



FONDNESS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Khushnuda Batirovna SAMIGOVA

Associate professor of the English language
Applied science department 2,
Uzbekistan state world languages university
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

kabsam@yandex.ru

Mirzoulughov Shakhzod Bekhzod oghli

Student of UzSWLU

shahzodbekmirzaulugov@gmail.ru

Rakhimova Charos Odiljonovna

Student of UzSWLU

chrahimova1990@mail.ru

Abstract: *In the article, the author examines the problem devoted to the national-cultural features of the functional-semantic field of affection in the English and Uzbek languages and studies the presence of common and national-cultural characteristics in the expression of affectionate words and expressions. Key words: functional and semantic field of affection, national and cultural characteristics, affection, affection.*

The study of the national and cultural characteristics of one of the eastern languages - Uzbek, and one of the largest European societies in a significant scale of humanity and world culture - Great Britain, is dictated by a number of reasons. Firstly, Uzbekistan and Great Britain are in a relationship of a long intercultural dialogue, which contributed to the establishment of interethnic contacts in various fields: diplomacy, art, literature, etc. Secondly, the history of the development of these societies allows us to say that they have both common features and ethnographic originality in the economic, political, demographic and other spheres. Thirdly, from a linguistic point of view, Uzbek and English are different types: agglutinative and analytical, respectively, which causes differences in their structure, in particular, in their semantic systems. Thus, an appeal to the materials of two linguocultures allows us to study the national and



cultural characteristics of the speech behavior of native speakers and thereby identify common and different features in the functioning of the functional-semantic field of affection within the Russian and English languages.

More information about this source For more information, enter the source to send the comment

Side panels Wilhelm von Humboldt wrote: "People understand each other not because they seem to actually convey the signs of things, and also not because they seem to persuade each other to accurately and fully reproduce one and the other in themselves. the same concept, but only in the way that they touch each other to the same link in the chain of their sensory representations and internal conceptual formations, hit the same key of their spiritual instrument, after which they emerge in each of them similar, but not completely identical concepts "[1, 559]. Thus, communication takes place with the help of hints, allusions to certain semantic concepts that are owned by all participants in the communication. This shared knowledge of them is ensured by the fact that they belong to the same national culture and communicate using the same language. National culture and national language are inseparable from each other and mutually influence each other.

The functional-semantic field of affection is one of the underdeveloped problems in modern linguistics. And also the functional-semantic field of affection is a poorly studied linguistic problem, and to date, no detailed coverage of the national-cultural characteristics of this field has been made within the framework of the English and Uzbek languages based on an analysis of their comparative-typological aspects. The purpose of this work is to study the national and cultural characteristics of the functional and semantic field of affection in the English and Uzbek languages. In the works of different linguists, the term "affectionateness" is understood in different ways and in some cases it is understood extremely contradictory, and not precisely (V.I.Belikov, L.P. Krysin,



N.B. Mechkovskaya, A.D. Schweitzer, R. Bell, A.A. Potebnya, A. M. Selishchev, V. V. Vinogradov, E. D. Polivanov S. Muminov, I. Pardaeva, S. K. Khozhiev, G. Rakhimov, O. Safarov, Z.A. Akbarova, S. Usmonov and others).

As you know, affection is a manifestation of tenderness, love, kind, friendly and gentle attitude to someone. And the word to caress - to show someone affection, shower with love and sensual caresses, show mercy, reward someone, cherish, cherish, deliver to someone, something. a pleasant sensation, to amuse, comfort, calm someone down, suggesting something. [2, 26].

When reviewing a number of sites on the Internet, you can also come up with the wording "endearment".

Weasel: 1) a) expression of affection, manifestation of tenderness; b) transfer. outdated. - rendering of mercy, good deeds, patronage. 2) transfer. delivering to smb., to smth. pleasant sensation, pleasure (about inanimate objects). 3) transfer. outdated. - consolation, inspiring hope [13].

English dictionaries define affection as follows: "affection" is words or expressions addressed to humans or animals with feelings of love and affection [Webster 2003: 21].

Taking into account the linguistic and journalistic interpretation of the term "weasel", we came to the following definition: an owl "weasel" means the expression of feelings with tender words or an attitude towards loved ones with love and attention.

A functional-semantic field is a system of multi-level means of a given language (morphological, syntactic, word-formation, lexical, as well as combined - lexical-syntactic, etc.), interacting on the basis of the commonality of their functions, based on certain semantic categories. The functional-semantic field includes not only grammatical units, classes and categories as source systems, but also elements of their environment belonging to the same semantic category. Semantic field, a term used in linguistics more often to denote a set of



linguistic units, united by some common (integral) semantic feature; in other words - having some common non-trivial component of the value. Accordingly, we also consider the words denoting affection as a semantic field, because they are all united by a common integral and semantic feature of “affection”. Having studied the materials collected as a result of familiarization with the country literature, explanatory dictionaries in the languages under consideration and the use of information presented on the Internet pages, we have received expressions of the presentation of information about the British and Uzbek forms of affection, the presence of common and national-cultural characteristics of which is reflected in the semantic structure of the functional-semantic field of nonsense.

