

LINGUOCULTURAL ASPECTS OF ZOONYMIC COMPONENT UNITS AND THEIR LEXICOGRAPHY

Visola Abdullaeva

Senior Teacher

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Samarkand, Uzbekistan.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18667078>

Abstract. *This article investigates phraseological and lexical units containing zoonymic components in Uzbek and English from linguocultural and lexicographic perspectives. The research aims to determine how animal names reflect national mentality, cultural values, and collective experience, as well as how these meanings are represented in dictionaries. The study identifies both universal associations and culturally specific interpretations. The results show that zoonymic expressions serve as important markers of cultural identity and require special treatment in lexicographic practice.*

Key words: *zoonym, phraseology, linguoculturology, lexicography, Uzbek language, English language, cultural semantics.*

Language is not only a system of grammar and vocabulary but also a repository of cultural knowledge. Words and expressions accumulate the historical experience of a people and transmit it from generation to generation. Among such units, phraseological expressions with animal names occupy a special place because they are closely connected with everyday life, beliefs, and symbolic thinking. Zoonymic components often emerge as a result of metaphorical transfer.

Observing animals, humans attribute certain qualities to them and later use these qualities to describe people. Over time, these associations become fixed and transform into stable linguistic formulas. Consequently, they turn into a valuable source for linguocultural research.

In the Uzbek language, zoonymic phraseology vividly reflects traditional lifestyle and moral evaluations. Expressions equivalent to "hungry like a wolf," "stubborn like a donkey," or "cunning like a fox" show how animal behavior is mapped onto human characteristics. Many of these images were formed in conditions where animal husbandry and close contact with nature played a central role. Therefore, they are deeply rooted in national consciousness. In English, similar metaphorical mechanisms can be observed. Lexicographic descriptions in works such as the Oxford English Dictionary demonstrate that animals like the lion, fox, bee, or dog possess relatively stable semantic associations. The lion symbolizes courage, the fox хитрость (cunning), the bee industriousness, and the dog loyalty or, in some contexts, humiliation. These meanings, however, may shift depending on pragmatic situation. From a linguocultural point of view, zoonymic units function as cultural codes. They help decode how a community interprets intelligence, bravery, laziness, or danger. For example, comparing a person to a donkey in Uzbek speech usually carries a negative evaluation, while in English similar semantics may be expressed by other animals. Such differences underline the importance of background knowledge.

An essential problem arises in translation. Direct equivalence is not always possible because the same animal may evoke different emotions in another culture.

A translator must therefore search for functional analogues rather than literal matches. Successful interpretation requires understanding not only vocabulary but also symbolic systems. Lexicography plays a crucial role in preserving and explaining zoonymic meanings. Dictionaries are expected to present accurate definitions, stylistic labels, usage examples, and cultural comments.

Without these explanations learners may misinterpret idioms. Modern lexicographic practice increasingly includes ethnolinguistic information, which makes dictionaries more informative.

In Uzbek lexicography, phraseological dictionaries traditionally focus on meaning and grammatical behavior. However, linguocultural commentary is becoming more common, allowing users to grasp national specificity. In English-speaking scholarship, explanatory dictionaries often provide etymological notes, historical background, and quotations from literature, which help trace semantic development. Another important aspect concerns classification. Zoonymic units can be grouped according to evaluative meaning (positive or negative), thematic sphere (character, appearance, social status), or degree of metaphorization.

Such typology facilitates comparative research and dictionary compilation. The development of bilingual dictionaries requires special attention. Compilers must identify whether a direct counterpart exists or whether descriptive translation is needed. In many cases, explanation may be more effective than substitution. This is particularly true for culturally marked expressions. Furthermore, corpus linguistics opens new perspectives for lexicography.

By analyzing authentic contexts, researchers can determine frequency, collocations, and pragmatic nuances. As a result, dictionary entries become more precise and user-oriented.

Teaching practice also benefits from linguocultural lexicography. When students learn why a certain animal symbolizes a specific trait, memorization becomes easier and intercultural competence improves. Thus, zoonymic phraseology becomes a bridge between languages.

Conclusion.

Zoonymic component units represent an intersection of language, culture, and cognition. In both Uzbek and English they reflect centuries of observation, belief, and evaluation. Their meanings are not limited to lexical definition but include rich cultural connotations. Therefore, lexicography must integrate semantic interpretation with linguocultural commentary. Only in this way can dictionaries adequately transmit the depth of phraseological imagery and assist translation, research, and language teaching.

References:

1. Maslova V.A. *Lingvokulturologiya: Uchebnoe posobie dlya studentov vishshix uchebnix zavedeniy.* — Moskva: Akademiya, 2001. — 208 p.
2. Ter-Minasova S.G. *Yazik i mejkulturnaya kommunikatsiya.* — Moskva: Slovo, 2000. — 624 p.

3. Telia V.N. Russkaya frazeologiya. Semanticheskiy, pragmaticheskiy i lingvokulturologicheskiy aspekti. — Moskva: Yaziki russkoy kulturi, 1996. – 288 p.
4. Rahmatullayev Sh. O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati. — Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1978. – 407 p.
5. Usmonova M. O'zbek tili zoonimlarining semantik-grammatik xususiyatlari: Filol. fanlari nomzodi ... diss. avtoreferati. — Toshkent, 1998.
6. Madayev O., Sobitova T. Xalq og'zaki poetik ijodi. — Toshkent: Sharq, 2010.
7. Dubichinskiy V.V. Lexicography and Dictionary Compilation. — Kharkov, 2009.
8. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. 5 jildlik. (Tahrir hay'ati: E.Begmatov, A.Madvaliyev va boshq.). — Toshkent: O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2006-2008.
9. Yusupov O.Q. Etno-lingvokulturologik tadqiqotlar metodologiyasi. — Toshkent, 2015.
10. Frazeologicheskiy slovar russkogo yazika. Pod red. A.I. Molotkova. — Moskva: Russkiy yazik, 1986.
11. Gulyamova Sh. "Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida zoonimik komponentli frazeologizmlarning qiyosiy tahlili." // Chet tillari filologiyasi jurnali. — Samarqand, 2021.
12. Oxford Learner's Dictionary of English Idioms. — Oxford University Press, 2010.