

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 11 Volume: 103

Published: 16.11.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



K.O. Saparova

UzSWLU

Doctor of Science in Philology, Prof.,

Tashkent

EXPERIENCE OF COGNITIVE INTERPRETATION OF PHONOVARIANTS OF WORDS OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Abstract: This article presents an attempt at a cognitive interpretation of the results of a psycholinguistic study conducted in order to identify the features of the use by informants of variants of pronunciation of the words of the Uzbek language *мартаба – мартаба, бемаъни – бемаъно* and the definition of communicative-pragmatic and cultural semantic shades, or cognitive signs, of the studied units formed in the minds of informants. At the same time, the hypothesis of the study is the assumption that different variants of the pronunciation of the same linguistic unit - a representative of a certain concept - are assigned different cognitive features. In the course of the analysis, all the identified cognitive features of the semantic zones of linguistic stimuli of the considered pronunciation options were described, and it was also established that in the structures of the analyzed concepts, formed in the cognitive consciousness of the interviewed Uzbek-speaking informants, conflicting cognitive features are distinguished.

Key words: concept, cognitive feature, linguistic stimulus, semantic zone, core, periphery, representative, pronunciation variant, phonovariant, phonostylistic unit, stylistic coloration, cognitive interpretation, assessment, concept modeling, variability.

Language: English

Citation: Saparova, K. O. (2021). Experience of cognitive interpretation of phonovariants of words of the Uzbek language. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 11 (103), 630-634.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-103-59> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.11.103.59>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

In the life of a person as a social phenomenon in the system of the entire complex of his knowledge, an important role is played by knowledge about the foundations of the culture of behavior and speech communication. Knowledge about the culture of speech communication in the mind of a person is structured, first of all, in the form of rules of word use at the phonetic, lexical, grammatical and stylistic levels.

The communicative-pragmatic and culturological semantic shades, or cognitive attributes, of a given unit, formed in a person's consciousness, make it possible to correctly select one or another form of a linguistic unit in various situations (spheres) of communication.

The formation of certain cognitive features in a person's knowledge system about the culture of verbal communication in various spheres and situations of verbal communication is carried out in different ways.

The proposed study presents an analysis of phonostylistic units of the modern Uzbek language on the basis of the concept adopted as a theoretical premise that frames (cognitive structures, cognitive contexts) are “models of culturally conditioned canonized knowledge, which is common, at least for a part of the speaker community. In principle, a frame can include any episode of knowledge, no matter how bizarre it may seem, as long as it is shared by a sufficient number of people” [26, p. 30].

The pronouncing aspect of speech occupies an important place in it: the ability to use the pronunciation options of linguistic units in the culture of speech communication correctly, expediently in the context and situation of communication is the most important factor of communication.

The legitimacy of posing the question of the cognitive interpretation of phono-stylistic units can be substantiated, provided that the presence of cognitive signs of meaning in them is recognized. Proceeding

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

from this, we considered it expedient to carry out a psycholinguistic study of the semantics of phonostylistic units on the material of stylistically colored phonovariants of words of the modern Uzbek literary language, based on those proposed by I.A. Sternin theoretical and methodological guidelines for linguo-cognitive research [158, p. 65-69].

Theoretical and methodological attitudes of I.A. Sternin is based on the distinction between the concepts of meaning and concept. Meaning and concept differ both in their sphere of formation, structure of content, and in the function they perform.

Psycholinguistic research as the basis of the method of cognitive interpretation was carried out by us on the material of stylistically colored phonovariants of words of the modern Uzbek literary language. At the same time, our assumption was based on the fact that different variants of the pronunciation of the same linguistic unit - a representative of a certain concept - are assigned different cognitive features.

176 Uzbek-speaking informants (students, undergraduates, postgraduates and teachers of the Uzbek State University of World Languages) took part in the psycholinguistic research. In the course of a step-by-step analysis of the results of the psycholinguistic experiment, the nuclear and peripheral semantic zones of the stimulus value were identified, the study of which revealed the following:

First, when assessing the phonovariant, the word informants focus on different aspects of it: one gives an ethical and moral assessment, the other - a normative one, the third - an aesthetic one.

Secondly, what kind of assessment is given to the linguistic stimulus, such a part of its field structure is relevant in the speaker's mind and determines his linguistic behavior - the speaker uses the phonovariant of the linguistic unit in his speech in accordance with the pronunciation assessment fixed in his mind.

Thirdly, when generalizing assessments, it becomes clear which semantic zone (zones) is most often actualized in the speaker's mind and constitutes the core of the semantic content of the linguistic stimulus.

