

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF STUDYING ANTHROPONYMIC PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Abdusamadov Zafar Nurmatovich

PhD (General Linguistics Department), UzSWLU

Nazarova Sarvinoz Tavakkaljon qizi

2nd year master student of English linguistics, UzSWLU

sarvinozotajonova27@gmail.com

Abstract. In this article, we have presented the theory and methodology of anthroponymic phraseological units in English and Uzbek. We have explored the linguistic status of anthroponymic phraseologisms in terms of their semantic structure, cognitive properties, and linguistic significance. We have also investigated how anthroponyms lose their nominative role in phraseological units and acquire generalized, symbolic, and evaluative meanings. The results of this paper show that anthroponymic phraseological units reflect national worldview, cultural memory, and value systems, and as such are a very important subject for comparative linguistics.

Keywords: anthroponym, phraseological unit, anthroponymic phraseologism, linguocultural analysis, cognitive approach, comparative linguistics, national worldview

Аннотация. В данной статье представлен детальный теоретический и методологический анализ фразеологических единиц с антропонимическими частями в английском и узбекском языках. Наше исследование изучает семантическую структуру, когнитивные свойства и лингвокультурную специфику антропонимических фразеологизмов. Обсуждается процесс утраты антропонимами их прямой номинативной роли и приобретения ими обобщенного, символического и оценочного значения. Данная статья является доказательством возможности использования семантической, когнитивной, лингвокультурной и сравнительной методологии. Результаты исследования подтверждают, что антропонимические фразеологизмы выражают национальное мировоззрение, культурную память и систему ценностей языкового сообщества.

Ключевые слова: антропоним, фразеологическая единица, антропонимический фразеологизм, лингвокультурология, когнитивный подход, сравнительное языкознание, языковая картина мира.

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillarida antroponimik xarakterga ega frazeologik birliklarni o'rganishning nazariy va metodologik asosi ko'rib chiqiladi va uning semantik tuzilishi, kognitiv va lingvistik-madaniy jihatlari muhokama qilinadi. Maqolada frazeologik birliklar tarkibidagi antroponimlar nominativ ma'noni tark etib, umumlashtirilgan ma'no (ramziy, baholovchi) ma'noni ifodalaydi. Bunday birliklarni ingliz va o'zbek tillarida qiyosiy o'rganishning semantik, kognitiv, lingvistik-madaniy va qiyosiy metodlari adabiyotda yanada o'rganiladi. Tadqiqot shuni ko'rsatadiki, antroponimik frazalar milliy ong, xalq xotirasi va lingvistik manzarani ifodalovchi muhim lingvistik birliklardir.

Kalit so'zlar: antroponim, frazeologik birlik, antroponimik frazeologizm, lingvistik madaniyatshunoslik, kognitiv yondashuv, qiyosiy tilshunoslik, milliy tafakkur.

Introduction. In linguistics, phraseology is widely recognized as one of the most culturally saturated and semantically complex layers of language. Phraseological units are so much more than a linguistic norm or a structure, they are also homes to history, collective memory, national mindset and cultural values that have been acquired by a speech community over centuries. Because of their figurative nature and semantic integrity, phraseological units play a key role in shaping the linguistic mindset and passing cultural knowledge on from one generation to the next. Among different types of phraseological units, anthroponymic components are of special importance among them. The reason is that they are often associated with personal names, historical figures, mythological and literary figures and cultural personalities in a lot of cultures. Anthroponyms in phraseological units become symbolic markers that convey cultural associations and meanings which are very firmly rooted in their cultural history and values. As such anthroponymic phraseological units are very powerful linguistic tools for social cognition, moral judgment, and stereotypical perception. In recent years, anthroponymic phraseological units have been coming to the attention of linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics and comparative linguistics researchers because they are more and more a matter of language-specific features but also cultural and cognitive patterns. Both in English and Uzbek, anthroponymic phraseological units are able to convey culturally meaningful meanings and attitudes, and are also the vehicle for national cultures, historical facts and values. But despite their linguistic and cultural significance, the theoretical and methodological basis of their comparative research are not yet well explained. This gap makes this study very relevant and necessary.

Theoretical foundations of Anthroponymic Phraseology. Anthroponyms are proper names used to represent human beings, such as personal names, surnames, nicknames, pseudonyms, historical, mythological and fictional names. In everyday usage, anthroponyms act as nominative names for a person. But when they become phraseological, they undergo semantic changes. These anthroponyms lose their referential meaning and become generalized, symbolic and evaluative. In phraseology, anthroponymic words are often cultural codes that represent the collective knowledge and experience of people. For example, Jack, Tom or John in English phraseological units are common names that represent a generic image of an ordinary person; they speak of universality and anonymity. In Uzbek anthroponymic phraseological units, the names Ali, Hasan, or Qodir are usually associated with the national character and beliefs of culture, and can also have cultural meaning in the form of folklorism, religious stories and historical narratives. *The names are based on moral character, social position and/or character traits of Uzbek people.* From a theoretical point of view, anthroponymic phraseologisms are at the intersection of onomastics and phraseology. They are characterized by semantic indivisibility, structural stability, figurativeness, and expressive potential. The meanings of such phraseological units are mainly metaphorical and idiomatic and cannot be deduced from the literal meanings of their individual components. This makes anthroponymic phraseologisms very relevant in linguistic and cultural analysis.

