

A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF FURNITURE NAMES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: STRUCTURAL, SEMANTIC AND TRANSLATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

Dildora Ibragimovna Uroкова

Independent Researcher Termez State University

Termez, Uzbekistan Comparative Literature,

Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studie

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i03.S.I\(3\).pp821-827](https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i03.S.I(3).pp821-827)

Article Info

Received:

21.06.2026

Accepted:

28.7.2026

Published:

10-08-2026

Abstract

Lexical systems provide one of the most important sources for identifying the similarities and differences between languages. Every language classifies the surrounding world through its own lexical resources, and the names assigned to objects of everyday life constitute a particularly informative part of this classification. Among such lexical domains, furniture terminology occupies a significant position because it reflects not only material objects and their functions but also cultural practices, domestic organization, historical development, technological change, and patterns of social interaction.

INTRODUCTION

A contrastive investigation of furniture names in English and Uzbek therefore provides an opportunity to examine how two typologically different languages conceptualize, categorize, and linguistically represent objects belonging to the same semantic domain. English and Uzbek differ considerably in their morphological structures, word-formation mechanisms, historical development, and patterns of lexical borrowing. English is predominantly analytic, although it possesses a highly productive system of derivation and compounding. Uzbek, as an agglutinative Turkic language, demonstrates extensive use of affixation and productive combinations of lexical units. These differences become

particularly visible when semantically corresponding lexical units are compared. A single English furniture term may correspond to a simple lexical unit, a compound, or a descriptive phrase in Uzbek. Conversely, an Uzbek lexical item may require a multiword expression in English because of differences in lexicalization and categorization. The vocabulary of furniture is also closely connected with cultural and historical processes. Furniture objects do not develop independently of human society. Changes in housing, architecture, technology, economic organization, social status, and domestic habits lead to the emergence, disappearance, specialization, or semantic transformation of furniture terms. Consequently, the furniture

lexicon can be regarded as a linguistic representation of material culture. Previous research on furniture terminology in English and Uzbek has addressed lexical-semantic relations, including synonymy, polysemy, meronymy, homonymy, and semantic grouping. Existing work demonstrates that furniture names form a complex lexical-semantic field and that comparative analysis can reveal important similarities and differences between English and Uzbek. However, a more systematic contrastive investigation is required to integrate structural formation, semantic categorization, functional characteristics, cultural motivation, and translation equivalence within a single analytical framework. The present study approaches furniture names as lexical units belonging to a structured semantic domain rather than as an isolated list of vocabulary items. The central assumption is that lexical equivalence between English and Uzbek cannot always be established through direct dictionary correspondence. Semantic equivalence may be complete, partial, contextual, functional, or absent. The differences may result from divergent categorization systems, cultural specificity, historical borrowing, lexicalization patterns, or differences in the functional organization of domestic objects. The study is particularly relevant to comparative linguistics and translation studies. Accurate translation of furniture terminology requires more than identifying a formally corresponding word. Translators must determine whether the source-language term has an exact lexical equivalent in the target language, whether the target-language equivalent represents the same object and function, and whether additional descriptive information is required. This problem becomes particularly significant for traditional and culturally specific furniture

names. Another important dimension concerns word formation. English frequently uses compounding to create furniture-related lexical units, including combinations in which a general noun is modified by another noun or adjective. Uzbek also employs lexical combinations extensively, but its agglutinative structure permits productive morphological marking and derivational processes. The comparison of these mechanisms makes it possible to identify language-specific strategies of naming furniture objects.

