

The Relationship Of Locality And Localization

M. Ergashova

PH.D., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR KOKAN STATE PEDAGOGICAL INSTITUTE mail: muhayyoergashova@gmail.com

Abstract. In this article, the opinions about the relationship between the Uzbek language as a whole, which is formed by the relationship of interrelated and mutually demanding elements, and the relationship between localization and localization are highlighted.

Keywords: linguistic field, formal-semantic, formal-functional, semantic field, invariant-variantity, locality, localization relationship.

Introduction

In today's complex globalization period, urgent problems arising in the field of spirituality, preservation and improvement of the spirituality of our people, especially the preservation and protection of the hearts and minds of the young generation from the influence of various harmful ideas and ideologies require special attention. Because today in some regions of the world, as a result of ideological attacks, it can be observed that great moral losses are taking place, the age-old values of the nation, national thinking and lifestyle are being lost, morals, family and community life, conscious way of life are in serious danger.

The introduction of the field theory to Uzbek linguistics is connected with the beginning of the use of system-structural methods in relation to language units. Among the scientific researches carried out in this regard, I. Kochkortoiev, A. Nurmonov, H. Ne'matov, R. Rasulov, E. Begmatov, T. Mirzakulov, Sh. Iskandarova, O. Bozorov, A. Sobirov, H. The scientific observations of researchers such as Hojjeva, B.Qurbonova, M.Ergashova are important in studying the lexicon of the Uzbek language based on field theory. In particular, the introduction of the concept of field into Uzbek linguistics is given in detail in the researches of Sh. Iskandarova and A. Sobirov. (1,9,10,11)

Until now, this concept has been interpreted in different ways in Uzbek linguistics studies devoted to the study of the meaningful field. They can be divided into two large groups. Scientists of the first group consider a class of

linguistic units of equal value united on the basis of a certain meaning as one meaningful field. In such a case, the field becomes common with the linguistic paradigm. For this reason, they try to distinguish between the concepts of the substantive field and the paradigm, and take the sign of different levels and uniformity as a distinguishing sign between the two concepts. Accordingly, if the concept of meaningful field is used only in relation to lexemes united around a common field, that is, if it is used only in relation to the lexeme level, then the paradigm can be used for almost all units of the level. In this case, the concept of a paradigm includes a class of lexemes united on the basis of a certain common meaning, a class of syntaxes, as well as a class of phonemes united into one class on the basis of a certain common sign.

The second group of scientists, although they took the same level and different levels as a distinguishing sign between the paradigm, meaningful field and different levels, but they apply this sign to the relationship between the members of the paradigm and the field. We approach the content field from the second point of view and recognize the different levels of members united in one content field.

Literature review

The theory of the semantic field has become widespread. The number of scientific studies is increasing. Clarifications are being made to this theory. Field theory is associated with a certain classification system of the vocabulary, which is divided into relatively large and small groups.

The concept of semantic field is one of the main concepts of current lexical semantics.

In linguistics, the problem of studying the semantic field was solved in parallel in the lexicographic aspect. The general structure of the dictionary structure and some features of the field structure in the lexicon were determined in the compilation of ideographic dictionaries. When defining the field, various relations between words are analyzed not separately, but in the general system of all lexical-semantic relations. Semantic field is a set of semantic units that have a similarity recorded in one or another semantic layer and are connected by specific semantic relations.

One of the main characteristics of the structure of the semantic field is its integrity. This is done, in particular, as a result of considering lower-level units as a phenomenon of higher-level units, that is, on the basis of a stepwise relationship indicating that small units are part of large units. (9,10)

Dividing semantic fields into lexical-semantic groups, classes of words is a high, but not the only, step of the hierarchy. Each lexical-semantic group has its own individual structure. An element of the lexical-semantic group structure is lexical-semantic variants united on the basis of synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, etc. relations. As a generalizing (integral) schema of each group, in addition to the archisema of the field, the invariant schema that gives the name to the group emerges. The set of distinctive symbols is individual for each group.

