

## STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC TYPES OF SYNONYMS AND THEIR USAGE CHARACTERISTICS

Dildora O. Ravshanova

Independent Researcher

Gulistan State University

Gulistan

Republic of Uzbekistan

**Abstract:** This article presents a structural-semantic classification of synonymous units and examines their patterns of use in the Uzbek language. Particular attention is paid to stable and variable synonymy, simple and complex structures, phrase-based equivalents, and the interaction of synonymy with polysemy and homonymy. The analysis shows that lexical units sharing a common semantic basis may differ in stylistic, evaluative, and emotional coloring and may enter different synonymic rows depending on context. Structural and contextual evidence is used to distinguish the principal functional types of synonyms and to clarify the role of dominant units within synonymic series. The findings confirm that contextual distribution is one of the central criteria for describing the functional organization of synonymy in Uzbek.

**Keywords:** structural semantics; synonymy; stable synonyms; variable synonyms; phraseological synonymy; contextual use; Uzbek language.

### *1. Introduction*

Within a given synonymic group, polysemous or homonymous lexical units may also occur. For example, *oshiq va xushtor*, *o't va olov*, *ko'k va osmon*

represent lexical pairs whose members may function as synonymous variants in particular meanings. At the same time, *oshiq*, *o't*, *ko'k* also belong to sets of homonymous forms. The lexical unit *oshiq* can denote *xushtor* but may also mean *ortiq* and can refer to a small bone above a joint. Likewise, *o't* is the root of an imperative verb and also the name of an internal anatomical organ. In the Uzbek expression *o'takamni yording*, the form *o'taka* is derived from the latter lexical meaning (Rahmatullayev, 2006; Sayfullayeva et al., 2009).

The distinction between synonymy and polysemy lies in the fact that a single polysemous lexical unit expresses several meanings, whereas synonymous units provide alternative lexical representations of the same or closely related object, quality, or process. For instance, in the sentence *Paxtani jadal teraylik* the lexical unit *jadal* may be replaced by *tez* or *ildam*. These lexical units are synonymous. Homonyms differ in another way: their form is identical, but their meanings are different.

Consequently, polysemous and homonymous words do not function as synonyms through the totality of their semantic features. They enter synonymic relations only through those meanings that are subordinate to a shared semantic component. Synonymous lexical units therefore characteristically group around a generalizing semantic center. Such a group is also referred to as a synonymic nest or series. The members of a synonymic series occupy particular positions according to their semantic nuances, and one lexical unit normally functions as the dominant member that generalizes the meanings of the other units in the row.

The same lexical item does not necessarily remain within one synonymic series in all contexts. Polysemous items may belong to one series through one meaning and to another series through a different meaning. For

example, *qobil* may occur in one synonymic row with *yuvosh*, *muloyim*, *mo'min* and in another with *qobiliyatli*, *salohiyatli*, *iste'dodli*, *talantli*, *layoqatli*. From this perspective, synonyms may first be divided, according to their functional character, into stable and variable types.

In Uzbek linguistics, synonymy has been treated not only as a relation of semantic proximity but also as a systemic phenomenon in which lexical meaning, stylistic distribution, contextual compatibility, and lexical development interact. Contemporary descriptions emphasize the need to classify synonyms according to semantic similarity, structural composition, functional stability, and pragmatic or expressive value (Abjalova, 2023; Mahmudov et al., 2022). This approach is especially important for Uzbek because native, Arabic-Persian, Russian, and international lexical layers often coexist within the same semantic field.

## *II. Methods and Methodology of Research*

The study employs descriptive, structural-semantic, and contextual methods. Lexical units are examined according to the degree of stability of their synonymic relations, their morphological and syntactic structure, semantic polarization, and their stylistic and emotional properties. The analysis also distinguishes between dictionary-level synonymy and context-sensitive synonymy, since a lexical item may shift from one synonymic series to another when its meaning changes.

The material is interpreted with reference to established descriptions of modern Uzbek literary language and recent work on the classification of Uzbek synonyms. The procedure consists of three stages: identifying the shared semantic component of a group; determining the formal structure and dominant member of the synonymic row; and testing the

substitutability and evaluative or stylistic value of the units in authentic or conventional examples. Examples are retained in Uzbek in order to preserve the original semantic and stylistic contrasts.

A further methodological principle is the separation of lexical meaning from formal identity. Units that have the same form but different meanings are treated as homonyms; units in which one form develops several related meanings are treated as polysemous; synonymy is established only where different forms share a common semantic basis. This distinction prevents the conflation of semantic categories and makes it possible to describe synonymic rows more precisely.

