



Received: February 2, 2023
Accepted: March 23, 2023
Available online: March 25, 2023

Matluba Turdieva

Teacher, Uzbekistan State World
Languages University
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: matlubaxonturdieva@gmail.com

ZOONYMS AS NATIONAL SPECIFIC MEANS CREATING IMAGES IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

ANNOTATION

Along with the formation of cultural views, the ideas related to it, especially customs and morals also begin to appear. Language, which is one of the important components of culture, serves as a means of conveying views, approaches, concepts and other characteristics. This article is devoted to revealing of national-cultural specificity of image-bearing means in the English and Uzbek languages.

In the main part of the article, descriptive features of zoonyms in English and Uzbek languages are revealed through the method of comparison with the help of examples in order to see a clear national image. Obviously, zoonyms are analyzed and their complete compatibility or non-compatibility is determined in two languages. Traditional (descriptive, comparative analysis) and cognitive modeling methods of analysis were used during the research. As a result of the research, it was possible to describe the main concepts of cultural studies in the English and Uzbek languages and identify national specific images using zoonyms. Therefore, in the Uzbek language, the word “pig” means dirt, while the symbol “horse” is associated with beauty. If the word “monkey” in English culture is used to describe a characteristic of person, including very active young people, in Uzbek society, the image of “monkey” has a negative meaning when describing people.

We can say that although the concepts are reflected in many languages, when we analyzed the materials in the Uzbek and English languages, we encountered similar and different aspects of expressing metaphors related to the animal world in both languages.

Matluba Turdiyeva

O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari
universiteti o‘qituvchisi
Toshkent, O‘zbekiston

ZOONIMLAR INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA MILLIY XUSUSIY TASVIRNI IFODALOVCHI VOSITALAR SIFATIDA

ANNOTATSIYA

Madaniy qarashlar shakllanishi bilan birga unga taalluqli g‘oyalar, ayniqsa, urf-odatlar va axloq haqidagi tushunchalar ham paydo bo‘la boshlaydi. Madaniyatning muhim tarkibiy qismlaridan biri bo‘lgan til qarashlar, yondashuvlar, tushunchalar va boshqa xususiyatlarni yetkazish vositasi bo‘lib xizmat qiladi. Ushbu maqola ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi tasviriy vositalarning milliy-madaniy o‘ziga xos jihatlari ochib berishga bag‘ishlangan.

Maqolaning asosiy qismida aniq milliy qiyofani ko‘rish uchun ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi zoonimlarning tasviriy xususiyatlari misollar yordamida taqqoslash usuli orqali ochib berilgan. Shubhasiz, zoonimlar tahlil qilinadi va ikki tilda ularning to‘liq mosligi yoki mos kelmasligi aniqlanadi. Tadqiqot davomida an‘anaviy (tasviriy, qiyosiy tahlil) va kognitiv modellash tirish kabi tahlil usullaridan foydalanilgan. Tadqiqot natijalari sifatida ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida madaniyatshunoslikning asosiy tushunchalarini tavsiflash va zoonimlar yordamida milliy o‘ziga xos obrazlarni aniqlashga erishildi. Binobarin, o‘zbek tilida “cho‘chqa” so‘zi kir/iffloslikni bildirsa, “ot” timsoli go‘zallik bilan bog‘lanadi. Ingliz madaniyatidagi “maymun” so‘zi xarakterli shaxsni, jumladan, o‘ta faol yoshlarni tasvirlashda qo‘llanilsa, o‘zbek jamiyatida “maymun” obrazi insonlarni tasvirlashda salbiy ma‘noni anglatadi.

Aytishimiz mumkinki, tushunchalar ko‘p tillarda o‘z aksini topgan bo‘lsa-da, o‘zbek va ingliz tillaridagi materiallarni tahlil qilganimizda, har ikki tilda hayvonot dunyosi bilan bog‘liq metaforalarni ifodalashning o‘xshash va farqli tomonlariga duch keldik.

Kalit so‘zlar: obrazlilik, hodisalar, kompo-

Keywords: imagery, phenomena, components, zoo-metaphors, zoonyms, components, image-bearing means, national world picture, national spirit, comparison.

nentlar, zoometaforalar, zoonimlar, tasviriy vositalar, milliy dunyo tasviri, milliy ruh, qiyoslash.