Main part

It represents a clear distinguishing feature that distinguishes one LSG from another. The non-uniformity of the semantic fields with this situation is explained as its integral, core and peripheral zone characteristics. The periphery, like the core of the field, consists of a complex of group structures, some elements and lexical-semantic variants. LSM as a unique system-forming unit has a unique and complex structure, and its members are united on the basis of mutual paradigmatic relations. Among LSMs, the local area stands out. Members of the local field are lexemes with the symbol "locality", and their

relationship with other lexemes is a localization relationship. The area of locality is multi-dimensional and large-scale. Based on the organization of LSM, there are organized classes, different types of lexical paradigms that form the semantic field both vertically and horizontally. The core of the lexical field is formed by the lexical unit representing the general invariant meaning, just as its lexical dominant forms. One of the main features of the LSM structure is its integrity. This wholeness is formed as a result of relationships that imply that complex units are composed of more complex units.

Another type of lexical-semantic paradigm occurs when the meaning is divided, when it is specialized in a certain field. Compare: move, run, walk, crawl, etc. In the systematic organization of the field, the generality of word-forming nests and word stems is important. In them, the root forms the substantive commonality of related words. At the same time, it is a common carrier for all words in the semantic component field.

Word-forming nests are structural elements of semantic fields.

There are a number of terms that refer to the dimensions of the semantic space of a language or the number of axes of a coordinate system that allows for a detailed view of various aspects of the lexical system. According to him, the first major divisions of the classification grid of ideographic dictionaries form the subsystem of the lexicon: Man, Universe, and the first layer of these subsystems: the sky and heavenly bodies, the earth, the world of plants, the world of animals. Lower layers of division can be evaluated as representations of semantic fields. For example, the subsystem of the sky and celestial bodies is two large interconnected and interconnected 1) sky and celestial bodies; 2) weather and wind fields, and these, in turn, have different levels of complexity: 1) sky; 2) heavenly bodies; 3) weather; 4) winds are divided into semantic fields. The author points to the fact that semantic fields are connected to somewhat larger generalizations and form microfields, and emphasizes that there is no clear terminology in this place.

The initial determining unit that forms the basis of SM determines the semantic and word-forming derivation of the elements. It is necessary to take into account the description of the LSM unit and the word group of the main word in it. The structure of the dominant field is its structure. This is the main element and forms the main semantic contours of the lexical-semantic paradigm.

It is known that any material body has a place, size and volume. Space reflects the arrangement of the points that make up the universe at a particular moment in time, while time represents the sequence of events occurring at a particular point in space.

Proponents of the substantial concept consider space to be a container, a space in which things are placed. According to them, everything is placed in space. Space is a substance that holds things in itself. It is said that there is nothing, that is, there can be a space without things. Proponents of the relational concept say that things have a spatial dimension.

Every thing and event, action and state, sign and characteristic are reflected in the human mind and find their expression through language. Concepts of space and time are no exception. The representation of space through linguistic means constitutes the field of locality. In linguistics, locality combines various tools related to space.

In recent years, it has been recognized that space and time have metrical and typological characteristics according to the basis of expression. The metric properties of space and time are measurable, visible and relative properties that reflect the quantitative relations of existence. They include properties such as scale, homogeneity, and isotropy. (12)

The center of the local area is a multi-meaning place word. The semantic structure of this generalizing word reflects all the broad layers of the concept of place. For example:

1) area, a certain part of the earth's surface (familiar places, territory, country);

2) area - the point (destination) where something exists, is happening;

3) area - a building intended for carrying out an activity, a shed (workplace);

4) province, periphery and peripheral organizations, institutions (opposite to the center) (delegates from places);

5) a free space occupied by a body or that can be occupied by someone or something (making room for books on the table);

6) a certain area that is specially allocated, usually occupied by something (hanging in the place of keys);

7) a separate part of an object (place of impact);

8) musical, artistic work or a part of a text (the most interesting part of the novel);

9) position, position in the service (getting a new position).

The first four LSVs are the main (central) meanings and form the core of the locality field. At the first stage of dividing the locality into lexical-semantic areas, a three-dimensional functional area is distinguished. As their concretizers, space is unlimited distance (in all directions) air, sea, world space, etc.

At the next stages of segmentation, each functional area (circle) is divided into small groups that describe the relationship of the area in different aspects. Based on indicators in ideographic dictionaries and collected materials, the functional area of the field can be differentiated into the following groups. General expressions (universe, world) space, earth, its structure.

Space (cosmos) lexical-thematic group can be differentiated into the following groups.

General expression. Circle of the sky, antiworld, constellations. 1. heavenly bodies. Planets. Constellations. Asteroid, star, earth, planets.

We give examples of group 1: space, universe, universe, chaos, hemisphere, element;

Group 2: asteroid, earth, comet, moon, planet, satellite, moon;

The lexical-semantic group of land, its structure is divided into the following groups: land, its structure, natural structures.

