
Theoretical interpretation of the concept of frame in Cognitive Linguistics

Alimova Dilzoda Ikromjon qizi
alimovadilzoda@gmail.com

Teacher,

The Department of Interfaculty languages,
Kokand State University

Annotation *This article examines the theoretical interpretation of the concept of frame in cognitive linguistics. The study aims to explore the origins, development, and major principles of Frame Semantics as proposed by Charles Fillmore and to explain the role of frames in the organization and interpretation of meaning. Particular attention is paid to the notions of semantic frames, frame elements, prototype effects, and FrameNet as a practical implementation of frame-semantic theory. The research employs descriptive, analytical, and comparative methods to investigate the theoretical foundations of the frame concept and its application in linguistic analysis. The findings demonstrate that frames function as cognitive structures that organize human knowledge and facilitate language comprehension by linking lexical meanings to broader conceptual contexts. The study concludes that Frame Semantics provides a comprehensive model for understanding the relationship between language, cognition, and cultural knowledge and remains one of the most influential approaches in contemporary cognitive linguistics.*

Keywords *Cognitive linguistics, frame semantics, frame, semantic frame, frame elements, prototype, lexical meaning, conceptual structure, FrameNet, language cognition*

Kognitiv tilshunoslikda freym tushunchasining nazariy talqini

Alimova Dilzoda Ikromjon qizi
alimovadilzoda@gmail.com

Fakultetlararo tillar kafedrasini o'qituvchisi,
Qo'qon davlat universiteti

Annotatsiya *Ushbu maqolada kognitiv tilshunoslikdagi freym tushunchasining nazariy talqini tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotning maqsadi Charlz Fillmor tomonidan ishlab chiqilgan Freym Semantikasi nazariyasining shakllanishi, rivojlanishi va asosiy tamoyillarini o'rganish hamda freymlarning ma'no tashkil etish va talqin qilishdagi rolini yoritishdan iborat. Maqolada semantik freymlar, freym elementlari, prototip hodisasi va freym-semantik nazariyaning amaliy ko'rinishi hisoblangan FrameNet tizimi masalalariga alohida e'tibor qaratiladi. Tadqiqotda tavsifiy, tahliliy va qiyosiy metodlardan foydalanilgan. Natijalar freymlar inson bilimlarini tartibga soluvchi kognitiv tuzilmalar bo'lib, leksik ma'nolarni kengroq konseptual kontekstlar bilan bog'lash orqali tilni tushunishni ta'minlashini ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqot xulosalariga ko'ra, Freym Semantikasi til, tafakkur va madaniy bilimlar o'rtasidagi munosabatlarni tushuntirishda samarali nazariy model bo'lib, zamonaviy kognitiv tilshunoslikning muhim yo'nalishlaridan biri hisoblanadi.*

Kalit so'zlar *Kognitiv tilshunoslik, freym semantikasi, freym, semantik freym, freym elementlari, prototip, leksik ma'no, konseptual tuzilma, FrameNet, til va tafakkur*

Теоретическая интерпретация понятия фрейма в когнитивной лингвистике

Алимова Дилзода Икромовна

alimovadilzoda@gmail.com

Преподаватель кафедры
межфакультетских языков,

Кокандский государственный университет

Аннотация *В данной статье рассматривается теоретическая интерпретация понятия фрейма в когнитивной лингвистике. Цель исследования заключается в изучении происхождения, развития и основных принципов теории фреймовой семантики, разработанной Чарльзом Филлмором, а также в объяснении роли фреймов в организации и интерпретации значения. Особое внимание уделяется понятиям семантического фрейма, элементов фрейма, прототипического эффекта и системе FrameNet как практической реализации фреймовой семантики. В исследовании используются описательный, аналитический и сравнительный методы. Результаты показывают, что фреймы функционируют как когнитивные структуры, организующие знания человека и обеспечивающие понимание языка посредством связи лексических значений с более широкими концептуальными контекстами. Делается вывод о том, что фреймовая семантика представляет собой эффективную модель для объяснения взаимосвязи языка, мышления и культурного знания и остается одним из наиболее влиятельных направлений современной когнитивной лингвистики.*