INTRODUCTION

Human communication is the most major thoughtful topic among linguists, anthropologists, psychologists, and philosophers nowadays. Language, culture, and their interconnections have a significant impact on one another because it is the primary means of social interaction. Language represents “the objective reality of the nation” and “cultural spirit”, according to W. von Humboldt, who first raised the relevance of the issue “language and culture” [Humboldt, 1985]. He described that the following fundamental ideas and the following statements are true: 1) language is an expression of both material and spiritual cultures; 2) language represents the national character of any culture; 3) language of one particular culture is an expression of “national spirit”; 4) the topic of “language and culture” is studied by an individual or community.

The language is “the result of the culture and its constituents”, according to another researcher, Levi-Strauss [Maslova, 2001; 26]. Language and culture are inextricably linked, according to American linguist and anthropologist E. Sapir, who also claims that language “germinates” from and further reflects culture [Sapir, 1993; 223]. The language is the primary method for storing, transmitting, and reflecting culture; therefore, it follows from the assertions made. In the later 20th century, this concept became fundamental to the development of new multidisciplinary sciences like linguistics and culturology.

Language is frequently referred to be “the systematic, traditional use of sounds, signs, or written symbols in a human civilization for communication and self-expression” [Crystal, 1971; 1992]. A similar perspective is held by Emmitt and Pollock (1997), who claim that language is a collection of random signs that are accepted by a community and society of users. Chase (1969) asserts that language is a tool for thinking, talking with others, and constructing one's worldview.

Today, a broad understanding of culture is needed for any research project in the humanities. It is utilized in archaeology, languages, history, psychology, and sociology, among other fields. Even the idea that a human being is a cultured animal has been floated. In other words, culture is the element that distinguishes human behavior from that of animals [Mesbahe, 2005]. Sociology defines culture as the collection of transmitted and intrinsic notions, attitudes, convictions, values, and information that constitute or shape the shared precepts of social behavior. According to anthropology and ethnology, culture is the full range of practices and beliefs of a particular group of people who share traditions, which are communicated, disseminated, and emphasized by group members.

There are between 200 and 300 different definitions of culture. According to Edward Sapir's definition of culture from 1956, culture is a set of social norms and behaviors that are based on subconscious. The statement "Culture is a connection

of ideas and sentiments recognized by the majority of individuals in a society" is made by anthropologist by the name of G.Rocher [Rocher, 2004; 142]. Culture is unquestionably passed down non-genetically and taught within social groups.

According to T.S. Eliot (1961), culture can advance a society's development and contribute to political and economic stability. According to Spencer (1986), the super organic component is unique to humans, whereas the other two are applicable to both humans and animals [Spencer, 1986; 95].

Language is the principal means whereby we conduct our social lives. When it is used in contexts of communication, it is bound up with culture in multiple and complex ways. Language, the most commonplace of all human possessions, is possibly the most complex and the most interesting. Thanks to their utilization of a pool of common knowledge about the world, the people speak about facts, thoughts, or events that are communicable. To put it another way, language conveys cultural reality.

The spoken word, written words, a speaker's accent, conversational style, gestures, and facial expressions are all used by people in different ways. Language represents cultural reality in all of its verbal and nonverbal facets. In other words, language is directly influenced by culture. Culture and language are intertwined.

Speakers perceive their language as a representation of their social identity and use it to identify both themselves and other people. The speakers of this language frequently interpret the ban on its usage as a rejection of their social circle and culture. As a result, language serves as a metaphor for cultural reality [Kramsch, 1998].

Every cultural practice and every act of social behavior, according to Sapir, "involves communication in some form, either explicit or implicit. Language is the medium for this communication" [Sapir, 1956; 104]. As a result of the discussion above, we can say that language is a necessary part of culture because:

- 1) it is a part of culture that we acquire from our past generations;
- 2) language is the main tool with which we find out culture;
- 3) language is an important phenomenon.

A person ought to think of these issues as codes derived within language to comprehend the basics of the culture (religion, science and literary works). One of the main concerns of philologists over time – both linguists and literary critics – has been the subject of imagery. According to the idea of likeness, imaging is understood as a phenomenon of style that involves the conceptual fusion of two mental domains. The use of imagery creates a "dual view" of the topics and events covered in the text by drawing comparisons between the real world and the author's imaginative worlds.

The concept of imaging involves two separate approaches: broad and narrow. In its strictest meaning, imaging is limited to specific linguistic constructs that produce images (metaphor, metonymy, simile, periphrasis, etc.). Since every work of fiction is not a precise copy of any real event, imagery permeates the entire text's plot in many different ways.

The basic stylistic devices creating imagery are metaphors, metonymies and similes.

