

ISSN 2063-5346



# THE ROLE OF SOMATIC PHRASES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK IN THE EXPRESSION OF THOUGHT

**BOLBEKOVA UG'ILOY JALOLIDDINOVNA<sup>1</sup>, Daminova  
Gulabza Ismatovna<sup>2</sup>**

**Article History: Received:** 01.02.2023

**Revised:** 07.03.2023

**Accepted:** 10.04.2023

## Abstract

The article describes the specific aspects of phraseological units. A comparative analysis of somatic phraseological units in English and Uzbek has been subjected to analysis with a number of examples. The theoretical data has been reacted to. The role of phraseological units in world linguistics is important. In the history of Uzbek linguistics, the solution of issues related to the classification of phraseological expressions, as well as research and studies in this area play an important role. However, it is difficult to explain that the somatic phraseological units representing the human body, their specificity, place and role in the life of the English and Uzbek peoples, have not been sufficiently studied and the conclusions of a number of new scientific studies have not been generalized. Therefore, a comparative study of the peculiarities of the structure of phraseological units, which are now ingrained in the minds of the English and Uzbek peoples, on the example of a number of scientific works and dictionaries, is an important scientific issue that requires indepth study.

**Key words:** somatism, phrase, phraseology, phraseology, phraseological unit, phraseological combination, phraseological fusion, somatic phraseologisms.

<sup>1</sup>Intern-teacher Samarkand Institute of Economics and service, ugiloybolbekova@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Intern-teacher Samarkand Institute of Economics and service, daminovagulabza@gmail.com

**DOI: 10.31838/ecb/2023.12.s1.135**

## Introduction

Serious attention is paid to the study of phraseologisms, one of the most important units of language in world linguistic schools and streams of the 21st century, on the basis of the paradigm of somatisms. The generalization of lexical, semantic, pragmatic, stylistic, cognitive meanings that phraseologisms carry and their phenomena in speech using modern methodological principles, the need to draw clear theoretical conclusions about the linguistic, as well as semantic properties of phraseological units formed on the basis of somatic phraseologisms, as well as their status in speech, testifies to the extremely important and In the next decade, it is often seen that innovations in comparative linguistics issues are happening on the topic of linguistic research. Comparative study of the phraseological system of non-sister English and Uzbek languages study such units in both languages by comparing their semantics-the name of the events and phenomena manifested in them. the disclosure of linguistic and semantic-pragmatic theories of somatic phraseologisms by modern methods of research is among the mysteries of current problems.

**Degree of study of the subject.** The issue of translating English phrases into Uzbek, insufficient scientific research of scientists in English and Uzbek on somatic phrases and their components, methods of their translation are the subject of much debate. A number of major studies have been conducted on various problems of English phraseology in England, the United States and Japan. For example, the contribution of Russian scientists to the study of this field is significant. The formation of somatic phrases in the structure of the text in Uzbek linguistics and the study of their functional-semantic features Y. Pinkhasov, Sh. Rakhmatullayev, A. Gajiyev, B. Yoldashev, A. Mamatov, A. Isayev, Sh.Abdullayev, Sh.Performed by scholars

such as Usmanova. The study of somatic phraseologisms in World linguistics dates back to the second half of the 20th century. Somatic phraseologisms are a language (Vakk F., Bagautdinova G.A., Dibo A.V., Alekseyeva S.G., Weintraub R.M., Yegorova T.I., Sedova N.A.), two languages (Chete T., Kharchenko L.I. and Shashkov Yu.A., Mugu R.Yu., Nikolina Ye.V., Arsenteva Ye.F., Arkadev P.M., Kononova O.A., Gumerova N.J., Choi Yun Xi), three languages (Gergokova J.X., Dolgoplov Yu.A.) are known to have been studied in comparative terms . The comparative study of somatic phraseological units in modern Uzbek and English, their coverage of the dialectic of commonality and specificity in the stages of language and speech, the disclosure of phraseological compounds, stages of their development and formation, linguistic and linguopoetic characteristics in areas of particular importance determine the basis of this master's thesis.

