

COGNITIVE FOUNDATIONS OF FORMATION INTERPRETING MEANINGS OF LEXICAL UNITS

Tillaev Zafar Akmalovich

Teacher, Termez State Pedagogical Institute

ANNOTATION

Conceptual derivation operations underlying the formation interpretation of the interpretative meanings of lexical units, provide two directions of realizing their interpretive potential, which rye activate interpretation functions. From this point of view, one can highlight the identifying interpretation and characterizing information interpretation. Identifying interpretation is the essence of the process secondary nomination, when a language unit fixes a new fragment a moment of knowledge in a certain configuration, i.e. development is taking place knowledge in a given linguistic unit of conceptual projection. In identifying interpretation - categorization of objects and objects of the surrounding world in a certain format of knowledge. As a result, a linguistic unit serving as a tool for such an identification, increases its denotative potential and begins to designate start a new class of objects.

Keywords: interpretation, cognitive meaning, categorization, structure of knowledge.

INTRODUCTION

However, understanding the interpretation, first of all, as an individual the subject's activity in perceiving and comprehending the actual assumes that interpretation cannot be limited to operational formation and transfer of knowledge in the process of communication. Intolerant human activity is also aimed at translating assessment of his individual intentions, emotional attitudes and appraisal. This understanding of the interpretation reveals its characterizing nature and determines the need to study cognitive foundations and the mechanisms of this particular aspect of interpretation.

The characterizing interpretation is focused on the transmission of non-only a fragment of knowledge, but also the individual's opinion regarding this knowledge and assumes the possibilities of units of lexical categories to render evaluative meanings in speech-thinking activity. Results of interpretation are the structures of knowledge represented by the interpretation: rational, emotive and axiological. The rational mode of interpretation correlates with the ontological co-keeping the concept in the projection of the existing scale of standards and stereotypes and can be understood, for example, as a manifestation of the trait to a greater/lesser extent or its compliance/non-compliance with the landmark. The rational mode has a logical or sensory basis, i.e. formed on the basis of reasoning/reasoning conclusions or comprehension of physical sensations. Axiological modus corresponds to the grading scale, which implies an assessment of the sign in terms of good/bad. The emotive mode is determined by the active attitude of the subject of assessment to the subject of assessment, which is the presence of an emotional reaction on the part of the subject.

The processes of the formation of new meanings in lexical units are based on the interpretation of the original verbalized knowledge as a result of conceptual derivation operations. Initial for interpretations, the knowledge behind lexical categories is as an interpretive cognitive area,

and the area of conceptualization of mental projection of objects of lexical categories gets the status of the interpreted area.

The establishment of inter-conceptual connections is based on the principle conceptual alignment. In compositional semantics, harmonization of conceptual structures behind linguistic forms, is considered as a principle that determines the correctness of the combined the latter in a particular language, for example, must be a function and its arguments as part of a statement, different elements derivatives and compound words.

Conceptual agreement in the structure of the interpretation of the itself as an associative agreement, i.e. agreement, provided based on associations based on similarity and contiguity in time and space, or as a logical agreement that turns out to be possible on the basis of logical inference due to the activation of logical connections between concepts. Associative agreement achieves the cognitive mechanisms of metonymy, conceptual or blue a static metaphor, analogy, comparison, defocusing; logical coordination is provided by mechanisms of generalization and conceptual content.

Establishing inter-conceptual connections that underlie conceptual derivation processes that provide interpretation, carried out by projecting into a single operational the conceptual space of signs from the interpreting and interpreting tied areas. Signs that serve as the interpretation of fragments in reality, for categories of different objects - natural objects, artifacts - will have their own specifics. Typical characteristics the stick of a feature or its format determines the nature of the categorical combining lexical units in their interpreting function and the criteria for their differentiation within the category. This allows to speak about the different interpretative potential of lexical categories. Identification and description of features characterized by the organizing status for the area of interpretive meanings of lexical units, is the essence of modeling the interpretive potential of lexical categories.

Every individual is connected by thousands of interpretations with other kinds of individuals (things, phenomena, processes), etc. Here we already have the elements, the germs, the concepts of necessity, of objective connection in nature, etc. Here we already have the contingent and the necessary, the phenomenon and the essence; for when we say: *John is a man, Pluto is a dog, this is a leaf of a tree*, etc., we disregard a number of attributes as contingent, we separate the essence from the appearance, and counterpose the one to the other. Thus in any proposition we can (and must) disclose as in a “nucleus” (“cell”) the germs of all the elements of dialectics, and thereby show that dialectics is a property of all human knowledge in general. The materialistic approach to the understanding of the essence of the meaning which is intrinsic to a word, as it is embodied in the theoretical considerations of the classics, should be borne in mind in the study of lexicology (from the Greek *lexis* “word” and *logos* “know ledge”), a branch of linguistics studying the vocabulary of languages, and of semasiology (Greek *semainein* “to signify”), a branch of linguistics studying the meanings of words and their changes.

In the course of the historical development of a language, the meanings of words change and the development of meaning proceeds from elementary to highly complicated forms, and eventually not only the meaning of a word but the very character of the reflection of life condensed in the word changes in the course of the development of thinking.

