



Received: April 7, 2024
Accepted: June 15, 2024
Available online: June 25, 2024

Zulaykho Ibotova

Teacher
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: Ibotovazulayho@gmail.com
ORCID iD: 0009-0002-0688-6132

Zulayxo Ibotova

O'qituvchi
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti
Toshkent, O'zbekiston

STRUCTURAL CLASSIFICATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH A ZOONYMIC COMPONENT IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDAGI ZOONIMIK KOMPONENTLI FRAZEOLOGIK BIRLIKLARNING STRUKTURAL TASNIFI

ABSTRACT

Phraseological units with a zoonymic component play a significant role in linguistics. The main aim of the article is to investigate the comparativeness of phraseological units containing a zoonymic component in both English and Uzbek languages. The tasks include clarifying the basic concepts of phraseology, finding similarities and intricacies in the use of phraseological units with a zoonymic component between the two structurally different languages, and understanding the cultural and national specificities of the speakers of the compared languages based on determining the connotative meanings of the analyzed phraseological units. Following that, this research employs a comparative analysis approach, descriptive method, dictionary definition analysis method, and componential analysis, combining quantitative analysis of phraseological units with qualitative insights into their cultural significance.

The research literature on animal names as a component of phraseological units in English and Uzbek has been investigated. Differences and similarities in the structural features of English and Uzbek phraseological units with a zoonymic component have been identified. The main conclusions can be drawn as follows: despite the different structures of the compared languages, the correspondence of structural types such as verbal, substantive, adjectival, adverbial, and interjective have been revealed. The group of verbal phraseological units with a zoonymic component is the most numerous in the languages

ANNOTATSIYA

Zoonimik frazeologik birliklar frazeologiya-ning katta qismini tashkil etadi va uning tilshunoslikda tutgan o'рни beqiyosdir. Ushbu maqolaning maqsadi – tahlil qilinayotgan tillar, ya'ni ingliz va o'zbek tillarida zoonimik komponentni o'z ichiga olgan frazeologik birliklarni strukturaviy tasnif nuqtayi nazaridan qiyoslash. Tadqiqotning vazifalarini frazeologiya-ning asosiy tushunchalarini oydinlashtirish va lingvistik hamda madaniy jihatdan xilma-xil bo'lgan bu tillar sistemasining strukturaviy klassifikatsiyasi o'rtasida zoonimik frazeologik birliklar qo'llanishining o'xshash va murakkab tomonlarini topish va tahlil qilinayotgan frazeologik birliklar konnotativ ma'nolarini aniqlash asosida solishtirilayotgan tillarda so'zlovchilar mentalitetining madaniy-milliy o'ziga xosligini aniqlashda ko'rish mumkin. Binobarin, mazkur tadqiqotda qiyosiy tahlil, tavsif, lug'at ta'rifini tahlil qilish, komponentli tahlil hamda frazeologik birliklarning miqdoriy tahlili metodlari bilan birga ularning madaniy ahamiyatiga oid bo'lgan sifat jihatidan uyg'unlashtirilgan yondashuvdan ham foydalanildi.

Ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi o'rganilgan ilmiy-tadqiqot adabiyotlari ichidan zoonimik nomlar frazeologik birliklarning tarkibiy qismi sifatidagi tadqiqotlarning olingan natijalari o'rganildi; ingliz va o'zbek tillari zoonimik frazeologik birliklarining strukturaviy xususiyatlari bo'yicha farqlar va o'xshashliklar aniqlandi. Tadqiqot davomida aniqlangan natijalardan quyidagicha

involved. Among the substantial components, in the group of adjectival, verbal, and adverbial components of the languages, structural models of the same type are identified. At the same time, in the case of the identification of non-predicative adverbial and interjective phraseological units, there are many unresolved issues, mainly related to the “problem of lexicographic extension” and the basic principles of lexicographic fixation of phraseological units.

Key words: phraseological unit, zoonymic component, structural classification, verbal structure, Uzbek, adverbial structure, substantial structure, lexicographic fixation, connotative meaning, English.

xulosalar chiqarish mumkin: solishtirilayotgan tillar, ya’ni ingliz va o‘zbek tillarining tuzilishi xilma-xilligiga qaramay, strukturaviy klassifikatsiyaga oid turlari mos keladi. Zoonimik komponentli fe’lli frazeologik birliklar ushbu izlanishda qamrab olingan tillarda eng ko‘p uchraydigan guruh hisoblanadi. Substantiv komponentlar orasida solishtirilayotgan tillarning sifatli, fe’lli, ravishli komponentli guruhlarida bir turdagi strukturaviy modellar ham aniqlanadi. Shu bilan birga, ayni jabhada predikativ bo‘lmagan ravishli va undov so‘zli frazeologik birliklar aniqlangan bo‘lsa-da, “leksikografik kengayish muammosi” va frazeologik birliklarning leksikografik fiksatsiyasi asosiy tamoyillari bilan bog‘liq bir qancha hal etilmagan muammolar mavjud.

Kalit so‘zlar: frazeologik birlik, zoonomik komponent, struktura tasnifi, fe’l tuzilmasi, o‘zbek tili, qo‘shimcha tuzilma, substantiv tuzilma, leksikografik belgi, konnotativ ma’no, ingliz tili.

INTRODUCTION

Today’s world has turned into a “global village” (the term – Marshall McLuhan) [McLuhan, 1962; 31] as a result of the invention of the latest information and communication technologies that have made it easier for people to access and exchange information. Against the background of scientific and technological progress within the anthropocentric paradigm, language plays an increasingly important role in intercultural communication, using, in particular, fixed forms of expression that make it an effective means of preserving and transmitting culturally significant information. In Uzbekistan also the rising of the importance of teaching foreign languages, growing of literacy of people and intellect since the first days of the Independence of the country gives opportunities researchers to contribute to this world. More improvement has to be done to organize the continuation of the study of foreign languages at all levels of the educational system, as well as to improve qualifications of teachers and provide them with modern teaching and methodological materials.

