

THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

U.E. Tagayeva, teacher, Samarkand State
Institute of Foreign Languages
utogayeva4@gmail.com , +998997442544

S. Xurramova, student, Samarkand State
Institute of Foreign Languages S.Khurramova @gmail.com

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqola ingliz va o'zbek tillarida uchraydigan frazeologik birliklarning qiyosiy tahlilini amalga oshiradi hamda ularning semantik, strukturaviy va madaniy tamoyillar bilan bog'liqligini o'rganadi. Frazeologik birliklar xalqning tarixiy tajribasi, dunyoqarashi va madaniy qadriyatlarini o'zida mujassam etgan barqaror birliklardir. Tadqiqot ikki tilda ishlatiladigan frazeologik birliklarning mazmuniy asoslari, kelib chiqishi, ma'no ko'chishi hamda milliy obrazlilik doirasidagi farqlarni ochib beradi. Solishtirma tahlil natijalari shuni ko'rsatadiki, mazkur birliklar umumiy insoniy tajriba asosida shakllansada, ularning milliy xususiyati ramziy tasvir, madaniy konnotatsiya va tarixiy omillar orqali namoyon bo'ladi. Ushbu tadqiqot ikki til frazeologiyasining o'zaro bog'liqligini chuqur anglashga hamda tarjima jarayonida ekvivalentlikni ta'minlashga hissa qo'shadi.

Kalit so'zlar: *frazeologik birliklar, idiomatik ifodalar, ekvivalentlik, qiyosiy lingvistika, milliy obrazlilik.*

Аннотация

В статье проводится сравнительный анализ фразеологических единиц английского и узбекского языков, исследуются их семантические, структурные и культурные особенности. Фразеологические выражения отражают исторический опыт, национальные традиции и мировоззрение народа, являются важными элементами языковой картины мира. Сравнительное исследование выявляет сходства и различия в семантике, образности и происхождении

устойчивых выражений двух языков. Результаты анализа показывают, что многие фразеологические единицы опираются на универсальный человеческий опыт, однако их культурная специфика определяется традициями, символикой и историческими реалиями.

Ключевые слова: фразеологические единицы, идиоматические выражения, межъязыковое сопоставление, культурная образность, семантическая эквивалентность.

Annotation

This article provides a comparative analysis of phraseological units in English and Uzbek, focusing on their semantic, structural, and cultural characteristics. Phraseological expressions represent collective historical memory, national traditions, and cultural worldview, forming an essential part of linguistic identity. The comparative study reveals similarities and distinctions in the metaphorical imagery, semantic shifts, and cultural connotations of idiomatic expressions in both languages. Findings demonstrate that while many phraseological units are based on universal human experience, their cultural representation is shaped by symbolic imagery, historical conditions, and national mentality.

Keywords: *phraseological units, idiomatic expressions, semantic equivalence, comparative linguistics, national imagery.*

INTRODUCTION

Phraseological units constitute one of the richest and most expressive layers of any language, encapsulating specific cultural, historical, and social experiences. They serve not only as linguistic elements but also as symbols of national mentality and worldview. English and Uzbek phraseological systems represent different cultural traditions, yet both languages preserve idiomatic expressions rooted in universal human cognition. Therefore, comparative analysis of phraseological units contributes to identifying semantic parallels and cultural distinctions between the two languages.

In both linguistic systems, idioms and stable combinations express metaphorical meanings based on human experience, yet their figurative realization reflects cultural

specificity. For instance, the English idiom “the early bird catches the worm” emphasizes punctuality and proactivity, whereas the Uzbek equivalent “ertalabki non qizil” conveys a similar meaning using imagery grounded in daily cultural practice. Such comparisons show that although meanings may coincide, conceptual metaphors differ according to cultural values.

The aim of this study is to analyze Uzbek and English phraseological units comparatively, identify their semantic and cultural commonalities and differences, and examine their equivalence in translation. Research methods include descriptive, comparative, and contextual analyses based on explanatory dictionaries, corpora, and linguistic sources.

Phraseological units in English and Uzbek display a rich combination of semantic depth, cultural symbolism, and metaphorical imagery. Their comparative analysis reveals that despite being grounded in universal human cognition, the two linguistic systems employ different cognitive models and symbolic representations to express similar concepts. In both languages, phraseological units originate from social practices, historical experiences, mythological beliefs, and collective memory; however, the degree of metaphorization, lexical imagery, and cultural orientation varies significantly. This demonstrates that idioms and fixed expressions are not only linguistic constructions but also cultural signs reflecting national mentality.

One of the most productive sources for phraseological development in both languages is **anthropomorphic imagery**, particularly the metaphorical extension of body parts to describe emotional and intellectual states. In English, idioms such as “to have butterflies in one’s stomach” signify nervousness by associating emotion with internal physical sensation, while the Uzbek analogue “ich-eti titramoq” conveys a similar meaning using tactile imagery. Although the physiological metaphor is present in both expressions, the symbolic animal imagery in English presents a more individualized perspective, whereas the Uzbek version highlights bodily sensibility as a collective emotional reaction. Another example is “to have a long face”, expressing sadness in English through facial expression, while Uzbek uses “ko‘ngli tusmoq” or

“eti uvishmoq”, showing how emotions are linked to internal feelings rather than outward appearance. These examples demonstrate that English often externalizes emotional states, whereas Uzbek tends to internalize and conceptualize emotions through the metaphor of heart, soul, or internal sensation.

