

Semantics and Pragmatics of a Literary Text

Kasimova Nafisa,

PhD, Associate Professor Head of the Department of
Translation Studies and Language Education
at Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract

The given article represents the main ideas of the integrity of the pragmatic structure of the literary text. The author provides a description of the pragmatics in the literary text, as well as the interpretation of some linguistic conditions for it by applying certain interpretation strategies.

Keywords: *contextual condition, literary text, linguistic interpretation strategy, pragmatics, semiotics, speech act, semantics, category,*

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics as a young and modern branch of linguistics goes back to the philosophy of language. Its philosophical roots originate in the works of such philosophers as Charles Morris, Rudolf Carnap, Charles Peirce in the 30's of the last century. Morris, for example, represents a three-dimensional division on syntax, semantics and pragmatics within the framework of semiotics – the general science of signs. According to this typology, the syntax is the study of the formal ratio of one sign with another, the semantics studies the ratio of signs to what they mean, whereas the pragmatics identifies the attitude of signs to their users [4, 62]. The components of this trichotomy are decomposed by three degrees of abstractness, where the syntax is the most abstract link, and pragmatics is a link with the smallest degree of abstractness; semantics is located somewhere between them. Consequently, the syntax ensures the integrity of semantics, which in turn creates the foundation for pragmatics [2, 42]. The development of linguistics in the second half of the twentieth century has reached its progress by moving from one level of the language to another: from the phonology to the syntax, from the syntax to the semantics, from the semantics to the pragmatics. Such progress requires a clear understanding of the occurred achievements, and from the moment of movement to pragmatics, there have been made a lot of efforts to distinguish between the pragmatics and semantics. By the definition of Jan Huang, pragmatics is a systemic study of the value based on the use of the language. The central themes of the pragmatic fields include implicature, presupposition (assumption), speech acts and deixis [5,2].

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pragmatics and literariness always complement each other: Pragmatics always goes with the principles of the language use in which the speaker and listener are the main categories defining linguistic interpretation. Literary text is a form of use of a language illustrating the need to look for a

ratio between the language and the language users to achieve the adequate interpretation. Horn claims that the pragmatics is a linguistic level dealing with the language users [2, 34].

In both cases, the definition of pragmatics is presented in the form of a linguistic level, deeply different from semantics. The pragmatics of a literary text is determined by awareness and understanding of certain linguistic conditions of the literary discourse. Pragmatic description of literary text should be based on categories that are included in the philosophy of language. It is reasonable to talk about such provisions as a statement differs from the proposal; language users are mainly speakers and listeners or writers and readers; the context includes time and place of the statement; the relationship between the users of the language. In the pragmatic description of the literary text, the next question occurs: what happens if the presented categories turn out to be imagined or invented, i.e. literary? Or how does the literariness affect the structure and interpretation of the language? The following definition may be answered: the literary text is determined by its pragmatic structure, and in turn, the structure is an integral condition for the interpretation of the literary text.

MAIN PART

The pragmatic definition of a literary text is based on the structure formed by the users of the language of this or that text. This pragmatic structure is enriched at the expense of an act performed by the writer, and its presence does not depend on whether the text is fiction or not. The established and generally accepted pragmatic description of the literariness is based on the conviction that the creator of the literary text is pretending to be performing certain speech acts [3, 43].

The pragmatic structure of literary text is, on the one hand, the relationship between all users of the language, especially between the writer and the literary speaker and listener, on the other hand, between the reader and literary speaker and listener. Such a pragmatic structure can be illustrated by the following formula: $W (S (text) L) R$, where W = writer, S = speaker (or narrator), $text$ = text, L = listener, R = reader. Judging by this formula, one can conclude that the pragmatic structure of the literary text is a communicative context, which also has a literary nature [2, 4]. Usually we interpret the words, immersing them in context. Contexts, however, are different, and in the same interpretation there may be more than one, especially in the literary text, where the reader is outside the communicative context.

As a result, the descriptions of the interpretational process in literariness can concentrate on the cluster of possible contexts. In order to read the text and understand it, the reader must determine the narrator, the one who is responsible for the words in the text and the listener, that is, who are addressed the certain words to. The narrators do not always appear in the literary text, as well as listeners that sometimes serves as a reason for easily not noticing their importance for interpretation. But when we take into account the difference between the value and meanings of proposals and the values and meanings of statements, we are convinced that the narrator and listener can not be ignored in the interpretation of a literary text.

In the text, the meaning of the sentence does not depend on the context, which makes it proportionate to its denotative or dictionary meaning, independent of the narrator. That is, this proposal in its foundation is part of the language. The meaning of the statement is, on the other hand, contextually dependent. That is to say, this is a statement plus a communicative context; and due to

the fact that the statement is limited and due to the time, place and its narrator, its meaning appears as unique [8, 4]. The study of the meaning of the sentence is usually the function of semantics, while learning the meaning of the statement remains in the pragmatic framework. The difference between the meaning of the sentence and the meaning of the statement can be illustrated by the syntactic model *Is the door painted?* Under the concept of the sentence, we mean the nature of the door and the color of the paint. It can also be noted that the proposal has an interrogative form. The meaning of the statement is much wider; the statement *Is the door painted?* in addition to the meaning of the proposal itself, it carries more specific meaning and value, supplemented by a communicative context in which this statement arises.

