

COMPARATIVE AND TYPOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS  
IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Samandarova Go‘zal Shokir qizi

**Abstract**

Phraseological units represent an important linguistic phenomenon that reflects both universal communicative functions and language-specific cultural features. This article presents a comparative and typological analysis of phraseological units in English and Uzbek. Using a qualitative and descriptive methodology, the study examines structural, semantic, functional, and cultural aspects of phraseological units in the two languages. The findings reveal that while English and Uzbek phraseological units share core characteristics such as semantic indivisibility, stability, and expressive function, they differ significantly in metaphorical motivation, stylistic distribution, and cultural grounding. The study also identifies different types of equivalence between phraseological units, including full, partial, and non-equivalence. The results highlight the importance of comparative phraseological analysis for theoretical linguistics, language teaching, and translation studies.

**Keywords**

phraseological units; comparative analysis; typology; English and Uzbek; idiomaticity; cultural specificity

**Introduction**

Phraseological units constitute an essential and expressive component of language, reflecting not only linguistic structure but also cultural and cognitive aspects of meaning. These units, which include idioms, fixed expressions, and stable word combinations, are characterized by semantic unity and relative structural stability. In linguistics, phraseology has gained increasing attention due to its importance in communication, stylistics, and intercultural understanding.

Comparative and typological analysis of phraseological units across languages enables researchers to identify both universal patterns and language-specific features. English and Uzbek represent two typologically different languages: English belongs to the Germanic branch of the Indo-European language family, while Uzbek is a Turkic, agglutinative language. Despite these differences, both languages possess a rich system of phraseological units that perform similar communicative and expressive functions.

The comparative study of English and Uzbek phraseological units is particularly relevant because it highlights how different linguistic systems encode figurative meaning and cultural values. Phraseological units often preserve historical experiences, national traditions, and collective worldviews, making them an important object of contrastive

analysis. The present article aims to conduct a comparative and typological analysis of phraseological units in English and Uzbek by examining their structural and semantic features, typological classification, and cultural specificity.

### **Methods**

This study adopts a qualitative and descriptive research methodology based on comparative and theoretical analysis. The primary method involves a systematic review of linguistic literature on phraseology in both English and Uzbek linguistics. Classical and contemporary works by leading scholars are analyzed to identify commonly accepted definitions, criteria, and classification principles of phraseological units.

Comparative analysis is employed to examine similarities and differences between English and Uzbek phraseological units at structural, semantic, and functional levels. Examples of phraseological units are selected from authoritative dictionaries, academic studies, and language teaching materials to illustrate theoretical observations. These examples are analyzed in terms of grammatical structure, degree of idiomaticity, and semantic motivation.

Typological analysis is used to group phraseological units according to shared features such as grammatical form, semantic cohesion, and communicative function. Cultural interpretation is also applied to explain differences in metaphorical imagery and national specificity. The study does not rely on quantitative corpus data, as its main focus is on theoretical comparison rather than statistical frequency.

To ensure the reliability and validity of the analysis, the selection of sources was guided by their academic relevance, methodological rigor, and influence on phraseological studies. Priority was given to widely cited works that have shaped theoretical discussions on phraseology in both English and Uzbek linguistics. This approach allows the study to build on well-established frameworks while also identifying points of convergence and divergence between different scholarly traditions.

The analytical procedure follows several stages. First, key theoretical concepts related to phraseological units are identified and systematized. Second, definitions and classification models proposed by different scholars are compared to determine shared criteria and theoretical inconsistencies. Third, representative examples of phraseological units from both languages are examined in parallel in order to illustrate typological similarities and differences. This step-by-step procedure ensures a coherent and transparent analytical process.

In addition, contextual analysis is applied to examine how phraseological units function within authentic linguistic contexts. Selected examples are analyzed in terms of their pragmatic and stylistic roles in discourse, including their expressive, evaluative, and emotive functions. Although the study does not employ large-scale corpus data, the use of contextualized examples helps demonstrate how phraseological units operate in actual language use.

An interdisciplinary perspective is also incorporated by drawing on insights from cultural and cognitive linguistics. Cultural interpretation is used to explain how national traditions, social norms, and historical experience influence the formation and meaning of phraseological units. Cognitive approaches, such as metaphor-based analysis, help clarify the conceptual motivation underlying figurative expressions in both English and Uzbek.

### Results

The comparative analysis reveals that phraseological units in both English and Uzbek share several core characteristics. In both languages, phraseological units are marked by semantic indivisibility, meaning that their overall meaning cannot be derived directly from the meanings of individual components. For example, the English idiom “*kick the bucket*” and the Uzbek expression “*olamdan o'tmoq*” both refer to death, though their literal imagery differs significantly.

