

Interpretation of the Derivated Meanings and its Regularization in the Uzbek Linguistics



Linguistics

Keywords: derivated meaning, metaphor, metonymy, denotative seme, connotative seme, functional seme.

Gulshan Nasrullaeva

Teacher of Karshi State University, Karshi, Uzbekistan.

Abstract

Present article covers intercourse between Main (Principal) and Derived (Secondary) meanings. More attention is paid towards metaphoric and metonymic styles during incipience of the derived meaning. Relation of the derived meaning towards the Principal one is analyzed on the basis of the Primal lexeme and its meanings. Moreover, article also covers ways of seme association on the basis of grouping of the derived meanings.

Derived meaning used to be lexically interpreted in various ways. Ways of origin of the derived meaning (incipience of the secondary meaning) noticeably varies, whereas derived meanings themselves differ with variety of words.

As the adherent of 2 formats of meaning derivation, consisting of metonymy and metaphor, we shall try to express opinion on structuring the following Primal lexeme and derived meaning as:

1. Beginning, round or longspun shaped part of living body (sconce); *kalla* (head).
2. *metonymy* human consciousness, brain.
3. *metonymy* human, person.
4. *metonymy* (in numeral numbers) each animal in cattle breeding.
5. *metonymy* head side of bed.
6. *metonymy* person misunderstanding name / fixed place/area of the object.
7. *metonymy* human physiognomy (3rd person, is used as subsidiary by means of personal case, other cases and affixes)
8. *metaphora* bacca, fruit of some plants in the round and paniculate forms.
9. *metaphor* upper side, top, peak of the standing object.
10. *metaphor* first or main in graduation.
11. *metaphor* Leader, forefront person for others.
12. *metaphor* superior in respect of designation.
13. *metaphor* starting point of any story, abode, time.
14. *metaphor* Initial reason, cause of any story, episode.
15. (by numeral numbers) count, numeric.

Metonymic Derived Meaning is characterized by affinity to Principal meaning and non-portrayal in respect to metaphor. Herein nomenclating function and naming of the object is superior rather than its description. Along with this, in the metonymic aspect, an intentional purpose of the spokesmen is not to expand and aggrandize the object, but to follow verbal conciseness, provision and achievement of word conveniences and relevancies. Metonymic definition directly serve to name object, which is naturally linked with the Principal meaning denotation. "It appears on the basis of intercourse of abstracters of the Derived and Principal meanings. Metonymies are divided into metonymy of generalized lexical meaning and lexical meaning based on personal lexemes. Pecularity of the derived meaning is in its initial generality, followed by its personality. Metonymies based on generalized meaning are encountered in all independent word-collocations, when metonymies based on personal lexemes appear in the composition with collective nouns" (Mirtojiev, 2010). It also should be noted that M.Mirtojiev, linguist, comparing Main and Derived meanings, describes its initial combinative meaning as "metonymic derivation" and qualifies it as metonymic meaning based generalized lexeme: "Generalized lexeme based metonymy is the very metonymy deriving from the lexeme as terminal unit in the phrase. Herein, Main and Derived meanings vary from each by seme and are conjoined with common seme. For example, the word "*bosh*" (head) in generalized character has semes as "*tananing*" (of body), "*yuqori*" (upper side), "*qismi*" (part). Derived meaning as "*yulning old qismi*" (foreside of path) appears herein, i.e. based on generalized lexical meaning. Combining with the 3rd seme, they vary with 1st and 2nd semes" (Mirtojiev, 2010). Concept of conextity in metonymy is used for aprehtion of overall "general connectivity" metaphoric shape of the derived meaning, rather than its metonymic "connectivity and attachment to venue and time" shape.

Presence of commonality, semic/sememic relations of Main and Derived seme against venue and time connectivity is encountered in the metaphoric phrases. This is why it is called “shortened shape of assimilation” for a reason (Tomashevskiy, 1952; Meylakh, 1958; Usmonov, 1967; Kabuljanova, 2000). In the 9th metaphor “Upper side, top, peak of the standing object” seme as “upper side” describes one angle of such assimilation.

Lexeme “*Bosh*” (head) starts with defining of community of the main and metaphoric seme, structure of the main seme as well as similarity of the main and metaphoric seme.

Sememe is “fore side part of body above neck”. Undoubtedly, definition as “in human and animals” in the comments provide particular abstraction, moreover, constricts its features. As “fish”, “bird”, “insects” are not included in the general seme “animals”. This is why it is expedient to describe it as “fore-side part of live body”. Preposition “*boshlanish*” (fore-side) unites semantic terms as “*yuqorigi*” (upper) and “*oldingi*” (fore). In this regard it is expedient to underline the following seme:

- a) “*tirik organism*” (live body);
- б) “*tana*” (body);
- в) “*boshlanish qismi*” (fore-side part).

These three “nomenclating” semes, being mentioned in the glossary, conceal definitive and executive functions. Besides attachment to particular group, stylistic features, etymology, scope and period of usage, its coloric and non-coloric features, these lexemes exist in similarity with denotative seme mentioned above. In other words, unity of these denotative seme indicates stylistic neutrality and non-colority as well. Stylistic non-colority, in its turn, defines general availability and absoluteness of its usage. It brought to irrelevance in lexicographic analyze of definitive and executive seme, as well as their interpretation. Hence, even semantic-semic interpretation serves as basis for lexicographic interpretations, where their concretizations is not recommended. This is why we think it is essential to provide an enhanced semic structure of the lexeme “*bosh*” (head):

Denotative seme: 1) “body of live organism”; 2) “location of brain”; 3) “round or paniculate shape”; 4) “fore-side”.

Connotative seme: “stylistic neutrality”.

Functional seme: “*ot*” (substantive); “*turdosh ot*” (common substantive); “*aniq ot*” (direct/definite substantive); “*yakka ot*” (unit substantive).

