

THE SPECIFIC FEATURES OF PRAGMATICS

Akhmedov O.S

DSc., professor UzSWLU

Normetova Munira

master student of Urgench State University

ABSTRACT

In this article the author investigates about the specific features of pragmatics, its main approaches and main focuses that it can deal with. Pragmatics is concerned with utterances, which we will define as specific occurrences, the deliberate actions of speakers at specific times and locations, usually involving language. Logic and semantics have historically dealt with properties of types of statements, rather than properties that vary from token to token, use to use, or, as we'll see, utterance to utterance, and vary with the specific properties that distinguish them. Pragmatic approaches are but do not restrict themselves to the resolution of ambiguity and vagueness, the reference to proper names, indexes and proofs, and anaphors, and some questions involving at least some presupposition. In all these cases, evidence about the pronunciation, beyond the expressions and meanings used is necessary. The author provides a brief and clear information about pragmatics and its explanations.

Keywords: communicative-functionallinguistics, speech interaction, multidimensional research, pragmatic spectrum, nomination, reference.

A subfield of linguistics called communicative-functional linguistics gave rise to linguistic pragmatics, also referred to as pragmatic linguistics, in the latter half of the 20th century. Her main area of interest is "the interaction between linguistic units and the circumstances of their use in a specific communicative-pragmatic space in which the speaker/writer, listener/reader, and other participants interact and for which specific indications of the place and time of their speech interaction are important, associated with the act of communicating the goal and expectations." It stands out for its impressive multidimensional research and has a wide variety of tools, techniques, and methodologies for analyzing linguistic content in addition to having a respectably robust conceptual and terminological apparatus of its own. According to Moeschler J. and Reboul A. in their Encyclopedic Dictionary of Pragmatics, the term "pragmatics"

has in some ways become established in linguistic literature to the point where it seems appropriate to speak about pragmatics as one of the scientific directions in the study of speech activity and even linguistics. Topics of discussion include pragmatics' position, internal dynamics, and separation from other disciplines. The term pragmatics is commonly used in the literature, but its meaning and application are frequently unclear. The name Pragmatics is more than well-known in the sciences of language, according to Dowty Oswald, one of the founders of the pragmatic school of thought in French linguistics. As this phrase has so many meanings attached to it, linguists cannot use it seriously without first offering substantial terminological clarifications.

Early attempts to define pragmatics attempted to limit it to the minimal essentials, but they forbade discussing the intricacies of the object and demanded more clarification. One of the classic standards for identifying pragmatics was the speaker's name being used (the understanding of Morris and Carnap). According to other, more recent definitions, pragmatics is the study of language in connection to its "use" or the comprehension of language as such: Examples of how linguistic pragmatics can be used include "learning the conditions that influence the use of language" and "understanding a language from the outside in." In this context, Grice H. distinguishes between "transcendental regulatory circumstances" and empirical conditions. Empirical conditions are occurrences whose amount and character are not rigidly predetermined and whose description falls outside the scope of the empirical sciences. Usage also lacks adequate distinction between the pragmatic and theoretical worlds and is fluid.

Pragmatics is the study of language used in interpersonal communication. It is focused on the choices that speakers make as well as the options and limitations that are present in social interaction. It investigates how language use affects those involved in communication actions. Semantics, the study of meaning, with which it is sometimes equated, is strongly tied to rationality. While semantics covers a variety of levels, including grammar, syntax, and the lexicon, pragmatics is spread across a number of linguistic fields and intersects most clearly with semantics and sociolinguistics. Yet, the boundaries cannot always be clearly defined. One can identify at least three subgroups in the field of pragmatics depending on the type of emphasis.

The more linguistic end of the pragmatic spectrum is what pragmatic linguistics deals with. Usage is viewed from the perspective of a language's structural resources, i.e., it concerns aspects of text that are typically encoded in a language's structure. This would be a part of a user's pragmatic competition.

Social psychologists would view usage as mostly determined by social factors in communication.

Applied pragmatics refers to practical communication issues in settings where successful communication is essential, such as medical consultations, legal proceedings, interrogations, and professional counseling.

