The Representation of the Limited Lexicon in French Language in Works of Art

Akhmedova Gulnoza Khayotovna

Teacher of the Department of French Philology of Bukhara State University

Abstract: In this article we wrote the representation of the limited lexicon in French language in the works of art and of a lexicon is very variable and depends in particular on the diversity of the fields of knowledge or techniques that it allows to express.. The extent of the lexicon known or used by each person also varies greatly, depending on background but also on life stories and situations. The often fundamental differences between the lexicons of different languages pose an essential problem of translation, without a general solution.

Key words: lexicon, function, semantics, diversity, language, philosopher, form.

INTRODUCTION

The **lexicon** of a language is the set of its words (sum of the vocabularies used), or more precisely in linguistics its lemmas . The words of a lexicon form a whole, a sort of system semantics , which therefore evolves over time. The relationships between words, of form and above all of meaning, as well as between the meanings of the same word, are very diverse.

The size of a lexicon is very variable and depends in particular on the diversity of the fields of knowledge or techniques that it makes it possible to express. The extent of the lexicon *known* or *used* by each person also varies greatly, depending on background but also on life stories and situations. The often fundamental differences between the lexicons of different languages pose an essential problem of translation , without a general solution.

New words can be created in any language, in different ways, and more or easily, depending on the language. Conversely, words disappear, replaced or not in their meaning . Words also change their meaning over time, sometimes radically, as cultural developments take place.

METHODS

There are essentially two main ways of defining or apprehending the concept of "representation", already present and identified in the classical age, as indicated in particular by Furetière's *Universal Dictionary*. The works of the philosopher Louis Marin and the historian Roger Chartier have insisted on this double definition.

1. On the one hand, what is called "representation" can designate the presentification of an absence by means of a language. The notion then refers either to the act of representing (which consists in making mediately present or perceptible an absent thing, whether this thing is empirically non-existent, immaterial or materially present elsewhere, in space or in time), or to the semiotic product of this act: thus we commonly speak, for example, of literary *representations* of such and such a phenomenon, of such and such an event, of such and such a figure. In this sense of the concept, to represent consists either of "presenting again (in the modality of time)", or of putting "in the place of

(in that of space)", the prefix "re-" having "the value of substitution", in the sense that the present sign replaces the absent thing (Marin, 1981, p. 9).

Thus defined, the representation, whether it be a mental image or an explicitly verbalized discourse, brings out an absence by resorting to signs that take its place. It is "the instrument of a mediate knowledge which makes an absent object visible by substituting an 'image' capable of restoring it to memory", the representative relation being "put in relation between a present image and an object absent, one valid for the other" (Chartier, 1998 [1989], p. 79). And it is because representations *are* not what they represent (languages are never confused with the realities they seek to describe) that they can contribute, precisely, to shaping and constructing what they hold. place. In this sense, the relationship between a representation and its object is one, twofold, of manifestation and interpretation: to represent is not only to make appear but also, by the same token, to confer a meaning on the object represented.. To make present is, in short and necessarily, to represent in a *certain* way, to the detriment of other possible ones. Always semiotic in nature, representations can mobilize several media and fall within several specific and codified discursive genres – it is up to semiology to describe the properties of the various modes or systems of representation, the differences which distinguish, for example, the linguistic representations that are words, where the relation between the signifier and the signified is largely unmotivated and therefore essentially conventional, "analog" representations such as figurative images, where the sign and the referent have common properties, to the point where the representation can become, as in the photographic image, a "[chemical] emanation from the referent" (Barthes, 1980, p. 126).

2. The term "representation", on the other hand, also drags with it a second family of meanings, from which falls the theatrical or dramatic significance of the notion. "Representation", in fact, can also mean the "showing of a presence", the "public presentation of a thing or a person" (Chartier, 1998 [1994], p. 176). *Representing* then rhymes with *exhibiting* : "in the particular, codified modality of its exhibition, Chartier always writes, it is the thing or the person itself that constitutes its own representation". Representing is no longer, here, making an absence present, but rather "showing, intensifying, doubling a presence" (Marin, 1981, p. 10). The prefix "re-" no longer designates a substitution of the present for the absent but an "intensity", a modality of presence, a way of drawing attention to it, of staging it. Thus we can say of social actors that they are "in representation", or even speak of "self-representations" to designate the way in which individuals, in the context of communication and social interactions, manufacture, deliver, " perform" and control a certain image of themselves.

In the field of the semiological analysis of the arts, discourses and literature, this second definition of representation, as Louis Marin clearly saw, opens the way – we will come back to this later – for the study of discursiveness proper to discourses, that is to say to the study of the processes by which these exhibit their belonging to a particular genre, not only represent (in the sense that *they* have objects and speak of the outside world) but *present* as representations by revealing the codes that define them. We can take the example of scholarly discourse as it is produced and disseminated in the university circuit: these, in fact, belong to a discursive genre characterized by processes (typical formulations, systematic recourse to a metalanguage, bibliographic apparatus, proliferation of more or less rigorous or approximate scholarly references, etc.), intended, in particular, to showcase knowledge and scientific authority and, therefore, to allow, on rhetorical bases which are not only knowledge but also the staging of it, an accentuation of the symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 44 and 160).

