SYSTEMATIZATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Sobirov Otabek Qodirovich
Teacher of English at the department of language teaching methods of the regional center for retraining and advanced training of public education staff of Andijan region

ZaynobiddinovaIroda Mardonovna
Teacher of English at the department of language teaching methods of the regional center for retraining and advanced training of public education staff of Andijan region

Abstract

In this article the analysis and systematization of phraseological units with names of animals of the English and Uzbek languages is considered, in the comparative plan and the semantic typology is carried out to two languages taking into account extralinguistic factors.

Keywords: *analysis; phraseological unit; seme; component; extralinguistic; typology;*

Semantic typology defines typical features based on the semantic properties of languages (or subsystems), the ultimate goal of which is to establish semantic universals.

The method of inventorying language systems (or subsystems) is one of the main and basic typological problems, without the solution of which it is impossible to start comparing them. Typological inventory is the study, analysis, textual analysis of the systems of each compared language separately and in parallel [1, p. 10].

This work examines the semantic inventory of WAN (words of animal names) and PUWCAN (phraseological units with a component of animal

names) in typologically heterogeneous languages, and in English and Uzbek, based on the theory of typological semantic opposition, by B.Yu.Gorodetsky [3, p.26] and the typological category of J.Buranov [2, p. 35].

A preliminary analysis of the entire corpus of PUWCANin two unrelated languages made it possible to establish the fact that the national-cultural specificity ofPUWCAN lies in the character of imagery, which is the basis of the national identity ofPUWCAN, which is studied and revealed at the semantic level of analysis.

The analysis of the PUWCAN schematic structure showed that in the compared languages the meanings introduced by the WAN sometimes do not coincide due to the mismatch of linguistic factors, which can only be identified taking into account extralinguistic factors. This is explained by the difference in traditions, national culture of the peoples themselves, associated with the national-cultural specifics of figurative means in a particular language, which inevitably left its mark on the semantic content of phraseological units, primarily on its imagery.

The experience of comparing the PUWCAN of the English and Uzbek languages showed that the reason for the frequent appeal of peoples to the PUWCAN is explained by a number of extralinguistic factors.

As a result of the analysis of the English and Uzbek WAN, it was found that the participation of the WAN in the formation of PUWCAN is primarily determined by a number of extralinguistic factors, which are the primary basis for the phraseological activity of the WAN in the PUWCAN, namely:

1) the functional and vital importance, the usefulness of this or another animal in human life: *dog - it, cat - mushuk, cow - sigir, horse - ot* and others;

2) the influence of the national tradition of a particular people, characteristics, quality of animals, acceptable for a given people, on the

regularity of participation of the WAN in PUWCAN. Consequently, not all WAN are included in PUWCAN.

So, for example, in the English language, out of 150 WAN, only 61 WAN participate in the formation of PUWCAN, and 89 WAN do not participate at all. In addition, out of 61 WAN, 31 WAN are able to form from 5 to 76 PUWCAN, the remaining 30 - from 1 to 4 PUWCAN.

The analysis showed that the most useful in everyday life are very often selected from among domestic animals: *dog, cat, cow, horse, lamb, sheep* in English; *it, musuk, sigir, kyi, eshak,ot* in the Uzbek language. Among the wild animals, both in English and in Uzbek, the most common are: *wolf –bo'ri, tiger - sher, lion - arslon, bear - ayiq, crow–qarg'a, snake - ilon.*

Such a selection of WAN can be explained by the fact that PUWCAN usually includes the names of animals with qualities useful to humans: *as gentle as a lamb –qo'ydek yuvosh.* From harmful, evil, dangerous animals, either harm, anger, danger, or those positive qualities that a person needs are taken:

1. To fight like a lion - Sherdek olishmoq.

2. Who keeps company with the wolf, will learn how to how - Qozonga yaqin yursang,qorasi yuqadi.

3. As obstinate a samule "stubbornness" - Stubborn as a donkey - itdek (eshakdek) qaysar.

Now let us consider how these data, revealed as a result of the analysis of extra linguistic factors, manifest themselves in linguistic design.

Analysis of the collected factual material from PUWCAN showed that the phraseological activity of all WAN in the composition of PUWCAN is uneven. For example, in some English WANphraseological activity is very high: cat (50 PU), dog (70 PU), at the same time, in other SNJ it is extremely low: lamb (3), rabbit (3), butterfly (1), eagle (1), turtle (1), leopard (1).

According to the data of 5 dictionaries, in contrast to the English language, in the Uzbek language the most active phraseological formation are the following SNJ: "ot" (horse) - 39 PUWCAN and "it" (dog) - 32 PUWCAN. Despite the fact that the amount of PUWCAN data in the Uzbek language is less than in the English language, the frequency of their use is much higher, which is explained by extra linguistic factors. Less active WAN in the composition of PUWCAN: *buqa (bull) - 2 PU, asalari (bee) - 1 PU, bit (louse) - 2 PU.*

In order to identify the influence of the value of WAN on the general phraseological meaning of PUWCAN, the analysis of the dictionary definitions of each WAN was carried out in the work.

