

# CHARACTER TRAITS EXPRESSING ATTITUDES TOWARD A GROUP AND INDIVIDUALS

**Mexruza Normurodova**

Doctoral student, Termez State University

**Annotation:** This study is devoted to a comparative-typological analysis of the structural, semantic, and functional features of information notes (informational texts) in English and Uzbek. The research identifies similarities and differences in the macrostructure and communicative-pragmatic functions of information notes in both languages. It is substantiated that linguocultural characteristics serve as the primary factor determining the discursive nature of informational texts.

**Keywords:** information note, structural analysis, functional linguistics, comparative linguistics, discourse analysis, communicative pragmatics.

**Introduction.** In recent years, semantic issues of phraseological units have increasingly attracted the attention of researchers in phraseology. Alongside general problems related to the theory of phraseological semantics, a number of issues connected with semantic categories are being addressed, including the problem of the semantic structure (organizational features) of phraseological units. Due to the specific nature of the research material, this chapter analyzes semantic features comparatively both at the level of phraseological units and phraseological groups. The study employs the method of seme (componential) analysis, focusing primarily on the paradigmatic relations of phraseological units. Determining and measuring the semantic complexity of phraseological units remains a complex and insufficiently studied issue. It is known that phraseological units in the compared languages differ in their degree of semantic complexity. Only a small part of them can be explained through single lexical units, whereas most require word combinations or extended descriptions for interpretation.

**Literature Review.** According to researchers (I.S. Merzlyakova, 2010), in English culture, the concepts of self-confidence and resourcefulness are rooted in the idea of “hard work,” one of the fundamental principles of Protestant ethics. These qualities are associated with positive traits such as self-reliance, independence in activity, and the pursuit of success.

**Analysis and Results.** In some cases, the polysemy of phraseological units arises as a result of secondary semantic shifts, allowing all meanings to be included within one phraseo-semantic subgroup. However, when the differences between meanings are determined by numerous differential semes, they are classified into different phraseo-semantic subgroups. For example, the phraseological unit “*переливать (пересыпать) из пустого в порожнее*” in its first meaning — “to engage in useless activity, to waste time” — belongs to the subgroup expressing “idleness.” Its second meaning — “to spend time in idle talk” — belongs to the subgroup expressing “verbosity.” Similarly, the English phraseological unit “*tell tales*” in its first meaning denotes “a tendency to gossip,” and in its second meaning expresses “meanness or maliciousness.”

The phraseological unit “*good faith*” (“honesty, sincerity, good intentions”) expresses “honesty” in its first meaning and “loyalty” in its second, thus belonging to two phraseo-semantic subgroups simultaneously. Likewise, “*chew the fat (the rag)*” in its second and third meanings refers to “nitpicking” and “idle talk,” respectively. Therefore, cross-linguistic

correspondence of polysemantic phraseological units is more complex than that of monosemantic ones, as each meaning enters into specific relations within the phraseo-semantic system.

In Uzbek: *ikkiyuzlama* — hypocritical person; *yuzaki do'st* — opportunistic friend; *tilini tiymaydigan* — gossip; *ko'r-ko'rona ergashuvchi* — person without independent thinking. In English: *two-faced* — hypocritical; *snake in the grass* — hidden malicious person; *backstabber* — treacherous person; *cold-hearted person* — indifferent individual.

Through such phraseological units, language expresses not only moral norms but also forms a system of social evaluation. For instance, in English culture, “honesty” is considered a supreme virtue, whereas in Uzbek folklore, the concepts of “conscience” and “honor” occupy a central place.

Negative phraseological units describe behaviors that are socially condemned or considered unacceptable. Their semantic structure includes integral semes such as “hypocrisy,” “betrayal,” “malice,” and “indifference,” while differential semes specify particular negative traits. Uzbek expressions such as *ikkiyuzlama*, *tilini tiymaydigan*, and *yuzaki do'st* reflect insincerity, gossiping, and opportunism. English expressions like *two-faced*, *backstabber*, and *cold-hearted* convey similar meanings of hypocrisy, disloyalty, and emotional coldness.

The connotative layer of such units is negative, often used in irony, criticism, or sarcasm. Their main pragmatic function is to provide social warning, moral evaluation, and exposure of undesirable behavior. They also serve as linguistic markers defining the boundaries of social values.

The evaluative nature of some phraseological units depends on context. They may express determination and independence, but can also be interpreted negatively as stubbornness. For example, the Uzbek expression *o'zi bilganidan qolmaydi* may denote principled behavior or inflexibility. Similarly, the English *strong-willed* can indicate determination but may also imply stubbornness.

In English, the word *wolf* often describes a man with passionate or sometimes improper behavior (*a wolf in sheep's clothing* — a malicious person disguised as good). At the same time, *lone wolf* refers to an independent individual. These examples show how animal imagery conveys moral and cultural evaluation.

In Uzbek, the word *dog* often has negative connotations (*itga o'xshash, itdek ishlash*), although in proverbs it may symbolize loyalty. In English, *dog* is commonly associated with friendship and loyalty (*man's best friend*), though expressions like *to lead a dog's life* carry negative meanings. Thus, the same image can have both positive and negative semantic layers depending on context.

The Uzbek expression *quyon yurakli* describes cowardice, similar to English expressions like *as timid as a rabbit* or *scaredy cat*. However, in some contexts, it may also reflect caution and survival instinct. Cultural perception determines whether caution is viewed positively or negatively.

In Uzbek culture, the rooster symbolizes pride (*xo'rozlanmoq*), while in English expressions like *cocky* or *proud as a rooster* carry similar meanings. However, in Uzbek folklore, the rooster can also symbolize renewal and awakening, a meaning largely absent in English.

**Conclusion.** Thus, the semantics of character-expressing units in both languages are closely connected with a person's social role, moral evaluation, and system of cultural values. Comparative analysis shows that intelligence, wisdom, and taste are key concepts in evaluating personality. In Uzbek, the ideal person is wise, perceptive, and well-mannered; in English,



intelligent, independent, and practical. Positive units express socially valued traits, while negative ones (*foolish, ignorant, tasteless*) perform a warning function. Therefore, these linguistic units serve as important indicators of moral, intellectual, and aesthetic evaluation in both cultures.

#### References:

1. Басаров Б. Характер и его место в психической жизни чело-^ века.-/SyLG, ...канд.психол.наук.-М.,1976.- с.38
2. Ламажаа Ч.К. Национальный характер тюркоязычных народов Цент- ральной Азии // Сборник. – Тува, 2015. – С. 106-111
3. Четвертакова Ж.В. Язык как форма выражения национального харак- тера. – Тува, 2015. – С.139-145.
4. Грынко А.В. Национальный характер и язык // Сборник. – М., 2016. – С. 136-141
5. Kadirova B.R. Belgi bildiruvchi leksemalarning lingvokulturologik xususiyatlari: Filol. bo‘y. fals. dokt. ... disser. avtoref.– T., 2019. – 11-b
6. Mobiladze I. The linguistuic image og the world. – Tblisi, 2012. – 103 p.
7. <sup>1</sup> Sayfullayeva R.R., Mengliyev B.R., Voqiyeva G.H., Qurbonova M.M., Yunusova Z.Q., Abuzalova M. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. – T.: Fan va texnologiya, 2010. – 25-b.
8. <sup>1</sup> Аминова М.Н. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларидаги дипломатияга оид лексик бирликларнинг лингвوماданий аспектлари: Филол. фан. номз. ... диссер.автореп. – Т., 2010. – 8-б