



Journal Website:
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajps>

Copyright: Original
content from this work
may be used under the
terms of the creative
commons attributes
4.0 licence.

THE STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE ANTHROPONOMIC COMPONENT PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Submission Date: November 01, 2022, **Accepted Date:** November 10, 2022,

Published Date: November 18, 2022

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume02Issue11-06>

G'oyibov Umarjon Alisher O'g'li

Student Of Master's Department, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Uzbekistan

Abdusamadov Zafarbek Nurmat O'g'li

Scientific Supervisor, Phd On Philological Sciences, Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

A phraseological unit is a linguistic unit consisting of two or more words which represents a particular figurative meaning, such as to flog a dead horse, as happy as Larry, to be snowed under. Nowadays, the cultural viewpoint and the structural and semantic analysis of phraseological units with a particular component has been in the limelight. In this article, a structural and semantic analysis of phraseological units consisting of anthroponomic components of English and Uzbek languages has thoroughly been given.

KEYWORDS

Anthroponomic phraseology, linguistic system, structural and semantic analysis, the plane of expression, the plane of content.

INTRODUCTION

The nature of anthroponomic component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages as an integral part of the vocabulary stock is better realized through the discrimination of the two planes of language, particularly, the plane of content and the plane of expression. The content plane comprises the semantic elements contained in the phraseological units, whereas the expression plane comprises the formal or linguistic units of the phraseological units. Each component of the phraseological units presents a unity of form and meaning. The correspondence between these two planes is peculiar to English and Uzbek languages and is explained by the structural and semantic analysis of the phraseological units in these compared languages.

First of all, the structural analysis of the anthroponomic component phraseological units is explained by the plane of expression and this analysis is realized through the ways of the constitution of proper names in phraseological units, through the viewpoint of morphological properties.

As a result of his research, Abdusamadov Z. , claims that in the constitution of the anthroponomic component phraseological units in compared languages, such proper names as a first name, a surname or last name, a nickname and a patronym are extensively used. Particularly, such proper names as Adam, Jack, Jill, Tom, Ann, Jim, Cain, Betty, Dickens, Jane, John, Job, Peter, Mary, Nancy, Sam, Paul,

Richard, Daniel, Robin, Charlie in English and Xizr, Ali, Vali, Iso, Sulaymon, Muso, Odam ato, Sattor, Muhammad, Eshmat, Toshmat, Masharif, Mirsharif, Hasan, Husan, Ahmad, Mahmud, Layli, Majnun in Uzbek are bright illustrations of the proper names in the constitution of anthroponomic constituent phraseological units.

1) First name in English: Adam, Jack, Jill, Tom, Ann, Jim, Cain, Betty, Dickens, Jane, Sam, etc. Examples:

Adam: “Adam’s ale”- water, the only drink available to Adam, “the old Adam”- the evil supposedly inherent in human nature lacking in grace, “Adam’s apple”- a bulge in the throat;

Mary: “contrary Mary”- a girl or woman who often disagrees with other people or does the opposite of what other people want them to do, “little Mary”- stomach, “bloody Mary”- cocktail made from vodka, tomato juice and ice;

Peter: “rob Peter to pay Paul”- to take from one merely to give to another, to discharge one debt by incurring another, “Peter out”- dwindle away to nothing.

First name in Uzbek: Xizr, Ali, Vali, Iso, Sulaymon, Muso, Odam ato, Sattor, Muhammad, Ahmad, Mahmud, Layli, Majnun, etc. Examples:

Ali and Vali: “aybni Ali qiladi, kaltakni Vali yeydi”- Ali is guilty, but Vali is beaten, “Alixo’ja- Xo’jaali”- it does not

matter, both are equal, “Alining o’chini Validan olmoq”- to take revenge on Vali instead of Ali;

Layli and Majnun: “Majnun bo’lib qolmoq”- to fall madly in love with someone, “Layli va Majnun”- a couple who is desperately in love with each other;

Sulaymon: “Sulaymon o’ldi, devlar qutuldi”- Suleyman died and ogres were released, “suv tilasang, Sulaymondan tila”- if you need to ask something, ask from the patron;

2) Surname in English: Crichton, Cocker, Robinson, Hoyle, Hancock, Oakley, Woodser, Collins, Holmes, Henry, McCoy, etc. Examples:

“The admirable Crichton”- educated, broad- horizon person, lettered husband, “According to Cocker”- right, reliable, correct, “Jack Johnson”- heavy shell, missile, “The real McCoy”- the genuine thing or person.

