APRIL 2025 | VOLUME 1 | ISSUE 1

# MODERN AMERICAN JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS, EDUCATION, AND PEDAGOGY

ISSN (E): 3067-7874
ResearchBIB: 10.95

Open Access | Peer Reviewed
https://usajournals.org/index.php/6

*Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*
**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874
Volume 01, Issue 06, September, 2025
**Website:** usajournals.org


# THE USE OF HYPONYMIC UNITS IN MILITARY-PATRIOTIC SPEECH

Murodova Firuza Jalolovna
Lecturer, Chirchiq State Pedagogical University
Firuzamj1984@gmail.com

**Abstract**
This article analyzes the role and functional features of hyponymic units in military-patriotic speech. Hyponymy is classified as a linguistic phenomenon, and the semantic relations of lexical units with military-patriotic content are revealed. The article highlights the connections between hyponyms and hypernyms, their forms of expression in speech, as well as their role in ensuring semantic clarity in context. The analysis is based on modern military texts and patriotic speeches, demonstrating the influence of the hyponymic system on speech style. The research results contribute to a deeper understanding of the semantic layer in military discourse.

**Keywords**: Hyponymy, hyponym and hyperonym term, central lexeme of the micro-system, implicit, semantic field, hierarchical relation, hyperonymic (genus-species) relation, partonymic (whole-part) relation.

## HARBIY-VATANPARVARLIK NUTQIDA GIPONIMIK BIRLIKLARNING QO‘LLANISHI

Murodova Firuza Jalolovna
Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti o‘qituvchisi
Firuzamj1984@gmail.com

**Annotatsiya**
Ushbu maqolada harbiy-vatanparvarlik nutqidagi giponimik birliklarning o‘rni va funksional xususiyatlari tahlil qilinadi. Giponimiya lingvistik hodisa sifatida tasniflanib, harbiy vatanparvarlik mazmuniga ega leksik birliklar misolida ularning semantik munosabatlari ochib beriladi. Maqolada giponim va

*Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*
**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874
Volume 01, Issue 06, September, 2025
**Website:** usajournals.org


gipergiponimlar o‘rtasidagi bog‘liqliklar, ularning nutqdagi ifoda shakllari, shuningdek, kontekstda ma’no aniqligini ta’minlashdagi roli yoritiladi. Tahlil davomida zamonaviy harbiy matnlar va vatanparvarlik ruhidagi chiqishlar asos qilib olinib, giponimik tizimning nutq uslubiga ta’siri ko‘rsatib beriladi. Tadqiqot natijalari harbiy diskursdagi semantik qatlamni chuqurroq anglashga xizmat qiladi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** Giponimiya, giponim hamda giperonim atama, mikrotizimning markaziy leksemasi, implisit, semantik maydon, ierarxik aloqa, giperonimik (tur-jins) munosabat, partonimik (butun –bo‘lak) munosabat.

## Introduction

The Uzbek language stands out for its rich lexical composition and a system of words with subtle semantic nuances. The abundance of semantic relations such as synonymy, homonymy, antonymy, partonymy, and hyponymy demonstrates its level of development, stylistic richness, and wide communicative potential. In particular, phraseological units, figurative expressions, and systematic relations within the lexical-semantic layer contribute to the effectiveness of communication in the language.

One of the main tasks of lexicology as a science is to study the semantic aspects of words, their semantic structure, and the scope of their meanings. From this perspective, the phenomenon of hyponymy holds a special place in linguistics, as it makes it possible to analyze the relationships of generality and specificity, breadth and narrowness among lexical units. Hyponymic relations not only reveal the hierarchical semantic structure of a language but also serve as an important tool in clarifying terminological systems in various spheres of speech — including military and patriotic texts.

Today, one of the urgent directions of linguistics is the systematization of domain-specific vocabulary, its functional analysis, and enrichment from a stylistic perspective. In particular, studying hyponymic units in military-patriotic speech, identifying their mechanisms of use, and highlighting layered lexical systems on the basis of semantic analysis is important not only for linguistic research but also for increasing the effectiveness of military-communicative activities.

*Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*
**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874
Volume 01, Issue 06, September, 2025
**Website:** usajournals.org


The terms hyponymy, hyperonym, and hyponym were first introduced into linguistics in 1968 by the English scholar J. Lyons as a semantic phenomenon expressing genus-species relations. He provided complete definitions and explanations of this issue in his fundamental work *Semantics*, published in London in 1977. Later, the phenomenon was given scholarly attention in Russian linguistics as well, with initial theoretical views presented in works by A.A. Ufimceva, L. Novikov, Zemskiy, Yu.S. Stepanov, and in *General Linguistics* edited by Fomyanova and Suprun. The French linguist V.G. Gak also expressed his ideas on hyponymy in his studies.

