ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 5| May 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

SEMANTIC FEATURES OF TRANSPORT RELATED TERMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Masharipov Jakhongir Axmedovich
PhD Student of Urgench State University

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra21587
DOI No: 10.36713/epra21587

ANNOTATION

Word formation is essential phenomenon in the creation of terms. There are several methods of word formation, yet in this article we mainly focus on semantic medium of this linguistic phenomenon. Particularly, we will focus on metaphors among figures of speech in English and Uzbek languages in forming new terms in transport sphere. We will analyze how these correspond to each regarding their quantity and meaning. Also, we will analyze these conditions with relevant instances.

KEY WORDS: *Transport Sphere, Terminology, Terms, Semantics, Metaphor, Word Formation.*

INTRODUCTION

The most striking manifestation of the national perception of the world by different ethnic groups in the special area under study are metaphorical designations of concepts of transport. The emergence of a large number of metaphors in terminologies is due to the fact that metaphor corresponds to the ability of a person to grasp and create similarities between very different individuals and objects.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In Uzbek and English, transport terms undergo semantic changes, meaning transfer, breaking of connections between some meanings of polysemantic words, and the assimilation of some of them, leading to the creation of new terms, i.e. the semantic expansion of certain terms. This phenomenon was used by O.S. Akhmedov as “word formation by the semantic method”. In some sources and research works, this method is also noted as “semantic-syntactic method” [Akhmedov 2020: 85].

The first ideas in Uzbek linguistics on the issue of term formation by the semantic method were noted by Professor S. Ibrohimov [Ibrohimov 1957: 63]. The scientist’s work in this area was discussed by R. Doniyorov in his work “Some Issues of Technical Terminology of the Uzbek Language” and, showing the importance of the semantic method in the terminology of this area, emphasized that this method serves to enrich the terminology of the field. The scientist divided the terms formed from common lexemes into several thematic groups [Doniyorov 1988: 76-79]. In addition, the use of this method in the process of term formation has been discussed to some extent in studies conducted in some areas of Uzbek terminology. In particular, N.T. Khotamov in his work on literary terms [Khotamov 1971: 223], S.A. Azizov analyzed the terms formed using the semantic method in some terms denoting the names of musical instruments and their parts of the Uzbek language [Azizov 1981: 284]. Azizov in his research work noted that some terms formed using the syntactic method, including compound terms such as Khorezm lazgi, Samarkand ushshog, Andijan polka, yogoch nay, ilgak tor, mis karnay, also belong to this group, while O.S. Akhmedov emphasizes that such terms have nothing to do with terms formed using the semantic method. We agree with this opinion, and it is necessary to note that in order for terms to be considered semantically derived, there must be a transfer of meaning, a break in meaning between the common word and the term formed in this way.

Yu.S.Stepanov emphasizes that the semantic development of a word is subordinated to the needs of two functions of the language: the assimilation of reality through metaphor and the participation of knowledge through scientific concepts, and notes that there are two directions in it. First, there is an exchange of lexeme denotations, which is based on metaphor, and secondly, the content of the signifiers is constantly deepened due to their integral connection with the system of word meanings [Stepanov 1976: 323]. Continuing his thought, the scientist emphasizes that a term arises as a result of the development of subsequent meanings based on the meaning of the word itself.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Most linguists have emphasized that metaphor plays a key role in the formation of terms through the semantic method. Because, new terms are created by taking as a basis certain features of common words: similarities in form, color, and other aspects.

The foundations of modern research on the general theory of metaphor are laid in the works of both major Russian philologists (O.S. Akhmanova, V.V. Vinogradov, A.A. Potebnya) and foreign scientists (N. Black, M. Johnson, E. Cassirer, D. Lakoff, H. Riards, A.A.). Terms-metaphors - appearing in the language of science and technology in the process of cognition, arise as a result of the establishment of one or another complex associative connection between objects and phenomena of the surrounding world, as a result of a complex cognitive process. In scientific knowledge, the transfer of everyday experience to a specific field of activity is characteristic of different languages, but each national language

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 5| May 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

uses a metaphorical method of forming terms in its own way. Thus, the cognitive content of the metaphor allows us to determine the specificity of the national specific view of the world. Consequently, it was found that English transport terminology is more figurative in nature than in Uzbek.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

When comparing metaphorical terms in English and Uzbek transport terminology, we found both complete interlingual equivalents and metaphorical terms that are not completely equivalent in the languages being compared, but are selected based on the specific features of each language. We included in the first type terms that are completely identical in content in both languages, that is, there is a coincidence of the meanings of term metaphors. Most of them fit well into the framework of universal units that reflect a common worldview.

