



Approach to the Study of National-Cultural Characteristics of Gender Stereotypes in the English and Uzbek Phraseological Units

Umrzokova Guljakhon

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

Uralova Nigora

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

ABSTRACT

The article contains information about the approaches that reveal the national and cultural identity of phraseological units, and the features of the functioning of the national mentality as linguistic thinking. The study of gender stereotypes in the linguistic landscape of these languages on the basis of the material of English and Uzbek phraseology is illustrated in the article. By means of a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek gender-marked phraseological units, similarities and differences in the formation of male and female characters in these languages are determined. These differences are explained by the national-cultural characteristics of the English and Uzbek languages and the historical conditions of their development. The theoretical side of the article is confirmed by a number of English and Uzbek gender-marked phraseological units.

Keywords:

extralinguistic, gender specific, phraseological units, females, males, paradoxically, bachelorette, husband, wife, national identity, stereotypes, statements, analogues, linguoculturological.

Introduction

The problem of the national and cultural specifics of the phraseological system of the language is currently the subject of research by many linguists. Increased attention to this topic is of general interest to the problem of language and culture, which, in its own way, receives a new impulse to develop and frame the new, anthropological paradigm of modern linguistics.

Within the framework of anthropological linguistics, designed to study "language in close connection with a person, his consciousness, thinking and spiritual and practical activity" [9. p. 49]. The need to create a unified theory of language and man makes it natural and necessary to turn to the phraseological system

of the language, which is the most specific nationally determined and original phenomenon.

The Main Part

According to the remarkable expression of L. I. Roizenzon, "phraseology of all the creations of the human linguistic genius is the most original, complex and complicative phenomenon" [10. P. 69]. In this way, the problem of national-cultural self-expression of phraseology comes out of a purely linguistic framework and requires development in Russia, such as "language and culture", "language and thought", which are all more relevant for contemporary linguistics.

In the study of national specifics, D. O. Dobrovolsky identifies two approaches. The first approach is called comparative, in which the national and cultural identity of one language is determined relative to another language. The second approach is introspective, in which the national specificity of the language is considered through the eyes of its speakers, that is, self-analysis, self-observation is carried out [11. p. 71].

In the comparative approach, all facts of one language relative to another language that are original from the point of view of traditional folk culture from the perspective of the second language (and the corresponding culture) are recognized as specific. At the same time, it is not important that many of the facts singled out as specific facts can also take place in other languages (cultures).

The introspective approach is based on the idea of the presence of basic national and cultural characteristics, regardless of the specifics of other languages and cultures. The task of the study is to find an answer to the question, what is the national specificity of the language through the eyes of its speakers. The most acceptable research methods in this case are a survey of informants and various tests aimed at clarifying the attitude of native speakers to the corresponding linguistic facts. So, for example, a signal of the presence of a basic national specificity may be an opinion about the inappropriateness of this statement in the mouth of a foreigner.

When addressing the problem of the national and cultural identity of phraseological units, it is necessary to realize that today in linguistics there are several different approaches to identifying the national and cultural component of phraseological units that have different methodological bases, different research methods that differ from each other in the degree of coverage of phraseological material.

First of all, it is necessary to name the linguistic and cultural approach. The linguo-cultural direction in linguistics was based on the indications that appeared in the works of linguists of the existence of an extra-linguistic component in the meaning of a word, due to

extra-linguistic factors. In the linguistic and regional study of phraseological units, extralinguistic factors reflected in the component composition of phraseological units are singled out and classified. Particular attention to the plan of expression of phraseological units is attracted by the significance of the historical and etymological interpretation of the elements or the prototype of phraseological units. The linguistic and regional approach is the most superficial level of revealing the national and cultural component of phraseological units.

The second approach to identifying the national specificity of phraseological units also arose within the framework of the structuralist understanding of the language. It is a definite opposite of the linguo-cultural approach - it focuses the researcher's attention not on the "non-equivalent" component of the phraseological unit, but, on the contrary, on the presence of certain foreign language correspondences in the analyzed phraseological unit. As is known, the category of the national in the sphere of phraseology is in dialectical unity with the category of the international. Comparison of phraseological analogues of different languages in order to identify their national flavor, national and cultural characteristics is the subject of a contrastive approach to identifying the national and cultural identity of phraseological units. The comparison of phraseological equivalents here takes place in order to identify not the general, as in the classical comparative method, but to identify the differences that constitute the national and cultural originality of the phraseological equivalents of the compared languages.

The development of a linguoculturological approach to the study of phraseology orients the researcher to the study of the correlation of phraseological units and signs of culture and actualizes the value of the system of standards, stereotypes, symbols, etc. to describe the cultural and national specifics of the phraseological system [12. p. 92].

