

Interlinguistic Correspondence And Semantic Transfer Of Phytonymic Phraseological Units In English And Uzbek Languages

Zohidova Sevara A'zamjon kizi
Doctoral student of Tashkent institute
of textile and light industry

Abstract: *The study of interlingual phraseological correspondences has always been of great theoretical and practical importance, so many scientists are interested in the issue of finding and identifying them. Naturally, interlingual correspondences are required, first of all, in the translation process, when transferring from one language to another.*

Comparative study of phraseological units with a phytonymic component in two languages is important not only for translation practice, but also for determining their semantic structure, conceptual model and linguocultural characteristics. "Translation problems" are used here not as a goal, but as a method of linguistic analysis: that is, the deep layers of meaning are revealed through how a phytophraseoema from one language is transferred to another.

Key words: *interlingual phraseological correspondence, phraseological units with a phytonymic component, alternative phraseologisms, partial equivalents, evaluative connotation*

It is worth noting that translating phraseologisms is not only about transferring semantic meaning, but also preserving connotative properties.

Interlinguistic relations of phraseological units are usually seen in three main types:

1. Full (or maximal) phraseological equivalents - units that correspond in terms of denotative meaning, basic image and evaluative connotation.
2. Partial equivalents - units that have the same general concept and semantic core, but partially differ in lexical composition, image details or stylistic coloring.
3. Alternative phraseologisms - units that do not have a ready-made phraseological alternative in the target language, are expressed by descriptive or combinatory means.

Although linguists (V.N. Komissarov, S. Vlahov, S. Florin, E.F.Arsentyeva, etc.) developed this classification mainly from the point of view of translation practice, this approach is also very convenient for linguistic and linguocultural analysis. Because it is through the degree of interlinguistic compatibility that:

- how universalized or nationalized the phytonymic image is;
- which semantic component is preserved, which is lost;
- which cultural codes are compatible, which are different.

In this article, the interlinguistic compatibility of phraseological units with phytonymic components in English and Uzbek is considered as an object of linguistic research. Translation is analyzed in this process as a means of semantic reconstruction, i.e., through the chain:

“phytophraseoema → interlinguistic equivalent → semantic and linguocultural model”.

Full or maximum equivalents are phraseological units built on the basis of the same phytonymic image in English and Uzbek, which coincide in terms of denotative meaning and main evaluative connotation. Such units indicate elements of the common worldview in both languages.

For example, the phraseologisms “forbidden fruit” in English and “taqiqlangan meva” in Uzbek are based on Biblical and religious-cultural traditions. In both languages:

- denotative meaning – “something that is not allowed, but attractive”;
- evaluative connotation – negative-moral (sin, vain desire);
- image – the concept of desire, lust and temptation through the metaphor of fruit.

Here, the phytonymic image (fruit) acts as an international religious-cultural code. From a linguistic point of view, phraseologisms are substantive units built on the adj + N (adjective + noun) model, the semantic core of which embodies the concept of "forbidden attraction".

Another similar pair is the English “(as) pure as a lily” and the Uzbek “oppoq yuvgandek”, “oppoqqina” units. Here, although the phytonym – lily / lilya flower is not fully preserved as an image, the concept of purity, innocence, sinless heart is common in both languages. In the English phraseologism, the phytonym is explicitly named, while in the Uzbek language the image of the flower is replaced by the semantics of the color white, however:

- semantic core – “morally pure, immaculate”;
- evaluative connotation – positive, laudatory;
- scope of application – mainly artistic and publicistic style.

The full equivalents also include phytphraseoems based on multinational religious-archetypal images. For example, the English expressions “the root of the evil” and the Uzbek “yovuzlik ildizi”:

- the phytonym uses the image of the root as a metaphor;
- represents the concept of “the true cause, source of evil”;
- is more typical of religious-philosophical and publicistic discourse.

This situation shows that the concept of root has expanded from the scientific-technical language (flora classification) to the moral-metaphorical sphere and has moved to the abstract concept of cause in both languages.

Among the full equivalents, there are also phytonymic images that express a person’s emotional state. Let’s take the examples of “quake (tremble) like an aspen leaf” in English and “kuz bargidek qaltiramoq / to ‘kilmoq” in Uzbek. Both units:

- are based on the phytonymic image (leaf);
- express a state of strong fear, excitement, anxiety;
- show an internal mental state through body tremors.

