



Expression of Semema and its Components in the Semantic Extension

Axmedova Dildora Baxodirovna ¹, Hamidova Iroda ²

¹ Doctoral student of BSU (DSC), PhD

² Student of the Department of English Literature of Bukhara state university

Abstract: This article discusses the internal, content side of the lexeme, the sememe, and the relationship of concept. The types of essence of semas are analyzed and the question of in which case they take place from the semantic extension is explained by examples.

Keywords: lexeme, nomeme, sememe, semantic extension, link, database, interface, corpus linguistics, tags, valence, connotative and denotative meaning.

INTRODUCTION

As you know, the lexeme is formed both externally and internally. The outer shell of the lexeme is called the nomeme. Nomema refers to the derivative of phonemes that make up the material side of the lexeme – the sounds of speech. For example, the outer side of the lexeme [Vatan] consists of the sum of the sounds V+A+T+A+N. Sources claim that linguistic unity is interpreted as free from materiality. Accordingly, neither the lexeme nor the other linguistic unit should have such materiality. In the textbook “the current Uzbek literary language”, published by R. Sayfullayeva and other authors, this issue is explained as follows: “the word materiality should not be departed in this place as directly affecting the sense member. Alternatively, by the form material appearance, which is not understood.

When we think about something, we separate it from others, imagining its appearance in our minds. The image of a thing in consciousness is also called a form. When a person thinks about a lexeme, it becomes obvious in internal speech. In the actual external speech, this form acquires a real, real material appearance. So, when the formative side of the lexeme in consciousness is outside the organs of intuition, in a state that does not affect it, the lexeme becomes a word when speech is realized, an immaterial form, that is, the nomeme acquires materiality, becomes felt with the sense member.”

ANALYSIS

The internal, meaningful side of the lexeme is called semema. Semema is the embodied appearance in the lexeme of such a concept as what is reflected in consciousness, character, quantity, action. In other words, semema is an internal aspect of the lexeme. The sememe of one lexeme will not be exactly similar to the sememe of the second lexeme. In other words, there are no two lexemes with the same sememe. In the textbook highlighted above, the idea is based on “we can be sure of this on the basis of comparing the sememe of two synonymous lexemes: [yuz] – a stylistic neutral expression of the part of the front of the human head from the forehead to the chin. [Bet] - Expression characteristic of the colloquial style of the part of the front of the human head from the forehead to the chin. It seems that the element "stylistic neutral" in the first sememe is absent in the second sememe, and the element "characteristic of the colloquial style" in the second sememe is absent in the first sememe. If semema remains exactly, then this is the basis for saying that there is an imperfection in their description. When Semema is perfectly described, from

this description to the most subtle aspects of this language, a person who has a thorough understanding of which lexeme the word is going about”. Therefore, from this point of view we conclude that it is required to be extremely attentive in giving sememes of lexemes.

Following the path of reduction, compaction of comments given in explanatory dictionaries, it is necessary not to compromise the quality of comments of semas. In addition, when compiling a semantic extension of synonymous lexemes, going only the path of giving a link will not give a good result; semas may remain unopened if limited to giving a mutual link to synonyms. For this reason, clear principles for enriching semantic extensions with hyperlinks must be developed.

In the aforementioned source, the issue of interpreting semas is reacted as follows: “in Linguistics, sema is distinguished as the element that makes up semema. For example, the [kitob] lexeme is a two-sememe, one sememe of which is "a non-periodic educational tool composed of a sheet, covered, printed or handwritten", which consists of the following components:

- 1) " Made up of sheets”;
- 2) " Learning tool”;
- 3) " Non-periodic”;
- 4) " Printed or handwritten”;
- 5) ”covered".

With the replacement of one sema in semema, it can turn into a completely different sememe. For example, if we replace the above "non-periodic" sema with the "periodic" sema, it will in itself remain the sema of the lexeme [journal]". These points are based; there is no need to analyze them. In the semantic extension, it is necessary to follow exactly the points presented in this quote in the correct reflection, not breaking the semas of lexemes. For example, replacing or shortening (due to inattention) sema the headword of the semantic extension leads to the fact that not all semas of the lexeme are interpreted or a vision appears, like any other lexeme.

