BASIC FEATURES OF LINGUISTIC CHARACTER OF THE WORD MEANING

Majidova Ezozakhon Ibrohim kizi
ESL Teacher at the 7th General Secondary School of Shakhrisabz City,
Kashkadarya Region

A B S T R A C T	K E Y W O R D S
In this article, basic features of linguistic character of the word meaning are analysed. As well as, the article gives a complete description of the meaning of the word, its actualization, the role of context and cites example sentences.	pragmatics , context, generative power, linguistic sign, V.V. Vinogradov, G.Leech, precontexts, linguistic units.

Introduction

Modern theories of pragmatics assume that the meaning of a word depends on context and postulate the generative power of context . Meaning is studied in pragmatics as part of the context. G. Leech defines pragmatics as the doctrine of the situational meaning of an utterance [1]. Neo-Grisian theory and relevance theory agree that the lexical meaning of a word is indeterminate without context and is conditioned by it. This idea is not new, because in From the early Middle Ages onward, it has been repeatedly asserted that a word without context has no meaning at all.

According to most pragmatists, the context allows the word to express its hidden potential. Modern pragmatics distinguishes between implicatures of the speaker - implicit information that the speaker puts in, and inferences - what the listener extracts. Speech activity in the process of communication presupposes the presence of two planes of perception simultaneously: from the side of the speaker - the one who generates the statement, and from the side of the listener. The speaker, creating an utterance, exercises control over what and how he says, how he formulates his thoughts. The listener interprets the speaker's statement, and his interpretation may not coincide with the content laid down in this statement by the speaker [2]. Thus, conflict risk factors may arise, which are determined by the contradictions between the generation of the text and its perception. In this article, we are primarily interested in the question of the role of the word and context in the emergence of a speech conflict.

Context is the terms in which a word is used to clarify its meaning. In linguistics, context is any factor —linguistic, physical, social—that influences the interpretation of linguistic signs. This may be the language environment, the situation of verbal communication or the environment in which the object exists. The context is everything but the given linguistic sign. According to modern theories of pragmatics, the context is responsible for everything. In the following anecdote, context plays a

selective and clarifying role: - *" What are you doing there, Anvar, are you reading so loudly!?"* *"History, mother." " So read to yourself." - " Yes, in History, Mom nothing is written about me"* .

The role of context is no longer so clear in the following sentence: - I'm bored with you, I want to sleep with you. *In this sentence, the word "sleep" can have both a literal and a figurative meaning. For its unambiguous interpretation, more context is needed, which would play a clarifying role. What role does the word play? Doesn't the word have the same mighty power as the context in determining meaning? The following phrases help us to give answer to this* - Hilola, where have you been? Anvar asked about you.

Roza, where have you been? It's already dark. I have already begun to worry. Get undressed and eat quickly.

The word *"lost"* has the same meaning in both sentences. If the word "disappeared" is used in other contexts, its meaning also does not change.

It turns out: - *And where did you disappear for so long? They searched all over the city for you, but you were nowhere to be found. Even your friends didn't know where you were.*

It turns out that the word can also have the same mighty power as the context in determining meaning. In fact, words and phrases can create their own context. The approach to the word and context differs significantly in British and American linguistics. It is determined by two interrelated factors - the typology of languages and the research tradition. There are different classifications of languages. Hale, Marácz & Muysken and others have distinguished between configurational languages and non-configurational languages based on how words are organized in sentences. In configuration languages such as English, word order determines the grammatical relationship between them, and n lexical object is usually the same as the grammatical object. For example: *John broke the glass*. You must watch this film. *Children like cats.*

Usually, any change in word order in an English sentence leads to violates grammatical norms and makes the sentence incorrect: *Broke John the glass.* In non-configurational languages, grammatical relations denote suffixes and endings, not word order, and various permutations of word order are allowed without changing the basic meaning of the sentence. Word order plays a pragmatic role. Of course, configurationality is not a dichotomy, but a continuum, on which configuration languages are located on the left (for example, English, German, etc.). Based on the idea of a close relationship and conditionality of all aspects of the language, V.V. Vinogradov described morphology in terms of its syntactic functioning. L.S. Vygotsky brought the fact of the development of the meaning of a word closer to the fact of the development of consciousness. For him, the word is an apparatus that reflects the external world in its connections and relationships. The question arises: does the word have semantic independence? There are opposite approaches to this question:

