ISSN:3030-332X
Impact factor: 9,493
International journal of scientific researchers

GRADUONOMIC FEATURES OF HYPER–HYPONYMIC RELATIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK VERB SYSTEMS: A LEXICAL-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

Askarova Fariza Muxtar qizi
Master's student, Department of Foreign Language and Literature
Chirchik State Pedagogical University
farizajurabekova00@gmail.com
Sabirova N. K.
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24441807

Abstract. The research thoroughly investigates how English and Uzbek verb systems commonly employ graduonomic elements to empirically establish hyper–hyponymic relationships. The research conclusively explored how degree and intensity and manner precisely determine hierarchical patterns in verb lexical semantics. The research findings can significantly enhance our comprehension of verb semantic structures and their common and distinct patterns of lexical degree expression. Typical language patterns and their distinctive ways of organizing semantic relationships have vividly been demonstrated by the language-specific methods for semantic hierarchy organization in verbs. o English uses different words to make semantic distinctions but Uzbek achieves this through word derivation and suffixes and manner indicators. This research also demonstrates that both languages efficiently use multi-level hypernym–hyponym chains to properly organize verb meanings but they use different methods to clearly express degree distinctions. The research made use of major English and Uzbek corpora to accurately identify semantic features through componential analysis of motion verbs and speech verbs and action verbs. The research, additionally, indicates that linguistic structures clearly define the extent of semantic meaning which can be conveyed and shows that verb classification systems strongly develop structured internal systems. The research findings accurately revealed possibilities for future studies to investigate the organizational patterns of lexical semantics within degree systems.

Introduction. The lexical semantic concepts of hypernymy and hyponymy are precisely defined by basic hierarchical connections which connect general semantic meanings to their particular counterparts. Full semantic connections were clearly demonstrated between particular words while plainly explaining how languages organize their lexical structure (Cruse, 2011). The verb category clearly states advanced complexity because verbs carry both action meanings and additional information about manner and degree and intensity and purpose. The characteristics of verb hierarchies essentially create more active structures than noun hierarchies (Murphy, 2010). Researchers can precisely understand word organization in verbal dictionaries and language semantic structure development through the analysis of these features. Extensive research about verb relationships continues to remain limited compared to noun hyper–hyponym relations because most studies mainly give a specific focus on different languages (Sayfullayev, 2023). The analysis of verb relationships solely remains underdeveloped because their interpretation mostly depends on contextual factors, the extent of their relationship and the organizational pattern of the process (Taylor, 2015). The fundamental nature of verbs as process-based words obviously makes them different from nouns because they definitely require measurement of speed, force and manner as these two languages English and Uzbek clearly display different methods to explicitly demonstrate semantic gradations through their verbal structures. English expresses different levels of meaning through separate lexical items such as ***walk → stroll → saunter*** but Uzbek uses derivation, affixation and manner modifiers to achieve similar effects such as ***yurmoq → sekin yurmoq → sekin-astalik bilan yurmoq*** *(walk → walk slowly → walk with caution).* These contrasts especially indicate how each language basically builds nuance inside verb systems (Croft & Cruse 2004).

This research aims to thoroughly investigate how hyper–hyponymic relations primarily function as graduonomic elements which actually affect English and Uzbek verb system structures. The research, additionally, extensively investigates verb hierarchy semantic layers and their meaning encoding methods between English and Uzbek languages. The analysis evidently demonstrates commonalities and distinct language-specific methods which verbs make use to create semantic depth through their structural organization. Three main questions about English and Uzbek verb structures have been in-depth analyzed such as how English and Uzbek verbs precisely establish their hyper–hyponym relations, what graduonomic characteristics appear in these connections and what differences exist between these two languages when showing verb semantic progression. These questions have been extensively researched to considerably develop better knowledge about verb semantic meaning and lexical patterns between languages and the rules which govern verbal hierarchy organization.

