

O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI
OLIY TA'LIM, FAN VA INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI
FARG'ONA DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI

**FarDU.
ILMIY
XABARLAR**

1995-yildan nashr etiladi
Yilda 6 marta chiqadi

**2024/6-SON
ILOVA TO'PLAM**

**НАУЧНЫЙ
ВЕСТНИК.
ФерГУ**

Издаётся с 1995 года
Выходит 6 раз в год

Ч.Х.Чамолов	
Ифодаи мафхуми ишқ дар шеъри фарзона	435
Е.В.Шевченко	
Особенности историзма в романах пиримкула кадырова	439
Я.И.Нишанов	
Общечеловеческое значение сюжета, касающийся всего человечества	441
E.R.Adjeminova	
Phraseological image and motivational model	444
Н.Д.Ирина	
Влияние философии ницше на русскую литературу начала XX века	447
Н.Д.Ирина	
Литературный стиль и философские идеи в произведениях Франца Кафки: Абсурд, отчуждение и экзистенциальный кризис	453
Я.И.Нишанов	
Место и роль воспевания самой прекрасной истории в творчестве Дурбека	457

TILSHUNOSLIK

I.M.Qo'chqarov	
The grammatical features of speech acts in english	460
A.Z.Nurbek	
O'zbek tilshunosligida nutqiy aktlarga doir tadqiqotlar: usul va yondashuvlar	464
S.A.Yusupova	
Pragmatic use of respect in various communicative contexts	471
S.A.Yusupova	
linguistic expressions of respect in english and japanese	474
Sh.Y.Usmoнова	
Comparative study of landscape terms in english and uzbek	477
M.K.Uktamova	
The main components expressing the meaning of the seme "Character" in english phraseological units	480
D.X.Madazizova	
Badiiy diskursda dialektlar individual nutq yaratuvchi vosita sifatida	483
Sh.B.Karimova	
O'zbek va ingliz tillaridagi son komponentli frazeologizmlarda kvantitativlikning ifodalanishi	488
Sh.B.Karimova	
O'zbek tili va ingliz tillarida kvantitativlik birliklarining sathlararo tahlili	495
Sh.R.Karimjonova	
Semantic analysis of visual cognitive verbs in uzbek and english	500
Sh.B.Dushatova	
Euphemisms representing hidden and mysterious concepts	507
Sh.T.Axmadjonova	
Definition and components of comprehension skills	511
Sh.M.Aripova	
Linguocultural analysis of superstitions	515
Sh.M.Aripova	
O'zbek va nemis tillarida irim-sirimlari bilan bog'liq tushunchalarni ifodalovchi leksemalar tahlili	519
Y.U.Abdurazzakov	
Frazeologik birliklarda jinsiy va yosh identifikatsiyasi: til va madaniyatning o'zaro aloqasi	522
N.X.Alieva	
Interlingual correspondence as a factor in enriching phraseology and identifying isomorphism and allomorphism of languages	525
R.U.Axrорова, M.T.Mamadaliyeva	
O'zbek amaliyotida turistik atamalarni standartlashtirishda ingliz tilining o'rni	530
M.S.G'aniyeva	
O'zbekiston ijtimoiy transformatsiyalashuvi jarayonida gender munosabatlari hamda tadbirkor ayol fenomenining falsafiy talqini	533



UO'K: 81-2:81'37:811.111

O'ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILLARIDAGI LANDSHAFT TERMINLARINING QIYOSIY TAHLILI**СРАВНИТЕЛЬНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ЛАНДШАФТНЫХ ТЕРМИНОВ В
АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ****COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LANDSCAPE TERMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK****Usmonova Shaxnoza Yoqubjon qizi** 
Farg'ona davlat universiteti, f.f.b.f.d., (PhD)**Annotatsiya**

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi landshaft terminologiyasining taqqoslama tahlili taqdim etiladi, bu yerda geografik xususiyatlarni tasvirlashda ishlatiladigan so'z boyligi va ularning madaniy konnotatsiyalari diqqat markazida. Tadqiqot oddiy leksik ekvivalentlikdan tashqariga chiqib, har bir tildagi so'z tanlovining semantik nozikliklari va pragmatik oqibatlarini chuqur o'rganadi. Lug'at tahlilini korpusga asoslangan tadqiqot bilan birlashtirgan aralash uslubdan foydalanib, tadqiqot ushbu tillarning landshaftlarni qanday tushinishi va tasniflashi bo'yicha o'xshashliklar va farqlarni aniqlashga qaratilgan. Tahlil nafaqat muayyan so'z boyligi farqlarini, balki ingliz va o'zbek tillarining lingvistik tuzilmalariga singib ketgan kengroq madaniy nuqtal nazarlar va ekologik tushunchalarni ham yoritib beradi. Ushbu taqqoslama asos ayniqsa, ekologik diskurs va badiiy adabiyot tarjimasida aniq tarjima va samarali madaniyaro aloqa uchun potentsial qiyinchiliklar va imkoniyatlarni ochib beradi. Tadqiqot natijalari til, madaniyat va atrof-muhit o'rtasidagi murakkab munosabatlarni chuqurroq anglashga hissa qo'shadi va turli lingvistik tizimlarning tabiatga bo'lgan qarashimizni qanday aks ettirishi va shakllantirishini tushunishga imkon beradi. Tadqiqot, shuningdek, til farqlarining madaniyaro ekologik xabardorlikka va tarjimada madaniy nozikliklarni saqlashga ta'siri bo'yicha kelajakdagi tadqiqot yo'nalishlarini taklif qiladi.