At present, many linguoculturological studies have appeared, where the authors seek to identify for individual universal concepts of

any culture (such as life and death, good and evil, love and hate, etc.) their national image, fixed in a naive picture of the world. The conceptual model of a concept is determined by analyzing its use in the language. Attraction of phraseological material, consideration of the internal form of phraseology as a key to understanding the content of a particular concept of culture is a characteristic feature of the works of this direction.

According to V. N. Telia, the main goal of the linguoculturological analysis of phraseological units is "the identification and description of cultural and national connotations that usually accompany meaning in the form of figurative associations with standards, stereotypes and other cultural signs and correlate with each other through cognitive procedures that give these connotations comprehension" [13. p. 79].

Thus, within the framework of the linguoculturological approach, the national and cultural originality of phraseological units is seen in the fact that they contain a complex of naive ideas of native speakers about a particular concept of national culture. An analysis of a phraseological unit that somehow points to a certain concept of spiritual culture reveals the national and cultural connotation of the analyzed concept, and an analysis of the totality of such phraseological units gives a complete picture of the concept under study in the phraseological picture of the world.

This approach to meaning provides great opportunities in the field of linguistic modeling of the actual meaning of phraseological units. As you know, the meanings of phraseological units are mostly metaphorical. This allows us to restore the complex of those conceptual transformations that underlie the formation of the actual meaning of idioms.

The relevance of the research topic is proved by the fact that gender studies of language units (including phraseological ones), as well as the use of linguistic means depending on belonging to one or another gender, attract the attention of scientists from leading scientific centers of the world.

The purpose of this study is a comparative analysis of gender-marked

phraseological units in the English and Uzbek languages, identifying similarities and differences between them. The object of the study was gender-marked phraseological units of the English and Uzbek languages, selected from the English-Russian and Uzbek-Russian phraseological dictionaries indicated in the list of used literature. The following research methods were used in the work: descriptive analysis, cognitive-conceptual analysis, comparative analysis, associative method, etc.

Conclusion

Thus, the cognitive approach to identifying the national and cultural originality of phraseological units provides for the analysis of individual phraseological semantic fields in order to describe phrase formation models within their framework, the totality of which shows both the national features of the linguistic division of the world and the features of creative thinking when creating each individual phraseological unit. The cognitive approach is a way of studying the mentality of a nation. The national and cultural originality of phraseology within the framework of this approach is the features of the functioning of linguistic thinking, the features of the figurative picture of the world.

References

1. Avdeeva O. I. All-Russian scientific conference "Phraseology at the turn of the century: achievements, problems, prospects" // *Philological Sciences*. - Moscow, 2000. - No. 5. - S. 122-125.
2. Zykova I.V. Gender Component in the Structure and Semantics of Phraseological Units in Modern English. Dis. ... cand. philol. Sciences. - Moscow: MGU, 2002. - 219 p.
3. Kirilina A.V. Development of Gender Studies in Linguistics // *Philological Sciences*, 2003. - No. 5. - P.51-56.
4. Kornilov OA Linguistic pictures of the world as derivatives of national mentalities. - Moscow: Nauka, 2003. - 348 p.
5. Kreydlin G. E. Men and women in non-verbal communication: cultural-

- universal and cultural-specific features of non-verbal communicative behavior // Gender: language, culture, communication: Proceedings of the Third International Conference. - Moscow: MSU, 2003. - S.67-68.
6. Nikolskaya V.A. Gender asymmetries and stereotypes in English phraseology. Abstract dis. ... cand. philol. Sciences. - N. Novgorod, 2005. - 23 p.
 7. Baron Dennis E. Grammar and Gender. - New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986. - 212 p.
 8. Nasrullaeva N.Z. Gender conceptualization of English phraseological units. // International Journal of Advanced Research. - September 2016 - No. 4 (9). Journal indexed by CrossRef, International Impact Factor 5.336; Index Copernicus 63.21. - P.1503-1508.
 9. Postovalova, V. I. Kartina mira v zhiznedejatel'nosti cheloveka // Rol' chelovecheskogo faktora v jazyke. Jazyk i kartina mira / Otv. red. B. A. Serebrennikov. M., 1988.
 10. Snitko, T. N. Predel'nye ponjatija v zapadnoj i vostochnoj lingvokul'turah. Pjatigorsk, 1999.
 11. Dobovol'skij, D. O. Tipologija idiom // Frazеografija v Mashinnom fonde ruskogo jazyka. M., 1990.
 12. Kirillova, N. N. Predmet i metody issledovanija idiojetnicheskoi frazeologii. L., 1988
 13. Telija, V. N. Metafora kak model' smysla proizvedenija i ee jekspressivno-ocenochnaja funkcija // Metafora v jazyke i tekste. M.: Nauka, 1988.