ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

THE SEMANTIC FIELD OF THE LEXEMES "UYAT" (SHAME) AND "OR-NOMUS" (HONOUR)
(Based on the Novels "O'tkan kunlar" (Bygone Days) and "Mehrobdan chayon" (The Scorpion from the Altar))

Rahmonova Madinabonu Habibulla kizi
2nd-year student, Faculty of Humanities and Languages,
Kokand State University
Scientific supervisor: **A.A. Xasanov,**
PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24279766

Abstract. The article briefly outlines the theoretical foundations of field theory in F. de Saussure's views and offers a comparative study of the semantic field of the lexemes "uyat" (shame) and "or-nomus" (honour) based on Abdulla Qodiriy's novels "O'tkan kunlar" (Bygone Days) and "Mehrobdan chayon" (The Scorpion from the Altar). The dictionary meanings of the lexemes are identified, their uses in the novels are classified into semantic groups according to context, and the core and periphery of the semantic field are determined. The analysis shows that in Qodiriy's works shame and honour appear not only as personal feelings but also as social judgement and a national-cultural norm.
Keywords: field theory, semantic field, syntagmatic relations, associative relations, shame, honour, core, periphery, contextual analysis, national-cultural norm.

Аннотация. В статье кратко освещаются теоретические основы теории поля во взглядах Ф. де Соссюра и в сопоставительном аспекте исследуется семантическое поле лексем «uyat» (стыд) и «or-nomus» (честь) на материале романов Абдуллы Кадыри «Минувшие дни» и «Скорпион из алтаря». Определены значения лексем в толковом словаре, контексты их употребления в романах распределены по смысловым группам, выделены ядро и периферия семантического поля. Анализ показывает, что в произведениях Кадыри стыд и честь выступают не только как личное чувство, но и как общественная оценка и национально-культурная норма.
Ключевые слова: теория поля, семантическое поле, синтагматические отношения, ассоциативные отношения, стыд, честь, ядро, периферия, контекстуальный анализ, национально-культурная норма.

Today, field theory occupies an important place in the research of linguists worldwide in addressing issues related to lexical and grammatical features. In linguistics, the concept of a field denotes a particular system of language units that are interrelated in terms of a common meaning or function. Such units do not exist in isolation; rather, by entering into relations with one another, they form an integral semantic or functional system. For example, words such as "kecha" (yesterday), "bugun" (today), "ertaga" (tomorrow), "hozir" (now) and "avval" (before) unite in a single semantic field on the basis of the general notion of time.

The concept of a field manifests itself in language as a complex mechanism. The roots of this view can be traced in the scholarly works of F. de Saussure. Describing syntagmatic and associative relations, the scholar writes: "Syntagmatic relations between words are characteristic of speech. Since words in speech are linked to one another, they enter into relations based on the linear nature of language, which excludes the possibility of pronouncing two elements at the same time. Associative relations, by contrast, lie outside the process of speech and consist in the grouping in memory of words that share a common feature" [1, p. 21].

In a syntagmatic relation, language units follow one another in the course of speech and enter into grammatical and semantic links. For example, in the sentence “Men kitob o‘qidim” (I read a book), the units “men” (I), “kitob” (book) and “o‘qidim” (read) are connected with each other and express a complete meaning. Associative relations, on the other hand, express the connection of language units in human memory according to their meaning, form or other common features: when the word “kitob” (book) is heard, units such as “daftar” (notebook), “jurnal” (magazine), “gazeta” (newspaper) and “darslik” (textbook) also come to mind. Such relations are not directly manifested in speech; they arise through the connection of units in the mind. These views of Saussure served as an important theoretical basis for the formation of field theory.

Field theory was later developed consistently in German linguistics. J. Trier interpreted the lexical field as a system of words that divide up a conceptual sphere, showing that the meaning of each word is determined by its relations with neighbouring words in the field. W. Porzig, relying on the regularities of the co-occurrence of words in speech, put forward the idea of syntagmatic fields. Thus, the paradigmatic and syntagmatic approaches took shape as the two main directions of field theory. In Uzbek linguistics, too, lexical-semantic groups, synonymic series and their realisation in speech have been studied on the basis of field theory.

A semantic field is a set of units united on the basis of a common semantic feature, the integral seme. The core of the field is the central part that expresses the integral seme fully and clearly, while the periphery is the outer part, connected to the core, that expresses the principal seme weakly, additionally or figuratively.

