

# Semantic Peculiarities of Antonyms (Based on the Works by I. Yusupov)

Bayrieva Maryam Jangabaevna

Assistant Teacher, Nukus Branch of Tashkent University of Information Technologies  
Named After Muhammad Al-Khorazmiy, Nukus, Karakalpakstan, Uzbekistan

## ABSTRACT

The article depicts stylistic features of antonyms in English and Karakalpak languages, through analyzing comparatively, and to note stylistic peculiarities, lexical and semantic features of antonyms in English and Karakalpak languages. Also, the some peculiarities of antonyms are described based on the work by the Karakalpak writer I.Yusupov. The semantic, comparative and descriptive analysis method was used to express the differences of antonyms in these languages. Furthermore, the article suggests some ways and techniques of teaching antonyms that can be effective in the foreign language teaching process.

**KEYWORDS:** *antonym; education; comparative; lexical; semantic difference; stylistic features*

**How to cite this paper:** Bayrieva Maryam Jangabaevna "Semantic Peculiarities of Antonyms (Based on the Works by I. Yusupov)" Published in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470, Volume-5 | Issue-3, April 2021, pp.1040-1042, URL: [www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd41079.pdf](http://www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd41079.pdf)



IJTSRD41079

Copyright © 2021 by author (s) and International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development Journal. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)



## INTRODUCTION

Currently, learning English is one of the major tasks of developing of the international relationship in our country. The role of foreign languages is great in developing the country. To date, many studies have explored the experience of stylistic features in the language related to usage in the English language. However, little has been written concerning the problems in identifying stylistic features of antonyms in English and Karakalpak languages. The importance of studying the semantic range of a word to learn its meaning will be shown in the thesis. Cruse [2, p. 167–172] distinguishes between complementaries, antonyms, reversives, and converses, 3 using the term opposites to encompass them all. Typical complementaries are *dead—alive, true—false, inside—outside, male—female*, and they are characterised by the reciprocal relation, in logic  $f(x)$  entails and is entailed by not  $f(y)$ . Cruse [2, p. 169–204] follows Lyons in his definition of antonymy. He lists five different types of antonyms: polar antonyms, equipollent antonyms, overlapping antonyms, reversives and converses. Only polar antonyms will be dealt with in this book. Polar antonyms are fully gradable. They normally occur in comparative and superlative forms, which indicate degrees of some objective, unidimensional physical property. They are incompatibles, but not complementaries. The comparative forms of the word pair stand in a converse relationship.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

While Cruse and Lyons [2, p. 220] exclude all other types of binary semantic opposites from their antonymous category,

Kempson suggests that only complementary opposites, which are not gradable, are truly antonymous, because complementary adjectives exhaustively bisect a domain (*for example: dead/alive, male/female*). The other most common types of semantic oppositions cited in the literature include converse (*for example: parent/child, buy/sell, give/receive, above/below*) and directional opposition (*for example: north/south, come/go, inside/outside*). The disadvantages of such classifications are that they merely state that words with a certain kind of behavior should be called antonymous, and the fact that they do not take into account the context of the opposition.

However, Murphy [9, p. 11–19] presents a contextual approach to the classification of opposites, suggesting that all antonymous pairs share core antonym properties, and proposes using the terms antonyms and opposites interchangeably. She develops a theoretical model in which the antonym relation, as well as all other paradigmatic semantic relations, holds between words in use.

Murphy develops a theoretical model [10, p. 320–348] in which antonym relations and indeed all paradigmatic lexical relations – obtain between words in use. As such, it presents an explicit argument against the position that lexical-semantic relations are central to the organization of the lexicon. Taking the example of black and white, then, Murphy claims that there is no need to represent the knowledge that they are antonyms in the lexicon, since their opposition is predictable from a pragmatic principle of minimal difference,

shown in which she terms Relation by Contrast (RC). The contrast relation holds among the members of a set if the members of the set have all the same contextually relevant properties but one [10, p. 44]. Different types of semantic relation arise through different applications of RC that specify the nature of the contrasting property. Antonymy is categorized as a binary realization of a more general relation of *lexical contrast*, the instantiation of RC presented in Relation by Contrast - Lexical Contrast (RC-LC). A lexical contrast set includes only word-concepts that have all the same contextually relevant properties but one [4, p. 170]. The key difference between this approach and semantic approaches that make reference to minimal difference is that RC does not refer to particularly semantic properties of the contrasted words. Instead, it holds that lexical relations are meta-lexical, rather than represented in the lexicon. Relations obtain between *word-concepts* such as conceptual knowledge about words, rather than lexical or semantic representation of the words.

