



Received: January 19, 2024
Accepted: March 20, 2024
Available online: March 25, 2024

Umarjon Goyibov

PhD Student, Uzbekistan State World
Languages University
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: umar.goyibov@mail.ru
ORCID iD: 0009-0006-6941-0106

ANALYSIS OF ANTHROPONOMICAL COMPONENTS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

ABSTRACT

A phraseological unit is a linguistic construct comprising two or more words and conveys a single figurative meaning. Examples of such units include ‘mare’s nest’, ‘Queen Ann’s dead’, and ‘fair-weather friend’. There is a growing interest in studying the linguocultural aspect of phraseological units that incorporate onomastic components.

The study aims to analyze phraseological units that contain anthroponomical constituents. This is one of the most intriguing subsystems in every language and culture, including English and Uzbek. However, the anthroponomical component phraseological units in non-related languages such as English and Uzbek have not been studied to a satisfactory extent using various traditional and modern approaches. The study aims to analyze such units using several traditional and modern analyses, interpret the association between personal names and anthroponomical units, and track the etymology of phraseological units with personal names in several example sentences.

Anthroponomical phraseological units have a deep cultural significance as they are linked to a nation's history, psychology and traditions. These units contain anthroponyms, which are names of people, and their meanings are influenced by the origin and evolution of these names. Therefore, anthroponomical component phraseological units are associated with rigid cultural associations and personalities that are deeply ingrained in national memory.

The article discusses the use of personal names in the phraseological layer of the English and Uzbek languages, and how they represent

Umarjon G‘oyibov

Tayanch doktorant,
O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti
Toshkent, O‘zbekiston

INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARI FRAZEOLOGIK BIRLIKLARIDAGI ANTROPONIM KOMPONENTLAR TAHLILI

ANNOTATSIYA

Frazeologik birlik – bu muayyan darajada majoziy ma’noga ega bo‘lgan yagona semantik doiraga birlashtirilgan ikki va undan ortiq so‘z komponentlaridan iborat til birligidir. Misol uchun, “mare’s nest”, “Queen Ann’s dead”, “fair-weather friend” kabilar. Qolaversa, hozirgi kunda ma’lum bir onomastik komponentni o‘z ichiga olgan frazeologik birliklarning lingvomadaniy jihati ko‘plab tadqiqot ishlarining diqqat markazida bo‘lib kelmoqda.

Mazkur tadqiqotimizning maqsadi har bir til va madaniyat sub tizimida, xususan, ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida qiziqarli va, shu bilan birga, olimlarning e’tiborini tortadigan mavzulardan biri – antroponim komponentli frazeologik birliklarni turli xil an’anaviy va zamonaviy yondashuvlar orqali tahlil qilishdir. Chunki, antroponim komponentli frazeologik birliklar qarindosh bo‘lmagan tillarda, jumladan, ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida, turli-tuman an’anaviy va zamonaviy yondashuvlar orqali yetarlicha o‘rganilmagan. Tadqiqotimizning vazifalariga turli misollar yordamida shaxs ismlarini o‘z ichiga olgan frazeologik birliklarni an’anaviy va zamonaviy yondashuvlar orqali o‘rganish, shaxs ismlari va antroponim komponentli frazeologik birliklar o‘rtasidagi assotsiatsiyani sharhlash, shaxs ismlari qatnashgan frazeologik birliklarning kelib chiqishini tadqiq qilishdir.

Antroponim komponentli frazeologik birliklarning katta qismi kishi xarakteri bilan assotsiatsiyalashtirilgan, millat tafakkurida konseptualashtirilgan holda boy madaniy ma’lumotga ega, chunki antroponimlar madaniyat

culture through various linguistic approaches and sentence examples. The conclusion drawn is that anthroponomical component phraseological units in English and Uzbek are a result of the development of anthroponyms. These units have associations with the characters, activities, functions, qualities, physical and psychological states, behaviours, and historical roles of anthroponyms.

Key words: anthroponomical phraseology, linguistic analyses, contrastive analysis, comparative analysis, cognitive-conceptual analysis, cultural peculiarity, etymology of phraseological units, cognitive aspect.

tarixi, xalq ruhiyati va milliy an'ana bilan uzviy bog'langan. Antroponim komponentli frazeologik birliklar va ularning ma'nolari o'rtasidagi bog'liqlik antroponimlarning kelib chiqishi va rivojlanishi bilan belgilanadi.

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillari frazeologik qatlamlarida madaniyatni aks ettiruvchi kishi ismlarining ishlatilishi, ular ustida misollar yordamida bir necha ilmiy yondashuvlar va tahlillarning amalga oshirilishi muhokama qilinadi. Shundan kelib chiqqan holda, maqolamiz ingliz va o'zbek tillari antroponim komponentli frazeologik birliklar kishi atqoli otlarining rivojlanishi mahsuli va natijasi ekanligi, ushbu birliklar antroponimlarning o'ziga xos xarakteri, olib borgan faoliyati, kasb-kori, jismoniy va ruhiy holati, yurish-turishi va tarixiy o'rni bilan assotsiatsiyaga kirishganligiga xulosa yasaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: antroponim komponentli frazeologik birliklar, lingvistik tahlil, kontrastiv tahlil, qiyosiy tahlil, kognitiv tahlil, konseptual tahlil, madaniy xususiyat, frazeologik birliklar etimologiyasi, kognitiv aspekt.

