

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DENOTATIVE AND CONNOTATIVE MEANINGS OF A WORD, AND THE MEANS OF EXPRESSING CONNOTATIVE MEANING

Saida Maksumova Sunnatovna

UzSWLU Uzbek Language and Literature

Associate Professor, Candidate of Philological Sciences saida2903@mail.ru

Jiyanova Nazokat Eshquvvatovna

UzSWLU Uzbek Language and Literature

Associate Professor, Candidate of Philological Sciences

jiyanovanazokat75@gmail.com

Salisheva Zilola Ismailovna

Associate Professor of the Department of Uzbek Language and Literature of

UzSWLU, UZ, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Pedagogical Sciences

Annotation: This article discusses the concepts of the lexeme, sememe, and types of semes. The definitions of denotative and connotative meanings provided by linguists are explained, and their distinctive features are identified. Situations in which denotative and connotative meanings cannot be clearly distinguished are analyzed through examples. The inherent and adherent types of connotation are mentioned. In addition, the article examines the ways in which connotative meaning is formed in the Uzbek language. Through examples, it is shown that in speech, connotative meaning can be created by phonetic, lexical, morphological, and syntactic means, as well as by various extralinguistic means, such as gestures and actions.

Keywords: lexeme, sememe, denotative, connotative, differential, polysemantic word, potential sema, stylistic sign, subjective relationship, axiological meaning, pragmatic meaning, inherent and adherent connotation, emotional, linguistic category, linguistic, extralinguistic, intonation, indicative verbs, phonation, paralinguistics, gesture mimicry.

It is well known that the lexeme is regarded as the basic and central unit of language. Any lexeme consists of the unity of material components, namely sound and meaning. The semantic aspect of a lexeme is the sememe, which itself represents a relative whole composed of certain elements. The elements forming this whole are called semes. Thus, the internal structure of a lexeme's sememe is composed of semes. The relations among these semes constitute the semantic structure of the lexeme, in other words, its semantic content. The semantic content

of a lexeme includes such semes as denotative (naming) and connotative (expressive) semes.

Semes within a sememe are not uniform. According to their nature, semes are divided into three types [13–90]:

- denotative seme (naming seme),
- connotative seme (expressive seme),
- functional seme.

The denotative seme is associated with reality, the connotative seme reflects the speaker's attitude, and the functional seme is determined by the role of the lexeme in language and speech.

In linguistics, there are various theoretical views on lexical meaning. In most cases, a word's ability to provide information about objects, actions, states, qualities, quantities, and similar phenomena of objective reality is considered its lexical meaning. For example, *qalam* (pen), *kitob* (book), and *daftar* (notebook) denote objects; *chopmoq* (to run fast), *yo'rg'alamoq* (to trot), *yugurmoq* (to run) refer to directional movement; *qizil* (red), *yashil* (green), and *sariq* (yellow) denote qualities, and so forth. Thus, words with lexical meaning are not the objects, qualities, actions, or quantities themselves, but lexical units that express the generalized reflection of concepts about them in human consciousness.

A. I. Smirnitsky defines lexical meaning as a psychological formation that reflects reality [14–79], while V. M. Boguslavsky points out that various emotional shades, stylistic and aesthetic coloring are also components of word meaning [3–248].

In the monograph “*Word Meaning and Its Valency*” by I. Qo'chqortoyev, it is emphasized that the essence of lexical meaning and the structure of word meaning should be approached from the perspective of the unity of relations between language, consciousness, and object. According to the scholar, the components of lexical meaning determine the spheres of word usage and serve to differentiate meanings. Accordingly, general, differential, and additional components of semes

are distinguished. While these semes differ from one another, they also unite words belonging to the same semantic field. Differential components distinguish the meanings of polysemantic words and words within the same lexical-semantic field, whereas additional components reflect secondary, less characteristic features of an object. These additional components function as potential semes that enable words to be used in various figurative meanings in speech [9–168].

Sh. Rahmatullayev emphasizes that considering only lexical meaning as a sememe leads to a narrow understanding of the phenomenon. According to him, the semantic plane of a lexeme includes not only lexical meaning but also stylistic and speech-related characteristics, all of which together constitute the semantic structure of the sememe [10–56]. Naturally, the semantic content of a lexeme should take into account not only lexical meaning but also the seme expressing the speaker's evaluative attitude. Rahmatullayev interprets this attitude toward the reality named by the lexeme as an evaluative seme [11–51].