Most people agree that metaphor is the interaction between a word's logical and

contextual logical meanings. Metaphor is based on similarities between items and offers analogy and comparison between them. Sometimes a metaphor is not confined to one image. The author feels that it is necessary to extend the image by including a number of other images, all of which are connected to the primary, the main picture. These metaphors are referred to as protracted or sustained metaphors.

Another stylistic tool for creating imagery is metonymy. To make a description more exact, metonymy is utilized as a real stylistic device. By providing a precise detail related to the phenomena, the author conjures up a real-world, tangible image and expresses some of his/her own emotions.

Simile, a stylistic element that conjures up a picture, is also quite important. A simile is a comparison between two objects that belong to completely distinct classes of things to describe one object. Similes and comparisons should not be confused. Comparison emphasizes the object being compared while taking into account all the characteristics of the two objects.

When certain words are used to create a visual representation of ideas in the reader's mind, this is referred to as imagery.

Metaphor may play a special role in organizing conceptual knowledge and aiding in the creation of imagery, according to a number of theorists. The idea that "A human being is an animal" is thus metaphorically modeled.

METHODS

During the investigations we have used:

a) traditional methods of analysis:

- descriptive (we tried to describe and give definitions for some terminologies or concepts);

- comparative analysis (two languages have been compared and similarities and differences between two nations' world pictures analyzed).

b) new method such as *cognitive modeling* (Computer science's field of cognitive modeling focuses on recreating human thought processes and problem-solving in digital form. In order to enhance human-computer interaction, such a model can be used to replicate or anticipate human behavior or performance on activities that are comparable to those being modeled).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The key concepts of cultural studies have been described, along with image-bearing mechanisms and their cognitive implications. National-specific images in English and Uzbek have been defined with the help of zoonyms.

As is known it is of greatest interest to study the reflection of the human appearance and his inner world in different languages, since it represents national world picture. The study of the human appearance, his psychological and physiological qualities nowadays becomes an issue of heated discussions in linguistics. However, this question raised an interest in the minds of ancient Greek scientists and at that time, the science physiognomy appeared. In general, physiognomists studied the peculiar features of the human face, his body construction, weight, heights, and other

parameters with regard to his character and psychological temperament.

The analysis of theoretical material shows that many linguists paid attention to the study of the human features, in particular his face and his social and psychological characteristics in relation with zoonyms, which brightly manifest the national world picture (Y.G. Zavalishina (1998), O.V. Galimova (2004), N.A. Kindrya (2005), E.Y. Loginova (2007), N.A. Skitina, N.Y. Temnikova (2007)). Language units denoting or describing human features explicitly demonstrate the specifics of linguistic world picture of a certain nation (Y.D. Apresyan, 1995; T.V. Bakhvalova, 1993, 1995; A.A. Zaliznyak, 2005; N.V. Zemlyakova, 2005; V.V. Katermina, 2004; M.P. Odintsova, 2000; G.N. Sklyarevskaya, 1993; S.G. Ter-Minasova 2000, G.V. Tokarev, 2005, etc.). The role of zoonyms and proverbs in this respect is difficult to overestimate. The specifics of appearance description, social, psychological and intellectual characteristics of humans can be accounted for such extra-linguistic factors as historical development, geographical situation, physiological differences, etc.

The results of our research show that we can classify zoonyms (zoo-metaphors) reflecting the image of an average Englishman and the representative of the Uzbek nation into: a) Zoo-metaphors, describing anatomic physical features (general evaluation, parts of body, etc.); b) Zoo-metaphors, describing psychological and moral characteristics (character features, etc.); c) Zoo-metaphors aimed to describe social characteristics (the description of social activity of the human); d) Zoo-metaphors aimed to describe human intellectual abilities.

It is well known that national cultural specificity can be revealed by means of comparative analysis (D.O. Dobrovolsky, V.N. Telia, V.G. Gak). The comparison of images created by zoonyms will help define full correspondence, and absence of correspondence of images in two languages (See Table 1).

Table 1. Examples for Zoo-metaphors, describing anatomic physical, psychological features and human beings' social behaviors

№	The image	Zoonyms representing the image in the English language	Zoonyms representing the image in the Uzbek language	Examples from literary texts
<i>Zoo-metaphors, describing anatomic physical features of humans</i>				
1.	An attractive person	<i>bat (Afro-American woman), pigeon, dog, bearcat, canary, chicken, fox, hammer fox, foxy lady, stallion, ass, beetle, bitch</i>	<i>ot, bo'ri, sher, buqa, kapalak, bo'taloq, kabutar, jo'ja, kiyik, qo'zichoq, ohu, tovu, lochin, qaldirg'och, yo'lbars</i>	Eng.: <i>Who is this stallion with that dude?</i> (Dangerous English, 2000). Uzb.: <i>Uning ohu ko'zlarida na mag'rurlik van na bir ma'no bor edi</i> (Xolmirzayev Sh. "Og'ir tosh ko'chsa").

