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**DISCUSSION**

Pragmatics is the study of how language is used in particular situations to express a meaning or attitude that may not be obvious from the actual words. The person who aimed to learn the subject of pragmatics, was Klaus. According to him “Pragmatics is learning psychological as well as sociological side of linguistic character”. Pragmatic linguistic was formed as an independent branch of linguistics in 60th and 70th years. The conference which was called pragmatics of natural languages was held in 1970. According to it, the expression plays an important role in pragmatic analysis. Conference was told the feature of thesauruses in pragmatic analysis. For instance; the word “love”. People can express it by the word “kiss”, or the heart which is drawn to the paper or saying “I love you”. All of these samples express the word “love”. But it differs from each other by expression. The power of expressive is different. Psychologists noted that the principles of assimilation play a vital role. Pragmatics is the study of relationship between word and uses of the word. For example, “I have got a new boat and now I have a specific picture of boat and you have different one in your mind. It is related to interpretation and utterances. According to George Yuli express pragmatics along four detail detentions.

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by listener. It has, consequently, more to do with the analysis of what people mean by utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning. First of all, This type of study necessarily involves the interpretation of what people mean in specific context and how the context influences what is said. For example, You are at my place and I ask you could bring me a glass of water? So the utterances are not fitting the context. You can see how the context influences the meaning: 

- Hi, How are you?  
- Lovely weather today. So You can see it is grammatically correct, but it does not fit context and the situation. It requires a consideration of how speakers organize what they want to say in accordance with who they’re talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances, Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.

Second of the dimensions is this approach also necessarily explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning. This type of study explores how a greater deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. We might say that is investigation of invisible meaning. Pragmatics is the study of how meaning more gets communicated than is said, which means that you as a listener have to investigate the invisible meaning. For instance, 

- Please, close the window! The invisible meaning, person asks that the person is freezing. That room is too noisy outside depending on the situation. So, for example if I hear noise of outside, the utterance “-appease, close the window. The
invisible meaning which is not being spoken is that is too noisy.

Last dimension is the perspective then raises the question of what determines the choice between the said and the unsaid. The basic answer is tried to the notion of distance. Closeness, whether it is physical, social, or conceptual, implies shared experience. On the assumption oh how close, or distant the listener is, speakers determine how much needs to be said. Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance. Physical closeness would be “take this!” The only person close the speaker know what this refers to and Social closeness can be found between friend. For sample, If I tell you we had fun at the weekend. You would know that last weekend and that you know which friends of mine I meant by we. One traditional distinction in language analysis contrasts pragmatics with syntax and semantics. Syntax is the study of relationships between linguistic forms, how they are arranged in sequence, and which sequences are well-formed. Semantics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and entities in the world; that is, how words literally connect to things. Semantic analysis also try to establish the relationships between verbal descriptions. Pragmatics is the study of relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. In this three-part of distinction, only pragmatics allows humans into the analysis. The advantage of studying language via pragmatics is that one can talk about people’s intended meaning, their assumptions, their purposes or goals, and the kinds of actions that they are performing when they speak. The pragmatic analysis is showed in the following popular work “Gone with the wind” of an American writer Margaret. “ELLEN O'HARA was thirty-two years old, and, according to the standards of her day, she was a middle-aged woman, one who had borne six children and buried three. She was a tall woman, standing a head higher than her fiery little husband, but she moved with such quiet grace in her swaying hoops that the height attracted no attention to itself. Her neck, rising from the black taffeta sheath of her basque, was creamy-skinned, rounded and slender, and it seemed always tilted slightly backward by the weight of her luxuriant hair in its net at the back of her head. From her French mother, whose parents had fled Haiti in the Revolution of 1791, had come her slanting dark eyes, shadowed by inky lashes, and her black hair; and from her father, a soldier of Napoleon, she had her long straight nose and her square-cut jaw that was softened by the gentle curving of her cheeks. But only from life could Ellen's face have acquired its look of pride that had no haughtiness, its graciousness, its melancholy and its utter lack of humor.[5,27]“According to context, the writer depicted the hero “ELLEN O'HARA” for writer in order to understand who is “ELLEN O'HARA. The play writer is giving description about her appearance, family members, quality of her to be clarify for readers. According to the semantic of this context, the woman appears in the imagine of reader because of the expression. The locutionary act is effecting ti improve the language of work. The roles of diexes are important also. We can face also several thesauruses in the context. For instance, the name of hero “ELLEN O'HARA” is given for us because of being unknown for us in te first time. In the second time instead of “ELLEN O'HARA”, the personal pronoun is given. Because it is clearly for us in the second time. Why the author used other thesauruses like “her”. Because the description firstly given, it is directing the hero for us. The context has also other thesauruses like “father”, and “a soldier of Napoleon”. If the author does not use synonyms, the quality of the work would be low for readers. The word “father” is utilized, because “ELLEN O'HARA is the girl of him. But the play writer think him unknown for readers, so description for her father is given the context as “a soldier of Napoleon”. If the play writer does not give expression of him, the semantic of father would be unclear for readers, the readers had no idea for the semantic of the word “father”
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