N.S. Sayidirahimova
Tashkent State University Uzbek language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi
Assistant Professor, Department of Uzbek Linguistics,
Faculty of uzbek philology, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
nasibatashkent@mail.ru

SEMANTIC CLASSIFICATION OF THE SYNTAX ANTONYMS OF UZBEK LANGUAGE

Abstract: The article discusses issues related to the criteria for determining syntactic antonyms in the Uzbek language and the formation of syntactic antonyms in sentences and their classification. It gives linguistic criteria that form the syntactic antonyms in the Uzbek language, also defines the essence of lexical and syntactic antonyms; types of syntactic antonyms are analyzed and methods for classifying the syntactic antonyms of the Uzbek language are proposed.

Key words: syntactic antonyms, criteria of definition of syntactic antonyms, the characterized and classified syntactic antonyms, the syntactic antonyms designating quantity and time, the syntactic antonyms designating a place and a measure.

Language: English

Citation: Sayidirahimova, N. S. (2020). Semantic classification of the syntax antonyms of Uzbek language. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 04 (84), 670-673.

Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-84-114   Doi: crossref https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.04.84.114
Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

UDC 811.512.133-1

For many years, the semantic structure of lexemes, as synonymy, homonymy and antonymy, as well as polysemy was considered an object of the lexical-semantic aspect. But in recent years it has been revealed that these phenomena are multifaceted (multifaceted) and can manifest themselves at different levels of the language. And this is connected with a new approach to the study of linguistic phenomena with the point of view of the anthropocentric paradigm that the above phenomena can be considered together with the human basis, that is, the transformation in the human mind of the picture of the world as an alternation of language, linguistic knowledge and speech.

In Uzbek linguistics, the identification of antonyms has been sufficiently studied, but it should be noted that in the scientific works of Z. Mirzaakhmedova [6], M. Mirtozhiev [7], R. Shukurov [12], antonymy and homonymy are considered from the point of view of the lexical-semantic aspect, and

M.Dzhurabaeva [4] and Y.Tadzhiev [10] study their morphological features.

Based on this, it can be noted that in most cases when these phenomena were studied, the main attention is paid to the lexical-semantic or formal-structural study of each phenomenon separately. In contrast to the studies that we intend to focus on, the study of the phenomenon of syntactic antonymy, homonymy and polysemy takes place at the highest level of the language.

Main body

Antonymy is considered not only at the lexical level of the language, but is also considered a universal semantic category, which is considered at the morphemic, morphological and syntactic levels of the language. At each level of the language, an antonym has its own language features. For example, the main function of syntax sis antonyms is to highlight information about the opposite entities of the subject (addressee). N.B.Boeva, who studied syntactic antonyms on the materials of the English language, argues that the opposition of syntactic antonyms

belongs to a high degree of informativeness, through the denial of primary information in syntactic antonyms new information is transmitted [1]. An analogous pragmatic goal is observed in the appearance of subjects through the syntactic antonyms of emotional relations (surprise, trust, enthusiasm, irony, etc.) in various speech situations. Given the above, it can be noted that the problem of syntactic antonymy is an object not only of syntactic semantics, but also of pragmatics.

In linguistics, the problem of syntactic opposites such as antonyms relatively little studied. In this matter, attention should be paid to the works of Russian scientists T.B. Fastovskaya, N.V. Galatov, N.B. Boyeva, who conducted studies using examples of Romano-Germanic languages [11, 3, 2]. In these works, the linguistic essence of the phenomenon of antonyms is characterized, and also syntactic antonymy is analyzed in phrases, simple and complex sentences, related texts and language units that reveal it.

In Uzbek linguistics, the problem of syntactic anthonyms requires special study both in semantic and in pragmatic aspects. This article discusses issues related to the criteria for determining the syntactic antonyms in the Uzbek language, the formation of syntactic antonyms in sentences and their classification [5,9].

