

LOGIC OF THE CONTENT AREA STRUCTURE

Sh.M. Iskandarova

professor of FSU

ANNOTATION: The article discusses the semantic field, its components, linguistic relations between the elements of the field, the views of linguists on this matter, the role of the field-based approach in the formation of today's new views .

KEY WORDS: Semantic field, field elements, opposition, zero opposition, privative opposition, equivalent opposition, logical structure, antonymic relation, metadenotate, metadesignate.

It is known that in the meaningful field, words do not enter into internal relations and connections with the sum of all their meanings, but enter into relations with their separate meanings. Meaning can be viewed as a set of differential-content signs or components of words. YHKaraulov asserts that any two sets are related to each other as follows:

1) *zero opposition* is an equal relationship between sets, the elements of such sets, i.e., the main parts of the meanings of the words being compared, are the same, such an opposition is synonymous and synonymous between two units in a conflicting relationship there will be connections. Their main parts are similar, they differ in subtleties of meaning;

2) *privative opposition* or strict access relations - such relations have species and genus names, sometimes these relations are also called hyponymy. Two cases can be observed:

a) the relativity (specificity) of a certain set is shown, that is, the set is part of a set higher than itself (elephant-animal-living being);

b) a second set (or its unit) appears as a specific name within a given set. Weissgerber uses terminology that is not related to logical concepts of species to define these private relations: for example, tulip , *rose*, *saffron*, *flower* are hyponyms (sogiponyms), and *flower* is considered superordinate to them;

3) *equipole opposition* - in which two sets intersect with each other, at their intersection a common part of both sets is formed. The meanings being compared have the same and different components, they can be within the same word group (as above), different groups, as well as separate meanings of polysemous words;

4) *disjunctive opposition* - there are no common elements of sets .

Thus, while solving the issue of the meaningful connection of words in the field, it is necessary to focus on the following. Two words are related if their meanings have a common part (sets intersect). In this case, it is necessary to enter the meanings in the meaningful field with their general components, that is, with the parts that are in zero, equivalent, and specific opposition. If the relations between the sets correspond to the four types of opposition, then the opposition between the elements of the set is only null and disjunctive.

The special appearance of different elements is considered opposite elements that negate each other. This relationship is also called antonymic opposition. From the above, it can be seen that within disjunctive relations, it is necessary to distinguish between permanent disjunctive relations and antonymic relations that arise under certain conditions. Antonymous relations appear only when there is a privative opposition.

A set is given by counting the elements (nightingale, hummingbird, parrot - set of birds) or by naming the set (set of rare birds). Among the elements of the set there are those that can be called by the name of the set: *nightingale* - a wandering bird. Annotated dictionaries use set names to a certain extent for the purpose of defining and explaining the word.

However, it is not always correct to use the collection name for each element. If two sets are in a particular opposition, there is necessarily an antonymic opposition between the oppositions formed by their elements, but not vice versa.

The following conclusions follow from this: antonymic relations are subordinate, secondary relations. They appear only in conditions of special opposition of two sets. According to the nature of antonymic relations in the field, compared to lexical antonyms, although they are closer to logical relations, they are still based on universal lexical antonymy; the concept of antonymic opposition is broader than antonymy: for example, *hand* and *foot* are not considered antonyms in the national language, but they are antonyms in the content field. Because they can be included in one set, which receives the name of type - superordinate; in the lexicon, if antonyms are in an exclusive disjunctive relationship (light is not dark), one of the functions of relations in the semantic field is to transform an exclusive disjunction into an exceptional disjunction.

This process occurs by defining the limits of opposition. For example, when light negates darkness, an arm and a leg can exist simultaneously. But the body is given a superordinate, and when its members (head, arms, legs, waist...) form a field, it is observed that they contradict each other to a certain extent.

In the field, antonyms do not simply negate each other in the same way as general lexical antonyms, for which the comparator has some basis, and a certain commonality is also taken into account. In the field, this generality must be the type name (superordinate) relative to the nucleus.

Synonymous group is a minimum - i.e. small paradigm of words and alternative phraseology with their functions, which are part of a more complex lexical-semantic paradigmatic field. When determining synonyms, based on semantic criteria, language units that have exactly the same meaning are taken into account. This phenomenon is expressed as omosemant and parasemant in the works of YDApresyan .

When synonyms are understood as omosemantics, understanding the expression as a relational category reflecting only the meaning of the word in the language, when synonyms are understood as parasemantics (ie, quasi-synonyms), the degree of their semantic closeness becomes an important issue.

