

Stylistic and Metaphorical Features of Bahuvrihi Compounds: A Comparative Study of English and Uzbek

Shodiya Rahimova

Department: Department of " Philology and foreign languages"

University name: Urgench Ranch technology university

Urgench City and Country Name: Urgench, Uzbekistan

Email: r.shodiyy@gmail.com

Orcid ID: 0000000315290162

ABSTRACT

Bahuvrihi compounds, first described in the grammatical tradition of Sanskrit by Pāṇini, represent one of the most intriguing types of exocentric word-formation. In such compounds, the meaning of the whole expression does not correspond directly to its constituents but refers instead to an external entity. This structural peculiarity has drawn attention in many linguistic traditions; however, the stylistic and metaphorical dimensions of bahuvrihis remain insufficiently explored. The present paper offers a comparative investigation of English and Uzbek bahuvrihi compounds, focusing on their stylistic registers, metaphorical domains, and evaluative orientations. English bahuvrihis, such as *redhead*, *bigmouth*, and *bookworm*, tend to emerge in colloquial discourse, where they function with humorous, ironic, or figurative force. By contrast, Uzbek bahuvrihis, including *vatanparvar* ("patriot"), *ilmparvar* ("science-loving"), and *foydaxor* ("profit-seeker"), reveal a systematic tendency to encode ideological, moral, and cultural values through productive affixoid patterns like *-parvar*, *-go'y*, and *-xor*. Beyond their formal and semantic characteristics, bahuvrihis are shown to operate as semiotic reflections of cultural worldview. The English tradition highlights individual traits and satirical perspectives, while the Uzbek tradition foregrounds collective identity and ethical ideals. This contrast demonstrates how compounding, as a universal word-formation process, can serve radically different cultural functions across languages. The analysis is based on a balanced dataset of 60 compounds (30 English, 30 Uzbek) drawn from lexicographic, descriptive, and corpus-based sources. The findings suggest that English bahuvrihis are predominantly negative or ironic in orientation, whereas Uzbek bahuvrihis favor positive and ideologically elevated evaluations. By integrating morphological typology, cognitive metaphor theory, and cultural linguistics, the study argues that bahuvrihi compounds provide valuable insight into how language encodes cultural salience, ideological orientation, and social identity. Ultimately, the paper contributes to comparative linguistics and cognitive semantics by demonstrating that bahuvrihi compounds are not marginal curiosities of morphology but meaningful cultural signs. Their analysis opens pathways for future corpus-driven, diachronic, and interdisciplinary research that could trace how compounding practices evolve in response to changing cultural and communicative needs.

Keywords: *bahuvrihi*, *exocentric compounds*, *stylistics*, *metaphor*, *affixoids*, *English*, *Uzbek*, *comparative linguistics*, *cultural semiotics*

INTRODUCTION

Bahuvrihi compounds occupy a distinctive place in the typology of word-formation. Originating in the grammatical tradition of Sanskrit and first systematically described by Pāṇini, bahuvrihis are classified as exocentric compounds, that is, their overall meaning does not directly correspond to the literal sum of their constituents but instead refers to an external entity. For example, *redhead* in English denotes "a person with red hair," not simply "a red head," while *vatanparvar* in Uzbek denotes "a patriot" rather than "the one who nurtures the homeland." This semantic shift beyond the internal components makes bahuvrihi compounds particularly interesting for scholars working at the intersection of morphology, semantics, and culture.

In Western linguistics, bahuvrihis entered typological studies through the works of Bloomfield¹, Marchand², Bauer³, and others, often under the label of "exocentric compounds." Their analyses typically

¹ Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

² Marchand, H. (1969). *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*. Munich: Beck.

³ Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

highlighted structural and classificatory aspects, such as how bahuvrihis differ from endocentric or coordinative compounds. Yet, relatively little attention was given to their stylistic potential, metaphorical value, or cultural resonance. In English, scholars such as Adams⁴ and Bauer⁵ provided numerous examples—bigmouth, loudmouth, bookworm—but discussion largely remained descriptive, focused on morphology rather than the broader cultural or evaluative functions of such words.

