

theory is meaning. This phrase appears to be easy to comprehend at first glance since it is frequently used in teaching, interpreting, and translation. However, there have been endless arguments over the scientific definition of meaning as well as the definitions of several other fundamental linguistic concepts, such word, phrase, etc.

One of the most contentious concepts in language theory is meaning. This phrase appears to be easy to comprehend at first glance since it is frequently used in teaching, interpreting, and translation. However, there have been endless arguments over the scientific definition of meaning as well as the definitions of several other fundamental linguistic concepts, such word, phrase, etc. Since there isn't a single, widely recognized definition of what meaning is [4:50-70], we'll limit our discussion to a quick overview of how the issue is seen in contemporary linguistics both here and abroad. Semantics examines the conceptual significance of words.

Semantics deals with the meaning according to syntax and vocabulary rather than the context. The goal of semantics is to offer precise definitions for words and phrases and clear up any ambiguity that might cause readers to assume a term has several meanings. By comparing their meanings, it establishes a connection between a word and a phrase. Additionally, semantics allows readers to investigate a feeling of meaning since if a single word is removed from a phrase or is placed in a different location, the statement's whole meaning changes or it becomes anomalous. As a result, the sense relationship inside a phrase is crucial because a single word has no sense or meaning.

Referential approach to meaning.

The two main schools of thought on meaning in modern linguistics are the referential approach and the functional approach. The referential approach aims to define the essence of meaning by demonstrating the relationship between words and the things or concepts they denote, while the functional approach focuses more on the functions of a word in speech and is less concerned with what meaning is than with how it operates. Referential ideas of meaning have served as the foundation for all significant studies on semantic theory to date.

This approach's defining characteristic is that it makes a distinction between the three elements that are closely related to meaning: the linguistic sign's sound-form, the concept underpinning this sound-form, and the actual referent, or the part or aspect of reality to which the linguistic sign refers. The so-called "basic triangle" is the most well-known referential model of meaning, and it serves as the foundation for the semantic systems of all followers of this school of thought, with some minor changes. The above diagram shows how the sound-form of the linguistic sign, such as [dAv], is related to our conception of the bird it indicates and, via it, to the referent, which is the real bird. Any referential approach has as a defining characteristic the notion that meaning is somehow related to the referent. Let's now look at the role that meaning plays in this approach. It is obvious that a word's pronunciation does not correspond to its meaning; for example, the sound [dAv] is used to refer to a peal-grey bird.

However, there is no innate relationship between this specific sound-cluster and the definition of the word dove. The link is arbitrary and customary. This is easily demonstrated by contrasting the sound-forms of several languages that communicate the same word, such as English (dAv), Russian (golub'), German (taube), and others.

Additionally, if a linguistic unit's meaning were inextricably linked to its sound form, it would follow that a change in sound form would need a change in meaning. However, we are aware that even significant changes to a word's sound throughout the course of its historical evolution may not always change the meaning of the term. The meaning "hold dear, bear love," etc., has stayed mostly same, while the sound-form of the OE word *lufian* [luvian] has experienced significant alterations and has been turned into *love* [lAv]. When we analyze a word, we can observe that, although being closely related to the underlying notion or concepts, its meaning is distinct from those concepts.

Concept is a category of human intellect, first and foremost. Concept is the idea of an object that highlights its key characteristics. The most prevalent and typical characteristics of the many things and processes in the world are abstracted and reflected in our conceptions. All "concepts are therefore inherently practically the same for the entire of mankind at one and the same epoch of its historical evolution, being the consequence of abstraction and generalization. However, words have diverse meanings in other languages. In other words, words that communicate the same concepts in various languages may have distinct semantic structures and meanings.

Comparing words and word groups that express essentially the same concepts but have linguistic meanings that are perceived differently in each of the units under consideration can also show the difference between meaning and concept. Examples include the words *big* and *large*; *to, die, to pass away, to join the majority*; and *to, die, to pass away, to kick the bucket, to join the majority*; *child, baby, babe, infant*. Although the precise definition of a concept's content is within the purview of logic, it is clear that the word's meaning is not the same as it. For instance, "three plus three," "five plus one," "ten minus four," etc. Can be used to describe the substance of idea six. It is clear that the meaning of these word groupings cannot be associated with the meaning of the term six.

Last but not least, there are terms like "angel" or "phoenix" that have different meanings but do not refer to anything real. Even though the items that these words refer to do not exist, the speaker and listener can understand their meaning. Therefore, none of the triangle's three points should be used to define meaning.

It should be noted that certain supporters of the referential approach believe that the idea behind a linguistic sign determines its meaning, and as a result, they replace concept with meaning in the fundamental triangle. Others associate the referent with significance.

