

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PARTONOMY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

<https://doi.org/10.2689/zenodo.187964816>

Haydarov Anvar Askarovich

Professor at Bukhara State University

a.a.haydarov@buxdu.uz

Shamsullayeva Dildora Sunnatullo qizi

Master's Degree Student

shamsullayevadildora@gmail.com

Abstract

This article analyzes the role of partonomic relations within the language system, their lexical-semantic characteristics, and theoretical perspectives on part-whole structures as a linguistic universal. The research identifies partonomic relations based on the lexical corpus of the Uzbek language, classifies them through experimental analysis, and conducts a comparative study of their linguistic features. Furthermore, the unique characteristics, similarities, and differences between the partonomic systems of both languages are examined with illustrative examples.

Keywords

partonomy, part-whole relation, lexical relations, hierarchy, partonomic system, linguistic feature.

Language is an ongoing live process that involves the dynamic growth and development of language units in response to internal and external stimuli. Hence, language itself has been perceived as a complicated system that constantly develops and improves itself in synchronization with the progressive growth of society itself. The study of language, that is, linguistics, itself, continues to add new branches. Within linguistics itself, among other disciplines of semantic relations in words, lexicography, semantic meaning, and lexical-grammatical description, this particular area has always occupied special importance. The significant work in this area was undertaken by researchers such as M. Kashgari, M. Zamakhshari, and in particular, Alisher Navoi, whose work contributed unconditionally to global science regarding semantic relations in Turkic languages, and this is continued in recent times in the work of contemporary Uzbek linguists such as Begmatov E., M. Narziyeva, H. Ne'matov, R. Rasulov, R. Safarova, Sh. Orifjonova, and S. G'iyosov, who have scientifically proven and defined more complex semantic spheres like

meronymy, hyponymy, partonymy, gradonymy, and hierarchy based concepts. Contemporary research reveals that the expressiveness of a language is not framed only within the usual connections: synonymy, antonymy, paronymy. Every word inevitably gets into semantic and stylistic links with other language units, and it is these very connections that become the reason for its classification.

The work of Western researchers—in particular, A. Cruse, J. Lyons, L. Murphy, and G. Lakoff—has focused on the stylistic characteristics of meaning and has brought new nuances into linguistic development. This has increased the scope of new lexical-semantic relationships such as meronymy, hyponymy, partonymy, gradonymy, and hierarchical relations within modern lexical semantics. This paper exclusively concentrates on the phenomenon of partonymy, which is presently reinterpreted in new ways, including the analysis of linguistic and stylistic characteristics. Contrary to pure synonymy or antonymy, partonymy marks the structure of the object⁷². Various scientists consider partonymy a basic method in classification, categorization, or construction of conceptual systems⁷³.

Partonymy—the semantic category of linguistics investigating whole-part relationships—and the status of partonymy in the lexical system and linguistic characteristics have been widely explored. During the last years, there have been some studies in Uzbek linguistics, as well as in linguistics of the West, that have helped to reveal the lexical-semantic characteristics of partonymy. A. Haydarov and M. Barnoyeva⁷⁴ studied partonomic relationships in Uzbek by means of lexical-semantic analysis. The authors revealed partonomic dependencies in object-oriented vocabulary and pointed out their role in lexicographic and linguistic classification as a whole. For instance, relationships such as **dwelling - room - door - window** or **transport - engine - wheel - piston** can be perfectly captured in Uzbek. The difference between metaphorical and non-concrete partonymy in Uzbek makes a significant addition to linguistic theory as a whole. M. Safarova⁷⁵ proposed a model of lexical unit classification relying on relationships of a whole to a part. Apparently, partonomic units could be divided into metaphorical/derivative ones and others of physical part-whole, collective/member-group, and substance/whole types respectively. The classification outline is used in this article as a basic theoretical model to explain what kinds of partonymy there is and its hierarchical structure. For example,

⁷² Cruse, D. A. (2011). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press, pp. 138-142

⁷³ Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, p. 71

⁷⁴ Barnoyeva, M. A., & Haydarov, A. A. (2024). Partonymy in the Uzbek Language: Lexico-Semantic Analysis. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education*, 2(11), 253–258

⁷⁵ Safarova, M. R. (2025). The Classification of Lexical Units Formed on the Basis of Whole-Part Relations (on the Example of Uzbek). *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education*, 3(10).

hierarchy **tree-branch-leaf-bud** is compatible with physical part-whole, and **student-group-school** is represented by the collective/member-group category.

In addition, R.Sobirova⁷⁶ explored the relationship between language and culture in terms of partonomy in the context of household and cultural lexical units. The relationship between parts and wholes was explored in the lexicon and pragmatics, and the complexity of the partonomic relationship was found to be rich and context-dependent in the Uzbek language. The relationship of domestic units such as **kitchen, shelf, cabinet, stove, and tandoor** go beyond lexical and includes cultural context, indicating that language and culture are in harmony.

Internationally, O.Materynska⁷⁷ investigated units that describe the process and phenomenon expressed through English and German. The important thing is that the abstract units of a partonomic structure are very typical for the English language because they have strong semantic characteristics. This ensures a comparative research on a partonomy structure in Uzbek and English. So, for instance, the units that compose a process such as **education-teaching-explanation-feedback** are very strictly linked. This supports the comparative part of the article.

Friederike Moltmann⁷⁸ has specifically studied part-whole relationships in relation to ontology and semiotics, and she has pointed out particularities of linguistic units in plural, collective, and process units of meaning. The work of Moltmann has improved the theoretical background of partonomy and facilitated analysis in linguistic units in terms of cognition and ontology.

In conclusion, these aforementioned studies contribute to understanding the lexical-semantic properties and structure of Uzbek and English partonomy from a cultural viewpoint. Partonomy is one of the semantic fields of both Uzbek and English lexicons and covers different means of manifestation of the part-whole relationships meaning. Thus, English partonomies are predominantly more structural and technological, and this semantic field is mostly and frequently represented through linguistic means in the Uzbek language that are more associated with different manifestations of folklore and home affairs. There is a strong ontological hierarchy for Uzbek categories instead of flexibility and variability in English. The typological differences between these languages properly emerge on the basis of their partonomy systems.

⁷⁶ Sobirova, R. (2022). Lexico-semantic relationships in the names of household items. Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Philology Series, (105), 83–88

⁷⁷ Materynska, O. (2019). Structure and semantics of the names denoting parts of processes in German and English. Linguistic and Conceptual Worldviews.

⁷⁸ Moltmann, F. (2005). Part Structures in Situations: The Semantics of ‘Individual’ and ‘Whole’. Linguistics and Philosophy, 28(5), 599–641.

REFERENCES:

1. Cruse, D. A. (2011). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press, pp. 138-142
2. Lyons, J. (1995). *Linguistic Semantics: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press, p. 71
3. Barnoeva, M. A., & Haydarov, A. A. (2024). Partonymy in the Uzbek Language: Lexico-Semantic Analysis. *American Journal of Language, Literacy and Learning in STEM Education*, 2(11), 253–258.
4. Safarova, M. R. (2025). The Classification of Lexical Units Formed on the Basis of Whole-Part Relations (on the Example of Uzbek). *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education*, 3(10).
5. Sobirova, R. (2022). Lexico-semantic relationships in the names of household items. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Philology Series*, (105), 83–88.
6. Materynska, O. (2019). Structure and semantics of the names denoting parts of processes in German and English. *Linguistic and Conceptual Worldviews*.
7. Moltmann, F. (2005). Part Structures in Situations: The Semantics of 'Individual' and 'Whole'. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 28(5), 599–641.