The meaning and value of a literary text, as well as the meaning and value of the sentence, is created by means of formal elements of the language, such as morphology, syntax and semantics. However, the meaning of the same literary text in relation to the communicative context, as well as the meaning of the statement, is created by pragmatics – the attitude of words to the one from whom they proceed and to the one who these statements or words are addressed to. And this is a secondary understanding of the text meaning in the communicative context and appears as a pragmatic basis for interpreting the literary text. Another approach to studying the issue includes a pragmatic structure and interpretation strategies.

It is known that reading is an understanding and awareness, for we read the text and at the same time, to a certain extent we realize and understand its ideas. Understanding and acquiring the literary text is partially determined by its pragmatic structure. On the other hand, according to Adams, the understanding of the text associated with the interpretational strategies of the reader. These two approaches are not mutually exclusive. In the literary text there is a context with a pragmatic structure, where someone under certain conditions is talking to someone. When the reader reads the text, for its being understood in an adequate manner, one will have to apply certain interpretation strategies [3, 23]. This is especially important in translation activities, since any literary text requires its reader a proper understanding and adequate interpretation of its pragmatic structure by which it is framed. The pragmatic structure and interpretation strategies are constantly present in the reading act. Using certain interpretation strategies, the translator successfully can determine the pragmatic value of the literary text and recreate it in the target language or the translation language.

CONCLUSION

We can conclude that the interpretation strategy is neither part of the text nor part of the interpretation that it determines. But the pragmatic structure is both part of the text, and functions in the process of interpretation of the text. Like all linguistic features, pragmatic structure makes any literary text possible and unique. Interpretation strategies contribute to an adequate understanding, acquiring and interpreting the pragmatic structure of the text, that is to say, they define its communicative context. Since the pragmatic structure is a permanent component of the literary text, it functions as an integral link exposed to interpretational strategies.

REFERENCES

1. Horn L., Ward G. Implicature. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. – 651 p.

2. Levinson S. Deixis and Pragmatics. – Cambridge, 2004. – P. 97–121.
3. Tashpulatovich, B. M. . (2021). Using Multimedia Technologies in Teaching Foreign Languages. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 64-67.
4. Nurullayevna, S. N. . (2021). The techniques of explicit grammar instruction. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 281-284. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/549>
5. Ruziyeva N. (2020). FACE CONCEPT IN THE CATEGORY OF POLITENESS. *European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements*, 1(4), 15-20.
6. Mehmonova Yulduz. (2021). LEXICO-GRAMMATICAL PARTS OF SPEECH EXPRESSING THE INDEFINITENESS OF THE SUBJECT. *JournalNX - A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal*, 7(1), 323–327. Retrieved from <https://repo.journalnx.com/index.php/nx/article/view/922>
7. Mr. Babayev Otabek Abdikarimovich. (2020). THE TRUE VALUES OF THE MAVLONO JALOLIDDIN MUHAMMAD RUMIY’S PHILOSOPHY IN RUSSIAN TRANSLATIONS. *International Journal on Orange Technologies*, 2(12), 68-71.
8. Косимова Нафиса К вопросу о прагматической целостности художественного текста // *European journal of literature and linguistics*. 2016. №3.
9. Imamkulova Sitora Anvarovna. (2021). Cognitive Interpretation of Degrees of Intensification. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 11(1). Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/469>
10. D.Sh.Islomov. (2021). The Definition of The Concepts of «Phoneme» and «Phonostylistics». *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.9.204>.
11. Djalolov F. F. “To the problems of complete assimilation of educational materials at schools” *European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements (EJHEA)* Vol. 1 No. 4, December 2020.p.55-57
12. Косимова Н.Ф. ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИЕ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ В ПЕРЕВОДЕ КАК ПРОЯВЛЕНИЕ МЕЖЪЯЗЫКОВОЙ АСИММЕТРИИ // *World science*. 2015. №4 (4). URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/grammaticheskie-transformatsii-v-perevode-kak-proyavlenie-mezhyazykovoy-asimmetrii>
13. Haydarova N. A (2020) Linguocultural analysis of English and Uzbek medical phraseological units describing physiological processes. *European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability*. Pp 15-16.
14. kizi, M. M. I. . (2021). Numbers and similarities in their use in English and Uzbek Folklore. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 175-177. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/536>
15. Olimova, D. Z. (2021). Transfer of modality in translation (modal verbs and their equivalents, modal words). *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 220-22. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/542>.
16. G’ayratovna, R. . M. . (2021). Semantics of euphemistic and dysphemetic units. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 243-246. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/545>

17. Bakhtiyorovna, I. F. . (2021). Translation of linguocultural peculiarities in hafiza kochkarova's translations. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 247-249. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/546>
18. Mukhammadovna, J. M. . (2021). Media relations in french discourse. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 178-180. Retrieved from <https://cejsr.academicjournal.io/index.php/journal/article/view/537>
19. Zokirova N S. (2020). TRANSLATOLOGY AND THE ANALYSIS OF ITS LINGUISTIC MECHANISM. *European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements*, 1(4), 8-10.