Ключевые слова *Когнитивная лингвистика, фреймовая семантика, фрейм, семантический фрейм, элементы фрейма, прототип, лексическое значение, концептуальная структура, FrameNet, язык и мышление*

The shift towards anthropocentric paradigm revolutionized the way we perceive language and define words. Language is no longer considered to be a mere collection of words and grammatical rules. Rather we have come to think of it as a reproduction of human thought and cognition. Knowing only a set of words and rules has proved to be useless in communicating in a particular language, for when we interact, we also need a vast amount of background knowledge about the world, how this world is shaped in the eyes of the native speakers of the language. This way of looking at language gave rise to the theory of Frame Semantics, which defines words not through meaning, but through conceptual structures called "frames". The main concept

behind Frame Semantics is that understanding a word requires knowledge of the entire real-world or cultural situation, event or object that the world evokes. the meaning of a word can only be fully understood within a broader conceptual structure called a frame. These frames represent our knowledge about situations, events, objects, and experiences.

According to Charles J. Fillmore, who is largely credited for the development and spread of Frame Semantics, linguistic meanings are understood in relation to cognitive frameworks, known as frames, that represent stereotypical experiences. It is through these frames that individuals interpret the world. A frame can be defined as a mental representation of a situation that includes all

the participants, objects, actions, and relationships typically associated with it. Let us consider the word *buy* as an example, in order to fully grab its meaning, we automatically activate a commercial transaction frame which typically involves a customer, a seller, goods or services, money and so on (see the first example below). Without the knowledge of the broader situation surrounding the word *buy* it would be difficult to understand its meaning. If this word is used in a different context, say in the meaning of to believe something, the frame surrounding it would have been a speaker, a listener and a belief or an excuse (see the second example below):

1. *Tourists usually visit souvenir shops to buy something as a keepsake.*
2. *He said the dog ate his homework but the teacher didn't buy it*

Traditional structural semantics analyzed the word through its componential features. Componential analysis of the word *buy* in structural semantics would have been *intentional action, acquisition, commercial activity* or *agent acquires an object by paying money*. As sound as this way of defining a word is, frame semantics argues that it is insufficient to fully deliver the meaning of the word. As Charles J. Fillmore (1982) put it: "A frame semantics outlook is not (or is not necessarily) incompatible with work and results in formal semantics; but it differs importantly from formal semantics in emphasizing the continuities, rather than the discontinuities, between language and experience". He masterfully uses the analogy of a grammar and a set of tools to depict the difference between frame semantics and compositional semantics. Knowing the physical assets of tool, such as what they are made of and what shape they are can be equaled to the phonology and morphology, but this also means to be aware of what they are used for, and why people are interested in these tools. A translator cannot interpret a single text by dividing it into small group of meanings, rather all the "tools" of the text come together to represent the thing that

has been built using them – the entire body of text.

Charles J. Fillmore was instrumental in shaping the core concepts of Frame Semantics and accumulating both practical and theoretical knowledge necessary to fully reach the essence of Frame Semantics. Under his direction, FrameNet, a large computational and linguistic database developed at the University of California, Berkeley was developed to document the relationship between words, meanings and the semantic frames they evoke. Both the FrameNet and the personal ideas and theories of Fillmore himself was instrumental in shaping another key concept behind Frame Semantics – frame and frame elements. The very concept of frame, however, was introduced to the world by Marvin Minsky. In order for a system to impose coherence on incoming information, frames were viewed as frameworks for representing stereotyped knowledge and expectations. Many frame-like or "higher-level" information, structures, and languages in the area were developed as a result of Minsky's "frames paper," which had a significant impact on researchers. The concept of a single frame in a movie is where the word "frame" originates, and Minsky thought of frames as collections of information embedded in a network of linked retrievals. Frames were designed to be both tiny enough to be a flexible and modular component of a large database and large enough knowledge packets to impose structure on a novel scenario.

Vyvyan Evans and Melanie Green's foundational textbook, "Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction" has also been instrumental in exploring meaning construction, encyclopedic semantics, conceptual metaphor and categorization of frames. They also argued that "Words serve as access points to vast stores of knowledge relating to a particular concept", highlighting the need for background knowledge to understand the meaning of the words.

