

## COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ANTHROPONOMIC COMPONENT PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

**G'oyibov Umarjon Alisher o'g'li**

Student of Master's Department, Uzbekistan state world languages university

[umar.goyibov@mail.ru](mailto:umar.goyibov@mail.ru)

**Hakimov Xamidullo Inamovich**

Scientific supervisor, PhD on philological sciences,

Uzbekistan state world languages university

[hakimov2905@mail.ru](mailto:hakimov2905@mail.ru)

### ABSTRACT

A phraseological unit is a linguistic unit consisting of two or more words which represents a particular figurative meaning, such as to put oneself in somebody's shoes, to be head over heels, Achilles' heel. A phraseological unit has several terms including a phrase, a phraseologeme, a stable compound, phraseological compound. Nowadays, the cultural viewpoint of the study of phraseological units with particular components has been in the limelight. In this article, a comparative analysis of phraseological units consisting of anthroponomyc components of English and Uzbek languages has thoroughly been given.

**Key words:** anthroponomic phraseology, linguoculture, onomastic unit, national specificity, linguistic system.

Phraseology has been one of the interesting and problematic topics among linguists. The notion of phraseology was first put forward by a Swiss scientist Charles Bally in his work "Stylistique français" (French stylistics) (Bally, 1909). Phraseology is a small branch of linguistics which deals with the phraseological units of language, a linguistic unit consisting of a combination of more than one independent lexeme form and having a figurative spiritual nature. Its meaning cannot be deduced from the meaning of its components and they do not allow their lexical components to be changed or substituted.

There has been given a classification of phraseological units and has arisen a problematic issue as to the classification of phraseology from the different viewpoints among linguists. Therefore, according to a particular point of view they have been classified into a number of subgroups, such as A. V. Koonin classified phraseological

units on the basis of functions of them in speech, V. V. Vinogradov has given his own classification on consideration of their motivation, N. Amosova categorized phraseological units into two subgroups, idioms and phrasemes, depending on whether just one component or both are used in phraseological- bound meaning, A. I. Smirnitsky suggested a classification of phraseological units on the basis of their semantic and grammatical inseparability and he worked out a structural classification of phraseological units, comparing them with a word. However, the most interesting classification of phraseological units is the classification with onomastic component, and they are, in turn, categorized into a number of subgroups, such as those with anthroponyms, toponyms, ethonyms, zoonyms, astronoms, cosmonyms, chrononyms, phaleronyms, georonyms, documentonyms, ergonyms, ideonyms, chrematonyms and biblionyms (Radjabova, 2021).

Recently, the researches have aimed at the study of phraseological units as transmitters of cultural information and embodiments of cultural values (Ashurova & Galiyeva, 2019). The reason behind this aim is the fact that as one of the basic ways of linguistic representation of linguoculturology can be regarded phraseological units (Telia, 1996). Another indispensable function of phraseological units in imparting cultural information is the fact that they denote a fully or partially figurative meaning (Kunin, 1970) or they carry connotations and have an emphatic or intensifying function in a text (Glaser, 1998). Krasnix also claims that phraseological unit is often carriers of cultural connotation as a result of research on the study of Slovene phraseology for the culture- specific interpretation (Krasnix, 2008). It is evident that the indispensable connection between phraseology and culture lies in the fact that onomastic components of phraseological units reveal cultural identity of a certain nation. According to Dobrovolsky and Pirainen, speakers perceive phraseological units with a proper name typical of a given national culture as being culturally connoted (Dobrovolsky & Pirainen, 2005). It means that a phraseological unit used in discourse must be understood by the receiver and this process of comprehension is influenced by linguistic, social and cultural factors (Szerszunowicz, 2008). That is why phraseological unit is deeply national and gives opportunity to understand nation's history and character (Rasulova, 2008). Moreover, phraseological units with anthroponomic components are very often culture- specific because they carry a unique historical, national phenomena belonging to only one nation.

Phraseological units containing anthroponymic constituents compose one of the most intriguing and fascinating subsystems in every language and culture. It is defined as the reflection of the anthroponymic character of phraseology and language in general. The majority of the anthroponymic phraseological units have a rich cultural

background, conceptualized in national memory as rigid associations- personalities (Abdusamatov, 2021). Such units as a universal phenomenon are one of the most interesting objects for the contrastive investigations in, especially, two separate English and Uzbek languages.

Furthermore, according to Solntzev, phraseological units with anthroponomical component in modern English constitute a larger group of over 1000 units, which predetermines the need for studying the mechanism of qualitative transformation of anthroponomy as a part of phraseological unit (Solntzev, 1977). As Ergashova claims anthroponomical component phraseological unit in English include over 40 units as compared to Uzbek where such units are just a few and still insufficiently investigated (Ergasheva, 2011). This is another issue which has to be investigated since establishing a comparative study on English and Uzbek anthroponomical component phraseological units reveals multiple peculiarities in both nations.