There is no surname in anthroponomic component phraseological units in the Uzbek language.

3) Nickname in English: Father Knickerbocker, Jack the Ripper, John Bull, Tom o’Bedlam, Namby-pamby, etc

“Father Knickerbocker”- a descendant of the Dutch settlers of New York, “Jack the Ripper”- an unidentified murderer.

There is no nickname in anthroponomic component phraseological units in the Uzbek language.

Consequently, the usage of names in the forming of anthroponomic component phraseological units is a general phenomenon for both compared languages, whereas it is not encountered such proper names as surnames, nicknames and patronyms in the Uzbek language as compared to English.

Furthermore, the structural analysis is also observed from the viewpoint of the morphological properties of the main components in anthroponomic component phraseological units in compared languages and can be classified into the following groups:

1. Anthroponomic component phraseological units which include substantive property. For example, in English: “Johnny- come- lately”- a newcomer, a person who has just joined a group, “Uncle Sam”- the government of the US and, by extension, the American people, “Moaning Minnie”- a person who complains a lot.

In Uzbek: “Hasan buvaning tayog’i”- everything remains as before, unchanged, “Bazmi Jamshid”- great, luxurious feast, “Aqli Salim”- a person who has a good judgement, a sensible person.

2. Anthroponomic component phraseological units which include adjectival property. For example, in English: “Even Stevens”- equal between people, “As happy as Larry”- very happy indeed, “In like Flynn”- quickly and emphatically attractive or successful.

In Uzbek: “Amir Temurdan qolgan”- ancient, very old, “Odam Atodan qolgan”- as old as the world, “Xizr nazar solgan”- happy, blessed.

3. Anthroponomic component phraseological units which include verbal property. For example, in English: “To take the Mickey out of somebody”- to make fun of somebody, “To live the life of Riley”- to live a really good life with few problems, “To rob Peter to pay Paul”- to discharge one debt by incurring another.

In Uzbek: “Majnun bo’lib qolmoq”- to fall madly in love with someone, “Rustami doston bo’lmoq”- to be talked by many people for a long time, “Alining o’chini Validan olmoq”- to take revenge on Vali instead of Ali.

4. Anthroponomic component phraseological units which include adverbial property. For example, in English: “Before you can say Jack Robinson”- in a very short amount of time, “Somewhere to the right of Genghis Khan”- holding the right wing views of extreme kind, “Rip Van Winkle”- behind the times and out of touch with what is happening now.

In Uzbek: “O’laman Sattor”- absolutely not, never, “Daqqiyunusdan beri”- for a very long time, etc

5. Anthroponomic component phraseological units which include interjectional property. For example, in English: “Oh, for the love of Pete!”- usually used in exasperation, “Home, James, and do not spare the horses!”- a clichéd way of telling the driver of a

vehicle to start driving, “Alas, poor Yorick! I knew him, Horatio!”- used as a meditation on the fragility of life.

In Uzbek: “Muhammad payg’ambar madadkor bo’lsin!”- May prophet Muhammad bless you.

Besides, there are such anthroponomic component phraseological units which include proverbs in compared languages. For example, in English: “All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy”- if a person does not take some time off work, they become bored. Particularly, the Uzbek language abounds in such proverbs which include personal names. Examples include: “Sog’ odamga Suqrotning keragi yo’q”- there is no need for Socrat for the healthy, “Eshmat ketib, Toshmat keldi”- leaving one, came another.

With reference to the semantic analysis of the anthroponomic component phraseological units, it is explained by the plane of content. From the semantic point of view, phraseological units are integrally connected to human characteristics and activities (Maslova, 2001) . Moreover, phraseological units provide a useful source of information concerning a person, his appearance, his personality and his intellectual and creative capabilities.

