



# CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE

eISSN: 2660-6828 | Volume: 04 Issue: 12 Dec 2023  
<https://cajipc.centralasianstudies.org>

## Syntagmatic Features of Antonyms

*Dildora Abdullayeva*

*Candidate of Philological Sciences, Tashkent University of Applied Sciences,  
Gavhar Str. 1, Tashkent 100149, Uzbekistan*

*Received 4<sup>th</sup> Oct 2023, Accepted 5<sup>th</sup> Nov 2023, Online 6<sup>th</sup> Dec 2023*

### ANNOTATION

The role of the syntagmatic aspect and the syntagmatic features of antonymic units in revealing the linguistic nature of the phenomenon of antonymy are highlighted in the article. An analysis of scientific sources related to the study of antonyms in the syntagmatic plan is presented. The semantic valence of antonymic pairs, the issue of lexical context is studied.

**KEYWORDS:** lexeme, antonymy, polysemy, antisemy, semantic core, lexical-semantic valency, lexical context, paradigmatic relation, syntagmatic relation.

### INTRODUCTION

The category of semantic opposition and its essence have always been among the phenomena that have attracted the attention of linguists. The reflection of this category in the language is mainly interpreted under the name of *antonymy* and subjected to certain standards. Antonymic relationship is one of the most complex phenomena in language system. Many monographic works are devoted to this phenomenon. As a result of the work done, a system of certain criteria was formed for defining this event. These criteria are determined on two levels: paradigmatic and syntagmatic.

As a rule, paradigmatic relations are associated with language system, while syntagmatic features are characterized by speech. Both of these aspects are important for language units and ensure the integrity of the language in different aspects. In the paradigmatic plan, the most important feature of antonyms is their expression of semantic opposition. This aspect has always been the main factor in defining antonyms.

In studying the essence of the phenomenon of antonymy, not only its paradigmatic features, but also the illumination of this phenomenon in the syntagmatic aspect are of particular importance.

Syntagmatic features of antonyms include the following: 1) lexical context of antonyms; 2) syntactic model of constructions using antonyms [2].

Linguists have paid special attention to the fact that antonymic pairs have the same lexical context. In many scientific sources, this feature is recognized as a prerequisite for defining antonyms. V.N.Komissarov says that "Antonymous words have the same lexical context, that is, they come together with the same group of

words.” If a word has an antonymic pair with one of its meanings (or all meanings), then it can be said that their lexical environment is exactly the same. It should be noted that in polysemantic words, the case of complete matching of the context is rarely observed. “Complete matching of the lexical environment is characteristic only of antonyms that do not have a synonymous pair and are not considered ambiguous” [9].

In polysemantic antonyms, it is natural that the lexical valence does not fully match, because “each word has its own distributive image, different from other units, its own shell of words in terms of cohesion”[8].

In addition, it is noted in linguistics that words with opposite meanings can have their own individual context even in antonymic meanings [5].

## METHODS

The article relies on the laws of dialectical philosophy about the unity and conflict of opposites, the unity of form and content, generality and particularity as a methodological basis. The methods of description, comparison, component analysis, and linguopoetic analysis were used in the work. In addition, semantic-structural, paradigmatic and syntagmatic methods are leading in the article.

## MATERIALS

The research material of the work is made up of lexical units in the relation of opposition in the lexicon of the Uzbek language. The article analyzes linguistic facts from the sources “An explanatory dictionary of antonyms of the Uzbek language” (Sh.Rakhmatullaev and others, 1980), “An explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language” (1981, 2006-2008), “An explanatory dictionary of synonyms of the Uzbek language” (A.Khojiev, 1974). In addition, attention is paid to the scientific-theoretical views and controversial issues in the research conducted by Uzbek and Russian linguists on this topic. In particular, L.A.Novikov, V.A.Ivanova, E.N.Miller, S.Mutallibov, S.Usmonov, R.Shukurov, B.Isabekov, and other linguists are paid special attention in the article.

## RESULTS

The analysis of scientific literature according to the theme of investigation has shown that the syntagmatic aspect is important in determining the characteristics of antonyms. The result of the study showed that antonymic pairs do not always have a common lexical context. The commonality or difference in the semantic valence of antonyms is determined by their semantic nature. Indeed, the presence of integral semes in the semantic structure of antonyms ensures that they can be syntagmatically combined with the same words, but this does not deny that these words can also have an individual context. We can observe this situation especially in the case of polysemantic lexemes.

The theoretical conclusions summarized in this study serve to further clarify the nature of lexical-semantic relations in the language system. The results of the article are important in teaching such courses as “Lexicology”, “Semasiology”, “Stylistics”, “Linguistic analysis of artistic text”, creating textbooks, teaching-methodical manuals, scientific pamphlets.

## DISCUSSION

As syntagmatic features of antonyms, models of syntactic constructions in which antonyms are realized in the text are also noted. V.N.Komissarov was one of the first to pay attention to the relationship of antonyms with specific syntactic constructions. As the main criterion for determining the antonyms, the author shows their regular opposition in speech and cites 6 types of contexts in which antonyms are regularly used in English [4].

V.N. Komissarov indicates that the lexical context is completely or almost completely compatible as the next criterion for the definition of antonyms: “The generality of the lexical connection shell serves as a precondition for the use of antonymous words in typical contexts, which in itself serves to strengthen the antonymic character of the word. This leads to the fact that in many cases where one of the antonyms is used, it is possible to directly replace the whole combination with the second one, having a directly opposite meaning”[3].

