SYSTEMATIZATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Mukhammadieva Shakhzoda Farkhodovna
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: This article deals with the analysis and systematization of phraseological units with the names of animals in the English and Uzbek languages, in a comparative plan and carried out semantic typology in two languages, taking into account the extralinguistic factors.

Keywords: analysis; phraseological units; sema; component; extra-linguistic; typology.

Introduction: Semantic typology determines typological features on the basis of semantic properties of languages (or subsystems), the ultimate goal of which is to establish semantic universals.

The way of inventorying language systems is one of the main and basic typological tasks, without solving which it is impossible to proceed to their comparison. Typological inventory is a study, parsing, textual analysis of the systems of each language being compared separately and in parallel [1,p.10].

In the given work the semantic inventory of "words of names of animals" and "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" in typologically different languages, and English and Uzbek, based on the theory of typological semantic opposition, B.Yu. Gorodetsky [3,p.26] and the typological category of J. Buranov [2,p.35].

Preliminary analysis of the entire corpus of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" in two unrelated languages allowed to establish the fact that the national-cultural specificity of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" lies in the nature of imagery, which is the basis of the national originality of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals", which is studied and revealed at the semantic level of analysis.

The analysis of the semantic structure of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" has shown, in the compared languages the meanings brought by the SNJ sometimes do not coincide due to the mismatch of linguistic factors, which can be identified only by taking into account extralinguistic factors. This is explained by the difference of traditions, national culture of the peoples themselves, associated with the national and cultural specificity of figurative means in a particular language,

which inevitably left its mark on the semantic content of phraseological expressions, primarily on its figurativeness.

The experience of comparing English and Uzbek "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" has shown that a number of extra-linguistic factors are the reasons for the frequent use of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" by the peoples.

As a result of the analysis of English and Uzbek "words of names of animals" it was found that the participation of "words of names of animals" in the formation of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" is primarily determined by a number of extra-linguistic factors, which are the primary basis for the phrase-formation activity of "words of names of animals" in "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" , namely: 1) the functional and vital importance, usefulness of this or that animal in the human household: dog -it, cat- mushuk, cow-sigir, horse – ot; 2) the influence of the national tradition of this or that people's characteristics, the quality of animals acceptable to that people on the regularity of "words of names of animals" participation in "phraseological units with a component of names of animals". Consequently, not all "words of names of animals" are included in "phraseological units with a component of names of animals".

The analysis showed that from the number of domestic animals very often the most useful in everyday life are chosen: dog, cat, cow, horse, lamb, sheep in English; it, mushuk, sigir, qo'y, eshak, in the Uzbek language. Of the wild animals in both English and Uzbek, the most common are: wolf – bo'ri, tiger –sher, lion– arslon, bear – ayiq, crow– qarg'a, snake – ilon.

Such a selection of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" can be explained by the fact that "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" usually include the names of animals with qualities useful to humans: as gentle as a lamb –qo'ydek yuvosh. From harmful, evil, dangerous animals are taken either harmfulness, malice, danger, or those positive qualities that humans need:

1. To fight like a lion "courage"-sherdek olishmoq.
2. Who keep scompany with the wolf, will learn how to howl "bad behavior"-to live with wolves, to howl at wolves-qozonga yaqin yursang qorasi yuqadi.
3. As obstinate as a mule "stubbornness" –itdek (eshakdek) qaysar.

Now let us consider how these data, revealed by the analysis of extralinguistic factors, manifest themselves in linguistic design.

The analysis of the collected factual material from "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" has shown that the phrase-forming activity of all "words of names of animals" within "phraseological units with a component of names

of animals" is uneven. For example, some English SNJs have a very high phrase-forming activity: cat (50), dog (70), while other "words of names of animals" have an extremely low activity: lamb (3), rabbit (3), butterfly (1), eagle (1), turtle (1), leopard (1).

According to 5 dictionaries, unlike the English language, in the Uzbek language the most phrase-forming active are the following "words of names of animals" : "ot"-horse and "it"- dog – 32 "phraseological units with a component of names of animals". Despite the fact that the number of these FNJs in the Uzbek language is less than in English, the frequency of their use is much higher, which is explained by extralinguistic factors. Less active SNJs in "phraseological units with a component of names of animals": buqa- ox; asalari- bees.

In order to identify the influence of the "words of names of animals" meaning on the general phraseological meaning of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals", the analysis of dictionary definitions of each "words of names of animals" was carried out.

The analysis of the dictionary definitions of "words of names of animals" has shown that they are mostly polysemantic, the formation of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" is based on one of the differential semes of the meaning of "words of names of animals". Phraseologicalization of"phraseological units with a component of names of animals" is based on the action, character and function of these animals in everyday life. Thus, for example, the "words of names of animals" ape is polysemantic and denotes:

1) Animal (tailless monkey).

2) Person who mimics (to play ape; to make smb. one's ape).

3) Clumsy, ill-bred person (god's ape; hairy ape).

The analysis of the definitions of SNV revealed that the phraseological meaning is based on the figurative meaning of SNV: clumsy - "to act as one must" (second meaning), and "ill-bred person" (third meaning).

The Uzbek "words of names of animals"- "it" is also polysemantic and has the following meanings:

1. Uy hayvoni –domestic animal;

2. Mahluq, axloqsiz kishi haqida: it tegdi- an immoral woman.

The Uzbek family does not keep dogs. If a dog touches something, it is not considered clean. It is this notion that formed the basis of the "phraseological units with a component of names of animals"- "it tegdi", which, secondary reinterpreted, means "immoral", "promiscuous", "depraved".

