

## TYPES OF EXPRESSION OF PRAGMATIC RELATIONS

**Aziza Shuhratovna Najmiddinova**

Independent researcher (PhD) of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7394295>

**Abstract.** *This article discusses types of expression of pragmatic relations. There is also information about methods and their types, with examples.*

**Keywords:** *language, teach, social, learn, methods, environment, category of relations, pragmatic relations.*

## ТИПЫ ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ

**Аннотация.** *В данной статье рассматриваются виды выражения прагматических отношений. Также есть информация о методах и их типах, с примерами.*

**Ключевые слова:** *язык, обучение, социальное, обучение, методы, среда, категория отношений, прагматические отношения.*

In the courtesy category of relations, rules such as manners, self-restraint, politeness, modesty, sweet speech are followed. All of the rules and principles discussed above show that interlocutors use different speech acts and propositions in literary texts and oral speech, create a context of communication, and express pragmatic content and behavior. Object-oriented pragmatic relations of the speaker in the speech and text:

- 1) clear and hidden goals of the speaker's speech;
- 2) speech tactics of the speaker and types of speech behavior;
- 3) the level of compliance with the rules of interaction in the interview process;
- 4) the pragmatic meaning of the opinion expressed by the speaker (implicit hints, cuts, and omissions in the directly expressed idea);
- 5) reference of the speaking person;
- 6) pragmatic presupposition;
- 7) expresses the attitude of the speaking person to the information he is transmitting.

Depending on the speaker's speech, the listener's:

- 1) rules for understanding the thought expressed directly or implicitly from the speech;
- 2) level of impact of the transmitted opinion on the listener: change in emotional state, evaluation of information, positive and negative attitude to it, their expression in the speech act of response;
- 3) the direct or indirect expression of the stimulus expressed in the speech act of the answer, for example, the methods of avoiding a clear answer are determined.

According to Komissarov, three types of pragmatic relations are involved in speech communication. First of all, these are pragmatic relations expressed by the source of information, and such a pragmatic relation includes the intention and purpose of the information transmitter, his personal attitude to the transmitted information, and the intended effect on the receiver. The second type of pragmatic relationship is expressed in the text covering the pragmatic meaning expressed by the linguistic unit. The third type of pragmatic attitude is the pragmatic attitude of the information receiver to the information he understands through the text. In this attitude, the process of information perception, the attitude towards this information or its transmitter is reflected. [Komissarov 2004:226]. The mutual exchange of ideas that occurs in

oral or written speech is always organized for some purpose, and in this process some kind of news is stated or received, the goal is to hold some event, exchange ideas or simply have a pleasant time, to react to things and events, the interlocutor's opinion, personality. The implementation of such a goal led to the formation of certain speech and behavior rules on the part of the interlocutors to use linguistic tools efficiently and effectively in their speeches, to teach, confirm, and interest the interlocutor. The most important of them are: 1) compliance with the rule of mutual cooperation in the process of communication; 2) following the rules of discourse organization; 3) compliance with the rules of information exchange; 4) the rule of considering status roles of communicants in communication. Taking into account the social status of communicants in communication is reflected in the politeness category of pragmatics, and it represents hierarchic and non-hierarchical relations between communicants. Such relations can be expressed through different linguistic means in different cultures. For example, English people express their bosses by means of language such as sir, Germans geer, French monsieur, Russians chef, Uzbeks boss, chairman, grandpa, big, large. Such an attitude is expressed in terms passed from generation to generation, such as lord, count, countess, baroness, viscount, viscountess, formed in Western European countries. Such differences are also observed in units that treat women with respect. For example, the social status of a person is expressed by terms such as lady in English, madam in French, begoyim and horse in Uzbeks. Such hierarchy can also be related to age, gender, marital status, and employment status. Non-hierarchical relations are observed in words expressing blood-brotherhood, mutual closeness. (Kholodovich, 1979). For example, the words uncle, aunt, uncle can be used at the same time as kinship and as a polite address to a stranger.

Words such as my dear, my dear, my dear, and my dear, indicate non-hierarchical relationships that express mutual closeness. In such relationships, the speaker's sarcasm, contempt, and disdain are also expressed.