Let us consider the nuclear and peripheral semantic zones of the meaning of stimuli using the example of phonovariants *мартаба* – *маротаба*, *бемаъни* – *бемаъно*. The number of informants who gave the specified assessment of the language stimulus will be indicated in brackets.

The core of the semantic content of the stimulus “pronunciation variant *мартаба*”

Zone of correlation with another variant of pronunciation: another word (46).

Zone of ethical and moral assessment:

a) good, excellent (38);

b) bad (4).

Pronunciation normative zone:

a) correct, literary (15);

b) wrong (19).

The zone of functional and stylistic coloration: common, colored, in artistic speech, in oral speech, colloquial (30).

Near periphery

Zone of territorial affiliation: dialectal (9).

Emotional Expressive Assessment Zone:

a) arrogant (4);

b) will go (5).

Far periphery

Sound Impression Zone: Pleasant (3).

Pronunciation modification degree zone: abbreviated (3).

The core of the semantic content of the stimulus “pronunciation variant *маротаба*”

Zone of correlation with another variant of pronunciation: another word (52).

Pronunciation normative zone: correct, literary (44).

Zone of ethical and moral assessment:

a) good, not bad (24);

b) bad (8).

Near periphery

The zone of functional and stylistic coloration: bookish, in artistic speech (22).

Zone of aesthetic evaluation: beautiful (16).

Far periphery

Zone of territorial affiliation: dialectal (4).

Zone of "optimistic" assessment: humorous, funny (3).

Usage zone: rarely used (2).

Zone of emotional-expressive assessment: agitated (1).

In the pronouncing pair of *мартаба-маротаба*, the stylistic label is high style (high style - high) has a second pronunciation option. It should be noted that *мартаба-маротаба* are variants of the pronunciation of the word *марта*. *Мартаба*, at the same time, also acts as a homonym for the word *мартаба* I “degree; rank; dignity; rank, position”. This circumstance leaves a direct imprint on the field structures of linguistic stimuli, the variant of pronunciation of *мартаба* and the variant of pronunciation of *маротаба*, the main zone in the core of the semantic content of which is the zone of correlation with another variant of pronunciation: another word (46; 52).

The manifestation of this zone in the field structure of linguistic stimuli requires close attention, since the variants of pronunciation of *мартаба* and *маротаба*, despite the fact that they were presented in pairs during the experiment, were perceived by informants as homonyms, and not as variants of pronunciation of the same word. This means that *мартаба* and *маротаба* are associated primarily as homonyms, and not as variants of pronunciation of the word march, although, according to the dictionaries of the modern Uzbek language, *мартаба* II and march are equivalent, stylistically unmarked.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИЦ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

In this regard, the variant of pronunciation of *мартаба* (against the background of the variant of pronunciation of *мартоба*) is assessed by the informants as more normative - the core of the semantic content of the stimulus is, in addition to the zone of correlation with another variant of pronunciation, the zone of normative pronunciation: correct, literary (44) and the zone of ethical and moral assessment: good, not bad (24), bad (8), and in the core of the semantic content of the stimulus, the variant of the pronunciation of *мартоба* includes, in addition to the zone of correlation with another variant of pronunciation, the zone of ethical and moral assessment: good, excellent (38), bad (4), the zone of normative pronunciation: correct, literary (15), incorrect (19) and the zone of functional and stylistic coloration: common, colored, in artistic speech, in oral speech, colloquial (30).

In the near periphery of the semantic content of the stimulus, the variant of pronunciation of *мартоба*, there is a manifestation of the zone of territorial belonging: dialectal (9), the zone of emotionally expressive assessment: arrogant (4), will go (5). The far periphery contains positive assessments in the zone of sound impression: pleasant (3), in the zone of the degree of pronunciation modification: abbreviated (3), which corresponds to the general trends in the development of the language (and languages in general) at the present stage - the desire for brevity, brevity.

These assessments favor the functioning of the phonovariant in the future within the limits, in general, of the literary language, but, perhaps, in the near future, its stylistic reassessment will occur, which is signaled by the zone of functional-stylistic coloration: common, colored, in artistic speech, in oral speech, colloquial (30) and negative assessments "bad" (4), "wrong" (19) in the core of the semantic content of the stimulus, as well as the zone of territorial affiliation: dialectal (9) in the near periphery. Moreover, the stylistic reassessment of the pronunciation option can be directed both towards the high style: "in artistic speech", "pleasant", and towards its decrease: "bad", "incorrect", "common, in oral speech, colloquial", "dialectal", "abbreviated". It would be categorical to predict a decrease in the stylistic coloring of the pronunciation variant on the basis of these estimates, if it were not for the more laconic form of *мартоба* functioning in literary, stylistically neutral speech. Against the background of this form, the version of the pronunciation of *мартоба* will most likely acquire a stylistically sublime character.