Having investigated the anthroponomy of both English and Uzbek languages and their role as a phraseological component, Isayev came to conclusion that such phraseological units in English came mainly from religion, political figures and literary texts, whereas those in Uzbek came from proverbs, religion, mythological and historical sources, indicating that such examples are just a few (Isayev, 2015).

As a result of her research on this issue, Ergasheva hold the view that in English the majority of such phraseological units appeared as a result of the process of communication, whereas in Uzbek such phraseological units are not much (Ergasheva, 2011). This proves the fact that there will be a huge discrepancy in both languages as to the analysis of such phraseological units since there will not be an equivalence of meaning and structure between English and Uzbek anthroponomical component phraseology.

The outcome of research conducted by Bally revealed that European languages have drawn vivid and expressive images from the treasury of biblical and ancient myths (Bally, 1955). As is the case with Turkish languages, including Uzbek, in whose stock there is an abundance of expressive images deriving from Koran and folklore (Azizova, 2018). Moreover, Teshaboyeva Z. Q. is of the same opinion with Azizova F. S. that they are mainly used in literary texts to embellish images and enrich the language stock (Teshaboyeva, 2021). They are represented in the language, doubtlessly, by means of phraseological units.

Another finding which was revealed by Radjabova M. A. is that one of the most common onomastic units in world linguistics are anthroponyms and toponyms, each of which is, in turn, divided into several subtypes (Radjabova, 2021). Phraseological units with such components found in English and Uzbek languages indicated that the

majority of English phraseological units with anthroponym components correspond to mainly Uzbek proverbs with anthroponyms from the viewpoint of their meaning.

According to contrastive exploration of phraseological units with anthroponym components conducted by Abdusamadov Z. N., such phraseological units reveal one of the deepest layers of the picture of the world introducing universal and specific features of a native speaker and his culture and they contribute to the preservation of the collective cultural identity (Abdusamadov, 2021). He also holds the view that names as the element of culture participate in the linguistic fields, such as phraseological units that include phrases, proverbs and sayings, etc.

As a result of the research conducted by Ismailova Z. I. L., the national specificity of a language lies in the onomastic components of phraseological units, which included geographical names, historical phrases, names of plants and names of clothes (Azizova, 2018). Besides, Azizova F. S. claims that the national- cultural peculiarities of phraseological unit come from extralinguistic factors, including social, economical, cultural conditions as the consequence of her research on names of streets, names of clothes and names of political figures as the components of phraseological units (Azizova, 2018).

Taking everything into consideration, phraseology as a complex area of the linguistic system is a developing field of research and has attracted interest from many aspects. Phraseology itself covers a wide range of unexplored areas, such as the national- cultural specificity of the components, mainly onomastic ones, of phraseological units and the integral connection between phraseology and linguoculturology. Another aspect of the research article which was not investigated is that the structural and semantic analysis of the anthroponomic component phraseological units of English and Uzbek languages has not been comprehensively revealed yet. The objectives of the article can be regarded as crucial because the establishment of the differences and similarities of such kind of phraseological units in both languages enrich national and cultural heritage and their role as a representation of national realia adorns speech and texts.

## REFERENCES

1. Ashurova D. Galiyeva M. (2019). Cultural linguistics, p. 46
2. Isayev S (2015). National cultural specificity of anthroponomy in English, Russian and Uzbek vision of the world. Retrieved from <http://library.ziyonet.uz/uzc/book/87617>

3. Obrueva G. (2021). Appellativation of proper nouns in phraseological units from the typological perspective. Retrieved from [https://ejmcm.com/article\\_5770\\_837f135043b623dba3704ae7dbf9c429.pdf](https://ejmcm.com/article_5770_837f135043b623dba3704ae7dbf9c429.pdf)
4. Abdusamadov Z. (2021). National and cultural features of anthroponomic component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages. Retrieved from [https://eprajournals.com/jpanel/upload/1126pm\\_40.EPRA%20JOURNAL-6008.pdf](https://eprajournals.com/jpanel/upload/1126pm_40.EPRA%20JOURNAL-6008.pdf)
5. Choriyeva Z. (2013). The semantic and grammatical features of the phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages. Retrieved from [http://213.230.96.51\\_ebooks](http://213.230.96.51_ebooks)
6. Radjabova (2021). The classification of phraseological units with onomastic components. Retrieved from <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/buxdu/vol4/iss6/7>
7. Ergasheva G. (2011). The comparative- typological investigation of the gender aspect of phraseologisms and proverbs in English and Uzbek languages, Tashkent
8. Teshaboyeva Z. (2021). The cognitive and lexicographical investigation of the phraseological units in the English translation of "Boburnoma", Tashkent
9. Azizova F. (2018). Linguocultural peculiarities of teaching English phraseological units to the students of higher educational establishments, Tashkent