

## STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH ANTHROPONYMIC COMPONENTS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

**Olimova Muslimaxon Muzaffar qizi**

Magistrant, O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti

[muslimakhanolimova@gmail.com](mailto:muslimakhanolimova@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** This thesis presents the structural-semantic analysis of phraseological units with anthroponymic components in English and Uzbek. The study used comparative-contrastive, semantic, structural, morphological, and linguoculturological analysis methods to study semantic similarities, differences, and equivalents between phraseological units. By comparing the two languages, the importance of anthroponymic components in a social, historical, and cultural context was revealed. New methodological approaches based on the correspondence or differentiation of phraseological units were proposed. The results of the study expand scientific knowledge in the fields of linguistics and cultural studies, demonstrating the important role of phraseological units in the relationship between language and culture.

**Keywords:** phraseological units, anthroponymic components, structural-semantic analysis, cultural analysis, linguoculturology, personal names, semantic equivalence, translation strategies, national-cultural features.

**Annotatsiya.** Ushbu tezis ingliz va o'zbek tillarida antroponimik komponentli frazeologik birliklarning struktur-semantik tahlili keltirilgan. Tadqiqotda qiyosiy-kontrastiv, semantik, struktural, morfologik va lingvokulturologik tahlil usullari qo'llanilgan holda frazeologik birliklar o'rtasidagi semantik o'xshashliklar, farqlar va ekvivalentlar o'rganildi. Ikkala tilni taqqoslash orqali antroponimik komponentlarning ijtimoiy, tarixiy va madaniy kontekstdagi ahamiyati aniqlandi. Frazeologik birliklarning yozishmalari yoki farqlanishiga asoslangan yangi uslubiy yondashuvlar taklif etildi. Tadqiqot natijalari tilshunoslik va madaniyatshunoslik sohalaridagi ilmiy bilimlarni kengaytirib, frazeologik birliklarning til va madaniyat o'rtasidagi munosabatlardagi muhim rolini ko'rsatadi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** frazeologik birliklar, antroponimik komponentlar, struktur-semantik tahlil, madaniy tahlil, lingvokulturologiya, shaxs nomlari, semantik ekvivalentlik, tarjima strategiyalari, milliy-madaniy xususiyatlar.

**Introduction.** Every language best portrays the world picture, history, and culture of its people. Phraseological units play an important role in this because they are often translated indirectly and have pragmatic, multi-layered meanings unlike words. Phraseological units with anthroponymic components are expressions containing the names of famous historical, literary, or mythological figures. They add expressiveness and imagery to the language and also cultural and historical nuances.

This thesis was written to provide a comprehensive structural-semantic analysis of anthroponymic phraseologisms in English and Uzbek based on theoretical foundations and practical material, to identify their common and distinctive features, and to show ways to solve translation problems. The study analysed English-Language units mainly from Biblical, Shakespearean works and examples from Greco-Roman mythology ("Achilles' heel", "Pyrrhic victory", "in Abraham's bosom"), while Uzbek ones were

derived from folk oral fiction, The Epic “Alpomish”, and the anecdotes of Nasriddin Afandi (“Yusufdek go‘zal”, “Odam atodan qolgan”, “Musoning alamini Isodan olmoq”). These differences clearly demonstrate that the two languages belong to different language families (English is inflectional, Uzbek is agglutinative) and have unique cultural heritage.

#### I. Linguistic foundations of anthroponymy and phraseology

Anthroponyms are studied in linguistics as personal names and carry a special semantic load in the composition of phraseological units. The theoretical foundations of the science of phraseology are V.V. Vinogradov, A.V. Kunin and Uzbek scientists M. Mirtazhiyev, Sh. Rakhmatullayev is covered in his works. Anthroponymic phraseologisms, unlike ordinary phraseologisms, are associated with a specific person (historical, literary or folklore character) and preserve cultural codes. For example, the English phrase "as old as Adam" is based on a biblical story, while the Uzbek phrase "Odam atodan qolgan" is based on folklore. These units give not only meaning, but also social assessment and emotional color.

#### II. Distinctive features of anthroponymic phraseologisms in English and Uzbek

Anthroponymic phraseologisms in English often came from religious and literary sources. They are syntactically stable and consist of possessive forms (“Achilles’ heel”) or prepositional constructions. In Uzbek, however, units are morphologically flexible due to their agglutinative nature: the phrase "Yusufdek go‘zal" can be modified with various affixes. In terms of socio-cultural content, English phraseologisms reflect the codes of Western culture, while Uzbek phraseologisms reflect Eastern folklore and Islamic traditions. The study found that while English units have a more fixed (stable) structure, Uzbek ones have morphological flexibility.

