

Journal of Language Pedagogy and
Innovative Applied Linguistics
December 2023, Volume 1, No. 5, pp: 36-40
ISSN: 2995-6854
© JLPIAL. (jainkwellpublishing.com)
All rights reserved.



The Importance of Neutrality in Linguistics

Alisher Nabiev *

*Teacher of the Department of English Philology, Samarkand State Foreign Language Institute,
Uzbekistan*

Abstract

This article presents the first applications of the concept of neutrality in linguistics, as well as the opinions of a number of scientists on this issue. The importance of neutrality is evident at all language levels, with the exception of the differences between ambiguity and vagueness, as well as its distinctive features and are identified by examples.

Key Words: *neutrality, vagueness, ambiguity, pragmatics, lexical ambiguity, interdeminacy ambiguity.*

Paper/Article Info

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Nabiev, A. (2023). The Importance of Neutrality in Linguistics. Journal of Language Pedagogy and Innovative Applied Linguistics, 1(5), 36-40.
<https://doi.org/10.1997/ddqng126>

** Corresponding Author*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1997/ddqng126>

Introduction. In all languages, certain polysemantic means, some grammatical categories, can cause some (for the listener, reader) ambiguity or unknowns in the use of lexical units in communication, text. There are also different approaches, methods regarding the research and analysis of such linguistic tools. In studies on the ambiguity highlighted, we mainly witness the appeal to the terms (belonging to the English language) vagueness as well as ambiguity. However, P.N. Whitman's research, these concepts began to be studied within the term neutrality [1].

Literature analysis. It is conspicuous that the use of the term neutrality is more expedient than terms such as vagueness or ambiguity. In the concepts of causality, ambiguity (ambiguity) or vagueness (anonymity), ambiguity is evaluated from a more logical point of view. And the concept of neutrality can be the most acceptable term here. Because the term covers not only the meaning content, property of the lexical unit, but also grammatical categorical characters, paralinguistic means, cognitive activity, pragmalinguistic means as well as semantic properties. In particular, Lascarides argues that the ambiguity is that properties associated with ambiguity are related to pragmatic means [2].

Lascarides notes that a given sentence may remain ambiguous even though it has its own intonational sound characteristics [2]. In the following sentence, two iterations of one lexical unit may also preserve ambiguity. It may not be neutrality or ambiguity when only additional lexical

means are well-defined. In particular, looking at the examples of who went to a bank and Robin went to a bank here, the lexical unit of the bank has meant neutrality, despite the fact that it is repeated twice. An example is a banking unit evaluated as neutrality while clarification of the lexical meaning of this unit is required to be clarified through pragmatic content, or it becomes clear that clarification can only be made by considering it within a pragmatic framework.

Research methodology. In different languages there are many lexical units that are identical from a homonymic or homophonic point of view but that mean different meanings in terms of meaning. There have been analyses of lexical units of this kind from a linguistic point of view. In particular, we have touched above on the fact that in English the use of terms such as ambiguity (ambiguity), vagueness (ambiguity) has become widespread, depending on the use of such lexical units in a small context. In particular, Zwitski and Sadok prefer the term lexical ambiguity i.e. lexical ambiguity when applying such terms [3]. The question may arise as to why linguists have encouraged these units to abandon homophonic or homonymous units used in traditional linguistics or to apply terms such as new ambiguity, vagueness i.e. ambiguity, obscurity to them if not.

The use of homonym or homophone in traditional linguistics is evaluated from a more phonetic point of view. That is why Kempson considers it inappropriate to use terms such as homonym or homophones in relation to lexical units with the same

pronunciation and shape, meaning that they are not attached to one another [3].

Zwitski and Sadok offer their own feedback on lexical events with different content but with two one-form representations. They come to the reasoning that the use of interdemancy ambiguity pronouns is related to the speech situation [3]. In this context, a particular lexical unit noted offers the term neutrality in relation to them, expressing them in different field-specific meanings. It is known that in terms of the ambiguity that lexical units with the same phonemic and orthographic form, which represent several meanings belonging to different areas, mean when, applied in a certain small context, the term neutrality seems to be purposeful.

Analysis and results. Neutrality is also relatively expressed in cases where it is not known whether the uncertainty that arises in a given context or what content, meaning, or form is addressed. For example, it may be unclear whether the English lexical unit "teacher" refers to a male or female individual. From this point of view, the presence of lexical neutrality is visible in this case. Similarly, it is argued that the English-language banking lexical unit can express a similar meaning of neutrality or vagueness obscurity. For example, if we take the sentence She went to the bank, then it will have uncertainty or obscurity that the coast is a seaside destination or that it has gone to the part of a financial institution. However, in this situation, the term neutrality seems more acceptable than the use of

the term uncertainty or anonymity. Reason, uncertainty or anonymity cover logic rather than linguistically.

Neutrality expressed in a language like this is considered to be related to cognitive activity at the same time that lexical units have immediate semantic, epstemic properties. General uncertainty, anonymity (ambiguity, vagueness), linguistic features of the concepts of neutrality activation in the language comparative studies in the framework of different languages J.Park, R.Deyets,.T. Williamson, P. Egre, a number of linguistic scholars, have found their place in theories. In the beginning of our century, comprehensive studies began to be carried out, comparing the features of neutrality in the language on the example of different languages. Of course the basis of such research, as we noted above, was proposed by the likes of Zwitski and Sadok [3] in the 70s of the last century. Later, Nicholas argues that uncertainty constitutes a vague logical idea or thought based on uncertainty, anonymity (ambiguity, vagueness) [4].