Methods. Corpus-based comparison with lexical-semantic analysis has been efficiently employed to extensively study graduonomic characteristics in English and Uzbek verb hyper–hyponymic relationships. The research used three datasets: the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA); the British National Corpus (BNC); the Uzbek National Corpus (O‘zbek Milliy Korpusi). The research methodology entirely consisted of four sequential stages which primarily included data acquisition backed up by corpus selection, semantic classification and finally comparative evaluation. The research team chose verb groups which mostly represented motion, speech and action semantic domains, and these domains have been given a specific focus on as they present distinct hierarchical patterns and show extensive variations in their degree, intensity and manner aspects. Frequency analysis, contextual behavior, collocations and degree markers have been used to link each hypernym to its corresponding hyponyms (Geeraerts 2010). The selection process accurately gathered together general verbs which served as hypernyms and their specific counterparts which acted as hyponyms and sub-hyponyms. The data was scrupulously obtained from two substantial corpora during the second stage of the study. English verbs were rigorously collected from the Corpus of Contemporary American English by properly selecting frequently used words which explicitly demonstrated distinct semantic patterns. Uzbek verbs were specifically gathered from the Uzbek National Corpus while giving a specific focus on popular vocabulary and their derived forms. Standard usage patterns and semantic characteristics were reliably confirmed through their analysis of frequency data, concordance examples and collocation patterns. Component analysis has been literally required to identify basic semantic components which formed each verb group in the third stage of the research. The semantic features purely used in this study consisted of degree, speed, force, intensity and manner. Each verb has been carefully broken down into its individual semantic elements to exactly establish its position in a hypernym–hyponym relationship. How different languages represent gradation through their use of distinct words and their application of suffixes, word order patterns and descriptive elements have been precisely studied, as well. A study to evaluate language differences between English and Uzbek has been thoroughly conducted where researchers specifically studied English and Uzbek verb structures through a comparison of their graduonomic organization systems. How languages structure semantic depth through hypernym and hyponym relationships has also been narrowly investigated to identify which directly allows speakers to purely make generalizations and specifications by merely using degree-based distinctions. Language structures have additionally been analyzed through their investigation of English word patterns and Uzbek word transformation patterns which plainly allowed the author to effortlessly perform complete verb meaning analysis while wholly creating methods to thoroughly study how graduonomic elements directly affect English-Uzbek hyper–hyponymic relationships.

Results. 1. Hierarchical structures in motion verbs

The extensive study into motion verbs between languages uncovered complex systems of hypernym–hyponym relationships which entirely spanned multiple semantic levels. English strongly bases its verb meaning distinction through separate lexical terms. The verb system of Uzbek solidly relies on both derived forms and additional manner indicators. Verb meaning often predominantly reflects how speakers principally conceptualize events and chiefly categorize experience (Taylor 2015).

English

- move → walk → stroll → tiptoe

- run → jog → sprint → bolt

Uzbek

- yurmoq → sekin yurmoq → juda sekin yurmoq

- yugurmoq → tez yugurmoq → juda tez yugurmoq

Here, it can be obviously seen that English adds new lexical items (*stroll*, *tiptoe*, *jog*, *sprint*), while Uzbek solely increases gradation using adverbs (*sekin*, *tez*, *juda*). The examples above also clearly show that both languages firmly organize their words into semantic structures but English purely divides its vocabulary into more specific categories than Uzbek which plainly uses adverbs and morphological markers to wholly indicate degree.

2. Gradation in speech verbs. The speech verbs showed exposed graduonomic patterns which purely depended on the volume level, speech clarity and purpose of the words. According to Croft & Cruse (2004) languages use different methods to convey meaning through their vocabulary because some languages have many verbs but others use sentence structure to convey meaning. English wholly contains multiple verbs which plainly help users cleanly indicate both the extent and power of something. The way English obviously shows semantic differences largely depends on its verb categories and its patterns of alternation (Levin, 1993). The Uzbek language exclusively achieves these meanings through its precise use of manner markers and adverbial forms.

English examples

- speak → say → whisper → murmur

- speak → shout → yell → scream

Uzbek examples

- gapirmoq → pichirlab gapirmoq → past ovozda gapirmoq

- aytmoq → ovoz bilan aytmoq → baland ovozda aytmoq

English rigorously uses separate verb lexemes to purely indicate different levels of intensity. The Uzbek language literally achieves similar intensity distinctions through its use of *pichirlab, past ovozda* and *baland ovozda* manner markers.