The topicality of the work is also determined by the need to study the phraseological system from the standpoint of functional and comparative, which allows us to identify a variety of functional structural possibilities of phraseological units in the compared languages, as well as the need to systematize phraseological units with animal names, to describe their similarities and differences in the compared languages. Zoonyms as part of phraseological units have recently attracted the attention of researchers. However, the object of the study was, as a rule, phraseological units with names of animals in each of the languages under consideration separately. The need for such studies has been repeatedly noted in the linguistic literature. The

comparative analysis of this category of phraseological units is justified by the fact that each language distinguishes two points in its content: universal (common to all or many languages of the world) and idioethnic, unique, characterizing the language in its individual originality.

The literatural foundation of this research is the theoretical hypotheses and practical findings of outstanding researchers in the field of Phraseology and General Linguistics that the works of foreign and national linguists on the problems of phraseology, as well as the rich experience of them in the comparative study of languages. We can see that many scientists did different research in this area. The scientists who worked in this area are followings: N.N. Amosova [Amosova, 1963], V.V. Vinogradov [Vinogradov, 1957], N.M. Shanskiy [Shanskiy, 1963], A.I. Molotkov [Molotkov, 1977], A.V. Kunin [Kunin, 1986], V.N. Telia [Telia, 1987], A.I. Smirnitskiy [Smirnitskiy, 1998], L.P. Smith [Smith, 1998], Ch.Bally [Bally, 2001], N.F. Alefirenko [Alefirenko, 2008], Zh.A. Golikova [Golikova, 2008]. The most popular investigation work in the scientific world can be considered a textbook by V.A. Kunin [Kunin, 1986]. In the field of phraseology, the role of Uzbek scholars is also valuable. They are: Sh.Rahmatullaev [Rahmatullaev, 1966], A.Abdullayev [Abdullayev, 1976], A.Mamatov [Mamatov, 1999], G.E. Khakimova [Khakimova, 2008, 2016], A.Haydarov, Z.Chorieva [Haydarov & Chorieva, 2012], S.F. Azizova [Azizova et al., 2020], and others.

The study of phraseology, especially with regard to phraseological units with a zoonymic, provides valuable insights on linguistic and cultural worldviews. “In other words, in order to learn a foreign language well, one usually needs to know something about the culture of the speakers of that language. Communication that lacks appropriate cultural content often leads to humorous incidents or, even worse, is a source of serious misunderstandings and incomprehension” [Khamzaev et al., 2021; 3738]. Many languages have idioms and phrases that make reference to animals, representing traits that human societies have given them. In addition to language distinctions, the comparison of phraseological units in Uzbek and English reveals both cultural divergences and similarities. The purpose of this study is to structurally categorize these components in order to lay the groundwork for future research on cross-cultural language studies.

METHODS

The work was carried out in line with the comparative analysis method in order to compare English phraseological units with their equivalents in Uzbek. To solve the tasks set in the article, a set of methods and techniques of comparative analysis of the actual material of different structured languages was used. A special place in the consideration of the universal and idioethnic is given to the study of the relationship of components. In order to use this method, a corpus of phraseological units with a zoonymic component was first assembled in both languages using available linguistic databases, books, and internet sources. There were taken into consideration all elements of both languages in their grammatical structures by finding similarities and

differences.

Following was structural classification using standards that were modified from pre-existing phraseological frameworks. Materials, books, articles that have information about structures of phraseological units were researched and identified standards of structural classification of phraseological units. Then, to describe main points of research work, descriptive method was utilized. Grammatical structures of phraseological units in English and Uzbek were characterized carefully and very accurately. Each element of phraseological units was considered and carried out structurally. The linguistic description is based on general scientific methods: classification, analysis, induction. The collection of language material was carried out by the continuous sampling method. All phraseological units that were collected have been sampled for each structure of phraseological units. Moreover, while qualitative analysis was looked at the cultural contexts and also meanings were attached to these phraseological components, quantitative analysis was determined by the frequency and distribution of structural types. There were taken components of one by one animal names and structural features out of the whole phraseological unit and analyzed them in the base of the componential analysis. Here, components of meanings of animal phraseological units were analyzed structurally and culturally essential features.

In order to collect phraseological units from dictionaries, dictionary definition analysis method was taken into consideration. All phraseological units in this article are taken from *An Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language* [Madvaliyev, 2006] in Uzbek and *Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms* [Walter, 2002].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Among the phraseological units (from now on PU) of the English language, V.A. Kunin distinguishes between nominative and nominative-communicative formations [Kunin, 1996; 58]. By the term “nominative” the author understands “called”, and in this sense any phraseology is a nominative unit. By the term “nominative-communicative” A.V. Kunin understands “related to the communication process”. Nominative phraseological units denote objects, phenomena, actions, condition and quality. Depending on the core component, it is customary to distinguish the following types of nominative phraseological units: verbal, substantive, adjectival, adverbial and interjective. We allocated 5 types of phraseological units according to parts of speech:

1. Nominal phraseological unities.
2. Verbal phraseological unities.
3. Adjectival phraseological unities.
4. Adverbial phraseological unities.
5. Exclamatory (draft) phraseological unities [Khakimova, 2016; 59].

PU with a zoonym component is represented by verbal, substantive, adverbial and adjectival structural types.

