THE ISSUE OF SEMEMA IN THE SEMANTIC TAGGING OF LANGUAGE UNITS

Axmedova Dildora Baxodirovna
Doctoral Student of BSU, PhD
daxmedova77@gmail.com

ANNOTATION

The article describes the semantic magnification in Corpus Linguistics and the reasoning about the problems of semantic touch and their solutions. Although the idea of the composition of lexical meaning (semema) is now recognized by many semasiologists, but there are still quite controversial places in the matter of the character of this composition, the relationship of meaning components to each other, as well as in the article the interpretation of semantic markers and semantic differentiating terms.

Keywords: corpus, semantic marking, semantic tags, semantics, semasiology, sema, semema, word, lemma, homonymy, polysemy, semema stresses, semantic marker, semantic discriminator.

INTRODUCTION

There are several studies on the theory of semantic razmetkalash in Corpus Linguistics, the problems of the development of semantic tags. Y.D.Apresyan, I.M.Boguslavsky, B.L.Iamdin; Y.V.Biryalsev, A.M.Yelizarov, N.G.Jilsov, V.V.Ivanov, O.A.Nevzorova, V.D.Solovyev; I.S.Kononenko, Y.A.Sidorova; Y.I.Yakovchuk, Y.V.Rakhilina, G.I.Kustova, O.N.Lyashevskaya, T.I.Reznikova, O.Y.Shemanayeva, A.A. The research of the Cretans can be included in the list of such works.

The development of the principles of creating a set of semantic tags for the body of each language stems from the characteristics inherent in this language. For this reason, studies on semantics and semasiology of the Uzbek language serve as a theoretical basis for the creation of a set of semantic tags in the Uzbek language Corpus, development of the principles of semantic touching of words.

ANALYSIS

The semantic touch of the word requires a full coverage of its semas. Based on the opinion of I. Kochkortoev, B.N. Golovin, F. Fortunatov, L.I. Barannikova, A.A. Patebnya, U. Tursunovs elucidate these thoughts: "the word is the smallest unit of meaning of the language and has the property of a free recovery in speech to form a sentence" [Golovin B.N. Vvedenie v yazykoznanie. − Moskva, 1973. − str. 70.); "The word is the most important unit of language, because in the word all the basic elements of the structure of the language are united" [Fortunatov, 1956:132]; "A literal expression without a section of meaningful sounds in the language is called a sound word" [Barannikov, 2010:392]; "Word-a unit of meaning with sounds" [Potebnya, 1958:13.); "The word is one of the complex language phenomena, it occupies a separate, central place among the number of language units (morpheme, phraseological unit)" [U.Tursunov va b., 1965:122]. According to I. Kochkortoyev, in the presented definitions, the word is a non-verbal unit (morpheme, word combination, sentence, etc.), characteristics that allow to distinguish

from not fully specified. [I. Qo'chqortoyev, 1965:122] The difficulty of describing the concept of words perfectly, consistently and without conflict forced some scholars to repeatedly touch upon this topic. For example, in the works of A. Meye there are four different definitions of the word concept. One of these definitions (chronologically the third) is common among linguists in the name of Meye's famous formula; The report is included in the dictionary of linguistic terms. This definition is as follows: "the Association of certain sounds with a certain meaning, which allows a certain grammatical application, is called a word" [Maruzo, 1960:274.] It is impossible not to see that this recipe is more thorough than all of the above recipes. Nevertheless, there are also serious shortcomings in this definition of the word. First of all, we must say that in this definition there is no criterion that allows us to distinguish between homonymy and polysemy: from the definition it turns out that each of the polysemantic word meanings is a separate word. Secondly, the genus presented in the definition lacks clarity, consistency in a private sign, which should limit the word by definition (general concept). In the definition of A. Meye word as a concept, the Association of a particular meaning with a certain vowel is given. To describe the concept of a word as a unit of meaning with the sound lexis is also shown by other linguists. G. Glisson's work "introduction to descriptive linguistics" talks about the three components of the language:

1) Structure of expression;
2) Content structure;
3) Dictionary.

