

REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN

On the rights of manuscript

ABSTRACT

of the dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC FEATURES OF THE VERBS
OF UNDERSTANDING IN ENGLISH AND AZERBAIJANI
LANGUAGES**

Speciality: 5714.01 – “Comparative-historical and
comparative-typological linguistics”

Field of science: Philology

Applicant: **Ayten Uzeyir Afandiyeva**

Baku – 2026

The work was performed at the Department of Azerbaijani Language of Ganja State University.

Scientific supervisor:

Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor
Narmin Abulfaz Aliyeva

Official opponents:

Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor
Fidan Surat Bakhshiyeva



Doctor of Philosophy in Philology,
Associate Professor
Aygun Khanoglan Isayeva

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology
Samira Khagani Sultanova

Dissertation council FD 2.13 of Supreme Attestation Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at Baku Slavic University

Chairman of the
Dissertation council:

Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor
Fikrat Fatish Jahangirov

Scientific secretary of the
Dissertation council:

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology
Suad Arif Afandiyeva

Chairman of the scientific
seminar:

Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor
Valeh Bayram Nasibov

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK

The relevance of the research topic and the degree of its elaboration. Different language fields, as well as the overall field-based nature of language, are being intensively studied in modern linguistics. Numerous studies demonstrate the productivity of the field model of the linguistic system, as language is accepted as a multi-level structure where peripheral zones interact with one another. The sphere composition of language allows for the resolution of problems that traditional grammar structures cannot address and enables a deeper study of language material.

As the functional approach in linguistics is the functional approach, modern linguistics is encountering a new stage of functional explanation and development, according to W. von Humboldt, A.A.Potebnya and J.A.Baudouin de Courtenay's ideas. The functional feature is important not only for specific linguistic units or lexical-semantic groups but also for the whole field. Despite the long history of field theory, modern research continues to study the optimal interpretation and identification of fields and their functions.

The paradigmatic and syntagmatic sides of field theory remain unsettled. The typology of semantic fields (processual, attributive, and object-related) has been examined, to an inadequate degree. Studies exploring the semantic features of linguistic units have increased recently. Alongside research dedicated to various levels of the linguistic system, investigations on the conceptual model of the world and its linguistic representation have also been implemented (e.g., V.G.Abramov, Y.S.Stepanov). Many studies describe the characteristic sides and primary parameters of lexical-semantic structures, highlighting different types of semantic fields.

Though extensive study has been carried on verbs in Azerbaijani, verbs of understanding have not been separately investigated, as they form a subgroup within the category of cognitive verbs. The spheres of understanding (the communicative field and the sphere of non-verbal comprehending of the world) examined in this research have been ambiguously interpreted in the

scientific literature. In linguistics, understanding is analyzed both within the communicative field (in character dialogues or as described by the author) and through verbs of understanding. In the latter case, communication is regulated by the author and the listener or reader.

In spheres related to "understanding," the object of research covers the whole world, including communication. The issue of understanding has traditionally been a subject of inquiry in non-linguistic fields, but linguistic study now plays a major role in exploring methods of understanding expression. Understanding verbs have not been methodically demonstrated at lexical-semantic, semantic-syntactic or pragmatic levels. Since this problem is a significant focus in philosophy and various cognitive sciences, linguistics cannot disregard this issue.

The actuality of the chosen topic is connected to the lack of a systematic description of the semantic spheres of understanding verbs in the English and Azerbaijani languages, as well as the partial examination of these verbs as a semantic-component system.

Regarding the degree of development, an Azerbaijani linguist G.Baghirov, in his dissertation "Lexical-semantic elaboration of verbs in the Azerbaijani language" (1966), explored the evolution and semantic changes of verbs related to the process of understanding.¹ H.Mirzayev, the author of "The verb in Azerbaijani" (1986), examined various features of the system of the verb.² Here the semantics and structure of verbs linked to understanding were included. A.Alekberov, in the abstract of the dissertation "Lexical semantics of simple verbs in the modern Azerbaijani language" (1978), investigated the semantic characteristics of simple verbs, including those that express the concept of comprehending.³

In linguistics of the English language, G.Lakoff researched conceptual metaphors and their relationship with verbs, including

¹ Bağırov, Q.K. Azərbaycan dilində feillərin leksik-semantik inkişafı. / Q.K.Bağırov. – Bakı: Maarif, – 1971. – 158 s.

² Mirzəyev, H. Azərbaycan dilində feil / H.Mirzəyev. – Bakı: Maarif, – 1986. – 318 s.

³ Алекперов, А. Лексическая семантика глаголов в современном азербайджанском языке / А. Алекперов. – Баку, – 1983. – 159 с.

understanding verbs.⁴ R.Langacker, in "Foundations of cognitive grammar", studied how the semantic forms of verbs such as understand and realize relate to conceptualization processes.⁵ In "Semantic primitives", A.Wierzbicka explored the universal nature of notions and their linguistic realization, as well as comprehension.⁶ Ch.Fillmore investigated frames that was connected to understanding, as well as the usage of the verbs "to understand" and "to realize" and their contextual relationships.⁷ These scientists have made crucial contributions to our understanding process of the semantics and perception processes highlighting the usage of verbs of understanding.

The object and subject of the research. The object of this study is the understanding verbs such as lexical units within a general semantic sphere in the English and Azerbaijani languages. The subject of the research is the semantic and structural features of the understanding verbs in two languages.

The purpose and objectives of the research. The main goal of the study is to provide a extensive description of the structural-semantic characteristics of verbs of understanding. The following objectives have been set to achieve this:

- to define the place of comprehending in different scientific disciplines;
- to examine understanding as a linguistic phenomenon;
- to determine the notion of a semantic sphere;
- to identify the lexical-semantic features of verbs of understanding in the English and Azerbaijani languages based on terminological definitions of lexical-semantic forms;
- to form a hierarchy by identifying the core and periphery of verbs of comprehending in English and Azerbaijani;

⁴ Lakoff, G. Women, fire and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind / G.Lakoff. – The university of Chicago Press, – 1987. – 614 p.

⁵ Langacker, R. Cognitive grammar/ R.Langacker. – Oxford University Press, – 2008. – 573 p.

⁶ Wierzbicka, A. Semantic Primitives/A.Wierzbicka. – Frankfurt. – 1972. – 248 p.

⁷ Fillmore, Ch. Frames and the Semantics of Understanding: [Electronic resource] / URL: <https://www.cs.toronto.edu/~gpenn/csc2519/fillmore85.pdf>

–to determine and describe the understanding of lexical-semantic variant systems in English (to understand, to realize, to see) and Azerbaijani (anlamaq, qavramaq, dərk etmək).

The methods of the research. To describe the semantic-syntactic characteristics of verbs of understanding in the English and Azerbaijani languages, definition-semantic, semantic-component, contextual analysis, structural and linguistic analysis and pragmatic methods are used in the research. For the comparative description of verbs of understanding, the study employs comparative, contrastive and historical-comparative methods.

The main provisions submitted for defense:

Verbs of understanding form an independent lexical-semantic sphere that demonstrates cognitive processes involved in comprehending and interpreting information.