**The purpose of the study.** Artistic, colloquial, publicistic materials of English and English somatic phraseological units it consists in determining the content of the basis and researching the features of its application in the text from a semantic, linguopoetic point of view.

**Method and methodology of research.** System-structural, classification, descriptive, cognitive, pragmatic, linguoculturological, component and linguostatistical analysis methods were used in the coverage of the topic.

Somatic phraseological units selected from phraseological dictionaries of English and Uzbek were used as research material.

Speech is the main way in which people communicate. Quotes, Proverbs, proverbs and phraseological units corresponding to a particular situation will help make speech brighter, convey the meaning of the topic of conversation, convey mood, attitude to certain situations. The use of figurative phrases in the study of language makes it possible to replenish vocabulary,

master the skills of managing idiomatic structures. In order to correctly express and interpret the words of the interlocutor, we need to know the phraseological units of the English and Uzbek language.

It is known that the human factor plays an incomparable role in making words in all layers of the language lexical layer, including the formation of somatic phraseologisms. As a person observes the activity of his body organs, he makes from them lexical units, phraseologisms, which carry new information about himself and others, about the universe. "As the main focus of this process is the person himself, he attempts to describe the universe by looking at a pattern in his imagination, cognitive consciousness. It should be noted that the linguistic anthropomorphism that occurs in this process is not the result of primitive consciousness, thinking, but rather the interpretation of the means of nomination in the language as a general law of development" [47, 311].

English phraseology is characterized by a richness of functional-stylistic and emotional-expressive synonyms. The stylistic coloring of phraseological units, as well as words, determines their strengthening in a certain style of speech. At the same time, in phraseology, two groups of phraseological units are distinguished: widely used phraseological units that do not have a constant connection with one or another functional style are functionally stationary phraseological units. Unlike English and the general dictionary, which form a very important part of the dictionary, general phraseology occupies a modest place in the entire mass of English phraseological units in terms of the number of units. Functionally strictly defined phraseological units are stylistically distinct from each other, their paradigms being differentiated by the degree of expressiveness, expressiveness of emotional traits, etc. The largest stylistic layer of phraseology is colloquial

phraseology, which is mainly used in oral communication, and in written form in fiction. Phraseological units are often given in explanatory dictionaries without stylistic symbols, but they still stand out against the background of bright colloquial color, slightly shortened, widely used phraseological units of familiar shade. Colloquial phraseological units, as a rule, are figurative, giving them a specific expression, vitality, brightness. Colloquial phraseology, which is usually close to a colloquial word, is more diminutive.

The use of phraseological units gives the vitality and image of speech. The creative transformation of phraseological units deserves a more detailed consideration. Let us dwell on some methods of phraseological innovation of journalists and writers. A tried and tested stylistic device for updating the semantics of phraseological units is a change in the number of components in them. It is expressed in the expansion of the composition of the phraseological unit by the use of words of one component or another that can change the phraseological unit beyond recognition, giving it a new figurative form.

For example:

To make a foam from the mouth-I have never seen him so angry. A white bruise formed from the mouth. - raised stylistic coloring;

In other cases, contraction (contraction) is observed in the phraseological unit, which is also related to its revision.

For example:

Not beauty, but happy birth - not to be born beautiful, but to be happy; in speech, the cut first part of this phraseological unit is often used, which creates a new phraseologism "beauty - the source of misfortune".

Replacing the dictionary components of phraseological units is also used for ironic revision of them. Such a change in phraseological expressions leads to a

radical change in their meaning, which creates a sharply satirical effect. A distinctive stylistic device in the use of phraseological units is the expression of several phrases (the use of two phraseological units of different meanings in one sentence). Such "intersection" returns the original lexical meaning to phraseological components, while phraseological units themselves participate in a new figurative system. This gives such vocabulary a distinct semantic capacity and expressiveness. One of the brightest stylistic means of updating phraseological units is the elimination of their figurative meaning. At the same time, in appearance, the phraseological unit does not change, does not lose its metaphorical meaning and is taken literally.

For example:

The opened letter was received by the writer Brown. It turned out that his boss opened his letters. In such situations, words appear based on the external homonymy of phraseological units and free combinations of words. The use of phraseological units in speech presents certain difficulties, since the language norm requires a clear repetition of them, which is not always taken into account by speakers.

