ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

UDC: 415.412.51=20(021)

COMPARATIVE FEATURES OF LINGUISTIC TERMS FORMED ON THE BASIS OF METAPHORIZATION: ON THE EXAMPLE OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Suyarova Nargiza Yuldoshevna
Associate Professor, Department of Interfaculty English Language,
Karshi State University
E-mail: suyarovanargiza345@gmail.com
Phone: 91.458.81.00
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-5564-7133
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23124899

Abstract: This article examines the role of metaphorization in the formation of linguistic terms, using English and Uzbek as examples. The study focuses primarily on the shift of general language units to specialized scientific meanings during the metaphorization process, the acquisition of conceptual content by terminological units, and the potential of metaphorical models in term formation. It offers a comparative analysis of the use of English units such as "head", "foot", "root", "branch", "stem", "mouth", "tongue", "bridge", and "tree" in specialized terminological contexts, alongside the terminologization of Uzbek units such as "bosh", "oyoq", "ildiz", "shox", "o'zak", "og'iz", "til", and "bo'g'in". The findings demonstrate that metaphorization serves as an active cognitive-semantic mechanism in the development of linguistic terminology.

Key words: metaphor, metaphorization, term, metaphorical term, terminology, linguistics, cognitive approach, comparative analysis, English language, Uzbek language, lexicography.

Introduction. Linguistic terminology, as a system expressing one of the specialized domains of scientific thought, is in constant development. With the emergence of new scientific concepts, the need arises to name them, and existing language units may be used in a new meaning or new terms may be created. Metaphorization is one of the most important of such processes. Metaphor is not merely a means of artistic imagery, but a cognitive mechanism related to human activity of comprehending, classifying and naming the world. Therefore, the study of metaphoric terms is important for understanding the internal developmental structures of terminology.

By metaphorization, in simple terms, is meant the transfer of a word or unit from its initial, concrete or general meaning into another domain, whereby it acquires a new conceptual meaning. For example, the unit *head* "head", denoting a part of the human body, expresses the meaning of a central or governing element in English linguistic terminology in combinations such as *head of a phrase*, *head of a construction*. In Uzbek, the word *bosh* ("head") denotes a grammatical or syntactic center in units such as *bosh bo'lak* ("main part") and *bosh so'z* ("headword"). Here, the idea of the uppermost and principal part of the human body has been transferred to the central element of a grammatical structure.

Main part. Although metaphor was historically regarded for a long time as a means of imagery in artistic discourse, its potential is now understood much more broadly in modern linguistics. Metaphor establishes a connection between two or more conceptual domains on the basis of similarity, functional proximity, formal relation or experiential association. As a result, a name existing in one domain serves to express a new meaning in another domain.

Metaphorization may manifest itself as a form of metaphor that has become established in the language system and has acquired terminological value. In this process, initially imagery-based transfer gradually turns into a means of precisely naming a scientific concept. For example, the word *root* is known as the name of the underground part of a plant. In linguistics, however, *root* is used to denote the basic, historical or derivationally central part in the morphemic structure of a word. The Uzbek word *ildiz* is used in the same terminological sense.

An important feature of metaphorization is that not all features of the transferred unit move into the new domain. Only a certain semantic feature is selected. In the example of *root*, features of the plant root such as "principal supporting part", "source" and "center" are transferred to the linguistic concept. Thus, the content of a metaphoric term is formed not from the imagery itself, but from the selected conceptual features of the image.

Unlike an ordinary word, a term performs the function of naming a concept in a particular scientific or professional domain. However, terminology does not exist in isolation from the real language system. Therefore, many units of common vocabulary extend or narrow their semantics in the process of terminologization.

Metaphorization is precisely one of the active mechanisms of this transitional process. The initial semantics of the name, bound to concrete experience, transfers into an abstract meaning denoting a scientific concept. As a result of such transfer, the term can be concise, imagistic and memorable. At the same time, in the terminological system its imagery-based origin recedes into the background, and the specialized concept takes the main place.

The units *branch* ("branch") can be given as an example. A branch of a plant is a part that separates from the trunk and develops in a separate direction. In linguistics, *branch* can denote a separate direction of a structure in certain classifications or in tree-like syntactic representations. The Uzbek *shox* also provides the possibility of metaphoric naming in scientific texts on the basis of the concept "a direction branching off from the main part".

