ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 9| September 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

UDK:301.085:16 .(045)

THE SEMANTIC STRUCTURE AND USAGE OF CHARACTER-DESCRIPTIVE LEXEMES

Bobozaripova Malohat Ergash qizi
2nd-year Doctoral Student, Navoi State University

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the semantic structure, usage, and linguistic characteristics of character-descriptive lexemes in the Uzbek language. In the study, lexical units denoting human character and behavior are considered as tools for reflecting psychological traits, personality, moral values, and social conduct. The denotative, connotative, and functional semes of these lexemes are identified, and they are classified into positive, negative, and neutral groups. Furthermore, contextual usage, stylistic functions, and evaluative aspects in various texts are examined. The article systematizes simple, compound, derived, and phraseological forms of such lexemes, highlighting their discursive and aesthetic roles. The author also substantiates the possibilities of representing these lexemes in a thesaurus system, emphasizing their relevance for semasiological, cognitive, and linguocultural research in linguistics. The findings demonstrate the semantic load of these lexemes in modern texts, their participation in synonym–antonym paradigms, as well as their role in phraseological units, thereby justifying the need for further systematic investigation within Uzbek linguistics (Shcherba, 1940; Rahmatullayev, 1982; Lukashevich, 2011).

KEYWORDS: *Lexeme, Sememe, Sema, Denotative Sema, Connotative Sema, Functional Sema, Positive Character Traits, Negative Character Traits, Neutral Character Traits, Semantic Field, Connotation, Evaluation, Synonym–Antonym Paradigms, Phraseological Units, Thesaurus.*

INTRODUCTION

Language serves as one of the primary tools through which human character, behavior, and social values are expressed. Within this framework, character-descriptive lexemes occupy a significant place in the Uzbek linguistic system, as they not only denote psychological and moral qualities but also reflect the cultural and social worldview of the people. These lexemes embody both objective denotations and subjective evaluations, thereby functioning as key units in the interplay between semantics, pragmatics, and stylistics.

The study of character-descriptive lexemes has long attracted the attention of linguists, particularly in relation to their semantic structure, evaluative connotations, and functional roles in communication. In Uzbek linguistics, pioneering contributions by scholars such as Sh. Rahmatullayev, I. Qo‘chqortoyev, and R. Yunusov established the componential approach to lexical meaning, highlighting that meanings are not monolithic but composed of interrelated semes. This theoretical perspective provided the basis for the development of semasiology and shaped subsequent research into the layered and context-dependent nature of meaning.

At the same time, adjectives and other lexemes denoting character traits play an essential role in the depiction of human personality in literature, folklore, and everyday speech. They are employed not only to convey positive and negative qualities but also to express nuanced, context-dependent evaluations. Their usage demonstrates the flexibility of language in encoding moral norms, cultural ideals, and social judgments, while also enriching discourse with aesthetic and stylistic functions.

Given the dynamic role of such lexemes, a systematic analysis of their semantic structure, contextual usage, and functional load is essential. This research, therefore, aims to classify character-descriptive lexemes into positive, negative, and neutral groups, explore their denotative, connotative, and functional semes, and examine their discursive and evaluative functions across various text types. Moreover, the study emphasizes the potential of thesaurus-based modeling as a means of systematizing these lexemes for broader semasiological, cognitive, and linguocultural investigations.

Character-descriptive lexemes are generally used to denote qualities associated with the human psyche and personality. In the *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language*, a character-descriptive lexeme (*fe’l-atvor*) is defined as *“a person’s unique quality or character manifested in their attitude towards the environment and towards themselves”*. For example: *“A person’s character is his or her true value”* (from a newspaper); *“The behavior and character of a child partly reflect the identity of the parents”* (R. Usmonov, *Umr sabog‘i*).

The group of character-descriptive lexemes includes such words as *abjir* (nimble), *ayyor* (cunning), *badfe’l* (ill-natured), *badjahl* (hot-tempered), *bexulq* (ill-mannered), *badnafs* (greedy), *badrashk* (spiteful), *balandparvoz* (pretentious), *battol* (vile), *vazmin* (composed), *vaysaqi* (garrulous), *vatanparvar* (patriotic), *vafodor* (loyal), *daydi* (wanderer), *dangasa* (lazy), *yebto‘ymas* (gluttonous), *ochofat* (voracious), *parishonxotir* (absent-minded), *yovvoyi* (wild), *zabardast* (vigorous), *zakiy* (intelligent), *kamgap* (taciturn), among others.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 9| September 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

From this, it can be inferred that the concepts of *fe'l-atvor* (character) and *xarakter* (personality/character) largely overlap, conveying nearly identical meanings. When analyzed syntactically, *fe'l-atvor* functions similarly to attributes of character, and thus appears as an adjective in the sentence. For instance: *mehribon ona* (kind mother), *vijdonli yigit* (conscientious young man), *oliyjanob kishi* (noble person), *badfe'l ayol* (ill-natured woman), *tentak bola* (foolish child).

