



TYPES OF SEMANTIC RELATIONS BETWEEN PHRASES

Shakhlo Akmal kyzy Asadova

Doctoral Student of Bukhara State University

g-mail: asadova90shakhlo@gmail.com

Abstract

It is known that each discipline that studies language has its own connection with it. This connection is determined by what aspect of language a particular social science studies. Language is a set of units prepared in advance for all members of a given society and serving to express a common and obligatory thought for all and for other purposes, as well as the laws of unification of these units. This interpretation of language proves that it is a psychophysical phenomenon that embodies such qualities as community, essence, possibility, and reason. Language manifests these properties in specific forms – in the form of specific phenomena and events. These include phrasemes and semantic relations between phrasemes. After all, language and each concept associated with it have their own unique nuances.

Keywords: Language, speech, community, particularity, phrase, expression, interphrase relations.

Introduction

The Swedish linguist F. Saussure expressed the fact that each unit of language forms small systems and performs a specific function as follows: “Language is a system of systems”. Phraseological units also exist in language as linguistic units. Thus, phraseological units, like other linguistic units – phoneme, lexeme, morpheme or models, have such properties as commonality, essence, possibility, causality.

Phraseological units are complex linguistic units, the expressive plan of which consists of a combination of two or more components. Phraseological units are widely found in the language, express thoughts broadly, expressively and capaciously, and are always consistent in their temporal structure [7, 437]. Structural features of phraseological units can also be classified by their external

appearance, i.e. by the category and number of words included in the phrase. When dividing them into groups by external structure, the number of parts in the phraseological units is taken as a basis. As a result of such grouping, it becomes clear how many words (components) phraseological units consist of by their nature. Phraseological units in the Uzbek language can be divided into the following groups depending on their external structure:

1. Phraseological units with two components.
2. Phraseological units with three components.
3. Phraseological units with four or more components.

Literature review

The following are examples of two-component phraseology: amri mahol (difficult, suspicious), anqoning urug‘i (rare, rare), aqldan ozmoq (to go crazy), etc. It is appropriate to give the following examples of three-component phraseology: arpasini xom o‘rmoq (to do something bad), barmog‘ini bigiz qilmoq (to point out), bir cho‘qishda qochirmoq (to win easily), chizgan chizig‘idan chiqmaydigan (to fulfill all his demands in full, to act according to his instructions), etc.

It is appropriate to cite the following examples of four-component phraseological units: boshini qayoqqa urishini bilmaydigan (one who does not know where to hit his head; helpless), fikrlari bir yerdan chiqadigan (thoughts coming from one place; thoughts are in harmony, like-minded people), gapni bir joyga qo‘ymoq (putting a sentence in one place; agreeing with each other), etc.

A phraseological unit is a two-sided linguistic unit, a dialectical unity of form and content. The formal side of a phraseological unit is formed by a word (not a lexeme). The substantive side of a phraseological unit is its phraseological meaning. Phraseological meaning has a very complex nature, since in the case of a lexeme, some have a denotative nature, while others have only a grammatical meaning.

Analysis

A phraseological unit is a two-sided linguistic unit, a dialectical unity of form and content. The formal side of a phraseological unit is formed by a word (not a lexeme). The essential side of a phraseological unit is its phraseological meaning.



Phraseological meaning has a very complex nature: some of them, like lexemes, have a denotative nature, others have only a grammatical meaning.

It is usually considered that the meaning of a phraseological unit is equal to the meaning of a lexeme. However, as practice shows, they are never equal. After all, if the meanings of a phraseological unit and a lexeme were equal, then the phraseological unit would be redundant. As an example, let's compare the meanings of the phraseological unit "to grab by the collar" (yoqasini ushlamoq) and the lexeme "to be surprised" (hayron bo'lmoq). This phraseological unit means "to be extremely amazed, surprised by an unexpected, incomprehensible matter or event", while the lexeme "to be surprised" means "to be amazed by an unexpected, incomprehensible matter or event". Both meanings reflect the internal mental state of a person (denotation). However, in the meaning of a phraseological unit, it differs from the lexeme "to be amazed" in that it has the semantics of "extremely" and "characteristic of the style of speech", "colorful". Therefore, the semantics of a phraseological unit is often characterized by imagery and colorfulness.