In Uzbek linguistics, by contrast, the productivity of affixoids like *-parvar*, *-go'y*, and *-xor* has long been noted (Rahmatullayev⁶, Jumaniyozov⁷,). These forms systematically generate compounds such as *ilmparvar* (“science-loving”), *nasihatgo'y* (“advice-giver”), and *foydaxor* (“profit-seeker”). What distinguishes Uzbek bahuvrihis is that they are not random lexical innovations but part of a patterned, almost formulaic strategy of word-formation. Their recurrence in political, literary, and ethical discourse suggests that they play a much more central role in shaping ideological and cultural identity than is typically the case in English. Despite these observations, there remains a significant gap in comparative scholarship. While English bahuvrihis are often colloquial, ironic, and metaphorically playful, Uzbek bahuvrihis are predominantly moralizing, ideological, and collectivist in orientation. Yet very few studies have directly compared the two traditions in order to reveal what these differences mean for understanding cultural worldview. This paper seeks to fill that gap by bringing together insights from morphological typology, cognitive metaphor theory, and cultural linguistics. The goals of the study are threefold. First, it aims to document and compare the metaphorical domains exploited by English and Uzbek bahuvrihis, asking whether animals, nature, ethics, or occupations dominate in each linguistic tradition. Second, it examines stylistic registers—colloquial, literary, journalistic, and political—to determine where bahuvrihis are most productive and socially meaningful. Third, it analyzes evaluative orientation, identifying whether compounds tend to praise, criticize, or neutrally describe their referents. By situating these findings within broader cultural frameworks, the study demonstrates how morphology itself can function as a mirror of ideology and identity. Methodologically, the analysis is based on a balanced dataset of sixty compounds (thirty English, thirty Uzbek) collected from dictionaries, descriptive works, and corpus-based sources. Each compound is coded according to domain, register, and evaluative orientation, allowing for both quantitative patterns and qualitative insights. This dual approach ensures that the analysis goes beyond anecdotal examples, grounding claims in systematic comparison. In doing so, this paper argues that bahuvrihi compounds are not marginal curiosities of word-formation, but highly revealing indicators of cultural values. The contrast between ironic, often negative English bahuvrihis and ideologically elevated Uzbek bahuvrihis illustrates how compounding can serve radically different cultural purposes, even while following a shared typological pattern. Ultimately, this study positions bahuvrihis as valuable semiotic resources that illuminate the interplay between language, thought, and culture.

DEFINITIONS AND BACKGROUND

Bahuvrihi is a type of exocentric compound, meaning that the semantic reference of the whole expression does not correspond directly to its constituent parts but points outward to an external referent. Etymologically, the Sanskrit word bahuvrihi literally means “much rice,” but in its grammatical usage it designates “a man who has much rice,” illustrating how the compound denotes something beyond its literal elements. This core feature—semantic shift from parts to an external entity—has made bahuvrihi a central category in word-formation typology. In English linguistics, bahuvrihis are often described as possessive or exocentric compounds. Classical examples include *redhead* (“a person with red hair”), *loudmouth* (“a person who talks noisily”), and *bookworm* (“a person who reads excessively”). These compounds are stylistically versatile: some function in colloquial registers with ironic or humorous undertones, while others, such as *trailblazer*, acquire metaphorical and even honorific force. Their flexibility reveals how compounding is not merely a mechanical process but also a stylistic resource shaped by context.

⁴ Adams, V. (1973). *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. London: Longman.

⁵ Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

⁶ Rahmatullayev, Sh. (1961). *O'zbek tili so'z yasalishi*. Tashkent: Fan

⁷ Jumaniyozov, A. (2017). *O'zbek tilida affiksoidlarning semantikasi*. Tashkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti.

In Uzbek, the *bahuvrihi* category has a different historical trajectory. Here, compounding often relies on affixoid elements such as *-parvar* (“nurturer, supporter”), *-go'y* (“speaker”), and *-xor* (“consumer, seeker”). This morphological productivity enables the creation of systematic patterns of meaning. Compounds such as *ilmparvar* (“science-loving”), *adolatparvar* (“justice-loving”), and *foydaxor* (“profit-seeker”) exemplify how Uzbek speakers use *bahuvrihis* to construct evaluative labels that foreground ideology, morality, and collective identity. Unlike English, where *bahuvrihis* emerge through lexical innovation, in Uzbek they arise through productive and semi-regular processes that make them a stable component of the lexicon. From a theoretical perspective, *bahuvrihi* compounds are of interest to several linguistic frameworks. In cognitive linguistics, they can be seen as instantiations of conceptual metaphor, mapping domains such as ANIMAL (eager beaver), NATURE (firebrand), or MORAL VALUE (adolatparvar) onto HUMAN identity. Such mappings not only describe traits but also evaluate them, which explains why *bahuvrihis* often carry strong positive or negative connotations. In semiotic and cultural linguistics, *bahuvrihis* function as symbols, encapsulating values and ideologies that a speech community considers central. For instance, calling someone *vatanparvar* in Uzbek invokes not only patriotism but also a larger ideological discourse tied to national identity.

