



**LEXICAL UNITS OF THE LANGUAGE AND METHODS OF NOMINATION  
AND MOTIVATION OF LEXICAL UNITS**

Rakhmonova Sardora Muminjanovna

Senior Teacher, The Department of Practical Disciplines of English Language 2, UzSWLU

Kenesova Jazira Baurjan qizi

Student of English Faculty 2, UzSWLU

<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>KEY WORDS</b>
<p>In the history of world linguistics, different and various approaches to the language phenomenon have appeared. Language is a means of social communication with a specific structure, and its basis is a lexical unit. This article provides information about the lexical units of business and economy, which were formed in foreign languages and entered the Uzbek language, what are the lexical combinations, their characteristics and categories. The article also discusses the formation of neologisms imported from foreign languages. The meaning of each lexical unit is analyzed in the article.</p>	<p>Lexicon, neologism, foreign languages, feature, category, composition, business, economy, business, active, passive.</p>

**Discussion**

The emergence and functioning of lexical units is determined primarily by the needs of communication and is associated with the processes of nomination, i.e. the processes of naming an object, phenomenon, property, etc.

To construct statements in which the speaker conveys a particular thought to his interlocutor or interlocutors, communicates some information, building material is needed. Nomination, as a result of which the creation of this building material is carried out and thereby the creation of a system of material, sensually perceived linguistic signs designed to respond to the needs of the language collective in the designations of individual objects and classes of objects, their properties and relationships, as well as facts, events and situations, is an extremely complex process. It is characterized by a variety of forms, methods, and functions. In the general descriptions of nomination processes proposed by Soviet scientists, special attention is drawn to the differentiation of nomination processes, firstly, by the type of linguistic forms and objects of nomination. Depending on the language forms used - words, phrases or sentences – within the general category, the nominations are distinguished:

- a) nomination through word and phrase (lexical nomination),
- b) nomination through sentence (propositive nomination),
- c) nomination through text (discursive nomination).

Lexical nomination is used, as a rule, to name elements of a person's external and internal experience. The objects of lexical nomination, or nominees, are certain elements of reality: subject, quality, process, relationships (temporal, spatial, quantitative, etc.), any real or conceivable object. The named elements of the nomination find expression in any language and form an objective foundation for the emergence of the main classes of words that name them - nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, numerals, various kinds of service words.

The object of naming in a prepositive nomination is a microsituation – an event, a fact that combines a number of elements and represents complex and multifaceted formations.

The object of naming through text, or discursive nomination, becomes an even more complex chain of situations.

Obviously, as the object of the nomination becomes more complex, the complexity of the nomination tools used also increases. By combining words – the initial and simple units of nomination used in their various forms (the laws of combinatorics of words in the processes of word formation, the formation of phrases and sentences will be discussed in the relevant sections), the speaker builds names that are more complex in structure, and as a result receives complex units: derived words, phrases, sentences and the final text. In the general register of linguistic units, the word acts as the main, main and leading unit of the nomination, in relation to which all other units turn out to be derivative or auxiliary.

The described relationship between the object of the nomination and the means of its designation is not rigid. A word can be called both an event and a fact, and a sentence can be called any objects (for example, this is what was on the table). At the same time, it reflects the most typical ratio of these values and the obvious tendency to complicate the means of nomination used as the object of nomination becomes more complex.

The second most important direction in describing nomination processes is their consideration in the functional and genetic aspect, from the point of view of using linguistic elements and units in their main, primary function, i.e. directly for what these units were specially created for, or for other nominative purposes. The use of linguistic forms for their original purposes to designate certain objects is known as primary, or direct, nomination, and the forms themselves are known as primary linguistic signs. However, the need for names is huge and almost endless, just as the world known by man is endless in all the variety of properties and connections already discovered and rediscovered in the process of human activity. The creation of a separate, unique designation for each individual object, phenomenon, or a separate class of objects, phenomena, properties, relationships, etc., would entail the emergence of an extremely cumbersome and, accordingly, inconvenient lexical system. Because of this, and also, perhaps, due to the limitations imposed by the volume of human memory and other features of the human psyche, the same linguistic element is often used to designate, in addition to those already designated by it, some other objects, phenomena, properties and the performance of some other functions. This is how the secondary nomination is carried out and secondary names of the English type are formed. hand, which in its primary function means

- 1) hand (brush), and as a result of the processes of secondary nomination has acquired values:
- 2) front paw or leg,
- 3) 3) power, order,
- 4) 4) dexterity, skill,
- 5) 5) worker, worker,

6) 6) wing (semaphore) and others.

