The Methodological View to Pragmatics and Semantics

Navruz Pattakulovich Imamov [1], Munisa Yaxyoyevna Karimova [2]

[1] Teacher of Samarkand Institute of Economics and Service

[2] Teacher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: In this scientific article the methodological view to pragmatics and semantics is analysed.

Key words: Epistemological characterization, Accuracy's sake, meaning, Chomsky, metapragmatically characterizable categories.

The first way to articulate the relationship concerns methodologies of, or metatheoretical stances toward, linguistic sciences. Clearly, they can be objective (deagentivized) or subjective (agentive), analytic (compositional)or synthetic (holistic), or various combinations thereof; but we may detect three ideal types in the recent history. The first of such types, best represented by the Chomsky an approach and generally characterized by objective and analytic attitudes, is called "componential, compartmental, or 'modular" [2, 39]. It sees the linguistic sciences as analytic pursuits dealing with decomposable objects (i.e.,modules) such as phonetics, phonology, morph phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics, naturalistically studied by compositional methods and described independently of the particular socio historical contexts in which analysts are involved as social agents. Clearly, this metatheoretical stance, which underlies the organizational institutions and academic curricula of linguistics, is typical of the modern sciences coming out of Baconian natural philosophy in 17th-century England [5, 88-131]. That is, it is the stance f the modern natural sciences, with their laws and other regularities, which try to explain empirically occurring phenomena by appealing to hypothetically idealized quasiempirical regularities('covering laws') [4, 112] analytically abstracted from the to talcum texts of scientific activities, which are there by decomposed into distinct fields, in our case semantics and pragmatics.

This epistemological characterization may be supplemented with a pragmatic understanding of the social and historical processes of epistemic authorization [5, 78]. That is, the componential stance toward language is pragmatically positioned in, and presupposingly indexes, the historical context of the post-Baconian specialized sciences and, more broadly, Durkheimian 'organic society' in modernity, or the age of social specialization and the division of labor. Because the truthfulness, appropriateness, and effectiveness of any actions, including scientific ones, depend on the contexts in which they take place, this implies that the componential stance and its 'scientific' results receive their authority primarily from the post-Baconian modernization project.

This project is characterized not only by social and epistemic specialization, but also by the standardizing regularization, methodical rationalization, and experimental controlling of contextual contingencies, chance happenings, and unique events, which earlier were understood as fate, epiphanies, and other phenomena originating in the heavenly universe, and transcendingthe sublunar, empirically manipulable space of human agency. Here, we must note that standardizing regularization, Saint-Simonian technocratic specialization, and Benthamite instrumental rationalization generally characterize the modern disciplineof logic (or, when applied to linguistics,

of formal syntax and semantics), which came to dominate American philosophy around 1900 and whose rise is precisely due to these social forces [5, 43-70].

First, as to the boundary between semantics and pragmatics, we may discern three approaches: semanticism, pragmaticism, and complementary. Semantic is menvisions pragmatics as the extension of semantically encoded yet metapragmatically characterizable categories (especially moods and verbadicendi, or verbs of saying), just as traditional logic has understood pragmatics (discourse) as the extensional universe onto which intentional (i.e., metasemantically characterizable) categories are projected. Naturally, semanticismis aligned with the decontextualized, analytic methodological perspective and sees language in use from the metasemantic perspective of the denotational code (linguistic structure) presupposingly used by language users, including linguistic scientists, to interpret the referential significances of discursive interactions in which they are involved as discourse participants. Hence, this approach, typically taken by the philosophers of language such as Austin and Searle, characteristically uses the method of 'armchair' introspection, in which only the presupposable (and referential) aspects of communicative processes may readily emerge. This approach generally excludesthe social-indexical aspects of pragmatics, particularlyas regards group identities and power relations among discourse participants and other contextual beings, inasmuch as these are created (vs. presupposed)in discursive interaction and only coincidentally, indirectly, or opaquely related to linguistic-structurally encoded symbols. In this approach, pragmatics is mostly reduced to metapragmatically characterizable types in what essentially is a semantic, denotational code; examples are mood /modality/tense categories, verbs of saying, pronouns, and other shifters (i.e., 'denotational–indexicalduplexes'; [5, 56]) or their psychological correlates, as observed in Austin's 'performative utterances' and Searle's 'primary illocutionary forces,' allegedly underlying the perlocutionary effects regularlycreated by the indirect (nonliteral) use of the tokens of such types (Deixis and Anaphora: Pragmatic Approaches; Speech Acts; Austin, John Lang Shaw (1911–1960)). Hence, this approach can be characterized as denotationalist, universalist, and presupposition list; it is based on, and expresses, aconsensualist linguistic ideology adopted by the scientific agents who, like many other language users, are inclined to see only or primarily the denotationally explicitly characterizable parts of language (Lucy,1992), while their social interest is limited to seeing language in vitro (vs. in vivo), essentially consisting of a set of universal categories commonly presupposed rather than contextually created in discursiveinteraction (Mey, 2001). Historically, this ideology derives from the 17th-century Locke an ideas about language and communication that started to prescribe and advocate, against the rhetorical practices of Scholastic disputants and the radically egalitarian Puritans, the transparently referential ('correct andliteral') use of language based on the 'universal public(i.e., bourgeois) consensus' about the proper, cooperative, rational use of language that should be presupposedby 'anyone'.

