



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF IMAGE EXPRESSIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Ruziyeva Dilnoza Eshpulatovna

Termez State University Pedagogical Institute

Foreign Language and Literature English Stage 1 Master Student

dilnozaruziyeva1998@gmail.com

Annotation

This article deals with the comparative analysis of image expressions in English and Uzbek.

Keywords: linguistics, communication, figurative expressions, phraseology, English, Uzbek, comparative analysis, linguistic analysis, comparative grammar.

The comparative-typological study of languages at the present stage has received worldwide activation, occupying one of the leading places in the circle of general linguistic disciplines.

Introduction

In general, the need for a comparative study of languages was caused by the opportunities provided by the comparative study of languages in revealing the features of the functioning of the language system and its individual elements. Comparative-typological linguistics selects as the object of its analysis those problems that are the most relevant and dominant in modern linguistics. More and more intensively, it contributes to the development of the foundations of a universal theory of comparative typological analysis. The origins of this science were such outstanding researchers of the 20th century as E.D.Polivanov, I.I.Meshchaninov and others. In later studies of this direction in the works of V.N.Yartseva, A.I.Smirnitsky, V.A.Zvegintseva, V.G.Gak and many others are developing a wide range of issues related to the methods and aspects of the implementation of comparative typological analysis, its significance for the general theory of language, the development of universal methods for disclosing various aspects of the study of language units and their systems is determined. Comparison of the same linguistic phenomenon in different languages makes it possible to more clearly and visually reveal the essence of the phenomenon under study, to reveal its specificity both in the linguistic and in the speech, functional aspect.

A comparative study of languages with a multi-system structure is carried out on the basis of determining the actual problems that dominate modern linguistics.





In the comparative grammar of the English and Uzbek languages, from the very beginning of its formation, special attention was paid to the study of the problems of the vocabulary of the compared languages, although the problematic coverage of the grammatical aspects of these languages in the contrastive-comparative plan has never lost its significance. At the same time, the lexical aspect of the study of compared languages was of particular interest to researchers.

A comparative analysis of the phraseological system of the Uzbek and English languages is of great scientific importance both for developing a general theory of phraseology and for identifying common, coinciding features of the studied languages.

In the comparative grammar of the English and Uzbek languages, from the very beginning of its formation, special attention was paid to the study of the problems of the vocabulary of the compared languages, although the problematic coverage of the grammatical aspects of these languages in the contrastive-comparative plan has never lost its significance. At the same time, the lexical aspect of the study of compared languages, especially phraseology, was of particular interest to researchers.

In terms of scientific, theoretical and applied significance, comparative and typological studies of the phraseological system of languages are of fundamental importance. This aspect, which covers a wide range of compared linguistic facts, makes it possible to more fully reveal the processes and patterns common to different languages and to systematize the phenomena and processes specific to each of them. At the same time, when implementing linguistic features and properties, each of the languages reveals such details and shades that are inaccessible or difficult to directly observe during their autonomous study.

Comparative analysis of phraseology is of great interest for the study of common and distinctive features of the languages under consideration. The issue of phraseology is relevant because to this day, despite numerous works, some aspects of the study of this section of the science of language remain debatable. Even in the Russian language, where the study of phraseology has the greatest tradition, the question of the elementary unit of phraseology - a phraseological unit or a phraseological unit (PU) - is considered not yet fully developed. A.I. Molotkov (editor of the phraseological dictionary of the Russian language) writes: "Russianists do not have a common opinion about what a phraseological unit, or a phraseological unit of a language is - therefore, there is no unity of views on what is the composition of such units in the language. The lists of phraseological units of the Russian language, proposed by different scientists, are so different from each other that one can talk about different,



often directly opposite, even mutually exclusive views on phraseological units, that is, on differential or distinctive features of the language. (Molotkov 1977.7).

Comparative-typological study of languages, first of all, is aimed at revealing identical and different features of the studied facts of the language.

Comparative study of phraseological units of English and Comparative-typological study of languages, first of all, is aimed at revealing identical and different features of the studied facts of the language.