2.	Not a beautiful man/woman	<i>baboon, crocodile, pig, gorilla, ox, rat, hen, bear (woman), buffalo, dog, crow</i>	<i>maymun, kalamush, qurbaqa, cho'chqa, ilon, ayiq, mushuk, sigir; kaltakesak</i>	Eng.: <i>There were not pretties, only pigs</i> (Dangerous English, 2000). Uzb.: <i>Eshon oyimning yuzi... maymunning yuziga o'xshagan tirish badbursh ekan</i> (Ismoiliy M. "Farg'ona tong otguncha").
3.	Physically not well-developed man/woman	<i>cow, crow, coyote-ugly, pig, mouse, herring, pelican, cow-cunted, dog, dog biscuit, swamp donkey, heifer, war horse, moose, butterfly</i>	<i>kapalak, toshbaqa, jirafa, mol</i>	Eng.: <i>How can you make me go with her to the party? She is a cow!</i> (Dangerous English, 2000). Uzb.: <i>Kapalak gulni sog'inar, bulbul-kuyini</i> (Maqol).
4.	Physically well-developed	<i>zebra</i>	<i>ayiq, ot</i>	Eng.: <i>The zebra blew the whistle on almost every play</i> (Torn, 2010). Uzb.: <i>Ayiq polvon barcha kuchini yig'ib, bir zarba bilan dushmanlarni yakson qilibdi</i> (Ertak).
5.	Sexually attractive man/woman	<i>dog, bearcat, canary, chicken, fox, hammer fox, foxy lady, pigeon, stallion, ass, beetle, wolf</i>	—	Eng.: <i>He was a real wolf!</i> (Dangerous English, 2000).
6.	Sexually not attractive man/woman	<i>sheep, chicken</i>	—	Eng.: <i>Wherever Mary goes, the sheep follows her; though she doesn't like him</i> (Dangerous English, 2000).
7.	A fat, plain, awkward man/woman	<i>pig, cow (woman), ass, bull</i>	<i>ayiq, ho'kiz, cho'chqa, buqa, fil</i>	Eng.: <i>Get that dog out of my garden. It's like a bull in a china shop</i> (Dangerous English, 2000). Uzb.: <i>Mehmonning biri aftini burishtirib ogan, buqa bo'yin odam edi</i> (Usmonov E. "Yolqin").
8.	A dirty man / woman	<i>hog (man)</i>	<i>cho'chqa</i>	Eng.: <i>He is eating the last of the food, he is really hog!</i> (Dangerous English, 2000). Uzb.: <i>U cho'chqa uylarni yig'ishtirmas, na bir kiyimi, na bir ovqatga qarayi, deb nolidi Norqo'zi</i> (Mushtum).

9.	A man with a massive body	<i>elephant, bear; bovine, horse</i>	<i>ayiq, ho'kiz, cho'chqa, buqa, fil</i>	Eng.: You're actually eaten like a horse (Comedy Club, 2010). Uzb.: O'zi ayiqday bo'lib, hamma yerga sig'mas edi ("Meshpolvon" ertagi).
10.	A strong, big man	<i>bull</i>	<i>buqa, fil, ot, sher</i>	Eng.: He was a bull of a man (Cambridge dictionary). Uzb.: Xalilov bilan baxslashib o'tirish shartmi! Xalilov-fil, sen-qo'chqor (Rahim I. "Ixlos").
11.	A young man	<i>gosling, puppy, cat</i>	<i>jo'ja, jo'jaxo'roz, kuchukcha</i>	Eng.: Get rid off these two puppies! (Agatha C.). Are you cats coming to hear my new records? (Glazunov, 1998). Uzb.: Zoirjonning qopqara yuzi alamdand ko'karib ketgan, o'tirgan joyida jo'jaxo'rozday bo'ynini cho'zib gapirardi (Hoshimov O'. "Qalbingga quloq sol").
12.	An Afro-American man	<i>ape</i>	—	Eng.: Tell that ape to let me go! (Comedy Club, 2008).
13.	A dwarf man	<i>shrimp</i>	<i>chumoli, sichqon, quyon</i>	Eng.: He's a little shrimp of a boy. Uzb.: Shu zamon ko'zingiz oldida birdan, Kichik chumolicha qolgusi Farhod (Oripov A.).
14.	A slow man	—	<i>toshbaqa</i>	Uzb.: Gal g'o'za parvarishida sudralayotgan "toshbaqa qadam" rahbarlarga keldi (O'tkir Hoshimov "Qalbingga quloq sol").
15.	A quick man	—	<i>kiyik, quyon, ohu, kaltakesak</i>	Uzb.: Qo'lini tortib, yana yuziga parda qildi va ohu chaqqonligi bilan yigit yonidan o'tib, shippilaganicha yugurib ketdi (Ismoil M. "Farg'ona tong otguncha"). Yo'l ustidan chiqib qolgan chaqqon kaltakesaklar o'qday otilib kavaklarga kirib ketadi... (Qahhor A. "Maston").

