PRAGMATIC AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF CONVERSIONS IN MODERN ENGLISH

Docent **Jumamuratova Ramiza Adilmuratovna**

Master student **Kudenova Ulbosin**

The English language has a rich vocabulary that we use when we describe our feelings, objects and phenomena of the world around us, state our requirements or try to prove something. However, an important factor in speech activity is not only what we say, but also why we say it. What determines the choice of a certain lexical unit in the communication process? Pragmatics is engaged in the search for answers to this question.

Unlike other branches of linguistics (phonology, semantics, grammar, etc.), which consider language as a static system, pragmatics approaches the study of language from the point of view of its dynamics, i.e. application in practice, in real communicative conditions. Pragmatics is faced with the task of identifying internal patterns that govern the adequate use of a particular lexical unit in each specific communicative act. The pragmatic aspect of the consideration of linguistic material determines the relevance of the study.

Modern English is characterized by wide opportunities in the field of word formation. One of the most important and most productive ways to form new words is conversion. This phenomenon is so active in modern English that words of all parts of speech are practically involved in it, although with varying frequency. But, despite the high productivity and activity of conversion word formation, the sphere of use of English converses in a pragmatic aspect has been little studied. That is why the study of this phenomenon is relevant. The problem of conversion was studied by such scientists as G. Sweet, S. Bally, A. I. Smirnitsky, I. V. Arnold, T. S. Bochkareva, G. B. Antrushina, M. V. Nikitin, V. V. Eliseeva, etc.

The great scientist was concerned about the perception and understanding of speech, the solutions of which he believed to be found in a certain linguistic unity of communicating people.

V. Humboldt noted: "The word, which we can stop at for the sake of simplification, does not have something ready-made, like a substance, and cannot serve as a shell for a complete concept, it simply encourages the listener to form concepts on his own, determining only how to do it.[5.159]

People understand each other not because they convey the signs of objects to the interlocutor, and not even because they mutually tune each other to an accurate and complete reproduction of an identical concept, but because they mutually touch the same link in the chain of sensory representations and cobs of internal concepts, touch the same keys an instrument of their spirit, thanks to which corresponding, but not identical symbols flash in everyone's mind" [5, 165-166].

Defining the subject of linguistic pragmatics presents many difficulties. It is often defined briefly as a discipline that seeks to describe language not in its internal structure, but in its human use. This is how it differs from the linguistic disciplines of the traditional set, which study language more as a static system. As for the linguistic pragmatics that complemented this set, it includes language not just in speech, speech activity for the production of statements, but in purposeful subject-practical and cognitive-theoretical socially significant human activity as a subject of communication.

Thus, pragmatics rediscovers for linguistics the basic principles of the general theory of activity and the principles of the theory of communication (communication). She focuses on how, in the words of Emile Benveniste, "appropriation" takes place a person's language in specific communicative acts.

The approval of the ideas and principles of general and linguistic pragmatics was the result of a long process of understanding a large number of concepts that specify various aspects of the category of activity. The range of these concepts includes such as action, the subject of action, goal, result, means and ways to achieve the goal, conditions, etc. [4]

In conclusion I want to mention it that, pragmatics studies the behavior of signs in real communication processes. This is how it differs from other linguistic disciplines that study language as a static system.

Literature:

1. Амосова Н. Н. Основы английской фразеологии. Л., 1963.
2. Апресян Ю.Д. Избранные труды том II ИНТЕГРАЛЬНОЕ ОПИСАНИЕ ЯЗЫКА И СИСТЕМНАЯ ЛЕКСИКОГРАФИЯ, 1995. - с.135-154.
3. Арутюнова Н.Д.. Падучева Е.В. Истоки, проблемы и категории прагматики // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М.: Прогресс, 1985. Вып. 16: Лингвистическая прагматика.
4. Арутюнова Н.Д. Фактор адресата // Изв. АН СССР. Сер. лит. и яз. - 1981. - Т.40.-№4.-С. 358.
5. Гумбольдт В. Избранные труды по языкознанию. М., 1984, с. 250