

ZOONYMS IN THE LINGUISTIC WORLDVIEW OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH SPEAKERS: A COMPARATIVE LINGUOCULTURAL STUDY

Mamatova Dilafróz Murodilla qizi

Namangan davlat chet tillar instituti 1-kurs doktoranti

mamatovadilafruz373@gmail.com

+998 99 511-21-31

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23016252>

ANNOTATSIYA. Mazkur maqolada o‘zbek va ingliz tillaridagi zoonimlarning lingvokulturologik va semantik xususiyatlari qiyosiy jihatdan tadqiq etiladi. Tadqiqotda hayvon nomlarining nominativ ma’nosi bilan bir qatorda ularning ko‘chma, metaforik, ramziy va milliy-madaniy mazmunlari tahlil qilinadi. Zoonimlarning xalqning tarixiy tajribasi, turmush tarzi, dunyoqarashi, mentaliteti va madaniy qadriyatlarini ifodalashdagi o‘rni ochib beriladi. Shuningdek, zoonimlarning inson xarakteri, xatti-harakati va ijtimoiy munosabatlarini tavsiflashdagi antropotsentrik xususiyatlariga e’tibor qaratiladi. O‘zbek va ingliz tillarida bir xil hayvon nomiga beriladigan madaniy va baholovchi ma’nolarning o‘xshash hamda farqli jihatlari aniqlanadi. Tadqiqot natijalari zoonimlar nafaqat hayvonot olami vakillarini nomlovchi leksik birliklar, balki muayyan xalqning lingvomadaniy tajribasi va milliy dunyoqarashini aks ettiruvchi muhim til birliklari ekanligini ko‘rsatadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: zoonim, zoonimik birlik, lingvokulturologiya, lingvomadaniyat, milliy-madaniy semantika, metafora, ramz, hayvon obrazi, milliy mentalitet, qiyosiy tahlil.

АННОТАЦИЯ. В статье проводится сопоставительное исследование лингвокультурологических и семантических особенностей зоонимов в узбекском и английском языках. Наряду с номинативным значением названий животных анализируются их переносные, метафорические, символические и национально-культурные значения. Раскрывается роль зоонимов в отражении исторического опыта, образа жизни, мировоззрения, менталитета и культурных ценностей народа. Особое внимание уделяется антропоцентрическому характеру зоонимов, проявляющемуся в характеристике человеческого характера, поведения

и социальных отношений. Выявляются сходства и различия в культурной и оценочной интерпретации одних и тех же названий животных в узбекском и английском языках. Результаты исследования показывают, что зоонимы представляют собой не только лексические единицы, обозначающие представителей животного мира, но и важные языковые средства репрезентации лингвокультурного опыта и национального мировосприятия.

Ключевые слова: зооним, зоонимическая единица, лингвокультурология, лингвокультура, национально-культурная семантика, метафора, символ, образ животного, национальный менталитет, сопоставительный анализ.

ABSTRACT. This article provides a comparative study of the linguocultural and semantic features of zoonyms in Uzbek and English. Alongside the nominative meanings of animal names, their figurative, metaphorical, symbolic, and national-cultural meanings are examined. The study explores the role of zoonyms in representing the historical experience, lifestyle, worldview, mentality, and cultural values of a nation. Particular attention is paid to the anthropocentric nature of zoonyms, which is manifested in their use to characterize human personality, behavior, and social relations. The similarities and differences in the cultural and evaluative interpretations of the same animal names in Uzbek and English are identified. The findings demonstrate that zoonyms are not merely lexical units denoting representatives of the animal world but also important linguistic means of representing a people’s linguocultural experience and national worldview.

Keywords: zoonym, zoonymic unit, linguoculturology, linguoculture, national-cultural semantics, metaphor, symbol, animal image, national mentality, comparative analysis.

INTRODUCTION. The history of a nation is inextricably linked with its national values and cultural history. The lifestyle, worldview, culture, and ethnographic characteristics of every nation with its own historical development and cultural evolution are reflected in examples of oral folklore, particularly in proverbs. Zoonymic units are present in the lexical wealth of every language and serve to express conclusions about nature and society, as well as positive and negative situations associated with human behavior and actions, thereby enhancing expressiveness. Studies devoted to

the analysis of zoonyms and texts containing zoonymic components in both global and Uzbek linguistics are predominantly historical, lexico-semantic, and functional-stylistic in nature, focusing on the semantic characteristics of animal names that occupy an important place in human society.

