

Linguocultural Specificity of English and Karakalpak Phraseological Units with Components of Zoonyms

Sagatova Zarima

Teacher of department of English Linguistics of KSU

Abstract: *The present article is devoted to studying English and Karakalpak phraseological units containing a zoonymic component. The phraseological fund of a language is closely connected with the national culture representing both its international constituent and its uniqueness. The group of phraseological units under consideration is one of the most widely presented in the phraseological fund of the English and Karakalpak languages. Animals symbolise various traits of human character, reflect this or that quality of a person that serves as a basis for creating of a phraseological unit. This article describes the common features and the differences of the linguocultures under consideration which are identified through the definition and linguocultural analysis of phraseological units. The similarities are mostly explained by the common origin of phraseological units, and the differences are based on the dissimilarity and peculiarities of English and Karakalpak peoples' ways of life, their traditions, customs, religion and geographical location.*

Keywords: *linguocultural specificity, phraseological unit, zoonymic component, connotation, meaning.*

Introduction

Language is a real treasure of each nation, that contains information about its ancestors, experience of previous generations and links the past of the nation with the present times and future. Language cannot be separated from the national culture, it reflects all the changes and peculiarities that happened during the language existence [2]. Phraseology is one of the special element of every nation and culture.

Just as everything in the universe is interconnected, so humanity is closely intertwined with nature. Proof of this is the naming or simulation of human behavior, character, and appearance with the names of animals or plants. From immemorial time, it has been customary for bad-tempered people to be likened to wild beasts, good-natured people to domestic animals, and sensitive, mobile people to some birds. Phraseological units are learned by dividing them into different groups and sections according to their expression and structure. Phraseologisms include various components, including somatic words, plants, flowers, natural phenomena, animal names, and more. Zoocomponent phraseological units are second only to somatic phraseology in terms of their activity in speech. Zoocomponent phraseological units have evolved as a result of long millennial relationships between humans and animals. Even today, many areas of human activity, such as agriculture, industry, sports, science, etc. related to animals. The human-animal relationship has also influenced language, forming a group of phrases with a zoonymic component in the lexical fund of the language. Zoononym component expressions are characterized by an anthropocentric feature.

Materials and Methods

The history of linguocultural study begins with the ideas of Wilhelm von Humboldt, who believed that the cultural originality and structure of the language are interconnected and complement each other [6]. In a number of works by prominent linguists (Maslova (2001), Shanskiy (1979), Telia (1996), Ter-Minasova (2001)) the fact that the most important translator of cultural originality in the language is a phraseological unit is highlighted. For example, Prof. Shanskiy writes: «In the language, in its lexical and phraseological fund the national character, mental quality, its history and culture can be found» [10]. This thought was also approved by foreign scholars, that is why we are interested in the linguocultural specificity from the phraseological point of view. Idiomatic expressions were mostly created by ordinary people, thus they are closely connected to everyday problems, interests and routine of those people [9]. Our forefathers tended to characterise their behaviour, feelings, states, appearance through animal images, as they believed in kinship between human beings and beasts. It explains the fact that the zoonymic layer of any language is one of the oldest. The first calendar with the names of animals appeared in the Ancient East, and people believed that a child born in the year of a particular animal inherits specific features of this animal. Moreover, even primitive tribes chose an animal as a symbol of their community and made it sacral. That is why the comparisons, sayings, proverbs and idioms that have a zoonymic component can be found in many languages. Many denominations of animals have become steady metaphors.