INTRODUCTION

Phraseological units are peculiar to every language spoken in the world. As a linguistic unit, they represent peculiarity, mentality, nationality, culture, literature, history and religion in the language. Especially, the parts of phraseological units pose a more problematic and actual question to scientists since they are combined with the culture, history, literature, religion and social life of a certain nation. Anthroponomical component phraseological units express such common features as stability, metaphoricality, functionality and semantically equality to words, expressivity and imagination, representation of modality and quantity, quality and condition of a certain object and emotionality as one group of phraseological units.

The association between the anthroponomical component of phraseological units and their meanings is dependent on the origin and development of anthroponyms, that is, personal names. Anthroponyms include first names, patronyms, surnames, nicknames and pseudonyms. The nicknames and pseudonyms reflect the functions performed by the author himself. Nickname is given by society as a result of their attitude towards him and a pseudonym is a self-given name as a result of his figurative embodiment. The origin and development of anthroponyms in two compared languages, such as English and Uzbek, differ in that these names depend on culture and traditions, geographical location, society and history. The personal names of the English language reflect Western society, while the Uzbek personal names reflect Eastern society

METHODS

A variety of linguistic investigation methods have been used by scientists studying phraseological units, such as the identification method (Ch.Bally and A.V. Kunin), contextological method (N.Amosova), variational method (V.L. Arkhangel'skiy), phraseological application method (V.Jukov), structural-tipological method (L.Royzenzon), complicative method (M.Tagiyev). While such scientists as B.Altenberg, R.Gläser and N.Norrik studied the panlinguistic and cultural features of phraseological units, a significant contribution to the study of formation, functional-stylistic and cognitive-pragmatic features, componential and semantic analysis of phraseological units was made by such Uzbek scholars as Sh.Rakhmatullayev, B.Yuldoshev, A.Mamatov and Sh.Almamatova. In this article, the comprehensive analysis of anthroponomical component phraseological units is realized through several traditional and contemporary approaches, linguistic analyses and methods, including diachronic approach, synchronic approach, structural analysis, semantic analysis, componential analysis, contextual analysis, contrastive (comparative) analysis, transformational analysis, discourse analysis, cognitive-conceptual analysis and statistical analysis.

RESULTS

A linguistic method that examines the rapidly changing, expressing and stabilizing cultures of peoples as a particular mode of human interaction is known nowadays as a linguocultural approach. Language and culture are forms of human knowledge of reality which reflect human activity and attitude to the environment and society. Only with the interrelationship of these two concepts can language be learnt from multifaceted aspects and expand our mentality. Extralinguistic factors determine the national-cultural features of phraseological units. Such factors are significant in the development of phraseological units in the creation of social, economic and cultural necessities and conditions vital for the internal structural and functional development of language and vital to present national peculiarity.

The linguocultural importance of phraseological units requires a comprehensive analysis of the onomastic components of such units since the onomastic constituents of phraseological units, as J.Szerszunowicz viewed them as carriers of cultural connotation [Szerszunowicz, 2011; 629], have an explicit and distinctive cultural peculiarities and historical-cultural heritage. This is grounded by the fact that the connection between onomastics and culture is maintained by the participation of certain personal, geographical and national names in the phraseological layer of the language. They are, in turn, divided into anthroponyms, toponyms, ethnonyms, etc. being the subgroups of onomastics.

Several scientists researched the onomastic component phraseological units, such as V.A. Khokhlova, who dealt with a study on the classification and structure of toponymical component phraseological units on the example of English and Ukrainian languages [Khokhlova, 2017; 234], A.V. Urazmetova, who gave a considerable classification of phraseological units with geographical names on the example of

English and French languages [Urazmetova, 2006; 23], M.A. Radjabova, who carried out a thorough classification of phraseological units with onomastic constituent [Radjabova, 2021; 54], Z.V. Korzyukova, who put a remarkable emphasis on the etymology, linguistic and mental features of phraseological units with English proper names [Korzyukova, 2003; 486], G.A. Hakimova, who studied a detailed description of phraseological units with zoological names [Hakimova, 2008; 145].

Regarding the origination of phraseological units with onomastic components, linguists put forward a diverse variety of theories, including Bulakhovskiy's, Babkin's, and Korzyukova's theories. L.A. Bulakhovskiy associates the origination of onomastic component phraseological units with proverbs and stories, vocational vocabulary, jokes and anecdotes, images and fragments in the religious book, influence of countries of the antique world, translation of foreign expressions, wise words of writers, quotes made by famous people's life experiences [Bulakhovskiy, 1952] and A.M. Babkin, in turn, emphasizes speech, writers' language, literary language, folklore and foreign language materials as the origination of phraseological units with onomastic component [Babkin, 1968; 26], whereas Z.V. Korzyukova indicates ancient English phraseological units and those borrowed components as well as those borrowed from the American and Australian English languages [Korzyukova, 2003; 486].

