



The Use Of Synonyms and Antonyms in K.Rakhmanov's Dramatic Works

Perijamal Turganbayeva*

Karakalpak State University

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.47134/jpbi.v3i2.2408>

*Correspondence: Perijamal

Turganbayeva

Email: pnr9323@mail.ru

Received: 10-12-2025

Accepted: 24-12-2025

Published: 24-01-2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract: The semantic and stylistic functions of synonyms and antonyms in the dramatic works of Karakalpak playwright K. Rakhmanov are analyzed through lexical-semantic and stylistic methods. Synonymous and antonymous units are examined in terms of their role in character portrayal, the intensification of dramatic conflict, and the construction of expressive dialogue. The analysis identifies lexical, derivational, and borrowed types of synonymy, demonstrating their function in reducing repetition, refining semantic nuance, and expanding the expressive capacity of the Karakalpak literary language. Antonyms derived from nouns, adjectives, and adverbs are shown to function as key devices for expressing semantic opposition, reinforcing thematic contrasts, and structuring dynamic dramatic interaction. Comparative insights from Turkic linguistics and Karakalpak stylistic theory are applied to situate these linguistic patterns within the framework of modern Turkic dramaturgy. The results indicate that the systematic use of synonymic variation and antonymic contrast enhances the aesthetic organization of dramatic discourse and reflects the lexical richness of the language. These lexical-semantic devices emerge as a defining feature of Rakhmanov's individual style and contribute significantly to the formation of national literary identity.

Keywords: Synonymy, Antonymy, Semantics, Dramaturgy, Stylistics, Turkic Linguistics

Introduction

The 20th century marked a significant stage in the development of the written Karakalpak literary language, transforming it into a fully functional and refined medium of literary expression. This period coincided with a range of cultural and social transformations within Karakalpakstan, including the emergence of local printing houses, the publication of newspapers and magazines, and the introduction of a new alphabet system—all of which played a crucial role in the enrichment and stabilization of the Karakalpak literary language.

During this pivotal era, one of the most influential figures contributing to the evolution of Karakalpak literature and linguistic culture was Kenesbay Rakhmanov (1942–2004). As a prominent poet, writer, and playwright, Rakhmanov created a substantial body of lyrical, prose, and especially dramatic works that played a formative role in advancing literary style, expanding vocabulary, and fostering literacy among the population. His contributions

are of particular importance today as modern Karakalpak linguistics seeks to investigate the lexical features and stylistic devices employed in his artistic language.

Given the dynamic social changes occurring in contemporary society and their corresponding impact on the Karakalpak language, the study of linguistic heritage has become increasingly urgent. Modern linguistic scholarship is now tasked with scientifically validating the development of the Karakalpak language, ensuring its synchronicity with the times, and preserving the cultural-linguistic legacy inherited from previous generations. As emphasized in the national discourse, safeguarding and advancing the mother tongue is not only a cultural necessity but a national obligation.

As a language of artistic expression, literature holds a unique place in shaping linguistic richness. According to V.V. Vinogradov, language in literature functions in two key dimensions: first, as a reflection of the structural system of a national language used in speech or text; and second, as the system of artistic imagery and stylistic expression that constitutes the language of art. Through the creative use of a language's expressive and semantic potential, literary texts bring forth nuanced meaning, emotional resonance, and aesthetic beauty.

In the context of Karakalpak literature, the dramatic genre developed significantly in the 20th century, enriched by the creative efforts of gifted authors such as Rakhmanov. His plays—spanning comedy, tragedy, and drama—have left a lasting mark on the theatrical and cultural life of the Karakalpak people. Notable works such as “Kelin” (Daughter-in-law), “O dúnyağa mirat” (A Guest to the Other World), “Jaralı júrekler” (Wounded Hearts), “Eglengen báhár” (Seized Spring), “Laqqılar emlewxfanada” (The Deceivers in the Hospital), “Mıńlardıń biri” (One of the Thousands), “Edige”, “Toǵız tońqıldaq bir sheńkildek” (Nine Whumblers Like One Whumbler), “Raxmet, kelin” (Thank you, Daughter-in-law) and “Ínjiqtıń muhabbatı” (Love of the Dwarf) remain widely appreciated by audiences to this day.