The immediate periphery of the semantic content of the stimulus, the variant of pronunciation of *мартаба*, is made up of a zone of functional and stylistic coloration: bookish, in artistic speech (22) and a zone of aesthetic assessment: beautiful (16), which, together with positive assessments of zones of normative pronunciation and ethical and moral

assessment, show that for this variant of pronunciation, the stylistic marking of highness will be preserved.

Further, according to estimates, in the far periphery of the semantic content of the stimulus: in the zone of territorial affiliation: dialectal (4), in the zone of "optimistic" assessment: humorous, funny (3), in the zone of degree of use: rarely used (2), in the zone of emotionally -expressive assessment: agitated (1), - stylistic reassessment of the phonovariant is also possible both downward: "dialectal", "humorous, funny", and upward: "rarely used", "agitated". However, in both cases, the phonovariant will be used mainly for stylization in artistic speech.

The core of the semantic content of the stimulus "pronunciation variant *беманни*"

Zone of ethical and moral assessment:

- a) good, excellent (45);
- b) bad (14).

Pronunciation normative zone: correct, literary (49).

Near periphery

Emotional Expressive Assessment Zone:

- a) like it, nothing (14);
- b) I do not like it (6).

The zone of functional and stylistic coloration: in oral speech, colloquial (19).

Aesthetic evaluation area:

- a) beautiful (5);
- b) ugly, bad taste (13).

Far periphery

Fashion zone: modern (5).

Zone of the degree of pronunciation modification: spoiled (5).

Individual Evaluation Area: Strange (1).

The core of the semantic content of the stimulus "pronunciation variant *беманно*"

Zone of ethical and moral assessment:

- a) good (17);
- b) bad (30).

Pronunciation normative zone:

- a) correct, literary (34);
- b) erroneous, incorrect (12).

The zone of functional and stylistic coloration: bookish, in artistic speech (30).

Near periphery

Aesthetic evaluation area:

- a) beautiful (8);
- b) terrible (7).

Individual evaluation area: strange (13).

Chronological evaluation zone: obsolete (12).

Emotional Expressive Assessment Zone:

- a) nothing, it will go (5);
- b) I do not like it (5).

Far periphery

Usage zone: unused (3).

The pronunciation of *беманно* is noted in the dictionaries of the modern Uzbek language as a high version of the pronunciation of the stylistically neutral

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
 ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
 GIF (Australia) = 0.564
 JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
 ПИИЦ (Russia) = 3.939
 ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
 SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
 PIF (India) = 1.940
 IBI (India) = 4.260
 OAJI (USA) = 0.350

word *бемаъни*, i.e. has a stylistic label high style (high style). Adequate characteristics of phonovariants are reflected in the field structures of linguistic stimuli, the variant of pronunciation of *бемаъни* and the variant of pronunciation of *бемаъно*. Thus, the core of the semantic content of the stimulus, the variant of pronunciation of *бемаъни*, is made up of the zone of ethical and moral assessment: good, excellent (45), bad (14) and the zone of normative pronunciation: correct, literary (49). Consequently, the phonovariant *бемаъни* is undoubtedly correct, literary and generally good, even excellent, although sometimes it is perceived as bad (14).

The core of the semantic content of the stimulus, the variant of pronunciation of the *бемаъни*, is made up of the zone of ethical and moral assessment: good (17), bad (30); zone of normative pronunciation: correct, literary (34), erroneous, incorrect (12); zone of functional and stylistic coloration: bookish, in artistic speech (30). As you can see, the phonovariant is mostly bad (30) than good (17), but still correct, literary (34), than erroneous, incorrect (12) and is used mainly in bookish, artistic speech, while the phonovariant *бемаъни*, according to estimates of the zone of functional and stylistic coloration, is used in oral, colloquial speech.

At the same time, the phonovariant *бемаъни* - like it, nothing (14); handsome (5), although he may not like (6); ugly, bad taste (13), as spoiled (5); strange

(1). In general, this version of the pronunciation remains modern (5).

The phonovariant is both beautiful (8) and terrible (7); strange (13); obsolete (12); nothing, will go (5), but do not like (5). Therefore, in the future, this version of the pronunciation will be unused (3).

