

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://doi.org/10.1177/2308494412222222) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://doi.org/10.1177/2409008512222222)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 12 Volume: 80

Published: 12.12.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Umida Ikromovna Nosirova
Ferghana State University
researcher

PRAGMASEMANTIC FEATURES OF THE POETIC TEXT

Abstract: The present paper reveals the issues of studying pragmatics in the poetic texts. The communicative intention of the poets can be shown by special combination of the words, which evoke the pragmatic effect. Lexical units and the word in poetry describe the pragmatic features in poetic speech. The word meaning emerges in different understanding of the poet's aim. Rendering the communicative aim can be shown by the words shade and colouring.

Key words: poetic text, word meaning, semantics, poetic speech, lexical units, communicative aim, pragmatics.

Language: English

Citation: Nosirova, U. I. (2019). Pragmasemantic features of the poetic text. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12 (80), 37-41.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-12-80-7> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.12.80.7>

Scopus ASCC: 1208.

Introduction

The range of issues as defining the place of pragmatics among other semantic phenomena, grounding its priority in the linguistic process, studying the semantic structure of language units and distinguishing the stylistic-semantic meanings have become an object of researches within the last periods of the development of linguistics.

The process of study the issues of semantics has increased the interest to the relationship of the meaning and sense of lexical units as well as to the matters of pragmatics. Due to it, expressing the phenomena of the reality approaching to pragmatics concepts has taken its own place. However, pragmatics is not a new branch of linguistics, considering its broad usage before Socrates' times. Later J.Lokk and E.Kant also were engaged in the matters of pragmatics on the bases of Aristotle's views. It is known that Aristotle substantiated the social-moral essence of the art of poetry and investigated the esthetic-emotional power of the theory and art of poetry, and the art of the artistic word in his work "Poetics". Aristotle's work "Poetics" ("The art on the poetry") is considered the initial theoretical research in philology, where Aristotle regarded the artistic literature as "poetry". As he cited, the life reflects itself in poetry; all the events in the past, present and future are expressed in it. Thus, the poet creates the similar events or brings them to existence [3,3]. According to these views of Aristotle,

the branch of pragmatism appeared in philosophy in the XIX-XX centuries. In particular, Ch.Pirs, R.Karnap, Ch.Morris and L.Vitgenshtein greatly contributed into linguistics by disseminating the ideas of pragmatism in America and Europe in 20-30 of the XX century.

One of the founders of the philosophical pragmatism Charlz Sanders Pirs suggested studying the meaning of the sign, approaching to the results, effectiveness of the action, fulfilling by this sign, considering the factor of the communicative action subject within the theory of sign.

C.Morris proposed the idea that pragmatics is broader than syntax and semantics, and pretends pragmatics to be a science, which studies the linguistic process in broad perspectives. Some linguists consider that pragmatics studies the relationship, related to the text, while the others claim that this science reveals the ways of using the linguistic means in order to show the intention and aim of the interlocutors.

There have been numerous conferences and conducted researches in the sphere of pragmatics in the world and Russian linguistics since 1970.

There are different approaches to pragmatics in the works by Yu.S.Stepanov, R.S.Stalneyker, G.M.Green, P.Grundi, H.Heberlend, J.L.Mey, A.V.Fedoruk, A.I.Shevchenko and some others [9;20;17;18;19;21;13;15], which created the scientific bases of pragmatics.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

The linguist G.G.Pocheptsov cites “Semantics is the permanent property of the units of the language system, while pragmatic features can appear in different spheres” [11,17].

A.Nurmonov in Uzbek linguistics founded the theories in revealing the matters of pragmatics. The theses “Pragmatic features of syntactic units” and “Presupposition of auxiliary constructions” [10,42-45] are the bright examples of it.

The special attention can be given to the monograph “Pragmalinguistics” in Uzbek linguistics, where the theories on the following terms and notions as the dichotomy of the language and speech, linguistic process, linguistic potentials and discourse have been given [12]. M.M.Khakimov advanced the theories on the issues related to pragmatics in the monograph of the doctoral thesis “Pragmatic analyses of the text in Uzbek language”. He analyzed the linguistic pragmatics and its historical origin, the types of pragmatic meaning in the semantic structure of the text. Furthermore, he revealed the rules of the direct and indirect meaning in the text, defined the laws of the semantic, syntactic, presupposition and pragmatic mechanisms.