As a consequence of her investigation, Khudoyorova S. T . classified two notable semantic groups of phraseological units with personal names, including phraseological units directly related to personal character, behaviour and actions and those that

indicate things, situations and beverages. This classification is illustrated by the following examples:

1. Phraseological units with anthroponyms associated with human traits, qualities and physical and psychological states. In English: “as happy as Larry”- very happy indeed, “smart Alec”- a conceited person who likes to show off how clever and knowledgeable they are, “good Samaritan”- somebody who helps another in need for compassionate motives and with no thought of reward. In Uzbek: “Aflotun miya”- very knowledgeable person, “ishni Ismat qiladi, lofni Toshmat uradi”- a person who boasts about himself while someone else does the work, “jonini Jabborga berib ishlaydigan”- a person who works hard, laborious.

2. Phraseological units with anthroponyms which characterize another objects, situations and phenomena. In English “John Hancock”- a person’s signature, “the real McCoy”- the genuine thing, “Annie Oakley”- free ticket, free permit for the theatre. In Uzbek “bazmi Jamshid”- great, luxurious feast, “Laynini ko’rish uchun Majnuning ko’zi kerak”- beauty lies in lover’s eyes.

Abdusamadov Z. N. conducted the research on the content plane of anthroponomic component phraseological units and, as a result, he asserts that the semantic features of the components with personal names can be realized through six criteria, such as the

criterion of anthroponyms which deliver a general concept about a particular person, the criterion of anthroponyms with precise or imprecise meaning, the criterion of the functions of anthroponyms, the criterion of the origin of source, the criterion of the transference of meaning and the criterion of the coordination of the functional- semantic viewpoint of the anthroponomic component phraseological units in compared languages. Therefore, he classified the semantic features of anthroponomic component phraseological units according to those criteria and they are illustrated with bright examples in compared languages.

1. The criterion of anthroponyms which deliver a general concept about a particular person. According to this criterion, the personal names are, in turn, subdivided into two subgroups:

a) Those which can be a symbol and embody a general concept, such as Adam, Balaam, Solomon, Pandora, etc in English and Odam ato, Muso, Iso, Xizr in Uzbek: “Adam’s apple”- a bulge in the throat, “Balaam’s ass”- a silent, submissive person who suddenly spoke up, protested (English); “Isoning alamini Musodan olmoq”- the pain of Jesus taken from Moses, “Xizr nazar solgan”- happy, blessed (Uzbek);

b) Those which cannot be a symbol and do not embody a general concept, such as Jack, John, Jimmy, etc in English and Ali, Vali, Sattor in Uzbek: “Jack in

office”- arrogant official, bureaucrat, “John Hancock”- a person’s signature (English); “aybni Ali qiladi, kaltakni Vali yeydi”- Ali is guilty but Vali is beaten;

2. The criterion of anthroponyms with precise or imprecise meaning. According to this criterion, the meaning of anthroponyms develops and changes to the present day and some of the personal names still maintain their exact meaning, but the meaning of others tarnish. The personal names are, accordingly, subdivided into the following groups:

a) Those with precise meaning, including Achilles, Cordelia, Job, Cain, etc in English and Xizr, Muso, Iso in Uzbek: “Achilles’ heel”- a person’s weak point, “Cordelia’s gift”- tiny and pleasant voice of woman (English); “ko’pda Xizr bor”- deeds done in harmony will always be blessed (Uzbek);

b) Those with imprecise meaning, including Sally, Cassandra, David, etc in English and Ali, Vali, Sattor, etc in Uzbek: “aunt Sally”- a person who is a target for criticism, “Cassandra warnings”- a warning of impending disaster or prophesizes doom, usually unheeded (English); “Alining o’chini Validan olmoq”- to take revenge on Vali instead of Ali” (Uzbek);

3. The criterion of the functions of anthroponyms. The personal names used in the anthroponomic component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages perform various

functions in the phraseological contexts, and they are subdivided into the following types:

a) Anthroponym- dedications. To this group such names as Achilles (a Greek hero in Greek mythology) in English and Xizr (a prophet who found a life spring) in Uzbek belong: “Achilles’ heel” (English); “Xizr nazar qilgan” (Uzbek);

b) Anthroponym- interpretations. To this group such names as Christ (a name given to the prophet Jesus), Cordelia (the only daughter of the King Lear) in English and Iso (the Arabian form of the name Jesus), Muso (the prophet of the Jew), Oppoqxo’ja (a sacred child who is born to the family of Khuja generation) in Uzbek belong: “For Christ’s sake”, “Cordelia’s gift” (English); “Isoning alamini Musodan olmoq”, “Oppoqxo’jam ursin” (Uzbek);

c) Anthroponym- wishes. To this group such names as Peter (from Greek, meaning “a stone”), Robin (meaning “glory, honour”) in English and Sattor (meaning “forgiver, merciful”), Daqqiyunus (the oriental name of the Roman emperor Diokletian) in Uzbek belong: “to rob Peter to pay Paul”, “round Robin” (English); “O’laman Sattor”, “Daqqiyunusdan qolgan” (Uzbek);