After identifying the nuclear and peripheral semantic zones of the meaning of the stimulus, which form its field structure, individual associates were generalized and cognitive features were formulated within the framework of the corresponding classifiers. This made it possible to reveal the structure of the concept of the studied phonovariants of the words of the Uzbek language. Single and contradictory associates made up the concept's interpretation field, which, together with the core, near and far periphery, represents the concept's field structure.

So, we examined various semantic zones of the meaning of stimuli that form the field structures of concepts. Next, we will rank these semantic zones, since, as I.A. Sternin, "the structure of a concept is formed by cognitive signs of varying degrees of brightness (relevance) for the cognitive consciousness of the people, and according to this parameter, it is possible to analyze and compare different concepts both within one national conceptual sphere, and in terms of comparing two different conceptual spheres - national, age, gender and etc. " [158, p. 68].

Table 1.

Variant pronunciation of martaba		Variant pronunciation of marotaba	
Another word	26,1%	Another word	29,5%
Good	21,6%	Correct	25%
in oral speech	17%	Good	13,6%
Wrong	11%	Bookish	12,5%
Correct	8,5%	Beautiful	9,1%
Dialectal	5%	Bad	4,6%

Variant pronunciation of бемаъни		Variant pronunciation of бемаъно	
Correct	27,8%	Correct	19,3%
Good	25,6%	In literary speech	17%
In oral speech	10,8%	Bad	17%
Bad	8%	Good	9,8%
Nothing	8%	strange	7,4%
Not beautiful	7,4%	outdated	6,8%

In the structures of the considered concepts, formed in the cognitive consciousness of the interviewed Uzbek-speaking informants, conflicting cognitive features are distinguished, for example, in the concepts:

- variant of pronunciation of bema'ni - good 25.6%, bad 8%;
- variant of pronunciation bema'no - beautiful 4.6%, terrible 4%;

The allocation of conflicting cognitive features in the structure of the concept, which may be quite bright, is "one of the essential proofs of the fundamental difference between the concept and the meaning of the word - in the latter, contradictory features are excluded" [158, p. 69].

In our opinion, it seems interesting and appropriate to compare the cognitive features of a concept of different degrees of brightness, not only in terms of the above aspects, but also from the point of

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

view of its modeling in the cognitive consciousness of Uzbek speakers, since the same concept can be subjected to different modeling depending on whether, what, for example, variants of the pronunciation of a word it is represented.

The fact that the phonovariants of the words of the Uzbek language contain different cognitive features with varying degrees of their brightness indicates that the same concept in the Uzbek language

can be represented not only by different language units of the content plan (words, phrases, etc.) but also their variant forms - units of the plan of expression, in particular, variants of their pronunciation. At the same time, the distinguished various cognitive features of different degrees of brightness in the structure of the same concept allow us to conclude that the variability of linguistic units interdependently determines the variability in the modeling of the concept.

References:

1. Abduazizov, A.A. (1985). Fonostilistik vositalarning o'rganilishiga doir. *O'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, Toshkent, No. 2, pp. 24-28.
2. Boldyrev, N.N. (2004). Conceptual space of cognitive linguistics. *Questions of cognitive linguistics*, Tambov, №1, pp.18-36.
3. Vekshin, G.V. (2005). On the phono-stylistics of text generation (Poems by A. Pushkin). *Philological Sciences*, No. 6, pp. 22-31.
4. Dzhusupov, M., & Saparova, K.O. (2011). *Turkic phono-stylistics (based on the Uzbek language)*. (p.338). Astana: Saryarka.
5. Kubryakova, E.S. (2004). On the attitudes of cognitive science and actual problems of cognitive linguistics. *Questions of cognitive linguistics*, №1, pp. 6-17.
6. (1990). *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary* / Ch. ed. V.N. Yartseva. (p.685). Moscow: Sov. Encyclopedia.
7. Nurakhmetov, E.N. (2002). On the origins and main directions of phono-stylistic research. *Tilta, now. Linguistics*, Almaty, No. 1 (5), pp. 7-11.
8. Saparova, K.O. (2020). *Phonostylistics of the Russian language (theoretical course)*. (p.164). Tashkent: VneshInvestProm.
9. Saparova, K.O. (2006). *Phonostylistics of the Russian and Uzbek languages*. (p.272). Tashkent: Uzbekistan.
10. Sternin, I.A. (2004). Cognitive interpretation in linguo-cognitive research. *Questions of cognitive linguistics*, Tambov, №1, pp. 65-69.
11. Fesenko, T.A. (2004). Conceptual translation in the structure of the relationship "activity - thinking - consciousness - language". *Questions of cognitive linguistics*, №1, pp. 112-122.