Before speaking about the practical examples and results of our research, we should state the definition of a «phraseological unit», as this topic is still disputable among linguists. Most scholars agree that the most common features of a phraseological unit are semantic indivisibility, shortness and figurativeness. Prof. Shanskiy writes «phraseological unit is a ready-made, reproducible unit, the content and form of which are fixed» [10]. Prof. Akhmanova considers that in a phraseological unit the meaning of the whole expression prevails over the meaning of each component [4]. But in English linguistics the term «phraseological unit» is not

commonly used, the term «idiom» is preferable there. Let us clarify if the difference between these linguistic phenomena is crucial. The definition provided by Longman dictionary presents the idiom as «a group of words that has a special meaning that is different from the ordinary meaning of each separate word». Thus, we may say that the discussed problem is more or less the same. Prof. Sh. Abdinazimov considers that phraseological unit shows itself the important cultural rites, ceremonies, because it is based on cultural-national introduction to the world. In his work “Linguoculture” he claimed that mostly phraseological units with the component of zoonym in Karakalpak language used for comparing with man and acts around him, especially to describe the character of a person [1].

Results and Discussion

The definition of the term «zoonym» is also a disputable issue. Most researchers give the following definition: «Zoonym is a name of an animal, that is given by people» [8] or «lexico-semantic variations of words, that stand for the generic name of an animal» [7] or «a denomination of an animal proper». In our research we use a combination of these definitions. We distinguish five main groups of phraseological units according to the type of the zoonymic component:

1. Mammals:
 - domestic: *sheep, dog, cat, cow, horse, goat, hare, donkey, pig*;
 - wild: *fox, bear, wolf, lion, rat, ape*;
2. Birds:
 - domestic: *rooster, chicken, goose, duck, cock*;
 - wild: *bird, sparrow, crow, lark, owl, pigeon, hawk*;
3. Reptiles: *crocodile, snake/serpent*
4. Fish, arthropods: *fish, crayfish*
5. Insects: *bee, fly, ant*.

The most productive semes belong to the domestic mammals group as people tend to mention animals familiar to them, which they can see quite often in their everyday life. The names of any kind of exotic or mythical animals are exploited significantly rarely. This fact is reflected in both languages. Phraseological units according the equivalents may be classified into the following groups:

Phraseological units equivalents which demonstrate full lexical and grammatical conformity: *old fox – qari tulki (sly, experienced)*; *hungry wolf – ash bo’ri (always hungry)*;

Phraseological units – analogues which has two subtypes:

- Structural semantic analogues which demonstrates the grammatical structure and the meaning: *take the bull by the horns – maldi shaqinan uslaw (to know the weak point of someone)*; *be like a horse – attay boliv (be healthy)*;

- Semantic analogues which demonstrates only conformity of meaning, but different structure and different components (animals) are used: *when pigs fly – tu’yenin’ quyrig’I jerge tiygende (after a long period or never)*; *lab rat – tajriybe qoyani (being experimented)*;

Phraseological units without equivalents: *camel’s nose* (used for a situation where the permitting of a small act opens the door for larger actions) – *qarlig’ash qanati* (used for describing the eye-brow of women); white elephant (a purchase that was not used, a useless object) – *iyttey u’riw* (to tell someone something but as a result that man do not want to listen to him or after some moments do not remember about what was said).

What is more, when using any animal name, people used to note mostly negative features and transfer them to people’s characters. That is why the number of phraseological units with negative connotation prevails over the number idioms with positive connotation.

«*fox sleep*» informal a state of apparent sleep (or feigned indifference) in which someone is actually aware of everything going on around them – it alludes to the idea that foxes sleep with one eye open and thus are always at the ready

«*jer astida jilan qiymildasa biliv*» (to know where the snake is going under the ground) phraseological unit is used for describing a person who is aware of everything what is happening around him

These two phraseological units seem to be semantically close for the first sight but in real they are absolutely different from each other. As far as we should pay attention to the word “sleep” in the first phraseological unit that it comes here in direct connotation while in the second phraseological unit the word “jer astinda” (under the ground) loses its real meaning and gives figurative one.