Verbal phraseological units

In the compared languages, the class of verbal phraseological units is the most

numerous. Verb units, as is known, are phraseological units that are functionally correlated with the verb. The core component in verbal phraseological units is one or another form of the verb.

Verbal PU can belong both to the class of nominative and to the class of nominative-communicative units. Nominative verbal PU are represented by word combinations, and nominative-communicative verbal PU are represented by both word combinations and sentences.

According to A.V. Kunin, “verbal PU can be completely or partially reinterpreted by motivated or unmotivated turns. The main types of reinterpretations are metaphor, metonymy, comparison. Metaphorical PU are often hyperbolic or euphemistic. The lack of motivation of PU is caused by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors. In partially reinterpreted unmotivated turns, the connection of the verbal component with the other components of phraseology is not motivated. ... Most of the verbal PU refers to a person, to actions performed, or to the state in which s/he is” [Kunin, 1996; 156]. Verbal PU, in turn, are divided into comparative and non-comparative.

Non-comparative verbal phraseological units can be completely reinterpreted (unmotivated) or partially reinterpreted. An example of a completely reinterpreted verbal phraseological unit in English is *to get on ones (the) high horse or ride the high horse* “to be arrogant”. This idiom is completely reinterpreted, because “in modern English, this expression is perceived as a phraseological unity associated not with the custom of feudal lords to serve military service on the best horses, but with a rider riding a high horse. There is a disintegration of fusion” [Kunin, 1996; 122].

From the point of view of structural organization, non-comparative verbal PU are divided into turns with a compositional structure and turns with a subordinate one, for example, *to swap horses while crossing a stream*, “to make major changes at an inopportune or dangerous moment”; *to buy a pig in a rock*, “to buy something without seeing, without knowing anything in advance about the quality of the purchased”; *to hit the bird in the eye* “to hit the spot”; *to keep the bird in one's bosom* “to keep loyalty, devotion”, etc. In the structure of some verbal PUs, prepositions are presented that express object-circumstantial relations, for example: *to kill two birds with one stone* “to do two things in one effort”; *to take the wolf by the ears* “to find yourself in a hopeless situation”; or spatial relations, for example: *to put the cart before the horse* “put the cart in front of the horse”, etc.

In English the most numerous groups of verbal phraseological units with components-zoonyms are represented by a verb-substantive structural type:

“verb + noun in nominative (zoonym)”, for example: *to cry wolf* “to raise a false alarm”; *toring the bull* “in a relaxed manner”, etc.

This structural type is represented by several subtypes obtained as a result of the expansion of one of its components, for example, the subtype:

“not + verb + noun in nominative (zoonym)”: *not to have a (dogs) chance* “not to have any chances”, etc.

Or a subtype in which both components are subject to expansion: both the verb-predicate and the noun, for example: *not to know in from a bull's foot* “not to know”, etc.

Or a subtype of the structure: “verb + adjective + noun (zoonym)”: *to talk gold turkey* (amer.) “To speak frankly”, etc.

The following subtype of this structural type is represented by the construction: “verb + noun + preposition + noun”: *to take a bear by the tooth* “climb into trouble”; *to put the cart before the horse* “to do topsy-turvy”, etc.

As a characteristic feature of phraseological units in the English language, especially with fully or partially reinterpreted components, including verbal phraseological units, A.V. Kunin identifies “the presence in stem of a smaller number of word forms, compared with the word forms of their components used as changeable words as part of variable combinations” [Kunin, 1996; 164].

In Uzbek, we were unable to detect similar structural types of verbal PU. Verbal PUs in the Uzbek language are represented only by comparative ones. Comparative verbal PU are always represented by a subordinate structure, in which the first components retain a direct (literal) meaning, and the second elements are reinterpreted and perform the function of intensification or semantic differentiation of the first components.

The comparative verbal PU of the English language is characterized by a structural type: “Verb + like (as) + noun” for example: *to blush like a dog* “don’t be ashamed”, etc.

Verbal comparative PUs of the English language are characterized by pronounced evaluative semantics. A.V. Kunin divides verbs in such phraseological units into three groups based on their semantic characteristics:

- 1) negative evaluation verbs: hate, lie, swear;
- 2) positive evaluation verbs: fit, get;
- 3) verbs with a neutral meaning: drink, eat, feel, follow, look, run, sleep, speak, spread, spring up, swim, talk, treat, work, etc. [Kunin, 1996; 166].

A.V. Kunin draws attention to the predominance of verbs with a neutral value [Kunin, 1996; 166]. In PU with verbs of negative and positive evaluation, the second component, as a rule, performs the function of strengthening this assessment, for example: *to swear like a fishwife*.

In verbal comparative PUs, as a rule, a verb of neutral meaning is represented. In such phraseological units, the second component performs the function of clarifying the verbal meaning, giving the whole turn an evaluative meaning, for example: *to blush like a dog* “to be shameless”; *to stick like a leech* “is a negative way to describe someone who’s sticking on to someone else” *to eat like a wolf* “eat greedily”, “have a wolf’s appetite”, etc.

In such PUs, the second component is represented by the names of animals (dog, leech, pig, wolf lion, horse), “whose real or imaginary actions formed the basis of comparative phrases used in relation to people” [Kunin, 1996; 166].

As the second component of verbal comparative PU, not only names of animals can be used, but also names of birds, fish, insects, for example: *to drink like a fish* “to drink heavily”; *to sing like a nightingale* “to sing beautifully”, etc.

The overwhelming majority of verbal comparative phraseological units are

represented by the structure “verb + like + noun nominative in (zoonym)”.

A.V. Kunin points out that “verbal comparisons, as well as adjectival ones, are characterized by the expression of the extreme degree of the trait, which is hyperbolic in nature” [Kunin, 1996; 168].

