



THE METHOD OF SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF LEXICAL UNITS

Hamdamov Ramzbek
Ferghana Polytechnical Institute

Abstract

In the article, the essence of lexical paradigmatics is considered. Understanding the parts of speech as semantic-functional lexical paradigms takes into account 2 series of features: 1. the nature of the semantic content; 2. performance of certain functions in a particular area of speech activity

Keywords: linguistic nomination, lexical paradigm, semantics, lexico – semantic groups.

Introduction

This paper is part of a larger study aimed at identifying the linguistic essence and patterns of language nomination. The nature of linguistic nomination is especially clearly and tangibly manifested when considering the meanings of lexical units in different languages and their comparison.

From a functional point of view, the vocabulary of a language is a collection of naming tools. "Something that exists must be named" in order to become a fact of the human world. Concepts of "To call", "to name" mean to see in the world, to single out from the world, to include in the humanized world. Naming is a necessary prerequisite for communication and regulation: therefore, the existence of a subsystem of nomination is mandatory for a language. "To name" means to correlate something, the reality of the Universe with one or another element of the ideal "picture of the world" and designate it in one way or another by explication of this element" [8, 148].

To analyze meanings in the nominative (functional) aspect, it is very important to choose an adequate method of semantic analysis of lexical meanings for this purpose. The purpose of this work is to substantiate the choice and describe the procedures for the method of semantic analysis of lexical meanings that make up the same semantic field of lexical units in different languages.

The category of meaning is the unity of three elements ("semantic triangle" by G. Frege): the signifier (the outer side of the verbal sign - sound, graphics); denotate or referent (denoted object of reality); signified (the reflection of this object in the mind of a person is a significat). In the signified of a verbal sign, as part of its signification, there is a more or less structured part - the designatum, due to the opposition of the



given word to other words of its lexical-semantic group, and the part that is unique for this concept is less structured or does not have any structure at all [6].

A designatum can be defined by a list of differential features that oppose and at the same time unite the given designatum with the designata of other words in its group. In the rest of the significat, the signs turn out to be not differential, but integral, inherent only in this significat, but when they go beyond the field, these signs turn out to be differential for various significates, as field names.

To identify the structuring of a lexical meaning and to determine the minimum semantic features, its seven components, component analysis is well suited, which implies the procedure for splitting the meaning into components (semes) that represent this meaning not in the form of a simple bundle, but in the form of a structure organized in a certain way, in which the significance of one or another component is determined by the relation to other components.

In modern linguistics, several varieties of component analysis have been developed. There is no need and opportunity to consider these techniques in detail, moreover, there is an extensive literature on this issue [3,4].

The method that meets the objectives of our study is a modified version of component analysis, called logical-linguistic.

The first step of this method is component analysis based on dictionary definitions. A. A. Ufimtseva believes that in order to analyze the semantics of lexical units, “researchers, not without reason, resort to the most objective evidence available to them - to dictionary definitions”, also noting “definitional analysis”, i.e. the use of dictionary definitions as a special methodological technique description of lexical semantics, elevated to the rank of a method of linguistic research” [7,134].

Component analysis based on dictionary definitions, however, is not without drawbacks, one of which, as O. N. Selivestrova rightly notes, is that “in dictionary entries, along with correct information, there are incorrect information and, moreover, dictionary definitions are often incomplete » [5, 358].

This disadvantage is partially eliminated by referring to a fairly large number of dictionaries, which are selected from among the most authoritative and modern lexicographic dictionaries, which are selected from among the most authoritative and modern lexicographic sources, which allows to overcome the subjectivity of the compilers to a certain extent and get an objective picture of the semantic volume of lexicographic units already. at the first stage of the analysis.

In his latest work on component analysis, L. M. Kuznetsov writes: “It seems doubtful that a semasiologist, having at his disposal various tools for studying lexical meanings, would limit himself in advance to only one of them, unless, of course, he pursues some





special goals ... Reasonable combination of different methods of description is an urgent need for modern semasiology” [2, 66].

In this work, component analysis based on dictionary definitions is combined with contextual analysis; the selected features were verified with the help of native speaker informants. In many cases, to highlight semantic features, especially categorical ones, it turns out to be necessary to conduct an experiment - a method of linguistic research, which, according to Yu. N. Karaulov, "essentially represents the strongest type of argumentation" [1,135].

The main type of linguistic experiment in this work was the implementation of various transformations. The markedness of transformational transformations is established with the help of informants.

Before proceeding to a more detailed description of research methods and demonstration of individual analysis procedures using specific examples, it must be emphasized that the decomposition of lexical units into components and the integration of lexico-semantic groups and semantic fields is a single process, the indicated procedures of which are carried out in parallel. Component analysis reveals the real organization of the meaning only when the identification of the components of the meaning “is determined both by the ratio of elements within a separate meaning ... and by the correlation of this meaning with the meanings of other linguistic units [5, 287].

Thus, since the procedure of component analysis itself involves a comparison of the values of the analyzed units, then already in the course of the analysis, the researcher discovers that some lexical units are in relation to identification according to dominant features, their semantic structures and are contrasted according to subordinate features, others - the relationship of identification of dominant features is not discovered. Coinciding dominant features are integral for combining lexical meanings into lexical-semantic groups and semantic fields.

