, and deixis are analyzed through Sufi symbols (wine, cupbearer, reed-flute, moth-and-candle). The article argues that the multilayered meaning of Sufi texts can be fully revealed only through a linguopragmatic approach rather than semantic analysis alone.*

Key words: *linguopragmatics, Sufi poetics, speech act theory, implicature, presupposition, deixis, anthropocentric paradigm, pragmalinguistics.*

Beginning in the second half of the twentieth century, world linguistics increasingly moved away from treating language solely as a grammatical or semantic system, and toward studying it as a complex phenomenon bound up with human thought, communicative activity, and socio-cultural experience. As a result, the structuralist principle of "language-as-system" was gradually superseded by the paradigm of "language – individual – speech – context." It was on the basis of this scientific evolution that pragmatics, and subsequently linguopragmatics, took shape as an independent scholarly direction.

Linguopragmatics studies linguistic units in relation to their communicative function in speech, the speaker's communicative intent, and the effect they produce in the addressee's consciousness. In this respect it differs from semantics: whereas semantics examines the lexical-grammatical meaning of linguistic units, linguopragmatics investigates the purpose for which they are used in a given communicative situation and the perlocutionary effect they generate. The relevance of this article lies in the fact that analyzing the system of symbols in Sufi poetics through the modern linguopragmatic paradigm represents one of the promising directions in philological scholarship.

The term "pragmatics" was first employed by the American philosopher and semiotician Charles Morris within the framework of the three constituent parts of semiotics – syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics. Morris divided semiotics into three components: syntactics (the relations among signs), semantics (the relation between sign and meaning), and pragmatics (the relation between the sign and the person who uses it). In his view, the true essence of linguistic units cannot be explained without taking into account their function in human activity. This position later became the theoretical foundation of linguopragmatics. As a result of the anthropocentric turn

that occurred in linguistics at the end of the twentieth century, the focus of research shifted from the internal system of language to the communicative activity of the speaker. In this way linguopragmatics took shape as an independent scientific paradigm studying the relationship between language and the human being, and today it continues to develop in integration with psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, and discourse studies. Speech act theory, developed by the American scholars J. Austin and J. Searle, occupies an important place in the scientific formation of linguopragmatics. Austin interprets speech not merely as a means of conveying information but as an action in itself: in speaking, a person not only expresses meaning but also performs a specific act – commanding, warning, requesting, or inviting. A speech act is realized in three stages: the locutionary act (the plain expression of meaning of linguistic units), the illocutionary act (the speaker's intention), and the perlocutionary act (the effect produced in the listener).

In Sufi texts the illocutionary and perlocutionary layers are especially pronounced, since the purpose of Sufi discourse is not mere aesthetic pleasure but the spiritual awakening of the reader. For example, in Navoiy's line "Ishq aro jon bermak erur mard ishi" ("To lay down one's life in love is the deed of the brave"), the locutionary meaning is simply "to sacrifice one's life on the path of love"; illocutionarily, however, the line functions as a call to surrender to divine love, while perlocutionarily it is intended to awaken devotion and spiritual tremor in the reader. Sufi texts thus cannot be adequately understood through semantic analysis alone – their pragmatic energy and communicative intent must also be uncovered.

According to the theory of cooperative principles developed by H. P. Grice, human communication contains hidden meanings – implicatures – that are not stated directly but are inferred on the basis of context and shared knowledge. Sufi poetry is a discourse built precisely on implicature, since many of its symbols carry an inner meaning quite distinct from their surface meaning: the image of "wine" (may) is not ordinary wine but a manifestation of divine love; the "cupbearer" (soqiy) is not a mere server of wine but the spiritual guide (murshid) or God Himself; the "reed-flute" (nay) is interpreted as the eternal lament of the human soul over its separation [from the Divine]. For the reader to grasp the true meaning of such a text, he or she must possess the relevant religious-philosophical presuppositions; otherwise the text's inner layers remain concealed.

Presupposition is the hidden information that communicants draw upon from their shared fund of knowledge; in classical Sufi texts, the pragmatic content of images such as Layli, Majnun, Yusuf, Zulaykho, Mansur, and Khizr becomes fully intelligible only to a reader familiar with their religious-literary connotations.

Linguopragmatics also studies deixis – the phenomenon whereby speech is anchored to person, place, and time. In Sufi discourse, deictic units frequently acquire a metaphysical character: words such as "he," "beloved" (yor), "sweetheart" (mahbub), and "friend" (do‘st), while superficially ordinary forms of address, point at a deeper level to God. Likewise, through the image of "candle and moth" (sha'm-parvona), the candle represents divine light and the moth the loving soul; the moth's self-immolation around the flame appears as the pragmatic model of the Sufi concept of "fanā fi'llāh" (annihilation in God), awakening in the reader's mind both aesthetic-emotional excitement and spiritual-intellectual reflection.

