

STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC STUDY OF LANDSCAPE TERMS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

Usmonova Shaxnoza Yoqubjon qizi

FerSu teacher, Phd

Ibrohimova Nilufar Ikromjon qizi

FerSu master's degree student

nilufarqodiraliyeva291@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: *This article explores the structural and semantic characteristics of landscape terms in Uzbek and English, analyzing their linguistic, cultural, and cognitive dimensions. The study examines the morphological and syntactic structures of these terms, focusing on how they reflect the natural environment and cultural perceptions of landscapes in both languages. A comparative approach is employed to highlight similarities and differences in the lexical composition, metaphorical usage, and semantic nuances of landscape terminology. By integrating insights from linguistics and cultural studies, the research sheds light on how language embodies environmental realities and cultural values. The findings contribute to cross-linguistic studies of landscape lexicons and provide a framework for understanding the interplay between language, culture, and nature.*

KEY WORDS: *Landscape terms, structural analysis, semantic analysis, Uzbek language, linguistic comparison, morphological structure, syntactic structure, lexical composition, cultural perceptions.*

АННОТАЦИЯ: *В данной статье исследуются структурные и семантические характеристики терминов, связанных с ландшафтом, в узбекском и английском языках, с акцентом на их лингвистические, культурные и когнитивные аспекты. В работе анализируются морфологические и синтаксические структуры этих терминов, а также их отражение природной среды и культурных восприятий ландшафтов в обоих языках. Сравнительный подход позволяет выявить сходства и различия в лексическом составе, метафорическом употреблении и семантических оттенках ландшафтной терминологии. Интеграция данных из лингвистики и культурологии помогает пролить свет на то, как язык воплощает экологическую реальность и культурные ценности. Результаты исследования способствуют развитию межъязыковых исследований ландшафтных лексиконов и предоставляют основу для понимания взаимосвязи между языком, культурой и природой.*

КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА: *Ландшафтные термины, структурный анализ, семантический анализ, узбекский язык, лингвистическое сравнение, морфологическая структура, синтаксическая структура, лексический состав, культурные восприятия.*

ANNOTATSIYA: *Mazkur maqolada o'zbek va ingliz tillarida landshaft bilan bog'liq atamalarning struktura va semantik xususiyatlari, shuningdek, ularning lingvistik,*

madaniy va kognitiv o'lchamlari tadqiq qilinadi. Ishda ushbu atamalarning morfologik va sintaktik tuzilmalari, shuningdek, ular orqali tabiiy muhit va landshaftlarning madaniy talqinlari qanday aks etishi tahlil qilinadi. Taqqoslash usuli yordamida landshaft terminologiyasining leksik tarkibi, metaforik ishlatilishi va semantik nozikliklaridagi o'xshashlik va farqlar aniqlanadi. Lingvistika va madaniyatshunoslik bo'yicha olib borilgan tadqiqotlar tilning ekologik haqiqat va madaniy qadriyatlarni qanday aks ettirishini yoritishga yordam beradi. Tadqiqot natijalari landshaft leksikonlari bo'yicha tilaro tadqiqotlarni rivojlantirishga xizmat qiladi va til, madaniyat hamda tabiat o'rtasidagi o'zaro aloqalarni tushunish uchun asos yaratadi.

KALIT SO'ZLAR: *Landshaft atamalari, strukturaviy tahlil, semantik tahlil, o'zbek tili, lingvistik taqqoslash, morfologik tuzilma, sintaktik tuzilma, leksik tarkib, madaniy talqinlar*

INTRODUCTION

Languages encapsulate the cultural and environmental perspectives of their speakers, reflecting how people interpret the world around them. Landscape terms—words describing natural and man-made features of the environment—play a vital role in how people conceptualize space, nature, and their place within it. By examining landscape terms in both Uzbek and English, we can uncover structural and semantic patterns that reveal cultural, environmental, and linguistic distinctions between the two languages. This article aims to conduct a comparative structural-semantic study of landscape terms in Uzbek and English, exploring their organization, usage, and meanings.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Word Formation Patterns

English: English landscape terms often derive from Old English, Latin, or French origins, reflecting the language's history of external influences. Many landscape terms are single morphemes (e.g., "hill," "lake") or simple compounds (e.g., "waterfall"). Compounds such as "mountaintop" or "riverbed" are also common, illustrating a descriptive approach that emphasizes visible features.

