

**THE METHODS OF INTERPRETATION OF FLORAL COMPONENTS IN
RELATION TO HUMANS IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES****Baxtiyorova Feruza Xurshidbek qizi**

Annotation: This study examines how plant-related words, known as phytonyms, are used in English and Uzbek to describe human characteristics. It focuses on two types of meaning: lexical meanings, which are fixed and recorded in dictionaries, and occasional meanings, which are context-dependent and often appear in literature and everyday speech. Through semantic, pragmatic, and comparative-typological analysis, the article investigates how both languages use phytonyms to express people's physical appearance, mental traits, and social behavior. The results show that while many figurative uses of phytonyms reflect shared human thought processes, unique, culture-specific meanings also develop due to environmental, historical, and cultural factors. This contrast highlights both the expressive potential of figurative speech and the complexity of interpreting and translating context-based meanings across different languages.

Keywords: phytonyms, lexical meaning, occasional meaning, figurative expression, cross-linguistic comparison, pragmatics, semantics, English, Uzbek

Symbolic meaning is a sociological theory that develops from practical considerations and alludes to particular effects of communication and interaction in people to make images and normal implications, for deduction and correspondence with others.¹ According to the researches of scholars, symbolic interactionism is “a framework for building theory that sees society as the product of everyday interactions of individuals”. In other words, it is a frame of reference to better understand how individuals interact with one another to create symbolic worlds, and in return, how these worlds shape individual behaviors.² It is a framework that helps understand how society is preserved and created through repeated interactions between individuals. The interpretation process that occurs between interactions helps create and recreate meaning. It is the shared understanding and interpretations of meaning that affect the interaction between individuals. Individuals act on the premise of a shared understanding of meaning within their social context. Thus, interaction and behavior is framed through the shared meaning that objects and concepts have attached to them. From this view, people live in both natural and symbolic environments.

Symbolic meaning comes from a sociological perspective which developed around the middle of the twentieth century and that continues to be influential in some areas of the discipline. It is particularly important in microsociology and social psychology. It is derived from the American philosophy of pragmatism and particularly from the work of George Herbert Mead, as a pragmatic method to interpret social interactions.

¹ Hall, Peter M. (2007). "[Symbolic Interaction](#)". *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. doi:[10.1002/9781405165518.wbeoss310](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeoss310). ISBN 9781405124331

² West, Richard L.; Turner, Lynn H. *Introducing Communication Theory: Analysis and Application* (6th ed.). New York. ISBN 9781259870323. OCLC 967775008

And it is obvious from these theories that all around us are closely connected with symbolism and have their symbolic meanings in the communication used.

The importance of the plant world for human, the fact that human has long pursued the analogy between themselves and the plants, finds consistent expression in the language. The choice of properties of a certain flora as a prototype of rethinking is due to two reasons: on the one hand, the peculiarities of human thinking, which leads to the formation of similar images in different cultures; on the other hand, this choice may depend on the cultural and historical development of the country, its geographical location and political structure.³ That is why it is particularly important to establish universal and unique features in floral symbols, what can explain the mechanisms of formation of the fund of a language. Moreover, the world of flora shows nearly symbolic interaction both in the oral and written speech of languages. As it is known the flora is widely spread bodies in the world and it is difficult to imagine the earth without the greens. The flora has a lot of functions in the lives of humans in all spheres that are around them, even the linguistics. In the field of language, the role of floral components is connected with the symbolism, as they are used to describe people's characteristics in the speech, which highlights the group of lexemes of "flora".

The lexical group of floral components has been studied a lot recently and according to the observations they are divided into some subgroups, such as, flowers, greens, fruits, vegetables, trees, and others. According to the study of the lexemes of phytonyms it shows that in Uzbek lexicology there are 250 words that are in the group of flora, while in the English language they are 348.

The symbolism of floral components is mostly used in the oral speech and in the fiction conversations. And the writer or speaker uses them in the communication mostly in the need for the description of the inner or outer qualities of people. For these functions floral components usually express figurative meanings that can be similar or fully different in the comparison of languages. For example, the word "flower" in English describes a positive character of a human, while it is the same with the Uzbek language, such as "gul". However, in the English language the lexeme of "nut" is used for charactering the stupid person that is found in the lexicology of Uzbek.

Furthermore, it is clear that in the field of lexical semantics it is difficult to find the group such as the floral components that is rich in semantic structures and complicated functions. So, they attract the attention of scholars as multifaceted linguistic category that has been being studied for a long time as a subject of researches in the sphere of linguistics. For example, the researches of T.Numonov (1979), N.Mamatov (1955), Kurbonov (1974) which are devoted to the theme of floral components, but they were analysed only according to Uzbek lexicology. The material of T.Numonov informs only the terms of vegetables in Uzbekistan that are widely used in the communication of Fergana region, whereas N.Mamatov⁴ studied the terminology of lexemes of "cotton" and Kurbanov⁵ researched the grain terms in their research works. However, there is not any information that describes the function of phytonyms in characterizing people.

