© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

LINGUOCULTURAL AND LINGUOPSYCHOLOGICAL PARAMETERS OF PERSONALITY-DENOTING PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Zebo Menginiyozova
Lecturer, National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
DOI:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23600501

Abstract. The article investigates personality-denoting phraseological units (PUs) in English and Uzbek from the standpoint of linguoculturology, cognitive linguistics and translation studies. It is argued that PUs of this type function as verbalized cultural codes that objectify the axiological system of the linguistic community, and that the strategy of their interlingual rendering is determined by the degree of correlation between the compared phraseological systems.

Keywords: phraseological unit, personality, linguoculturology, cultural code, equivalence, translation transformation.

Introduction. Within the anthropocentric paradigm of modern linguistics, the human being is regarded as the central object of linguistic conceptualization. The thematic domain that describes a person's character, intellectual capacity, volitional qualities and moral disposition constitutes one of the most phraseologically saturated fields of the lexicon. The theoretical premise of the present study derives from W. von Humboldt's conception of language as the "spirit of the people" and from the linguistic relativity hypothesis of E. Sapir and B. Whorf, according to which the categorization of reality in language is conditioned by the mentality of its speakers (Humboldt, 1836; Sapir, 1921). Phraseological units, as secondary nominative means, retain national imagery, folk observation and evaluative stereotypes, and therefore serve as a privileged object of linguocultural analysis (Telia, 1996; Maslova, 2001).

Theoretical framework. Following A.V. Kunin (1996), a PU is defined as a stable word combination characterized by a fully or partially reinterpreted meaning. On the criterion of semantic cohesion, PUs are classified into fusions, unities and combinations (Vinogradov, 1947). Personality-denoting PUs belong predominantly to the latter two types and are grounded in figurative comparison and metaphor, e.g. as brave as a lion, as hard as iron, have a heart. The conceptual metaphor theory of G. Lakoff and M. Johnson (1980) accounts for the mapping of abstract personality traits onto concrete source domains – zoomorphic, somatic and material – which function as culturally marked codes. The somatic component is particularly productive: the heart, blood and liver are conceptualized as loci of courage, compassion and temperament. Within the linguoculturological approach, these images are interpreted as cultural codes whose meaning is fixed by tradition and can be decoded only against the background of the corresponding culture (Maslova, 2001).

Comparative analysis. Proceeding from the semantic, structural-grammatical and component parameters, three types of correlation between English and Uzbek PUs may be identified. (1) **Phraseological equivalents** exhibit identity of meaning, syntactic structure and imagery: as brave as a lion – sherday qo'rqmas; as hard as iron – temirday baquvvat; as cunning as a fox – tulkidek ayyor; high blood – qoni qaynoq. Their existence is explained by universal human experience and the commonality of certain cultural symbols. (2) **Phraseological analogues** express an identical or similar figurative meaning on the basis of a different internal form: blood from a stone – tosh bag'ir (a hard-hearted person). The imagery diverges, whereas the emotive-evaluative content is preserved. (3) **Non-equivalent PUs** have no correspondences in the target phraseological system owing to the national specificity of their imagery. Thus, the zoomorphic image in as wise as an owl actualizes the

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

seme of wisdom in Anglophone culture, while in the Uzbek folk worldview this bird is conventionally associated with a negative connotation; a literal transfer would therefore result in pragmatic distortion, and descriptive translation is required. This demonstrates that one and the same personality trait may be objectified through different cultural codes.

Translation aspects. According to V.N. Komissarov (2004), the rendering of figurative PUs involves the use of a phraseological equivalent, an analogue or a calque; where these are unavailable, descriptive translation is resorted to. The choice of strategy is determined by three factors: preservation of the figurative meaning, retention of the emotive and stylistic coloring, and compliance with the national-cultural specificity of the image. Since translation entails the substitution of one sign system by another, semantic losses are inevitable, and the translator's task is to minimize them by means of adequate translation transformations.

Conclusion. Personality-denoting phraseological units are characterized by the interaction of a universal conceptual basis and culturally specific imagery. Their analysis from the linguocultural and linguopsychological perspectives makes it possible to reveal the axiological dominants of the respective linguistic communities, while the tripartite typology of equivalents, analogues and non-equivalent units provides a methodologically sound basis for their adequate interlingual transfer.

References:

1. Humboldt W. von. Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues. – Berlin, 1836.
2. Komissarov V.N. Modern Translation Studies. – Moscow: ETS, 2004.
3. Kunin A.V. Course of Phraseology of Modern English. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1996.
4. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
5. Maslova V.A. Linguoculturology. – Moscow: Academia, 2001.
6. Sapir E. Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech. – New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1921.
7. Telia V.N. Russian Phraseology: Semantic, Pragmatic and Linguocultural Aspects. – Moscow: Shkola "Yazyki russkoy kultury", 1996.
8. Vinogradov V.V. Basic Concepts of Russian Phraseology as a Linguistic Discipline // Selected Works: Lexicology and Lexicography. – Moscow: Nauka, 1977 (first publ. 1947).