Terms Denoting Pragmatic Features

Ruzikulov Elyor Shukurovich

Teacher of Samarkand State of Architectural and Civil Engeneering Institute

ANNOTATION

The article presents a single systematic conclusion with a creative study of different approaches to the study of text pragmatics, the study of theoretical cases on the example of specific speech acts, and a comparative analysis, and such interpretation and analysis identification of criteria and their importance in the functional pragmatic aspect, specification of the classification of means of forming pragmatic content, theoretical conclusions are considered on specific text analyzes.

KEYWORDS: *Indicative, descriptive, objective being, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, connotative component, syntactic devices, allusions, denotative.*

Pragmalinguistics as an independent branch of linguistics began to take shape in the 60s and 70s of the last century. An international conference of linguists on the pragmatics of natural languages in Dordhert in 1970 unanimously concluded that "the pragmatic features of communication through natural language should be studied within the framework of linguistic theory, such as the syntactic and semantic features of this communication."

In modern linguistics, words that have the property of naming certain objects, events, signs, actions in an objective being are considered to be indicative - "pointing" words, words that do not have such a feature - non-indicative words. In system-structural linguistics, the words of the first type are called descriptive words, and the words of the second type are also called non-descriptive words.

Linguists dealing with speech semantics face significant difficulties when it comes to such non-indicative (non-descriptive) words in a sentence. The point is that even if the descriptive words in a sentence are not associated with a specific speech situation, it is not possible to identify non-descriptive words in such a way if it is possible to determine what the denotative (noun) meaning is, what the objective being is referring to. Since such words do not directly name things and events, signs and properties, actions and situations in an objective being, it remains unclear what they are referring to if they are not related to a particular situation.

This shows that the semantics of a sentence cannot be fully explained by determining the relation of the words used in that sentence to an objective being only. To this must be added the definition of the relation of speech to the process of speech, to the state of speech. With such a practical need, linguistic pragmatics was formed in the heart of linguistic semantics. Thus three directions were formed in syntax: 1) syntax; 2) semantics; 3) pragmatics.

Syntax studies how one linguistic character in a syntactic device interacts with another linguistic character.

The relation of linguistic signs in the structure of syntactic devices to the objective being is studied in semantics.

Pragmatics, on the other hand, deals with the study of the relation of a speech act directly to context. Apparently, the interaction between the speech act and the context is the main object of study of pragmatics.

Hence, when the relationship between the speech act and the context is very strong, a pragmatic need arises where the speech act is resolved in relation to the context. While the analysis of descriptive words in the syntactic device is based on semantics, the analysis of non-descriptive words is based on pragmatics. (Arutyunova N.D., Paduchaeva E.V. s.7.)

So first we have to think about the essence of descriptive and non-descriptive words. Indicative and descriptive words are words that have a denotative meaning that serve as a noun. While the meaning of indicative (denotative) words can be determined independently of the context, the meaning of non-indicative words is revealed only within the context, in a particular speech situation. That is why such words are inextricably linked with context and speech situation.

Any language symbol in a text or dialogue usually contains three different relationships. They are semantic, syntactic and pragmatic relations, the first of which reflects the relationship of the language sign with the object it represents, the second - the relationship that connects the language sign with other characters related to the system, and the third - the relationship between language users. , the language symbol in the text is distinguished by its semantic, (denotative), syntactic and pragmatic meanings. A language sign is usually a word. The pragmatic meaning of the word is understood as its methodological feature, ie the features of its use in different communicative situations, purposes some scholars, while widely interpreting the pragmatic meaning, point out that it is used not only for words with connotative but also denotative meaning.

Pronouns, which belong to the category of non-indicative words, the specific meaning of the famous horses is revealed only in context, in a certain speech situation.

For example, the word "businessman", which is actually an English word and is now part of the Uzbek dictionary, was used in the former Soviet Union not only to refer to a businessman, but also to a businessman who amassed wealth in an unclean way. Therefore, in the eyes of every Uzbek who came across this word in the text, this second meaning, formed under the influence of the policy of the former Soviet regime, came to life. However, due to the fact that due to independence, the policy of our country is moving in the right direction, now Uzbek translators are choosing the true meaning of the word and translating the English word "businessman" as "businessman".

Auxiliary words are also included in the list of non-indicative words. Because such words are also associated with context or speech situation.

There are also words that connect the content of the sentence with the speaker, which are also considered to be closely related to the context. Each sentence, in addition to providing certain information (nominative or propositive function) about the objective being in the sentence, also expresses the speaker's reaction to that information. Each concrete sentence finds expression in the speaker's psyche, culture, worldview, and so on. Because of this, it is possible to judge who the speaker is based on what he or she says. This shows how the patterns of a sentence, which is a unit of language, emerge through sentences in a specific situation and express a variety of additional information (connotative). This additional information forms a separate meaning layer of the sentence. The meaning (propositive meaning) of a sentence related to objective reality is the main meaning, while other meanings are additional meanings.

There are some sentences in which the objective content understood is entirely related to a particular speech situation, context. If this sentence is taken out of this context or speech situation, then that objective content turns out to be incorrect. Because not all people in the world can always spend their time. Someone is worried about something, they are suffering. Someone suffered from an illness and so on.

It is clear from the above examples that a number of additional meanings understood from concrete

sentences are inextricably linked to the speech situation, context. Concepts such as speech act, non-indicative words (connotation) context, speech situation, speaker personality, etc. are the basic concepts of pragmatics.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Apresyan Yu.D. Deyksis v lexike i grammatike nazvanie modnl mira // Siomatika i informatika. 1986, vyp.28. –P.5-33.

2. Aryutunova N.D. Type yazykovyx znacheniy.Otsenka. Sobytie. Fact. –M .: Nauka, 1988. -341 p.

3. Baqieva G.H. Linguistic basis of the analysis of the xudojestvennogo text. Autoref. Diss. Doc. Filol. Nauk.-T .: UzGUMYa, 1993. -46 p.

4. Bogdanov V.V. Rechevoe obshchenie: pragmaticheskie i semanticheskie aspekty. –Leningrad: Izd-vo LGU, 1990.-89 p.

5. BozorovO.O. Communicative (actual) structure of speech in Uzbek language. NDA.-Forgona, 2004.- 21 p.

6. Damirovich K. U. Joint Operation of a Cross member with Multi-Hollow Floor Slabs //International Journal of Human Computing Studies. – 2022. – T. 4. – №. 2. – C. 63-67.

7. Borbotko V.G. Principles of formation of discourse. Ot psycholinguistics to lingvosinergetike.-M .: Kom Kniga, 2007. 288 p.

8. Bushuy A.M. Sushchnost yazyka kak problema obshchey lingvistiki.-Samarkand: SamDChTI, 2004.-89 p.

9. Bushuy T.A. Lexical pragmatics as obshchelingvisticheskiy object. // Cognitive-pragmatic principles of foreign language teaching. Collection. Samarkand: SamDChTI, 2007. 18-20 p.