In addition, there are structures whose pragmatic content is constant, have the same illocutionary force in almost all conditions, and illocutionary verbs are usually used in such structures. In the theory of the speech act, such structures are called "specific performatives". The grammatical structure of performatives is also unique. In such sentences, the verb is usually expressed in the first person present tense, and the first actant of this verb is the first person singular of the deictic pronoun, and the second actant is expressed by means of the second person singular or plural of the deictic pronoun. A performative model set in this mold, it is rarely used in its entirety. Often the first actant is omitted: Je vous remercie pour votre assistance! The grammatical system of the Uzbek and Russian languages provides the possibility to drop both actants of performative structures: "Proshu ne raskhoditsya - I ask you not to disperse", Klyanus, chto eto pravda, - I swear that this is true. In addition, the third actant, that is, a proposition, can also be dropped. : "Thank you", "Congratulations", "Request", "Warning". In the third direction in the research of speech acts, the background knowledge used by communicators in the speech structure and their level, influence on the realization of the pragmatic goal is studied.

In pragmatics, pragmatic goals, actions and relationships in speech acts are also studied by dividing them into classification groups. For example, J. Austin suggests to study linguistic units expressing pragmatic purpose, action and attitude in speech acts in the following groups: 1. Verdicatives - speech acts expressing pragmatic purpose, action and attitude related to

sentencing: Je compte que tu es coupable I consider you guilty; Je tu met à l'amande - You will pay a fine; Je te préviens!-I warn you. 2. Exercisives - speech acts for the purpose of commanding, forcing, advising, warning: "It's better not to call"; "I will dismiss you from your position"; "Get out!"; "Beware of hypocrisy!" 3. Commissives-speech acts related to making a promise, making a commitment: "I promise to come tomorrow"; "I will definitely carry out the plan"; "I swear to fulfill my duty"; "I guarantee to pay the fine"; "I support your opinion!" 4. Behabitivs - speech acts related to behaving in a team, reacting to someone: "Thank you for your help"; "Be healthy!"; "Don't be upset!"; "Go to the moon and come alive!" 5. Expository - speech acts to explain, confirm, explain one's opinion: "I suspect that you are sick"; "I may get sick"; I want to remind you of your debt." This classification is often criticized by researchers because it is not based on clear principles. Another pragmalinguist - J. Searle divides the pragmatic movement in speech acts into five groups, and they are quite different from the above classification: 1. Assertives - speech acts that express the conviction of the truth of the information: "I have finished writing the article"; "The train leaves at 10"; "Jamshid-student". 2. Directives - command, question, request, warning relations, speech acts urging the listener to respond. 3. Commissions (corresponds to the group divided by J. Austin) 4. Declaratives - speech acts related to announcement: "I declare the meeting closed"; "I declare you a couple." 5. Declaratives-speech acts expressing the attitude of congratulation, condolence. According to Professor Sh.S. Safarov, this classification is not without some shortcomings, but it provides an opportunity to generalize the main features of speech acts and in the future to further expand the standards of classification, concretize and systematize groups. (Safarov, 2010: 84 p.) Sh.S.Safarov states in his research that the same expanded and deepened classification belongs to K.Allan. He proposes to study speech acts by dividing them into two main classes, i.e. interpersonal acts and declarative acts. The first group includes constative (confirmation, indication), predicative (prediction, prediction), commissive (promise, offer), acknowledgment (congratulation, invitation, respect, etc.), directive (please, question, command, pursuit, etc.) includes groups of authoritative (allow, advise). The second group, i.e. declarative acts, includes the speech acts of effective christening, marriage, appointment, and verdictive judgment. (Safarov 2010: 85 p.) In their classification, a group of researchers is based on the semantic characteristics of verb predicates. They divide verbs into groups based on the characteristics of expressing one or another illocutionary goal and try to explain these groups specially. 150) in Uzbek speech acts, it is said about the speech act, judgment verbs, silence verbs, pronunciation verbs, expression verbs, that comparing their participation in speech acts with other languages will undoubtedly lead to interesting results. J. Liya, the author of the book "Pragmalinguistics", relies on sociolinguistic indicators to distinguish the groups of speech acts, according to their connection with the purpose of "providing politeness and learning this environment" in the process of communication: 1) competitive (speech acts expressing command, question, request, request relations); 2) convivial (invitation, welcome, greeting, thank you) speech acts; 3) collaborative confirmation (such as reporting, announcing, giving information) speech acts: 4) conflictive - (threats, accusations, swearing, cursing) are divided into speech acts expressing relations. In addition, speech act units can be divided into groups according to their structural structure. According to the differences in structural features, simple and compound (complex) speech acts are distinguished. A simple speech act is the smallest unit of speech activity. A joint speech act is formed by the combination of simple actions. Joint speech actions with equality