The first operation that prepares the material for the direct analysis of meanings is the compilation of the most complete definition of a single meaning according to different dictionaries in order to present the content of the interpreted meaning in a more explicit form of a linguistic expression. Such a transformation, however, retains the meaning of the unit being described, since not a single component specified by the dictionaries is eliminated. Thus, the verb eat in its transitive meaning is defined as follows: take (solid food, also soup) into the mouth and swallow it; take in through the mouth as food: ingest, chew and swallow in turn; take in through the mouth and swallow (solid food or soup).





The given definitions of different dictionaries do not fundamentally differ from each other. The only difference that can be seen is the completeness of the definition. Together they describe the process of eating in all its phases. A modified definition reflecting all these phases would be: take solid food also soup through the mouth, ingest, chew and swallow it in turn.

The second operation, pursuing the same goal of transforming a less explicit form into a more explicit one, is the operation of semantic expansion. This operation consists in substituting interpretations of words, components of the definition, into the definition. This technique provides a consistent reduction of the definition to constructions with a simpler connection between form and content. For example: the definition of the verb devour - eat hungrily or greedily as a result of transformation becomes: take solid food, also soup through the mouth, ingest, chew and swallow it in turn + hungrily or greedily.

The use in such transformations of only what is actually encountered in dictionary definitions provides a guarantee against the arbitrariness and subjectivity of the researcher. Such transformations allow definitions to be reduced to a uniform form that makes their comparison possible.

Here, however, there is a danger of over-detailing, in which the components of the definition can be decomposed and replaced ad infinitum. Therefore, in each particular case, the procedure of semantic deployment should be terminated when the features obtained as a result of division do not have a differentiating power within the given system. The segmentation of the semantic space of a lexical unit and the isolation of individual semes must be carried out until there is not a single lexical unit left in the original list that requires such a division in order to distinguish it from other units of the original list.

As a result of the first two operations of analysis, the meanings of lexical units take the form of a complex of components, in which some components play a dominant role, while others play a subordinate role. In the meaning of the verb devour, the dominant component is eat (its content is represented by the semes "take solid food", etc.); and subordinative components - "hungrily or greedily".

Here it is appropriate to recall that the decomposition into components and the integration of lexical-semantic groups and semantic fields are two parallel sides of a single process of studying the semantics of lexical units. Therefore, already at this stage of the analysis, it becomes obvious that the verbs to eat and devour belong to the lexical-semantic group, which unites, along with them, the verbs dine, breakfast, etc., since the component eat is in the dominant position in their meanings: dine - eat the main meal of the day; breakfast - eat the first meal of the day.



For example, the integral feature of the verbs anger, frighten, is “cause”: anger – cause to begin to feel anger; frighten -cause to begin to feel fear; kill - cause to stop living.

For example, the integral feature of the verbs anger, frighten, is “cause”: anger – cause to begin to feel anger; frighten -cause to begin to feel fear; kill - cause to stop living.

The verbs anger, frighten are combined according to the subordinate component “feel” and together with other verbs form a lexical paradigm of the lowest rank - the paradigm of verbs with the generalized meaning “cause an emotional state”.

In this paradigm, in turn, paradigms of a lower rank are distinguished according to the meaning components (semes) located at the second level of subordination. So, the verb anger forms, along with the verb enrage and others, one paradigm (enrage - cause to begin to feel great anger), and the verb frighten, along with the verb scare and the like, forms another peer-to-peer paradigm (scare - cause to begin to feel sudden fear). Each of the selected paradigms is characterized by its generalized semantic feature. For example, for the verbs frighten, scare, dismay, terrify, etc., such a generalized semantic feature will be (“fear causation”). The content of the generalized semantic feature of the paradigm of a higher rank "causation of the emotional state" is expressed in the system of the English verb by the generalized semantic features "causation of fear", "causation of anger", etc., and he, along with other generalized semantic features of the same rank, expresses the content of the generalized semantic attribute "causation", which is present in the semantic structure of all the constituents of this large paradigm in the form of the "cause" component (seme).

The described component analysis, which reveals the content of the lexical meaning as part of a lexico-semantic group or a semantic field or any other lexical paradigm, for each compared language is a sufficient basis for identifying the specifics of the nomination of this piece of reality (denotation) and the division of a conceptual continuum (significate) into a separate language

References

- 1.Ю. Н. Караулов – Вторичные размышления об эксперименте в языкознании // Теория языка, методы его исследования и преподавания. – Л., 1981. – С. 135-140.
- 2.А. М. Кузнецов – От компонентного анализа к компонентному синтезу. – М., Наука, 1986 –124с.
- 3.А. И. Кузнецова – Понятие семантической системы языка и методы ее исследования (из истории разработки проблемы в современном зарубежном языкознании). – М., изд-во МГУ, 1963. – 57с.





4. А. Н. Рудяков – Язык, или почему люди говорят. (Опыт функционального определения естественного языка.) Киев, «Грамота», 2004. – 223с.
5. О. Н. Селиверстова – Некоторые типы семантических гипотез и их верификация. Гипотеза в современной лингвистике. – М., Наука, 1980. – С. 262-300.
6. Ю. С. Степанов – Номинация, семантика, семиология (виды семантических определений в современной лексикологии). В кн. Языковая номинация. – М., Наука, 1977. – С. 300.
7. А. А. Уфимцева – К вопросу о так называемом дефиниционном методе описания лексического значения. В кн. Слово в грамматике и словаре. – М., Наука, 1984. – С. 131-141.

