SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF ZOOMORPHISM AND AS AN OBJECT OF LINGVOCULTUROLOGICAL RESEARCH

Shukurova Rano Akmalovna*; Islamova Ozoda Gulomovna**

*Teacher,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Samarkand, UZBEKISTAN

**Student,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Samarkand, UZBEKISTAN
Email id: ozodaislmva@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article provides a brief overview of works on the study of zoolexics in the synchronous aspect, clarifies the main zoolexics used in the analysis, describes the semantic content of zoonism as a primary nomenclature and its functions. In addition, the lexical-semantic version of the zoonym is analyzed - the linguistic status of zoomorphism. In this regard, some problems of zoometaphor and zooidentification , questions related to the main elements of the connotative content of zoomorphisms, are considered.

KEYWORDS: *Zoomorphisms, Zoological, Zooatama, Zoonyms, Zoosemism, Zooanalogies, Morpheme, Entomonym, Entomorphism, Entomorphic Metaphor, Entomorphic Analogy, Ethnosemantics, Ethnopsycholinguistics, Linguoculturology, Monolingual, Ethnic Group, Phraseologisms, Anthropocentric, Linguistic Terminology, Non-Linguistic, Sociolinguistics, Psycholinguistics, Expressions, Linguistics;*

INTRODUCTION

As the First President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.A. Karimov noted in his speeches: Everything depends, first of all, on what kind of people our new generation, our growing children will grow up to be.

Zoomorphisms and zoomorphic analogies are both external and internal features of a person (*etre un ane / donkey*), as well as more universal life situations, such as a person's attitude to work (travailler comme une abeille) to work) reflects and describes. We use the term zoonom to refer to linguistic terminology of lexical units combined through the concept of animal in general, and the terms zoomorphism and zoomorphic metaphor to name an animal in a figurative sense (butterfly, ant - about object, situation, man). Similarly, we use the term zoomorphic simulation to denote a zoomorphic analogy, and the corresponding zoomorphic analogy term to name a zoomorphic analogy. These meanings are based on the same characters as in the phraseology: in this way, these characters are included in the phrases; composition and derivation (morphological and semantic) arise in the general matrix of different occurring semantic characters. From these morphemes we get many meanings that we need. It belongs to

each semantic group 20 metaphors and analogies are explained in the following order, for example: entomonym, entomorphism, entomorphic metaphor and entomorphic analogy, and so on. **[1]**

Both universal features that characterize the cultural and national identity of each nation and its language, and ethno -specific patterns are reflected. Their study has recently attracted more and more attention of scientists. As a result, linguistic theories arise (ethno semantics, ethnopsycholinguistics, linguoculturology, etc.) based on the understanding of language as a model of culture.

The perceptual features of a non-linguistic being are reflected more vividly than in any other area of language. Because the images of animals in different languages (in terms of the assimilation of being by a person and its impact on the environment) at first glance are given features that are completely unreasonable, and sometimes even contradicting the internal connections of the language. object . These images and fantasies come from the depths of the human mind, from its beliefs and myths. Animals were included in the social hierarchy, in human society there were ideas that this community originated from animals, the animal was presented as a specific god of man. **[2]**

The anthropocentric idea remains a generally accepted and even central idea in linguistics to this day, since the identification of various descriptions of linguistic structure in itself can no longer be a pure goal of linguistic analysis. While human zootechnics arise on the basis of the figurative image of animal, evaluative images are the most accurate and direct reflection of the national self-consciousness of languages through a system of norms characteristic of a given ethnic group. The original name of the animal - zoosemism (for example, donkey) and the zoological characteristics existing in its basis - zoomorphism (donkey - about a person) are exactly the same lexical unit of the language - variants of zoonism[1].

