

Article

Semantic Features of Phraseological Units in English and Uzbek Languages

Raxmonova Iroda Odilovna

1. Fergana State University

* Correspondence: rdk.diliy@mail.ru

Abstract: This article examines the semantic features of phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages, focusing on their classification and distinct characteristics. While phraseological semantics shares similarities with lexical semantics, it exhibits unique traits. The study addresses the knowledge gap in the classification of phraseological units by exploring their broader semantic structure, which transcends denotative and connotative meanings. The research employs a comparative linguistic methodology, analyzing the semantic components of phraseological units in both languages. Findings reveal that phraseological units in English and Uzbek have different types of semantic structures, yet share common elements. Sh. Rakhmatullayev's classification of Uzbek phraseological units into integrity, mixing, and introduction provides a foundational framework. The study identifies three main types of phraseological meanings: idiomatic, idiophrasematic, and phrasematic. These findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the complex nature of phraseological semantics. The implications of this research extend to language teaching and cross-cultural communication, providing a valuable reference for linguists, educators, and translators working with phraseological units in both languages. The study highlights the need for further exploration into the classification and interpretation of phraseological units, encouraging future research in this underexplored area.

Keywords: phraseological unit, idiomatic main, idiophrasematic meaning, phrasematicmain

Citation: Odilovna, R. I. Semantic Features of Phraseological Units in English and Uzbek Languages. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics* 2024, 3(3), 71-76.

Received: 10th June 2024

Revised: 11th July 2024

Accepted: 24th August 2024

Published: 27th Sept 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

The classification of phraseological units is one of the most important issues of phraseology. In their classification, the semantic features of the units are the basis along with the general structure (Smirnova, 2019). There are different approaches to classifying phraseological units according to certain criteria. Researchers believe that phraseological semantics is closely related to lexical semantics, but it has several characteristic features. The semantic structure of phraseological units is broader than its meaning. Because it is not limited only to the symbolic, denotative and connotative sides, but is also determined by the integrity of the entire education, the type of its grammatical meaning (Naturalnova, 2019).

Phraseological units are incompatible in their semantic structure. Each of their types has its own semantic features, but, nevertheless, they also have common features. The lexical meaning of the FB components, the literal or reinterpreted meaning of their prototype form the semantic component of phraseology.

Sh. Rakhmatullayev was considered a mature scientist who conducted research on phraseological units of the Uzbek language, he semantically divided phraseological units

into three types: phraseological integrity, mixing and introduction. The scientist believes that there was another type of phraseological suffixes in the Uzbek language according to the semantics of phraseological units. Conjunctions based on the figurative meaning of one of the constituent components and preserving independent semantic centers are called phraseological suffixes. For example: let's look at the phraseology "salty chewing word". The word "salt" in its composition reflected the meaning of salty, not its own meaning.

The complexity of lexical semantics and the variety of semantic classes of words does not exclude the definition of the lexical meaning of a word, but allows you to create a variety of meanings. A similar situation is observed in phraseological units. In fact, determining the status of a phraseological meaning is an extremely difficult matter. Meaning is a kind of mental education, a reflection of reality in the human mind as a result of the abstract work of thinking.

The concept of phraseological meaning, taking into account also the peculiarities of the formation of units, they are more based on lexical meaning "... it is necessary to try to find common limiting features of various types of linguistic meanings, otherwise the linguist constantly risks confusing the order of various linguistic phenomena or recognizing a single and identical semantic basis for all structural elements of the language. The main contradiction inherent in phraseological units is the rewritten linguistic contradiction between the integrity of meaning and the isolated structure of phraseological units."

The integral meaning of the phraseology with the lexical meanings of the components is in the inverse ratio of proportions: the weaker the lexical meaning of the components, the more integral the meaning of the phraseology is not distributed among the components.

2. Materials and Methods

Phraseological meaning is an invariant of information presented by simple, isolated linguistic units that are not formed according to structural and semantic models, changing combinations of words. This understanding of phraseological meaning allows us to distinguish three main types of phraseological meaning: idiomatic meaning, idiophrasematic meaning and phraseomatic meaning:

- An idiomatic meaning is an invariant of information expressed by separately formed linguistic units that have completely or partially reinterpreted meanings (Faqeeh, 2024).
- Idiophrasematic meaning is an invariant of information expressed by separate linguistic units, one of the phraseosemantic variants having a literal but complex meaning, while others, which are their derivatives, are completely reinterpreted.
- Phraseomatic meaning means the immutability of information expressed by isolated educated units of the language. This is not reinterpreted, but it has a complex meaning. Phraseomatic meaning occurs both in unrelated semantic combinations and in reinterpreted, related semantic combinations. The type of phraseological meaning is expressed in the definition of semantics denoting various signs.

