

MODELING THE INTERPRETIVE POTENTIAL OF THE LEXICAL CATEGORY «INSECTS» IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Usmonova Guljahon

Teacher at Kattakurgan branch of Samarkand State University

МОДЕЛИРОВАНИЕ ИНТЕРПРЕТАТИВНОГО ПОТЕНЦИАЛА ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОЙ КАТЕГОРИИ «НАСЕКОМЫЕ» В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Усмонова Гульжахон

*Преподаватель Каттакурганского филиала Самаркандского
государственного университета*

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA "HASHAROTLAR" LEKSIK TOIFASINING INTERPRETATIV IMKONIYATLARINI MODELLASHTIRISH

Usmonova Guljahon

Samarqand davlat universiteti Kattaqo'rg'on filiali o'qituvchisi



E-mail:
usmonova@mail.ru

Orcid: 0009-0003-
9967-2797

Abstract. The interpretive potential of the lexical category "insect" in English and Uzbek languages includes signs of perceptual formats, observation, experimental effects, as well as associative and operative rational formats. Signs that form the conceptual keeping this category and serving as the basis for interpretation corresponding areas are distinguished by linguistic consciousness as landmarks reflecting the specificity of the experience of interaction human connection with these representatives of the animal world.

Key words: nomination of artifacts; characterizing interpretation of units; conceptual subject.

Аннотация. Интерпретативный потенциал лексической категории «насекомое» в английском и узбекском языках включает признаки перцептивных форматов, наблюдений, экспериментальных эффектов, а также ассоциативных и операционально-рациональных форматов. Признаки, формирующие концептуальную основу данной категории и служащие базой для интерпретации соответствующих сфер, воспринимаются языковым сознанием как ориентиры, отражающие специфику человеческого опыта взаимодействия с представителями животного мира.

Ключевые слова: номинация артефактов; характеристическая интерпретация единиц; концептуальный субъект.

Annotatsiya. Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida "hasharot" leksik toifasining interpretativ (talqin) salohiyati idrokiy formatlar, kuzatish, eksperimental ta'sirlar, shuningdek, assotsiativ va ratsional faoliyat formatlarining belgilarini o'z ichiga oladi. Ushbu toifani tushunishda asos bo'ladigan va interpretatsiyani ta'minlovchi belgilarning konseptual mazmuni til ongida insonning ushbu hayvonot dunyosi vakillari bilan bo'lgan o'zaro tajribasining o'ziga xosligini aks ettiruvchi mezonlar sifatida ajralib turadi.

Kalit so'zlar: artefaktlarning nomlanishi, birliklarning tavsifiy interpretatsiyasi, konseptual subyekt.

INTRODUCTION (ВВЕДЕНИЕ/KIRISH). So, identification is manifested in the nomination of artifacts (technical devices, technical means of transportation) and conceptualization of the area of man (human activity, movement (sports terminology)) based on the metaphorical mechanism for

interpretation of the features of the perceptual format and formats for observation and experimental effects.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
(**ЎИТЕРАТУРА И МЕТОД/ADABIYOTLAR TAHLILI VA METODLAR**). The characterizing interpretation of units of this category is when subjectively understood, the speaker of the object is interpreted and extends to areas such as “man” and “artifact you”. This type of interpretation is realized through cognitive mechanisms of metaphor, comparison, defocusing when activating the first chain, operational, associative formats, as well as form-observation mats and experimental effects.

Perceptual format features serve as an interpretation of external type of artifacts and person (domain “physical characteristics”) or the sounds they make. For example, color shade and body shape or parts of the insect’s body can be used to characterize artifacts:

1. *They ignored him, and he saw that another ship had beaten them to it. It resembled a black **wasp**[2].*

2. *The tank looks empty, except for a piece of plastic shaped **like an insect wing**, ...[1].*

3. *Janie had crimped hair streaked with peroxide strands, and wore a **butterfly** collar disco print shirt opened much too low ...[3].*

Lexical units, like *wasp*, *insect*, *butterfly* in these examples denote the rational mode of interpretation, which determines the color and shapes of artifacts.

Interpretation of a person’s appearance through the use of insects implies the establishment of inter-conceptual connections by the following lines: body parts, body shape, color shade, for example:

4. *She wore huge rock-star sunglasses, the ones that made her head look like a bug’s [1].*

5. *Mexicans people wearing sunglasses that make them look like insects.*

6. *... their cars and tanks covered with freshly cut branches, the soldiers like ants in their steel helmets.*

8. *My shape was an exercise in aesthetics, not practicality. My waistline was a wasp’s.*

9. *- Maybe that’s respectable hair?*

- *No! It’s the color of a cockroach, that’s what it is!*

10. *It was low-cut, and it had a band of accordion pleats stitched close together at the cleavage and giving way to big chiffon wings over the shoulders. She was so skinny that she looked like a dragonfly in the thing.*

11. *- But you know, I’ve got huge, long legs and a very short torso.*

- *Yes. Yes, you look like a grasshopper. It’s amazing, people find you attractive at all.*

In the above examples, the lexical units *insect*, *bug*, *ant*, *wasp*, *cockroach*, *dragonfly*, *grasshopper* update their interpretative potential, namely signs associated with the structural features of the body, for assessing a person’s appearance. So, *insect*, *bug*, *ant* units detect a similar function of interpreting parts of the human body: head, eyes.