There is a difference in the details of the image: in English, aspen leaf means a leaf that trembles even in the light wind, while in Uzbek, “kuz bargi” has the connotation of weakness, fading, and exhaustion. Nevertheless, the semantic core is the same: “to tremble completely because of fear”.

Thus, fully equivalent phytphraseoems:

- are formed around a common cognitive metaphor (fruit – temptation, flower – purity, root – reason, leaf – fear);
- are usually based on international religious-mythological and archetypal images;
- through interlinguistic correspondence, they reflect segments of the close worldview in English and Uzbek.

Partially equivalent phytphraseoems are units in English and Uzbek that:

- represent the same conceptual space,
- but differ in phytonymic image, image intensity, evaluative connotation, or stylistic coloring.

In this case, interlinguistic correspondence is seen at three levels:

1. The semantic core is similar, the image is differential;
2. The image is similar, but the evaluative connotation is different;
3. The functional task is similar, the lexical content is different.

For example, the expressions “bitter as wormwood” in English and “achchiq yantoqdek”, “qalampir chaynagandek achchiq” in Uzbek express the same concept of “bitterness / pain”. Phytonyms:

- wormwood – bitter (bitter plant);
- qalampir – bitter taste.

Phraseologisms are built on the basis of emotional-sensory experience:

- physical taste experience → moves to an abstract assessment such as “spirit, fate, life is bitter”;
- in use, a negative evaluative connotation often prevails.

The English “green as grass” and Uzbek “g‘ora, dovuchcha, xom bola” are also partially equivalent. Here:

- in English, the green color (grass) is associated with youth, experience;
- in Uzbek, the phytonym is expressed without a specific name, but through the metaphor “g‘ora” (unripe fruit).

The semantic core – “experience, ignorance of life” – is common, but the phytonymic image is different. This situation indicates that in interlinguistic relations the metaphorical substitution – the images of “fruit” and “grass” serve one conceptual category.

Another cognitively interesting pair is the English “a hard nut (to crack)” and the Uzbek “qattiq yong‘oq”, “an inaccessible task/person”. In both languages:

- nut / nut – a metaphor of complexity, a mystery that is difficult to solve;
- denotative meaning – “a difficult problem or character to solve”;
- scope of application – everyday and journalistic style.

Here, not a phytonym, but a botanical object (nut) is the source of the conceptual metaphor, but it forms a separate microfield in the system of phraseological units with a phytonym component.

Another interesting partial correspondence is the English “apple of discord” and such units as “nizo urug‘i” and “cause of discord” in Uzbek. In English, the image of the golden apple from Greek mythology is preserved, while in Uzbek:

- sometimes the image of “apple” is not directly preserved;
- abstracted units such as “urug‘”, “cause of discord” are used.

The semantic core - “the object that caused the conflict” - is the same, and this pair demonstrates a model of partial loss of the image, but the preservation of the concept.

The pair “Rest on one’s laurels” - “to be content with one’s achievements” also demonstrates the interlinguistic transformation of the image of the phytonym (laurel / laurel). In English, laurel is an ancient symbol of victory, while in Uzbek the flower “laurel” is much more limited in the everyday cultural code. Therefore:

- in English, the phytonym is clearly named;
- in Uzbek, the phytonym is often desemantized, the concept of “resting on previous achievements” is expressed in an abstract form.

Thus, the article analyzes phraseological units with phytonymic components between English and Uzbek from the point of view of the level of interlinguistic equivalence, linguocultural parallels and differences, and cognitive-metaphorical models. The results fully support the general direction of the dissertation - the concept of "linguistic research" and create a solid scientific foundation for the contextual, discursive and corpus-based study of phytphraseoems in the following chapters.

List of used literature:

1. Комиссаров В.Н. Современное переводоведение: Учеб, пособие / В.Н. Комиссаров - М.:ЭТС, 2004. - 424с.
2. Влахов С.И. С.П.Флорин. Непереводимое в переводе. 2009.-188с.
3. С.П.Флорин. Непереводимое в переводе. 2009.-188с.
4. Арсентьева Е.Ф. Сопоставительный анализ фразеологических единиц (на материале фразеологических единиц, семантически ориентированных на человека, в английском и русском языках) / Е.Ф.Арсентьева. - Казань: Изд-во Казан.ун-та, 1989. -100с.
5. Zohidova S.A. Fitonim komponentli frazeologik birliklarning semantik tadqiqi. Urganch davlat universiteti Ilm sarchashmalari Ilmiy-nazariy, metodik jurnal 5/1-son(may 2024) ISSN 2010-6246