



SEMANTIC-ASYMMETRIC INTERPRETATION OF THE "FOOD" FRAME (Using synonymy as an example)

Khasanov Akbarjon Abdurashidovich

Docent

Candidate of Philological Sciences
Kokand State Pedagogical Institute

ANNOTATION

The semantic-asymmetric study of the "food" frame in the article was carried out on the example of a synonym series of the food lexeme. The phenomenon of semantic asymmetry in the range of synonym units was analyzed using the frame method. In the process of analysis, under the notion of a linguistic person, the awareness of a person belonging to a particular society from the language belonging to that society, the degree and ability to use opportunities were proved through practical examples. Also, in this article, the linguistic realization of semantic acuity in the semantic structure of the synonymic lexemes was studied within the framework of the thought activity and mental structures of the linguistic personality. Rather than onomasiological and semasiological studies conducted on synonyms, it was proved that the application of the cognitive-conceptual method of frame analysis to them was an effective method of analysis.

KEYWORDS: *frame, frame semantics, frame analysis, synonymy, semantic acuity, language and thought, mental structures.*

DISCUSSION

Since the emergence of mankind, language has always been developing and improving under its influence. But admittedly, language based on different paradigms of different eras (comparative-historical, traditional, system-structure), the study took the human factor away from the research object. Currently interpretation based on the anthropocentric paradigm has set itself the goal of eliminating some gaps in the field of language research. "The anthropocentric paradigm is the shift of the researcher's attention from the object of cognition to the subject, that is, the human man is studied inside the language and the language is studied in the structure of man." [4; 53] therefore, anthropocentric linguistics cooperates with cognitive linguistics, which is an integral part of cognitology, and assimilates the one that propels the language system and deals with the issues of regulation of the rules of their use. [9; 75]

One of the supporters of the system-structure paradigm suggests that "today, with the development of anthropocentric directions of linguistics, areas of integration with other sciences, pure linguistic investigations in the interpretation of the semantic structure and conclusions from its results have decreased due to the emphasis on its surface aspects in the interpretation of hidden, internal features of the language, whereas" [14; 69]. The author is right in

one place: it is true that in the world linguistics it is necessary to study the hidden, internal features of the language in a cognitive-discursive direction on the basis of anthropocentric paradigm, but such studies in Uzbek linguistics cannot be said to have been studied sufficiently. But joining the author's confession in the style of "semasiological problems cannot be solved on anthropocentric grounds" is somewhat difficult. Because anthropocentric linguistics, in a certain sense, also includes cognitive-mental activity, which is able to analyze mental processes such as perception, thinking, understanding, categorization of perceived reality. One of the mental structures that exist independently separately for the analysis of meaning in solving semasiological problems is the frame analysis famous phylogenic Ch. Filmor had recorded. [16; 115] "In the interpretation of the film," says Sh. Safarov, – frame model-understanding semantics model. This model should allow a full, detailed understanding of the information content that the speaker is referring to and the listener is seeing." [10; 246-247] in the frame analysis, all characters in the meaning of language units are covered in the most subtle aspects, so the frame analysis is more detailed and more accurate than the structural line analysis results. Exactly the implementation of this article on the basis of frame analysis is aimed at the actual importance of the above points.



It is known that the meaning is not an element of object existence or a conditional symbol of human consciousness, it is an image that is abstract in the mind of a person, a generalization is a perception.[8; 44]

Of course, the meaning will be attached to the sign (Form). But on the lexical level, as on all levels of the language, there arises a form and meaning inconsistency (acetretry). In the world linguistics, the formal and meaningful asymmetry of linguistic units has been sufficiently studied, and in Uzbek linguistics studies have also been carried out in a monographic plan in this regard.[2,3,5,7] Including, M.Mahmudov and M.Mirtojiev in the research, if the acuity of the form and content between high-level units (syntax and its units) is studied, either. In Odilov's research, the occurrence of form and content acetretry in enantiosema, which is a special manifestation of polysema in the range of lexical units, was analyzed by the example of lexical and phraseological units. In other studies, including monographs, scientific treatises, articles, theses, there are opinions about the form and content acuity, but in these studies the form and content acuity has not become an object of special study. In many studies on the asymmetry of the linguistic character, more emphasis was placed on one aspect (structural side) of the issue, not deviating from the principle of linguistic form and content. Personality and character attitudes were kept away from the research center. Therefore, it was limited to one-sided views on the study of hidden, internal features of the language, the interpretation of spiritual contradictions, meaningful inconsistencies. F.Jumaev in the monographic work of on the study of synonyms and antonyms semas in the framework of polysemaic lexemes, the issues of spiritual conflict were also carried out in the semasiological plan.[1] It investigated the relationship between lexeme, sememe, and sema internal content in the relationship of nausea and conflict.

