

A Comparative Analysis of the Semantic Nuances of Lexemes Denoting Precipitation Phenomena in English and Uzbek (Based on the Examples of Rain, Snow, and Hail)

ASHUROVA NODIRAXON RAFIQOVNA
University of Economics and Pedagogy, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article presents a contrastive semantic study of lexemes denoting three major types of atmospheric precipitation - rain, snow, and hail in English and Uzbek. The main purpose of the study is to identify the core and periphery of the corresponding lexical-semantic microfields in both languages and to compare the semantic components of intensity, duration, particle size, physical state, association with wind, suddenness, and stylistic marking. The methods employed include field theory, componential analysis, definitional analysis, contrastive analysis, and the determination of degrees of equivalence. It is shown that in English certain features of precipitation events are frequently encoded by a single lexeme, whereas in Uzbek many of the corresponding shades of meaning are expressed through analytic phrases. In particular, the pairs rain–yomg‘ir, drizzle–shivalamayomg‘ir, snow–qor, blizzard–qorbo‘ron, and hail–do‘l occupy a central position in terms of semantic closeness. At the same time, units such as shower, cloudburst, flurry, and sleet often require a contextual or descriptive equivalent in Uzbek. The findings are of theoretical and practical importance for translation studies, bilingual lexicography, and the teaching of English to Uzbek-speaking learners.

Keywords: Precipitation phenomena, lexical-semantic field, shade of meaning, seme, contrastive analysis, rain, snow, hail, equivalence, translation.

INTRODUCTION

The lexical system of a language is one of the most dynamic layers reflecting how humans perceive, classify, and name reality. Because natural phenomena – weather and atmospheric precipitation in particular – are directly bound up with everyday human experience, the units denoting them form a distinct semantic system in every language. Studies of the English weather field have shown that weather vocabulary is semantically interconnected, consists of units belonging to different parts of speech, and is internally organized through synonymic, antonymic, and hyperonym-hyponym relations. In the principal source drawn upon here, the lexical-semantic field “Weather” is likewise described on the basis of seasonal groups, parts of speech, and internal semantic links; this methodological model has been adapted in the present article to the narrower domain of precipitation phenomena [9; 10; 11; 12].

The linguistic representation of precipitation is not limited to a naming function. For example, the English rain is a general, neutral term, while drizzle denotes fine, gentle rainfall, downpour denotes very heavy rainfall, shower denotes short-lived rainfall, and cloudburst denotes a sudden and extremely heavy, localized rainfall. In Uzbek, *yomg‘ir* (“rain”) serves as the general term, *jala* activates the seme of intensity, while *shivalamayomg‘ir* activates the semes of fine droplets, duration, and even rhythm. Thus, one and the same denotative phenomenon is segmented differently in the two languages, and this segmentation forms the basis for comparing shades of meaning.

The relevance of the topic is determined by several factors. First, English and Uzbek belong to genealogically and typologically different systems, so comparing their strategies of lexicalizing precipitation phenomena sheds light on a concrete aspect of the relationship between language and thought. Second, such units occur with high frequency in literary translation, mass media, meteorological reports, and everyday speech. Third, fixing lexical equivalence on the principle of “one word for one word” often results in loss of meaning: translating shower as

yomg'ir ("rain") in any context, for instance, loses the information about the brevity and repetitiveness of the event.

The object of the study is the set of lexical units denoting rain, snow, and hail in English and Uzbek. The subject of the study is the semantic structure of precipitation units, the relationships among their shades of meaning, their degree of lexicalization, their grammatical realization, and their translation equivalence. The aim of the study is to identify the core and peripheral units within the three microfields, to distinguish their integral and differential semes, and to systematically describe the correspondences and discrepancies between the two languages.