4. The criterion of the origin of source. From the viewpoint of origin, the personal names used in the anthroponym component phraseological units in

English and Uzbek languages can be classified into the following groups:

a) Mythological anthroponyms. To this group such personal names as Pandora, Castor, Pollux, Croesus, Achilles, Hercules, Damos, Pythias, etc in English belong: “Pandora’s box”- a procedure that once begun generates many complicated problems, “Castor and Pollux”- candles that are fired at the end of the competition. However, there is no phraseological units which include mythological personal names in Uzbek.

b) Religious anthroponyms. To this group such personal names as Adam, Balaam, Cain, Job, David, Jonathan, Jesus, etc in English and Odam ato, Iso, Muso, Xizr, Muhammad payg’ambar, in Uzbek belong: “as old as Adam”- ancient, very old, “the mark of Cain”- the stigma of murder, a sign of infamy (English); “Odam atodan qolgan”- very old, “Isoning alamini Musodan olmoq”- the pain of Jesus taken from Moses (Uzbek).

c) Historical anthroponyms. To this group such personal names as Lucullus, Vandyke, Brummel, Hobson, Cocker, Crichton, etc in English and Daqqiyunus in Uzbek belong: “a banquet of Lucullus”- the abundance and sophistication of the table, many dishes, “Vandyke beard”- taken from the portrait of Van Dyke (English); “Daqqiyunusdan qolgan”- very old, ancient (Uzbek).

d) Literary anthroponyms. To this group such personal names as Barkus, Billy Bunter, Fortunatus, Cordelia, Dr. Jekyll, Mr. Hyde, John Barleycorn, Bountiful, Aladdin, Riley, etc in English and Nadirmat, Ali, Vali, Sattor, Oppoxo’ja in Uzbek belong: “Barkus is willing”- somebody is willing to get married, “Billy Bunter”- a fictional fat boy, gluttonous, stout teenager (English); “tata- tat, usta Nadirmat”- nonsense, “Oppoxo’jam ursin”- an expression of repentance (Uzbek).

e) Daily anthroponyms. To this group such personal names as Annie Oakley, Sally, Gladstone, Teddy, Gallagher, Jack, etc in English belong: “Annie Oakley”- free ticket, free permit for the theatre, “aunt Sally”- a person who is a target for criticism. However, there is no phraseological units which include daily personal names in Uzbek.

5. The criterion of the transference of meaning. According to this criterion, the personal names used in anthroponym component phraseological units in compared languages are divided into two types, including anthroponyms with direct meaning and those with indirect, metaphorical meaning.

a) Anthroponyms with direct meaning used in phraseological units in English include “Jack the Ripper”- an unidentified murderer, “as patient as Job”- very patient indeed and in Uzbek include “Ali desa, Bali demoq”- to argue, to squabble.

b) Anthroponyms with indirect, metaphorical meaning used in phraseological units in English include “John Hancock”- a person’s signature, “Aladdin’s lamp”- a talisman that enables its owner to fulfil every desire and in Uzbek include “Xizr nazar qilgan”- blessed, very happy, “tata- tat, usta Nadirmat”- nonsense, a useless advice.

6. The criterion of the coordination of the functional- semantic viewpoint of the anthroponomic component phraseological units in compared languages. According to this criterion, the relationship of anthroponym component phraseological units in compared languages from the functional- semantic viewpoint constitute as follows:

a) Anthroponym component phraseological units have their absolute equivalence from the semantic viewpoint in both compared languages, such as “by George!”- an expression of surprise, “all my eye and Betty Martin”- nonsense in English and “Daqqiyunusdan qolgan”- ancient, very old, “Oppoqxo’jam ursin”- an expression of repentance, “tata- tat, usta Nadirmat”- nonsense in Uzbek.

b) Anthroponym component phraseological units in one language do not have their equivalence in another language, such as “Herculean labour”- a heroic deed, “the thread of Ariadne”- solving a problem by multiple means in English and “Ali desa, Bali demoq”-

to argue, to squabble, “Isoning alamini Musodan olmoq”- the pain of Jesus taken from Moses in Uzbek.

