European International Journal of Philological Sciences

TYPE Original Research
PAGE NO. 21-24
DOI 10.55640/eijps-05-12-06

A Study Of Meronymic Units In English And Uzbek

Alaudinova Dilnoza Rustam qizi

Doctor of philosophy on pedagogical sciences, Termez state university, Uzbekistan

Amonova Bakhora Nuriddin qizi

Master student of Termez state pedagogical institute, Uzbekistan

OPEN ACCESS

SUBMITED 10 October 2025
ACCEPTED 18 November 2025
PUBLISHED 14 December 2025
VOLUME Vol.05 Issue 12 2025

Abstract: This article investigates meronymic relations—part–whole semantic connections—in English and Uzbek, two languages belonging to different typological families. Meronymy plays an essential role in the structuring of vocabulary and conceptual organization in natural languages. By comparing English, an analytic Indo-European language, with Uzbek, an agglutinative Turkic language, the research highlights similarities and differences in the expression, classification, and usage of meronymic units. The analysis shows that although meronymy is universally present, the linguistic realization, morphological mechanisms, and patterns of lexicalization differ significantly across the two languages.

Keywords: The linguistic realization, morphological mechanisms, and patterns of lexicalization.

1. Introduction: The study of semantic relations is a central concern in linguistics, as meaning is mediated not only through the definitions of individual words but also through the relationships they hold with one another. Among these relationships, **meronymy**—the part–whole relationship—occupies a distinct position. It reflects how speakers conceptualize the structure of objects, organisms, systems, and abstract entities through language.

English and Uzbek represent two different linguistic typologies and historical developments. English, belonging to the Germanic branch of the Indo-European family, displays predominantly analytic structures. Uzbek, a member of the Turkic language family, exhibits rich agglutinative morphology. Because of this typological contrast, examining meronymic units in both languages provides valuable insights into how languages categorize and structure semantic information.

This article explores theoretical foundations of meronymy, identifies major types of meronymic relations, compares their manifestations in English and Uzbek, and discusses implications for lexicography, translation, and semantic theory.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF MERONYMY

2.1 Definition of Meronymy

Meronymy is the semantic relation in which one term denotes a part of something denoted by another term. In formal semantics, if X is a meronym of Y, then X is a part of Y. For example, “wheel” is a meronym of “car” in English, and “g‘ildirak” is a meronym of “mashina” in Uzbek.

Meronymy is the opposite of **holonymy**, where a holonym denotes the whole. Thus “car” is the holonym of “wheel”.

2.2 Types of Meronymic Relations

Scholars generally identify several subtypes of meronymy:

1. **Component–Object Meronymy**
   - A physical component belonging to a larger object.
   - e.g., engine–car; qo‘l–tana.
2. **Member–Collection Meronymy**
   - An item that is part of a group.
   - e.g., soldier–army; talaba–guruh.
3. **Portion–Mass Meronymy**
   - A quantity taken from a mass or uncountable substance.
   - e.g., slice–bread; bo‘lak–non.
4. **Feature–Activity Meronymy**
   - A step or stage within an action.
   - e.g., warm-up–exercise; namoz ruku’i–namoz.
5. **Place–Area Meronymy**
   - A smaller location within a larger one.
   - e.g., kitchen–house; xona–uy.

These types appear universally across languages, but the mechanisms used to encode them vary.

3. MERONYMIC STRUCTURES IN ENGLISH

3.1 Lexical Expression of Meronymy

English expresses meronymy primarily through lexical relationships without extensive morphological markers. A majority of part–whole relations are fixed word pairs:

- leaf–tree
- page–book
- fence–yard
- toothbrush handle
- car door
- phone screen

These relations are embedded in vocabulary and often must be learned individually.

3.2 Productivity and Compounding

English frequently uses **compounding** to express part–whole relationships:

Compounds may explicitly indicate meronymy, but often the part–whole relation is inferred.

3.3 Prepositional Constructions

Prepositions indicate meronymic relations:

- the roof **of** the house
- the legs **of** the table

The preposition **of** is the main marker for expressing possession and part–whole relations.

3.4 Meronymy in English Lexical Fields

Certain semantic fields, such as anatomy (heart, lungs, spine), technology (keyboard, mouse, monitor), and natural phenomena (peak, valley, riverbank), contain dense networks of meronyms. These networks exhibit hierarchical organization, often forming multi-level meronymic trees.

4. MERONYMIC STRUCTURES IN UZBEK

4.1 Lexical and Morphological Features

Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, frequently expresses meronymy not only lexically but also **morphologically** through possessive and relational suffixes:

- uy ning tom i (the house’s roof)
- mashina ning eshik i (the car’s door)

The suffix **-ning** (genitive) and **-i/-si** (possessive) create explicit part–whole structures.