#### III. Sources of origin and classification of anthroponymic phraseologisms

Historical and etymological analysis shows that English phraseologisms are mainly derived from religious and literary sources, while Uzbek phraseologisms are derived from folklore and oral creativity. They are classified semantically (by the evaluative component), structurally and functionally. Stylistically, they have high expressiveness and emotionality. As Monastretskaya (2018) noted, such units serve as a means of expressing human character, activity and social qualities.

#### IV. Structural analysis

The syntactic structure of anthroponymic phraseologisms has been found to be more fixed (stable) in English and more flexible in Uzbek. In terms of Morphology, the form of phraseological units can be changed with the help of affixes in Uzbek. We can take English phrase “Achilles’ heel” as it remains as a stable syntactic pattern, while the Uzbek phrase “Yusufdek go‘zal” can be adapted to different grammatical forms. This difference between two languages plays a key role in the translation process.

#### V. Semantic analysis

The analysis of denotative and connotative meanings showed that the units were formed through metaphor and metonymy. Semantic classification divided the groups into positive ("Yusufdek go‘zal"), negative ("raise Cain"), and neutral ("Joe Public"). As Abdusamadov (2022) points out, these units are also divided into two groups by the degree of equivalence: equivalent in English and Uzbek (“as old as Adam” – “Odam atodan qolgan”) and non – equivalent (“a Herculean task” - “Musoning alamini Isodan olmoq”).

#### VI. Pragmatic and stylistic analysis

In terms of their function in speech, these units convey emotional load and are used depending on the context. They represent human qualities, social assessment and cultural stereotypes in conversation and text. Discourse analysis has shown that anthroponymic phraseologisms have great expressive power in a communicative situation.

#### VII. Comparative analysis

Structurally-semantically and linguoculturologically, the common aspects are the universal expression of human qualities; the different aspects are cultural codes and structural features. In terms of the degree of equivalence, completely equivalent, partial and unique groups were separated. These differences suggest a distinct national worldview and historical experience.

#### VIII. Translation problems

Translation strategies: full equivalence, cultural adaptation, free translation, and annotation. Due to cultural differences, contextual adaptation is often required. In non-equivalent units, the translator must take into account cultural nuances.

#### IX. Role and prospects in modern linguistics

The importance of phraseology in modern research is increasing. The correct processing of anthroponymic units in artificial intelligence and machine translation systems is still insufficient. There are great opportunities for future research in this direction.

#### **Conclusion**

A structural and semantic analysis of phraseological units with anthroponymic components in English and Uzbek showed that these units preserve not only the linguistic, but also the cultural and historical heritage of the language. The new classification proposed by the study (based on the evaluation component and equivalence level) and translation strategies will be useful for translators, language teachers, and lexicographers. Future research should aim for a broader corpus and deeper analysis based on empirical material.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Abdusamadov Z.N. National and cultural features of anthroponymic component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages. PhD dissertation. – Tashkent: Uzbekistan State World Languages University, 2022.
2. Hovhannisyan A.V. Semantic and etymological classification of English and Uzbek phraseological units with personal names. Article. – Theoretical & Applied Science, 2020. – № 7 (87). – P. 227-230.
3. Kunin A.V. Kurs frazeologii sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka. Monograph. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1996.
4. Mirtojdiyev M. O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati [Phraseological Dictionary of the Uzbek Language]. Dictionary. – Tashkent: Fan, 2008.
5. Monastyretskaya O.V. Structural and semantic analysis of English phraseological units with the meaning "human character". Article. – Philology. Theory & Practice, 2018. – № 3. – P. 39-47.
6. Rahmatullayev Sh., Mahmudov N., Xolmanova Z., O'razova I., Rixsiyeva K. O'zbek tili frazeologik lug'ati [Explanatory Phraseological Dictionary of the Uzbek Language]. Dictionary. – Tashkent: G'afur G'ulom Publishing House, 2022. – 636 p.
7. Siefring J. (Ed.). Oxford Dictionary of Idioms. Dictionary. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

8. Superanskaya A.V. Obshchaya teoriya imeni sobstvennogo. Monograph. – Moscow: Nauka, 2009.
9. Vinogradov V.V. Russkiy yazyk. Grammaticheskoye ucheniye o slove. Monograph. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1986.
10. Xudoyorova S. Semantic and etymological classification of English and Uzbek phraseological units with personal names. Article. – Theoretical & Applied Science, 2020. – № 7 (87). – P. 227-230.