<i>Zoo-metaphors describing psychological features of humans</i>				
1.	A greedy man	cormorant, coon, dingo, beetle, hound, polecat	cho'chqa, to'ng'iz	Eng.: Tell that polecat I want to talk to him (Baykov, Hinton, 2008). Uzb.: Mana Ismat degan yangi director keldi. Shu tuzukmi deb o'ylovdik G'irt cho'chqa ekan ("Yoshlik" jurnali).
2.	A cunning man	pig, ram, rat-face, roach, rook, shark, bitch, wolf in a sheep's clothing, fox	tulki, ilon	Eng.: You know I have to warn you that jack is a wolf in a sheep's clothing. Uzb.: Ishonmayman-u, lekin qari tulki eridan ko'p narsalarni yashirishini bilaman (Umarbekov O' "Yoz yomg'iri").
3.	A brave man, a leader	hairy-ass, donkey, lion	sher, xo'roz	Eng.: Speed is so strong a weapon of defense that an active donkey can. Uzb.: Bu hujjatni butun rayonga taratamiz, sher, obro'ying oshib, cho'qqiga ko'tarilayotganingni bilasanmi?! (Rahim I. "Ixlos").
4.	Not a character	nit, worm, ass-worm, pigeon, puppy, shrimp, turkey, louse	—	Eng.: Don't be such a worm; you don't have to lie to me (Cambridge dictionary).
5.	An aggressive man	hairy-ass, hard ass, rough-ass, bearcat, bully boy, cock, tiger, cocky, colt, dog, dog-eat-dog, gorilla, hog, wasp, wolf, bitch	buqa, maymun	Eng.: Now bully boy, 'said the stout man, raising his eyes from his cards for the first time, can't you let him speak? ("Swimming and Diving", Chap. 29). Uzb.: Buqa, huddi uyatchan kelinchakdek, yuvosh tortib, xonasiga kirib ketsa bo'ladimi (Mushtum).
6.	A stubborn man	mule, ass, bullhead, bullheaded	—	Eng.: I tried to convince Jack to go to the doctor, but he is as stubborn as a mule.
<i>Zoo-metaphors describing social characteristics of humans</i>				
1.	A miserable man	sitting duck, poor fish, jellyfish	qo'y	Eng.: Out in the open field, the soldiers were sitting ducks for enemy snipers. Uzb.: Qutidordek qo'ymijoz odamning bunday zo'r ishga aralashishiga aql bovar qilmasdi (Qodiriy A. "O'tkan kunlar").

