ЛУЧШИЕ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

SEMANTIC GENERALIZATION AND DIFFERENTIATION: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON UZBEK, RUSSIAN, AND ENGLISH

Jabborov Shakhrizod Ulugmurod ugli, *English instructor at Karshi International University, Kashkadarya, Uzbekistan*

Annotation: This paper explores semantic generalization in Uzbek in contrast to semantic differentiation in Russian and English. Drawing on typological evidence, the study shows how Uzbek, as an agglutinative language, encodes grammatical meanings through affixes while leaving lexical roots semantically broad. Words such as *omad* illustrate polysemy, covering meanings like *luck*, *success*, and *happiness*. By contrast, Russian and English employ separate lexical items for these concepts. Historical, sociolinguistic, and cultural factors are considered to explain this divergence.

Keywords: Semantic generalization, polysemy, Uzbek, Russian, English, typology, differentiation

Аннотатция: В данной статье рассматривается семантическая генерализация в узбекском языке в сопоставлении с семантической дифференциацией в русском и английском языках. Показано, что узбекский язык как агглютинативный выражает грамматические значения аффиксами, тогда как лексические корни остаются семантически широкими. Слово *omad* иллюстрирует полисемию, охватывая значения «удача», «успех», «счастье». В отличие от этого, в русском и английском для данных понятий существуют отдельные слова. Объяснение дается с учетом исторических, социолингвистических и культурных факторов.

Ключевые слова: семантическая генерализация, полисемия, узбекский язык, русский язык, английский язык, типология, дифференциация

Anotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada oʻzbek tilidagi semantik umumlashtirish rus va ingliz tillaridagi semantik tafovut bilan solishtiriladi. Agglutinativ til sifatida oʻzbek tili grammatik maʼnolarni qoʻshimchalar orqali ifodalab, leksik ildizlarni kengroq semantik maydonda qoʻllaydi. *Omad* soʻzi bunga misol boʻlib, «omad», «muvaffaqiyat», «baxt» maʼnolarini qamrab oladi. Rus va ingliz tillarida esa bu maʼnolar alohida soʻzlar bilan ifodalanadi. Ushbu tafovut tarixiy, sotsiolingvistik va madaniy omillar bilan izohlanadi.

Kalit soʻzlar: semantik umumlashma, polisemiya, oʻzbek tili, rus tili, ingliz tili tipologiya, differensiallash.

Introduction

Languages differ not only in structure but also in how they divide and label human experience. While Indo-European languages such as Russian and English tend to lexicalize distinct concepts into separate words, Turkic languages, including Uzbek, often display semantic generalization, where one lexical item covers a broader semantic field. This phenomenon is particularly visible in abstract domains such as luck, success, and happiness.

Previous research in linguistic typology (Comrie, 1989; Nichols, 1992) has shown that agglutinative languages frequently rely on morphology and context for disambiguation. Meanwhile, fusional and analytic languages have developed rich lexicons to encode fine semantic distinctions. This paper examines the Uzbek word *omad* and its equivalents in Russian and English as a case study of this typological divergence.

1. Typological Background

Uzbek is an **agglutinative** language, where grammatical categories are encoded through suffixes rather than separate words. For instance:

- *bor-di-m* ("I went") → verb root *bor-* + past tense marker *-di* + first-person suffix *-m*.

In contrast, English expresses the same concept with separate words (*I went*), and Russian uses a fusional form (*ya poshel*). According to Johanson & Csató (1998), this structural difference results in Uzbek roots retaining broader semantic potential, encouraging polysemy.

2. Polysemy in Uzbek

Polysemy is a hallmark of Uzbek vocabulary. The word *omad* exemplifies this by encompassing multiple meanings:

- *luck* (a favorable coincidence),
- *success* (achievement of goals),
- *happiness* (subjective well-being).

The disambiguation of *omad* relies heavily on context:

- *Menga omad kulib boqdi* → "Luck smiled at me."
- *U katta omad qozondi* → "He achieved great success."
- *Omadli inson* → "A fortunate/happy person."

Scholars of Turkic languages (Johanson, 1998; Clark, 2011) note that this broad polysemy is a systematic feature of agglutinative typologies.

3. Comparative Perspective

In **Russian**, the semantic field of *omad* is differentiated into:

- *удача* (luck, chance),
- *успех* (success, achievement),

- *счастье* (happiness, well-being).

In **English,** the field is similarly split:

- *luck* (external chance),
- *success* (outcome of effort),
- *happiness* (emotional satisfaction).

Thus, Uzbek generalizes, while Russian and English differentiate. According to Wierzbicka (1992), Indo-European languages often "carve up semantic space" into narrower lexical categories, reflecting their cultural and philosophical traditions.

4. Historical and Sociolinguistic Factors

Several factors explain this divergence:

1. **Nomadic and oral traditions** – Early Turkic societies valued practical communication; broad words sufficed for daily needs.

2. **Collective worldview** – Concepts like luck, success, and happiness were not strongly distinguished in community-oriented cultures.

3. **Morphological richness** – Uzbek can rely on affixation (*omad-im*, *omad-li*) and context for disambiguation, reducing the need for separate lexemes.

4. **Philosophical and literary traditions in Indo-European languages –** Russian and English developed nuanced vocabularies under the influence of philosophy, theology, and early literacy (Lehmann, 1995).

5. Semantic Strategies

- **Uzbek (Generalization)** → Broad lexical items, disambiguated by context.

• **Russian/English (Differentiation)** → Narrow lexical items, explicit semantic boundaries.

As noted by Lyons (1977), neither system is superior; both represent adaptive strategies of human language.

Conclusion

The case of *omad* demonstrates how Uzbek employs semantic generalization, contrasting with the semantic differentiation of Russian and English. This difference is rooted in typological structure, sociocultural history, and communicative needs. Recognizing such variation prevents viewing polysemy as "deficiency" and instead frames it as a natural and functional outcome of language evolution.

References

Clark, L. (2011). *The Turkic Languages*. Routledge.

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. University of Chicago Press.

Johanson, L., & Csató, É. (1998). *The Turkic Languages*. Routledge.

Lehmann, W. P. (1995). *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*. Routledge.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vol. 1–2). Cambridge University Press.

Nichols, J. (1992). *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time*. University of Chicago Press.

Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition: Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*. Oxford University Press.