Historically, much of the scholarship on compounding has focused on classification and formal properties, leaving aside the stylistic and cultural dimensions. Works by Bloomfield, Marchand, and Bauer provided foundational typologies for English but rarely addressed how compounds encode evaluative stance or cultural identity. In Uzbek scholarship, Rahmatullayev and later Jumaniyozov analyzed affixoid-driven word-formation, but systematic attention to metaphor and stylistics remains limited. This creates an opening for comparative research that situates *bahuvrihis* within broader debates about language and culture. By defining *bahuvrihis* not only as a structural type but also as cultural signs, this paper frames them as a valuable lens for understanding how languages conceptualize human identity. English compounds often satirize or individualize behavior, while Uzbek compounds elevate moral, ideological, and collective ideals. This divergence shows that the same morphological mechanism can serve radically different cultural functions depending on the linguistic and social environment.

METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a comparative and interdisciplinary methodology designed to capture both the structural properties and the cultural meanings of *bahuvrihi* compounds in English and Uzbek. Since previous research has largely emphasized descriptive and classificatory aspects, the methodological framework here deliberately integrates approaches from morphological typology, cognitive metaphor theory, stylistics, and cultural linguistics in order to provide a fuller picture of how *bahuvrihis* function in two different linguistic traditions. The dataset for analysis consists of 60 *bahuvrihi* compounds: 30 drawn from English and 30 from Uzbek. English examples were identified through a combination of lexicographic sources (such as The Oxford English Dictionary and Bauer's works on word-formation), corpus evidence (British National Corpus, Corpus of Contemporary American English), and descriptive studies on compounding. Uzbek examples were taken from monolingual dictionaries, academic works and contemporary literary, journalistic, and political texts. This dual-source strategy ensures that the dataset is representative of both traditional lexicon and living usage. To maintain balance, only compounds that clearly meet the exocentric (*bahuvrihi*) definition were included. For English, this excluded transparent endocentric compounds (*football player*, *schoolteacher*) and idiomatic phrases that fall outside compounding. For Uzbek, the focus was on affixoid-driven compounds (*-parvar*, *-go'y*, *-xo'r*) and other recognized *bahuvrihi* forms. Each compound was verified by at least two independent sources (e.g., dictionary entry and corpus citation) to confirm that it is attested in real usage rather than artificially constructed. A coding manual was developed to ensure consistency. For example, *bigmouth* was coded as ANIMAL (metaphor), colloquial (register), and negative (orientation); *vatanparvar* was coded as ETHICS/IDEOLOGY, political/literary, and positive. To enhance reliability, ambiguous cases were discussed and resolved using contextual examples from corpora or texts.

ANALYSIS / FINDINGS

The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek *bahuvrihi* compounds reveals clear patterns in their metaphorical domains, stylistic registers, and evaluative orientations. By examining a balanced dataset of 60

items, it becomes evident that while the two languages share the same typological mechanism of exocentric compounding, they diverge sharply in cultural function and semantic orientation.⁸

1. Metaphorical Domains

Domain	English (n=30)	Uzbek (n=30)	Examples
Animal	9 (30%)	2 (7%)	bookworm, eager beaver / qushparvar
Nature	7 (23%)	4 (13%)	firebrand, trailblazer / bog‘parvar
Ethics/Ideology	3 (10%)	18 (60%)	do-gooder / adolatparvar, vatanparvar
Occupation/Role	11 (37%)	6 (20%)	councilman, journeyman / ilmparvar

The first striking difference lies in the metaphorical source domains. In English, bahuvrihis frequently draw on ANIMAL imagery (bookworm, eager beaver, fat cat) and NATURE (firebrand, trailblazer). These metaphors emphasize individual traits, often highlighting quirks, excesses, or talents. By contrast, Uzbek bahuvrihis overwhelmingly belong to the ETHICS/IDEOLOGY domain (adolatparvar “justice-loving,” vatanparvar “patriot,” insonparvar “humanist”). The metaphorical contrast indicates distinct cultural orientations: English highlights individuality through metaphorical creativity, while Uzbek prioritizes collectivist ideals through systematic moral coding. Quantitatively, 30% of English compounds relied on ANIMAL metaphors, whereas only 7% of Uzbek ones did. Meanwhile, 60% of Uzbek compounds foregrounded ETHICS and IDEOLOGY, compared to only 10% of English compounds. This confirms that English favors figurative humor and irony, while Uzbek consistently encodes cultural values and social ideals.⁹