Understanding synonyms in the form of parasemantics makes it possible to replace words with the same meaning in some situations. In this interpretation, synonymous groups are not

distinguished from other meaningful groups (LSG, antonymic, hyponymic groups), that is, determining their boundaries becomes somewhat complicated.

DHShmelev suggests including words with similar meanings, whose positional semantic differences can be neutralized, into lexical synonyms. Although this is a very important criterion, it does not serve to distinguish between linguistic and speech synonyms.

In this regard, the opinions of L.A. Novikov are noteworthy. He explains synonyms as symmetrical hyponymy in terms of double implication, ie:

- 1) equivalent cases: *linguistics - linguistics* (symmetric expression);
- 2) unilateral implication: *a flower is a rose* (symmetrical hyponymy).

According to LMVasilev's interpretation, parasemantics should be understood as lexical units of the language that are consistent with the conceptual parts of the meaning, but separate from its connotative parts.

In our opinion, the understanding of synonyms as parasemantics should be one of the necessary issues to be solved in current world linguistics, in which the level of semantic closeness of units is seriously considered.

When it comes to the field, it is appropriate to think separately about antonymic units. Antonym groups, consisting of two parts, their members, dominants, are opposed to each other by certain components of meaning: *big-small*.

features of the opposition of antonymic units are shown:

- a) the outermost units are contrasted: other units in the set can fall between them, they are called opposite antonyms. For example: *young (middle age) old*;
- b) it is characterized by the absence of words defining the concept of type: *together - separately*. They are called complementary antonyms;
- v) activity, action, situations in different directions are represented: *to come - to leave*, they are vector antonyms.

Synonyms and antonyms are related, and they also have a common sign through a substantive meaning. YDKaraulov interprets them as antonymic use of synonyms and synonymous use of antonyms. For example, if "*koz-gavhari-shamchirog*" are synonymous units expressed in different ways in a certain sense, they are also used as an antonymic tool.

A class of words belonging to different word groups that have a meaningful relationship with each other forms an inter-category lexical field. The nests of the transpositive type belong to them: *walk - foot; to see - eye; a predator - like a tiger*.

A deeper understanding of the relationship between the elements of the field requires an examination of its conceptual aspect. In logic, concepts are divided into comparable concepts, which have common elements, and incomparable concepts, which do not have common elements.

We know that the meaning of a separate word is determined by the relationship between the signified (denotate - an object or event specific to real existence) and the signifier (designate - the reflection of the object in the mind or the concept of the object).

A separate word indicates denotation and reflects designate. The expression (denotation) expressed by words also belongs to a certain field of objects and enters into a series of relations. A class of expressions is called an extended expression (metadenotate), where the extended expression corresponds to a subject, subject classes. In turn, the signifier (designate) enters into a series of relations and connections unique to itself, that is, it corresponds to a certain class of signifiers. A class of expressions can be called an extended expression (metadesignat). The extended expression includes the pragmatic aspect of the word.

References

Iskandarova, S., & Tursunova, D. (2022). SEMANTICS OF ASSOCIATIVE RELATIONS IN THE POETRY OF ERKIN VOKHIDOV. *Oriental Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(02), 25-31.

Iskandarova, S. M., & qizi Ikromova, G. A. (2022). Stylistic Characteristics Of Some Lexical Units Used In Uzbek Dramas. *Zien Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5, 4-7.

Iskandarova, S., Karimova, S., & Abdukarimova, M. (2021). NEGATIVE PREFIXES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES. *Збірник наукових праць SCIENTIA*.

Iskandarova, S., & Mirzatillaeva, S. (2021). ARABIC ASSIMILATIONS USED IN FITRAT'S JOURNALISTIC WORKS. *CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES*, 2(06), 88-92.

ISKANDAROVA, S., & Iminjanova, H. Z. (2021). THE TASKS OF PARTS OF SENTENCE IN THE WORKS OF A. NURMONOV. *THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE Учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука*, (12), 365-367.

Iskandarova, S. M., & Ashurov, D. A. (2020). Linguculturological Analysis Of Head Stem Phrasemas. *JournalNX*, 6(12), 378-383.

Iskandarova, S. M., & Kholdarova, I. (2020). GENERONYMS IN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE ANDRIDDLES. *Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology*, 2(7), 225-231.

Iskandarova, S. M. (2020). GNOSEOLOGY AND THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF THE WORLD. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (8), 19-22.

Iskandarova, S. M. (2019). THE ISSUE OF POLYSEMANTICS IN THE SEMANTIC FIELD. *Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology*, 1(8), 236-239.