### ***III. Results***

The analysis shows that stable synonyms are lexical units that remain within the same synonymic row across ordinary contexts of use. Stable relations are especially frequent in relatively compact synonymic nests. Typical examples include

Examples of stable synonymic rows include *bezak, ziynat, hasham; bezakli, ziynatli, hashamli; maosh, moyana*. Their stability is determined by the character of the lexical meanings involved.

Variable synonyms, by contrast, enter different synonymic rows in different meanings or contexts. The lexical unit *havo* illustrates this pattern. In the meaning "sky," it occurs in the example *samolyot havoga ko'tarildi* and forms a row with *osmon, ko'k, samo, falak*. In the meaning "weather," the example *havo bugun bulut* brings it into relation with *ob-havo*. In combinations such as *havo olish, havo chiqarish*, it may be replaced by *nafas* or *dam*: *havo olish – nafas olish*. The same unit may also express pride

or arrogance in *yoshlik havosi – yoshlik g'ururi* (Rahmatullayev, 2006; Tursunov et al., 1992).

A similar contextual mobility is observed in the row *safar, marta, daf'a, karra, bor*. These units function as synonymous variants in combinations such as *bir safar, bir daf'a, ming marta, besh karra, yuz bor*. However, *safar* also forms another synonymic relation with *sayohat* in *safarga ketdi – sayohatga ketdi*. Lexical units of this type are therefore appropriately described as variable or unstable synonyms.

From the structural point of view, the material falls into three principal groups: simple, complex, and phrase-based synonyms. Simple synonyms are represented by roots, stems, or a combination of root and derived forms. Root-based rows include

Typical root-based rows are *katta, ulug', buyuk, zo'r, azim, ulkan, gigant; odam, kishi, inson, bashar; fikr, zikr, xayol, o'y*.

Derived simple synonyms are formed through the addition of different morphological elements. Examples include *sonsiz, sanoqsiz, cheksiz, hisobsiz; kuchli, quvvatli, baquvvat; mo'lchilik, serobchilik, kengchilik, to'kinchilik, ma'murchilik; yo'ldosh, hamroh; fikrdosh, maslakdosh*. Root and derived forms may also occur together in one row, as in *arang, zo'rg'a, bazo'r, zo'rg'atdan; batafsil, mufassal, mukammal, to'la, to'liq, to'lig'icha; hech, aslo, asti, sira, zinhor, mutlaqo, butunlay*.

Complex synonyms include compounds and paired formations. Rows containing compound, derived, and root forms are represented by *dovyurak, botir, qo'rqmas, jasur; shod, xurram, xursand, xushnud, xushvaqt*. Paired synonyms include *el-yurt, baxt-saodat, kuch-quvvat, omon-eson, sog'-salomat, or-nomus, qadr-qimmat, hurmat-ehtirom, qaddi-qomat*.

These formations are often treated as synonymic pairs because the components reinforce, specify, or stylistically enrich a shared meaning (Sayfullayeva et al., 2009).

Borrowing also contributes to the formation of equivalent synonymic relations. Examples such as *proekt va loyiha*, *ekonomika va iqtisod*, *tema va mavzu*, *forma va shakl* illustrate the coexistence of native or established equivalents and international lexical items. For a certain period, both members may function in parallel until usage preferences become more stable. In modern Uzbek, such relations are especially visible between Arabic-origin and international terms, whose distribution may differ by field and register.

Phrase-based synonyms include combinations that function as lexical equivalents, fixed expressions, or idiomatic units. Their structural types can be summarized as follows:

- lexical combinations and single-word equivalents: *yordam bermoq*, *yordam ko'rsatmoq*, *yordamlashmoq*; *farq qilmoq*, *tafovut qilmoq*, *farqlamoq*; *ishtirok etmoq*, *qatnashmoq*;
- euphemistic expressions and lexical equivalents: *boshni ikki qilmoq*, *uylantirmoq*; *og'ir oyoq*, *homilador*;
- idiomatic and lexical equivalents: *jonini jabborga bermoq*, *berilib ishlamoq*; *qo'lini qo'ltiqqa urmoq*, *umidsizlanmoq*; *tishini qayramoq*, *o'chakishmoq*; *tilini tishlab qolmoq*, *barmog'ini tishlamoq*, *achinmoq*, *o'kinmoq*; *ko'z bo'yamachilik qilmoq*, *aldamoq*.

These examples show that synonymy is not restricted to single words. Phraseological and periphrastic units may occupy the same functional-semantic space as lexemes, especially when they convey intensity,

evaluation, euphemism, or expressive coloring. Such relations are important for precise, varied, and stylistically effective expression.

