

Some Peculiarities Of Semantic Organization Of Phraseological Antonyms In The English And Uzbek Languages

Toshtemirov Elyor Nuraliyevich¹, Matkarimova Ashurxon Ismoilovna², Ziyayeva Hamida Abdurahimovna³, Turgunova Erkinoy Ergashevna⁴

¹Senior teacher, Andizhan state institute of foreign languages, Uzbekistan, elyor75@mail.ru

²Senior teacher, PhD, Andizhan state institute of foreign languages, Uzbekistan, sanam_2004@mail.ru

³Teacher, Andizhan state institute of foreign languages, Uzbekistan, ziyayevah@mail.ru

⁴Teacher, Andizhan state institute of foreign languages, Uzbekistan, erkinoy63@mail.ru

Abstract: The article presents the semantic organization of phraseological antonyms in English and Uzbek, developed on the basis of data from modern linguistic studies on the problems of lexical and phraseological antonymy, taking into account the semantic-grammatical principle of interpreting the meanings of phraseological units.

Keywords: antonymic paradigm, antonymy criteria, semantic structure of a phraseological unit, phraseological antonyms, features of antonymy 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 antonymy, 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 of co-researchers of the antonymic paradigm, we note that the logical model of opposition, built “on opposite specific concepts, which represent the limit of the manifestation of a quality (property) determined by generic concept” [12, 35] is a necessary but not sufficient condition for antonymy in a 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 antonymy.

The essence of the phenomenon of antonymy lies in the expression of the opposite in the language, based on the semantic opposition of nominative units. antonymy is based on a logical

model of opposition (a generic concept determines the manifestation of a quality or property, specific concepts represent the limits of the manifestation of this quality), but antonymic relations cannot be characterized without taking into account the nature and features of the semantics of language units [9, p. 247].

The semantic structure of a linguistic unit is a hierarchical system in which the smallest components of meaning - semes - are strictly ordered. Units are considered antonymous in the case of the semantic homogeneity of their structure, while paradigmatically they must differ in one differential feature. N.V. Drachuk confirms this thought and distinguishes two types of semes in the semantic structure of antonyms: semes common to opposition members, which ensure the creation of an antonymic paradigm (pair), and incompatible, contradictory semes, which determine the presence of opposition in a pair of antonyms [3, p. 37].

According to A.B. Kunin, phraseological antonyms are phraseological units that have a common semantic component in the presence of polarity of meanings [6, p. 134]. The antonymy of phraseological units is ensured by the

homogeneous semantic structure of language units in the presence of opposite components in it, due to which opposition is created in a pair of antonyms

Materials and methods

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.

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 their meanings, giving reason to oppose these units to each other.

As the second criterion, we singled out the presence of 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), which 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 research results 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)." [8, 97] 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 in foreign linguistics there are many works that consider the essence of this phenomenon, and definitions of phraseological units are given -antonyms, their classification is carried out.

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” [2, 6], “are regularly opposed in their denotative correlation” [3, 66], as they are “associated in our minds as mutually exclusive”, characterizing “phenomena or objects of objective reality from different, but common sides”. [1, 58] 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 single-structured 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: in hot blood - in cold blood, in a good/happy hour - in an ill / evil hour, birinchi navbatda - oxirgi navbatda, tunu-kun – hech qachon, na joyga - joyga emas.

Diversely structured phraseological antonyms have a different component composition and excellent syntactic models: burnining tagida – dunyoning narigi burchagida; beyond praise (‘maqtovga loyiq’) – in a tin-pot way (‘hech narsaga yaramaydi’), to one’s teeth (‘ochiq-oydin’) – when smb.’s back is turned (‘sirdan, g’oyibona’) and others.

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, single-structural 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.

Results

Antonymy is included in the meaning of a phraseological unit along with its subject-logical 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 - subjective and functional.

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. [11, 24]. For example: In Uzbek: gapni chozmay, lo’nda qilib, tavakkal qilib, qo’lini qyerga chozsa yetadi, ter to’kmay qo’lga kiritmoq, in English: fair and square (ochoqchasiga), by leaps and bounds (chaqqonlik

bilan), hammer and tongs (g'ayrat bilan, yeng shimarib), tooth and nail (bor kuchi bilan), etc.

The essential components of the semantic structure of the analyzed units are, first of all, categorical semes - "mode of action" and "mode of sign". The categorical seme "mode 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 "mode of action", expressing the actual qualitative feature of the action: ochiq, ro'yi rost, dangal, gaping ochig'i, qaqqayib turmoq; by fits and starts - 'onda-sonda', in the twinkling of an eye - 'ko'z ochib yumguncha', in two shakes (of a lamb's tail) - bir lahzada nd the semantic group "intensity of the manifestation of the action", which includes phraseological units expressing the qualitative and quantitative modes of the action: butun vujudi bilan, turgan-bitgan; lock, stock and barrel - 'butunlay', from A to Z - avvalidan oxirigacha, boshidan-oyoq, etc.