2. Stylistic Registers

Register	English (n=30)	Uzbek (n=30)	Examples
Colloquial	14 (47%)	2 (7%)	bigmouth, nitwit / badgo‘y
Literary	5 (17%)	12 (40%)	earth-mother / dilparvar
Journalistic	6 (20%)	5 (17%)	weatherman, showman / ilmparvar

⁸ Rahimova Sh. Sh. Ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida bahuvrihining differensial o‘rganilishi., (PhD) ilmiy darajasini olish uchun yozilgan dissertatsiya. Urganch. -2025.

⁹Rahimova Sh. Sh. Ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida bahuvrihining differensial o‘rganilishi., (PhD) ilmiy darajasini olish uchun yozilgan dissertatsiya. Urganch. – 2025.

Political/Ideological	5 (16%)	11 (36%)	fallen woman / vatanparvar, insonparvar
-----------------------	---------	----------	---

The analysis also shows important differences in register distribution. Nearly half of the English bahuvrihis studied (47%) occur in colloquial contexts. Compounds like bigmouth or nitwit thrive in spoken language, often with ironic or pejorative overtones. A smaller number (17%) occur in literary registers, while another 20% appear in journalistic writing, often as creative headlines (weatherman, showman).

In Uzbek, by contrast, only 7% of compounds occur in colloquial contexts. Instead, literary (40%) and political/ideological (36%) registers dominate, reflecting how compounds like ilmparvar, dilparvar, or vatanparvar circulate in elevated discourse. These words are widely used in formal speeches, academic writing, and public communication to reinforce values such as patriotism, justice, and humanism. This contrast indicates that English bahuvrihis function as markers of everyday expression, while Uzbek bahuvrihis function as tools of cultural and ideological affirmation.

3. Evaluative Orientations

Orientation	English (n=30)	Uzbek (n=30)	Examples
Positive	9 (30%)	21 (70%)	trailblazer, eager beaver / adolatparvar, ilmparvar
Neutral	8 (27%)	4 (13%)	councilman / molparvar
Negative	13 (43%)	5 (17%)	bigmouth, nitwit / foydaxor

Evaluation is perhaps the most culturally loaded dimension. The data reveal that 43% of English bahuvrihis carry negative or ironic connotations, such as bigmouth, nitwit, or loudmouth. Only 30% are positive (trailblazer, eager beaver), with 27% neutral. The predominance of negative/ironic items demonstrates that English bahuvrihis often serve a satirical, critical, or humorous purpose, consistent with a cultural tendency toward irony and individual critique. Uzbek, by contrast, shows a 70% positive orientation, with compounds like adolatparvar, ilmparvar, and vatanparvar functioning as honorific labels. Only 17% are negative (*foydaxo'r, badgo'y*), and the remaining 13% are neutral. This indicates that Uzbek compounds are overwhelmingly mobilized to praise moral and ideological alignment, reflecting cultural priorities of collectivism and ethical evaluation.

4. Structural Mechanisms

The structural mechanisms behind bahuvrihi formation also differ across languages. In English, compounds are typically lexical creations, often metaphorical, with no regular morphological pattern. Words like redhead or firebrand are coined through creative metaphorical extension. In Uzbek, however, the use of productive affixoids (*-parvar, -go'y, -xo'r*) provides a semi-regular template for creating new compounds. This morphological productivity not only systematizes word-formation but also makes bahuvrihis available

for ideological discourse, as speakers can readily coin new compounds with predictable meanings (*tabiatparvar*; *kitobparvar*; *sadoqatparvar*).

5. Cross-linguistic Implications

Together, these findings suggest that bahuvrihis, while typologically similar, embody different cultural worldviews. English employs bahuvrihis as lexical devices for satire, humor, and individual expression, while Uzbek employs them as ideological and cultural symbols. This shows that a single morphological category can diverge functionally across languages, depending on cultural context and evaluative priorities. The analysis also illustrates how compounding interacts with cultural semiotics. The dominance of animal metaphors in English reflects a cultural readiness to caricature human behavior through humor. The prevalence of ethical affixoids in Uzbek reflects a cultural emphasis on moral alignment and social solidarity. Thus, morphology is not merely a linguistic process but a vehicle of cultural ideology.

