SCIENCE AND INNOVATION
INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL VOLUME 5 ISSUE 5 MAY 2026
ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

HYPER-HYPONYMIC AND EQUONYMIC RELATIONS IN THE SYSTEM OF LEXEMES DENOTING ANIMAL NAMES

Y. Karshibayeva
Doctoral Student, Department of Uzbek Linguistics, Gulistan State University
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20078995

Abstract*. This article focuses on issues of Uzbek linguistics, particularly hyper-hyponymic and equonymic relations in the system of lexemes denoting animal names and their functioning within the lexical system of the Uzbek language. The article analyzes hyper-hyponymic and equonymic relations among lexemes expressing animal names. Animal names serve as the illustrative material of the study. The analysis shows that in Uzbek, especially in folk speech, many animal names are differentiated according to sex, age, and biological function. Such lexical distinctions demonstrate the richness of the Uzbek language and reveal systematic semantic relations between general and specific names. The study also refers to examples from Alisher Navoi's* Muhokamat ul-lug'atayn*, Mahmud Kashgari's* Devonu lug'otit-turk*, and materials from folk speech. The findings confirm that animal names in Uzbek actively form hypernymic, hyponymic, and equonymic relations.*

Keywords: *lexis, lexeme, hypernym, hyponym, antonym, antonymy, equonym, equonymy, genus, species.*

Introduction

In Uzbek folk speech, especially among pastoral communities, special lexical units are used to express the sex and age of animals. The Eliboy people, who are livestock-breeding people, use the suffix **-jin** added to the root of a word denoting equal age in order to express the sex of animals in speech. For example, the meaning "a male horse between two and three years old," which in literary Uzbek is expressed by a phrase, is expressed in folk speech by a single word: **g'o'non**. A female horse of the same age is called **g'o'najin**. Similarly, the meaning "a four-year-old horse" in literary Uzbek is expressed in folk speech by **do'nan**, while a female horse of the same age, a mare, is called **do'najin**.

In the relation between **g'o'non** and **g'o'najin**, the lexeme **yilqi** "horse/cattle of the horse kind" functions as a hypernymic lexical unit, while **g'o'non** and **g'o'najin** are its hyponyms and, at the same time, equonyms. In this relation, the lexemes **g'o'non** and **g'o'najin** are opposed only by one semantic feature: **g'o'non** expresses maleness, whereas **g'o'najin** expresses femaleness.

Alisher Navoi, in his work *Muhokamat ul-lug'atayn*, compares the Uzbek and Persian languages and emphasizes that in Persian the word for "wild boar" is not divided according to sex and is expressed by a single word. In Uzbek, however, this animal is differentiated by sex: the male wild boar is called **qobon**, and the female wild boar is called **megajin**. Navoi considers this to be evidence of the richness of the Uzbek language. Even today, in folk speech, the word **qobon** is used for a male wild boar, while **megajin** is used for a female wild boar.

Navoi writes that in the hunting of wild boar, the male is called **qobon**, the female is called **megajin**, and the young one is called **cho'rpa**. Today, this distinction is not always sufficiently observed in the literary language. The concept of sex is often expressed not by a single word but by a word combination. The hypernym of the hyponyms **qobon** and **megajin** is the lexeme

to‘ng‘iz “wild boar/pig.” The relation between the hyponyms **qobon** and **megajin** forms equonyms.

Methods

This article uses a descriptive and lexical-semantic analysis method. The main focus is placed on hyper-hyponymic and equonymic relations in the system of animal-name lexemes in Uzbek. Examples are taken from folk speech, Alisher Navoi’s *Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn*, Mahmud Kashgari’s *Devonu lug‘otit-turk*, and linguistic studies devoted to the expression of sex in animal names.

In the analysis, a **hypernym** is understood as a general lexical unit that includes a broader category, while a **hyponym** is a lexical unit that denotes a specific member or type within that general category. **Equonyms** are lexical units that are united under one common hypernym and are mutually related as coordinate members of the same semantic class. For example, under the hypernym **it** “dog,” the lexemes **arlon** “male dog” and **qanchiq/qanjiq** “female dog” function as hyponyms and equonyms.