In Uzbek linguistics, this phenomenon was first scientifically analyzed in R. Safarova's 1990 candidate dissertation *Hyponymy in the Uzbek Language (Based on Commonly Used Zoonyms)*. Later, it was explored in greater depth by J.Sh. Jumaboeva in her doctoral dissertation *Lexical and Stylistic Gradonymy in Uzbek and English Languages*. The linguist R. Sayfullaeva defines hyperonyms as central lexemes in the general semantic micro-system that express generic features, while hyponyms are described as lexemes denoting specific features within the same genus, semantically richer in meaning. The prominent linguist H. Jamolxonov characterizes hyponymic relations as hierarchical semantic connections among lexemes in the lexicon, represented through genus-species and whole-part relations.

Thus, the phenomenon of hyponymy is an important tool in determining semantic relations among lexical units, playing a significant role in uncovering the semantic hierarchy within the language system.

As in the discourse of any specialized field, hyponymic relations also hold an important place in the vocabulary of military-patriotic speech. In particular, the frequent use of hyponyms in this field's lexicon indicates that the system of terms and expressions is organized on a clear hierarchical basis. Lexical units, according to their mutual relations within the semantic field, are divided into hyperonyms (general class) and hyponyms (specific type). Hyponyms belong to a certain semantic group, and their sememes contain the general seme of the hyperonym. In other words, the meaning of a hyponym implicitly incorporates the main seme of the hyperonym. Therefore, within the semantic field, hyponyms function as narrower but specifying units in relation to the hyperonym. Put

*Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*
**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874
Volume 01, Issue 06, September, 2025
**Website:** usajournals.org


differently, hyponyms constitute the structural components of a hyperonym that expresses a general meaning, with each of them denoting a concrete and specific concept. Such lexical-semantic relations serve as an important tool in the systematization of military-patriotic vocabulary.

For example, within the hyperonym *patriotism*, there exist numerous hyponymic units: devotion, courage, bravery, sacrificing one's life for the homeland, and perceiving military service as an honor. These concepts represent different manifestations of patriotism, illustrating its theoretical and practical breadth as well as its modes of expression in the language.

Studying the relationship between hyperonyms and hyponyms is especially relevant in analyzing the vocabulary of military-patriotic discourse from a functional perspective. Through this, not only the semantic connections among linguistic units but also their communicative and ideological functions in society are revealed. For instance, the word *courage* is evaluated not only as a personal trait but also as a value manifested in service to the homeland. Hence, such lexical units must be analyzed not only at the lexical level but also within cultural and spiritual contexts.

In general, the semantic relations between hyperonyms and hyponyms provide an important scientific foundation for the systematic analysis of military-patriotic vocabulary, allowing classification and grouping of lexical units according to spheres, roles, values, and concepts.

The hyperonymic (genus-species) and partonymic (whole-part) relations within the meanings of lexemes are among the key factors shaping the vocabulary of a specialized field and determining the construction of its terminological systems. These relations make it possible to identify and systematize the paradigmatic structure of lexemes — i.e., their semantic groupings. As a result, the interrelations, structures, and functional roles of lexical units in each field or terminological domain become clear.

For instance, in military vocabulary, the concept *military uniform* functions as a hyperonym, encompassing a range of hyponyms denoting specific types of clothing. This semantic group includes such lexical units as armor, helmet, striped undershirt (*telnyashka*), greatcoat (*shinel*), cap (*furajka*), combat helmet, tunic (*kitel*), coverall (*kombinezon*), jacket (*pidjak*), quilted jacket (*fufayka*), field coat

*Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*
**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874
Volume 01, Issue 06, September, 2025
**Website:** usajournals.org


(*bushlat*), and others. Each of these terms reflects the unique features, purposes, and functions of military clothing, while also defining its role and significance within the entire system.

Another important terminological group in the military field is that of military vehicles. This group commonly includes such lexemes as amphibian vehicle, tank, transporter, barge, and others. These lexical units denote different types of military equipment, which are distinguished by their technical characteristics, intended purposes, and usage contexts.

A deep analysis of hyperonymic and partonymic relations not only reveals the richness of a domain's vocabulary but also demonstrates the logical structure of its terminological systems. For example, within the domain of *military clothing*, partonymic relations are manifested in whole–part form: a *greatcoat* is a part of "military clothing"; a *helmet* is classified as headgear. In this way, lexical items in the field are organized on the basis of genus–species and whole–part relations, which is of great significance in the systematic study and application of vocabulary.

Furthermore, these relations provide a solid scholarly foundation for the deeper analysis of military-patriotic vocabulary, enabling the study of its communicative, functional, and pragmatic aspects.

