



FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC PROPERTIES OF NOUN UNITS REPRESENTING CHARACTERS IN UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

Shomuratova Orzigul Husan kizi

*University of Information Technology and
Management, Assistant teacher of the
Department of Philology*

Annotation: *This paper examines the functional-semantic characteristics of descriptive nominal units in Uzbek and Russian. It explores the differences and similarities between nominal expressions in the two languages in terms of function and meaning. Uzbek and Russian often express descriptive units through adjectives, which serve essential roles in communication, reflecting cultural and semantic nuances. This topic is relevant in the fields of linguistics, translation studies, and cultural studies.*

Keywords: *nominal units, functional characteristics, semantic characteristics, descriptive expressions, adjectives.*

Introduction: Exploring the distinctive features of descriptive nominal units in Uzbek and Russian languages is a pressing issue in linguistics. Each language has specific ways of emphasizing information about the environment and people in communication. In Uzbek and Russian, descriptive units are primarily expressed through adjectives and attributive expressions, representing linguistic and cultural differences in meaning and function.

Nominal units typically denote attributes, states, and qualities of people or objects. In both Uzbek and Russian, nominal units are largely expressed through adjectives and descriptors. For instance, the phrases "qizil gul" (Uzbek) and "красный цветок" (Russian) both refer to a red flower, sharing lexical similarities but potentially differing in semantic context.

Descriptive nominal units in Uzbek and Russian fulfill the following main functions:

Descriptive Function: This function conveys information about the characteristics of a person or object. For instance, "qalin kitob" (thick book) in Uzbek and "толстая книга" in Russian describe an object's size or volume.

Evaluative Function: This function expresses a subjective evaluation of an object. In Uzbek, "ajoyib inson" (wonderful person) and in Russian, "великолепный человек" use nominal units to positively appraise someone.

Comparative Function: This function is used to compare or equate two objects. For example, the Uzbek phrase "uchib yuruvchi qush kabi" (like a flying bird) and the Russian "летит как птица" illustrate similarity in actions or states.

Semantically, descriptive units in Uzbek and Russian can vary significantly. Some examples of these distinctions are:



Color Names: Both languages use color descriptors with specific cultural connotations. In Uzbek, “oq” (white) symbolizes purity, whereas in Russian, “белый” may imply innocence or honesty depending on context.

Ethnic and Cultural Imagery: In Uzbek, expressions such as “oq yuvosh” (white sheep) are unique cultural metaphors, reflecting aspects of Uzbek heritage. In Russian, idioms like “чёрный как ночь” (black as night) carry culturally specific semantic meaning, often evoking mystery or darkness.

Differences between descriptive nominal units in Uzbek and Russian are apparent in cultural and lexical contexts. For instance, the Uzbek term “mehribon” (kind-hearted) often conveys warmth and humanity, whereas the Russian equivalent, “добрый,” gives a generally positive evaluation of a person. Such differences demonstrate how these languages reflect unique cultural perceptions.

Annotated dictionary differs from a thesaurus due to the fact that language corpuses are interpreted side by side with all the meanings of the word, words that enter into lexical-semantic relationship, in which only the meaning of the word is explained in the annotated dictionary; Although the thesaurus aims to reveal a relatively large number of words, it differs from the corpus in terms of simplicity and limited possibilities of search. Corpuses do not show all the semantic features that refer to a word's context of use, showing the possibility of a word to be associated with another unit.

There is no need to refer to another word in the corpus of the language (as in the dictionary), because artificial intelligence has a large memory, in which paper is not wasted, there is always the possibility of expanding the volume as desired, the size of the volume does not cause any difficulty to the user, and millions of words fit in just a few megabytes. If the number of illustrative examples in a dictionary article is limited, it is possible to refer to the context of thousands of examples of a single searched word in the corpus.

