

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2020 Issue: 11 Volume: 91

Published: 10.11.2020 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Shaxzoda Toxirjon qizi Yusupova
Fergana State University
teacher

Feruzabonu Anvar qizi Anvarova
Fergana State University
student

LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL INVESTIGATION OF ZOONYMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Abstract: The article illuminates linguoculturology and its main notion linguocultureme and linguoculturological features of certain zoonyms were investigated.

Key words: linguoculturology, linguocultureme, linguoculturological unit, lexeme, zoonym.

Language: English

Citation: Yusupova, S. T., & Anvarova, F. A. (2020). Linguoculturological investigation of zoonyms in English and Uzbek. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 11 (91), 78-80.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-91-18> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.11.91.18>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Learning languages comparatively and identifying peculiarities of different languages through their linguoculturological aspects are essential in the processes of globalization and integration. Because it is important to know similarities and dissimilarities between cultures of different nations while communicating. The need to know linguoculturological features of lexemes of certain systems in different languages shows the importance of the theme.

It is obvious that learning language without culture is difficult, language and culture unquestionably necessitate one another. Especially, the combination of language and cultural studies is important while teaching a foreign language. It means that learning the culture of the nation of which language is being learned has a significant role. And vice versa, while learning the culture of some nation, language materials are also taken into account.

While talking about the culture of a certain nation, one should think of countless things as its traditions, principles, values, beliefs, rituals, lifestyle, clothes, eating habits as well as thinking of the members of those people. And these factors function as the most important for gaining knowledge about

culture. Language is also one of the factors that were counted above: words or expressions, or language signs that are used by one nation might be appropriate only for that nation. Or one word could be used by one nation in one way, by another one in different way, in diverse meanings. For example, the word “aunt” is used for both father’s sister and mother’s sister in English. But Uzbek people have dissimilar - special names for father’s sister and for mother’s sister. Father’s sister is called “amma”, while aunt from mother’s side is called “xola”. Furthermore, in Uzbek culture elderly women are usually called “xola” even if she is not relative at all. As we see, in Uzbek the word “xola” has wider meaning. In this case one lexeme can express “national language picture of the world”. Because as Kornilov said, “How many the languages, so many the national pictures of the world are”.

Many linguists consider that “concept” is the main notion of linguoculturology. For instance, according to V.A.Maslova “concept is a semantic structure that includes linguoculturological peculiarities and characterizes the holders of certain ethnoculture in different ways”. [1.50]

Stepanov gives dissimilar definition: “Linguoculturological concept - ...is the cultural

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHIQ (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.997	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

compilation in human’s mind; a form that brings culture to human’s mental world. From the second point of view, concept is the means that brings humankind to culture, in some cases, it effects culture when it is used by people”.[2.40]

It is right that concepts may include linguoculturological peculiarities or certain concepts may depict linguoculturological notion. But we think that since concept is the term that is main for cognitive approaches, it is somehow wrong to define concept as a main notion of linguoculturology.

Some linguists use the term “linguocultureme” for language units containing cultural elements. [3.43] According to our opinion, this term is appropriate as it can express any language unit of linguoculturology and is scientific enough to apply.

Moreover, term “linguoculturological unit” can also be used as a leading notion for linguoculturology.

Consequently, linguocultureme or linguoculturological unit –is a language unit that contains cultural elements showing peculiarities of worldview and national language picture of certain nations.

Names of animals can help to reveal similarities and differences between languages and cultures. For

instance, particular animals are sacred in some nations and people try to be more careful and show respect to those animals. Demonstrating high deference towards cow, elephant and goat can be a good symbol in this situation. These animals are holy only for Indians and not so important in other cultures. Comparative linguoculturological analysis of zoonyms in English and Uzbek will help us to reveal resemblances and dissimilarities between languages and nations.