The phraseological units with anthroponomical component, being one of the subtypes of onomastic component phraseological units, according to S.T. Khudoyorova, originated from the names of real historical names, literary sources, the influence of certain historical events, religious beliefs and common national names [Khudoyorova, 2023; 14]. In this regard, Z.N. Abdusamadov classifies the origination of anthroponomical component phraseological units into mythology, religion, history, literature and common national names [Abdusamadov, 2022; 70]. The semantic-structural, functional and national-cultural features of anthroponomical component phraseological units on the material of a certain language or languages of different systems were studied by such scholars as N.Ablova, S.Guzenko, A.Nosirov and R.Madjidova.

DISCUSSION

As V.N. Telia emphasizes, the phraseological layer of the language is the mirror, through which the linguocultural society can view their national peculiarity [Telia, 1996; 9] — likewise, T.Z. Cherdansea regards phraseological units as linguistic heritage reflecting the outlook, national culture, traditions, beliefs, imagination and history of those speaking a certain language [Cherdansea, 1996; 58]. As L.Khan stated in her scientific article called *'Translation and culture: A comparative analysis of English idioms and proverbs with their Urdu translations'*, phraseological units are the exact reflection of national mentality which involves the people's stereotype and the sign of nationality, along with the embodiment of the people's linguocultural features [Khan, 2014; 67]. Moreover, they reflect a certain nation's distant past, religion, wisdom and morality. In Y.M. Vereshagin and V.G. Kostomarov's view,

phraseological units describe national culture through special symbols and via this description the historical events, way of life and culture of the society can be seen [Vereshagin & Kostomarov, 1990; 68].

As already mentioned above, the comprehensive analysis of anthroponomical component phraseological units, in particular, is closely linked with the research on such units because the representation of culture in such phraseological units with personal names are materialized through several traditional and contemporary approaches, linguistic analyses and methods, including diachronic approach, synchronic approach, structural analysis, semantic analysis, componential analysis, contextual analysis, contrastive (comparative) analysis, transformational analysis, discourse analysis, cognitive-conceptual analysis and statistical analysis. The examples of anthroponomical component phraseological units in English are taken from *English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary* [Kunin, 1984; 944], *Oxford Dictionary of Idioms* [Siefring, 2004; 340], *Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs* [Speake, 2008; 625], *McGraw-Hill's Dictionary of American Idioms and Phrasal Verbs* [Richard, 2005; 1098] and those in Uzbek are taken from *Paremiological Dictionary of Uzbek language* [Berdiyev & Rasulov, 1984; 288], *Significance of Meanings* [Shomaksudov & Shorakhmedov, 2018; 480], *Concise Dictionary of Uzbek-Russian Phraseology* [Sodikova, 1989; 336], *Explanatory Dictionary of Uzbek language* [Rahmatullayev et al., 2022; 636].

First of all, the synchronic approach to anthroponomical component phraseological units studies them normally in coincidence with the period of the research. In contrast, the diachronic approach to the study of phraseological units with personal names analyses the changes word components of the phrase undergo taking into account its historical development. According to Ginzburg, the diachronic approach to phraseology has scarcely been investigated [Ginzburg et al., 1979; 86]. What should be highlighted in this aspect is the origin of phraseological units and the ways they appear in language, in particular, how personal names have become component of the phraseological units. On the contrary, the main point of the synchronic aspect is often the analysis of how the parts of a phrase work together at a given time. For instance, the phraseological unit *Hamlet without the Prince* in English denotes, synchronically, an event or occasion at which the expected principal is not present. This is brightly illustrated in the sentence following:

*The 2005 ceremony for the Nobel Prize for literature drew many distinguished people, with one notable exception. Without Harold Pinter, to whom the award had been given, it was **Hamlet without the Prince**.* (Elizabeth Knowles)

Diachronically, it originated in a theatrical incident which supposedly took place in the summer of 1775 and was narrated in September of that year, for example in *The Caledonian Mercury* (Edinburgh, Scotland) on the 27th which says “*Lee Lewis diverts them with the manner of their performing Hamlet in a company that he belonged to, when the hero who was to play the principal character had absconded with an innkeeper's daughter; and that when he came forward to give out the play, he added, “the part of Hamlet to be left out, for that night”*”. It is based on the incongruity of

performance, without an actor playing the title role, *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (between 1599 and 1602).

Concerning the phraseological unit “*Laylini ko‘rish uchun Majnunning ko‘zi kerak*” in Uzbek, it is used, from a synchronic viewpoint, to say that beauty lies in lover’s eyes. This is illustrated in the example sentence below:

Mendagi go‘zalliklarni ko‘ra olishingiz uchun sizga Majnunning ko‘zlari kerak bo‘lur. (Jaloliddin Rumi)

Diachronically, the phrase was used in one of the stories of *Masnaviyi ma‘naviy* (Spiritual Couplets) for the first time by Jaloliddin Rumi, a 13th-century Persian poet as a reference, possibly, to the characters described in one of the five epic poems of a well-known masterpiece called *Khamasa* (Quintuple) or, allegedly, to a folklore famous among the people of Middle East. The characters Majnun and Layli were described as two metaphorical deep lovers.