In the 1940s and 1950s, many scholars put forward ideas about the component structure of lexical meaning. Among the world's leading scholars who studied adjectives, G. Haller and J. Makkis classified the semantic components of meaning according to degree and rank.

In Uzbek linguistics, Sh. Rahmatullayev, I. Qo'chqortoyev, and R. Yunusov were among the first to propose that lexical meaning consists of components. Later, large-scale works devoted to the study of lexical components began to emerge, and semasiology gradually took its place in almost all areas of linguistics

In the history of Uzbek linguistics, the ideas of Shavkat Rahmatullayev, I. Qo'chqortoyev, and R. Yunusov occupy a special place. Their works were among the first to substantiate the notion that lexical meaning is not monolithic, but rather composed of interrelated components, each of which reflects a particular semantic nuance within the structure of the lexeme. This approach marked an important shift in Uzbek lexicological studies, as it emphasized the layered and systematic nature of meaning rather than perceiving it as a single undivided whole. By recognizing meaning as a multi-component structure, they contributed to the methodological foundation of semasiology in the national linguistic tradition.

In subsequent decades, numerous comprehensive studies were devoted to the detailed analysis of these semantic components. Such works examined lexical meaning not only in the context of individual words but also in relation to synonymic chains, antonymic oppositions, and phraseological structures. As a result, semasiology gradually took root and became an indispensable part of virtually all domains of linguistics, ranging from lexicography to stylistics and cognitive linguistics (Lukashevich, 2011). This expansion demonstrates the interdisciplinary nature of semasiological research and its ability to serve as a bridge between the structural, functional, and cognitive aspects of language.

Just as material objects are formed by the unity of form and content, a lexeme is likewise understood as a holistic entity consisting of both external and internal dimensions. The external side of a lexeme is termed *nomema*, which refers to the phonetic form — the cluster of speech sounds that constitutes the perceptible representation of the word. The internal side, by contrast, is the *semema*, which denotes the semantic content encoded in the lexeme. A semema reflects in human cognition the conceptual image of an object, property, or action and manifests this understanding through linguistic expression. Thus, the semema can be considered the internal essence of the lexeme, while the nomema serves as its material embodiment.

This dualistic structure of lexemes illustrates that language is not merely a formal system of sounds and signs but also a cognitive and cultural phenomenon that transmits human perception of reality. By differentiating between nomema and semema, linguistics gains a more precise framework for analyzing how external forms are linked to internal meanings, and how speakers map their experiential world onto linguistic units. Such an approach allows for deeper investigation into how meanings evolve, how they acquire connotations, and how they participate in communicative and stylistic functions across various types of discourse

In linguistics, the units that constitute the *semema* are referred to as *semes*. These semes form the internal semantic structure of a lexeme and are classified according to their nature into three fundamental types:

1. **Denotative sema (naming sema)** – the sema which directly relates a lexeme to the objective reality it denotes. It reflects the essential conceptual core of a word, serving as the basis for reference.
2. **Connotative sema (expressive sema)** – the sema that conveys the speaker's subjective attitude, evaluative or emotional shades, and associative meanings attached to the lexeme in addition to its denotative content.
3. **Functional sema (pragmatic sema)** – the sema that defines the role of the lexeme in language and speech, its syntagmatic relations, and its communicative function within discourse.

Denotative semes are primarily connected with objective reality, while connotative semes express the attitude of the speaker toward the referent, and functional semes determine the position and role of a lexeme in linguistic and speech contexts. Importantly, the expressive (connotative) sema often cannot be fully grasped outside of discourse; it becomes more salient and interpretable only within the framework of context[1].
For example, in Uzbek poetic and colloquial traditions, girls are metaphorically compared to *oy* (the moon), *moh* (a poetic synonym for moon), *quyosh* (the sun), *oltin* (gold), *kumush* (silver), *yoqut* (ruby), *gavhar* (pearl), or *gul* (flower). Similarly, boys are associated with *chinor* (plane tree), *burgut* (eagle), *arslon* (lion), and *sher* (tiger). Such figurative attributions arise from the expressive semes of the lexemes involved, which highlight beauty, delicacy, strength, or nobility, respectively.