If the unit of the structure of the expression is morpheme, then the unit of the structure of the content is semema.

This classification of G. Glisson comes very handy for Corpus Linguistics in the semantic touch of lemmas. In order for the morphological touch of the verb in the language bodies to be based on the structure of its expression, in the semantic touch, the structure of its meaning should be fully touched. If the structure of the content is not fully covered, then such a body cannot fully manifest the wealth of the language, since it does not cover all the meanings of the word. And the dictionary forms the semantic base of the language Corpus.

According to I. Kochkortoev, one of the issues associated with the word is the question of the character of the semantic volume of the word. This issue, of principle importance for semasiological research, is interpreted differently in linguistics. When drawing up a language body, touching its units, there is a need to refer to these interpretations and views.

The fact that the semantic volume of the word (meaning, meaning side of the word) is not a single, holistic phenomenon is recognized by all linguists. The fact that the elements of the word semantics are not a single type of phenomenon, too, no one doubts. The issue that causes intense debate among linguists is the question of the relationship of the elements of word semantics to each other: are the elements of word semantics different meanings or should one be considered different manifestations, variants of meaning? What solution should this issue have in the semantic touching of words in the language Corpus?

According to a group of scientists, the phoneme, which is a unit of language, is realized in speech as a private phenomenon, both in the literal meaning (general meaning). [Zvigensev, 1957:217] Such an arrangement of the issue is due to the mutual differentiation of two phenomena: the general meaning (1) and the variants of the private meaning (2). Such an understanding of the

meaning of the word rejects polysemy. According to this point of view, such terms as the main meaning, the right meaning, the portable meaning do not mean real events; the word does not have such meanings. In the literal sense, the result of a certain generalization will be strengthened, and as long as this generalization process does not stop during the whole life and development of the language, the generalization in several directions in one word cannot be carried out parallel. Therefore, more than one meaning in the word does not arise either, since According to V.A. Zveginsev, in order for polysemy to form, generalization in the so-called more than one direction is necessarily carried out parallel. "The meaning of the word can consist of many potential typical combinations, - writes V.A. Zveginsev, in these sense, potential typical combinations characterize the unique meaning of the word from different sides.

Scientists argue that the idea of the composition of lexical meaning (semema)is now recognized by many semasiologists, although the character of this composition is still quite controversial in the question of the relationship of meaning components to each other.

Some linguists interpret lexical meaning (semema)as a simple set of differential semantic signs. According to this view, the components contained in the lexical meaning are mutually equal in value and differ in character and number of semantic characters from one meaning to another. In this respect, it is possible to indicate the observations of T.P Lomtev. In one of his articles, the component composition of the meaning of words denoting individuals who differ among themselves. [Lomtev, 1976:296-297.] T.P. Lomtev writes that the meanings of such words (in general, all words) cannot be fully revealed in the existing dictionaries. For example, the meaning of the word "donishmand" in dictionaries the meaning of the word wise man, perceptive is interpreted in the style of a quick-tempered. T.P. Lomtev considers these definitions insufficient and interprets the meanings of these words as follows: donishmand – 1) shaxs, 2) mulohaza yuritishga qodir, 3) boy intuitsiya egasi, 4) tez fahmlovchi, 5) ko'p o'qigan; ziyrak – 1) shaxs, 2) mulohaza yuritishga qodir, 3) intuitsiya egasi, 4) normal fahmlovchi.

In this regard, the issue that interests us is the question of how to indicate the meanings of wise and perceptive words in the above interpretation. From the presented interpretation it is understood that the meaning of the word wise consists of five components, and the meaning of the word wise consists of four components. Part of these components is common for both words: 1) Person, 2) able to reason. A group of components has a special character: 1) the owner of a rich intuition, 2) a quick-tempered, 3) a lot-read (these components belong to the word wise); 1) the owner of the intuition, 2) a normal interpreter (these components belong to the perceptive word). The grouping of lexical meaning components into such two (general and special components) arises from their different position in the composition of meaning. From this it is understood that the semantic components in the lexical meaning are not elements of mutual equal value, but elements that are subordinate to each other, interpreting the other.