Another example is *bridge* ("bridge"). A bridge is conceived as a means connecting two points. In linguistics, in units such as *bridge language*, *bridge construction*, the semantics of "connecting", "transition" and "linking two systems" is important. In Uzbek, too, the bridge model can serve to express the concept of mediation and connection in the process of translation or term creation.

Metaphoric terms are classified on the basis of directions such as zoomorphic, phytomorphic, anthropomorphic, cosmomorphic and theomorphic. In anthropomorphic metaphorization, names related to the human body, its movements or activities are transferred to express linguistic concepts. English units such as *head, foot, mouth, tongue, shoulder, body, face* possess wide terminological potential in various sciences. In linguistics, *head* can terminologize in the meanings "head, governing element", *foot* -- "lower part or rhythmic unit", *mouth* -- "opening or entrance part", *tongue* -- "tongue/language".

In Uzbek, the word *bosh* creates a terminological model expressing centrality at various levels in units such as *bosh bo'lak* ("main part"), *bosh so'z* ("headword"), *bosh kelishik* ("nominative case"). The word *oyoq* ("foot"), in poetic meter and certain linguistic representations, evokes the idea of the lower or final part of a unit. The word *og'iz* ("mouth") is also important in phonetic

terminology as an anatomical concept related to the production of sound. In these examples, the transfer of a body-part name to a scientific concept demonstrates the anthropomorphic form of metaphorization.

In phytomorphic metaphorization, names belonging to the plant world serve to express the structure of language. Units such as *root* -- *ildiz*, *stem* -- *o'zak/tana*, *branch* -- *shox*, *tree* -- *daraxt* are among these. The *tree* model is especially convenient for explaining tree-like structures in linguistics. The branching of a syntactic or morphological structure from top to bottom, from center to branches, is compared with the trunk, branches and roots of a tree.

In Uzbek, images such as *ildiz*, *o'zak*, *shox*, *daraxt* can be used to explain the structure and interrelation of language units. For example, in the phrase "so'zning ildizi" ("the root of a word"), the seme of *ildiz* transfers to the basic, relatively stable part of the word. In the terminological combination "so'z yasash daraxti" ("word-formation tree"), the branching property of a tree serves as the basis for a graphic representation of derivational relations.

The zoomorphic model is based on transferring the body parts, behaviors or natural characteristics of animals to scientific concepts. Images such as *animal, bird, wing, tail* may occur in certain theoretical and descriptive units of linguistic terminology. For example, *wing* ("wing") in a figurative sense can express the seme of spreading in two directions, an additional branch or a separate direction; *tail* ("tail") serves to express the concept of the final part of a sequence.

In this model, the main source of metaphorization is human experience of the animal world. In term creation, not all biological features of the animal are selected, but only one or several features matching the scientific concept. Therefore, in understanding the content of a metaphoric term, its terminological definition, rather than its etymological image, should be taken as the main criterion.

Metaphorization is not limited to names of living beings. Spatial concepts such as up-down, inner-outer, center-periphery, road, boundary, bridge, layer, field also actively participate in creating linguistic terms. For example, units such as *language field* ("field of language"), *semantic field*, *boundary*, *path* evoke contextual semes beyond abstract relations.

In Uzbek, units such as *maydon*, *chegara*, *qatlam*, *yo'l* are also actively used in scientific terminological combinations. In "semantik maydon" ("semantic field"), the concept of *maydon* ("field") helps to conceive a set of units united on the basis of common meaning as a spatial field. In "til qatlamlari" ("language layers"), the concept of *qatlam* ("layer") makes it possible to depict within a single system the constituent parts that differ historically or functionally.

The following table presents a comparative view of units formed on the basis of metaphorization or explained by a metaphoric model.

