

**STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF
PHRASE-OLOGICAL UNITS WITH PROPER NAMES
(ON THE EXAMPLE OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH)**

Kakhramonova Zukhrakhon Sobirjon kizi

Student at National University of Uzbekistan for Master's degree

Field: Linguistics (English)

Scientific adviser: PhD., associate prof. M.M. Bolibekova

Abstract

Phraseological units, or fixed expressions, are an integral part of any language, often reflecting the cultural, historical, and linguistic heritage of a particular society. Among the diverse types of phraseological units, those that incorporate proper names, such as the names of people, places, or literary characters, are particularly fascinating to study. These phraseological units with proper names often carry unique connotations and meanings that go beyond the literal interpretation of the words, serving as vehicles for the transmission of cultural knowledge and social commentary.

This article aims to explore the structural and semantic characteristics of phraseological units with proper names, drawing examples from both the Uzbek and English languages. By comparing and contrasting these linguistic phenomena across the two languages, the study seeks to gain valuable insights into the cultural, historical, and linguistic factors that shape the formation and usage of such expressions.

Key Words: Phraseological Units, Idiomatic Expressions, Proper Names, Cultural Knowledge, Cross-Cultural Linguistics, Semantic Analysis, Conceptual Metaphors, Comparative Linguistics.

Introduction

The use of phraseological units, such as idioms, proverbs, and fixed expressions, is a ubiquitous feature of natural language, serving as a repository for the cultural, historical, and social nuances of a linguistic community. Within this broad category of multiword expressions, a particularly intriguing subset involves the incorporation of proper names – be they names of people, places, or literary/mythological figures. These phraseological units with proper names function as linguistic vehicles for the transmission of cultural knowledge, social commentary, and conceptual associations, often transcending the literal meaning of their individual components.

The present study aims to investigate the structural and semantic characteristics of phraseological units with proper names in the Uzbek and English languages. By adopting a comparative approach, the research seeks to uncover both the similarities and differences in the ways these linguistic constructs are employed within the two

language systems, shedding light on the intricate interplay between language, culture, and identity. The rationale for this comparative analysis is rooted in the recognition that the use of proper names within phraseological units is a complex phenomenon, shaped by a confluence of linguistic, cultural, and historical factors. While some phraseological units may be shared across languages due to shared cultural heritage or literary influences, others may be uniquely tied to the specific sociocultural contexts of a particular language community. By examining the structural patterns, semantic associations, and conceptual metaphors underlying the incorporation of proper names in Uzbek and English, this study aims to provide a more nuanced understanding of the role of these linguistic elements in the construction and transmission of cultural knowledge.

The findings of this research will contribute to the broader scholarly discourse on phraseology, semantics, and cross-cultural linguistics. By delving into the multifaceted characteristics of phraseological units with proper names, the study will offer insights into the ways in which language both shapes and reflects the cultural, social, and cognitive landscapes of its users. Moreover, the comparative analysis between Uzbek and English will provide a platform for exploring the universal and language-specific patterns in the use of proper names within fixed expressions, generating a more comprehensive understanding of this linguistic phenomenon.

Theoretical Background

The study of phraseological units, or fixed expressions, has been a longstanding area of interest in linguistics, with scholars exploring the various structural, semantic, and functional aspects of these linguistic phenomena. Phraseological units, which encompass idioms, collocations, proverbs, and other types of formulaic language, have been recognized as crucial components of a language's lexical system, reflecting the cultural, historical, and social experiences of its speakers.

Within the broader field of phraseology, the investigation of phraseological units with proper names has garnered growing attention in recent years. These linguistic constructions, which incorporate the names of people, places, or literary characters, are particularly intriguing as they often carry unique connotations and symbolic meanings that go beyond the literal interpretation of the words. Scholars have proposed various theoretical frameworks and approaches to the study of phraseological units with proper names. One prominent perspective is the cognitive-linguistic approach, which considers these expressions as reflections of the conceptual structures and metaphorical thinking processes of a language community (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Kövecses, 2010). From this viewpoint, the incorporation of proper names into phraseological units can be seen as a means of accessing and conveying culturally-specific knowledge, beliefs, and worldviews.

Another theoretical perspective is the sociolinguistic approach, which emphasizes

the role of phraseological units with proper names in the construction and negotiation of social identity, power dynamics, and cultural norms (Coulmas, 1981; Pamies, 2017). This approach examines how the use of such expressions can serve as a marker of group membership, social status, or cultural affiliation within a language community.

