

## COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN PHRASEOLOGY

**Ikromova Nozanin Vohidjon qizi**

student of the Faculty of Russian Language and Literature,  
Kokand State  
Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan.

**Annotation.** This study is aimed at the comparative study of English and Russian phraseology and semasiology. It provides a new scientific approach to solving one of the most difficult problems of comparative study of the phraseological material of different languages at the semantic level.

**Beak words:** comparative research, semantic equivalents, semantic analogues, interlingual, phraseological correspondences, semantic structure, component theory

A characteristic feature of the modern stage of development of linguistics is the strengthening of comparative research. The problem of determining the types of interlingual relations is one of the most important in the comparative study of English and Russian phraseology. Modern interlingual comparisons aimed at identifying phraseological correspondence form the basis of the theory and practice of phraseography. Comparative research could be an effective solution to both translation problems and phraseography problems. Comparative research could be an effective solution to both translation problems and phraseography problems. determination of the types of interlingual ratio of phraseologisms of the compared languages. In addition, such studies help to identify similarities and differences in the linguistic picture of the world for further research on ways of reflecting reality in different languages.

The main feature of phraseological equivalence in relation to multilingual comparative-typological analysis, according to E. M. Solodukho, is the coincidence of the content side of the related phraseological units [2]. This approach to the definition of phraseological equivalence allows, in his opinion, to extend this concept to a large number of the number of phraseological units not recognized by most researchers as interlingual equivalents, that is, not having complete formal similarities. According to E. M. Solodukho, phraseologisms that coincide in meaning and (in the case of polysemy) in stylistic coloring are complete equivalents. Those that have partial discrepancies in the semantic structure and / or do not coincide stylistically in one of the meanings in the case of polysemy are called limited equivalents [2].

However, the lexical composition, imagery and grammatical form of the related units also plays an essential role in determining the degree of equivalence. E. M. Solodukho proposes a classification of equivalent phraseological correspondences and non-equivalent correspondences, including the following categories: identical equivalents, direct equivalents, synonymous equivalents and interlingual phraseological homonyms. Accordingly, identical, direct and synonymous equivalents are characterized by an upper, middle and lower equivalence threshold [2].

In the works of Y. P. Solodub, the characteristic of the equivalence of phraseological units is limited by the specific structural and typological orientation of the study [1]. According to Y. P. Solodub, when determining the concept of interlingual phraseological equivalence based primarily on the components of the content plan, namely meaning, stylistic coloring and phraseological image, it is possible to deeply study the phenomenon itself by analyzing the components of the components substantive. expression plan. In this case, all the features of the grammatical and lexico-semantic organization of a particular language or group of related languages are manifested [1].

Considering the phraseological image as a necessary component of the semantics of a significant part of phraseologisms, Y. P. Solodub conducts a structural and typological study of phraseological units that have the meaning of a qualitative assessment of the personality, revealing not only the fact of the figurative proximity of units in different languages, but also determining the degree of this proximity as a degree of structural-type of the linguistic similarity and divergence of Russian phraseologisms with phraseologisms of the compared languages. In the classification of Y. P. Soloduba distinguishes interlingual phraseological

equivalents of four degrees and interlingual phraseosemantic correspondences of two degrees of similarity. The concept of "interlingual phraseological equivalents" is specific to the concept of "typologically identical phraseological units". The above phraseologisms, the semantic structure of which is integrated on the basis of the general model of the sleuth They allow you to meet both multilingual and monolingual phraseologisms. Interlingual phrase-semantic correspondences of the second degree of similarity are characterized only by the commonality of the phrase model with various specific and figurative forms of its implementation in each individual language [1].

The classification of types of interlingual relations is also of great interest proposed by A.D. Reichstein [3]. The author identifies the following qualitative types of interlingual relations: identity (complete coincidence of species organization and aggregate value); lexical variability or structural synonymy (complete coincidence of the aggregate meaning and syntactic organization with incomplete identity of the constituent part); ideographic synonymy (incomplete identity of the owls); of the cumulative significative meaning due to the presence of specific semantic features in both multilingual phraseologisms, regardless of species identity). A. D. Reichstein also distinguishes hyperhiponymy (incomplete identity of the aggregate significative meaning due to the presence in one of the compared phraseologisms of additional, clarifying semantic features, regardless of the species identity), stylistic synonymy (incomplete identity of the aggregate meaning due to the difference in stylistic z genesis), homonymy and polysemy (identity of the organization of the species with greater or lesser differences in cumulative value), enantiosemy (identity of the organization of the species when contrasting the cumulative value). This detailed classification takes into account all possible discrepancies both in the formal-semantic organization of phraseologisms and in their aggregate content. Especially valuable (in relation to our study) is the identification of such types of interlingual relations as ideographic synonymy and hyperhyponymy, where we take into account the presence of additional differential sems in the significative and denotative meaning of phraseological units [3].

