LEXICOGRAPHICAL INTERPRETATION OF ADJECTIVE-COMPONENT ZOONYMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Khidirova Makhfuza Amirkulovna
Senior Lecturer
Denov Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy
E-mail: m.xidirova@dtpi.uz
Tel.: +998 97 553 89 68

Abstract: *This article examines the lexicographical interpretation and nominative functions of zoonyms containing adjective components in English and Uzbek. Adjectives serve as primary differential markers in animal naming, specifying morphological features, size, body structure, and biological status. Through a comparative analysis of various species (mammals, reptiles, and invertebrates), the research explores naming models and highlights how qualities like "slender", "large", "flat", "common" function systematically to distinguish species. The study concludes that adjective-component zoonyms provide a logical, descriptive, and scientifically grounded framework for zoological nomenclature in both languages.*

Keywords: *zoonyms, adjective components, lexicographical interpretation, comparative linguistics, nomination, differential markers, animal naming, morphological features.*

INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA SIFAT KOMPONENTLI ZOONIMLARNING LEKSIKOGRAFIK TALQINI

Xidirova Maxfuza Amirkulovna
Denov tadbirkorlik va pedagogika instituti katta o‘qituvchisi

m.xidirova@dtpi.uz
tel:+998975538968

Annotatsiya: *Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi sifat komponentli zoonimlarning leksikografik talqini va nominativ vazifalari tahlil qilinadi. Sifatlar hayvonlarni nomlash jarayonida asosiy differensial belgi bo‘lib xizmat qiladi hamda turning morfologik xususiyatlari, hajmi, tana tuzilishi va biologik maqomini aniqlashtiradi. Turli hayvon guruhlari (sutemizuvchilar, sudralib yuruvchilar, umurtqasizlar) misolida “ingichka”, “katta”, “yassi”, “oddiy” kabi sifatlarning turlarni bir-biridan ajratishdagi tizimli o‘rni qiyosiy o‘rganilgan. Tadqiqot natijalari sifat komponentli zoonimlar har ikki tilda nominatsiyaning mantiqiy, tasviriy va ilmiy asoslanganligini ta’minlashini ko‘rsatadi.*

Kalit so‘zlar: *zoonimlar, sifat komponentlari, leksikografik talqin, qiyosiy tilshunoslik, nominatsiya, differensial belgilar, hayvonlarni nomlash, morfologik xususiyatlar.*

Introduction. In zoonymic nomination, adjectives serve as primary differential markers that specify an animal’s appearance, size, shape, body structure, and biological status. Research materials indicate that zoonyms with adjective components are used systematically and consistently in the naming of mammals, reptiles, and invertebrates, performing a crucial nominative function in distinguishing species from one another.

The problem of nomination and the principles underlying the naming of objects in language have been extensively examined in general linguistics. Scholars such as V. V. Vinogradov, E. V. Kolshansky, and B. A. Serebrennikov approached nomination as a complex interaction between language, cognition,

and objective reality, emphasizing the role of differential features in the formation of lexical units. The theoretical foundations of nomination were further developed in works on linguistic semantics and onomasiology, where nomination is interpreted as the process of fixing salient features of denotata in linguistic signs. In studies devoted to lexical semantics and taxonomy, N. D. Arutyunova highlighted the importance of classificatory and relational meanings in naming natural objects, including animals. V. G. Gak demonstrated that despite cross-linguistic differences, the qualitative principles of nomination remain largely universal, while their lexical realization reflects language-specific conceptualization. From a cognitive and anthropocentric perspective, Yu. D. Apresyan emphasized that linguistic worldviews shape how speakers perceive and categorize reality, including fauna. Although the general theory of nomination and semantic motivation has been thoroughly investigated, the systematic analysis of adjective-based zoonyms, particularly in a comparative English–Uzbek perspective, remains insufficiently explored. This gap highlights the relevance of studying adjectival components in zoonymic nomination as key differential markers reflecting morphological, biological, and evaluative features of animals.

Methods. The research employed a complex set of linguistic methods to ensure a comprehensive analysis of adjective-component zoonyms in English and Uzbek. Comparative-typological method is the primary tool used to identify the similarities and differences in the nomination processes of both languages. It allowed for the examination of how different linguistic systems categorize the same biological traits. Descriptive Method is used to characterize the morphological, physiological, and biological features of the animals that serve as the basis for the adjective components. Data were collected from authoritative sources, including the *Oxford Dictionary of Zoology*, the *Online*

Etymology Dictionary, and various specialized Uzbek biological and terminological dictionaries. Over 200 zoonymic units were analyzed to identify recurring patterns.