Comparative overview of units based on metaphoric models

Metaphoric model	English unit	Uzbek equivalent	Initial image	Transferred feature
Anthropomorphic	Head	bosh	human head	centrality, dominance
Anthropomorphic	Foot	oyoq	human foot	lower/final part
Anthropomorphic	Mouth	og'iz	mouth	opening/entrance
Anthropomorphic	Tongue	til	human tongue	connection with speech/sound
Phytomorphic	Root	ildiz	plant root	basic, supporting part
Phytomorphic	Stem	o'zak/tana	plant stem	central structure
Phytomorphic	Branch	shox	tree branch	branching
Phytomorphic	Tree	daraxt	tree	hierarchical branching

Spatial	Field	maydon	physical field	a set of units
Spatial	Boundary	chegara	territorial border	separation/limit
Spatial	Bridge	ko'prik	connecting two points	mediation
Path model	Path	yo'l	road of movement	sequence/development
Object model	Layer	qatlam	superimposed arrangement	level within a system
Object model	Frame	ramka	limiting construction	structural delimitation

As can be seen from the table, there are common cognitive models in creating metaphoric terms in English and Uzbek. Images related to the human body and the plant world are convenient for expressing universal concepts such as center, basis, branch and up-down orientation in both languages. At the same time, the form of a concrete term, its grammatical combinability and the scope of its scientific application may differ across languages.

One of the complex aspects of metaphoric terminology is the issue of polysemy. In an ideal terminological system, it is expedient that one term express one specialized concept accurately. However, the property of polysemy of natural language also affects terminology. One and the same form may have separate terminological meanings in different domains or in different branches of a single science.

For example, the word *root* denotes a plant root in general vocabulary; in domains such as mathematics, computer technologies and linguistics it is used in various specialized meanings. Within linguistics, too, *root* denotes a morphological concept. The Uzbek *ildiz* may also combine everyday and terminological meanings. Thus, the precise meaning of a term arising as a result of metaphorization is determined through context and a domain-specific definition.

The polysemy of a metaphoric term should not always be evaluated as a shortcoming. If there is a clear conceptual connection between the meanings, such polysemy can also create convenience in scientific communication. However, in educational literature, dictionaries and digital resources it is necessary to distinguish the meanings clearly.

A metaphoric unit may perform different functions in scientific, journalistic and artistic discourse. For example, "ildiz" ("root") can be used imagistically in an artistic text in the meaning of origin or basis, while in a scientific text it is a term denoting a morphological concept. Thus, the function of one and the same form changes depending on the type of discourse and the communicative purpose.

It is important to show this distinction in teaching linguistic terms. A student must be able to distinguish the ordinary meaning of the word "bosh" ("head") from the meaning of the term *bosh bo'lak* ("main part"). Because the terminological meaning is not merely a lexical transfer; it occupies a place within a certain theoretical system. From this point of view, metaphorization creates a term, and the terminological system gives it a precise scientific boundary.

In lexicographing metaphoric terms, three main issues are important: the form of the term, its specialized meaning, and the context substantiating the meaning. Ordinary translation cannot always fully reveal the scientific content of a metaphoric term. Therefore, it is expedient for a dictionary entry to provide a brief, precise definition, a domain label and, where possible, a normative example.

For example, it is not sufficient to translate *head* merely as "bosh" ("head"). If it is used as a syntactic term, it is necessary to show that it is the governing element in a phrase or construction. For *root*, along with the translation "ildiz", its function in the morphological structure of the word must be explained. Thus, in metaphoric terminography, translation and definition complement each other.

In digital dictionaries this possibility expands further. For a term, the main meaning, synonyms, variants, domain, language, etymological source, collocations, graphic structure and examples can be given in separate fields. This approach makes it possible to systematically present metaphorization models in the formation of English-Uzbek terminological resources.

Comparing English and Uzbek makes it possible to identify not only the lexical correspondence of metaphoric terms but also the conceptual models behind them. For example, in pairs such as *head* -- *bosh*, *root* -- *ildiz*, *branch* -- *shox*, the source of the image is similar. However, the scope of application and the semantic boundaries of the terms do not necessarily have to be exactly the same.

In comparative analysis it is useful to distinguish three levels: first, the correspondence of the image source; second, the correspondence of the transferred semantic feature; third, the correspondence of the function in the terminological system. For example, the root may be conceived as the basic part in both languages, but there is no guarantee that its theoretical interpretation in specific grammatical schools does not differ.

Studying metaphorization from a cognitive point of view shows how language units express abstract scientific concepts through concrete images from human experience. Since concepts such as head -- center, root -- basis, branch -- network, bridge -- connection, boundary -- separation are comprehensible to humans, they become active models in scientific naming as well.