LITERATURE REVIEW. Research on zoonyms occupies a significant position in global linguistics. In particular, linguists such as Ch. Inkuy, A.P. Kosmenko, E.A. Kreinovich, E.S. Novik, E.V. Antonova, S.P. Nesterov, Y. Vinokurova, E. Leverovskiy, P. Minorskiy, and G.I. Kulikovskiy have investigated lexemes with the archiseme of “animal.” Among these studies, works published in the second half of the nineteenth century are of particular importance. In particular, the works of E. Leverovskiy, P. Minorskiy, G.I. Kulikovskiy, and others are noteworthy. One of the significant aspects of Y. Vinokurova’s research is her attention to animals associated with religious beliefs in the traditional Vepsian worldview. Prior to I. Vinokurova’s research, the concept of religion, including its application to animals, had been examined by scholars such as E.A. Kreinovich, E.S. Novik, E.V. Antonova, and S.P. Nesterov. [1, 464-b.]

METHODOLOGY. It has been particularly emphasized that worshipping the animal itself, rather than its image or statue, constitutes totemism, understood as a complex of beliefs and rituals characteristic of tribal society.

A.P. Kosmenko emphasizes the important role of folk visual art in the study of mythological representations. Although such art may reproduce information obtained from other sources, it can nevertheless serve as a reliable and significant source of evidence. I. Mullonen draws attention to the fact that animals and plants constitute the basis of Vepsian toponyms and anthroponyms. The scholar provides a comprehensive analysis of Russian zoonymic components semantically related to the Vepsian language and characterizes them from a linguocultural perspective. The study follows the tradition of classifying Russian terms containing zoonymic components into semantic groups and revealing their national and cultural characteristics. Ch. Inkuy, in his doctoral dissertation, analyzes the semantic development of zoonyms. In particular, he identified 127 animal names used in descriptions of people: 52 of them referred to wild animals, 75 to domestic animals, 15 to insects, 11 to general animal categories, 10 to fish, 7 to amphibious animals, and 5 to unicellular organisms. In the general

analysis of zoonyms used in the language, three major categories were identified: the semantic function of the animal image, its cultural-symbolic content, and its mental-cognitive characteristics.[2, 384, 388-b.] In V. Porkhomovskiy’s research, Turkish proverbs were analyzed from morphological and syntactic perspectives. N. Trubachev notes that European hunters, fishermen, and farmers traditionally avoid pronouncing the names of dangerous or harmful animals during hunting seasons. He also points out that in Sweden, Finland, Estonia, and other countries, forest animals such as bears and wolves have traditionally been referred to by affectionate, flattering, ironic, or euphemistic nicknames. The history of the study of zoonyms among Turkic peoples can be traced back to the work *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk* (Compendium of the Turkic Languages). This unique masterpiece of the Turkic peoples contains more than 300 poetic excerpts related to oral folklore, as well as 291 proverbs and sayings. Approximately 200 zoonyms, including nearly 100 bird names, occur in these texts. *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk* played a significant role in the development of linguistics. The main part of the work is a dictionary containing more than 7,500 Turkic words. In addition, it contains more than 300 poetic excerpts from oral folklore and 291 proverbs and sayings. Nearly 200 zoonyms, including approximately 100 bird names, are found in these texts.[3, 12,15-b.]

It should be emphasized that domestic animals, particularly horses, occupied a special place in the lives of the Turkic peoples. The author himself provides the names of various types of horses and explains their characteristics. For example, *yağız at* refers to a dark-colored horse; *yugruk at* denotes a horse that wins races; *iqilaç* refers to a lively and swift horse; *uğar at* is a horse with a white mark on its forehead; *öküş jilqi* denotes a stubborn horse; *erik at* refers to an ambling horse; *ulduq at* means a horse without horseshoes; and *qir at* denotes a light-colored horse.

Horse names are also reflected in Turkic proverbs. For example:

Alp erig jawritma, iqilaç arqasın jag’ritma — “Do not hurt or weaken a brave man; do not make the back of a swift horse sore.”