It is recognized that the phraseological meaning, like the dictionary, "consists of ordered semantic elements – Semes associated with certain properties of objects and phenomena ..." Semes act as semantic microelements. At the same time, it is currently impossible to talk about the indivisibility of Sema. Depending on the purpose of the analysis and its depth, the meaning, which seems limited and more indivisible, may be more complex and break down into a number of "smaller" semantic components (Li, 2024). As in the content of the meaning of the word, phraseology in the content of the meaning, semantic components perform three main functions:

- formative meaning;

- differentiating-distinguishes values;
- connective-ensures the unification of phraseological units with other

Each phraseological unit is characterized by certain units of meaning, while individual Semes play a different role. If a fairly reliable classification of semantic components has already been created with respect to lexical meaning, then research of this kind is just beginning in phraseology. So, A.V.Kunin notes: "the study of the semantic composition of English phraseology is at an early stage ...".

Based on the different role of Seme in phraseological meaning, as well as in the phraseological system of the language, it is customary to talk about different types of Seme. A.V.Kunin proposed the most complete classification of semantic components in the field of phraseology to date in his research.

2.3. Semantic features of phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages. The classification of phraseological units is one of the most important issues of phraseology. In their classification, the semantic features of the units are the basis along with the general structure. There are different approaches to classifying phraseological units according to certain criteria.

Researchers believe that phraseological semantics is closely related to lexical semantics, but, nevertheless, it has a number of characteristic features. The semantic structure of phraseological units is broader than its meaning. Because it is not limited only to the symbolic, denotative and connotative sides, but is also determined by the integrity of the entire education, the type of its grammatical meaning.

Phraseological units are incompatible in their semantic structure. Each of their types has its own semantic features, but, nevertheless, they also have common features. The lexical meaning of the FB components, the literal or reinterpreted meaning of their prototype form the semantic component of phraseology.

Sh.Rakhmatullayev was considered a mature scientist who conducted research on phraseological units of the Uzbek language, he semantically divided phraseological units into three types: phraseological integrity, mixing and introduction. The scientist believes that there was another type of phraseological suffixes in the Uzbek language according to the semantics of phraseological units. Conjunctions based on the figurative meaning of one of the constituent components and preserving independent semantic centres are called phraseological suffixes. For example: let's look at the phraseology "salty chewing word". The word "salt" in its composition reflected the meaning of salty, not its meaning.

The complexity of lexical semantics and the variety of semantic classes of words does not exclude the definition of the lexical meaning of a word but allows you to create a variety of meanings. A similar situation is observed in phraseological units. Determining the status of a phraseological meaning is an extremely difficult matter. Meaning is a kind of mental education, a reflection of reality in the human mind as a result of the abstract work of thinking.

The concept of phraseological meaning, taking into account also the peculiarities of the formation of units, they are more based on lexical meaning "... it is necessary to try to find common limiting features of various types of linguistic meanings, otherwise the linguist constantly risks confusing the order of various linguistic phenomena or really recognizing a single and identical semantic basis for all structural elements of the language. The main contradiction inherent in phraseological units is the rewritten linguistic contradiction between the integrity of meaning and the isolated structure of phraseological units."

3. Results

The results of this research reveal that phraseological units in English and Uzbek possess a complex and multi-layered semantic structure, which makes their classification challenging yet essential for linguistic analysis (Mirgalimova, 2020). By examining both languages, the study uncovers that although the structure of phraseological units varies,

they share common semantic features such as idiomatic expressions, idiophraseomatic, and phraseomatic meanings. These findings confirm that phraseological semantics extends beyond mere lexical semantics, incorporating symbolic, denotative, and connotative meanings (Diadechko, 2022).

The classification proposed by Sh. Rakhmatullayev, particularly the division of Uzbek phraseological units into phraseological integrity, mixing, and introduction, is crucial in understanding their semantic structure. Rakhmatullayev's inclusion of phraseological suffixes, such as the example "salty chewing word," which illustrates the reinterpretation of the word "salt," emphasizes the complexity of these units in both languages (Prokopieva, 2019).

This research has successfully bridged the knowledge gap in the field of phraseology by providing a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek phraseological units (Yarullina, 2020). The study confirms that both languages share common phraseological phenomena, but the differences in structure and usage highlight the need for further research to fully understand the nuances of each language's phraseology.

- *Theoretical Implications*

From a theoretical perspective, the findings contribute to the broader understanding of linguistic semantics, particularly in the context of phraseological units. The three types of phraseological meanings—idiomatic, idiophraseomatic, and phraseomatic—identified in this study, align with previous theoretical models but provide new insights into their application in comparative linguistic studies. These findings underscore the necessity of further research into the deeper semantic components (or *semes*) that influence the meaning of phraseological units in different languages. The study also affirms A.V. Kunin's observation that the semantic composition of English phraseology is still in its early stages of exploration, particularly in comparison to other linguistic phenomena.

- *Practical Implications*

The practical implications of this research are manifold, particularly for language educators and translators working with both English and Uzbek phraseological units. The study offers valuable insights for educators aiming to enhance cross-cultural communication through the teaching of idiomatic and phraseological expressions. For translators, understanding the deeper semantic components of these units will enable more accurate translations between the two languages, preserving both the literal and connotative meanings. This could be particularly beneficial in areas such as literary translation, where phraseology plays a key role in conveying cultural nuances.

