

NOMINATIVE FEATURES OF TRANSPORT LEXEMES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Ergasheva Baxtiniso Uktam qizi

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22875373>**INTRODUCTION**

The theory of nomination is the branch of linguistics that studies the process of naming objects and phenomena — that is, the mechanisms by which linguistic units become linked to reality. Every lexeme forms its name either in a “motivated” way, on the basis of a particular feature, property, or function, or, conversely, in an “unmotivated” way, by being borrowed ready-made from another language. Studying nominative features serves to reveal the history of a word's formation, the cognitive process behind it, and the way a given people classifies reality.

Transport vocabulary offers rich material in this respect, since the need to name new means of transport arises constantly as they appear, and in this process either the language's internal resources (affixation, compounding, metaphor) or an external source (borrowing) is actively employed. The aim of this paper is to identify the nominative methods that form the names of means of transport in English and Uzbek, to classify them according to their degree of motivation, and to comparatively analyze the results in the two languages. The study draws on the main tenets of the theory of nomination developed by E.S. Kubryakova and A.A. Ufimtseva [1], [2].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The material of the study consists of more than 100 transport lexemes, selected from explanatory and specialized dictionaries of English and Uzbek. The following methods were used in the analysis: the nominative-motivational analysis method, to determine the basis on which a lexeme was chosen as a name; the componential analysis method, to reveal the semantic components within a lexeme; and the comparative-typological method, to compare the results across the two languages. Each lexeme was first classified according to whether it belonged to primary (direct) or secondary (figurative) nomination, and then classified according to its degree of motivation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**1. Nominative features of transport lexemes in English**

A considerable portion of English transport vocabulary consists of unmotivated words, that is, words borrowed ready-made from other languages: car (from Latin carrus), taxi (from French), canoe (from Caribbean languages), and the like. The internal form of such lexemes is not transparent from the standpoint of modern English, meaning that native speakers do not directly perceive the basis of their naming.

At the same time, lexemes with functional motivation are also widespread: in words such as steamboat and sailboat, the name is based on the means's mode of propulsion. The word double-decker (a two-level bus) exemplifies motivation based on structure or external appearance. In lexemes formed through compound (structural) nomination, such as aircraft, spacecraft, and snowmobile, two independent components combine to express a new concept. Examples of metaphorical nomination include submarine (Latin “sub-”, meaning “under,” plus “marine,” meaning “sea,” i.e., “under the sea”) and jumbo jet (“jumbo” being transferred from the name of a famous large elephant), where the name is transferred from another semantic domain (size, spatial position).

2. Nominative features of transport lexemes in Uzbek

A large part of Uzbek transport vocabulary likewise consists of borrowed, unmotivated words: words such as mashina, avtobus, taksi, tramvay, and metro entered the language through Russian, or via Russian as an intermediary, from international vocabulary, and their internal form is not transparent from the standpoint of Uzbek.

At the same time, the distinctive morphological potential of Uzbek also actively produces lexemes with functional motivation: uchoq (formed by adding the instrumental suffix “-oq” to the verb stem “uch-”, “to fly”, giving the meaning “flying device”) is a vivid example. Through compound nomination, descriptive-functional names such as temir yo'l (“railway,” literally “iron road”), yengil mashina (“passenger car”), yuk mashinasi (“truck”), and suv osti kemasi (“submarine”) are formed, in which the basis of naming (material, function, location) is clearly visible. Metaphorical nomination occurs relatively rarely in Uzbek transport terminology proper, but figurative names such as temir ot (“iron horse,” for train) are found in folklore and literary style.

3. Comparative analysis

A comparative overview of the nominative methods in the two languages is presented in the table below:

Type of nomination	English example	Uzbek example
Unmotivated (borrowed)	car, bus, taxi	mashina, avtobus, taksi
Functional motivation	steamboat, sailboat	uchoq (“flying device”), suzuvchi
Structural / external-appearance motivation	double-decker	yengil mashina (“passenger car”), yuk mashinasi (“truck”)
Metaphorical (figurative) nomination	submarine (“under the sea”), jumbo jet	temir ot — “iron horse” (train, in poetic speech)
Compound nomination	aircraft, spacecraft, snowmobile	temir yo'l (“railway”), suv osti kemasi (“submarine”)

Table 1. Comparative overview of the types of nomination of transport lexemes in English and Uzbek.