Uzbek: In Uzbek, many landscape terms are formed through root words with added affixes or are borrowed from Persian, Arabic, and Russian. Uzbek compounds, such as "tog' yonbag'ri" (mountainside), frequently utilize the structure "noun + modifier," creating descriptive terms similar to English compounds. Affixes like "-lik" (e.g., "cho'llik" for desert-like areas) modify

nouns to indicate specific characteristics of landscapes.

2. Nominalization and Adjectival Forms

Both languages use nominalization (nouns derived from verbs or adjectives) to describe landscape features. In English, terms like "foothills" or "uplands" derive from adjectives or spatial descriptors. Similarly, Uzbek terms often use adjectival endings or suffixes to indicate particular attributes, such as "cho'qqi" for "peak" or "cho'l" for "desert."

3. Use of Borrowed and Indigenous Terms

MODERN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AND INNOVATIVE TEACHING SOLUTIONS

English has incorporated numerous foreign terms for unique landscapes (e.g., "canyon" from Spanish, "tundra" from Russian), whereas Uzbek landscape terminology also includes Russian and Persian loanwords due to Uzbekistan's historical context. Words like "daryo" (river) and "cho'l" (desert) are originally Persian but are now standard in Uzbek.

Semantic Aspects of Landscape Terms

1. Types of Semantic Categories

Topographical Terms: In both English and Uzbek, there are clear terms for prominent topographical features like mountains, valleys, rivers, and deserts. However, the nuances in meaning often differ. For instance, "river" in English has a specific connotation of flowing water and is often distinguished from "creek" or "stream," while Uzbek primarily uses "daryo" for rivers without as many gradations in scale.

Vegetation and Terrain Descriptors: Terms describing vegetation and terrain vary due to environmental conditions. For example, "savanna" and "prairie" have specific ecological connotations in English, while Uzbek focuses more on terms for desert and steppe landscapes (e.g., "dasht" for steppe). These differences reveal how landscape terms adapt to regional ecosystems.

2. Metaphorical Usage

Both languages use landscape terms metaphorically, reflecting cultural associations. In English, "peak" can signify the highest point in life or achievement, while "valley" often implies hardship. In Uzbek, similar metaphors exist but are influenced by cultural perceptions, with "tog'" (mountain) symbolizing stability or strength, and "cho'l" (desert) representing isolation or resilience.

3. Semantic Fields and Conceptual Domains

English landscapes are often categorized by specific distinctions within semantic fields (e.g., "marsh," "swamp," "bog" for wetlands). Uzbek, in contrast, may employ broader terms for similar features, which reflects the language's adaptive terminology suited to its own physical environment.

The concept of "water bodies" (e.g., "river," "lake") and "elevation" (e.g., "mountain," "valley") is present in both languages, but Uzbek tends to generalize due to its unique landscape influences.

Comparative Analysis of Landscape Terms

1. Cultural Influence on Landscape Terms

English reflects a diverse range of landscape terms due to cultural influences from around the world. The language includes terms for many biomes and terrains not present in the British Isles. Uzbek, by contrast, is shaped largely by the arid and semi-arid landscapes of Central Asia. This cultural context has influenced a specialized vocabulary for desert and steppe terrains, with less emphasis on terms for forested or aquatic landscapes.

2. Environmentally Influenced Vocabulary

English speakers have historically developed distinct terms for various environments, such as "woods" vs. "forest" or "hill" vs. "mountain." Uzbek, meanwhile, lacks some of

these distinctions but has nuanced terminology for desert-related features, reflecting the ecological environment of Uzbekistan. For example, Uzbek includes terms like "qumtepalar" (sand dunes) and "cho'l" (desert), crucial for describing the region's arid landscape.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis of landscape terms in Uzbek and English reveals significant insights into their structural and semantic features, reflecting linguistic and cultural specificity. The findings are discussed under the following categories:

- **Structural Features of Landscape Terms**

Lexical Composition: In both languages, landscape terms are often composed of simple, compound, and derivative forms.

