

12-30-2020

GRADUONYMIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IDIOMATIC WORDS

Sultonbek Mirzaakbarov
sulton.m@jspi.uz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mirzaakbarov, Sultonbek (2020) "GRADUONYMIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IDIOMATIC WORDS," *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*: Vol. 2020 : Iss. 2 , Article 12.

Available at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj/vol2020/iss2/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. For more information, please contact sh.erkinov@edu.uz.

GRADUONYMIC RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN IDIOMATIC WORDS

Sultonbek Mirzaakbarov

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute

e-mail: sulton.m@jspi.uz

Abstract: In this paper, the phenomenon of hyponymy and graduonymy in phrases is explained with examples. They are analyzed by comparing English and Uzbek hyponymic phrases with three different levels using the method of comparison. Also, the phrases and expressions used in the Uzbek language are analyzed in a clear and simple way with the help of examples, and their comparative English appearance, which corresponds in parallel, is shown in the table from the real life today and explained how to use properly. This is because today, the harmonization of two languages with each other leads to some difficulties in the field of phraseology. Therefore, the analyzed examples show simplicity and are very helpful to the learners.

Key words: phraseology, phraseological units, phraseme, graduonymic phraseme, idioms, comparative study, comparative linguistics, comparative phraseology, hyponymy, hyponymic phraseme, hyponymic order, hypernym, polysemiony, graduonymy, graduonymic degree.

INTRODUCTION

Words and phrases can enter into different emotional relationships with other words and phrases in the language. “The sense of expression is its place in the system of semantic relations with other expressions in language” [3, p. 29]. These emotional relationships are synonymy, antonym, polysemy, and hyponymy. The fourth type of semantic relationship is the hyponymy, inclusion relationship. “Hyponym is a word added in a general sense” [2, p.298]. Hyponymy can be interpreted as the relationship between explicit and general lexemes and phrases; for example, a house is a building hyponym. Georgios Tserdanelis and Wai Yi Peggi Wong consider this relationship to be a “loss of identity” [10, p.225]. This

means a transition from specific (flower, tulip and petunia) to general (flower). Flowers and plants are super ordinate terms or hypernym. The flower is a hypernym for crocus, rose, begonia and saffron, and it is a hyponym for the plant. The flower is superior to crocus, rose, begonia and saffron, but the flower is less than planted at the same time [4, p. 617] .

We all know that the Uzbek language has a lot of potential, but at the same time it has a long history. That is why it is necessary to look for the roots of our language from ancient times [1, p. 34-35].

Although we do not say that the problem of grading has been studied for a long time, we do encounter it in part in Alisher Navoi's *Muhokamat-ul-lughatayn*.

The great Uzbek poet Alisher Navoi analyzed the synonyms of the verb "cry" and other words to prove the breadth of expression of the Uzbek language, the comparison with the words of the Persian-Tajik language itself their family always confirms their interest [9, p.10].

It is well known that in nature and in society, all events and products are inextricably linked. In particular, linguistic units are closely interrelated and have many similarities and differences. While some of their features have been studied, others are still pending. The same can be said of graduonymy and synonymy. If synonymy and its specific aspects have been extensively studied, the phenomenon of graduonymy has not been adequately studied.

THE MAIN PART

Although synonymous relations have as long a history in the history of linguistics as our science, thousands of pages and works have been devoted to the problems of lexical meaning, even though not a single dictionary of several synonyms has been compiled the problem is still a puzzle that needs to be solved. These include, but are not limited to:

- I. The problem of synonyms and double words (*arava/ aroba*)
- II. Synonyms, words with a moderate style and bright style (*yuz/turq, yuz/aft*)

III. Full and partial synonyms (uy/bino; hovli/uy)

IV. Synonyms and lexical graduonyms (example: *yaxshi~tuzuk~binoyi~joyida~soz*)

V. The issue of linguistic and speech synonyms (*yor-do'st; yor~sevgili~jonona~dilbar,mahbuba*)

The list could go on and on. But that is enough for us, and we will focus on the issues of lexical synonymy and lexical graduonymy and limit ourselves to describing the similarities and differences between these two linguistic phenomena [5, p. 223].

The study of graduonymy (spiritual hierarchy) as a separate type of inter-verbal spiritual relations began in the late 80's.

In linguistics, before graduonymy was distinguished as a separate form of inter-word spiritual relations, a series of words denoting a sign were studied within the framework of synonyms.

In the Uzbek dictionary of synonyms, the words with the same meaning were often given as synonyms. Of course, since the phenomenon of graduonymy is not specifically distinguished, the words that indicate the degree of meaning are often scattered in different synonymous cells. There were real reasons for this. Because synonyms contain words that have similar meanings.