Semantic marker is a component that denotes a feature of the lexical unit of meaning that has a regular character for a particular language dictionary composition. This component expresses a systematic relationship between this lexical unit and other lexical units that have the same component. In other words, the semantic marker will be the basis for combining more than one semema into one lexical-semantic group.

The semantic discriminator is a component, which is inherent in the concrete meaning itself, serving to subtract it from other meanings. [Qo'chqortoyev, 1977:96] Semantic marker and semantic differentiation are very important parameters in the semantic touch of Corpus units.

CONCLUSION

What is said about the structure of lexical meaning (semema) allows us to draw the following conclusion:

1. Semema (lexical meaning) is not a holistic phenomenon that does not decompose into parts. Semema will consist of a specific structure of ideal elements (thought components).

2. Two different elements of the structure of Semema (lexical meaning) are distinguished among themselves: semantic (lexical-semantic) component and valence (structural-syntagmatic component).

3. According to the place of bearing in the structure of Semema, the components are divided into three types: General (unifying), differential (differentiating) and complementary components.

4. The valence of Semema is of two types according to the property of expression in the flow of speech: syntactic reactive valence and syntactic non-reactive valence.

REFERENCE

1. Apresyan YU.D., Boguslavskij I.M., Iomdin B.L. i dr. Sintaksicheski i semanticheski annotirovannyj korpus russkogo yazyka: sovremennoe sostoyanie i perspektivy // Nacional'nyj korpus russkogo yazyka: 2003-2005. – Moskva: Indrik, 2005. – C.193-214.

2. Biryal'cev E.V., Elizarov A.M., ZHil'cov N.G., Ivanov V.V., Nevzorova O.A., Solov'ev V.D. Model' semanticheskogo poiska v kollekciyah matematicheskih dokumentov na osnove ontologij // Trudy 12j Vserossijskoj nauchnoj konferencii "Elektronnye biblioteki: perspektivnye metody i tekhnologii, elektronnye kollekcii" – RCDL'2010. – Kazan', 2010. – C.296-300.

3. Kononenko I.S., Sidorova E.A. Sistema semanticheskoj razmetki korpusa tekstov kak instrument izvlecheniya ekspertnyh znanij (na materiale tekstov po katalizu) // Trudy mezhdunarodnoj konferencii "Korpusnaya lingvistika – 2011". – Sankt-Peterburg, 2011. – C. 193-198.

4. YAkovchuk E.I., Sidorova E.A. Obobshchennye semantiko-sintaksicheskie modeli v zadachah obrabotki teksta // Trudy rabochego seminara "Naukoemkoe programmnoe obespechenie NPO-2011". Ershovskaya konferenciya po informatike. – Novosibirsk: ISI SO RAN, 2011. – S.287-292.

5. Golovin B.N. Vvedenie v yazykoznanie. – Moskva, 1973. – str. 70.

6. Fortunatov F. Izbrannye trudy. t. I. – Moskva, 1956. – str. 132.

7. Barannikova L.I. Vvedenie v yazykoznanie: Uchebnoe posobie / Predisl. V.E.Gol'dina. Izd. 2-e, dop. - Moskva: Knizhnyj dom «LIBROKOM». 2010. – 392 s.

8. Potebnya A.A. Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike. – t. I-II. – Moskva, 1958. – str. 13.

9. Tursunov U., Muhtorov ZH., Raҳmatullaev SH. Ҳozirgi ўzbek adabij tili. – Toshkent, 1965. – B.122.

10. Қўchқortoev I. Sўz ma"nosi va uning valentligi. – Toshkent, 1965. – B.122.

11. Maruzo ZH. Slovar' lingvisticheskih terminov. – Moskva, 1960. – str. 274.

12. Кÿchқortoev I. Sÿz ma"nosi va uning valentligi. - Toshkent: Fan, 1977.

13. Zvegincev V.A. Semasiologiya. – Moskva, 1957. – str. 217.

14. Lomtev T.P. O postroenii analitiko-smyslovogo slovarya russkogo yazyka, «Obshchee i russkoe yazykoznanie». – Moskva, 1976. – str. 296-297.