Names of animals have various shades of meaning according to their biological features and connotative meanings that are peculiar to animals. For example, a fox is a symbol of cunning and misleading people. *The battle was now entirely terminated, with the exception of the protracted struggle between Le Renard Subtil and Le Gros Serpent. (Le Renard Subtil – the clever fox, French name for Magua because of his sly craftiness.) “The last of the Mohicans” by James Fennimore Cooper.*

Therefore, connotative meanings of zoonyms might be unique or dissimilar for different nations. Figure 1 shows biological features of dog, while Figure 2 eliminates connotative meanings of the lexeme “dog”.

Meaning	English	Uzbek
Animal	*	*
Mammal	*	*
Vertebrate	*	*
With four legs	*	*
Lives on the land	*	*
With tale	*	*
Furry	*	*

Figure 1.

Meaning	English	Uzbek
Friend of a human being	*	*
Guard	*	*
Loyal, faithful	*	*
A servant	-	*
Unattractive woman	*	-
Someone who gives information about people to the police or to another authority	* (Great Britain)	-
Something that is of bad quality or very unsuccessful	* (Australia)	-
Idleness	* (USA)	-

Figure 2.

As a symbol of stable simile, dog is usually used for defining loyalty. This can be seen in English as well as Uzbek:

“Poor Wolf,” he would say, “thy mistress leads thee a dog’s life of it; but never mind, my lad, whilst I live thou shalt never want a friend to stand by thee!”

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.997
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Wolf would wag his tail, look wistfully in his master's face, and if dogs can feel pity, I verily believe he reciprocated the sentiment with all his heart...

“Rip Van Winkle” by Washington Irving.

*Ит вафо, хотин жафо. Ўзбек халқ мақоли.
(Dog is loyal, but wife is not. Uzbek proverb)*

As we have seen in Figure 2, in English, dog is seen as a symbol of idleness in some cases. Let's see it with examples:

Rip's sole domestic adherent was his dog Wolf, who was as much hen-pecked as his master;

for Dame Van Winkle regarded them as companions in idleness, and even looked upon Wolf with an evil eye, as the cause of his master's going so often astray. “Rip Van Winkle” by Washington Irving.

Analyzing the denotative and connotative meanings of the lexeme “dog”, we can verily say that “dog” – is a linguocultureme, that shows national and cultural features of English and Uzbek.

References:

1. Maslova, V.A. (2008). *Kognitivnaja lingvistika*. Minsk: TetraSistems.
2. Stepanov, Jy.S. (1997). *Konstanty. Slovar` russkoj kul`tury. Opyt issledovanija*. Moscow.
3. Tokarev, G.V. (2009). *Lingvokul`turologija. Uchebnoe posobie*. Tula: Izdatel'stvo TGPU imeni L.N.Tolstogo.
4. Farxodjonova, N. F. (2016). *Problemi primeneniya innovatsionnix texnologiy v obrazovatel'nom protsesse na mejdunarodnom urovne*. Mejdunarodnaya konferentsiya. Innovatsionnie tendentsii, sotsial'no-ekonomicheskie i pravovie problemi vzaimodeystviya v mejdunarodnom prostranstve.(pp. 58-61).
5. Numonjonov, S. D. (2020). Innovative methods of professional training. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 01 (81), pp. 747-750.
6. Ergashev, I., & Farxodjonova, N. (2020). Integration of national culture in the process of globalization. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, T. 7, №. 2, pp. 477-479.
7. Farxodjonova, N. F. (2018). History modernization and integration of culture. *Teorija i praktika sovremennoj nauki*, №. 3, pp. 13-15.
8. Selevko, G.K. (1998). *Sovremennye obrazovatelnye tehnologii: Uchebnoe posobie*. Moscow: Narodnoe obrazovanie.
9. Farxodjonova, N. F. (2018). Modernization and globalization as historical stages of human integration. *Teorija i praktika sovremennoj nauki*, №. 3, pp. 16-19.
10. Farxodjonqizi, F. N., & Dilshodjonugli, N. S. (2020). Innovative processes and trends in the educational process in Uzbekistan. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, T. 10, №. 4, pp. 621-626.