

PROBLEMS OF PRAGMATIC LEARNING OF GRAMMATICAL FORMS

Rakhmatullayeva Shakhodat Ziyotovna

Doctor of philological sciences (PhD), associate professor at KarSU

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7657963>

Abstract. *This article focuses on the issues of pragmatic study of grammatical forms. The opinions of American scientists Ch. Pierce and Ch. Morris about pragmatics are analyzed. When a person engages in speech communication, in which society, in what environment and in what situation this communication takes place, each period and environment has its own rules of communication. It is shown that the rules of selection and use of language units and the conditions of communication are the basis for determining the form of speech.*

It has been determined that the role and place of grammatical possibilities in speech cannot be imagined, thought and interpreted without pragmatic factors. It is under analysis that the level of research of linguistic units and the linguistic relations between them requires the examination of their speech reality in this regard.

Keywords: *grammar, pragmatics, substantive, pragmatic approach, discourse, linguistic unit, linguistic attitude.*

At the beginning of the new century, Uzbek linguistics entered a new stage of its development and seriously began to study the speech realization of linguistic possibilities from the point of view of the effectiveness of practical use of the language. For this reason, a new direction of linguistics - Uzbek substantive-pragmatic linguistics - is being formed, which studies the realization of the substantial possibilities of the language on a pragmatic basis.

The word pragmatics, which is part of the substantive-pragmatic term, meaning new tasks of linguistics, is derived from the Greek word pragma, pragmatos, which generally means "activity". Uzbek substantive-pragmatic linguistics examines the practical attitude of those who possess the language capabilities and use it to this system of units. It studies the characteristics of a linguistic person's "calculation" with a pragmatic situation. It is known that the non-linguistic directions of pragmatics came as a result of the services of American scientists Ch. Pierce and Ch. Morris. It is settling down in Uzbek linguistics, acquiring a characteristic that is somewhat different from its traditional nature in world linguistics.[1] According to the article, "substantive-pragmatic approach as a new empirical direction of linguistics that is being formed in Uzbek science, linguistic possibilities in connection with non-linguistic phenomena such as the speaker, listener, their interaction in the communication process, communication situation" will try A person's practical use of linguistic opportunities depends on the personal qualities of the speaker and the listener, the purpose of speech, its types (overt or hidden), forms (message, question, command, request, advice, promise, greeting, request, farewell, excuse, congratulations, complaint, etc.), it emerges in common with a number of non-linguistic factors such as speech strategy and tactics, speech etiquette, culture of communication, worldview, level of knowledge, interests of the speaker or listener" [1]. The scientist stated that, as in all other levels of the language, at the same time, in the realization of the general grammatical meanings of the means that form the grammatical form, it is true that there is a commonality of linguistic and non-linguistic (person, situation, conditions) factors. For example, Due to the fact that "Biz kim mulki

Turon, amiri Turkistonmiz” (Amir Temur) sentence is disconnected from the pragmatic situation, a falsity arises in the understanding of the original essence of the semantic value of the grammatical means contained in it. This is the reason why the king's opinion about himself gives the impression that he is speaking on behalf of the Uzbek nation as a whole. "Linguistic units cannot reveal their speech characteristics without a pragmatic factor, but these factors are not equal, as the importance of one increases, the other decreases. That is, in the speech realization of each linguistic unit, there are three factors (linguistic, personal, pragmatic), the whole of which can be compared to a triangle, and each factor can be compared to one of its corners. As the expansion of one angle is based on the narrowing of another, the strengthening of one of these factors occurs based on the weakening of others. Linguistic units are sometimes more connected with the pragmatic factor in speech, and sometimes they feel less need for it" [1].

As long as linguistic units appear in speech, the factor of cooperation is clearly visible. In particular, any linguistic unit cannot speak independently. Just as particles of different generalities are reflected in features, any language phenomenon in speech is mixed and synthesized with various linguistic and non-linguistic factors. "Speech is the realization of language, in which it "comes to life" as a whole. In other words, a whole system consisting of lexical, morphological, syntactic, and stylistic levels "appears" by taking "samples" of all its properties in each speech occurrence. Each of these "patterns" takes the status of "assistant" for the other in its speech realization. Even a single sound that occurs in speech is not a simple sound, but a part of a sentence that represents a complete speech. It seems that the difference between linguistic levels is eliminated only in speech. Each speech fragment is a product of the direct realization of language and the collaborative realization of all necessary levels as a "faded" linguistic conflict" [2,28]. Fully agreeing with these opinions of the linguist, it should be noted that only the cooperation of linguistic factors is noted, but non-linguistic factors also have an incomparable power in terms of cooperation in speech. In this sense, the following opinions of linguists B. Mengliyev and M. Ernazarova can be said to be a logical continuation and complement of the previous opinions: "However, the speech realization of grammatical meaning cannot be limited by purely linguistic factors. Because the human communication system consists of a combination of linguistic and non-linguistic factors".

Any abstract system is characterized by homogeneity, and specific systems are characterized by heterogeneity. In this sense, an abstract linguistic system with a homogeneous description differs from a speech system with a heterogeneous sign.

Speaker and listener, speech situation and conditions play an important role in the speech realization of any linguistic unit. This also applies to the realization of grammatical meaning. Therefore, non-verbal elements in the speech system can be conditionally divided into two:

- a) personality element;
- b) pragmatic elements.