G'. Qambarov also notes that evaluation is a means of expressing the speaker's attitude toward the object being described. According to him, evaluative attitude emerges through axiological meaning superimposed on nominative meaning [7–5]. In our view, the additional meaning attached to a word is not secondary but represents a distinct component within the semantic structure of the word. In some contexts, it is not the original lexical meaning but the pragmatic-connotative meaning conveyed in a particular speech situation that becomes primary. Thus, the component of a word that provides information about objects, qualities, quantities, actions, or states in reality constitutes its denotative meaning, which is the primary and fundamental component of word semantics. Connotative meaning, in turn, is significant as it reveals the speech potential of denotative meaning and expresses the speaker's evaluative attitude.

Another feature that is not obligatorily required in the semantic structure of a word is the stylistic feature. This feature indicates a word's affiliation with a particular functional style. For example, the word *kulmoq* (to laugh) does not carry stylistic marking, whereas its synonyms *hiringlamoq*, *ishshaymoq*, *irjaymoq*,

tirjaymoq are characteristic of the colloquial style. Thus, stylistic marking serves as an indicator of a word's functional stylistic affiliation.

In linguistics, the meaning expressed by expressive coloring and stylistic features, regarded as additional shades in the semantic structure of a word, is also referred to as connotative meaning. Therefore, word meaning consists of the synthesis of denotative and connotative meanings. For instance, in the word *qizaloq* (little girl), the base *qiz* expresses denotative meaning, while the suffix *-(a)loq* conveys affection and a positive evaluative attitude of the speaker, thus forming connotative meaning.

The textbook "*Introduction to Linguistics*" also states that the lexical meaning of a word includes its connotative meaning (from Latin *con* – together, *notation* – to denote), that is, its additional meaning, which provides emotional-expressive coloring and stylistic nuance. This is illustrated by the following examples.

Chehrasi ochiq (He has an open face).

Basharasini ko 'rmay (Without seeing his ugly face).

The textbook explains that the words *chehra* and *bashara* express not only lexical meaning (*face*) but also connotative meaning reflecting positive and negative attitudes, respectively [15–99].

O. S. Akhmanova notes that the connotative meaning in such words is distinguished not merely by referring to an object, but by revealing characteristics inherent specifically to that object [2–203].

M. Mirtojiyev notes that the connotative expression of a word adds an additional meaning to its denotative expression. The scholar distinguishes two types of connotative expression: **informative expression** and **pragmatic expression**. According to M. Mirtojiyev, the pragmatic aspect of connotative expression reflects the subject's, that is, the speaker's attitude toward the denotative meaning. For example, in the word *yigitcha*, the affix *-cha* expresses diminution in relation to the denotative meaning of *yigit*, which denotes an adult male. This evaluative attitude

constitutes the pragmatic aspect of connotative expression. Informative expression, in turn, includes both the denotative expression and the remaining part of the pragmatic aspect of connotative expression.

The scholar also identifies two subtypes of pragmatic–connotative expression: **expressive expression** and **emotional expression**. Expressive expression manifests itself through the intensification of the denotative meaning of a word, often via phonetic changes, whereas emotional expression is characterized by the addition of a subjective evaluative attitude to the denotative meaning of a word [6–14].

It is evident that M. Mirtojiyev uses the term *connotative expression* rather than *connotative meaning*. This indicates that connotative meaning and connotative expression are not identical concepts; although closely related, they differ in certain aspects. While connotative expression refers to the expressive coloring and stylistic features present in a word, connotative meaning denotes the meaning conveyed through such expressive coloring and stylistic markers.

In the Uzbek language, there are words in which lexical and connotative meanings cannot be clearly separated. For instance, the word *turq* reflects both denotative and connotative meanings, the latter expressing the speaker's negative evaluative attitude. In such cases, the connotative meaning is inferred from the lexical meaning itself. In this regard, the views of E. Qilichev and B. Qilichev are noteworthy. They argue that a word's connotative meaning can emerge not only in context but also within a specific synonymous set. Here, connotative meaning is determined based on the paradigmatic relations of words. From this perspective, the scholars distinguish between **inherent** and **adherent** connotation. Inherent connotation refers to the connotative meaning perceived outside of context, whereas adherent connotation denotes the connotative meaning that arises within a specific context [8–68].