In light of the growing academic interest in Rakhmanov's literary language, this study focuses on the use of synonyms and antonyms in his dramatic works. These lexical devices not only contribute to stylistic elegance but also serve as essential tools for character development, emotional depth, and narrative clarity in his plays. Despite Rakhmanov's significance in Karakalpak literary history, the specific linguistic aspects of his dramas—particularly his use of synonymy and antonymy—remain underexplored. Therefore, this research seeks to address this gap by offering a detailed linguistic and stylistic analysis of these features in his dramatic texts.

The study of lexical-semantic devices such as synonymy and antonymy in literary texts has long occupied a central place in linguistic and stylistic scholarship. Within the broader context of Turkic philology, these phenomena have been explored from both structural and functional perspectives. Seminal contributions in Russian linguistics, particularly by V. V. Vinogradov emphasized the dual role of language in literature: as a reflection of grammatical and lexical systems and as a tool for creating artistic imagery. His distinction between the “language of art” and “language as system” provides a foundational framework for understanding the stylistic function of lexical choices in literary texts. From

a general stylistic perspective, synonymy and antonymy function as foregrounding devices (Leech, 2008; Crystal, 2003).

In Uzbek linguistics, early discussions of antonymy were initiated in the 1950s, with scholars such as S.Mutallibov and S.Usmonov paving the way. This was followed by more systematic investigations by B.Isabekov, who focused on lexical antonyms in the modern Uzbek language, and R.Shukurov, who analyzed the semantic nature of antonymy through derivative and root-based forms. Their works laid the groundwork for the typological and semantic classification of antonyms, including complementary, gradable, and relational (conversive) types.

In Kazakh linguistics, J.Musin's dissertation "*Antonyms in the Kazakh Language*" (1970) offered one of the earliest in-depth studies of antonymic structures in a Turkic context. His analysis contributed significantly to cross-linguistic understanding of oppositional semantics.

Within Karakalpak linguistics, foundational insights into antonymy were presented by E. Berdimuratov in "*Lexicology of the Contemporary Karakalpak Language*" (1968), and A. Bekbergenov in "*Stylistics of the Karakalpak Language*" (1990). Bekbergenov examined the stylistic roles of antonyms and their relation to synonymy, highlighting their use in poetic devices such as antithesis and oxymoron. A more comprehensive and systematized approach was later offered by M.Qudaybergenov and T.Bashirov in their "*Concise Dictionary of Karakalpak Antonyms*" (1995), which remains a key reference in the field.

Recent advancements include Sh.Xojanov's monographic work "*The Phenomenon of Antonymy in the Karakalpak Language*" (2017), which provides detailed grammatical and stylistic analysis of antonym usage in contemporary texts. His findings underscore the productivity of antonyms in dramaturgical language, especially in constructing contrastive meanings and intensifying emotional impact.

In terms of synonymy, classical definitions trace back to the Greek term *synōnymos*, meaning "of the same name." A.Bekbergenov defines synonyms as words with different roots or morphological forms but similar or contextually substitutable meanings, often used to enhance stylistic variation and avoid lexical repetition. Synonyms thus function as essential tools in artistic expression, enabling writers to enrich meaning, tone, and imagery.

Despite the existence of foundational studies on Karakalpak lexicon and stylistics, a noticeable gap remains in the investigation of synonymy and antonymy within dramatic literature, particularly in the works of Kenesbay Rakhmanov. The dramaturgical language of K. Rakhmanov has been addressed in literary studies by Nurimbetov (2004), Akhmedov (2008), and Kamalov (2012); however, these works focus primarily on thematic and genre-related aspects, while the lexical-semantic features of his dramatic language—especially the systematic use of synonymy and antonymy—remain largely unexplored. This study therefore aims to bridge this scholarly gap by examining how Rakhmanov employs synonymic and antonymic structures in his dramatic works. It contextualizes these devices within the broader tradition of Turkic literary stylistics and seeks to demonstrate their functional significance in character development, emotional resonance, and thematic opposition.