In general, the phraseological meaning is narrower and more specific, while the meaning of the lexeme is broader and more abstract. For example, the lexeme to be surprised (hayron bo'lmoq) is considered neutral in the general stylistic and emotional-affective aspects, based on its use in speech reality. This in itself shows that this lexeme can be used in all styles of speech and with different "coloring". It seems that, although the phraseological unit and the lexeme name the same object or phenomenon (even if the semelas of the name coincide), they differ sharply in their expressive coloring (that is, the expressive semelas are different).

A phraseological unit consists of several independent words, but its meaning is not a simple sum of the meanings that make it up. The meaning of a phraseological unit is formed as a result of using the word that is part of it, in a figurative or partially figurative sense. For example, trying to find out someone's opinion is similar to trying to feel someone's breast and find out what's inside. As a result, the free combination "qo'yniga qo'l solmoq" specializes in expressing another meaning, similar to the one from which it is understood, and the technique becomes a phraseological unit. Or what happens if a person drops the watermelon he is carrying? The situation of a person who is upset about something is similar and is essentially a free compound phraseological unit [9;10]. This indicates the logic of the phraseological meaning.

Phraseologism can also arise as a result of using some words in a figurative sense, and others in a literal sense. For example, in the phraseological units “aqlini yemoq” (to eat the mind), “ko‘zini bo‘yamoq” (to paint the eyes), “ko‘zi ko‘ziga tushmoq” (the eyes to get into the eyes), “og‘zi qulog‘ida” (in the ear of the mouth) the words “mind”, “eye”, “mouth” have their own meaning, and the words “eat”, “paint”, “get” are figurative. Sometimes a phraseological unit becomes a device expressing the result of an action or situation. For example, a person can bite his finger out of regret.

We observe that most phraseological units in speech are unambiguous. However, polysemanticism is also found among phraseological units. For example, the phraseological unit “aqli yetadi” means “to understand”, “to convince”, the expression “bo‘yniga qo‘ymoq” has 3 meanings: “to accuse”, “to prove”, “to hold someone responsible for doing something”, and the expression “qo‘lga olmoq” has 4 meanings: “to capture”, “to take by surprise”, “to seize with the purpose of imprisonment”, “to subordinate someone to one’s will in some way”.

Since all meanings in phraseological polysemy are mobile, it is difficult to divide them into primary and derivative.

Discussion

Semantic relations in phraseological units. As in vocabulary, linguistic-semantic relations also operate in phraseology. These include:

Phraseological synonymy. Language is a product of long historical development, and synonymous words and expressions in it arise in connection with the gradual development of human thinking. Synonyms arise as a result of people's attempts to more fully and perfectly reveal the meanings of words. From this point of view, one of the main tools of the vocabulary of any language are synonymous words and expressions.

Synonyms are a linguistic treasure that, firstly, reveals the subtlest shades of meaning of linguistic units denoting events, people and objects. Secondly, synonyms prevent repetitions and reiterations in expressing thoughts. Reuse of words can damage speech and lead to stylistic confusion. The Uzbek language has a large, rich group of synonymous words and phrases, and their appropriate use in



the speech process requires from each speaker great responsibility, respect for the national language and the spirit of the nation.

Synonymy is a semantic phenomenon that is explained as follows: “The grouping of linguistic units (words, expressions, etc.) based on the commonality of denotative meaning is called synonymy (Greek - having the same name)” [4,88]. The fact that synonyms serve to clearly and purposefully express thoughts leads to the emergence of synonymy, and the number of synonyms formed by lexical units of language is replenished depending on changes in social life.

If the phenomenon of synonymy in lexemes is more often observed within the category of a noun, then in phraseological units synonymy is found mainly in phraseological units within the category of a verb, adjective and partly the category of an adverb.