In the Uzbek language, as in other languages, the syntactic antonymy in structure refers to a single paradigm, and also in semantics it is formed in oppositional pairs - phrases, simple and complex sentences, and between their parts [9]. Based on observations in the Uzbek language, we can distinguish the following linguistic criteria that determine syntactic antonymy:

1. Syntactic antonymy requires an oppositional antonymic meaning expressed through syntactic units.

2. In its structure, syntactic antonymy requires unification in a single paradigm according to the value of opposition units

3. Syntactic antonymy requires semantic relationships of paired syntactic units.

4. Syntactic antonymy requires a relationship of conditionally interconnected opposite elements of the phenomenon

Based on these criteria, it can be concluded that syntactic antonymy is based on semantic opposition and is structurally formed between paired units uniting into a single paradigm.

The formation of syntactic antonyms is manifested with the help of lexical, morphological units, as well as with the help of some syntactic constructions that create opposite relationships.

In the Uzbek language, lexical antonyms are important in the formation of syntactic anthony. When used in syntactic units of lexical antonyms, the latter create opposition relations and form a syntactic antonymy. In this case, it will be necessary to distinguish antonyms at the lexical and syntactic level of the language.

In addition, in the Uzbek language, syntactic antonymy is created using various syntactic constructions reflecting opposite semantic relations. For instance:

– *Неччи қопиди, опой?* – *чийиллаб сўради яна бирови.*

– **Бир қоп ... иди** ... *етимчалар насибасидан қайириб опкелгандим.*

– **Қанчайди, деёпман?** – *чийиллади бояги киши.*

– **Анчайде** ... *ман санамаган ...* **бир даста эди!..** (X. Do'stmuhammad).

In this microtext, syntactic antonymy is formed using sentences **бир қоп ... иди – анчайде** (**бир даста эди).**

In the Uzbek language, syntactic antonyms in terms of structural composition and semantic structure can be classified according to whether they are ready-made in the language or formed in the speech process.

According to the sign of a ready-made existence in a language or formation in a speech process, syntactic antonyms can be divided into the following types:

1. Syntactic antonyms used as stamp units in a language. For instance: *Яхши боринг! – Яхши қолинг! Хайрли тонг! – Хайрли кеч!*

2. Syntactic antonyms that form in the speech process. For instance: *Бола хархаша қилди. – Бола тинчиди.*

In the Uzbek language, syntactic antonyms can also be classified on a semantic basis. The semantic types of syntactic antonyms are divided on the basis of the predicate semantics, which are considered both the grammatical and the semantic center of the sentence structure. The authors of the book "Ўзбек тилининг мазмуний синтаксиси" ("Semantic syntax of the Uzbek language") also recommend defining semantic-grammatical models and generalized meanings of sentences based on the classification of predicates [8]. But in some cases, when determining the semantic type of antonymic sentences, only the main predicate is not enough; in these cases, the ratio of the arguments to the main predicate is important. For example, in sentences "*Бошлиқ қаттиққўл одам. – Бошлиқ бўшанг одам*" antonymic relationships are formed using predicate formations **қаттиққўл одам – бўшанг одам.**

In the Uzbek language, syntactic antonyms from the point of view of semantics can be divided into the following types [5, 9]:

1. Characterizing syntactic antonyms. Such syntactic antonyms are characterized by oppositional features of objects. In syntactic antonyms of this kind, the following internal semantic forms are distinguished:

a) syntactic antonyms, reflecting the oppositional characteristic features of people and

animals: *Янги ходим камгап. – Янги ходим сергап*; *Ит ювош. – Ит қопағон;*

b) opposition states associated with people and animals: syntactic antonyms that reflect the natural state, physical state, psychological state, social, economic, etc.: *У қашшоқ одам. – У бой одам; Қўй семиз. – Қўй ориқ;*

s) syntactic antonyms reflecting opposing internal features and the external state of things: *Бу қўғирчоқ куладиган. – Бу қўғирчоқ йиғлайдиган;*

d) syntactic antonyms, reflecting the opposites of form, volume, color, taste, smell of things, etc.: *Йўл узун. – Йўл қисқа.*

2. Syntactic antonyms that classify. Such syntactic antonyms reflect the classification of objects into opposite groups, classes, types. Inside the syntactic antonyms of this type, the following semantic types can be distinguished: a) syntactic antonyms reflecting opposing social groups of people; б) syntactic antonyms reflecting opposing species and classes of animals; в) syntactic antonyms, reflecting opposite types, types, varieties of things. For example, a sentence "*Илонбалиқ – умуртқали жонивор, чувалчанг – умуртқасиз*" has an antonymic character and displays information about opposing classes of animals.