Discussion. In the English zoonymic system, qualifying components play an important distinguishing (differential) role in the process of animal naming. Research shows that such adjectives help clarify the animal's external structure, body proportions, size, general biological status, and distribution characteristics. Zoonyms with adjective components are primarily formed based on the **[Adjective + Noun]** model, which demonstrates the analytical and descriptive nature of nomination in the English language.

In English, zoonyms featuring the **"slender"** component reflect the animal's external morphological features as a primary trait, signifying a delicate or elongated body structure. In names such as *Slender Loris*, *Slender-snouted Crocodile*, and *Slender Glass Lizard*, this adjective expresses the thinness of the animal's body or the elongation of the snout, thereby identifying the uniqueness of the species.

Similarly, zoonyms with the **"ingichka"** (slender/thin) component serve to express body structure and proportions in Uzbek. In the names *ingichka lori* (slender loris), *ingichka ilonlar* (slender snakes), and *ingichka barmoqli daryo qisqichbaqasi* (narrow-clawed crayfish), this adjective indicates the external morphological delicacy and elongated structure of the species. Here, the adjective component acts as a criterion for zoological differentiation.

Conversely, the **"keng"** (broad/wide) component in both languages signifies the spread or larger shape of body parts. In names like *kengquloq ko'rshapalaklar* (European free-tailed bats/wide-eared bats), *kengbarmoqli gekkonlar* (broad-toed geckos), and *keng barmoqli daryo qisqichbaqasi* (broad-clawed crayfish), the adjective "keng" highlights specific features in the

structure of the animal's ears or paws. In the English names *Broad-snouted Caiman*, *Broad-banded Copperhead*, and *Broad-headed Skink*, the attribute of wideness is the main differential factor, where the width of the snout, head, or body pattern serves as the basis for nomination.

In zoonyms related to the adjective **"yo'g'on"** (thick/fat), the thickness or volumetric mass of body parts is taken as the primary nominative feature. The name *yo'g'onbosh ilonlar* (thick-headed snakes) categorizes species with thick and wide heads. In this instance, the adjective performs an anatomical differentiation function. The **"fat"** component, which expresses characteristics related to the animal's tail or general body mass, appears in English in the *African Fat-tailed Gecko*. In this unit, the adjective clarifies the morphological traits of the species through the thickness of its tail.

Zoonyms with the **"yassi"** (flat) component in both languages denote animals with level, broad, or compressed body parts. In names such as *yassi peshona butilka burun* (flat-headed bottlenose whale), *yassidum kunduzgi gekkon* (flat-tailed day gecko), *yassi dengiz tipratikani* (sand dollar/flat sea urchin), and *yassi chuvalchanglar* (flatworms), the flatness or compressed shape of the animal's body serves as the primary distinguishing feature. In English, in the names *Flatback Sea Turtle*, *Flat-tail Gecko*, and *Mwanza Flat-headed Rock Agama*, the flat shape of the animal's back, tail, or head was selected as the primary nominative sign.

Zoonyms formed with the adjectives **"katta / ulkan"** (large / giant) indicate volume and overall body size. In names such as *katta chumolixo'r* (giant anteater), *katta zirhli* (giant armadillo), *katta pangolin* (giant pangolin), *katta tupayya* (large treeshrew), *katta shoxli qo'y* (bighorn sheep), *katta qumsichqon* (great gerbil), *katta qo'shoyoq* (great jerboa), *katta ko'rshapalaklar* (megabats), *katta gibbon* (siamang/large gibbon), and *ulkan*

tiyin (giant squirrel), volumetric superiority is the main nominative criterion. The same pattern is observed in *katta yer ilon* (large earth snake), *katta qalqondum ilon* (large shield-tail snake), *kattabosh toshbaqalar* (big-headed turtles), *ulkan salamandra* (giant salamander), and *katta g'o'za biti* (large cotton aphid).

Furthermore, zoonyms formed with the adjective **"giant"**, signifying volumetric superiority, are found across various animal groups in English. In names like *Giant Anteater*, *Giant Armadillo*, *Giant Pangolin*, *Giant Day Gecko*, *Giant Girdled Lizard*, *Galapagos Giant Tortoise*, *Giant Squid*, *Giant Isopod*, *Chinese Giant Salamander*, and *Japanese Giant Salamander*, this adjective emphasizes the animal's massive size, distinguishing it from closely related species. The **"great"** component is also used as an adjective expressing size and biological significance, indicating the largeness or prominence of the species, as seen in the *Great Crested Newt* and *Great Plains Skink*.

