



**ONOMASIOLOGICAL APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF INTENSIFICATION OF
LEXICAL UNITS**

**Ozoda Abdullayeva,
Tamara Kavilova
JSPI, Jizzakh, Uzbekistan**

Summary: *One of the urgent problems of modern linguistics is the identification and definition of onomasiological patterns in the development of languages of different structural types. The solution of the problems arising in this case requires an analysis of lexical units as signs with a certain nominative potential, and a comparison of the nominative properties of correlated multilingual lexemes from the point of view of the implementation of their nominative capabilities. At the same time, despite the fact that considerable attention is currently being paid to the processes of formation of nominative linguistic units, the verb nomination, in contrast to the nominal one, has been studied completely insufficiently, and as a field of linguistic knowledge it largely does not meet the requirements of modern scientific theory.*

Keywords: *intensification, nomination, onomasiological, multilingual lexemes, polysemantic*

Like other full-valued words, a verbal lexical unit is capable of nominating an extralinguistic reality. In addition, the verbal denotation is multi-element, since it includes not only relationships, but also objects associated with these relationships. Therefore, it seems important for the development of the theory of nomination itself to study the special nature of the procedural-indicative nomination of verbs, since it is associated with the names of realities (actions, processes, signs) that have minimal discreteness. From this point of view, the study of the nominative properties of the verb and the description of its nominative capabilities make a certain contribution to the study of general theoretical problems of linguistic nomination. The particular interest of researchers in verbs is explained by the fact that these linguistic signs have a number of specific features in terms of their nominative properties, paradigmatic affiliation, functional features and patterns of use in languages of different types. With this approach, the peculiarities of the semantics and structural organization of the fields of functional unities of different languages are taken into account to a greater extent within a wide zone of aspectual relations, when verbal

lexemes are included in the functional-semantic microfields, which are included in the broader functional-semantic field of aspectuality.

In addition, in recent years, along with the active development of general problems of aspectuality, a comprehensive development of individual modes of verbal action, especially methods of verbal action with the meaning of intensity, has begun. The concept of "intensity" is far from a new term in modern linguistic research, quite often in works on linguistics such words and phrases as "intensity", "intensives", "intensification", "degrees of intensity of quality" appear. Fewer researchers refer to the concept of "category of intensity". The term "intensity" is either absent altogether in the dictionaries of linguistic terms with its replacement by the narrower concept of "speech intensity", or is limited to the field of phonetics - "the degree of intensification or weakening of exhalation." At the same time, in real speech practice, we often come across the facts of using the names of the same feature, which differ in the degree of intensity.

The category of intensity refers to any linguistic level and aspect: intensity refers to the areas of morphemics, the functioning of various parts of speech (adjectives, verbs, adverbs, nouns) as intensifiers, the lexical meaning of a word, layering on the basic meaning, phonetics, grammar, word formation. "Intensity", according to the dictionary definitions, is the presence of this or that tension, a measure of this or that strength. In linguistics, intensity is referred to as the degree of expression (signal strength, its quantitative characteristic). Hence the category of intensity is a semantic category based on the concept of the gradation of quantity in the broad sense of the word. Intensity is a quantitative measure of quality assessment, a measure of explicativity.

In connection with the above, we believe that the comparative onomasiological study of verbal lexicon, aimed at a more complete disclosure of the possibilities of verbs with the value of intensity as units of nomination, is relevant and is of great importance both in theoretical and practical terms when considering an important scientific problem in the field of general theoretical problems of language nomination.

Currently, the onomasiological approach to the study of linguistic phenomena is one of the possible directions of linguistic analysis. The feasibility and effectiveness of this approach is recognized by many linguists. However, the understanding of the essence and principles of the onomasiological approach is ambiguous.

At the beginning of the 20th century, atomistic analysis, when a single word was studied, was replaced by a systematic study of the language content plan. The idea of a linguistic system finds its recognition among lexicologists. The appearance of the term "onomasiology" is associated with

A. Zauner, who proposed a new direction of analysis, opposed to the semasiological one. With this formulation of the problem, the lexical unit is considered as a two-dimensional entity: on the one hand, the word is addressed to reality, and on the other hand, it is an element of the lexical-semantic system. I. Trier and a number of other scientists come to the conclusion that the criteria for the analysis of the lexical system should be sought not in the language itself, but outside the language. This is reflected in the theories of the semantic (conceptual) field.

ists point out that this analysis is directed from concept to word. Others define its direction as the direction from object to word. In both definitions, not all components of the semantic triangle are present (in the first case, the object is not mentioned, in the second, the concept). Apparently, the third component is not ignored by researchers, but implied - from a concept (through an object) to a word or from an object (through a concept) to a word. It seems that these variants in the interpretation of the direction of the onomasiological approach do not contradict each other, but reflect the two-way nature of the connection connecting the denotatum and the concept. It follows from this that onomasiological research, regardless of whether it comes from an object or from a concept, must take into account the special nature of the connection between the concept and the denotation. From the stated point of view, the object of onomasiology should be considered "... the process of the emergence of a lexical unit, which is materialization, consolidation in the sound shell of the ideal content typical of the ideal content of lexical units."