The semantic identity or distinction of multilingual phraseologisms means the identity or difference of their semantic structure, a simplified set of minimal semantic components of the significative and denotative and connotative components of the phraseological meaning. The coincidence of the seed structure of the significative and denotative macrocomponent means the coincidence of the inficative and denotative macrocomponent tegreal and differential sem in the structure of the phraseological meaning of English and Russian phraseologisms. Semantic equivalence in our study means a complete coincidence of the semantic structure of the significative and denotative macrocomponent and the four components of connotation: evaluative, emotive, expressive seed and functional-stylistic component.

Some differences may be characteristic of the component composition of the phraseological meaning of multilingual phraseologisms. First of all, they concern the connotative macrocomponent, namely such components as the functional-stylistic and emotive components, which may differ in the same structure of the significative and denotative macrocomponent. However, very often there are partial differences in the semantic structure of the significative and denotative the whole (ideographic synonymy and hyperogyponymy according to the classification of A. D. Reichstein), i.e. the presence of a differential additional seed (or sem) in one of the compared phraseological units. or in both. At the same time, there is both a coincidence and a difference between the three components of connotation: emotive, expressive and functional-stylistic. Such partial discrepancies with close similarity are characteristic of semantic analogues [3].

When analyzing extensive phraseological material, it was revealed that the selected types of semantic equivalents and analogues do not include all phraseological units that are beyond the phraseological lacunarity. When comparing similar units, certain semantic discrepancies are found, concerning, first of all, their significative and denotative macrocomponents. These discrepancies, observed not only in the differential, but also in one integral seed, are characteristic of particular semantic analogues. Thus, in our study, the allocation of such a group is dictated by the needs of phraseography and to a certain extent is very conditional and rarely applicable. In partial semantic analogues connotative components (the value of the evaluative) can both coincide and differ.

Thus, the primacy of semantic identity/difference as the identification of types of interlingual phraseological correspondences/discrepancies means that the component theory, based on the method of component analysis, acts as an organizing theory in determining these types. This approach to solving the problem of criteria for

identity and differences in phraseologisms of comparable languages is justified, given that in numerous monolingual and multilingual studies of phraseology the method of component analysis is used.

Semantic equivalents fully coincide in the semantic structure of significative and denotative macrocomponents and four components of connotation: evaluative, emotive, expressive sems and functional-stylistic components. The coincidence of the semantic structure of the significative and denotative macrocomponents means the coincidence of integral and differential sem in the structure of the phraseological meaning of English and Russian phraseologisms.

Semantic equivalents can be presented in the following examples: the English phraseology cast (throw) stone (stones) at someone and its Russian correspondence (throw (throw) a stone at someone). Both phraseologisms in this example refer to interstyle units, since they have a common hypersem "people", semantic components "personal action", "interpersonal relations", sems characterizing similar actions ("condemn, accuse", "accuse" denigrate, discredit), also having a negative evaluative view, an emotive "disapproving attitude" and a lack of expressiveness. Thus, these phraseologisms are semantic equivalents.

Comparative analysis is of great importance today, as it helps to identify similarities and distinguishing features in the English-speaking and Russian language picture of the world. Consequently, it allows you to explore different ways of reflecting reality in the language and reveals the features of different languages and cultures.

Determining the types of interlingual phraseological correspondences / differences in this study, we focus primarily on a complex criterion that includes semantic coincidence, grammatical (syntactic) organization and component (lexical) structure of multilingual phraseologisms (with an undisputed primacy of semantic identity / difference or content plan).

Semantic equivalence (the identity of the semantic organization of phraseological meanings of English and Russian phraseologisms) means a complete coincidence of the semantic structure of the significative and denotative macrocomponents and the four components of connotation: the evaluative sem, the emotive sem, the expressive sem, and the functional and stylistic component. As a rule, semantic equivalents in their functional and stylistic characteristics are either interstyle or bookish and are characterized by an upper level of semantic correspondences.

#### References:

1. Solodub, Y. P. (1997). Comparative analysis of the structure of lexical and phraseological meaning. *Philological Sciences*, 5, 43-54.
2. Solodub, E. M. (1977). *Issues of comparative study of borrowed phraseology*. Kazan, USSR: Kazan University Press.
3. Reichstein, A. D. (1980). *Comparative analysis of German and Russian phraseology*. Moscow, USSR: Vysshaya shkola.