The study of meaning is complicated by the fact that there are a lot of words with more than one meaning. That is quite natural. When a man perceives the world surrounding him he uses

the same word to denote various inner features of the thing for which the word is used, i.e. he makes new applications of the word. If there is a need to name a thing or phenomenon in our material environment in any way connected with an object already designated by a word, the word is used in another meaning. This process of words acquiring new meanings led to polysemy (Greek *polys* “many”, and *sema* “sign”). The meaning of the word *house*, for example, absorbs the meanings of such words as *hut*, *cottage*, *palace*, *bungalow*, or the meaning of the word *urmoq*, may include the words such as *kaltaklamoq*, *do’pposlamog*, *savalamog*, *solmog*, *tushirmog*, *so’kmoq*, *po’pillatmog*, etc. These meanings cluster together, partly overlapping, partly defining each other.

In the process of further development, the meaning of a word which appeared later may lose its connection with the original one and, thus, be infinitely distant from it or entirely new.

A *pen* was originally a “feather”, but when steel pens were invented for the purpose of writing the original meaning was lost in current usage. On close analysis it can be seen that the meaning of many words has changed while their phonetic expression has remained unchanged. In the process of the semantic development from one primary meaning, many new meanings may appear, in successive and progressive derivation. This primary meaning may be considered a centre of radiation of other meanings.

The word *eye* originally meant the “organ of sight”. From this semantic root there appeared such derivative meanings as “the power of seeing”, “sight”, “anything resembling an eye”, like the “hole of a needle”, “the loop of a hook”, etc. Another example is, the Russian word *кора* (земная) – *yer qatlami*, *earth crust*; *кора* (древесная) – *daraxt po’stlog’i*, *bark*; *кора* (головного мозга) – *bosh miya qobig’i*, *cortex*.

This is one direction in which the meaning of a word can be changed, and this may be called the *extension of meaning*. The extension of meanings includes the change both from concrete to abstract and from specific to general.

The reasons for this extension of meaning can be different. They are often due to contiguity, to resemblance in form, position, colour and to the similarity of function. Some times the extension of meaning can be explained by extralinguistic factors or through the borrowing of words.

Numerous examples of extension of meaning caused by extralinguistic factors may be found in Russian words denoting new socialist economic relations after the revolution. The following will suffice for illustration: *temp* “tempo” in the sense of “rate of activity”; *aktiv* “active” denoting “an advanced group of men and women”, and so on.

The Latin noun *passer*, *passeris* “sparrow”, when borrowed by some Romance languages, got a more extended meaning in these languages: The Rumanian *pasdre* and the Spanish *pajara* mean “bird”, while “sparrow” in these languages is *vrabic* and *gorrion* respectively.

The question arises, how does it happen that in the process of intercourse people do not mix up words but manage to choose the appropriate one with the necessary meaning from all the possible meanings? We may answer that the context generally gives the word its actual meaning. The context will generally show in what meaning the word is used: in its proper primary meaning or figuratively. When used literally, words have their natural, primary meaning; when used figuratively they have a non-literal, figurative meaning. The context generally shows which meaning out of all its possible meanings is to be attached to the word.

Alongside with extension of meaning, there is the process of narrowing the meaning, as a result of which a word of a broad meaning acquires a narrower specialized meaning, applicable only to some of the objects it had previously denoted, or a word of wide usage is restricted in its application and comes to be used only in a special meaning. In Old Russian, the word *квас* meant “acid”; now it means a certain kind of beverage. The French term *chauffeur* which meant “a man who stokes a fire” acquired the general meaning of “driver”, but has now been specialized to mean the driver of a motor vehicle. The English word *fowl*, which once meant “a bird” in general (compare the German *Vogel*) is now confined to a bird of the poultry variety. *Corn* in English means generally “seeds of cereal grasses”. In America it has the specialized meaning of “maize”, in England it means “wheat”, and in Scotland and Ireland “oats”.

Narrowing of meaning is frequently brought about by the omission of a noun and the retention of an adjective to express the whole phrase, e.g. (it leads to substantiation): *private*—*private soldier*, *native*—*native man*, *general*—*general officer*.

Words may become narrowed in meaning, and their specialized meaning often becomes generally known through the nature of the context in which they habitually occur. The word *room* originally had the broad meaning “space”, a meaning which survives in such expressions as *to make room*, *plenty of room*, and so on; but *room* is generally a part of a house or building. Narrowing of meaning is less common than extension of meaning.

Narrowing of meaning leads to the appearance of terms which have only one meaning. If a term has two or more meanings, it is recognized to be ambiguous, which in its turn can bring about misunderstanding used for definite ends.

One-meaning terms are usually used in branches of science and technology and are of great importance for a deeper understanding of the subject.

Closely connected with the problem of polysemy is the problem of homonyms (from the Greek *homos* “the same” and *onoma* “name”, i.e. having the same name). Homonyms are words different in meaning but identical in their pronunciation.

One should distinguish between homonymy and polysemy.