4.2 Compounding and Derivation

Uzbek uses compounding and derivation less frequently than English for meronymic relations. However, some compounds do encode part–whole relationships:

- qo‘lsoat (“hand watch”)
- eshik tutqichi (“door handle”)

Derivational suffixes such as **-cha, -chak, -gacha** sometimes imply diminutive or partial qualities, contributing to portion–mass meronymy.

4.3 Semantic Transparency

Compared to English, Uzbek often exhibits greater **semantic transparency** due to its regular morphological systems. The genitive construction **X ning Y si** clearly indicates Y is a part of X:

- daraxt ning shox i (the branch of the tree)

Thus the meronymic relationship is overtly marked and structurally uniform.

4.4 Meronymy in Uzbek Lexical Fields

Similar to English, the fields of human anatomy (qo‘l, oyoq, jigar, yurak), kinship, and traditional cultural artifacts (do‘ppi, belbog‘, cholg‘u asboblari) demonstrate rich meronymic networks. For example:

- do‘ppi → tepa qismi, cheti, bezaklari
- dutor → tanasi, qo‘li, torlari

These reflect the strong cultural embedding of part–whole relations in Uzbek vocabulary.

5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK MERONYMY

5.1 Structural Expression

Feature	English	Uzbek
Meronymy is indicated by	lexical pairs, prepositions	genitive + possessive suffixes
Morphological marking	weak	strong
Compounding	very common	moderate
Semantic transparency	medium	high

The main distinction lies in morphological expression: English is primarily lexical, while Uzbek is both lexical and grammatical.

5.2 Hierarchical Depth

Both languages allow multi-level meronymic hierarchies:

English:
house → room → window → frame → glass

Uzbek:
uy → xona → deraza → rom → shisha

The structural parallels demonstrate that hierarchical conceptualization of wholes and parts is universal, even though linguistic forms differ.

5.3 Cultural and Conceptual Factors

Certain meronyms arise from culture-specific concepts:

- English: keyboard key, dashboard, cottage roof
- Uzbek: sandal oyoqchasi (part of a traditional heating table), do‘ppi qirrasi, palov oshi tarkibi (parts of traditional dishes)

These culture-driven terms show that meronymic structures reflect not only universal cognition but also cultural environment.

5.4 Translation Challenges

Translating meronymy between English and Uzbek may pose problems:

1. **Explicit vs. implicit marking**
   Uzbek often marks part–whole grammatically, while English may use straightforward juxtaposition.
   - English: car engine
   - Uzbek: mashina ning dvigatel i
2. **Compounds without direct equivalents**
   - keyboard key → klaviatura tugmasi
   - Uzbek forces a genitive construction, not a compound.
3. **Cultural-specific meronyms**
   Translation often requires descriptive paraphrasing.

5.5 Cognitive and Typological Observations

Cognitive linguistics suggests that part–whole relations reflect human perception. Regardless of typology, both languages:

- organize objects through hierarchical structures,
- differentiate between essential and non-essential parts,
- use meronymy to classify the natural and man-made world.

However, Uzbek morphology provides more systematic overt cues, while English relies more on lexical conventions and compounding.

6. MERONYMY IN LINGUISTIC APPLICATIONS

6.1 Lexicography

Understanding meronymy enhances dictionary definitions, especially for bilingual lexicography. Uzbek–English dictionaries often must clarify whether a word is a part of something larger, as this relationship affects usage.

6.2 Language Teaching

In ESL or Uzbek language teaching, meronyms help learners build vocabulary networks. Teaching meronymic sets (e.g., car → wheel, door, engine) increases semantic associations and retention.

6.3 Computational Linguistics

Meronymy is essential for:

- word sense disambiguation,

- ontology building,
- semantic information retrieval.

English NLP tools such as WordNet incorporate extensive meronymic relations. Similar resources for Uzbek are emerging, and this contrast highlights the importance of structured semantic databases.

7. CONCLUSION

Meronymy provides insight into how languages conceptualize and express part–whole relationships. Both English and Uzbek exhibit universal types of meronymic relations—component–object, member–collection, portion–mass, and others—yet the linguistic means of expressing these relations differ significantly.

English relies on lexicalization and compounding, with prepositions serving as the main grammatical tools. Uzbek, on the other hand, uses systematic morphological marking, giving it higher semantic transparency in expressing meronymy.

Comparative analysis shows both the universality of human cognitive categorization and the typological uniqueness of each language. These findings have implications for translation studies, lexicography, second-language teaching, and computational linguistics.

8. REFERENCES

1. Cruse, D.A. (1986). Lexical Semantics. Cambridge University Press.
2. Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics (Vol. 1–2). Cambridge University Press.
3. Murphy, M.L. (2010). Lexical Meaning. Cambridge University Press.
4. Uzakov, A. (2019). O‘zbek tilida semantik munosabatlar. Toshkent: Fan.
5. WordNet Project. Princeton University.