

SEMANTIC ORGANIZATION OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH ANTONYMIC PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Toshtemirov Elyor Nuraliyevich

Senior Teacher, Andijan State University, Uzbekistan

email: elyor75@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

The article contains the semantic ordering of Uzbek and English antonymic phraseological units based on the information given by the modern linguistic treatises concerning the problems of lexical and phraseological antonymy. The combined semantic and grammatical approach to the interpretation of phraseological meaning is taken into account by the developers of this semantic organization.

Keywords: antonymic paradigm, antonymy criteria, semantic structure of a phraseological unit, antonymic phraseological units, antonymic features of phraseological units.

INTRODUCTION

The increased interest in the study of systemic relations in the field of phraseology, in particular, in the problems of phraseological antonyms, is a characteristic feature of modern studies of the semantics of nominative units.

Initially, antonymy in linguistics was considered only on the basis of lexical material, although it was noted that this phenomenon also covers the phraseological composition of the language. The essence of antonymy as a linguistic phenomenon is that it is a way of lexical expression of the category of opposition in the language, based on the semantic opposition of nominative units. But, adhering to the authoritative opinion of most researchers of the antonymic paradigm, we note that the logical model of opposition, built “on opposite specific concepts, representing the limit of the manifestation of the quality (property) determined by the generic concept” [12, 35], is a necessary but not sufficient condition of antonyms in language. Only taking into account the nature and features of the semantics of linguistic units makes it possible to distinguish antonyms from other oppositions of nominative units that do not form antonyms. It is known that the semantic structure of language units is a strictly ordered hierarchical structure of semes - the smallest components of the meaning of language units. Semantically, antonyms are structurally homogeneous units of the language, different paradigmatically based on only one differential feature.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This feature is pointed out by many researchers. [6], [7], [10] So, R. Sirbu writes: “in the semantic structure of the members of an antonymic pair, there are two types of semantic components: common semes for both members of the antonymic paradigm and incompatible counter-semes that mutually exclude and mutually presuppose each other. Common semes determine the connection of antonyms into one paradigm (pair), and counter-semes determine the presence of a diametrical opposite. [5, 37] Based on this, we believe that the first criterion of antonymy is the homogeneity of the semantic structure of nominative units in the presence

of opposite components in the composition of their meanings, giving reason to oppose data units to each other.

As the second criterion, we have identified the presence of the ultimate negation in the semantic structure of the compared nominative units, which determines the ability of antonyms to express the true opposite, in contrast to contradictory (contradictory) concepts.

So, the antonymic paradigm, built on the opposition of correlative concepts, is a union of nominative language units with opposite meanings, the semantic correlation of which is based on a common integral feature (or features) and a differential feature (or features) that carries the ultimate opposition of meanings.

In his speech practice, a person often opposes the meaning of one language unit to the value of another, however, speaking abstractly theoretically, one can oppose the meanings of any pair of words or phraseological units to each other. But in the language there are such nominative units that are perceived by human consciousness as constantly opposed to each other in meaning. Such a perception is a reflection of the real features of the values of such units. This feature lies in the fact that the mutual opposition (or, in other words, mutual negation) of the meanings of these words and phraseological units has a formal linguistic expression and is assigned to the meaning of a linguistic unit as part of its own denotative meaning. Thus, opposition turns into a linguistic phenomenon - antonymy, and only those nominative units whose meanings are antonymous form a special group in the language called antonyms.

The phraseological composition of any language largely repeats those systemic relations that exist between lexical units. Semantic oppositions, in particular, antonymic oppositions, occupy an important place in the system of paradigmatic relations.

As the results of the research show, "the volume of phraseological antonymy is certainly less compared to lexical". [5, 194] But this fact does not yet indicate that phraseological antonymy is less developed than the antonymy of lexical units. "The development of antonyms in phraseology cannot differ significantly from the development of antonyms in vocabulary," says E.N. Miller. - "With a relatively equal rate of development, phraseological antonymy objectively and should be smaller in volume, since the volume of vocabulary (the basis for the formation of lexical antonymy) is many times greater than the volume of phraseology (the basis for the formation of phraseological antonymy)." Focusing on the consideration of the problems of phraseological antonymy, we emphasize that scientists turned to a more detailed study of these issues during the last decades of the twentieth century, and at the moment there are many works in Uzbek linguistics that examine the essence of this phenomenon, give definitions of phraseological units -antonyms, their classification is carried out.

RESULTS

In the scientific works that exist at this stage in the development of linguistics, there is no general definition of the term "phraseological antonym", but the vast majority of its definitions are largely similar. For the most part, researchers agree with each other that phraseological antonyms have the opposite meaning, "the same lexical and grammatical characteristic", "are regularly opposed in their denotative correlation", since they are "associated in our minds as mutually exclusive", characterizing "phenomena or objects of objective reality from different, but common sides". In general, we share this position, but we want to note that, being entirely

based on data from linguistic studies on lexical antonymy, it does not reflect the specifics of phraseological antonyms.

Drawing a parallel between lexical and phraseological antonymy, one should not, however, forget that any phraseological unit has a certain property that qualitatively distinguishes it from a word: it always represents a syntactic construction - a model of a phrase, sentence, or combination of words. In view of the separate form, phraseological units behave in a peculiar way during antonymization. From the point of view of syntactic organization, phraseological antonyms can be monostructured and multi-structured.

The antonymy of monostructural phraseological units is usually based on the semantic opposition of the components of a phraseological unit, which, as a rule, have a partially coinciding component composition and the same syntactic model: *birinchi navbatda* – *so'nggi navbatda*, *kunu-tun* – *na kun na tun*, *o'z o'rniga* – *o'z o'rnidan tashqariga*, in hot blood ('qizig'ida') - in cold blood ('sovuqqonlik bilan'), in a good / happy hour ('rosa vaqtida') – in an ill / evil hour ('vaqtdan tashqarida') and etc.