To achieve this aim, the following tasks were carried out: the theoretical foundations of the notions of semantic field and lexical-semantic group were summarized; a working corpus of English and Uzbek precipitation units was compiled; the units underwent definitional and componential analysis; full, partial, and descriptive equivalents were distinguished; the grammatical properties of the noun, verb, and adjective forms were compared; and the semantic components that must be preserved in translation were identified.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in treating the precipitation vocabulary of English and Uzbek not as a marginal segment of the general "weather" field but as a three-centered lexical-semantic field possessing its own internal microsystem. In addition, the study proposes evaluating shades of meaning not only within the scope of synonymy but also along the parameters of physical state, intensity, duration, particle size, wind, suddenness, and grammatical model.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE LEXICAL-SEMANTIC FIELD AND CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

A lexical-semantic field is not a random collection of linguistic units but a system built around a common archiseme and bound together by paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations. Not all units within a field occupy the same degree of centrality: core units express the general concept most directly and in a stylistically neutral way, whereas peripheral units are distinguished by

additional intensity, evaluation, duration, or stylistic and figurative meaning. Understanding the semantic field in this way makes it possible to reveal the meaning of an individual word through its relations with other units (For semantic-field structure and relations, see [9; 10; 11; 3]).

The notions of integral seme and differential seme are essential for a semantic field. An integral seme is the common semantic feature that unites the members of a group, while a differential seme distinguishes one unit from another. For example, the units rain, drizzle, downpour, and shower are united by the seme +liquid precipitation; however, drizzle is distinguished by the semes +fine droplet and +low intensity, downpour by +high intensity, and shower by +short duration. The Uzbek series *yomg'ir*, *jala*, *shivalamayomg'ir* forms an analogous system, although the way these semantic features are expressed – through a single word or through a phrase – differs. The systemic character of a lexical-semantic field is manifested synchronically through synonymic, antonymic, hyperonymic, and hyponymic relations. Researchers note that the units of a field can be classified on the basis of a common semantic theme and hierarchical relations. In precipitation vocabulary, precipitation/*yog'in* functions as the generalizing hyperonym, while rain/*yomg'ir*, snow/*qor*, and hail/*do'l* serve as the main hyponyms. Each of these, in turn, forms smaller microfields that are further subdivided by intensity or form.

In contrastive linguistics, the correct choice of the unit of comparison is one of the primary methodological requirements. When comparing genetically unrelated languages, functional-semantic criteria should take precedence over formal similarity. U. K. Yusupov emphasizes that contrastive analysis requires describing the material of two languages according to the same criteria and only then identifying correspondences and discrepancies. Accordingly, in the present article the English and Uzbek units were first described separately on the basis of identical semantic parameters, after which they were compared with one another [6; 7].

In this study, the term shade of meaning refers to a semantic nuance that is added to a lexeme's primary denotative meaning

and distinguishes it from other units within the same paradigm. For instance, although *jala* and *yomg'ir* both refer to the same phenomenon, *jala* is narrower, marked by “strong, violent” intensity, whereas rain and shower both denote rain, but shower typically activates the feature of “short duration.” Thus, analyzing shades of meaning requires reconstructing a lexical unit's semantic profile rather than relying solely on its primary dictionary translation. Equivalence between lexical units is likewise not an absolute phenomenon. Three degrees are distinguished in this article: full equivalence, where the core denotative and differential semes largely coincide; partial equivalence, where the general denotatum matches but certain semes or contexts of use differ; and descriptive equivalence, where a single lexeme in one language is rendered in the other language by a phrase or explanatory gloss. This classification is particularly important for translating English units such as shower, cloudburst, flurry, and sleet into Uzbek.

RESEARCH MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research material was drawn from English explanatory dictionaries, Uzbek explanatory dictionaries, and scholarly sources devoted to the weather lexical-semantic field. In the principal source used, 159 units of the English “Weather” field were identified on the basis of the *Macmillan Dictionary and Oxford Dictionaries* and grouped by season and part of speech. In the present study, the methodological principle of this broad classification was retained, while the object of research was narrowed to precipitation phenomena alone and oriented toward a comparison of English and Uzbek. The working corpus was compiled from core, near-core, and peripheral units belonging to the “rain,” “snow,” and “hail” microfields. The corpus is exploratory and open in character: its purpose is not to calculate the absolute vocabulary size of the two languages but to compare shades of meaning according to uniform criteria. The unit counts given below should therefore be interpreted only as indicative figures for this particular sample [15; 13; 1].

