

## 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: 11 Volume: 79

Published: 25.11.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Zafar Bekpulatovich Umurkulov  
Termez State University  
PhD student  
[umurkuloff@gmail.com](mailto:umurkuloff@gmail.com)

## LEXICAL MEANS EXPRESSING COMPARISON

**Abstract:** In the article, comparative lexical means are considered to be the key unit that makes up the basis of comparisons, and it is an important tool for comparisons. The main difference between pure and comparative comparison is the difference in the character of the mark in them. At the same time, it was analyzed that the words that form the basis of comparison are the words that represent the basis according to the category of words in the basis of comparisons.

**Key words:** Comparative, pure comparisons, comparative comparisons, subject of comparisons, etalon of comparison, comparative basis, lexical means, comparative words.

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Umurkulov, Z. B. (2019). Lexical means expressing comparison. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 11 (79), 237-240.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-79-50> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.11.79.50>

**Scopus ASCC:** 1203.

### Introduction

Since the Uzbek language is a wide-ranging expression, the means used for its expression are varied. The lexical method stands out among the methods of comparative expression and is remarkable with its high specificity. This is because certain identities related to the subject of comparison and the benchmark of the sign on the basis of analogy are expressed by dictionary means. Morphological, lexical-morphological, and syntactic comparisons are also used to identify basis of comparison by lexical means. This indicates that the lexicon is a key component of the comparative component. Although Uzbek linguistics provides information on some of the comparative morphological tools, it does not provide information on comparative mechanisms. Therefore, the study of comparative means and their peculiarities is an important part of the scientific study of this issue.

### Analysis of Subject Matters

An important aspect of lexical means in making comparisons is the fact that word comparisons arise in the construct of discourse. For example: – *Take it easy, son!* – *he said. Your daughter is more clever than you* (P.Qodirov. “Yulduzli tunlar”). An important reason for the analogy in this text is the character represented by the word *smart*. If there is no

such lexical unit in the text, even though there are three components of the analogy needed to create the analogy, the comparative character will remain vague and the comparison will not be expressed. One of the most important aspects of comparisons defining its peculiarities and differing from the assimilation - comparison is that situation above. For example, when you look at the face like a tulip, the meaning of the face is expressed by the expression of tulips. The identification symbol in this expression is red, and the word that represents the symbol does not have to be used. In the expression the similarity of the similarity between the subject of identification and the benchmark is reflected. In this sense, if the face is represented by a red tulip on the basis of a pure analogy, there is a difference in the sign of the subject, and a *red* word must be used to indicate the logical completeness of the idea. This indicates that the use of the word defining sign in comparative constructs is an important factor in comparisons.

Prof. N.Makhmudov researches pure comparatively simple expressions, and shows that in pure comparatively simple phrases come words of categories of adjectives and adverbs as an expression of the sign on the basis of comparison [1;87]. This idea has been the only idea of comparisons and the lexicon of its expression. After all, comparative vocabulary

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (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

tools have not been specifically studied in Uzbek linguistics.

### Research Methodology

An important aspect of the words in the category of adjective and adverb is that the vocabulary expresses the meaning of the word, as well as the character's expression, as well as the different attitude of the speaker to the object. These peculiarities in the words also serve as the basis for comparative expression. For example, the comparative expression of *good, intelligent, knowledgeable, cunning, hypocritical, cheerful, beautiful, intelligent* and many other vocabularies, along with the opposite meaning of these words, depends on the person's attitude towards what is being compared.

Although comparative devices may be created on the basis of the words of all categories of adjective and adverb in the language, it is possible to say that lexical means are limited in the form of comparisons. There are few comparisons from other categories of words, and when words in another category make comparisons, they sometimes occur only on the basis of the displacement of the meaning, and sometimes on the basis of the verb being combined with other words.

An important aspect of comparisons in lexical means is that the word-denoting expressions do not make comparisons without the help of denotative meanings, although they can form comparisons. In order to make a comparison, there must be another vocabulary or morphological tool that interconnects with the symbolic words. Such lexical means that serve to link words defining signs are defined as contributors. Contributors also have the task of linking one word to another in terms of task. In the case of comparisons, this role of assistants becomes broader and becomes a means of making comparisons.

Comparative lexical units have also been limited, and it is possible to see that several assistants in the Uzbek language, such as the words: *than, compared to and in comparison with* have been actively used as comparative tools.

Another important aspect of comparisons is that the words in a comparative device are so interconnected that even the shape of one and the other changes accordingly. This can be illustrated by means of comparative means and words that represent the subject of comparison. Actually, due to the demand of a comparative means, the name of the subject of comparison is used in various forms. For instance, *There are seven, eight thousand troops in each crowd. The pursuit of the crowd is much little than theirs* (P.Qodirov. "Yulduzli tunlar"). In this sentence combinations of words such as *than, little* plays important role to make comparison. The word *little* in the text is the basis of comparison, and the word *than* is a means of comparison. The subject of comparison as an etalon of comparison required the word *they* to be dependent as its dative case \*\*\* *Or I understand*

*the words of the Jadids much easier and faster than others* (Cho'lpon. "Kecha va kunduz"). The comparative tool in the sentence ensures that the word is linked by a suffix from which it depends. The proportionality of the use of lexical means in the text is also important for comparison with all expressions. This is due to the fact that comparisons are a logical category and violation of the criterion of comparison leads to a loss of meaning.

