

**PRAGMATIC INTERPRETATION
OF THE APPEAL****Creative Writing**

Keywords: appeal, nomination, denotation, reality, signification, cohesion, coherence.

**Ravshanova Rano
Khandanovna**

Teacher of Navoi State Pedagogical Institute. City Navoi, Uzbekistan.

Abstract

The article discusses the fact that the pragmatic features of the appeal are used as a means of nomination, as well as its more important cohesive function and expression as a category of coherence. It is also analyzed that coherence is one of the main features of textuality, along with such features as cohesion, intentionality (intention), acceptance (acceptance), informativeness, situationality, intertextuality (intertextuality).

The appeal is not part of the dialogue, it can be studied as a pragmatic act that serves not only the appeal function of the communication, but also the naming (nomination) of the communicator.

The term "nomination" is the naming of a particular object by a specific name (word, noun, name). It is a semiotic process that allows a given denotation (referent) to interact with a given denominator. In the linguistic encyclopedic dictionary, nomination is interpreted as a process related to the three-part structure of the sign: it is accepted to interpret the process and structure of nomination acts from the three-part relation - ("semantic triangle") "reality – concept – name".

Each component of this universal-logical relation of nomination, its precise-linguistic application, is enriched with features that serve to divide the world into parts in this language.

The denotation name of reality is expressed as the sum of properties allocated for acts of nomination of all representations under the name of these realities (class of objects).

The concept, which includes categorical-linguistic signs, manifests itself as a name signifier (meaning). It can also include expressive characters. The name is understood in the linguistic mind as a series of sounds that are divided according to the structural formation of that linguistic code.

The relationship between the nomenclature and the denotation, and the fact that this relationship focuses on the act of explicit nomination (sentence structure) – denotation of the object of expression from the meaning of the name – forms the basic structure of the nomination universal for natural languages. Acts of nomination are the product of speech activity, and their results are mastered through the linguistic system, functional and social norms of language and uzus" [7, p. 433].

Most of the words in a language belong to the category of symbols formed by free and hereditary lack of communication between the expressive and the expressed between them by

human agreement. In the process of a communicative act, the nomination appears as an act of creating a symbol and forms the basis of the dialogue: the results of the nomination, which represent the "parts" of the being, serve as building materials for the sentence. Linguistic essences are adapted to the roles of deictic (see Deixis), purification, and service, as well as identifying or reporting the elements of being in the nomination process" [7, p. 433].

Nomination in the text is one of the ways to express the author's position. When naming a protagonist, event, or object in one way or another, the speaker often tells the listener what he or she thinks about that object or person by giving the coordinates of acceptance of that event.

"The speech sign is not given in advance, it is formed in every speech act. The sign of the selected object in the naming process forms the internal form of the speech sign. Every object, as well as man, has many characters, sides, levels, features. Each of them is active in speech and serves as the basis of the speech nomination, so that one person can receive many speech expressions" [2, p. 173].

Many linguistic nominations are secondary and are based on the figurative meaning of the word. A.A. Reformatsky describes the mechanism of meaning transfer through the archetypal situation as follows: "The first case. The nominative orientation is also clearly expressed in the name of the *sharik* (*шарик хлеба*, *шарик глины*, *sharik* in general): the word *sharik* can be used to name any object that meets the requirements of the concept of "sharik"; Conformity with the concept of "two important signs" is also evident: spherical (*кубик*, *квадратик* (cubic, square): reflected to it) and small size (dimension) (sphere: reflected to it); other, i.e. color (blue, red, white) or material (*из глины* (from clay), *из хлеба* (from bread)) and other marks do not matter.

The secondly, *Sharik* is the dog's own name, nickname. Apparently, this nickname comes from the name of the noun, because the round-bellied puppy (*sharik*) rolls like a small ball. However, the puppy has grown up, and perhaps a tall, thin "big" dog may no longer fit the "small" or even "spherical" characters at all. This word is in conflict with the signs of the noun "partner" or simply loses the existing meaning of the concept of the name of the partner and thus the concept, although the concept can not exist or exist apart from those that represent its "essential features".

What does it mean to understand that in the word *sharik*, the meaning of fame does not exist at all? No. Famous names have meanings (otherwise could they exist in a language?), But the meaning of famous names is weakened by their naming function, by their conformity with the object they are naming (more precisely, the class of objects).

The third case. The word *Sharik* ("besporodnaya sobaka" - "purebred dog", "dvor-nyajka" - "ko'ppak") is a new generic name, without losing the ability to name and clearly nicknamed the dog, again acquires all the rights of the genus, that is, again expresses the concept, now it "sharik" – derived from the concepts of "neighborhood", "compatibility" ("in harmony"), other than "malenkiy sharik" ("small ball"), through metonymy and synecdoche, its "important features" and

a new dream that has nothing in common with the concept of ‘sharik’ (and its essential features). This is exactly T_2 (P_2 , ie the second concept” [9, p. 67].