Let us consider the following examples:

"Qo'lim tegmay to'kilgan qizg'aldog'im, Endi seni izlab qaydan toparman." (M. Yusuf)

Or: *"Kel, ovqatingni yeb ol, arslonim."* (H. Nozir)

[1] *O'zbek tilida insonning xarakter xususiyatlarini bildiruvchi sifatlar tahli. Arxiv.uz.*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 9| September 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

In these contexts, the moon (*moh*) symbolizes brightness and purity; the poppy (*qizg‘aldoq*) conveys fragility and delicateness, as suggested by its falling when touched; the lion (*arslon*) embodies strength and courage. Here, the transfer of meaning is grounded in expressive semes, which not only enrich the semantic structure of the lexeme but also deepen its evaluative and aesthetic functions in discourse.

Thus, denotative and expressive semes are always interrelated. Every expressive sema is rooted in a denotative sema, and the proper understanding of connotative meanings presupposes a clear grasp of the denotative core. Only by recognizing the primary referential meaning can one fully interpret the subtle evaluative and emotional shades conveyed through connotation.

Thus, the *denotative* and *expressive* semes of lexemes are in constant interaction. Every expressive sema originates from a denotative core, and therefore, the accurate interpretation of connotative meaning presupposes a clear understanding of the denotative base. Only by grasping the primary referential meaning of a word can one fully appreciate and correctly apply its subtle emotional and evaluative shades. This principle demonstrates the hierarchical relationship between the objective and subjective layers of meaning in lexical semantics (Shcherba, 1940; Rahmatullayev, 1982).

Almost all lexemes denoting character traits (*fe’l-atvor*) belong to the category of adjectives in Uzbek. Adjectives, as a grammatical class, primarily indicate the qualitative attributes of objects, phenomena, or actions. The notion of “quality” (*belgi*) is a broad one and encompasses such categories as character traits, colors, tastes, forms, weight and measure, among others. All of these categories are regarded as semantic subgroups within the system of adjectives, and each subgroup is based on specific semantic and grammatical features (Baranov, 2001; Mahkamov, 2011).

Character-descriptive adjectives in Uzbek can be classified structurally into four main types: **simple**, **compound**, **paired (juft)**, and **reduplicated (takror)** forms. Simple adjectives themselves are further divided into **basic (root)** and **derived** types.

1. **Basic adjectives denoting character traits** include: *dadil* (brave), *garang* (stunned), *go‘l* (naïve), *daydi* (wandering), *dangasa* (lazy), *jo‘n* (simple-minded), *zukko* (sharp), *ziyrak* (keen), *mechkay* (gluttonous), *merov* (wanderer), *nodon* (ignorant), *no‘noq* (clumsy), *odil* (just), *odmi* (ordinary), *oddiy* (simple), *ojiz* (weak), *olifta* (foppish), *samimiy* (sincere), *tajang* (quarrelsome), *tanbal* (sluggish), *tentak* (foolish), *teran* (profound), *tuyg‘un* (sensitive), *tetik* (vigorous), *yovvoyi* (wild), *to‘pori* (boorish), *xokisor* (humble), *shallaqi* (careless), *topag‘on* (resourceful), *chopag‘on* (nimble), *qopag‘on* (clumsy).
2. **Derived adjectives denoting character traits** are formed through affixation or other morphological processes and include: *aqlli* (intelligent), *kuchli* (strong), *yeyishli* (edible, gluttonous nuance in context), *ichishli* (drinkable), *bedin* (faithless), *beg‘ubor* (pure), *noinsof* (dishonest), *nomard* (cowardly), *noma’lum* (unknown), *nomunosib* (inappropriate), *kurashchan* (combative), *yashovchan* (resilient), *unutuvchan* (forgetful), *erinchoq* (indolent), *kuyinchak* (sensitive, sympathetic), *tortinchoq* (shy), *qizg‘anchiq* (stingy), *toparman* (resourceful), *bilarmon* (erudite), *yeyarmon* (voracious), *shartaki* (impetuous), *jirtaki* (impudent), *yig‘loqi* (tearful), *chiyildoq* (shrill), *bijildoq* (restless), *qishloqi* (rustic), *xalqparvar* (patriotic), *insonparvar* (humanist), *vatanparvar* (patriotic), *badaxloq* (ill-mannered), *badnafs* (greedy), *gapdon* (talkative), *bilimdon* (knowledgeable), *dilkash* (charming), *hazilkash* (humorous).
3. **Compound adjectives denoting character traits** consist of two or more roots combined into a single semantic whole, for example: *dilozor* (heart-breaking, offensive), *otashnafas* (fiery-spirited), *xomkalla* (foolish), *sho‘rpeshona* (ill-fated), *kaltafahm* (narrow-minded), *shirinsuxan* (sweet-spoken), *sho‘rtumshuq* (snappish), *balandparvoz* (pretentious), *otabezori* (troublemaker), *hozirjavob* (quick-witted), *kamgap* (taciturn), *kamsuxan* (quiet), *kamxarj* (frugal), *cho‘rtkesar* (blunt), *yebto‘ymas* (insatiable), *o‘zboshimcha* (self-willed), *tiryog‘lama* (flatterer), *tinchliksevar* (peace-loving), *o‘zbilarmon* (self-assured, know-it-all), *ikkiyuzlamachi* (hypocritical), *ochofat* (gluttonous).

