

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH ETHNONYMIC COMPONENTS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Jabborov Fakhridin

Termez university of economy and service

Abstract

Phraseological units containing ethnonymic components reflect cultural stereotypes, historical experience, and national worldview. This article presents a comparative analysis of ethnonym-based phraseological units in Uzbek and English. The study examines their semantic features, structural patterns, and cultural connotations. By analyzing selected examples, similarities and differences between the two languages are identified. The findings show that while both languages employ ethnonyms to express evaluation and imagery, the cultural motivations and pragmatic functions often differ. The research contributes to contrastive phraseology and intercultural linguistics.

Keywords: Phraseology, ethnonym, Uzbek language, English language, comparative linguistics, cultural semantics

Introduction

Phraseological units are a significant part of any language, reflecting the collective experience, mentality, and cultural values of its speakers. Among them, phraseological units containing ethnonymic components occupy a special place, as they directly relate language to ethnic identity and cultural perception.

Ethnonyms are names of nations, ethnic groups, or peoples (e.g., *English*, *Uzbek*, *French*). When used in phraseological units, they often convey stereotypical features, historical associations, or evaluative meanings. Studying such expressions allows linguists to explore how different cultures perceive themselves and others.

This article aims to conduct a comparative analysis of ethnonymic phraseological units in Uzbek and English, focusing on their semantics, structure, and cultural background.

Theoretical Background

Phraseological units are defined as stable combinations of words with partially or fully transferred meanings. According to Vinogradov and Kunin, they are characterized by stability, idiomaticity, and reproducibility.

Ethnonymic phraseological units include an ethnonym as one of their components. These units often arise from:

- historical events,
- intercultural contact,
- social stereotypes,
- national character traits.

In modern linguistics, such units are studied within ethnolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and cultural semantics.

Ethnonymic Phraseological Units in English

English contains a considerable number of phraseological units with ethnonymic components. Some examples include:

- *Dutch courage* – false bravery induced by alcohol
- *French leave* – leaving without permission
- *Indian summer* – a period of warm weather in autumn

These expressions often reflect historical relations between nations. For instance, many English expressions with *Dutch* originated during Anglo-Dutch conflicts and often carry negative connotations.

Structurally, English ethnonymic phraseological units are commonly adjective + noun combinations or noun phrases. Semantically, they tend to express evaluation, irony, or metaphorical meaning.

Ethnonymic Phraseological Units in Uzbek

Uzbek phraseology also contains ethnonym-based expressions, though they are generally fewer and often more context-dependent. Examples include:

- *Arab harfi* – something difficult to understand
- *Xitoy devori* – something extremely strong or impenetrable
- *Ruscha gap* – formal or official speech

Unlike English, Uzbek ethnonymic phraseological units often emphasize cultural distance, education, or historical influence rather than negative stereotypes.

Structurally, Uzbek units frequently appear as noun phrases or attributive constructions. Their meanings are closely connected to historical trade routes, religion, and cultural exchange.

Comparative Analysis

A comparison of Uzbek and English ethnonymic phraseological units reveals both similarities and differences:

Similarities:

- Both languages use ethnonyms metaphorically.
- Many expressions are culturally motivated.
- Ethnonyms function as evaluative markers.

Differences:

- English shows a higher number of negatively connoted ethnonymic units.
- Uzbek expressions are more neutral or descriptive.
- Historical conflict plays a stronger role in English phraseology.

These differences reflect distinct historical and intercultural experiences of the two language communities.

Conclusion

Ethnonymic phraseological units are valuable linguistic material for understanding national mentality and cultural perception. The comparative analysis of Uzbek and English shows that while both languages employ ethnonyms in phraseology, their semantic orientation and cultural motivation differ significantly.

This study highlights the importance of cultural context in phraseological meaning and contributes to the development of comparative and intercultural linguistics.

List of Used Literature

1. Kunin, A. V. *English Phraseology: Theoretical Aspects*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola, 1996.
2. Vinogradov, V. V. *Lexicology and Phraseology of the Russian Language*. Moscow: Nauka, 1977.
3. Cowie, A. P., Mackin, R., & McCaig, I. R. *Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
4. Fernando, C. *Idioms and Idiomaticity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
5. Crystal, D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
6. Gibbs, R. W. *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
7. Lyons, J. *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
8. Norrick, N. R. *Proverbs in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1985.
9. Mieder, W. *Proverbs: A Handbook*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2004.

10. Dobrovol'skij, D., & Piirainen, E. *Idioms: Motivation and Etymology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005.
11. Rahmatullayev, Sh. *O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati*. Toshkent: Fan, 1992.
12. Hojiyev, A. *O'zbek tili leksikologiyasi*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1998.
13. Karimov, S. *O'zbek tilida frazeologizmlar va ularning semantik xususiyatlari*. Toshkent: Fan, 2005.
14. Sapir, E. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1921.
15. Whorf, B. L. *Language, Thought, and Reality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1956.