The book also contains the names of numerous animals, ranging from common domestic animals to rare wild animals inhabiting remote and inaccessible areas, along with interesting information about them. For example, *arqar* means “female mountain goat”; *alavan* means “crocodile”; *azg’iraq* means “deer”; *yunaq* means “donkey”; *yag’an* means “elephant”;

yamlan denotes a rodent; yilon means “snake”; and yarbuz refers to an animal believed to kill snakes. One proverb states:

Yilon yarbuzdan qochar, qancha borsa, yarbuz otru kelur — “The snake always flees from the yarbuz; wherever it goes, the yarbuz follows it.”

Several other proverbs containing zoonymic components can also be found in the work:

Atan jüki ash bolsa, açqa az körünür — “Even if a camel’s load is food, it seems insufficient to a hungry person.”

Og’laq jiliksiz, og’lan biliksiz — “A kid has no marrow, and a young child has no wisdom.”

İñän inräsä, botu bozlar — “When a female camel groans, the male camel bellows.”

Alp erig jawritma, iqilaç arqasın jag’ritma — “Do not hurt or weaken a brave man; do not make the back of a swift horse sore.” [4, 54, 56- b.]

The work *Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk* by Mahmud ibn Husayn ibn Muhammad al-Kashgari, an eleventh-century ethnographer, philologist, and one of the founders of comparative-historical linguistics, is an invaluable source for all Turkic peoples. As S. Rustamova points out, the *Dīwān* contains the names of objects essential to the lives of the Turks, names of tribes and clans, honorary titles, various positions and offices, food products, wild and domestic animals, poultry and wild birds, plants, astrological terms, the folk calendar, names of months, weeks and days, geographical terms, cities, diseases, anatomical terms, metals and minerals, military terminology, and administrative terms. The work contains such a wide range of information that its comprehensive analysis and description would require many years.[5,124, 125-b.]

RESULTS. Domestic animals, in particular, occupied a special place in the everyday life of Turkic peoples. For example, a sheep is a domesticated, even-toed, ruminant mammal raised for its meat, wool, milk, and skin. Sheep are believed to have descended from the wild mouflon and were domesticated approximately 8,000 years ago.

The linguistic characteristics of zoonyms and texts containing zoonymic components have also been studied by scholars such as D.Kh. Bazarova, H.A. Saidova, J. Metyakubov, B.B. Abdushukurov, N.R. Nishonova, B. Zaripov, B.M. Jo’rayeva, D.M. Yo’ldosheva, G.E. Hakimova, A.J. Omonturdiyev, Sh. Noraliyeva, and D.A. Tosheva. Their studies address

zoonyms in Turkic written sources, the stages of formation of zoological terminology, the role of proverbs in the linguistic system, their semantic and stylistic characteristics, semantic shifts of zoonyms, their role in creating literary devices and expressing human character, the semantic analysis of the lexical field with the archiseme “animal,” the mythological interpretation of the wolf image in Uzbek folklore, the use of animal names in describing individuals, the anthropocentric interpretation of literary texts, zoonyms in the language of Uzbek children's folklore, and the lexical, semantic, and structural characteristics of units containing zoonymic components.

D.Kh. Bazarova studied bird names existing in the Uzbek language. She emphasizes that changes occurring in Uzbek as a result of centuries-long external contacts contributed to the emergence of variants, doublets, and synonyms among bird names. Based on the study of Uzbek bird names, the research describes ornithonyms characteristic of Turkic languages.

In her study, H.A. Saidova explains that words referring to wild and domestic animals, poultry, insects, and other creatures constitute animal names and takes animal names as the object of research. Fifty zoonyms were analyzed semantically. H.A. Saidova selected the most frequently used animal names in Uzbek and argues that zoonyms perform two main functions: naming and description. When animal names perform a naming function, they are used in their direct meaning. When used as a means of description, they serve as an important means of characterizing a person and acquire a figurative meaning.[6, 35-b.]

For example, the lexical meaning of arslon (lion) is “a large, agile, fearless predatory animal.” Its figurative meanings include: (1) “leader,” “ruler,” “commander,” “king”; (2) “healthy,” “mature,” “strong,” “powerful”; (3) “formidable,” “furious”; (4) “agile,” “nimble”; and (5) “persistent,” “true to one’s word.”