Methodology

This study adopts a descriptive and analytical approach to investigate the use of synonyms and antonyms in the dramatic works of Kenesbay Rakhmanov, a prominent representative of 20th-century Karakalpak literature. The research is based on qualitative linguistic methods that enable the identification, classification, and interpretation of lexical units—particularly synonymic and antonymic expressions—within selected dramatic texts. The primary sources for analysis include several of Rakhmanov's most representative plays, such as *Kelin*, *Jaralı júrekler*, *Izban*, *Laqqılar emlewxanada*, and *O dúnyağa mirát*. These works were chosen for their linguistic richness, cultural significance, and sustained popularity in Karakalpak theatrical tradition. The analysis was carried out in several stages. First, all relevant lexical items were extracted using close reading and keyword-in-context techniques. Second, these items were classified into recognized categories of synonymy (absolute, stylistic, contextual) and antonymy (gradable, complementary, and conversive) according to established linguistic frameworks derived from the works of scholars such as B. Isabekov, R. Shukurov, and Sh. Xojanov. Third, the contextual functions of these lexical items were examined to assess their role in character development, emotional tone, and thematic contrast within the plays. Special attention was paid to how lexical variation contributed to dramatic expressiveness and how contrastive pairs enhanced rhetorical or stylistic effects such as irony, emphasis, or humor. The findings were interpreted through the lens of modern stylistics, semantic theory, and Turkic lexicology, integrating insights from both classical and contemporary sources in Karakalpak, Uzbek, and Russian linguistics. This methodology provides a detailed and functionally grounded analysis of Rakhmanov's lexical choices, demonstrating how his creative use of synonyms and antonyms serves as a key element in shaping the linguistic and aesthetic quality of his dramatic language.

One of the key findings of this study is that Kenesbay Rakhmanov's dramatic language demonstrates a highly nuanced use of semantic features, particularly in how he selects and arranges words to convey character, mood, and social context. The playwright's intentional deployment of lexemes—both in literal and figurative senses—reflects his mastery of the expressive resources of the Karakalpak language. In his plays, Rakhmanov skillfully constructs dramatic, comedic, and tragic images that not only reveal the psychological and moral dimensions of his characters but also enrich the aesthetic texture of the text. This confirms the well-established view in stylistic theory that literary characterization is impossible without artistic imagery, and that semantic precision is central to this process.

Result and Discussion

Rakhmanov's works significantly contribute to the development of the Karakalpak lexical system. Through contextually appropriate and semantically charged word choices, the author expands the vocabulary base of the literary language. In particular, his creative and context-sensitive use of synonyms stands out. Synonymy, derived from the Greek term *synōnymos* ("of the same name"), refers to words that share similar or closely related meanings. As noted by A. Bekbergenov, even when words differ in form, they may function

as synonyms if they converge semantically and provide subtle shades of meaning. These lexical alternatives help avoid repetition, intensify expression, and create stylistic variation.

Rakhmanov's strategic use of synonymic expressions allows him to heighten the artistic resonance of his plays while maintaining semantic precision. His substitution of near-equivalent terms in character dialogue not only preserves clarity but enhances poetic rhythm and imagery. For example, in several passages, the playwright replaces a concrete noun with a more stylistically loaded or emotionally toned synonym, thereby altering the tone or intensity of the utterance. Such careful selection of synonymous expressions demonstrates Rakhmanov's individual literary style and confirms his status as a master of the artistic word.

Moreover, the analysis shows that synonymy in his texts serves not just an ornamental function but also supports dramatic logic and communicative intent. By selecting context-specific variants—whether colloquial, poetic, or neutral—Rakhmanov aligns his language with character psychology, social hierarchy, and narrative pace. These findings support the broader argument that synonymy is a powerful stylistic and semantic device, and in Rakhmanov's hands, it becomes an instrument for dramatization, characterization, and emotional engagement. For example:

-Astımızǵa bir-bir *arǵımaq* tawıp minbesek bolmaydı, Izban.

-At miniwimiz kerek deysen be?

(*"We must find a stallion to ride, Izban"*).

- Do you think we need to ride horses?) (Izban)

Biz olardıń mal-dúnıyaların tartıp alıp *gedeylerge* úlestiremiz.

Baylar shaynap, *jarlılar* jutıp otıra bere me?

(*We seize their possessions and distribute them to the poor.*

Will the rich keep chewing, and the poor keep swallowing?) (Izban)

Apa bıyıl barlıq adaǵansılıqtı qoyıp jerimizge *daqıl* egeyik.

Alıp bolıpsañ, erteń *egin* egejaqız.

Ne qılasañ akelesen. Endi sen jalańput júrgen náreste emessen.

Shókelep júrgeniń bar ma edi.

(*Mother, let's put aside all the worry this year and plant crops on our land.*

After you've finished, we're going to plant crops tomorrow.

What will you do, father? You are no longer a child walking barefoot. Squatting

Did you ever walk?) (Izban)

Balańa kimniń qızın *qolaylap* júrseń?

(*Whose daughter are you choosing for your son?*) (Jaralı júrekler)

Arzikópirdegi ilaq oyın waqtında *topalań* shıǵıptı.