Structurally, phraseological units in both languages can be classified into verbal, nominal, and adjectival types. Verbal phraseological units are particularly frequent in both languages and function as predicates within sentences. English examples such as “*break the ice*” and Uzbek expressions like “*muzni eritmoq*” illustrate similar communicative functions despite typological differences in grammatical structure.

The analysis also shows that phraseological units differ in their degree of idiomaticity. Some units are fully idiomatic and opaque, while others are partially motivated and allow limited semantic interpretation. This gradation is observable in both languages, although the metaphorical sources often differ. English phraseological units frequently rely on everyday actions and objects, whereas Uzbek units tend to reflect social relations, nature, and moral values.

Typological classification further demonstrates that phraseological units in English and Uzbek perform similar functional roles. They are used to express evaluation, emotion, emphasis, and pragmatic attitudes. However, stylistic distribution varies: English phraseological units are widely used in informal spoken discourse and media language, while Uzbek phraseological units often carry strong cultural and stylistic coloring, especially in literary and folkloric contexts.

Further results indicate that equivalence between English and Uzbek phraseological units can be classified into several types. In some cases, full equivalence is observed, where both languages employ phraseological units with similar meanings and comparable metaphorical motivation. For instance, English expressions related to emotional states often have Uzbek counterparts that convey the same pragmatic effect, even if the lexical components differ. Such cases demonstrate that universal human experiences can lead to parallel phraseological development across typologically different languages (Vinogradov, 1947).

Partial equivalence is more frequent and is characterized by similarity in meaning but differences in imagery or structural form. In these cases, phraseological units in English and Uzbek perform the same communicative function but rely on different cultural symbols. This finding confirms that phraseological meaning is shaped by national worldview and culturally specific conceptualizations (Kunin, 1970). As a result, direct lexical correspondence is not always possible, even when semantic intention is shared.

The analysis also reveals a group of non-equivalent phraseological units that are unique to one language and lack direct counterparts in the other. These units are often deeply rooted in national traditions, historical events, or culturally specific practices. Uzbek phraseological units frequently reflect concepts related to family relations, respect, and social hierarchy, whereas English units may draw on historical, maritime, or literary sources. This asymmetry highlights the strong link between phraseology and cultural identity (Gläser, 1998).

Another significant result concerns the pragmatic usage of phraseological units. In both languages, phraseological units are strategically employed to increase expressiveness, persuasion, and emotional impact in discourse. However, the degree of conventionality differs. English phraseological units are more frequently used in everyday spoken interaction and journalistic texts, while Uzbek phraseological units often retain a marked stylistic value and are especially prominent in artistic and folkloric discourse.

### **Discussion**

The findings confirm that phraseological units represent a complex linguistic phenomenon that combines universal linguistic principles with language-specific and culture-bound features. The shared characteristics observed in English and Uzbek phraseological units support the view that phraseology fulfills common communicative needs across languages, such as expressiveness and evaluative meaning.

At the same time, the differences identified in metaphorical motivation and structural realization highlight the influence of typological and cultural factors. English phraseological units reflect the analytic structure of the language and its historical sources, while Uzbek phraseological units are shaped by agglutinative morphology and national traditions. This reinforces the idea that phraseological systems cannot be fully understood without considering cultural context.

The diversity of classification approaches discussed in the literature suggests that no single typological model can adequately capture all aspects of phraseological units. Structural classifications provide grammatical clarity, semantic classifications reveal degrees of idiomaticity, and functional classifications emphasize communicative roles. An integrative approach that combines these perspectives is therefore the most effective framework for comparative phraseological analysis.

The results also have important implications for applied linguistics. In language teaching, awareness of cross-linguistic similarities and differences in phraseology can help learners avoid literal translation errors and develop idiomatic competence. In translation studies, understanding cultural specificity is crucial for achieving functional equivalence rather than word-for-word correspondence.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, the comparative and typological analysis of phraseological units in English and Uzbek demonstrates that phraseology is a dynamic and culturally embedded component of language. While both languages share fundamental features such as semantic unity, stability, and expressive function, they differ in structural organization, metaphorical sources, and stylistic usage.

The study confirms that phraseological units serve as linguistic and cultural markers, reflecting national identity and collective experience. By adopting a comparative and typological perspective, the article contributes to a deeper understanding of phraseological systems across languages. Future research may expand this analysis through corpus-based studies and investigate phraseological usage in specific discourse genres.

### REFERENCES:

- Cowie, A. P. (1998). *Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications*. Oxford University Press.
- Gläser, R. (1998). The stylistic potential of phraseological units in the light of genre analysis. In A. P. Cowie (Ed.), *Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and applications* (pp. 125–143). Oxford University Press.
- Kunin, A. V. (1970). *Angliyskaya frazeologiya* [English phraseology]. Vysshaya Shkola.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1947). *Russkiy yazyk: Grammaticheskoe uchenie o slove* [The Russian language: A grammatical study of the word]. Uchpedgiz.
- Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.