

THE ROLE OF ASYMMETRY IN THE FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC FIELD AND MORPHOLOGICAL PARADIGMS

Aslanova Ozoda Ibrokhimovna

Senior lecturer

Navoi State University of Mining and Technologies

Abstract: In the article, morphology is formed as a branch of descriptive grammar in the traditions of linguistics and one of the richest features of the language - general order, regularity, departure from uniformity. In the functional-semantic field, asymmetry and morphological paradigms interact to shape the meaning and function of linguistic units. The asymmetrical relationships between different elements within a language system can influence how meaning is constructed and interpreted.

Key words: asymmetry, core, periphery, polysemy, linguistic units, discreteness, specificity, consistency, compatibility, polysemy, polyfunctionality, morphological absorption, diachronically, synchronically, semasiologically.

Asymmetry and morphological paradigms play crucial role in the functional-semantic field of linguistics. In linguistic analysis, asymmetry refers to the unequal distribution or relationship between linguistic elements within a system. This can manifest in various ways, such as in the hierarchical structure of language or in the asymmetrical relationships between different linguistic units.

Morphological paradigms, on the other hand, refer to the systematic arrangement of morphological forms that a particular word or lexical item can take. These paradigms help to establish patterns and relationships between different forms of a word, allowing for a more nuanced understanding of its meaning and usage.

In the functional-semantic field, asymmetry and morphological paradigms interact to shape the meaning and function of linguistic units. The asymmetrical relationships between different elements within a language system can influence how meaning is constructed and interpreted. Morphological paradigms provide a framework for organizing and categorizing linguistic forms, which in turn affects how these forms are used to convey meaning in communication.

Overall, understanding the role of asymmetry and morphological paradigms in the functional-semantic field is essential for gaining insight into how language functions at both the structural and semantic levels. In ancient Greek, the term "asymmetry" originally referred to disproportion, inconsistency, or deviation from order. When this concept was applied to natural language, specifically human language which is known for its complexity and richness, it came to signify a departure from uniformity and regularity. Asymmetry can be observed in two main scenarios where there is no chaos within the order: 1) the relationship between the central (core) and peripheral elements; 2) the gap between expressive forms. An illustration of this can be seen in the transformation of polysemy into homonymy.

While the significance of content in the field of linguistics has not been disregarded, scholars have acknowledged that the examination of language structure levels and their respective units has predominantly emphasized the external, formal aspect. Historically, from the establishment of linguistics as a scientific discipline up to the early 20th century, researchers primarily concentrated on the outward appearance of linguistic units. The concept of discreteness (separation) identified by de Saussure as a key characteristic of the linguistic sign was also predominantly defined based on its form...

From the 30s of the last century, the members of the Prague Linguistic Circle made a critical assessment of the prevailing tradition in linguistics and stated that linguistic units have not only a formal structure, but also a substantive structure, and that the interaction between these two structural units is often asymmetrical.

Such an idea was first expressed by the Czech scientist S. Kartsevsky in 1929" S.Kartsevsky in his article "On the asymmetric dualism of the linguistic sign" writes: "The sign and the meaning do not completely cover each other. Their boundaries do not correspond at all points: if one and the same sign has several functions, one and the same meaning is the same. represented by several signs. Any sign is simultaneously a potential "homonym" and "synonym", that is, it arose from the intersection of two lines of mental events"(Знак и значение не покрывают друг друга полностью. Их границы не совпадают во всех точках: один и тот же знак имеет несколько функций, одно и то же значение выражается несколькими знаками. Всякий знак является потенциально "омонимом" и "синонимом" одновременно, т.е. он образован скрещением двух рядов мыслительных явлений").

According to S. Kartsevskiy, if signs were unchanging and performed only one task (function), language would consist of a simple collection of labels. On the other hand, in concrete situations, language signs (symbols) change to such an

extent that they lose their meaning, it is difficult to imagine such a language. It is necessary to be. Due to the need to adapt to a specific situation, the sign may change in part; due to the constancy of another part, the sign is required to maintain its specific specificity, consistency and compatibility. So, although the sign is changing and developing in a certain way in a certain period (both diachronically and synchronically), it must maintain its own balance. This is not the case. The levels of language and their specific linguistic symbols are adapted to perform certain semantic functions according to their place in the system. The process is usually imperceptible to language speakers. Considering these processes, Russian-Polish scientist I.A. Baduen de Curtene, one of the founders of systematic linguistics, expressed these thoughts: „, should be considered as constantly changing, at the same time, living, real units“ [See: Baduen de Curtene, I.A. Zametkina polyakh sochineniy V.V. Raulova Linguistic units, including morphemic units, while maintaining their general essence, change historically-semasiologically, linguistically, and functionally, and are subjected to the processes of redistribution and placement. The well-known linguist A. Maye came to the following conclusion based on his research on Germanic languages: "The next main task should be to study not the "achieved changes", but the "driving principles" of these changes, "progressive tendencies".