The plane of expression explains the structural analysis of the anthroponomical component of phraseological units. This analysis is realized through the constitution of proper names in phraseological units, through the viewpoint of morphological properties. This analysis is crucial in understanding the formation and interpretation of phraseological units. The structural analysis of a phraseological unit with personal names entails examining the internal structure and grammatical peculiarities of the unit and often intend to understand how the individual words within the unit combine to create a specific meaning and how they function together within the phraseological unit, that is, the syntactic roles of individual words. For instance, the phraseological unit “*to make a Freudian slip*” in English means accidentally using the wrong word, but in doing so they reveal what they are thinking rather than what they think the other person wants to hear:

During the presentation, he made a Freudian slip by accidentally referring to his boss as “mom” instead of “ma’am”, revealing his subconscious feelings of seeking approval from authority figures.

The structural analysis of this phrase is *Verb + Article + Adjective + Noun*, altogether, it has a verbal property in syntactic relation to other parts of the sentence.

About the phraseological unit “*Bazmi Jamshid*” in Uzbek, it is used to describe a great and luxurious feast:

Bazmi Jamshid davom etibdi. Umarxon toliqib, mudroqqa ketibdi... Bir mahal ko‘zini ochsa, qo‘sh otli foytonda ketayotganmish. Biydek dala... Hammayoq zulmat... Osmonda yulduzlar... Navkarlar otining tuyog‘i gursillaydi... (Utkir Hoshimov)

The structural analysis of this phrase is *N + N*, altogether, it has a substantive property in syntactic relation to other parts of the sentence.

The meaning of phraseological units involving human names is determined by their content. From the semantic point of view, phraseological units are integrally connected to human characteristics and activities. Moreover, phraseological units provide a useful source of information concerning a person, his appearance, his personality and his intellectual and creative capabilities because “the semantic side of a compound word is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon” [Tukhtayeva, 2004;

29]. The semantic analysis of phraseological units with personal names involves examining the meaning and interpretation of the unit within its individual linguistic and cultural context. The aim is to reveal the underlying connotations, associations, and implications of the phraseological unit. For example, the phraseological unit “Cordelia’s gift” in English is often used metaphorically to refer to a woman’s small and pleasant voice:

*It is her voice that he hears prevailing over those of the rest of the company as he enters the room, for she has not **Cordelia’s gift**.* (Rhoda Broughton)

The semantic analysis of this phrase leads to the etymology of the image, the disclosure of the internal form, and basic metaphors, describing the connotation that arises in the context: “Cordelia” – is a name that is often associated with purity, grace and divine blessings and it has been used to epitomize the spiritual journey and the pursuit of enlightenment; “gift” – a natural ability or talent that is given to someone by God. Entirely, the phrase conveys the idea of a woman’s sweet and lovely voice, thus, it constitutes the semantic field of “Voice” since the personal name mentioned in the phraseological unit is a character, who is portrayed as being kind, loyal and pure-hearted, described in one of Shakespeare’s plays called *King Lear*.

For the phraseological unit “*Alixo‘ja – Xo‘jaali*” in Uzbek, it is used to describe that something is equal from both directions, unchangeable:

*Ayrim kompozitorlarimiz ham yangi-yangi kuylar yaratish o‘rniga mavjud xalq kuylarini qayta ishlaganlar-ishlagan: **Alixo‘ja – Xo‘jaali** qilib.* (Uzbek national folklore)

The semantic analysis of this phrase might involve exploring its implicit meanings. Both “*Alixo‘ja*” and “*Xo‘jaali*” are common Uzbek national names and here in this sentence example it constitutes the semantic field “Equality” as a phraseological unit since both names comprise two elements: *Ali* and *Xo‘ja*, signifying the interchange of them does not impact on its meaning.

The componential analysis of phraseological units with personal names is the study of their semantic structure of them distinguishing such semantic components as sememes, semes and their types. Thus, “it reveals the culturally important features by which speakers of the language distinguish different words in a semantic field or domain” [Ottenheimer, 2006; 20]. In other words, it is an approach that describes phraseological meanings as a combination of elementary meaning components called semantic components. It focuses on the decomposition of the meaning of phraseological units into their component features and then comparing those components across different concepts to identify similarities and differences and aims to identify the essential features that contribute to the overall meaning of the phrase [Arnita et al., 2016; 14]. For instance, the phraseological unit “*as pleased as Punch*” denotes a person is very pleased indeed; it means to show extreme happiness or pride in achieving a task:

*The first thing you’ll see when they open the doors is a great, ugly, red-faced copper with big feet and a broken nose. And if you’ll say “Hello” to him when he says “Hello” to you, he’ll be **as pleased as Punch** and as proud as a duke.* (Pelham

Grenville Wodehouse)

The componential analysis of the above-mentioned phraseological unit is as follows: 1) “*as ... as*” – this component is a grammatical structure used to compare two items; 2) “*pleased*” – this component is an adjective signifying a state of happiness or contentment; 3) “*Punch*” – this component refers to the character Punch from the traditional puppet show *Punch and Judy*, known for his boastful and self-satisfied demeanour. The combination of this phrase conveys a sense of immense contentment or delight, exploiting the character’s customarily exuberant and self-satisfied disposition.