Awa húkimettiń sıyasatına qarsı *qozǵalań!*

(*A riot broke out during the Uloq game in Arzikopir.*

Yes, rise up against the government's policies!) (Izban)

Kishem kóp kúnnen berli qapalanıp, jılap júr goy.

Úyinde bir qonaq bar eken... Ekewi más bolıp uyqılap qalıptı. *Jeńgeyge* aytıp kettim

(My little sister has been grieving and crying for many days now.

There was a guest at his house...

The two of them fell asleep drunk. I told the young woman) (Jaralı júrekler)

Kelin durıs aytadı, sen birewdiń *shańaraǵın* taydırıp kete bereseń be?

Meni óz *xojalıǵımda* shermende qılıp kete beremen dep oylaysañ ba?

(The daughter-in-law is right, are you going to leave someone else's house?

Do you think I'll be disgraced in my own household?) (Jaralı júrekler)

Ańǵarǵanıń jaqsı, *balam.*

Ákeńniń tilin alsañ xor bolmaysañ *qulımım.*

)It's good that you understood, my child.

If you listen to your father, you won't be humiliated, my dear.) (Jaralı júrekler)

-Qoydıq –qoydıq! *Qatın*, usı kóterip soqqaylıǵıń bar da! Bolmasa jap jaqsı *hayalsań*-aw. (Urını qaraqshı bastı) Sapar ata ǵoy. *Biyshara* bir shoq ǵarrı edi. Jarqıldıǵan kelini bar edi *paqırlardıń!*

("We're done for!" "Wife, why don't you raise your head like that!" You're a very good woman. (The robber robs the thief.) He was a poor old man.

The poor souls had a shining bride!) (Jaralı júrekler p.28)

Jaratqanıń isine shara joq, Sapar ǵoshshım.

Ya, *jabbar iyem*, óziń yar bola ǵór.

(There's no solution to the Creator's will, my dear Sapar.

Oh, my lord, be my companion.) (Jaralı júrekler p.21)

Qudayǵa shúkir, qolıń qurı emes ǵoy.

Allataala birińdi mıń etsin, quda

(Thank God, you're not empty-handed.

May God bless you a thousand times over, God.)(Jaralı júrekler p.22)

Márt bolsań, urısqa barıp, usı kúshińdi *dushpanǵa* kórset!

Meniń *jawım*-sen! Sennen basqa *jawım* joq.

(If you are brave, go to war and show your strength to the enemy!

You are my enemy! I have no enemy but you.) (Jaralı júrekler p.20)

Further semantic analysis of Rakhmanov's dramatic language reveals his deliberate and stylistically effective use of synonymic pairs and word substitutions to enrich textual variety and avoid lexical redundancy. In several instances, the playwright replaces one word with its close semantic equivalent, thereby maintaining continuity of meaning while enhancing the stylistic texture of the dialogue. For example, the word *arǵımaq* (a fine horse) is replaced with *at* (horse) in a different sentence, indicating a stylistic shift from poetic to neutral register. Similarly, the substitution of *gedey* (beggar) with *kambag'al* (poor), *dán* (grain) with *egin* (crop), *shókelep* (hastily) with *qolaylap* (adjusted), and *topalań* (riot) with *qozǵalań* (uprising) demonstrates the author's ability to modulate tone and emotional weight depending on narrative context.

This nuanced use of lexical variants showcases Rakhmanov's sensitivity to semantic gradation and his skill in employing synonyms to create expressive and emotionally resonant passages. He chooses terms with slight shifts in connotation to match character

psychology and social tone. For instance, *gedey* may imply helplessness or pity, whereas *kambag'al* has a more neutral and descriptive tone. Similarly, *qozgalań* implies a politically motivated upheaval, while *topalań* connotes a more chaotic, less organized disturbance.

Rakhmanov also employs pairs of synonymous words with minimal semantic difference to intensify expression or produce a rhythmic or rhetorical effect. Examples include *kishi jeńge* (younger–sister-in-law), *shańaraq-xojalıq* (household–domestic unit), *balam-qulınım* (child–my little one), *qatın hayal, biyshara-paqır, jaratqan-jabbar-quday-allatala* (creator–Almighty–God–Allah), and *dushpan-jaw* (enemy–foe). In these constructions, Rakhmanov avoids repetition while also intensifying the stylistic force of the utterance. This technique allows him to preserve the semantic core of a sentence while giving it poetic or emotional coloring.