The most common structural type of verbal PU with a zoonym component in the Uzbek language are:

“Noun in the nominative + -dek/o‘xshab+ verb”, for example: *cho‘chqaga o‘xshab bo‘kib yemoq* “to eat too much”; *eshakdek qaysarlik qilmoq* “a person who is stubborn”; *to‘tidek takrorlamoq* “repeating too much”; *itdek charchamoq* “tired of” and so on. A verb in this type of constructions always has intransitive semantics, occupies a postpositive position and is the grammatical center of a phraseological unit. A comparative turn is placed before the verb, expressing the similarity of the objects being compared.

The comparative turnover consists of the comparative component -dek/o‘xshab and the noun in the nominative case, which denotes the subject of comparison.

This structural type of verbal comparative phraseological units is the most common not only in the Uzbek, but also in English. N.M. Sidiyakova explains the prevalence of this structural type in the English language as follows: “... the conciseness of the most common type of comparisons is not accidental, because cumbersome comparisons are inappropriate in a live spoken language - the main sphere of their use” [Sidiyakova, 1961; 112].

Comparative verbal PU in Uzbek and English have different grammatical structures. First of all, the order of the components differs: in the Uzbek language, the verb in the structure of phraseology occupies the final position, for example: *itga o‘xshab akillamoq* “barking like a dog”, In English, the verb in comparative phraseological units takes the first place, for example: *singing like a nightingale* “singing melodiously and beautifully”. “The sentence in the English language in its structure is presented in ADJ + N + V + ADJ + N. And in the Uzbek language -in the form of ADJ + N + ADJ + N + V. According to the rules of sentence construction in Uzbek, the verb stands at the end of the sentence, and in English-in the middle of the sentence. It follows that the rules for constructing a word in English and Uzbek differ from each other” [Azizova et al., 2020; 672].

The next most common structural type of phraseological units in English is represented by the construction:

“verb + noun (zoonym) + preposition”, for example: *to put the bee on, to get the monkey off, to get the tail down (up)*, etc.

In this structural type, most often, complex verbs with postpositions characteristic of the English language are presented, such as: put on, ride on, get down, where a noun (zoonym) can stand between the components.

A detailed version of this structural type is represented by the construction: “verb + noun (zoonym) + preposition + noun” for example: *to take the bull by the horns, to lead apes in hell, to set cock on hoop*, etc.

The same components of the construction can be presented in a different

sequence, for example: “verb + noun + preposition + noun (zoonym)”, for example: *to put money on a horse, to cast pearls before swine* “throw beads in front of pigs”, etc.

The following structural type is represented by the construction: “verb + preposition”, in which the entire phraseology with the zoonym component acts as a predicate, for example: *to chicken out, louse up, pig out, wolf down, snake through* etc.

Further, according to the degree of prevalence, the structural type follows: “verb + noun (zoonym) + infinitive”, for example: *to teach dog to bark* “to teach a learner”, *to hear the birdies sing* “to be successful at something”, etc.

This structural type is also represented by the following subtypes, in which an extension of one or another member of the construction occurs:

a) “verb + noun (zoonym) + infinitive + noun (zoonym)”, for example: *to set the wolf to keep the sheep, to set tortoise to catch the hare*, etc.

b) “verb + noun (zoonym) + infinitive + preposition + noun”, for example: *to let flies stick in the wall, to teach a pig to play on a flute*, etc.

We also failed to find similar structural types of verbal phraseological units in the Uzbek language. The absence of verb-prepositional combinations in the Uzbek language is explained by the peculiarities of the grammatical structure of the Uzbek language, in which the prepositions of the English language correspond to postpositions and affixes of forms of spatial cases.

Almost all phraseology researchers note that verbal phraseological units are the most numerous layer of the phraseological fund of all languages. The material of the languages studied by us (Uzbek and English) is also no exception in this matter.

The largest group of Uzbek phraseological units is also represented by verbal phraseological units. PU with the zoonym component are no exception.

Verbal phraseological units with a zoonym component are represented by various structural models. In terms of the number of components, these are binary and multicomponent structures. The components of verbal phraseological units are represented by: noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, participle, and adverb. In all cases, the verb component is the string component and the grammatical data center of phraseological units.

The valence properties of the verbal component are reflected in the structure of the verbal phraseology. All verbal PUs are united by one common meaning – the meaning of an action or state.

As can be seen from the analyzed material, the overwhelming majority of verbal PUs with a component – zoonym refers to a person, characterizing his/her appearance or internal qualities. In them, you can find an accurate definition and assessment of people’s actions and deeds.

Substantive phraseological units

Phraseological units, in which the core component is a noun, are commonly called substantive PU. Substantive PUs constitute one of the numerous categories of the phraseological fund of the languages under study.

In substantive PUs, the leading element is a noun, on which the components

included in this phraseological unit depend, for example:

UZB: *itdek charchagan* “too tired”; *ayiqdek polvon* “strong”; *misoli oqqush* “pure, beautiful”; *chumoli-bel* “thin”; *cho‘chqadek beso‘naqay* “clumsy”; *eshshakdek qaysar* “very stubborn” and etc.

ENG: *God’s ape* “fool”, “idiot”; *an egregious ass* “single, not very smart person”; *an eager beaver* “a very hardworking, conscientious person”; *fly on the coach-wheel* “worthless man”; *lucky dog* “a lucky person”, etc.

A.V. Kunin divides substantive PU of the English language into two categories based on their grammatical structure:

1. Phrasemes, i.e., PUs with the structure of phrases;
2. Nominative - partial-predicative phraseological units.

A.V. Kunin, in turn, divides substantive phrasemes into two types: a) with the structure of a subordinate phrase; b) with the structure of a compositional phrase [Kunin, 1970; 144].