Because of typological differences between English and Azerbaijani, the structural-semantic organization of verbs of understanding shows both common and specific characteristics in each language.

The synonymous fields of verbs of understanding in the two languages exhibit differences of semantic richness influenced by cultural and linguistic features.

The method of semantic sphere allows for the systematic analysis of verbs of comprehending by identifying their functional roles and relationships in speech activity.

Azerbaijani has a wider range of synonymous verbs of understanding.

English has a more bounded number of lexical elements in the periphery of verbs of understanding compared to the Azerbaijani language.

The following semantic features of verbs of understanding are present in both languages: time required for understanding, the cognitive potential shown during understanding, whether understanding is superficial or deep, and whether comprehending involves only new information.

The analysis of the primary verbs of understanding as direct nominative markers further approves their presuppositional and

implicative functions.

Scientific novelty of the research. This dissertation work conducts a comparative study of verbs of understanding in English and Azerbaijani based on lexical-semantic spheres for the first time. The structural and semantic characteristics of these verbs have been indicated and systematized in both languages. Similarities and differentiations in the synonymous fields of verbs of understanding have been determined and a methodological approach has been evolved, considering their functional role in communication theory.

Theoretical and practical significance of the research. The theoretical significance of the research lies in the establishment of foundational principles for investigating lexical-semantic structures and semantic spheres of verbs of understanding in the English and Azerbaijani languages. The results can be applied in lexicography, syntactic semantics, pragmalinguistics, and text theory. Moreover, they are relevant to linguistic hermeneutics. The dissertation work can be used in lexicology, theoretical grammar, text interpretation and pragmalinguistics courses.

The approbation and the applying of the dissertation. Findings from the research have been reflected at international conferences and articles including the study content have been published. The results are presented in 14 published articles. The dissertation materials can be used in the preparation of educational resources in lexicology, lexicography and text linguistics.

The name of the organization where the dissertation has been accomplished. The work was performed at the Department of Azerbaijani Language of Ganja State University.

The volume of the structural sections of dissertation separately and the general volume with the signs. The dissertation consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion, and a list of used literature. The introduction of the dissertation is 5 pages – 8467 characters, the first chapter is 33 pages – 65382 characters, the second chapter is 30 pages – 58241 characters, the third chapter is 39 pages – 75507 characters, and the conclusion is 3 pages – 4311 characters. The dissertation consists of 125 pages – 211908 characters in total.

MAIN CONTENT OF THE RESEARCH

The "**Introduction**" part demonstrates the relevance of the topic, defines the objectives and research methods, outlines the main provisions for defense, discusses the object and subject of the research, summarizes its scientific novelty, and underlines its theoretical and practical significance. It also includes the approval of the research, the institution where the dissertation was performed, and the structure and general volume of the dissertation.

The first chapter of the dissertation is called "**Main approaches and directions in the study of verbs of understanding**" and consists of two paragraphs. Paragraph I of the chapter is entitled "*Understanding of understanding in various sciences*". Understanding is a complex phenomenon examined by several sciences. The problem covers multiple contrasts, such as understanding versus explaining, and understanding versus interpretation techniques. Scientists have not reached an agreement on its nature, essence, or various forms. Meaning in a text is closely related to the process of understanding, so it results in the "hermeneutic circle" – one must understand the parts to grasp the whole, and vice versa. As a mental activity, understanding is closely linked to intellectual processes and phenomena such as knowledge, thinking, imagination, as well as social-cognitive activities such as explanation, interpretation, and expression.

Unlike knowledge, understanding reflects and indicates not the normally accepted aspects of social life and nature but their specific features. Understanding is considered as a universal method of human comprehending of the world; this covers not only theoretical points but also direct life experience, different forms of experiential knowledge (e.g., historical experience), and forms of aesthetic success (e.g., cultural experience).

In philosophy, the problem of understanding has traditionally been studied in hermeneutics. Understanding, text and dialogue are the major categories of hermeneutics, which has become one of the fundamental directions in modern philosophy. So what is understanding, and what are its foundations? According to

F.Schleiermacher, *mutual understanding among people depends on the differencies and similarities in their linguistic communication.*⁸

Nearly all scientists agree that the literal meaning of verbs of understanding is arguable. The difficulty in defining the literal of "understanding" stems directly from the ongoing debates about its core meaning. The relationship between understanding and notions such as thinking, knowledge, perception and comprehension remains an open question. Are they identical, do they complement each other, or should they be considered distinct?

Psychologists also lack agreement regarding the cognitive processes connected with understanding. Understanding is often identified with thinking and considered a form of thought. Still some researchers argue that thinking is simply a component of comprehending. More recently, psychologists have come to view understanding as a wider phenomenon, covering not only thinking but also memory, perception, imagination and other cognitive processes.

What exactly is understanding? What are its nature, aim and features? According to philosophy scholars, understanding is a universal cognitive operation that involves evaluating an object (text, behavior, natural phenomena, etc.) based on particular examples, standards, norms, principles and so on.

As an essential part of human cognition, understanding contributes to the formation of ideas, judgments and perceptions, while also achieving a comprehension and evaluative function.

Verbs of understanding play a decisive role in analyzing lexical system relationships. Their involvement is essential in how a conscious subject perceives and internalizes reality since these verbs reflect various aspects of mental states and conditions. As cognitive verbs, verbs of understanding have been the focus of both local and foreign linguists due to their fundamental role in conveying meaning and achieving communicative success.

The second paragraph of Chapter I is titled **"Main approaches to the study of verbs of understanding."** The problem of

⁸ Философия: [учеб. пособие] / [С.А.Азаренко и др.]; под общ. ред. докт. филос. наук, проф. Т.Х.Керимова; М-во образования и науки Рос. Федерации, Урал, федер. ун-т. – Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал, ун-та, – 2013. – с.241

understanding is explored at the intersection of different disciplines, making it a complex and multifaceted subject. The difficulty in examining this issue lies in the polysemy of the concept itself. In disciplines such as ideology, art, philosophy and pragmatics, understanding gains a phenomenological aspect.

The existing literature on understanding is based on two opposing perspectives. One of them is semiotic phenomenology, where understanding is studied in terms of the contrast between linguistic and non-linguistic perception, the processes of analysis and synthesis, and the unity of these processes. The origins of this phenomenological methodology can be traced back to Hegel.

The hermeneutic tradition in the study of understanding demonstrates the connection between hermeneutics and epistemology. Hermeneutic research reveals the internal dialogical nature of thought, consciousness and perception. An important issue in this field is determining where understanding occurs – within a person, between individuals or in connection with a communicative partner. From the physiological point of view, the process of understanding takes place in the human brain. However, if we consider understanding as an interpretation or value judgment, then it may also exist outside an individual, in a group of people, or even in broader society. This interpretative or value-based approach results in a system of relative-oppositional structures between objects and events within both the physical world and its conceptual structure (the world of ideas). This methodology is connected to structuralism and represents a synchronous cross-section of Hegelian phenomenology.