Furthermore, the use of componential synonymy—where paired or doubled words share near-identical meanings—serves as a distinctive feature of his dramaturgic style. These paired constructions often function as emphatic devices, reflecting a tradition rooted in oral storytelling and lyrical repetition common in Turkic and Central Asian poetic forms. As a result, Rakhmanov's drama does not merely reflect linguistic richness but also reinforces cultural identity through idiomatic expression and semantic resonance. For example

Ol haqıyqat ash-jalańashtı, jarlı-jabıqaylardı *qollap-quwatlawdı* niyet etken húkimet bolsa, bunday qanxor emes shıǵar.

(If it's a government that truly intends to support the destitute and impoverished, it probably isn't such a bloodthirsty one. (Izban)

Ákemnen qalǵan *azlı-kem* óli dúnyanı da atamnıń ayaq ushına jiberdińler.

(You've sent my father's few remaining possessions to his grave) (Izban)

Bunıńızǵa raxmet! Biraq biziń Izban da ne jumısıńız bar? Bul bir *asıp-tasıp* atırǵan bay emes. (Thank you for that! But what business is it of yours with Izban? He's not a rich man.) (Izban)

Meniń ishki sarayım toqtawsız jılaydı, bul *uw-záhár* kóz qaraların tamshıǵa aylanıp kózden aǵıp ketkeni jaqsı eken ǵoy. (My inner palace weeps incessantly, and it's good that these poisonous glances have turned into drops and flowed from my eyes) (Izban)

Hey, sen taǵı keldiń be (alardı qaraydı) baydıń malların, *dúnya-múlklerin* tartıp alamız. ("Hey, you're here again!" he said, looking around. "We'll seize the rich man's property") (Izban)

Az-maz shıdaǵanıńızda boladı ǵoy usındaydan *awıl-eldiń* awızbirshiligi qashadı-dá! (If you endure a little longer, the unity of the village and the people will be ruined!) (Izban)

Another key observation from the semantic analysis of K.Rakhmanov's dramatic texts is the frequent use of synonymous paired words (compound synonymy) which serve both emphatic and generalizing functions. These word pairs, such as *ash-jalańash* (destitute), *kambaǵal-biyshara* (poor–wretched), *azlı-kem* (the few), *asıp-tasıp* (overflowing), *uw-záhár* (highly poisonous), *dúnya-múlk* (worldly possessions), and *awıl-el* (village–people), are not

only semantically close in meaning but also function to amplify or intensify the expressive power of the utterance.

In this context, Rakhmanov uses such constructions to underscore social and emotional states with greater rhetorical force. For example, the compound *ash-jalańash* conveys not just economic deprivation but a deeper, existential state of vulnerability. Similarly, *kambaǵal-biyshara* expands the concept of material poverty into one of helplessness and societal marginalization. The usage of *dúnya-múlk* symbolizes the transience and illusory nature of worldly wealth, while *awıl-el l* evokes a collective rural identity and social belonging.

Importantly, these synonymous pairs are not only distributed across different parts of the text but sometimes appear in a single clause, functioning syntactically as coordinated elements within the same grammatical structure. In such instances, they not only convey nuanced shades of meaning but also serve rhythmic and stylistic functions, contributing to the musicality of the dramatic language. These doublets create a heightened stylistic atmosphere, drawing on the oral tradition of repetition, parallelism, and poetic symmetry prevalent in Turkic literary culture.

Thus, Rakhmanov's deployment of synonymous compounds is not accidental; it is a deliberate stylistic strategy rooted in traditional aesthetics and contemporary linguistic expressivity. It reinforces both thematic depth and emotional resonance while enriching the semantic layers of his dramatic language. For example:

Waqtında *aytisqan, tartisqan* adamlardıń ekewi de o dúnyaǵa ketti. (Both of the people who argued and argued in their time have gone to the other world) (Urını qaraqshı bastı)

Bala shaǵalarıń *qorqar, úrker, soar..* (Your children are afraid, startled, and scared...) (Izban)

Ey *párwardigar, saqawatlı qudayım, mushrı panaxım*, meniń tileklerimdi mústajap etkeyseń! (O Lord, my generous God, my protector, grant my wishes!) (Izban)

Jaq endi umıt tiri gezdegi,

Mártebe, abıray, dańq degenlerdi.

(There's no longer the memory of those living days.