In the monograph “The bases of Uzbek pragmalinguistics” the issues of pragmalinguistics, which had not been thoroughly studied, were under analyses, where M.Khakimov elucidated the matters of semantics, sygmatics, syntax and pragmatics as the composite parts of linguosemiotics. Moreover, the researcher touched upon the logical, philosophical, social, psychological and pragmalinguistic features of a sign [14,176].

Materials and Methods

One of the problems in Uzbek linguistics, which requires the further investigations, is the semantic and pragmatic features of poetry. Each literary work can be studied when its linguistic content is considered. Nowadays analyses of the matters of a fiction give an opportunity to clearly imagine the emergence of language units in a fiction and understand the artistic and esthetic impact in broad perspectives. Though the numerous researches on the role of all the language units in the poetic text, their expressive semantic meaning, their linguistic and artistic-esthetic function have been conducted, the issues of studying the language of poetry, the connotative meaning, which shows the expressive-emotional evaluation of the word and word combinations, or in other words, pragmatic meaning of the word, require further analyses.

Undoubtedly, there is a law of connection of each element with other elements and units according to their function and meaning. Only being aware of the

laws, the poet can create marvelous, inimitable in their beauty and unique lines, using his artistic and language flair and skill. The poetic text is an intellectual creation. Creation is a process; realizing creation is a process again [6,7]. This process occurs due to pragmatic use of semantic meanings of the word. The pragmatic features of the poetic text include the following: pragmatics deals in communicative function of the language, while poetics displays the different shade and colours due to the artistic features of the word. While analyzing each poetic text the lexical-semantic and pragmatic features of the used words are considered. Each word possesses its semantic expression in the definite branch of linguistics. The artistic evaluation of the word use is connected with the exact imagination and realizing the word meaning.

The poet’s attitude to the word in poetry, the art of word selection and use have their own place. Only that poet can create inspirational works, who correctly uses the artistic opportunities of a word. The poetic language creates the opportunities to skillfully use all the phonetic, lexical and grammatical means, chooses the forms of expressions peculiar to the writer. The opportunities of the word meaning are vividly seen in the context, even such artistic features can appear, which cannot be imagined by the poets and readers. Any work created by the word power can be revived only due to the readers’ imagination.

The artistic opportunities of a word in the poetic speech reveal the pragmasemantic features. The creator chooses the linguistic units from the vernacular language in order to present some information to the reader, transforms, artistically enriches it and delivers back to the folk.

The following poem by Erkin Vokhidov proves our thoughts:

Xalq — ustozim, men esa — tolib,
So‘z durlarin termoqdir ishim.
Odamlarning o‘zidan olib,
Odamlarga bermoqdir ishim [4]¹.

The selected words by the poet change their function in the context, the meaning of expression, which depicts the concrete attitude of the poet to the event taking the priority place instead of the naming seme. As Belgian linguist Jan Newts cites: “there is no opportunity to know the speech structure or its meaning not approaching to the factors of the context or, in particular, to the factors of using these structures” [22,68]. The opportunities of the word meaning are not seen in the context. For example, in the poem “Riddle” by Erkin Vokhidov:

Topishmoq aytadi menga nabiram - “K” dan
boshlanadi, har uyda bor, - der, - Sodda ish asbobi...
Men, ketmon, desam,

¹ My folk is my teacher, I am a learner,
My work deals in collecting the pearl of words,

Which I take from the people,
And render to people.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Nabiram kuladi: -Yo‘q, bu – kompyuter![4]²

In this poetic text the character of the relations between the interlocutors, their scope of perception and attitude to the communicative-pragmatic information is expressed by the word. The “*cultivator*”, chosen by the grandfather, gives the information about the collectivization in 30-40ss, the cotton monopoly in 50-80ss, while the chosen word “*computer*” by the grandson exposes the advantages of the technologies of the modern world. Thus, the scientific views of E.S.Aznaurov on the linguopragmatic analyses of the word have their own significance. He initially substantiated the principles of the linguopragmatic analyses on the bases of the communicative-pragmatic event in his research and included the following:

- the place and event of the communicative act;
- the theme and aim of the communication;
- the ethnic and individual characteristics of the interlocutors;
- the interrelations of the interlocutors [2,38].