A comparative study of phraseological units of the English and Uzbek languages is aimed at revealing the essence of the phenomenon under study, revealing its specificity both in linguistic, systemic terms and in speech functional. Therefore, the identification and description of identities and differences between the studied units of the English and Uzbek languages, the definition of equivalent relations between the compared languages is one of the most important aspects of the comparative study of these languages.

The main task that is posed in this case during comparison is the establishment of equivalent relations in the compared languages, therefore, the allocation of the main methods of correspondence between phraseological units. The phraseological composition combines various language combinations that differ from each other, as we considered above when classifying phraseological units according to semantics and grammatical structure, the degree of semantic cohesion of components, grammatical structure, stability, motivation, etc. As the comparison shows, in general, the study of equivalent relations between phraseological units of compared languages leads to the identification of the following types of interlingual relations: full and partial phraseological equivalents, full and partial phraseological analogues and non-equivalent phraseological units. Such a distinction between phraseological units in a comparative study naturally proceeds from the criteria for identifying allomorphic and isomorphic characteristics at the phraseological level. It most clearly reflects the specific features of the compared languages in displaying the linguistic and national properties of both languages, since, despite, although distant, but genetically related relations between the compared languages, the phraseology of the two languages has developed and is developing in different ways and in different conditions. Russian language is aimed at revealing the essence of the phenomenon under study, revealing its specificity both in linguistic, systemic terms and in speech functional. Therefore, the identification and description of identities and differences between the studied units of the English and Tajik languages, the definition of equivalent relations between the compared languages is one of the most important aspects of the comparative study of these languages.





The main task that is posed in this case during comparison is the establishment of equivalent relations in the compared languages, therefore, the allocation of the main methods of correspondence between phraseological units. The phraseological composition combines various language combinations that differ from each other, as we considered above when classifying phraseological units according to semantics and grammatical structure, the degree of semantic cohesion of components, grammatical structure, stability, motivation, etc. As the comparison shows, in general, the study of equivalent relations between phraseological units of compared languages leads to the identification of the following types of interlingual relations: full and partial phraseological equivalents, full and partial phraseological analogues and non-equivalent phraseological units. Such a distinction between phraseological units in a comparative study naturally proceeds from the criteria for identifying allomorphic and isomorphic characteristics at the phraseological level. It most clearly reflects the specific features of the compared languages in displaying the linguistic and national properties of both languages, since, despite, although distant, but genetically related relations between the compared languages, the phraseology of the two languages has developed and is developing in different ways and in different conditions.

It should be noted that modern phraseology has not yet developed a unified terminology when studying the criteria of correspondence and equivalent relations between phraseological units in comparative terms. Researchers use different terms when referring to the concept of "equivalent or interlingual relations": "homonymy and polysemy", "identity", "interlingual phraseological units", "stylistic synonymy", identical parallels and partially identical parallels, "absolutely identical" and "semantically identical PU", "semantic-component correspondences", "semantically equivalent units", etc.

Thus, summing up the review of the literature on the problem of interlingual correspondences of phraseological units, it should be noted that the problem of determining the criteria for identifying phraseological equivalence and, in general, distinguishing between types and types of phraseological correspondences is legitimately based on three aspects: semantic, structural-grammatical and component. The semantic aspect of the study of phraseological units considers the features of the semantic formation of phraseological units in the compared languages, highlights the similarities and differences between the phraseological units of the compared languages in terms of content. The structural-grammatical aspect considers the features of the structural organization of phraseological units in the compared languages, establishes the types and kinds of structural models and reveals the possibilities of their adequate replacement. The component aspect is associated with



determining the features of the component formation of phraseological units in the compared languages, identifying the identity or difference of organizing elements in the component composition of the compared phraseological units.