Therefore, the classification of anthroponym component phraseological units from the semantic viewpoint in compared languages can be various and multi- faceted. The structural analysis of phraseological units with personal names is conducted according to morphological property and the semantic analysis of such units is implemented in relation with semantic property.

In the process of the structural and semantic analysis of the anthroponym component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages, it has been observed that both languages have several similarities and differences in this viewpoint of analysis. As Abdusamadov asserts, anthroponym component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages have their own lexical- semantic and grammatical peculiarities and can be characterized with their isomorphic and allomorphic possibility in compared languages.

First of all, from the structural viewpoint, phraseological units with personal names in compared languages have the following similarities:

1. First names are mostly used in phraseological units in both languages, such as Adam, Jack, Jill, Tom, Ann, Jim, etc. in English and Xizr, Ali, Vali, Iso,

Sulaymon, Muso, Odam ato, Sattor, Muhammad, Eshmat, Toshmat, Layli, Majnun, etc.in Uzbek.

2. Both languages have the same substantive, adjectival, verbal, adverbial and interjectional properties from the morphological viewpoint, including “Uncle Sam” (substantive), “as rich as Croesus” (adjectival), “to rob Peter to pay Paul” (verbal), “before you can say Jack Robinson” (adverbial), “Even blind Freddy could see it!” (interjectional) in English and “bazmi Jamshid” (substantive), “baloyi Azim” (adjectival), “Rustami doston bo’lmoq” (verbal), “Daqqiyunusdan beri” (adverbial), “Muhammad payg’ambar madadkor bo’lsin!” (interjectional) in Uzbek.

3. In substantive phraseological units with personal names, both languages have phraseological units with the same two components, such as “Annie Oakley” in English and “bazmi Jamshid” in Uzbek, and the same three and more components, including “Darby and Joan” in English and “Hasan buvaning tayog’i” in Uzbek.

4. In substantive phraseological units with personal names, both languages have the same phraseological units in possessive case from the viewpoint of syntagmatic relation, such as “Cordelia’s gift” in English and “Hasan buvaning tayog’i” in Uzbek.

5. Both languages have the same phraseological units with couple personal names, such as “Darby and

Joan”, “David and Jonathan”, “Castor and Pollux”, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde” in English and “ishni qilar Masharif, mushtni yeydi Mirsharif”, “aql- Hasan, odob- Husan”, “Alining o’chini Validan olmoq” in Uzbek.

6. Both languages have the same proverbs with personal names, such as “Caesar’s wife is above suspicion” in English and “Abdulkhikim ovga chiqdi, orqasidan g’avg’o chiqdi in Uzbek.

Moreover, from the structural viewpoint, phraseological units with personal names in compared languages have the following differences:

1. Personal names with surnames, nicknames and a patronym are used in anthroponym component phraseological units in English, whereas there is no such kind of personal names in Uzbek. For instance, a surname is used in “the admirable Crichton”, a nickname is used in “Father Knickerbocker” and a patronym is used in “the cask of Danaides”.

2. Articles and prepositions are widely used in English anthroponym component phraseological units, while six types of case affixes, such as nominative, genitive, accusative, dative, locative and ablative and auxiliary postpositions are frequently used in Uzbek phraseological units with personal names. Examples in English include “a banquet of Lucullus”, “as happy as Larry”, “to be between Scylla and Charybdis”, “since Adam was a boy” (articles and prepositions are used in all of them) and in Uzbek include “Sulaymon o’ldi,

devlar qutuldi” (in nominative case), “Alining o’chini Validan olmoq” (in genitive and ablative case), “Berdisini aytguncha belimni bukma” (in accusative case), “jonini Jabborga berib ishlamoq” (in dative case), “suv tilasang, Sulaymondan tila” (in ablative case), “Daqqiyunusdan beri” (in ablative case and auxiliary postposition).