The aim of the study is to determine the semantic field of the lexemes “uyat” and “or-nomus”, to compare their use in the two novels, and to reveal the facets of their meaning on the basis of the literary text. In line with this aim, the following tasks were set: to identify the meanings of the lexemes in the explanatory dictionary; to collect instances of their use in the texts of the novels; to classify them into semantic groups according to context; and to determine the core and periphery of the semantic field. Abdulla Qodiriy’s novels “O‘tkan kunlar” and “Mehrobdan chayon” were chosen as the object of the study, and the methods of contextual and componential analysis were used.

The “Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language” records the following meanings of the lexeme “uyat” [2, p. 314]: 1) a feeling of embarrassment over one’s own deed or inappropriate behaviour; 2) an act or behaviour that does not conform to, or contradicts, the requirements of morality, manners and custom: Sanam xola ishq-muhabbatni qattiq uyat hisoblar edi (Aunt Sanam considered love a grave shame); 3) shameful, disgraceful; 4) used to emphasise a shameful act, behaviour or situation: Duduqlanma, buyruq bajarildimi yo‘qmi? Uyat! (Stop stammering – was the order carried out or not? Shame!) As can be seen, the dictionary gives the meaning “a feeling of embarrassment” as primary, while the meanings “behaviour contrary to morality” and “emphasising a situation” come later.

The dictionary records two meanings of the lexeme “or” [3, p. 131]: 1) a feeling of embarrassment or shame over a deed or thing considered unworthy of oneself: Xato qilmoq bordir, tuzatmaslik ordir (Making a mistake is natural; failing to correct it is a disgrace); 2) prestige, pride: Sen mening chin yorimsan, Dilda yo‘g‘u borimsan, G‘am nomusu orimsan (You are my true beloved, all that my heart has, my care, my honour and my pride). Thus, in its first meaning “or” comes close to the lexeme “uyat”, while in its second meaning it is linked to the notion of a person’s prestige and dignity. This shows that the two lexemes intersect within one semantic field.

The lexemes “uyat” and “or-nomus” form a broad synonymic series in Uzbek. This series includes words such as “hayo” (modesty), “sharm” (bashfulness), “andisha” (scruple, considerateness), “iymanish” (diffidence), “hijolat” (embarrassment), “nomus” (honour), “oriyat” (self-respect) and “hamiyat” (sense of honour). All of them are united by the feeling of measuring one’s own behaviour against the norms of the community and of guarding oneself against

humiliation or condemnation. At the same time, “uyat”, “hayo” and “hijolat” mostly express a person’s inner state, whereas “or”, “nomus” and “oriyat” express his or her worth in the eyes of the community. This difference is also clearly seen in their use in the novels.

In the novel “O‘tkan kunlar”, the lexemes “uyat” and “or”, as well as their field-mates such as “uyalmoq” (to be ashamed), “iymanmoq” (to be diffident), “ta’na” (reproach) and “xo‘rlik” (humiliation), are used in various meanings in the speech of characters such as Kumush, Mirzakarim the merchant (qutidor) and Oftob oyim, as well as in the author’s narration. According to context, each lexeme was divided into three semantic groups.

In the first group, shame manifests itself directly as a feeling. Kumush, lying ill, is described thus: “...her clear white face, like the full moon, had turned slightly red, as if she were ashamed before someone...” [5, p. 28]. Here, being ashamed appears not as a permanent virtue of modesty but as a feeling arising in response to a situation. The author conveys it through an outward sign – blushing – while the comparative particle “kabi” (as if) presents this sign as a possibility rather than naming it definitively.

In the second group, shame is interpreted as a communal norm. After To‘ybeka’s words, Kumush cries out, and the text says: “The mothers took Kumushbibi’s cry for bashfulness” [5, p. 50]. Although the true cause of the cry is grief over a forced marriage, the mothers call it “being ashamed” and thereby turn the situation into one that is normative for the community and befitting a girl’s behaviour.

In the third group, shame appears in the sense of reticence through its synonym “iymanmoq”: “The merchant could not understand at all the words that Ziyo shohichi spoke with a smile, and was too diffident to ask the unexpected guests the reason for their visit” [5, p. 64]. The merchant hesitates to ask the guests, who have suddenly come as matchmakers, why they have come. Through this situation, the writer reveals, in the image of Mirzakarim the merchant, the national etiquette connected with respect for guests.

It can be seen that Qodiriy depicts shame not only as an inner feeling but also as a sign that is read and interpreted by the community. The outward sign (blushing, a cry) and its cultural interpretation (being ashamed) do not always coincide. For this reason, the lexeme “uyalmoq” expresses in the field not only an inner state but also a social interpretation.