As some of the theories that underlie the communicative-pragmatic technique are still developing, it is still possible to watch this process in action. Since linguistics has realized the need to move away from the study of basic linguistic units and toward the study of speech activity and the consideration of language as a dynamic system, taking into account its functionality and anthropocentricity, there has been an increase in interest in this approach. The theory of nomination, the theory of reference, and the theory of speech actions are the three linguistic theories that form the basis of this method. These theories also draw on the philosophy of communication, the linguistics of speech, the theory of text and discourse, and the theory of pragma-semantics in a larger sense. The communicative-pragmatic method, in general, is an interdisciplinary integration of techniques, techniques, and procedures used to study how speakers use language in the course of communication in unity with the pragmatic properties of language units in connection with the communication situation, to achieve communication success and control communicatively (speech) behavior people to coordinate increasingly complex human activities. The focus of pragmatics is on utterances, which we shall define as discrete occurrences, the intentional actions of speakers at certain times and places, typically involving language. In the past, logic and semantics have focused on the characteristics of different statement types rather than the characteristics that vary from token to token, use to use, or, as we'll see, utterance to utterance and vary with the particular characteristics that set them apart. A common definition of pragmatics is the study of background effects. This is equivalent to saying that it has to do with language. A common definition of pragmatics is the study of background effects. It can also be said to deal with words in this way. The study of background effects is a common definition of pragmatics. When all the specifics that may vary from speech to utterance are referred to as "context," it is equivalent to saying that it deals with utterances. The word is frequently used with more restricted definitions, thus one must exercise caution.

Although they are not limited to it, pragmatic approaches include the clarification of ambiguity and vagueness, the use of proper names, indices and evidence, anaphora, and some queries having at least some presupposition. Beyond the terms and meanings employed in each of these situations, proof of the pronunciation is

required. This research finds its goals in the multilingual and multicultural interaction of speakers from different national, ethnic, and racial backgrounds, starting from the predominately monolingual and monocultural study paradigms. Comparative studies of communication and communication units in the context of second language acquisition, however, may arise from opposing linguistics. In the former, the issue facing a speaker of a second language is highlighted, and significant communication blunders as well as the speaker's ancestry are described. I want to be able to think of the normal sort of customary practice as something that is reasonable for us to follow and that we should not forsake, even though they may be inescapable given these sources of knowledge. People who hear something assume that it is intended to have some sort of meaning, thus if the message lacks the appropriate conventional meaning, they will search for a more practical and non-conventional interpretation. As far as the listener is concerned, a speaker who delivers an unintelligible or meaningless utterance would be pointless and thus inappropriate.

REFERENCES:

1. Adams J.K. *Pragmatics and Fiction* – Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Comp., 1985. -77 p.
2. Adamzik K. *Sprachliches Handeln und sozialer Kontakt*. - Tübingen: Narr, 1984. - 365p.
3. Adorno T.W. *Negative Dialectic*. – Frankfurt an Main, 1966. -19-50p.
4. Allwood J.A. A critical look at speech act theory. - In: *Logic, Pragmatics and Grammar*. - Lund, 1977. -14-21p.
5. Ashurova D. *Language and Cultural Studies // Хорижий филология*, 2006, 4-сон. 11-146.
6. Austin J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. –Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. 1962; 2nd ed., 1973. - 167 p.
7. Auwera J. van der. Pragmatic presupposition: Shared beliefs in a theory of irrefutable meaning. In: *Syntax and Semantics*. –New York, ect: Acad. Press, 1979. – Vol.11. Presuppositions. – 249-264p.
8. Bach K., Harnish R.M. *Linguistic communication, and speech acts*. – Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2000, - 484p.
9. Bar-Lev, Z., Palacas, A. Semantic command over pragmatic priority. -*Lingua* 51, 1980. -137–146p.
10. Blackwell, Oxford. Sperber, D., Wilson, D. Postface. In: Sperber, D., Wilson, D. (Eds.), *Relevance: Communication and Harvard University Press*, Cambridge, MA, 1995. -269–283p.