In substantive phrasemes with a zoonym component with a subordinate phrase structure, prepositions are most often used: about, at, between, for, from, in, of on, out, to, with, within, for example: an ass in a lion’s skin “a coward who brags” or “a fool who tries to look smart”; like a bee in a bottle “repetitive, monotonous sound”; a snake in the grass “insidious, hidden enemy”.

Substantive phrasemes with the structure of a compositional phrase in English have become less widespread. These are such phraseological units as: horse and foot “with all one’s might; as hard as one can”.

Substantive phrasemes with the structure of a compositional phrase in the overwhelming majority contain conjunctions. From the point of view of the quantitative characteristics of the structure, these phrasemes fall into two groups: binomial substantive phrasemes and three- and polynomial substantive phrasemes.

Two component substantive phrasemes are represented by two structural types:

a) “noun + and (or) + noun”, for example: *horse and foot* “with all one’s might”; *cat and mouse*, *mouse and man*, etc.;

b) “neither + noun + nor + noun”, for example: *Neither peacock nor sparrow*; *neither hawk nor buzzard*; *neither fish nor flesh*.

Three and multicomponent substantive phrasemes are represented by the following structural types:

“half + noun + and+ half + noun”, for example: *half an horse and half an alligator*, etc.

“Neither+ noun + nor + adjective + adjective + noun”, for example: *neither fish, nor good red herring*, etc.

“Neither + noun + noun + nor + noun”, for example: *neither fish, flesh nor fowl*, etc.

The syntactic functions of substantive phrasemes coincide with the syntactic functions of nouns. Just like nouns, substantive phrasemes with a compositional structure perform the following functions in a sentence: subject, predicative term, complement. Substantive phrasemes with a compositional structure can also be

included in a prepositional-nominal group that performs the function of a postpositive definition or circumstance.

The most common structural type of substantive PUs in the Uzbek language is represented by the construction “noun in the nominative + noun in the nominative”, for example: *tovuq miya*, *tovuq kalla* “a person who is not clever”; *ilon til* “a person who speaks sharply” etc.

In English, these constructions of the Uzbek language correspond to the constructions “noun in the possessive case + noun in the nominative”, for example: “snake’s dance” in the meaning: “triumphant approach”; sheep’s head “stupidity”; “monkey’s trick”; lion’s shin “feigned bravery”; the lion’s share, etc.

The second most common in the English language is the structural type of noun phrases: “adjective + noun nominative”, for example: a black sheer book in the meaning: “shame in the family”; poor sheep book in the meaning: “a poor, needy person”; “a worker performing hard, tedious work”; lucky dog book, “lucky man”; a jolly dog “joker”; the black dog “melancholy, despondency, bad mood”; dark horse “little-known candidate in the presidential election”, etc.

In Uzbek, among the substantive PU with components-zoonyms, such structures are not rare, for example: *ayyor tulki* “silly as a fox; *qaysar eshak* “stubborn”; *xira pashsha* “a person who always nose out in everybody’s communication”. Rarely, but there is a PU with components-zoonyms of the structure: “participle + noun nominative”, for example: *kuydirgan kalla* “a person who always smiles”.

In English, the determinative component is always represented by a possessive form, for example: snake’s “snake”, sheep’s “sheep”, Substantive-substantive PU with components-zoonyms are often used in the Uzbek language also, for example: *otning dumi* “a person who has very little hair”; *burgut ko‘z* “whose eyes are very sharp”, etc.

Another distinctive feature of substantive PU with component-zoonyms of the English language is the presence of a large number of prepositional combinations in the structure of phraseology.

Adjectival phraseological units

In the analysis of comparative zoonymic PUs of Uzbek, the classification given in the work of N.M. Sidiyakova “Comparative units of the as + adjective + noun type in modern English” was used [Sidiyakova, 1967].

L.I. Roizenzon believes that comparative phraseology “is quite significantly different from the rest of phraseology: if non-comparative phraseology is primarily and most characterized by an individual, often unique character of derivation, then the regularity of structure formation is primarily characteristic of CPU slender rows and series of phraseological units” [Roizenzon, 1971; 16].

The basis of comparative phraseological units is a logical comparison operation. In logic, the method of comparison involves the establishment of similarities and differences of objects and phenomena by comparing them.

In terms of content, a comparison is a comparison of two subjects of thought based on a common feature. In terms of expression, it is a certain construction consisting of three elements: the subject of comparison, a common feature and the

object of it (A + C + B).

CPUs based on the generalized mental process of comparison are also built according to this general model, however, the linguistic tradition fixes them as units of language in a two-component form: C + B, i.e., a common feature + an object of comparison.

The addition of comparison elements as a logical operation within the framework of the CPU does not indicate the similarity or difference in the manifestation of the feature in the compared objects. “Due to the fact that the attribute underlying the comparison is a constant, reference for the object (image) of comparison, then it (the object) acts as an expression of the maximum given quality (attribute)” [Khristova 1986; 5]. This contributes to the semantic discrepancy between the CPU expression plan as a linguistic implementation of a logical technique, comparison and the content plan, i.e. a superlative semantic result.

“Although there is no isomorphism between the plan of expression and the plan of the content of this class of phraseological units, nevertheless, in view of the generality of the structure and identity of the semantic result, we can talk about the possibility of structural and semantic modeling of the CPU” [Khristova, 1986; 6].

Thus, the structural-semantic model of CPU implies a certain syntactic structure with the same comparatively intensifying semantic result.