2.	A rude man	<i>animal, ape, ass, cheeky monkey</i>	<i>to 'ng'iz, ho 'kiz, mol</i>	Eng.: <i>He's quite a cheeky little monkey, isn't he?</i> Uzb.: <i>Muhtaram qaynotamizga! Siz bilan meni qorong'u zindonga tushirib, dor ostlarigacha tortgan... Homid ismli bir to'ng'izni, nihoyat ikki yillik sargardonlik so'ngida.. tuproqqa qorishtirishga muvaffaq bo'ldim (Qodiriy A. "O'tkan kunlar").</i>
3.	A hardworking, industrious man	<i>bearcat, alfa dog, top dog, ant</i>	<i>chumoli, it, asalari</i>	Eng.: <i>He was determined to be top dog at the swimming meet.</i> Uzb.: <i>Bir gal yarimta bo'shoqni sudrab kelayotgan chumolini ko'rganman (Hoshimov O' "Ikki eshik orasi").</i>
4.	A timid man	<i>rabbit, candy ass, bulldog, scaredy-cat</i>	<i>quyon</i>	Eng.: <i>Even though he has turned twenty, he's still too timid as a rabbit to chat with girls.</i> Uzb.: <i>Mayna. Narzi ota bilan gurununglashishni xohlamasdi, istamasdi. Bu qari quyon biror vahimani javrab, g'ashimni keltiradi, deb javrab indamadi (Toshmatov Sh. "Erk qushi").</i>
5.	A lying man	<i>chicken, chicken-livered, dingo, fox</i>	<i>tulki</i>	Eng.: <i>He is a sly fox.</i> Uzb.: <i>Haqiqatda bu tulkilar uni laqillatardilar (Qahhor A. "Sarob").</i>
6.	A talkative man/woman	<i>parrot, rabbit, worm, magpie, ass-kisser, bitch, jackal</i>	<i>bulbulugo 'yo, to'tiqush</i>	Eng.: <i>She doesn't have an original thought in her head - she just parrots anything that Sara says (Cambridge dictionary).</i> Uzb.: <i>Ilgari oring kelmas edi, bulbulugo'yo eding, - dedi asta Tabibiy (Siyoyev S. "Yorug'lik").</i>
7.	A foul man/woman	<i>ass, canary, dog, hound</i>	<i>cho'chqa</i>	Eng.: <i>I've never seen so much gorgeous ass (offensive).</i> Uzb.: <i>Devordan oshib qarab, xir-xir ovoz chiqarib, po'choq titkilayotgan uch-to'rtta cho'chqani ko'rdi ("Yoshlik" jurnali).</i>

8.	A betrayer	<i>louse, pig-fucker, rat, ratbag, rat-face, rat fink, pack rat, snake, scut, toad, mouse, polecat</i>	—	Eng.: For me there could be nothing worse than living with a pack rat (Cambridge dictionary).
9.	An immoral man/woman	<i>polecat</i>	<i>eshak</i>	Eng.: Husband rolling in drunk, stink of pub off him like a polecat . Uzb.: Ishqi yo 'q eshak – dardsiz kesak (Maqol).
10.	A man in society	<i>pig, bull, mole, cormorant, horse, chow hound, pig, wolf, hairy-ass, chicken, snake, gosling, puppy, old bat, fish, old goat, pig-meat, old trout, fish, frog, kiwi, bat, cat, cockeyed, whale, rat-arsed, ratted, mule, grasshopper, mustang, rook</i>	<i>bo'ri, toshbaqa, chumchuq, qurbaqa</i>	Eng.: Some politicians are wolves in sheep's clothing. Uzb.: Bor ekan-u, yo 'q ekan, bo'ri bakovul ekan, tulki yasovul ekan, qarg'a qaqimchi ekan, chumchuq chaqimchi ekan, toshbaqa torozibon ekan, qurbaqa undan qarzdor ekan... (O'zbek xalq ertagi).
11.	A fashionable man/woman	<i>hep cats, clothes horse</i>	—	Eng.: This is a favorite hang-out for the local hep cats . (Zap, 2010)
12.	A professional	<i>bull (detective)</i>	<i>it, laycha</i>	Eng.: He put the most inquisitive bull on his trail (Makovsev, Shevchenko, 2004). Uzb.: Ho 'jayinning laychasi -ku, burnini pir qarich ko 'targaniga hayronmiz (Oybek "Tanlangan asarlar").
13.	A man of a different race	<i>a monkey (African-American)</i>	—	Eng.: "I'll give you something gently, you monkey you".
14.	patient man	—	<i>tuya/baqiroq tuyaning bori yaxshi</i>	Uzb.: Suvsizlikni tuya ko 'taradi.. (Qahhor A. "Maston"). <i>Baqiroq tuyaning bori yaxshi deyilar. Ota-ona borligida bolalar bir-birlari bilan ahil bo 'ladilar</i> (Ahmedov I. "Og'ir operatsiya").
<i>Zoo-metaphors, describing intellectual abilities of humans</i>				
1.	A clever man	<i>aurochs, bug, horse</i>	<i>ot, tulki</i>	Eng.: He is really Clever Hans (horse) , he can predict anything beforehand. Uzb.: Balkim?!-yur otni oldiga boramiz, u aqlli, balki u bilar? (Hajviya)

2.	Low intellectual abilities man	<i>ass, baboon, bat, bug, cuckoo, goat, gosling, ox, pilchard, turkey, colt, pig</i>	<i>echki, eshak, tovuk, jirafa</i>	Eng.: Are you bat or what? (Dangerous English, 2000). Uzb: Bundan ko'ra go'ng titkaning yaxshi emasmi keksa tovuq! (Oybek "Tanlangan asarlar").
3.	A small-minded man	<i>bitch, cat's paw, crab, duck</i>	<i>it</i>	Eng.: Come and sit beside me, duck; If that son of a bitch gets away with this, it would kill me! Uzb.: Xalq tovushi tinimsiz guvullaydi: - Buyoqqa chiq itlar! (Oybek "Tanlangan asarlar").