A semantic markup is a set of annotations, a symbol that specifies the meaning of a word/compound in the language corpus, and indicates that it belongs to a certain semantic category. The semantic tags of the corpus include the specification of word meaning(s), creating a set of comments related to homonymy, synonymy, categorizing the word, determining its belonging to the thematic group, semantic field, derivational characteristics, and the meaning of the word. Since the semantic marking system consists of discharge, lexical-semantic characteristics and derivational description, lexical-semantic tags are grouped according to taxonomy, mereology, topology, causation, evaluation fields.

The peculiarity of semantic markup is that two types of annotation methods are used: facet and tree. Depending on the nature of the unit, one or both of these



methods are used in combination. While the facet method requires sequential annotation of the unit, the genealogical method requires specifying the group, cluster, area to which the unit belongs.

Units that reflect the lexicon of a particular language as a necessary tool for corpus semantic classification:

- 1) vocabulary,
- 2) a semantic dictionary that can fully interpret the lexicon of the language,
- 3) a linguistic module for the implementation of semantic markup - a set of rules,
- 4) semantic marking system,
- 5) an additional software tool: a filter capable of distinguishing ambiguity and anonymity is allocated.

Morphological, lexical homonymy in the process of semantic tagging; universal lexicon, which is part of a compound word (composite term); a word that does not exist in the dictionary; piece fragment; it is necessary to develop the specific principles of decoding the literal-symbolic construction, because these units have a special character in each language.

Corpus units are defined by operator and constant tag according to semantic field, group, group membership. After all, setting the field boundary is important in semantic tagging. The fact that a polysemous word can be an element of only one/several fields requires solving certain problems in word form/lemma tagging, because the field of a polysemous word is determined only on the basis of a semantic filter.

A language corpus differs from a paper dictionary in that it is possible to display all the meanings of a lexical unit, but paper dictionaries are the main raw material for a language corpus. By means of semantic tagging, it is necessary to achieve a sequential representation of the schemas. In this case, the linguistic support of the language corpus can be achieved by introducing the conjugation dictionary of the Uzbek language. The fact that such a dictionary does not exist in the Uzbek language increases the type of dictionary considered necessary to be created in the Uzbek lexicography.

There are different methods of tagging homonymous units, elimination of homonymy in the process of automatic text reading - 1) based on grammatical norms and 2) based on statistics. Homonymy should be determined separately in relation to literary speech and colloquial speech, because the dictionary mainly describes lexemes belonging to the modern Uzbek language, and includes a limited number of words specific to colloquial speech. But in the corpus of the language, homonyms used in literary speech and colloquial speech are used in the same way, so



homonymous forms that are not reflected in the dictionary can be observed in the corpus of the language. The most necessary tool for distinguishing homonyms in the text is a morpho-semantic filter, its creation organizes the search for homonyms in the language corpus.

Conclusion: *Examining the functional-semantic characteristics of descriptive nominal units in Uzbek and Russian provides deeper insights into cultural and linguistic distinctions between the two languages. Analyzing the unique semantic and functional properties of these units highlights differences rooted in the historical and cultural backgrounds of the two languages. This research has practical implications for translators, linguists, and educators, offering valuable information and new approaches that they may use in their respective fields.*

References:

1. Akhmedova D.B., Mengliyev B. *Semantic Tag Categories in Corpus Linguistics: Experience and Examination// International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering (IJRTE) ISSN:2277-3878, Volume-8, Issue-3S, October-2019.*
2. Karimov, A. (2022). *Lexical-Semantic Relationships in Linguistic Corpora. Tashkent University Press, pp. 45-46.*
3. Ахмедова Д.Б. *Лексик-семантик муносабатларнинг атов бирликларини теглашдаги ўрни// «Илм сарчасималари». Урганч давлат университетининг илмий-методик журнали. – Урганч, 2019. №7.– Б. 107-112. (10.00.00; № 3).*
4. Karimov, A. (2022). "The Role of Corpora in Lexical-Semantic Analysis." *Linguistics Research Online. <https://www.linguisticsresearchonline.org> (accessed October 30, 2024).*