Phraseologism is called a special speech turnover, which is not taken literally and does not always have a literal translation. The view that some phraseological units cannot be translated verbatim is often a challenge in translation and understanding. Idioms, on the other hand, give the language a bright emotional color. It should also be noted that in this place the comparative characteristics of the syntactic structures of the somatic phraseologisms of English and Uzbek should also be touched upon separately, since they do not have a fluent form of syntactic communication in English, they correspond to the same fluent+noun model in Uzbek Russian (slomya golovu - hardened his head-boshini qotirib; skrepya

serdtse – heartbroken- yuragi ezilib). This situation is also reflected in such peculiarities as the presence of complex tense forms in the verb system in English and Uzbek, individual forms of adjectives, the absence of conjugations and personality forms in English, and shows the structural-semantic difference of somatic phraseologisms in both languages. But these aspects are not the main criteria when it comes to the structural-semantic equivalence of phraseological units, since in this place it should go about the main criterion - semantic alternative.

For example: I alive! (Act faster, more lively!), Marry come up! (See this-a!). It is characteristic that in colloquial speech, communicativity is stronger than informativity. In the composition of the phrase, colloquial phrases are the most common methodological type, such phrases make up more than half of the linguistic phraseological fund. They are widely used in folk oral creativity, in everyday communication, and in general represent household goods, clothing names, food names, monetary units, everyday work-actions, as well as emotional - mental states of a person. Colloquial phrases are distinguished from other biblical phrases by their simplicity, domestic character, sometimes having a satirical or comic stylistic coloring, and a high degree of emotionality.

Among the somatic phraseologisms that are part of the phraseological units of the Uzbek language and English language, eye, Hand, Heart, Head-component manifestations are seriously distinguished from expressions in their layer by the width of the semantic field and emotionally-expressively colorful, and this is explained by their relative communicative superiority and activity. This activity, on the one hand, causes the transformation of somatic phrasemas, the expansion of their expressiveness and functional scope, on the other hand, leads to stagnation. Stationary, traditional

somatic phraseological units are recognized as a linguistic phenomenon, while their transformed manifestations are recognized as a speech phenomenon. The more important the figurative-pictorial tool resulting from the actualization of the language unit is for the speech process, the greater the service of these elements in the enrichment of the lexical-phraseological layer of the language dictionary Foundation. In this-language "providing phraseological background dynamics" (V.Mokienko) is a continuous process. This theoretical basis was also the reason why they are grouped in a continuous and occasional way, and researchers call them nominating and expressive phrases

In linguistics, phraseology it is the science that studies descriptive words such as phraseological crossovers, phraseological verbs and other types of lexicological units, in which it is impossible to know the general meaning through the meanings of the composition of vocabulary, they are used as independent units. For example, the english phrase turn a blind eye is used to mean a situation or information in the sense of disdain, non-acceptance. Literally, it translates as turning blind. In Uzbek, phraseologisms are similar, whereas phrases or phrases are created depending on the culture of each nationality and fall into a single mold. For example, the phrase to catch a leg is used in the sense of rushing.

It will not be equal to a word that actually consists. According to Collins, author of the book "books of English idioms", today's guide to writing and learning is a standard phraseological unit in English that enriches, decorates the language, and is of course used with reverence, which is a simple and grounded element. Using it with entrepreneurship is important to obtain information, since the speech that is overflowing with phrases will destroy the word itself. Despite the fact that they are brought into speech in a ready-to-use state, many of their repetitions destroy the polish

of speech and cause an old-fashioned jaundice.

Also, the information about the word association itself will not be understandable in general. Important characteristics of phraseological units are bularation:

1. Motivation i.e. lack of meaning
2. What is understood by the fact that lexical components stand for motivation? We'll figure it out first. Motivation is a meaning that causes it if the words in the left of the vocabulary give a general meaning. For example, the word red ribbon understand that red ribbon it is encouraged that there is no simple word combination, if it is understood as bureaucratic methods then there is no unenthusiastic-phraseological conjunction or idiom, its meaning has a different meaning. We will consider a number of examples below.