In the Uzbek language, the most productive structural type of adjectival comparative phraseological units is the simplest model:

“Noun in the nominative + dek + adjective”, for example: Sherdek baquvvat “as brave as a lion”; qo‘ydek beozor “innocent as a sheep”; itdek vafodor “faithful as a dog”; cho‘chqadek semiz “fat like a pig”; eshakdek qaysar “stubborn as a donkey”; tulkidek ayyor “sly as a fox”; mushukdek muloyim “gentle as a cat”.

This structural type is also represented by a subtype in which the first component consists not of a single noun in the nominative, but of a combination of two nouns united by the compositional union va “and”, for example: it va mushukdek urushqoq “fightful as a cat with a dog”, etc. This subtype is represented by a fairly limited number of examples.

As S.G. Gadzhieva notes: “In addition to adjectives proper, participial forms of verbs are introduced into the ACPU, acting in the sentence as an attribute to the noun – the subject of comparison. Depending on the form of which verbs they are, participles have or do not have class indicators” [Gadzhieva, 2001; 35].

The analysis of the materials of the Uzbek language indicates that adjectival comparative PUs (ACPU) easily turn into verbal comparative phraseological units (VCPU). This is due to the tendency of Uzbek to verbality, firstly, and secondly, the high verbal use of verbs of broad semantics, such as: bo‘lmoq “to be”, bo‘lib qolmoq “to become”, gapirmoq “to speak”, aytmoq “to say”, etc.

A.D. Reichstein, speaking about the structural secondary character of the phraseological system, emphasizes that “the phraseology of each language reflects to a greater or lesser extent all the main features of its other levels” [Reichstein, 1980; 14].

Adjectival PUs in English are represented by comparative and non-comparative units. The first one is that adjectival PUs have a subordinate and compositional structure. In quantitative terms, the second PUs in the English language are very sparsely represented.

Adjectival zoonymic PUs are mainly represented by comparative turns. As A.V. Kunin notes: “adjectival comparisons, as well as other types, are characterized by a two-dimensional meaning: one is compared with the other. This structure of meaning distinguishes it as a phraseological meaning of a special kind.

Adjectival comparative PUs, as a rule, are two-component and are represented only by subordinate structures. In the sentence, the ACPU act as a definition (postpositive and detached) and a predicative. Coinciding with adjectives functionally, ACPU differ from them positionally: use in preposition for adjectival comparative PUs is a deviation from the norm, and use in postposition is the norm. While with an adjective, the situation is the opposite: preposition is the norm; postposition is a deviation from the norm.

The first component of adjectival comparisons is usually used in its basic literal meaning. The function of the second element is always amplifying, since it denotes the degree of the trait expressed by the first one” [Kunin, 1996; 139], for example: as busy as a bee “hardworking as a bee.”; as innocent as a dove; as bold as a lion “brave as a lion”; as tricky as a monkey “naughty”; as wise as an owl “a wise person”; as silly as a goose “a stupid person”; as obstinate as a donkey “stubborn”; as fat as a pig “fat”; as strong as a bull “healthy”; as timid as a hare “cowardly”; as gaudy as a peacock “important”; as graceful as a swan “graceful”; as cunning as a fox “cunning”.

The first component (blind, busy, innocent, bold, tricky, wise, cunning, silly, fat, fleet, slippery, strong, timid, gaudy) A.V. Kunin [Kunin, 1996; 139], calls “the basis of comparison”, and the second component (a swan, a hare, a fox, a peacock) – “object of comparison”. The comparative union as performs the function of a bundle in the ACF. “Adjectival comparisons arise in language because there is a need to transmit additional information with the information transmitted by the first components of comparisons taken separately” [Kunin, 1996; 139].

As it can be seen, in these acts, the adjective is used in the positive degree, and the nouns are in the singular form. However, in some cases, to increase the expressiveness of the comparative turnover, it is possible to use an adjective of a comparative degree. The use of a noun in the plural is much more common, and occurs when the comparison refers to two or more denotations, for example:

as strong as a horse “very healthy”, “a strong person”:

... and here you are, the three of you, young and strong as horses... (J.B. Priestley)

ACPU of structural type as... as...it can be used both with the initial conjunction as... and without it. The initial conjunction is omitted, as a rule, in elliptical sentences and in unambiguous answers to questions.

Adverbial phraseological units with components-zoonyms can occur much less frequently. As a rule, these are semi-comparative phrasemes that begin with a component with a similar meaning like, for example: like a hen with one chicken; like

water off a ducks back.

Semi-comparative phrasemes with the conjunction like “are entirely figurative adverbial phrases forming the second element of comparison. A complete comparison occurs only in speech” [Kunin, 1996; 149], for example: I confess that I danced like a cat on hot bricks. (P.G. Wodehouse)

In both Uzbek and English, adjectival zoonymic PU are represented, as a rule, by comparative turns. What is common for the compared languages is that adjectival PU with a component - zoonym are interpreted only by subordinate structures. The component composition of PU is also common, as a rule, two-element.

Adverbial phraseological units with components-zoonyms in the Uzbek and English languages have different grammatical structures. In Uzbek, in the structure of the adverbial PU, the noun comes first, and the adjective comes last. In English, on the contrary, in the first place is an adjective, in the last place is a noun, comparison: Eng, blind as a beetle; Uzb, cho‘chqadek semiz “fat as a pig”.

In English, the first component of adjectival PU is used in the main meaning, and the second one performs the function of strengthening the feature expressed by the first element. In the Uzbek language, the second is used in the direct meaning, and the 1st one denotes the degree of the feature expressed by the 2nd.

In both Uzbek and English, in adverbial comparative PU, the adjective is used, as a rule, in the positive degree, and nouns are used in the singular form. However, exceptions are possible in both languages (to increase expressiveness).