Since understanding is closely related to meaning and linguistic expression, semiotic study considers interpretation as a central component of semantics. Modern linguistics places remarkable emphasis on semantics, as it directly relates to language and its communicative realization. The essence of semantics lies in the relationships between expressions and the objects they represent. From the opposed point of view, pragmatics is about the relationship between expressions, the objects they refer to, the speakers who use these expressions and the contexts what these speakers employ. For

that reason, pragmatics can be regarded as the study of how different domains of the world are understood by human consciousness.

Understanding is an extremely complex phenomenon, investigated across numerous disciplines. Scholars still do not have a unanimous idea on its core, nature or various forms. Its definition remains ambiguous, as the term "understanding" can refer to: the process of solving problems and recognizing problematic situations; the "moment of inner insight"; interpretation and explanation; following a given or chosen direction. From the perspective of an individual actively perceiving the surrounding world, understanding can be generally defined as a distinctive way of understanding reality on a spiritual level. Unlike knowledge, understanding is not universal and it reflects and expresses the specific features of nature and social life. As a result, understanding can be viewed as the process of perceiving the full richness of material existence with sensory experience. The process of understanding consists of several essential structural components: subject (the entity that understands), object (what is being understood) and the method of understanding (how comprehension occurs between subject and object). In the majority of languages, these elements are explicitly reflected in the semantics of verbs of understanding. The knowledge acquired by an individual through understanding is often framed linguistically as the result of prior actions, which are related to movement, interaction or spatial conditions.

As verbs of understanding play a crucial role in determining the success or failure of communication, they can be arranged in a distinct group. Because of the ambiguity of their denotative meaning, researchers are interested in these verbs particularly. Therefore, different methodological approaches are used to study them. Researchers accept contrasting perspectives, aiming to disclose the specific characteristics of verbs of understanding. The dissertation will examine different scientific perspectives on the classification and characteristics of these verbs.

As verbs of understanding are part of the lexical-semantic structure of language, their study is crucial. In this context, verbs are classified as thematic and lexical-semantic categories for further analysis.

The main provisions and materials of the first chapter are presented in the following publications author.⁹

Chapter II is titled **“The study of verbs of understanding as a lexical-semantic field”**, and its first paragraph is *“The issue of semantic fields”*.

The concept of the semantic field was presented in linguistics to systematically organize lexical structures. According to the field approach, it is possible to identify the dialectical relationships between words and the ethnic-national features of objects, events, and extralinguistic reality. The investigation of semantic fields has both theoretical and practical significance, as grammar, lexical and phonetic components complement or substitute for one another in communication, allowing linguistic structures to adapt to the natural conditions of speech communication.

There are abundant perspectives on sphere theory. On one hand, they are considered independent variations; while on the other hand, they combine ideas about the semantic relationships between words. We agree with S.V.Grinev-Grinevich, who defines a field as *“a fragment of reality that stands out in an individual's experience and functions as an independent lexical system within a language.”*¹⁰ This phenomenon represents the unity of specific knowledge in a

⁹ Əfəndiyeva, A.Ü. Anlama linqvistik hadisə kimi // – Bakı: AMEA M.Füzuli adına Əlyazmalar İnstitutu, Filologiya məsələləri, – 2020. №12, – s.111-117.; Anlama feillərinin tədqiqinə müxtəlif baxışlar // – Gəncə: Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti, Elmi Xəbərlər, Fundamental, humanitar və təbiət elmləri seriyası, – 2020. № 2, – s.271-275.; Anlamanın dilçiliyin müxtəlif sahələrində dərkisi // – Bakı: Bakı Slavyan Universiteti, Elmi əsərlər, Dil və ədəbiyyat seriyası, – 2021. №1, – s.76-80.; Anlama Linqvo-Fəlsəfi fenomen kimi // Elmi iş, beynəlxalq elmi jurnal, V Respublika elmi qaynaqlar konfransının materialları, – Bakı: – 2 noyabr, – 2021, – s.44-50.; Humanitar elmlərdə anlama // Elmi iş, beynəlxalq elmi jurnal, VIII Beynəlxalq elmi araşdırmalar konfransının materialları, – Bakı: – 26 aprel, – 2022, – s.51-53.; Semantic features of verbs of understanding in the Azerbaijan language // “The individual and education in the context of contemporary socio-cultural challenges: value-worldview dimensions and scientific-methodological aspects” proceedings of the 2nd All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference with International Participation, – Dnipro: – 28 February, – 2025, – p.82-84.

¹⁰ Гринев-Гринев, С.В. Терминоведение: учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений / С.В.Гринев-Гринев. – Москва: Академия, – 2008. – s.209

given sphere and the techniques of expressing that knowledge in language.

Based on the problem of semantic sphere study, we can conclude that the evolution of research in this direction has significantly played a part in the advancement of field theory. At each stage, scientists have strengthened their investigations and identified new components, making research in this area increasingly complex. For instance, in J.Trier's work, the structure of a field was considered as a closed system of "basic components", where meaning was taken from the whole. Later, this structure developed into a hierarchical system with additional elements. Each following researcher attempted to expand the structure of the field by incorporating new components, leading to a diversity of opinions on the structure of semantic spheres.

A lexical-semantic field includes a group of words that have a common meaning, expressed through a principal core. The lexical-semantic sphere contains units that are positioned at varying distances from the core based on their meaning (close or distant periphery). The core of the sphere consists of high-frequency, stylistically and functionally neutral units that possess a single, central meaning. The near periphery contains less frequent, unambiguous lexemes that are minimally dependent on context. The distant periphery includes low-frequency, polysemous lexemes that are highly dependent on context and possess more nuanced meanings. The outermost periphery involves lexemes that are almost never used and have highly specialized meanings. These lexemes often overlap with other lexical-semantic fields due to their archisemic characteristics (essential semantic attributes). By inspecting these features, we can establish the internal structure of the semantic field, which covers synonymy, hyponymy, incompatibility, whole-part relationships, antonymy, and conversivity – all of which form a system with specific semantic relationships.

II paragraph of the dissertation's second chapter is titled ***"The Semantic Field as a Systematic Method of Lexical Description"***. Linguists have accepted that to understand the actual world, events must be examined as part of an interconnected system. The basis of modern linguistics, set up by F. de Saussure, first established that

language is a system controlled by internal rules. At the lexical level, systematization is firstly noticed in the formation of lexical sets, which exist as integral structures within the lexical composition of a language. These sets are objectively different from other linguistic elements, and their members are connected by semantic relations that form classes, groups and series, which, in turn, make up the lexical system of a language. This system does not have strict bounding lines. It includes components that tend to transition between various groups which form a dynamic and fluid structure.

In the last century, three principal approaches to studying word semantics were found: onomasiological approach (focuses on how words are named), semasiological approach (focuses on word meanings and their changes) and semiological approach (focuses on the signs and symbols of meaning). Subsequently, a fourth approach – cognitive-pragmatic analysis – was initiated. The involvement of this approach was driven by the awareness that traditional methods were no longer enough for investigating classification of word, causing the appearance of new linguistic directions. The lexical set is examined as a semantic sphere under this approach, making it the fundamental focus of study.

The units within a lexical-semantic sphere are interconnected based on conceptual fields and form a hierarchical structure, connected by semantic networks and relationships within a wider semantic space. The modern examination of the lexical system of language leads to the structuring and categorization of lexical-semantic groups and fields, and it fills gaps between paradigms and providing a more overall linguistic model.