Polysemy is used to describe cases where different meanings of the same word are mutually dependent and proceed from the primary meaning in every direction like rays. Polysemy is the natural consequence of the meaning shift undergone by words in different contexts. With homonymy, the different meanings of words are mutually independent, there is no connection between the words whatsoever, they only have the same pronunciation and spelling, or are identical only in spelling or sound.

The Russian linguist E.S.Kubrakova presents graphically the relation between polysemy and homonymy in the following way: In the first case the meanings are connected with each other and go from the same source, while in the second there is no such connection, and the parallel lines never intersect.

Homonyms may be of different types. We may speak of full or perfect homonyms which are identical both in pronunciation and spelling: Russian *лук* “onion” and *лук* “bow”, German *Acht* “attention” and *acht* “eight”, English *bear* and *to bear*. One should not confuse these with homophones which are identical only in pronunciation in the nominative and the accusative cases (Russian *прут* “twig” and *пруд* /prut/ “pond”, English *knight*—*night*) but with different phonemes in other forms of these words or in their compounds: *prutik* “small twig” and *prudik*

“small pond”. Homographs are identical only in pronunciation and/or in spelling in one form: Russian *tri* “three” and *tri*—the imperative mood of the verb “to wipe”; English *lead* (Pres. Ind. of the verb) and *lead* (the metal).

D.V.Ushakov suggested the following system of classifying all homonyms:

1) Lexical homonyms, which differ only in their lexical meaning but belong to the same grammatical category (part of speech); for instance, the English *bail* “a sum of money paid by or for a person accused of wrongdoing” and *bail* “a small metal tank for water”; German *Seite* “string” and *Seite* “side”, French *louer* “to hire” and *louer* “to boast”. Lexical homonyms may be full or complete when they are homonyms in all their grammatical categories, e.g. the English *page* “one side of a leaf of paper”, and *page* “a boy servant” have the same plural form *pages*, and partial when they are homonyms only in some of their grammatical categories—e.g. *to found* “to establish” and *found* (pret. and p. p. of “to find”).

2) Lexical-grammatical homonyms, which differ not only in lexical meaning but also in their grammatical category; for example, the English *rose* (the flower) and *rose*, pret. of *to rise*; Uzbek *oshhona* “kitchen, canteen” and *oshhona* used as an adjective in the word combination *osh hona* “dining-room”.

3) There may also be grammatical homonyms which differ in their grammatical meaning and express different grammatical categories.

To sum up, the origins of homonymy are different. They may be the result of borrowing; for example, *fair* in the sense “exhibition” is a noun derived from the Latin *feria* and *fair* “pleasant” is an adjective derived from the Anglo-Saxon *fseger* “fair”; the Russian *brak* “marriage” and *brak* “spoilage”, borrowed from the German *Brack* (from the verb *brechen* “to break”). Homonyms may be created through the break-up of a former case of polysemy. The history of form-words, prepositions and conjunctions will give sufficient evidence to show this: the English *provided*, past participle of *to provide*, and *provided* as a conjunction “on the understanding (that)”; Russian *blagodarja*, which is the participle from the verb *blagodarit’*, “to thank”, and *blagodarja* as a preposition “owing (to)”. A number of words serve as examples of homonyms created by abbreviation. A few examples of this process are: *cab* “cabriolet”, *cab* “cabin”.

REFERENCES

1. Болдырев Н.Н. Роль когнитивного контекста в интерпретации мира и знаний о мире // Вестник Челябинского университета. 2014. № 6 (335). С. 118-122.
2. Болдырев Н.Н. Структура и принципы формирования оценочных категорий // С любовью к языку: Сборник науч. трудов, посвящ. Е.С. Кубряковой. Москва- Воронеж: ИЯ РАН, ВГУ, 2002. С. 103-114.
3. Болдырев Н.Н., Панасенко Л.А. Когнитивная основа лексических категорий и их интерпретирующий потенциал // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. 2013. № 2. С. 5-12.
4. Большой Англо-Русский словарь / Под общ. рук. И.Р. Гальперина. Москва: Советская энциклопедия, 1972.
5. Большой энциклопедический словарь (БЭС) / Гл. ред. Ярцева В.Н. М.: Большая Российская энциклопедия, 2000. – 668 с.
6. Бондарчук Г.Г. Семиотические аспекты описания категории предметных имен // Вестник МГЛУ. Вып. 577. Языкознание. Москва: ИПК МГЛУ «Рема», 2010.

7. Виноградов В.В. Русский язык. М.: Высшая школа, 1972.
8. Дементьева А.Г. Когнитивные основы формирования переносных значений фитонимов (на материале английского, русского и французского языков): дис. канд. филол. наук. Тамбов, 2012.
9. 9.Murodova M.I. Current challenges in teaching English for ESL learners.
10. 10.M.I.Murodova M. E. WAUGH AND ABDULLA KAHHOR'S CREATIVE WORK Archive of Conferences, 71-72
11. 11.Tillaev Z.A. Teaching pragmatics of translation. Science and Education scientific journal Volume 2, Issue 10, October 2021.
12. 12.Tillaev Z.A. Equivalence of translation. Texas journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, Volume 1.