REALIZATION OF GENETIC AND SPECIFIC RELATIONS AMONG THE TERMS OF UZBEK NATIONAL MATERIALS OF TEXTILE

Abstract: In this article realization of gender-type relations of names of Uzbek national fabric with examples is discussed and learned on the basis of linguistic facts met in literary works. Such a likeness as whole-part, gender-type syntagmatic relations between terms of designing national fabric which is one of the components of linguistic terms of field. Types of designing terms are analyzed on the basis of category of generality and individuality; results are generalized on the grouping; conclusions are made.
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Introduction

One of the founders of the theory of linguistics Wilhelm von Humbold said “There is no any part existing in two conditions in language Its every element exists as a part of the whole.” This idea is also related to the lexical system of the language. So all the words in a language comprise one whole lexical system, and all lexemes have mutual relations within this system. V.M. Solntsev says, “A system is one whole object consisting of mutually related elements” [1, p.19; 2, p.74].

Semantic relations are characterized by having inner opposition in the language. It has a permanent feature on the one hand: word and morpheme stand for a certain object. On the other hand they have a feature of mobility; language forms change their connection to the reference very easily, and sometimes cut their connection with the reference. Permanent and mobile features of word meaning have always been in the center of attention of linguists. We can also say that unless there is this semantic asymmetry, there would be the difficulty of theoretical and practical learning. Such dual nature of semantic relations differ in taking names too. Semantic permanence of language units is expressed by mobile, changeable nature of such ideas as “invariant of word meaning”, “main or general meaning”, “etymologic meaning”, “intermediate link of polysemy development”, “lexical semantic variant of the word”, “usage of the word”, “contextual meaning”, “shade of meaning”. [2, p.74]

Paradigm is taken from Greek word-paradigma meaning – sample, example and used as a meaning of collection of elements of language system[3,p.31]. Or the range of similarity in language is called paradigm [4, p.9]. Paradigmatic is relation of choosing. It is based on similarity and dissimilarity between language units. Differential and none differential signs help to find out paradigms. H. Nematov and R. Rasulov divide language units into three:

1. Relations of similarity (paradigmatic relations);
2. Step-by-step (hierarchical) relations;
3. Neighboring (syntagmatic) relations [5, p.14-15].

Professor A. Nurmonov divided relations between lexical units into two:

a) Relations of units belonging to one level;
b) Relation of units belonging to different levels.

In dividing into two the scientist determines the paradigmatic relations as members of the first group and gives it another name “roommate” relations [6, p.9].
B. Kilichev writes about paronymy, “as everything in the universe is many sided meaning relations of every word is diverse and colorful.” That is why every lexeme stays at the intersection of synonymous, hyponymous, gradational and partonym ranges, and its verbal-meaning essence is marked according to the intersection of these lines.”[7, p.4-11] B. Kilichev states that paronymic relations can be observed not only in nouns, but also in verbs, numerals, adverbs, adjectives as well. The difference of paronymy from hyper-hyponymy is that while in hyponymy one member of the field is put opposite the others, and meaning relations between them is found out, in paronymy the question of relation of a certain member with its constituting inner members is pushed into the foreground.

The man studies the surrounding world by means of his/her sense perceptions: sees it by means of eyes, hears it by means of ears, feels the smell by means of nose, feels it by means of his/her body, feels its taste by means of his/her tongue. Thus he/she relying on the specific features of the things or events he/she collects the qualitative and quantitative changes and classifies them.

On the basis of their general features he/she unites them into definite groups and then on the basis of their individual features he differentiates them from each other. In this process the man is helped by the dialectical unity of the surrounding world, thought and language[9, p. 83]. Relying on these principles in this article we tried to study the nature of genetic and specific relations of the terms of the Uzbek national textile materials.

Materials and Methods
In 1968 the English linguist J.Lyons introduced the terms into scientific world with terms ‘hyponymy, hyperonym, hyponymy’ denoting genetic and specific relations among the related terms [9, p.136]. Among the dialectical relations the notion of ‘hyper-, hyponymic relations has its own specific position. The genetic relations include definite units and they are called specific type. But this is not the relation of the whole and its parts. Genetic type contains all the specific features of its components. The specific type specifies and individualizes all of these peculiarities. It is peculiar for the specific type o be generalized. The genetic type can be individualized in some of the specific types. In most cases denotative meanings in the structure of the thematic groups genetic and specific relations can be realized. For instance, in the Uzbek terms of national textile design such as ‘gazlama’(textile fabric) ‘mato’ (a piece of cloth) ‘atlas’(fabric made of silk), ‘alak’ (a kind of silk material) there exists inclusive relations between them. In the semantic field of these terms there are two meanings of the members of this group understood implicitly: ‘gazlama’ has a generalized integral meaning, whereas the terms ‘atlas, alak’ have differential meaning, differing the types of textile material.

