



LEXICOGRAPHIC ANALOGY OR LEXICOGRAPHIC INTERPRETATION OF MEANINGFUL UNITS

Urakova Zilola

Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Assistant Professor TCTTRPNEKR Karshi city

Article history: Received November 28 th 2020 Accepted: December 11 ^h 2020 Published: December 30 th 2020	Abstract: Dictionaries differ from each other in the principles of describing words. But the value of the Explanatory Dictionary, in most cases, will depend on the degree of semantic interpretation of words. lexical tus. In this type of dictionaries, which are evaluated as "Ummul lexicon" (the mother of dictionaries), the fact that the wordlararo is considered as one of the base factors of lexical-semantic relations is one of its main features. Below is the type of lexical-semantic relationship, which should be given special attention in the Explanatory Dictionary – the role of meaningfulness in determining the lexical value of words, and instead is addressed by the example of dwelling nouns.
Keywords: Lexemas, linguistic values, Ummul lexicon, lexicographer	

It is known that if meaningful units are combined in one microcosm on the basis of the generality of the atash and task SEMAS, the specificity of the expression SEMAS in the lexeme sememe indicates or is more indicative of the essence of some of them. Therefore, among the synonyms, one edge of the essence of lexical units is opened. For example, in the conflict of "stylistic character specificity", the Dior and Vatan lexemes indicate a mutual specific or complex unity. This suggests that lexemas differ in linguistic values, which in their interpretation should not allow lexicographic analogy. After all, the form of synonyms is different, the meanings are close to each other, that is, words that represent one concept. But not a word that means exactly.

Apparently, each lexeme in a synonymous series has different characteristics along with a similar sign. Therefore, when giving semantic units in the dictionary, their similarities and differences should be consistently distinguished. Otherwise, a logical illusion of synonyms arises in the mind of the reader.

The fact that in some sources the homogeneity in the description of word meanings, i.e. the emphasis of the factor of lexicographic analogy by the authors, is itself an indication of its still predominance in lexical practice. For example, in the Annotated Dictionary of Active Words in Modern Uzbek, the authors acknowledge this: "It is known that there are thousands of words in the Uzbek language that are synonymous. If the meaning of each of them (which is mutually identical) is explained by a description, a description, there will be too many repetitions of the same explanation in the dictionary. In order to prevent such a situation, one of the synonyms is interpreted with the same meaning, and the other words are referred to the same semantics with which they are interpreted. For example, the words face, page, aft ... are mutually exclusive in one sense, and this meaning is provided by a descriptive explanation in a dictionary article composed for one of them (e.g., in a dictionary article composed for one hundred words). The rest are left in the same sense or with the same sign.

Apparently, for a lexicographer, synonyms are exactly the same word. True, the meanings of full synonyms, i.e. lexical doublets, are exactly the same. For example, student-student, linguistics-linguistics, lexical-lexical, and so on. But in synonyms such a situation is not observed. As noted above, the noun and function semantics of synonyms are general, while the semantic semantics are unique in each. For example, since the leading meaning in a noun phrase is a noun, the homeland lexeme has its own meaning together with the lexemes of the country, country, country, region, which are members of the series, in a specific way, the general meaning of "place-name" as the same semantics and corresponding function semantics, and this is called "horse", "name", "place-place". can be defined as The noun semantics are the same for all lexemes in this series. However, in each lexeme, the semantic "place name" that is common to them is customized to varying degrees. The extent to which an expression semantics is present in a particular lexeme cannot be assessed by cutting it out of the semantic sequence. Without it, the semantic essence of the lexeme to which the semantics of expression were relevant remained obscure and abstract. To do this, first of all, it is necessary to restore the existing series of partial synonyms of the lexeme in the dictionary and to determine the position of the lexeme in the series based on the level. This series of lexemes is then included in the lexicographical article in the relevant lexeme commentary.

As a result of the reference to the following meaningful place names in the OTIL, none of them has been commented on.

Semantic series: place-space-homeland.

Accommodation, place of residence,

Makon Qozikalon: There is no work from Madras, this is a place for atheists. J.Sharipov, Khorezm. (OTIL, 1, p. 450).

Residence, space. My hometown is Uzbekistan. (HO'TFSIL, p. 129).

Location 2. Accommodation, dwelling, homeland. Let's go to my place together. Let us take the heart of the poor Sendai. (OTIL, 1, p. 443).

Place 2. Residence, abode. My place is Andijan. (HO'TFSIL, 127-b). Makon.

3. Accommodation, shelter, house. Tora wants to make a kafangado, to lose the homeland. J.Sharipov, Khorezm.

It seems that the lexemes of place, place, and homeland are included in the list of meanings, but their meanings are not explained and their specific meanings are not revealed. It is known that the lexemes of space and homeland have many meanings. They create meaning with the word dwelling in some sense. However, the dictionary does not reveal the meaning of that differential sign of the lexeme. The general meaning for this series of meanings is "place", "accommodation". But there are unique, irreversible meanings for each word. For example, homeland is a dominant word in this sense because it can be used instead of space. The scope of the words space and place of residence is narrower. This is their distinguishing feature.

Homeland-country-country-country meaning series.

Homeland 1 A country where a person is born and raised and considers itself its citizen, motherland, motherland. Great Motherland. Protecting the homeland is the sacred duty of every citizen. (OTIL, I, p. 173).

Homeland country, homeland, country. (OTIL, I, p. 223).

Homeland, country, homeland. Our prosperous and free country is becoming more prosperous. (OTIL, I, p. 49).

A country is a state and its territory that is politically and economically sovereign. Our country is prosperous and free. (HO'TFSIL, 127-b).

Province 1. ayn. country. Uzbekistan, my free country, is as beautiful as spring. Yo.Mirza. (OTIL, II, p. 504).

If we pay attention to the semantic structure of the units of this series of semantics, it becomes clear that the integral semantics of all of them are "place", "place of residence". Each of the lexemes is not a lexical doublet indicates that it has specific distinguishing features. However, the descriptions show that no specific sign of any lexeme is clearly indicated. Along with this semantics, the dominant word is homeland. The rest of the synonyms unite around this word. The lexeme of homeland is less used than the lexeme of homeland. Mainly used in artistic style. The country lexeme is used more as a scientific term. If we look at the definition of a country lexeme, we come across the "explanation" of "exactly the country". But country and country lexemes are not used in the same sense. The semantics of the regional lexeme is characterized by the activity of the "artistic style" semantics.

It turns out that the existing explanatory dictionaries of the Uzbek language in the interpretation of synonymous units often relied on the principle of lexicographic analogy, and the interpretations did not take into account the expressive semantics of lexemes. The results of the substantive study of semantic units, on the other hand, require their consistent sequencing in lexicographic descriptions as well. Therefore, the methodological specificity of lexemes, which are manifestations of the expressive semaphore, allows the lexicographic interpretation of their properties according to the period or scope of application to avoid the unification of interpretations.