

<https://doi.org/10.29013/EJLL-23-2-57-61>

*Saparov Salamat Perdebaevich,  
Lecturer, Department of English language and literature,  
Nukus State Pedagogical Institute, Nukus Uzbekistan*

## SEMANTIC-STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF COMPARATIVE EXPRESSIONS OF ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK LANGUAGES

**Abstract.** In this article based on the structural-semantic, cognitive and discursive approach, comparative adjectival phraseological units are interpreted as the basis of conceptual understanding. The purpose of this article is to comprehensively analyze the structure and semantics of adjectival comparative phraseological units in the English and Karakalpak languages and to determine their general and specific features.

**Keywords:** Phraseological units, semantic structures, comparative expressions, adjectival phraseological unit, lexical-semantic.

### Introduction

The semantics of the phraseological units being compared is determined in the analysis of the basis of comparison or the object of comparison. In most cases, the semantic classification is thematic, in which “expressions are classified according to the basis of comparison or the object of comparison” [10]. Thematic group appears as a set of lexical units used in communication on a specific topic. The basis of the integration of the thematic group is the interrelations of the objects of objective reality, which are the denotations of the lexical units that make up the thematic group. The relationship between objects of real existence and lexical symbols and the term “denotation” are thoroughly covered in the studies of Shmelyova (1973), Seliverstova (1975) and Zalevskaya (1978).

### Results and Discussion

O. M. Nevedomskaya provides a lexical-semantic analysis of the first and second components of phraseologisms [9. 64]. Adjectives (the basis of comparison) are divided by the author according to the productivity in creating similes. Nouns (objects of analogy) are divided into four thematic groups: a) nouns related to living nature (plants and animals), b) nouns representing inanimate nature objects, c) nouns related

to human activity, g) nouns expressing abstract concepts. In this group of horses according to productivity, the author distinguishes further subgroups. Michael McCarthy and Felicity O’Dell [8] present such a classification, which for practical purposes presents 44 thematic groups and subgroups of phrases containing somatism or another lexical unit, separated as the main component of the semantic structure of the phraseological unit. Their number is 16 units, total thematic groups of semantic structures – 60.

The issue of equivalence of phraseological units in Indo-European languages was discussed by A. V. Kunin, A. D. Reichstein, Ya. I. Retsker, V. N. Komissarov, N. V. Alefirenko, A. N. Lyubova, A. N. Considered in the studies of Terentev et al. In the case of Turkic languages, S. N. Muratov, S. K. Kenesbaev, U. Kenesbaeva, G. A. Bayramova, N. A. Basakakov, E. Berdimuratov, K. Babaev, Sh. Rakhmatullaev, A. Orudjev, A. Annanurov, N. B. Burganova, L. T. Makhmutova, S. T. The works of Nauryzbaeva and others are known. In Turkology, a number of Turkic languages are mainly compared with Russian and related languages. Only recently, works devoted to the comparison of one or another aspect began to appear. Among such studies, it is possible to include the research of L. T. Muftakhutdinova, L. R. Sakaeva,

R. R. Zakirov, G. M. Polkina, A. M. Taukenova and others.

As A. N. Lyubova noted, the degree of alternation can be analyzed from the point of view of complete compatibility of the meanings of the compared phraseological units, lexical completeness and stylistic features [7, 73]. Alternatives according to the first sign are called constant alternatives, that is, expressions that are consistent in meaning, as well as polysemantic expressions that differ partially in their semantic meaning. Alternatives according to the second sign are called absolute alternatives, that is, there are partial differences and methodological orientation in the lexical structure of such phraseological units. As Solodukho noted, the external side of phraseological equivalents, i.e., grammatical formation and quantitative composition of components that make up phraseological units, does not have a significant impact on the level of equivalence [12, 142]. Therefore, in distinguishing three types of interlinguistic equivalents, we consider it logically correct that the linguists of the Yu. G. Solodub phraseological school refer to the figurative basis [11]:

1. the same phraseologisms, whose figurative structure is close to each other;
2. the same phraseologisms that are not similar in image;
3. non-alternative phraseologisms that do not have a semantic or phraseological alternative in the languages being compared.

Similarities and differences in the figurative structure of phraseological units should be the main criteria for determining the alternative or opposite in the languages being compared. In the study, the semantics of the adjectival phraseological unit in the English and Karakalpak languages were compared.