Scientists distinguish two directions in relation to semema in linguistics:

- a) Approach from within (i.e. from sememe to lexeme);
- b) Approach in absentia (that is, from lexeme to sememe).

LITERATURE REVIEW

In Uzbek linguistics, semema and the attitude of consciousness are interpreted differently. Some experts believe that semema, most often, will be associated with a certain concept in our consciousness. Consciousness is a unit of consciousness, logic, and semema is a unit specific to language, lexeme. A semema in many cases involves several concepts. In particular, the sememe of the lexeme [apricot] is manifested in the following concepts: a) a type of wet fruit; b) the dried of this fruit; C) the tree that gives this fruit. Accordingly, the concept and semema mutual are not suitable for all time. This phenomenon is especially evident in spiritual lexemes. It seems that the phenomenon of asymmetry in linguistic signs is also seen in the semema and concept relationship. When drawing up a semantic extension, we rely on the comments in the bile. For this reason, it is natural that the defects in the wood are repeated when giving semis. However, we will avoid abandoning existing SEMAS, allowing reducing comments. For example, if three semas of the lexeme [apricot] are listed in the herb, all these semas are entered and displayed as separate semas.

It should be noted that the appearance of the semantic extension in the interface and the appearance of the database that makes it up differ.

Linguist Sh.Rahmatullayev assesses only a unit with a sememe as a lexeme: “we are used to the path of analysis, that is, the path from speech to language. Of course, from a concrete unit (word form) it is easy to get to abstract units (word forming units). Going this way, we separate the part that represents the lexical meaning in the word form and name it the lexeme. The unit of language, which originally means lexical meaning, is called a lexeme”. Hence, the scientist does not prefer to

view an imperfect unit as a lexeme because he treats the interpretation of the lexeme from the inside (meaning). Issues like these cannot be a theoretical problem for Corpus Linguistics. After all, corpus linguistics relies on theoretical linguistic achievements, uses generalizations. Corpus linguistics is a practical linguistics. Nevertheless, there will be such problems that without solving them in theoretical linguistics, there will be no support for the Corpus.

DISCUSSION

Sema in Semema is not the same. Sema in essence is of three types:

- 1) Syllabic sema (denotative sema);
- 2) Expression sema (connotative sema);
- 3) Task sema (functional sema).

The syllabic sema is determined by being, the expression sema is determined by the speaker's attitude, and the task sema is determined by the lexeme's role in listen and speech. The syllabic sema is the noun sema, assigning the property of the lexeme in being-action-state, thing-subject, quantitative, determinant. They connect being, understanding and semema. For example, all the sema of the lexeme [book] presented above is the sema – the sema of the citation. This sema is naturally reflected in the semantic extension as well as being the first part of the semantic extension.

Expression sema refers to semema, which assigns various additional meanings (stylistic coloring, personal attitude, scope and period of application) in the composition of semema. An expression sema, such as the sema of a call, is a sema that has the power to distinguish a sememe of a lexeme, which is also defined in a lexical paradigm. For example, the "archaic" in the [aero plan] lexeme, the "neologism" in the [computer] lexeme, the "dialect-specific" sema in the [harseb] lexeme, indicating the period and scope of application of the expression sema. The expression sema is highlighted in the extension with a special icon. For example, the pometa indicating the period of application, the tags indicating the specificity of the dialect are among them.

The expression sema is also classified into an important or non-essential type. Therefore, the differentiating, essential expression semas are called the inherent connotative sema and the non-essential expression semas are called the adherent connotative sema. The task sema is the sema that indicates the possibility of attachment (valence) of the lexeme, what place it occupies in the linguistic mold. For example, the valence capacity of lexemes such as [Book], [notebook], [school], [Go] is extremely wide and therefore comes in the function of different parts of speech in a sentence. The task Sema of the lexemes [firm], [sharp], [blue], [Reddish] is narrow and therefore clear. They are not only able to associate with certain words. From the above it becomes clear that the valence property of lexemes is also desirable to take place from the semantic extension.