Multi-structural (diversely structured) phraseological antonyms have a non-matching component composition and excellent syntactic models: *burnining tagida* – *dunyoning narigi burchagida*, *ko'ngli hotirjam* – *yuragi g'ash*, *qo'l yetmas joyda* – *burni tagida*; beyond praise ('juda yaxshi') – in a tin-pot way ('juda yomon'), to one's teeth ('ochqchasiga') – when smb.'s back is turned ('yashirin', 'sirli ravishda'), etc.

DISCUSSION

Summarizing all of the above and proceeding to the description of the actual semantic organization of phraseological units-antonyms in Uzbek and English, we will offer our own definition of phraseological antonyms:

these, in our opinion, are at least two comparable nominative, separately-shaped, monostructural and multi-structural units that characterize objects or phenomena of objective reality from different, but common sides, which determines in the semantic structure of their associative contrasted meanings the presence of a common categorical meaning, a single semantic (logical) basis and polar individual sem. Antonymy is included in the meaning of a phraseological unit along with its substantive component and is reproduced when this phraseological unit is used under certain conditions. In its position in the semantic structure, the antonymic characteristic of the meaning is similar to its stylistic characteristic, which is always reproduced together with the subject-logical meaning of the nominative unit. The signs of antonymy of phraseological units, from our point of view, include:

- 1)Correlation of phraseological units-antonyms with one type of categorical meaning;
- 2)Belonging to one semantic-grammatical class;
- 3)The obligatory presence in the semantic structure of antonymous phraseological units of incompatible contra semes, which mutually exclude and mutually presuppose each other, with the general semantic content of the opposed units;
- 4)Identical syntactic and lexical-semantic compatibility of phraseological units-antonyms;
- 5)(Sometimes) the presence of phraseological synonyms, to the meaning of antonymous phraseological units, which, in turn, will also be antonyms.

In the field of phraseology, antonymy as a whole is represented insignificantly, and unevenly by class. Antonymic relations are more characteristic of qualitative and circumstantial, procedural, to a lesser extent - quantitative and attributive phraseological units, and to a small extent - objective and auxiliary.

We include phraseological units that are the designation of a sign or circumstance of an action, as well as the degree of manifestation of an action or a sign of an object, to the qualitative-circumstantial class.

Examples of such phraseological units in the Uzbek language are units of the type: ‘gapni cho’zmasdan’ – immediately, without wasting time talking, ‘nima bo’lsa, bo’lsin – ‘thoughtlessly, naridan beri, apil tapil – ‘1) quickly, without spending a lot of time; 2) hastily, somehow’, betiga aytmoq - ‘to say openly, directly’, ‘hech narsasiz, osongina’ - ‘independently, without auxiliary means’, ingliz tilida: fair and square - ‘chin dildan, samimiy’, by leaps and bounds - ‘tezlik bilan, ko’z yumguncha; hammer and tongs – ‘qizishib ketgan’, tooth and nail – ‘tish-tirnogi’igacha’, etc.

The necessary components of the semantic structure of the analyzed units are, first of all, categorical semes - “sign of action” and “sign of sign”. The categorical seme "sign of action" is represented by subcategorical semes "quality of action" and "circumstance under which the action is performed". In the subcategory with the meaning of “quality”, one can single out the semantic group of phraseological units of the “mode of action”, expressing the actual qualitative feature of the action: ochiq, ro’yi-rost, dangal – ‘openly, without hiding true intentions’, gapning dangali - ‘openly, directly, frankly’, kinoya yoki nafrat bilan - ‘hostile’, serrayib, qaqqayib - ‘without movement’; in English: by fits and starts - ‘goh g’ayrat bilan, goh imillab’, in the twinkling of an eye – ‘ko’z ochib yumguncha’, in two shakes (of a lamb's tail) - ‘bir lahzada’; and the semantic group “intensity of the manifestation of action”, which includes phraseological units expressing a qualitative and quantitative sign of action: suyak-suyagigacha – “completely, through and through”, butun vujudi bilan – “very strongly, passionately”, with one eye - “ozgina’, lock, stock and barrel – ‘butunlay’, from A to Z – ‘batafsil, ipidan-ignasigacha’.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the theory and practice of comparative studies of phraseological systems has already proved the inappropriateness of classifying the entire phraseological composition of a particular language only as national-individual, national-peculiar. [9, 142] When comparing the phraseological systems of two unrelated languages, not only different features are revealed between them, but also many common ones. In general, antonymy is a universal phenomenon of natural languages, which is based on some common reasons that lie in the very nature of human thinking.

REFERENCES

1. Linguistics: Great Encyclopedia, 1998. - 685 [Text] / under red. V.N. Yartsevov. – M.: Great Russian Encyclopedia, 1998. – 685 p.
2. L’vov, M.R. Attempt of Systematization of Lexical Antonyms [Text] / M.R. L’vov //Urgent Problems of Lexicology and Lexicography. – Pyerm’, 1972. – P. 307 – 311.

3. Miller, E.N. Nature of Lexical and Phraseological Antonymy [Text] / E.N. Miller. – Saratov, 1990. – 211 p.
4. Vasilyeva, E.A. Combined Phonetics and Semantic Characteristics of Dominant Lexical Categories (Antonymy and Synonymy): Research Work ... Cand. Degree in Philology [Text] / E.A. Vasilyeva. – Tula, 2004. – 170 p.
5. Vvedenskaya, L.A. Antonymy Between a Word and a Free Word-Combination [Text] /L.A. Vvedenskaya // Philological Scatches, Linguistics Series, Issue 1, Rostov-on-Don, 1972. – P. 33 – 43.