The Uzbek WAN "it" is also polysemantic and has the following meanings: *Uyhayvoni - a pet; mahluk, ahloqsizkishihaqida: it tegdi- is an immoral woman.* In the Uzbek family, dogs are not kept. If the dog touches something, then this thing is considered not clean. It was this concept that formed the basis of PUWCAN"it tegdi", which, rethinking a second time, means "immoral", "dissolute", "depraved".

Thus, the figurative meaning of WANis the basis for the rethought meaning of PUWCAN.

Based on the analysis, it was concluded that the formation of phraseological units is equally inherent in both the English and Uzbek languages. However, in the Uzbek language, there is a wider compatibility of WAN than in English (61 WAN and 53 WAN, respectively). Further, it was found that the value of PUWCAN is based on the figurative value of the WAN. This is where the connection between the value of SNJ and PUWCAN is manifested.

As for the figurative meaning, the figurative rethinking of linguistic units seems to be even more important than the area of primary division, since it

exists in our linguistic consciousness in the form of certain associations, representations associated with one or another object of reality. In different languages, figurative rethinking is manifested, not the same. In some cases, completely different characteristics are attributed to the same animals, in others, one and the same figurative feature is assigned to completely different names. For example, the meaning of "stupid" in English is noted for such words with animal names as: *donkey, ass, fish, mule, duck. In the Uzbek language as "it", "eshak".*

It should be noted that in the compared languages the figurative meanings introduced by the WAN sometimes do not coincide due to the mismatch of extra linguistic factors. This is obviously due to the difference in tradition, culture of the peoples themselves. Secondly, there are not always full equivalents in these languages. The image of one animal can evoke several different associations. This is due to the polysemantic nature of the WAN, the more additional hidden in the WAN, the greater its phraseological activity.

For example, WAN, *dog (it)* has 10 meanings in English and Uzbek languages, and all additional meanings are phraseological. On the other hand, different animals can be carriers of the same quality in two languages, in other words, different animals are sometimes associated with one representation. So, for example, the concept of quality "drunk" in English is associated with fish, for example: to drink like a fish, in the Uzbek language the following series of animals*: it, eshak,* they say (but in different situations): To drink like a fish, etc. *ichmoq (mastlik)*specifically about a drunk person.

Phraseological units with the names of animals in English and Uzbek languages are divided into three groups, and each group into small groups.

1. Components found in English and Uzbek.
2. Components found only in Uzbek.

3. The components are only found in English.

Each language has its own national mentality, and in each language you can see the worldview, ideas, traditions of a particular people, they reflect the life of the people. For example, in the Uzbek language one can find phraseological units with insect components, while in English they are not found. In the phraseological units of the Uzbek language, fish are not divided into species, but given only by the word "fish" in English, they are divided into species. In English, they pay attention to the types of fish, but in Uzbek, not very much. For instance,

In English: *draw red herring across the path.*

you cannot hide an eel in a sack.

In Uzbek: *baliqningtirikligisuvbilan, odamningtirikligiodambilan.*

Baliqboshidansasir.

The phraseological activity of the WAN is equally inherent in both the English and Uzbek languages. Specific differences include a wider compatibility of WAN observed in the Uzbek language / 53-60% of WAN / than in English / 61-40% of WAN /.

Imagery is created due to the association that accumulates in the human mind during observation not only of animals, but also of people themselves, which leads to the emergence of new phraseological units. The figurativeness of PUWCAN is based on the figurative meaning of WAN. As examples in the compared languages show, there are differences that are manifested in extralinguistic factors, which is explained by the national-cultural specifics of the image.

Analysis of the schematic structure of PUWCAN revealed the following: in the compared languages, the meaning introduced by the WAN in both

languages has differences that can be identified only taking into account their extralinguistic factors. This is explained by the difference in traditions, the national culture of the peoples themselves, associated with the national and cultural specifics of figurative means in a particular language, which inevitably left its imprint on the semantic content of phraseological units, first of all, on its imagery.

References:

1. Buranov ZH.B. Printsytipologicheskoyinventarizatsiiyazykov. SborniknauchnykhtrudovTashGU.- Tashkent, 1988. – S.10.
2. Buranov ZH.B. Tipologicheskayakategoriya i sravnitel'noyeizucheniyeyazykov: - Avtor. Dis. doktnauk.- M., 1979. – s.35.
3. Gorodetskiy B.YU. K problemesemanticheskoytipologii. – M.: Nauka, 1969. – s.26.
4. Amosova N.N. Osnovyangliyskoyfrazeologii. – Leningrad: LGU, 1978.