Connotative meaning is formed in the process of speech. For example, the word *bola* carries only a lexical meaning, whereas *jujuq* contains, in addition to its lexical meaning, an affectionate connotation and the speaker's evaluative attitude. While *bola* belongs to the literary language, *jujuq* is characteristic of colloquial

speech. This demonstrates that connotative meaning is realized in speech and is understood through denotative meaning. Therefore, to explain connotative meaning, it is necessary to define the language–speech dichotomy at the lexical level.

Thus, the meaning expressed by expressive coloring and stylistic features, which function as additional shades in the semantic structure of a word, is referred to in linguistics as **connotative meaning**. Connotation is a linguistic category related to the evaluative–emotional aspect of language, expressing the speaker’s (or author’s) subjective attitude toward objects, phenomena, the interlocutor, or the communicative situation, and it manifests itself through both linguistic and extralinguistic means. Accordingly, two types of means that give rise to connotative meaning can be distinguished in linguistics:

Linguistic means

Extralinguistic means

Linguistic means are language units that generate connotative meaning, whereas extralinguistic means include gestures and bodily movements that express connotation but do not belong to the system of linguistic units.

Expressive-emotionality (connotation) is most prominently manifested in colloquial speech. Although oral speech shares a common foundation with written speech, it also possesses distinctive characteristics.

Written speech is a form of speech that has been shaped and refined over long periods of time. Oral speech, by contrast, is directly oriented toward the listener and emerges in the process of communication. Oral speech differs from written speech in that it is based on pronunciation, possesses features that facilitate communication, and is characterized by conciseness.

The primary features characterizing the normative aspects of oral speech are intonation and pronunciation. Indeed, oral speech is distinguished by its inherent melodic pattern. Through intonation, the speaker can highlight important segments, emphasize key points, and express subjective attitudes.

Scholarly sources note that intonation is a complex phenomenon consisting of the unity of prosodic elements such as phrase stress, melody, rhythm, intensity, tempo, and timbre, which serve to express various syntactic, expressive, and emotional meanings in language [4–45]. Melody and phrasal stress are considered primary components of intonation, while the remaining elements are regarded as secondary components.

Melody indicates the rise or fall of the main pitch. In segmented speech, each phrase has its own melody. Typically, a declarative phrase is pronounced with falling intonation, whereas an interrogative phrase is articulated with rising intonation.

In oral speech, both features typical of the standard literary language and those characteristic of colloquial speech are reflected in pronunciation. In linguistics, depending on the nature and characteristics of speech, two types of pronunciation norms are distinguished [5-14]. The first type of pronunciation norm is typical for speakers, actors, and orators, who are required to adhere to the standards of the literary language, with each word pronounced clearly and distinctly. The second type of pronunciation norm primarily occurs in colloquial style during oral communication.

It is known that in colloquial speech there is considerable flexibility in the pronunciation of commonly used words. Words in this style often exhibit pronunciation features that do not fully comply with literary language norms. The following phonetic changes associated with flexible pronunciation in colloquial speech can be observed:

Consonants are doubled due to strong articulation: *uchiga* – *uchchiga*, *eshak* – *eshshak*; *Essiz mehnatlarim*, *uyqusiz kechalarim* (E. Vohidov).

Vowels are elongated in pronunciation: *e-rtalab* (very early), *o'y-la-b* (after long thought); *Jumaboy qo'lini chakkasiga qo'yganicha hayro-on o'tirardi* (Oybek).

Vowels are strongly pronounced: *bala:nd imorat*, *yo'g'o:n odam*, *ki:r sochiq*, *Qa:ttiqliq sovuq*, *ma:yda qor yog'ib turar edi* (A. Qahhor).

Sound changes occur: *ko'jim* (ko'zim), *aylanay o'jimni qijimdan* (o'zimni qizimdan); *Xudoyo ayamdi daydiga davo beygin* (A. Qahhor).