3. Degree-based variation in action verbs. The action verbs in both languages explicitly used hyponymy through strength, force and precision levels and the pattern of action verbs merely remained consistent. Research on language corpora revealed how words are generally distributed throughout texts and how degree is primarily expressed in different languages (Geeraerts, 2010). Multiple verbs in the English language precisely carry the meaning of the language while the Uzbek language specifically expresses meaning through three methods such as intensifiers, reduplicated forms and affixes. The study of context-dependent variation largely enables researchers to carefully detect fine differences between hyponyms and their general hypernyms (Lyons 1995).

English

- hit → tap → knock → punch → strike

- cut → trim → slice → chop → carve

Uzbek

- urmoq → yengil urmoq → juda qattiq urmoq
- kesmoq → ehtiyotlik bilan kesmoq → juda qattiq kesmoq

The English verbs (*tap, knock, punch, slice, carve*) obviously demonstrate lexical segmentation but Uzbek specifically uses degree markers (*yengil, juda, qattiq, ehtiyotlik bilan*) to solely indicate the same hierarchical distinctions. According to Birner (2013), people basically select their verbs and degree markers based on the particular language environments they operate in.

4. Language-specific strategies for encoding gradation. The distinction between these two languages clearly became consistent throughout all verb-based domains. The use of specific words in lexical encoding systems essentially creates restricted semantic meanings (Saeed, 2016). English tendencies: primarily uses particular verbs which create exact meanings through their application; mainly contains complex organizational structures which link different semantic fields together; largely expresses degree through an expansion of its lexical resources. Uzbek tendencies: generally depends on adverbs together with manner markers for expression; principally depends on syntactic and morphological str

5. Cross-linguistic similarities and differences. These two languages predominantly create hypernym to hyponym relationships through separate methods. English basically creates new words to notably expand its meaning but Uzbek typically achieves this through word modification. The research largely shows that graduonomic structures generally exist in both languages but each language particularly uses distinct methods to achieve this structure (Qurbonboyeva, 2025).

Discussion. These two languages evidently demonstrate distinct patterns in their verb lexicon expression of hyper–hyponymic and graduonomic relations. English plainly uses lexical diversification to merely express degree through multiple separate verbs, for example, a vertical-position continuum can be simply created from verbs such as *stand, lean, crouch, kneel, lie* (Levin, 1993). The verbs entirely maintain precise distinctions through their inherent semantic structure so English purely uses this method to basically organize various verb fields (Murphy, 2010). The Uzbek language primarily uses morphological markers together with adverbial modifiers to generally indicate degree in its verbs as shown by "yugurmoq" expanding into "yengil yugurmoq" and "tez yugurmoq" and "qattiq yugurmoq" (Ochilova, 2024). The main verb practically stays the same in this structure because modifiers evidently serve as graduonomic elements which predominantly help create both efficient verb formation and syntactic dependency. The study remarkably revealed that the English language generally uses distinct words for near-synonyms but Uzbek language principally unites these terms under general hypernyms which solely allow for adverbial expansion. The analysis of these languages, additionally, shows their distinct approaches to basically represent particular data elements. The English hyponyms in the corpus data fundamentally have specific situational contexts through their connection to verbs such as *walk, tiptoe, stride* and *march* which chiefly create separate contexts but Uzbek language essentially uses adverbs to ultimately expand the meaning of single verb bases. Preliminary findings suggest that language structures inherently establish their own boundaries which chiefly restrict semantic meaning (Geeraerts, 2010). English, moreover, fundamentally maintains separate core definitions which virtually establish clear distinctions between their different forms. Uzbek verbs, however, primarily maintain flexible boundaries because their variations substantially emerge from modifiers instead of changes to the root verbs.The current patterns have affected translation process as well (Akhmedzhanova, 2023). English terms that chiefly function as hyponyms largely need multiple words to precisely translate them into Uzbek which also means that a single Uzbek hypernym plainly corresponds to multiple English hyponyms. The different ways modifiers are basically used in language translation apparently leads to meaning changes when they are removed (Lyons, 1995). Research, in addition, suggests how language patterns principally follow common patterns which mainly appear across various language families (Levin, 1993). Languages that predominantly possess extensive derivational verb systems largely use lexical methods to specifically express degree (Fillmore, 2003). The productive adverbial systems of languages primarily generate syntactic patterns which mostly display

