

Interpretation of Pragmatics and Semantics in Narrative Text

Guzal Nizomjonovna Berdiyeva¹

Abstract: this article deals with interpretation of pragmatics and semantics in narrative texts as well as gives several feasible notions in terms of pragmalinguistics, linguistic expression and discourse from prominent linguists.

Keywords: pragmalinguistics, semantics, internal, semantic-concepts, functional-structurality.

It is known that the word "Pragmatics" is derived from the Greek word pragma-action, and is actually a philosophical concept. Pragmatics in philosophy was also widely used in the times of Socrates. In the second half of the Middle Ages, philosophers such as J. Locke and E. Kant introduced it to a wide discussion by adopting it from Aristotle. In this way, the stream of pragmatism arose in philosophy. The period of the main development of this movement and its promotion began to be felt in the 20-30s of the 20th century. American scientist Ch. Peirce made a great contribution to the reflection of pragmatics in philosophy in linguistics. The main idea of this philosophical system was to study the meaning of a semiotic sign (including a linguistic sign) in connection with the effect, results, and success of the action performed by means of this sign [1]. Ch. Peirce distinguishes three scientific directions within the framework of semiotics: syntax, semantics and pragmatics as independent directions. According to his definition, syntax is "identification of the mutual syntactic relations of signs, while semantics analyzes "the relationship of signs to their designators, that is, to the object expressed through them", and finally, pragmatics is "the meaning of a sign to its user-interpreter was evaluated as an area that illuminates the relationship" [2]. A designate is a class of objects represented by a sign, and a denotation is a member of this class.

On the other hand, pragmatics covers issues studied together with the fields of semantics and syntax and acts as a specific generalizing field. N. Chomsky considers language activity as a two-part phenomenon consisting of competence and performance. The linguist connects pragmatics only with the concept of performance. Sh. Safarov explains that the pragmatic theory is the matching of the sentence mark of the speaker and the listeners with the proposition in the text [3].

According to G.N. Leach, the theory of pragmalinguistics cannot avoid functionalism. It becomes clear that the tariff of pragmalinguistics can be revealed only by approaching the analysis of communicative activity from the point of view of the functional characteristics of the linguistic system [4]. J. Lyons proposes to distinguish text-sentence and system-sentence, sentence-language and sentence-sign on the one hand, and on the other hand, speech act and speech derivative, speech sign and language phenomena, which are speech units [5]. This, in turn, causes the evaluation of the meaning of a sentence as an object of semantics and the meaning of a speech unit as an object of pragmatics.

Pragmalinguistics research subject is conceived on a large scale, which means that this field will develop in different directions. As a result, "pragmalinguistics has its own "internal" fields, such as speech act theory, pragmasemantics, and pragmastylistics" [3]. Such a difference helps to expand the possibilities of different approaches to the analysis of a certain text.

It is known that semantics-language system studies the direction of meaning of units. The pragmatic approach is evident in the meanings of speech units in the context of communication, the relationship between the speaker and the listener. So, the use of linguistic units in concrete communication situations is the object of pragmatic analysis.

¹ Samarkand state institute of foreign languages Teacher of the department of English theory and practice



From the typological point of view, the individuation of many linguistic universals differs from each other. The following main differences are observed in their semantic composition: 1) "discourses inter-metamorphoses" preserve their integrity and play an important role in the identification of kinship and cover all the signs of conceptual, rational-discursiveness: 2) in the semantic mobile models, abstract existence is metaphorically-figurative. , emotional-feeling units are included; 3) forms "conceptual" and "language system" units related to the forms covering a concept and its verbalization methods in a certain language [6]. It seems that the semantic and pragmatic features of languages can serve as important tools in the typological comparison of linguistic and cultural concepts in certain natural languages.

The comparison of semantic-concepts, which has a unique place in the comparison between languages, plays an important role in the verbalization of the narrative reality, revealing the anthological features of the text. It also serves to clarify the principles of grammatical means in the text. In the process of this comparison, first, referential and pragmatic features of semantics are distinguished and their equivalents in the languages being compared are obtained. In the comparative study of the grammatical system of languages, the functional tasks of the units belonging to the verb system are categorical features, contextual usage, laws of semantic expression under the influence of arguments, and certain meanings specific to each language in the formation of "grammatical speech". It is emphasized by V. G. Gak that it should be focused on functional semantic verbalization [7]. In comparative languages, the object taken for comparison is also important. In particular, the object obtained for comparative typological research should be carried out in a linguistic field in these languages. Of course, the chosen object should have its own theoretical significance. Regarding the language levels at which the research should be conducted, the well-known Uzbek typologist O'.Q. Yusupov's opinion is appropriate: "Comparison of languages for theoretical purposes at the lexical level is the structure and inventory of lexical paradigmatic groups with all connections, semantic and associative fields, lexical-semantic groups, synonymous lines, antonymic pairs and equivalent words"[8].