In the languages being compared, the relationship between these variants is generally the same, regardless of the exact semantics of the link. Then the unity of their linguistic nature is expressed. A glance at the work devoted to this area of vocabulary showed that the research here is relatively extensive and considered material from different languages and linguistic aspects. The lexico-semantic group "Names of animals" is observed mainly in synchronous terms. Zoonists easily fall into the category of words and symbols that reflect the human perception of various animals, such as cunning, like a fox, cowardly, like a rabbit, and industrious, like ants. Many animal names have become permanent metaphors of the language. These names refer to the traits and qualities of a person: for example, a fox is a cunning and cunning person, a bear is a loser, lavender is about a person, and so on. **[3]**

The similarity of zoomorphic systems may indicate a common historical past of different peoples. The creation of a metaphor is based on the mythical imagination of the speaker, and not the real imagination of the animal. This means that the metaphorical view of the universe is not inspired by the scientific view of the universe, but by the linguistic view itself. That is why zoomorphic descriptions differ from each other in different languages, and as a result, metaphors or analogies that arise on the basis of the same zoonyms as nominative units can also take on different cultural and linguistic connotations.

Collections of monolingual phrases and proverbs. In these collections, the classification was carried out by topic or by keywords. The thematic classification is not sufficiently presented: topics are semantic categories that change from one topic to another. This situation creates a problem in the implementation of a purely semantic classification; topics range from general (eg, nature, human relationships) to specific (eg, washing and clothing); they are not detailed, which contradicts the very concept of classification and therefore does not offer clear consultative factors. **[4]**

Thematic classification is often combined with keyword classification, add an index to clarify some cases in syllabic or mixed order, for example, the inclusion of a word in the thematic classification refers to the word cle , or the keywords are both thematic and lexical (for example , *cadeau*: *friendship*). Moreover, these collections strive for perfection and contain occasional phraseological units that are neither active nor passive. So, it seems that the time has come to introduce a single choice, mainly from a didactic point of view. Concerning contrast, some recent works on proverbs have retained the thematic classification: "identify as accurately as possible the Spanish proverb expressing the meaning and theme of the French paremia", "we have a semantic tool that represents a semantic idea and makes the topic much easier for us: for example, Quand le *chat n'est pas la,* les souris dance sous / autorite / required. In other words, we need to go back to words that mean zoonyms . From a semantic point of view, we are talking about structuring by grouping phraseological units according to a reasonable attribute: in the above two proverbs, exactly one attribute (wild rodent) is associated with a cat. The best lexico-semantic model that can be used here is the stereotype model, which includes typical and unnecessary symbols used specifically by phraseology. Thus, comparison between languages extends to the components of meaning in each language and sharpens in many ways. On the one hand, the emphasis is on the non- delimitation of proverbs and phrases (combinations are mainly those that include proverbs, and not vice versa), on the other hand, simple words (for example, *Un tel est un an ane)* and derived (*formiller)*) values. These meanings are based on the same signs as the signs in phraseology: thus these signs are included in phrases; the composition and origin (morphological and semantic) of the various semantic features encountered emerge in this wax matrix. **[5]**

From a syntactical point of view, phrases should be arranged into classes (nouns, adjectives, verbs, phrases). This is not without the difficulty of limiting phrases. For example, a group of verbs with a human theme **mettre la charge advanced les boeufs** (*II a mis la charge advanced les boeufs) and maqolli frazaga IIne _ faut pas mettre la charge advanced les boeufs ; ot tour de cochon ve fe'l jouer (a qn) un tour de cochon* ; or, again, a quality **tour de cochon figure** with a horse (*un tour de cochon = un mauvais tour, un sale tour*).

