The Cognitive Comparative Analysis of Some Verbs of Motion in the Russian and English Languages

Sultonova Yulduz Rustam qizi

Teacher of the University of Information Technologies and Management

.

Abstract: This paper reveals the cognitive status of polysemy as a linguistic phenomenon. An attempt is made to determine the range of semantic realizations of verbs of motion in the Russian and English languages. The paper discusses the verbs ехать-ездим/ to go-to ride-to drive, идти-ходим /to go-to walk in the cognitive-comparative aspect. The article examines the volume of meanings and the degree of coincidence/discrepancy of the given verbs in terms of the volume of meanings in both languages. We make an attempt to reveal the cognitive peculiarities of the verbs of motion in each of the studied languages. The idioethnic features of semantics and tropeization of the verbs of motion in the given languages against the background of the universal characteristics are identified.

Keywords: *verbs of motion, cognitive analysis, lexical-semantic group, epidig-matics, cognitive map of a word, volume of a word meaning, the specific and the universal*

Introduction

The research of the human factor in the language, or language cognition, is becoming increasingly important. At the present time it has become commonplace to assert that the language role in the cognition of the world is extraordinarily great. "Native speakers of different languages can see the world in different ways, in the light of their own languages" (Apresyan, 1995). It's not a secret that Russian grammar is a little bit complicated. When people start learning Russian they think that cases are the hardest part, but from my own experience as a teacher, verbs of movement are pretty tricky too. I usually spend a great amount of time doing grammar exercises with my students to make them feel comfortable using verbs of movement. It will be difficult to describe all verbs of movement in one article so I would like to start with the most useful verb of movement: to go.

As you know in Russian, we have two forms of the verb to go: идти and ходить. Both of these verbs have the meaning "go." We, Russians, use these verbs intuitively without thinking why in one situation we use идти, and ходить in another. If you have time to finish my article, I hope it will become clearer and you will be able to use these verbs correctly. The language role is especially noticeable in the human perception of everything which surrounds us, when we compare two or more languages within the scope of a particular semantic system, within the semantic field, or semantic group which represents a semantic micro field. Against the background of the anthropomorphic universality of the general picture of the world the human vision of the world is surprisingly diverse, having a vivid manifestation in natural languages. It is shown at all levels of the language, but the specific against the background of the universal is more vividly shown at the lexical level, particularly, in the structure of the meaning of a polysemantic word. "Polysemy can be considered as one of the most vivid features of the national identity of the lexicon" (Fomina, 1990).

A comparative study of different system languages is carried out on the basis of highlighting current problems, among which the most important, in our opinion, is the verb and the study of its multidimensional system. Verbs of movement belong to the Slavonic vocabulary. They have

correspondences not only in Slavonic, but also in Indo-European and Baltic languages. Despite their archaic nature, they are actively used in Russian for many centuries.

Verbs of motion have a high frequency. For example, according to the dictionary "Lexical minima of the modern Russian language" some of these verbs are included in the 500 most common words of the Russian language. Verbs of movement are traditionally an object of linguistic and methodological research.

Information about them can be found not only in studies specifically devoted to this group, but also in academic grammar of the Russian language, in textbooks for philological students and in Russian language manuals for foreign students.

The peculiarities of polysemy are the major characteristics of the lexical-semantic system of the language. This phenomenon, which is also called epidigmatics, represents a self-sufficient system of any language, since due to old words, by means of their rethinking, the lexicon extends, its semantic aspect becomes rich. It is known that the so-called original lexicon takes place in any language on the basis of which the whole lexical structure of the language is formed at a later stage. One of the ways, undoubtedly, is a word-formation by means of various word elements: prefixes, infixes, postfixes and so on, that is, word-formation formants. But not less important if not more, polysemy is a means of extending and developing the language lexical system, otherwise, the tropeization of original, direct meanings of words. It is the microsystems of polysemantic words where the cognitive status of semantic realizations of the word meaning variants is clearly manifested, that is, its lexical-semantic variant (LSV). "The peculiarities of polysemy generally determine the lexical specificity of the languages of the world and the discrepancy of their lexical structure" (Shmelev, 2006). The cognitive analysis of polysemy reveals what exact knowledge is reflected when extending the structure of polysemantic words, how they reflect knowledge about the world of a native speaker, and also provides a material for consideration about the mental and cultural characteristics of the nation – the native speaker. So, Cubryakova (2004), speaking about the structure of a word meaning, uses the term "the cognitive map of a word". "It is possible to consider it (the cognitive map of a word) as a reflection of the most generally used contexts of a word… All together this provides insight into semantic networks connecting individual word meanings, and it is possible to speak about the cognitive structure as being frame-based". At the same time, the direct meaning of a word, according to Cubryakova (2004), is "a generating mechanism, a source of its various unfolding", "a source and a starting point for new word usage". The works of Layoff (1988), Chafe (1983), and Shvedova (1984) are devoted to the so-called prototypical semantics, or generation of new meanings by the main meaning of a word.