The consistency of the terminological system is one of the important conditions of scientific communication. Since metaphoric terms have an imagistic origin, in certain cases several names may arise for one concept, or several meanings for one name. This situation is especially noticeable in translation, the creation of textbooks and the compilation of bilingual dictionaries.

In the standardization process, it is necessary to determine which concept the term expresses, its synonymous variants, abbreviations, grammatical form and equivalents in other languages. A metaphoric basis is not a reason to reject a term; on the contrary, its semantic boundary must be determined precisely from a scientific point of view. Therefore, in English-Uzbek terminological research, metaphoric units can be divided into three groups: units with full conceptual correspondence, partially corresponding units, and units that are metaphoric in one language but expressed by another nominative mechanism in the other. Such a classification is useful for translation and term-creation practice.

Metaphoric transfer does not always create a term. For terminologization, the new meaning must be used stably in a certain domain, attached to a concept and accepted communicatively. Therefore, it is methodologically important to distinguish the processes of metaphor, metaphorization and terminologization from one another.

The analysis of new examples shows that the most productive sources of metaphorization are concepts directly connected with everyday human experience. Units such as head, hand, foot, tongue, mouth, root, tree, branch, road, boundary, bridge, layer and field make it possible to express abstract scientific relations on the basis of concrete conception. Such units adapt to different terminological systems in different languages. Metaphorization is an important cognitive-semantic mechanism in the formation and development of linguistic terminology. By loading

existing language units with a new, specialized meaning, it provides the possibility of naming scientific concepts. Comparative observations conducted on the material of English and Uzbek show that anthropomorphic, phytomorphic, zoomorphic and spatial models are active in term formation. In understanding the essence of a metaphoric term, three factors have special importance: the source of the image, the transferred semantic feature and the specialized function in the terminological system. Examples such as *root -- ildiz*, *head -- bosh*, *branch -- shox*, *bridge -- ko'prik*, *field -- maydon* clearly demonstrate the transfer of names related to concrete experience to abstract scientific concepts.

Terms formed as a result of metaphorization may also be connected with polysemy and multifunctionality. Therefore, in lexicographing them, one should not be limited to translation alone; the definition, domain, context and semantic model of the term must also be indicated. Digital lexicography creates a convenient opportunity for systematically combining such data.

Conclusion. In general, the comparative study of metaphorization can serve as a theoretical and practical basis for revealing the common and national features of English and Uzbek terminology, for creating new terms and standardizing existing ones, as well as for improving bilingual and digital dictionaries.

REFERENCES

1. Abduazizov A.A. Tilshunoslik nazariyasiga kirish. – Toshkent: SHARQ NMAK, 2010. – 177 b.
2. Исмаилов Ғ. М. Ўзбек тили терминологик тизимларида семантик усулда термин ҳосил бўлиши. – Тошкент, 2011. – 116 б.
3. Эрматов И. Ўзбек тилшунослик терминларининг шаклланиши ва тараққиёти (умумий ўрта таълим мактабларининг дарсликлари асосида): филол. фанлари … фалсафа доктори (PhD) … дисс. автореф. – Тошкент, 2019.
4. Махмараимова Ш.Т. Оламнинг миллий лисоний тасвирида теоморфик метафоранинг когнитив аспекти: Филол. фанлари … фалсафа доктори (PhD) … диссер. – Тошкент, 2018. – 160 б.
5. Mirzaxmedova X.V. Fors va o‘zbek tillarida termin yasash prinsiplari va muammolari (ijtimoiy-siyosiy terminlar misolida): Filol. fanlari doktori (DSc) … disser. avtoref. – Buxoro, 2022.
6. Миртожиев М. Ўзбек тили семасиологияси. – Тошкент: Мумтоз сўз, 2010. – 286 б.
7. Менглиев Б. Лисоний тизим яхлитлиги ва унда сатҳлараро муносабатлар: Филол. фан. доктори … диссер. – Бухоро, 2001. – 217 б.
8. Қобулжонова Г.К. Метафоранинг системавий лингвистик талқини: филол. фан. номз. … дисс. автореферати. – Тошкент, 2000. – 21 б.
9. Xudayberganova D.S. Metaforik matnning lingvistik xususiyatlari // O‘zbek tili va adabiyoti. Toshkent, 2012 y. 1-son. 36-b.