The following definitions of linguoculturology have been given by linguists:

A) According to American linguists Sepir-Wharf, linguoculturology

"Objects of cultural values reflected in the language as a system theoretical and descriptive holistic study, contrast analysis at the linguocultural level of different languages (peoples) on the basis of the theory of linguistic relativity "[2];

b) Russian scientist V.A. Maslova sees linguoculturology as a "linguistic network formed as a result of the fusion of linguistics and cultural studies," just as "the humanities study the material

and spiritual culture manifested in the processes of living language communication," or "cultural studies." and as a complex field of research in the fields of linguistics, ethnolinguistics, and cultural anthropology";

c) V.V. According to Vorobyev, linguoculturology is a "complex scientific discipline is a type of generalization in which the relationship between language and culture in the process and explores the interdependence, and the process as a whole, based on the current system of priorities and culture (universal values and norms) and the integration of linguistic and extralinguistic units in a variety of ways ";

In Linguoculturology: Theory and Methods, the linguist proposes a systematic study of the study of linocultural objects based on the integrity of semantics, sigmatics, syntax, and pragmatics. To conduct such research, writes V.V. Vorobyev's dialectical connection of linguistic and extralinguistic essence allows us to imagine the above-mentioned branches of science as a whole.

Linguoculturology has been variously defined by researchers (linguists, culturologists, anthropologists, philosophers, ethnographers, etc.). Based on the above and other definitions, we can say that the science of linguoculturology is the study of the linguistic units present in the linguistic description of a particular language. is a branch of linguistics that studies culture. So when we study a foreign language, when we do research in that or that language, we study the culture that is specific to those who speak that language. There is no culture without language, and without culture there is no language. Therefore, one of the most pressing issues facing modern linguistics is the study of the relationship between language and culture. In this regard, it is worth quoting the views of linguist S. Ter-Minasova: "Language is a mirror of culture, in which the people's social self-consciousness, its mentality, nationality, lifestyle, traditions, customs habits, moral norms, value system, worldview, attitude to the world "

Linguocultural studies are all described by S. Ter-Minasova based on the theory of lingvoculturology, we have tried to shed some practical light on the anthropocentric role of French zoomorphisms in French culture, including language levels.

 V.Von Humbold put forward and the main leading research on neogumboldists

Many of the problems that led to the formation of the paradigm of anthropocentrism in language began to find new solutions. It is well known that with the advent of language lies an idea that describes man and his interests. The parems and expressions that have existed for thousands of years are also a reflection of the language and culture of a particular people.

The linguistic landscape of the world as a whole includes a set of products related to various indirect forms of perception, in harmony with the logical perception of the world. For example, the phraseology of each language is unique, it is related to the knowledge of the speakers and, in general, to the peculiarities of the ethnos way of life.

In particular, the use of zoomorphic proverbs in proverbs, sayings and aphorisms of every nation, in everyday conversations, reflects the characteristics of a particular ethnic group. In this article, we will look at some of the paremies and phrases in French and Uzbek that involve some "wolf-loup", "chicken-poule", "fox-renard" and a few other zoomorphisms.

In short, the descriptive means that allow us to move from one language to another cannot be based on too broad categories (words and topics): we cannot succinctly represent subtle semantic

and syntactic information. The difficulty is manifested not only in clear differences, but also in a wide range: not only the corresponding words, but also similar characters differ from each other in different expressions, and sometimes in very subtle semantic features. Phraseologisms are distributed differently within similar syntactic structures. Linguoculturology is one of the many disciplines to carry out lingvocultural research it opens up new opportunities to delve deeper into and study this or that language, both linguistic and non-linguistic, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, cultural studies, anthropology, history, and other fields.

REFERENCES

1. Karimov IA. Training the most educated and intellectually advanced generation is the most important factor in the sustainable development and modernization of the country. "People's Word", February 18, 2012.

2. Combet L, Munos S. Proverbs, proverbial expressions, sayings and commonplaces of the French language today with their Spanish correspondence", Paremia 4, ACI, Madrid, 1995.

3. Guiraud P. Les locutions franaises, PUF, Paris, 1967.

4. Shapira C. Les stereotypes en fran9ais, Ophrys, Paris, 1999.

5. Kleiber G. Semantique du prototype, PUF, Paris, 1990.