Role of above 3 type seme varies in origination of the derivative seme. As variation of the denotative seme occurs in some derivative meanings, so that sometimes such variation takes place in the intercourse of the denotative and connotative seme. We shall try to explain this in the example of main lexeme in the form of metaphoric meaning. As it was seen, 8th seme of our structure is defined as “bacca, fruit of some plants in the round and paniculate forms”. Meaning consists of the following seme:

Denotative seme: 1) “some plants”; 2) “round and paniculate forms”; 3) “bacca, fruit”.

Connotative seme: “stylistic neutrality”.

Functional seme:

- 1) “substantive”;
- 2) “common substantive”;
- 3) “direct/definite substantive”;
- 4) “unit substantive”.

Only fruit of the plant is alike the head of the living body. Round shape of the fruit is a basis for analogy. Such analogy is not applied towards small fruits. Comparative object is to be somehow similar to the head of human either animal to some extent, at least to be average size as well. Herein, in majority, human head is used as basis and serve as comparative criteria.

Difference between derivative seme and main seme is occurring in their denotative seme. Derivative seme “*Ba’zi usimliklar*” (some plants) is engrossing main seme “*tirik organism*” (live organism). Seme “round or peniculate shape” expresses similarity of the mentioned denotation between main “head or peniculate shape” fragment. Particular similarity of this objects takes place in vision, as well as their strengthening and expansion. There is lacuna in our language to count fruits (for example, grape-fruit). This emptiness is filled by word “*bosh*” (head). It is known that there is referentive combination between metaphoric and main meanings (Baldinger, 1957; Арнольд, 1959; Реформатский, 1968; Калинина, 1971; Шмелев, 1977; Хожиев, 1981). As noted by team of authors, “one of the following would be the reason of origination of metaphoric meaning”:

- 1) one particular word would be more suitable, more appropriate to express the spokesmen's opinion, and it is why it is used instead of the main (initial) word;
- 2) some denotations do not have definitive, whereas can be used for explanation of other denotation.

Thus, if in first case the word is serving as secondary nomenclature of the denotation, it is the very initial term in the 2nd case. For example, the word “*etak*” (fore, foot) is more suitable to define foothill area rather than the word “*quyi*” (entry). As there is no suitable sea-related objects in Uzbekistan, the word “*qulitq*” (oxter) is used for explanation of the geographical names/places” (Сайфуллаева, 2010). The 2nd reason of this is that the word “*bosh*” (head) is serving as a basis for the seme being described. 3rd meaning segment of the denotative seme is specifically enervated, but this enervation does not mean its overall extinction. Generally, in this context, the aim is not to define the starting part of the plant, but conversely to define its ending side, i.e. converse meaning of the main seme. But it indicates the appropriation of the present seme to explain starting and ending parts in gross apprehension.

One can notice symbolism in metaphoric derivative seme “Leader, forefront person for others” and it is also an outcome of imagination. It has become tradition in lexicography to expose with figurative sign in majority of metaphoric derivative meanings, as symbolism is precisely enounced in it. The semic structure of the meaning is as following:

Denotative seme: 1) “*boshqalarga*” (to others); 2) “*yulboshchi*” (leader); 3) “*kishi*” (person).
 Connotative seme: “Stylistically appropriate”.

Functional seme:

- 1) “Substantive”;
- 2) “Common substantive”;
- 3) “Direct/definite substantive”;
- 4) “Unit substantive”.

Due to excessive enervation of the denotative seme of the Main seme and personalization of the definitive seme – “stylistic neutrality” is replaced by “stylistic appropriation” and one can encounter symbolism in this seme. However, as in the previous seme, functional seme is permanent here – change of objective/symbolic features does not occur. Symbolism, i.e., conditional similarity among objects (head of live organism and human) has revealed the present metaphoric meaning. Even this derivative meaning has long-term consequent perspectives due to its oral vitality and prospectiveness, it has availed social and logistic aspects. Generally, similarity is a broad concept, it shifts from preciseness towards absoluteness and finally faced a complete variety.

Whereas “in-efferent” anthropocentric metaphor serves for description of a person, it is expedient to apprehend such “evasion” in metaphoric meaning. However, seme to explain parts of human body mentioned above do serve to describe a person. This facilitates us to understand “in-efferent” direction being converted as “main meaning → derivative meaning”.

References

1. Baldinger K. (1957). .Die semasiologie. – Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
2. Kabuljonova G.K.. (2000). Systematic Linguistic Interpretation of Metaphor: Candidate of Philological science. Author's thesis – Tashkent.
3. Meylakh B. (1958). Comparative Literature and Esthetics. – Leningrad..
4. Mirtojiev M. (2010). Semasiology of Uzbek language. – Tashkent: Mumtoz suz.
5. Tomashevskiy B.V. (1952). Stylistics and Versification. – Moscow.
6. Usmonov S. (1967) Metaphor. – p.34; T.Rasulov. Metaphor // Uzbek Language and Literature. -- № 1.
7. Арнольд И. (1959). Лексикология современного английского языка. – Москва.
8. Калинина И.К. (1971). Метафора // Современный русский язык / Под ред. Д.Э.Розенталя. – М.: Изд-во МУ. Шмелев Д.Н. (1977). Современный русский язык. Лексика. – М.:Просвещение.
9. Реформатский А.А. (1968). Введение в языковедение. – М.:Просвещение.
10. Сайфуллаева Р., Менглиев Б. ва бошқ. (2010). Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. – Тошкент: Фан ва технологиялар.
11. Ҳожиёв А. (1981). Семасиология // Ўзбек тили лексикологияси / Махсус мух. А.Ҳожиёв, А.Аҳмедов. – Тошкент: Фан.