



LEXICOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF ZOONYMIC COMPONENT UNITS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH”

Suvanova Mahliyo Jalol qizi

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Master’s Degree student Group: 2501

Tel: +998991456354

Gmail:suleymanovaezozal@gmail.com

Dotsent Xotamova Parvina Ilhomovna

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

PhD, docent

Abstract: *This study investigates the lexical, semantic, and cultural characteristics of zoonymic component units in Uzbek and English, with a focus on their lexicographic representation in monolingual and bilingual dictionaries. By employing comparative and descriptive methods, the research examines how animal-based lexemes and phraseological units encode cultural symbolism, metaphorical conceptualization, and social meanings. The study highlights divergences and convergences between the two languages in expressing human traits, behaviors, and evaluative nuances through zoonymic elements. Additionally, it provides recommendations for improving dictionary entries, including the integration of cultural explanations, pragmatic labeling, corpus-based examples, and cross-references, ensuring a more accurate and culturally informed lexicographic representation. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of metaphorical language, cultural cognition, and phraseological structures in both Uzbek and English.*

Keywords: *zoonym, phraseology, lexicography, metaphor, culture, semantics, Uzbek, English.*

INTRODUCTION.

Zoonymic component units—lexical items containing animal names—represent one of the most culturally rich layers of vocabulary in both Uzbek and English. They are used metaphorically to describe human qualities, social relations, emotional states, and behaviors. Due to their figurative nature, they often present challenges in translation, corpus annotation, and dictionary compilation. Scholars such as A. V. Kunin [1, p.45] emphasize that a majority of phraseological units rely on vivid imagery, which is often rooted in animal-based metaphors. The symbolic and evaluative functions of these expressions reveal how culture shapes language and cognition. The linguistic notion of the zoonym pertains to words denoting animals and their metaphorical extensions in human contexts. Uzbek scholars, including Sh. Rahmatullayev [2, p. 78] argues that animal terms in Uzbek phraseology reflect the national character, nomadic traditions, agrarian lifestyle, and socio-historical experience. English phraseology, evolving within urban and aristocratic contexts, developed metaphors that often diverge from Uzbek equivalents. Conceptual metaphor theory, proposed by Lakoff and Johnson [3, p.112], provides a framework for understanding how humans systematically map animal characteristics onto human behavior, producing expressions such as “busy as a bee,” “stubborn as a mule,” or “a dark horse” [1, p.45]. Uzbek counterparts, including “itdek mehnat qilmoq” (to work like a dog), “quyonday chaqqon” (nimble as a deer), or “tulkidek ayyor” (as cunning as a fox) [4, p.58], demonstrate culture-specific metaphorical extensions. Animal-based lexical units convey subtle evaluative nuances. English expressions such as “dog days,” “to go to the dogs,” and “a lucky dog” [3, p.112] differ in connotation from their Uzbek analogues, like “itdek charchamoq” (to work tirelessly) or “itday sodiq” (very loyal) [2, p.78], which may express a more intensified or direct evaluative judgment. Cross-linguistic divergences in metaphorical usage reflect cultural cognition: for instance, the fox embodies cunning and intelligence in English, whereas in Uzbek it is more strongly associated with slyness or deceit. In one well-known fable, the Fox flatters the Crow to obtain her cheese, demonstrating cunning used for trickery rather than noble intelligence [5, pp.45–46]. Sheep in English often symbolize



passiveness, whereas in Uzbek they connote innocence or purity, as illustrated by Muhammad Yusuf's poetic example.

“Ich-ichimdan ko‘zimga yosh kelar qalqib,
Baliqday gung, qo‘ydek yuvosh o‘zbek xalqi!
Sen ham bunday qomat kerib yursang balki,
Uyingga o‘t ketmasmidi, Farg‘onajon?..”[6, p.94].

The wolf conveys aggression in English, whereas in Uzbek it may symbolize bravery and strength. These divergences highlight the cultural and cognitive differences encoded in language and demonstrate challenges in translation and lexicographic representation.

Lexicographic practices for zoonymic units reveal additional challenges. Many bilingual dictionaries provide literal equivalents but fail to incorporate cultural and pragmatic explanations. Expressions like “a dark horse” [1, p.45] are often translated simply as “noma'lum shaxs”, omitting the hidden talent connotation. Similarly, the Uzbek idiom “ilonning yog‘i” (snake's oil) [4, p.58] lacks a direct English equivalent, yet dictionaries rarely annotate this semantic gap. The absence of pragmatic labels, stylistic markers, and cross-references reduces dictionary efficacy for learners and translators.

