Volume 15 Issue 05, May 2025

Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023:

6.995, 2024 7.75

STYLISTIC AND SEMANTIC PURPOSES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH ORNITHONYMS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Aliyeva Zimixol Ashurqulovna, Teacher Termiz State Pedagogical Institute Phone: +998 99 426 02 19

Email: zimixolalieva9093@gmail.com

Abstract: This article explores the semantic and stylistic functions of phraseological units (PUs) containing ornithonyms (bird names) in English and Uzbek. Through comparative analysis, the study examines how ornithonym-based idioms reflect cultural values, worldview, and communicative strategies in both languages. The analysis reveals that while both English and Uzbek phraseologies utilize ornithonyms to express metaphorical meanings, stylistic nuances and semantic associations differ significantly. The findings underscore the role of birds as symbolic agents in human cognition and discourse, enriching stylistic expressiveness and cultural imagery.

Key words: to Phraseological units, birds, symbolism, ornithonymic, cultural connotation, semantic feature

Introduction. Phraseological units with ornithonyms—idiomatic expressions that include the names of birds—constitute a vibrant and expressive segment of both English and Uzbek lexicons. Birds have been central to human observation, mythology, and symbolism, making their names particularly rich in connotation and metaphor.

The primary aim of this article is to examine the semantic roles and stylistic functions of ornithonymic phraseological units in English and Uzbek. These units are not only tools for linguistic economy but also vehicles of cultural symbolism and stylistic embellishment.

Key research questions include:

- What are the dominant semantic fields of ornithonymic PUs in English and Uzbek?
- How do these idioms function stylistically in discourse?
- What cultural or national characteristics influence the metaphorical use of bird names

This investigation contributes to contrastive phraseology and highlights the deep-rooted cultural dimensions embedded in idiomatic language.

Methodology. This research employs a comparative-descriptive method combined with semantic and stylistic analysis. The data corpus comprises:

- 120 English PUs with ornithonyms;
- 120 Uzbek PUs with ornithonyms.

Sources include monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, proverb collections, corpora (British National Corpus, Uzbek National Corpus), and literary texts.

Each PU was analyzed based on:

- Ornithonym used (e.g., crow, nightingale, eagle);
- Semantic field (intelligence, cowardice, beauty, etc.);
- Stylistic function (irony, exaggeration, poeticism, etc.);
- Cultural connotation (symbolic, mythological, religious).

Idioms were categorized according to their pragmatic roles: expressive, evaluative, intensifying, and symbolic.

Volume 15 Issue 05, May 2025

Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023:

6.995, 2024 7.75

Results. Semantic Functions

The most prominent semantic roles of ornithonymic PUs are:

- Negative human traits:
- English: "To eat like a bird", "silly goose"
- Uzbek: "Qargʻadek qiyshiq", "Toydek yurgizmoq"
- Social status or behavior:
- English: "Lame duck", "nest egg"
- Uzbek: "Loqayd qush"
- Freedom and independence:
- English: "Free as a bird"
- Uzbek: "Qushdek erkin"
- Beauty and grace:
- Uzbek: "Turnadek go'zal"
- English: Rare in this sense
- Danger or vigilance:
- English: "Watch like a hawk"
- Uzbek: "Lochin kabi hushyor"

Stylistic Functions

Ornithonym-based idioms perform several stylistic functions:

- Expressive/Evaluative: Express opinions or attitudes (e.g., "birdbrain", "qushdek")
- Poetic/Imagistic: Found in literary and poetic texts, especially in Uzbek (e.g., "Qaldirg'ochdek sadoqatli")
- Humorous/Ironic: "Go on a wild goose chase", "Qarg'aday chiyillamoq"
- Metaphorical Compression: Condensation of complex ideas into short, vivid expressions

Cross-Cultural Observations

Semantic Field	English Example	Uzbek Example	Observation
Intelligence	"Birdbrain"	"Qush miyali"	Shared metaphor,
			negative
Vigilance	"Eagle eye	""Lochin nigoh"	Similar symbolism
Foolishness	"Silly goose"	"Toy qush"	Cultural match
Loyalty	Rare	"Qaldirg'ochdek	Stronger in Uzbek poetic
		sadoqatli"	tradition
Isolation	"Bird in a cage"	"Qafasdagi qush"	Shared emotional
			metaphor

Discussion. The analysis demonstrates that ornithonym-based PUs in English and Uzbek serve both referential and stylistic purposes. While many idioms overlap semantically, their stylistic deployment varies due to cultural frameworks.

In English, ornithonymic PUs are often used in everyday speech, informal writing, and political discourse. In contrast, Uzbek idioms often appear in folklore, poetry, and proverbs, imbuing them with emotional and symbolic depth.

The stylistic richness of Uzbek ornithonymic idioms reflects the country's oral traditions. English

Volume 15 Issue 05, May 2025

Impact factor: 2019: 4.679 2020: 5.015 2021: 5.436, 2022: 5.242, 2023:

6.995, 2024 7.75

idioms, more secular and modernized, use birds for rational and pragmatic evaluations.

This contrast reveals how phraseology encodes not just language but worldview, value systems, and communicative preferences.

Conclusion. Phraseological units with ornithonyms are vital tools for expressing complex ideas in a vivid, concise, and culturally embedded manner. English and Uzbek both utilize bird metaphors to convey semantic content and stylistic richness, yet their idiomatic realizations differ due to cultural and literary traditions.

The study confirms that:

- Ornithonymic PUs serve distinct semantic roles (traits, emotions, status);
- They enrich communication through stylistic effects (humor, expressiveness, metaphor);
- Cultural worldview shapes the imagery and usage of these idioms in each language.

Understanding these phraseological nuances is essential for translators, linguists, and cultural mediators working between English and Uzbek.

References:

- 1. 1. Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge.
- 2. 2. Gläser, R. (1984). The Stylistic Potential of Phraseological Units. Phraseology and Culture, 125–143.
- 3. 3. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 4. 4. Kunin, A.V. (1996). English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary. Moscow: Russian Language Publishers.
- 5. S. Nazarov, S. (2006). O'zbek Tilining Iboralar Lug'ati. Tashkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
- 6. 6. Cowie, A. P., Mackin, R., & McCaig, I. R. (1993). Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms. Oxford University Press.
- 7. Abdurahmonov, R. (2003). Folklor va Ramzlar. Tashkent: Fan.