DISCUSSION(ОБСУЖДЕНИЕ/МУНОКАМА)

Differentiation of the interpretative capabilities of units is associated with differential features of objects of this group. So, unit *wasp* characterizes the heroine’s waist, *cockroach* is used to evaluate hair color characteristics, *dragonfly* units, *grasshopper* interphysique of a person pretends.

Let’s analyse the use of the lexical units: *insect*, *ant*, *wasp*, *butterfly*, *cockroach*, *dragonfly*, *grasshopper* in Uzbek discourse.

1. *Yomon arida bol bulmas, suvsiz yerda tol bulmas.* (Maqol)

2. *Chigirtkalarning chirillashi, kecha hasharotlarining na’masi kuchli shamol tovushi bilan kesildi.* (A. Qodiriy, Mexrobdan chayon.)

3. *“Bolaligim go’yo oppoq kapalak edi. Tabiatdagi har qanday hodisa meni ohanrabodek o’ziga tortardi”* (J. Matyoqubov)

4. *Ertasiga ot og’rib qolsa bo’ladimi! Kapalagim uchib ketdi.* (Oybek) (to be very frightened)

5. *Erkaligi ham mayliga-ya, buyruqni yomon ko’rishadi, sal gapga kapalaklari uchadi.* (Oydin) (to get angry)

6. *Qayerlarda yurar beparvo eri? Tonggacha mijja qoqmaydi siren Tungi kapalaklar dastidan.* (Yo. Ahmadjonov)

7. *Shu zamon ko’zingiz oldida birdan Kichik chumolicha qolgusi Farxod.* (A. Oripov) (as small as ant)

8. *chumoli bel – slender waist*

9. *Bunaqa kimsalar pana-pastkam yerlarda ko’zga tashlanmay, ivirsib yurishaveradi-da, bir*

payt qarabsizki, suvarakdek lop etib yorug'likka chiqib olishadi. (N. Aminov)

10. *O't-o'lanlar ustida oq, sariq kapalaklar, qizil, binafsharang ninachilar uchib yuribdi.* (M. Maxmudov)

Often interpretive signs are given in the definition of the first the primary meaning of the lexeme, compare:

cockroach - a large brown insect that is sometimes found in warm places where food is kept [2];

dragonfly - a brightly-colored insect with long, thin bodies and two sets of wings [2].

grasshopper - an insect with long back legs that jumps high into the air and makes a high vibrating sound [2].

RESULTS (РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ/NAIJALAR).

The revealed signs in the considered examples implement the rational mode of interpretation, which is associated with conceptualization their qualitative or quantitative manifestation. In some of the examples given, the semantic structure is completed is expressed in axiological and emotive modes. Emotive modus assumes a positive or negative aesthetic assessment of the object of interpretation and is updated due to the semantics of the corresponding lexical elements, compare: *aesthetics* - the study of beauty [2], *so skinny* - very thin, especially in a way that is unattractive [3] or organization of context based on respects ... *respectable hair? - No! It's the color of a cockroach, It's amazing, people find you attractive at all.* Emotive modus set by the emotional background set by the exclamation *No!*, or the semantics of the unit *amazing - so surprising that it is hard to believe* [3].

Insect sounds are used to characterize sounds produced by artifacts or humans:

12. *The HUM of the LOCOMOTIVE is like insects in a jar* [4].

13. *Selonnah's cell phone buzzed her side like a wasp in her waistband* [4].

14. *The machine coughed, buzzing to life like a hornet on the prow.*

16. *Then I saw a child, not more than 3 years old, lying on the pillows, making a thin noise, like the buzzing of a fly*

Interpreting conceptualization in these examples is implemented is a rational mode of interpretation that can be achieved by

differentiating the characteristics of sound by comparing with sound a lump of an insect published in a certain situation, compare: *like insects in a jar* (12), *like a hornet on the prow* (14). When a sign of sound perception is projected onto the «person» there is also an interpretation of the segment «mental state of a man» (domain «psyche»):

15. *En: He was starting to become distracted; his thoughts buzzed like insects in the hot summer sun* [4].

Uz: U chalg'ita boshladi; uning xayollari yozning jazirama quyoshida hasharotlardek guvillardi.

Observation format cues are used to interpret domains «physical characteristics» (segment «kinematics»), «socialization» (segment interpersonal relations, «human actions in relation to other people»), «human psyche» (segment traits») for the area «person» and «physical characteristics» («the part «kinematics») for the area «artifacts».

CONCLUSION (ЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЕ/XULOSA).

In conclusion, as a philosophical component of the theory of interpretation of phenomena the recognition that the most important result of cognitive activity is the formation of a system of knowledge about cognitive world, providing understanding of people in communication and from one generation to another in the format of knowledge, objectified in one way or another of reflection. One of the main assets objectification of knowledge is language. It is he who provides fixation knowledge about the world in linguistic signs, represented primarily by words *mi*, the reflective nature of which is recognized by most scientists.

REFERENCES (ИСПОЛЬЗОВАННАЯ ЛИТЕРАТУРА/ADABIYOTLAR RO'YXATI)

1. Collins Cobuild. English Dictionary. – London: Harper Collins Publishers, 1997. – P. 302.
2. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. L: Longman, 1992. – P. 21.
3. Философский энциклопедический словарь. – М: Советская энциклопедия, 1983.
4. <http://corpus.buy.edu/coca>