

LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF VERBAL PHRASEOLOGICAL COMPOUNDS (ON THE MATERIAL OF RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES)

Ropieva Yulduz Tirkashevna – English Language Teacher, Jizzakh City No. 1 Technical School

Kuzibayeva Kumushbibbi Zafar kizi - English Language Teacher, Jizzakh City No. 1 Technical School

SUMMARY

The linguoculturological approach makes it possible to determine the scope of the semantics of phraseological units of different languages in relation to an identical fragment of reality; show how a similar set of semes is configured in phraseological units; identify the original archetypes reflected in their internal form; reveal the ethnospecificity of phraseological images; show how culturally conditioned conceptual models underlying these images form the axiological content of phraseological units; and match their patterns of usage in different communicative contexts. Such an approach makes it possible to consider phraseological units not only as stable linguistic combinations but also as important carriers of national cultural information.

The comparative analysis of phraseological units is particularly significant because the same reality can be conceptualized and represented differently in different linguistic cultures. Phraseological expressions preserve culturally significant information concerning traditions, customs, social relationships, historical experience, everyday life, and the emotional evaluation of reality. Therefore, the study of phraseology at the intersection of language and culture provides a more complete understanding of the national linguistic worldview.

The linguoculturological interpretation also helps to identify the relationship between the literal image of a phraseological unit and its figurative meaning. In many cases, the internal form of an idiom contains cultural associations that cannot be understood exclusively through the dictionary definition of its components. Consequently, comparative research should consider semantic, structural, stylistic, pragmatic, and cultural characteristics simultaneously.

Keywords: phraseological units; cultural compounds; cultural linguistics; comparative research; concept; linguoculturological approach; linguistic worldview; cultural component of meaning.

INTRODUCTION

Attention to the issues of comparative linguistics is quite understandable: it makes it possible to better understand the mechanism of functioning of a separate phenomenon in each language and use the information obtained for a complex contrastive description of the compared languages. Comparative linguistics allows researchers to establish common linguistic tendencies as well as identify specific characteristics determined by the historical and cultural development of individual linguistic communities.

Of particular interest among this kind of comparisons and studies are investigations in the field of phraseology, in which the originality of life, lifestyle, mentality, traditions, and worldview of a particular people is most visibly manifested. Phraseology "condenses the entire complex of culture and psychology of a given people, the unique way of its way of thinking" (L.I.

Roizenzon). Phraseological units therefore represent a valuable source for studying not only the language itself but also the cultural experience encoded in linguistic expressions.

Phraseological expressions are closely connected with human perception of reality. They frequently describe emotions, personal qualities, interpersonal relationships, social behavior, physical states, and moral evaluations. Because of their figurative nature, phraseological units are capable of transmitting information in a more expressive and emotionally marked way than neutral lexical units. This expressive potential makes phraseology especially important for the study of the relationship between language, thought, and culture.

The comparative study of phraseological units allows solving a number of complex and still not unambiguously resolved issues concerning the identification of interlingual identities and differences between two distantly related languages – Russian and English. A significant commonality of the European way of life, together with the ever-increasing cultural and economic ties between Russia and the English-speaking countries, are reflected in the phraseology of the two compared languages. At the same time, differences in historical experience, national traditions, social organization, and cultural values contribute to the emergence of culture-specific phraseological expressions.

Of great importance is the comparison of phraseological pictures of the world of peoples, which is based on the study of the thematic and ideographic semantics of phraseological units and the identification of their figurative and motivational foundations and cultural sources for the formation of their semantics. The phraseological picture of the world can be understood as a fragment of the general linguistic worldview represented through stable figurative expressions. It reflects the ways in which speakers categorize reality and evaluate phenomena that are important for their community.

In domestic and foreign linguistics, works are widely represented on the study of the national identity of the phraseological fund on the material of different languages, including in comparative terms. These studies demonstrate that phraseological units may preserve information about historical events, traditional occupations, religious beliefs, household practices, literature, mythology, and other elements of national culture.

The uniqueness of the phraseological picture of the world in each national language lies in the special correlation of the general, typological, and nationally specific. The comparative method helps to find out the essence of general linguistic categories, as well as the features of each of the compared languages, which may go unnoticed when analyzing intralinguistic material. In this respect, comparison makes it possible to distinguish universal patterns of human cognition from culturally determined patterns of conceptualization.

A comparative study carried out in line with the linguoculturological paradigm is aimed at identifying the universal, culturally determined, and nationally specific features of phraseological units as signs of language, culture, and communication. It seems that at the intersection of these three areas, the "life" of the phraseological sign is carried out. Phraseological units function simultaneously as linguistic structures, cultural repositories, and communicative instruments.

As a sign of a language, a phraseological unit reports what is happening, figuratively describes reality, conveys an assessment, and expresses an emotion. The plan of the content of the phraseological unit corresponds to the plan of the system-linguistic expression. At the same time, its meaning is not limited to the literal meanings of its components. The semantic structure of a phraseological unit usually includes an integral figurative meaning, emotional evaluation, stylistic characteristics, and additional connotative components.