The history of the study of the phenomenon of synonymy in Uzbek linguistics is widely analyzed in the works of such scholars as S. Isamuhamedova, Ulug Tursunov, N. Radjabov, A. Doniyev, Yormat Todzhiev, H. Shamsiddinov, B. Doniyev [5;8]. In our language, issues of lexical synonymy were studied by such scientists as S. Usmonov, S. Isamuhamedova, I. Kochkortoiev, and on issues of grammatical synonymy, one can cite the works of professors M. Askarova, R. Kongurov, V. Egamberdiev, M. Sodikova, G. Zikrillaev, and on stylistic synonymy, the candidate's dissertation of A. Donierov.

In the works of the aforementioned scientists, phraseological synonyms are mixed with the phenomena of phraseological variants and phraseological graduonyms. B. Yuldoshev in the textbook “Fundamentals of the Methodology of Phraseology” notes the differences between phraseological synonyms and phraseological variants and emphasizes, that when used, phraseological synonyms can replace each other, but synonymous expressions can be replaced only if they are stylistic compatible and comply with literary and stylistic norms. But even in the most widespread usage, the phenomenon of phraseological synonymy is not differentiated from the phenomenon of phraseological graduonymy. It is necessary to distinguish between synonymous phraseological units and phraseological variants. In synonymous phrases, one word may be the same. However, the remaining words should not be manifestations of a synonymous lexeme.

The phenomenon of synonymy also exists in phraseological units. Only here it is necessary to pay attention to one point. The semantic meaning of synonymous



phraseological units is the same. For example, in such expressions as “ipidan ignasigacha” (from thread to needle) – “miridan sirigacha” (from small to large) – “qilidan quyrug‘igacha” (from head to tail), common is the semantic meaning “in all details”. However, with the difference in semantics, expressing the level of stylistic concreteness and colorfulness, with the strengthening or weakening of the lexical meaning, phraseological graduonymy certainly takes place.

Phraseological gradation. Observations show that the language system has a strictly systemic constructive character from the very first stage to the lowest stages. Even the sememes of a separate lexeme or phraseme, the composition of semes in them, the occurrence of the sememe in speech in its proper and figurative meanings, the relationship of lexical-semantic variants of speech with the sememe of the lexeme have a systemic character, as indicated by dozens of researchers, such as E. Begmatov, B. Dzhoraev, Sh. Iskandarova, I. Abdurakhmanov, R. Yunusov, I. Kochkortoiev, Sh. Rakhmatullaev, B. Bafoev, M. Narzieva, M. Mirtodzhiev, Kh. Saidov, S. Giyasov [1; 2; 5].

Naturally, phraseological units, as linguistic units, also exist in the language as an independent system. Like lexemes, in the graduonomic paradigm of phraseology, units differ in the level of expressive semantics. Therefore, phraseological units can also form their own gradational series. This can be observed in examples from works of art.

Almost all phraseological graduonyms are figurative expressions used in a figurative sense. They serve to add color and expressiveness to the author's speech and are considered one of the most effective means of describing a character's speech. A distinctive feature of phraseological graduonyms is that they play an important role in distinguishing the emotional and expressive potential of a specific phraseological unit.

Phraseological hyponymy. Another type of interphraseological semantic relations, similar to lexemes, is hyponymy (or more precisely, hypohypernymy), that is, the relation of type to gender. In relation to hyponymy, a hyperonym (type) and hyponym (genus) are distinguished.

A hypernym is a unit representing the name of an object, indicating a gender characteristic, and considered a central lexeme, a dominant unit of a microsystem,



semantically generalizing a set of meanings. A hyponym is a lexical unit that represents the name of a certain gender type and implicitly expresses gender meaning in its semantic structure, semantically richer than a hypernym.

The connection between the hyponym and the hypernym has a logical basis. It is connected with the concept of community in objective existence. For example, the hypernym "laughter", as a phraseme expressing the meaning of a type, unites all expressions expressing the type of laughter, based on lexical-semantic relations, forming a lexical-semantic group. Consequently, the lexeme "laughter", as a hypernym, can enter into a lexical-semantic connection with its hyponym. Hyponyms are equal and have the same relation to the hypernym. In turn, this relation is also connected with the phenomena of polysemy and homonymy. The meaning of the hypernym is broader and "fuzzy" (more indefinite) than the hyponymic lexeme, while the meaning of the hyponymic lexeme is narrower and "brighter" than the hypernym. Therefore, we can say that the spiritual essence of a hypernym is equal to the sum of the spiritual essences of all its hyponyms.