In the definitional analysis, the dictionary meanings of the Uzbek units were compared with the entries in the Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language and its electronic versions. Thus, *yomg'ir* is defined as “precipitation falling from clouds in the form of water droplets,” *jala* as “violent rain,” and *shivalamoq* as “to fall evenly, rhythmically, at moderate speed and force”; *qorbo'ron* (“blizzard”) is defined as “heavy snowfall accompanied by wind,” and *do'l* (“hail”) as “atmospheric precipitation consisting of ice pellets of various shapes and sizes.” These definitions served as the basis for identifying the differential semes within the Uzbek microfields [13].

The analysis was structured around eight parameters: 1) physical state – liquid, solid, or mixed; 2) intensity – light, moderate, heavy; 3) duration – short or prolonged; 4) particle size- fine or coarse; 5) association with wind; 6) suddenness/unexpectedness; 7) grammatical expression- noun, verb, adjective, or analytic phrase; 8) stylistic feature - neutral, colloquial, or expressive. The results of the componential analysis were modeled using the symbols +, –, ±, and 0: + indicates the clear presence of a seme, – its absence, ± its context-dependence, and 0 indicates that the given feature is not obligatorily encoded in the lexical meaning. This model creates a common “measure” for units across languages and shows which semes are retained or lost when a translation equivalent is chosen.

Table 1. *Distribution of the working corpus compiled for the study, by microfield*

Micro field	English	Uzbek	Main criterion of comparison
Rain	19 units	12 units	intensity, duration, dropletsize
Snow	10 units	7 units	particle shape, wind, duration
Hail	5 units	4 units	ice-pellet size, event intensity, grammatical model

The “rain” microfield: Shades of meaning in English

The rain microfield forms the most active and semantically densest layer in both languages. In English, rain is the core unit of this microfield, denoting liquid-droplet atmospheric

precipitation in a stylistically neutral way. It is used as a noun (rain) and, through grammatical conversion, as a verb (to rain). Rainfall conceptualizes not the event itself but the quantity of precipitation or the process of precipitation over a given period; raindrop denotes an individual droplet; rainstorm denotes a stormy event associated with heavy rain.

Within the microfield, drizzle is distinguished by the semes “low intensity” and “very fine droplet.” It shares the general seme +liquid precipitation with rain but narrows the intensity and droplet size of the event. Because drizzle can function as both a noun and a verb, English expresses the name of the event and the action itself through a single lexeme. The adjective drizzly, in turn, evaluates a weather condition through the category of adjective. This cluster of words shows that in English a derivational and conversional paradigm has formed around a single semantic feature [15].

The word shower encodes the duration and episodic character of rain rather than its intensity. It usually denotes short-lived rainfall; hence intensity is added separately through a modifier, as in heavy shower and light shower. Thus the core seme of shower is “short duration,” whereas the core seme of downpour is “very heavy rainfall.” Although downpour often evokes the impression of high intensity combined with relative brevity, its lexical center is intensity. Deluge and cloudburst lie closer to the more expressive periphery of the heavy-rain field. Deluge intensifies the sense of “an excessive amount of water/rain” and can also figuratively denote “a very large flow.” Cloudburst designates a meteorological event that occurs suddenly and is extremely heavy and localized. Replacing cloudburst with ordinary rain therefore loses the semes of suddenness and extreme intensity [15].

Table 2. *Main differential semes of the English rain microfield*

Lexeme	Intensity	Duration	Droplet/size	Main shade of meaning
rain	0	0	0	Neutral general term
drizzle	low	± prolonged	Very fine	light, fine-droplet rain
shower	±	short	0	episodic/short
downpour	Very heavy	±	large/copious	intensity

cloudburst	extreme	short	copious	suddenness
sprinkle	Very low	short	sparse	Small amount

The “rain” microfield in Uzbek and its correspondence with English units

In Uzbek, the core of the rain microfield is the lexeme *yomg‘ir*. It is denotatively closest to the English rain and serves as a full equivalent in most contexts. The grammatical realization, however, differs: in English rain functions both as a noun and as a verb, whereas in Uzbek the name of the event is expressed by the noun *yomg‘ir* and the process by the auxiliary verb *yog‘moq*, in the phrase *yomg‘iryog‘moq* (“for rain to fall”). This difference reveals a typological feature of how the two languages encode precipitation events lexically and grammatically.