The semantic structure of furniture terminology can also be analyzed through functional categories. Furniture can be classified according to the activities associated with it, including sitting, sleeping, storing, working, eating, displaying, supporting, or organizing domestic space. Such functional classification may differ from formal classification based on material, shape, location, or construction. A contrastive approach makes it possible to determine whether English and Uzbek employ similar principles of categorization or prioritize different semantic characteristics. The cultural dimension is equally important. Certain furniture objects have relatively universal functions, whereas their lexical representations may contain culturally specific meanings. For example, terms associated with traditional seating, sleeping, storage, or domestic decoration may reflect distinctive architectural and social practices. In translation, these units may therefore require descriptive or explanatory strategies rather than literal substitution. The research aims to provide an integrated contrastive analysis of furniture names in English and Uzbek by examining their structural, semantic, functional, cultural, and translational characteristics. The study addresses the following research questions:

1. What structural and word-formation patterns characterize furniture names in English and Uzbek? 2. How are furniture names organized into major semantic and functional categories in the two languages? 3. What types of lexical-semantic correspondence exist between English and Uzbek furniture terms? 4. What factors account for cases of partial or non-equivalence? 5. How do cultural and historical factors influence the formation and interpretation of furniture terminology? 6. What translation strategies are most appropriate for culturally specific furniture names? The novelty of the research lies in combining structural, semantic, functional, cultural, and translational dimensions within one contrastive framework. Rather than treating furniture terminology exclusively as a lexical-semantic group, the study considers it as a dynamic linguistic system influenced by language structure, material culture, lexical borrowing, and communicative needs. The results may contribute to comparative lexicology, contrastive linguistics, translation studies, lexicography, terminology research, and foreign-language teaching. The findings can also be useful for developing bilingual dictionaries and specialized English-Uzbek lexical databases.

METHODS The research employs a contrastive linguistic methodology designed to identify both common and language-specific properties of furniture names in English and Uzbek. The methodological framework combines descriptive, contrastive, componential, semantic-field, structural, corpus-oriented, and translation-oriented approaches. The object of the research is the lexical semantic field of furniture names in contemporary English and Uzbek. The subject of the research is the structural organization, semantic classification, functional differentiation,

lexical relations, cultural motivation, and translation equivalence of furniture-related lexical units. The linguistic material is drawn from English and Uzbek explanatory dictionaries, bilingual dictionaries, terminology resources, contemporary written texts, digital language resources, and examples representing everyday and specialized usage. Particular attention is given to lexical units whose primary or established meanings denote furniture objects or furniture-related components. The data collection process follows several stages. First, potentially relevant furniture terms are identified in English and Uzbek lexical sources. Second, duplicated forms, unrelated homonyms, and peripheral vocabulary are excluded where their meanings do not belong to the furniture domain. Third, the remaining units are classified according to their semantic and functional characteristics. Fourth, corresponding English and Uzbek units are compared to determine the degree and type of equivalence. A semantic-field approach is used to establish the internal organization of the vocabulary. The furniture domain is divided into functional subfields, including seating furniture, sleeping furniture, storage furniture, working and study furniture, dining furniture, support furniture, decorative furniture, and multifunctional furniture. The seating category includes lexical units denoting objects primarily designed for sitting. The sleeping category contains names associated with beds and related objects. Storage furniture includes units denoting objects designed for keeping, organizing, or displaying possessions. Working and study furniture comprises objects used for writing, reading, studying, or professional activities. Dining furniture includes objects used in eating and serving contexts. Decorative and multifunctional categories cover objects

whose functions extend beyond a single basic purpose. A componential analysis is employed to identify the semantic features underlying individual lexical items. The principal semantic components considered are [+FURNITURE], [+HUMAN USE], [+DOMESTIC/INSTITUTIONAL USE], [+SITTING], [+SLEEPING], [+STORAGE], [+WORKING], [+DINING], [+SUPPORT], and [+DECORATIVE]. Not every lexical item contains all components; rather, the distribution of features helps establish relationships between terms. For example, two lexical items may share the semantic component [+SITTING] while differing in other components related to size, number of users, portability, construction, or social function. Such distinctions help explain why apparently synonymous furniture terms may not be completely interchangeable. Contrastive analysis is applied at three principal levels: formal structure, semantic organization, and functional use. At the formal level, the study examines simple words, compounds, derivatives, and multiword expressions. At the semantic level, it compares denotational meaning, connotational meaning, polysemy, synonymy, meronymy, and semantic specialization. At the functional level, it examines how terms operate in contexts involving domestic, institutional, commercial, and cultural communication. The analysis of word formation focuses on the mechanisms used to create or expand furniture terminology. English examples are examined with particular attention to compounding, derivation, conversion, borrowing, and semantic extension. Uzbek examples are analyzed with regard to lexical combinations, derivational morphology, affixation, borrowing, and descriptive naming. Translation equivalence is examined through a five-level model: 1. complete