Adverbial a units

In attributing phraseology to another part of speech, the semantics and syntactic features of PU are of great importance. Adverbial PU are stable expressions correlated with an adverb, having an syntactic function of circumstances denoting signs of a process, a state [Kunin, 1986; 242].

The most common structural type of adverbial PU in the Uzbek language is: “Participle + noun in the nominative + o‘xshab, -dek”, for example: *ko‘tiga tuxum tiqilgan tovuqga o‘xshab* “a very rushing person in inconvenient time”.

Adverbial PU characterize a person’s behavior or his/her human condition, and their syntactic functions coincide with the functions of adverbs.

Such PUs, which are participial constructions of both transitive and intransitive types represent the specifics of the Uzbek language. These constructions are qualified in Uzbek either as phrases or as sentences. We adhere to the point of view of scientists who consider these constructions as phrases. Verbs with such expressions are used, although limited.

As reproducible linguistic units, phraseological units always act as a structural whole of a composite nature, consisting of words that differ in their morphological properties and are in different syntactic relations with each other. The simplest structural type of adverbial phraseological units in English is represented by the model:

“like (as) + noun (zoonym)”, for example: *like flies* “a lot”, *like a bird* “willingly”, *as a dove* “meekly”, *as a mule* “stubbornly”, etc. or a structural type: “preposition + noun (zoonym)”, for example: *off the bat* “immediately”, *for the birds* “for whom to

laugh at” *in a bee-line* “straight”, etc.

This structural type of adverbial PU has an extended version: “preposition + possessive name + noun (zoonym)”, for example: *in the lion’s paws* “in mortal danger”; *on foot’s horse* “on foot”; *in a pig’s eye* “unbelievable”; *at a snail’s gallop* “slow step”; *on Shank’s pony* “on foot”, etc.

The structural type “like+ noun (zoonym)” is also being expanded by introducing the first or second participle, for example:

“like+ participle II + noun (zoonym)”, for example: *like a scalded cat* “headlong”; *like a drowned rat*; *like a skinned rabbit*, etc.

“like + participle I + noun (zoonym)”, for example: *like fighting cocks* “madly”; *like a dying duck* “like a wet chicken”, etc.

Adverbial PU structures are quite common: “like + noun (zoonym) + preposition + noun”, for example: *like a bat out of hell* “from all legs”; *like a bull at a gate* “madly”; *like a fly in amber* “reliably”; *like a duck in thunder* “confused”; *like herring in a barrel* “tight”.

This structural type can also be expanded by introducing a possessive name, for example: “like+ noun + preposition + possessive name + noun”: *like a wolf in sheep’s clothing*; *like water of duck’s back*, etc.; and through the introduction of an adjective, for example: “like + noun (zoonym) + preposition + adjective + noun”:

There are other types of models, but the number of examples illustrating them is very small. These are some of them: “as+ possessive name + noun + preposition + numeral + noun + preposition + noun”, for example: *as Buridan’s ass between two bundles of hay* “in indecision”; “not + noun + preposition + possessive name + noun”, for example: *not a cat in hell’s chance* “unavoidable”; “like + noun (zoonym) + pronoun + adverb + noun”: *like a cat that got the cream* “roguishly”, etc.

In the Uzbek language, there is only one comparative component of o‘xshab, -dek, represented by four forms, according to the number of grammatical classes. In English, the comparative function is performed by two linguistic units: a) the comparative union as: *as a dove*, *as a mule*, etc. b) a component with a comparable meaning like: *like flies*, *like a bird*, etc.

A feature of the English language is adverbial PU without a comparative union (component), for example: *for the birds*, *in a bee-line*, etc.

Adverbial phraseological units do not so much call this or that phenomenon of reality, as they indicate a certain attitude of the speaker to this phenomenon.

The image expressed by them has a high subjectivity; a fantastic comparison makes this phraseology an expressive emotional means endowed with semantic and stylistic shades of irony, joking, hyperbole.

Deeper cultural narratives are suggested by the structural classifications’ contrasts and similarities. The emphasis on particular animal characteristics in English phraseological units reflects a more practical and direct understanding of nature. Uzbek units, on the other hand, are filled with moral and ethical teachings, indicating a more symbolic and integrated link with the animal kingdom. These results imply that phraseology serves as a mirror to society norms and that language structure and

cultural perspective are closely related.

CONCLUSION

Based on the structural analysis of PUs in two genetically and structurally distant languages – Uzbek and English – equivalents, the features of universal and differential are revealed. The study of the material showed that phraseological zoonyms simultaneously carry the universal, that is, what is characteristic of all or many nations, and at the same time specifically national (differential), what is characteristic of this particular people. The sphere of the universal, first of all, refers to the fact that PUs with a component-zonym represent the most significant layer of phraseology in each of the compared languages. Despite the fact that Uzbek and English are unrelated, typologically different and non-contact languages, they contain a certain number of complete equivalents of PUs with a component-zonym.

In the compared languages, the class of verbal PUs in which one or another verb form is the core component is the most numerous. Verbal PUs, in turn, are divided into comparative and non-comparative. Non-comparative verbal PUs can be completely reinterpreted (unmotivated) or partially reinterpreted. From the point of view of structural organization, non-comparative verbal PUs are divided into turns with a compositional structure and turns with a subordinate structure. The most numerous groups of verbal PUs with a component-zonym is represented by a structural type: “verb + noun in the nominative (zonym)”.

