



ANALYSIS OF CONTACT RELATIONS VERB IN LEXICAL AND SEMANTIC FIELD

Shermatova Nigora Isoqulovna
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT

The article examines the verbal vocabulary expressing contact relations; the semantic structure of verbs is determined; the types of semantic changes in the semantic structure of word forms functioning in the context are established; the conclusion is made about the patterns of verb use.

Keywords: contact relations verbs, semantic structure, semantic field, verb groups, analysis of verb lexemes.

In the course of the study, it was revealed that the semantics of tactile verbs implies a different degree of activity of the subject of perception; he can both accidentally, involuntarily touch the object, and purposefully explore the object, feeling it. All languages have a number of words that name tactile sensations, therefore, each language has gone its own way in the formation of this group of verbs. This speaks in favor of the fact that the circle of vocabulary under consideration was formed in a rather late period. For the ancient state of the language, it is very difficult to determine in which direction the semantic development went: from general perception to particular or vice versa. However, over time, the syncretism of semantics is gradually eliminated, names are formed for each type of sensory perception - vision, hearing, smell, touch, taste. [5]

Nowadays, the discussion and debate of our scientists in the field of linguistics is noteworthy of discussions on the semantic area of the verb. Similarly, recently our scholars identified that the verbs represent various lexical meanings and that these meanings will be reflected in different relationships later. A lot of work is done on this issue, that is, on the verbs of social attitudes in Uzbek linguistics.

M.S.Sodiqova, Qo'chqortoyev I.K, A.Hojiev's monographs of "Verb" and other linguists works in the fields, forms of verbs, their semantic fields and groups are in a great attention. M.S. Sodiqova recommended the doctoral dissertation of the verbs where she divided them into three groups: 1) verbs of action; 2) verbs of state; 3) verbs of relation[1]. However, it is not appropriate for verbs expressing all relationships within the study. Accordingly, the signatures of different edges of linguistics are being examined separately. Qo'chqortoyev I.K in his work "Semanticheskaya klassifikatsiya glagolov v uzbekskom yazike//Aktualniye voprosi russkoy i uzbekskoy semasiologii" he noted that the semantic field of the verbs of relation are available and these verbs have the semantic, lexical-semantic properties of social relation[4].



Verbs of tactile relations have a complex semantic structure, which allows one and the same lexeme to be defined not only as an angle characterizing social relations, but also as a verb of movement, speech activity, gathering, professional and labor activity, social status, etc.

This article explores the vocabulary of touch in languages, as mentioned above. We were interested in questions about what lexemes are used to express tactile perception in these languages, how these lexemes are connected within each language and between languages, whether their perceptual meaning is primary and what are the nominal models of this type of perception. On the basis of lexicographic information for each language, a synonymous series of words was formed for tactile perception of reality, in particular:

Here are some examples of verbs of contact relation in English and Uzbek languages:

“touch”(to touch,to sway.to reach,etc.), “affect”(to affect,to impress, to influence,to sway)

While all these words mean "to produce or have an effect upon," *touch* may carry a vivid suggestion of close contact and may connote stirring, arousing, or harming.

The words *affect* and *touch* are synonyms, but do differ in nuance. Specifically, *affect* implies the action of a stimulus that can produce a response or reaction.

e.g The sight *affected* her to tears

The meanings of *impress* and *touch* largely overlap; however, *impress* stresses the depth and persistence of the effect.

e.g Only one of the plans *impressed* him.

The synonyms *influence* and *touch* are sometimes interchangeable, but *influence* implies a force that brings about a change (as in nature or behavior).

e.g Our beliefs are *influenced* by our upbringing.

While in some cases nearly identical to *touch*, *strike*, similar to but weaker than *impress*, may convey the notion of sudden sharp perception or appreciation.

e.g *Struck* by the solemnity of the occasion.

Although the words *sway* and *touch* have much in common, *sway* implies the acting of influences that are not resisted or are irresistible, with resulting change in character or course of action.

e.g Politicians who are *swayed* by popular opinion

Here different examples also in Uzbek language:

1.Tegmoq.1. Bir-biriga yoki bir narsaga bevosita yonma-yon,uchma-uch kelib taqalmoq,yopishmoq,urinmoq. *Shaftolilar mevasining ko'pligidan yerga tegib yotibdi.Parda yerga tegib turibdi.* 2.Zarb bilan urilmoq.. *To'p borib,Buviniso xolaning ko'chaga qaragan derazasiga tegib,bir ko'zini chil-chil qildi.*R.Fayziy.Sen yetim emassan.

2.Urilmoq.Urmoq fe'li o'zlikva majhul isbatda. Boshi devorga urildi.Tashqarida eshik bir narsaga qattiq-qattiq urildi.A.Muxtor,Opa-singillar.

3.Urmoq..Yoqalashmoq,olishmoq. *Bizning o'g'il ko'p yaxshi-da:birov bilan urishmaydi,papiros chekmaydi.*A.Qahhor,Asarlar.