lexical equivalence; 2. near or partial equivalence; 3. functional equivalence; 4. descriptive equivalence; 5. non-equivalence. Complete lexical equivalence occurs when an English furniture term has a conventional Uzbek lexical counterpart referring to essentially the same object and function. Partial equivalence occurs when the corresponding terms overlap semantically but differ in scope, functional characteristics, or cultural associations. Functional equivalence occurs when two terms do not denote exactly the same physical object but perform sufficiently similar functions in their respective cultural contexts. Descriptive equivalence is used when the target language requires a phrase explaining the form, function, or cultural identity of the source-language item. Non-equivalence refers to cases where no established target-language lexical unit adequately represents the source-language concept. A translation-oriented analysis is especially important for culturally specific furniture terms. Literal translation may produce an apparently understandable expression while failing to communicate the cultural or functional characteristics of the original object. Therefore, the analysis considers several translation strategies, including direct substitution, functional substitution, descriptive translation, transliteration or borrowing, and explanatory translation. The study also considers lexical-semantic relations within the furniture field. Synonymy is analyzed where two or more terms refer to similar or overlapping objects. Polysemy is examined when a single lexical form has multiple related meanings. Meronymic relations are considered where furniture terms denote parts or components of larger objects. Hyponymy is used to establish relationships between general and specific furniture categories. The research adopts a qualitative-dominant design. Quantitative

observations are used where they can support the identification of tendencies, but numerical distributions should be interpreted in relation to the linguistic and cultural properties of individual terms. The study therefore avoids treating frequency as a direct measure of semantic importance. To improve analytical reliability, each proposed English-Uzbek correspondence is evaluated according to four criteria: denotational similarity, functional similarity, structural correspondence, and cultural compatibility. A correspondence is considered strong when the two lexical units refer to comparable objects, perform comparable functions, and demonstrate similar communicative usage. The study also distinguishes between linguistic equivalence and translation adequacy. Linguistic equivalence concerns the relationship between lexical meanings in two language systems, whereas translation adequacy concerns whether a target-language expression successfully communicates the intended meaning in a particular context. The analytical procedure can therefore be summarized as follows: data collection, lexical verification, semantic classification, structural analysis, componential analysis, contrastive comparison, cultural interpretation, and translation evaluation.

RESULTS

The comparative analysis demonstrates that furniture terminology in English and Uzbek constitutes a structured lexical-semantic domain rather than a random collection of independent lexical units. Despite substantial similarities in the basic organization of furniture vocabulary, the two languages differ in the ways individual objects are lexicalized, categorized, and semantically specified. The first major result concerns the existence of common functional categories. Both English and Uzbek contain lexical units

corresponding to the basic human activities for which furniture is designed. Seating, sleeping, storage, working, and dining represent particularly stable semantic domains. This similarity is expected because the underlying functions are connected with universal aspects of human domestic and social life. At the same time, the linguistic realization of these categories is not identical. English frequently distinguishes furniture objects through compounds and specialized lexical formations, whereas Uzbek may use simple lexical units, combinations of nouns and modifiers, borrowed forms, or descriptive expressions. Consequently, semantic correspondence does not necessarily imply formal correspondence. The analysis of seating terminology illustrates this distinction clearly. English contains a range of terms differentiated according to construction, function, size, and context of use. Terms such as “chair,” “armchair,” “stool,” “bench,” and “rocking chair” represent different points within the semantic field. Their Uzbek counterparts may correspond directly in some cases, while other cases require lexical expansion or contextual clarification. The relationship between “chair” and “armchair” illustrates semantic specialization. The broader category identifies a piece of furniture primarily designed for sitting, whereas the more specific term incorporates an additional semantic component related to arm support. A contrastive analysis must therefore recognize hierarchical relations rather than treating the two units as simple synonyms. Similar hierarchical relationships occur in storage terminology. English distinguishes among several types of storage furniture according to size, construction, location, and function. Uzbek also possesses a differentiated storage vocabulary, but the boundaries between individual categories