According to Y. Karaulov's theory of the "linguistic personality" (языковая личность), behind every text stands a particular linguistic personality, and fully understanding a text requires reconstructing that personality's worldview. Applied to Sufi poetry, this theory reveals the poet not as an ordinary creative figure but as a spiritual subject who has undergone genuine mystical (irfani) experience. For this reason, fully grasping the images found in the works of Navoiy, Fuzuliy, Mashrab, or Jomiy requires taking their Sufi worldview into account: for instance, the image of the "desert" (sahro) does not denote a geographical space but a field of spiritual search, while the symbol of the "path" (yo‘l) signifies the stages of spiritual perfection. According to the anthropocentric-linguistic notion of the "linguistic worldview," Sufi poetics constructs its own distinctive mystical linguistic worldview, in which love (ishq) is conceptualized as the path leading to divine truth, separation (hijron) as a stage of spiritual purification, union (vasl) as a state of divine closeness, wine (may) as the light of gnosis, the cupbearer (soqiy) as the source of divine guidance, and the tavern (xarobot) as a space of liberation from worldly attachments.

The development of linguopragmatics can be clearly traced through the chain Morris–Levinson–Mey–Safarov. S. Levinson characterizes pragmatics as the discipline that studies the relationship between language and context, arguing that a significant part of the meaning of speech resides not in the text itself but in the context. G. Leech regards pragmatics as the study of communicative meaning, linking the success of an utterance to principles of politeness, respect, and communicative cooperation. G. Yule, for his part, defines pragmatics along four lines: as the study of speaker meaning, contextual meaning, implied meaning, and the distance between participants in communication. J. Mey ties pragmatics to human social activity, emphasizing that language cannot be studied in isolation from society.

Within Uzbek linguistics, Sh. Safarov defines pragmalinguistics as the discipline studying the goal-directed features of speech activity, paying particular attention to communicative purpose, the addresser–addressee relationship, pragmatic meaning,

speech strategies, and national-cultural factors. M. Hakimov treats every speech unit as the product of a specific communicative intention, elucidating the roles of presupposition, implicature, and the addressee factor. A. Nurmonov, meanwhile, interprets language not as a static system but as a dynamic phenomenon bound up with human thought and speech activity, thereby reinforcing the theoretical foundations of the anthropocentric approach. In Safarov's conception, linguopragmatic analysis is carried out through six principal layers: (1) the goal-directed nature of speech activity; (2) the relationship between addresser and addressee; (3) the determinant role of the speech situation (context); (4) pragmatic meaning and implication; (5) pragmatic strategies and speech effect; (6) pragmatic competence. This coherent framework serves as an effective methodological basis for investigating the multilayered content of Sufi symbols.

The analysis presented above shows that linguopragmatics has taken shape as a complex scholarly discipline that studies linguistic units in inseparable connection with human thought, communicative intent, cultural experience, and discursive environment. The symbols of Sufi poetics – wine, the cupbearer, the reed-flute, the moth and the candle, the desert, the path, and others – are not merely artistic devices but communicative-pragmatic phenomena that operate through pragmatic mechanisms such as speech acts, implicature, presupposition, and deixis. Studying Sufi texts within the framework of the modern linguopragmatic paradigm therefore serves not only to reveal the text's inner layers but also to illuminate, on a scholarly basis, the spiritual-communicative bond between the addresser (poet-guide) and the addressee (reader-disciple). Bringing together the theoretical views of foreign scholars such as Morris, Levinson, and Mey with those of Uzbek scholars such as Safarov, Hakimov, and Nurmonov into a single methodological framework makes it possible to conduct a deep and coherent analysis of the multilayered meaning-making mechanisms of Sufi poetics. This, in turn, raises the linguopragmatic approach to the level of a fundamental theoretical platform for the study of Sufi literature in contemporary philology.

References:

1. Baker M. In Other Words. London: Routledge, 2011.
2. Bhabha H. K. The Location of Culture. London: Routledge, 1994.
3. Lotman Y. Universe of the Mind. London: I.B. Tauris, 1990.
4. Venuti L. The Translator’s Invisibility. London: Routledge, 1995.
5. https://uzresearchers.com/index.php/stj/article/download/4661/4998/9066
6. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/398486786_NAZARIY_POETIKA_ASOSLARI_TERMINLAR_IDENTIFIKATSIYASI_VA_TRANSFORMATSIYASI_PRIZMASIDA