Additionally, some scholars have adopted a historical-comparative approach, analyzing the evolution and cross-cultural variation of phraseological units with proper names (Burger, 2007; Dobrovol'skij & Piirainen, 2005). This perspective explores the ways in which these linguistic constructions have been shaped by diachronic changes, language contact, and the interplay between local and global cultural influences.

Methodologically, the study of phraseological units with proper names has involved a range of qualitative and quantitative techniques, including corpus-based analyses, ethnographic observations, and experimental studies. Researchers have employed methods such as semantic categorization, structural classification, and comparative analyses to unveil the underlying patterns, functions, and cultural significances of these linguistic phenomena (Gottlieb, 2005; Piirainen, 2012).

The theoretical foundations and methodological approaches outlined in this section provide a solid framework for the analysis of phraseological units with proper names in the Uzbek and English languages, which will be the focus of the present study. By drawing on these established perspectives, the current investigation aims to contribute to the growing body of knowledge in the field of phraseology and to offer new insights into the linguistic and cultural dynamics that shape the use and interpretation of these unique linguistic constructions.

Methodology

The present study adopted a multi-faceted methodological approach to investigate the structural and semantic characteristics of phraseological units with proper names in the Uzbek and English languages. The primary data for this research was collected from a variety of sources, including dictionaries of Uzbek and English idioms and fixed expressions, corpora of literary works, media publications, and online forums, as well as ethnographic observations and interviews with native speakers. This comprehensive data collection process allowed for the identification of a robust set of phraseological units that incorporate proper names, such as the names of people, places, or literary characters.

To examine the structural characteristics of the identified phraseological units, the study employed a systematic classification scheme. This involved categorizing the expressions based on their grammatical structure, such as noun phrases, verb phrases, or clauses, as well as their degree of lexical and syntactic fixedness. The semantic analysis of the phraseological units with proper names utilized several complementary techniques. First, the expressions were grouped according to their core semantic fields, such as those related to personality traits, social relationships, cultural references, or

historical events. Second, drawing on cognitive linguistic principles, the study investigated the metaphorical mappings and conceptual associations underlying the use of proper names within the phraseological units. Finally, the researchers examined the pragmatic functions and contextual meanings of the phraseological units in relation to the cultural and communicative contexts in which they are used.

To unveil the similarities and differences between the Uzbek and English phraseological units with proper names, the study employed a systematic comparative approach. This involved identifying cognate or functionally equivalent expressions across the two languages, analyzing the structural and semantic parallels and divergences, and discussing the potential linguistic, cultural, and historical factors that shape these cross-linguistic patterns. The combination of these methodological techniques, drawing on both qualitative and quantitative analyses, allowed for a comprehensive investigation of the structural and semantic characteristics of phraseological units with proper names in the Uzbek and English languages. The findings of this study contribute to the broader understanding of the complex interplay between language, culture, and identity.

Results and Discussion

The analysis of the collected data revealed a rich tapestry of phraseological units with proper names in both the Uzbek and English languages. The findings of this study shed light on the multifaceted characteristics of these linguistic constructs, showcasing the intricate interplay between structure, semantics, and cross-cultural dynamics. The examination of the grammatical structure of the phraseological units with proper names highlighted several key patterns across the two language systems. In both Uzbek and English, a significant proportion of these expressions took the form of noun phrases, such as "Achilles' heel" and "Hamlet's dilemma." This structure allowed for the seamless integration of the proper name as a modifier or complement within the broader phraseological unit. Interestingly, verb-based phraseological units were more common in the Uzbek data, reflecting the language's greater tendency toward verbal constructions. Additionally, a number of the Uzbek expressions incorporated proper names within clausal structures, often drawing on the cultural and historical significance of the referenced individuals or places.

The semantic analysis of the phraseological units revealed that the incorporation of proper names served to evoke a wide range of conceptual associations and cultural references. In both languages, a significant number of the expressions were related to personality traits and character archetypes, such as "Don Juan" and "Scrooge," highlighting the richness of literary and mythological allusions embedded within these linguistic forms. Other semantic fields included social relationships ("Romeo and Juliet"), historical events ("Waterloo"), and literary/artistic traditions ("Midas touch"), demonstrating the diverse ways in which proper names are employed to encapsulate

complex cultural and social meanings.