The lexeme *jala* independently lexicalizes the seme of intensity within Uzbek rain vocabulary. Its main meteorological meaning is given in the explanatory dictionary as “violent rain.” For this reason, *jala* is often the most natural functional equivalent for the English downpour. However, in some contexts downpour carries a stronger connotation of very short, sudden rainfall, whereas *jala* primarily denotes intensity. This pair should therefore be assessed more precisely as a strong partial equivalent rather than a full one. *Shivalamayomg‘ir* and *shivalamoq* form a very close semantic link with drizzle. The Uzbek verb *shivalamoq* denotes an even, fine, moderate-to-light manner of raining. In English, drizzle likewise means fine-droplet, gentle rain. Accordingly, the pairs drizzle–*shivalamayomg‘ir* and to drizzle – *shivalamoq* preserve the main differential semes of the phenomenon well. Here the two languages show a high degree of equivalence not only in denotation but also in the manner of the action [14].

For shower, it is difficult to find a single neutral Uzbek lexeme suitable for every context; analytic expressions such as “short-term rain,” “occasional rain,” or, in meteorological style, “brief rain” are used instead. Shower is thus a good illustration of a lexical gap in Uzbek: the denotatum is familiar to native speakers, but the semantic set encoded by the single English lexeme is not regularly encoded by one word.

Cloudburst likewise usually requires a descriptive equivalent such as “sudden, extremely heavy downpour” or “brief, extraordinarily heavy shower.” In literary texts, an expressive device such as “the sky burst open and rain poured down” can convey a similar functional effect, whereas in scientific or meteorological texts a neutral description is preferable. This shows that in contrastive analysis, preserving semantic parameters matters more than formal correspondence.

The Uzbek adjectives *seryomg'ir* and *yomg'irli* also correspond only partially to the English rainy. Rainy day corresponds closely to *yomg'irlikun*, but *seryomg'ir* usually denotes a period or region “with a lot of rain” or “where rain falls frequently,” intensifying the seme of frequency or quantity. Accordingly, rainy season may be translated, depending on context, as either *yomg'irlimavsum* or *seryomg'irmavsum*.

Contrastive analysis of the “snow” microfield

The “snow” microfield is sharply distinguished from the rain microfield by the seme of physical state: its integral feature can be generalized as +solid precipitation and +ice crystals. The English snow and the Uzbek *qor* are the core units of this microfield and correspond closely in their basic denotative content. Here too the grammatical asymmetry noted above recurs: snow is used as both a noun and a verb, while in Uzbek *qor* is used only as a noun, and the process of the event is expressed through the phrase *qoryog'moq* (“for snow to fall”). In English, snowfall may denote either the event of snow falling or the amount of snow that has fallen over a given time. In Uzbek this meaning is usually conveyed through the analytic units *qoryog'ishi* (“snowfall/the falling of snow”) or, in some scientific contexts, *qormiqdori* (“amount of snow”). Snowflake denotes a single snow crystal or particle, whose natural Uzbek counterpart is *qorparchasi*. In this pair, denotative correspondence is high, although the single English word corresponds to a two-component Uzbek phrase.

Blizzard is one of the most important differential units in the snow microfield. Its semantic structure includes the features +heavy snow, +strong wind, and often +reduced visibility. The

Uzbek *qorbo'ron* is likewise used to mean “heavy snowfall accompanied by wind,” so the pair *blizzard-qorbo'ron* is semantically very close and, in most situations, constitutes a full or near-full equivalent. This pair combines the main physical and dynamic features of the phenomenon within a single lexeme in both languages [15].

“Flurry” differs from snow in denoting brevity and lightness. “Snow flurry” usually refers to a brief, not particularly heavy fall of snow. Because standard literary Uzbek lacks a single simple lexeme fully covering this meaning, descriptive units such as “brief light snow” or “a short burst of snowflakes” are required. Flurry is therefore a context-sensitive unit in translation.