Nomination involves the personal attitude of the speaker, or writer to the naming process as a secondary character. The clash of the correct and figurative meanings of the word used forms a mockery, an allusion, a pitching, a cut-off nomination.

In addition to being used as a nomination tool, the appeal also has a more important cohesive function: the appeal provides the cohesion of the text. From the point of view of structuralism, the text is a higher linguistic unit in the hierarchy of different units of language – from phonetic units to syntactic units.

«1. Language itself exhibits a complex, hierarchically stratified semiotic structure. 2. Each layer of the linguistic structure forms a system of interconnected and related units. 3. In any tier of the linguistic structure, its own levels can be distinguished. 4. For each tier, its basic unit can be allocated. 5. For a morphological tier, a morpheme is the basic unit. 6. For the phonological tier (or: phonetic) the phoneme is the basic unit” [9, p. 124].

According to the structural linguistic concept, phonemes are “structure materials” for morphemes, which in turn are part of the word, and the word is part of the next level - the syntactic unit. In linguistics, a text is a collection of freely dimensional cohesive and coherently connected sentences.

In linguistics, the size of a text is still a contentious issue. Linguists, in particular I.R.Galperin and O.M.Kamenskaya, refer to several (at least two) sentences of the text. There are, of course, connections between them that are manifested by this or that means. At the same time, in modern literature, since the time of R.Bart and J.Christeva, any sentence, even a single sentence, is a text. Impressing the reader or listener who receives this text is its main feature.

As A.A.Leontev points out, “integrity, separability, relevance, logicity, temporality, evaluation, composition are the main features of a text” [6, p. 119].

The appeal in the texts, which consists of the sentences and utterances of the various communicators, ensures its cohesion. Along with coherence (in other words, integrity, the conformity of different parts of a text to its idea of unity), cohesion is also one of the basic features of modern text.

The author of the term "cohesion" I.R.Galperin states: "Cohesion is a specific type of communication that provides a continuum, that is, a separate message, fact, logical sequence, interdependence of events" [3, p. 74].

The term “continuum” refers to the sequence of narratives and their interrelationships with different periodic categories of text. “The continuum category as a text category, manifested in various forms of the flow of time, period, space, events, in itself reflects the artistic understanding

of the categories of time and period of objective being. This led to the introduction of the term "continuum" instead of the word "consistency".

N.V.Lukashevich distinguishes several means of representing cohesion:

- 1) discursive words;
- 2) lexical repetition;
- 3) anaphoric information, reference;
- 4) ellipsis [8].

Discursive words include the Russian words *nu*, *vot*, *da* and the English words *well*, *certainly*, *indeed*. Determining their exact meaning and belonging to word groups is a much more complex, difficult task, but they perform important functions in the text that ensure the interdependence of sentences. If the term discourse is understood as "the state of its creation (writing, pronunciation): the creator of the text, its addressee (s), the purpose of the text and the consequences of its influence" [7, p. 489], then discursive words refer to the situation of the text it provides this connection and can often form negative or affirmative statements on its own, often providing a dialogue connection.

Lexical repetition refers to the repetition of words that are placed side by side or at a distance in sentences, allowing one to understand that these sentences are related to a single subject or subject.

The reference, as a rule, performs its cohesive functions precisely through lexical repetition. It should also be noted that the appeal also serves the function of sorting the texts in the discourse: with the help of the appeal the text determines its orientation – the place, clearly communicates with the speaker, speaker and listener, assimilates the immanent features of the situation.

L.I.Grishaeva notes the connection of coherence with coherence as an application: "Coherence is recognized by almost all linguists (linguotextologists) as a category corresponding to the immanent nature of the text. ... Here and in other scientific works on the problem of text grammar, coherence is emphasized as one of the main features of textuality, along with six signs: cohesion, intentionality (intention), acceptance (acceptance), informativeness, situationality, intertextuality (intertextuality)" [4].

Different scientists distinguish different groups of means that provide cohesion. For example, L.Voborjil distinguishes the types of cohesion and calls them "connectors": To the connectors in the text:

1. Lexical means.
2. Naming substitution.

3. Logical and grammatical means.
4. Associative relations.
5. Figurative cohesion.
6. Compositional-structural forms of cohesion.
7. Special methodological methods, techniques.
8. Rhythm-forming forms.
9. Graphic features» [1].