In his candidate dissertation, B. Abdushukurov analyzes zoonyms used in Turkic written sources dating from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries from lexical-semantic, functional-semantic, and structural-grammatical perspectives. His research is significant for identifying semantic groups of zoonyms found in the Turkic lexical stock.

N.R. Nishonova’s research covers lexemes generalized by the archiseme “animal” in Uzbek, primarily analyzing zoonyms denoting mammals and

vertebrate animals. The study distinguishes animal names belonging to different microfields according to their distinctive and common features. Generalizing and differentiating semes are identified and explained.

In her candidate dissertation, D.M. Yoʻldosheva examines zoonyms used in lullabies, soothing songs, affectionate expressions, fairy tales, riddles, praises, humorous and mocking expressions, and tongue twisters. For example, the study analyzes the names of large predatory mammals belonging to the feline family, such as arslon (lion), yoʻlbars (tiger), and qoplon (leopard); the canine predator boʻri (wolf); the equid mammal toychoq (foal); and the names of large mammals with one or two humps, such as tuya (camel).

In his candidate dissertation, B.P. Zaripov reports that 337 zoonyms were used by Alisher Navoi in the creation of literary devices. Of these, 117 referred to livestock, 97 to birds, 9 to reptiles, 48 to wild animals, 41 to insects and other small creatures, 6 to aquatic animals, and 12 to mythical creatures. The study also provides historical names of animals such as horses, ducks, and deer used in Alisher Navoi's works. It examines the principles of naming animals according to their sex, color, and age.

D. Tosheva defended her candidate dissertation on the topic “A Linguocultural Study of Proverbs Containing Zoonymic Components.” Dildora Tosheva statistically analyzed proverbs containing zoonymic components in Uzbek, Russian, and English. According to the results, there are 1,668 such proverbs in Uzbek, 466 in English, and 202 in Russian. The larger number of zoonymic proverbs in Uzbek demonstrates the richness and expressive potential of the Uzbek language. The study found that Uzbek zoonymic proverbs include references to 34 birds, 20 domestic animals, 19 wild animals, 4 aquatic animals, and 1 reptile. The dissertation investigates Uzbek proverbs associated with animal names from a linguocultural perspective.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION. In conclusion, proverbs with zoonymic characteristics in English and Uzbek constitute an important linguocultural factor reflecting the mentality, lifestyle, and sociocultural values of the respective peoples. In both languages, animal images have a metaphorical character and are used to evaluate human behavior. In English proverbs, animals such as the cat, dog, and horse are central images, whereas in Uzbek proverbs, the donkey, horse, sheep, and wolf

occupy prominent positions. While animals in English proverbs are more frequently interpreted as representations of individual character traits, in Uzbek proverbs they are more often associated with social functions and practical life experience. Zoonymic proverbs therefore represent an important linguocultural source for studying the worldview and cultural stereotypes of different people.

REFERENCES

1. O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi Davlat ilmiy nashriyoti, 2008. – 464 b.
2. Sharipova M. Tilshunoslikda zoonimlarning o‘rganilishi // Journal of Science-Innovative Research in Uzbekistan. – 2024. – Vol. 2, Issue 4. – B. 384–388.
3. Трубачев О.Н. Из истории табуистических названий // Вопросы славянского языкознания. – М.: Наука, 1958. – Вып. 3. – С. 12–15.
4. Абдулахатов Н., Тошпўлатов И., Носирова У., Жўрабаева У. Маҳмуд Қошғарийнинг “Девону луғотит турк” асаридаги лексик бирликлар тадқиқи. – Тошкент: Янги аср авлоди, 2013. – Б. 53–54.
5. Рустамова С. Маҳмуд Қошғарий ва унинг “Девону луғотит турк” асари // Адабиёт кўзгуси. – Тошкент: Ғафур Ғулом номидаги Адабиёт ва санъат нашриёти, 1996. – № 2. – Б. 124–125.
6. Саидова Ҳ.А. Ўзбек тилида ҳайвон номларининг шахс тавсифи вазифасида қўлланилиши: Филол. фанлари номзоди... дисс. – Бухоро, 1995. – Б. 35.