It is necessary to speak about mental categories and not about concepts within the scope of the cognitive analysis of a polysemantic word: the microsystem's coverage of a polysemantic word not only of the conceptual sphere of the surrounding world, but also of the reflection in the lexical language system of such logical categories as repeatability, continuity of an action, infinity/finiteness of an action/state.

The volume of a word meaning with the identical direct meaning in one language never repeats its volume in another language. But there are still partial coincidences. How exactly does it happen? What is the range of semantic word realizations coinciding in their direct meanings in different languages? What is similar and what is different about the volumes of word meanings with identical meanings in different languages? The comparison of different languages in this respect gives an interesting material for observation and scientific interpretation. The study of this problem opens the veil of secrecy not only concerning the peculiarities of the structure and functioning of the lexical-semantic systems of human languages, but also allows to explain the peculiarities of a language cognition, that is, 1) to reveal the correlations between the structures of a language and the structures of knowledge, 2) to define the peculiarities of the specific language formations at the level of senses.

The cognitive-comparative method in this case even more emphasizes the specific character of the conceptual thinking of each nation, it more accurately represents the identity of linguistic thinking and

conceptualization of the world, in our case, Russians and Englishmen. Our aim is to study, observe, and reveal the range of figurative meanings of the English and Russian verbs coinciding in their direct meaning, to determine the specific and universal characteristics concerning polysemy in each language. This issue has been little studied (Kenetova, 2014).

As it is known, verbs can be dynamic and static (Maslow, 2000). In turn, there is a group of verbs of motion among dynamic verbs. "The Grammar of the Russian language" includes into the above group imperfective verbs denoting movement which are formed from one root and are grouped into binomial correlations, members of which are opposed in the meanings of multiplicity/no multiplicity, unidirectionality/non-unidirectionality. They are the following verbs: бежать-бегать, an imperfective verb, but always with an additional lexical meaning which is introduced by a prefix: войти, донести, пригнать, укатит, пойти, понести, погнать. Secondary imperfective verbs are formed from the prefixes perfective verbs, thus an aspectual pair appears: привести-привозит, привести-приводит, пригнать - пригонят and so on. Verbs of non-unidirectionality also form perfective verbs by adding the prefix: пробегать, поносит, покатать and others. In this case, aspectual pairs are not formed (The Grammar of the Russian language, 1969).

Thus, the group of verbs of motion, including the prefixes formations from the given 14 pairs, is very extensive in the Russian language. Verbs of motion are presented differently in the English language. In the English grammar verbs of motion are not allocated into a separate category, as it is done in the Russian grammar. There are more verbs of motion in the English language than in Russian, as there are no categories of multiplicity/non-multiplicity, unidirectionality/non-unidirectionality in English. The category of repeating action and constant continued action is expressed by definite grammar constructions in it. So, two Russian non-prefixes imperfective verbs бежать-бегать and their derivatives (prefixes perfective verbs) correspond to one English verb to run, the Russian verbs вести-возит correspond to 6 English verbs to convey, to carry, to take, to cart, to drive, to bring (Kenetova, 2014).

Materials and Methods

For our analysis we have taken the verbs of motion in the Russian and English languages which meanings are fixed in modern dictionaries: ехать-ездить/to go-to ride-to drive; идти-ходить'/to go-to walk- to come. The materials of the following dictionaries have been used in the article: "The English-Russian dictionary" by Prof. V.K. Muller (2007), "The Russian-English dictionary" (edited under O. S. Akhmanova). – M., 1969, and "Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian language" by S.I. Ozhegov and N. Shvedova (1999). During our analysis we used such linguistic methods as observation and description, the cognitive-comparative method.