3. The usage of definite and indefinite articles in anthroponym component phraseological units is also peculiar to English and they are not usually used in Uzbek. Examples include: “a beau Brummel”, “the Gordian knot”.

4. In adjectival phraseological units with personal names, the pattern of comparison “as... as” is widely used in English, whereas there is no such kind of pattern in Uzbek adjectival phraseological units. Examples include: “as old as Adam”, “as rich as Croesus”.

5. Anthroponym component phraseological units with the components consisting of only personal names are also peculiar to the English language, while there is no such kind of phraseological units in Uzbek. Examples include: “Sherlock Holmes”, “Peter Pan”, “Jack Johnson”.

Secondly, from the semantic viewpoint, phraseological units with personal names in compared languages have the following similarities:

1. As a result of Khudoyorova’s research, it can be claimed that both languages have the same phraseological units associated with human traits, qualities and physical and psychological states, such as “smart Alec” in English and “Aflotun miya” in Uzbek. Besides, there are such phraseological units characterizing another objects and phenomena in both languages, including “John Hancock” in English and “bazmi Jamshid” in Uzbek.

2. According to Abdusamadov’s research on the semantic analysis of phraseological units with personal names in compared languages based on the six criteria, almost both languages have the same anthroponym component phraseological units pertaining to those six criteria, excluding mythological, religious and daily phraseological units with personal names in the criterion of origin of source.

Furthermore, from the semantic viewpoint, phraseological units with personal names in compared languages have the following differences:

1. As a result of Khudoyorova’s research, there are such anthroponym component phraseological units which contain items in connection with the prototype in English, while there are no such kind of phraseological units in Uzbek. Examples include “Big Ben”, “Joe Miller”, “Sally Lynn”, “Annie Oakley”.

2. Based on Abdusamadov’s research, there are no mythological and daily phraseological units in

Uzbek, while the English language abounds in such kinds of phraseological unit in the criterion of origin of source. Examples include “Pandora’s box”, “Castor and Pollux” (mythological anthroponyms), “Annie Oakley”, “Teddy bear” (daily anthroponyms).

3. From the viewpoint of the religious origin of source, personal names used in anthroponym component phraseological units in English originate from Christian religion, particularly from Bible, whereas those in Uzbek originate from Islamic religion, particularly, from Koran. Examples in English include “Balaam’s ass”, “as old as Adam”, “David and Jonathan” and in Uzbek include “Muhammad payg’ambar madadkor bo’lsin!”, “suv tilasang, Sulaymondan tila”.

REFERENCES

1. Abdusamadov Z. N. “National and cultural features of anthroponomic component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages” dissertation for the defence of PhD, UzSWLU, Tashkent- 2022;
2. Abdusamadov Z. N. (2021). National and cultural features of anthroponomic component phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages. Retrieved from <https://eprajournals.com/IJMR/article/4645/download>
3. Ashurova D, Galiyeva M. “Cultural linguistics” textbook for Master’s department English linguistics, Tashkent- 2019;
4. Begmatov E. A. “Explanation of Uzbek names”, Tashkent- 2016;
5. Ergasheva G. “The comparative- typological investigation of the gender aspect of phraseologisms and proverbs in English and Uzbek languages” dissertation for the defense of PhD, Tashkent- 2011;
6. Khudoyorova S. (2020). Semantic and etymological classification of English and Uzbek phraseological units with personal names. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 07 (87), 227- 230. Retrieved from <http://www.t-science.org/axivDOI/2020/07-87/07-87-47.html>
7. Kunin A. V. “Phraseology of modern English language”, Moscow- 1972;
8. Maslova V. A. “Linguoculturology”, textbook for students of high education, Moscow- 2001;
9. Radjabova M. (2019). Equivalence of phraseological units with onomastic components as the means expressing cross-cultural communication. Retrieved from <http://journalofresearch.us/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/314-321.pdf>
10. “Uzbek national proverbs” (Compiled by Mirzayev T., Musoqulov A., Sarimsoqov B.), Tashkent- 2005;

11. Choriyeva Z. O. “The semantic and grammatical features of the phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages”, dissertation for the defence of MA, Bukhara- 2013.



OSCAR
PUBLISHING SERVICES