Methodological Approaches to the Study. The investigation of anthroponymic phraseological units requires a comprehensive and multilevel methodological approach because their linguistic and cultural aspects can be difficult to detect. An integrated methodological approach is therefore necessary. In this regard, we consider the following methods the best. *Semantic Analysis* Semantic analysis is the most fundamental

tool for understanding and interpreting the figurative meaning of anthroponymic phraseological units. It focuses on semantic shifts that occur when a personal name goes from nominative to symbolic or generalized meaning. Through semantic analysis we can deduce how anthroponyms contribute to the overall meaning of a phraseological unit and what evaluative or expressive functions they perform. *Linguocultural Analysis*. Linguocultural analysis aims to discover the cultural background and national specificity of anthroponymic phraseological units. This approach views the linguistic unit as a reflection of cultural values, traditions, beliefs, and stereotypes in the linguistic community. With cultural context understanding, we can understand why certain anthroponyms become phraseologically fixed and how they reflect the collective cultural consciousness of English and Uzbek speakers. *Cognitive Approach*. The cognitive approach looks at anthroponymic phraseological units as structures that are cognitive constructs formed by human thinking. Personal names, in this context, are cognitive models for social and culturally significant concepts. We look at how anthroponyms contribute to the way we understand human behavior, social roles, moral qualities, and interpersonal relations and what the cognitive mechanism is that drives meaning formation. *Comparative Method*. The comparative method is central for anthroponymic phraseological units in English and Uzbek. It allows us to observe similarities and differences between the two languages and to identify common features and cultural variants in the two languages. Comparison allows us to see the differences in metaphorical thinking, evaluative orientation, and cultural symbolism, which helps to understand the national linguistic worldview. *National and Cultural Specificity*. One of the most important features of anthroponymic phraseological units is the national and cultural character. In English, many such units are founded on biblical sources, classical literature, mythology, and historical events. These sources reflect the historical development and cultural priorities of English-speaking societies. Uzbek anthroponymic phraseological units are mainly based on folklore, oral traditions, religious narratives, and everyday social practices, which reflect the cultural and moral values of Uzbek society. These differences suggest that anthroponymic phraseologisms are mirrors of different linguistic worldviews and cultural experiences. So any framework to understand them needs to consider extralinguistic factors (history, religion, social structure, and collective memory) in order to study them. *Findings and Discussion*. We have shown that anthroponymic phraseological units in English and Uzbek are expressive and evaluative, which contribute to emotional coloring and stylistic richness of speech. The selection of such anthroponyms and the semantic associations they have in common are quite different. English phraseology tends to universalize personal names and isolate them from specific cultural figures, but Uzbek phraseology tends to be more connected to concrete cultural, historical, and religious contexts. The results show that a purely linguistic approach is not sufficient to study anthroponymic phraseological units. To see their full semantic and cultural potential, a comparative and linguocultural perspective is required.

Conclusion and Recommendations. The study points out that anthroponymic phraseological units in English and Uzbek need to be studied from a theoretical and methodological perspective, with the semantic, cognitive, linguocultural, and comparative approaches. An integrated perspective of linguistic structure and cultural meaning for such studies is critical to better understand the conceptual mechanisms of phraseological semantics. Finally, research in this area should expand comparative

corpora, incorporate cross-disciplinary methods, and implement results into language teaching, translation studies, and lexicographic practice.

REFERENCES:

1. Amosova, N. N. (1963). *Fundamentals of English phraseology*. Leningrad: Leningrad State University Press.
2. Ashurova, D. U., & Galieva, M. R. (2018). *Cognitive linguistics*. Tashkent: Uzbekistan State World Languages University Press.
3. Baker, M. (2011). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
4. Cowie, A. P. (Ed.). (1998). *Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Fernando, C. (1996). *Idioms and idiomaticity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Kunin, A. V. (1996). *A course in modern English phraseology*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.
7. Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Linguoculturology*. Moscow: Academia.
8. Nida, E. A. (2001). *Language and culture: Contexts in translating*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
9. Rahmatullayev, Sh. (2000). *O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
10. Teliya, V. N. (1996). *Russian phraseology: Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects*. Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kultury.
11. Vinogradov, V. V. (1977). *Lexicology and lexicography*. Moscow: Nauka.
12. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding cultures through their key words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.