In the definition of Lug'at, the type of "hand" somatism refers to the process (which represents the process) nominalizing work actions on the formation of somatic phaseologisms. For example: take matters into your own hands to solve the problem yourself, because people who had to deal with it could not do it.;

wash your hands - to end contact with someone or something ' - wash your hand;

After Margaret told me to be tough, I watched Tom sew with an eagle's eye... (J. London, the rebellion of "Elsinore", ch. XLV-Margaret told me then I had to stand firm, I started watching tom Spink, with no glimpses of sophistication;

opening someone's eye to something,

looking down someone's nose / nose in the air

The origin, use of each phrase in general will depend on the culture of that language nation. Accordingly, various disputes have also arisen over the naming of



phraseological units, and terms have also been found differently:

set phrases, phrases, phrases, fixed word groups, collocations. Most Russian scientists use the term phraseological units introduced by academician Vinogradov. Western scientists, on the other hand, use the term *idioma*, but according to comments in Russian linguistics it is only a branch of phraseological units.

Russian scientist V. Vinogradov semantically classifies phraseological units according to their meaning and divides them into 3 types:

1. Phraseological Fusion are units, and it is impossible to draw conclusions about the general meaning from the meaning of the word composition. The meaning of phraseological functions is considered Immobile at the current stage of language development. *red ribbon* (bureaucrats), *mare's nest* (chalg'itish),

2. Phraseological units it is possible to extract meaning from the content of phrases, words. The general meaning is based on the portable meaning. *show teeth*, *stand on weapons*. They are motivational phrases.

3. Phraseological compounds are phraseological compounds that not only give impetus, but one of the words is used in the correct sense, the other in the portable sense. *to meet requirement* (meet demand) *,to attain success* (achieve success). In this group of phraseological units, some parts may not lose portable meaning. For example: *satisfaction of needs*, *satisfaction of demand*, *satisfaction of need*; *success*, *loss of success*. These compounds are not synonyms and the general meaning changes, but the meaning of the main word does not change.

Professor A.I. Smirnitsky structurally classifies phraseological units and characterizes them semantically and grammatically, being high idiomatic word descriptors that function as word

equivalents. It offers 3 types of available phrases:

1. traditional phrases-traditional phrases (nice distinction, rough sketch;

2. phraseological combinations-phraseological structures(to fall in love, to get up;

3. idioms-idioms (to wash one's dirty linen in public); divides the second group into two more subgroups:

1) one-top phraseological units, that is, formed from one main word;

(a) verb - to-give up, to bring up, to try out, to look up, to drop in, etc.

b) to be supportive: to be surprised, to be up to, etc.

d) prepositional compounds: by heart.

2. two-top is formed from phraseological units, i.e. compound words. These units can be equated to a noun, verb or syllable:

*brains trust*, *white elephant*, *blind alley*;

*to know the ropes*, *to take place*; *ups and downs*, *rough and ready*, *flat as a pancake*;

*every other day*.

Prof. In contrast, Kunin differentiates between phraseological units, phraseomatic units, and mixed States. Phraseological units change meaning in whole or in part, while phraseomatic units are used in its literary meaning. They are characterized by the phraseological stagnation of both which differ from free phrases and compound words.

Prof. A.V. Kunin developed the theory of stagnation according to the following aspects(54, 256):

1. stability of usage-phraseological unit processed ready-made in speech not created in speech;

2. lexical stability is the composition of phraseological units that are partially or completely inimitable in phraseological variation.

According to the following classification, the phrases are varying and the meaning is not changing

Lexical: a skeleton in the cupboard / closet (family secret), a blind pig / tiger (illegal sale of alcohol);

Grammatical: to be in deep water / waters (being in a difficult situation), a stony heart – a heart of stone;

Positional: a square peg in a round hole – a round peg in a square hole (a person in a situation that does not suit his ability or character), to dot the I's and cross the T's - to cross one's t's and dot one's I's;

Quantitative: Tom, Dick and Harry-every Tom, Dick and Harry;

Mixed variants: raise/stir up the nest of hornets' nest about one's ears – to arouse/stir up the nest of hornets.