The first pages of E.S. Stepanova's study "Mythological frame and its expression in a

philosophical novel" highlight that cognitive research is at the core of the work, that frames and concepts serve as stereotypes for many situations and situations in philosophical novels, and that existing knowledge is also investigated from the perspective of culture. The scientist points out that establishing the frame in legends involves a number of factors. He highlights that the location of the event, the author's creative goal, the participants, and the text's structural significance are all crucial in capturing the essence.

The concept of frame has also been extensively researched and analyzed by linguists and scholars in Uzbekistan as well. Textbook "Cognitive Linguistics" by Ashurova D. and Galieva M., monograph "Cognitive Linguistics" by Safarov Sh. have been instrumental in shaping the framework for Frame Semantics among Uzbek audience. Research led by Nurmonov A. focused on modern directions of Linguistics, in particular, cognitive linguistics and units studied at this level.

The participants, properties, or circumstances are called frame elements that make up a particular semantic frame. They represent the roles associated with a situation, event, or state described by a word or

expression. There are two major types of frame elements distinguished: core and non-core frame elements.

Core frame elements, by their name, represent concepts and participants that are essential to a particular frame. Without them, the frame would lose its identity, and the meaning of the word could not be deduced. Non-core elements, on the other hand, are not that essential to grab the meaning of the word, which is why they are considered to be optional components. Also labelled as Peripheral Frame Elements, they provide additional information about the event or circumstance surrounding the word and are not unique to a specific frame. Let us further analyze the above – mentioned example of the word *buy*. In the following example: *Tourists usually buy souvenirs in local markets*, the words *tourists*, and *souvenirs* are core frame elements as they represent the customer and the object, without which the process of buying would be incomplete. The words *usually* and *local market* give information about the frequency and place, these frames are not important to deduce the meaning of the word *buy*. The Table 1 summarizes more examples including the words *buy*, *lecture*, *hire*, *travel* and clearly outlines the type of frame elements:

Examples	Core frame elements	Non-core frame elements
Father bought a laptop from a shop for \$500 yesterday	Buyer (father), place (shop), goods (laptop), money (\$500)	Time (yesterday)
The professor lectured on linguistics to the students online for two hours	Teacher (professor), subject matter (linguistics), students (students)	Place (online), duration (for two hours)
The company hired a new manager in June	Employer (company), employee (manager)	Time (in June)
We traveled to Paris by train last summer	Traveler (we), destination (Paris)	Means (train), time (last summer)

Table 1. *Examples of core and non-core frame elements*

Safarov (2006), on the other hand, presented the teaching of framing by Leonard Talme, according to which, a frame consists of the following elements:

- Figure, landscape;
- Space;
- Direction;
- Motion;

- Method, style;
- Reason.

One of the most important theoretical stances in cognitive linguistics nowadays is frame semantics. Every text can be seen as a linguistic expression of a specific frame from a lingua-cognitive standpoint. Researchers define a frame as a knowledge framework that combines possible and typical information related to a specific topic. A structure like this is made up of interrelated parts that are stored in human memory and triggered when needed. Frames are especially attractive as a way to describe knowledge since psychological research has demonstrated that humans frequently rely on prior knowledge, which they then modify to deal with novel or somewhat altered circumstances. Therefore, people rely on a vast collection of structures that represent their prior experiences with objects, people, and situations rather than analyzing and creating descriptions of each new situation as it arises. They then use these prior expectations to guide their analysis and representation of new experiences. Word cannot be understood in isolation, but only as part of the broader knowledge structures (Cruse, 2004). As a result, frames offer a framework or structure that allows expectations and information about particular experiences or occurrences to be arranged and applied to novel circumstances.

