

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 10 Volume: 78

Published: 23.10.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Irodakhon Kholdorova

Fergana State University
senior teacher, Fergana city, Uzbekistan
dokma@bk.ru

SEMANTIC ANALYSES OF GENERATIVE LEXEMES WITH “BIRTH” AND “DEATH” SEMESIN THE UZBEK LANGUAGE

Abstract: The article discusses linguistic paradigm, the relation among the parts of paradigm which form generative lexemes and particularly semantic features of generative lexemes with “birth” and “death” semes.

Key words: Paradigm, generative lexemes, connotative meaning, denominating seme, expression seme, functional seme, valencylinguaculture.

Language: English

Citation: Kholdorova, I. (2019). Semantic analyses of generative lexemes with “birth” and “death” semesin the Uzbek language. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 10 (78), 362-364.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-10-78-67> **Doi:** [crossref https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.10.78.67](https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.10.78.67)

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Certainly, the words with the meaning of *fyaralish* (endanger), *dunyoga kelish* (bear) in the base of “tug’ilish” (birth) seme conjoin in determinate paradigm: *tug’moq* (bear), *bolalamoq* (cub), *qo’zilamoq* (lamb), *qulunlamoq* (foal), *tuxum qilmoq* (hatch out). Presently these lexemes differ with their distinctive features [1; 6; 9]. Because “... units in paradigmatic relations have combining seme and distinctive seme at the same time. Those distinctive semes base for the contradiction of parts of paradigm” [8, 13].

Generic units take a special place in the lexical system of language. In the structural-semantic study of generative lexemes, it is important to classify lexemes within the paradigm according to particular bases and to deeply analyze the relationship between them. In particular, the vocabulary units in the generative lexeme paradigm constitute an antisemic relationship. Determining what paradigms semantically constitute generative lexemes, the interconnection of the internal structure and the structural units of these fields and their inseparable relationship closely linked to their contradictory relations.

D. Abdullaeva, who conducted a monographic research on the phenomenon of antisemia in the Uzbek linguistics, notes: “The

presence of semes in the semantic structure of lexical units that underpin the contradictory relationship determines the phenomenon of antisemia. As a linguistic phenomenon, antisemia is characterized by more widespread use than antonymy. At the heart of every antonymic pair is antisemia, but any antisemic relationship may not be antonymy. Antonymy is the peak of antisemia” [1, 21 - 22]. In particular, the archiseme of “life” and “death” form the basis of generative lexemes. All other lexical units within the paradigm merge on one or the other around these semes.

It is well known that the semantic structure of the word (expressing, expressing, expressing) is defined as an element of the lexical system. Inter-system interaction alters the semantic structure of the word. When this change occurs in the expressor, it is also reflected in the expression. Some semes in generative lexeme semes are mutually exclusive and at the same time opposing. These semes help to ensure the antisemic relationship between the units. ke a

While the lexemes in the base of “birth” seme are conjoined under general meaning endanger, bear, determinate meaning which is distinctive for each one differs. Though one of the parts of the paradigm in paradigmatic line unifies other parts as it expresses general meaning.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
 ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
 GIF (Australia) = 0.564
 JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
 PIIHII (Russia) = 0.126
 ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
 SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
 PIF (India) = 1.940
 IBI (India) = 4.260
 OAJI (USA) = 0.350

For.ex. I have a woman-she bore a lot of children. (Togay Murad “Otamdan qolgan dalalar”)

In the line of the words with “birth” seme, “bear” unifies other parts of paradigm as it has a generative meaning. Other words in this line differ from “bear” with their distinctive meaning, usage frequency or usage area and chance of valency.

For.ex. bolalamoq-cub for wolf, lion

Qo'zilamoq - Lamb for ship

Qulunlamoq - Foal for horse

Tuxum qilmoq - Hatch out for hen

But the meaning of “bear” generates these units.

“Bear” lexeme in paradigmatic line contradicts to other parts of paradigm as it has high usage frequency (*give birth for dog, cow, hen*). But it is not used for hens in the meaning of *give baby*. It is used as “The hen hatched out” (Tovuq jo'ja ochdi). The lexeme “bear” differs from other lexemes in paradigmatic line concerning its chance to connect the words.

When the lexemes with “birth” seme are used in phrases, they show their peculiar expression.

Kuni tug'di. (to become lucky)

Ikkita tug'di.(overworry)

Puli tug'di. (rise, multiply)

Biti bolaladi. (concern / trouble rose)

Xo'rozi tuxum qildi. (to be lucky)

These phrases are unified under the semes “rise, increase”. But *xo'rozi tuxum qildi* and *kuni tug'di* differ from others with their meaning “to be lucky”. Lexemes with “birth” seme contradict to other parts of paradigm with their excess of connotative meaning and specific style. Because phrases are characterized that they are not used in scientific and formal style [2]. Their chance to unite with other words broadens when they are used in connotative meaning:

Dalalarim... bolaladi.! To'qqiz kunu, to'qqiz soatda bolaladi. (Tog'ay Murod “Otamdan qolgan dalalar”)

My fields....gave birth! In 9 days and nine hours. (Togay Murad “The fields left by dad”)

The lexemes with “birth” seme are used in the meaning of “appear, emerge” as well:

U halqa orasida ekanini bilardi, shunday bo'lsada qochish imkoniyati tug'ilishi yoki o'qlar yomg'iridan qutulish chorasini izlashim mumkinligini ham hisobdan chiqarmagandi. (Tohir Malik “Shaytanat”)

He knew that he was stuck. Though he didn't forget the possibility of appearing of the way to run away or searching the way of escaping from bullet rain.

	appearing	alive	continuous	To be absent	The end of the act	dead
birth	+	+	+	-	-	-
death	-	-	-	+	+	+

Usually, while the semes in one line generalize the lexemes, the very semes differentiate them from the one in the next line.