The semantic analysis of phraseological units leads to the etymology of the image, the disclosure of the inner form, and the identification of basic metaphors. It also describes the connotation that arises in the context and compensates for the insufficiency of the conventionalized meaning. The concept of connotation brings semantic analysis to the level of interpretation of a linguistic sign in the space of various types of knowledge. Linguistic semantics is therefore considered in conjunction with cultural semantics, and a cultural component, or culturally marked meanings embodied in a linguistic sign, is singled out.

This cultural component is especially important when comparing phraseological units belonging to different languages. Two expressions may have similar denotative meanings while differing significantly in emotional evaluation or cultural associations. Conversely, phraseological units with different lexical structures may express practically identical concepts and communicative intentions.

As a sign of culture, an idiom preserves the traditions of the people and transmits from generation to generation cultural knowledge regarding the realities underlying the phraseological image: everyday, ritual, religious, historical, literary, mythological, scientific, and other realities. Phraseological units can therefore be viewed as a kind of linguistic memory in which elements of collective cultural experience are preserved.

A phraseological unit fixes stable cultural representation in the image and turns into a symbol of what is happening, becomes a stereotype of situations, and serves as a standard of certain qualities of realities. Phraseologism stores in the depths of its inner form the original models of human perception of the world, or archetypes, which “hold” the phraseological image, do not allow it to “disintegrate,” and make it possible to see the cultural information contained within the semantics of phraseological units.

“Language is becoming an increasingly valuable guide in the scientific study of a particular culture. In a sense, the network of cultural models of a civilization is indexed in the language that expresses that civilization. It is naive to think that one can understand the essential concepts of culture by observation alone, without relying on the linguistic symbolism that makes these contours meaningful and clear to society.”

As a sign of communication, an idiom participates in a variety of discursive practices, where optimal communicative conditions are formed for its implementation. Idioms in speech acquire many semantic nuances caused by the participants' interpretation of the communicative situation. Their meaning can therefore be influenced by the speaker's intention, the social relationship between participants, the topic of communication, and the stylistic context.

Knowledge, attitudes, and ideas of culture are translated into speech in the form of cultural connotations – a special categorical component of meaning. Thus, the linguistic, cultural, and communicative-pragmatic properties of a phraseological unit are realized simultaneously. This explains why a phraseological expression may perform several functions at once: nominative, expressive, evaluative, stylistic, and pragmatic.

The linguoculturological analysis of phraseological units also makes it possible to identify concepts that are particularly significant for a particular linguistic community. Concepts such as **human character, family, work, friendship, wealth, poverty, courage, fear, intelligence, physical appearance, and social status** are represented in phraseology through a wide range of figurative models. Comparing these models can reveal both common human values and culturally specific interpretations.

Phraseological units that are functionally correlated with the verb, that is, idioms, the core component of which is the verb, should be considered as verbs. The connection between the

core and dependent components of subordinate phraseological units is an objective one. For further classification of phraseological units, it is also necessary to take into account the valency of the transitive verb.

“For object phrases, the valency of the verb is of particular importance, which is understood as the ability of the verb to enter into combinations with other words in the sentence. In modern linguistics, the following types of valency have been discovered: subjective valence, if we mean the ability of a verb to combine with the subject of a sentence; object valency, which refers to the ability of the verb to combine with one, two or more objects; predicative valency, which means the ability of the core component to combine with another verb and together with it form a compound predicate, and some others.”

To determine the types of object phrases, it is precisely the object and predicative valency that is important, since it is directly related to the composition and structure of phrases. The study of valency is particularly useful in comparative phraseology because the same semantic relationship can be grammatically expressed in different ways in different languages.

If the verb is monovalent, simple phraseological units with the structure of a phrase are distinguished; if the verb is two- or more-valent, complex phraseological units with the structure of a phrase are distinguished. Such a classification makes it possible to establish structural patterns and determine the syntactic organization of phraseological units.

It should also be noted that if in English the method of expressing an object connection is adjunction, then in Russian it is control. This structural difference demonstrates the importance of grammatical organization in comparative phraseological research. Even when phraseological units have similar meanings, their internal grammatical relations may be organized according to different linguistic models.

The following main subclasses have been identified that are characteristic of phraseological units in both languages:

1. Phraseological units with the structure V + N

The most numerous subclass is PU with structure V + N. Due to the fact that in Russian the leading method of expressing an object connection is control, and in English – adjunction, the object-postpositive type with control in Russian corresponds to the object-postpositive type with adjacency in English:

need the spur; sow discord; weather the storm; swap lies; shoot (throw) the bull; beat the air; play the hog; cast (come to, drop) anchor; answer the bell (the door); pass the baby; hit the ceiling.

These examples demonstrate that the verbal component plays a central role in determining the syntactic and semantic organization of the phraseological unit. At the same time, the noun component often contributes significantly to the figurative image and cultural interpretation of the whole expression.

For example:

The wealth he had acquired by sucking the blood of his miserable victims had but swelled him like a bloated spider.