and subordinate relations between parts form a logical and communicative whole and are used by the speaker as a whole unit (Karabin, 1989). that it has a systemic nature and creates opportunities to study it as a whole system. Consequently, the interpretation of speech activity from the perspective of the general theory of activity in terms of pragmatic goal, action, attitude, and the classification of speech acts into the classification principles of textual pragmatics creates opportunities to study it as a whole system.

## REFERENCES

1. Азнаурова Э.С. Прагматика художественного слова . Ташкент: Фан, 1988. - 121 с.
2. Арутюнова, Н.Д. Истоки, проблемы и категории прагматики. // Новое зарубежной лингвистике. М.: Прогресс, 1985. - Вып. XVI: Лингвистическая прагматика. - С.3-42.
3. Баранов, А.Г. Текст в функционально-прагматической парадигме. Краснодар: Кубанский Госуниверситет, 1988. - 90 с.
4. Барченков А. А. Прагматическое содержание текста и его передача при переводе // Общие и частные проблемы теории перевода. Сб. научн. тр. – М., 1989.
5. Безменова Л.Э. Функционально-семантические и прагматические особенности речевых актов. Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. Самара, 2001. - 18 с.
6. Богданов В.В. Речевое общение: прагматические и семантические аспекты. Л.: Изд-во ЛГУ, 1990. - 88 с.
7. Булыгина, Т.В. О границах и содержании прагматики // Изв. АН СССР. Серия лит-ры и языка, 1981. Т.40. - № 4. - С. 1839.
8. Гальперин, И.Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2004. - 144 с.
9. Дейк, Т.А. ван. Вопросы прагматики текста. // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М.: Прогресс, 1978. - Вып. VIII: Лингвистика текста. - С.259- 336.
10. Дмитриева, М.М. Семантико-прагматические и стилиобразующие характеристики экспрессивных единиц языка Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. Нижний Новгород, 2000 - 16 с.
11. Дудина, Т.Б. Прагматическая характеристика текста и его лингводидактическая направленность // Проблемы лингвистического анализа текста. Коммуникативно-прагматический аспект. Иркутск: ИГПИИЯ, 1990.-С. 5-10.
12. Кифер Ф. О роли прагматики в лингвистическом описании // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М.: Прогресс, 1985. -Вып.16: Лингвистическая прагматика. - С. 333-348.
13. Левковская Н.А. Прагматическая установка текста и прагматическая установка адресанта. // Коммуникативные единицы языка: структурные, семантические, прагматические аспекты. М., 1990. -С. 125-130.
14. Наер, В.Л. Прагматика текста и ее составляющие. // Сб. науч. трудов. Вып. 245. -М., 1985.
15. Почепцов Г.Г. Прагматический аспект изучения предложения (к построению теории прагматического синтаксиса) // Иностранные языки в школе. М., 1975. - №6.
16. Почепцов Г. Г. Прагматика текста // Коммуникативно - прагматические и семантические функции речевых единств: изд-во Калинин. гос. ун-т. – Калинин, 1980. – с.5-10.

17. Рахимов С. Речевая коммуникация и проблема дейксиса в разносистемных языках. – Т.: Фан, 1989. -119 б..
18. Сафаров Ш.С. Прагмалингвистика. Самарқанд, 2008.-285 б.
19. Ismailovich S. A. Socio-Psychological Problems of Educating an Independent-Minded, Creative Person in the Educational Process //CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 12. – С. 4-7.
20. Саидов А., Джураев Р. Баркамол авлодни тарбиялаш-соғлом турмуш тарзини шакллантиришда спортнинг ўрни //Общество и инновации. – 2021. – Т. 2. – №. 2. – С. 203-208.
21. Саидов А. pedagogik mahorat: ёшлар ўртасида соғлом турмуш тарзини шакллантириш устувор вазифа сифатида //центр научных публикаций (buxdu. uz). – 2020. – Т. 2. – №. 2.