

## THE USE OF GEOGRAPHIC TERMS IN THE NOMINATIVE FIELD IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

**Karimov Rustambek Kozimjon ugli**

PhD student, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

**Abstract:** This article presents a concise, systematic IMRaD-format analysis of the use of geographic (toponymic) terms within the nominative field in English and Uzbek. The field concept in linguistics is traced from Saussure through European and Russian structuralism to functional and cognitive orientations. Comparative analysis addresses phonological, morphological, and lexico-semantic strata in the formation of toponyms, center–periphery relations, paradigmatic and syntagmatic connections, and nominative strategies in both languages. Principal findings show the prominence of suffix/prefix models (Uzbek agglutinative affixation; English historical Germanic suffixes and directional prefixes), color/number/relief semantics, animate–inanimate noun oppositions, and multi-nuclear structures as determinants of field organization. Practical recommendations are provided for corpus-based clustering, distributional and componential analyses.

**Keywords:** linguistic field; nominative field; toponymy; phonological stratum; morphological stratum; lexico-semantic stratum; center–periphery; paradigmatic–syntagmatic; affixation; color semantics; number semantics; cognitive linguistics; typology; Uzbek; English

**Introduction** Field approaches to systematic study of linguistic units require joint consideration of semantic, functional, stylistic, and grammatical parameters. Saussure’s sign model, paradigmatic–syntagmatic relations and the notion of value through difference provide a methodological foundation. Ipsen and the Trier school conceptualized semantic fields by conceptual delimitation; Weizsäcker and Humboldt advanced notions of *Weltanschauung* and inner form. In the Russian tradition Shcherba, Vinogradov, Novikov and Gak developed core–periphery models and linked fields with text and pragmatics; Bondarko construed functional-semantic fields as systems deploying different expression levels of content; Lakoff mapped conceptual fields via cognitive metaphor. Uzbek linguists Boronov, Yusupov and Abduvaliev elaborated typological, multi-nuclear and syntactic aspects of field theory. Building on this theoretical groundwork, this study comparatively analyzes nominative-field usage of geographic terms in English and Uzbek.

### Aims and Objectives

1. Describe the role and interaction of phonological, morphological and lexico-semantic strata in English and Uzbek toponymy.
2. Map center–periphery relations in the nominative field and the mechanisms of paradigmatic selection and syntagmatic combination.
3. Compare naming strategies via affixation (suffix/prefix), color, number, relief and animate–inanimate oppositions.
4. Develop practical guidelines for corpus-based methods (clustering, distributional and componential analysis).

### Literature Review (Theoretical Basis)

1. Saussure: the sign’s twofold nature, paradigmatic–syntagmatic relations, value as differential; importance of synchronic–diachronic distinctions in field mapping.

2. Trier, Ipsen, Weizsäcker, Humboldt: semantic fields, conceptual delimitation, inner form and Weltanschauung.
3. Shcherba, Vinogradov, Novikov, Gak: core-periphery, semantic center and shade, pragmatic orientation.
4. Bondarko: functional-semantic field as coordination of expression means across content levels.
5. Lakoff and cognitive linguistics: metaphoric systems and conceptual fields.
6. Uzbek school (Boronov, Yusupov, Abduvaliev): typological congruence, multi-nuclearity, syntactic permeability of fields.

## Methods

1. Synchronic comparative analysis: cartography of paradigmatic choices and syntagmatic combinations in contemporary Uzbek and English toponyms.
2. Componential analysis and paraphrase tests: identification of invariant semes (color, number, relief, directionality, abstract-concrete, animate-inanimate).
3. Distributional analysis and clustering: calculation of center-periphery gradients based on frequency and co-occurrence metrics of toponymic components.
4. Typological comparison: determining iso/allomorphic correspondences between agglutinative (Uzbek) and analytic (English) models.

## Results

### Phonological stratum

1. Toponyms in both Uzbek and English exhibit increased phonotactic complexity in rapid speech; consonant clusters, stress patterns and syllabic templates increase articulatory load. These units correlate with linguo-cultural layers and constitute a stable phonological tier of the nominative field.

### Morphological stratum

1. Uzbek affixation: suffixes such as -lik (possessive/relational), -zor (vegetation/produce), -ko'l/-kul (water body), -tepa/-qir/-tog' (relief) form nuclear toponymic formats.
2. English historical suffixes and components: -land, -shire, -ton/-town, -bridge/-ford/-mouth, -hill/-mount; prefixes: North-/South-/East-/West-, New-, Great-, Upper-/Lower-. Prefixes in English foreground directionality, novelty and prestige near the field center.
3. Uzbek lacks native productive prefixes; instead, determiner+noun compounds (Yangiobod, Yuqorichirchiq) functionally perform prefix-like roles, moving morphosyntactic devices closer to the nucleus.

### Lexico-semantic stratum

1. Color semantics: examples such as Qizilqum ~ Black Sea/White Mountains/Greenland show color terms operating as central semantic axes.
2. Number semantics: Beshtepa, To'rtko'l, Yettiqir ~ Seven Hills, Two Rivers — quantification governs conceptual mapping.
3. Relief and water features: Sho'rko'l, Chortoq, Beshtepa ~ Lake District, Rocky Mountains, Plymouth — natural features motivate naming.

4. Animate–inanimate opposition: Qorako‘l, Bo‘ribuloq ~ Wolf River, Swan Lake — animate names tend to occupy a mid-zone between periphery and core, enriching symbolic stratification.
5. Anthroponyms and historical motivation: Amir Temur Square ~ Washington, Georgetown — personal/historical names create indexical cultural meanings.

### Discussion

1. Within the field, core layers are dominated by stable morphemic patterns (Uzbek suffixes; English suffix+prefix); the periphery favors metaphoric and animate denominations and stylistic colorations.
2. Agglutinative vs analytic models: Uzbek morphological consistency strengthens the core and near-core strata; English compositional and premodification strategies share central functions across concatenative structures.
3. Cognitive perspective: universal semes such as color and number function as salient conceptual markers in both languages, linking spatial perception and navigational models to linguistic naming.
4. Typological isomorphisms: correspondences such as Upper/Lower ~ Yuqori/Quyi; New ~ Yangi; -land ~ land/territory; -shire ~ administrative unit are observable. Direct morphemic equivalents for Uzbek relief suffixes (-zor, -tepa, -qir) are absent in English and are typically rendered via syntagmatic paraphrase.

**Conclusion.** The nominative field of geographic terms in English and Uzbek is a multi-layered system in which phonological stability, morphological nuclei and lexico-semantic motivations interact to produce a center–periphery spectrum. The agglutinative Uzbek model privileges affixation in the nucleus, while English favors suffix+prefix patterns and compounding. Color, number, relief and animate–inanimate semantics constitute principal vectors of naming in both languages. Corpus-based clustering and distributional analyses are recommended as effective methods for identifying centers and peripheries.