

# Isomorphic and Allomorphic Properties of Multi-Tiered Verbalizers of the Concept "Head/Голова/Жла" in English and Russian Languages and Translation Problems

*Yusupjanova Firuza Kurbanovna*<sup>1</sup>

**Annotation:** The article examines the isomorphic and allomorphic properties of different-tiered verbalizers of the concept "head/голова/жлава" in English and Russian, as well as the problems that arise when translating them. The study focuses on analysing semantic, morphological and syntactic features of these verbalizers, identifying their similarities and differences. The authors also consider the difficulties associated with the transfer of semantic nuances and cultural contexts when translating from one language to another. The article provides examples of successful and unsuccessful translation solutions, which helps to better understand the nature of interlingual and intercultural communication.

**Keywords:** isomorphic properties, allomorphic properties, verbalizers, concept "head", concept "head", concept "chapter", English language, Russian language, translation problems, semantics, morphology, syntax, interlingual communication, intercultural communication.

## Introduction

Comparative analysis of the linguistic representation of key cultural concepts is one of the leading areas of modern comparative linguistics.

The concept of "head" is one of the oldest and most significant elements of the conceptual sphere of various lingua cultures. Being one of the key organs of the human body, the head is endowed with a special status and symbolic meaning in many cultures. It is associated with intelligence, knowledge, management, and power, as well as with the spiritual, religious and mystical spheres of existence.

In the context of comparative studies, the concept of "head" is a multidimensional mental construct that combines various physiological, psychological, social and cultural characteristics. The study of its linguistic representation in different linguacultural traditions allows us to identify both universal and specific features of this concept.

The purpose of this section of the work is to identify isomorphic and allomorphic properties of verbalizers of the concept "head" in English and Russian, as well as to analyze the problems of their translation. To achieve this goal, we need to solve the following tasks:

1. to determine the conceptual content and figurative-associative component of different verbalizers of the concept "head" in the compared languages;
2. describe the key morphological, lexical, syntactic, phraseological and paralinguistic means of representing this concept, and establish their national and cultural specificity;
3. to conduct a comparative analysis of verbalizers of the concept "head" in English and Russian, to identify their isomorphic and allomorphic features;
4. to consider the main problems of translation of morphological, lexical, syntactic, phraseological and paralinguistic units that objectify the concept of "head" and ways to solve them.

In this regard, the theoretical basis of the study is formed by fundamental works of domestic and foreign linguists on comparative linguistics, cognitive linguistics, linguacultural studies, and

<sup>1</sup> Senior Lecturer in English at the Department of Foreign Languages of Ferghana State University



phraseology (Yu.D. Apresyan, A. Vezhbetskaya, V.I. Karasik, V.N. Teliya, Yu.S. Stepanov, U.K. Yusupov, Sh. Safarov, G.M. Khoshimov, A.E. Mamatov, etc.). The empirical material includes data from explanatory, phraseological, and ethnolinguistic dictionaries of the Russian and English languages, as well as examples of the use of relevant linguistic means in various types of discourse.

Our analysis of multi-level verbalizers of the concept "head/гола/жла" has established both isomorphic and allomorphic features in their structural-semantic, communicative-pragmatic, linguacultural and lingua stylistic characteristics in compatibility with other linguistic units in the compared languages. The following can be attributed to isomorphic features:

1. Both languages have a special system of multi-tiered verbalizers (morphological, lexical, syntactic, phraseological, paralinguistic):
2. There are synonymous, homonymous and antonymous types of verbalizers of the concept under study:
3. In both languages, the following were identified at the morphological level:
  - a) there are root morphemes "head" and "head/chapter", which form the entire arsenal of all kinds of multi-level linguistic means;
  - b) the root morphemes "head/head/chapter" function in complex lexemes with these somatonymies as a substantive, verbal and adjectival base (adjective);
  - c) homonyms "head / head / chapter" as a morpheme in a complex lexeme are located about another part of the derivative or complex lexeme: 1) prepositionally; 2) postpositionally (interposition root morphemes are rare), with lexemes with a postpositive root morpheme dominating;
  - d) homonyms "head/голова/жла" in postposition about another part of a complex lexeme in terms of frequency of formation and functioning as a root morpheme in languages dominate;

At the lexical level, we have identified the following isomorphic properties:

- a) homonyms "head/гола/жла" exist together with their synonyms and variants;
- b) among the synonyms and variants of the somatonymies "head/голова/жлава" there are both intralingual and borrowed lexemes (while the latter do not have the status of a root morpheme-base like "head" and "голова/жлава");
- c) somatonymies "head/гола/жла" can represent a substantive, a verb and an adjective;
- d) somatonymies "head/голова/жлава" as root morphemes generate simple, derivative and complex lexemes, composite lexemes and even abbreviated lexemes;