To improve lexicographic representation, dictionaries should integrate:

1. Cultural explanations elucidating figurative meanings, historical origins, and social connotations.
2. Pragmatic and stylistic labels (humorous, formal, offensive).
3. Cross-references among semantically related zoonyms.
4. Literal and figurative distinctions are clearly delineated.
5. Corpus-based usage examples to reflect contemporary language use.

Such measures enhance the accuracy of bilingual dictionaries, facilitate translation, and promote intercultural understanding. They also preserve metaphorical richness, enabling linguists and learners to access deeper cognitive and cultural layers of language.

In conclusion, zoonymic component units in Uzbek and English offer a unique window into cultural traditions, cognitive patterns, and historical experiences. Their study highlights the complex relationship between language, thought, and culture. By examining these units comparatively, we gain insight into how different societies perceive and categorize the natural world, and how these perceptions shape social attitudes and human behavior. The divergences between Uzbek and English metaphorical expressions reflect broader cultural frameworks, illustrating differences in moral evaluation, social norms, and historical experience. Moreover, these expressions demonstrate that language is not only a tool for communication but also a repository of cultural knowledge, metaphorical reasoning, and conceptual mapping. Lexicographic documentation of zoonymic units must therefore go beyond mere translation; it requires capturing semantic nuance, pragmatic function, and culturally embedded meaning. Enhanced lexicographic practices would aid translators, language learners, and researchers in accurately interpreting figurative expressions while preserving their cultural specificity. Ultimately, the systematic analysis and comprehensive lexicographic treatment of zoonymic component units enrich our understanding of both languages, support cross-cultural communication, and underscore the essential role of metaphor and culture in human cognition. This approach encourages ongoing research into phraseological structures, metaphorical language, and cultural semantics, emphasizing their relevance for comparative linguistics, translation studies, and intercultural education. The expanded focus on lexicography ensures that the subtleties of these expressions are adequately represented, contributing to a more nuanced appreciation of linguistic and cultural diversity, and reinforcing the importance of culturally informed lexical resources.

REFERENCES:

1. Kunin, A. V. English Phraseology. Moscow: Vysshayashkola, 1996, p.45.
2. Rahmatullayev, Sh. O‘zbek Frazologiyasining Asoslari. Tashkent: Fan, 1978, p.78.
3. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980, p.112.
4. Yoqubov, O. Frazelogik Birliklarning Milliy-Madaniy Xususiyatlari. Tashkent, 2005, p.58.



5. Aesop. Aesop's Fables. Translated by V. S. Vernon Jones. London: Macmillan and Co., 1912, pp.45–46.
6. Muhammad Yusuf. Uyqudagi qiz: She'rlar to'plami. Toshkent: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti, 1992, p.94.
- ?? Suleymanova, N. J. (2020). CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION THROUGH LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL CONTENT. Theoretical & Applied Science, (4), 645-647.
- ?? Jabbarovna, S. N. (2022). Appearance of the Concept of Assessment in the Artistic Text. European Scholar Journal, 3(3), 121-125.
- ?? Sulaymanova, N. J. (2016). Locative syntaxemes and disaccordance of their antecedent means. In Humanities and Social Sciences in Europe: Achievements and Perspectives (pp. 249-252).
- » Jabbarovna, S. N. (2020). Types and usage locative sennas in english and uzbek languages. International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research, 9(3), 1844-1854.
- » Jabbarovna, S. N. (2020). DISCURSIVE-PRAGMATIC AND LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF THE EVENT OF THE EVALUATION CATEGORY IN THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF THE WORLD (IN THE MATERIAL IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES). PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology, 17(7), 8303-8312.
- » RUSTAMOVNA, H. F. (2020). Training Simultaneous Interpreters. JournalNX, 6(06), 623-627.
- » Сулайманова, Н. Ж. (2016). Способы выражения локативности в современном английском языке. Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире, (9-3), 74-77.
- » Халимова, Ф. Р. (2016). AN UZBEK NATIONAL POETIC GENRE-"GAZEL" AND ITS TRANSLATION INTO UZBEK (THE EXTRACT FROM" FIROQNOMA"(A VERSE ABOUT SEPARATION), WRITTEN BY NODIRA). Ученый XXI века, (4-1 (17)), 57-59.
15. Халимова, Ф. Т. (2017). Особенности среднерегиональных показателей клеточного иммунитета у женщин, проживающих в различных климатогеографических условиях. Вестник российских университетов. Математика, 22(1), 218-221.