The founders of Descriptivism, F. Boas, E. Sepir, S. Newman, researched the units of morphemics with the terms of process, change, and focused on the formation of secondary forms from primary forms. Therefore, disproportion (asymmetry) is the name of an important law that naturally applies in every language, which reflects the different connection of form and content, the organic connection, the processes of change, migration, and mutual transition of form and meaning. Synchrony is the legal successor and successor of diachrony. Similarity of form (homonymy), similarity of meaning (synonymy), contradiction of meaning (antonymy), polysemy (polysemy), multitasking (polyfunctionality) also has its own explanation and reasons. Thanks to these processes and events, the language fully demonstrates the ability of a responsive (mobile) system to the needs of society. Since the last quarter of the 19th century, these processes have been described as historical-diachronic and synchronistic special laws: "morphological absorption", "pereintegration" (N.V. Krushevsky), "simplification" and "morphological re-division" (V.A. Bogoroditsky), "hyperagglutination" (V.V. Radlov), "fusion" (E. Sepir, A.N. Kononov), "asymmetric dualism" (C.O. Kartsevsky), "functional transposition" (Sh. Bally) became fundamental concepts of science with their names. Professor V.A. Bogoroditsky discussed the evolution of language content,

noting that replacing genetic meanings with real meanings is a significant and beneficial cognitive process. He emphasized that if the real meaning of a word constantly gravitated towards genetic meanings in our minds, it would pose a considerable hindrance to thinking and, consequently, to cultural development.

Therefore, asymmetry, which is a fundamental principle that reflects the interconnectedness of form and content in a natural way in every language, plays a crucial role in the processes of change, transformation, interaction, and mutual influence of form and meaning. Synchrony is the lawful continuation and heir of diachrony, each synchronic stage having its own explanations and reasons for shape similarity (homonymy), meaning similarity (synonymy), meaning opposition (antonymy), multiple meanings (polysemy), and multifunctionality (polyfunctionality). Through these processes and events, language communities' needs are fully demonstrated to the present response (mobile) system capability. The famous French linguist S. Bally expressed the following idea about the characteristic feature of language: "Symbols (signs, symbols) that have been developed within their own limits have served as a very limited source in meeting the many needs of language. However, through category interaction, it reaches freedom of thought and also acquires richness and various shades." Asymmetric dualism in language units, in this case morpheme units, results in relationships between them in terms of both form and content, leading to phenomena such as homonymy, synonymy, and polysemy, which are the products of changes and processes in the language system: "Homophony is a general phenomenon, with homonymy being its specific manifestation... The opposite of homophony is synonymy. These two phenomena represent the two sides of the general principle that any linguistic sign (symbol) has the potential to be both a homonym (polysemantic sign) and at the same time a potential synonym." Based on S.O. Karcevskiy's theory of asymmetric dualism in language signs, V. Skalicka in 1935 highlighted the specific form and content relationship of morphemes. The idea emerged that it is necessary to distinguish between morphemes on the formal side and semes on the semantic side for the smallest linguistic unit. In the history of linguistics, initially, words, word combinations, and sentence models were identified, followed by the designation of phonemes and morphemes. Consequently, language levels and their hierarchical relationships were described: "In this context, if morphemes, words, and sentences are considered as two-sided units, phonemes are explained as one-sided units. If we try to separate these sides with a line, we currently cannot clearly define them: all these units are based on the discretization

from the expressive (sound) side of speech. In other words, speech is not only expressive but also has a discrete character from the semantic side."

It is clear that, according to the division of speech units into parts (units) based on expressiveness, there is a need to also allocate their content side into known parts. Professor I.K. Kuchkorov concludes the following based on analysis: "The two-sided units of language, specifically the expression plan structure (form) of a word being independent to a certain extent, its content plan structure (meaning) is also independent to the same extent. Therefore, it is necessary to include the segments of the content plan of language (meanings) in the series of basic units of language." Changes in language occur simultaneously with changes in the specific context (environment, society): "Language exists and evolves over time. The relationship between the user and interpreter operates in time, and the development (evolution) of the user and interpreter occurs over time. Thus, time serves as a constant component for both sound and meaning."

References:

- 1) Большой энциклопедический словарь.Языкознание.М.,2000,стр.47
- 2) Makhmudov Nizomiddin Mamadaliyevich: Биобиблиография (foreword authors A.Nurmonov,A.Umarov).Tashkent, 2010, page 9.
- 3) Карцевский С. Об асимметричном дуализме лингвистического знака.
- 4) Звечинцев В.А. История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях, часть. II, М., 1965, стр.85.
- 5) Хрестоматия по истории русского языкознания М., 1976, стр.401.
- 6) Сравнительно-историческое изучение языков разных семей. Задачи и перспективы. М., 1982, стр.94
- 7) Общее языкознание. Внутренняя структура языка. М., 1972, стр. 240.