According to meaning and sphere of use, the analyzed material also distinguishes semantically grouped synonyms from emotionally or evaluatively marked synonyms. Units of the first type retain their basic lexical meanings and form a synonymic group without an additional figurative function. Within such groups, positive and negative evaluation may organize separate or intersecting rows (Rahmatullayev, 2006).

Positive synonymic rows include *ishchan, harakatchan, g'ayratli, tirishqoq; foyda, naf, manfaat*. Negative rows include *dangasa, yalqov, tanbal, ishyoqmas; zarar, ziyon, futur; yomon, rasvo, yaramas, bo'lmag'ur, nobop; yolg'on, noto'g'ri, bekor, nohaq*.

A single synonymic field may also contain members with contrasting evaluative coloring. The lexical unit *yuz* has poetic and positive synonyms such as *jamol, chehra, ruxsor, oraz*, while *aft, bashara* are more frequently negative; *bet, diydor* may acquire either value depending on context. Thus, *yuzingdan o'rgilay, diydoringga bir to'yay* convey positive evaluation, whereas *yuzing qursin, betingni ko'rmay, diydoring o'chsin* convey negative evaluation.

Emotionally marked synonyms preserve their lexical meanings while simultaneously expressing psychological states such as excitement, joy, fear, anger, or hatred. This expressive layer confirms that synonymic choice is not only a matter of denotative equivalence; it is also a means of encoding attitude and affect.

#### *IV. Discussion*

The results demonstrate that the structure of Uzbek synonymy is multidimensional. Semantic proximity is the necessary basis of the relation, but it does not by itself explain how synonyms function. Stability, morphological form, phraseological structure, register, evaluation, emotional coloring, and contextual distribution all contribute to the organization of synonymic series. This supports a systemic interpretation of synonymy rather than a definition based solely on interchangeability.

The distinction between stable and variable synonymy is particularly important because it connects lexical semantics with polysemy. A variable lexical unit does not possess one fixed set of synonyms; its synonymic partners are selected by the activated meaning. The examples with *havo*, *safar*, and *qobil* show that synonymic relations must therefore be established at the level of lexical-semantic variants rather than at the level of the word form as a whole. This conclusion is compatible with contemporary Uzbek classifications that emphasize semantic differentiation within synonymic series (Abjalova, 2023).

The structural findings also broaden the traditional view of synonymy. Single-word rows remain central, but compound, paired, phraseological, euphemistic, and idiomatic equivalents demonstrate that functional equivalence can extend beyond the lexeme. Such units are especially significant in stylistic analysis because they allow speakers and writers to vary intensity, formality, expressiveness, and evaluation without abandoning the shared semantic core.

Finally, the coexistence of borrowed and native equivalents reveals the historical dimension of synonymy. Parallel forms may compete, specialize,

or stabilize in different registers. For Uzbek, this process is inseparable from the layered history of its vocabulary. Synonymic analysis therefore provides evidence not only about lexical meaning but also about language contact, norm formation, stylistic differentiation, and the dynamics of lexical development.

## *V. Conclusion*

The structural-semantic classification of synonyms makes it possible to define their place in the Uzbek language system more precisely. Stable and variable rows, simple, complex, and phrase-based units, and positive, negative, and emotionally marked distinctions reveal the multilayered character of synonymy. Context is one of the principal factors determining which synonymic row a lexical unit enters and what stylistic value it acquires. The study also shows that synonymy interacts systematically with polysemy, homonymy, borrowing, phraseology, and evaluative meaning. A comprehensive account of Uzbek synonymy should therefore combine structural, semantic, contextual, and stylistic criteria rather than reduce synonymic relations to formal interchangeability.

## **References**

- Abjalova, M. A. (2023). O'zbek tilidagi sinonimlar tasnifi. *Modern Science and Research*, 2(10), 234–243. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10206034>
- Abdurahmonov, G'., & Xo'jayeva, D. (2003). *Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. O'qituvchi*.
- Mahmudov, N., Lutfullayeva, D., Odilov, Y., Xudoyberganova, D., Yo'ldoshev, M., Ko'chimov, Sh., Andaniyazova, D., & Musayeva, F. (2022). *O'zbek tili sinonimlarining katta izohli lug'ati: I jild*.

Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2006). Hozirgi adabiy o'zbek tili. Universitet.

Sayfullayeva, R. R., Mengliyev, B. R., Boqiyeva, G. H., Qurbonova, M. M.,

Yunusova, Z. Q., & Abuzalova, M. Q. (2009). Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. FTM.

Tursunov, U., Muxtorov, J., & Rahmatullayev, Sh. (1992). Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili (3-nashr). O'zbekiston.

*Reviewer:*

*Dr. Jur. Tunay KÖKSAL*

*Assistant Professor*

*Atılım University, Turkey*