Concerning the phraseological unit “*aqli Salim*” in Uzbek, it describes a person who has good judgement, as a sensible person:

Alhosisil, jaholat insoniyat nomiga yarashmagan bir sifat o‘ldig‘indan ilm yo‘lida harakat qilmak, aqli Salim sohiblarining hikmatli so‘zlaridan hissalanmak. (Abdulla Avloniy)

The componential analysis of this phrase is normally as follows: 1) “*aqli*” – this component refers to something related to intelligence, reason or logic; 2) “*Salim*” – this component derives from the Arabic word meaning healthy or sound and in the Uzbek context, it refers to something that is in good condition, protected or secure. The phrase can be interpreted as representing intellectual soundness and rational decision-making while ensuring safety and prosperity.

The contextual analysis of phraseological units with anthroponomical component involves exploring the application and meaning of specific phrases within a particular context, the minimal stretch of speech, which may include in consideration of cultural, social, historical or linguistic factors that contribute to the comprehension of the phrase [Pazilova & Sanginova, 2022; 414]. For instance, the English phraseological unit “*to rob Peter to pay Paul*” denotes an action taken from one merely to give to another; an action discharging one debt by incurring another:

We had an entire generation of families and of leaders of companies and countries, who spent more than they made, bought what they could not afford, lived beyond their means, robbed Peter to pay Paul and had absolutely no idea how the story was going to end. (Forbes Business Magazine)

This phrase in this context is used to express that one financial obligation is met by neglecting another. In a contextual analysis, this phrase can be interpreted in various ways depending on the context. On the one hand, it could refer to a government’s redistribution of funds from one area of the budget to make up for another, or it could describe an individual borrowing money from one source to pay off a debt to another and, on the other hand, it can also be used in non-financial contexts, such as sacrificing one aspect of life to focus on another.

Concerning the Uzbek phraseological unit “*Hulkar bilan tarozi, bir-biridan norozi*”, it is used to express that if solidarity within a team is not maintained, then they are bound to disunite:

Balki, otam saksoninchi yillar: Hulkar bilan tarozi, bir-biridan norozi, bemahal qichqiradi Kremlning xo‘rozi, – deb kuylaganida shu obod zamonlar kelishini ilhaq

bo 'lib kutgandirlar. (Abdunabi Abdiyev)

This phrase, from the viewpoint of contextual analysis, in this context emphasizes the importance of mutual support and cooperation among the people to encourage them to work together and help each other in achieving common goals. Moreover, it conveys a message of collaboration, unity and mutual assistance.

Transformational analysis, which “is strictly a method for dealing with particular types of utterances and is applicable only where reference can be made to underlying structures” [Morris, 1971; 14], can also be applied to phraseological units with personal names to change its structure according to a prescribed model and following certain rules to discover differences in usage and meaning. Phraseological transformations here are “understood as occasional transformations of set expressions of words that make changes in the form and meaning of the original phraseology” [Dreeva, 2019; 766]. According to a translation theory, as Z.G. Proshina wrote in her manual, “transformations are known as shifts of translation of word, phrase or sentence. They can be of three categories: grammatical, lexical and complex transformations” [Proshina, 2008]. This means that transformational analysis can be conducted from grammatical, lexical and grammatical-lexical viewpoints. For instance, the phraseological unit in English “*to open a Pandora's box*” denotes an action doing something that causes all sorts of trouble that one had not anticipated:

Pandora's box has been opened and voices pleading for the de-construction of the European project are becoming louder. (The New York Times)

Here in this sentence, the original phrase, from a grammatical viewpoint, in the active voice has been transformed into the present perfect passive voice: “*to open a Pandora's box*” > “*Pandora's box has been opened*”.

Regarding the Uzbek phraseological unit “*Ayamajuz olti kun, qahri kelsa qattiq kun*”, it is used to express that a person should be patient during difficult times:

Xotinining qo'ng'irog'i Ayamajuz qishning qahri singan payt bahor daragini olib kelgan qaldirg'ochning tashrifi kabi horg'in ruhiga ilqlik soldi. (Fozil Tilovat)

Here in this sentence the original phrase, from a lexical viewpoint, has been transformed into a condensed form, applying the lexical substitution: “*Ayamajuz olti kun, qahri kelsa qattiq kun*” > “*Ayamajuz qishning qahri singan*”. In this phrase the words “*olti, kun, kelsa, qattiq, kun*” have been replaced by “*qishning, singan*”. The author transformed the negative connotation of the original phrase into a positive one, that is, the original phrase means difficulty, and coldness, while the transformed phrase signifies relaxation and warmth.

Discourse analysis involves examining how language is used within a broader communicative context. It encompasses various aspects of language, from structural characteristics to the organization and construction of texts to convey meaning, as well as sociocultural interpretations that connect speakers, writers, and communicative events. In particular, such analysis of phraseological units encompasses examining how certain expressions perform within a particular discourse or communicative context, attempting to understand the meaning, use and impact of these phraseological units within language and communication [Naciscione, 2010; 35]. For instance, the

phraseological unit “*Elvis has left the building*” in English is used to say that the show is over and there is nothing more to see:

*We kept waiting for the band to come back on stage to perform some of the fans’ favourite songs, but it looked like **Elvis had left the building**.* (idioms.thefreedictionary.com)

The phrase mentioned above originated as a statement made at the end of Elvis Presley’s concerts to indicate that the show was over and he had exited the building. Gradually, it has become a generally accepted expression used to convey that something is finished, often in a dramatic or finalizing manner. The discourse analysis of this phrase includes usage in a music review that might be used to signify the end of the musical performance stage.