This example demonstrates how a metaphorical image may be connected with cultural associations and evaluation. The image of “sucking blood” creates a strong negative characterization and conveys an evaluative attitude toward the person described.

Another example is:

Oh, I see. You mean that I'm the only person who might blow the gaff (W. Maugham).

The phraseological unit *blow the gaff* illustrates the importance of contextual interpretation. Its figurative meaning cannot be adequately understood through the literal meanings of the individual lexical components.

Another example:

Who took a delight in gossiping and telling tales but who was his father whom he painfully loved (G. Parker).

Such examples confirm that phraseological units are closely related to discourse and that their interpretation depends not only on their dictionary meaning but also on the communicative situation in which they are used.

In Russian, depending on the type of government, two subtypes can be distinguished.

a. Subtype with direct object control

This subtype has an object in the accusative case:

курить (жечь) фимиам кому; ломать (играть) комедию; метать петли; чесать (трепать, мозолить) язык; разводить бодягу; распускать язык; бить тревогу; заливать глаза; давать подножку кому; брать сторону кого.

For example:

(Он) писал часто и ... любил изливать в письмах душу.

The expression *изливать душу* demonstrates how a physical image can acquire an abstract emotional meaning. The metaphorical transfer from a concrete action to an internal psychological state is a characteristic mechanism of phraseologization.

b. Subtype with indirect object control

This subtype has an object in the instrumental case:

кривить душой; болтать языком; извиваться ужом (змеей); бить челом; чесать (трепать, трещать, молотить) языком; вилять хвостом; брать измором; заливаться соловьем; владеть пером; выдавать головой кого; сверкать глазами; бросаться словами.

For example:

— Думаешь, в партию всякую заваль принимают? Твое дело — только языком балабонить, брехни рассказывать (M. Sholokhov).

The expression in this example has a strong expressive and evaluative component. The use of the phraseological unit not only describes the person's activity but also expresses the speaker's negative attitude toward it.

Another example is:

Да, он действительно умрет где-нибудь в нищете и в бедности; но неужели ж и за это пускать в него камни?

This example demonstrates the relationship between phraseological meaning and the broader cultural context in which an expression is used.

Unlike phraseological units of the English language, in a number of phraseological units of the Russian language, the reverse order of the components is observed:

труса (трусу) праздновать; бобы разводить; собак гонять; разводы (узоры) разводить; муху раздавить; волком выть; клещами тащить (вытягивать) из кого.

The difference in component order is significant for comparative analysis because phraseological units are characterized by a relatively stable internal structure. Changes in word order may influence both the grammatical organization and the stylistic perception of an expression.

The comparative analysis of English and Russian phraseological units demonstrates that similarities and differences between languages can be observed at several levels simultaneously. These include lexical composition, syntactic structure, semantic organization, figurative motivation, stylistic coloring, and pragmatic function.

In addition, the comparison of phraseological units makes it possible to identify culturally specific images. Animals, body parts, household objects, food, occupations, social institutions, and historical figures may acquire different symbolic meanings in different linguistic cultures. Consequently, a phraseological unit should be interpreted not only as a linguistic construction but also as a cultural sign.

From the perspective of translation, this issue becomes particularly important. A translator must distinguish between full equivalents, partial equivalents, phraseological analogues, and expressions that have no direct correspondence in the target language. Literal translation may sometimes preserve the formal structure but completely lose the cultural or pragmatic meaning of the original.

The comparative analysis of phraseology also contributes to foreign-language teaching. Knowledge of phraseological correspondences and differences allows learners to avoid literal translation, understand authentic speech more accurately, and develop intercultural communicative competence. Phraseological material can therefore be used not only in linguistic research but also in practical language education.

On the basis of a comparative analysis of phraseological units of the Russian and English languages, similarities and differences between languages are most clearly revealed, both universal and specific phenomena are distinguished at different language levels. The originality of phraseological units is determined both by the internal laws of the language and by extralinguistic factors.

Thus, the linguoculturological and comparative approaches provide an opportunity to study phraseological units as complex linguistic and cultural phenomena. They reveal how speakers of different languages conceptualize reality, express emotions and evaluations, preserve cultural memory, and organize their communicative behavior. The study of phraseological units therefore contributes to a deeper understanding of the interaction between **language, culture, cognition, and communication**.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Алехина А.И. *Исследование системной организации фразеологии современного английского языка / Проблема фразеологических отношений и фразеологических структур*. Автореф. дисс. докт. филол. наук. Л.: Просвещение, 1986. 33 с.
2. Быкова Г. В. *Лакунарность как категория лексической системологии*. Автореф. дис. докт. филол. наук. Воронеж, 1999. 32 с.
3. Добрыднева Е.А. *Коммуникативно-прагматическая парадигма русской фразеологии*. Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. 187 с.
4. Catford J. C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Essay in Applied Linguistics* (= Language and Language Learning 8). London: Oxford University Press, 1985.
5. Seidl Jennifer, W. McMordie. *English Idioms and How to Use Them*. М.: Высшая школа, 1983.