Results

Hyper-Hyponymic and Equonymic Relations in Navoi’s Work

In *Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn*, Alisher Navoi presents several examples of animal names differentiated according to sex. He writes that in hunting terminology, some animal names are clearly distinguished in Turkic speech. For example, the male of **kiyik** “deer” is called **huna**, while the female is called **qilchoqchi**. Another type, **suyqu** “horned deer,” has the male form **bug‘u** and the female form **maral**. According to Navoi, Persian-Tajik uses only general words such as **ohu** and **gavazn**, without such detailed distinctions.

Thus, Navoi names a number of animal terms by differentiating them according to sex. This means that in old Uzbek, the concept of sex was clearly distinguished, and each sex had its own special name. In the examples taken from *Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn*, the lexemes **huna** and **qilchoqchi** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **kiyik**, while **bug‘u** and **maral** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **suyqu**.

Gender Distinction in Folk Speech

In recent times, an interesting tendency has appeared in the speech of young people, especially in connection with the word **kuchuk** “dog.” Many young people, when referring to the sex of a dog, use expressions such as **o‘g‘il bola kuchuk** “boy dog” and **qiz bola kuchuk** “girl dog.” From the point of view of speech norms and logic, such usage is questionable. In folk speech, the male dog is called **arlon**, and the female dog is called **qanchiq**.

Similarly, the camel, which played an important role in the life and lifestyle of our ancestors, also has sex-specific names in folk speech. The male camel is called **nor**, while the female camel is called **moda**. Therefore, **arlon** and **qanchiq** are hyponyms of the hypernym **kuchuk** and, in this relation, become equonyms. The same situation can be observed in the lexemes **nor** and **moda**, which are hyponyms of the hypernym **tuya** “camel.”

The analysis of Alisher Navoi’s *Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn* and folk speech materials shows that both old Uzbek literary language and modern Uzbek contain many animal and human names that were historically differentiated according to sex.

Animal Names in Navoi’s *Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn* and Folk Speech

Hypernymic lexical unit	Equonymic lexical unit	Source	Meaning
yilqi	**g‘o‘non**	Folk speech	male horse between two and three years old
yilqi	**g‘o‘najin**	Folk speech	female horse between two and three years old
ot	**do‘nan**	Folk speech	four-year-old male horse
ot	**do‘najin**	Folk speech	four-year-old female horse
to‘ng‘iz	**qobon**	*Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn*	male wild boar/pig
to‘ng‘iz	**megajin**	*Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn*	female wild boar/pig
kuchuk	**arlon**	Folk speech	male dog
kuchuk	**qanchiq**	Folk speech	female dog
tuya	**nor**	Folk speech	male camel
tuya	**moda**	Folk speech	female camel

Gender Distinction in Historical Sources

Initial information about the fact that plants may also be differentiated according to sex is found in *Devonu lug‘otit-turk*. In explaining the word **sig‘un oti**, Mahmud Kashgari writes that it is a plant whose root grows in the shape of a human being. It was used to treat men who had become sexually weak. The Persians called it **satran**. It had male and female forms: men used the male form, while women used the female form.

M. Rasulova writes that the male of the bird called **qorayaloq** was called **mayna** because it sang beautifully, while the female was called **qorashaqshaq** based on its color. A. A’zam also notes that in Uzbek, even the sex of small birds such as **bedana** “quail,” **chumchuq** “sparrow,” and **so‘fito‘rg‘ay** was once differentiated by the words **mashak** and **majik**. However, only **mashak** has remained in the speech of quail keepers, while the others have mostly fallen into dictionaries.

The analysis of ancient Turkic and old Uzbek materials shows that many animal names were historically used differently according to sex. The following table presents male and female animal and bird names recorded in Mahmud Kashgari’s historical dictionary *Devonu lug‘otit-turk*.

Animal and Bird Names in *Devonu lug‘otit-turk*

Hypernymic lexical unit	Equonymic lexical unit	Meaning
it	**qanjiq**	female dog
it	**it**	male dog
echku	**taka**	male goat
echku	**erkach**	male goat
echku	**echku**	female goat
echku	**arqar**	female mountain goat
chetuk	**kok chetuk**	male cat

Hypernymic lexical unit	Equonymic lexical unit	Meaning
chetuk	**chetuk**	female cat
qoramol	**tishi tazun**	two-year-old female cattle
qoramol	**tazun**	two-year-old male cattle
tuya	**atan**	castrated camel
tuya	**bug‘ra**	male camel
tuya	**inan**	female camel
to‘ng‘iz	**qobon**	male pig
to‘ng‘iz	**mekachin**	female pig
kiyik	**huna**	male deer
kiyik	**qilchoqchi**	female deer
inak	**inak**	cow
inak	**ud**	cow
at	**azg‘ir**	stallion
at	**azg‘iraq**	stallion
at	**qulun**	stallion, foal
o‘rdak	**barchin**	female duck
o‘rdak	**moda**	female duck
o‘rdak	**nar**	male duck
qo‘y	**qoch, qochnar**	ram
qo‘y	**sovliq**	ewe