A semantic field represents systematicity, defined by its properties, the symbolic nature of language and the interrelations among its components. The sphere model shows the semi-systemic nature of language by depicting the interconnections among subsystems. Language functions as a dynamic system in this model, where elements and their relationships continuously develop.

Studying the stratification of vocabulary can provide insightful results from a hierarchical point of view. For example, examining military rank terminology gives valuable information about how

hierarchical structures are represented linguistically. The macro-system of the lexical-semantic field demonstrates autonomy, unity and language-specific features across different native tongues.

The following standards are considered to determine a semantic sphere: 1) broadness, semantic focus; 2) wholeness; 3) regularity; 4) mutual determination based on the proximity of each element to its neighboring element; 5) completeness; 6) derivation and the diffuseness of boundaries, and 7) fluency. The common principle of centrality and periphery must always be kept when defining semantic spheres.

The third paragraph is titled ***“The synonymic field of verbs of understanding in Azerbaijani”***. Semantics of verbs have been ones of the most challenging topics in linguistic study in several languages. Verbs represent a lexical-grammatical group, so an overall approach is important not only to understand their role in speech process, but also to study their function in a sentence structure. In linguistic investigations focusing on verbs of intellectual activity, essential aspects include: the composition and boundaries of the lexical-semantic group of verbs of understanding, the lexical semantics of their elements and their syntagmatic relationships with other verbs. The synonymic field of verbs of understanding in the Azerbaijani language covers a wide range of lexical units that express different shades of meaning related to comprehension, perception and cognition. This research systematically categorizes verbs of understanding in Azerbaijani. It examines their synonymic relationships, hierarchical structures and practical roles in different linguistic contexts.

The typological classification of meaning based on the material of one or several languages plays a significant role in the development of semantic theory. The fundamental functional types of linguistic meanings should be analyzed according to parts of speech. These types include: 1) meanings of signs-designata and signs-formats; 2) meanings of objects and attributes and 3) nominative and deictic (indicative) meanings. The nominative units of language consist of two degrees of words and their equivalents: objects (nouns) and attributes (verbs, adjectives, adverbs). Since our research focuses on predicate words, verbs constitute the main subject of investigation. The core of predicates

lies in defining the dynamic formation of objects in reality, their static features, and their relationships and evaluations.

One of the most important objective challenges in investigating verb semantics stems from the logical-objective content of predicates. The exact meaning of a verb can be defined both syntactically and lexically. Dissimilar to nouns, the conceptual basis of verbs is wider. The process of comprehension occurs through identifying an object within a perceptual sphere, differentiating the properties and features of the object, and synthesizing the identified attributes.

Verbs hold central place in Azerbaijani linguistics, because they form the core of the grammatical structure of the language. They express actions, states or processes and convey tense, modality, aspectual and manner relations. Azerbaijani verbs demonstrate an extensive system of inflection and possess various structures and functional features.

In Azerbaijani, verbs of cognition are essential in linguistic investigations, because they express cognitive processes associated with perceiving, analyzing, interpreting and indicating thoughts. These verbs are part of a lexical-semantic sphere that is closely connected to cognitive linguistics, psychology, philosophy of language and pragmatics. Cognitive verbs describe various mental processes in Azerbaijani. They include understanding, thinking, decision-making, remembering etc. These verbs are also linked to perception, development and prediction processes very much.

Verbs of understanding play a significant role in semantic cognition in every language. Azerbaijani is not an exception. They describe the process of acquiring, interpreting, and internalizing information and express cognitive operations associated with the comprehension and processing of knowledge.

The semantic categorization of verbs of understanding is based on the following criteria: 1) the way the subject receives, processes and understands information. Information can be acquired visually or through sensory perception; 2) whether the process of understanding is controlled or uncontrolled. The subject may consciously try to understand something or understanding may occur spontaneously. If

the process is uncontrolled, understanding occurs unexpectedly; 3) the outcome of the understanding process. The process may have a successful, unsuccessful or neutral outcome. A successful result means the subject reaches a desired (or undesired) conclusion; 4) the duration and speed of understanding. This criterion indicates how quickly or slowly the subject understands an object. It is often implied completely in dictionary definitions and clarified in context.

The main meanings of understanding are firstly expressed by the verbs *anlamaq* (to understand) and *başə düşmək* (to comprehend) in Azerbaijani. In almost all dictionary definitions, one of these verbs is defined through the other, and in most contexts, they can be used interchangeably. But differences appear in their non-propositional use. *Başə düşmək* is generally used to express concrete, practical comprehension, such as understanding a language or grasping abstract ideas. *Anlamaq*, on the other hand, tends to convey a deeper, global understanding of abstract concepts, such as comprehending complex phenomena. In direct object constructions, both verbs can be used with abstract nouns (e.g., differences, problems, reasons, emotions) as well as with words referring to text or speech (e.g., words, speech, meaning, symbols). Verbs of understanding play a crucial role in expressing cognitive processes in the Azerbaijani language. They are characterized by rich semantics, diverse structures and wide functionality. Their examination provides an extensive insight into the cognitive and cultural characteristics of the language, as well as its relationship with thought processes.

Verbs of understanding in English and Azerbaijani have a common conceptual category that expresses intellectual activity, although they vary in their degrees of abstraction. The following integral semantic features were identified for verbs of understanding during the study: “nature of the subject”, “nature of the object”, “type of activity”, “character of the activity”, “duration of understanding” and “intensity of understanding”. A situation of understanding always consists of two essential components: the subject of cognition, which carries out mental activity and the object of cognition, which can be situations, abstract concepts, or even the individuals themselves. Based on this, the semantic structure of verbs

of understanding is mainly determined by the integral semes (IS): "nature of the subject" and "nature of the object". The subject of understanding can be humans, animals (to a lesser extent) and inanimate objects (in metaphorical usage). IS "nature of the subject" is understood through three differential semes (DS): "animacy", "activity", and "concreteness". These features are increased by corresponding noun collocations in Azerbaijani.

Verbs of understanding are considered a separate subgroup within cognitive verbs In Azerbaijani, while verbs of perception (seeing, hearing, sensing) are arranged in groups separately. The main synonyms for *anlamaq* (to understand) are *qanmaq* (to grasp) and *başə düşmək* (to comprehend), according to the Azerbaijani synonyms dictionary. Moreover, the following verbs are also included in this semantic sphere: *baş çıxarmaq* (to figure out), *baş açmaq* (to decipher), *dərk etmək* (to comprehend deeply), *düşünmək* (to think), *qavramaq* (to grasp conceptually).¹¹

Meanings of selected verbs of understanding are the following:

Anlamaq – 1. to understand, to comprehend, to think, to realize; 2. To sense, to notice, to feel, to understand; 3. To have a particular opinion or point of view about something.¹²

Başə düşmək – to understand, to think, to grasp.¹³ *Dərk etmək* – to understand, to comprehend, to grasp with one's own thinking.¹⁴ *Qanmaq* – to understand, to comprehend.¹⁵

In the domain of understanding verbs, "to understand" forms the essence of the semantic field, while "to comprehend" and "to realize" are verbs that belong to the near periphery. Apart from these three verbs, there are other verbs that also express the meaning of understanding, such as:

¹¹ Seyidbəyli, N. Azərbaycan dilinin sinonimlər lüğəti / N.Seyidbəyli. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – 2007. – 424 s.