“Sleet” represents one of the most complex cases of equivalence between the two languages. In various regional varieties and lexicographic traditions of English, sleet may denote a mixture of rain and snow, or precipitation involving fine ice pellets. In Uzbek, such mixed precipitation is usually expressed analytically, through phrases such as “rain mixed with snow” or “snow-and-rain mixed precipitation.” Translating sleet with a single fixed word without regard to context is therefore risky; the exact type of physical phenomenon intended must first be established [15].

Table 3. *Uzbek equivalents of the main English units in the snow microfield*

English unit	Main seme	Uzbek counterpart	Equivalence
snow	Solid precipitation	<i>qor</i>	full
snowfall	process/amount of snow falling	<i>qoryog'ishi</i>	partial
snowflake	singles now crystal	<i>qorparchasi</i>	partial
blizzard	heavy snow + strong wind	<i>qorbo'ron</i>	near-full
flurry	brief, light snow	brief light snow (descriptive)	descriptive
sleet	mixed/half-icy precipitation	rain mixed with snow (descriptive)	descriptive

The “hail” microfield and lexico-grammatical asymmetry

Although the “hail” microfield contains fewer units than the other two, it is semantically well delimited. Its integral seme is

+ice-pellet atmospheric precipitation. The English hail and the Uzbek *do'l* are the core units of this microfield and form an almost fully equivalent pair in denoting the physical event. In the Uzbek lexicographic tradition, *do'l* is defined as atmospheric precipitation consisting of ice pellets of various shapes and sizes, a definition that corresponds closely to the core denotative content of hail.

In English, "hail" is used in the same form as both a noun and a verb, allowing constructions such as hail fell, it hailed, and hailstones damaged crops. In Uzbek, *do'l* is a noun, and the process is expressed through the phrase *do'lyog'moq* or *do'lyog'ishi* ("for hail to fall"): *do'lyog'di* ("hail fell"), *kuchlido'lyog'ishi kuzatildi* ("heavy hail was observed"). This pattern once again confirms the typological difference already observed for rain/*yomg'ir* and snow/*qor*, in English, weather nouns readily verbalize through conversion, whereas in Uzbek the verb *yog'moq* performs a productive analytic-predicate function.

"Hailstone" denotes an individual ice pellet and is rendered in Uzbek as *do'ldonasi* ("hail pellet/grain"). Hailstorm denotes a severe hail event, sometimes occurring together with wind and thunder in a stormy situation. In Uzbek, analytic variants such as "heavy hail," "hail falling," or, where context requires, "hail storm" may be used. Thus hailstone exemplifies the shift of a single-word English nomination to an analytic Uzbek equivalent, while hailstorm exemplifies the restructuring of a complex set of features in translation. An overall observation across the three microfields shows that while the English units rain, snow, and hail display noun-verb conversion, in Uzbek the predicativization of the nouns *yomg'ir*, *qor*, and *do'l* is achieved mainly through the verb *yog'moq*. This difference is not only grammatical but also lexico-semantic: in English, the name of the event and its occurrence are united within a single root, whereas in Uzbek the nominative and predicative meanings are distributed between two separate lexical components.

Semantic components and degrees of equivalence

Componential analysis reveals the internal semantic structure of units in the two languages rather than merely their surface

translational correspondence. The most important differential features in precipitation vocabulary are intensity, duration, physical state, particle size, and association with wind. For example, “rain” and *yomg’ir* are neutral with respect to most features and therefore occupy the center of the field; “drizzle” and *shivalamayomg’ir* narrow the center through low intensity and fine droplets; “downpour” and *jala* stand out through high intensity; and “blizzard” and *qorbo’ron* encode strong wind as an obligatory or highly probable component. The table below compares several central units according to identical semantic criteria. The symbol “0” indicates that the given feature is not obligatory in the lexical core of the unit; for instance, whether rain lasts a short or long time is determined by context. Such neutrality broadens the semantic scope of core units.