3. Quantitative syntactic antonyms. Such syntactic antonyms provide information about opposing quantitative meanings of objects. For instance: *Ишларим кўп. – Ишларим кам.* The syntactic antonyms of this type can be divided into the following types: a) syntactic antonyms representing an indefinite opposite amount; б) syntactic antonyms reflecting a certain opposite quantity.

4. Syntactic antonyms reflecting time. Such syntactic antonyms provide information about opposing temporal meanings of objects. For instance*: Қишнинг биринчи куни. – Қишнинг сўнгги куни.*

5. Syntactic antonyms reflecting a place. Such syntactic antonyms give information about opposing values of the place of objects. For instance: *Меҳмонлар ичкарида. – Мезбонлар ташқарида.*

6. Syntactic antonyms reflecting a dimension. Such syntactic antonyms give information about the opposite values of the weight, distance and volume of objects. For instance: *Пахта даласи бу ердан олис. – Пахта даласи бу ерга яқин.*

7. Syntactic antonyms that reflect relationships. In such syntactic antonyms, one can see the opposite, that is, a positive or negative attitude and an emotionally expressive assessment of the speaker.

In accordance with this, the syntactic antonyms of this type can be divided into the following types:

a) syntactic antonyms reflecting opposite emotional relationships: Тасанно сиздек йигитга! – *Ҳайф сиздек йигитга!;*

b) syntactic antonyms reflecting opposing evaluative relationships: *Бу ишинг яхши бўлибди. – Бу ишинг ёмон бўлибди.*

8. Syntactic antonyms reflecting presence and absence. Such syntactic antonyms reflect presence or absence. For instance: *Дарди йўқ. – Дарди бор.*

It should be noted here that the ways of expressing sentences, meaning denial and absence, are similar, but they are two different sentences. When defining syntactic antonyms, it is necessary to distinguish between these two types of sentences. For example, offers *Ҳа! – Йўқ!* when expressing an affirmation or denial, they do not form a syntactic anthonyms, but when expressing presence and absence, they enter into antonymic relations.

For comparison, we show:

1. – Машғулотга бординГми? – Ҳа.

– Машғулотга бординГми? – Йўқ.

In the given example, the expressions *Ҳа – Йўқ*, being meanings of affirmation and negation, do not enter into mutual antonymic relations.

2. – Ҳунаринг борми? – Ҳа.

– Ҳунаринг борми? – Йўқ.

In this example, the expressions *Ҳа – Йўқ* are sentences reflecting the antonyms of presence and absence.

9. Syntactic antonyms that reflect opposing actions. Such syntactic antonyms reflect expressions showing general opposing actions based on implementation or non-fulfillment. The syntactic antonyms of this type can be divided into the following types:

a) syntactic antonyms representing an indefinite opposite amount: *Самолёт пастлади. – Самолёт юқорилади.*

b) syntactic antonyms reflecting the beginning and end of an action: *Ўқиш бошланди. – Ўқиш тугади;*

s) syntactic antonyms that reflect the opposite directions of action of the subject: *Бола кийимини кийди. – Бола кийимини ечди;*

d) syntactic antonyms reflecting opposing natural phenomena, changes: *Ёмғир ёғди. – Ёмғир тинди; Йўл торайди. – Йўл кенгайди.* и др.