From the table above we could define that some animals represent some features of people. For instance, **stallion** is considered as an attractive person according to English culture, as for Uzbek culture **deer (ohu)** represents a beautiful woman. Controversially, not a beautiful woman can be seen as a **pig** in English, **monkey (maymun)** in Uzbek. Besides, physically not well-developed man/woman compared to **cow** in English, **butterfly (kapalak)** in Uzbek. However, the peculiarities of sexually attractive or non-attractive man/woman are not compared to an animal in Uzbek. Like that, slow or fast human movement is not compared to an animal in English culture. It is worth to consider the cases of full correspondence of images in the English and Uzbek languages (See Table 2):

Table 2. Similarities of Zoo-metaphors in the Uzbek and English nations' representation

Characteristics	English	Uzbek
<i>Anatomical –physical</i>	horse – an attractive person pig – a fat, an awkward person hog – a dirty person elephant, bull, bear – a man with massive body cow – not a beautiful, fat woman	horse/ot – an attractive person pig/cho'chqa – a fat, an awkward, dirty person elephant/fil, bull/ho'kiz, bear/ayiq – a man with massive body, fat person cow/sigir – not a beautiful, fat woman
<i>Physiological- age characteristics</i>	bull – a strong and big man	bull/ho'kiz, horse/ot – a strong and big man
<i>Social characteristics</i>	rabbit – a timid person parrot – a talkative man/woman ant – a hardworking person	rabbit/quyon – a timid person parrot/to'tiqush – a talkative man/woman ant/chumoli – a hard working person
<i>Intellectual abilities</i>	dog – a small minded man/woman	dog/it – a small minded man/woman

There are national specific images which do not correspond in two languages:

Table 3. Differences of Zoo-metaphors in the Uzbek and English nations' representation

Characteristics	English	Uzbek
<i>Anatomical physical features of humans</i>		
a beautiful, flippant girl	butterfly, fox	horse/ot
not beautiful man/woman	pig	monkey/maymun
physically well-developed	zebra	bear/ayiq
a young man	puppy, gosling	jo'ja, jo'jaxo'roz
<i>Psychological features of humans</i>		
a greedy person	cormorant, coon, dingo, beetle, hound, polecat	pig/cho'chqa, tong'iz
a foul man	ass, canary, dog, hound	pig/cho'chqa
<i>Social features of humans</i>		
a miserable man	sitting duck, poor fish, jellyfish	lamb/qo'y
a lying man	chicken, dingo	fox/tulki
an immoral man/woman	Polecat	ass/eshak
<i>Intellectual abilities</i>		
a clever man/woman	aurochs, bug	horse/ot; fox/tulki
a small-minded man/woman	crab, duck	dog/it

As it is seen from the graph one and the same image can have different connotations in different cultures. For instance, the word “hog” (pig), is associated with dirt, while in the Uzbek language the image of the horse is associated with beauty. In the English culture the word “monkey” reveals the meaning of a man's character, and when it concerns very energetic children they are called “monkeys”, while in the Uzbek culture the image of a monkey is rather negative than positive.

Moreover, there are specific English zoo-metaphors which were not found in the Uzbek language: “**bat**” – a beautiful Afro-American girl; “**bear**” – physically not attractive woman; “**bovine**” – a heavy man; “**bearcat**” – an attractive woman; “**beaver**” – a man with a beard; “**crow**” – not a beauty; “**shrimp**” – a man of little sizes; “**lobster**” – an awkward man, “**zebra**” – a physically well-constituted man, “**crocodile**” – unattractive woman; “**pilchard**” – low intellectual abilities man; “**turkey**” – low intellectual abilities man. Besides, for some extra linguistic reasons, there are groups of zoonyms representing the images of Afro-American Diaspora, and images of sexual attractiveness/unattractiveness in English and no similar images found in the Uzbek language.

