

BINARY OPPOSITION AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH: A THEORETICAL ASPECT

Davidkhodjaeva Shakhnoza Istamovna
Lecturer of the Department of Russian Linguistics, BukhSU
e-mail: davidxodjaeva@gmail.com
phone: +998934556755

Abstract

The article deals with the analysis of the notion of "binary opposition" and reveals its specificity. The author touches upon the universality of oppositional relations and analyzes the grounds of oppositions typology, analyzes functional-semantic, lexico-semantic, cognitive and other approaches to the study of oppositions.

Keywords: binary opposition; oppositionality; dichotomy; universal category; oppositional models.

The binarity of the material world had a direct influence on the creation of the "mechanism" of cognition and modeling of reality, the formation of a system of ideas about key concepts with the status of categorical concepts. According to a fair remark of Konrad Lorenz, "the division of the world of phenomena into pairs of opposites is an innate principle of ordering, an a priori forced pattern of thinking, inherent in man since the earliest times" [2]. This "innate principle of ordering" is certainly reflected in the linguistic practices of both the individual and the whole society. And it is quite logical, since the duality of perception is characteristic of representatives of different nationalities, and is not a distinctive feature of a certain ethnic group.

Indeed, a person perceives the surrounding world as a continuum, including a number of oppositional categories, which cannot be "isolated": they "seek" their second component, as a result of which oppositions are formed, which differ both in terms of structure and content.

Binary oppositional relations are universal, since dichotomousness is a basic property of natural processes and culture, of human language and thought. It is no coincidence that oppositionality has long been the subject of special interest of representatives of various scientific spheres. It should be noted that the foundation of "binary oppositionality" was laid exactly in the linguistic sphere and is connected with the name of N. S. Trubetskoy, who shifted the emphasis to sense-differentiating oppositions. He introduced universal notions into scientific usage, which later went beyond the boundaries of linguistics proper and became the basis for characterizing various oppositional systems. N. S. Trubetskoy emphasized that when characterizing binary phenomena, one should distinguish not only differential, but also invariant features, which are the "basis for comparison". This is largely due to the fact that two things that have no basis for comparison cannot be contrasted in any way [3, p. 72-83]. N. S. Trubetskoy makes a detailed classification of oppositions taking into account the following bases: a) in relation to the system of oppositions as a whole (multidimensional and unidimensional, isolated and proportional oppositions); b) in relation between opposition members (privative, stepped (gradual) and equivalent (equipotent) oppositions); c) in the volume of their semantic-differential power or effectiveness in different positions (permanent and neutralized oppositions).

Further development of ideas about oppositeness is connected with the expansion of scientific ideas about the basis, the "base" of comparison (works of T. V. Bulygina, A. A. Ufimtseva and others). Linguists pay special attention to the establishment of denotative semes, which participate in the formation of the system of binary differential signs.

Scientific interest in the functional specificity of units has led to the formation of an integrated approach to the study of oppositions, taking into account functional, logical, semantic and other criteria. Such aspect of study allows to consider the analyzed category in action, to answer the question concerning definition of the mechanism of realization of oppositeness in speech practice. "Movement" from function to means expands the boundaries of comprehension of the linguistic material, its functional and semantic differentiation. Within the framework of this approach the following types of opposition are analyzed in detail: privative (one of the opposition members is characterized by the presence and another by the absence of a differential sign), gradational (opposition members differ from each other by different degrees of manifestation of the same sign) and equipotent (each member of the opposition is characterized by the presence of a differential sign). The focus on revealing semantic connections between the components-antonyms contributed to the development of the lexical-semantic approach to opposition. The basis of the study of oppositeness is the analysis of dictionary entries without taking into account the specific context.

The semantic-pragmatic approach implies revealing the specificity of oppositional relations, taking into account the pragmatic component. The solution of this problem involves establishing the role of oppositional relations in the implementation of the "sign-subject" scheme, describing the "implicit", "hidden" content of the sign, which encapsulates the practical experience of the speaker.

The cognitive approach expands the boundaries of opposition research, as it makes it possible to describe specific oppositional models on the basis of involving material from various discourses. The focus of attention is on conceptual oppositions that objectify key categories of the space-time continuum, allowing to reveal the specificity of oppositional nomination.

The introduction of the concept "discourse" into the scientific language contributed to the actualization of the discursive approach to the study of the category "opposition". In this case, the identification of the specificity of oppositionality is based on a rich material covering both institutional discourse and personal discourse.

Active development of the cultural approach to the study of phenomena has touched the sphere of oppositeness as well. A fundamental role in the description of oppositional nominations is played by the concept of "cultural connotation", acting as a feature "which lies at the basis of oppositional comparisons, serves to express emotionally-valued and stylistically marked attitude of the subject of speech to reality". [1, c. 484]. All these characteristics are certainly important for determining the place and role of oppositions in the national picture of the world, as they allow to define a set of nationally marked oppositions, to identify their role in the formation of ethnopreferences and culturally conditioned speech patterns.

Conclusions:

1.Binary oppositional relations have the status of universal, as dichotomousness is a basic property of natural processes and culture, human language and thinking.

2. The foundation of "binary oppositeness" was laid by N. S. Trubetskoy, who shifted the emphasis to sense-differentiating oppositions, offered a detailed classification of oppositions taking into account the following bases: a) in relation to the opposition system as a whole (multidimensional and unidimensional, isolated and proportional oppositions); b) in relation between opposition members (private, stepped (gradual) and equivalent (equipollent) opposition); c) in their volume of semantic-differential power or effectiveness in different positions (permanent and neutralized oppositions).

3. The following approaches to studying the category of "binary opposition" seem to be the most productive: functional-semantic, lexical-semantic, semantic-pragmatic, cognitive, discursive, culturological.

Literature

1. Lavrent'eva, T. V. Structural organization of conceptual field of positivity [Electronic resource] / T. V. Lavrent'eva // Man and Science. -Mode of access: <http://cheloveknauka.com/strukturnaya-organizatsiya-kontseptual-nogo-polya-oppozitivnosti>. - Date of access: 12.10.2019.
2. Lorenz, K. The reverse side of the mirror [Electronic resource] / K. Lorenz. -Access mode: https://royallib.com/book/konrad_lorents/oborotnaya_storona_zer-kala.html. -Date of access: 20.12.2019.
3. Trubetskoy, N. S. Fundamentals of phonology / N. S. Trubetskoy. - M. : Aspect Press, 2000. - 352 c.
4. Авезов С., Юсупова А. ПРОЦЕСС ОБРАБОТКИ УЗБЕКСКОГО ПАРАЛЛЕЛЬНОГО КОРПУСА В УСЛОВИЯХ НЕДОСТАТОЧНОСТИ ДАННЫХ //Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры. – 2023. – Т. 3. – №. 3. – С. 49-58.
5. Авезов С. С., Маринина Ю. А. Электронные Корпусы: Инновационный Подход К Обучению Переводу //Periodica Journal of Modern Philosophy, Social Sciences and Humanities. – 2023. – Т. 16. – С. 7-13.
6. Нигматова Л. Х. ЯЗЫК И КУЛЬТУРА В ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ: <https://doi.org/10.53885/edinres.2022.8.08.006> Нигматова Лолахон Хамидовна, Доктор филологических наук, доцент. Бухарский государственный университет //Образование и инновационные исследования международный научно-методический журнал. – 2022. – №. 8. – С. 45-51.
7. Sharipov S. ТАРЖИМАВИЙ ЛЕКСИКОГРАФИЯНИНГ ТАРИХИЙ ВА ХРОНОЛОГИК ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ //ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.uz). – 2022. – Т. 15. – №. 15.