The term ‘hyponim’ appears as a means denoting the type of the genetic notion and alongside with other hyponyms it is dependet to hyperonym, so the genetic and specific relations in the language are called ‘hyponimy’[9, p.137]. For instance the hyperonym ‘rang’ (colour) in Uzbek includes in itself such hyponyms as ‘to’q rang’ (dark colour), ‘och rang’ (light colour), ‘nim qizil’ (half red, reddish), ‘oqish’ (whitish), etc. At the same time the words and phrases denoting the notion of ‘type’ provides the names of both the notion of genetic sign and specific sign: ‘bo’yash’ (painting), naqsh’ (ornament), ‘atlas’ (silk material), etc.

It should be noted that though the word denoting the genetic sign is not expressed explicitly in the framework of hyponymic row does not always combine the word denoting the specific type. The word denoting the sign of the type may also be reflected by another independent lexical unit. For instance, атлас, адрас, банорас. The words and phrases denoting the the sign of the specific type perform the same function, i.e. they denote the names of the specific type included into the genetic type. Though in the hyponymic lexical row the names of silk materials such as ‘қорғаш атлас, қозголош, қозгол и атлас, армгилар, қарғашойи’ the words ‘қозголош, армгилар, қарғашойи’ do not have the word ‘atlas’ according to the function they all equal with the words ‘қорға атлас, қозгол атлас’. They usually denote a differentiating feature of the general word ‘atlas’. Thus in the process of expressing th notion of genetic and specific types of relations the language realizes its own possibilities.

a) With the help of the phrase containing the names of genetic sign it denotes the name of the specific type. E.g.: сариқ атлас, қорға атлас, etc.

b) Without the help of the phrase containing the names of genetic sign it denotes the name of the specific type by means of lexical units. E.g.: ‘атлас, банорас, адрас, бекасас’, etc.

As is seen from the above mentioned example in the process of realizing the genetic and specific relations the mains off expressions are words and phrases.

It is more attractive that in the process of realizing genetic and specific relations the use of phrases instead of single lexical units can often be met in matters of other world languages. Therefore the study of these relations in matters of other languages.
is of great importance for general lexicology, especially its main component – semasiology.

Lexico-semantic groups of words constitute the most important components of the lexico-semantic field i.e. the component parts of the semantic field can be imagined as lexico-semantic groups of words. In other words semantic field is in genetic and specific relation with lexico-semantic groups (LSG) of words.

One of the main types of relations of the semantic field is a hyper-hyponymic relation.

The head word expressing general meaning in relation to other adjunct words occupies the central position in the center of the semantic field. It is called a dominant word that constitutes hyperonymic position.[9, 136]. For example, the hyperonym ‘atlas’ includes unites under itself the hyponyms as‘сариқ atlas, кора атлас, қизил атлас, кушл алтас’ etc. the hyper-hyponimic relations of lexical units a well known linguist A. Sobirov offers the following conclusions:

1. The hyper-hyponimic relation is a special pattern of forming the semantic field of words. 2. Hyperonim repeats one of the ‘sea’s’a hyperonyms. 3. Hyponims are to some extend dependent to the hyper-hyponyms.4. According to its characteristic features hyper-hyponimic relation sharply differs from the synonymic, partonymic and graduonymic relations.

With its special characteristic feature such as its own logical-semantic structure, existence of the symmetrical relations between this structure and the reality of the surrounding world, formation of strong paradigm in the patterns of the dominant word and its dependents, reflection of cultural, socio-political and economic life hyponymy differs greatly from other relations of the lexical units [9, p. 140].

According to genetic and specific relations between the the words the lexical units denoting the names of the Uzbek national design of textile materials can be divided into the following semantic groups:

1. Names of national textile materials: абридам, атлас, банорас, адрас, бекасам, атлас, бўз чиқ, жанда, жанда, атлас, бўз чиқ, жанда, атлас, бўз чиқ, жанда, атлас, бўз чиқ, жанда, атлас, бўз чиқ, жанда, атлас, бўз чиқ, жанда.
2. Names of paints: рўян (Rubia tinctorum), коркок (pomegranate, nut, apple), коркок (mulberry tree, fruits of, barberries, zarcho‘ba, hydrosulfide, aluma sulfide, dried insects, indigo, ‘tucmak, etc. [11,p.12]
3. Names of personnel: weaver, fabric seller, sewer, a hired worker, paint-maker,‘адрасбоf’, cotton printer, thead maker, etc.[8, p.44].

