

ANALYSIS OF CANONICAL AND NON-CANONICAL ANTONYM PAIRS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES**Azimova Dildora Aslitdin kizi**

The teacher of Uzbekistan National University named after "Mirzo Ulugbek"

E-mail: dildoraazimova009@gmail.com

Tel:(97) 0604000/ (97) 0504000

Abstract

Antonymy is one of the most significant semantic relations in language, reflecting the opposition of meanings between lexical units. The study of antonyms contributes to understanding lexical organization, cognitive categorization, and cross-linguistic semantic structures. This article examines canonical and non-canonical antonym pairs in English and Uzbek, focusing on their semantic, morphological, and functional characteristics. Through a comparative analysis, the research identifies similarities and differences in the formation and usage of antonyms in both languages. The findings reveal that while canonical antonyms are relatively stable and universally recognized, non-canonical antonyms are context-dependent and influenced by cultural, cognitive, and pragmatic factors.

Keywords: antonymy, canonical antonyms, non-canonical antonyms, semantics, English language, Uzbek language, lexical relations.

O‘ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDAGI KANONIK VA KOKANONIK ANTONIM JUFTLIKLAR TAHLILI**Annotatsiya**

Antonimiya tildagi eng muhim semantik munosabatlardan biri bo‘lib, leksik birliklar o‘rtasidagi ma’no qarama-qarshiligini ifodalaydi. Antonimlarni o‘rganish leksik tizimning tashkil topishini, kognitiv kategoriyalashuv jarayonlarini hamda tillararo semantik tuzilmalarni tushunishga yordam beradi. Mazkur maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi kanonik va nokanonik antonim juftliklar ularning semantik, morfologik va funksional xususiyatlari nuqtayi nazaridan tahlil qilinadi. Qiyosiy tahlil asosida har ikki tilda antonimlarning shakllanishi va qo‘llanilishidagi o‘xshashliklar hamda farqlar aniqlanadi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko‘rsatadiki, kanonik antonimlar nisbatan barqaror va umum tomonidan tan olingan bo‘lsa, nokanonik antonimlar kontekstga bog‘liq bo‘lib, madaniy, kognitiv va pragmatik omillar ta’sirida shakllanadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: antonimiya, kanonik antonimlar, nokanonik antonimlar, semantika, ingliz tili, o‘zbek tili, leksik munosabatlar.

АНАЛИЗ КАНОНИЧЕСКИХ И НЕКАНОНИЧЕСКИХ АНТОНИМИЧЕСКИХ ПАР В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ**Аннотация**

Антонимия является одним из важнейших семантических отношений в языке, отражающим противопоставление значений между лексическими единицами. Изучение антонимов способствует пониманию организации лексической системы, когнитивной категоризации и межъязыковых семантических структур. В данной статье рассматриваются канонические и неканонические антонимические пары в английском и узбекском языках с точки зрения их семантических, морфологических и функциональных особенностей. На основе сравнительного анализа выявляются сходства и различия в образовании и употреблении антонимов в обоих языках. Результаты исследования

показывают, что канонические антонимы являются относительно устойчивыми и общепризнанными, тогда как неканонические антонимы зависят от контекста и формируются под влиянием культурных, когнитивных и прагматических факторов.

Ключевые слова: антонимия, канонические антонимы, неканонические антонимы, семантика, английский язык, узбекский язык, лексические отношения.

Introduction

Language users constantly rely on semantic oppositions to express contrasts, evaluate phenomena, and organize knowledge. Antonymy, as a lexical-semantic relation, represents one of the most fundamental mechanisms of meaning construction. Antonymy refers to a semantic relationship in which two lexical items express opposite meanings (Lyons, 1977; Cruse, 2004). "Traditional linguistic studies have primarily focused on canonical antonyms such as *hot-cold*, *big-small*, and *good-bad*. However, contemporary semantic research recognizes that oppositional meanings may also emerge through contextual and pragmatic associations, resulting in non-canonical antonym pairs.

The purpose of this study is to analyze canonical and non-canonical antonym pairs in English and Uzbek languages and to identify their structural and semantic peculiarities. The comparative approach provides insights into how different linguistic systems conceptualize opposition.

Antonymy refers to a semantic relationship in which two lexical items express opposite meanings. According to lexical semantics, antonyms can be classified into several categories:

1. **Gradable antonyms** – opposite ends of a semantic scale. English: *hot-cold*, *young-old*. Uzbek: *issiq-sovuq*, *yosh-qari*

2. **Complementary antonyms** – mutually exclusive categories. English: *alive-dead*. Uzbek: *tirik-o'lik*

3. **Relational (converse) antonyms** – meanings that imply each other. English: *buy-sell*. Uzbek: *sotib olmoq-sotmoq*

Within modern linguistic theory, a distinction is often made between canonical and non-canonical antonyms. Canonical antonyms are conventionalized word pairs widely recognized by speakers as opposites. They occur frequently in discourse and are cognitively salient (Murphy, 2003). Examples:

English		Uzbek	
good	bad	yaxshi	yomon
big	small	katta	kichik
rich	poor	boy	kambag'al
fast	slow	tez	sekin

These pairs are deeply embedded in the lexical systems of both languages and are often acquired early in language development.