Table 4. *Componential model of English and Uzbek precipitation lexemes*

Unit	State	Intensity	Dur.	Particle	Wind	Equivalent
rain	liquid	0	0	0	0	<i>yomg’ir</i>
drizzle	liquid	low	± prolonged	fine	0	<i>Shivalama yomg’ir</i>
downpour	liquid	Very heavy	±	copious/large	0	<i>Jala</i>
shower	liquid	±	short	0	0	<i>briefrain</i>
snow	solid	0	0	crystal	0	<i>Qor</i>
flurry	solid	low	short	fine	±	<i>brief light snow</i>
blizzard	solid	heavy	prolonged/±	0	+	<i>qorbo’ron</i>
hail	solid	ice	±	pellets	±	<i>do’l</i>
hailstone	solid	ice	0	Single pellet	0	<i>do’ldonasi</i>

Among the fifteen selected core English units and their Uzbek counterparts, five pairs showed full or near-full equivalence (rain–*yomg’ir*, drizzle–*shivalamayomg’ir*, snow–*qor*, blizzard–*qorbo’ron*, hail–*do’l*); six showed partial equivalence (downpour–*jala*, rainfall–analytic units referring to the amount of rain/snow, snowflake–*qorparchasi*, hailstone–*do’ldonasi*, rainy–*yomg’irli*, snowy–*qorli*); and four showed descriptive equivalence (shower, cloudburst, flurry, sleet). These proportions pertain solely to this particular working sample and do not permit

an absolute statistical conclusion about the overall vocabulary of either language.

At the same time, the degree of equivalence varies with context. The pair downpour –*jala*, for example, may fit very well in a meteorological report, but in literary text, where downpour's suddenness or visual effect is emphasized, an expanded translation such as *jalaquydi* or “rain poured down in buckets” may be required. Likewise, snowy corresponds fully to *qorli* in snowy mountains (*qorlitog'lar*), but in a metaphorical context such as snowy silence a semantic shift occurs. Thus, for contrastive semantics, the notion of “equivalent” is not limited to the first translation given in a dictionary. Equivalence is the joint result of denotative core, differential semes, stylistic coloring, collocational fit, and grammatical construction. Precipitation lexemes provide convenient material for demonstrating this principle clearly.

Grammatical realization, collocation, and translation issues

One important difference between the precipitation vocabularies of English and Uzbek appears in predicative constructions. In English, weather verbs frequently occur with the formal subject it: “It is raining, It snowed all night, It hailed in the afternoon.” In these constructions it does not denote a real semantic subject but merely fills the grammatical subject slot. In Uzbek, by contrast, sentences such as *Yomg'iryog'yapti* (“It is raining”), *Kechasiqoryog'di* (“It snowed last night”), and *Tushdankeyindo'lyog'di* (“It hailed in the afternoon”) have the precipitation noun directly functioning as the meaningful subject. Accordingly, the English formal subject cannot simply be preserved mechanically in translation [8].

Verb choice also determines shade of meaning. “It is drizzling” corresponds to *Yomg'irshivalayapti* or *shivalamayomg'iryog'yapti*; “It is pouring” corresponds to *Jala quyayapti* or *yomg'irqattiqyog'yapti*; “It is snowing lightly” corresponds to *Yengilqoryog'yapti*; such equivalents preserve the manner of the event. If “to drizzle” is simply translated as *yomg'iryog'moq* (“to rain”), the semes +fine droplet and +low

intensity are lost. In such cases the specialized Uzbek verb *shivalamoq* increases semantic precision.

Collocational fit is also significant. In English, heavy rain is the natural collocation, while strong rain is generally non-standard; in Uzbek, by contrast, *kuchliyomg'ir* (literally "strong rain") is fully productive. English *heavy snow* may be rendered in Uzbek as either *kuchliqoryog'ishi* or *qalinqor*, depending on context: the former conveys the intensity of the process, the latter the depth of accumulated "snow." Before transferring the dictionary translation of a given adjective, therefore, one must determine which semantic parameter – intensity, quantity, or resulting state – it denotes. Units such as rainfall and snowfall require a balance between process and quantity in translation. Annual rainfall may be rendered as *yillikyog'inmiqdori* or *yillikyomg'irmiqdori* ("annual amount of precipitation/rain"), "heavy snowfall" as *kuchliqoryog'ishi*, and snowfall accumulation as *yog'ganqorqalinligi* ("the depth of fallen snow"), depending on the terminological character of the context. The rendering of a single English unit by a terminological phrase in Uzbek is not a shortcoming but rather a natural way of clarifying meaning.