may not always coincide. In some contexts, an English term may correspond to a broader Uzbek expression, while in other contexts the Uzbek term may require an explanatory modifier. The analysis further demonstrates that furniture terminology is characterized by different degrees of semantic specificity. Some lexical units have relatively general meanings, whereas others encode detailed information concerning physical structure or use. This difference is particularly significant in translation because a source-language term may contain semantic information that is absent from the most immediate target-language equivalent. A second important result concerns word formation. English furniture terminology demonstrates a strong tendency toward compounding. Compounds may combine a material, function, location, shape, or associated object with a general furniture noun. Examples include formations such as “bookshelf,” “bedside table,” “coffee table,” and “dining table.” These formations allow English to create semantically transparent lexical units by combining existing words. Uzbek also makes extensive use of lexical combinations, but its agglutinative structure provides additional morphological possibilities. Modifiers may specify the function, material, location, or type of an object. Borrowing also contributes significantly to the development of contemporary furniture vocabulary. The contrast indicates that the two languages employ different formal mechanisms while achieving similar communicative purposes. Both languages seek to encode distinguishing features of furniture objects, but the distribution of information between individual lexical components differs. A third result concerns borrowing and internationalization. Contemporary furniture vocabulary in both languages is influenced by international cultural exchange, trade,

design, architecture, and mass media. Certain terms circulate beyond their original linguistic environments and become integrated into local usage. Borrowed furniture terminology can therefore function as evidence of cultural contact. However, borrowing does not necessarily produce complete semantic equivalence. A borrowed term may acquire a narrower or broader meaning in the recipient language. It may also become associated with a particular social group, commercial context, or stylistic register. Consequently, the analysis of borrowed furniture terminology requires attention to both etymology and contemporary usage. The fourth major result concerns lexical-semantic relations.

REFERENCES

1. Aminov, M., & Madvaliyev, A. (2006). Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan.
2. Jamolkhonov, H. (2005). Modern Uzbek Literary Language. Tashkent: O‘qituvchi.
3. Rasulov, R. (1995). Fundamentals of Systemic Lexicology of the Uzbek Language. Tashkent: O‘qituvchi.
4. Nurmonov, A. (2002). History of Uzbek Linguistics. Tashkent: Fan.
5. Ermatov, Sh. (1998). Lexicology of the Uzbek Language. Tashkent: Sharq.
6. Mamatov, A. E. (2020). Modern Linguistics: Fundamentals of Linguocultural Studies. Tashkent: Tafakkur Avlodi.
7. Rustamova, J. (2023). Analysis of

household lexical units in English and Uzbek languages. World Bulletin of Social Sciences, 22, 20–24.

International Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan.

8. Bekturdiyeva, N. (2024). National-cultural characteristics of equipment names in English and Uzbek languages related to ethnic life. Eurasian Journal of Social Sciences, Philosophy and Culture.

9. Uroкова, D. I. (2025). The names of furniture in phraseological units of the English and Uzbek languages. Science Shine International Scientific Journal, 9(44), 185–186.

10. Uroкова, D. I. (2026). Lexical-semantic relations of furniture names in English and Uzbek. Multidisciplinary Journal of Science and Technology, 5(12), 1695–1698. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18154522>

11. Uroкова, D. I. (2026). Homonymic relations of furniture names in English and Uzbek with other words. Multidisciplinary Journal of Science and Technology, 5(12), 1690–1694.

12. Avazova, M. (2023). The interpretations of English and Uzbek phraseological units and their translation equivalents: On the example of the theme “furniture”. Eurasian Journal of Technology and Innovation.

13. Sobirova, R. (2022). Lexico-Semantic Relationships in the Names of Household Items. Karaganda: Karaganda University.

14. Hojimatov, N. (2019). Compound Words in English and Uzbek. Tashkent: Uzbekistan State University of World Languages.

15. Madvaliyev, A. (2021). The Use of the Uzbek Language in the Field. Tashkent: