

1-26-2020

WORD, MEANING AND CONTEXT

Elmira Abdulla Huseynova

head teacher, Language Coordinator Nakhchivan University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/buxdu>



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Huseynova, Elmira Abdulla (2020) "WORD, MEANING AND CONTEXT," *Scientific reports of Bukhara State University*. Vol. 3 : Iss. 1 , Article 6.

DOI: 10.52297/2181-1466/2019/3/1/6

Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/buxdu/vol3/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scientific reports of Bukhara State University by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. For more information, please contact sh.erkinov@edu.uz.

TILSHUNOSLIK

7. **Qilichev E.** O'zbek tilining praktik stilistikasi. - Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1985. - 104 b.

8. **Haydarov A.** Konnotativ ma'noning fonetik vositalarida ifodalanishi.: Diss... kand. filol. nauk. - T., 2009. - 136 s.

УДК: 8

СЎЗ, МАЪНО ВА КОНТЕКСТ

СЛОВО, ЗНАЧЕНИЕ И КОНТЕКСТ

WORD, MEANING AND CONTEXT

Huseynova Elmira Abdulla

head teacher, Language Coordinator Nakhchivan University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan

Таянч сўзлар: сўзнинг маъноси, коммуникатив маъно, вазиятга оид контекст, олдинги контекст, динамик қиймат модели.

Ключевые слова: значение слова, коммуникативный смысл, ситуационный контекст, предыдущий контекст, динамическая модель ценности.

Key words: meaning of a word, communicative meaning, situational context, pre-context, dynamic value model.

Ушбу мақола сўз маъноси ва контекст ўртасида динамик боғлиқлик борлигини исботлашга уринади. Сўзнинг ўзи маъно-мазмунни яратади. DVM да сўзнинг энг аниқ ифодаланган маъноси ижтимоий-маданий омиллар билан белгиланади. Тил бирликлари нафақат тингловчи, балки маърузачи учун ҳам психологик воқеликда энг катта аҳамиятга эга. Ниятларни ифодалашда маърузачи ўз ниятини аниқ ифодалайдиган сўзларни танлайди.

В данной статье делается попытка доказать, что существует динамическая связь между значением слова и контекстом. Само значение слова создает контекст. В DVM наиболее выраженное значение слова определяется социокультурными факторами. Наибольшее значение языковые единицы имеют в психологической реальности не только для слушателя, но и для говорящего. При выражении намерений говорящий выбирает слова, которые наиболее ярко выражают его намерение.

This article attempts to prove that there is a dynamic relationship between the meaning of a word and the context. The meaning of the word itself creates a context. In DVM the most marked meaning of a word is identified by socio-cultural factors. The most marked value of linguistic units has a psychological reality not only for the listener, but also for the speaker. When expressing intentions the speaker chooses words that are the most marked to express his intention.

Introduction. Modern theories of pragmatics as Neo-Gricean Theory and Relevance Theory assume the dependence of the meaning of the word on the context and postulate generating context strength. Some linguists give the definition of pragmatics as a doctrine of the situational meaning of an utterance.

The Neo-Gricean theory and the Theory of Relevance are consistent in the lexical meaning of a word and is indeterminate without context and is conditioned by it. This idea is not new, because in the theory of language since the early Middle Ages it has been repeatedly asserted that the word does not possess a meaning out of context.

Main part. The importance of the current situational context. According to most pragmatists, the context gives the opportunity to express the word with their hidden potentialities. In modern pragmatics implicature of the speaker - implicit information that is laid by the speaker and the inferences are what the hearer extracts are distinguished. Speech in the communication process assumes the simultaneous presence of two plans perception: the part of the speaker - the one who generates the utterance, and the side of the listener. Speaking,

TILSHUNOSLIK

creating a statement, exercises control over what and how he says. The listener decodes the utterance and his interpretation may not coincide with the content laid down in this statement. With this way they can conflict about risk factors that cause contradictions in the generation of the text and its perception. In the work we will define the role of words and the context in the origin of the speech conflict.

The role of context and words. Context - this is the conditions for using the word, allowing you to clarify its meaning. At linguistics context is any factor which affects the interpretation of linguistic signs. It may be the language environment, the situation of verbal communication, or the environment with an object. By modern theories of pragmatics, the context is responsible for everything. Context plays a selective and clarifying role. The role of the context is not so clear in the following sentence.

- *I'm bored with you, I can sleep.*

In the sentence, the word "sleep" can have both literal and figurative value. Context plays a more precise role. And what role does the word play? Does not the word have the same mighty power, what is the context in determining the value? The following suggestions help us to answer this question.

- *"Musa, where have you been?" Natavan was asking about you.*

- *"Sura, where have you been?" It's already dark.*

The sentence "Where have you been?" has the same meaning in both sentences. No matter how the context changes, the sentence does not change the meaning. If the sentence is used in other contexts, its meaning also won't change.

"And where have you been for so long?" we looked for you the whole night, but couldn't find.

From these sentences it turns out that the word can also have the same mighty power as the context when determining the value. In fact, a word or phrase can create a context.

Approach to the word and context. The approach to the word and context are significantly similar in the German and English- American linguistics but in Russian it is completely different. It is determined by two related factors: typology of languages and research tradition. Classifications of languages are different. In such languages as English, the order words defines grammatical relations, and the logical object is usually coincides with the grammatical object.

For example:

Sanan hit my child.

To see this film is a must.

Children like cats.

Usually any change in word order in English leads to the wrong meaning:

My child hit me.

In languages, as Russian suffixes and endings denote grammatical relations, and different permutations of the order of words are allowed without a major change in the value of the sentence. Word order plays a pragmatic role. For example:

Дети любят кошек.

Дети-кошки любят.

Кошки любят детей.

Дети кошек любят.

So Russian is a non-configurational language, in the research traditions of it, the main focus is given to the word and its behavior in process of the structure of the sentence. Outstanding scientists of the Russian research traditions put the word in the center of the description of language. Based on the idea of a close interconnection and conditionality of all parties language, Viktor Vinogradov described morphology taking into account its syntactic functioning. Vygotsky brought together the idea on the development of the meaning of the word with the idea on the development of consciousness. For him, the word is an apparatus reflecting the external world in its connections and relations [1, 310].

Both sides of the context. The question arises: Does the word have semantic independence? To that there are opposite approaches:

TILSHUNOSLIK

Hjelmslev: "In absolute isolation, no sign has any meaning, any value; any sign value arises in the context of ..." [8, 88].

Vinogradov: "Regardless of its given use, the word is present in consciousness with all its meanings, with hidden and possible, ready for the first occasion to float to the surface" [6, 123].

What is "absolute isolation?" Is it possible to talk about absolute isolation words, as does Hjelmslev?

Take the following expression without context:

"Listen." Does this expression make no difference without context? No, it's not so. The word generates a context, creates a context. On the mind of a person value is generated on the basis of previous experiments with the word. Take the following conversation:

- *It is Sevda.*
- *I'm in the toilet.*
- *All right.*

We know exactly where and how the conversation takes place, because the words create a context. So the question arises: What is encoded in a word? What is hidden in the potential possibilities of the word? Facts indicate that words encode the former experience and the former experience and former contexts use of the word or expression. It appears that the word is also context. It is a storehouse of former situations in which the word was used. We may claim that the word is a storehouse of pre-existing contexts.

Selected words in the following sentences have certain metaphorical values, based on previous uses, ingrained in experience of the speaker.

Marry me?

What is she driving at?

I heard that you would soon leave us.

Language resources are always focused on a previously known reality. New knowledge is always lacking in language. The language reflects the previously known reality, but it is ready to change, as required by socio-cultural factors. The occurrence of new words and phrases is the reaction of the language to changes in socio-political and economic life of society, conditioned by time. New words appear to denote new phenomena in society, such as the words *tablet*, *selfie* or the expression *brain drain*. On the other hand, changes occurring in the language itself, the use of "old" words and phrases speaks of internal possibilities of the language itself. The history of changing the meaning of the word clearly shows how social changes are resempled in the language. The lexical meaning of the word encodes the contexts where it was used. The actual context only realizes what is embedded in the word itself. Fomenko was right about saying that: "The word does not adapt to context, is not deformed, is not reworked in it, but is used in the meaning used by the speaker" [4, 156].

Katsnelson also noted: "Context in such cases, isn't a value generator, but their external developer" [7, 218]. The facts indicate that words encoding the old contexts use of the given word or expression, play the same determining actual meaning of the word, also the actual context. The following example clearly shows this defining role.

- *Yusif, let's drink vodka.*
- *No, I can not. The doctor does not allow.*
- *What's wrong with you?*

The word changes the context:

- *Yusif, let's drink vodka.*
- *No, I can not. My mother does not allow.*
- *What's wrong with you?*

Changing the word "doctor" to the word "mother" causes a change in the meaning of "What's wrong with you?" and the whole actual context. The facts discussed above indicate that knowledge of the external world appears in two types of context:

- Actual, situational, extra-linguistic contexts,
- "Old", previous, former contexts encoded in words, and linguistic units.

The dynamism of the context is seen in the fact in which words generate, that is, create actual contexts, and contexts generate, create meanings of words. Hence, there is a dialectical connection between the two sides of the context.