In the novel, the concept of or-nomus appears first and foremost as a social judgement. The merchant says: “We will not make reproach our son-in-law... if people say ‘he gave her to a stranger’, let them say it” [5, p. 46]. In this example, or-nomus is presented as the judgement of the community, and the father, rejecting the reproach of the community, puts his daughter’s happiness first. In the second example: “...after searching for years for a suitable son-in-law, the humiliation of finally giving her to a stranger from Tashkent was hard for Oftob oyim” [5, p. 46]. Here “xo‘rlik” (humiliation) expresses the inner, psychological side of having one’s honour trampled in front of people.

The third example is connected with the wedding ceremony: the bride, “...although she wished to answer at once, fearing the people’s reproach ‘She must have been born dead’, does not answer” [5, p. 58]. By custom, a girl gives her consent not immediately but only after the third time she is asked. Here or-nomus appears in the sense of fearing the reproach of the community, and the writer depicts it with subtle irony.

In the novel “Mehrobdan chayon”, three different uses of the lexeme “uyat” were also observed. In the first, it serves as a means of rebuke: “Aren’t you ashamed? Wash your hands, wash them! I call your little brothers children, but you outdo even them!” [4, p. 6]. Here “uyat” is close to the fourth dictionary meaning and is used as a rebuke urging observance of manners and cleanliness.

In the second example, shame expresses the embarrassment and reticence characteristic of girls: “Ra’no raised her head, smiled and turned her face aside...” [4, p. 106]. Ra’no cannot openly

express her consent, while Anvar, in the course of the dialogue, firmly insists that being ashamed is out of place in this situation. In the third example, Solih maxdum reflects on giving Ra'no in marriage to Anvar: "...what is there to blame? Being an orphan is no fault..." [4, p. 53]. Here the words "ayb" (fault) and "malomat" (blame) are used as field-mates of the lexeme "uyat".

The concept of or-nomus is also revealed in several facets in the novel. In the sentence "Thank you and your comrades for your sense of honour" [4, p. 229], the word "hamiyat" denotes the feeling of keeping one's honour and dignity pure. In the sentence "...whose heart would not be pierced by the cry of an oppressed woman whose honour has been violated?" [4, p. 131], "nomus" appears in the sense of a woman's personal honour and chastity, that is, in the gravest, moral meaning of the concept.

In the third example, Sultonali says cunningly: "Mirzo Anvar has committed a dishonourable betrayal against His Highness" [4, p. 223]. Here the word "nomussizona" (dishonourably) turns Anvar's step for the sake of love into "betrayal" from the point of view of court law. Hence, the concept of or-nomus is used here as a weapon for accusing a person and condemning him before the community.

The results of the analysis are summarised in the table below.

Table. Semantic groups of the lexemes "uyat" and "or-nomus" in the novels

Lexeme	**"O'tkan kunlar"**	**"Mehrobdan chayon"**	**Position in the field**
uyat	embarrassment, blushing (Kumush)	embarrassment, reticence (Ra'no)	core
uyat	interpretation as a communal norm (the mothers)	rebuke urging good manners	periphery
uyat	diffidence, reticence (the merchant)	fault, blame (Solih maxdum)	periphery
or-nomus	reproach, standing in the community (the merchant)	sense of honour, dignity	core
or-nomus	humiliation – inner experience (Oftob oyim)	a woman's honour and chastity	core – periphery
or-nomus	fear of reproach (wedding ceremony)	"nomussizona" – accusation (Sultonali)	periphery

The table shows that the core of the field of the lexeme "uyat" is formed by the seme "feeling of embarrassment", which is also given as primary in the dictionary. The periphery contains the semes of interpretation as a communal norm, reticence, rebuke, and fault and blame. At the core of the "or-nomus" field stand the semes "dignity, worth, prestige", while fear of reproach and the accusation of "dishonour" make up the periphery.

In conclusion, the lexemes "uyat" and "or-nomus" intersect within one semantic field in Qodiriy's novels and complement each other: shame mostly expresses a person's inner experience, while honour expresses his or her worth in the eyes of the community. In "O'tkan kunlar" these concepts appear mainly in connection with family relations, marriage and wedding customs, whereas in "Mehrobdan chayon" they acquire socio-political content and also become a means of accusing a person in the court environment. In both novels, shame and honour are not limited to personal feelings but are interpreted as social judgement and a national-cultural norm. This confirms that these lexemes express important moral values in the worldview of the Uzbek people.

References

1. Соссюр Ф. де. Курс общей лингвистики / Пер. с франц. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2004.
2. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati [Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language]. In 5 vols. Vol. 4. – Tashkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2020.
3. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati [Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language]. In 5 vols. Vol. 3. – Tashkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2020.
4. Qodiriy A. Mehrobdan chayon [The Scorpion from the Altar]: a novel. – Tashkent: Sharq, 2018.
5. Qodiriy A. O‘tkan kunlar [Bygone Days]: a novel. – Tashkent: Navro‘z, 2019.