## Methodology

The methodology for this research was designed to investigate the isomorphic and allomorphic properties of multi-tiered verbalizers of the concept "head" in English and Russian, along with the challenges of translating these linguistic elements. The study adopted a comparative linguistic approach, analyzing semantic, morphological, syntactic, and phraseological levels of verbalizers. Data was sourced from explanatory, phraseological, and ethnolinguistic dictionaries in both languages, complemented by examples of usage in diverse discourses. The analysis identified universal and unique features through structural-semantic, communicative-pragmatic, and linguacultural characteristics. The theoretical framework integrated works on comparative and cognitive linguistics, linguacultural studies, and phraseology, emphasizing a multidimensional approach to the concept of "head." Key methodologies included identifying root morphemes, examining their roles in simple and complex lexemes, and analyzing syntactic and phraseological verbalizers. Additionally, the study assessed paralinguistic expressions, such as gestures and facial movements, which carry cultural nuances. This methodology facilitated the comparison of linguistic representation and cultural connotations, uncovering insights into interlingual and intercultural communication.



## Results and Discussion

At the syntactic level, we have identified the following isomorphic properties of syntax verbalizers of the concept "head/голова/жла":

1. There are three universal types syntax verbalizers: 1) nominative; 2) nominative-communicative and purely communicative (proverbial);
2. The homonyms «head/голова/жлава» as lexemes generate phrasemes (word combinations) of the following types: 1) coordinate (with at least two substantive components) and 2) subordinate; a) substantive (with a leading lexeme-metonym «head/голова/жлава» and another substantive lexeme); b) verbal (with a leading verb lexeme and the metonym «head/голова/жлава»); c) adjectival (with an adjectival lexeme and a leading lexeme-metonym «head/голова/жлава»); d) prepositional (with a preposition and a leading lexeme-somatonym «head/голова/жлава»); d) adverbial (with a leading lexeme-somatonym «head/голова/жлава» and an adverb);
1. somatonyms "head/голова/жлава" as lexemes generate simple and rarely complex sentences (of both proverbial and non-proverbial types);
2. somatonyms "head/голова/жлава" as lexemes generate proverbemes (monoatomic and polysemic);
3. somatonyms "head/голова/жлава" as lexemes generate texts (microtexts).

At the phraseological level, we have identified the following isomorphic properties of phraseological verbalizers of the concept "head/голова/чава":

1. There are three main types of phrase-verbalizers: 1) nominative; 2) nominative-communicative and purely communicative (proverbial), using which the following are verbalized: 1) non-rethought, 2) completely rethought and 3) partially rethought types of phrase-verbalizers;
2. designation of the upper, cranial part of the human body containing the brain;
3. expression of mental abilities, intelligence, consciousness;
4. representation through the lexemes "head/голова/жла" of social status, power, and leadership of a person;
5. Nomination of the beginning, source, upper part, spatial orientation of natural existential phenomena of the world around us.

Along with this, certain allomorphic properties of lexical representatives of the concept "head" have been identified:

1. in Russian, the lexeme "head" has a broader semantic field, including the meanings "person", as well as "head of animals" (30 heads of cattle), "unit of counting" (two heads of sugar), "beginning, source" (head of a river), than in English "head", which indicates the anatomical and metonymic type "head/head";
2. The English and Russian lexemes "head" are more closely associated with the concepts of "receptacle of the mind and reason", "intellect", "memory" than with other metaphorical and metonymic concepts.
3. In English, "head" is actively used to denote a chief, a leader, while in Russian this sense is less pronounced.

Phraseological verbalizers of the concept "head" also exhibit both isomorphic and allomorphic properties in Russian and English. Common - isomorphic - universal features include set expressions representing the following semantic components:

1. physiological state, well-being (headache; have a headache);
2. intellectual, mental abilities (have an empty head);



3. social status, power, leadership (head of the family; the head of the department);
4. Spatial orientation (keep one's head up).

At the same time, a number of allomorphic characteristics of phraseological units with the component "head/голов/чава" were identified:

1. In Russian, expressions associated with a person's physical and emotional state, behavior, and character (head spinning, from head to toe) predominate, while in English, they are associated with intellectual abilities and knowledge (put one's head together, use one's head);
2. Russian phraseological units often have a more expressive, figurative character (to break one's head, to stick one's nose up), in contrast to their more neutral English counterparts (lose one's head, stick one's nose up);
3. In English, there are common idioms that reflect the idea of the head as a receptacle of reason and memory (have a one-track mind, have a good head on one's shoulders), which are less typical of the Russian language.

In languages, there are unique phraseological verbalizers, characteristic only of one or another language, which testifies to their relevant and unique typological properties.