TILSHUNOSLIK

Lotman also considers the text not only generator of new meanings, but also a condensate of cultural memory. He wrote: "The text has the ability to preserve the memory of their previous contexts, calling this phenomenon the memory of the text" [3, 312]. Modern theories of pragmatics usually ignore the dialectical connection between the both sides of the context and are consistent that in the lexical meaning words are indeterminate without context.

Neo-Gricean theory shows the process of communication from the speaker's perspective, and the Theory of Relevance from the listener's side [5, 49]. So, to describe the whole communication process, we need a model that (a) is aware of the dialectical connection between the both sides of the context, (b) shows how in the communication process this or the other side of the context dominate, (c) describes the communication process from the both participants' side, speaking, and listener.

Dynamic Value Model (DVM). The figure of the DVM demonstrates how different sides of context and perspectives of the speaker and the hearer are linked and competed in communication process. The personal context of the speaker is encoded in lexical units and is formulated in a speech, pronounced in the actual situational context. The result of this process is a statement having actual communicative meaning.

How do the previous context and the actual context function in the process of communications? New research results in cognitive psychology point to two important factors for a pragmatic analysis. In the initial phase of communication the egoistic approach of the speaker is observed, which acts on the following principle: what is clear, important and understandable to me, it is clear, important and understandable for the interlocutor. Listening also has an egoistic approach to interpretation. In the initial phase interpretation is dominated by the most marked value for the listener's statements. The speaker concentrates on his communicative goal, not paying sufficient attention to the proposed common ground and cooperation with the listener. This behavior is instinctive and not intentional. For example:

"Hafiz, help me to lift it."

- *It would be pleasant if you say "please".*

- *What?*

- *I say, it would be pleasant if you say "please".*

- *Young gentleman. I am not here to say "please". I'm telling you what to do.*

- *I am here for help. And if my help is not appreciated, then it's your problem.*

"I did not say anything wrong."

Communicative behavior of the listener can be explained with the help of the theory of graded salience. In the process of interpretation, regardless of the context, this value is automatically comes to the fore. If the actual situation context approves this value, then the interpretation process continues. If the most marked meaning of the word does not agree with the actual situational context, then there must be an amendment to the interpretation.

Giora believes that in the process of interpretation, priority should be not a literal meaning, but the most marked value that by its nature can be either literal or indirect [2, 199]. The most marked value of words or linguistic units can be determined so: this is the most probable value of all possible values. For example, what is the most marked value for the word "worry"? It's hard to say, because, personal experience with a word or expression varies from speaker to speaker. But in one of our experiments, 78% of the 23 Azerbaijani-speaking students agreed that the most marked meaning of the word is to worry about somebody. For example, "worry" for a son, or for favorite team.

Conclusion. In DVM the most marked meaning of a word is identified by socio-cultural factors. The most marked value of linguistic units has a psychological reality not only for the listener, but also for the speaker. When expressing intentions the speaker chooses words that are the most marked to express his intention.

According to modern theories of pragmatics, communication is cooperation between participants and the search for relevance. The task of the speaker is to be based on the knowledge of the listener to decide which form will be better understood. The task of the addressee is to understand the intent of the interlocutor, to decipher, to "calculate" it on the basis of all knowledge and facts, which he decomposes. The degree of accuracy of the calculated pragmatic meaning is dependent on the nature of the verbal and / or behavioral response of the

TILSHUNOSLIK

addressee and the quality of the communication act - in the zone of harmonic or disharmonious communication.

LITERATURA

1. **Vygotsky, L.S.** Thinking and speech. The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky, Volume 1: Problems of general psychology (pp. 39–285). New York: Plenum Press. (Original work published 1934.) 1987.
 2. **Giora R, Fein.** “Irony: context and salience. Metaphor and symbol”. 1996. – P. 241-257.
 3. **Lotman Jurij M.** “The content and structure of the concept of “literature””. PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature 1(2): 339-356. 1976.
 4. **Fomenko, A.T.** “Experimental test of the maxima correlation principle”. [History: Fiction or Science? Chronology 1](#). – P. 194-196.
 5. **Carston, Robyn.** “Relevance Theory, Grice, and neo-Griceans: A Response to Laurence Horn's “Current Issues in neo-Gricean Pragmatics”. Intercultural Pragmatics 2-3: 303-319. 2005.
 6. **Vinogradov V.** Sovremennyi russkii iazyk. Issue 1: Vvedenie v grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove”. – Moscow, 1938.
 7. **Diana Sidtis, Gina Canterucci, Dora Katsnelson.** “Effects of neurological damage on production of formulaic language, [Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics](#)” Apr 2009.
 8. **Hjelmslev.** “Louis R sum  of a Theory of Language”. Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Copenhague, vol. XVI. Copenhague: Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag. 1975.
-