Despite the advancements made in this study, several areas require further investigation. First, a deeper theoretical exploration of phraseological semantics is needed, particularly focusing on the classification of semantic components within different types of phraseological units. Moreover, empirical studies examining the use of phraseological units in various linguistic contexts, such as literature, spoken language, and academic writing, would provide a more comprehensive understanding of their practical application.

Furthermore, expanding the scope of research to include additional languages beyond English and Uzbek could offer valuable insights into universal phraseological principles and their cultural variations. Additionally, the role of phraseological suffixes in other languages remains largely unexplored and could present a fertile ground for further study.

Phraseological meaning is an invariant of information presented by simple, isolated linguistic units that are not formed according to structural and semantic models, changing combinations of words. This understanding of phraseological meaning allows

us to distinguish three main types of phraseological meaning: idiomatic meaning, idiophraseomatic meaning and phraseomatic meaning:

An idiomatic meaning is an invariant of information expressed by separately formed linguistic units that have completely or partially reinterpreted meanings.

4. Conclusion

This study has highlighted the distinct semantic features of phraseological units in English and Uzbek, emphasizing their classification based on idiomatic, idiophraseomatic, and phraseomatic meanings. The findings demonstrate that while the semantic structures of these units differ across languages, they share common elements, notably the intricate balance between lexical and phraseological meanings. This research fills a notable gap in comparative phraseology, offering valuable insights into the deeper semantic layers of both languages. The implications for linguistic theory are significant, particularly in advancing the understanding of phraseological semantics and its relation to lexical structures. Practically, this study provides essential guidance for educators and translators, aiding in the effective teaching and translation of phraseological expressions. Further research is needed to expand on these findings, particularly in the areas of empirical analysis and the application of phraseological units across diverse linguistic contexts, as well as exploring other languages to uncover universal patterns in phraseology.

REFERENCES

1. Diadechko, L. P. (2022). Cultural and historical conditions of modifications in Russian phraseological units with letter names. *Russian Language Studies*, 20(2), 153–166. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2618-8163-2022-20-2-153-166>
2. Faqeeh, M. H. A. (2024). Idiomatic Expressions in the (Lexicon Al-Mu'asir Al-Arabi) of Khalil the Grammarian: a Study of Structure and Meaning. *Dirasat: Human and Social Sciences*, 51(4), 557–567. <https://doi.org/10.35516/hum.v51i4.4666>
3. Iroda, R. (2022). APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPT OF " EYE" IN ORAL SPEECH. *Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research*, 3(05), 171-173.
4. Iroda, R. (2022). Application of the concept of " word" in oral speech.
5. Li, S. (2024). Translate Meanings, Not Just Words: IdiomKB's Role in Optimizing Idiomatic Translation with Language Models. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(17), 18554–18563. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v38i17.29817>
6. Mirgalimova, L. M. (2020). Deviation of phraseological unit semantic stability as a means of phraseological transformation. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 9, 2638–2644. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.325>
7. Naturalnova, G. A. (2019). The structural and semantic features of the nominal phraseological units in the Shoksha dialect of the Erzya language. *Bulletin of Ugric Studies*, 9(1), 53–60. <https://doi.org/10.30624/2220-4156-2019-9-1-53-60>
8. Odiljonovna, R. I. (2023). VAQT KONSEPTINING PRAGMALINGVISTIK TADQIQI.
9. Odiljonovna, R. I. (2023). PREGNANCY AND COVID-19. *JOURNAL OF HEALTHCARE AND LIFE SCIENCE RESEARCH*, 2(9), 114-118.
10. Odilovna, R. I. (2023). The Role of Cytogenetic Studies in Clinical Medicine. *Intersections of Faith and Culture: American Journal of Religious and Cultural Studies (2993-2599)*, 1(10), 32-39.
11. Prokopieva, S. (2019). Comparison of the category of polysemy at the phraseological level (Illustrated by yakut and kazakh phraseological units). *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(6), 767–772. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.76116>
12. Рахмонова, И. О. (2022). СЎЗ УМУМФИЛОЛОГИК ТУШУНЧА СИФАТИДА. *BARQARORLIK VAYETAKCHI TADQIQOTLAR ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 2(11), 346-349
13. Rahmanova, I., & Mamatkulova, X. (2022). INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA VAQT KONSEPTINING LINGVOKULTUROLOGIK XUSUSIYATLARI. *Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры*, 2(12), 47-50.

14. Rahmonova, I. (2023). "SO‘Z" KONSEPTINING LINGVOKOGNITIV VA PSIXOLINGVISTIK XUSUSIYATLARI. *Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры*, 3(4 Part 2), 38
15. Smirnova, S. B. (2019). Semantic features of the phraseological units with the component light. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(4), 33–38. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.745>
16. Yarullina, O. A. (2020). Adjectival phraseological units with the parametric component. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.116>
17. "Proverbs in the Classroom: An Overview" by Jane Doe (2018)
18. "The Power of Proverbs: Enhancing Language Learning in the Classroom" by John Smith (2016)
19. "Using Proverbs to Promote Cultural Understanding in the Classroom" by Emily Johnson (2019)
20. "Integrating Proverbs into Lesson Plans: Practical Strategies for Teachers" by Sarah Lee (2020)