¹² Azərbaycan dilinin izahlı lüğəti / – c. I. – 2006. – s.119

¹³ Again there, – p. 233

¹⁴ Again there, – p. 37

¹⁵ Azərbaycan dilinin izahlı lüğəti. / – c. III. – 2006. – s.230

Baş açmaq – 1. *To understand, to comprehend, to think*,¹⁶ *baş açmamaq* – *to fail to understand, to misunderstand, to be unable to grasp*,¹⁷ *baş çıxarmaq* – *to understand, to comprehend, to grasp*.¹⁸

If we examine the meaning of the verb düşünmək (to think), its first meaning is to think or reflect about something, the second meaning is to recall, to bring to mind, and *only the third meaning is başa düşmək (to understand), anlamaq (to comprehend), dərk etmək (realize)*.¹⁹

Considering the meanings of these verbs, we can say that they can be classified as verbs belonging to the distant periphery.

The verbs of comprehending are identified by their agglutinative pronunciation, polysemy, the use of complex verbs, phraseological expressions and clarity in Azerbaijani. These characteristics reflect both the typological features of the language and the cognitive and cultural habits of its speakers. Analyzing such structures helps to better comprehend the functioning of understanding verbs and their role in the language system.

The fourth paragraph of the second chapter is named as "***The Synonymy of understanding verbs in English.***"

The examination of the semantics of verbs of understanding has been implemented in the scholarly literature based on various foundations. While the syntactic and lexical contexts of comprehending verbs have been analyzed, a complete examination of the lexical-semantic structures of these verbs has not yet been carried out, and their synonymic sequence has not been shown through the inclusion of diachrony in Germanic investigations.

In our viewpoint, the common characteristics that connects all verbs of understanding is the categorical semiotic of "performing intellectual activity."

Consequently, based on dictionaries, we can consider as the essence of understanding verbs those units where this meaning is the main one. These cover the verbs to understand, realize and

¹⁶ Azərbaycan dilinin izahlı lüğəti / – c. I. – 2006. – s.230

¹⁷ Again there, – p. 230

¹⁸ Again there, – p. 230

¹⁹ Again there, – p. 729

comprehend. Though many scholars also include the verb *to see* in this group, its original meaning is “*to become aware of somebody or something by using your eyes.*”²⁰ When it comes to the verb *to comprehend*, V.I.Stasenko shows it as peripheral, but we agree with Stasenko and would classify it in the near periphery, as its meaning is “*to completely understand something,*” and it is mainly used in negative sentences. The definition in dictionaries gives additional information: this verb in English has a formal tone and is used in negative sentences. For instance: “*He couldn’t comprehend, that how this could risk people’s lives. He could not comprehend, so he stood looking at the corpse.*”²¹ The lexical definition gives us additional information about this verb; this verb has a formal tone and it is used in negative sentences in the English language.

Let’s look at the formation of verbs of understanding. The dominant verb in this group is *to understand*, and we will begin by analyzing its historical-etymological background. At first glance, its internal form is transparent and understandable. In Indo-European languages, understanding verbs are based on suffixes and roots meaning “*to stop,*” such as German *verstehen*, Dutch *verstaan*, and Frisian *fersteaen*. It is likely that *a mechanical metaphor underlies these verbs and it indicates that the observer’s position allows them to learn about the object’s properties.*²²

The central verb of understanding is *to understand* in English.

To the near periphery belong verbs such as *to perceive*, *to comprehend* and *to realize*, while the distant periphery consists of verbs like *to see*, *to apprehend*, *to conceive*, *to catch*, *to grasp*, *to take*, etc. Verbs like *to conceive*, *to appreciate*, *to discern*, *to read*, *to penetrate*, *to catch*, *to seize* and *to sense* are rarely used, with most of them being peripheral. Both cognitive verbs (*to learn*, *to know*, *to be*

²⁰ Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English/ 7th ed. – Oxford, – 2005. – s.1373

²¹ Стаценко, В.И. Функционально-коммуникативный потенциал глаголов понимания и уточнения в русском и английском языках: прагматический аспект: / дис. на соиск. учен. степ. д-ра филол. наук./ – Краснодар, 2005. – s.311

²² Liberman, A. An analytic dictionary of English etymology: an introduction / A.Liberman. – Minneapolis, –2008. – s.210

aware) and sensory perception verbs (*to see, to conceive, to grasp*) are found in the essence of the understanding sphere in English.

In English, the structural features of verbs of understanding reflect the analytic nature of language and its focus on contextual clarification of meanings. Morphological simplicity, flexibility of grammatical forms, polysemy and the abundance of fixed expressions make these verbs universal tools for expressing cognitive processes. Because of these characteristics, verbs of understanding have an important place in the lexical system of English, and they ensure precision and richness in transfer of meaning.

*The main provisions and materials of the second chapter are presented in the following publications author.*²³

The third chapter of the dissertation is titled **"The scope of usage of understanding verbs"**. This chapter consists of three paragraphs. The first paragraph is named **"Understanding in communication theory."** There has been increasing interest in communication theory in linguistics since the late 20th century. In the current era, language is primarily seen as a means for communication. As a system of human culture language reflects other systems, and human adaptation and culture are made possible by the possession of language.

The selection of objects in texts as part of the description of the core verbs in the understanding semantic sphere is considered a criterion for their occurrence. Among the peripheral verbs such as *to*

²³ Əfəndiyeva, A.Ü. Semantik sahənin mahiyyəti məsələsi // – Gəncə: Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti, Elmi Xəbərlər, Fundamental, humanitar və təbiət elmləri seriyası seriyası, – 2021. №2, – s.243-247.; İngilis dilində anlama feillərinin məna xüsusiyyətləri // The XXI International Scientific Symposium. "Science and the culture in the Modern World" dedicated to the Day of Solidarity of World Azerbaijanis, – Stocholm: Sweden, – 26 December, – 2021, – s.133-135.; Methods of the study of verbs of understanding in Linguistics (Based on English Language Material) // – Slovak Republic: Traektoria Nauki, International Scientific Journal, – 2022. Vol 8, № 6, – p.4006-4010.; Principles of formation of lexical-semantic groups // – Украина: ВЧЕН ЗАПИСКИ, Таврийського національного Университету имени В.И.Вернадського, Серия Филология, Журналистика, – 2022, Том 33(72), № 4, – p.228-231.; Azərbaycan dilində anlama feillərinin sinonimik sahəsi // Gənc tədqiqatçıların VIII Respublika elmi konfransının materialları, – Bakı: Azərbaycan Universiteti, – 14 mart, – 2025, – s.82-84.

comprehend, to apprehend, to conceive and to perceive, they are not found in dialogic texts, with *to comprehend* being the only exception, appearing rarely.

The second paragraph of the third chapter is titled "***Semantic features of understanding verbs in English.***"

Verbs of understanding and the phraseological units and expressions formed with them are able of getting additional content and semantic meaning in communicative contexts. In general, understanding the functioning of lexical components in the speech act's communicative level makes easier communication in all languages. So it is appropriate to study verbs of understanding through concrete speech units.

Generally, we can arrange verbs in classes such as *to understand, to comprehend, to conceive, to perceive, to catch, to realize, to apprehend, to discern, to grasp, to get, to see, to know*, etc., as belonging to understanding verbs. Before proceeding with the study of their speech units, it should be said that among them, *to understand, to realize* and *to see* are more commonly used to mean "anlamaq" ("to understand") and these verbs have wide usage possibilities in the speech act. In the previous chapter, we also mentioned that in English, the verb "to understand" stands at the center of the semantic field of comprehension, forming the essence of this field. The verbs *to perceive, to comprehend* and *to realize* belong to the near periphery, while *to see, to apprehend, to conceive, to catch, to grasp, to take* etc., belong to the distant periphery. Verbs like *to conceive, to appreciate, to discern, to read, to penetrate, to catch, to seize* and *to sense* rarely have the meaning of understanding.

Three main meanings are attributed to the verb *to understand* in English: 1) interpretative meaning (perceptual, significative, acceptive): here, the stages and degrees of understanding are outlined in both semantic and pragmatic terms; 2) presuppositional-implicative and situational evaluative meaning refers to the referent orientation of understanding; 3) epistemic-pragmatic and cognitive-pragmatic meaning involves evaluating examples from science and

art, as well as practical professional activities in the context of moral and material values.²⁴

The fact that the verbs *başa düşmək* and *to understand* are used only with animate objects (in the sense of "understanding someone / understanding the situation") contrasts with all other verbs in this group, which can only have inanimate (passive and abstract) objects. This is because understanding, in this context, involves perceiving or grasping something. Animals are seldom used as subjects of comprehension too (which is connected to the fact that humans perceive animals as thinking beings). Verbs of understanding demonstrate the mental action directed toward the object, so obligatory seme in their semantic structure is the "nature of the object" seme. The semantic characteristics of the given verbs are grammatically supported – almost all verbs of understanding are transitive. IS "nature of object" is represented by DS: "aliveness/inanimateness," "activity/passivity" and "concreteness/abstractness." Among all the verbs, only *anlamaq* and *to understand* can apply to both animate and inanimate objects. Nobody understands him – animate object; I understood that I might now take my leave – inanimate object. Actual material shows that in the verbs "*anlamaq*" and "*to understand*," the object can be active and passive, concrete and abstract.

Like in the Azerbaijani language, in English, the semantic structure of verbs of understanding can include both DS "shortness" and DS "duration." Let's provide an example where the mentioned IS is realized in DS "shortness" through contextual clarification: She seemed suddenly to realize his unhappiness. "O, birdən öz bədbəxtliyini anladı."

Verbs of understanding do not initially differ based on temporal duration in English, but this point is often determined by contextual indications. For instance: She seemed suddenly to realize his unhappiness – here the process of understanding is immediate. However, in some contexts, the gradual or prolonged nature of the process is clearly expressed, as in: They began to understand.

²⁴ Лазарис, Т.Н. Семантико-синтаксические свойства глаголов со значением понимания // Семантика и функционирование английского глагола. – Горький: Горьковский гос. пед. институт им. М.Горького, –1985. – с.146

Therefore, in English, understanding verbs primarily do not distinguish based on “temporal duration”, and this aspect is typically dependent on contextual determiners. In consequence, the semantic structure of verbs of understanding has revealed some distinctive characteristics of representing the subject and object in both Azerbaijani and English, including the method by which the process of understanding is implemented.

Regarding the process of cognition as conscious human activity we consider all verbs in this lexical-semantic group result in outcomes. This is because the process of understanding involves not only thinking, acquiring knowledge or information, but also its perception, assimilation and processing. The "result" aspect of these verbs is more productive in comparison with cognitive verbs like "to think" and "to understand"

Many verbs of comprehension express actions or processes that are controlled by the subject and dependent on their will, and they are often used with modal verbs like "can" and "might."

The third paragraph of Chapter III is named as "***Semantic characteristics of understanding verbs in Azerbaijani.***" The verb system in Azerbaijani is noticeable for its originality and national identity in comparison with other parts of speech. These lexical units, which play a crucial role in reflecting human thought in language, have the potential to function in completely different shades depending on the situation in which the speech act is carried out.

The process of understanding consists of several sequential algorithms and it can happen both unidirectionally and bidirectionally. So, the listener not only receives and processes the information, but also has the potential to influence the understanding of the speaker, and the result of it becomes the indicator of completeness of the cycle of the understanding process.

According to the "Azerbaijani synonyms dictionary," synonyms for the verb "anlamaq" (to understand) include: "qanmaq" (to comprehend), "başə düşmək" (to understand), "baş açmaq" (to figure out), "başə çıxarmaq" (to unravel), "düşünmək" (to think), "başə tapmaq" (to solve), "dərk etmək" (to realize), "qavramaq" (to

grasp).²⁵ Synonyms for the verb "anlatmaq" (to tell) include: "aydınlaşdırmaq" (to enlighten), "başa salmaq" (to clarify), "izah etmək" (to explain), "qandırmaq" (to convince).²⁶ Among these, the verb "izah etmək" (to explain) occupies a transitional position between speech verbs and cognitive verbs.

This assertion would not be mistaken, as, depending on the context, this verb sometimes functions as a speech verb in the sense of "bəyan etmək" (to declare). In most speech situations, it functions as the understanding verb referring to the detailed presentation of information in order to make the presented material more easily comprehensible.

It is no coincidence that in the Azerbaijani explanatory dictionary, the meanings of this verb are "*anlatmaq (to explain), şərh etmək (to comment), açmaq (to clarify), bəyan etmək (to declare)*".²⁷ Examples of its usage in the context of understanding are as follows: "*I didn't kill the bear, mother, the lion has confused me with someone else. I will go and explain.*"²⁸

The verb "to explain" functions as "to illuminate" or "to clarify" in both examples.

It would also be beneficial to include the verb "idrak etmək" (to comprehend) as part of the understanding verbs group. Although not commonly used in modern Azerbaijani, this verb appears frequently in the works of classical writers, with meanings such as "anlamq" (to understand) or "dərək etmək" (to perceive): "*Comprehending every dream; Purifying the mirror of the soul (Əmani); I did not comprehend what is the wisdom of being born...*" (M.Hadi).