Status, reputation, and fame) (Urını qaraqshı bastı)

Men... (kúledi) jaslıq baǵın aralap júrmen. *Mazalı, shiyrin* miywelerden bir sebetin alıp baraman. (I... (laughs) I walk through the garden of youth. I'll bring a basket of delicious, sweet fruits.) (Abıyǵa babıy)

Ekensiz emes sulıwsań de. *Sulıwsań, gozzalsań* de onıń menen júregim jarılıp ketpeydi. (Even if you're beautiful, you're not without it. Even if you're beautiful, my heart won't burst with her.) (Yar diydarı)

-Ataman? Ataman degen bayaǵı baspashılardıń *basshısı, sárdarı* emes pe? (I'll shoot? Isn't Ataman the leader, the leader of the bandits?) (Abıyǵa babıy)

Elimiz, xalqımız tınısh jasasın.

Sawap is eteyik hár bir qádemde (Let's do good deeds at every step)

(Abıyǵa babıy)

Men olarǵa anaw-mınaw dep atırǵanım joq. Qudayǵa shúkir bayaǵı *ashlıqtı, joqshılıqtı* umıtıp kiyatırımız. (I'm not saying anything to them. Thank God, we're forgetting the old hunger and poverty) (Jaralı júrekler)

The synonymous expressions used in K.Rakhmanov's dramatic works demonstrate a distinct hierarchical (gradual) feature, where each paired or substituted word contributes a slightly different degree of intensity or stylistic coloring. This gradual synonymy—*kambag'al-biyshara, ash-jalańash, uz-záhár, asıp-tasıp*—not only enhances the semantic precision but also amplifies the artistic vividness of the language. The intentional layering of synonymous meaning enables the author to convey emotional depth, character complexity, and social critique through the nuances of word choice.

Furthermore, an etymological and structural analysis of the synonyms employed reveals multiple pathways through which these synonymous pairs emerge in the author's language. These include:

1. Stable Synonyms Used Individually

Jetistik biz *Ǵárezsizlik* zamanǵa,

Erkinlik berildi barlıq adamǵa.

(We have reached the time of Independence,

Freedom was granted to all people) (Abıyǵa babıy)

2. Derivational Synonyms Formed by Affixation

Men olarǵa anaw-mınaw dep atırǵanım joq. Qudayǵa shúkir, bayaǵı *ashlıqtı, joqshılıqtı* umıtıp kiyatırımız. (I'm not saying anything to them. Thank God, we are forgetting the old famine and poverty.) (Jaralı júrekler)

Jetistik biz *Ǵárezsizlik* zamanǵa,

Erkinlik berildi barlıq adamǵa.

We have reached the time of Independence,

Freedom was granted to all people (Abıyǵa babıy)

3. Loanwords Used as Synonyms Alongside Native Lexemes

Házirgi tártip boyınsha kóshpes múlkimizdi de, kóshetuǵın múlkimizdi de mámlekettiń iyeliginen shıǵarıp alamız da *kim zıyat sawdasına* shıǵaramız, *aukcionǵa*.

(According to the current procedure, we will remove both our real estate and movable property from state ownership and put them up for auction) (Yar diydarı)

In conclusion, the synonymous words found in the works of the author testify to the richness of our lexical stock and demonstrate the writer's masterful application of them in literary discourse. These synonyms not only enhance the stylistic beauty of the text but also reflect the author's linguistic intuition and creativity.

In addition to synonyms, the vocabulary of the Karakalpak language includes a significant number of words that differ in phonological structure but express opposing meanings. Such words, which are phonetically distinct yet semantically antithetical, are classified as antonyms. Antonyms may belong to various parts of speech—nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs.

It is important to note that antonyms do not indicate the contradiction of the object itself, but rather reflect the opposition of meanings between lexical units. For instance, word

pairs such as *uzaq–jaqın* (far–near), *jaqsı–jaman*(good–bad), *kóp–az* (many–few), and *aq–qara* (white–black) illustrate semantic contrast.

However, not every word in the language can have a corresponding antonym. This observation corresponds with the semantic classification of antonyms proposed by Isabekov (1972) and Shukurov (1981), who emphasize gradable and contextual oppositions in Turkic languages; comparable patterns are also noted in Kazakh linguistics (Musin, 1970). Words that denote scientific or technical concepts, as well as certain monosemous lexical items from specific domains of everyday usage, typically do not participate in antonymic relationships. In such cases, terminological or highly specialized expressions tend to lack the capacity for antonymic pairing.