The word is a known subject that, together with the fact that it means real-lexical meaning by expressing the concept of either event or event, in the same tense, the same word can also come to mean a different meaning in a different context. For example, my sister, in the example of bring a mirror, the word Mirror is used in its initial, real (lexical) meaning, expressing the concept of a mirror. Alternatively, take the word spring. Along with the fact that the word spring expresses the concept that it is one of the seasons of the year, it is also used in fiction, especially in one type of poetry, in many portable meanings: The Shining snow of Elbrus the great on the day of boiling in the South Sun. The Tsar was filled in a long, heavy exile from the spring of Russian poetry. (H.Alimjan.) in this passage, the poet used the word spring in a portable sense.

The lexical meaning of the word is the correct meaning of the word. For example, The Sun, The Star – the planet, these meanings are the lexical, correct meanings of the words Sun, Star, treasure. The lexical/prime meaning of a word and one (or several) semas in its own meaning form the basis of a semantic extension. In the semantic extension, first, the word itself is brought into meaning. After that, portable meanings are brought, if any, tags are placed in the database that represent this.

People rely on their own experience in the production process, in living and other areas, using words in a variety of portable meanings by analogy, irony, exaggeration, adjective and other methods. Hence, in addition to the word's own real, lexical, correct meaning, the use of analogy, exaggeration or irony in other meanings by such methods is called the portable meaning of the word.

The derivative meaning arises in several ways: like metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and task making. Derivative meaning appears based on proper, prime meanings.

Metaphor (gr. metaphor-eviction), first of all, the mechanism of speech, the use of a lexeme to express a different meaning based on the external, apparent similarity of the denotation. For the formation of a metaphorical meaning, one of the following causes:

- 1) One word is more suitable and suitable for the purpose of the speaker's expression in relation to another word; therefore, in place of the first, the second is used;
- 2) There will be no exponent of one denotate, and a certain word will be used to express another denotate as well.

Hence, in the first case the word being copied is the second term of denotate, while in the second case it is the first term. For example, the word (skirt) was used in relation to the lower side of the mountain, since the word (skirt) means more convenient and complete. Since the Uzbek language does not have the name of a specific geographical place in the sea, the word (armpit) is also used in relation to it.

If such meanings (grass) are reflected in the dictionary, it is necessary to indicate it by definition in a semantic extension. If such meanings are not indicated in the herbalist, then it is impossible to expand the semantic extension. Usually, metaphorical meanings are brought in the herb.

CONCLUSION

It seems that there is a reference to the connotative meaning of the word, but the method of migration of meaning is not indicated. When developing a data warehouse of a semantic extension, it is advisable to enter columns indicating methods of connotation of meaning. Then what method of migration of meaning exists is visible in the semantic extension. It should be noted that the appearance of the semantic extension in the interface and the appearance of the database that makes it up differ.

From the above it becomes clear that the valence property of lexemes is also desirable to take place from the semantic extension.

References:

1. Sayfullayeva R. va b. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. O'quv qo'llanma. – Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2009. – 391 b.
2. Rustamov A. So'z hususida so'z. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston LKSM Markazij «Yosh gvardiya» nashriyoti, 1987. – 235 b.
3. Ahmedova D.B. Semantik razmetka tizimida ko'p ma'nolilik va filtr // Berdaq nomidagi Qoraqalpoq davlat universitetining axborotnomasi. – 2020, 1-son. – B. 202-205.
4. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. Besh jildli. 1-jild. – Toshkent: ŷzME, 2006. – 680 b.
5. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. Besh jildli. 2-jild. – Toshkent: O'zME, 2006. – 672 b.
6. Akhmedova D.B., Mengliyev B. Semantic Tag Categories in Corpus Linguistics: Experience and Examination// International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE) ISSN: 2277-3878, Volume-8, Issue-3S, October-2019
7. Akhmedova D.B. Semantic labeling of language units// International Journal on Integrated Education. E-ISSN: 2620 3502 p-ISSN: 2615 3785. Volume 3, Issue I, Jan 2020. – P. 177-179