4. Names of paints: ‘саккиз тупки’, то‘рт тупки’, processing, weaving, , painting, colour printing, ornamenting, etc.

5. Names of instruments: ‘анjom‘(details of instruments), ‘асбоb (instrument), ‘гўла’, weaving loom, ‘ кўдуг (a kind of instrument)? [8, p. 44] archuruq, rolling press, copper-cattle, ‘ховонча’, weights, etc.[10, p.12].

The first group contains the names of the weaved textile (hyperonyms) but the components of this group also have their hyponyms. The units of the first group denotes the genetic and specific relations of the first level, and at the same time components of this group also denote the genetic and specific relations of the second level. For example, the lexeme ‘atlas’ as a hyperonym may be included into the system of ‘гўлама’ (raw textile), but at the same time this lexeme as hyperonym has its own subtypes, i.e. the types of ‘атлас’ such as ‘гўзил атлас (red atlas), ‘гора атлас’ (black atlas), ‘намозшам атлас’, ‘барги карам’, etc. In this case silk raw material denotes genetic type of relations whereas its types ‘адрас’, ‘банорас’ denote the specific type, i.e. hyponym.

E.g.: Дўконда бахмал тўн ва заррин дўппи зукор тўқилиган садиқ дўкондор ва унинг икки хизматчиси кўлланип чиқилган қируат ва ўтқизиган қўйлаб ўлтириш учун кўплаб ёғоч асбоб.

The same picture can be seen in the examples of the second group: names of paints denote the genetic features of lexical units (hyperonyms), whereas types of paint denote the specific types hyponyms). There also exists the genetic-specific type of relations of the second level, i.e. types of yellow colour. E.g. : Аммо эндида тўғ сарик иннат кўйлак, курк, узунчо ойболдоқ, охордан тушмаган амиркон ковуш, жуфтли кардова, сирдарияда ойболдоқ, астони шунаб ташланиш эмас, узунчо бетларида эмас, туси қандайлиги намоўлум чунқур кўллар теварасида сура, туталаб тўқилган сыйриқ қўширидаги ўсма (М Исоний).

She was wearing dark yellow silk dress, long and thin legs were wearing ‘амиркон’ type of slippers, golden earings (юйбордоq) on her ears, her thin, lengthy face was cowered with a kind of powder, her eyes were of indefinite colour, her eyebrows and eyelids were also painted with colour of eye-grass.

In the third group the word ‘тоқувчи’ (weaver) denotes a generalized meaning (hyper-hyponym) whereas the names of definite professionals, e.g.
‘kudunglovchi’ denotes the person engaged in the more narrow activity in the process of weaving.

E.g.: Кайдимдан матолар уч кис ўйл билан бўлган, исек манбанд бўлган бўлиши, совук манби билан бўвши (индиго кукуни усулли ҳамда хумда бўви. Хумли бекасам кўк ва зангори рангда бўлган (Р.Мирзаахмедов).

From the ancient times the textile materials were painted in three ways i.e. by means of hot source, by means of cold sources and painting in the ‘hooms’. The last one was of blue and green colour.

In the process of painting the textile materials we have seen close relation of the language and the reality of the process of producing textile materials. In this process personnel as well as the names of instruments and specific relations between them constitute the main possibilities and types of the study of the lexical system of textile materials. As an example of genetic and specific relations between the names of textile personnel as well as the names of instruments and their component parts of the instruments used in the process of producing textile materials. we have seen in the above mentioned explanations.

Generally speaking, hyponymy is one of the possibilities and types of the study of the lexical system of the Uzbek language. It is a row of lexical units formed as a result of studying the language in close relation of the language and the reality of the surrounding world.

Hyponymy as a possibility of organizing the lexical system gets mixed with such notions as partonomy, graduonymy, hierarchionymy, but remains with its specific features. The hypo-hyponymic rows existing in the lexical layer of the Uzbek language is an objective reality.

**CONCLUSION**

Genetic and specific relations constitute the main basics of the semantic field and through these relations taxa unite into cellulars, the cellulars unite into groups, and these groups form the semantic field. In other words in the semantic field the groups form hyperonyms, and each lexeme in the paradigm has its own hyponymic sign. in the Thuss the notion of genetic and specific relations is a comparatively conditional notion. One and the same relation forming the genetic relation can be at the same time appear as a specific type of that relation. Such relations in matters of terms of design of textile materials we can observe in the system of relations of the terms of design of textile materials. As an example of genetic and specific relations between the names of textile personnel as well as the names of instruments and their component parts of the instruments used in the process of producing textile materials. we have seen in the above mentioned explanations.
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