From Complementarism to Pragmaticism Nonetheless, complementary is distinct from semantic is min so far as the former advances a uniquely pragmatic principle (or perspective). This principle (or perspective) is communication, a notion that conceptualizes discursive interaction as opposed to linguistically encoded semantic categories (even though communication is still often taken as the intentional correlate of semantic categorization). This shift from decontextualized code to contextual process is also observed in the robustly pragmatic understanding of presupposition that has emerged in the wake of Rothstein's complementarist distinction between 'semantic' and 'pragmatic presuppositions' (Rothstein, S 2001: 27–29); in the discursive-functional model of communication, presupposition is a fundamentally pragmatic contextual process rather than an essential property of semantic types or their tokens. Discursive interactions in dexically presuppose and create their(con)texts, yielding contextual appropriateness and effectiveness, both in the referential and social-indexical domains of discourse. The focus of pragmatics is thus on the discursive interactions that indexically createreferential and social-indexical texts by in dexically presupposing contextual variables, including but not limited to metalinguistic codes such as metapragmatic principles and metasemantic relationships (Presupposition; Pragmatic Presupposition).Thus, complementarism may lead to the kind of pragmaticism that tries to include semantics as a partof the all-encompassing pragmatic processes of presupposing and creative indexicality in both referential and social-indexical

dimensions, involving not just ordinary language users but also linguistic scholars and including not just linguistic but also extralinguistic (sociohistorical) domains.

Thus far, we have explored how the three methodological stances are related to how we define the disciplinary boundaries and noted the correspondence between the methodological scale, stretching from componentialism to perspectivalism to critical pragmaticism, andanother scale, extending from semanticism to complementarism, reductionistic pragmaticism, and to talpragmaticism. Like any ideology, this configuration of metalinguistic ideologies is also embedded in the sociohistorical context; thus, we may observe a historical drift of pragmatics from componentialism and semanticismto perspectivalism and complementarism and, finally, to total and critical pragmaticism (Koyama, 2001b).

Again, let us start with Kant's critical turn, which yielded two traditions: the semantic and the socialscientific (i.e., pragmatic). Whereas Kant's centralconcerns were '(re)cognition' and 'judgment,' behindwhich the problematics of 'meaning' and 'language' were still hidden [4], Frege's (1848–1925) later discovery of predicate logic replaced the Kantian notion of synthetic judgment (or value) with analytic logic and the notions of proposition and sentence, further divided into 'force' (assertoric, interrogative, imperative, and so on) and propositional content (represented by structurally decomposable units such as the subject, predicate, and their subcategories).

The branch of lexicology that is devoted to the study of meaning is known as Semasiology. Words, however, play such a crucial part in the structure of language that when we speak of semasiology without any qualification, we usually refer to the study of word-meaning proper, although it is in fact very common to explore the semantics of other elements, such as suffixes, prefixes, etc.

Meaning is one of the most controversial terms in the theory of language. At first sight the understanding of this term seems to present no difficulty at all—it is freely used in teaching, interpreting and translation. The scientific definition of **meaning** however just as the definition of some other basic linguistic terms, such as **word, sentence,** etc., has been the issue of interminable discussions. Since there is no universally accepted definition of meaning1 we shall confine ourselves to a'Л brief survey of the problem as it is viewed in modem linguistics both in our country and elsewhere.

Some critics believe that the cognitive function of a text is more important than its persuasive (or expressive) function ; that whilst in translation cognitive (i. e. extra linguistic) accuracy can and must always be achieved, the other factor, the connotative, lexical, stylistic or pragmatic , defies accuracy, and is therefore secondary. K. Baldinger has referred to it as a "halo" round the conceptual of content; A. Neubert states that only the "pragmatic" is untranslatable. Thiswidespread idea appears mistaken to me; a glance at the entries for, say, "Munich" or "Hitler" in, say, the Petit Larousse or the Quillet- Flammarion suggests that lexicographers tend to leave out the most important facts [186-189], [5, 14].

The Limits of word Meaning for Accuracy's sake.

A word can mean anything at all under the following conditions:

a)   that it has a stipulate license to do so;

b)   that it forms part of a special code;

c)   that it is spoken or written in error, is a misprint;

d)   that the author is writing under stress (fear, illness).

In all the above cases, the translator still has to discover the word's meaning. However, under normal circumstances, the meaning of a word can never be wholly dictated or conditioned by its linguistic or situational context. The semantic contours of conceptual terms are often vaguer and wider, but system must not be translated as "arrangement", unless as part of a recognized collocation .

Theoretically, at any rate, all words have a minimum semantic content, that is one or two primary semantic components which form part of each of their meanings, and which must therefore be

International Journal of Language Learningand Applied Linguistics
For more information contact: mailto:editor@inter-publishing.com

Volume 2, No 5 |
May - 2023

"transferred" in any translation; these are the boundaries of translation, beyond which translation becomes paraphrase.

References.

1. Сафаров Ш.С. Прагмалингвистика. -Тошкент, "Ўзбекистон миллий энцеклопедияси" нашрёти, 2008. -300 б.

2. Chomsky N. Language and consciousness. Language 50: 1974. –P 111-33.

3. Лайонз Дж. Лингвистическая семантика. Введение. - М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2003. - 400 с.

4. Biber, Douglas. Styles of stance in English. *Text 9.*1989. –P 93-124.

5. Brown, Penelope; and Levinson, Stephen. Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1978. –P 56-311.

6. Akramovna, K. M., & Nusratullayevich, T. B. (2020). Classification of Sciences in the Works of Abu Raykhan Beruniy. *Open Journal of Philosophy*, *10*(03), 411.

7. Nusratullayevich, P. T. B. (2022). The role of alisher Navoi's spiritual heritage in the moral education of youth. *EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)*, *7*(4), 38-39.

8. Kizi, I. Y. N. Organization of Modular Training in Education.

9. Аслонов, Ш. Ш. (2020). Компьютерная лингвистика и филология: проблемы и решения. *Гуманитарный трактат*, (84), 17-19.

10. Аслонова, Ш. И. (2020). Проблемы педагогических технологий в обучении молодёжи в высших учебных заведениях. *Интернаука*, (21-1), 59-60.