According to the Russian scholar N. K. Dmitriyev, the suffix **-chin** in ancient times served to form names denoting the female sex. Examples include **bildir-chin** “female nightingale,” **sigir-chin** “female starling,” **qoyer-chin**, originally meaning “female pigeon” and now meaning “pigeon” in general, **meler-chin** “a type of pear,” and **meker-chin** “female pig.”

In modern Uzbek and its dialects, there are animal names with the suffix **-jin/-chin** that express the meaning “female,” such as **g‘unajin**, **megajin**, and **do‘nojin**. Continuing N. K. Dmitriyev’s view, Professor E. Begmatov considers the suffix **-chin** in the female name **Barchin** to be a remnant of a female gender-forming element.

The analysis of modern Turkic languages shows that E. Begmatov’s opinion is well grounded. Words with the root **bar** express the meaning “bird” in many Turkic languages. For example, in modern Kyrgyz, **baarchi’n/barchin** means “hunting bird”; in Yakut, the phrase **bar kööl** means “eagle” and “mythical bird”; in Altai, **barintiči qush** means “bird of prey”; in Khakas, **parchi’x** means “starling”; and in Kazakh literary language, **barshi’n** means “an eagle older than ten years.”

Heteronymy and Synecdoche in the Expression of Gender

Linguistic literature also provides information about gender distinction through the lexical-semantic method called **heteronymy**. Heteronymy is defined as “linguistic suppletivism,” that is, the naming of objects that naturally form pairs or series through words derived from different roots.

In the system of cattle-breeding terminology, words such as **govemchak**, **ko‘remchak**, **chirtemchak**, and **biremchak**, formed through synecdoche and expressing the concept “female cattle,” are encountered. These lexical units are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **qoramol** or **sigir** “cattle/cow.”

In meaning transfer through synecdoche, words such as **mo‘ylov** “mustache” and **soqol** “beard” may express the meaning “man.” For example: “I ... we,” said the mustache. In this case, **mo‘ylov** and **soqol** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **erkak** “man/male.”

In expressing the sex of animals, words such as **erkak** “male” and **urg‘ochi** “female” are used. For birds, the words **nar**, **moda**, and **makiyon** are used.

Although animal and bird names generally have a common gender category, in some names gender differentiation can be observed. In addition to the general name of a species, there are special names used separately for females and males: for camel, **nortuya** and **moya**; for horse, **ayg‘ir**, **axta**, **biya**, and **baytal**; for cattle, **ho‘kiz**, **buqa**, **novvos**, **juvona**, **sigir**, **g‘unajin**, **govmish**, **tana**, and dialectal **qochar**; for donkey, **hangi** and **mocha**; for sheep, **qo‘chqor**, **sovliq**, and **to‘qli**; for dog, **ko‘ppak**, **arlon**, and **qanjiq**; for pig, **to‘ng‘iz** and **megajin**; for goat, **taka** and **echki**; and for chicken, **xo‘roz** and **makiyon**.

In the examples above, **nortuya** and **moya** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **tuya**; **hangi** and **mocha** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **eshak** “donkey”; **qo‘chqor** and **sovliq** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **qo‘y** “sheep”; **arlon** and **qanjiq** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **it** “dog”; **to‘ng‘iz** and **megajin** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **cho‘chqa** “pig”; **taka** and **echki** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **echki** “goat”; and **xo‘roz** and **makiyon** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **tovuq** “chicken.”

Likewise, **ayg‘ir**, **axta**, **biya**, and **baytal** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **ot** “horse.” The words **ho‘kiz**, **buqa**, **novvos**, **juvona**, **sigir**, **g‘unajin**, **govmish**, **tana**, and dialectal **qochar** are hyponyms and equonyms of the hypernym **qoramol** “cattle.” These lexical units are considered equonymic lexical units because they are united under one common hypernym.

Discussion

The analysis shows that animal-name lexemes in Uzbek demonstrate a highly developed system of semantic classification. These lexemes are not limited to naming animals in a general way. Rather, they often express additional semantic features such as sex, age, biological role, and cultural importance.