The meaning structure of the language has a variable character. It will continue to improve in accordance with the intellectual and social thinking of society and the individual. As a result, in the semantic structure of lexemes, there are cases of spiritual silences, cases of spiritual proportionality and disproportionality, which correspond to the mental activity of the linguistic person. The issue of spiritual asymmetry should be carried out on the basis of a two-plan. If at the first stage the emphasis is on the form and content acuity of the linguistic sign, then at the second stage the question of semantic acuity in the semantic structure of the lexeme should be studied in connection with the activity of the linguistic person in accordance with the principles of language and speech, language and thought dialectics. To carry out the second stage of semantic acuity, undoubtedly, the first stage will

serve as a base. In this article, the events of semantic acuity in the semantic structure of synonyms lexemes are studied within the framework of the thought activity and mental structures of the linguistic personality.

Synonyms are linguistic units that indicate the seriousness of the language, wealth, subtleties of meaning, the breadth of the style of expression. Synonyms are phenomenon of language that occurs on the basis of various social pronouns. This phenomenon is meeting between all the surface units of the language, and they are a special object of research. In recent studies, attention was paid to the study of synonym semas in the composition of non-synonymous lexemes. In Particular, F.Jumaeva polisememe specially studied the semantic synonyms in the framework of lexemes in her monographic study.[1;44-82]

All units in the series of synonyms are equally important for the expression of meaning, for the understanding of meaning. Therefore, the frame analysis of the series of synonyms looks more detailed and more convenient for understanding the meaning than the approved analyzes in the direction of structural semantics.[10;247]

The synonymic range of the food lexeme is described in the "O'zbek tili sinonimlarining izohli lugati": "Ovqat, taom, oziq, tomoq, xo'rak, yemish, ne'mat." A person, an animal, creature in general, is a liquid or dark, in which eat.

Food means what a person or animals eat. The food is used only to represent the food that people eat, and the food has a slightly artistic coloring in relation to the word. Food means "food that man and other animals, even plants receive". The word food and food basically refers to what is in the ready-to-eat state, the food generally refers to what is in the ready-to-eat or raw state it is necessary to eat. The abscess, sucking is used very rarely. The blessing is inherent in the artistic style.[15; 253] The "food" frame merges with all members of the above synonymic series under the guise of "A person, an animal, creature in general, is a liquid or dark, in which eat.". Apparently, a single expression was defined by several demonstrators, telling the asymmetry of form and content. Now let's focus not on the form and content acuity, but on the inner essence of the meaning, the interpersonal meaningful acuity. The food lexeme and its synonyms are described in the "O'zbek tili sinonimlarining izohli lugati" as follows:

Ovqat1. Rizqlanish, yeyish-ichish uchun tayyor narsa; yemish, taom, yemak.

Ovqat2. Ovqatlanish.

Ovqat3. Uy hayvonlarining yem-xashagi; oziq; ozuqa.

Ovqat4. Yeyish, ichish, tirikchilik uchun darkor narsalar; oziq.[12;82]



Taom1. Pishirilgan, yeyish-ichish uchun tayyorlangan narsa; ovqat.[12;671]

Oziq1. Ovqat bo'ladigan mahsulot, ovqatli don-dun; yemish.

Oziq2. Hayvonlar ovqati, yem-xashak.

Oziq3. O'simliklar o'sish jarayonida yerdan oladigan moddalar.[12;94]

Tomoq1. Buyinning engak osti qismi.

Tomoq2. Qizilo'ngach bilan kekirdak boshlanadigan yer; bo'g'iz.

Tomoq3. Taom, ovqat, ovqatlanish.[13;144]

Xo'rak1. Yeyish mumkin bo'lgan narsa; yemish, ovqat.

