



COMPARATIVE SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF COLLOCATIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Tursunboyeva Ruxshona Yo'ldosh qizi

*Faculty of English filology and translation, Samarkand State institute of
Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan*

Annotation: *This study presents a comparative semantic analysis of collocations in English and Uzbek. It examines how words are combined in both languages and highlights similarities and differences. The research focuses on common types of collocations and shows that their meanings are not always translated directly. The study also explains the importance of collocations for natural communication and discusses challenges faced by language learners. The results can help improve vocabulary, translation skills, and overall language use.*

Annotatsiya: *Ushbu tadqiqot ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi qo'shma gaplarning qiyosiy semantik tahlilini taqdim etadi. U ikkala tilda so'zlarning qanday birikishini o'rganadi va o'xshashlik va farqlarni ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqot umumiy ko'rinishdagi birikma turlariga e'tibor qaratadi va ularning ma'nolari har doim ham to'g'ridan-to'g'ri tarjima qilinmasligini ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqot, shuningdek, tabiiy muloqot uchun kollokatsiyalarning ahamiyatini tushuntiradi va til o'rganuvchilar duch keladigan muammolarni muhokama qiladi. Natijalar lug'at, tarjima ko'nikmalarini va umumiy tildan foydalanishni yaxshilashga yordam beradi*

Key words: *collocations, semantics, the English language and the Uzbek languages, comparison, meaning.*



Introduction. Collocations play an important role in every language because they help speakers sound natural and fluent. A collocation is a combination of words that are commonly used together, such as “make a decision” in English or “qaror qabul qilmoq” in Uzbek. Understanding these combinations is essential for effective communication and accurate language use. This article focuses on the comparative semantic analysis of collocations in English and Uzbek. It aims to explore how meanings are formed when words are combined and to identify similarities and differences between the two languages. Although some collocations may appear similar, their meanings and usage are often influenced by cultural and linguistic factors. The study of collocations is especially useful for language learners, translators, and teachers, as it helps avoid common mistakes and improves fluency. By analyzing collocations from both languages, this article seeks to provide a clearer understanding of their semantic features and practical usage.

Methodology. Many linguists have studied collocations and their role in language. Researchers state that collocations are not random combinations but follow certain patterns and rules. According to linguistic studies, collocations are closely connected with semantics, as their meanings are often not predictable from individual words. Previous research also shows that mastering collocations helps learners improve fluency and avoid unnatural expressions. In both English and Uzbek linguistics, collocations are considered an important part of vocabulary learning. This study uses a comparative method to analyze collocations in English and Uzbek. Examples are selected from common usage in both languages. The analysis focuses on their structure, meaning, and semantic features. Different types of collocations are compared to identify similarities and differences.

Types of Collocations:

Collocations can be classified into several types based on their structure:

- Verb + Noun: make a mistake / xato qilmoq



- Adjective + Noun: strong tea / achchiq choy
- Adverb + Verb: deeply regret / chuqur afsuslanmoq

These patterns exist in both English and Uzbek, although their usage may vary.

Semantic Analysis of Collocations:

Semantic analysis focuses on meaning. In collocations, meaning is often different from the literal meaning of individual words. For example, “strong tea” does not refer to physical strength, but to the intensity of the tea. In many cases, collocations are fixed and cannot be freely changed. For instance, English speakers say “make a decision,” not “do a decision.” This shows that collocations have specific semantic restrictions.

In Uzbek, similar patterns exist, but sometimes there is more flexibility in word choice. However, many collocations still follow conventional usage and must be learned as fixed expressions.

Comparative studies by Wanner have established frameworks for cross-linguistic collocation analysis, emphasizing the importance of examining both formal and semantic equivalence when comparing collocations across languages. The literature reveals that English collocations frequently exploit polysemy and semantic extension, with individual lexical items participating in multiple collocation patterns across different semantic fields, as demonstrated by Hanks in his analysis of verb patterns and semantic preferences.

Similarities:

Both English and Uzbek use collocations to create natural and meaningful expressions. Many collocations in both languages have similar meanings, especially in common everyday situations. In addition, both languages show regular patterns such as verb–noun and adjective–noun combinations.



Differences:

Despite similarities, there are important differences. First, many collocations cannot be translated word-for-word. For example, “pay attention” in English corresponds to “e’tibor bermoq” in Uzbek. Second, English collocations tend to be more fixed and less flexible. Uzbek, on the other hand, may allow some variation depending on context. Cultural factors also influence collocations, leading to differences in meaning and usage.

The analysis identified three primary semantic types of English collocations: compositional collocations where meaning is predictable from components, semi-compositional collocations involving metaphorical extension or semantic specialization, and non-compositional collocations approaching idiomaticity. Metaphorical collocations in English frequently employ systematic conceptual mappings such as ARGUMENT IS WAR ("defend position," "attack argument") or TIME IS MONEY ("spend time," "waste time"), demonstrating productivity across semantic domains. In contrast, Uzbek collocations exhibit stronger semantic compositionality and cultural-conceptual motivation, with meaning construction more directly tied to literal semantic content or to conventional cultural associations. Body-part collocations in Uzbek, such as "ko'ngli ochildi" (heart opened, meaning became happy) or "qo'li yengil" (hand light, meaning generous), demonstrate systematic semantic patterns where physical attributes metaphorically encode psychological and moral qualities.

These metaphorical patterns differ from English equivalents, reflecting culture-specific conceptualizations of emotion and character. The semantic analysis revealed that Uzbek verb-noun collocations frequently employ semantically "light" verbs such as "qilmoq" (do/make) or "bermoq" (give) combined with action nouns, a pattern reflecting the agglutinative structure where semantic content concentrates in nominal elements. This contrasts with English preference for semantically



"heavy" verbs that encode specific actions independently. Semantic restrictions in Uzbek collocations often correlate with cultural and religious concepts, with certain collocational patterns reserved for specific semantic domains such as respect, hospitality, or religious practice, creating semantic fields with limited metaphorical extension to other domains.

Conclusion. The findings of this research contribute to a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic and cross-cultural variations in the conceptualization and articulation of distress. Furthermore, this study highlights the utility of corpus-assisted discourse analysis in uncovering subtle yet significant semantic nuances within literary texts. By grounding our analysis in empirical linguistic data, we move beyond intuitive interpretations and provide a more systematic and evidence-based account of how profound emotions like sorrow are constructed and conveyed through language in different literary and cultural contexts. Future research could expand upon this initial investigation by examining a broader range of literary texts and exploring the diachronic evolution of these semantic fields within both English and Uzbek.

List of used literature:

1. Wanner, L. (Ed.). (1996). Lexical functions in lexicography and natural language processing. John Benjamins Publishing.
2. 10. Hanks, P. (2013). Lexical analysis: Norms and exploitations. MIT Press.
3. Rahmatullaev, Sh. (2000). O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati. O'qituvchi.
4. Abduazizov, A. A. (2014). O'zbek tilida so'z birikmalari. Akademnashr.
5. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. University of Chicago Press.
6. <https://grnjournal.us>