Based on this, it can be concluded that the elements of the speech system are of three types - linguistic, personal and pragmatic in nature.

Grammatical meaning is considered as a phenomenon related to elements of a linguistic nature in the speech system, and the characteristics of its realization are studied in connection with linguistic and non-linguistic (personal, pragmatic) elements. So, it can be said that the cooperation of linguistic levels is emphasized in the study of language as a whole system, and the level of cooperation of non-linguistic factors with linguistic levels is studied in the study of

speech as a whole system. Among these factors, the role and place of speech situation and circumstances is unique.

"Communication process is a unique complex system, a system formed from the totality of various linguistic and non-linguistic factors. In the process of communication, elements belonging to such different levels and systems combine to form one separate system - the communication system. In any communication, the speaker and the listener participate as necessary parts. Communication parts mean elements that directly and indirectly participate in the process of communication, exchange of ideas, speech" [7,157].

S. M. Mominov, who started Uzbek sociolinguistics in a practical form, tentatively groups the components of the speech communication system as follows in his doctoral dissertation:

1) internal elements (nationality, gender, age, social status, degree of proximity to the unit of influence);

2) external elements (time, situation, condition, social status).

In this case, the units (elements) of the second group constitute, in our view, the type of speech condition and situation of the linguistic factor [4,126].

N.I. Formanovskaya distinguishes the following forms of the communication system from different points of view:

1) according to the position of subjects in relation to space and time: contact communication and remote communication;

2) according to the existence / non-existence of the tool "apparatus": directly and indirectly;

3) according to the form of speech: oral communication and written communication;

4) according to the addressee: dialogic and monologic communication;

5) according to the amount of the subject of communication: interpersonal and public communication;

6) communication according to conditions and mutual relations of communicants: formal and informal communication [5,159].

The first, third, fourth, and sixth cases, among the various characteristics of communication distinguished by the linguist, appear as communication systems in which the factor of speech conditions in communication is prioritized.

M.S. Kagan classifies the communication system as follows:

1) personal communication: interpersonal, group communication, representative communication;

2) communication between persons and non-persons: communication with the animal world and things;

3) communication with an imaginary person: communication with a second "I" and an image of an unreal person [6,319].

It seems that the communication system also has the characteristics of diversity and multi-elements, such as any thing-subject, event-event, sign-property, communication-relationship in the objective existence, and every aspect of it is important in its own way. As it is, each element has its own place and role.

Approaching the object of scientific study as a whole consisting of many characteristics and relationships is one of the main criteria of dialectical logic. Therefore, in Uzbek substantive

linguistics, where the methodology of scientific study is dialectical logic, the principle of diversity is the main methodological principle in revealing and describing the substantial nature of language units.

When a person engages in speech communication, it is of great importance in which society, in what environment and in what situation this communication takes place. Because each era and environment has its own rules of communication, there are rules for the selection and use of language units, which shows that the conditions of communication determine the form of speech.

It seems that the role and place of grammatical possibilities in speech cannot be imagined, thought and interpreted without pragmatic factors. The level of research of the identified linguistic units and the linguistic relations between them requires the investigation of their speech reality in this regard.

REFERENCES

1. Mengliyev B. The commonality of possibility and reality in language // "Marifat" newspaper, May 13, 2015.
2. Mengliyev B.R. Language as a whole system. - Tashkent: Nihol, 2010. - 28 p.
3. Mengliyev B., Ernazarova M. Interpretation of grammatical meaning in a systematic approach // Current issues of Uzbek linguistics. - Tashkent: TSPU named after Nizami, 2011. - 54 p.
4. Mominov S.M. Socio-linguistic features of Uzbek communication behavior. Philol. science. doc. ... diss. autoref. - Tashkent: 2000. - 20 p.
5. Formanovskaya N.I. Speech etiquette and communication culture. - Moscow: Higher School, 1989. - 159 p.
6. Kagan M.S. The world of communication. - Moscow: Politizdat, 1988. - 319 p.
7. Toirova G.I. Systematicity and informativeness in Uzbek speech communication. Doctor of Philology (RhD) ...diss. - Tashkent: 2017. - 157 p.
8. Rakhmatullaeva Sh. Z. The role of ethnic factors in the implementation of grammatical meanings of the forms of the mode of action // Journal of scientific publications of graduate students and doctoral students. – 2016. – no. 6. - p. 61-63.
9. Bazarova D.B. Variability of phraseological units. Science and innovation. 1 (B7), 483-486.
10. Рахматуллаева, Ш. З. (2013). ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИХ ЗНАЧЕНИЙ ФОРМ ОБРАЗА ДЕЙСТВИЯ В ПИСЬМЕННЫХ ПАМЯТНИКАХ. *SCIENCE AND WORLD*, 31.
11. Рахматуллаева, Ш. З. (2016). РОЛЬ ЭТНИЧЕСКИХ ФАКТОРОВ РЕАЛИЗАЦИИ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИХ ЗНАЧЕНИЙ ФОРМ СПОСОБА ДЕЙСТВИЯ. *Журнал научных публикаций аспирантов и докторантов*, (6), 61-63.
12. Рахматуллаева, Ш. З. (2013). О НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-КУЛЬТУРНОЙ ЗНАЧИМОСТИ ФОРМ ОБРАЗА ДЕЙСТВИЯ В УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (6), 139-143.
13. Bozorova, D. B. (2015). Some notes of variability in the Uzbek linguistics. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (4), 135-138