

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Nomozova Kamola Ahmadjon qizi

National university of Uzbekistan

named after Mirzo Ulug'bek.

Abstract: This article presents a comparative analysis of phraseological units in the English and Uzbek languages, focusing on their semantic features, structural patterns, and classification. While phraseological semantics shares certain similarities with lexical semantics, it also demonstrates distinct characteristics that require independent analysis. The study specifically examines how phraseological units function differently across the two languages while maintaining some universal properties. A comparative linguistic methodology is employed to analyze the semantic and structural components of phraseological units in English and Uzbek. The findings reveal that, despite differences in linguistic structure and cultural background, both languages exhibit common features in the formation and use of phraseological expressions. At the same time, notable differences are observed in imagery, usage, and semantic organization. The research also draws on Sh. Rakhmatullayev's classification of Uzbek phraseological units into integrity, mixing, and introduction, using it as a framework for comparison. Furthermore, three main types of phraseological meaning are identified: idiomatic, idiophraseomatic, and phraseomatic. The results of this study contribute to a deeper understanding of phraseological systems in both languages and highlight their importance in translation, language teaching, and intercultural communication. The paper emphasizes the need for further comparative research in this field.

Keywords: phraseological units, idioms, comparative analysis, semantics, translation, culture.

1

1. Introduction

The classification of phraseological units is one of the most important issues in phraseology. In their classification, semantic features of the units serve as a primary basis along with their general structural characteristics (Smirnova, 2019). There are different approaches to classifying phraseological units according to various criteria. Researchers note that phraseological semantics is closely related to lexical semantics; however, it possesses several distinctive features.

The semantic structure of phraseological units is broader than their surface meaning. It is not limited only to denotative and connotative aspects but is also determined by the integrity of the whole expression and the type of its grammatical meaning (Nazarova, 2019).

Phraseological units differ in their semantic structure. Each type has its own specific semantic features; nevertheless, they also share certain common characteristics. The lexical meanings of the components of phraseological units, as well as the literal or reinterpreted meanings of their prototypes, form the semantic basis of phraseology.

Sh. Rakhmatullayev, a prominent scholar in Uzbek linguistics, conducted significant research on phraseological units of the Uzbek language. He semantically classified them into three types: phraseological integrity, phraseological combination (mixing), and phraseological expression (introduction). According to the scholar, there is also another type of phraseological unit in Uzbek based on semantic features. These units, in which one component retains a figurative meaning while preserving an independent semantic center, are called phraseological combinations. For example, in the phrase “salty chewing word”, the word “salt” does not express its literal meaning but reflects a figurative sense.

The complexity of lexical semantics and the variety of semantic classes of words do not prevent the definition of lexical meaning,

2

but rather allow for the formation of different shades of meaning. A similar situation is observed in phraseological units. In fact, defining the status of phraseological meaning is a highly complex issue.

Meaning is a mental construct, a reflection of reality in the human mind as a result of abstract thinking processes. When considering phraseological meaning, and taking into account the peculiarities of unit formation, it is often based on lexical meaning: it is necessary to identify common limiting features of different types of linguistic meaning; otherwise, there is a risk of misinterpreting linguistic phenomena or assuming a single semantic basis for all language structures.

The main contradiction inherent in phraseological units is the linguistic opposition between the integrity of meaning and the segmented structure of the expression. The integral meaning of a phraseological unit is inversely proportional to the lexical meanings of its components: the weaker the independent lexical meaning of the components, the more holistic the meaning of the phraseological unit becomes, as it is no longer distributed among individual elements.

Analysis: The study of phraseological units has become one of the central issues in modern linguistics, particularly within the field of Phraseology. Phraseological units are defined as stable combinations of words whose meanings are often not deducible from the meanings of their individual components. According to Viktor Vinogradov, phraseological units can be classified into three main types: phraseological fusions, unities, and combinations, depending on the degree of semantic cohesion.

In both English and Uzbek languages, phraseological units play a significant role in enriching speech expressiveness and conveying cultural meanings. Despite belonging to different language families, both languages demonstrate similarities in the use of

metaphorical expressions. For instance, the English phrase “time is money” corresponds closely to the Uzbek equivalent “vaqt — oltin,”

3

illustrating a shared conceptual metaphor that reflects the value of time.

However, significant differences can also be observed, particularly in culturally bound expressions. Many English idioms are rooted in historical or geographical contexts that may not exist in Uzbek culture. For example, the phrase “carry coals to Newcastle” refers to a redundant action, whereas in Uzbek a similar meaning is expressed by “Buxoroga qozon olib borish.” Such examples highlight the importance of cultural background in the formation of phraseological units.

Another important aspect of comparative analysis is the issue of equivalence in translation, which is widely discussed in Translation Studies. As noted by Eugene Nida, equivalence can be categorized into formal and dynamic types. In the case of phraseological units, three types of equivalence are commonly identified: full equivalence, partial equivalence, and non-equivalence. Full equivalence occurs when both meaning and structure are similar in two languages, while partial equivalence involves differences in form but similarity in meaning. Non-equivalence arises when a phraseological unit has no direct counterpart and requires descriptive translation.

Furthermore, phraseological units reflect the national worldview and cultural identity of a speech community. This aspect is studied within Linguoculturology, which examines the relationship between language and culture. English phraseology often reflects individualism and practicality, whereas Uzbek phraseology tends to emphasize collectivism, respect, and moral values.

Conclusion: the comparative analysis of phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages demonstrates that, despite structural and genetic differences between the two languages, there exist notable similarities in their use of figurative and metaphorical expressions. These similarities often arise from universal human

experiences and shared cognitive patterns, which are studied within the framework of Phraseology.

4

At the same time, the analysis reveals significant differences shaped by cultural, historical, and social factors. Many phraseological units are deeply rooted in national traditions and worldviews, which makes their direct translation challenging. This issue is particularly important in Translation Studies, where achieving equivalence requires not only linguistic knowledge but also cultural awareness.

The classification of phraseological units, as proposed by Viktor Vinogradov, provides a useful framework for understanding their semantic and structural properties. Additionally, the concept of equivalence introduced by Eugene Nida helps to identify the degree of similarity between phraseological expressions in different languages.

Furthermore, the role of phraseological units in reflecting national identity highlights the importance of Linguoculturology. Through phraseology, it becomes possible to explore how language encodes cultural values, beliefs, and collective experiences.

Overall, this study emphasizes that phraseological units are not only linguistic phenomena but also cultural markers. Their comparative analysis contributes to a deeper understanding of both languages and supports more effective intercultural communication, translation practices, and language teaching methodologies.

Use of Literature;

1. Viktor Vinogradov. Selected Works on Phraseology. Moscow: Nauka, 1977.
2. Amosova N. N.. Fundamentals of English Phraseology. Leningrad: Leningrad University Press, 1963.
- 3 .Arnold I. V.. The English Word. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House, 1986.
4. Smirnitsky A. I.. Lexicology of the English Language. Moscow, 1956.