

PROBLEMS OF SEMANTICS PRAGMATICS AND COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

Karabaeva Barno Bobir kizi,

PhD in Philological Sciences

barnokhon.k@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

This scientific article highlighted the main problems of semantic pragmatics and cognitive linguistics. Also the analysis of these problems is sufficiently researched.

Keywords. Concept formation, cognitive basis, context-dependent, lexicographer, language system, linguistic form, formal system.

INTRODUCTION

In the scientific study of lexicographers, semantics plays an important role in the use of language, studied as the most fundamental force. Based on this approach, on the mathematical views of language as a formal system, a less formal approach has emerged that considers language as a biological system. In the second case (i.e., when language is seen as a biological system), language is considered to be by its very nature disordered and a much more difficult phenomenon to elucidate. The development of cognitive orientation in American linguistics has clearly demonstrated that traditional methods of semantic expression cannot meet all the needs of cognitive semantic research. Cognitive linguistics emerged on the basis of epistemology in the modern central anthropology model and has greatly expanded the scope of linguistics research. In the last years of the 20th century, it is necessary to approach language from the point of view of its participation in the activities of human thought. As a result of thinking activities, information comes to people through many different channels, but the cognitive object of linguistics is only a certain part of information, which is reflected and expressed in different forms of language consciousness.

Cognitivism is a scientific field that studies the human mind, thoughts, and mental processes. It is the science of understanding, perceiving and understanding the world in the process. According to Kubryakova, cognitive linguistics defines language as a cognitive mechanism that plays an important role in the encoding and transmission of information. The tasks of cognitive linguistics include: 1) Determining the role of language in the emergence of human knowledge; 2) Understand the processes of classifying the universe and its objects (classification, concept formation), concept formation (concept creation) and naming; 3) Determine the relationship between the conceptual system and the language system; 4) Reveal problems with linguistic and perceptual (conceptual) images of the world. Cognition, which is the basic concept of cognitive linguistics, includes understanding and thinking in a language, so cognition, epistemology, is closely related to linguistics. Today, throughout the humanities, it has become a common axiom to study the relationships between language and other forms of human activity. Language helps cognitive scientists understand human behavior more than culture and society. Attempts to classify these disciplines are often found in scientific research devoted to the problems of modern cognitive linguistics. In particular, in some scientific studies, On the other hand, E.Yu. Balashova focuses on the existence of two: linguistic cognition and cultural

linguistics, distinguishing the fields of cognitive linguistics such as classical cognition and modern theoretical cognition, which studies the structure of knowledge from logical methods. Stern argues that today it is possible to at least list the following areas of cognitive linguistics:

- Culturological - the concept studied as an element of culture based on findings from the sciences. study differently. This research is interdisciplinary in nature, in which language appears as one of the sources of conceptual knowledge;
- Linguoculturological - concept studied as a component of ethno-linguistic culture, the relationship of national values and national identity of this culture, this direction is called "from language to culture".

Semantic-cognitive-lexical and grammatical semantics of language is studied as a tool to reveal conceptual content, a tool for transforming language from semantic model to world-space. These listed fields are fully formed in modern linguistics, all with their own methodological principles and their representation among the best known cognitive-linguists. Cognitive linguistics uses memory operational units such as frames, concepts, and gestures as a research tool. Cognitive linguistics aims at modeling worldviews as well as vehicles of linguistic thought. The formation of a certain perception of the world is manifested as a result of the interplay of three spiritual perceptions, such as the emotional sphere, the level of imagination formation, the verbal field of the mind. thinking processes. The sum of all these forms the basis of a system of concepts. Among the many current problems of non-cognitive linguistics, the study of the cognitive (conceptual) basis of the signs of language is of great importance.

The fields of semantics and pragmatics are devoted to the study of the semiotics of language. The fact that two separate disciplines have developed for this purpose reflects the complexity of human language as a semiotic system, as does the debate over how it should be analyzed. This complexity has at least four types. First, we use language not only to represent information (or thoughts) for ourselves and to convey it to others, but also to act and interact with others in ways that are not directly related. followed by conveying information, such as greetings, exclamations or command. Second, the language is both highly systematic and flexible. On the one hand, the interlocutor is under intense pressure to be consistent in the use of language to convey the message; otherwise, communication will be more difficult and less reliable. On the other hand, they are constantly innovating by using existing linguistic forms to convey new, sometimes even completely different messages, through metaphor, irony and other devices. Third, even if we assume some stability in the relationship between linguistic form and what is communicated, the immediate context of use is almost always important in determining exactly what is being communicated. A speaker is communicating on any given occasion - how to interpret pronouns as a model example. Finally, certain linguistic forms, such as the so-called cleft construction in English (e.g. It was his sister who called), are specially conventionalized to help the interlocutor manage discourse; Their semiotic value is, in the proper sense, metacommunication. This value must be learned in order for an individual to master the language in question, but it does not contribute to what is commonly understood as information conveyed by a spoken word.