7) Secondary names are also lexical units of the English type. keyhole 'keyhole', which arose as a result of the addition of key 'key' and hole 'hole, hole', hunter 'hunter', kindness 'kindness', formed by suffixation, black pudding 'black pudding' and many similar examples in both English and any other natural language.

The repeated use of language forms for nomination purposes is of great importance because:

a) makes it possible, with the help of means already available in the language, to designate something for which there was no special name, and thereby fill in linguistic gaps,

b) b) creates a stylistic effect (for example, when using animal names to designate people with some negative qualities, cf. cat 'grumpy woman' and goose 'fool, fool, simpleton', bulldog 'stubborn, tenacious person', etc.),

c) c) provides a combat, service function (cf. the use of the verbs be, have, do, etc. The use of linguistic elements both in their own primary and secondary, inappropriate functions leads to the formation of a fundamental property of linguistic signs – their asymmetry, or an ambiguous correspondence of the linguistic form (a complex of sounds or letters) and its content, formulated by S. Kartsevsky. in the form of the principle of "asymmetric dualism".

The ability of a linguistic form to be associated with a number of signified and express several meanings, respectively, and, conversely, the connection of one signified with several linguistic forms becomes possible due to the cardinal property of the original, primary linguistic units, namely: their arbitrariness, or unmotivation. Despite the direct and inextricable unity of the form and content of lexical units adopted by a certain linguistic collective, the form itself is chosen to designate an object, phenomenon, etc. and expressions of a certain content do not depend on the thing being designated, i.e. it is conditional or arbitrary in relation to the signified, which is proved primarily by the existence of various languages. In the primary language form, as F. points out. de Saussure, there is really no natural connection with this signified. Due to the arbitrariness of the language sign, the choice of a sound complex for the designation needed by the speaker is not conditioned by any properties of the signified. This makes it possible to use various techniques and methods for the nomination: onomatopoeia, the use of a sound complex meaning any of the signs inherent in the phenomenon being designated (the most common method), the formation of one word from another word and word composition, the formation of phraseological phrases, borrowing and calculus. The listed methods of nomination, as pointed out by Academician B.A. Serebrennikov, are common to all languages of the world.

Using, however, a rather limited system of ways of expressing meaning and a single nominating technique in principle, different language groups nevertheless create original naming systems that represent the diversity of the surrounding world in an orderly way and are thus its peculiar linguistic pictures. This originality is based, firstly, on the peculiarities of the conditions - territorial, climatic, economic, social, etc. – the existence of a particular language collective, which give rise to the presence in languages of the so-called equivalent vocabulary, denoting the realities inherent only in the life of a particular language collective. Examples of non-equivalent vocabulary can be the designations of banknotes (such as the English penny 'penny', pound 'pound', shilling 'shilling', farthing 'farthing', guinea 'guinea'), a system of names associated with the administrative division of the country, government bodies, institutions, political parties, etc. (for example, English borough 'small town, urban-type settlement; having a municipal council in accordance with the Royal Charter',

whip 'parliamentary party organizer', sheriff 'the sheriff (in England: the chief representative of the government in the county)'etc., the names of the games (English cricket 'cricket', golf 'golf', darts 'darts', 'lamb bones', 'darts'darts, 'darts'" and many others.

Secondly, a certain influence on the creation of a specific linguistic picture of the world is exerted by the different productivity of using certain naming methods in languages. In English, borrowing and word composition are widely used, which are not so common, for example, in French.