While analyzing the language features of each poetic text, there is a need to approach to the described event in terms of space and time, as each work is created in relations to the period and place. The structure of the time or, in other words, the temporality can be one component of its content, being important in the process of creating the sense and understanding it. According to Sh.Iskandarova, the temporality is “a semantic category, which presupposes the further understanding of the defined events and its elements towards the moment of a speaker’s speech” [5,152]. In this regard, the poet expresses the individual features of the person character, formed in two different social environment by the words “*cultivator*” and “*computer*”. Therefore, he introduces a new shade of meaning into the word semantics and reaches the pragmatic effect.

The author is able to make each linguistic mean colorful in the poetic text in order to depict his intentions and motives. The expressive means of the word in the poetic text can be enriched with the poetic spirit and the poetic attire. Under the linguistic means can be understood the unit of each stylistic layer, where the poet’s skill can artistically enrich the expressive means related to the different functional styles. The opportunities of the pragmatic meaning, meant by the poet, can expand. The author points at the information, which he disposes, and gives the proposition of resembling the definite object with the other ones in the poetic texts.

The author uses the unconventional ways of presenting the lexical meaning to the readers and

reaches his aim. This process occurs due to the use of the semantic meaning of the word and syntactic structure of the lexical units with pragmatic aim. It is obvious, that these factors consider the external pragmatic components of the lexical units, which have the influence only in the definite context [7,12].

The Russian linguist P.A.Lecant emphasizes that nonstandard word combinations consist of the combinations of attributive relations, pretending that “mainly the combinations of the attributive relations are characteristic to the word combinations of the semantic model “the object and its sign” [8,263].

The Uzbek linguist Kh. Abdurakhmonov and N.Makhmudov called these combinations “unnatural combinations” in their thesis “Word esthetics”. “The combinations, which are unusual, draw the attention by their “novelty”, individuality and unusualness. The readers unconsciously think about them, thus, they deeply understand the writer’s intention. That is why, in comparison with the usual word combinations the unusual word combinations have more importance in the poetry” [1,41], - by this statement the linguists emphasized the plenitude of word meanings.

The unusual combinations in Uzbek language are formed on the bases of the head and subordinate words, they are similar to the word combinations, however, the meaning and semantic relations have unusual character. For example, in “Black sun” by M.Yusuf the features of the character of the lyric hero are revealed by the illogically connected attributive combination:

U yorug’ dunyoda
Tengi yoq inson,
Qadrdon begona,
Yovuz mehribon [16,197].³

The word combinations “*closest stranger*”, “*evil kindness*” in the poetic lines are semantically irrelevant; however, the two words opposition, which have the function of the determiner and determinant, bring to the new meaning. The position of the words is of great importance in Uzbek language, as changing of the place of the determiner and determinant “*қадрдон бегона*” (“*closest stranger*”) denotes the close relations between the strangers, while “*бегона қадрдон*” (“*stranger relative*”) shows the meaning that the relationship between the relatives is distant.

Thus, the great attention is paid to the determiner in the relations of the determiner and determinant, as the determiner reveals the meaning of the determinant. A new unexpected meaning appears between the determiner and the determinant.

² My grandson is telling the riddle
Begins from “C”, everyone has it,
A simple tool...
I am saying, it is cultivator.
No, it is computer,- he is telling with a smile.

³ In the whole world
He is incomparable man,
The closest stranger,
Evil kindness in the man.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

The expression of the communicative intention of different meaning in the author's speech occurs on the bases of the communicative tactics. The author's communicative aim in the poetic text is one of the main characteristics of the communication process, this aim linguistically emerges in the structure and meaning of the poetic text as if deliberately formed communicative intention. As it is known, the internal aim of the informant in any text consists of two meanings. They are extended and concise meanings. These forms of meanings emerge in some parts of the text according to the communicative intention. For example, in the poem "Weak eyes" by Erkin Vokhidov:

Ko'zidan shikoyat qilar qariya:
"Menga nima bo'ldi, hayronman o'zim.
Hov uzoqda turgan kulrang Neksiya
Raqamini yaxshi ilg'amas ko'zim".
Uni o'rab olgan bir to'p o'g'il-qiz
Xo'rsinib tinglashar cholning so'zini.
"Ey, otaxon, - derlar, - biz ko'rmaypmiz
O'sha Neksiyaning hatto o'zini" [4, 202].⁴

In this poem the concise meaning form shows that the old man can see better than the young girls and boys. However, the real meaning reveals the philosophical meaning of speculating broadly, having the broad horizon and open-heartedness. The readers realize the social factors between the elders and young generation and perception of the life in different

perspectives. The information "we do not see" has the concealed, indirect meaning, reaching the pragmatic effect. The inner intentions of the poet and their understanding from the meaningful structure of the text are related to the reader. The information about the linguistic action is collected, and then is delivered to the addressee, triggering the information change. The power of influencing of the lexical units on the listener in the definite context evokes the pragmatic relation.