The subcategorical seme "circumstance of action" is subdivided into group semes:

1. "locality" (from the English 'location' - place, position), which includes subgroups of "location": burnini tagida, har qadamda; from China to Peru - 'har qayerda', at the back of God-speed - 'allaqayerda', to and fro - u yoqqa, bu yoqqa, etc.
2. "temporality" (from Latin 'tempora' - time): yaqinda, kallayi saharda; in the year dot - Daqyonus zamonida, etc.
3. "causative" (from the English 'cause' - reason): hurmat yuzasidan, yoshlik qilib; in one's cups - 'kayf bilan', in the heat of the moment - qiziqqonlik bilan, etc.
4. "intendency" (from the English 'intend' - to aim): chalg'itish uchun, on the off-chance - har ehtimolga qarshi, etc.
5. "conditionality" (from the English 'condition' - situation): qulay fursatdan foydalanib; at one's earliest convenience - kimningdir qulay vaqtiga, etc.
6. "concession" (from the English 'concession' - assumption): garchi hohlasa ham iloji yo'q; rain or shin - hohlar-hohlamay, etc.

The categorical seme "aspect of a feature", according to our data, is represented by only one subcategorical seme - "the quality of a feature", which is divided into two groups:

- "conditionality of the presence of a feature", the phraseological units of this group carry the actual qualitative characteristic of the feature: tabiatan hushfe'l, hizmat burchi yuzasidan talab qilingan, hudo bergan iqtidor egasi; charming by nature - tabiatan maftunkor, tug'ilishidan olijanob, etc.
- "measure, degree of manifestation of a feature", the phraseological units that make up this semantic group convey the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of the feature: bo'riday och, devor kabi oppoq; as ugly as a sin - qattiq gunohkordek qo'rqib ketgan, as rich as Croesus - Qorun kabi boy, etc.

Some group semes are also subdivided into integral (subgroup) semes, which, in turn, are divided into plural ones. However, it should be noted that the composition of the phraseological meaning of each individual unit does not have to contain all the semes, in some cases the subgroup and plural semes may be omitted.

Conclusion

Thus, the data obtained as a result of the analysis of the fact that the theory and practice of comparative studies of phraseological systems have 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.

The reference:

1. Alekhina, A. I. Studies of the systemic organization of the phraseology of the modern English language: the problem of phraseological relations and phraseological structures [Text] / A. I. Alekhina. - L., 1986. - 249 p.
2. Vasilyeva, E. A. Phonosemantic characteristics of the main lexical categories (antonymy and

- synonymy): Dis. cand. philol. Sciences [Text] / E. A. Vasilyeva. - Tula, 2004. - 170 p.
3. Vvedenskaya, L.A. Antonymy between a word and a free phrase [Text] / L.A. Vvedenskaya. // Philological studies, series "Linguistics", vol. 1, Rostov-on-Don: Publishing House of the Rostov-on-Don University, 1980. - P. 33 - 43.
4. Vinogradov, V. V. Basic concepts of Russian phraseology [Text] // V. V. Vinogradov // Selected works. Lexicology and lexicography. - M.: Nauka, 1977. - p. 118 - 139.
5. Drachuk, N. V. Polysemy as one of the factors in the formation of antonymic-synonymous blocks (on the example of qualitative adjectives): Dis. ... cand. philol. Sciences [Text] / N. V. Drachuk. - Volgograd, 2006. - 204 p.
6. Kuznetsova, E. V. Lexicology of the Russian language: textbook. allowance for philol. faculties of high fur boots [Text] / E. V. Kuznetsova. - M. : Higher school, 1989. - 215 p.
7. Lvov, M. R. Experience of systematization of lexical antonyms [Text] / M. R. Lvov. //Actual problems of lexicology and lexicography. - Perm, 1972. - p. 307 - 311.
8. Miller, E.N. The nature of lexical and phraseological antonymy [Text] / E. N. Miller. - Publishing House of Saratov University, 1990. - 211 p.
9. Reichstein, A. D. Comparative analysis of German and Russian phraseology [Text] / A. D. Reichstein. - M.: Higher school, 1980. - 142 p.
10. Tikhonov, A. N. Russian language [Text] / A. N. Tikhonov. - M.: Citadel, 2001. - 576 p.
11. Chelyabinsk phraseological school (results and comprehension of the path): scientific and historical essay [Text] / Chelyabinsk: Publishing House of Chelyab. state ped. univ, 2002. - 304 p.
12. Linguistics: Big Encyclopedic Dictionary [Text] / ed. V. N. Yartseva. - M. : Great Russian Encyclopedia, 1998. - 685 p.