



FONDNESS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Khushnuda Batirovna SAMIGOVA

Associate professor of the English language

Applied sience department 2, Uzbekistan state world languages university

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Mirzoulughov Shakhzod Bekhzod oghli

Student of UzSWLU

Rakhimova Charos Odiljonovna

Student of UzSWLU

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 article is devoted to reveal one of the linguistics problem national-cultural peculiarities of functional-semantic field of affection in the English and Uzbek languages and to reveal their similarities and differences in expressing affectionate words and phrases.

Key words: *functional-semantic field of affection, national and cultural peculiarities of affection, caress, 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 different areas:

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.

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 the same thing in themselves. concept, but only by the way that they touch each other to the same link in the chain of their sensible representations and internal conceptual formations, they hit the same key of their spiritual instrument, after which similar, but not completely identical concepts emerge in each of them "[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 regional literature, explanatory dictionaries in the languages under consideration and the use of information presented on the Internet pages, we 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 was reflected in the semantic structure of the functional semantic field of derogation.



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 defined 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 / toychoқ, bўtalok, toyloқ, қўzichok, қурун, arslon). For example:

Fare you well, my dove! / Қўзичоғим, яхши қол!

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 / ўрдак (duck), mouse / сіхқон (mouse), bee / ари (bee), etc.

The research materials showed that in English, when expressing weasel, the use of the name of birds and insects is characteristic, 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 Kumushning Bosch Tomoniga ўтири. Ўзбек ойим фотixa ўқиди. Сынgra чақалоқни Otabekka yaқинлаштириб:

- Toychoғимнинг кўрманасини чиқар, дадаси! - grandfather [79, 378].
- Ishonaman, Azichoim, Kammasini Tushunaman [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 / toychoқ (calf) has meanings of affection, and is often found in colloquial speech. These word groups include the words lamb / қўзичоқ (lamb), bird / қуш (bird), chicken / ja

(chicken), etc.

It turned out that another most common factor of petting is a group of words denoting food (sweet, honey, sugar, sweet pie, crumpet, muffin, dumpling, cupcake, dish, chocolate cookie / shakar, asal, marmalade, chocolate, бўғирсоқ, novvot).

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

питания. Например, в расследуемых языках денотативное слово *honey/асал 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 products (honey) has the meanings of affection, and is often found in colloquial and literary language. Such word groups include words such as sugar-shakar (sugar), sweet-popuk (candy), dumpling / бүғирсоқ (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 the words meaning the world of plants (rose, bud, buddy, bunch, carrot, flower, blossom, peach, apricot, buttercup / rum, gul-uncha, momiқ, buttermilk, etc.) Let us give examples in the studied 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]

Это языковое явления объясняется тем, что в Узбекистане Yaratgandan, darakhtginam, tilangiz, aslo sizga yomon kuzin solmasin ...

Tilang, tilang, elkalarim tolmasin, darakhtginam, borayapmiz hyn korib [71, 72].

Research has shown that in the Uzbek language the word momiқ (cotton) has an emotional and evaluative character expressing affection, while this word in the English language is not used in the meaning of affection.

highly developed cotton growing 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.



The collocation my flower / gulim (my flower) in the meaning of affection is used in both studied languages and shows the general universal character 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 sense of words expressing: the character of a person (sugar daddy, caballero, brave, kind, lady killer, hottie, brave, gallant / duster, soddadilim, duogyim, muminta , obiltoy, shirin sozim, қақажон, etc.), literary heroes and historical figures (Don Juan, Queen of Hearts, Valentine, Munchkin / Laili, Shirin, Majnun, Rustamtoy, etc.), mythonyms (angel, cherub, peri / farishta , bet, parizoda, etc.), celestial bodies (sunshine, my shining star / oh yulduz, құyosh, etc.), as well as flowers (blue eyed, my blue world / oppoқ қızıim, оқ қızıim, 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. The national and cultural characteristics of this field were determined 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.

1. Bibliography:
2. Гумбольдт 1963: 559.
2. Ушакова Д.Н. Толковый словарь русского языка. – М.: Государственное издательство иностранных и национальных словарей, 1938. – 26 с.
- (79) Кодирий А. Үтган күнлар. – Т.: Адабиёт ва санъат, 1974. – 378 с.
3. (159). Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. – М.: Русский язык, 1984. – 119-577 с.
4. (20.) Мусаев Қ. Таржима назарияси асослари. – Т.: Фан, 2005. – 166 с.
5. (26) Сафаров О. Болаларни эркаловчи құшиқ. – Т.: Фан, 1983. – 18 с.

6. (145). Скультэ В. Английский язык для детей. – Бишкек: Туркестан, 2005. – 187-489 с.
7. (71). Содикова Т. Атиргул иси. Сайланма. – Т.: Узбекистан, – 2007. – 72 с.
8. (72) Соҳиб Ж. Гули сиёҳ. – Т.: Бадиий адабиёт, 1965. – 50 с.
- 9.
10. Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. Eleventh Edition, – Massachusetts, USA: Incorporated Springfield, 2003. – 21 p.
11. (187) Shakespeare. W. Hamlet (Prince of Denmark). – М.: Издательство литературы на иностранных языках, 1939. – 87 с.
12. (188) Shakespeare. W. Othello (The Moor of Venice). – М.: Издательское товарищество иностранных рабочих, 1936. – 100 p.
13. (189) Shakespeare. W. Romeo and Juliet. – М.: Higher School Publishing House, 1972. – 18-84 p.
15. (13) http://slovarus.info/rus_ef.php

The list of used literature

3. Gumboldt Гумбольдт 1963: 559.
2. (79) Qodiriy A. The Past Days. – Т.: Literature and Arts, 1974. – 378 p.
3. (159) Kunin A.V. English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary. – М.: Russian language, 1984. – 119-577 p.
4. (20.) Musayev Q. The Bases of Translation Theory. – Т.: Science, 2005. – 166 p.
5. (26) Safarov O. Affectionate Songs of Children. – Т.: Science, 1983. – 18 p.
6. (145). Schulte V. English Language for Children. – Б.: Turkistan, 2005. – 187-489 p.
7. (71). Sodiqova T. The Scent of Rose. – Т.: Uzbekistan, 2007. – 72 p.
8. (72) Sohib J. Соҳиб. Гули Сиёҳ. – Т.: Literature, 1965. – 50 p.
9. Ushakova D.N. Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language. – М.: 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 Juliet. – M.: Higher School Publishing House, 1972. – 18-84 p.
15. (13) http://slovarus.info/rus_ef.php