4.Urishtirmoq.1.Urishmoq.*Mahalla bolalari,o'spirin yigitlar yungi hurpaygan ikki katta kuchukni urishtiradilar.*Oybek.Tanlangan asarlar.2.Bir-biriga urmoq,tegizmoq(asos qadah haqida).*Temirjon esa qadah urishtirish u yoqda tursin,aqlini yuqotib xomush utirardi.*J.Abdullaxonov,Oriyat.3.Ko'z urishtirmoq.Bir biriga ma'noli qarab quymoq,tikilmoq.



Bektemirov ko'lda bo'ynini cho'zib, odamlar orasidan cholni topib, ko'z urishtirib oldi, keyin imlab yonidan joy ko'rsatdi. S. Axmad. Xukm.

Let's consider the selected lexemes in the aspects that interest us. 1. It should be noted that a person perceives differently accepts the world around: non-contact and contact. When we look around, hear sounds, smell, we do not have to be very close to the object, we can perceive it from a distance. At the same time, in order to feel the taste of an object, to understand how it feels to the touch, we must necessarily be in direct contact with the object being known. Thus, in the tactile perception of any object, there is necessarily a subject of action, an object of action and an instrument of action through which perception occurs.

In this case, most often human hands or fingers become the instrument of perception (in animals - paws, in birds - wings), as well as any other parts of the human body (for example, skin; it is interesting that the eyes can also be a tool of touch, feel eyes "carefully inspect") or the tools themselves (for example, a probe). Any object of the surrounding reality can act as a perceived object: both concrete (hat, cloth, horse, etc.) and abstract (for example, a theme, thought, period of history, achievements, etc.).

It is these elements of semantics (subject, object, instrument) that are common to the main meaning of all lexemes that make up a series of synonyms in languages. However, they are reflected in the lexical meaning of the highlighted verbs in different ways.

So, for example, the degree of activity of the subject of perception is different. The least degree, in our opinion, is expressed by the lexemes: "to touch in, to poke, to sway" in English language, "teginmoq, ushlab kurmoq, silamoq" in Uzbek language. In these variant of the nomination of tactile sensations, the subject does not have a special task to carefully examine the object, the touch is, for the most part, random. A little more, the degree of activity of the subject is manifested in the semantics of the verbs touch, poke, (English), teginmoq, ushlamoq, tasir qilmoq (Uzbek). Here the subject touches the object in order to form a first, superficial impression of it. Finally, the highest degree of activity of the subject, when he not only lightly touches the object, touches it, but also takes this object in his hands, carefully feels it, is manifested in the semantic structure of the following verbs: feel, (simple) paw (English), teginmoq, ushlamoq, ushlab kurmoq (Uzbek). The degree of activity of the subject of perception affects, as it seems to us, the severity of the instrument of perception when formulating the meaning of the analyzed words. So, for example, a direct indication of the instrument of perception is in the formulation of the meaning of the verb to feel ("to touch with a hand, fingers, etc. (to examine, recognize)"; "to touch with a hand, fingers, etc.") and Eng. simple. rude paw ("touch, grasp with hands", "touch, grasp with hands, feel"). In the meaning of other words, the instrument of perception is not named directly, but is assumed, since the touch requires contact with the perceived object, which is carried out through some instrument.[5]

A peculiar tool (although imaginary), rendered in a separate word, is the noun touch, feel by touch, perceive in languages in the phrases.

It should also be noted that when abstract objects (such as a theme, thought, etc.) are perceived, the instrument of perception is also imaginary, abstract, and the semantics of the perceptual verbs themselves is already figurative, metaphorical in this case.



The status of the category "contact relations" as an extra-linguistic conceptual category is determined on the basis of knowledge of the disciplines of the humanities cycle, as one of the forms of universal interrelation of objects,

phenomena, processes in nature, society and thinking - in general, as a form of interaction of representatives of various social groups - in particular.

Based on the status of the category of contact relations, semantic structuring of verbs correlated in their meaning with the category of contact relations is carried out. Since many verbs are polysemous, the object of research in some cases are lexico-semantic variants of verbs.

List of used Literature

1. M.S.Sodiqova "Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tilida fe'l stilistikasi" (semantic aspektda): Filol.fan.d-ri...dis.-Toshkent, 1991.-288 b.
2. Современный философский словарь / под общ. ред. проф. В. Е. Кемерова. – М. ; Бишкек ; Екатеринбург : Одиссей, 1996. – 608 с.
3. Социальная психология в трудах отечественных психологов / сост. и общ. ред. А. Л. Свенцицкого. – СПб.: Питер, 2000. – 512 с.
4. Кучкартаев И.К. Семантическая классификация глаголов в узбекском языке // Актуальные вопросы русской и узбекской семасиологии. № 656. –Ташкент, 1981.- С.19-
5. Лексика тактильной перцепции в восточнославянских языках. И.В. Садыкова.Русин 2016.№3(45).