10. Syntactic antonyms reflecting opposite actions and various situations arising on their basis. The syntactic antonyms of this type can be divided into the following types:

a) antonymic sentences reflecting a mental state based on opposing actions: *У ғазабланди. – У хурсанд бўлди;*

b) antonymical sentences reflecting a physical state based on opposing actions: *У касал бўлди. – У соғайди;*

s) antonymical sentences reflecting a biological state based on opposing actions: *У ёшарди. – У кексайди;*

d) antonymic sentences reflecting continuous states that arose on the basis of opposing actions: *Вазифа осонлашди. – Вазифа қийинлашди;*

i) antonymic sentences reflecting the results of opposing actions: *У семирди. – У озди.*

Matherial method

The object of the article is syntactic antonymy. The main objective of the study is to identify the specificity and analysis of antonymy as a multifaceted linguistic phenomenon. In the study of syntactic antonyms, the methods of component and semantic-comparative analysis were used, and the scientific works of the studied antonyms in the lexical-semantic aspect of Russian and Uzbek linguists served as the methodological basis.

Conclusion

As a result of the study, it was found that antonymy is considered not only as an object of the lexical-semantic aspect, but also as a multi-aspect linguistic phenomenon that can be studied at the syntactic level. Based on the foregoing, we note the following conclusions:

1. Syntactic antonymy as a special type of opposition reflects the relationship between the form and content of syntactic units.

2. The semantic criterion is the main criterion for the definition of syntactic antonymy and is based on opposite semantic relations in the semantics of syntactic units.

3. In the Uzbek language, syntactic antonyms from the point of view of semantics can be divided into various semantic groups. Our proposed semantic classification is important in the semantic analysis of syntactic antonyms.

4. In our opinion, antonymy should be considered on the basis of an anthropocentric paradigm.

References:

1. Boeva, N.B. (2001). *Grammaticheskaya antonimiya v sovremennom angliyskom yazike*. Diss… d-ra fillol.nauk. (p.367). Moskva.

2. Boeva, N.B. (1989). *Antonimichnost predlojnix slovosochetaniy sovremennogo angliyskogo yazika.* Diss… kand-filol.nauk. (p.207). Pyatigorsk.

3. Glatova, N.V. (1989). *Antonimichnost pridatochnix predlojeniy v sovremennom angliyskom yazike*. Diss… kand. filol.nauk. (p.202). Pyatigorsk.

4. Djurabayeva, M. (1975). *Affiksalnaya omonimiya v uzbekskom yazike*. Avtoreferat diss. kandidata. fil. nauk. (p.37). Tashkent.

5. Lutfullayeva, D., & Sayidiraximova, N. (2016). *O'zbek tili sintaktik antonimlarining semantik tavifi - Vinogradovskoe chteniye* / Xalqaro ilmiy-maliy konferensiya materiallari. (pp.56-65). Toshkent.

6. Mirzaahmedova, Z. (1994). *Hozirgi o'zbek tilining antonimik terminologiyasi*. Diss. kand. fil.nauk. (p.150). Toshkent.

7. Mirtojiyev, M. (1963). *O'zbek tilida leksik omonimlarning vujudga kelishi.* Fil.fan.nom dissertatsiyasi. (p.174). Toshkent.

8. Nurmonov, A., et al. (1992). *Semanticheskiy sintaksis uzbekskogo yazika*. Tashkent.

9. Sayidiraximova, N. (2019). O'zbek tilida antonimo-sinonomik munosabatlar ("Hibatul Haqoyiq" asari leksikasi misolida). *NamDU xabarlari,* Namangan, №11, pp.22-23.

10. Tadjiyev, Yo. (1974). *Sinonimiya slovoobrazuyushix affiksov so znachenie «nalichie-otsutstvie» v sovremennom uzbekskom yazike*. Avtoreferat diss. kandidata. fil. nauk. (p.20). Tashkent.

11. Fastovskaya, T.B. (1988). *Antonimichnost v sisteme slojnosochinyonnix predlojeniy v sovremennom angliyskom yazike*: Avtoref. dis. kand. filolog. nauk. Pyatigorsk.

12. Shukurov, R. (1989). *Leksiko-semanticheskaya priroda antonimov*. (p.20). Tashkent.