Comparative verbal PUs are represented in both Uzbek and English by a subordinate structure. In comparative subordinate structures of the English language, the first components retain a direct (literal) meaning, and the second components are reinterpreted and perform the function of intensification or semantic differentiation of the first components. In the Uzbek language, the opposite is true: the second components retain a direct (literal) meaning, and the first components are reinterpreted and perform the function of intensification or semantic differentiation of the second components. The comparative verb forms of the English language are characterized by a structural type: “verb + like + noun (zonym)”. The structural type is most characteristic of the comparative verbs of the Uzbek language: “noun (zonym) + (-dek), o‘xshab + verb”.

The most common structural type of substantive phraseological units in both Uzbek and English is represented by the construction “noun (zonym) in the genitive + noun in the nominative”.

There are five structural types of adjectival comparative phraseological units with four subtypes in the Uzbek language. The most productive structural type of adjectival comparative PUs is the simplest model: “Noun in the nominative + (-dek), o‘xshab + adjective”. The second most common structural type is the construction: “Noun in the genitive + (-dek), o‘xshab + adjective”. Adjectival PUs in English are represented by comparative and non-comparative units. Non-comparative adjectival PUs have a subordinate and compositional structure. In adjectival terms, non-comparative PUs in the English language are very sparsely represented.

The most common type of adverbial PU with a zoonym component in the Uzbek language is represented by a three-element structure, and in English – by a two-component structure. In the Uzbek language, the comparative factor is in the last place, and in English – in the first position.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullayev, A. (1976). Expressive feature of phraseologisms. *Uzbek Language and Literature*, 5, 36–39.
2. Alefirenko, N.F. (2008). *Phraseology and cognitive science in the aspect of linguistic postmodernism: monograph*. Belgorod: Belgorod National Research University.
3. Amosova, N.N. (1963). *Basics of English phraseology*. Leningrad: Leningrad University Publishing House.
4. Azizova, F.S., Ashurova, F.L., Abramova, N.T., & Djabbarova, K.A. (2020). Teaching English phraseological units to linguistic university students. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(5), 671–674.
5. Bally, Ch. (2001). *French stylistics*. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
6. Gadzhieva, S.G. (2001). *Comparative phraseology of the Lak language*. Makhachkala: Dagestan Educational and Pedagogical Publishing House.
7. Golikova, Zh.A. (2008). *Translation from English to Russian*. Minsk: Publishing House of 'New Knowledge'.
8. Haydarov, A., & Chorieva, Z. (2012). *Semantic-grammatical and stylistic movements of phraseological units in English*. Tashkent: Publication House of 'Editor'.
9. Khamzaev, S.A., Gilyazetdinov, E.Z., Ashurova, F.L. (2021). Cross-cultural context of english language teaching. *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology*, 25(2), 3737–3750.
10. Khakimova, G.E. (2008). Structural semantic features of phonological units with Zoonimic component. *Diss. abs. doc. philol. scien*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan State World Languages University.
11. Khakimova, G.E. (2016). Grammatical structure of phraseological units and its relation with a context. *Archivist*, 3(7), 59–62.
12. Kunin, A.V. (1970). *English phraseology*. Moscow: Moscow University Press.
13. Kunin, A.V. (1986). *Course of phraseology of modern English*. Moscow: Moscow University Press.
14. Kunin, A.V. (1996). *Course of phraseology of modern English* (2nd ed.). Moscow: Phoenix.
15. Madvaliyev, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Coping: An explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language*. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan State Scientific Publishing House.
16. Mamatov, A.E. (1999). Issues of the formation of the phraseologisms of the Uzbek language. *Diss. abs. doc. philol. scien*. Jizzakh: Jizzakh State Pedagogical University.
17. McLuhan, M. (1962). *The Gutenberg galaxy: The making of typographic man*. Canada: University of Toronto Press.
18. Molotkov, A.I. (1977). *Basics of phraseology of the Russian language*. Leningrad: Publication House of 'Science'.
19. Rahmatullaev, Sh. (1966). Some questions of Uzbek phraseology. *Diss. abs. doc. philol. scien*. Tashkent: National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek.
20. Reichstein, A.D. (1980). *Comparative analysis of German and Russian phraseology*. Moscow: Moscow University Press.
21. Royzenzon, S.I. (1971). Phraseological derviation based on verbal comparative phraseological units of modern English. *Proceedings of Samarkand State University*, 217, 58–68.
22. Shanskiy, N.M. (1963). *Phraseology of the modern Russian language*. Moscow: Moscow University Press.
23. Sidiyakova, N.M. (1967). Comparative phraseological units like “/as/+, adj. + as + noun.”

- in modern English. *Diss. abs. doc. philol. scien.* Moscow.
24. Sidiyakova, N.M. (1961). *Structural features of comparative phraseological units in modern English*. Vologda: Vologda State Pedagogical University.
 25. Smirnitkiy, A.I. (1998). *Lexicology of modern English*. Moscow: Moscow University Press.
 26. Smith, L.P. (1998). *Phraseology of the English language*. Moscow: State Educational and Pedagogical Publishing House of the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR.
 27. Telia, V.N. (1987). Semantic structure of phraseological units-idioms and principles of their phraseographic processing. In V.N. Telia (Ed.), *Phraseologism and Its Lexicographic Development* (pp. 98–101). Minsk: Publication House of 'Science and Technology'.
 28. Vinogradov, V.V. (1957). *Main types of phraseological units in Russian*. Moscow: State Educational and Pedagogical Publishing House of the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR.
 29. Khristova, V.I. (1986). Structural and semantic characteristics of the comparative phraseological language of the unified Moldovan language. *Diss. abs. doc. philol. scien.* Kishinev: State Pedagogical University named after Ion Creangă.
 30. Walter, E. (Ed.). (2002). *Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.