In the Uzbek language, the components **"kichik"** (small) and **"mitti"** (tiny/pygmy) serve to distinguish relatively small-sized animal species. Zoonyms such as *kichik panda* (red panda/lesser panda), *kichik chumolixo'r* (silky anteater), *kichik yumronqoziq* (little ground squirrel), *kichik qo'shoyoq* (lesser jerboa), *kichik kashalot* (pygmy sperm whale), *mitti begemot* (pygmy hippopotamus), *mitti kashalot* (dwarf sperm whale), *mitti yerqazar* (pygmy shrew), and *mitti yuvoqimaymun* (pygmy marmoset) are formed based on size contrast. To distinguish small-scale animals, the components **"pygmy"** and **"dwarf"** are actively used in English. In the names *Pygmy Hippopotamus*, *Pygmy Sperm Whale*, *Pygmy Shrew*, *Pygmy Rattlesnake*, and *Pygmy Chameleon*, the adjective "pygmy" denotes smallness, while in *Dwarf Hamster*, *Dwarf Sperm Whale*, *Dwarf Crocodile*, *Dwarf Gecko*, and *Cuvier's*

Dwarf Caiman, the "dwarf" component expresses this same semantic layer. These units demonstrate that naming is established through volumetric contrast.

The adjectives **"kokildor / tojdor"** (crested/tufted) represent features related to protrusions or hair/feathers on the animal's head. In the names *kokildor kiyik* (tufted deer), *tojdor jayra* (crested porcupine), and *tojdor tyulen* (hooded seal), this feature manifests as a primary distinguishing characteristic in the animal's appearance. In English, features related to protrusions or hair on the head are expressed via the **"crested"** component. In names like *Crested Porcupine*, *Crested Gecko*, and *Great Crested Newt*, the presence of a crest or tuft is highlighted as a significant morphological trait of the species.

The components **"kalta / qisqa"** (short) and **"uzun"** (long) signify the relative length or shortness of body parts. Emphasis is placed on shortness in names like *kaltadum* (short-tailed lizard), *qisqa tumshuqli yexidna* (short-beaked echidna), *kaltadum kaltakesak* (short-tailed skink), *kaltabarmoqli ilon kaltakesak* (short-fingered skink), *kaltabosh baqalar* (short-headed frogs), and *kalta mo'ylov* (short-horned/short-antennaed). Conversely, length is used as the primary differentiator in *uzunoyoq* (long-legged/long-footed), *uzunburun ayiq* (coati/long-nosed bear), *uzunburun maymun* (proboscis monkey), *uzundumli yumronqoziq* (long-tailed ground squirrel), *uzunqo'lli maymunlar* (gibbons/long-armed monkeys), *uzun tumshuqli yexidna* (long-beaked echidna), *uzundum kaltakesaklar* (long-tailed lizards), *uzuntumshuq suvilonlar* (long-snouted water snakes), *uzunburunlar* (long-nosed species), *uzunoyoqlilar* (long-legged species), and *uzun mo'ylovli* (long-horned/long-antennaed).

In English, the **"short"** and **"long"** components, indicating the relative length or shortness of body parts, also hold a significant place in zoonymic nomination. While shortness is emphasized in *Short-beaked Echidna* and

Short-tailed Python, length is used as the primary distinguishing factor in *Long-beaked Echidna*, *Long-eared Hedgehog*, *Long-eared Bat*, *Long-nosed Bandicoot*, *Long-necked Turtle*, and *Daddy Long-legs*.

In the Uzbek language, zoonyms with the **"oddiy"** (common/ordinary) component indicate widespread, typical representatives of a species. Biological status serves as the main nominative criterion in names like *oddiy jayra* (common porcupine), *oddiy tupayya* (common tree shrew), *oddiy vombat* (common wombat), *oddiy ko'rsichqon* (common mole), *oddiy xameleon* (common chameleon), *oddiy suvilon* (common grass snake), *oddiy qora ilon* (common adder), *oddiy baqaqurulloq* (common bullfrog), *oddiy sassiq baqa* (common toad), and *oddiy triton* (common newt). The **"common"** component in English, which expresses biological status and prevalence, indicates that the species is an ordinary, widespread, or typical representative, as seen in *Common Tree Shrew*, *Common Dolphin*, *Common Wombat*, *Common Wall Lizard*, *Common Chameleon*, *Common Garter Snake*, *Common Snapping Turtle*, *Common Frog*, *Common Toad*, and *Common Octopus*.