The main reason for the uniqueness of linguistic worldviews, however, is the specificity of human nominative activity, universal in its procedural aspects and dialectically contradictory in the choice of properties and features that can be used as the basis for naming. This is evidenced by numerous discrepancies even in onomatopoeic vocabulary, in which, it would seem, a single nomination technique (imitation) and a single set of properties (sound manifestations), chosen as the basis for naming, should have provided an identical result in different languages. Such an identity, however, does not occur. Cf., for example, English cock-a-doodle-do and Russian. cook river, English mew-mew and Rus. meow-meow, English quack-quack and Russian quack-quack, which, along with some similarity of sound forms, have significant differences in this regard. Even more striking discrepancies are observed where the choice of properties and features of the named object, on which speakers rely in the nomination process, as well as the method of naming and the nominative means used, is free and rather arbitrary. Such variability is typical for the processes of secondary nomination. The variety of properties, relationships and connections of designated objects, their variability and development while maintaining identity, the individuality of each individual object in a class of homogeneous entities, as well as the specifics of perception of the same object in different situations and by different people, create the possibility of relying on its essential, most important, most often functionally significant characteristics when naming an object and communications, on the one hand, or the use of random, peripheral parameters. The largest number of analogies in different languages are based on the reflection in secondary names of really existing and significant connections and functions of objects. Cf., for example, the English winnowing-machine 'winnow' from winnow 'winnow', sowing-machine 'seeder' from sow 'sow', threshing-machine 'thresher' from thresh "threshing" and their Russian equivalents, in which the same signs are fixed, namely: the functional purpose of these objects. There are numerous coincidences in the choice of a feature for naming in the names of persons by profession, place of residence and other categories of words. At the same time, even in this area of secondary nomination, based on the reflection of the most important properties of objects in the name, discrepancies and discrepancies are possible in different languages. Cf., for example) English bedroom 'room with a bed/beds' and Rus. bedroom 'a room in which to sleep', English sitting-room 'a room for sitting' and rus. living room 'guest room', English sailor 'the one who swims' and rus. the sailor is 'the one who is connected with the sea' and others. The greatest discrepancies (this, however, does not exclude correspondences) are observed when choosing random, peripheral signs and connections in the process of creating names, i.e. in the sphere of metaphorical transfers.

Cf. English eye in secondary meanings 'eye of a needle, loop, peephole, spy, informant', etc. and rus. the peephole is a small round hole in something, a kidney cut from plants for grafting, a pigment spot (in the coloring of insects, birds, jellyfish, etc.), as well as a circle, a speck in the fabric pattern, and many others.

Linguistics, however, does not investigate the reasons for the choice of different features in the nomination processes. This is more within the competence of physiology and psychology. For

linguistic science, for lexicological research, the question of the relationship between the form and content of lexical units is much more important, and therefore the problem of motivation of lexical units, their internal form, through which the way of expressing the concept, the connection between the sound shell and the content, becomes of fundamental importance. Motivation, or the internal form of language names, which is not mandatory from the point of view of the functioning of the language as a semiotic system, but arises as a mandatory consequence of the secondary use of the name in nomination processes, becomes the most important feature dividing the entire vocabulary of the language into units motivated and not motivated, or primitive. The close and inextricable connection between sound and content, which is an indispensable condition for the existence of any lexical unit, is deterministic in motivated units, while in unmotivated units it is absolute, conditional and arbitrary. So, in modern English, the words black in the meaning of 'black', salt in the meaning of 'salt', ten 'ten' and many others do not reflect in their sound form anything that would "prompt" the speakers of their meaning, and are unmotivated primary lexical units. Words like clap 'clap your hands', cluck 'cluck, cluck', chairbed 'armchair-bed', poetess 'poetess', sable meaning 'sable fur', warm 'hot, hearty, warm (about color)' and many others, on the contrary, are motivated, and the ways of motivating them are different. In the onomatopoeic words clap, cluck and the like, the sound shell seems to mimic the sounds characteristic of the object or accompanying one or another of its actions. Comparison of onomatopoeic words in different languages (for example, English cackle and Russian giggle, English hiss and Russian sizzle, English bubble and Russian gurgling, bubbling (about water), English whimper and Rus. whimper and many others) convincingly demonstrates how approximate this imitation is. Phonetic motivation, however, is only a particular and not the most common method of motivation. Morphological and semantic motivations are much more common in languages. In morphological motivation, the meaning of a lexical unit is "suggested" by its very composition, its components, which is obvious in the above examples of chairbed and poetess. Thus, the sound and meaning of a morphologically motivated word are determined by the sound and meanings of the connected units. Semantic motivation is based on the connections (real and unreal, essential and non-essential - see above) that are found between the primary designation of a name and those objects for which this name is used for a second time in the language, and, accordingly, the connections between the primary and secondary meanings of lexical units. The word sable in the meaning of 'sable fur' appears as motivated by the primary meaning of 'sable', and the word warm in these meanings is motivated by the primary meaning of 'warm'.