In addition to morphological, lexical and phraseological means, in concept "head" is also actively verbalized by paralinguistic types of phraseological verbalizers, objectified in such phrase codes - gestures, facial expressions, body movements, etc. Thus, in both languages, similar gestures (tilt, shake, nod of the head) express similar meanings - agreement, disagreement, doubt, reflection, etc. At the same time, national and cultural specificity is manifested in differences in intensity, duration, and accompanying movements, as well as in the symbolic meaning of some paralinguistic units. For example, in Russian culture, the gesture of "tilting the head forward" can be interpreted as a manifestation of obedience, and submission, while in the English tradition, this same gesture is more associated with an expression of politeness, and attention.

Considering the proverb as the largest verbalizer of the concept "head" in the context of various language systems, we can identify several universal and specific features that reflect national and cultural specificity.

The universal (isomorphic) features of proverbial phrase-verbalizers are as follows:

1. the presence of two main types of proverbial phrase-verbalizers in the languages being composed (and, apparently, in all languages), namely: 1) monoatomic; 2) polysemic;
2. the ability and capacity to represent the general axiological, assertive semantics of "consecutive and conclusively" about various manifestations of human activity, starting with its multi-aspect life activity up to qualitative, quantitative and other qualities of phenomena associated with mental semantics;
3. the testing, approval and truth of conclusions and inferences regarding human actions, states, qualitative and quantitative parameters of phenomena directly related to human mental activity;
4. didactic and instructive nature of the test;
5. imagery and metaphor as the main ways of conveying meaning;
6. brevity, conciseness and rhythmic-melodic organization;
7. Stereotype, cliché, phraseology.

Specific (allomorphic) features of proverbial phrase-verbalizers:

1. national and cultural realities underlying proverbs and sayings, which accordingly function as lingua-cultures in the region;
2. value guidelines and worldview attitudes recorded in the test cases;



3. features of the grammatical structure and syntactic constructions of premiums, for example, proverbs and sayings of the English language reflect such cultural features as:
4. commitment to traditional family values;
5. individualism and independence ("God helps those who help themselves"), while in Russian proverbs and sayings emphasize:
6. collectivism and mutual assistance ("one for all, and all for one")
7. contemplation and philosophical attitude to life ("A spoon is dear to dinner")
8. Humility and submission to fate ("What is destined will not be avoided").

### Conclusion

Thus, comparative analysis of the verbs in different language systems in general, and in the compared languages in particular, allows us to identify deep connections between language and culture, contributing to a more complete understanding of the ethnonational worldview and perception of the world and ethnoculture.

### REFERENCES

1. Arutyunova, N.D. Addressee factor / N.D. Arutyunova // *Izv. Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Ser. Lit. and language* —1981. - No. 4. - P. 356 - 367.
2. Karasik V. I. Cultural dominants in language // *Language personality: cultural concepts*. Volgograd, Arkhangelsk: Peremena, 1996. P. 3-16.
3. Telia V.N. *Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects*, M., 1996
4. Vezhbitskaya A. *Language. Culture. Cognition*. M.: Nauka, 1997.- p.378
5. Stepanov Yu. S. *Constants: Dictionary of Russian Culture. Research Experience*. Moscow: *Academicheskijproject*, 2004. 992 p.
6. Safarov Sh. *Cognitive tilshunoslik*. - Jizzakh: "Sangzor" nashriyoti, 2006
7. Yusupov O.K *Concept va linguo culturema atamalari hususida//Kiyosiy-chogishtirma, typology va umumumiy tilshunoslikning dolzarb muammolari*. Republic of ilmiygamaliy anzhumani material are. – Andijon: Zhagon inter print, 2010.
8. Mamatov A.E. *Tilga cognitive yondashuvning mohiyati nimada?//Ozbek tilshunosliging dolzarb muammolari (Prof. A. Nurmonov tavalludining 70 yilliga bagishlangan ilmiy-amaliy anzhuman materiallari)*. Andijon, 2012
9. Khoshimov.G. M. On the current problems of the theory of concepts and their new classification and typology in modern cognitive linguistics // "Umumiy tilshunoslik va antropotsentrik tilshunoslik hamda lingvoadabiyotshunoslikning dolzarb muammolari" Andijon. -2023- P.271-284
10. Bird, S., & Klein, E. (1994). Phonological analysis in typed feature systems. *Computational linguistics*, 20, 455-491.
11. Booij, G. (1999). *The phonology of Dutch*. Oxford University Press.
12. Neijt, A. (2002). The interfaces of writing and grammar. *The relation of writing to spoken language*, 11-34.
13. Zwicky, A. M. (1982). *Current Approaches to Phonological Theory*.
14. Stewart, T. (2008). A consumer's guide to contemporary morphological theories. *OSUWPL*, 58, 138-230.