All of these complexities in one way or another reflect the division of labor between convention and context. On the other hand, some things we hear seem to stick to words and phrases regardless of who is speaking and the context in which they are used, and have some stability over time; This section is often associated specifically with propositional, informational, or

thought concepts. On the other hand, part of what we mean depends crucially on the context, whether it is understood in the broad sense as knowledge shared among interlocutors or in the narrow sense as a record, specific conversation.

However, in the community of scholars particularly interested in "the relation of signs to the objects they signify and their real properties", a the narrower distinction is often referred to by the terms "semantic" and "pragmatic". The important fact is that, even if we limit ourselves to cases where language is used to convey information, we find that the same expression that is completely indistinguishable can be used. to convey very different messages or use H. Paul Grice's terminology, implying dialogue. Consider the short conversations in and, for example:

a. When will you be finished studying?

b. I will be finished studying by 5pm.

a. When can I borrow your history book?

b. I will be finished studying by 5pm.

Assuming that the speaker and the date and time of the speech are the same in both cases, the answers to (b) are exactly the same. However, the statements contrast clearly in terms of what they convey, (1 b) simply inform the listener of the time by which the speaker will finish studying; on the contrary, (2 b) strongly suggests that listeners can borrow books after 5 pm. In this view, semantic scope is limited to the analysis of the content, or what is said in Grice's terms, while the analysis of the conveyed message, or of what is implied, belongs to pragmatics (with analysis of all other aspects of language use).

Still narrowing our field of study further, we come to a third way of defining the boundary between semantics and pragmatics. Even reducing the existence of implication, examples of contextual dependence of meaning are common in natural language. A good example appears in: shades and the exact distribution of red must be evident in each case for the correct sentence to be different.

a. The dress was red.

b. The child's nose was red.

The analysis of this kind of example has given rise to much debate, especially in the area of the philosophy of language. Some philosophers, such as Charles Travis, have argued that these examples show that no consistent semantic representation in terms of truth conditions can be meaningfully ascribed to sentences. Such a view can be considered purely contextual. At the other extreme, some philosophers have argued that such sentences can in fact be associated with propositions without context, but that they have minimal content. shade or color distribution is involved. On at least some versions of this view, the specification of the latter is the result of processes similar to those involved in the computation of implication. The intermediate approach gives the adjective a representation that contains one or more context-dependent parameters whose values must be specified before the phrase can be associated with a clause. Only when this proposition is defined can deductive processes such as implication calculus take place. According to such a vision, the semantic content of a word such as red and, by extension, of a sentence containing it, is only a part of it independent of context, while processes by which values assigned to context-dependent parameters are considered pragmatic. This last notion implies that the proposition expressed by asserting a sentence - that is, what is said in the Gricean sense will depend not only on its semantic content but also on factual

factors. used differently than those that interfere with the calculation of allusions. . In other words, semantics is the domain of the content-context-dependent element, while pragmatics is the domain of the content-context-dependent element. Therefore, the semantic content of a declarative sentence used affirmatively in this sense may, in some cases, not be a complete but incomplete proposition; more precisely, it can be understood as a function of the context to the proposition.

CONCLUSION

Despite the growing trend towards integrating the conventional and context-dependent aspects of natural language semiotics, some heated debates remain open. Some of them are so concerned with fundamental questions that it is necessary to distinguish between the conventional and context-dependent aspects of meaning, or language-specific content, versus understanding the world; whether the metaphorical sentences are interpreted directly or only through an inferential procedure after calculating the literal interpretation; what is the extent of the implied phenomenon and what kinds of events need to be explained; whether in some cases the truth of an assertion should be relative to individuals, rather than absolute; or whether dynamic theories of sentence content take precedence over static theories.

REFERENCES

1. Kecskes I. Editorial: lexical merging, conceptual blending, and cultural crossing. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 2004,1:1–31.
2. Kadmon N. *Formal Pragmatics: Semantics, Pragmatics, Preposition, and Focus*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell; 2001.
3. Portner P. The semantics of imperatives within a theory of clause types. In: Watanabe K, Young, R B, eds. *Proceedings of 14th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference; 2004*, 235–252. <http://elanguage.net/journals/salt/issue/view/284>.
4. Kennedy C, Mc Nally L. Color, context, and compositionality. *Synthese* 2010, 174: 79-98.
5. Mitchell J, Lapata M. 2010. Composition in distributional models of semantics. *Cognitive Science* 34(8):1388–1429.
6. Baroni M, Zamparelli R. Nouns are vectors, adjectives are matrices: Representing adjective-noun constructions in semantic space. *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP2010)*. East Stroudsburg PA:ACL; 2010,1183-1193.