Thus, the figurative meaning of "words of names of animals" is the basis for the reinterpreted meaning of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals".

On the basis of the analysis, it was concluded that the formation of phraseological expressions is equally inherent in both English and Uzbek languages. However, in the Uzbek language there is a wider combinability of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" than in English. Further, it was found that the meaning of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" is based on the figurative meaning of "words of names of animals". This is where the relationship between the meaning of and "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" appears.

As for figurative meaning, figurative reinterpretation of linguistic units seems even more important than the area of primary membership, since it exists in our linguistic consciousness in the form of certain associations, representations associated with this or that subject of reality. In different languages, figurative reinterpretation manifests itself, not in the same way. In some cases, completely different characteristics are attributed to the same animals, in others, the same figurative feature is assigned to completely different names. For example, the meaning "stupid" in English is noted in such words with names of animals as: donkey, ass, fish, mule, duck. In the Uzbek language as "it", "eshak".

As for the imagery of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals", they characterize properties, state or action through a specific image, based in the compared languages, mainly on the additional semes of "words of names of animals":

1) Ass (domestic animal) - eshak (uy hayvoni),

2) Fool - ahmok, tentak: Never bray at an ass - do not mess with a fool - ahmokga gap yukmaydi, toshga mih utmaydi.

It should be noted that in the comparable languages the figurative meanings introduced by the "words of names of animals" sometimes do not coincide due to the mismatch of extralinguistic factors. This is obviously due to the difference in tradition and culture of the peoples themselves. Secondly, there are not always complete equivalents in these languages. The image of a single animal can evoke several different associations. This is due to the polysemantic nature of the SNJ, the more additional latent semes in the SNJ, the greater its phrase-forming activity.

For example, the "words of names of animals" , dog "it" has 10 meanings in English and in Uzbek, and all additional meanings are phrase-forming. On the other hand, carriers of the same quality in the two languages may be different animals, in other words, different animals are sometimes associated with the same representation. So,

for example, the concept of the quality "drunk" in English is associated with a fish for example: to drink like a fish, in Uzbek the following series of animals: it, eshak, mol; Another example: "timidity" in English is associated with the word "goose", in Uzbek with the words "qo'yi", "pashsha", "mushuk": not to be able to say 'boo' to a goose "qo'ydek yuvosh", "qo'y og'zidan cho'p olmagan", "pashshaga ham ozor bermaydi".

The study of dictionary definitions of words with the names of animals and phraseological units with the components of animal names in the compared languages revealed that the names of animals, used in figurative meaning, serve in both languages as the basis for figurative characteristics of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals".

So, figurative reinterpretation in English and Uzbek languages occurs in different ways in different languages. In some cases, completely different characteristics are attributed to the same animals, in other cases, the same figurative feature is assigned to completely different denominations. For example: the meaning "stupid" in English is marked in the following SNVs: donkey, ass, fish, mule, duck, cuckoo, goose; in the Uzbek language in the SNV "eshak". However, the phrase-forming activity of these ELNs in the creation of the figurative meaning of the FFs is not equal, i.e. phrase-forming secondary re-thinking in some of them is marked due to their inability to create FFs, respectively, they cannot serve as a typological benchmark when comparing FFs with their correlates in the Uzbek language (isomorphic phenomenon).

As we can see from the above examples, the sema "stupid" is figuratively marked in the "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" in English with the LNJ "ass", in Uzbek with the LNJ "eshak", which allows us to talk about a partial lexical correspondence of this image in the correlating languages.

The phrase-forming activity of SNG is equally inherent to both English and Uzbek languages. The specific differences include a wider combinability of ELLs observed in the Uzbek language (53-60% of ELLs) than in English (61-40% of ELLs).

Imagery is created due to association, which is accumulated in human consciousness while observing not only animals, but also people themselves, which leads to the emergence of new phraseological units. The imagery of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" is based on the figurative meaning of SNJ. As the examples in the compared languages show, there are differences, which are manifested in extra-linguistic factors, which is explained by the national-cultural specificity of the image.

The analysis of the semantic structure of "phraseological units with a component of names of animals" revealed the following: in the compared languages the meaning

brought by the SNJ in both languages have differences, which can only be revealed by taking into account their extralinguistic factors. This is explained by the difference of traditions, national culture of the peoples themselves, related to the national-cultural specificity of figurative means in this or that language, which inevitably put an imprint on the semantic content of phraseological expressions, primarily on its figurativeness.

REFERENCES
1. Buranov J.B. Typological Category and Comparative Study of Languages: - Author. D. / Doctor of Philosophy / M., 1979. - c.35. Gorodetsky B.Y. To the problem of semantic typology. - Moscow: Nauka, 1969. - c.26.
2. Eble C. Slang and Sociability: in group language among college students / C. Eble. - Chapel Hill, New York : University of North Carolina Press, 1996. - 228 p.
3. Rakhmonova A. STYLISTIC PECULIARITIES OF EXPRESSING INNER EMOTIONS OF PERSONAGES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH NOVELS //Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal. – 2021. – T. 2021. – №. 2. – C. 9-19.
4. Barbiery F. Patterns of age-based linguistic variation in American English / F. Barbiery // Journal of Sociolinguistics. - 2008. - 12. - P. 58 88.
5. Dictionary of Contemporary Slang / T. Thorne. – London: A&C Black, 2007. - 494 p.