When comparing the semantics of adjectival phraseological units, mainly L. K. Using Bayramova's approach, phraseosemantic fields can be called "methodological universals" in phraseology. A number of comparative analyzes of the linguistic material

of the languages being compared with the help of semantic fields can be cited below [1, 3–11].

In the analysis, a number of adjectival comparative phraseological units can be included in the full structural-semantic equivalents, in which the following components are used as the object of comparison:

1. The name of the part of the day. For example: **as clear as a day** – kúndizgidey jariq, kúndizgidey anıq, quyashtay anıq (kunduzday anıq, xudoning kuniday ravshan); **as black as night** – tündeý qararı (tunday qora);

2. Name of the household items: **as sharp as a razor** – almastay keskir, pıshaqtay keskir (olmoday keskir, pıchoqday utkir); **as white as sheet** – sütteý aq (sutday oq);

3. Name of the abstracts: **as ugly as sin** – jaladay jağımsız, jazaday jağımsız (gunohdek xunuk); **as innocent as a babe unborn** – nárestedey girbiñsiz, nárestedey haq, jaña tuwılğan baladay (gudakdek masum), as quick as thought – qıyalday júyrik (hayoldek uchqur).

Specially, noteworthy words in phraseologisms serve as the nucleus of these stable structures from a lexical-semantic point of view. "The majority of phraseological combinations in the Karakalpak language were created on the basis of things and events of vital importance for humanity", says Professor E. Berdimuratov – "among them there are often words denoting human body parts (head, heart, tongue, eye, mouth, ear, foot, etc.) and animal names (horse, camel, sheep, donkey, dog, etc.)" [2, 136–137]. Many studies have been devoted to this issue in Turkology, including A. Isaev, S. Kenesbaev, U. Kenesbaeva, K. Gabitkanuli, Sh. Usmanova's works can be shown. In these works, it is emphasized that the components of phraseological units arise in direct connection with various objective household phenomena, flora and fauna [3; 4; 5; 9; 13].

When dividing phraseologisms into thematic groups, attention was paid to the main components, that is, the cores belonging to one group. In G. Aynazarova's candidate thesis, based on the

opinions of the above-mentioned linguist Turkologists, symmetrical two-component expressions in the Karakalpak language were divided into the following thematic groups:

Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (nucleus) representing the relationship between people

1) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) representing the cosmic universe: *pan ayaday, jer tebingendey* – every time one turns around (odatiy, avvalgidek); *ay dese awzi, kún dese kózi bar* – as pretty as a picture (ajoyib).

2) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) representing time intervals: *kúndiz kúlki, tuned uyqı kórmegendey, kún-tún demeytuğın* – all the time, at all times (har doim, har vaqt).

3) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) representing the relationship between people: *dosqa kúlki, dushpanğa taba* – curiosity killed the cat (do'stga kulgu, dushmanga emish bo'lmaslik uchun); *ózi biy, ózi xoja* – ahead of the game/ as conceited as a barber's cat (o'ziga xon, o'ziga bek); *dos egiz, dushpan segiz* – strike up a friendship with someone (do'stdan dushman ko'p); *miñsiz bizden bir shij-pij* – as easy as apple pie.

4) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) representing relative relationships: *бири ини, бири аға* – match made in heaven (родственные); *uldi uyağa, qızdı qıyağa qondırğan* – get hitched (бывалый).

5) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) representing religious concepts: *Quday bir payğambar haq* – religious about doing something (xudo bir payğambar haq); *Quday deggen (dep jürgen) bendemiz* – in someone's prayers (Xudo degan odammiz).

6) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) expressing emotional state: *sırtı jiltıraq, ishi qaltıraq* – beat around the bush (sirti yaltiroq ichi qaltiroq); *juwıq arada, sır shashpaytuğın* – down to the wire. (sabr-toqatli);

*dos dushpanğa birdey* – cover ground (do'st-dushmanga birday); *aspaytuğın, taspaytuğın* – common or garden (maqtagulik emas).

7) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) expressing mental state of a person, human activity: *otı menen kirip, kúli menen shıǵıw*, – bog down (halol mehnat qiladigan); *tumsıqlıǵa shoqıtpaytuğın, tuyaqlıǵa tepkizbeytuğın* – ball is in the court (o'zini himoya qila oladigan); *dárya tassa tobıǵına kelmeytuğın* – cave into someone or something/ hold one's horses; *miñ ursada bir joritpaytuğın* – as sool as cucumber (sabr-toqatli, javob qaytarmaydigan); *shaǵal máslik penen ómir ótkergen; kayfu-safoda hayot kechiradigan* – run like a hairy goat.

8) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) representing household items: *bosağasın barlatqan, keregesin sırlatqan* – босағасын барлатқан, керегисин сырлатқан – as warm as a toast (boy-badavlat).

9) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) representing kitchen items: *qazanda may, shómishte may* – as sweet as honey/sugar (boy-badavlat).

10) Phrases formed on the basis of the main component (core) representing concepts related to the animal world: *úyrek uship ǵaz qonǵan* – as gentle as a lamb (hayvonot olamiga boy).

*Kólinde bar qasqaldaǵı úyregi* (Ajiniyaz “Ellerim bardı”) – ...;

*Dunyani suw alsada, úyrekke bir pul* – dime a dozen (parvoyi falak). *Beǵam befarq. Dunyoni suv olsada, o'rdakka bir pul.*

As can be seen from the content of the above-mentioned phrases, such classification signs are characteristic of both comparative and non-comparative adjectival phraseological units.

In addition, the main component (core) in the semantic structure of phraseological units may include: a) geographical names, b) historical events (facts, v). The concept of “money” can also be found in these phraseological structures:

A) Ulin Rumğa, qızın Qırımğa qondırğan – kith and kin xorijliklar bilan quad-andachilik qilgan odam – olamga mashxur – glorified, well-known.

Б) Aq túyeni kórgen (megen) – cat gets ones' tongue (быть не в состоянии что-либо сказать “язык проглотил”) oq tuyani ko'r(ма)gan – aybdor (aybsiz).

B) Qattı nanga zar, bir tisle nanga zar – be on the breadline (juda muhtoj, bir burda nonga zor); aqshağa duza qurğan – dirty money, (iflos pullar; no-qonuniy daromad, nopok yullar bilan pul topadigan) black money (amer. jarg. “qora pullar”, soliqqa tortish-dan yashiriladigan yashirin daromad); bir pul – dime a dozen (bir pul- befarq, beparvo); soqır tiyini joq – below par/to cut off without a penny (не имеющий ни гроши/оставить кого-либо без гроши); aqshanı suwday ağızıw, samalğa suwırğanday jumsaw – have more money than sense, spend money like water; shirigen bay – money bag, be flush with money (chaqadan pul qiladigan); aqsha jumsap bilmegennin dawleti tayar – money is a good servant but a bad masters; aqsha qoldıñ kirindey – almighty dollar (pul qolning kiri); qağaz aqsha – soft money (qogoz pullar); aqshanı qazıp alıp atırğan – be flush of money, stink of money (pulni ko'chadan supurib olish); mañlay tersiz tabılğan dunya (aqsha), juğımsız aqsha – easy money, maney for jam, muck and money go together (bebiliska pul); sawaplı aqsha (pul), sadaqa pul, járdem pul – smart money (yordam pul); aqshanıñ (dunyanıñ) qasapatına ushırağan – money unmakes the men who make it.

Altın menen toltırsada arshalar

Baydıñ kúni kesher barha el menen. (Kúnxoja “El menen”).

Thus, the comparative method allows for a deeper, more detailed study of the material of each of the compared languages and becomes the basis for further typological studies, which is of particular importance in identifying phraseological alternatives, analogs and non-equivalent phraseological units. The path from the structure of phraseological units in English and Karakalpak languages to the study of their semantic

and stylistic features, and on this basis to identify alternative and non-alternative expressions, is, in our opinion, a consistent and step-by-step path.

The development of many general problems of semantics and the accumulated experience in the study of thematic groups, synonymous and antonymic lines, semantic fields, including phraseosemantic fields, within the framework of this work, provides an opportunity to systematically study the phraseology of English and Karakalpak languages based on semantic analysis.