Moreover, certain words may function as antonyms only within specific contexts. Their antonymic meaning arises not from an intrinsic lexical relationship, but from the contrast constructed in situational discourse. For example, in literary or conversational usage, a word like *baraka* (blessing) may acquire an antonym *ǵarǵıs* (curse), depending on the narrative or rhetorical context.

Thus, antonyms, much like synonyms, serve as valuable tools for enhancing semantic richness and expressive nuance in dramatic texts. Their use by K. Rakhmanov contributes to the stylistic distinctiveness of his plays and reflects the dynamic, flexible nature of the Karakalpak lexicon. For example:

Saǵadaǵı *suw* ishedı,
Ayaqtaǵı *uw* ishedı.
(They drink water from the stream.
The foot drinks poison.)

In the dramatic works of K. Rakhmanov, antonyms are most often formed from nouns, adjectives, and adverbs. Their presence not only enhances the emotional and philosophical depth of the dialogue but also reflects the dynamic and semantically rich structure of the Karakalpak language.

a. Antonyms Derived from Nouns

-Jaq emes! Seniñ *dosların* joq, *dushpanların* kóp!
Kimge *qaza*, kimge *toy*... Háy dúnyayay!!
(Not at all! You have no friends, but many enemies!

A funeral for someone, a wedding for someone... Oh, my world!) (Jaralı júrekler)
Bul táǵdirde *kúlkiden* góre *kóz jas* kóppe dep qaldım. (I wondered if there were more tears than laughter in this fate) (Jaralı júrekler)

Sen toyǵa baratırǵanıñ joq, sen *ólim* menen *ómir* ayqasıp atırǵan qanlı maydanǵa baratırsañ (You're not going to the wedding, you're going to the bloody battlefield where life and death are fighting.) (Jaralı júrekler)

Ot penen *suw* arasınan jettiñ be,
Gá kúyip, gá tońdıñ bas sen, muhabbat?
(Did you reach between fire and water?
Sometimes you burned, sometimes you froze, love?) (Yar diydarı)
Uyat?! Sen qashan úyrendiñ bunı?

Bári bir sen jurttan bólek adamsań. Al men xalqım ushın jasadım mudam
Hám miynetkesh boldım pal hárresindey,
Doslarǵa pal berdim, dushpanlarǵa uw.
(Shameful?! When did you learn this?)

You're a different person from the rest of the world. But I have always lived for
my people.

And I became hardworking, like a bee.

I gave fortune to friends, poison to enemies.) (Urını qatraqshı bastı)

Ne deydi?! *Túsim* be *ońım* ba?! (What does he say? Is it a dream or reality?!) (Izban)

b. Antonyms Derived from Adjectives

Ayırmasań *jaqsı* menen *jamandı*

Bilmegeniń *hadal* menen *haramdı*

Adamlardan haywan shıǵıp qalsa da,

Haywanlardan ala almaysań adamdı

(If you don't distinguish between good and bad

You don't know what's permissible and forbidden.

Even if animals emerge from people,

You can't get a person out of an animal) (Yar diydarı)

Qáydem bileyin... Sen *qara* mayǵa bılǵanıp júrgen Anwarsań... Meniń *aq* mayǵa
bılǵanıp júrgen Anwarım bar! (I don't know... You're Anwar, smeared with grease...
I have my Anvar, smeared with white butter!) (Abıyǵa babıy)

Ketpeyseń! Házir Baymurat keledi ! Júzlestiremen! Meniń *tıniq* suwımdı *ılaytıp*,
appaq kókiregime *qara* qurımındı taslap kete bereseń be? (You won't leave! Baymurat
will be here soon! I'll make you meet! Are you going to muddy my clear water and
leave your black soot on my white chest?) (Jaralı júrttekler)

Basqalarǵa *húrriyat* zaman, meniń ushın *zulmat* pa? (Is freedom a time for others,
and darkness for me?) (Izban)

Onıń kempir ǵarrısı da *ashshı-dushınıń* mánisin bildiretuǵın adamlar ǵoy. (Even
his grandmothers and grandfathers are people who express the essence of their
sorrows.) (Izban)

c. Antonyms Derived from Adverbs

Traktor degen temir, ústinide basqarıp otıratuǵın adam boladı. *Aldına, artına*
qaramay júredi. (A tractor is like iron, and there's a person on it who controls it. He walks
without looking back or forward.) (Izban)

Qoy, ǵarrı. Qudamdallı jer menen barıs-kelis qılıp adamday bolıp qatnasıp
keteyik. Biriniz *joqarıdan* kedseńiz, biriniz *pásten*-aq keliń. (Come on, old man. Let's get
along with the matchmakers, making a proper acquaintance. If you come from above,
come from below.) (Jaralı júrekler)