These lexemes are mostly used to describe different objects and have various functions in the communication, which gathers more meanings in one group. If the floral components are used

³ Willman S. Descriptive semantics in linguistic typology. "World" #3. 1953.

⁴ Маматов Н. Ўзбек пахтачилик терминологияси. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол.наук. Т., 1955.

⁵ Қурбанов О. Ўзбек тилида ғаллачилик терминлари. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол.наук. Т. 1974, -326

in their lexical meaning for description of people, they preserve their own functions, for example the word “green” for the characterizing a human gives meaning, such as healthy, young, powerful, whereas they are used in their figurative meanings, nothing changes, the context preserves its own meaning. So, it becomes obvious that for the comparison of floral components and humans, it should be taken into consideration that the characteristics or descriptions should be firstly connected with the meaning, as well. On the other hand, as the sayings of E.R.Kurilovich “I, II, III meanings of lexemes of the word “green” are connected to different semantic groups and their usage is based on their linguistic structure and functions”.⁶

Metaphor is a means of asserting that two things are identical in comparison rather than just similar. This is useful in literature for using specific images or concepts to state abstract truths. Most think that metaphor is used only in prose and fiction context, so they consider that it is possible to have a communication without it in a daily life, however it is not true. As G.Jakoff and M.Jonson wrote in their researches that metaphor is around us and it is not only in our communications, but also in our mind and images.⁷

For example: “She is a flower” (U guldir). In this phrase there are two emphasizes that are expressed in two words such: she and flower. It is clear that a reader can understand the core meaning of the phrase without any explanations. The used metaphor gives the meanings of beauty, charm and delicateness in the sentence below.

However, there is a figurative meaning of the word, as well. The lexeme of “flower” is sign of beauty and charm and can be used for describing women that gives a positive character and emotions about them.

Furthermore, there are other methods of making figurative meanings in the context, such as metonymy and comparison. Metonymy is a figure of speech in which one object or idea takes the place of another with which it has a close association. In fact, metonymy means “change of name.” As a literary device, it is a way of replacing an object or idea with something related to it instead of stating what is actually meant. Metonymy enables writers to express a word or thought in a different way by using a closely related word or thought. Therefore, this is a method for writers to vary their expression and produce an effect for the reader. For example, the floral component “cabbage” can be used as a description of a stupid person as a form “cabbage-head”, which is expressed by metonymy in the context. According to N.D.Arityunova “metaphor and metonymy are two different devices, metaphor is observed in comparison of two objects, while metonymy is observed in the following cases:”⁸

- a) lexical and nominative
- b) constructive
- c) identification of metonymy

As another type of comparison, simile is a figure of speech involving the comparison of one thing with another thing of a different kind, used to make a description more emphatic or vivid. According to J.B.Black “the metaphor is differentiated from the simile according to the structure and form used, and in simile the comparison is clearly seen by the help of devices, such as like, as and so on ...”⁹ For instance, “Jane is rose” is a metaphorical structure, while “Jane is like a rose is a simile”, but both of them give the meaning of beauty as a rose.

⁶ Курилович Е. Понятие изоморфизма. М., 1962.

⁷ Jakoff G., Jonson M. We live by Chicago. – University of Chicago Press. 1982. 83p.

1. ⁸ Артюнова Н.Д. К проблеме функциональных типов-лексических значений. М., 1980.-288 стр.

2. ⁹ Black J.B. Point of view in narrative comprehension – E., Behaviour. 1979 – 187 p.

Furthermore, there is only a single descriptive meaning in a metaphor, for instance: “He is a real nut” – “U haqiqiy axmoq” describes the stupidity. However, in a simile the descriptive meaning should be concrete expressed, such “You are as fair as a lily” (Sen nilufar gulidek beg’uborsan). As it is seen they are two different semantic groups of stylistics.

On the other hand, in metonymy, the relation between a part and a whole is shown: “She was flower-faced”. In the nominations of the language and speech, even in the group of floral components, there is a semantic difference: the word “kissel” – a) sticky mass; b) indecisive, weak man; the word “nut” a) a flora, fruit; b) a stupid man; and so on.

The floral components with figurative meanings are used not only in the oral context of the language, but also in the fiction so as to describe and characterize personages. One can recognize not only the lexical meanings

of the lexemes of flowers, trees, fruits and vegetables in the dictionaries, but also their figurative meanings that can change the meaning of the context used. This aids a reader to learn more about floral components and their usages.

Furthermore, it is essential in the linguistics to highlight the problem of determining the general and integral lexemes of floral components, and their lexical-semantic groups that generalize the paradigmatic structures of them. For example, “hardworking”, “young” and other lexemes seem to be connected to formal group for the first sight, but after analysing the core meanings of them it will be understood that they are from semantic micro groups that describe people’s characteristics.