Also, the fact that some semes have only negative connotation in both languages must be pointed out. For example, phraseological units with such components as «*ass*» (or «*donkey*»), «*goat*», «*rat*» are surely to have negative meaning both in the English and Karakalpak languages. Compare the connotation of the component «*goat*» in two phraseological units (English, Karakalpak):

«*act the goat*» informal to behave comically or playfully, often to amuse others/ deliberately behave in a silly or foolish way

Note: goats are often associated with unpredictable behavior.

Ex: Stop acting the goat or I'll send you out. I'm warning you.

«*bazar ko'rgen eshki* (the goat that have been in the bazaar) » informal phraseological unit is used for describing a person who acts who acts in careful and tricky way and having much more experience in mentioned situation

It may be clearly seen that the semes have negative meaning in both languages. At the same time, the negative features represented by the zoonym in question differ in the two linguocultures that defines their specificity.

Conclusion

Analysing the phraseological fund of the English and Karakalpak languages we may come to the conclusion that meanings, connotations and images that are presented with the help of the zoonymic component may be unique and at the same time universal for each language, they represent the cultural identity of nations. Some similar concepts have different meanings and connotations in each language; some are productive in Karakalpak language and non-productive in English and vice versa. All these facts prove that international and unique linguocultural components can be found in any language.

References

1. Abdinazimov Sh., Tolibaev X. Lingvokulturologiya. – Nukus: Karakalpakstan, 2020. – p.158
2. Alefirenko N.F. Lingvokulturologiya. – M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2010. – p.399
3. Amosova N.N. The basis of English Phraseology. – L.: Leningrad University Press, 1963. – p.208
4. Axmanova O.S. About the principles and methods of linguostylistic research. – M.: Moscow University Press, 1966. – p.183
5. Vinogradov V.V. Russian language. Grammatical learning of word. – 3rd edition. – M.: High School Press, 1986. – p.693
6. Gumboldt V. The best works in language learning – M.: Progress, 1984. – p.397
7. Lavrova O.V. Stranavedcheskiy component nazvaniy jivotnix v aspekte mejkulturnoy kommunikatsii: dis. ... cand. ped. nauk: 13.00.02 – Saint Petersburg, 2009. – p.265
8. Podolskaya N.B. Russian dictionary of onomatopoeic words. – M.: Nauka, 1978. –p.199
9. Ter-Minasova S.G. Language and intercultural communication. – M.: Slovo, 2000. – p.624
10. Shansky N.M. Phraseology of modern Russian language: for the students of higher education of department «Russian language and literature». – 4th ed.,– Saint Petersburg: Spetsiyalnay literatura, 1996. – p.192

ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНАЯ СПЕЦИФИКА ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ С КОМПОНЕНТОМ ЗООНИМОМ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И КАРАКАЛПАКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аннотация: Данная статья посвящена изучению английских и каракалпакских фразеологических единиц с компонентом-зоонимом. На современном этапе развития лингвистическая наука проявляет повышенный интерес к проблеме взаимосвязи языка и культуры. Каждый язык отражает особенности национальной культуры и менталитета народа, понимание которых может вызвать трудности у носителей других языков. Фразеологический фонд национального языка характеризуется высокой степенью национальной самобытности, являясь своеобразным кладом знаний о культуре народа, поэтому именно фразеологизмы зачастую выступают материалом лингвокультурологических исследований. Рассматриваемая нами группа фразеологизмов является одной из широко представленных в фразеологическом фонде английского и каракалпакского языков. В данных фразеологических единицах животные символизируют различные положительные и отрицательные черты характера, те или иные личные качества человека, что является основой для создания фразеологизма. Наше исследование нацелено на описание сходств и различий, сопоставляемых лингвокультур, выявленных с помощью

дефиниционного и лингвокультурного анализа фразеологических единиц, содержащих компонент-зооним. Сходства в большинстве своём обусловлены общим происхождением фразеологических единиц, тогда как различия основываются на отличиях и особенностях быта, традиций и обычаев, религии и географическом положении народов.

Ключевые слова: лингвокультурная специфика, фразеологическая единица, компонент-зооним, коннотация, значение.