Xo'rak2. Mol, hayvon, paranda ovqati (em, don va sh.k.).

Xo'rak3. s.t. Xo'ra.[13;436]

Yemish1. Oziq-ovqat bo'ladigan narsa; ovqatlik.[11;9]

Ne'mat1. Tabiat in'om etgan yegulik, narsalar; noz-ne'matlar.

Ne'mat2. Ezgu ish, yaxshi narsa.[12;36]

Policy, sema, sememe get integrated and mutually a certain food leksema, semantic template according to "food" in the form of frames lace: «ovqat» ↔ «taom» ↔ «oziq» ↔ «tomoq» ↔ «xo'rak» ↔ «yemish» ↔ «ne'mat».

If the frames have a complex structure, they are again divided into smaller frames (subframes, categories). "Ovqat" frame consists of a set of several categories, such as «egulik», «taom», «rizq», «tansiqlik», «harorat belgisi (sovuq, iliq, issiq)», «maza-ta'm», «makon-zamon», «tirikchilik», «darmon, quvvat», «ro'zg'or, kundalik turmush», «harakat (emoq, ichmoq)», «tayyorlanadigan yoki pishiriladigan», «holat (tayyor yoki chalatayyor)», «em-xashak». The complex course of the events of everyday life shows that our mental knowledge of reality is also formed in a complex frame system.[9;46] Frame lines and categories in the mental thinking of the individual are modeled through linguistic units.

The semitic structures of lexicon sememes move from consciousness, thinking, that is, from the begin, as well as in the process of communicative discursive activity. For example, when the "food" frame is reused in the speech process with the categories "edibles", "temperature mark (cold, warm, hot)", the food lexeme is in a state of spiritual symmetry, proportionality with all members of the synonym row. But in some semas of the lexeme, semantic acuity is manifested. Sememe "male" in the composition of food sememe formed a sema-sememic relationship with the food lexeme, and between the sema and sememe of the lexeme there was a state of semantic acuity. The food lexeme is methodically neutral, while the food lexeme is artistic and, in part, specific to the publicistic style. The stylistic neutrality of the food lexeme allowed the application of the latter in place of one of these

lexemes, spiritual symmetry: the evangelical dish is an evangelical dish. At the same time, the lexicon of the blessing also takes place in a synonym for food – meal – blessing with the ownership of artistic coloring. On the contrary, if the blessing lexeme is actualized in a certain pragmatic semen, then between the members of the synonymic series there is a semantic asymmetry. Example: here is the blessing of knowledge. Is there a more delicious sweet blessing than science in the world? (Hamza. "Tanlangan asarlar") Eating in place of the blessing question in this place, will not support the lexemes of food – there will be meaningful asymmetry. "Food" frame stands in a synonymous line under the category of "delicacies": delicacies dish – delicacies store – delicacies meal, even when characterized by "delicacies" sememe.

There is a state of spiritual proportionality between the members of the following synonymic series, united under the category "fodder" of the "food" frame:

Ovqat3 – immerse the food in the cow.

Oziq2 – prepare food for winter for animals.

Xo'rak2 – give the colt to the sheep.

Yemish1 – if you give the cattle suckling, look after you summer-winter (proverb)

Since the other members of the "food" frame network do not combine the "meal", "throat", "blessing" frames with the "fodder" category, they are in a relationship with the members of the above synonymic series, and it is impossible to apply the second one in place of the other: to give a pet to the sheep, to give food to the sheep.

Based on the generality of the categories of "food" frame "action (eat, drink)", "prepared or cooked", "Status (Ready or half ready)", the semesters of food1, male1, store1, throat3, dish1 form a mutually symmetrical relationship. It does not combine with other sememas under one general category, it remains with them in the relationship of semantic acuity.

The "space-time" category of the "food" frame is reflected when it is represented by speech-guided assistants[12;82]: 1. Sidikjon had newspaper on his hand after a meal, half an article without gasping. (A.Qahhor. "Qushchinor chiroqlari") 2. On the dish, no one spoke superfluous. The examples presented show the possibility of using a food lexeme, which is its synonym in place of a food lexeme, a symmetrical balance is maintained. If you pay attention to the stylistic coloring of the dish lexeme – functional coloring, the imperfect condition is reflected. Naturally, among other members of the synonymic series, the state of semantic acuity is stagnated.