General expressions: earth, its structure, natural ridges, geographical zones, earth's atmosphere, air space.

For example:

Qaldirg`ochlar qanotin

Ko`zga surtar yer (M.Ulug`) (6)

Parts of the earth's surface, its reliefs, mountains, valleys, depressions in the ground, water bodies, rivers, ice, snow masses, forests.

Although the sign of locality is typical for all levels of the language, it is characterized by the fact that it has a wide range of lexical units.

At the lexical level, the relationship of lexemes united into one class on the basis of local archisema constitutes a microsystem in the lexical system of the language. For each LSG, a local sema acts as a unifier.

Linguistic concepts included in the field of locality have the characteristic of heterogeneity, because locality is expressed at different levels of language.

D. Nabieva, arguing about invariant-variantity, shows the above concepts as follows: "... any real pronounced units affecting our sense organs are variants, and the generalization in the form of possibilities hidden under these units is invariant is counted. From this, it becomes clear that invariant and variant are not homogeneous events in the same series, but heterogeneous events in different series". (7)

Reflecting on the characteristics of all the linguistic units united in the field of locality, which are different from the linguistic units united in the paradigm of locality, B. Qurbonova classifies the linguistic units included in the field of locality into meaning groups such as generative locality, positional locality, nominative locality, derivational locality, derivational locality, relational locality, and explains their types.

Expressing the local meaning in the current Uzbek language **place, place, space, village, city, village, country**. There are a number of lexemes in which the locality scheme is the central scheme, and this scheme is the general scheme that unites the locality area.

Locality is also expressed in secondary names formed by derivation. Such local lexemes are created on the basis of the word formation model of a certain language with the help of special tools.

Such lexemes in the Uzbek language – **zor, -iston, -goh, -liki** it is formed with the help of additions.

A lexeme that takes certain relational forms enters into a syntagmatic relationship with other lexemes of the same form. Some of the relational morphemes, which serve to ensure the syntagmatic relation of the word forms, also have the grammatical scheme of locality.

In particular, the agreement forms express the relationship of the subordinate word to the dominant word, as well as the place of origin, direction, emergence or non-emergence of the action-state expressed from the lexical meaning of the dominant clause. Such agreements are contrasted with subject and accusative agreements on the basis of locality. Exit, place, departure agreements are characterized by having a sign, and the other two do not have a sign. Therefore, the agreements of the first group are also called local agreements. In this respect, income agreement takes an intermediate place. Because this form of agreement is connected to transitive verbs and represents the place of descent, the point of descent of the action understood from the governing part. The difference between the local agreement and local agreement in expressing the meaning of place is that local agreement is stable, permanent, and central, while the local agreement is borderline.

The syntactic functions of local lexemes are specific for local cases. Therefore, syntactic structural units also have specialized means for expressing locality. Such syntactic units are considered a central tool in the expression of syntactic locality. In addition, at the syntactic level, there is also the concept of the place (position) of the parts of the sentence in relation to the participle, which is also inextricably linked with the meaning of locality. The sign of syntactic position is of great importance in determining the thematic-rhematic function of the communicative structure of the sentence, whether the formal structural units of the sentence are part of the sentence or part of the sentence, i.e. functional and non-functional parts for the sentence structure. However, in expressing the local meaning of sentences, the next case is considered as a boundary sign.

At any level, there are central units that represent this meaningful category and are

specific for this theme, as well as border units that serve as auxiliary tools in expressing this theme.

All linguistic units related to the representation of the locality scheme can be combined into one semantic field - the locality field.

The relationship of localization expresses the relationship of a specific action-state, characteristic with the concept of place. That is, the generalized image reflected in our mind of the relationship between things and events, actions-states, signs-characteristics and their location in the objective existence is considered a spatial relationship through certain linguistic means. The localization relation is both a logical and a grammatical category. If the property between the object-event, action-state, sign-property and its place reflected in the mind is considered a logical relation, then the relation between the linguistic units representing this relation is considered a linguistic relation. So, the relation of linguistic space is a denotative logical relation. In other words, the propositional structure of a linguistic space relation is considered a logical space relation.