It should be noted that since a language is a system, the vocabulary system is also a system, and there are no words (lexemes) in the language that do not fit into a particular lexical paradigm. Because the phenomenon of spiritual hierarchy is not specifically distinguished, words that give meaning are often embedded in synonyms, such as “*pichirlamoq~gapirmoq~baqirmoq*” like “*whispering-speaking-shouting*” words could not be included in the dictionary of synonyms [6, p. 5]

The main factor in distinguishing synonyms, combining words into synonymous paradigms is the accuracy of what synonymous words mean, what

they name, event, event, sign, feature. It has this sharp difference that distinguishes graduonymy from synonymy.

The leading factor in combining synonymous series is that words of synonymic paradigm have one common denotation (so-called), and within their own paradigm differ mainly methodical colors, the scope of application, while words in graduonomic paradigm refer to different denotations, but the difference between these denotations is not in the qualities of the denotations, but in their quantitative indications [8, p. 182].

The main difference between synonymy and graduonymy, therefore, is that the members of the paradigm of words associated with synonymous relations have the same denotant, the same volition, in different ways. Members of the paradigm of words associated with graduonymic relationships are associated with different amounts of the same sign increasing or decreasing in different denotations. At first glance, the boundary between synonymy and graduonymy is clear - if the denotations are the same - synonymy, if the denotations are different, these denotations are mutually qualitative, as well as the meaning of the words, if the amount of these words is different – graduonymy .

The linguistic point of view in distinguishing a synonymous line is in the meaning of the words and in the rotation of the reality that these words mean; at the level of the same character, which differs in quantitative indicators in the semantic structures of these words, as well as the meaning of the words in the graduonymic lexical series [7, p. 3].

It has long been known in linguistics that lexical units form a series of hierarchies according to their spiritual relations. We can see this in the following example: The characters in the words "*issiq-sovuq*" are contradictory. Therefore, these words are considered as antonyms. But it is not difficult to understand that in the line of warm-hot-boiling there is a degree of expression of the sign. Linguistic combinations have a long history in linguistics.

Leveling can occur between lexemes, between phrases, and between lexemes and phrases. Based on this, it is appropriate to talk about lexical and phraseological graduonyms.

Lexical hierarchies are displayed in special graduonymic rows. Therefore, in order to grade, it is necessary to think about the units of this and the relationship between these units.

The most important construction sign of a hierarchy is the increase or decrease in the amount of a common sign in it. This means that the lexemes and phrases in this series form semantic connections between the common-character hierarchy. The main factor in the structure of the graduonymic series is the fact that the increase or decrease of one type of sema sign becomes a constant component of different lexemes and phrases. A lexical hierarchy can consist of two or more units. Graduonymy is actually seen in three members. However, we must keep in mind that a series (event) can have both linguistic members.

For example, consider the relation "*jo`ja-tovuq*". If we look at the original phenomenon here (the reference), we come across (ontological) levels like the "*jo`ja – bir kunlik jo`ja ikki – ikki kunlik jo`ja = uch kunlik jo`ja – to`rt kunlik jo`ja..... bir oylik jo`ja- yeti oylik jo`ja- tuxumga kir boshlagan jo`ja – tovuq-sakkiz oylik tuxumga kirgan yosh tovuq ikki yillik yosh tovuq – uch yillik Yoshi o`rtacha tovuq-n.....- besh yillik qari tovuq*" that just came out of the egg.

It is clear from this that linguistic lexical lamination generally divides the series of natural continuous hierarchies into two parts, and that the quality from a young state (to the egg-laying state) is related to the subsequent evolution of a lexeme (chicken). He was able to name the general quality he had with a second lexeme (chicken). Thus, each graduonymy (member) of the chicken-type series has its own hidden (which can be expressed by other means of speech) hierarchical possibilities, in which contradictions such as "*kuchuk- it, jo`ja- tovuq*" in the base (association) belong to the group of gradual oppositions, not privative seems to belong to. In other words, other linguistic means of speech that sometimes serves

as hierarchies (such as numerals, lexemes of NOUNS denoting time, day, month, and year, such as their various speech combinations) under the general linguistic system economy may affect the contraction.

It goes without saying that each degree has a specific place in the grades. Because, meaning is crucial. However, in speech, graduonyms have a wide range of meanings. For example, in the chicken-chicken series, the chicken lexeme has a specific graduonym (second member) in the narrow sense, while the chicken in the broad sense can also be used for semantics. For example, when we say chicken, chicken means chicken. It turns out that we are dealing with gradual polysemy.

A lexeme that, in its broadest sense, can be used in place of a series of graduonyms in some degree may not be included in that degree in a narrow sense. For example, with the lexeme "joke", the degree of laughter, ridicule, mockery is the same. In some cases, a member of a lexical degree may not have its own lexeme.

It is not possible to speak of a dominant member that occurs in synonymy with respect to the graduonymic series. Since the synonymous series is exactly the same as the graduonymic series, it is based on differences. While the lack of additional meanings in synonymous dominance (preservation of identity in the main sense with other synonyms) is the main feature, the fact that graduonyms differ sharply in semantic gradation from the basic meaning itself is characteristic of a certain hierarchy. The breadth of meanings and the use of one instead of the other within the framework of existing stable dominonyms differ qualitatively from the synonymous dominants and their usage features.

