

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2023 Issue: 09 Volume: 125

Published: 06.09.2023 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Dilfuza Abdixalik qizi Normurodova

Termez State University

Teacher

Uzbekistan

COMPARATIVE ANALYSES OF BUILDING VOCABULARY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Abstract: This article covers the figurative use of construction words in English and Uzbek languages. Their meanings are shown in both languages and devoted to consideration of representation of the category of form in the conceptual picture of the world of English and Uzbek speakers through metaphorization.

Key words: categorizes, shape, object systematizes, line, structures, column, construction.

Language: English

Citation: Normurodova, D. A. (2023). Comparative analyses of building vocabulary in English and Uzbek languages. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 09 (125), 175-178.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-09-125-14> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2023.09.125.14>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

At the present stage of linguo-cognitive research, interest in the multidimensional phenomenon of metaphor in language, speech and thinking of the native speaker is not extinguished. Today, there is no doubt that the consideration of metaphor has shifted from its narrowly stylistic understanding as a model means of language designed to "beautify" speech to the cognitive aspect of its functioning. The results of the numerous studies carried out in this field of linguistics demonstrate conclusively the fact that the metaphor, in particular the concept. It is a conceptual operation that structures, categorizes, systematizes and conceptualizes objective reality in the mind of the native speaker and predetermines his behavior and world perception, as it reflects stereotypes of thinking and stereotypes of perception of the surrounding reality. Comparative study of the patterns of metaphorical representation of objective reality gives the opportunity to reveal both universal and differential, nationally specific features of cognitive consciousness of speakers of different languages, and lacunarity of metaphorical representation of concepts.

Methodology

Lexus is a semantic field of construction vocabulary. The category of form is one of the categories of reality, the concept of which is formed

in man first. Objects of different shape and configuration, of different structural organization, the spatial judgment about which is formed in the consciousness of the person, surround it in all spheres of its existence. By understanding the surrounding reality, human consciousness, comparing fragments of reality on different features, classifies them into separate groups, categories, classes, subclasses, categories. There are certain established and fixed standards applicable to the evaluation of the external appearance of the subject. Nevertheless, the human consciousness, which is inclined to anthropocentricity and anthropometrics, provides new images and its standards in order to bring the abstract concept of the form of an object closer to a quite tangible, real, close to man sphere.

Results

The results of the comparative study conducted in the material of English and Uzbek languages show that the construction vocabulary is one of the frequency and productive prototype patterns of the form of objects, objects, entities. It should be noted that in all such cases the analogy is based on perceptual similarity. One example of a productive metaphorical reinterpretation of construction vocabulary in order to characterize the shape of an object is the development of metaphorical meaning in

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHIQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

nouns columns and column in the concept spheres of the languages in question. Thus, the same metaphorical significance is observed in the following examples of rethinking people, objects, located or moving behind each other with an extended line: column of demonstrators; tank column; tractor column; a line of moving people or vehicles: a column of refugees. Similar similarity of development of metaphorical meaning of considered nouns is traced in the following examples: column - the same as a column: newspaper column, column of numbers; one of several vertical blocks of print into which a page of a newspaper or magazine is divided: I didn't have time to read the whole article - just the first column; any vertical block of words or numbers: Add the column of figures and divide the sum by three.

In the conceptual sphere of the Uzbek language, a rather productive prototype standard of form is a noun pole, the separate portable values of which coincide with the metaphorical values of the above noun column, as well as the synonym pillar: the column is a mass of something moving, volatile, rising directly up: a column of smoke, a column of fire, a column of insects, dust stands by the column.

For comparison let's give the similar metaphorical meaning of the noun column - something with a tall narrow shape: A column of smoke rose from the chimney; a column of smoke, a column of steam and ash. It should be noted that the synonymous noun pillar A similar metaphorical value is developing: pillar - something that is tall and thin: a pillar of rock, a pillar of smoke.

In addition, the concept of the English language is characterized by the use of the noun pillar for metaphorical representation of the underlying idea as a building pillar: pillar - an important idea, principle or belief, which is not traceable in the concept of the Uzbek language. In the concept spheres of both languages considered a fairly productive source metaphorizing in the sphere of categorization of objects of reality on the basis of FORM are nouns wall and wall, which develop similar metaphorical values: A wall is a solid mass of something that forms a barrier, a veil: a wall of trees, a wall fog, rain, wall of fire, wall of the people, wall of the people, and also in battle, fist fight: A close, closed group of people: to go into battle with the wall, to stand with the wall, to stand with the wall. A similar development of the metaphorical meanings of the noun wall can be seen in the conceptual sphere of the English language: wall - mass of people or things formed in such a way that you cannot: get through or past them: The demonstrators formed a solid wall to stop the police from getting past them; a large, powerful, usually fast moving mass of something: After the rains, the houses were washed away by a wall of mud/water. However, there is also a separate metaphorical meaning of the noun wall - a large number of things that form an upright structure like a wall: a wall of books/boxes.

The similarity of the metaphorical representation of the category of form is observed in the conceptual spheres of the compared languages with the metaphorical use of the following lexical units: arch - to form the shape of an arch; vault - the inner upper part of something resembling such an overlap; dome - an object shaped like the top half of a ball; a dome is a semicircular top of something, the top of something in the form of a hemisphere, an object in the form of a hemisphere: a parachute dome; a maze is a complex, intricate arrangement, combination something: a maze of streets, a maze of thoughts; labyrinth - a system or process that has a lot of very complicated details.