### METHODOLOGY

Murphy acknowledges the psycholinguistic evidence for an antonym canon that entails knowledge of antonym pairings, not just knowledge that allows the derivation of antonym pairings. She argues that the psycholinguistic methodologies for determining relational entrenchment are evidence for meta-lexical, rather than intra-lexical, knowledge and processes, and therefore the knowledge that, say, *black* is the antonym of *white* is recorded in the conceptual representation of knowledge about the words, rather than lexical knowledge that contributes directly to the formation of grammatical and sensible utterances [9, 10]. Contrast is considered a major category in information organization, evidenced by its inclusion in almost all major taxonomies of rhetorical relations. Since Lakoff, two types of contrast are generally recognized, denial of expectation (1) and semantic opposition (2). For example: (1) *It's raining but I'm taking an umbrella and wearing my coat*; (2) *Jamal is tall but Bayram is short*.

Charles and Millers' proposal that lexical associations between adjectival antonyms are formed through co-occurrence in sentences (the co-occurrence hypothesis) rather than substituting for one another in the same syntactic context (the substitution hypothesis) [1, p. 357-375], Justeson and Katz [7, p.1-19] showed that very high co-occurrence rates appear for antonymous adjective pairs, a finding they claim supports the precondition for the formation of associations between words, shown experimentally by Deese [5, p. 219]. They tested the co-occurrence hypothesis by examining the frequencies of the intersentential occurrences of adjectival antonyms in the Brown Corpus of English and confirmed that a set of adjectival antonyms co-occurred significantly more often than a set of random adjectives. Fellbaum [6, p.175] conducted the first large scale corpus work that looked at a wider class of antonym pairs, including nouns and verbs. She looked at the co-occurrence of nominal and verbal antonyms in the Brown Corpus and found that antonyms in both groups co-occurred in the same sentence significantly more often than was the case by chance.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Leech points out that: "In interpreting the language of literature, the linguists' aim is to make 'statements of meaning'. Meaning here is interpreted in a broader sense than usual, sometimes including every aspect of linguistic

choice, whether in the field of semantics, vocabulary, grammar, or phonology. One advantage of this extended use of the word 'meaning' is that it liberates us from the habit of thinking that the only type of meaning that matters is *cognitive or referential* meaning: a view that literary critics have long found unsatisfactory" [8, p. 28].

When two words having opposite meanings are used together to refer to or modify an object or situation, ambiguity or absurdity is likely to emerge. Antonymy is the source of contrast in a small number of contrastive sentences. When it co-occurs with the contrastive marker but it is quite often the source of contrast. Using it alone to identify contrast in unmarked sentences will give high precision, will most often coincide with contrastive topics and could help in predicting proper intonation, but will only give very low recall.

In the following we will analyze some examples from Karakalpak literature, a poem by a national Karakalpak writer I.Yusupov's poems "Ko'riner bolin'" and "Bul jer ele zor boladi" and in the English language it can be explained in the following way:

11	Ashiq ayaz na'siyeti sol bolar, <b>Biyda'wletlik</b> jigit o'mirin qor qilar, <b>Isbilermen</b> bolsan', baxtin' zor bolar, <b>Qulday</b> islep, <b>begdey</b> kiyiner bolin' [13].	<i>Advice of a freezing cold,</i> <i>Poorness disgraces the life of a man,</i> <i>Business makes you happy and powerful,</i> <i>Work as a slave, dress as a lord.</i>
22	Birjag'in' <b>suw</b> , birjag'in' <b>sho'l</b> bolmasa, Ja'nnet qurip bersen'de men barmayman, Gu'l ha'm juwsan' iyisi an'qip turmasa, Ol jerde men qaraqalpaq bolmayman [13].	<i>If there is neither water nor desert in sides,</i> <i>I will not go even you build me a paradise,</i> <i>If it does not disperse the smell of flower,</i> <i>I will not be Karakalak there.</i>
33	Nabada kimgedur jaqsiliq etsen', Ziyani joq oni <b>umitip ketsen'</b> , Kim sag'an jaqsiliq qilsa biraqta, Oni <b>este tut</b> sen ha'mme waqta [13, p.11-224].	<i>If you do a kindness to somebody,</i> <i>No matter if you forget it,</i> <i>But if somebody does kindness to you,</i> <i>Always keep it in your mind.</i>
44	Na'psimiz ashilip <b>ken'eygen</b> , Peylimiz dim <b>tarayipti</b> , Endi mine o'zgelerden, Izlep ju'rippiz bar ayipti [14, p.12-165]	<i>Our desires are opened and expanded,</i> <i>Our characters are very narrowed,</i> <i>And now we are blaming and,</i> <i>Looking for the faults in others.</i>

Thus, we can see the following semantic differences in the English and Karakalpak languages from this literary works:

- 1) Biyda'wletlik – Isbilermen; Poorness - Business  
Qor – Zor; Disgrace- Powerful  
Qulday – Begdey; Slave - Lord
- 2) Suw - Sho'l; Water - Desert
- 3) Umitiw - Este saqlaw (umitpaw); Forget - Keep in mind
- 4) Ken'eygen – Tarayıpti; Expanded - Narrowed.

## CONCLUSION

Thus, practical importance of antonyms relies on their understanding in use of everyday life communicational situations. Even though the linguistic explanation is important and fundamental, it helps for other disciplines to understand better situations and circumstances when antonyms are used. Their misuse can cause a lot of misunderstandings and cultural clashes. Croft notes that antonym has more powerful relationship between lexicon-semantic relations [3]. Antonyms from native speakers are use intuitively in all walks of life. Antonym plays an important role in several fields of study, such as linguistics, psychology, literature or psycholinguistics and language acquisition in children. It is used to express binary opposition in all modalities and communication registers as spoken language in the writing, as to the facts as well as fiction, as the in the standard and unofficial use of language.

## References

- [1] Charles, W. G., Miller, G. A. Contexts of antonymous adjectives. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 10. 1989. pp. 357–375.
- [2] Cruse, D. A. *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [3] Croft, W. *Radical construction grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2001.
- [4] Decree on “Uzbekistan’s development strategy for 2017-2021” from February 7, 2017.
- [5] Deese, J. *The structure of associations in language and thought*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- [6] Fellbaum, Ch. Co-occurrence and antonymy. *International Journal of Lexicography* 8. 1995. pp. 281–303.
- [7] Justeson, J. S., Katz, S. M. Co-occurrences of antonymous adjectives and their contexts. *Computational Linguistics* 17. 1991. pp. 1–19.
- [8] Leech Geoffrey. *Semantics*. Middlesex: Penguin Books. *Language and Literature: Style and Foregrounding*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited. (1986), 2008.
- [9] Murphy M. Lynne. Linguistic and conceptual information in Meaning-Text Theory: the case against some paradigmatic relations. *Proceedings of MTT-2003*. Paris, 16-18 June, 2003. University of Paris. 2003. pp. 11–19.
- [10] Murphy, G. L., Andrew, J. M. The conceptual basis of antonymy and synonymy in adjectives. *Journal of Memory and Language*. 32. 1993. pp. 301–319.
- [11] Steven, J. *Antonymy: a Corpus-based Perspective*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- [12] Willners, C. *Antonyms in context*. Lund: Lund University. 2001.
- [13] Yusupov, I. “Tan’lawli shig’armalarinin’ eki tomlig’i” *Qosqlar, Poemalar*. (in Karakalpak). Nukus, Karakalpakstan. (volume I), 1992. pp. 11-224.
- [14] Yusupov, I. “Tan’lawli shig’armalarinin’ eki tomlig’i” *Qosqlar, Poemalar*. (in Karakalpak). Nukus, Karakalpakstan. (volume II), 1992. pp. 12-165.