Conclusion

The analysis of synonymic and antonymic expressions in the dramatic works of K. Rakhmanov demonstrates the playwright's high level of linguistic mastery and stylistic awareness within the Karakalpak literary tradition. The deliberate selection and contextual use of synonymous and antonymous lexical units enhance the aesthetic and emotional depth of characters while simultaneously reflecting broader social, ethical, and psychological oppositions embedded in the dramatic narrative. Synonyms function as important stylistic devices that prevent lexical repetition, refine semantic nuance, and strengthen expressive and figurative meaning. Antonyms, in turn, play a central role in structuring oppositional relationships, intensifying dramatic conflict, and reinforcing ideological contrasts, including moral and philosophical dualities. The systematic use of semantic contrast highlights the richness of the Karakalpak lexicon and underscores Rakhmanov's contribution to the development of expressive strategies in modern Turkic dramaturgy. Future research may expand this analysis through comparative studies with other Turkic dramatists, corpus-based quantitative investigations of synonymy and antonymy, or interdisciplinary approaches combining linguistics and performance studies. In practical terms, the findings can be applied in literary stylistics, language teaching, and drama analysis courses to develop students' sensitivity to lexical-semantic devices and to promote deeper engagement with national literary heritage.

References

- Abdinazimov, Sh. (2006). *Berdaq shig'armalariniñ tili*. Tashkent: Fan.
- Abdinazimov, Sh. (2015). *Lingvofolkloristika*. Nukus: Karakalpak State University.
- Akhmedov, S. (2008). *XX ásir Qaraqalpaq ádebiyatında drama janrı*. Nukus.
- Bekbergenov, A. (1971). *Sinonimler hám antonimler*. Nukus.
- Bekbergenov, A. (1990). *Qaraqalpaq tiliniñ stilistikası*. Nukus: Qaraqalpaqstan.
- Berdimuratov, E. (1968). *Házirgi zaman Qaraqalpaq tiliniñ leksikologiyası*. Nukus.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Isabekov, B. (1972). *Hozirgi o'zbek tilida antonimlar*. Tashkent: Fan.
- Jarimbetov, Q., & Sag'idullaeva, J. (n.d.). *Ádebiyattanıw teoriyası*. Nukus.
- Kabdalov, Z. (1982). *Soz öneri*. Almaty: Mektep.
- Kamalov, Q. (2012). *Qaraqalpaq ádebiy tili hám kórkem stil*. Nukus.
- Khalizev, V. E. (1978). *Drama kak yavlenie iskusstva*. Moscow: Iskusstvo.

- Khojanov, Sh. (2017). *Qaraqalpaq tilindegi antonimiya qubılısı*. Nukus.
- Leech, G. (2008). *Language in literature: Style and foregrounding*. London: Routledge.
- Mirziyoyev, Sh. M. (2019, October 22). *Milliy o'zligimiz va mustaqil davlatchiligimiz timsoli* [Speech at the ceremony dedicated to the 30th anniversary of granting the status of state language to Uzbek]. Xalq so'zi.
- Musin, J. (1970). *Kazakh tilindegi antonimder*. Almaty: Nauka.
- Nurimbetov, M. (2004). *Qaraqalpaq dramaturgiyasiniń til-úslub ózgeshelikleri*. Nukus.
- Pospelov, G. N. (1988). *Vvedenie v literaturovedenie*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Qudaybergenov, M., & Bashirov, T. (1995). *Qaraqalpaq tili antonimleriniń qisqasha sózligi*. Nukus: Bilim.
- Rakhmanov, K. (1999). Ilham-arwaklari adamlarda boladi. *Amudarya*, (3), 75–76.
- Rakhmanov, K. (2010). *Payg'ambar jasindag'i kuyew*. Nukus: Karakalpakstan.
- Shukurov, R. (1981). *O'zbek tilida antonimlarning semantik xususiyatlari*. Tashkent: Fan.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1981). *Problemy russkoy stilistiki*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Volkenstein, V. M. (1988). Sud'by dramaticheskikh proizvedeniy. In *Iz istorii sovetskoy nauki o teatre 20-e gody* (pp. 162–163). Moscow: GITIS.
- Yusupova, B. (2021). *Fonostilistika: Sh. Seitov's novel "Khalqabad" and phraseological phonostylistic analysis*. Tashkent: Tafakkur avlodi.