Аннотация

В данной статье представлен сравнительный анализ терминологии ландшафта в английском и узбекском языках, сфокусированный на лексике, используемой для описания географических объектов и связанных с ними культурных коннотаций. Исследование выходит за рамки простого лексического эквивалента, углубляясь в семантические нюансы и прагматические последствия различного выбора слов в каждом языке. Используя смешанный подход, интегрирующий анализ словарей с корпусно-ориентированным исследованием, данное исследование направлено на выявление как сходств, так и различий в том, как эти языки концептуализируют и классифицируют ландшафты. Анализ выявляет не только вариации в конкретном словарном запасе, но и подчеркивает более широкие культурные перспективы и представления об окружающей среде, заложенные в лингвистических структурах английского и узбекского языков. Эта сравнительная основа освещает потенциальные проблемы и возможности для точного перевода и эффективной межкультурной коммуникации, особенно в областях экологического дискурса и художественного перевода. Результаты исследования способствуют более глубокому пониманию сложных взаимосвязей между языком, культурой и окружающей средой, предлагая понимание того, как различные лингвистические системы отражают и формируют наше восприятие окружающего мира. Исследование также предлагает направления для будущих исследований воздействия лингвистических различий на межкультурную экологическую осведомленность и сохранение культурных нюансов в переводе.

Abstract

This article presents a comparative analysis of landscape terminology in English and Uzbek, focusing on the vocabulary used to describe geographical features and their associated cultural connotations. The research extends beyond simple lexical equivalence, delving into the semantic subtleties and pragmatic implications of differing word choices in each language. Employing a mixed-methods approach that integrates dictionary analysis with corpus-based research, the study aims to uncover both the similarities and divergences in how these languages conceptualize and classify landscapes. The analysis reveals not only variations in specific vocabulary but also highlights the broader cultural perspectives and environmental understandings embedded within the linguistic structures of English and Uzbek. This comparative framework illuminates potential challenges and opportunities for accurate translation and effective cross-cultural communication, particularly within the domains of environmental discourse and literary translation. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the intricate relationship between language, culture, and the environment, offering insights into how different linguistic systems reflect and shape our perception of the natural world. The study further suggests avenues for future research into the impact of linguistic differences on cross-cultural environmental awareness and the preservation of cultural nuances in translation.

Kalit so'zlar: landshaft terminologiyasi, leksik yozishmalar, madaniy istiqbollar, atrof-muhitni tushunish, semantik chuqurlik, madaniy rezonans, o'zlashtirma so'zlar, madaniy konnotatsiya, madaniyatlararo muloqot.

Ключевые слова: ландшафтная терминология, лексические соответствия, культурные перспективы, понимание окружающей среды, семантическая глубина, культурный резонанс, заимствованные слова, культурная коннотация, межкультурная коммуникация.

Key words: landscape terminology, lexical correspondences, cultural perspectives, environmental understandings, semantic depth, cultural resonance, loanwords, cultural connotation, cross-cultural communication.

INTRODUCTION

Landscape terminology is a rich reflection of both the physical environment and the cultural lens through which it is perceived. The vocabulary used to describe landscapes – mountains, rivers, forests, plains – is not merely a neutral cataloging of geographical features; it embodies the cultural experiences, historical interactions, and environmental understandings of a society. Different languages categorize and describe landscapes in unique ways, reflecting their specific geographical contexts and historical development. This inherent linguistic diversity necessitates a comparative approach to understanding how varied cultures interpret and engage with their surroundings[1]. This study, therefore, aims to investigate the similarities and differences in landscape terminology between English and Uzbek, two languages representing vastly different geographical and cultural backgrounds. The contrasting environments of the Anglosphere and Central Asia, coupled with their distinct historical trajectories, are expected to yield a fascinating case study in linguistic variation[3]. Understanding these linguistic differences is crucial not only for accurate translation and effective cross-cultural communication but also for appreciating the diverse and nuanced ways humans interact with and perceive their environment, revealing insights into how language itself shapes our understanding of the natural world. This research will contribute to a more nuanced comprehension of the complexities of environmental discourse and the challenges and opportunities presented by cross-cultural communication in this crucial area.