The degree to which a sign is more or less in a multi-level series is evident from the direct relationship of the graduonyms. For example, whispering, whispering, and talking. In some cases, the level of the sign is understood indirectly on the basis of the order of the general system of graduonyms: south-west, north-east, Monday-Tuesday-Wednesday-Thursday-Friday-Saturday.

Graduonyms can often be understood as a gradual increase or decrease of not only a particular character, but also the characters associated with it.

The phenomena of graduonymy and synonymy differ sharply in their basic features. Indeed, while synonymy is based on the identification of two or more lexemes and phrases, graduonymy relies on gradational differences in the basic semantics of semantics. From this it is clear that the basic meanings in synonyms are equal, and in graduonymy they are not. Therefore, the use of synonyms instead of one is generally not possible in basic denotative graduonymic series, if possible. It is true that in many cases when the degree differences between graduonyms are small or weak, the similarity in the semantics increases, and this leads to a spiritual closeness (not a spiritual unity, not an identity, as in homonyms), as a result of which they will be able to use one instead of the other due to some contextual factors. Hence, a correct understanding of the differences between the phenomena of reciprocity in the realms of synonymy and graduonymy, on the other hand, in such cases the increase of similarity between the pairs of graduonyms and synonyms, even the connection of these two phenomena must be taken into account.

Again, the subtle differences in hierarchy in synonymy are, in fact, peripheral signs of graduonymy, not synonymy. To be more precise, the refined primitive signs of graduonymy have entered the realm of synonymy as secondary signs. From the above, it can be concluded that synonymous and graduonymic relations, synonymous and graduonymic lexical paradigms do not occur even if they intersect at certain points.

While synonymy is mainly based on the differences between expression and function semantics in the semantic structure of a word, the separation of graduonomic lexical paradigms is based on the semantics of qualitative differences associated with quantitative indicators in word naming and naming semantics. Therefore, adjacent words in a graduonymic row can enter into a synonymous relationship.

CONCLUSION

As for the relationship between graduonymy and antonymy, antonyms are very well-studied in linguistics, and although antonyms appear to be a definite phenomenon at first glance, there are still very confusing problems in this area. Today, there is no clear and unequivocal norm for defining antonymic relations and distinguishing antonyms. Antonyms are distinguished on the basis of intuitive external contradiction. After all, affirmation and denial are mutually exclusive phenomena. Adjacent words in a graduonymic row are in synonymous relationship, while words in the margins of a graduonymic row are in synonymous relationship. The boundary between synonymy and antonymy is defined by the leading word of the graduonymic series; words on one side of the border are associated with long-distance synonymous relationships, and words on both sides of the border are associated with antonyms. As for the phenomenon of graduonymy and antonymy, it turns out that these are in fact semantic phenomena based on a single criterion. It is well known that in the concept of graduonymy and antonymy, contradictions, which are strong or vivid manifestations of differences, are dealt with only by opposites. In other words, in the traditional and now common definition of antonymy, the two poles of a graduonymic series are taken, and the intermediate or adjacent differential relations of that series are excluded from the evaluation.

REFERENCES

1. Bozorov O. Fundamentals of Linguistic Graduate Study // Modern Bukhara Philology. Bukhara, 1994. –I juz. –B. 35-38
2. Denham. K., & Lobeck A. (2011). [*Linguistics for everyone: An Introduction*](#). Boston, MA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning
3. Hurford J., Heasley B., Smith M. (2007). *Semantics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

4. Mamatov, A., & Mirzaakbarov, S. B. (2019). Uzbek comparative analysis of hyponymy in English graduonymic phrasemes. *Central Asian Problems of Modern Science and Education*, 4(2), 617-625.
5. Mirzaakbarov, S. B. (2018). The analysis of relations of hyponymy in Uzbek graduonymic phrasemes. In *Sopostavitel'no-tipologicheskiiy rakurs v issledovanii raznostrukturnykh yazykov* (pp. 223-228).
6. Mirzaakbarov, S. (2020). Comparative Study Of English And Uzbek Graduonymic Phrasemes In Use. *Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI*.
7. Mirzaakbarov, S. (2020). Analysis Of The Story "Love And Friendship" By The Famous Orientalist Writer Jane Austen. *Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI*.
8. Mirzaakbarov, S. (2020). The comparative analysis of hyponymic English and Uzbek phrases in graduonymic manner. *Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI*.
9. Orifjonova Sh, "Lexical graduonimiya in the Uzbek language" Ph.D. dissertation, abstract. Tashkent, 1997. Page 10
10. Tserdanelis G., Wong W. (2004). *Language files*. Columbus: OH: The Ohio University Press.