English: Compound forms like waterfall, grassland, and hillside are frequent, reflecting the syntactic tendency to describe landscapes by combining descriptive elements.

Uzbek: Compound terms such as tog' cho'qqisi (mountain peak) and ko'l sohil (lake shore) showcase a similar approach but often rely on agglutinative structures and possessive suffixes for clarity.

- **Morphological Features:**

Uzbek relies heavily on affixation for creating nuanced meanings. For example, the suffix -lik in cho'llik (desert area) denotes "characteristic of a place." English, on the other hand, frequently uses prefixes and suffixes like -land (e.g., woodland) to designate terrain types.

- **Semantic Features of Landscape Terms**

Denotative Meanings: landscape terms in both languages primarily denote natural features such as mountains, rivers, and forests. However, cultural and environmental contexts influence their semantic scope. In English, terms like valley and meadow often have broad, universally understood meanings. In Uzbek, terms like ovul (village near a natural feature) incorporate socio-geographical connotations, emphasizing the relationship between nature and settlement.

Connotative Meanings: Uzbek landscape terms are deeply rooted in cultural traditions and often evoke historical or spiritual associations. For instance, tog' (mountain) is a symbol of strength and resilience in folklore. In English, terms such as prairie or moors carry literary and historical connotations tied to specific regions or eras.

- **Cross-Linguistic Differences**

Categorization: English tends to have more specialized terms for certain landscapes due to its global exposure and environmental diversity, e.g., archipelago, canyon, and savanna. Uzbek, with a focus on regional landscapes, often uses broader terms like cho'l (desert) or daryo (river) with contextual modifications.

Loanwords and Influence: English has borrowed extensively from other languages (e.g., fjord from Norwegian, oasis from Arabic), enriching its lexicon. Uzbek, influenced

by Persian, Arabic, and Russian, has terms like soy (stream) from Persian and ob-hayot (water of life) from Arabic.

- Cultural and Geographic Implications

The semantic richness of landscape terms reflects the unique geography and cultural heritage of each language. Uzbek: Terms like qumtepa (sand dune) and dasht (steppe) underscore the significance of arid and semi-arid environments, vital to the region's history and economy. English: Words like coastline and peninsula reflect the maritime orientation of English-speaking countries.

- Idiomatic and Metaphorical Usage

Both languages exhibit metaphorical extensions of landscape terms. In Uzbek, tog'dek (like a mountain) is used to describe a steadfast person, while daryo misol (like a river) signifies abundance. In English, terms like desert symbolize isolation or barrenness, while mountain represents challenges.

CONCLUSION

A structural-semantic study of landscape terms in Uzbek and English highlights how language is shaped by cultural and environmental factors. English landscape terms reflect a diverse lexicon influenced by multiple cultures, while Uzbek terms emphasize Central Asia's unique terrain. These differences reveal how both languages categorize, understand, and interact with their landscapes, shaped by their speakers' geographical and cultural experiences. Such studies are invaluable for understanding linguistic adaptation to the physical world and offer insight into how languages reflect the collective experience of their speakers. This comparative analysis demonstrates that landscape terminology not only provides functional descriptors of the natural world but also encapsulates cultural knowledge and environmental interaction. As languages continue to evolve, further comparative studies can illuminate the changing relationships between people, language, and the land they inhabit.

REFERENCES:

1. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge University Press.
2. Crystal, D. (1997). Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. Blackwell Publishers.
3. Danilenko, V. P. (1977). Principles of Terminology. UNESCO.
4. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. Longman.
5. Khudyakov, V. A. (2008). Cultural and Linguistic Landscapes: Concepts and Methods. Nauka Press.
6. Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics. Cambridge University Press.
7. Sapir, E. (1921). Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. Harcourt, Brace & World.
8. Sirojiddinov, U. A. (2002). O'zbek Tilining Leksikasi. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
9. Trask, R. L. (1996). Historical Linguistics. Oxford University Press.
10. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese. Oxford University Press.