The existence of such pairs as **qobon–megajin**, **arlon–qanchiq**, **nor–moda**, **g‘o‘non–g‘o‘najin**, and **do‘nan–do‘najin** proves that Uzbek has historically possessed a rich lexical system for distinguishing male and female animals. These lexical units show hyper-hyponymic relations because they are subordinated to a broader general name. At the same time, they show equonymic relations because they stand side by side under the same hypernym.

The material from Alisher Navoi’s *Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn* is especially important because it demonstrates that such distinctions existed in old Uzbek literary language and were considered a sign of lexical richness. Navoi’s comparison of Uzbek and Persian shows that Uzbek had more precise lexical means for expressing animal sex in certain cases.

The examples from *Devonu lug‘otit-turk* also confirm that the differentiation of animal names according to sex was deeply rooted in ancient Turkic. The presence of special names for male and female animals, birds, and even plants demonstrates that this semantic system has a long historical basis.

The role of affixes such as **-jin** and **-chin** is also significant. These affixes historically participated in forming names connected with female sex. Their traces can still be seen in words such as **g‘unajin**, **megajin**, and **do‘nojin**. This indicates continuity between ancient Turkic, old Uzbek, and modern Uzbek lexical systems.

Modern usage, however, shows some weakening of this traditional lexical knowledge. Expressions such as “boy dog” and “girl dog” in the speech of young people indicate that some traditional animal-sex terms are being forgotten or replaced by descriptive word combinations. From a linguistic point of view, this shows the need to preserve and study such lexemes as part of Uzbek lexical heritage.

Conclusion

In conclusion, hyper-hyponymic and equonymic relations are actively used in the system of lexemes denoting animal names in the Uzbek language. Animal names form semantic groups in which a general lexical unit functions as a hypernym, while sex-, age-, or function-specific names function as hyponyms. These hyponyms, when united under the same hypernym, become equonymic lexical units.

The analysis of folk speech, Alisher Navoi’s *Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn*, Mahmud Kashgari’s *Devonu lug‘otit-turk*, and linguistic studies shows that Uzbek has historically had a rich and systematic vocabulary for naming animals according to sex and other semantic features. Such lexemes reflect not only linguistic structure but also the lifestyle, culture, livestock-breeding traditions, and worldview of the Uzbek people.

Therefore, the study of animal-name lexemes is important for Uzbek lexicology, semasiology, historical linguistics, and the preservation of national linguistic heritage.

REFERENCES

1. Akhmanova, O. S. (1969). *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms*. Moscow, p. 98.
2. Alisher Navoi. (2013). *Complete Collection of Works: In Ten Volumes. Volume 10. Muhokamat ul-lug‘atayn*. Tashkent: G‘afur G‘ulom Publishing House, p. 516.
3. Ahmad A’zam. *Tilda machchoyi sayl*. ziyo.uz.
4. Begmatov, E. A. (1972). The expression of the concept of gender in names. In *Spelling of Uzbek Names: Issues of Writing in Russian*. Tashkent, p. 372.
5. Dmitriyev, N. K. (1952). On the category of grammatical gender in the Azerbaijani language. *Proceedings of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences*, Issue 40. Moscow, p. 99.
6. Kashgari, M. (1960). *Devonu lug‘otit-turk*. Volume I. Tashkent, p. 388.
7. Rasulova, M. I. (1997). The expression of the concept of gender in animal names. *Public Education*, 1. Tashkent, p. 119.
8. *Russian-Altai Dictionary*. (1964). Moscow, p. 615.
9. To‘ychiyev, B. (2013). The expression of the concept of gender in folk speech. *Uzbek Language and Literature*, 1. Tashkent, p. 88.
10. Yudakhin, K. K. (1985). *Kyrgyz-Russian Dictionary*. Frunze, p. 89.
11. *Yakut-Russian Dictionary*. (1972). Moscow, p. 63.
12. *Khakas-Russian Dictionary*. (1953). Moscow, p. 144.
13. O‘rinova, O. T. (2007). *A Lexical-Semantic Study of Cattle-Breeding Terms in the Uzbek Language*. Candidate Dissertation in Philology. Tashkent, p. 63.
14. *Dictionary of the Kazakh Literary Language: In Fifteen Volumes. Volume II*. (2011). Almaty, p. 741.