

ESTABLISHING A COMMUNICATIVE PRAGMATIC METHOD

Kh.Idrisova

The 1st year MA course student

Currently, the process of formation of the communicative-pragmatic method is still observed, since some of the theories underlying it are just emerging. The interest in this method is now since linguistics has realized the need to move from the study of minimal linguistic units to the study of speech activity and the consideration of language as a dynamic system, taking into account its functionality and anthropocentricity.

Three linguistic theories serve as the foundation for this approach: the theory of nomination, the theory of reference, and the theory of speech acts. In a broader sense, these theories are also based on the theory of communication, the linguistics of speech, the theory of text and discourse, and the theory of pragma-semantics [1, 17].

In general, the communicative-pragmatic method is an interdisciplinary integration of techniques, techniques, and procedures used to study the use of language by speakers in the process of communication in unity with the pragmatic properties of language units in connection with the communication situation, to achieve communication success and regulate communicatively (speech) behavior people to coordinate increasingly complex human activities.

The basic concept of this method includes: speech act as the main unit of communication, the statement in a procedural aspect, communicative attitude as a general attitude towards communication, intention as the focus of consciousness on the result of communication, communicative success as the realization of the goal of the communicative act, communication failure.

To implement this method, it is necessary to understand the difference between the concepts of text and discourse. Discourse is understood as a coherent sequence of speech acts, while a text is the result of a discourse that has taken place, an integral unit of communication.

The communicative-pragmatic approach to the text presupposes its complex analysis to identify the different-aspect properties of the text, such as compositional, semantic, and pragmatic properties, as well as ways of text design following the stylistic norms and functions of the language [2, 62].

Following this, a generalized approach to research can be identified, which includes seven main steps:

1. Delimitation of the text (definition of boundaries, extreme limits of the text).

2. Determination of the type of text.
3. Establishment of the topic of the text (thema –“a question for discussion, the nuclear-semantic basis of the text”).
4. Determination of the structure of the text.
5. Revealing the peculiarities of intra-text links.
6. Determination of the stylistic features of the text.
7. Establishing the pragmatic essence of the text.

The similarity of the methods of analyzing text and discourse in the communicative-pragmatic aspect lies in the complexity of the analysis. However, when analyzing discourse, it is assumed to go beyond the limits of language into the sphere of extralinguistic factors.

The main tasks of discourse analysis are to study the types of discourse and its linguistic and paralinguistic characteristics; determining the intentions, communication strategies, and tactics of the participants in the discourse; studying the features of the speech of each of the participants; definition of semantic features and lexical and grammatical means of the entire discourse [3, 22-24].

The discourse analysis algorithm can be presented as follows:

- Description of the communication situation.
- Determination of the type of discourse.
- Establishing the structure of discourse.
- Revealing the role of communicants in places of transition of the course (speech round).
- Semantic and pragmatic features of the speech behavior of the communicant A.
- Semantic and pragmatic features of the speech behavior of the communicant V.
- Determination of intentions, speech strategy, and tactics of both communicators.
- Semantic and pragmatic features of the entire discourse.
- Lexico-grammatical aspects of discourse [4, 78].

The emergence of interest in the field's object is the first step in the creation and advancement of any field of science. Curiosity prompts inquiries. Linguistics is no different. The search for answers to questions directly related to the language system, construction, and composition has led to the advent and advancement of this research.

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

TIL HÁM AWDARMA MÁSELELERI

V ilimiy maqalalar toplami

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. Pragmatics is often defined as the study of background effects. This is the same as saying it deals with words. Pragmatics is often defined as the study of background effects. If all the details that may differ from utterance to utterance are collectively referred to as “context”, this is similar to saying it deals with utterances. However, one must be cautious since the word is often used with more narrow definitions.

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.

These facts can be divided into different categories. Basic information on the utterance is required for indexes like “I”, “now”, and “here”: the agent, and when and where. The intentions of the speaker are also relevant for other indexicals and demonstrations. The point of reference of ‘you’ seems to have to be a speaker, who seems to be the speaker's intentions among several possible addresses. Anaphoric relationships appear to be largely an issue for speakers within syntactic and semantic constraints. The intention of the speaker and how the speaker is linked to the world in causal/historical ‘reference chains’ are relevant to the proper reference [5, 322].

Far-side pragmatism addresses what we do in language, beyond (literally) what we say. “That is how Voltaire's remarks are understood as pragmatic”. It is up to semantics to tell us what somebody says literally if they use phrases of a certain type, to explain pragmatism for the information that you provide, and for the actions that you do, in or by saying something.

The idea is that pragmatism typically involves a different kind of argument than semantics. Semantics consists of traditional sense rules for phrases and their mixture patterns. Locke believed that communication was essentially about a speaker who coded thoughts into words and that the listener decoded words into thoughts. Saussure and other prominent theorists are very clear in the same basic illustration. This panorama seems to have a fairly good fit with the picture that emerged from logicians and language philosophers in the logical analysis tradition of language as a system of phonological, syntactical, and semantic rules with the implicit mastery of competent speakers and interpreters. The sincere speaker, in paradigm, intends to make an utterance with a belief that she wishes to express. She chooses her words to

ensure that its utterance has those conditions of truth. the credulous interpreter must perceive the wordings of the truth, recognize which phones, morphemes, words, and sentences it involves. Pragmatics, by contrast, involve perceptions increased by some kinds of 'ampliative' inference – induction, inferences to the best explanation, Bayesian reasoning, or perhaps a special application to the communication of general principles as conceived at Grice [6, 225], and in any case, a type of reasoning that goes beyond the application of rules and inferences that go beyond what is established by the basic facts about what expressions are used and their meanings:

- Facts on objective facts of speech, including, who the speaker is, when the speech occurred, or where;
- Facts about the intention of the speaker; The facts with which pragmatic treatments are of different types. On the near side, the language that the speaker wants to use, the meaning she wants to use to refer to, whether the pronoun is used demonstratively or anaphorically, and so on, with various common names. On the other hand, she is saying what she intends to accomplish.
- Facts on the speaker's and her conversations, what their opinions share, what is the focus of the conversation, what they are talking about, etc.
- Facts about relevant social bodies, like promising, marriage ceremonies, proceedings in the courtroom, and so on, affecting what a person does or what they do.

References:

1. Iten, C. 'Non-truth-conditional' Meaning, Relevance and Concessives. Ph.D. Thesis, University of in: Carston, R., Uchida, S. (Eds.), *Relevance Theory: Applications and Implications*. John Benjamin, Amsterdam, 2000. -1–22p.
2. Blakemore, D. Denial and contrast: a relevance theoretic analysis of but. - *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12, 1989. -28-55p.
3. Гаспаров Б.М. Язык, Память, Образ, Лингвистика языкового существования. - М.: Новое литературное объединение, 1996. 14с.
4. Витгенштейн Л. Философские исследования // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 16: Лингвистическая прагматика. -М., 1985. -С. 79-128.
5. Гак В.Г. О книге Шарля Балли «Язык и жизнь». М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2003. -11-19 с.
6. Городецкий Б.Ю. От редактора // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. 17: Теория речевых актов. М.: Прогресс, 1986. -5-6 с.
7. Арзымбетова, С. (2023). АЎДАРМА БАРЫСЫНДА КОГНИТИВ ЖАНТАСЫЎ ӨЗГЕШЕЛИКЛЕРИ. Центральназиатский журнал образования и инноваций, 2(7), 163-165.