As regards the phraseological unit “*Sulaymon o’ldi – devlar qutuldi*”, it is used to express that a person feels free and no more dreads somebody else:

*Bugungi ishimizdan xursand holda ikkalamiz betma-bet o’tiribmiz. Muallim ming’irlab qo’ydi: **Sulaymon o’ldi – devlar qutuldi**, ko’pam xijolat bo’laverma. O’rtamizda ovchilarning, yo’lovchilarning doimiy hamrohi – gulxan.* (Shukur Xolmirzayev)

The proverb used in the above-mentioned example originated from a religious legend, which says that Solomon’s death refutes the suspicions that demons and giants know the unforeseen events that will happen in the future: the demons did not know that Solomon had died until the cane on which Solomon, who gave up his life, had been leaning for a long time was eaten by a woodworm and fell onto the ground and the prophet told them those who continued the task of building a high castle (Surah Saba’, verse 14). Thus, Solomon died and the giants were freed from labour. The discourse analysis of this proverb can be associated with the example above, it can be seen as a pivotal moment that advances the plot and shapes the overall meaning and message of the narrative.

Conceptual (cognitive) analysis, which in practice concerns distinguishing terms, and analysing the understandings they refer to, involves many higher-order cognitive processes, such as relational reasoning and abstraction, which are based on the integration and maintenance of information. This kind of analysis is integrally connected with concept, which comprises some of the most fundamental entities of phenomena associated with a discipline [Cocchiarella, 1996; 8]. Such concept cannot have meaning or representation outside thought, but it must be expressed in language, and to this extent, concepts are constructed, they create a framework for understanding. For instance, the concept of “*Insincerity*” can be verbalized with anthroponomical component phraseological units in English, such as “*Janus-faced*”, “*A Judas kiss*”, “*An Uriah Heep*”, “*Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*”, “*Lady Muck*”, “*Smart Alec*”, while in Uzbek “*Ishni Ismat qiladi, lofni Toshmat uradi*”, “*Qimorboz boy berganda Jamshidni yodlar, boy bo’lganda – qochishni*”, “*Suvdan o’tguncha yo Bahovuddin, suvdan o’tgach qoch Bahovuddin*”, “*Otasini so’rasang – Ahmadi forig’, onasini so’rasang – tovonni yoriq*”.

Moreover, the theory of conceptual blending is frequently associated with the

cognitive- conceptual analysis. According to this theory, it “is a basic mental operation that leads to new meaning, global insight and conceptual compressions useful for memory and manipulation of otherwise diffuse ranges of meaning” [Fauconnier & Turner, 2003; 58]. Conceptual blending analysis of anthroponomical component phraseological units involves identifying the implicit mental processes and conceptual structures that give rise to the meaning and usage of these units. This analysis includes four mental spaces, such as Generic space, which provides abstract information common to both input spaces; Source input domain 1 and Source input domain 2, which interact and interpenetrate into each other based on a generic domain; and Blended space, which contains selected aspects of structure from each input spaces. For instance, the English phraseological unit “*Jekyll and Hyde*” is used to express a personality which has a pleasant and a very unpleasant side to the character:

*After a **Jekyll and Hyde** spring that started soggy then transformed practically overnight to consistent sun, Portland is bracing for the usual round of heat waves and days when the thermometer tops 90 degrees (or even 100).* (Mrusell, Oregonlive)

Etymologically, this phrase comes from the character described in *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* by Robert Louis Stevenson. According to this novel, the character is depicted as a person who sometimes feels he is battling between the good and evil within himself, leading to the struggle between his dual personality, as a person who is respectful and benevolent, then moves to the dark, opposite side of his personality. The phrase in the example sentence mentioned above describes spring that is associated with the character *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* as:

Input 1 for Spring: started soggy, then transformed to consistent sun;

Input 2 for Jekyll and Hyde: battling between the good and evil, first respectful and benevolent then the dark side of his personality;

Generic space for both inputs: soggy weather and sun are associated with malevolence and benevolence;

Blended space: Spring is sometimes soggy, then sometimes sunny, like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde who is sometimes warm-hearted, then sometimes unkind.

Regarding the Uzbek phraseological unit “*Otasini so‘rasang – Ahmadi forig‘, onasini so‘rasang – tovonni yoriq*”, it is used to say that one avoids telling the truth, one knows the truth but he does not want to expose it:

Mo‘ysafid otasi toqati toq bo‘ldi, otasi yorildi: - Ulim, erta birov aytgan ekan, otangni ko‘rdim – Ahmadi forig‘, enangni ko‘rdim – tovonni yoriq, deb. Otang shul, enang shul. Qo‘y endi, o‘z tilingda gapir: – Nu, dayosh, papasha, dayosh! (Togay Murod)

From a semantic point of view, the phrase mentioned in the example sentence constitutes the semantic field “Insincerity”. This extract taken from the novel *The Song of Grandmother Land* (Momo yer qo‘shig‘i) by Togay Murod describes the situation that the son does not speak in his language but in Russian. This situation is associated with the concept “Insincerity” verbalised in “*Otasini so‘rasang – Ahmadi forig‘, onasini so‘rasang – tovonni yoriq*”:

Input 1 for the son: he avoids speaking in his language;

Input 2 for the phrase: the phraseological unit has an insincere and deceitful connotation;

Generic space for both inputs: avoidance of speaking in one's mother tongue is equal to hypocrisy;

Blended space: the son can speak in his language but has no desire to reveal it, like one who avoids telling the truth.