Phraseological paronymy. Paronymy is a phenomenon expressing the relationship of the whole to the part between lexemes. For example, a tree (whole) – a branch, root, trunk, leaf, bark (parts). Lexical paronymy has been widely studied in Uzbek linguistics [6,8], but the question of the existence of the phenomenon of phraseological paronymy in the Uzbek language still remains open.

In our opinion, phraseological paronyms are also found in the Uzbek language. For example, considering a person (as a whole) and his body parts (head, face, forehead, mouth, tongue, nose, ear, arm, leg, shoulder, waist, heart, lung, liver, intestines (piece)), we took as an example of phraseological paronymy the phraseological units formed by these lexemes.

Phraseological antonymy. Antonyms with opposite meanings express concepts that are opposite to each other. As we have seen, lexical units can form microsystems such as lexical antonyms (between words), phraseological antonyms (between phrasemes) and lexical-phraseological antonyms (between words and phrasemes), depending on their contradictory meanings.

Conclusion

In a phrase, two or more lexemes, having lost their lexical independence, are subordinated to one common semantic center, which serves to embody the meaning understood from the phraseme as a whole. The meaning understood from a phraseme is not a simple (arithmetic) sum of the meanings understood from the lexemes included in it, but is embodied as a generalized, superordinate meaning, and at the same time a figurative meaning.

The specificity of the phraseological meaning determines the nature of the semantic relations between phrasemes. Synonymous, antonymous and level relations of phrasemes with lexemes differ from interphrase relations. In this regard, in the phraseological meaning, in contrast to the lexical meaning, along with nomination, figurative affiliation, etc., the constant presence of connotation is important. Phraseologisms are linguistic and cultural units that carry cultural information about the world, objective existence and society. Therefore, phraseologisms are a "fount of wisdom" that preserves the mentality and culture of the people and is passed on from generation to generation.

REFERENCES

- 1.Бегматов Э. Ўзбек адабий тилининг лексик қатламлари.–Т.Фан, 1985.– 200 б.
- 2.Данияров Б.Х. Проблемы лексической синонимии узбекского языка: коннотативный аспект семантики номинативных единиц. –М., 1994. –С. 15-93.
- 3.Djurayev B. A. Insufficiently studied problems of language policy and language situation in modern Uzbekistan. –Т.: Мерос, 2001.– S.20-29.
- 4.Ҳожиёв А.. Тилшунослик терминларининг изохли луғати. –Тошкент: Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси.–2002.– Б. 88.
- 5.Искандарова Ш.М. Ўзбек тили лексикасини мазмуний майдон сифатида ўрганиш (шахс микромайдони): Филол.фан. док. дис. автореф.–Т.: ТАИ,1999. – Б.12.
- 6.Қиличев Б. Ўзбек тилида партонимия: Филол.фанлари номзоди ...дис. автореф. –Т.:ТАИ, 1997.– Б. 8.
- 7.Раҳматуллаев Ш. Ҳозирги адабий ўзбек тили. Дарслик. – Тошкент: Университет, 2006. –Б. 437.



8. Вафоева М. Ўзбек тилида фразеологик синонимлар ва уларнинг структурал-семантик таҳлили: Филол. фан. номзоди дисс. – Самарқанд.– 2010.– Б.112.
9. Yuldasheva D.N., Asadova Sh.A. O‘zbek tilida frazeologik graduonimiya. Monografiya. – Germaniya: Globe Edit international Publishing Group.– 2021.– 85 p.
10. Yuldasheva D.N., Asadova Sh.A. Graduonimiya hodisasi va uning tadqiqi xususida// Ayniy vorislari, 2024. – Buxoro, 2-son. – 106-110-b.
11. Юлдашева Д. Профессиональные фразеология (Professional Phraseology)// International conference on academic studies in philology (BICOASP). – 2019/3. – С. 26-28.