Sound omission: *Qayerning handalagi amak?* – dedi u oliftagarchilik qilib (Said Ahmad).

Words are pronounced in syllabic breaks: *bor-may-man*, etc.

Additionally, connotative meaning is expressed through supersegmental elements such as intonation, pauses, and stress [16-12]. It is evident that these phonetic changes observed in colloquial speech contribute to the creation of connotative meaning. Thus, phonetic means occupy a specific role in forming connotative meaning in speech.

In the speech process, the expressive-emotional lexical layer, which reflects the speaker's evaluative attitude, also holds significant importance. This is particularly characteristic of colloquial style, which is rich in such lexical units compared to other stylistic forms of speech. For example, expressive-emotional words like *do'ndiq*, *ketvorgan*, *suluv*, *tirjaymoq*, *bashara* are unique to this style and indicate the dominance of connotative meaning within it: *Men cho'chidim afti bir xunuk // Basharasi to'la chandiq qora plashda* (E. Vohidov).

In oral speech, words indicating affection, diminution, respect, disdain, irony, solemnity, or grandeur, as well as subjective evaluative affixoids such as *-jon*, *-xon*, *-xo'r*, *-bachcha*, *-tilla*, are widely used. Through these units, the speaker can express a positive or negative attitude toward a person. For example: *oyimcha*, *tirrancha*, *qaqajon*, *kekkaymaxon*, *yetimcha*, *pashshaxo'rda*, *jinnivachcha*, *oyimtilla*; *Sizdaqa boyvachchaning o'ntasini do'kon-po'koni, ichak-chavag'i bilan sotib olishga qurbim yetadi* (E. Vohidov). Conversely, certain affixes convey a positive attitude toward a person: *opajon*, *kelinchak*, *otaginam*, *bolakay*, *toychoq*, etc. *Ey, siz mening yerevanlik do'stlarim, Qora ko'zli bolakaylar hush qoling* (E. Vohidov).

It is clear that in such cases, connotative meaning is formed solely through affixes.

Oral speech has a distinctive syntactic structure. Emotional-expressive features in oral speech manifest through rhetorical questions, word order changes, repetition, and vocative constructions. For instance:
Men sargardon hayotimda nimani ko 'rdim? (E. Vohidov)

Through this rhetorical question, the speaker effectively conveys the idea “*I have seen nothing in my life*”, simultaneously expressing dissatisfaction and regret about their life, thus enhancing the emotional impact of the utterance.

In oral speech, extralinguistic means are also used to express thoughts effectively. In linguistics, extralinguistic means include gestures and various actions performed by individuals during the speech process. These tools, which serve to express ideas, do not manifest directly in language. When necessary, extralinguistic means are transferred to written speech through linguistic means. Used alongside linguistic tools, they provide additional support, resulting in two information channels: the first is the acoustic signal line, and the second is the paralinguistic line used alongside it. When paralinguistic tools are transferred to written speech, they are often expressed descriptively through special gesture verbs.

M. Saidxonov includes phonation, kinetics, and mixed tools among the extralinguistic means involved in expressing thoughts. He defines phonation as “all additional sound-based tools that transmit information relevant to the speech process to the addressee” and emphasizes that among extralinguistic means, phonation is the most active method of information transfer [12-46]. In this context, linguist I.R. Galperin’s remark is noteworthy: “In paralinguistics, it is not what is said, but how it is said that matters” [4-25]. Phonational tools include intonation, pauses, qualitative changes in voice (lengthened, short, slow, hard pronunciation), rhythm, and similar elements.

Extralinguistic means function not only as auxiliary communication tools but also as devices creating connotative meaning. For example, in E. Vohidov’s work “*The Tragedy of Istanbul*”, a paralinguistic tool generates connotation in the following example:

A tourist with a bag – (showing the thumb) It has bundles. Come, I will show you myself.

Another

example:

"I don't want to go to the guest," said my mother shaking her head. I have work to do. (O. Hoshimov)

If the explanatory note indicating the gesture in the first sentence, “showing the thumb,” is removed, the meaning becomes vague. Here, the paralinguistic tool, expressed linguistically as “showing the thumb,” ensures that the information in “It has bundles” is conveyed expressively. In the second sentence, the head-shaking action strengthens the negation statement, emphasizing the effect. As seen, in both examples, extralinguistic means serve connotative functions.