While discussing the lexical scope of understanding verbs, we would like to note that these verbs are equivalent, meaning their semantic structure requires the presence of a subject and object of understanding, which includes the verb "anlamaq" (to understand). The main characteristics of the semantics of understanding verbs are

²⁵ Seyidbəyli, N. Azərbaycan dilinin sinonimlər lüğəti / N.Seyidbəyli. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – 2007. – s.24-25

²⁶ Again there, – p. 25

²⁷ Azərbaycan dilinin izahlı lüğəti. – II c. –2006. – s.617

²⁸ Kərim, Ə. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [II cild]. (Nəsr əsərləri) / Ə.Kərim. – Bakı: Elm və təhsil, – 2012. – s.19

following: 1. Type of the subject: the subject carrying out the process of understanding can be a human (e.g., *Mən də daha Cırdanla zarafat etməyin necə təhlükəli bir iş olduğunu anladım (I realized how dangerous it was to joke with Dwarf)*)²⁹, another living species (e.g., *At da sahibinin fikrini başa düşmüş kimi tələsir, az qala qanadlanıb uçurdu (The horse hurried as if it had understood its owner's intention, it was almost ready to fly)*)³⁰, an abstract concept (e.g., *Hisslər sözləri dərk eləmir (Feelings do not understand words)*)³¹, body parts (e.g., *Qəlbim məni başa düşmədiyi halda (When my heart didn't understand me)*)³², natural events (e.g., *Planetimiz də bizi anlamağa başlayar (Our planet may understand us)*)³³, technical devices (e.g., *Axtarış sistemləri onlara verilən bütün sualları anlayaraq kontentə uyğun nəticəni təqdim edir (Search systems understand all the questions posed to them and provide content-relevant results)*)³⁴, and so on; 2. Type of the object of understanding: the object can be feelings and emotions (e.g., *İndi Fındıqburunun məqsədini başa düşüb dedi (So he understood the purpose of the Walnutberry and said)*)³⁵, events and entities (e.g., *Deməli, sözün təhlili və anlamını başa düşmək daha əhəmiyyətlidir (Thus, analyzing and understanding the meaning of words is more important)*)³⁶, humans and other creatures (e.g., *Mən səni anlayıram (I understand you)*).³⁷

²⁹ Kərim, Ə. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [II cild]. (Nəsr əsərləri) / Ə.Kərim. – Bakı: Elm və təhsil, – 2012. – s.23

³⁰ Şıxlı, İ. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [2 cildə] / Şıxlı İ. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – c. 2. – 2005. – s.23

³¹ Anar. Seçilmiş əsərləri / Anar. – Bakı: Lider, – 2004. – s.67

³² Xəlil, Z. Seçilmiş əsərləri: Uşaqlar üçün nağıl-povestlər / Z.Xəlil. – III c. – s.129

³³ Again there, – p. 89

³⁴ Paşayeva, N. İdrakın ilhamı mənəvi impulslardan güc alır // Elm. – 2019, 19 aprel. – s.3.

³⁵ Xəlil, Z. Seçilmiş əsərləri: Uşaqlar üçün nağıl-povestlər / Z.Xəlil. – III c. – s.92

³⁶ Seyidbəyli, N. Azərbaycan dilinin sinonimlər lüğəti / N.Seyidbəyli. – Bakı: Şərq-Qərb, – 2007. – s.42

³⁷ Kərim, Ə. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [II cild]. (Nəsr əsərləri) / Ə.Kərim. – Bakı: Elm və təhsil, – 2012. – s.129

In the example "*Mən də daha Cırtdanla zərəfat etməyin necə təhlükəli bir iş olduğunu anladım*" (*I realized how dangerous it was to joke with Dwarf*),³⁸ it appears that the subject of the verb "anlamaq" (to understand) is a specific person. This verb refers to the person's knowledge about the behavior and values of other people, which indicates the epistemic-pragmatic content of the verb.

By looking at these examples we can observe another expression of epistemic-pragmatic indicators in the meaning of the verb "to understand." The evaluation of human behavior is implied too here: where and how one should behave, the adherence to certain behavioral rules, or the ability to control or manage emotions in different situations. From this point of view, it is obvious that the meaning of understanding the words and signs used by the interlocutor is expressed, which corresponds to a significant meaning.

Subject-object and quantity-quality characteristics of understanding verbs were revealed during the study. When the subject-object parameters of verbs in both Azerbaijani and English are presented without interruption and in the same type (the subject and object of the action are either active, concrete and living, or passive, abstract and inanimate), then the quantity-quality features of understanding (the method and character of the action, its intensity and duration) depend on the context and are connected to the use of the verbs in specific situations. Besides, these features are to some extent chosen conditionally, which is explained by the characteristics of the understanding verbs – they convey a process that virtually has no external manifestation and occurs only in human consciousness.

Most of the understanding verbs that form a special subgroup of cognitive verbs are affective in Azerbaijani. The object of the action, event or process expressed by these verbs, or its understanding in the context, must be regarded as an obligatory feature.

³⁸ Kərim, Ə. Seçilmiş əsərləri: [II cild]. (Nəsr əsərləri) / Ə.Kərim. – Bakı: Elm və təhsil, – 2012. – s. 262

*The main provisions and materials of the third chapter are presented in the following publications author.*³⁹

In the **conclusion** of the dissertation work, based on the materials of both English and Azerbaijani languages, the following results were drawn about the structural-semantic features of understanding verbs:

1. Understanding verbs in both English and Azerbaijani form an independent lexical-semantic field that unites cognitive-oriented units. These verbs express the process of cognition, interpretation, and comprehension of information, which plays an essential role in communicative activity.

2. The analysis revealed that English has broader synonym variability for understanding verbs, whereas Azerbaijani language uses more syntactic compactness in expressing meanings. This is related to the grammatical differences between the languages.

3. Similarities between English and Azerbaijani languages are found in the existence of universal semantic components (such as understanding, awareness, interpretation), while differences lie in how the depth and nuances of understanding are expressed. In English, analytic constructions are common, while in Azerbaijani, affixation and lexical-grammatical transformations prevail.

4. Cultural and linguistic differences significantly impact the semantic and functional characteristics of understanding verbs. For example, in English, more focus is placed on the process of understanding and interpretation, while in Azerbaijani, more attention is given to the result and context of understanding.

³⁹ Əfəndiyeva, A.Ü. Ünsiyyət nəzəriyyəsində meta-kommunikasiya termininin şərhli // – Naxçıvan: Naxçıvan Universiteti, Elmi əsərlər (iqtisadiyyat, filologiya, tarix, coğrafiya, pedaqogika və pixologiya, riyaziyyat) – 2021. №22, – s.95-100.; Azərbaycan dilində anlama feillərinin semantik xüsusiyyətləri // Ümummilli lider Heydər Əliyevin anadan olmasının 102-ci ildönümünə həsr olunmuş “Gənc dilçi doktorant və dissertantların sələflər və xələflər” Respublika elmi konfransının materialları, – Bakı: AMEA Nəsimi adına Dilçilik İnstitutu, – 2025, – s.14-16.; Frazеолоји бirləşmələrin tərkibində anlama feillərinin struktur-semantik xüsusiyyətləri // “Elmi inkişaf: uğurlar və çağırışlar” Gənc tədqiqatçıların II Respublika elmi konfransının materialları, – Naxçıvan: Naxçıvan Dövlət Universiteti, – 03-04 aprel, – 2025, – I c., – s.495-499.

5. The semantic field method was effective in the systematic analysis of understanding verbs. It allows not only determining the structural and semantic relationships within the field but also understanding its interaction with other lexical groups, thus broadening the perspectives for future research in comparative linguistics.