(Tohir Malik “Shaytanat”)

Regarding some scientific resources, semes in sememes are in 3 types according to their meaning:

1. Denotative semes
2. Connotative semes
3. Functional semes [7,58]

Denotative seme of lexemes with “birth” archisemes is “bear”,.....they are unified in one family on the base of denotative meaning. Expressive semmes are the semes which signify various extra meanings (stylistic..., personal attitude, usage area) [7,60]

The lexemes with “birth” archisemes contradict to each other concerning usage area and personal attitude: bear-cub-lamb-foal. They are neutral in paradigmatic line. Their stylistic expressionis seen in relation with their usage area: it bolaladi. Dog gave birth. (neutral)

Itdekbolaladi. ...gave birth as a dog. (negative) (gave birth many times)

According to the functional seme, lexemes with “birth” archiseme stand in different positions ina sentence. The lexemes with “birth” archiseme constitutes a paradigmatic line according to their generative meaning.

Whereas the lexemes “death, decease, demise” unified on the base of the seme “ending of the act” are conjoined under the general meaning “to be absent”, their distinctive meaning differs. But one of the parts of paradigm unites other parts as it expresses general meaning, which is “the end of the action”. The lexemes stand on a line under this general meaning, though they differ from each other. The words vafot (decease), qazo (demise), nobud (perish), qurbon (victim), halok (fall) are used with auxiliary verbs and give various meanings:

Vafotetmoq (pass away), qazoqilmoq (demise), nobud bo'lmoq (perish), halok bo'lmoq (perish).

The lexemes o'lmoq (die), qulamoq (fall), uzilmoq (rip) can be used substantively. Qazoqilmoq (demise) is used in order to inform about the death to elder people in colloquial speech. Nobudo'lmoq (perish) is used to tell about the death of infants. Qurbon bo'lmoq (victim) and halok bo'lmoq (fall) express the death in wars, battles. Qulamoq (fall, tumble) is used in colloquial speech and has negative meaning.

The lexemes in the paradigmatic line of archisemes “to be born” and “to die” are contradicted to each other.

The lexemes with “birth” seme (to be born, give a birth) have “alive, “continuous” meanings but this kind of seme does not exist on the line of “death”.

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PИИИ (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

They are united under the semes “ending, lifeless, dead”. Though the line of “birth” ends with “death”, “birth” and “death” are united under generation termin, as it means birth and it is continuous.

The death is called nexronim and it means to end. Every generation faces the end. In this meaning “birth” and “death” are united under the term generative. They are united in one field and this field is called generonim.

Generally, different concepts about paradigm and field are devide into three.

1. Paradigm and field are identical subject matters and the parts of paradigm are language units which grammatical and substantial generality.

2. Field is differentiated from paradigm and unites several parts of paradigm.

3. System and fiels are understood equally [3,19].

Field is wider than paradigm and includes a few paradigmtic lines. The lexemes with “birth” archisemes are united in one paradigmatic line. Generative field unites the lexemes with “birth” and “death” archisemes. It is preferable to call generonymsthelexemes united in this field. Because generation expresses continuance and the end of continuance is death. While generation ends with death, generonyms include the lexemes which express the process of death.

In brief, uniting generative lexemes under an exact paradigm undera general seme differentiate them from each other and finding out their place in this paradigm is very essential. This gives a way to clarify the signs of valency, linguacultural signs of people in set-expressions.

References:

1. Abdvliyev, M. (1988). To'siqsizlik maydoni va uni tashkil etuvchi sintaktik birliklar. *o'zbek tili va adabiyoti*, № 4, pp.62-66.
2. Ganiyeva, Sh. (2013). A. *O'zbek frazeologizmlarining stuktur tadqiqi*. Toshkent: Fan.
3. Iskandarova, Sh. (2007). *Til sistemasiga maydo asosida yondashuv*. Toshkent: Fan.
4. Isknadarova, Sh. (1998). *Leksikani mazmuniy maydon asosida o'rganish muammolari*. Toshkent: Fan.
5. (1990). *Lingvisticheskiy ensiklopedicheskiy slovar*. Moscow: SE.
6. Mirzaqulov, T. (1994). *O'zbek tili morfem paradigmasi va sintagmatikasi masalalari*: filol. fanlari. dok....diss. avtoref. Toshkent.
7. Ne'matov, H., & Rasulov, R. (1995). *O'zbek tili sistem leksikologiyasi asoslari*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
8. Nurmonov, A., Shahobiddinova, Sh., Iskandarova, Sh., & Nabiyeva, D. (2001). *O'zbek tilining nazariy grammatikasi (Morfologiya)*. Toshkent: Yangi asr avlodi.
9. Sobirov, A. (2004). *O'zbek tilinig leksik sathini sistemalar sistemasi tamoyili asosida tadqiq etish*. Toshkent: Ma'naviyat.
10. Hojiyev, A. (2002). *Tilshunoslik terminlarning izohli lug'ati*. Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy ensiklopediyasi.