Discussion

The localization relationship, in general, represents the location of a certain object, action (event, sign-property) in a certain space through a target (landmark). According to M. Ergashova, the concept of lokum occupies a central place in this relationship. Expressing the relationship of an object with a location is localization. For example, a river flows from the south side of the city. There are three members in this sentence, the first member is the flowing movement, the second member is the river, and the third member is the south side of the city. Lokum means a space or an object that is a means to determine the location of a certain object, (movement, symbol). That is, in the above example, the relationship between the subject of the river and the location of the south side of the city is a localization relationship. Lokum, that is, a lexeme with the meaning of "locality" is defined not only qualitatively, but also quantitatively. For example:

Yo`lim jar uzra so`qmoqdir,

Toshlari misoli pichoqdir (M.Ulug`).

It can be seen that this concept is represented by a space named by names as a local lexeme (such as forest, city, field, kilometer, hectare). The form of the names expresses the character of the relationship to the space, the meaning relations such as inside, outside, next to the lexeme "locality". For example, walking through the forest - walking through the forest - walking towards the forest. In the above sentence, the relationship between the forest and the movement of walking, which is a lexeme with the meaning of "locality", is considered a localization relationship, and in this relationship, not only the sense of the lexeme, which is a lexeme with the meaning of "locality", but also its form and how it is expressed in a grammatical form will be important. In particular, although the general meaning of the place represented by the lexeme "locality" forest in the above sentence is preserved in all forms of this name, but the ratio of the action to the lexeme "locality" in relation to localization (such as inside, outside, above, below) is different. It has different forms. This means that the lexeme form with the symbol "locality" is of great importance in relation to localization. In relation to localization, the spatial (local) valency of lexemes denoting action, state, and sign is of great importance. The realization of this valence gives rise to the relationship of localization. (13)

In Uzbek linguistics, an attempt has been made to study the relationship of localization based on the local valence of verbs. In particular, S. Muhamedova's candidate's dissertation entitled "Predicativity and valence of directional action verbs in Uzbek" discusses the local valence of directional action verbs and its realization. According to it, the local valence of verbs of directional action in the Uzbek language is also a necessary valence. The local actant is directly related to the directional movement of the agent. It indicates the place of execution of the directional movement.

When the implementer of YHF (verbs of directional action) has a place agreement, it means the place of performance of direct, direct directional action.

At the same time, the actant of YHF can bring the adverbs of departure and departure. It is stated that "shilib YHF" is an actant of locative valence. can express the place of execution of the action, the place of exit and the place of the direction by adding to the local actant of . These forms of agreement can be added both to lexemes with a place schema and to auxiliaries with such a grammatical schema. For example, the lexeme to go (reverse direction from one point to another point), and the lexeme to come has the meaning "to go from one point to another" because local agreement nouns and auxiliaries with local agreement and auxiliary+local agreement nouns with can be local actants of these verbs, for example, to come from the capital, to come from the capital, to go to the capital, to go towards the capital, to go towards the capital.

It is worth noting that the relationship of localization is not limited to the relationship between the lexeme with the meaning of "locality" and YHF. The lexeme "locality" +YHF relation forms part of the localization relation (LM). In addition to YHF, speech verbs (NF), work verbs (YUF), thinking verbs (TF), action verbs (FF), for example, to work, to perform; state verbs (HF), for example, to be sick, to fall asleep, to be treated, to rest, and semantic groups of other verbs and the lexeme relationship with the symbol "locality" also form a localization relationship. In the studies of I. Kochkortoiev, R. Rasulov, and O. Sharipova, some opinions about the local valence of verbs are expressed (15, 16).

It seems that the relation of localization is to come, to go, to go, to walk, to smile; enter, exit, flow; In addition to verbs denoting directional movement such as fly, start, lead, sit, lie down, squat, crouch, climb, land, etc., occupy a central place in verbs denoting state, and space valence is the obligatory valence of these verbs. At the same time, the verbs of thought, such as to think, understand, know, learn, rest, take a rest (in a health center, garden), be treated (in a hospital), work (in the field, in a factory), There are spatial valences of action verbs such as to sweat (at a meeting, at a wedding) and speech verbs such as to say, to speak, to say, and these valences are considered facultative valences of the above verbs.

Thus, the localization relationship appears through the obligatory (mandatory) and facultative (additional) valences of verbs. Arguments that produce this valence come in different syntactic functions. If the position is the main, leading task, the other tasks are additional, secondary tasks.

The localization relationship can be expressed not only by the combination of the lexeme with the "locality" theme + the verb with the local theme, but also by the combination of the lexeme with the "locality" theme with the noun. That is why the compounds expressing the localization relationship can be divided into verb and noun compounds.