Figurative association on the external basis underlies the rethinking of a number of lexical units of the conceptual sphere of the Uzbek language, metaphorical correspondence to which we have not found in the conceptual sphere of the English language: tower - a pile of objects in the form of such a structure; floor - a number of objects located horizontally on the same level; canopy - a protruding, overhanging part of something some; a corridor is a narrow, long space connecting something, a passage, a ladder - about something located by ledges, with parts protruding one above the other: the rows are arranged by a ladder, multi-stage - consisting of prefabricated steps, nodes, carried out in several stages. This list can be continued, including all the objects of the real world, which in the mind of a native speaker of the Uzbek language are metaphorically reinterpreted by means of construction vocabulary.

The development of a similar metaphorical meaning is observed in the functioning of the nouns brick and brick in English and Uzbek. The concept sphere of a native English speaker is characterized by a metaphorical reinterpretation of the brick lexeme to represent the shape of objects: a bar of soap, tea, a loaf of bread, which can be traced in the concept sphere of a native Uzbek speaker: a brick is a very thick book, a manuscript; a product in the form of such a bar: peat in bricks.

It should be noted that a number of the listed objects serve as a standard not only in naive, but also in scientific categorization, in particular when nominating anatomical objects: the vestibule in the ear labyrinth, the nasal septum, the labyrinth - the inner ear of vertebrates and humans, the palate - the heavy upper part inside the mouth, In the wall of the uterus/stomach, the arch is a raised curve on the lower part of the legs.

The representation of the form category in real reality is inextricably linked with the structure of the object. In the metaphorical nomination, which is based on the similarity of the shape of the object and the prototype standard, the structural features of the characterized objects and phenomena are also reinterpreted. The metaphorical reinterpretation of structural features testifies to the potential of the construction vocabulary in the nomination of abstract

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

concepts. The building and the process of its construction become the basis for more complex analogies, which are based not so much on the visual perception of the shape of the object, as they are created in the human mind. Such a structural feature of a building as a foundation in both considered conceptual spheres, by functional analogy, is reinterpreted as a base, a support, the basis of something, including abstract concepts: the foundation of knowledge, the scientific foundation; the foundation is the most basic part of what the rest of which develops.

Accordingly, to lay the foundation of something is to lay the beginning of something; to lay the foundations – to carefully plan and prepare something that will be needed in the future to achieve an aim; foundation-stone – the basic ideas, principles, facts etc that something depends on or develops from. The widespread use of the nouns foundation and foundation may indicate the generalization of its meaning: "the foundation of a building is the foundation of something."

The analogy with the construction of a building allows us to visualize important structural elements of abstract concepts as a building material: brick is an essential element of something; building block is one of the basic parts that something is made from and cannot exist without; cement is something binding, binding, uniting someone, anything; cement – something that helps to make an idea stronger.

Conclusion

The above examples indicate that this metaphorical reinterpretation is universal for both conceptual paintings under consideration. Thus, the above examples indicate the high productivity of the construction vocabulary in the representation of the form and structure of a large number of objects of the material and ideal worlds. In our opinion, this is explained by the desire of human consciousness to give the form and structure of cognizable objects and entities familiar recognizable outlines.

The conceptual sphere of building construction is close to a person, since a dwelling, a building in its generalized sense, is a primary necessity for the well-being of an individual. Its orderly internal organization serves as a prototype of categorization and systematization of objective reality. The commonality of world perception and categorization of objects of the surrounding reality in the conceptual world pictures of native English and Uzbek speakers is obviously explained by the commonality of physical and mental organization, the similarity of the world perception of native speakers of the languages in question, the possible interpenetration and mutual influence of languages caused by external contacts. The revealed inconsistency and lacunarity of the metaphorical perception of a number of concepts indicate the nationally determined specificity of the metaphorical perception of a certain number of objects of the material and ideal worlds.

References:

1. Booij, G. (2013). *Morphology in CxG*. In Th. Hoffmann & G. Trousdale (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Construction Grammar*. (pp.255-273). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Booij, G. (2015). Word formation in Construction Morphology. In P. O. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S.Olsen & F. Rainer (Eds.). *Word Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe*, Volume 1. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter, 188-202.
1. Booij, G. (2016). *Construction Morphology*. In A. Hippisley & G. Stump (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Morphology*. (pp.424-448). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Booij, G. (2017). *The construction of words*. In B. Dancygier (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 229-245.
3. Booij, G., & Audring, J. (2017). Construction Morphology and the Parallel Architecture of Grammar. *Cognitive Science* 41 (S2), 277-302.
4. (2009). *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Johnson, S. (1807). *Dictionary of the English Language Abstracted from the Folio Edition* (12th ed.). London.
6. (2006). *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*. International Student ed. Macmillan Publishers Limited.
7. Pisarchuk, K. (1974). *Some system discrepancies between Russian and English terms and their reflection in translation*. Abstract cand. of Philol. Sciences. (p.30). Moscow.
8. Proshina, A.A. (2008). *Modeling a bilingual dictionary-thesaurus in economics*: Abstract of the thesis. diss. philol. Sciences. - Ekaterinburg.
9. Paluanova, H.D. (2016). *Ecological terminology derivational-semantic features* (Uzbek, Karakalpak, English and Russian): DSc diss. abstract. (p.88). T..

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Impact Factor: | ISRA (India) = 6.317 | SIS (USA) = 0.912 | ICV (Poland) = 6.630 |
| | ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582 | РИИЦ (Russia) = 3.939 | PIF (India) = 1.940 |
| | GIF (Australia) = 0.564 | ESJI (KZ) = 8.771 | IBI (India) = 4.260 |
| | JIF = 1.500 | SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184 | OAJI (USA) = 0.350 |

10. Polivanov, E.D. (1934). *Russian grammar in comparison with the Uzbek language.* – Tashkent.
11. (2002). *Webster's New World College Dictionary*, Cambridge University Press, Fourth Edition.