They contend that we cannot provide a scientifically correct definition of a word's meaning unless we have a scientifically precise understanding of the referent. They claim

that the term “salt” in English, for instance, refers to sodium chloride. But how do we exactly define the meanings of terms like “love” or “hate,” etc.? We must acknowledge that exact definitions of word meanings are not attainable given the current state of human understanding [2:139]. It follows logically that any attempt at a linguistic study of meaning along these lines must be abandoned as impractical. Here, we’ve tried to demonstrate how meaning is intimately related to, but distinct from, sound-form, idea, and referent. However, even people who agree with this viewpoint disagree on what meaning actually is.

Some linguists see meaning as the relationship between the three triangle points within the context of the target language, i.e., the relationship between the soundform, concept, and referent, rather than as an objectively real component of the linguistic sign. Others, including several great Soviet linguists, start with the premise that language and meaning are objective and view the linguistic sign as a dualistic object. According to this perspective, meaning is “a certain reflection in our mind of objects, phenomena, or relations that makes part of the linguistic sign — its so-called inner facet, whereas the sound-form functions as its outer facet.” [3] [5:197] To convey meaning and facilitate communication, linguistic signs must have an external facet. All language units have meaning, which coupled with their soundform makes up the linguistic signals that linguistic science studies.

Conclusion

The following concise summary of the criticism of referential theories of meaning is provided:

1. According to the referential approach, meaning is the relationship between linguistic signals and categories and things that are not related to language. Since concepts and referents—i.e., real objects, phenomena, etc.—do not fall under the purview of linguistic study, the analysis of meaning is limited to either the study of the relationship between linguistic signs and referents or the relationship between linguistic signs and concepts.

2. The main problem with referential theories of meaning has always been that they depend on intangible, irrational, and subjective brain processes. As a result, the findings of a semantic inquiry are somewhat dependent on “the feel of the language” and cannot be independently confirmed by another researcher who examines the same linguistic data. As a result, unlike other areas of linguistic study (such as phonetics and the history of language), semasiology is excessively dependent on linguistic intuition and lacks objective research methodologies. As a result, it is asserted, linguists should either abandon the study of meaning and attempts to define meaning entirely or focus only on examining the role of linguistic signals in speech.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. D. Bolinger. *Getting the Words In. Lexicography in English*, N. Y., 1973.
2. L. Bloomfield. *Language*. N. Y., 1933.
3. А. И. Смирницкий. Значение слова. — *Вопр. Языкознания*, 1955, № 2.
4. Л. С. Бархударов. *Язык и перевод*. М., 1975. с 50-70
5. С. И. Ожегов. *Лексикология, лексикография, культура речи*. М., 1974.

BASED ON LABOR PROTECTION RULES IN THE PROCESS OF DESIGNING COMMUNICATION SYSTEMS

Akhunov Daniyar Bakhtiyarovich

*Dotsent of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Construction 12,
I. Karimov street, Namangan district, 160103, Republic of Uzbekistan*

Annotation: *This article describes the rules of labor protection in the process of designing cold and hot water and sewerage systems in house constructions, that is, how to organize labor protection in laying pipes in the ground, welding pipes and communication works.*

Key words: *Occupational safety, injury, accident, excavation, welding, water pipes, tarpaulin gloves, instruction. harmful factor, working conditions.*

Attention to workers in the construction of engineering communications, where there is a high probability of injuries and occupational diseases, even accidents, is carried out by developing measures to ensure the safety of labor and life activities in the enterprise based on the Labor Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan. The main essence of this is that by increasing the requirements of industrial sanitation and occupational hygiene of labor protection and life safety, it is possible to create comfortable working conditions for workers and prevent injuries.

According to the type of work, harmful factors and dangerous factors are more common in pit digging, gas and water pipeline welding.

Labor protection in pit excavation works is organized as follows. Pipes are used to transfer gas, water, and sewage from one place to another in the construction of communications, and these pipes can be buried on the ground, on the surface of the ground, or buried under the ground. will be achieved.

When digging pits for burying pipelines in the ground, the following should be taken into account. First of all, before the pits are dug, the local authorities of such enterprises as "Electroset", "Suv Oqava", "Telephone", "Sewage", "Gas", "Metro", "Road construction" joint written permission is obtained. When digging by hand, special attention should be paid to the depth to be dug. If there is a risk of gas release as a result of mining, the relevant personnel will be notified in advance.

If the depth is more than 1 m, it is necessary to protect the workers by means of anti-slip trailers and poles, to create an opportunity for the workers to warm up when they have to work in the cold, to provide the workers with sanitary and household service rooms, and to organize mobile wagons if there is mobile work. .

Workers are not allowed to stand inside the pit during the lowering of the pipes into the pits, the slope is allowed on the slopes when digging the pits.