DISCUSSION

The findings presented above highlight not only structural and stylistic contrasts between English and Uzbek bahuvrihi compounds but also deeper cultural patterns that emerge through their usage. This section situates the results within broader theoretical debates in morphology, cognitive metaphor theory, and cultural linguistics, showing how the study of bahuvrihis provides insights into the interaction between language, identity, and ideology.

1. Morphological Typology and Productivity

One of the most striking contrasts lies in the mechanisms of word-formation. English bahuvrihis are largely lexical innovations, coined through creative metaphorical extension. Each compound tends to stand alone, often without forming part of a systematic paradigm. For example, bookworm and firebrand share no common morphological pattern, and their meanings are understood only through metaphor and cultural convention. By contrast, Uzbek bahuvrihis show morphological productivity through affixoids such as *-parvar*, *-go'y*, and *-xo'r*. These elements function semi-systematically, creating a family of compounds with predictable semantic orientations. The suffix *-parvar* consistently encodes positive nurturing or loyalty (*ilmparvar*, *vatanparvar*), while *-xor* often carries a negative evaluative meaning (*foydaxo'r*; *nafaqaxo'r*). This productivity allows Uzbek to mobilize bahuvrihis as ideological tools, since new words can be coined rapidly to fit emerging social and political discourses. In this respect, Uzbek bahuvrihis exemplify what Bauer calls "morphological regularity as a resource for cultural reproduction."

2. Cognitive Metaphor and Conceptual Mappings

The analysis also underscores differences in conceptual metaphor usage. English favors ANIMAL and NATURE domains, consistent with Lakoff and Johnson's¹⁰ observation that metaphorical mappings often draw on embodied or environmental experiences. Calling someone a bookworm or eager beaver draws humor and vividness from projecting animal traits onto human behavior. Similarly, compounds like firebrand or trailblazer metaphorically equate human initiative with natural forces. These mappings emphasize individuality, creativity, and irony. Uzbek, however, foregrounds ETHICS and IDEOLOGY as dominant metaphorical domains. Compounds such as *adolatparvar* and *insonparvar* conceptualize human identity through moral values, while *vatanparvar* situates it in relation to collective belonging. Here, the metaphorical process is less about caricature and more about valorization of cultural ideals. The difference suggests that while English speakers exploit metaphor for wit and critique, Uzbek speakers employ it to reinforce ethical alignment and social solidarity.

3. Stylistic Registers and Social Functions

The register distribution reinforces these cultural contrasts. English bahuvrihis thrive in colloquial and journalistic settings, where they add expressive color and humor. Their function is often interpersonal and pragmatic, serving to criticize, tease, or amuse. Uzbek bahuvrihis, conversely, dominate in literary and political/ideological contexts. Their role is more didactic and symbolic, intended to elevate discourse, inspire collective values, and legitimize ideological positions. This divergence illustrates how morphology interacts with discourse traditions: English compounds operate at the margins of formal language, while Uzbek

¹⁰ Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

compounds are central to formal and institutional communication. Thus, the same structural phenomenon is appropriated for different communicative purposes across languages.

4. Evaluative Orientation as Cultural Index

Perhaps the clearest cultural difference lies in evaluative orientation. English compounds lean heavily toward negative or ironic connotations (*bigmouth*, *nitwit*), reflecting a cultural comfort with satire and critique of individuals. Uzbek compounds overwhelmingly adopt positive orientations, using *bahuvihi*s as honorifics that signal alignment with collective ideals (*ilmparvar*, *vatanparvar*). This contrast suggests that evaluation is not incidental but integral to the function of *bahuvihi*s. In English, the compound is a tool of critique; in Uzbek, it is a tool of praise and ideological alignment. Such evaluative asymmetry reveals how morphology encodes broader cultural narratives: English emphasizes individuality, often at the risk of mockery, while Uzbek emphasizes collectivism, often through moral elevation.

5. Broader Implications

The comparative findings carry broader implications for linguistic theory and cultural semiotics. First, they challenge the assumption that compounding is a purely formal process, showing instead that it is deeply embedded in cultural practices of meaning-making. Second, they illustrate how morphological productivity conditions cultural function: the absence of productive affixoids in English results in sporadic, humorous compounds, while their presence in Uzbek supports systematic ideological deployment. Third, they highlight the importance of studying evaluation and pragmatics in word-formation, domains often overlooked in traditional morphology. For applied linguistics and translation studies, the findings underscore the difficulties of cross-cultural equivalence. Translating *vatanparvar* as “patriot” captures denotation but fails to convey the ideological weight and emotional resonance the term carries in Uzbek discourse. Similarly, rendering *bigmouth* into Uzbek requires compensatory strategies to reproduce its colloquial irony. Such examples show that *bahuvihi*s embody not only lexical meaning but also cultural positioning, making them resistant to straightforward equivalence.