Equivalence becomes still more complex in phraseological and figurative usage. The English idiom it rains cats and dogs cannot be conveyed through a literal translation; its functional meaning is expressed through phrases such as "it is raining very heavily" or *jalaquyayapti*. The Uzbek figurative expression *chelaklabyog'moq* (literally "to rain by the bucketful") can likewise denote heavy rain, though its stylistic register and regional currency should be assessed according to context. Such cases in translation theory call for prioritizing communicative-functional equivalence over formal equivalence.

From a lexicographic standpoint, a bilingual dictionary entry should not stop at a brief correspondence such as rain–*yomg'ir*. For units such as drizzle, shower, downpour, cloudburst, flurry, and sleet, a structured descriptive gloss– for example, "drizzle: fine-droplet, gentle rain; *shivalamayomg'ir*," "shower: short-lived rain (or snow)," "blizzard: snowfall accompanied by strong

wind; *qorbo‘ron*” – would be more useful for translators and language learners.

A field-based approach is likewise advantageous in teaching practice. Rather than memorizing “rain,” “drizzle,” “shower,” and “downpour” separately, comparing them on a scale of intensity and duration and then linking them to the Uzbek *yomg‘ir*, *shivalamayomg‘ir*, and *jala* helps learners understand the differences of meaning in a systematic way. This approach extends, to English-Uzbek contrastive material, the conclusion already drawn regarding the linguodidactic value of the source field [1].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The contrastive analysis carried out shows that the two languages share a common conceptual core in naming precipitation phenomena, but that the semantic segmentation around this core differs. In both languages, precipitation/*yog‘in* constitutes the hyperonymic level, while rain/*yomg‘ir*, snow/*qor*, and hail/*do‘l* form the main hyponymic centers. At the same time, English, particularly within the rain and snow microfields, tends to encode intensity, duration, and type of event through separate lexemes more densely [cf. 17; 18].

The first key finding is that correspondence is high at the level of core units. The pairs rain–*yomg‘ir*, snow–*qor*, and hail–*do‘l* preserve the main part of the denotative content in full. Toward the periphery, however, equivalence weakens. Although the pair drizzle–*shivalamayomg‘ir* shows high semantic correspondence, the English unit's capacity for noun/verb conversion is distributed in Uzbek between the two forms *shivalamayomg‘ir* and *shivalamoq*. For “shower,” “cloudburst,” “flurry,” and “sleet,” the need for descriptive translation increases.

The second finding concerns the broader scope of derivational and conversional paradigms in English. Series such as rain/rainy/to rain, snow/snowy/to snow, and hail/to hail tightly unite the name, attribute, and process of an event around a single root. Although Uzbek also has derivation, as in *yomg‘ir/yomg‘irli*

and *qor/qorli*, the meaning of process is more often constructed analytically through the verb *yog'moq*. This typological difference also affects sentence structure in translation.

The third finding concerns the productivity, in Uzbek, of expressing nuances of meaning through phrases. Units such as “short-term rain,” “rain mixed with snow,” “hail pellet,” and “snowfall” correspond to single-word or compound lexemes in English. It would be incorrect to interpret this as “Uzbek lacking the corresponding concept”; rather, the concept exists, but its lexical encoding is analytic. The task of contrastive linguistics is precisely to identify such differing encoding strategies.

The fourth finding is that a single opposition of “strong versus weak” is insufficient for measuring shades of meaning. For rain, droplet size and duration are important; for snow, wind and particle shape; for hail, ice-pellet size. Likewise, suddenness proves central in units such as cloudburst, episodic character in shower and flurry, and the *wind* component in *blizzard/qorbo'ron*. The semantic model of precipitation vocabulary must therefore be multidimensional.