As our analysis has shown, each of these aspects has its own specific features and requires independent consideration, although when identifying specific cases of correspondence, each of the aspects shows its own characteristics, which is associated with a certain aspect of the functioning of phraseological units in languages. The organization and formation of each of the aspects in the compared languages shows its own specific features, which is manifested in specific types of correspondences. It should be noted that modern phraseology has not yet developed a unified terminology when studying the criteria for correspondence and equivalent relations between phraseological units in a comparative plan. Researchers use different terms when referring to the concept of "equivalent or interlingual relations": "homonymy and polysemy", "identity", "interlingual phraseological units", "stylistic synonymy", identical parallels and partially identical parallels, "absolutely identical" and "semantically identical PU", "semantic-component correspondences", "semantically equivalent units", etc.

Thus, summing up the review of the literature on the problem of interlingual correspondences of phraseological units, it should be noted that the problem of determining the criteria for identifying phraseological equivalence and, in general, distinguishing between types and types of phraseological correspondences is legitimately based on three aspects: semantic, structural-grammatical and component. The semantic aspect of the study of phraseological units considers the features of the semantic formation of phraseological units in the compared languages, highlights the similarities and differences between the phraseological units of the compared languages in terms of content. The structural-grammatical aspect considers the features of the structural organization of phraseological units in the compared languages, establishes the types and kinds of structural models and reveals the possibilities of their adequate replacement. The component aspect is associated with determining the features of the component formation of phraseological units in the compared languages, identifying the identity or difference of organizing elements in the component composition of the compared phraseological units.

As our analysis has shown, each of these aspects has its own specific features and requires independent consideration, although when identifying specific cases of correspondence, each of the aspects shows its own characteristics, which is associated with a certain aspect of the functioning of phraseological units in languages. The organization and formation of each of the aspects in the compared languages shows



its own specific features, which is manifested in specific types of correspondences in the Uzbek and English languages.

The main types of interlingual relations of phraseological units include: 1) phraseological equivalents (full and partial); 2) phraseological analogues (full and partial); 3) non-equivalent phraseological units in the Uzbek and English languages. Equivalent, as noted above, are phraseological units that are identical in semantics, structural and grammatical organization and component composition. Usually, two groups of phraseological equivalence are distinguished, which is based on differences in the ways of expression:

1) complete equivalence; 2) partial equivalence (having minor differences in terms of expressing phraseological units of identical semantics).

Full equivalents cover phraseological units that have the same meaning, the same structural and grammatical organization and component composition, as well as the same stylistic function. Full equivalence between phraseological units of the studied languages is rarely allowed, therefore phraseological units with full equivalents make up the largest number.

English-Uzbek phraseological analogues form phraseological units that express the same or close meaning, but show a complete difference in other aspects.

References

1. Жамолдиновна, Б.М. (2020). Лингвокультурологические научные направления и интерпретация языка и культуры в современной лингвистике. *Вестник Приамурского государственного университета им. Шолом-Алейхема*, (3 (40)), 104-115.
2. Bekiyeva, M.J.K. (2022). DEVELOPMENT OF LINGUOCULTUROLOGY AND INTERPRETATION OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE IN MODERN LINGUISTICS. *Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies (CARJIS)*, 2(1), 93-102.
3. Saxibdjanovna, N.M. (2022). Special Requirements For Textile Production On Exporting To The European Market. *Eurasian Scientific Herald*, 5, 56-60.
4. Jamoldinovna, B.M. (2020). Lingvokulturologiyaning tadqiqot obyekti, predmeti, maqsadi va vazifalari. *Интернаука*, 18(147 часть 3), 69.
5. Bekiyeva, M.J. Q. (2022). Frazeologiya bo'limining mustaqil fan bo 'lib shakllanishi. *Science and Education*, 3(1), 393-399.
6. Oblanazarovna, S.N. (2022). LINGUISTIC VIEWS OF WOMEN'S COMMUNICATION. *Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research*, 3(01), 83-88.



7. Bekiyeva, M. J. Q. (2022). FRAZEOLOGIK BIRLIKLER OBRAZLILIK VA EMOTSIONAL-EKSPRESSIVLIKNI YUZAGA KELTIRUVCHI ENG MUHIM VOSITA. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 2(1), 650-655.
8. Oblanazarovna, S.N. (2022). Psycholinguistics One of The Modern Branches of Linguistics. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*, 4, 277-280.