Contrastive (comparative) analysis, being the systematic comparison of two or more languages [Johansson, 2007; 1], is used to reveal the similarities and differences in linguistic features of two or more languages. Precisely, contrastive analysis emphasizes the differences, while comparative analysis deals with the similarities between two languages. The comparison of word combinations in two or more languages is known as contrastive phraseology. Such kind of analysis can be conducted from different viewpoints, including structural, semantic and cultural, one of which the third is the most comprehensively studied nowadays since the language as cross-cultural communication is in the limelight. Through this analysis, the cultural peculiarities between English and Uzbek anthroponomical component phraseological units can be revealed. The phraseological units of English and Uzbek anthroponyms reflect the interrelation between Western European and Eastern Asian cultures. Therefore, there are notable differences in the cultures of these two nations and they are reflected in the phraseological units with personal names which are considered as one of the linguistic units although there are some similarities in phraseological units of this component in compared languages. For instance, the anthroponym *Genghis Khan*, who was the founder of the Mongol empire, is found in the phraseology of both languages related to politics, but the cultural viewpoint differs:

*Voters were left to choose between one candidate believed to have ties to criminal organizations and another who is **somewhere to the right of Genghis Khan** in terms of her political agenda.* (idioms.thefreedictionary.com)

*Bo'ji keldi, bo'ji keldi, **Chingiz** bilan Jo'ji keldi.* (Proverbs of Uzbek people)

The phrase "*somewhere to the right of Genghis Khan*" in English denotes holding right-wing views of extreme kind, whereas the proverb mentioned above in Uzbek is used as a supreme example of a repressive and tyrannical ruler, according to Uzbek people, this phraseological unit was used to intimidate children if he was not obeying their parents.

Moreover, the English people wish someone luck and a nice journey using the phraseological unit "*Christ be with you!*", whereas the Uzbek people use "*Muhammad payg'ambar madadkor bo'lsin!*" to wish someone bless and peace. As can be seen, about wishing someone luck and blessing, the prophet *Jesus Christ* is associated with the English people, while the prophet *Muhammad (pbuh)* is revered by the Uzbek people.

Statistical analysis of anthroponomical component phraseological units involves using quantitative methods to determine the frequency, distribution and co-occurrence patterns of multiword expressions in a corpus. This kind of linguistic analysis can help researchers comprehend how these phraseological units with personal names are

used in different circumstances and how they contribute to the overall meaning and communicative context. Moreover, it can offer insights into the cultural, historical, and linguistic significance of these names and phrases. From the statistical point of view, there is a huge discrepancy between the English and Uzbek anthroponomical component phraseological units, which can be seen in the following results:

1. Z.N. Abdusamadov, who researched the national and cultural features of anthroponomical component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages, claims that there are 271 phraseological units with personal names in English based on such three sources as *Cambridge Dictionary of American Idioms*, *Collins Cobuilt Dictionary of Idioms* and *Словарь современных английских идиом* (Dictionary of Contemporary English Idioms), whereas there are only 62 phraseological units with personal names in Uzbek based on such the following materials as *O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati* (Explanatory Phraseological Dictionary of the Uzbek language), *O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati* (Phraseological Dictionary of the Uzbek language) and *O'zbek tili izohli lug'ati* (Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek language) [Abdusamadov, 2022; 47];

2. As a result of her investigation, G.I. Ergasheva, who conducted research on the comparative-typological analysis of gender aspect in English and Uzbek phraseological units and proverbs, concludes that anthroponomical component phraseological units with gender aspect in English include over 40 units as compared to the Uzbek language where such phrases are just a few [Ergasheva, 2011; 139].

CONCLUSION

To sum up, the abundance of the phraseological layer, particularly with the anthroponomical component, of the English and Uzbek languages is achieved through several linguistic approaches and analyses, conducted from several viewpoints, including structural-semantic, cultural, conceptual-cognitive, etc. As a consequence, it facilitates the process of compiling phraseological dictionaries and maintains such phraseological units as representative means of communicative exchanges. The discrepancies, as a result of linguocultural approach, provide much information regarding the culture and traditions of English and Uzbek languages.

REFERENCES

1. Abdusamadov, Z.N. (2022). National and cultural features of anthroponomical component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages. *PhD thes. philol. scien.* Tashkent: National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek.
2. Arnita, I.G.A., Puspani, I.A.M., & Malini, N.S. (2016). Componential analysis of the cultural terms in the bilingual short story entitled Mati "Salah Pati" and its translation "The Wrong kind of Death". *Linguistics*, 23(44), 12–19.
3. Babkin, A.M. (1968). Russian phraseology, its development, sources and lexicographic development. *DSc thes. philol. scien.* Leningrad: Leningrad State University.
4. Berdiyev, H. & Rasulov, R. (1984). *Paremiological dictionary of the Uzbek language*. Tashkent: Publishing House of 'Teacher'.
5. Bulakhovskiy, L.A. (1952). *The course on Russian literary language* (Vol. 1). Kiyev: Radyanska School.
6. Cherdansea, T.Z. (1996). Idiomatics and culture. *Issues in Linguistics*, 1, 58–70.