"The question of the relationship between semantics and pragmatics remains relevant. Researchers continue to "swim from one coast to another" in search of a solution to this problem. On the other hand, supporters of the idea that linguistic expressions do not have any meaning outside of the context [3], supporters of text analysis, if the phrase does not express an event or does not have a certain meaning, how it is used in the text and the content of the text they put forward the question that it is compatible with [9].

The idea that it is necessary to determine the meaning of any linguistic expression based only on the text is not very close to reality. Researchers from another group prefer to interpret the content of a speech expression as a unique "social construction" and as a product of "agreement" between interlocutors.

In the text, discourse as a linguistic unit is characterized by universal and specific features. Universal features of discourse include integrity and coherence [10].

Discourse is the use of language units at a certain time and place with a certain purpose, their consistent connection they emphasize [11]. Discourse as a linguistic unit is characterized by universal characteristics. Generality and connectedness are the main features of discourse. Aspectual semantics plays an important role in discourse, mainly in narrative situations. Perfective and imperfective forms affect the chronological relationship of various actions presented in the text. Aspectual meanings are given in a way that is clearly indicated in the discourse. Information of the situational type of aspectuality appears in the discourse in the form of "being". [12].

Pragmatics covers issues studied in the fields of semantics and syntax and acts as a unique generalizing field. N. Chomsky considers linguistic activity as a two-part phenomenon consisting of competence and speech performance. Pragmatics is concerned only with performance. Sh. Safarov explains that the pragmatic theory is the matching of the speaker's and listeners' sentence marks with the proposition in the text [2]. So, the information in the text appears to a certain extent complete, continuous and similar



features. This indicates the importance of some of the pragmatic data to be included in the aspectual analysis. The author says, "It is important to indicate the period and time of the event in the description of events happening in reality and in the transmission of information about them. Such a task of showing is performed by means of time (time) diction [2]. Based on this idea, the means of time deixis serve as a reference to the exact past of events and processes in the speech situation. In particular, these events or processes take place within certain aspectual semantics.

The deixis of the text is activated in the text in two different cases, anaphoric and cataphoric. The features of aspectual opposition play an important role in discourse, especially in narrative deixis. The choice of imperfective or perfective forms affects the analysis of the chronological relationship of various actions in the text. In particular, "grammatical aspect does not depend on the external deictic connection in the speech situation in contrast to the tense. It only serves as a reference to the internal temporal characteristics of events. In functional linguistics, the oppositional approach based on opposition is leading in defining discourse/text criteria such as functional-structurality, process-result, dynamism-stagnation, activity. Accordingly, the "text-result" structure and the functional "discourse-as-process" view are mutually compatible.

The interrelationship of semantics and pragmatics in the narrative text directly serves to clarify the use of aspectual meanings, aspects of purpose, or the activation of aspectual semantics. The semantic meaning in the text is realized through pragmatic imilication.

The text is a complex object of research, in its analysis the complex hierarchical structure of structural elements and levels is studied. Since aspectuality is related to the analysis of the semantics of situations and events, its study is directly related to the study of deictic expressions in the text. Thus, in canonical speech situations, deictic means are focused on the speaker, in non-canonical situations, on the listener, and in narrative situations, the deictic element is analyzed as being focused on the person who replaces the speaker. Usually, deixis is divided into such types as time (temporal) and space. Such aspectual situations and events are directly related to this linguistic phenomenon. According to R. Lengaker, any verb is analyzed on two bases, that is, in relation to time and space.

In this case, one or another state of the subject is described in the component of the action expressed by the verb. That is why there are those who include action art in the pragmatic category rather than the semantic category. We can observe such views in the works of B. Fanning and V. Evans [13].

In the context of the text, it is possible to observe that the use of sentences in the English language expresses separate situations and individual aspectual events in a narrative order, while in the Uzbek language, one is formed depending on the other. One sentence can fill the aspectual situation expressed in the second sentence.