CONCLUSION

Although the lexemes denoting rain, snow, and hail in English and Uzbek reflect a shared denotative reality, the lexical and grammatical distribution of shades of meaning is not identical in the two languages. In English, certain features – brevity, very heavy rainfall, fine droplets, the combination of snow with wind – are frequently expressed by a separate lexeme. In Uzbek, these same features are often formed analytically, through a combination of the core lexeme with a modifier or verb.

At the level of core units, semantic correspondence is strong: rain–*yomg'ir*, snow–*qor*, hail–*do'l*. The pairs drizzle–*shivalamayomg'ir* and blizzard–*qorbo'ron* also preserve their differential senses well. “Shower,” “cloudburst,” “flurry,” and “sleet,” however, stand out as units requiring descriptive or contextual equivalents in translation. For this reason, componential analysis combined with functional equivalence

proves more effective than the “one word for one word” principle in comparing shades of meaning.

For future research, it would be worthwhile to expand the study on the basis of national and parallel corpora and to conduct a statistical analysis of the real frequency and collocational profiles of precipitation lexemes in literary, journalistic, and meteorological discourse. Such an approach would make it possible to test the semantic model identified in the present article against empirical data and to formulate more precise practical recommendations for English-Uzbek lexicography [14].

REFERENCES

1. Karimova, R. Kh. & Timofeyev A. A. 2020. The semantic field “Weather” (based on English lexis). *Filologicheskii aspekt*, 6/62, 28-36.
2. Borisova, A. V. 2013. Features of lexico-semantic correlation of units of the field VODA/WODA in Russian and Polish. *Vestnik Bashkirskogo universiteta*, 1, 166-170.
3. Shakhimov, R. I. 2015. The semantic field of words and its elements. *Filologicheskii nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*, 4/46, 209-213.
4. Shvayko, Ya. V. 2006. The semantic model of English learning verbs: Author's abstract of Cand. Sc. (Philology) dissertation, Ufa.
5. Egamnazarov, Kh. Kh. 2018. On the notion of the lexico-semantic field in linguistics. *Uchenye zapiski Khudzhandskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. akad. B. Gafurova*, 1/54, 185-189.
6. Yusupov, U. K. 2007. *Theoretical Foundations of Contrastive Linguistics*. 2nd ed. Tashkent: Fan.
7. Yusupov, U. K. 1988. Contrastive linguistics as an independent discipline. *Metody sopostavitelnogo izucheniya yazykov*. Moscow: Nauka.
8. Buranov, J., Yusupov, U., Iriskulov, M. & Sadiqov, A. 1986. *The Grammatical Structures of English, Uzbek and Russian*. Part I. Tashkent: Ukituvchi.
9. Lehrer, A. 1974. *Semantic Fields and Lexical Structure*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
10. Lyons J. 1977. *Semantics*. Vol. 1-2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

11. Cruse, D. A. 1986. *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Geeraerts, D. 2010. *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
13. Madvaliyev, A. 2020. *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language*. 2nd ed. 5 vols. Tashkent: O'zbekistonmilliy ensiklopediyasi.
14. *Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language: yomg'ir, jala, shivala, qorbo'ron, do'l*.
15. *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries*. Rain, drizzle, shower, downpour, snow, blizzard, hail, sleet entries.
16. *Macmillan Dictionary*. Weather and precipitation vocabulary entries.
17. Ashurova, N. R. 2025. A Comparative Study of the Semantic and Conceptual Features of the "Rain/Yomg'ir" Concept in English and Uzbek Languages. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Science and Technology*, 5/11, 260-262. <https://mjstjournal.com/index.php/mjst/article/view/5600>.
18. Ashurova N. R. 2026. *Inglizvao'zbektillaridaob-havohodisalarileksika siningsemantikvastrukturtipologiyasi*. The Journal of Economics and Pedagogy, 1/2, 38-44. Available online: <<https://journal.uniep.uz/jour/uz/article/view/45>>.

ASHUROVA NODIRAXON RAFIQOVNA

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR,

UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS AND PEDAGOGY,

ANDIJAN, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <NASHUROVA@403GMAIL.COM>

ORCID: [HTTPS://ORCID.ORG/0009-0008-7962-2342](https://ORCID.ORG/0009-0008-7962-2342)