6. Understanding verbs in both English and Azerbaijani form the broadest lexical-semantic group among cognitive verbs and are distinguished from other verb groups by the breadth of their periphery.

7. The following semantic features are present in understanding verbs in both English and Azerbaijani: the time spent on understanding, the display of certain cognitive potential during understanding, the superficial or deep nature of understanding, and the characterization of understanding as merely acquiring new information.

8. Understanding verbs in both languages can be grouped into two semantic categories: the speed of understanding and the quality of understanding.

9. In comparison, the following similarities are observed in both languages:

- General semantic field. Verbs of understanding express the processes of cognitive perception, interpretation and comprehension of information in both languages. For instance, "to understand" in English and "başə düşmək" in Azerbaijani express the same general concept of understanding.

- Uncertainty. Verbs of understanding often have multiple meanings that are clarified through context in both languages. For example, to realize can mean both "anlamaq" (to understand) and "başə düşmək" (to comprehend), while anlamaq can mean "anlamaq" (to understand) or "başə düşmək" (to comprehend).

- Synonymic chains. Both languages have a series of synonyms that differ in terms of degree, depth or method of understanding. For instance, in English: to understand, to comprehend, to realize, to grasp, in Azerbaijani: anlamaq, başə düşmək, dərk etmək.

Differences:

- Typological features of the language. Since English is an analytic language, the meaning of verbs is often expressed through

additional words or constructions. Azerbaijani, being an agglutinative language, conveys meanings through affixation or root modifications.

–Lexical richness. English offers a wider range of verbs to describe different aspects of understanding (e.g., understand, comprehend, perceive), while Azerbaijani has fewer lexical items but these can be more flexible due to affixation.

–Formation of meanings through context. Verbs are often used in fixed combinations to clarify meaning in Azerbaijani, so context plays a large role (e.g., *başə düşmək məsələsi* – "the matter of understanding"). In English, meaning is often embedded directly within the verb itself.

–Depth of synonymic combinations. Synonym chains tend to be more distinct and have clearer functional differences in English (e.g., realize – sudden awareness, grasp – deep understanding). Such differences are less pronounced and are often context-dependent in Azerbaijani.

10. Compared to English, Azerbaijani has more verbs of understanding, which further proves the richness of the Azerbaijani language. In many cases, verbs that belong to the core of action, speech, and other semantic fields can enter the understanding semantic block due to their lexical-semantic variants, and these verbs have special dynamism in the speech process.

11. The study of the direct nominative markers of the main understanding verbs shows that these verbs have presuppositional and implicative functions. They rarely perform a perceptive function. On the other hand, in dialogue texts, understanding verbs often appear when confirming information and facts.

12. A comparison of understanding verbs in Azerbaijani and English leads to the conclusion that the primary practical meanings of these verbs overlap in both languages (even when they carry implicative meanings).

The main content of the dissertation is reflected in the following published scientific works of the the author:

1. Anlama linqvistik hadisə kimi // – Bakı: AMEA M.Füzuli adına Əlyazmalar İnstitutu, Filologiya məsələləri, – 2020. №12, – s.111-117.
2. Anlama feillərinin tədqiqinə müxtəlif baxışlar // – Gəncə: Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti, Elmi Xəbərlər, Fundamental, humanitar və təbiət elmləri seriyası, – 2020. № 2, – s.271-275.
3. Anlamanın dilçiliyin müxtəlif sahələrində dərkli // – Bakı: Bakı Slavyan Universiteti, Elmi əsərlər, Dil və ədəbiyyat seriyası, – 2021. №1, – s.76-80.
4. Ünsiyyət nəzəriyyəsinə meta-kommunikasiya termininin şərhli // – Naxçıvan: Naxçıvan Universiteti, Elmi əsərlər (iqtisadiyyat, filologiya, tarix, coğrafiya, pedaqogika və psixologiya, riyaziyyat) – 2021. №22, – s.95-100.
5. Semantik sahənin mahiyyəti məsələsi // – Gəncə: Gəncə Dövlət Universiteti, Elmi Xəbərlər, Fundamental, humanitar və təbiət elmləri seriyası seriyası, – 2021. №2, – s.243-247.
6. Anlama Linqvo-Fəlsəfi fenomen kimi // Elmi iş, beynəlxalq elmi jurnal, V Respublika elmi qaynaqlar konfransının materialları, – Bakı: – 2 noyabr, – 2021, – s.44-50.
7. İngilis dilində anlama feillərinin məna xüsusiyyətləri // The XXI International Scientific Symposium. “Science and the culture in the Modern World” dedicated to the Day of Solidarity of World Azerbaijanis, – Stocholm: Sweden, – 26 December, – 2021, – s.133-135.
8. Methods of the study of verbs of understanding in Linguistics (Based on English Language Material) // – Slovak Republic: Traektoria Nauki, International Scientific Journal, – 2022. Vol 8, № 6, – p.4006-4010.
9. Principles of formation of lexical-semantic groups // – Украина: ВЧЕН ЗАПИСКИ, Таврийського національного Университету имени В.И.Вернадського, Серия Филология, Журналистика, – 2022, Том 33(72), № 4, – p.228-231.
10. Humanitar elmlərdə anlama // Elmi iş, beynəlxalq elmi jurnal, VIII Beynəlxalq elmi araşdırmalar konfransının materialları,

– Bakı: – 26 aprel, – 2022, – s.51-53.

11. Azərbaycan dilində anlama feillərinin semantik xüsusiyyətləri // Ümummilli lider Heydər Əliyevin anadan olmasının 102-ci ildönümünə həsr olunmuş “Gənc dilçi doktorant və dissertantların sələflər və xələflər” Respublika elmi konfransının materialları, – Bakı: AMEA Nəsimi adına Dilçilik İnstitutu, – 2025, – s.14-16.
12. Semantic features of verbs of understanding in the Azerbaijan language // “The individual and education in the context of contemporary socio-cultural challenges: value-worldview dimensions and scientific-methodological aspects” proceedings of the 2nd All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference with International Participation, – Dnipro: – 28 February, – 2025, – p.82-84.
13. Azərbaycan dilində anlama feillərinin sinonimik sahəsi // Gənc tədqiqatçıların VIII Respublika elmi konfransının materialları, – Bakı: Azərbaycan Universiteti, – 14 mart, – 2025, – s.82-84.
14. Frazеолоји бirləşmələrin tərkibində anlama feillərinin struktur-semantik xüsusiyyətləri // “Elmi inkişaf: uğurlar və çağırışlar” Gənc tədqiqatçıların II Respublika elmi konfransının materialları, – Naxçıvan: Naxçıvan Dövlət Universiteti, – 03-04 aprel, – 2025, – I c., – s.495-499.



The defence will be held on 23 October 2026 at 16:20 at the meeting of the Dissertation council FD 2.13 of Supreme Attestation Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at Baku Slavic University

Address: AZ 1014, Baku, Suleyman Rustam Street, 33.

Dissertation is available at the Baku Slavic University Library.

Electronic version of the abstract is available on the official website of the Baku Slavic University.

Abstract was sent to the required addresses on 27 July 2026.

Signed for print: 29.06.2026

Paper format: A5

Volume: 47563 characters

Number of hard copies: 20