Another importance concept underlying frames is prototype. It is important to think of frames as paradigmatic descriptions of scenes. One benefit of a prototype is that it doesn't have to cover all facet of a phrase's meaning; in other words, it doesn't have to offer sufficient and required circumstances for a phrase to be used correctly. Fillmore uses an examination of the idea *widow* to show how prototypes are used inside frame semantics. The term "widow" refers to a background situation in which individuals marry one person, their lives are impacted by their partner's passing, and possibly other features. Similarly, the prototypical image of a teacher includes a

person who works in a school or university, instructs students in a classroom, plans lessons, assigns homework, and assesses students' performance. However, someone who has retired and no longer teacher can also be called a teacher. Those who conduct online classes, holds online webinars and runs online blogs or channels aimed at teaching are also addressed as teachers. Categories are often organized around prototypical situations rather than strict necessary and sufficient conditions. The prototype provides a central and most typical representation of a concept, while actual instances may differ from it in various ways and still belong to the same category. A theory of meaning based on the prototype concept has the advantage of not having to worry about specific boundary requirements, in contrast to a theory that concentrates on specifying necessary and sufficient circumstances for the meaning of a phrase;

Equally significant is the categorization of frames. While a lot of scholars have proposed various ways and methods of classifying frames, Ashurova D. and Galieva M. in their book *Cognitive Linguistics* (2018) point out the following categorization of frames which is widely accepted by scholars:

- Frame – structures that denote notions and objects (passport, contract, mortgage, scholarship);
- Frame – roles (doctor, patient, lawyer, customer, passenger, driver, scholar, scientist);
- Frame – scenarios (wedding, interview, funeral, flight, trip, election);
- Frame – situations (fire, flood, traffic jam, earthquake, robbery).

Frame resembles a hierarchical structure of linguistic data and is comprised of two levels: the upper level and lower level. (Ashurova, Galieva, 2018). The name of the frame is considered to be its upper level, while the lower level consists of terminals, namely slots and subslots that give further information about the situation. And these terminals are not independent of one another, rather they are

interconnected. Each terminal presents a certain aspect of a situation which is characterized by a range of features and attributes. Therefore, each terminal is connected with each other, and if one or the other is omitted or excluded, the meaning would be incomplete.

Lawrance Barsalou also argued that frames are "dynamic relational structures whose form is flexible and context dependent". One frame may not be attached to a sole situation or context, and can be applied across variety of concepts. However, they cannot exist or be understood out of their particular context or situation. To give an example of this theory, in order to get the essence of the word elbow, one needs to have the knowledge of the arm as well. Without understanding what an arm is, it would be impossible to get what elbow actually means.

Frames are adaptable enough to convey data of any required level of detail because of their recursivity. We make the assumption that attributes in frames indicate functional interactions by giving objects distinct values. Formally, connected directed graphs with arcs

that represent attributes can be used to represent frames. No node may have two outgoing arcs with identical labels as attributes are functions. The types used to label the nodes may limit the ranges and domains for which an attribute is suitable as well as the range of values that an attribute can have (Novosadska, 2018).

Frames are sufficiently rich to offer a thorough and sufficient account of a person's mental representation, especially conceptual representations. They are suitable for describing ideas at various granularities because of their recursive structure.

Today, linguistics is becoming increasingly important due to its attractiveness to many professions and research centered on the study of the human factor in the center, from short sentences to large-scale works. Any utterance that has been produced demonstrates the existence of the essence that served as its foundation. Similarly, cognitive linguistics assesses human knowledge and intellectual capacity in a number of ways and demonstrates the foundation for its actualization.

References:

1. Nurmonov, A. (2012). *Selected works on theoretical and practical problems of linguistics. Selected works*. Tashkent
2. Cruse, A. (2004). *Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Second Edition, Oxford University Press, New York, ISBN 978-0-19-9263066
3. Alimova, D. (2026). Linguistic aspects of translating legal discourse. *Miasto Przyszlosci*, 68(1). 118-122.
4. Ashurova D., Galieva, M. (2018). *Cognitive linguistics*. Tashkent
5. Barsalou, L. (1992). *Frames, concepts, and conceptual fields*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
6. Barsalou, L. (1992). *Cognitive Psychology: An Overview for Cognitive Scientists*, Hillsdale.
7. Fillmore, Ch. (1982). *Frame Semantics: Linguistics in the morning calm*. Linguistic Society of Korea. 10-14.
8. Novosadska O. B. (2018). The concept of Frame and Framing process. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*, VI (43).
9. Safarov, Sh. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Jizzakh.
10. Stepanova, E. S. (2007). *Mythological frame and ego language expression and philosophical novel*. Samara.