For example, a road leading away from a railway line caused an association with a tree branch among Uzbek and English speakers, which led to the emergence of the metaphor *branch(*in Uzbek *tarmoq/qism)* in the terminology under study. Other similar examples include: ***neck*** *– quyish* ***bo'yni****,* ***tooth – tish****, air* ***cushion*** *barge/ship – havo* ***yostiqchal****i barja/kema,* ***ladder*** *track –* ***narvon*** *yo'li, drainage* ***gallery*** *– drenaj* ***galereyasi.***

The terms that we have compared to the second type have a figurative nature in the languages we have compared, but their metaphorical nature in each language has its own language-specific characteristics. For example, the term ***leg*** is used in English in the meaning of a pillar in various circles of the transport sector. This lexeme, whose original meaning is a member of the human body, acquires the meaning of a metaphorical term within the transport sector. In Uzbek, this term is used not as a leg, but in the sense of a support (***tayanch***). There is also the term ***knuckle*** in English, which is a hinged, rotating or bending part of a mechanism that provides movement or flexibility. It is used in railway, automobile, aviation and sea transport. In Uzbek, its alternative is expressed by the metaphorical term ***mushtcha***, that is, in Uzbek we can witness that this term was chosen based on similarity of form. Another such example is the term ***shoe web*** in English. Its explanation is as follows - this is the inner part of the structure associated with the brake or friction surface, usually found in brake shoes or components working with railway rails. In Uzbek transport terminology, this term is used as the ***rib*** of a brake shoe (*tormoz kolodkasi* ***qovurg'asi***). We can witness that the lexeme rib is added to the alternative to this term in Uzbek.

The second type includes terms that have a figurative nature in the languages being compared, but their metaphorical nature in each language is unique and depends on the characteristics of that language.

It is clear that a term can be expressed as a metaphor in one language and as a non-metaphorical lexeme in another. As we have found, English transport terminology is more metaphorical in nature than Uzbek, and therefore there are often situations where an English metaphorical term corresponds to a non-metaphorical Uzbek term. To illustrate, *full-****dress*** *ship – bayroqlar bilan bezatilgan kema, ocean* ***goer*** *– okean kemasi,* ***runner*** *– tez yurar kema,* ***second-hand*** *vessel – eksplatatsiya qilingan kema,* ***skimmer*** *– glisser,* ***skimming*** *boat – glisser,* ***smack*** *(vessel/craft) – bir machtali baliq tutishga mo'ljallangan kema,* ***waist*** *boat – kichik qayiq, brake shoe – tormoz kolodkasi,* ***cat's back*** *– do'nglik,* ***skirt*** *– yubka,* ***apron*** *management service – perron xizmati, fuel-****hungry*** *aircraft – katta hajmda yoqilg'i sarflovchi uchish apparati,* ***hopper*** *car – xopper vagon,* ***patch*** *– ta'mir(lash) parchasi,* ***destroyer*** *– minonosetslar eskadrasi,* ***dummy*** *ship – kema maket, fast* ***merchantman*** *– tez yurar savdo kemasi,* ***bracket*** *– kronshteyn and* others.

In very rare cases, an Uzbek metaphorical term has a non-metaphorical English equivalent. Examples of these include ***izquvar*** *kema – pursuing ship, xavfsizlik* ***yostiqchasi*** *– airbag, poyezd* ***dumi*** *– rear end of train.* These terms, reflecting differences in approaches to the nomenclature of transport concepts in the languages being compared, demonstrate the language-specific features of a single substantive invariant.

CONCLUSION

A comparative analysis of Uzbek and English metaphorical terms revealed that the nature of special lexical units and the level of metaphoricality in the terminology of the same name in the languages under study differ. There are cases when metaphor-terms can have equivalents in both languages. Yet, it should be noted that English contains more terms having metaphorical features compares to the Uzbek language. In rare cases, vice versa can be witnessed. Among figures of speech, metaphor plays more important role and makes up majority examples than other figures of speech.

REFERENCES

1. *Axmedov O.S. Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida soliq-bojxona terminlarining lingvistik tahlil va tarjima muammolari. Monografiya. -T.:2020.-85 b.*
2. *Kozlovskaya, O. G. Cognitive and structural-semantic features of marine terminology (based on English and Russian languages)]. PhD dissertation. Saint Petersburg: 2005.-p. 374-462.*
3. *Olmatova, Sh. S. Lexical-semantic analysis of railway transport terminology in Tajik, Russian and English languages]. PhD dissertation. Dushanbe: 2017.- p. 135,183-201*
4. *Азизов С.А. Лексико-грамматическое исследование музыкальной терминологии узбекского языка. Т.:1981.-284 с.*
5. *Данияров Р. Техническая терминология узбекского языка на современном этапе: Дис. …д-ка.филол.наук.-Т.:1988.-76-79 с.*
6. *Иброхимов С. Профессиональная лексика Ферганской группы говорв: Автореф. дис. …д-ка.филол.наук.-Т.:1957.-63 с.*
7. *Степанов Ю.С. Основы общего языкознания. 2 издание. М.:1976.-323 с.*
8. *Хатамов Н. Развитие узбекской литературоведческой терминологии.- Т.:1971.-223 с.*