Language exists in our consciousness as a system of potentiality and generality, and it manifests itself through speech. For this reason, in communication, the use of general lexemes often creates convenience. The concept of generality is broad and understandable to all, while specificity is expressed clearly and distinctly within the vocabulary of a particular domain. Analyzing the aspects of generality and specificity in linguistic units helps us to gain a deeper understanding of the functional possibilities of language.

For instance:

*1.* "Our loyal servicemen, who have always remained true to their sacred oath and stood as an unyielding shield in the defense of the homeland, are the true patriotic heroes of Uzbekistan."

*2.* "Respected soldiers and sergeants, officers and generals! Servicemen and veterans of our Armed Forces!"

*Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*
**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874
Volume 01, Issue 06, September, 2025
**Website:** usajournals.org


In the first example, the word *servicemen* (*harbiylarimiz*) functions as a lexical unit expressing generality and wholeness. It encompasses all those serving in the military, denoting a broad, comprehensive concept. In the second example, lexical items such as *soldiers*, *sergeants*, *officers*, *generals*, and *servicemen of our Armed Forces* are used as hyponyms of the general concept *servicemen*, functioning as its more specific subdivisions. These lexemes specify ranks and positions of military personnel, thus emphasizing particularity within the language of the field.

The definitions of these lexemes are as follows:

- **Serviceman (harbiy)** — a person serving in the army; one engaged in military affairs. *Example: "No one responded with the agility characteristic of servicemen." (Shuhrat, Shinelli yillar)*
- **Soldier (askar)** — a person in military service. *Example: "...a group of parents came to learn about the lives of soldiers in the Kashkadarya region." (From a newspaper)*
- **Sergeant (serjant)** — a rank given to junior commanders in the military, police, or militia, and a person holding this rank. *Example: "A sergeant was firing alongside me." (Aydin, Stories)*
- **Officer (ofitser)** — a member of the officer corps in the armed forces, police, or gendarmerie. *Example: "The colonel checked the combat readiness of soldiers and officers." (A. Qahhor, Golden Star)*
- **General (general)** — a rank given to members of the high command, and a person holding this rank. *Example: "The general entered the battalion commander's dugout with several other officers." (Oybek, The Sun Will Not Darken)*

It is evident that the lexeme *servicemen* is used in a general sense, encompassing all those in military service. At the same time, the other lexical units — *soldier*, *sergeant*, *officer*, and *general* — represent the specific, more concrete layers of this general concept.

In addition, partonymic (whole–part) relations also play an important role in linguistics. These relations express the connection between a whole and its constituent parts. However, lexical units formed on the basis of partonymic relations differ from paradigms representing hyperonymic-hyponymic relations.

*Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*
**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874
Volume 01, Issue 06, September, 2025
**Website:** usajournals.org


While hyperonym-hyponym relations determine the generality and hierarchy of meanings among lexical units, partonymic relations demonstrate the syntactic and semantic connection between a whole and its parts.

For instance, the word *military* (*harbiy*) when used as a personal noun expresses the concept of a whole category. However, when the same word is used as an adjective or attribute (e.g., *military unit*, *military field*, *military troops*), its lexical-semantic system cannot form stable paradigms. This is because such words acquire different meanings depending on the context and, in speech situations, take on occasional (context-dependent) meanings.

For example, when used as a personal noun, the word *military* may denote servicemen: *"A group of military personnel took part in the event"* (From a newspaper). In another context, however, *military* functions as an adjective, combining with nouns denoting objects, places, or qualities: *military aircraft*, *military uniform*, *military base*. This indicates that the paradigmatic chains of the word are not consistently fixed.

In conclusion, the interconnection between generality and specificity in our language, as well as the distinctive nature of hyperonymic and partonymic relations, enriches the vocabulary and provides a solid foundation for the systematic study of domain-specific lexis. These relations help to identify the paradigmatic system of lexical units, revealing the complexity of their semantic layers and their dependence on context. As a result, the hypo–hyperonymic series in the language appear as an important factor reflecting the richness of the lexicon and the vocabulary of specialized discourse. This, in turn, creates new opportunities for the in-depth and systematic study of specialized vocabulary and for the comprehensive structuring of its system.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Safarova R. Leksik-semantik munosabatning turlari. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1996. b-4.
2. Сафарова Р. "Гипонимия в узбекском языке (на материале общеупотребительных зоонимов)". АВТОРЕФЕРАТ диссертатции на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Тошкент:1990

*Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy*
**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874
Volume 01, Issue 06, September, 2025
**Website:** usajournals.org


3. Sayfullayeva R. va boshqalar. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. Darslik. Toshkent. 2010. b-117.
4. Jamolxonov X. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. Darslik. Toshkent. 2005. b-125.
5. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati. (keyingi o‘rinlarda O‘TIL tarzida beriladi) 5-jild. Toshkent. “O‘zbekiston nashriyoti”. 2020. b-508.