In the process of functioning, the motivation of lexical units may change, completely or partially disappear. The reasons for the loss of motivation, or demotivation of lexical units, are different: these are phonetic changes (e.g., cupboard 'buffet, zysaf'), loss of the attribute by which the object was named (e.g., blackboard 'blackboard', which currently does not have to be black), loss or change in the meaning of the motivating unit until it is completely out of use (e.g., happy 'happy', formed from the obsolete 'chance, happy accident'), etc. The main reason for the demotivation of lexical units is the uselessness, the non-necessity of motivating units for their functioning. Motivation facilitates the birth of a word and the memorization and recognition of its meaning; thanks to motivation, the connections and associations existing among speakers about the so-called objects and phenomena of reality are consolidated in the language. In other words, the motivation of names acts as a support for the emergence, storage and recognition of lexical units. But since the motivation of a name is not identical to its meaning, reflecting only one distinctive feature of the named object, and not the whole set of its



most essential properties fixed in the meaning, it becomes redundant when the name acquires the status of a familiar and fixed object designation in this linguistic collective. It is no coincidence that the most commonly used and most important words are simple, although etymological studies show that they also arose as motivated units that were demotivated in the process of their functioning. Thus, in the lexical system, there is a dialectical confrontation between two important principles: arbitrariness, conditionality of linguistic signs and their motivation, and one of them may be dominant at one stage or another of language development. This allows us to talk about the varying degree of motivation of the language, which becomes a typological characteristic. The Old English language, for example, according to S. Ullmann was a more motivated language than modern English, which is primarily due to the large number of loanwords – French and Greek-Latin – in modern English.

Motivation is especially important for teaching a foreign language. The quantitative ratio of unmotivated and motivated words and the relative frequency of different types of motivation in different languages often do not coincide, as a result of which motivated words correspond to unmotivated words of one language in another language and vice versa. It is believed, for example, that the degree of motivation of words in German is higher than in English, due to greater freedom of word formation and a greater number of onomatopoeic formations. A consequence of the differences in the motivation of the English and German languages is the presence of many cases when words of the English language whose form does not suggest their meaning correspond to words with an internal form in the German language (cf. skate 'skate' – German. Schlittschuh literally: 'sliding shoe', English glove 'glove' – German. Handschuh 'shoes for the hand', English phonetics 'phonetics' –German. Lautlehre 'the doctrine of sounds', Eng. hydrogen 'hydrogen' – German. Wasserstoff 'substance from water', etc.).

The assimilation of words with different internal forms is more difficult than the assimilation of words with the same form of motivation (cf. English teacher – rus. the teacher, English singer – rus. singer, English. swimming – rus. swimming and many others that are similar in their internal form and therefore do not pose a particular problem when memorizing them).

## Conclusion

Concluding the description of linguistic units in the nominative aspect, it should be emphasized that the external form and extent of units used as names, primary or derivative character, globality, integrity, arbitrariness in opposition to fragmentation, motivation and the presence/absence of predicative connection as a whole constitute the main set of features that become the basis for various typologies of nominative units. It is important to note that plums, phrases and sentences are characterized by unique combinations of these features, which make it possible to distinguish one class of nomination units from another. For example, a simple word is characterized by synthetics, integrity, fragmentation, lack of motivation and predicativity. The word derivative also acts as a synthetic (one-word), but dissected motivated nominative unit with hidden predicativity. The phrase is an analytical (several-word), dissected derivative unit with hidden predicativity. In a sentence, in contrast to a phrase, predicative communication finds the most complete and explicit expression, as a result of which it becomes a unit of communication rather than a nomination, although there is no doubt that acts of communication are closely related to the nomination.

## References

1. Виноградов В.В. Об основных типах фразеологических единиц // Виноградов В.В. Избранные труды. Лексикология и лексикография. – М., 1977.
2. Гак В.Г. К проблеме семантической синтагматики // Проблемы структурной лингвистики 1971. – М., 1972.
3. Косериу Е. Лексические солидарности // Вопросы учебной лексикологии и лексикографии. — М., 1969.
4. Кунин А.В. Английская фразеология. – М., 1970.
5. Медникова Э.М. Значение слова и методы его описания. – М., 1974.
6. Смирницкий А.И. Лексикология английского языка. – М., 1956.