“A. Abdullayev notes that gestures and facial expressions reflect the speaker’s various psychophysiological attitudes toward the interlocutor” [1-84]. Indeed, a person’s mental state can often be inferred through their actions and gestures. When performing an action, facial expressions correspond to that action, and extralinguistic means help to convey these in speech, enhancing the impact of the text.

For

instance:

The wolf wrestler came out of the barn with his mother. His mother’s hands... became pitch-black! Rais wrinkled his forehead. He turned his face aside. – Tfu!- he spat. Put your hand on the narik, old woman! Do you have any sense? (T. Murod)

In this example, the sense of disgust is further reinforced through non-verbal tools, such as “wrinkled his forehead” and “turned his face aside,” conveying a connotative meaning.

Based on the theoretical perspectives presented above, the following conclusions can be drawn:

The semantic structure of a word is the sum of the semes contained in the lexeme of this word. There are three types of semes based on their essence. The

nominal meaning of a word is its denotative meaning, a generalization of its semantic shades, additional emotional, stylistic shades, and emotions of transferred meaning.

The main component of the semantic structure of a word is the denotative meaning, and the additional meanings built on it are connotative. Additional meanings are understood as the addition of meanings to the lexical meaning of a word, that is, the assignment of emotional-expressive and stylistic features.

Connotative meaning is mainly formed in speech. The denotative and connotative meanings of a word are interconnected. If a word does not have a denotative meaning, there is no place for connotative meaning. Connotative meaning can be interpreted as an unstable aspect of speech in the form of a free meaning living in a certain speech situation. Adherent and inherent types of connotation have been identified. In speech, connotative meaning is formed through phonetic, lexical, morphological, and syntactic means of language, as well as through various gestures and actions, which are considered extralinguistic means. Consequently, in literary works, connotation is an additional semantic component of a language unit, through which the emotional-expressiveness of speech is ensured or the evaluative attitude of the subject of speech is revealed. In this case, connotation manifests itself as a semantic-pragmatic aspect that serves to reveal the mental state and evaluative attitude of the subject of speech.

References:

1. Abdullayev A. O'zbek tilida ekspressivlik ifodalashning sintaktik usuli. – Toshkent, 1987. – B. 84.
2. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М., 1969.
3. Богуславский В.М. Слово и понятие / Мышление и язык. – М., 1957. 248-b.
4. Galperin I.R. Informativnost - yedinisa yazyka: po kursu obshchego yazykoznaniye. – М., 1974. – S. 25
5. Haydarov A. Konnotativ ma'noning fonetik vositalarda ifodalanishi Filol. fanlari nomzodi diss. Avtoreferati T.-2009 B. 21
6. Mirtojdiyev M. Tovushlardagi ma'nolar. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston, 1982. 14-b.

7. Qambarov G'. Baho munosabati va uning o'zbek tilida ifodalanishi (shaxslararo munosabat asosida): Filol. fanlari nomzodi ... diss. avtoref. – Toshkent, 2008.
8. Qilichev E., Qilichev B. Konnotativ ma'no va uning ifodalanishi // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. – Toshkent, 2006. – №. 6.
9. Qo'chqortoyev I. So'z ma'nosi va uning valentligi. – Toshkent: Fan, 1977.
10. Rahmatullayev Sh. Leksik ma'noni komponentlab tahlil qilish tajribasidan // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti. – Toshkent, 1978. – № 4.
11. Rahmatullayev Sh. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. – Toshkent: Universitet, 2006.
12. Saidxonov M. Aloqa-aralashuv va imo-ishoralar. – Toshkent : Fan, 2008 – B. 46.
13. Sayfullayeva R.R. va boshqalar Hozirgi o'zbek tili -Toshkent, 2021 90-b.
14. Смирницкий А.И. Вопросы языкознания. – М., 1977. – №2.
15. Sodiqov A., Abduazizov A., Irisqulov M. Tilshunoslikka kirish. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1981. – B. 45.
16. Shomaqsudov A., Rasulov I., Qo'ng'urov R., Rustamov H. O'zbek tili stilistikasi. —Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1983. – B. 14.