Let us consider sequentially what are the main typological features of the English and Uzbek languages, as well as the characteristic features of the English and Uzbek national character, in order to then assess the degree of influence of these features on the nature of verbal communication, on the communicative behavior of people in the two sociocultural environments we are considering. The English people, being influenced by European culture, namely its Protestant version, have, of course, their own special, unique national character (by the way, any other people). At that time, the Uzbek people were influenced by oriental culture, and the Islamic religion has its own national characteristics. These national and cultural features are reflected in the speech of both peoples in the expression of feelings with tender words or an attitude towards loved ones with love and attention.

In the languages under investigation, the national-cultural features, the functional-semantic field of affection were identified in the following groups of words expressing: zoonyms, flora, body parts, food, celestial bodies, national literary heroes and historical figures, colors, etc. As you know, the character, the appearance of the human trait is often compared to the animal kingdom. And this linguistic phenomenon is reflected in the expression of love and affection for



loved ones and relatives in the studied languages (hen, calf, chicken, mouse, chick, duck, puss, dove, ladybird, bird, lamb, chuck

/ toychoq, bʻytalok, toyloq, kʻyʻzichok, kulun, arslon).

For example: *Fare you well, **my dove!** / **My lamb, good hand!***

This example shows that the word dove (dove) in English has an emotional and evaluative character, while this word in the Uzbek language in a figurative meaning only means a symbol of peace, it is not used in the meaning of affection. These types of words include words such as duck / ʻyrdak (duck), mouse / sichkon (mouse), bee / ari (bee), etc.

Research materials showed that in English, when the expression Weasels are characterized by the use of the name of birds and insects, and in Uzbek, in many cases, weasel is expressed with the name of animal husbandry. This can be explained by the fact that the Uzbek people have been engaged in cattle breeding for a long time. And in Britain, poultry farming is the most common type of farming. Let's give an example in the target languages: *Nurse to Juliet:*

Now, by my maidenhead, at twelve year old,

*I bade her come. What, lamb! what, **ladybird!***

God forbid! Where's this girl? What, Juliet! [189, 18]

*Othello: Pray, **chuck**, come hither [188, 100].*

Otabek sat down on Silver's head. My Uzbek mother recited the Fatiha. Then he brought the baby closer to Otabek:

"Take out my toy, Daddy!" - said [79, 378].

- *I believe, my lamb, I understand everything [72, 50].* It was revealed that the functional-semantic field of affection has universal characters in the identification of love and affection with the names of zoonyms. For example, in both languages, the denotative word calf / toychoq (calf) has meanings of affection, and is often found in colloquial speech. Such word groups include the words lamb / kʻyʻzichok (lamb), bird / kush (bird), chicken / ʻja (chicken), etc.



It turned out that another most common factor of affection is a group of words denoting food. (*sweet, honey, sugar, sweet pie, crumpet, muffin, dumpling, cupcake, dish, chocolate cookie/ шакар, асал, мармелад, шоколад, бўғурсоқ, новвот*).

Our research has shown that the national and cultural peculiarities of petting in the English language are expressed by words and phrases expressing flour food (*pudding, sweet pie, cupcake*), and in Uzbek, confectionery products (*шакар, новвот, қанд*).

For example:

*Good Ian, Is that you, **honey**? [20, 166].*

*Georgie Porgie, **pudding** and **pie**,*

Kissed the girls and made them cry.

When the girls came out to play,

Georgie Porgie run away [145, 489].

***Darling old sweetie pie** liked us all here under his eye [159, 577].*

Алла-ё алла, оппоқ қизим, алла.

***Қаймоқ қизим**, алла, гўзал қизим, алла.*

***Асал қизим**, алла, оқча қизим, алла...*

***Шакар қизим**, алла, дакар қизим, алла [26, 18].*

*It was revealed that the functional-semantic field of affection has universal characters in identifying love and affection with the names of food products. For example, in the languages under investigation, the denotative word honey/асал (honey) has meanings of affection, and is often found in colloquial and literary language. These word groups include words such as *sugar-шакар* (sugar), *sweet-nonyuk* (candy), *dumpling/snail* (donut), etc. As a result of the study, it turned out*



that affectionate words in the languages under investigation are found in the figurative meaning of words meaning the world of plants. (*rose, bud, buddy, bunch, carrot, flower, blossom, peach, apricot, buttercup/ гул, гул-гунча, момик, пахта* etc.) Here are some examples in the target languages:

Paris: Sweet flower, with flowers thy bridal bed I strew, –

O woe! thy canopy is dust and stones [189, 84].

This was not drawing room, my cabbage; at least not in my time [159, 119].

“Jimmy is five year old. His Mother calls him the Carrot. He has red hair, red lips, red ears, red hands and a red face. Mother often says to him: ”My little Carrot, darling, give me your right hand” [145, 187].

Till our scale turn the beam. O rose of May!

Dear maid, kind sister, sweet Ophelia!

O heavens! is't possible, a young maid's wits

Should be as moral as an old man's life? [187, 87]

Яратгандан, дарахтгинам, тилангиз, асло сизга ёмон кўзин солмасин...