The linguistic theory of uncertainty or neutrality applies to the analysis of objects with a broader or shorter Unknown or uncertain emphasis in terms of degree of certain objects. The term neutrality, or vagueness, is usually only a study of uncertainty that occurs during a separate analysis process when a given noun category, cross section, or object is applied to a dependent count.

The ambiguity or neutrality characteristics found in lexical units like this are considered a characteristic of all languages. From this point of

view, it is noticeable that the possibilities of studying this area from a typological point of view are wide.

Research is underway on the concepts of ambiguity uncertainty, vagueness uncertainty, and neutrality neutrality, which are widely emphasized in modern English Studies [5]. These researchers aim to identify differences between polysemantic properties of lexical units and uncertainty or neutrality. It is known that each language has many polysemantic units. The use of these polysemantic units within a given sentence or sentence in a small text may in some cases give ambiguity sometimes obscurity. Such cases have been considered by many linguists in the interpretation of certain lexical units [5]. But Arnold Zwitski and Jerrold Sadok have advanced opinions and considerations regarding the existence of ambiguity (ambiguity) in the English sentence system, i.e. syntactic relations as well. The authors note that ambiguity, the concept of ambiguity, is important in syntactic conjunctions. Certain sentences are considered ambiguity that is, what is meant or what is meant by the meaning that a certain syntactic form implies in this determination of the imperfection gives rise to clumsiness. Focusing on the analysis of the I don't think she bald gap for example the authors compare in this vague concepts such as It is not the care I think she is a bald or I think she is not bald. The interpretation of such statements can give rise to a diverse analysis of speech acts. Or if I don't Why don't you ask for help? as an example, Here Comes the concepts of

you have to ask for help you are not to ask for help.

An objection to the "Ambiguity" analysis approach is that there is a question of linking each indefinite predicate in a language to a particular function that sorts a real number (the level of property control chosen by that predicate) to each object, and linking each indefinite sentence in a language. In this, an unthinkable or somehow ambiguous expression of the information conveyed may arise. In this case, the degree and ambiguity of truth, which means the sentence, are considered important [4].

In general, language is a human artifact. Sounds expressed by a person that is, native speakers understand what these sounds mean. It is considered a product of their native linguistic experience and knowledge. For example, if the word dog "has always been used where", cat "was used, and vice versa", dog "may actually mean" cat, or vice versa. Thus, differences are also observed in addition to the fact that there is an important relationship between meaning and the use of speech.

- All information about what the speaker actually says and writes, including event-events, is realized as a result of the consequences of events in the universe that surrounds him.

- The speaker uses all the information that he has the opportunity to speak and write under any circumstances.

It is common in the scientific literature to suggest that semantic expression is not primitive or finite [6]. Semantic expression always has signs that define a different meaning. There

are also opinions that means determinants of actual use, opposite use, and use dispositions occur [7].

Thus, if this information is insufficient to determine the (individual) meanings of certain statements, then there may be considerations that these statements do not have (individual) meaning.

For example, Keefe and Smith argue that “predicates that produce neutrality are used to put a limit between situations that imply finite, ambiguous opposite meanings. In this regard, P.E. Klindinst argues that linguistic units are susceptible to paradoxes of meaning [8, 9]. The existence of these boundary States is a decisive criterion: “it becomes clear if the word describes a well-defined set of objects. Conversely, the inappropriate use of a word in relation to an object would be ambiguous” [10]. A simple example is, for example, the

word “tall”, which is used to refer to people, since tall people are considered a concept that distinguishes them from those who are not tall. The fact is that “high” applies to border situations (that is, people who may or may not be considered high). The use of a unit like this can also generate a certain uncertainty or neutrality interpretation. Because, the “high” tushincha is relatively evaluated. The meaning of “balanced person” is the presence of people of low stature in relation to that person reason this is used in this context. Also, the “high-rise building” is assessed by the presence of low or small buildings in relation to this building.

Conclusions. In general, when analyzing certain lexical units in a language, uncertainty or anonymity can be baratarafed using cognitive, pragmatic approaches.

References

- [1]. Whitman P. N. Category Neutrality: A Type-Logical Investigation. The Ohio State University. Working Papers in Linguistics. 2002.
- [2]. Lascarides A., Copestake A., Briscoe T. Ambiguity and coherence. *Journal of Semantics*, 1996. 13(1), 41-65. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/13.1.41>
- [3]. Zwicky A. Sadock J. Ambiguity Tests and How to Fail Them // Kimball (ed.). *Syntax and Semantics*. N. Y.: Academic Press, 1975. Vol. 4. P. 1-36.
- [4]. Smith N. J. J. Vagueness and degrees of truth. In Oxford University Press eBooks. 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199233007.001.0001>
- [5]. Winter-Froemel E. Zirker A. Ambiguity in Speaker-Hearer-Interaction: A Parameter-Based Model of Analysis. In De Gruyter eBooks. 2015. - pp. 283-340. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110403589-013>
- [6]. Апресян Ю. Лексическая семантика: синонимические средства языка. М.: Наука, 1974.
- [7]. Bach K. Semantic Non specificity and Mixed Quantifiers // *Linguistics and Philosophy*. 1982. № 4. P. 593-605.
- [8]. Keefe, Rosanna and Peter F. Smith. “Vagueness: A Reader.” MIT Press. 1999.
- [9]. Paul Egré & Klindinst Nathan. *Vagueness and Language Use*, Palgrave Studies in Pragmatics, Language and Cognition. Palgrave Macmillan. 2011.- 331 p.