

Classification of Types of Lexical-Semantic Relationships Approaching to Cell

Son of Musurmongulov Adham Abdurashid

*Teacher of the Department of Uzbek Language and Literature of Termiz State Pedagogical Institute
adhammusurmonqulov76@gmail.com*

Abstract. *In this article, the semantic relations between words within the framework of Uzbek linguistics, including nesting, are discussed in detail. Also, scientific-theoretical views about similar and different aspects of nesting with other lexical-semantic types are stated.*

Key words: *Nesting, lexical-semantic relation, paradigm, synonymic (semantic relation), hyper-hyponymic (body-species), holo-meronymic (whole-piece), graduonymic (lexical ranking), funconymic (functionality) relations.*

Introduction

Humanity has the ability to feel all the things and events in existence with the help of its sense organs and to be able to perceive all the concepts through the mind, to think by grouping them into thematic groups. Due to the existence of mental capacity, it is superior to other creatures in the universe and has the ability to subjugate them to its will.

The macrofield “Man and the Universe” can be divided into the following four parts:

- I. “Semantic field related to the personality (external aspect) of a person.
- II. Semantic field of lexemes representing the spiritual world (inner aspect) of a person.
- III. Semantic field of lexemes representing the relationship of a person to other people (social relations).
- IV. Semantic field of lexemes representing a set of social structures (relations).”¹ In all these classifications, it is assumed that the person takes the central place. In the thinking of a linguistic person who owns a language, the world and the events related to it have always been side by side and have been decided on the basis of interpersonal communication.

Relationships mean interrelationships and connections between components of a whole. Such connections can be different. “Looking at the form, meaning or function of language units, several types of relations and connections between them can be indicated. Similarities and differences are the main manifestations of such relationships.”² For example, there are semes that combine wolf and sheep lexemes from animal species. These are: an animal is determined to be hoofed, to belong to the horse family, to be of the same species, as a specific horse. While the common animal is united in the semantic sense, we divide these animals according to their relationship with humans, that is, they are divided into wild and domestic animals. The wolf lexeme has a syntagmatic connection with words

¹ Sobirov A. Researching the lexical level of the Uzbek language based on the principle of the system of systems. - Tashkent: Ma'naviyat, 2004. - b-102.

² Nematov H., Rasulov R. Basics of system lexicology of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Teacher. 1995. – B. 13.

such as hunting, hunter, forest, izgimaq, ulimaq, bloodthirsty, and the sheep lexeme with lexical units such as maramak, shepherd, kora, lamb, lamb, poda, meadow. The connection system of lexemes is not determined by themselves, but by their connection and relationship with other language units. This shows that two lexical units have a conflict in terms of meaning. The conflict in the content nest is similar in this aspect to the graded units within the semantic relations of words. For example, young and old contradict each other in the gradational units of young, teenager, young man, middle age, and old. That is, the beginning and the end of the grading point are sometimes observed to contradict each other.

Methodology

According to scientists such as H. Nematov and R. Rasulov, there are three types of relations between language units:

1. Similarity (paradigmatic) relations.
2. Hierarchical relations.
3. Neighborhood (syntagmatic) relations.³ In forming a semantic nest, mainly, paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations are important.

The word paradigm is derived from the Greek words sample, example, and is used in the sense of a set of elements of a language system.⁴ Or, a series of similarities in a language is called a paradigm.⁵ The term paradigm is used interchangeably with system in the language. Also used to refer to relationships based on similarity.

“Prof. Nurmonov A. Relations between lexical units a) relations of units belonging to the same level; b) dividing it into two in the form of the relationship of units belonging to different levels, includes the paradigmatic relationship in the first type and also calls it the relationship of nesting by the second name.”⁶ At this point, it is necessary to note that Professor Nurmonov A. correctly cited paradigmatic relations as nesting relations.

“The uniting of language units belonging to the same level and of the same value into one group (nest) based on a certain common sign is called a nested relationship.”⁷ The nesting relation is a common relation at lexical levels. In particular, the meaning and sometimes the form of lexemes is an important sign for uniting. The general meaning that serves to unite lexemes within one cell should be relevant for all the units belonging to this cell. For example, in the lexemes of horse, sheep, cow, goat, dog, and cat, the general theme of animal is repeated, and for the lexemes of sparrow, quail, dove, crow, maina, sa'va, bird serves as the general theme. Each cell is a system. Based on the general meaning, the nesting series can be divided into small nests (paradigms). For example, units such as student, reader, teacher, professor, researcher, book, pen, notebook, eraser, desk, lecture, book, pencil, exercise, blackboard, chalk, room are grouped into one common theme based on the reading slot. If we analyze the book lexeme from the given examples, it is possible to create a sub-system within the system by classifying it in the internal framework and by gathering such things as an art book, a scientific textbook, a monograph, a collection of articles, a table of contents, a section, a chapter, a page, a foreword, an author, etc. under the general theme of a book.