The fact that comparisons can be used as expressions is also due to the fact that language and morphological tools are not widely used in comparative expression. Consequently, languages that are extremely freely expressive in the process of expression are limited to expressing comparative devices. The main criterion of comparative expressions is that the basis of comparison is made up of symbolic words, that the means of comparison such as *than, in comparison with and compared to* demand dative and ablative cases towards its words.

One of the most important features of comparative devices is the fact that the subject mark is more than the mark on the other subject.

The over-expression of the sign in the comparable subjects is compared to the other by the use of the load before the sign [1;76]. The overload also indicates the average overlap of the mark compared to the sign when it comes to the word. You can see this in the following examples. *At the same time, as he held a good position like Azizbek, Normuhammad gained even more and more attention in front of the birdhouse* (A.Qodiriy. "O'tkan kunlar"), *Qosimbek's words seemed very logical to Bobur* (P.Qodirov. "Yulduzli tunlar"). The fact that the sign is more than the sign represented by the particle is also caused by the use of different lexical means before the word defining comparativeness. Such lexical tools are often composed of words defining degree and quantity and numbers. The word in the number series precedes words such as *tames, share* defining times, contributions and indicates a high degree of comparative character. For example, *Since Ahmad Tanbal was not able to achieve his goal on the Khonzoda begim, his hatred against Babur was ten times stronger than before* (P.Qodirov. "Yulduzli tunlar"). *Why should I have to hide? Instead, I had better kick a ball with a team or go to a peaceful place and paly chillak than wander about the dusty street* (X.To'xtaboyev. "Sariq devni minib"). *But Shaybaniykhon is a hundred times more dangerous than you, my lord* (P.Qodirov. "Yulduzli tunlar"). It is also possible that the comparative sign is higher in relation to one of the subjects than by the number of words such as *many, much, more, very, too* that express more quantities. For instance, *Jacob wanted to show his most loyalty to Bobur in order to keep this secret* (P.Qodirov. "Yulduzli tunlar"), *His position was more difficult than Abdulla's* (O'.Umarbekov. "Odam bo'lish qiyn").

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (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

In comparative devices it is observed that the subject of comparison and the sign on the benchmark benchmark are higher than the others. Devices that are caused by low marking are rare, and it is observed that low-dose approaches are the basis of comparison. For example, *Special guards began to fight, even though they were twice as small as the other ones* (P.Qodirov. "Yulduzli tunlar"). In the text, *as twice as small* defining two times few means that the comparable character in the text is small. The degree to which the character is expressed in comparative expressions also depends on the degree of difference between the subject of comparison and the benchmark. If the presence of rank preceding the character's expression is present, a greater degree of sign is expressed. For example, the building is much larger than the other.

Apparently, more or less of the mark is compared to the normal sign, and the lexical units are used to represent the sign. This indicates that vocabulary tools are an important basis for comparisons. In comparison, comparative components can sometimes not be represented in the dictionary. Two cases can be observed on devices where comparable components are not fully expressed. First of all, in this case the analogy applies to the whole text, and the comparative device becomes part of the text. The meaning of the entire text means the subject of comparison and the benchmark. For example, *Now there is no one in Shaybonikhan's residence who knows Islam well enough and recites the Koran better than him* (P.Qodirov. "Yulduzli tunlar"). Considering that most of the comparative devices are comparative subjects and benchmarks, one of them is in the text, the other is vague, and is generally expressed, and the possibilities for such semantic comparisons are not limited.

Secondly, the etalon of comparison is represented by the words defining times. Prof. N.Mahmudov argues that such expression is an implicit expression, and that it is distinguished by the appearance of a sign at a specific time compared to other times [1;88]. In this case various lexical tools are used as the basis of comparison. On the basis of comparison there are lexical tools of the past, present, for the time being, today, all the time, the former and the other, and the subject of comparison is compared with the benchmark. For instance, *Tolibjon realized he was missing his country much more than before* (S.Ahmad. "Jimjitlik"). In this statement, the level of the sign on the basis of comparison is compared to the previous one, that is, over the previous missions. This type of comparative device is quite common in the literary texts and can take on the importance of artistic speech. The expression of one of the bases of comparison, and the reference to the other, is most commonly found in the comparison of the human condition. This is also illustrated by the following example. *With the brown spots on her face, Aisha seemed more precious to Bobur than before. When she*

*realized this, Aisha would act more confidently than before* (P.Qodirov. "Yulduzli tunlar"). Comparing the previous situation with the present one, we can see that one of the key components of the comparison is not.