In relation to the verb, there are polar views on the ratio of the significatum and the denotatum in its meaning. Some scholars believe that the verb has only a conceptual content (significatum) and is not adapted by itself to denotation [Arutyunova, 1976]. However, the most widespread idea was that both components are represented in the meaning of the verb: both the significative and the denotative. In this understanding, the denotation of the verb is perceived as "an idea of the nature and volume of real objects, in relation to which the name of the action itself is given" [Ufimtseva, 1986, p. 48]. At the same time, a generalized concept in its more specific forms is considered a signature - the concept of an action, a process, a state.

The nature of the denotative meaning of the verb determines the special place that it occupies in the series of nominative units. In the theory of nomination, there is a provision that the units of nomination are divided into two categories - units of simple (elemental) and complex (event) nomination. According to G.V. Kolshansky, "an elementary nomination denotes a certain element of reality - an object, quality, process, attitude, any real or conceivable object." Eventual nomination as an object of designation has a microsituation, i.e. an event, a fact that unites a

number of elements. Continuing this thought, it can be argued that in relation to the verb, the dual nature of this nominative unit should be emphasized. Due to its specificity, the verb occupies an intermediate place between the elemental and event nominations.

In our opinion, the dual nature of this nominative unit is based on a peculiar ratio of denotative and significative meanings within the framework of the verbal lexeme. At the same time, subject and conceptual correlation, being combined within the limits of the verb sign, as a rule, “does not fit into the framework of only the verbal lexeme”. Verb semantics is characterized through the concept of a relationship. In this case, the very concept of a relationship is revealed and concretized by the subject-objective localization of the verbal action. Pointing to the correlative nature of the verb meaning, the verb is defined as "a feature concept characterized by that special connection between an object and its attribute, in which the object's mode of existence, its behavior is revealed." Subject and feature concepts form the onomasiological structure of event nomination. Event nomination, in which a verb participates, is a designation of some event, which in the language can be represented as a typical class of a situation.

In modern linguistics, it has been repeatedly pointed out that the desemantization of nouns does not at all deprive them of the opportunity to fulfill their nominative functions. At the same time, the desemantization of verbs leads to the fact that they are capable of performing only structural, connecting functions. But they shift the nominative functions to their partners, cf. English to turn red "turn red", to get mad "mad", "get mad", etc. As such, verbs stop calling any real actions.

The common place of linguistic science is ?, the provision on the central role of the verb in the language system and, accordingly, on the hierarchical dependence of the noun on the verb. This position, however, is justified only in relation to the syntactic level and only when considering statements organized by a verb. So, in the sphere of nomination, the verb is clearly inferior to the noun. The proof of this fact is the simple fact that when analyzing the semantics of a verb, we inevitably go beyond the limits of the verb itself. When studying the semantic structure of verbal lexemes, we inevitably turn to the analysis of the object names combined with it and to the analysis of the relationship between the action and its subject or object. Semes hidden in a verb are mainly hidden actants, but actants are, first of all, objective entities.

Consideration of the theoretical foundations of the onomasiological study of the verbal lexicon shows that the problems of linguistic nomination are relevant and are constantly in the center of attention of linguists. However, the verb nomination, in contrast to the nominal one, has been studied completely insufficiently and in many ways does not meet the requirements of modern

scientific theory. Therefore, it seems important for the development of the theory of nomination itself to study the special nature of the procedural-indicative nomination of verbs, since it is associated with the naming of realities with minimal discreteness.

An onomasiological approach to the study of linguistic phenomena is one of the possible directions of linguistic analysis. Semasiological research is directed from word to concept, onomasiological research - from concept to word. At the same time, the onomasiological approach, in contrast to the semasiological one, presupposes the consideration of the content side of linguistic units not from the point of view of their intrasystemic significance, but from the point of view of the subject orientation. With the onomasiological approach to verb formation, it becomes possible to penetrate into the very essence of the birth of the verb, to establish the patterns and conditions for the appearance of neoplasms, to reveal the nature of onomasiological categories, which include the category of intensity.

Bibliography:

1. Semantic structure of a word in modern English and methods of its research. L., 1966.
2. Zhirova I.G. Referential pragmasemantics of the conceptual category of intensification // Bulletin of the Moscow State Regional University, 2012. - P. 31
3. Lexico-semantic features of nouns denoting units of time measurement in English and Russian, KD, M., 1973.
4. Turansky I.I. Semantic category of intensity in English. M., 1990. -- S. 7-21.
5. Tamara Kavilova, The concept of the cultural component of meaning. , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №59 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)
6. Tamara Kavilova, About linguistic reconstruction , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №32 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)