The collected material allows classifying zoonyms (zoo-metaphors) reflecting the image of an average Englishman and the representative of the Uzbek nation are classified into:

- a) zoo-metaphors, describing anatomic physical features (general evaluation, parts of body, etc.);
- b) zoo-metaphors, describing psychological and moral characteristics (character features, etc.);
- c) zoo-metaphors aimed to describe social characteristics (the description of social activity of the human);

d) zoo-metaphors aimed to describe human intellectual abilities.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, we can stress that languages reflect culture. It is often said that language is a “mirror” of a particular community because language reflects its spiritual and material cultures. Thus, it can be claimed that there are close relations between language and culture. It should be stressed that cultural linguistics is a rapidly expanding field, which has its subject matter, objectives and aims. Since the end of the 20th century cultural linguistics has been intensely developing and because of researches done in this field cultural linguistics acquired the status of an independent discipline. Despite the fact that cultural linguistics is a comparatively new science, there have been formed several trends: phraseological, conceptological, lexicographical and stylistic.

The goal of examining connections between conceptual and linguistic world views is put forward by the study of the human factor in language with reference to text generation and text perception. The notions of conceptual and linguistic world pictures seem to be of great importance. As a result of a person's spiritual activity, a conceptual world picture – a comprehensive representation of the universe and its key features – is realized. The language world picture is offered as the linguistic model for the conceptual world picture and is explicated using a variety of linguistic techniques. It serves as a channel for disseminating knowledge about the world, people, and relationships.

REFERENCES

1. Ashurova, D.U. (2012). *Text linguistics*. Tashkent: “Wing of Thought” Publishers.
2. Chase, S. (1969). How language shapes our thoughts. In J.H. Burl & E.Y. Roberts (Eds.), *Language: An introduction reader* (pp. 97-108). New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
3. Claire, E. (1998). *Dangerous English 2000: An indispensable guide for language learners and others* (3rd ed.). Ohio, USA: Delta Systems Co Inc.
4. Crystal, D. (1971). *Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Press.
5. Crystal, D. (1992). *Linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Press.
6. Eliot, T.S. (1961). *Notes toward the definition of culture*. London: Faber & Faber.
7. Emmitt, M., & Pollock, J. (1997). *Language and learning: An introduction for teaching second language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
8. Goodenough, W.H. (1981). *Culture, language and society*. USA: Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Co.
9. Goodenough, W.H. (1996). Culture. In D. Levinson & M. Ember (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of cultural anthropology* (Vol.1, pp. 225-228). Oakville, Canada: David Brown Book Company
10. Humboldt, von, W. (1985). *Language and philosophy of culture*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
11. Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford University Press
12. Levi-Strauss, C. (1976). *Structural anthropology* (Vol. 2). New York: Basic Books.
13. Maslova, V.A. (2010). *Linguoculturology* (4th ed.). Moscow: Academy.
14. Mesbahe, Y., & Mohammad, T. (2005). *Cultural offense*. Tehran: Imam Khomeini Educational and Research Institute Press.
15. Mezenin S.M. (1983). *Figurative means of language (on the material of Shakespeare's works)*. Moscow.
16. Mirzayev, T., & Musoqulov, A. (2005). *Uzbek folk proverbs*. Tashkent: “East” Publishing House.

17. Paul, N. (1991). *Collins English dictionary: Complete and unabridged*. California: Harper Collins Publishers. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/resources>.
18. Paul, N. (1994). *Collins English dictionary: Complete and unabridged*. California: Harper Collins Publishers. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/resources>.
19. Paul, N. (1998). *Collins English dictionary: Complete and unabridged*. California: Harper Collins Publishers. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/resources>.
20. Paul, N. (2000). *Collins English dictionary: Complete and unabridged*. California: Harper Collins Publishers. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/resources>.
21. Paul, N. (2003). *Collins English dictionary: Complete and unabridged*. California: Harper Collins Publishers. <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/resources>.
22. Potebnya, A.A. (1989). *Thought and language: Words and myth*. Moscow: "Truth" Press.
23. Rocher, G. (1972). *A general introduction to sociology: A theoretical perspective*. Canada: Macmillan Co.
24. Rocher, G. (2004). *A general introduction to sociology: A theoretical perspective*. India, Calcutta: B.K. Dhur Academic Publishers.
25. Sapir, E. (1956). *Selected writings in language, culture and personality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
26. Sapir, E. (1993). *Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
27. Spencer, H. (1986). *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
28. Vinogradov, V.V. (2003). *Selected works: The language and style of Russian writers: From Gogol to Akhmatova*. Moscow: Science.