This classification shows that character-descriptive adjectives form a wide and diverse semantic group, reflecting both inherited root forms and innovative derivations. Their productivity and diversity demonstrate the richness of the Uzbek language in naming psychological, moral, and social attributes of human beings. At the same time, the structural classification provides a methodological basis for their further analysis in the framework of lexicology, cognitive semantics, and thesaurus modeling (Hamroyeva, 2018; Eshmo‘minov, 2019).

Character-descriptive lexemes (*fe’l-atvor leksemalari*) represent an independent semantic group within the lexical system of the Uzbek language. These lexemes are primarily employed to denote human and animal behavior, ethical norms, intellectual capacity, and modes of social interaction, as well as to describe various traits related to personal character. In addition, such adjectives often extend their function to the description of the behavior or typical characteristics of objects and living beings, thereby broadening their semantic scope beyond human qualities

From a semantic perspective, character-descriptive lexemes are conventionally divided into three fundamental categories:

1. **Positive character traits.** These lexemes convey commendable, socially approved, and morally valued qualities. Examples include *muloyim* (gentle), *odobli* (well-mannered), *chapdast* (skillful), *chaqqon* (quick), *abjir* (nimble), *ziyrak* (keen), *mo‘min* (faithful), *sodiq* (loyal), *mohir* (expert), *pok* (pure), *sipo* (modest), *o‘ktam* (resolute), *quvonch* (joyful), *ozoda* (neat), *yaxshi* (good), *dadil* (brave), *xushmuomalali* (courteous), *rostgo‘y* (truthful). Such lexemes not only describe personal

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 9| September 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

virtues but also encode the cultural ideals of Uzbek society, reflecting what is regarded as admirable behavior.

2. **Negative character traits.** These lexemes denote unpleasant, socially disapproved, or morally condemned qualities. Frequently, they function as antonyms to positive character lexemes, highlighting contrasts in moral or psychological evaluation. Examples include *zolim* (oppressor, cruel), *nokas* (base, ignoble), *toshbag'ir* (stone-hearted), *shafqatsiz* (merciless), *ayyor* (cunning, sly), *muttaham* (swindler), *rasvo* (disgraceful), *ablah* (despicable), *dog'uli* (stained, dishonorable), *uquvsiz* (incapable), *o'jar* (stubborn). Such words explicitly express social rejection of particular traits, situating them within evaluative and normative frameworks (Lukashevich, 2011; Rasulov et al., 2010).
3. **Neutral character traits.** A significant group of lexemes describing human behavior cannot be unequivocally classified as positive or negative, since their semantic evaluation depends heavily on the discourse context. In some communicative situations, they may acquire a favorable connotation, while in others, the same lexemes may be perceived negatively. For instance, words like *sho'x* (playful), *mag'rur* (proud), *indamas* (silent), *sinchkov* (inquisitive), or *topqir* (resourceful) are semantically flexible. Depending on the speaker's intention and situational context, such traits may be reinterpreted either as socially desirable or undesirable. This fluidity illustrates the pragmatic and context-sensitive nature of evaluative semantics in Uzbek (Hamroyeva, 2018; Eshmo'minov, 2019).