As Gak (2010) notes, "the use of dictionary definitions of a lexical word meaning is one of the ways to study them" (Gak, 2010). Dictionaries offer linguistic material which includes conventional language units which is extremely important. We have not studied occasional and author's variants of word meanings. It should be also noted that the article deals with stylistically neutral lexicon. We do not touch upon the problem of stylistically colored verbs of motion. The revealed semantic structures of the above verbs of motion are presented in the form of a table, at the same time, the method of semantic transfer is defined. "Two basic types of metaphor are distinguished: cognitive and figurative". It is clear that poetic, figurative meta-phors are beyond the scope of our study. As it has been already noted, the material of our research is the dictionary material, in which the cognitive figures of speech are fixed.

Results and Discussion

As we see from the material we have analyzed, the volume of meanings of Russian verbs ехать-ездить and English verbs to go-to ride-to drive does not correspond, which is not surprising since, as we have already mentioned, in the languages of the world the discrepancy in the volume of meanings of the words with the same sense is observed (in their direct meanings). Russian verbs ехать-ездить are contrasted on the grounds of multiplicity / no multiplicity, pointedness/ unwontedness. Nothing like this is observed in the English verbs, meaning "moving on any transport." There are three of them (to go-to

ride-to drive) and they are not contrasted, rather they are synonymous. Each of the English verbs used in a particular context, has its own syntagmatic. Russian verbs ехать-ездить demonstrate the unity of common meaning "a movement in space on anything", but each of them has its own volume of meaning. The attribute of completeness/incompleteness of the action creates opportunities for various metaphorical and metonymical transference. The semantics of the verbs we analyze creates special difficulty in this matter. The Russian verb ездить contains a sense of endless repetition of actions with definite purpose. This grammatical feature creates a huge potential for indirect meaning of the verb. There are no more complicated in its meaning words than the verbs of motion - words, reflecting the ever-changing reality. Their meanings are elusive. This issue is complicated by the presence of a large number of prefixes verbs of perfect form in Russian language, which have no correspondence in the English grammatical system.

Three English verbs to go-to ride-to drive that correspond to Russian verbs ехать- ездить have 18 indirect meanings (see table. 1) The presence of such a large number of verbs with indirect meaning occurs due to the fact that we have not one, but three different verbs, and they are not themselves an indication of the repeatability/incompleteness of the action, as the Russian verbs are. The lack of this feature is compensated by the peculiarities of English grammar.

Conclusions

What is the result of a small study which was carried out in terms of language cognition?

1. The logic of the language, especially the grammar, despite the fact that we analyzed the lexical material, shows uniqueness in each of the languages involved for analysis. The presence of perfect / imperfect form in Russian language and the absence of such an opposition in English once more confirms the long-ago established fact that the features of grammar are directly connected with its lexical system. We must not forget about the difference in the structure of Russian and English languages. The first has a vivid synthetic character, and the second is of an analytical structure. This difference also affects the choice of one or another way of transferring new indirect meanings. This phenomenon occurs not because of the knowledge of native speakers acquired in the process of their life, but because of the language intuition given them from birth, which can be also identified as a special knowledge / cognition.

2. Discrepancy of volume of word meanings denoting the same action, says about the difference in knowledge of Russian and English people in various ways. First of all, it is different associative thinking, different historical experience, landscape, geographic location. All this, of course, tells about the difference of structure of knowledge / cognition of these peoples, which is reflected in a certain way in the differences of the structure of their languages.

All the semantic varieties of the verb, including the verbs of movement, cause great difficulties in the process of mastering the Russian language by non - Russian. In this respect, the study of verbs of motion in a comparative plan is relevant, primarily because the different typological affiliation of languages, the specific character of their lexical structure determine the specific character of the functioning of lexical and grammatical means of transmitting modes and character of movement. In this regard, the synchronous-comparative analysis carried out in the articles makes it possible to draw a conclusion about the relevance of the issues under consideration and in the practice of translating fiction.