Results. The analysis of the gathered material led to several key findings regarding the role of adjectives in zoonymic nomination:

1. In both languages, adjectives act as "differential markers." They are not merely descriptive but serve a crucial taxonomic purpose by distinguishing a specific species from its genus or related groups based on size (giant/small), shape (flat/slender), and status (common/true).

2. The [Adjective + Noun] model is the most productive structural pattern in English zoonymics, reflecting an analytical approach to naming. In Uzbek, a similar syntactic approach is observed, though often characterized by specific semantic nuances in the use of intensifiers (*mitti* with *kichik*).

3. There is a significant cross-linguistic overlap in the selection of nominative signs. Both English and Uzbek prioritize "size" and "physical proportions" as the most recognizable traits for naming.

4. The study found that English terminology often uses more specialized adjectives (*pygmy, dwarf, slender*) which are reflected as systematic categories in dictionaries, whereas Uzbek terminology frequently utilizes common adjectives that gain a specialized terminological status within a zoological context (*oddiy, asl*).

In conclusion, zoonyms with adjective components serve to clearly express the external features, size, body proportions, and biological status of animals. Based on the analyzed materials, it can be stated that adjectives occupy a central place as differential markers within the system of such zoonyms, ensuring that zoonymic nomination remains consistent, logical, and scientifically grounded.

Suggestions. Based on the research findings, the following suggestions are proposed for further academic and practical application:

1. There is a need for a comprehensive *English-Uzbek Bilingual Dictionary of Zoological Terms* that specifically categorizes animals based on their nominative components (color, size, habitat).

2. Future studies should focus on other adjective categories, such as color-based zoonyms (*Golden Eagle, Qizil bo'ri*) and geographical-based zoonyms (*African Elephant, O'rta Osiyo qoplon*i), to provide a holistic view of the system.

3. It is suggested that Uzbek zoological nomenclature be further standardized in academic textbooks to ensure consistency in the use of "true" (*asl*) and "common" (*oddiy*) components, aligning them more closely with international taxonomic standards.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allaby M. Oxford Dictionary of Zoology. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. – 605 p.

2. Berlin B. Ethnobiological Classification: Principles of Categorization of Plants and Animals in Traditional Societies. – Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992. – 335 p.

3. Brown C. H. Language and Living Things: Uniformities in Folk Classification and Naming. – New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1984. – 306 p.

4. Gak, V. G. Comparative Typology of Languages. Moscow, 1977.

5. Khidirova Makhfuza Amirkulovna. (2025). ANTONYMY IN ANIMAL NAMES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. *Hamkor Konferensiyalar*, *1*(14), 898–902. Retrieved from https://academicsbook.com/index.php/konferensiya/article/view/1837

6. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 242 p.

7. Lyons J. Semantics: Vol. 1–2. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. – 394 p.

8. Rosch E. Principles of categorization // Cognition and Categorization / Ed. by E. Rosch, B. Lloyd. – Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978. – P. 27–48.

9. Stern G. Meaning and Change of Meaning. – Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber, 1931. – 256 p.

10. Serebrennikov, B. A. Problems of Linguistic Nomination. Moscow, 1977.

11. Trier J. Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. – Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1934. – 347 S.

12.Ullmann S. Semantics: An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. – Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962. – 278 p.

13.Vinogradov, V. V. Lexical Semantics and Nomination. Moscow, 1976

14.Oxford English Dictionary Online. – Oxford: Oxford University Press. – URL: https://www.oed.com.

15.Harper D. Online Etymology Dictionary. – URL: https://www.etymonline.com.

16. Реформатский А. А. Введение в языкознание. – 5-е изд. – Москва: Просвещение, 1967. – 432 с.

17. XIDIROVA, , M. (2024). THE STUDY OF ANIMAL NAMES IN UZ BEK LINGUISTICS . *«ACTA NUUz»*, *1*(1.10), 269–271. https://doi.org/10.69617/nuuz.v1i1.10.4573

18. Хидирова М. (2024). Understanding animal names formed with affixes . *Актуальные вопросы лингвистики и преподавания иностранных языков: достижения и инновации*, *1*(1), 58–62. https://doi.org/10.47689/TOPICAL-TILTFL-vol1-iss1-2024-pp58-62