V.N.Komissarov’s scientific views on this issue were developed by several other linguists. In particular, L.A.Vvedenskaya distinguishes 3 types of syntactic constructions in which antonymic pairs can be used based on the material of the Russian language. But the linguist says that these syntactic constructions are not only for antonyms, but non-antonymous words can also participate in them [9].

V.M.Zavyalova (based on the material of the German language) comments on the typical syntactic constructions in which antonyms are usually used [10].

The relatively common views of typical constructions cited in scientific sources are as follows: *A* and *B*; neither *A* nor *B* (neither *A* nor *B*); *X* is not *A*, but *B* (or *X* is *A*, *Y*, but *B* instead) [6].

It should be said that the regularity of being used together in context is a characteristic of antonyms. We can observe this in many speech situations, primarily in the interpretation of antonyms. However, this aspect cannot serve as a criterion for defining antonyms.

The theoretical ideas of N.M.Merkureva are especially noteworthy. She objected to V.N.Komissarov’s views on this matter, she states that “It is almost impossible to include one or another pair of words in antonyms based on the criteria for identifying antonyms presented by V.N. Komissarov”[6]. The linguist says that the lexical material of these constructions does not have to be only antonyms, other words in the language can be used as the lexical material of any model type. In addition, she said that “these constructions were separated on the basis of the study of the functionality of the words already included in the antonyms, that is, in the examination of the syntactic constructions, no principle was found that determines the characteristic of one or another pair of words as antonyms. An additional proof is that the use of words in the given constructions does not indicate that they are antonyms” [6].

A number of other linguists objected to V.N.Komissarov’s theoretical views on this issue. A.I.Edelshtein said that in the works of V.N.Komissarov, language and speech phenomena are often mixed. For example, the linguist admits that the term “antonymous word” used by V.N.Komissarov is very conditional, and usually this term is understood not as a word, but as a lexical-semantic variant of a word that occurs in speech [1].

A relatively deeper interpretation of this aspect in antonyms is given by L.A.Novikov. He examines the structural types of opposition on the basis of typical constructions in which antonyms are more common [7]. L.A. Novikov admits that the study of the lexical context of antonyms provides important information about the regularity of the use of this phenomenon in speech. According to the linguist, it is very reasonable to point out that the opposition of antonyms is realized based on these contexts, but the use or non-use of antonyms in such contexts cannot be a criterion for defining them, because in such contexts, other words that are not antonyms are also easily involved [7].

E.V.Zadorojneva tries to reveal the essence of this issue. She says that “contrary antonyms show almost complete congruence, while complementary antonyms have this feature only partially”[11]. She claims that contrary antonyms, having a gradual sign, stand at a close “semantic distance” with each other, and

complementarity increases the “semantic distance” between them. In this regard, the linguist gives the following classification of antonymic pairs based on conjunction:

- 1) representing fully compatible cohesion;
- 2) representing partially compatible cohesion.

But in our opinion, it is not correct to judge certain antonymic pairs as having exactly the same environment due to this feature. Because speech has a wide range of possibilities, and it is very difficult for the conditions of realization of certain lexical tools in it to be completely exact.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be said that paradigmatic criteria is primary in determining antonyms compared to syntagmatic criteria. But this fact does not negate the importance of studying antonyms syntagmatically. The study of antonyms in this context serves to clarify the speech possibilities of the phenomenon. It is known that the description of events on the basis of various contradictions is the most necessary aspect in revealing their essence more clearly. This is a very large-scale opportunity to increase expressiveness and effectiveness, especially for literary context.

## REFERENCES

1. Edelshtein A.I. Antonymy of the English verb: Author's abstract. diss. ...cand. Philol. Sci. – M., 1971. – P. 6-7.
2. Ivanova V.A. Antonymy in the language system. – Chisinau: Shtiintsa, 1982. – P. 17.
3. Komissarov V.N. Dictionary of antonyms of modern English. – M.: Int. relations, 1964. – P. 6-24.
4. Komissarov V.N. The problem of determining an antonym (On the relationship between logical and linguistic in semasiology) // Questions of linguistics, 1957. – No. 2. – P. 55-56.
5. Lesnik M.D. On the antonymy of the adjectives big, small, small and the sphere of their use in the modern Russian literary language // Uchen. Zap. LSU. – No. 161, series philol. Sciences, vol. 18. – L., 1952. – P. 84.
6. Merkur'yeva N.M. Antonymy of compound words in modern Russian: Diss. ...cand. Philol. Sci. – M., 1996. – P. 32.
7. Novikov L.A. Antonymy in Russian. M.: Moscow. University, 1973. – P. 96-134.
8. Ufimtseva A. A. The word in the lexical-semantic system of language. – M.: Nauka, 1968. – P. 191.
9. Vvedenskaya L.A. Compatibility of antonyms in the Russian language. – Kursk, 1970. – P. 187
10. Zavyalova V.M. Antonyms. (German vocabulary guide). – M., 1969. – P. 7-8.
11. Zadorozhneva E.V. Combination of components of antonymic-synonymous blocks (Based on the material of nouns, adjectives, adverbs of the Russian language): Author's abstract. diss. ...cand. Philol. Sci. – Volgograd, 2007. – P. 6.