Results and discussion

Common types of relations between members of a paradigm in the semantic field can be divided into the following.

1. Synonymous relationship.

³ Nematov H., Rasulov R. Basics of system lexicology of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Teacher. 1995. – B. 14-15.

⁴ Fomina M.I. Vocabulary of the modern Russian language. – M.: Higher school. 1973. – P. 31.

⁵ Nematov H., Rasulov R. Basics of system lexicology of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Teacher. 1995. – B. 15.

⁶ Sobirov A. Researching the lexical level of the Uzbek language based on the principle of the system of systems. - Tashkent: Spirituality, 2004. -p-129.

⁷ Nurmonov A., Shahobiddinova Sh., Iskandarova Sh., Nabieva D. Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Generation of the new century. 2001. -B. 9.

2. Hyper-hyponymic (body-species) relationship.
3. Holo-meronymic (whole-piece) relationship.
4. graduonymic (lexical grading) relationship.
5. Functional relationship.

6. Conflict attitude.⁸ Each of the above-mentioned types of semantic relationship between words forms meaningful nests within its scope. Scientific classification in linguistics requires studying their relationship to each other. These types of relations are the part of lexicology that needs to be studied and perfectly classified. "The connection of a series of words with different forms and the same content on the basis of a certain similarity, the differences between these units, their nature and the reasons for their appearance have found their solution in special scientific works, dozens of manuals and textbooks."⁹ Among the types of inter-word semantic relations, the synonymy series has been scientifically proven to be more widely studied than other types. The units in the synonymous series are closer to the graduonymic units. The reason is that the units in this row have increasing meaning in terms of positive or negative color. For example, there is also grading in the synonymous line of lexemes clean - tidy - clean.

Hyper-hyponyms are one of the types of relations that encompass a wide range of paradigms. In 1968, the English linguist Lyons introduced the words hyponymy, hyperonym, and hyponym into linguistics as terms expressing the gender-species relationship. Lyons gave detailed information about hyponymy in his book "Semantics", published in London in 1977.¹⁰ In Uzbek linguistics, scholar Safarova R. has done significant work on this phenomenon. The aspect of nesting is based on the grouping of the constituent parts of hyponymy into nests, nests into groups, groups into large groups, and the gender-species relationship is determined. The phenomena of hyponymy and nesting are inextricably linked in terms of generality and specificity. For example, the hyponyms of a poem, a feuilleton, an essay, a novella, a short story, a story, a novel are grouped together as a nesting relation to the hyperonym of prose. In this respect, the two types of relationships are very close to each other. In the units in the above hyponymic relation, there is mutual quantity and volume grading. From this point of view, hypo-hyperonymic attitude differs from nesting. In fact, gradation is observed in some places in all types of semantic relations between words. We cannot deny this legitimacy. The hyper-hyponymic relationship plays an important role in the formation of a semantic nest and requires more extensive research.

Conclusion

Another related phenomenon is paronymy or holo-meronymic relationship. In particular, the Russian scientist M. V. Nikitin proposes to call the concept of "whole" as holonim (from the Greek word holos - whole) and "part" as meronym (from the Greek word ter part) or partonim (from the Greek partos - part, part).¹¹ All objects and tools in existence are composed of wholes. This whole-part relationship is certainly reflected in our lexicon and should be studied. The paronymic relationship is similar to the above hyponymic relationship. If the hyponyms in the hyperonym are opposed to each other, the members of the paronymic part, combined, form the sum of the whole. For example, if we consider the word coat as a whole, its parts such as collar, sleeve, pocket, button, fur are the parts that make up the whole.

List of used literature:

1. Fomina M. I. Lexicon of the modern Russian language. - M.: Vysshaya shkola. 1973.
2. Sobirov A. Researching the lexical level of the Uzbek language based on the principle of the system of systems. - Tashkent: Spirituality, 2004.

⁸ Sobirov A. Researching the lexical level of the Uzbek language based on the principle of the system of systems. - Tashkent: Spirituality, 2004. -p-130.

⁹ Nematov H., Rasulov R. Basics of system lexicology of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Teacher. 1995. – B. 105.

¹⁰ See about it: Novikov L. A. Semantics of the Russian language. – M.: Higher school. 1982. – P. 241-242.

¹¹ Nikitin N.V. Fundamentals of the linguistic theory of meaning. – M.: Higher school. 1988. –S. 88.

3. Nematov H., Rasulov R. Basics of system lexicology of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Teacher. 1995.
4. Nikitin N. V. Meaning of basic linguistic theory. - M.: Vysshaya shkola. 1988
5. Novikov L. A. Semantics of the Russian language. – M.: Higher school. 1982
6. Nurmonov A., Shahobiddinova Sh., Iskandarova Sh., Nabieva D. Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Generation of the new century. 2001.