Тиланг, тиланг, елкаларим толмасин, дарахтгинам, бораяймиз хўп ҳориб [71, 72].

Research has shown that in the Uzbek language the word *momik* (cotton) has an emotional and evaluative character expressing affection, while this word in the English language is not used in the meaning of affection. This linguistic phenomenon is explained by the fact that highly developed cotton growing in Uzbekistan influenced the development of the language at the semantic level and shows the national-cultural peculiarity of affection in the Uzbek language. The phrase *my cabbage, bunch, cucumber* in English has the same meaning.

Collocations *my flower/гулим* (my flower) in the meaning of affection are used in both studied languages and show the general universal nature of languages in revealing love and affection for the addressee.



As mentioned above, the national-cultural features of the functional-semantic field of affection in the studied languages are found in the meaning of words expressing: character of a person (*sugar daddy, caballero, brave, kind, lady killer, hottie, brave, gallant / дастёрим, соддадилим, дуозўйим, мўминтой, қобилтой, ширин сўзим, қақажон* and others), literary heroes and historical figures (*Don Juan, Queen of Hearts, Valentine, Munchkin / Лайли, Ширин, Мажнун, Рустамтой* и др.), mythonyms (*angel, cherub, peri / фаршита, нари, наризода* and others), celestial bodies (*sunshine, my shining star / ой юлдуз, қуёш* etc.), as well as flowers (*blue eyed, my blue world / онноқ қизим, оқ қизим* etc.).

Thus, in the English and Uzbek languages, the functional-semantic field of affection has common and national-cultural characteristics that reflect on the semantic structure of words. National and cultural characteristics of this field were defined in groups of words expressing: zoonyms, flora, body parts, food products, celestial bodies, national literary heroes, historical figures, colors, etc. Living conditions, religious beliefs, customs, culture and history of different peoples, geographical locations of states, communication with neighboring countries are the main factors in determining the differences in the functional-semantic field of affection in the languages studied.

Bibliography:

1. Humboldt 1963: 559.
2. Ushakova D.N. Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language. - M.: State publishing house of foreign and national dictionaries, 1938. - 26 p.
(79) Kodiriy A. Atgan kunlar. - T.: Adabiyot va san'at, 1974. -- 378 p.
3. (159). A. V. Kunin English-Russian phraseological dictionary. - M.: Russian language, 1984. -- 119-577 p.



4. (20.) Musaev K. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. - T .: Fan, 2005 .-- 166 p.
5. (26) Safarov O. Bolalarni Erkalovchi kʻyshi. - T .: Fan, 1983 .-- 18 p.
6. (145). Skulte V. English for children. - Bishkek: Turkestan, 2005 .-- 187-489 p.
7. (71) Sodikova T. Atirgul isi. Sailanma. - T .: Uzbekistan, - 2007 .-- 72 p.
8. (72) Soxib J. Guli siyox. - T .: Badiy adabiyot, 1965 .-- 50 p.
nine.
10. Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Eleventh Edition, - Massachusetts, USA: Incorporated Springfield, 2003 .-- 21 p.
11. (187) Shakespeare. W. Hamlet (Prince of Denmark). - M .: Publishing house of literature in foreign languages, 1939. - 87 p.
12. (188) Shakespeare. W. Othello (The Moor of Venice). - M .: Publishing Association of Foreign Workers, 1936. - 100 rubles.
13. (189) Shakespeare. W. Romeo and Julliet. - M .: Higher School Publishing House, 1972 .-- 18-84 p.
15. (13) http://slovarus.info/rus_ef.php

The list of used literature

2. Gumboldt Humboldt 1963: 559.
2. (79) Qodiriy A. The Past Days. - T .: Literature and Arts, 1974 .-- 378 p.
3. (159) Kunin A.V. English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary. - M .: Russian language, 1984 .-- 119-577 p.
4. (20.) Musayev Q. The Bases of Translation Theory. - T .: Science, 2005 .-- 166 p.



5. (26) Safarov O. Affectionate Songs of Children. - T .: Science, 1983 .-- 18 p.
6. (145). Schulte V. English Language for Children. - B .: Turkistan, 2005 .-- 187-489 p.
7. (71) Sodiqova T., The Scent of Rose. - T .: Uzbekistan, 2007 .-- 72 p.
8. (72) Sohib J. Sohib. Guli Siyah. - T .: Literature, 1965 .-- 50 p.
9. Ushakova D.N. Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language. - M .: State Publishing House of Foreign and National Dictionaries, 1938 .-- 26 p.
10. Merriam W. Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. - Massachusetts, USA, 2003 .-- 21 p.
11. (187) Shakespeare W. Hamlet (Prince of Denmark). - M .: Literature and Foreign Languages Publishing House 1939 .-- 87 p.
12. (188) Shakespeare W. Othello (The Moor of Venice). - M .: The Partnership of Foreign Workers Publishing House, 1936 .-- 100 p.
13. (189) Shakespeare W. Romeo and Julliet. - M .: Higher School Publishing House, 1972 .-- 18-84 p.
15. (13) http://slovarus.info/rus_ef.php