degree information. These two languages, therefore, particularly follow established patterns in their language structure. These two languages, besides, share only a few common elements such as using particular word combinations to show degree in their spoken dialogue. English speakers use "*speak softly*" to indicate softness but Uzbek speakers choose "*past ovozda gapirmoq*" to achieve the same effect. The common patterns between languages, similarly, solely show that languages mostly use lexical and syntactic methods to plainly transmit their intended meaning (Birner, 2013). Speakers of English and Uzbek have been observed to fundamentally use different mental approaches to principally organize their language. English speakers predominantly select specific words to solely show their comprehension of action operations while Uzbek speakers basically view actions as entities which can be largely expanded or reduced in size (Akhmedzhanova, 2023). The way speakers from each language group plainly understand subtle changes in motion and manner basically develops from their native language structure. The research, besides, substantially provides new insights about how verbs in language notably express gradable meaning and specially demonstrates how hypernym and hyponym relationships mainly affect the process of encoding degree information. Lastly, the research shows that language structure broadly controls the amount of semantic detail which typically appears in different word groups.

Conclusion. The article has provided in-depth analysis of how English and Uzbek languages basically organize hyper–hyponymic and graduonomic relationships through their verb lexical structures. While English speakers mainly use separate words to solely express degree which merely produces exact semantic limits and restricted verb combinations, the Uzbek language mostly uses adverbs and morphological markers to plainly express degree which chiefly enables flexible meaning expansion from a single verb root. The different approaches between languages preponderantly affect their ability to elementally express subtle meanings, their translation methods, their systems for classifying actions, and their interpretation of motion and manner degrees. The analysis obviously demonstrates that graduonomic relationships principally emerge from the combination of lexical organization, semantic detail and syntactic construction methods. The research, in addition, demonstrates that English and Uzbek languages specifically present degree through their verb hierarchy structures using different yet organized systems. The research chiefly creates possibilities to significantly investigate more word categories and graduonomic structures which exist between other languages.

References:

1. Cruse, D. A., *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press, 2011. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/meaning-in-language-9780199559466
2. Murphy, M. L., *Lexical Meaning*. Cambridge University Press, 2010. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/lexical-meaning/6A85C0E60A948BB3E5D3BB3D58F75C34
3. Taylor, J. R., *The Mental Corpus: How Language is Represented in the Mind*. Oxford University Press, 2015. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-mental-corpus-9780198709848
4. Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A., *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
5. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cognitive-linguistics/7D9EC6A221BE2EAE2D6A9ECA87F43A6E
6. Levin, B., *English Verb Classes and Alternations*. University of Chicago Press, 1993. https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/E/bo3684036.html
7. Fillmore, C., Frame semantics and the nature of language, 2003. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6sd403n1
8. Lyons, J., *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, 1995. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/linguistic-semantics/9C686E1F3E34D842897C408C2B3F7B1E

9. Geeraerts, D., *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford University Press, 2010. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/theories-of-lexical-semantics-9780198700302
10. Birner, B. *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2013. https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Introduction+to+Pragmatics-p-9780470658980
11. Saeed, J. I., *Semantics* (4th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell, 2016. https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Semantics%2C+4th+Edition-p-9781118430163
12. Ochilova, Sanobar. *O‘zbek tilida xulq-atvor fe’llarining leksik-semantik munosabatlarga ko‘ra tavsifi va til sistemasidagi o‘rni*. **Tamaddun Nuri Jurnali**, 5(56), 2024.
13. Sayfullayev, Najibullo. *The Phenomenon of Hyponymy* (“Fenomen giponimiiya”). **Theory and Analytical Aspects of Recent Research**, Volume 2 No. 19, 2023.
14. Akhmedzhanova, Sitora Djurakhodjaevna. Classifications of Hyper-Hyponymic Series in Uzbek Linguistics. (IJNRAS, 2023)