Summary

Thus, the language units emerge in different forms in the poetic texts and the poetic features of the linguistic means are expressed in different colours, arising the delicate shades of meanings. The essence of life is revealed vividly by the word in the poetry. The lexical units serve to express both internal and external alterations and esthetic-emotional relations of the person's spirituality. Acquiring the artistic shade in the poetic text, the word and linguistic units, which serve to express the various meanings, enlarge the expressive opportunities of the text, evoking the contrasts, making the plot complicated and forming the pragmatic meaning and imagination.

Opportunities of the poetic texts in pragmatic definition of the word meaning are wide. The study of the word meaning as the object of pragmatics helps reveal the lexical opportunities of the Uzbek language.

References:

1. Abdurahmonov, H., & Mahmudov, N. (1981). *So'z estetikasi*. Toshkent: Fan.
2. Aznaurova, E.S. (1988). *Pragmatika khudozhestvennogo slova Tekst*. Tashkent: Fan.
3. Aristotel (1980). "Poetika" (Poeziya san'ati haqida) G'afur G'ulom nomidagi "Adabiyot va san'at" nashriyoti. Toshkent.
4. Vohidov, E. (2010). *Orzuli dunyo. She'rlar*. – Toshkent: Sharq.
5. Iskandarova, Sh. (2007). *Til sistemasiga maydon asosida yondashuv*. Toshkent: Fan.
6. Kazarin, Yu.V. (1999). *Poeticheskaya tekst kak sistema*. Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta.
7. Ko'chiboev, A. (2015). *Matn pragmatikasi*. (O'quv-uslubiy qo'llanma) Samarqand.
8. Lekant, P.A. (1988). *Sovremennyy russkiy literaturnyy yazyk*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
9. Morris, Ch.U. (1983). *Osnovaniya teorii znakov*. Per. s angl. Semiotika / Sost., vstup. statya i obshch. red. Yu.S. Stepanova. (pp.37-89). Moscow: Raduga.
10. Nurmonov, A. (1985). *Ko'makchili konstruktsiyalar presuppozitsiyasi*. O'zbek tili va adabiyoti.
11. Pocheptsov, G.G. (1985). *O meste pragmaticheskogo elementa v lingvisticheskom opisanii*. Pragmaticheskie i semanticheskie aspekty sintaksisa. Kalinin: Izd-vo.

⁴ An old man complains
What's the matter, I cannot understand,
I cannot see the numbers
Of the grey "Nexia", standing aside.
The group of girls and boys

Say, listening to the old man words,
We do not see Even the "Nexia" itself.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

12. Safarov, Sh. (2008). *Pragmalingvistika*. Monografiya. Tashkent.
13. Fedoryuk, A.V. (2002). *Funksional'no-pragmaticheskie aspekty frazeologicheskikh intensifikatorov v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke*. Avtoref. kand. diss. (p.20). Irkutsk.
14. Hakimov, M. (2013). *O'zbek pragmalingvistikasi asoslari*. (p.176). Toshkent: Akademnashr.
15. Shevchenko, A.I. (1987). *Pragmaticheskaya obuslovlennost' nominatsiy neverbal'nykh komponentov kommunikatsii v angloyazychnom khudozhestvennom tekste*. Avtoref. kand. dis.. (p.23). Kiev.
16. Yusuf, M. (1991). *Ishq kemasi*. Tashkent.
17. Green, G.M. (1989). *Pragmatics and natural language understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
18. Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
19. Haberland, H., & Mey, J.L. (2002). Editorial: pragmatics and linguistics twenty five years later. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (12), pp.1671– 1682.
20. Lawal, B., et al. (1996). "A pragmatic study of selected pairs of Yorubaproverbs" in *Journal of Pragmatics*, pp.635-652.
21. Mey, J.L. (2001). *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell publishers.
22. Nuyts, J. (1992). *Aspects of a Cognitive-Pragmatic Theory of Language. On cognition, functionalism, and grammar*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: J.Benjamins Publishing comp..
23. Stalnaker, R. (1974). *Pragmatic presupposition*. In: *Semantics and Philosophy*. (pp.197-214). NewYork.