The lexeme with the word "locality" in noun phrases representing the relationship of localization indicates the location of the object, and where is it? there will be an answer to the question. For example,

Dunyodagi eng nozik gulim,
Kitoblarda e'zozli gulim (M.Ulug`).

In such combinations, not the form of the lexeme, which acts as a lexeme with the meaning of "locality", but the space theme in its semantic structure serves to reveal the localization relationship. That's why in such compounds expressing the relationship of localization, the lexemes with the meaning of "locality" appear as lexemes with the meaning of space. If the lexeme with the role of "locality" as a seme does not have a space seme, there will be no localization relationship. In such cases, the attributive attitude takes the lead. For example, notes in a notebook, a flower on a pillar, a book on my brother, etc.

So, the localization relation is both a logical and a grammatical category. If the specific logical relationship between the object-event, action-state, sign-characteristic and its place reflected in the mind, then the relationship between the linguistic units representing this relationship is considered a linguistic relationship. A lexeme with the meaning "locality" is a space named by names as a lexeme. The form of the names helps to express the character of the relationship to the space, the meaning relationships such as inside, outside, next to the lexeme "locality".

Conclusion

The relationship of localization appears through the obligatory (mandatory) and facultative (additional) valences of verbs. Arguments (actants) that create this valence come in different syntactic functions. As verbs of directional action indicate the movement of the subject from one point to another, such verbs have three place actants: 1) place of departure of action; 2) place of general direction of movement; 3) the limit position of the movement direction.

References:

1. Iskanderova Sh.M. Researching the lexicon of the Uzbek language as a meaningful field (personal microfield): Filol.fanl.doct. .. diss. autoref. Tashkent, 1999.
2. Maslova V.A. Cognitive linguistics. Minsk: Tetra Systems, 2008. P.50.
3. Mirzakulov Sh.O'. The meaning and paradigm of word formation in the Uzbek language: Filol.fanl.nomz..... diss.avtoref. Samarkand, 1995.
4. Mirzakulov T.O. Problems of morpheme paradigmatics and syntagmatics of the Uzbek language: Filol.fanl.doct...diss. autoref. Tashkent, 1994.
5. Muhamedova S. Predicativeness and valence of verbs of directional action in the Uzbek language: Filol.fanl.nomz..... diss.avtoref. Tashkent, 1999.
6. His Excellency. O my tongue. Tashkent: Nihol, 2012. - 128 pages.
7. Nabieva D. Manifestation of the generality-specificity dialectic at different levels of the Uzbek language. Tashkent: Sharq, 2005. p. 52.
8. Nishonova N.R. Semantic analysis of the field of lexemes with the archiseme "animal" in the Uzbek language: Filol.fanl.nomz..... diss.avtoref. Tashkent, 2000.
9. Nurmonov A. Structural linguistics: roots and directions. Andijan, 2006. B.11.
10. Nurmonov A., Iskanderova SH. Linguistic theory. Tashkent: Science, 2008. - 41 pages.
11. Sobirov A.Sh. Researching the lexical level of the Uzbek language as a system: Filol.fanl.nomz..... diss.avtoref. Tashkent, 2005.
12. Foundations of philosophy. (compiler and editor K. Nazarov) Tashkent: "Uzbekistan" publishing house, 2005. - p. 138
13. Ergashova M.V. The relation of locum and localization in Uzbek: Filol.fanl.nomz..... diss.avtoref. Tashkent, 2009.
14. An explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language. 5th floor. -Tashkent: Uzbek National Encyclopedia. 2008.
15. Kurbanova B.Q. Locality and its expression in the Uzbek language. Filol.fanl.nomz..... diss.authorref. Tashkent, 2007.
16. Kochkortoiev I. Word meaning and its valence. Tashkent, "Teacher" 1977. - p. 34.
17. Sharipova O'. Semantic valences of simple verbs in the Uzbek language. Philol.fan.nomz. diss. Autoref. Tashkent: 1996. 16 p.
18. Hojiev A. Explanatory dictionary of linguistic terms.-Tashkent: "National encyclopedia of Uzbekistan". State Scientific Publishing House, 2002.

Internet saytlari:

<http://psycholing.narod.ru/auto/bosova-auto.html> wikipediya.org

<http://ontol.philos.msu.ru/info/themes/psych.html>
l v yazyake rechi