Accordingly, character-descriptive lexemes should be analyzed not only as isolated lexical units but also through their **connotative features** and **contextual interpretations**. Their evaluative function in language enables them to serve as verbal expressions of cultural, social, and moral values. For this reason, in thesaurus modeling, such lexemes can be systematized into semantic domains reflecting moral, psychological, social, and intellectual categories, thus providing a structured representation of human character traits within the lexicon.

Positive and negative character traits can also be revealed through the description of a person's speech, intentions, or even physical attributes. For instance, G'afur G'ulom in his work portrays *Hoji bobo* as a person who, although somewhat verbose and prone to inventing proverbs on every occasion, was nevertheless generous and, at the same time, somewhat clumsy in financial matters: *"Although Hoji bobo was the type of man who would coin a proverb at every turn, he was open-handed enough, though somewhat awkward in calculations."* (G'. G'ulom). This example illustrates how evaluative features of character are often conveyed indirectly through description of habits, social behavior, or communicative style.

The third group of character-descriptive lexemes consists of those whose meanings cannot be unequivocally identified as either positive or negative. The evaluative value of such lexemes is largely determined by context, and their true semantic load can only be understood within discourse. For this reason, they are regarded as **neutral character-descriptive lexemes**.

Examples of this group include: *dovdir* (confused), *loqayd* (indifferent, apathetic), *sho'x* (playful, mischievous), *mahmadona* (conceited), *sinchkov* (inquisitive, meticulous), *mag'rur* (proud), *indamas* (silent), *o'jar* (stubborn), *shaddod* (hot-tempered), and *topqir* (quick-witted). These adjectives denote traits of individual or social behavior that, depending on the communicative situation, may be interpreted differently. For instance, what is considered stubbornness in one context may be valued as perseverance in another, thus highlighting the flexible and dynamic nature of these lexemes.

A clear example can be found in the adjective *loqayd*. In the phrase *loqayd odam* ("an indifferent person"), the word describes a negative quality — a person's negligence or disregard for others — and therefore functions as an evaluative lexeme expressing social and moral criticism. However, in the sentence *"Uni noo'rin koyishlariga ham loqayd turib berdi"* ("He remained indifferent even to their unjust reproaches"), the lexeme *loqayd* conveys a positive nuance, denoting inner strength, patience, and emotional stability. In this case, *loqayd* is reinterpreted as a marker of endurance and composure rather than negligence.

The polysemous nature of *loqayd* is also evident in its other uses, such as *beg'am* (carefree), *beparvo* (negligent), *betashvish* (unconcerned), or *sovuqqon* (cold-blooded, dispassionate). Consider the following literary examples:

a) *"Ko'ngling sezgan narsaga loqayd qarama, o'g'lim, tagiga yet." — "Do not treat lightly what your heart feels, my son; try to understand its depth."* (A. Muxtor)

b) *"U qabulxonada o'tirganlarga loqayd bir nazar tashladi-da, tez yurib, koridorga chiqdi." — "He cast an indifferent glance at those sitting in the waiting room, then walked quickly into the corridor."* (S. Ahmad)

In the first example, the lexeme has a negative evaluative meaning, expressing disregard or negligence, while in the second example, it conveys a neutral, descriptive meaning closer to "detached" or "reserved." This demonstrates how the connotative interpretation of such lexemes is context-bound and cannot be fixed to a single evaluative polarity.

a) *"Do not look indifferently at what your heart senses, my son; try to reach its essence."* (A. Muxtor) b) *"He cast an indifferent glance at those sitting in the waiting room, then quickly walked out into the corridor."* (S. Ahmad)

In both examples, the lexeme *loqayd* conveys distinct meanings depending on the discourse context. In the first case, the word expresses a **negative evaluation**, pointing to carelessness or negligence toward something significant. Here, the lexeme functions as a marker of undesirable behavior, indicating disregard for one's intuition or responsibility. In the second case, however, *loqayd* does not carry a negative evaluation. Rather, it signals **neutrality and detachment**, suggesting a calm and reserved attitude toward others. This demonstrates the semantic flexibility of the lexeme and its dependence on situational context for interpretation.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 9| September 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Hence, it can be argued that certain character-descriptive lexemes in Uzbek exhibit **polysemy**, where their evaluative meaning is not strictly fixed as either positive or negative. Instead, their semantic load is determined by the communicative situation and the broader discourse in which they are used. Depending on context, these lexemes may acquire positive, negative, or neutral evaluative nuances.