LITERATURE ANALYSIS AND METHODS

This research employed a comparative analysis of landscape terms, grounded in existing literature on linguistic relativity and cross-cultural semantics. Studies such as [cite relevant studies on linguistic relativity, e.g., Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and its applications to environmental vocabulary] informed the theoretical framework, highlighting the potential influence of cultural context on linguistic categorization of landscapes. Furthermore, research on translation studies, particularly concerning the challenges of translating culturally specific terminology [cite relevant studies on translation of environmental terms or cultural-specific vocabulary], guided the methodological approach.

This research employed a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative analyses. The quantitative component involved a comparative analysis of landscape terms found in monolingual dictionaries (e.g., the Oxford English Dictionary, authoritative Uzbek-Uzbek dictionaries) and bilingual dictionaries (English-Uzbek, Uzbek-English). This provided a foundational understanding of the existing lexical resources and potential lexical correspondences. The qualitative component consisted of a corpus-based investigation of English and Uzbek texts, focusing on identifying the frequency and contextual usage of specific landscape terms[7]. This allowed for a nuanced understanding of the pragmatic implications of word choice and the cultural connotations associated with specific terms. The analysis focused on identifying equivalent terms, near-synonyms, and terms with no direct equivalent in the other language, exploring the semantic nuances and cultural connotations associated with each term, informed by existing literature on linguistic relativity and translation studies [cite relevant studies]. The integration of quantitative and qualitative data allowed for a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of landscape terminology across the two languages.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis of landscape terminology in English and Uzbek revealed a complex interplay of similarities and significant differences, extending beyond simple lexical correspondences. While basic geographical features like "mountain" (tog'), "river" (daryo), "forest" (o'rmon), and "sea" (dengiz) possess relatively straightforward equivalents, a deeper examination

TILSHUNOSLIK

of more nuanced descriptions unveiled considerable variation reflecting differing cultural perspectives and environmental understandings[1]. The English language, for instance, showcases a rich and diversified vocabulary to distinguish various types of forests (e.g., woodland, forest, jungle, thicket, wood, copse)[7], a reflection of its historical engagement with diverse ecosystems and a potentially more granular ecological classification system. This contrasts with Uzbek, where fewer, broader terms are employed, suggesting a different historical trajectory in categorizing and conceptualizing forest environments, potentially shaped by the specific ecological characteristics of Central Asia. Furthermore, the analysis unearthed a considerable number of terms denoting specific land formations or vegetation unique to the Central Asian region, lacking direct counterparts in English. These necessitate either lengthy descriptive translations, which often fail to capture the full semantic depth and cultural resonance of the original term, or the adoption of loanwords, which risks sacrificing subtle cultural connotations. The study also underscored the crucial influence of culturally embedded connotations on lexical choice. For example, the Uzbek term for a specific type of oasis frequently carries strong historical and cultural weight, evoking a far richer sense of cultural identity and historical memory than any possible English translation can convey[2]. These findings underscore the limitations of relying solely on direct lexical equivalence and emphasize the critical need to consider the cultural and historical contexts inherent in landscape terminology when comparing and translating between languages. This nuanced understanding is crucial for accurate translation, cross-cultural communication, and a more comprehensive appreciation of the diverse ways humans interact with and perceive their environment.

CONCLUSION

This comparative study of landscape terms in English and Uzbek highlights the intricate relationship between language, culture, and the environment. While basic geographical features often have direct equivalents, nuanced descriptions reveal significant differences reflecting the distinct geographical contexts and cultural perceptions embedded in each language. Further research could explore the impact of these linguistic variations on translation practices and cross-cultural understanding of environmental issues. Understanding the cultural baggage associated with specific landscape terms is vital for fostering more accurate and culturally sensitive communication. This study serves as a preliminary investigation into this complex area, suggesting avenues for future research into other language pairs and specific semantic domains within landscape terminology.

REFERENCES

1. Самохина Е.В. Репрезентация концептосферы "Land" в английской лингвокультуре: Дис. канд. фил. наук. – Волгоград, 2010. – 246 с.
2. Гавриленко О.В. Когнитивное освоение ландшафта в британской и американской лингвокультурах: сравнительно-сопоставительное исследование: Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Владивосток, 2010. – 181-186 с.
3. Ивашкевич И.Н. Лексическая категоризация // Когнитивные исследования языка. – М.: Ин-т языкознания РАН, 2012. – 192 с.
4. Прохорова М.Р. Цвет как основа характеристики человека в сравнительных словосочетаниях (на материале русского, английского и французского языков): Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Тамбов, 2010. – 61-65с.
5. Usmonova Sh.Y.(2023). O'zbek va ingliz tillarida landshaft atamalarining struktur xususiyatlari. International Multidisciplinary Research in Academic Science (IMRAS) Volume. 6, Issue 07, 552-556 b
6. Usmonova Sh.Y.(2023). Comparative analysis of landscape terms in uzbek and English languages. Journal of research and innovative. May, 10-13 p
7. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English