On the other hand, floral components have special and differential lexemes in their semantic structures. In the structure of polysemantic phytonyms with these meanings the action of semantic synonymy is observed that shows the meanings without general components.

The division of floral components into micro groups gives an opportunity to analyse the linguistic isomorphism method, in which the similarity of phytonyms according to their meaning and form have an essential and significant role. And this shows that similar lexemes are connected with analogic floral components. After the analyses of contexts it is obvious that one can find these phytonyms in the oral and written speech, which are used to characterise humans.

However, in these structures the floral components can be used much more differently according to their meaning and form. And this information describes that the floral components in their structural forms have cultural and universal elements. These phytonyms are main factors to appear the secondary figurative meanings of them in contexts.

The analysed differences of floral components as equivalents in various languages can be observed not only in linguistic spheres, but also according to their cultural factors.

The forms of them are differentiated in analogic semantics, which says that different denotational phytonyms are used in various contexts. On the other hand, there are some lexemes expressed by only special actions in most floral semantic structures that are used by the help of metaphor and comparative methods. In other cases, there are some differences. These ones are expressed to use the names of floral components. This is observed in both languages that can make the context more obvious.

Furthermore, it is complicated to analyse some lexemes in the context by these comparative structures. Especially, these phraseological units differentiated from real

comparison can express cultural features that are not connected to various systematic lexemes. In the pragmatics this can be observed in various factors, and it is seen to have or not semantic elements in different variants. The general similarity of different semantic elements is analysed by the semantic description.

By the help of foreign materials, it is important to analyse completely the descriptions of people by floral components in the linguistics. All this can help to research more and more on this sphere. Besides this, it is difficult to characterize people by floral components in the oral and written speech. And this research paper carries some problems on this.

And there is enough information about the flora world in all languages, but not all features of them are recognized and studied well. The main reason of this is that it is so difficult to learn all functions and characteristics of floral components in one research work, so the paper analyses mostly some micro groups of them that are gathered from all materials and observations.

The analyses researched show that the direct translation of figurative meanings and functions of floral components can confuse to find out the core meanings of them. And it is essential to find out complete equivalents of them in various systematic languages. So, this research work discusses the role of general system and its paradigm function in the linguistics.

If it is seen from the observations of the research, it will be obvious that the figurative meanings of floral components are expressed mostly by metaphoric method: 70% in English, 63% in Uzbek, and less by metonymic method: 4% in Uzbek, 9% in English, and by comparative units: 11% in Uzbek, and 12% in English.

The associative contextual floral components are expressed in different contextual structures, while the occasional meanings of phytonyms are used to characterize people that have individual and subjective features.

The observation and analyses of floral components used in the contexts, the lexemes of phytonyms in different structures and the occasional meanings of them aid to find out the lexical-semantic and stylistic factors of them in linguistics. In the research paper floral components are not discussed as suffix or prefix structure but they are analyzed as forms of adjectives and nouns.

The floral components in describing people's characteristics can be found mostly in all languages, their meaning is concreted with their structures and function used in the speech. The phytonyms used to characterize people and their activities make the context more expressive and they have meaningful and expressive action in it.

The analyzed floral components not only describe people's characteristics, but also give positive and negative images about them. In most cases they are expressed not only by their lexical meaning, but also by occasional meanings that makes the text more sensitive and expressive. So, the usage of them in the micro contexts, oral and written speeches is considered as an important and informative factor in the sphere of linguistics.

References:

- Apperson G.L. English proverbs and proverbial phrases. L., 1949.
Black J.B, Turner T.J, Bower G.H Point of view in narrative comprehension. "Behavior" #18 1970. -87-98p.
Black J.B. Point of view in narrative comprehension – E., Behavior. 1979 – 187 p.
Copeland J.I. New Direction in linguistics and Semantics. H., 1984.
Fillmore Ch. Lexical semantics and text semantics. Copeland. 1984. -123p.



- Hall, Peter M. (2007). "Symbolic Interaction". Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology. doi:10.1002/9781405165518.wbeoss310. ISBN 9781405124331
- Jakoff G., Jonson M. We live by Chicago. – University of Chicago Press. 1982. 83p.
- West, Richard L.; Turner, Lynn H. Introducing Communication Theory: Analysis and Application (6th ed.). New York. ISBN 9781259870323. OCLC 967775008
- Willman S. Descriptive semantics in linguistic typology. "World" #3. 1953.
- Арутюнова Н.Д. К проблеме функциональных типов-лексических значений. М., 1980.- 288 стр.
- Курилович Е. Понятие изоморфизма. М., 1962.
- Қурбанов О. Ўзбек тилида ғаллачиллик терминлари. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол.наук ғ Т. 1974, -326
- Маматов Н. Ўзбек пахтачилик терминологияси. Автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол.наук. Т., 1955.