3. Semantic stability is based on lexical stagnation of phraseological units. Despite some changes, the meaning of the phrase is preserved. It can be strong, kychless, clear or vague;

4. Syntactic stability.

In this case, the character traits of phraseological units can be as follows:

- Finished copy;
- Structural division;
- Morphological instability;
- Invariance of lexical content;
- Semantic unit;
- Syntactic flexibility.

Prof. A.V. Kunin defines phraseological units as: "a Phraseological unit is a stationary group of words whose meaning has changed in whole or in part" [55,345].

Phraseological units are divided into four subclasses according to their function in communication, determined by their structural-semantic characteristic. Practical classification

1. Quarter phraseological units, taking the place of certain concepts: a bull in a china shop (rude man);

2. Quarter-input phraseological units, taking the place of specific concepts in the exact proportion, can be used in the majhul structure: to cross the Rubicon – the Rubicon is crossed!

3. Exclamation phraseological units, exclamation comes in place of concepts: a pretty (nice) kettle of fish! For crying out loud!

4. Communicative phraseological units, propositions (proverbs or sayings) are used in place: Still waters run deep. The world is a nice place.

Also, the question of whether the component-expressive portable metaphorical meaning in somatic phraseologism matches the kuchma metaphorical meaning in the language of translation, that is, the question of the uniformity or diversity of concepts being associated in this case in phraseologisms in both languages, can lead to interesting conclusions. For example does the same somatic lexical unit have exactly the same semantics in a translation language or is it associated with another lexical unit? We analyze such somatic phraseologisms in the following groups:

- somatic phraseologisms with complete structural-semantic equivalents. Both the semantic meaning and component composition and syntactic construction of such phraseologisms are the same in both languages. For example:

to dab with one's finger - finger mask (disambiguation);

to wind round one's (little) finger-turn at the tip of the finger;

Ta turn (ili Ta twist) smb. round one's (little) finger-turn someone on the tip of their finger (cheat, cheat);

not to move a finger-not to catch a hand, not to put a hand on any work, look away;

not to lay (to put) a finger on smb – not to touch, look after, not to hear.

From the above classifications, we can conclude that all propositions and conjunctions, used in a portable sense and ready for speech, are phraseological units, and all stationary units, proverbs and proverbs, phrases and idioms include all. The phraseological layer of each language is formed based on the culture, customs and way of living of that language nation and enriches its own language. In modern linguistics, idiomatics in the broad sense of verbal or phraseological units is one of the main ways to present a linguistic picture of the world. In addition, according to researchers, the internal form of phraseological units reflects non-linguistic world components, objects. Therefore, the system of images is entrenched in the phraseological composition of the language, which serves food, in order to collect the worldview of the linguistic community, which can show its cultural-national experience and Customs. In this field of communication, its members have semantic values that are not only very diverse, but also combine several conceptual areas

In phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages, the landscape of the universe is associated through the names of the human body, serving to vividly reflect the characteristics of the representatives of the language characteristic of General humanity. In this place can come in the function of the chief component of somatic phraseologisms in both languages. The words most commonly used in either language and actively involved in the generation of phraseologisms are “hand– qo’l”, “eye – ko’z”, “head – bosh”;. The phraseological activity of both language-specific somatic units, as well as the semantics of phraseologisms derived from the same components, are quite different from each other. Thus in phraseological units made with the names of the human organism and

its individual parts, the linguistic picture of the universe is imagined differently in both languages. All this is explained by the fact that cultures and traditions belonging to a particular ring are reflected in the language and form certain identities.

Cross-phraseologisms have their own relation of meaning (synonyms, antonyms, semantic-syntactic variants), and they create a complete system in interaction. Hence phraseologisms function as the means of expression and communication of their functional meaning in a language such as a word. The meaning of phraseologisms brings a portable denotative-significantly directed whole to the surface based on the integration (sum) of meanings of the words that make it up. On the basis of phraseological integration, a newly formed unit meaning arises in the language. The higher the level of integration, the further away from the meaning of the words that make up phraseologisms, and, conversely, the sluggish the level of integration, the closer the phrase is to free vocabulary and free speech.