The first meaning of the concept of representation (presentification of an absence) supposes a radical ontological separation between what represents and what is represented, which overlaps with the classic distinction posed by semiological theories between the sign and its extra-semiotic referent; the second meaning (showing a presence) on the contrary implies a certain identity, by and in the act of representation, between the sign and its object (which signifies itself). The distinction between the two definitions is essential but it hides at the same time a common denominator. In either case, the same fundamental logic is at work: to represent is to make something *manifest*. Representation always refers to the process and the form by which a "reality", material or immaterial, real or

International Journal of Language Learningand Applied Linguistics
For more information contact: mailto:editor@inter-publishing.com

Volume 2, No 3 | Mar - 2023

fictitious, is shown, evoked or presented to an audience (whether real or virtual, actually present or only imagined).). In short, the notion of representation names the way a thing has of being manifested or of manifesting itself. But the concept of representation understood as the demonstration of a presence has not only inspired sociologists; it is also, in fact, at the heart of all modern semiological theory, as it was developed (taking up elements already present in the logicians of Port-Royal) during the 20th century, both on THE ^{side} of linguists than among analysts and theoreticians of literary and artistic fact. The work of Louis Marin has, from this point of view, the merit of having synthesized this modern understanding of the sign by insisting in a remarkably effective manner on the ambivalent nature of any representational device. Every sign in fact presents a double character: it is not only what is effaced before the thing represented, but at the same time, and in one piece, a thing in itself, having its own consistency, a materiality, an irreducible "opacity". The sign can therefore never make its presence completely forgotten. Making an absent thing present, it always remains itself, in its own thickness, present as a thing, thus showing at the same time, not only what it represents, but the very fact of representation. Analyzing several pictorial works of the Quattrocento, Marin thus opposes these two dimensions of the sign by showing their concrete articulation (and the tensions that this gives rise to) in the representational devices of Renaissance painting. On the one hand the transparency of the representation, on the other its opacity: the representation has not only a "transitive dimension – "every representation represents something" – but [also a] reflexive dimension – "every representation presents itself representing something". thing" –, its *opacity* " (Marin, 2006 [1989], p. 68). Like a dirty or cracked window, the representation always recalls, in a more or less subtle way, its presence. Hence, in Marin, the development of an analysis of the means by which painting exhibits the very mechanisms of representation.

CONCLUSION

In the human and social sciences as well as in literary studies, all of the plural and varied uses and uses of the notion of "representation" (whether this is strongly conceptualized or mobilized as an element of a common lexicon) derive in a way where it is necessary, finally and in conclusion, to return briefly to cultural history, which also grants, since the works of Roger Chartier, an importance to the double nature of representation and to the various ways in which the representations of the world, historically, present themselves to the public, in their changing materiality, passing from the written to the oral, from the singular book to the periodicity of the issues of the newspaper burying one another successively, from the *codex* on computer screen. This attention paid today to written media and their effects clearly fits into the contemporary context of the "electronic text revolution", mutations, writes Chartier, which "inevitably, imperatively command new ways of reading, new relationships to writing" and to information (1996, pp. 32-33). This concern for materiality has a strong programmatic dimension for cultural history, inviting or inciting the latter to take into account, when making the history of representations, the "material forms of writing" and of discourse, which influence the reception of works, moreover always partly undetermined from another of these two great classical meanings.

Bibliography

1. Barthes (Roland), "The old rhetoric. Aide-mémoire" [1964-1965], in *L'aventure sémiologique,* Paris, Seuil, "Points", 1985, pp. 85-164.

2. Barthes (Roland), *The Clear Room. Note on photography,* Paris, Gallimard/Seuil, "Cahiers du cinema", 1980.

3. Barthes (Roland), Bersani (Leo), Hamon (Philippe), Riffaterre (Michael) & Watt (Ian), *Literature and Reality,* Paris, Seuil, "Points", 1982.

4. Belloï (Livio), *The Proustian Scene. Proust, Goffman and the theater of the world,* Paris, Nathan, "The text at work", 1993.

5. Boudon (Raymond), *Ideology or the origin of received ideas,* Paris, Seuil, "Points", 1986.

6. Bourdieu (Pierre), "Are intellectuals out of the game? » [1978], in *Questions de sociologie* [1984], Paris, Minuit, « Reprise », 2002.

7. Bourdieu (Pierre), *What speaking means. The economy of linguistic exchanges,* Paris, Fayard, 1982.

8. Bourdieu (Pierre), *Homo academicus,* Paris, Minuit, "Common sense", 1984.

9. Chartier (Roger), *Written culture and society. The order of books (14TH ⁻ 18TH century),* Paris, Albin Michel, "Histoire", *1996.*

10. Chartier (Roger), "The world as representation" [1989], in *Au bord de lacliff. The story between certainties and anxiety,* Paris, Albin Michel, "History", 1998, pp. 67-86.

11. Д.Б.Нарзулаева Теолингвистическая лексема религиозного стиля Educational Research in Universal Sciences 1 (7), 332-338

12. DB Narzullaeva History of the translation of the quran into french international conferences 1 (2), 116-118

13. D.B.Narzullaeva Developing the communication competence of french-speaking students through dialogues in the development of oral speech Scientific Journal, 1(10), 53–57.