A notable cultural contrast appears in the metaphorical conceptualization of **honor, pride, and dignity**, which hold central positions in Uzbek mentality. Expressions such as “nomini baland qilmoq”, “yuzini yorug‘ qilmoq”, and “qorni yorilmoq” are deeply rooted in social reputation and collective evaluation. In English, similar ideas may be expressed through idioms like “to save face” or “to hold one’s head high”, but their pragmatic force is less culturally obligatory than in Uzbek. This suggests that Uzbek phraseology frequently encodes social interdependence, while English idioms often reflect individual responsibility and personal autonomy. Consequently, Uzbek idioms demonstrate a stronger reliance on social judgment and moral expectations, whereas English phraseology leans toward psychological states and interpersonal interaction rather than communal evaluation.

Historical experiences have also shaped the semantic evolution of phraseological units. English, being influenced by maritime and colonial history, contains idioms like “to be at the helm”, “to make waves”, and “to miss the boat”, all of which reflect navigation-based conceptual metaphors rooted in seafaring heritage. Uzbek phraseology, influenced by nomadic tradition, agriculture, and pastoral lifestyle, displays imagery such as “otday chopmoq”, “sahroga sig‘maslik”, and “qozon-tovoq bo‘lmoq”, representing spatial freedom, communal living, and domestic unity. Thus, English idioms often rely on directional and movement-based metaphors, whereas Uzbek idioms utilize spatial openness, familial relations, and environmental conditions as dominant sources of meaning. These differences illuminate how the lived experience of speakers shapes linguistic representation.

Another important aspect is the **animal symbolism** within phraseological units. In English, animals frequently symbolize character traits: “a copycat” (someone who imitates), “a dark horse” (an unexpected competitor), or “to cry wolf” (to raise a false

alarm). Meanwhile, Uzbek phraseology employs animals to emphasize social values and moral judgments, as seen in “o‘roqchi bo‘lsang o‘roqchiday bo‘l” (be consistent with your role), “eshakday yurmoq” (work hard silently), or “bo‘riday bo‘ri bo‘lmoq” (remain strong and independent). English animal metaphors are descriptive and evaluative, whereas Uzbek animal metaphors tend to be normative and instructional, reflecting cultural attitudes toward behavior and responsibility. This indicates that Uzbek idioms frequently carry implicit moral lessons, while English idioms focus on characterization and situational evaluation.

Semantic comparison also reveals differences in the **metaphorization of temporal concepts**. English uses linear metaphors to frame time, as in “time flies”, “to lose time”, or “to save time”, showing the conceptualization of time as a measurable commodity. Uzbek, however, portrays time as a seasonal or cyclical process, for example: “kun o‘tib kun kelar”, “nonni non bilan topasan”, or “bahor kelar, g‘alla pishar”. These expressions reflect an agrarian worldview where time is neither wasted nor saved but naturally unfolds. Therefore, while English phraseology adopts economic metaphors of time, Uzbek idioms rely on agricultural-temporal metaphors rooted in environmental experience.

When analyzing **translation equivalence**, it becomes evident that literal translation often fails to convey pragmatic force, cultural nuance, and metaphorical content. For instance, English “to let the cat out of the bag” cannot be rendered word-for-word into Uzbek without losing idiomatic meaning; instead, the closest semantic match is “sirni oshkor qilmoq” or “tili qichimoq”. Conversely, Uzbek “qoshga qarab ko‘z chiqarish” requires explanation in English as “to overdo something and spoil it”, since cultural connotation may not be immediately recognizable. These cases illustrate that phraseological translation must prioritize functional equivalence over lexical matching to maintain meaning, emotional tone, and cultural resonance.

Overall, the comparative analysis demonstrates that **English phraseology tends to reflect individual perspective, emotional expression, and action-oriented meaning**, whereas **Uzbek phraseology emphasizes collectivism, moral didactics,**

and socially embedded values. Yet both languages reveal shared cognitive foundations rooted in human experience—such as love, sorrow, fear, ambition, and pride—suggesting that while metaphorical imagery differs, conceptual universals remain stable. These findings highlight the importance of phraseological competence in intercultural dialogue and linguistic education, especially in translation studies where idiomatic accuracy determines communicative success.

CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis of Uzbek and English phraseological units confirms that idiomatic expressions reflect universal human cognition while simultaneously maintaining distinct cultural markers. Despite shared semantic concepts, imagery, symbolism, and metaphorical embodiment differ due to cultural traditions, values, and historical experience. Therefore, understanding cultural nuances is crucial for correct interpretation, translation, and cross-cultural communication.

Phraseological research enhances theoretical and practical linguistic knowledge, supports translation accuracy, and contributes to cultural studies. Further comparative investigations may explore pragmatic functions, emotional connotations, and cognitive mechanisms in idiomatic structures.

REFERENCES

1. Амосова Н.Н. Основы английской фразеологии. Л., 1989.
2. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. М., 1996.
3. Рахматуллаев III. O‘zbek tili frazeologizmi. Toshkent, 1978.
4. Shomahmudov Sh., Usmonova M. O‘zbek tilida idiomalar. Toshkent, 1995.
5. Cowie A.P. Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications. Oxford, 1998.
6. Moon R. Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English: A Corpus-Based Approach. Oxford, 1996.