The data in the table show that in both languages the nominative system of transport vocabulary consists of a combination of borrowed and internally formed (motivated) layers. The difference is that in English, compound (structural) and metaphorical nomination are relatively more actively used, whereas in Uzbek, functional-affixal motivation (as in uchoq) and descriptive compound names (as in temir yo'l, yuk mashinasi) predominate. This difference is directly linked to the analytic typological nature of English and the agglutinative typological nature of Uzbek: in an agglutinative language, the possibility of

Multidisciplinary research and Innovation (SICMRI 2026)

forming a motivated name through affixation is greater, since adding a suffix to a stem allows the meaning of an instrument or an agent to be expressed compactly.

It was also observed that in both languages, words denoting the oldest and most everyday means of transport (car, bus — mashina, avtobus) are frequently unmotivated and borrowed in character, whereas the names of newer and more complex technical means (spacecraft, snowmobile — suv osti kemasi) tend to be more motivated and formed through compounding. This demonstrates that the novelty and complexity of a concept directly influences the choice of linguistic means in the process of nomination.

4. Productivity of nominative methods and linguocultural factors

An analysis of the productivity of nominative methods showed that, in English, compound (structural) nomination is the most productive method for naming new means of transport — lexemes formed by this method made up approximately one-third of the corpus examined. This is linked to the analytic nature of English, in which the free combination of two independent stems offers ample opportunity to express a new concept compactly and transparently. In Uzbek, by contrast, affixation and descriptive compound naming stand out as the most productive methods, which is explained by the agglutinative property of the language — the possibility of generating new meaning by adding a suffix to a stem.

Linguocultural factors also exert a significant influence on nominative choice. The manner in which a people has participated in technical progress — as an inventor or as an adopter of technology — determines the degree of motivation of a lexeme. Since English has often been the language in which many transport technologies were first created, motivated names formed from internal resources are relatively more common in it. In Uzbek, by contrast, since most modern means of transport were adopted as ready-made technology from another culture (mainly via Russian), their names, too, were borrowed in ready-made, unmotivated form. At the same time, for traditional, national means of transport (such as the cart, the handcart), Uzbek almost always employs motivated, internally formed names — which shows that the language actively draws on its internal resources when naming realities that are familiar and historically its own.

In conclusion, it can be said that the nominative features of transport lexemes constitute not only a purely linguistic but also a linguocultural phenomenon: they reflect a people's place in technological progress, the typology of its language, and its historical language contacts.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the analysis conducted, the nominative features of transport lexemes in English and Uzbek were classified into five main types: borrowed (unmotivated), functionally motivated, structural/external-appearance-based, metaphorical, and compound nomination. Although the borrowed layer occupies a significant place in both languages, a typological difference was observed in the methods of internal word formation: in English, compound and metaphorical methods predominate, while in Uzbek, affixal-functional and descriptive-compound methods take the lead.

The conclusions obtained are of practical value in the fields of the theory of nomination, comparative linguistics, and terminology, and may be applied in the processes of standardizing and translating transport terminology.

REFERENCES

1. Kubryakova E.S. The Theory of Nomination and Word Formation. — Moscow: Nauka, 1977.

2. Ufimtseva A.A. Lexical Nomination. — Moscow: Nauka, 1977.
3. Hojiyev A. Word Formation in Uzbek. — Tashkent: Fan, 1989.
4. Marchand H. The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. — Munich: C.H. Beck, 1969.
5. Rahmatullayev Sh. Explanatory Phraseological Dictionary of the Uzbek Language. — Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1978.
6. Bauer L. English Word-Formation. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.