In the process of expressing a comparative relation, it is observed that the word in the constellation is also used as a dictionary tool for symbolizing. For example, *Miryacob is much more innocent than Akbar!* (Cho'lpon. "Kecha va kunduz"). The word innocent is used as a basis for comparisons, acting as a substitute for a word. The distinctive feature of this comparative device is that the analogy is mainly based on the character identification. In this text, the word is used to denote such a condition - a noun as a substitute for a comparative sign, which served as the basis of comparisons. It can also be seen that the words in the verb category form a comparative basis, although they represent a comparative basis.

Comparative verbs are often used as verbs. For example, *The Sheibani Khan gained a great advantage over the Timurids, combining the power of the khanate with his religious authority* (P.Qodirov. "Yulduzli tunlar"), *Honor was superior to life* (T.Malik. "Shaytanat"), *Sayyora knew it, that's why she kept him closer to her and even told him her secrets* (O'.Umarbekov. "Odam bo'lish qiyin"). Comparative characters in his words are expressed by the prevailing veracity of these words. The following example illustrates this. Such as: *Dear, one hundredth of a dark red horse is good. One hundredth of a white-colored black-spotted horse gets worse* (T.Murod. "Ot kishnagan oqshom").

### Analysis and results

It is seen that the words in the nouns and verb categories are used in the expression of the basis of the analogy. However, since comparisons are a form of expression that is formed by the correspondence of a character, its formation is directly related to the words that signify it.

In most cases of comparisons, the evaluation of a person, especially in comparison with the individual, is the key to the formation of comparisons. Goodness, intelligence, or vice versa, are characterized by the use of a dictionary to describe these concepts, and based on this, a description of the pros and cons of the other person and their motivation to draw conclusions. G. Kambarov explains this. "Relationship is based on mutual comparison. And the comparison is made against a certain criterion" [3;36]. The criterion for comparison is the existence of the meaning of comparison. This is because even in ordinary speech, when the words of the adjective category are used, the contradictory meaning in them makes the mark different. For example, it can be seen that this child is represented by the good word in the sentence of a good child in relation to the bad word. But comparisons do not occur. This is because there is no

## 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

subject of comparison or the criterion of comparison that creates the meaning of comparison. This is also true of expressions that have some comparative device models. For example, *Came out strong. The Kurash has grown* (T.Murod. “Yulduzlar mangu yonadi”). The combination of the word *best of the best* has a means of over-symbolizing comparatively. However, there is no subject and etalon of comparison. Accordingly, it does not meet the criteria for comparisons and cannot be compared.

One of the components of the comparison is the presence of the pronoun *this*. For example, *Is it more polite than water, more white than milk, more softer than ants, and more sophisticated than mosquitoes?* (Cho'lon. “Kecha va kunduz”), *The city, which had not survived the war for fifteen or twenty years, was living in peace with Samarkand* (P.Qodirov. “Yulduzli tunlar”). In the first words, pronoun *this* is used instead of the words, *Miryakub* in the first sentence

and the second in the words of Tashkent, which means that it is based on the character level of the subject of comparison and benchmark. This type of comparative expression is also closely related to the text, and the subject of comparison is understood from the content of the text.

In general, lexical means take a role as a basic unit of comparisons in the Uzbek language. According to which category of words is the basis of comparison, pure comparison is divided into two groups. Comparisons are made using words that indicate the character, and comparisons are derived from words in the nouns and verbs. When the basis of comparisons is expressed in words in the verb category, it is seen that the adjective verbs on the basis of adjectives, adverb, and verbs are found to be comparative. This indicates that the presence of words that signify the basis of comparison is important for the comparison.

## References:

1. Maxmudov, N. (1984). *Uzbek tilidagi sodda gaplarda semantik-sintaktik asimetriya*. (p.147). Toshkent: Ukituvchi.
2. Nurmonov, A. (2012). *Tanlangan asarlar. 1 zild*. (p.409). Toshkent: Akademnashr.
3. Kambarov, F. (2008). *Baxo munosabati va uning yzbek tilida ifodalanishi*. Filol. fan. nomz. diss. (p.117). Toshkent.
4. Safarov, Sh. (2006). *Kognitiv tilshunoslik*. (p.92). Samarqand: Sangzor.
5. Tulenov, Zh., & Fafurov, Z. (1991). *Falsafa*. (p.384). Toshkent: Ukituvchi.
6. Yildoshev, M. (2007). *Badiiy matn va uning lingvopoetik taxlili asoslari*. (p.123). Toshkent: Fan.
7. Yakubbekova, M. (2005). *Uzbek khalk kyshiklarining lingvopoetik khususiyatlari*. Filol. fan. dok. diss. (p.237). Toshkent.
8. (1981). *Uzbek tilining izoxli luzati*. 1 tom. (p.632). Moskva.
9. (1981). *Uzbek tilining izoxli luzati*. 2 tom. (p.717). Moskva.
10. Foziev, E. (1990). *Tafakkur psixologiyasi*. (p.183). Toshkent: Fan.
11. Cheremesina, M.I. (1976). *Sravnitel'nye konstruksii russkogo yazyka*. (p.270). Novosibirsk: Nauka.