Despite the fact that the language system consists of different levels, the verb system is also in the center of attention of researchers in comparative typological studies. According to the activation of the verb system in the predicate, it has its own expression in all languages and can form a diverse composition of categories. Comparative typological analysis of these phenomena related to the verb serves to realize the intended purpose. In particular, the semantic field, which forms categories such as tense, ratio, aspect, is common to all levels of the field in the comparable languages. Similarities and dissimilarities between languages appear in the semantic field. Of course, the semantic field and pragmatic concept can be met with considerations that lead to incorrect interpretation in many cases. One of the important concepts in pragmatic linguistics is the concept of discourse. The concept of discourse as a linguistic term entered linguistics in the middle of the last century. In linguistics, it was initially understood as a connected and agreed consequence in a sentence or speech, but in modern linguistics it is used as a complex communicative phenomenon. The term discourse refers to the generalization of some information, information or content expression. And information is generally understood as the meaning of information delivery [14].

In works devoted to the study of language from a pragmatic point of view, the term discourse is used in eight different meanings:



1. Word alternative;
2. A unit that passes through assumptions in terms of size;
3. The effect of the thought on the addressee, taking into account the speech situation;
4. Conversation;
5. Position of the speaker in the speech;
6. Use of linguistic units;
7. Theoretical devices intended for researching the conditions of text formation includes concepts representing the process [3]. In practice, discourse is a way of forming a text. From this point of view, G. Mirsanov notes the importance of temporal and atemporal tools in the formation of discourse. [15].

Discourse analysis is widely activated within the framework of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of the text. Syntactically, it is used to describe an activity that consists of different thoughts and speech acts according to the plan of expression, i.e., its structure, semantically, according to the content-meaning plan, and pragmatically, perloquy is used to convey a message.

Also, the use of the linguistic units of the discourse at a certain time and in a certain sense, as well as with a specific purpose, and their consistent connection to each other is counted. [16]. In functional linguistics, the oppositional approach based on opposition is the leader in determining discourse / text criteria such as task content, temporal aspect, process-result, dynamism, stagnation, activity [2]. Accordingly, the "text-result" structure and the functional "discourse-as-process" view are mutually compatible.

It can be seen that most of the analyzes carried out within the framework of the discourse include features such as aspectuality, semantics, process-result, dynamism-stagnation, and activity. Therefore, research on aspectual semantics outside the scope of the sentence, i.e. research in the structure of the text, seems to be promising. Aspectuality can make it possible to solve problems such as textual semantics, textual grammar, which are related to the content of the text.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Пирс Ч.П. Начала прагматизма / Перевод с английского, предисловие В. В. Кирюшенко, М. В. Колопотина, — СПб.: Лаборатория метафизических исследований философского факультета СПбГУ; Алетейя, 2000. — 352 с.
2. Сафаров. Ш. Прагмалингвистика. “Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси”. Тошкент, 2008,- 30-б
3. Сафаров Ш.С. Когнитив тилшунослик. -Жиззах. “Сангзор”. 2006.-92 б.
4. Leech, G. (1975). Semantics. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth. P. 35-205.
5. Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics. Vols 1–2. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge etc.
6. Гурочкина А.Г. Понятие дискурса в современном языкознания // Номинация и дискурс. – Рязань, 1999. –С 13.
7. Гак В.Г. Межъязыковое оопогавление и преподавание иностранного языка. - Иностр. языки в школе, 1979, К 3, с. 3-11.
8. Юсупов Ў.Қ. Тилшуносликдаги янги йўналишлар хусусида. “Тилшуносликдаги янги йўналишлар ва уларнинг муаммолари” илмий-амалий семинари материаллари. –Т., 2013. – Б. 251-257.
9. Ryazanseva T.I. Hypertext and electronic communication [Text] / T.I. Ryazanseva. - М.: LKI/ URSS, 2010. - 256 p.



10. Григорьева, В.С. Дискурс как элемент коммуникативного процесса: прагмалингвистический и когнитивный аспекты: монография / В.С. Григорьева. – Тамбов : Изд-во Тамб. гос. техн. ун-та, 2007. – 288 с
11. Гурочкина А.Г. Понятие дискурса в современном языкознания // Номинация и дискурс. – Рязань, 1999. –С 13.
12. Smith C. S. Modes of Discourse // The Local Structure of Texts. Cambridge University Press, 2003. –336 p.Fanning, Verbal Aspect, 49–50.
13. Buist M. Fanning. Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs Oxford theological monographs, Clarendon Press, 1990. - P. 471.
14. Declerck R. Tense in English: its Structure and Use in Discourse. London, 1991 – P. 64-305.
15. Мирсанов Ғ.Қ.Юриш ҳаракат фелларининг акционал ва аспектуал хусусиятлари. Фил.фан.номз.Автореф.2018. -23 б.
16. Плуноян, 2009; 13 почему языки такие разные. АСТ-Пресс,2009,-272