Non-canonical antonyms are contextually constructed oppositions that may not be traditionally listed as antonym pairs in dictionaries. Their oppositional relationship emerges through discourse, situational context, or cultural interpretation. Examples:

city – village, technology – tradition, modern – classical

Uzbek examples: *shahar – qishloq, yangilik – an'ana, zamonaviy – mumtoz*

Such pairs demonstrate semantic contrast without belonging to the standard inventory of lexical antonyms.

Canonical antonyms exhibit several common features in both languages.

Canonical antonyms occur frequently in educational materials, dictionaries, and everyday communication. In English, many canonical antonyms are formed through negative prefixes: *happy – unhappy, legal – illegal, possible – impossible*

Similarly, Uzbek employs derivational morphology and lexical opposition:

odobli – odobsiz, foydali – foydasiz (Hojiyev, 2010; Rasulov, 2007)."

However, lexical antonymy remains more productive than affixal antonymy in both languages.

Non-canonical antonyms are characterized by flexibility and contextual dependence. Words become opposites only within a specific discourse. (Lehrer & Lehrer, 1982; Murphy, 2003). Example: *science* versus *belief*, *nature* versus *technology*

These pairs do not represent inherent lexical opposites but may function as contrasts in particular communicative situations. Uzbek examples include: *ilm – e'tiqod*, *tabiat – texnologiya*

When it comes to cultural influence, they significantly influence non-canonical oppositions. For example: *East – West*, *traditional – modern*

In Uzbek discourse: *milliy – xorijiy*, *an'anaviy – zamonaviy*

Such contrasts often reflect social and ideological perspectives rather than purely semantic opposition.

They have pragmatic functions, non-canonical antonyms are commonly used in journalism, political discourse, and literature to create rhetorical effects.

Example: "The debate was between innovation and tradition." Here, *innovation* and *tradition* function as oppositional concepts despite lacking strict lexical antonymy.

The comparison between English and Uzbek reveals both similarities and differences. Similarities:

- Both languages possess a rich inventory of canonical antonyms.
- Gradable antonyms constitute the largest category.
- Non-canonical antonyms frequently arise through contextual interpretation.
- Antonymy serves important cognitive and communicative functions.

Differences

- English relies more extensively on affixation (un-, in-, im-, dis-) to create opposites.
- Uzbek often expresses opposition through separate lexical items rather than prefixes.
- Cultural and historical factors influence non-canonical antonym formation differently in each language.

- Uzbek discourse frequently reflects collectivist and traditional values, while English discourse often emphasizes individualism and innovation, affecting contextual oppositions.

The study of non-canonical antonyms broadens the traditional understanding of lexical semantics. It demonstrates that antonymy is not merely a dictionary-based relation but also a dynamic cognitive process. Speakers actively construct oppositions according to communicative goals, social contexts, and cultural knowledge. From a cognitive perspective, humans tend to organize concepts through binary contrasts. Consequently, even unrelated lexical items may acquire oppositional meanings within discourse.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that canonical and non-canonical antonym pairs play complementary roles in English and Uzbek lexical systems. Canonical antonyms represent stable, conventionalized semantic oppositions, whereas non-canonical antonyms emerge from contextual, cultural, and pragmatic factors. Both languages exhibit similar semantic principles in antonym formation, although they differ in morphological mechanisms and cultural conceptualization. The findings contribute to comparative linguistics, lexical semantics, and cognitive studies by highlighting the dynamic nature of oppositional meaning.

References

1. Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
2. Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Murphy, M. L. (2003). *Semantic Relations and the Lexicon: Antonymy, Synonymy and Other Paradigms*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Saeed, J. I. (2016). *Semantics* (4th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.

5. Palmer, F. R. (1981). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Lehrer, A., & Lehrer, K. (1982). Antonymy. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 5(4), 483–501.
7. Hojiyev, A. (2010). *O'zbek Tili Leksikologiyasi*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
8. Nurmonov, A. (2012). *O'zbek Tilshunosligi Tarixi*. Toshkent.
9. Rasulov, R. (2007). *Hozirgi O'zbek Adabiy Tili Leksikologiyasi*. Toshkent.
10. Yule, G. (2020). *The Study of Language* (7th ed.). Cambridge University Press.