CONCLUSION

This comparative study of *bahuvihi* compounds in English and Uzbek demonstrates that a single typological category can serve profoundly different cultural and communicative functions across languages. While both traditions share the structural principle of exocentric compounding—where the meaning of the whole points outward to an external referent—the stylistic, metaphorical, and evaluative realizations of this principle diverge sharply, reflecting distinct worldviews. The analysis has shown that English *bahuvihi*s are primarily lexical innovations, often metaphorically creative, humorous, and ironic. They thrive in colloquial and journalistic registers, where they function as tools of social commentary and satire. Their dominant metaphorical sources—animals and natural phenomena—allow speakers to caricature human behavior in vivid, often exaggerated ways. The prevalence of negative or ironic orientation further suggests that in English, *bahuvihi*s are a mechanism for individual critique, wit, and playfulness rather than ideological affirmation.

By contrast, Uzbek *bahuvihi*s are formed systematically through productive affixoids such as *-parvar*, *-go'y*, and *-xo'r*. Their stylistic domains are primarily literary and political, and their dominant metaphorical source lies in ethics and ideology. Far from serving humorous or playful functions, they carry moral, ideological, and collective significance. Compounds like *adolatparvar* and *vatanparvar* operate as honorific labels that signal alignment with communal values and national identity. The overwhelmingly positive evaluative orientation of Uzbek *bahuvihi*s highlights their role as linguistic vehicles for praise, solidarity, and moral elevation. These findings contribute to three broader areas of linguistic inquiry. First, they extend morphological typology by illustrating how productivity (affixoid-based vs. lexical innovation) influences cultural functions of compounding. Second, they enrich cognitive metaphor theory by showing that different languages privilege distinct metaphorical domains according to cultural salience—ANIMAL and NATURE for English, ETHICS and IDEOLOGY for Uzbek. Third, they advance cultural linguistics and semiotics by framing compounds as symbolic resources that reproduce social values and identities. The study also highlights practical implications. In translation studies, the cultural weight of *bahuvihi*s often resists direct equivalence: terms like *vatanparvar* or *insonparvar* cannot be fully captured by English counterparts such as “patriot” or “humanist,” which lack the same ideological intensity. Conversely, colloquial compounds like *bigmouth* or *nitwit* lose much of their ironic flavor when rendered into Uzbek.

These challenges underline the need for culturally sensitive translation strategies that account not only for denotation but also for evaluative and ideological resonance. Finally, the research points toward fruitful directions for future inquiry. Expanding the dataset through corpus-driven and diachronic studies would allow scholars to trace how *bahuvrihis* evolve in response to changing cultural narratives. Comparative studies involving additional languages could further illuminate how universal morphological processes are harnessed for diverse cultural ends. Integrating methods from discourse analysis, pragmatics, and computational linguistics would deepen understanding of how *bahuvrihis* circulate in media, literature, and everyday interaction. In conclusion, *bahuvrihi* compounds are far more than curiosities of morphology. They are semiotic mirrors of culture, encoding values, identities, and ideologies in compact linguistic form. English and Uzbek, though typologically distinct in their strategies, both reveal through *bahuvrihis* how language simultaneously reflects and shapes the way communities see themselves and others. The study thus reaffirms the central insight that morphology is not only a structural system but also a cultural practice, inseparably tied to the symbolic life of human societies.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, V. (1973). *An Introduction to Modern English Word-Formation*. London: Longman.
2. Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-Formation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Bauer, L. (2001). *Morphological Productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
5. Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
6. Jumaniyozov, A. (2017). *O'zbek tilida affiksoidlarning semantikasi*. Tashkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti.
7. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
8. Marchand, H. (1969). *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*. Munich: Beck.
9. Rahimova, Sh. (2025). *Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida bahuvrihining differensial o'rganilishi*. Dissertation, Urgench State University.
10. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (1961). *O'zbek tili so'z yasalishi*. Tashkent: Fan.
11. Spencer, A. (1991). *Morphological Theory: An Introduction to Word Structure in Generative Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
12. Waugh, L. R. (1995). "Reported speech in journalistic discourse: The role of culture, ideology, and identity." *Text & Talk*, 15(1), 129–173.
13. Zwicky, A. M. (1985). "How to describe inflection." In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon* (pp. 371–389). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.