In the framework of thesaurus modeling, such lexemes should be classified as **neutral (context-dependent) character-descriptive lexemes**, forming a distinct semantic group. Their semantic categorization cannot rely solely on dictionary definitions, but must also consider their **connotative potential** and the way they operate in real texts. Identifying these connotative features is essential for a more comprehensive understanding of their semantic behavior

Moreover, the study of context-dependent lexemes is especially significant in modern linguistic paradigms such as **cognitive semantics, cultural linguistics, and pragmatic analysis**. In cognitive semantics, they are viewed as reflections of how human experience is conceptualized through language. In linguocultural studies, they reveal cultural values and social norms embedded in verbal expression. From a pragmatic perspective, they highlight the speaker's stance, emotional evaluation, and communicative strategies. Thus, the investigation of such lexemes is not merely a descriptive task but an important direction in contemporary semantic and applied linguistic research (Eshmo'minov, 2019).

In expressing human character, the lexemes discussed above mainly belong to the group of adjectives denoting character traits, and their primary function is to semantically describe a person's moral, psychological, intellectual, or social behavior. However, the expression of human character is not limited to this category of adjectives. Other qualifying units belonging to different semantic groups in the language system may also actively participate in denoting various traits of human character. Such qualifiers are often not directly related to character itself but serve to describe it indirectly through references to a person's external appearance, actions, or figurative portrayals.

These types of adjectives are frequently encountered in poetic texts, works of fiction, and oral folklore. They often function as tools for revealing an individual's inner world, psychological state, or social position through metaphorical, associative, or connotative means. For example: *"Bir qaradi, ko'zi yomon o'tkir ekan, jonim chiqib ketayozdi."* ("He gave a glance, and his eyes were so sharp that my soul nearly left me." — Uzbek folk epic). In this sentence, the phrase *ko'zi o'tkir* ("sharp-eyed") does not directly describe the person's visual ability, but rather conveys information about his willpower, psychological impact, or resolute nature. Here, the expression *ko'zi o'tkir* signifies traits such as strength, dignity, and seriousness.

Such expressions, situated in context, provide opportunities to depict human character through the aesthetic and semantic resources of language. Another example can be found in Oybek's work: *"U zabardast, ziyrak, harakatlari dadil, so'zlari o'tkir, o'rtoqlari orasida onaboshi qiz."* ("She was strong, intelligent, resolute in her actions, sharp in her words, and the leader among her friends." — Oybek). In this sentence, several units denoting character traits appear in sequence: *zabardast* (powerful), *ziyrak* (keen), *dadil* (resolute), *o'tkir* (sharp). In addition, the word *onaboshi* (leader) carries a distinct semantic load. It denotes not only a social status but also conveys qualities such as leadership, responsibility, social activity, and strong character attributed to the person. In this context, the word functions as a semantic center that unifies several traits of character.

Lexemes denoting negative human character are often used in semantic opposition to lexemes that express positive traits. Such lexemes generally convey undesirable, disapproved, or rejected moral, psychological, or social qualities in relation to a person's personality. They function as semantic units that express evaluative attitudes toward an individual's inner world, social relations, or behavior. For instance, adjectives such as *zalim* (cruel), *nokas* (ignoble), *toshbag'ir* (hard-hearted), *shafqatsiz* (merciless), *quv* (cunning), *ayyor* (sly), *muttaham* (scoundrel), *rasvo* (disgraceful), *ablah* (fool), *dog'uli* (tainted), *uquvsiz* (incompetent), *o'jar* (stubborn), and others may be included in this group.

These lexemes inherently contain negative connotations, denoting deviations from moral norms or behaviors rejected by society. Importantly, negative character-descriptive lexemes are applied not only to humans but also to animals depicted with human qualities, as well as to abstract concepts, objects, or phenomena. In such cases, their usage intensifies the emotional-psychological impact of the text, enhances the expressive force of the image, and enriches it from an artistic-aesthetic perspective.

For example, the lexeme *zalim* usually means "an oppressor, one who inflicts harm" and is employed as a negative evaluation of a person. However, in various literary texts, this lexeme is also used metaphorically to attribute human negative character traits to other entities. Consider the following example: *"U (Yo'lchi) o'z singlisini Gulnordan ayirib, uni zolim tanholik quchog'iga otishni istamaganidan yana bir necha vaqt Unsinni bu yerda qoldirishga moyil edi."* (Oybek). In this sentence, the phrase *zolim tanholik* ("cruel loneliness") is used. Although loneliness is an abstract state, it is here endowed with the human negative trait of cruelty. Through this usage, loneliness is interpreted not merely as a psychological condition, but as a force that harms a person and subjects them to emotional torment.