References:

1. *Berdaliev A. Suzdagi Sehr. -Tashkent, 1996*
2. *Batyrova M.A The imperative mood of the verb in the Russian language in comparison with the imperative-desirable inclination in the Uzbek language: AKD. Tashkent, 1965*
3. *Borovkov AK, Marufov 3. Gulomov G., Shermukhamedov U. Uzbek textbook. Tashkent, 1943*
4. *KENETOVA, R.B. 2014. Verbs of motion in cognitive aspect. In: Izvestiya kabardino-balkarskogo nauchnogo tsentra RAN, vol. 6(62), 248-253. ISSN: 1991- 6639*

5. KUBRYAKOVA, E.S. 2004. Language and knowledge. Moscow. Nauka. 376 p.

6. LYONS, J. 1978. Introduction to theoretical linguistics. Moscow: Progress. 301 p.

7. LAKOFF, G. 1988. Thinking in the classifiers' mirror. In: Current Issues in foreign linguistics, vol. 23, pp.12-51. ISSN 1387-6759.

8. MULLER, V. K. 2007. English – russian dictionary. Moscow. Education. 888 p. 9. MASLOV, Y.S. 2000. Verb. In: Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. Moscow. Education. 105 p.

9. OZHEGOV, S. I. SHVEDOVA, N. YU. 1999. Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language. Moscow: Azbukovnik. 924 p.

10. Nasirov, A. N. (2023). ODIL YOQUBOVNING "QAYDASAN MORIKO" QISSASIDA PESAJ VA XARAKTER TALQINI. Ustozlar uchun, 15(1), 40-47.

11. Nasirov, N. A. (2021). The history of literary translation from uzbek into English. Academic research in educational sciences, 2(6), 1011-1022.

12. Normamatovich, N. A. (2023). ARTISTIC THOUGHT IN THE PROCESS OF GLOBALIZATION AND LOGICAL CONSISTENCY. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE & INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact factor: 8.036, 12(01), 90-94.

13. Nasirov, A. N. (2020). Artistic chronotope interpretion in Odil Yakubov's novels. Academicia: An Internatioonal multidisciplinary Research journal ISSN222-49-7137. Impact Faktor SJIF, 7, 498-501.

14. Normamatovich, N. A. (2019). STYLISTIC UNITS AND COMPOSITIONAL IMPARTIALITY. THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE, 12(586-571).

15. A'zamjonovna, X. S., & Azimidin, N. (2023). ISAJON SULTON HIKOYALARI BADIIY KONFLIKT. Ustozlar uchun, 15(1), 72-77.

16. Normamatovich, N. A. (2021). Features of Symbolic Interpretation. International Journal on Orange Technologies, 3(3), 71-76.

17. Nasirov, A. N. (2023). Alisher navoiy obrazining badiiy ifodasi. Ustozlar uchun, 15(1), 35-39.

18. Маджидова, Р. У., Мухитдинова, Х. С., & Оманов, П. Х. РОЛЬ ЛИНГВОСТРАНОВЕДЧЕСКИХ МУЛЬТИМЕДИЙНЫХ СРЕДСТВ В ПРЕПОДАВАНИИ УЗБЕКСКОГО ЯЗЫКА КАК ИНОСТРАННОГО. ''ЎЗБЕКИСТОН ОЛИМЛАРИ ВА ЁШЛАРИНИНГ ИННОВАЦИОН ИЛМИЙ-АМАЛИЙ ТАДҚИҚОТЛАРИ''7-ҚИСМ, 149.

19. Маджидова, Р. У. (2019). Антропоцентризм и аксиологическая картина мира. Наука, техника и образование, (6 (59)), 67-71.

20. Majidova, R. U. (2023). LANGUAGE AS A COMMUNICATION TOOL: UNDERSTANDING ITS FUNCTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS. " GERMANY" MODERN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH: ACHIEVEMENTS, INNOVATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTS, 9(1).

21. Маджидова, Р. (2018). РЕЧЕВОЕ ПОВЕДЕНИЕ ЧЕЛОВЕКА В СОЦИОЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОЙ И ПСИХОЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОЙ ТРАКТОВКАХ. Farg'ona davlat universiteti, (1), 20-20.

22. Urishevna, M. R. (2019). Representation of the linguistic world picture through a human factor. RELIGACIÓN. Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 4(15), 234-240