The cognitive linguistic analysis of the phraseological units further illuminated the underlying conceptual metaphors that shaped the use of proper names within these fixed expressions. For example, the metaphorical mapping of "Achilles" onto the concept of a vulnerable or weak point was prevalent in both Uzbek and English, reflecting a shared cross-cultural association. Similarly, the association of "Midas" with the concept of excessive wealth or greed was observed across the two language systems, suggesting the universality of certain conceptual metaphors.

The comparative analysis of the Uzbek and English phraseological units revealed both similarities and differences in the ways that proper names are incorporated into these linguistic constructs. While some of the expressions, such as "Trojan horse" and "Pandora's box," were cognates or functional equivalents, others were unique to the cultural and historical contexts of each language community. For instance, the Uzbek phraseological unit "Amir Temur's sword" evoked the legacy of the renowned Timurid ruler, whereas the English expression "Achilles' heel" drew on the mythological figure of the Greek hero.

These findings suggest that the use of proper names within phraseological units is a complex phenomenon, shaped by a confluence of linguistic, cultural, and historical factors. The comparative analysis underscores the need to consider the nuanced contexts and conceptual associations that give rise to these linguistic phenomena.

Conclusion

This comparative study of phraseological units with proper names in the Uzbek and English languages has shed light on the rich tapestry of cultural, historical, and cognitive associations woven into these linguistic constructs. The analysis of the data revealed both similarities and differences in the ways that proper names are incorporated into fixed expressions within the two language systems, highlighting the intricate interplay between linguistic, cultural, and conceptual factors.

The examination of the grammatical structures of the phraseological units underscored the prevalence of noun-based constructions in both Uzbek and English, as well as the greater tendency toward verb-based expressions in the Uzbek language. This structural diversity reflects the nuanced ways in which proper names are embedded within the broader phraseological units, serving to evoke a wide range of conceptual associations and cultural references.

The semantic analysis of the data further illuminated the multifaceted roles that proper names play in these fixed expressions. Across both language communities, the incorporation of proper names was often linked to the evocation of personality traits, character archetypes, social relationships, historical events, and literary/artistic traditions. This finding highlights the rich cultural knowledge and social commentary that is encapsulated within these linguistic forms.

The comparative analysis of the Uzbek and English phraseological units revealed both shared conceptual metaphors, such as the association of "Achilles" with vulnerability, as well as language-specific expressions that were rooted in the unique cultural and historical contexts of each linguistic community. This cross-linguistic examination underscores the need to consider the nuanced contextual factors that shape the use of proper names within fixed expressions.

The insights gained from this study contribute to the broader scholarly understanding of phraseology, semantics, and cross-cultural linguistics. By delving into the multifaceted characteristics of phraseological units with proper names, the research has illuminated the ways in which language serves as a repository for cultural knowledge, social commentary, and conceptual associations. The comparative perspective, in particular, has provided a platform for exploring the universal and language-specific patterns in the employment of proper names within fixed expressions, offering a more comprehensive understanding of this linguistic phenomenon.

Moving forward, further research in this area could explore the diachronic developments and sociolinguistic variations in the use of phraseological units with proper names, as well as their pedagogical implications for language learning and intercultural communication. By continuing to investigate the intricate relationships between language, culture, and cognition, scholars can deepen their understanding of the rich complexities that underlie the use of proper names within the broader realm of phraseology.

References:

- Ackerman, F., & Webelhuth, G. (1998). *A theory of predicates*. CSLI Publications.
- Barkema, H. (1996). Idiomaticity and terminology: A multi-dimensional descriptive model. *Studia Linguistica*, 50(2), 125-160.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Cacciari, C., & Glucksberg, S. (1995). Imagining idiomatic expressions: Literal or figurative meanings? In M. Everaert, E. van der Linden, A. Schenk, & R. Schreuder (Eds.), *Idioms: Structural and psychological perspectives* (pp. 43-56). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Carter, R. (2012). *Vocabulary: Applied linguistic perspectives* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Childs, G. T. (1994). African ideophones. In L. Hinton, J. Nichols, & J. J. Ohala (Eds.), *Sound symbolism* (pp. 178-204). Cambridge University Press.
- Cowie, A. P. (1998). *Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications*. Clarendon Press.
- Dobrovolskij, D., & Piirainen, E. (2005). *Figurative language: Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives*. Elsevier.
- Fillmore, C. J., Kay, P., & O'Connor, M. C. (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of let alone. *Language*, 64(3), 501-538.
- Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in linguistics 1934-1951*. Oxford University Press.