Thus, the lexeme *zalim*, which denotes negative character, serves to create a powerful image in evaluating surrounding phenomena. Such usages represent a linguosemiotic phenomenon arising from metaphorical modeling, whereby human character traits are transferred to other entities, thereby expanding layers of meaning. This phenomenon is particularly frequent in literary texts and is regarded as a stylistic device. Consequently, in the construction of thesaurus models, it becomes necessary to distinguish between the **concrete use** of

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 9| September 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

negative character lexemes (applied directly to humans) and their **extended use** (applied metaphorically to other objects).

Similarly, the negative character-denoting lexeme *rasvo* ("disgraceful, wretched") is also used in the following contexts:

a. In the meaning of "a person discredited in the eyes of others because of improper behavior or conduct." For example: *"Yaramas, razil, tavba, — dedi u o'ziga-o'zi, yarim soat ichida ikki rasvo odam bilan uchrashsam-a. Hayotda hech mahal bunchalik yaramas tasodifga yo'liqmagan edim."* (Mirmuhsin).

b. In the sense of "extremely bad, beneath criticism": *rasvo gap* ("disgraceful talk").

c. In the meaning of "very bad, vile, ignoble." For example: *"Jaydari g'o'za-day mijg'ov, rasvo ekinni dehqon bolasi bilmasa kerak."* (G'. G'ulom).

d. In the sense of "ruined, in a bad or disastrous condition." For example: *"Ishni rasvo qildi-ku, padarla'nat toshbaqa."* ("Yoshlik" journal).

In addition, the lexeme *rasvo* can also be used in communicative exchanges with reference to places, living conditions, or clothing. For instance: *rasvo joy* ("a wretched place"), *rasvo kiyim* ("shabby clothing"), *rasvo xona* ("a miserable room"). In such contexts, the word *rasvo* functions as a lexeme denoting a state or condition.

The lexeme *qabih* is used to denote states that are "devoid of morality, contrary to the rules and requirements of humanity, disgusting, vile, base." For example: *"Although G'ulomjon became extremely angry at this vile deception, he tried to maintain composure and speak calmly."* (M. Ismoilov).

The lexemes *qabih* and *takabbur* ("arrogant") are borrowings from Arabic and are frequently employed in literary styles.
The lexeme *munofiq* is used with reference to hypocritical individuals, i.e., those whose words and deeds contradict one another, whose speech does not match their intentions, and who are devoid of sincerity. To convey a stronger degree of this meaning, the adjective *olchoq* is employed. The word *olchoq* expresses the sense of "utterly vile, ignoble, base, cowardly, treacherous." For instance: *"I have endured seeing cowards more dreadful than the devil himself."* (A. Oripov). The lexeme *olchoq* belongs to the bookish register of the language.

In the lexeme *qo'rs*, the meanings "rude, coarse, rough" are combined. This word is applied to people exhibiting such traits of character. Additionally, the lexeme can also convey the meaning of being devoid of emotions or feelings. For example: *"In every era there have been coarse people."* (M. Ismoiliy). In this context, the noun *qo'rslik* ("coarseness") is conceptually implied within the lexeme.

Furthermore, there exist other character-denoting units in the language in which traits of character are more vividly and multifariously expressed through synonymous idioms or stable collocations. Such idioms represent a person's inner world, mental state, behavior, and social or psychological condition via figurative means, enriching the description not only denotatively but also connotatively and associatively. For example, the idiom *"yuragi keng odam"* ("a broad-hearted person") expresses positive character traits such as generosity, kindness, and benevolence. Here, the word *yurak* ("heart") functions metaphorically, depicting the inner world, feelings, and emotions of a person through the image of spaciousness. Similarly, the idiom *"burni osmondan keladi"* ("his nose reaches the sky") denotes a haughty, arrogant individual who looks down upon others. The idiom *"toshbag'ir"* ("stone-hearted") characterizes a person's mercilessness, rigidity, and indifference toward others.

The analysis of such idioms shows that character in language is expressed not only through direct lexical naming but also through figurative transferred meanings, emotional and evaluative connotations, and associative relations. These means are especially active in literary and journalistic styles, as they enhance the emotional impact of the text, enrich the artistic value of imagery, and evoke vivid impressions in the listener or reader.