## Reference

1. Abduazizov A.A. Text-the product of cognitive activity // laws of language development. - Samarkand: SamDCHTI, 2009. - 23b.stive Linguistics.– Sofia, 1996. - №1.–P.30-35.
2. Avaliani Yu.Yu. Texts of lectures on comparative phraseology of Iranian languages. Samarkand: Publishing House of Samarkand. un-ta, 1979.- 76s.
3. Avdeeva O.I. All-Russian scientific conference “Phraseology at the turn of the century: achievements, problems, prospects” // Philological sciences. – M., 2000. -No. 5. – pp. 122-125.
4. Ashurova D.U. Interaction of cognitive linguistics, stylistics and text interpretation // Philology of masalalari.- Toshkent, 2003.-No. 2.-p.40.



5. Babushkin A.P. Types of concepts in lexical and phraseological semantics of language. – Voronezh: VSU, 1996. – 212s.
6. Bakieva G.H. Semantics: content and expression // Philology of masalalari. Russian Russian Phraseology – Toshkent, 2003. – No.2. – pp.5-9.
7. Baranova L.F. Structural and semantic relations of English and Russian phraseology (based on the works of James Aldridge and their translations into Russian): Abstract. diss. . Candidate of Philology. sciences. Leningrad, 1970. – 19 p.
8. Bushuy T., Safarov Sh. Language curation : analysis of methodology and methodology. - Tashkent: Fan, 2007.- 274b.
9. Wack F. The structure of lexical and phraseological meaning 1968,- 223s.
10. Vacc F. On somatic phraseology in the modern Estonian literary language: Abstract. dis. ...Candidate of Philology.sciences. –Tallinn, 1964. –.23 s;
11. Yuldashev B. Uzbek phraseology and phraseography of the formation of this development. - Samarkand SamDU, 2007. - 108b
12. Kolpakova G.V. Semantics of a linguistic unit.–Kazan: Publishing house of Kazan. university, 2004. – 216c.
13. Kunin A.V. Phraseology of modern English. – M.: International Relations, 1972. - 288c.
14. Kunin A.V. Course of phraseology of modern English. – M.: Higher School, 1986. – 336c.
15. Rakhmatullayev Sh. Phraseological Dictionary of the Uzbek language. - T.: General editorial office of the Commons. 1982. [http. / www. academia. edu](http://www.academia.edu)
16. Bushuy T.A. Phraseological Equivalentation as a problem of Contrastive Lexicography
2. A large English-Russian dictionary. Russian Russian Language, 1977. – T.I. – 822s.; T.2. - 863s. (BARS). 3. Kunin A.V. English–Russian Phraseological Dictionary.– Ed. 3. – Under the general direction of I.R. Galperin.– Vol. 1-2. – Ed. 2. - Moscow: Russkiy yazyk, 1977. – T.I. - 822s.; Vol.2. - 863s. (BARS).
3. Kunin A.V. English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary.–Ed.3-e, ispr., in two books.– M.: SE, 1967.– Vol.1. – 738s.; Vol.2. – 739-1264s. (ARFS). Russian Russian Phraseological Dictionary.–Ed.4th, revised and supplemented. – M.: Russian language, 1984. – 942s. (ARFS).
5. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary. Edited by V.N.Yartseva.- M.: The Great Russian Encyclopedia, 2002.- 709c
6. A supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary / Ed. by R.W. Burchfield. – Vol.3. –Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992. – 1579p.
7. A supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary / Ed. by R.W. Burchfield. – Vol.4. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. – 1410p.
8. Barnhart, Clarence L. The second Barnhart dictionary of New English / Clarence L. Barnhart, Sol Steinmetz, Robert K. Barnhart. – New York: Barnhart books. – cop. 2008. – XV. – 520p.
9. Collins Dictionary of the English Language. Ed. by L. Urdang, P. Hanks, Th. H. Long. – London; Glasgow: Collins, 2006. –XXXV, 1690p.

## Dictionaries

1. English-Russian dictionary / Comp.: V. K. Muller. –M.: SE, 1978. – 912s.