

Date: 27th June-2025

LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL FEATURES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS
WITH NUMERALS IN ENGLISH

Mamadaliyeva Mohlaroyim Kodirjon qizi

English Language Teacher, Vocational
School № 1, Shakhrikhan District, Andijan Region

Annotation: This article is devoted to a comparative study of the national-cultural specifics of phraseological units with a component of a body part in English languages. The linguacultural features of phraseological units as well as the interconnected issues of language and culture and their impact on understanding and enforcing semantic structures of English phraseological units.

Key words: clarify their grammatical, lexical, and semantic-syntactical features, the reasons for their use,

In our fast-paced time, people more and more often go out into the world, there are intercultural contacts. People have become more proficient in other languages for communication, so it becomes necessary for them to know the cultural component of the language. In this regard, recently, studies of the language in terms of its interaction with culture have become extremely relevant, in connection with which a new special direction has appeared, called cultural linguistics. Cultural linguistics, the development of which began in the early 90s, is today one of the most relevant areas of modern linguistics, whose tasks include the study and description of the relationship and mutual influences of language and culture, language and folk mentality. It has to do with both cultural science and language science. Cultural linguistics studies the national and cultural semantics of linguistic units in order to understand them in their entirety of content and shades, to the extent that is as close as possible to their perception by the speakers of a given language and a given culture.

Language not only represents reality, it also deals with how it is interpreted, resulting in a unique reality in which humans live. Language has a variety of purposes. It is often known as the primary medium by which people express themselves and communicate with one another. Language is used to collect and preserve culturally significant material. Various linguists have referred to language as "the house of objective reality" and the means by which we can delve not only into modern nationalism, but also into ancient people's perspectives on the world and culture. Proverbs, sayings, phraseological units, metaphors, and cultural representations represent events that occurred several years ago and have survived through the centuries. They are regarded as important sources of knowledge about the nation's culture and mindset, as well as myth, legend, and tradition.

Comparison of phraseology should answer the following questions: what are the similarities and differences between the phraseological and systems of the English and



Date: 27th June-2025



Uzbek languages; how they manifest themselves in the main aspects of the language; what intralingual and extralinguistic factors they are determined by, what is the degree of interlingual equivalence of somatic phraseological units. Features of the comparative study of phraseological composition are primarily due to the special position of the phraseological system among other linguistic systems. "Phraseologisms are units of secondary education that differ from ordinary complexes in low regularity of linguistic organization, based on a semantic shift of one type or another and leading to mandatory reproducibility of phraseological units and poor predictability of their content plan relative to the expression plan, and vice versa". According to its formal structure, phraseological units are verbal complexes.

The next feature of comparative analysis in phraseology is that phraseological units are more complex than their constituents-lexemes both in structure and in meaning. The specificity of comparing the phraseology of different-system languages, including English and Uzbek, at the level of specific languages is not based on the material identity of the units being compared. For different system languages, the interlingual material identity of phraseological units turns out to be a rare phenomenon associated with the borrowing of phraseological units from one compared language to another or from any third language into both compared ones. Comparison of specific phraseological units provided researchers with material for generalizations in various directions: in the theory of translation, in the theory of phraseology, in comparative typological studies. All these studies are based on various aspects of the interlingual correlation of specific phraseological units, i.e. the identity of their semantic or formal-semantic organization. The absence of this correlation means a complete difference of phraseological units. Along with the relations of complete identity and complete difference, there are intermediate steps that can be generalized as relations of incomplete identity. The relationship of identity, incomplete identity and difference can, according to Reichstein, manifest in the following:

- 1) in some aspects of their formal-semantic organization, mainly lexical and structural syntactic (aspect correlation);
- 2) in their aggregate content (functional and semantic correlation).

The comparative characteristic of phraseological units also has a quantitative aspect - the number of equivalents in a particular phraseological unit, their comparative use. Aspect correlation of phraseological units, i.e. the correlation of their component composition and grammatical organization, for English and languages, has only an indirect, structural and semantic character, since for unrelated language, the direct material identity of lexical components and grammatical structures is not typical. The functional-semantic correlation of phraseological units of different languages means, ideally, the identity of a lot of composition and additional connotations in the aggregate content of the compared phraseological units. The combination of aspect and functional-semantic identity gives full interlingual phraseological equivalents. For example: a heart of stone - tosh yurak. If only an abstract figurative model unites phraseological units in the languages under consideration, then their aggregate functional-semantic correlation loses its

Date: 27th June-2025

character, since according to such an abstract model, a number of phraseological units with a similar meaning can be formed. When only the abstract figurative model coincides, the functional-semantic correlation of phraseological units is usually incomplete. Interlanguage aspect correlation of phraseological units and their functional-semantic correlation are not directly dependent on each other. Their relationship is subject to the general provision on the asymmetry of the signifying and signified linguistic sign. Differences in the aggregate phraseological meaning with the aspect identity of the compared phraseological units of the English and Uzbek languages may be the result of multidirectional rethinking. Another reason may be the appearance of additional semantic shades against the background of an identical common meaning. For example: positively colored English phraseological unit keep one's chin up (do not hang your nose, keep a stiff upper lip) can be translated into Uzbek to turn up your nose, which carries a negative connotation (to assume importance, to behave arrogantly). Undoubtedly, with a closer examination of the compared phraseological units, a number of other semes can be distinguished, and when comparing units according to different characteristics, it is likely that equivalence criteria can be obtained. Such pairs of phraseological units with more or less diverging, and sometimes even opposite meanings act as "false friends of the translator" in the sphere of phraseology.

Distinguish between high-, medium - and low frequency PU. Interlingual phraseological equivalence assumes approximately the same speech use of phraseological units. Each phraseological unit has no more than one full structural and semantic equivalent in the compared language. The number of incomplete structural and semantic equivalents and functional semantic equivalents fluctuates in a fairly wide range.

REFERENCES:

1. Reichstein A.D. On the comparison of phraseological systems // Foreign languages at school. - №4. 1960.
2. Lakoff, G. The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor // Metaphor and Thought. / ed. A. Ortony. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. – P. 202–251.
3. Palmer, G. B. Toward a Theory of Cultural Linguistics / G.B. Palmer. - Austin, USA: University of Texas Press, 1995. - 348 p.