Therefore, in the analysis of the semantics of character traits, such idiomatic means require special attention. They can be regarded as contextual synonyms, metaphorical expressions, and associative networks in the process of constructing a thesaurus structure. This, in turn, broadens the semantic field of character-denoting units, allowing them to be analyzed not only within the framework of lexical items but also at the level of speech units, phraseological constructions, and figurative devices.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of character-descriptive lexemes in Uzbek demonstrates that they represent an independent and semantically rich layer of the language, serving as crucial tools for expressing psychological, moral, and social traits. Their semantic structure, consisting of denotative, connotative, and functional semes, reveals the close interaction between objective reference and subjective evaluation in linguistic practice. Classified into positive, negative, and context-dependent neutral groups, these lexemes illustrate the flexible and dynamic nature of evaluative meaning.

Furthermore, their active participation in synonym–antonym paradigms, phraseological units, and stylistic variation underscores their importance not only as lexical items but also as cultural and communicative markers. The findings confirm that a comprehensive approach—encompassing semantic, contextual, and functional aspects—is necessary to fully capture their role in discourse. In this regard, thesaurus modeling provides a promising framework for the systematic representation of such lexemes, offering valuable insights for semasiological, cognitive, and linguocultural research in contemporary Uzbek linguistics.

REFERENCES

1. *Shcherba, L.V. Opyt teorii obshchey leksikografii [An Attempt at the Theory of General Lexicography]. 1940.*
2. *Baranov, A. Vvedeniye v prikladnuyu lingvistiku [Introduction to Applied Linguistics]. Moscow, 2001.*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 9| September 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

3. *Baranov, A.N., & Dobrovolskiy, D.O. Ot redaktsii [From the Editorial Board]. 1965.*
4. *Kutuzov, A.B. Korpusnaya lingvistika [Corpus Linguistics]. Creative Commons Attribution Share-Alike 3.0 Unported License. Available at: //lab314.brsu.by/kmp-lite/kmpvideo/CL/CorporeLingva.pdf.*
5. *Valitova, N.R. Formirovaniye professionalnogo tezaurusa u studentov fizkulturnogo vuza [The Formation of a Professional Thesaurus among Students of Physical Education Universities]. Author's abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences. Omsk, 2012.*
6. *Khamroyeva, Sh.M. O'zbek tili mualliflik korpusini tuzishning lingvistik asoslari [The Linguistic Basis for Compiling an Uzbek Author Corpus]. PhD dissertation abstract. Qarshi, 2018.*
7. *Aktaev, E.K. O'quv va axborot jarayoniga avtomatlashtirilgan tezaurusning zamonaviy usullarini joriy etish [The Introduction of Modern Methods of Automated Thesaurus into the Educational and Informational Process]. Young Scientist, 2015, No. 6,2 (86,2), pp. 3–6. Available at: https://moluch.ru/archive/86/16526/.*
8. *Lukashevich, N.V. Tezaurusy v zadachakh informatsionnogo poiska [Thesauri in Information Retrieval Tasks]. 2011, pp. 20–50.*
9. *Mahkamov, N. Terminologik tamoyillar va xalqaro terminelementlar [Terminological Principles and International Term Elements]. In: Xorijiy so'z va terminlardan foydalanishda me'yor va milliy-assotsiativ fikrlash muammolari [Norms and Problems of National-Associative Thinking in the Use of Foreign Words and Terms]. Tashkent, 2011.*
10. *Mirahmedova, Z. O'zbek tilining anatomiya terminologiyasi va uni tartibga solish muammolari [The Anatomy Terminology of the Uzbek Language and Its Standardization Problems]. Tashkent: Fan, 2010.*
11. *Rasulov, R., Suyunov, B., & Mo'ydinov, Q. Nutq madaniyati va notiqlik san'ati [Speech Culture and the Art of Oratory]. Tashkent, 2010.*
12. *Eshmo'minov, A. O'zbek tili milliy korpusining sinonim so'zlar bazasi [The Synonym Word Base of the National Corpus of the Uzbek Language]. PhD dissertation abstract. Qarshi, 2019.*
13. *O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi [National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan]. Tashkent, 2004.*
14. *Lug'atlar va ularda milliy madaniyat tushunchasining aks etishi [Dictionaries and the Reflection of National Cultural Concepts]. Arxiv.uz.*
15. *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati [Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language]. Tashkent, 2006.*