It should be noted that L.Voborjil, there is no reference between the connectors, but it manifests itself in the categories of "associative relations" of cohesion, as well as in logical-grammatical and compositional-structural forms. "M.Holliday and R.Hasankogeziya distinguish five means: reference, substitution, ellipse, conjugation (connection) and lexical cohesion, although the authors emphasize that there is no solid boundary between these categories. All categories of cohesion are structural-grammatical and lexical communication phenomena. The five means of cohesion are based on two different types of relationships – the similarity of the objects and events being expressed or their combination" [5, 6].

L.Voborjil points out that the use of all connectors in the same text is a rare phenomenon, the author of the sentence, mainly chooses from them the one that suits the content and stylistic features of the text.

Thus, lexical tools can also include lexical repetitions that have changed without change, agreement, or number. In the constitution, instead of one name of the object or person, another, which is basically a hyperonym, is used.

In the process of naming the female protagonist in the text, the use of horses with an independent set of words instead of her name – "qiz" ("girl") ("devushka") or "ayol, xotin" ("woman, wife") ("jenshchina"), "talaba" ("student") ("studentka"), depending on her social status "xonim" (lady) ("dama"), "yosh xonim" ("young lady") ("baryshnya"), and b. can be called.

Similar exchanges are used in English texts. Gender-based substitution often leads to semantic problems.

The ideology of linguistic political correctness, for example, created the problem of *ochairman* and *chairwoman*: the chairman was traditionally called chairman, as usual, she started a feminist women's movement that demanded the use of the word male, then chairwoman, but for many it was considered an insult to use the word gender in the process, the word chairperson was invented to use a new, gender-neutral word that signifies that neither the woman nor the manhood of being president is yet known.

When addressing the chairperson, it is important to know which option is most important to her, as the opposition to political correctness, the tendency of society to be loyal to language traditions and the unconscious enjoyment of political correctness, when the presence of those who emphasize their "femininity" leads to the use of the word, and finally divides the chairman into those who do not wish to emphasize gender at all, i.e., those who prefer to use the term chairperson. This is also true of substitutions in other areas: in a few cases, the word "man" has been adopted for basic situations and situations, and it has been used by representatives of the feminist women's movement to refer to women or, for example, "Man at work" they demand to be replaced by *person* words.

Among the logical-grammatical means of cohesion are various connecting and connecting words that provide the connection between the main sentence with subordinate clauses and between several sentences in the text. These include *vsledstvie*, *potomu chto*, *v svyazi s tem*, *chto*, *poskolku*, *because*, *as a result*, *as well* and other connecting and connecting words.

Cohesion is not always clear to the recipient using associative connections. Because these associative ties themselves may not be in it. However, usually the author in such cases moves on to another topic that is in any case related to the previous topic. In translation, this very type of cohesion poses considerable difficulties, because the associative relations of one culture do not fit into the associative relations of another culture.

The same idea can be applied to the relative figurative cohesion of the conclusion: the figurative connection of this or that idea may be familiar to the author, but not to the translator and, in a broader sense, to another culture carrier. Thus, the pragmatic tasks of an appeal can include its nominative (naming, calling) and features that shape text cohesion.

References

1. Voborjil L. Leksicheskie i drugie sredstva kogezi teksta
http://www.rusistika.upol.cz/publikace/voboril_kohezekoherence.pdf
2. Gak V.G. Teoriya i praktika perevoda. – M.: Interdialekt, 1999.
3. Gal'perin I.R. Tekst kak ob'ekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya. – M.: Nauka, 1981.
4. Grishaeva L.I. Kogerentnost' teksta i aksional'nie seepochki // Yazik, muloqot i sosial'naya sreda
http://lse2010.narod.ru/yazik_kommunikatsiya_i_sotsialnaya_sreda_vipusk_6_2008/ligrishaeva_kogerentnost_teksta_i_aktsionalnie_tseepochki/
5. Lavrent'eva I.V. Kogeziya – Ul'yanovsk: Kolokol, 2004.
6. Leont'ev A.A. Psixolingvisticheskie osobennosti yazika SMI. – M.: Dobrosvet, 2007.
7. Lingvisticheskiy ensiklopedicheskiy slovar' (gl. red. V. N. Yarseva i dr.) – M.: Bol'shaya Rossiyskaya ensiklopediya, 2002.
8. Lukashevich N.V. Modeli i metodi avtomaticheskoy obrabotki nestrukturirovannoy informasii na osnove bazi znaniy ontologicheskogo tipa // <https://www.dissercat.com/content/modeli-i-metody-avtomaticheskoi-obrabotki-nestrukturirovannoi-informatsii-na-osnove-bazy-zna>
9. Reformatskiy A.A. Vvedenie v yazikovedenie. – M.: Aspekt Press, 1996.