" In absolute isolation, no sign has any meaning; symbolic meaning arises in the context..." [3]; " Regardless of its given use, the word is present in knowledge with all its meanings, with hidden and possible, ready at first reason to rise to the surface" [4]. Take the following sentence without context: *"Listen."* It has not any meaning without context. The word creates a context, and context creates meaning. In the mind of a person, a meaning is generated on the basis of previous experiences with the word. For example, a wife appears in my head, who usually addresses me like this: " Listen" (" Let me tell you something"). Or take the following conversation: - *Sasha, phone. -I'm in the toilet. -Okay.*

We know exactly where and how the conversation is happening because words create context. Evidence indicates that words encode past experiences, and past contexts for the use of a given word or expression. It turns out that the word is also a context. It is a storehouse of previous situations in which the word was used. We can say that a word is a warehouse of former contexts [4]. The words in the following sentences have certain metaphorical meanings based on previous usages rooted in the speaker's experience. - *Will you marry me? What is she getting at? I heard that you will be leaving us soon.*

Language resources are always oriented towards a previously known reality. New knowledge always lacks language. The language reflects the previously known reality, but it is ready to change, as required by socio-cultural factors. The emergence of new words and phrases is a reaction of the language to changes in the socio-political and economic life of society, due to time. New words appear to denote new phenomena in society, such as the expression brain *drain,* which is a tracing paper from the English language.

On the other hand, the changes taking place in the language itself with the use of "old" words and phrases speak of the internal possibilities of the language itself. The history of the change in the meaning of the word *comrade* clearly shows how social changes are reflected in the language. The lexical meaning of a word encodes the contexts in which it was used. The actual context only realizes what is inherent in the word itself. Yu.V. Fomenko was right when he said that "The word does not adapt to the context, is not deformed, is not remade in it", but is used in the sense in which the speaker uses it [5]. S.D. Katsnelson also noted that "Context in such cases is not a generator of meanings, but their external 'developer'". Evidence indicates that words that encode past contexts of use of a given word or expression play just as important a role in determining the actual meaning of a given word as the actual context of use. The following example clearly shows this defining role: - *Hilola, let's go drink beer. - No I can not.* **The doctor** *won't allow it. - What's wrong with you?* The word changes the context :- *Hilola, let's go drink beer. - No I can not.* **Mother-in-law** *does not allow. -What's wrong with you?*

Changing the word *"doctor"* to the word *"mother-in-law"* causes a change in the meaning of the expression *What's wrong with you?* and the whole actual context. The facts discussed above indicate that knowledge of the external world about is in two context types:
- actual, situational, extralinguistic contexts,
- "old", previous, former contexts encoded in words and linguistic units, or precontexts.

In conclusion, according to modern theories of pragmatics, communication is cooperation between participants and the search for relevance. The speaker's task is to decide, on the basis of the listener's ideas known to him (his knowledge of the meanings of the compared forms, knowledge of the previous and wider context, ideas about the world, etc.), which of the possible formulations of his intention will be better understood by the listener . Understanding necessarily includes the conclusions that the listener must draw in order to restore the speaker's intention, and these conclusions will be made on the basis of all the information listed. The task of the addressee is to realize the intention of the interlocutor, decipher, "calculate" it on the basis of all the knowledge and facts that he has. The degree of accuracy of the calculated pragmatic meaning determines the nature of the verbal and/or behavioral response of the addressee and the quality of the act of communication — in the zone of harmonic or disharmonic communication.

References:

1. Leech Geoafrey. Principles of Pragmatics. - London: Longman, 1983
2. Tretyakova V.S. 2004. Speech conflict and aspects of its study. Jurislinguistics-5: Server of electronic publications WMC ASU
3. Elmslev L. Prolegomena to the theory of language // New in linguistics. - M., 1960. - T. 1. - p. 303
4. Kecskes I. Dueling context: A dynamic model of meaning // Journal of Pragmatics. 2008. Vol. 40. - Issue 3. - P. 385-406
5. Fomenko Yu.V. Man, word and context (The concept of man in modern philosophical and psychological thought. - Novosibirsk, 2001. - P. 164-168)
6. Katsnelson S.D. Categories of language and thinking: From the scientific heritage / Otv. ed. L.Yu. Sconce ude. - M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2001.