"Food" frame also merges with the category "space" in colloquial speech: – it would be if you sat down for food... This is represented by the sememe "place", using the lexeme of food in a metonymic



sense. In this place, too, it becomes impossible to apply its synonym options in place of food lexeme.

The "food" frame is a colloquial event with several more categories in colloquial language. For example:

With the category "sustenance": – do not leave food, my child.

With categories "household, Daily living", "living":

– You had time to look at the food, now you would have earned money from the manufacturer...

With the category "medicine, power": – do not look, when you chew pepper with bread, pepper also eat porridge?!

With the category "Age measure" (the degree of maturity to a certain age): – a sweet boy! You're getting sick of eating?!

From the given examples, it can be understood that what signs of an object are the main ones, what kind of associations a person can evoke in his mind, is an extreme process of pre-planning. To do this, it is necessary to rely on information about reality, the social environment, as well as all kinds of activities of a person.[10; 265] in this respect, when removed, the speech applications of the "food" frame, even in the above examples, were carried out depending on the language ability of the linguistic person, the situation of speech. After all, " under the concept of speaking ability, the awareness of a person belonging to a particular society from the language belonging to that same society, the ability and level to use its capabilities are understood. And speech is the result of recruitment or application by some individual for a specific purpose of communication on the basis of language skills.[6; 9] therefore, the subtleties of the meaning of the categories that are mentioned in the colloquial speech of the "food" frame do not exist in other members of this frame. And this is the way of manifestation of semantic acuity between them.

In summary, we can say that the approach to language units on the basis of cognitive-conceptual aspect – frame analysis serves the framework of semasiological and onomasiological methods of analysis carried out in the direction of structural semantics kengaytirishga the results of the mental activity of the linguistic person – the results of cognitive characteristic activity. Because the frame analysis is more detailed and more accurate than the structural line analysis results. In particular, the application of the frame analysis method among the synonymic units contributes not only to the development of semasiological and onomasiological research, but also to the theoretical and practical improvement of Uzbek lexicography.

REFERENECEES

1. Jumaeva F. *Polisemem leksemalar doirasidagi sinonim va antonim semalar tadqiqi.* – Toshkent: *Qaenus*, 2019.
2. Maxmudov N. *Odilov Yo. So'z ma'no taraqqiyotida ziddiyat.* – Toshkent: *Akademnashr*, 2014.
3. Maxmudov N. *Semantiko-sintakticheskaya asimmetriya v prostom predlojenii uzbekskogo yazyka. Diss.dokt.filol.nauk.* – Tashkent, 1984
4. Maxmudov N. *Til tilsimi tadqiqi.* – Toshkent: *Mumtoz so'z*, 2017.
5. Mirtojiev M. *O'zbek tilidagi gap bo'laklarida semantik-sintaktik nomutanosiblik.* –Toshkent: *Universitet*, 2008.
6. Ne'matov H. *Bozorov O. Til va nutq.* – Toshkent: *O'qituvchi*, 1993.
7. *Odilov Yo. O'zbek tilida leksik va frazeologik enantiosemiya.* – Toshkent: *Tafakkur*, 2015.
8. *Rasulov R. Umumiy tilshunoslik.* – Toshkent, 2006.
9. *Safarov Sh. Kognitiv tilshunoslik.* – Jizzax: *Sangzor*, 2006.
10. *Safarov Sh. Semantika.* – Toshkent: *O'zME*, 2013.
11. *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. II jild.* – Toshkent: *O'zME*, 2006.
12. *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. III jild.* – Toshkent: *O'zME*, 2007.
13. *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. IV jild.* – Toshkent: *O'zME*, 2008.
14. *Xasanova D. Semasiologiya muammolariga doir / O'TA.* – Toshkent, 2018 №2.
15. *Hojiev A. O'zbek tili sinonimlarining izohli lug'ati.* – Toshkent: *O'qituvchi*, 1979.
16. www.brenocon.com. *Fillmore Ch. Frame semantics // Linguistics in the morning calm.* Seoul, Korea 1982.