Adjectival phraseological units in the Karakalpak language are divided into several groups in terms of meaning: 1. Adjectival phraseological units related to human nature aq kókirek – soft-hearted; júrek jutqan (samimiy) – whole-hearted; tas bawir – hard-hearted, stony-heart; ash kóz (jonsız buyum, hissiz odam) – a stick and (yoki .. dan) a stone, so'zlashuv.a cold fish; beti qalıñ – as bold as brass; til alğış – gold mouth; eki júzli – two-faced, have the face to (beti qalin, sulloh (nimadir qilmoq)); eki sózli – as cunning as a fox, as sly as a fox; yoki – as barmy (crazy) as bedbug; qoyan júrek – faint-hearted; daw júrek – heart of oak; kem kewil – heart-sick, down-hearted; kórse qızar – ginger shall be hot in the mouth; iyisi bos – half-hearted; qanğibas, qaqañbas – walk smb. off his feet(legs) (kimnidir sayr qildirib charchatmoq); esi pútin – heart-whole; jel ókpe – hot-headed; kóz kórgen – ring my bell, alma- moyın – as graceful as a swan; qara mañlay – black flesh, fate worth than death; shala jansar – the flesh is weak; turi suwıq – heavy heart; qos jaqbas – lazy beggar (bones yoki dog); shala sawat – lights are on and nobody is home, head in the cloud; zip berdi – cut and run, get-away.

In the above examples, adjectival phraseological units consist of two components and are not considered comparative. Their morphological structure covers different parts of speech and is expressed in different ways.

### Conclusion

In all semantic groups of comparative phraseological units, national-specific images are distinguished.

Studying the distribution of phraseological units in this semantic field into thematic groups allows us to conclude that phraseological units in the Karakalpak language are semantically focused on people.

The semantic scope of phraseologisms includes positive and negative connotations. Subjects and

events that make up the semantic basis of the images are related to the living environment and life activities of ethnic groups. The Karakalpak phraseological system is characterized by its own spatial and temporal diversity, each of which has a separate sign and symbolic meaning.

### References:

1. Bayramova L. K. Tojdestvo frazeologizmov v zerkale transformatsiy i korrelyatsiy / L. K. Bayramova // Problema tojdestva frazeologicheskix yedinitits.– Chelyabinsk, 1990.– P. 3–11.
2. Berdimuratov Ye. Həzirgi qaraqalpaq tili. Leksikologiya. – Nəkis, 1994.– P. 136–137.
3. G'abitxanuli Q. Nanim senim baylanisti qazaq tilindegi turaqti tirkester KDA. – Almati. 1995.– 25 p.
4. Isaev A. Somaticheskie frazeologizmi uzbekskogo yazika. AKD.– T., 1977.
5. Keñesbaev S. Qazaq til bilimi turali izertteuler. – Almati. 1987.– P. 240–250.
6. Keñesbaeva Y. Ag'ilshinsha-qazaqsha frazeologiyaliq sozdik.– Astana. 2010.
7. Lyubova A. N. Ad'ektivnie komparativnie frazeologizmi v angliyskom, nemetskom i norvejskom yazikax: obshee i spetsificheskoe: Dis..., kand. filol. nauk. 10.02.04. 2009.– 207 p.
8. McCarthy Michael. O`Dell Felicity: Cambridge, 2018: In Use. URL: <https://www.labyrinth.ru/books/651158/>
9. Nevedomskaya O. M. Komparativnie frazeologizmi nemetskogo yazika v sopostavlenii s russkimi. Avtoref. diss. na soiskanie uch. stepeni kand. filol. nauk. L., 1973.– 14 p. sblijeniya.– Kazan': Izd-vo KazGU, 1989.– 296 p.
10. Sidiyakova N. M. Komparativnie frazeologicheskie yedinititsi tipa (as) + pril. + as + sush. v sovremennom angliyskom yazike: dis. ... kand. filol. nauk.– M., 1967.– 385 p.
11. Solodub Yu. G. Frazeologiya kak ob'ekt sopostavitel'nogo strukturno-tipologicheskogo issledovaniya. Diss.... dokt.filol.nauk.– M.: 1985.– 406 p.
12. Soloduxo E. M. Teoriya frazeologicheskogo sblijeniya.– Kazan': Izd-vo KazGU, 1989.– 296 p.
13. Usmanova Sh. Uzbek va turk tillarida somatik frazeologizmlar, nomzodlik dissertatsiyasi. Avtoref – T., 1998.

\* *Examples of thematic groups are only phraseological units*