7. Cocchiarella, N.B. (1996). Conceptual realism as a formal ontology. In R.Poli, P.Simons (Eds.), *Formal Ontology*. Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-8733-4_2.
8. Dreeva, D. (2019). Transformations of phraseological units in poetics. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 76, 765–772.
9. Ergasheva, G.I. (2011). The comparative-typological investigation of the gender aspect of phraseologisms and proverbs in English and Uzbek languages. *PhD thes. philol. scien.* Tashkent: Uzbekistan State World Languages University.
10. Fauconnier, G. & Turner, M. (2003). Conceptual blending, form and meaning. *Recherches en Communication*, 19(19), 57–87.
11. Ginzburg, R.S., Khidekel, S.S., Knyazeva, G.Y., & Sankin, A.A. (1979). *A course in modern English lexicology* (2nd ed.). Moscow: Higher School.
12. Hakimova, G.E. (2008). The structural and semantic peculiarities of zoonymic component phraseological units (based on the English language). *PhD thes. philol. scien.* Tashkent: Uzbekistan State World Languages University.
13. Johansson, S. (2007). *Seeing through multilingual corpora: On the use of corpora in contrastive studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
14. Khan, L. (2014). Translation and culture: A comparative analysis of English idioms and proverbs with their Urdu translations. *Pakistan Journal of Languages and Translation Studies*, 1, 58–83.
15. Khokhlova, V.A. (2017). Phraseological units with toponymic component in English and Ukrainian languages: linguoculturological aspect. *PhD thes. philol. scien.* Donetsk: Donetsk National University.
16. Khudoyorova, S.T. (2023). Linguostylistic peculiarities of the semantics of phraseological and paremiological units, reflecting historical realities. *Diss. abs. doc. philol. scien.* Samarkand: Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages.
17. Korzyukova, Z.V. (2003). The main aspects of the functioning of phraseological units with proper names in the English language: national and cultural specificity. *Diss. cand. phil. scien.* Moscow: Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
18. Kunin, A.V. (1984). *English-Russian phraseological dictionary*. Moscow: Russian Language.
19. Morris, I. (1971). Transformational analysis. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 26(1), 14–19.
20. Naciscione, A. (2010). *Stylistic use of phraseological units in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
21. Ottenheimer, H. (2006). *The anthropology of language: An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. USA: Thomson Wadsworth.
22. Pazilova, N.M. & Sanginova, D.A. (2022). Features of contextual meaning and translation issues of phraseological units in modern English and Uzbek. *Oriental Renaissance: Innovative, Educational, Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(4/2), 412–417.
23. Proshina, Z.G. (2008). *Theory of translation (English and Russian)*. Vladivostok: Far Eastern University Press.
24. Radjabova, M.A. (2021). The linguocultural aspect and translation problems of onomastic component phraseological units (on the material of English, Uzbek and Russian languages). *Diss. abs. doc. philol. scien.* Bukhara: Bukhara State University.
25. Rahmatullayev, Sh., Mahmudov, N., Kholmanova, Z. (2022). *Explanatory dictionary of Uzbek language*. Tashkent: Publishing House named after Gafur Ghulam.
26. Richard, A.S. (Ed.). (2005). *McGraw-Hill's dictionary of American idioms and phrasal verbs*. USA: McGraw-Hill.
27. Shomaksudov, Sh. & Shorakhmedov, Sh. (2018). *Significance of meanings*. Tashkent: State Scientific Publishing House of 'National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan'.
28. Siefring, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Oxford dictionary of idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29. Sodikova, M. (1989). *Concise dictionary of Uzbek-Russian phraseology*. Tashkent: State

- Scientific Publishing House of 'National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan'.
30. Speake, J. (Ed.). (2008). *Oxford dictionary of proverbs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 31. Szerszunowicz, J. (2011). The cultural component in bilingual dictionaries of phraseological units, in lexicography: Theoretical and practical perspectives. Papers submitted to 'The Seventh ASIALEX Biennial International Conference' (pp. 628–637). Japan: Kyoto.
 32. Teli, V.N. (1996). *Russian phraseology: The semantic, pragmatic and linguoculturological aspects*. Moscow: School of 'Languages of Russian Culture'.
 33. Tukhtayeva, K.D. (2004). Structural and semantic-nominative characteristics of complex words included in phraseological units (on the material of the English language). *PhD thes. philol. scien.* Navoi: Navoi State Pedagogical Institute.
 34. Urazmetova, A.V. (2006). The linguistic and cultural aspect of the study of toponyms as part of phraseological units (based on the material of English and French). *Diss. abs. cand. philol. scien.* Ufa: Bashkir State University.
 35. Vereshagin, Y.M., & Kostomarov, V.G. (1990). *Language and culture: Linguistic and regional studies in teaching russian as a foreign language*. Moscow: Russian Language.