



LINGUOCULTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SOMATIC PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Kurbonova Marguba Sotvoldiyevna

Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, teacher

+998 88 988 64 80, kmarguba2020@gmail.com

<https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10158226>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 13th November 2023

Accepted: 19th November 2023

Online: 20th November 2023

KEY WORDS

Phraseological units, linguacultural, equivalent, speech culture, culture code, cross-cultural, somatisms, national-cultural features, picturesque, linguocultures, socioeconomic semantics, national mentality, vivid expression, culture, enlightenment, culture, code, component.

ABSTRACT

This article clarifies the pragmatic roles performed by somatic phraseologies in the English and Uzbek languages. The study of linguistic and cultural materials used in language instruction has brought about a lot of interest in modern linguistics. This has led to the formation of an anthropocentric paradigm, which views language as a kind of cultural code that enforces to specific linguistic and cultural communities in addition to its communicative and cognitive uses.

Introduction. In addition to being a crucial tool for organizing knowledge about the outside world, language serves as the primary indicator of a specific group of people. Language is an essential the medium through which the people's psychology, customs, and mores are communicated. It is a way to produce national literature, which serves as the primary source of knowledge about a specific people.

The figurative interpretation of phrases that name different bodily parts-related actions and states gives rise to somatic phraseological units.

Some conclusions with regard to somatic vocabulary and phraseology are now considered axiomatic: The most dependable source of information about history, ethnography, and the psychology of native speakers is somatic vocabulary and phraseology. Somatic vocabulary and phraseology are the earliest layer of nominative language units and the keepers of antiquated forms, features, and language unit functioning.

Materials and Methods. We chose somatic phraseological units with the most commonly occurring components—such as the hand, head, neck, heart, mouth, tongue, foot, leg, eye, ears, face, and nose—in order to examine the features. The majority of somatic phraseology's imagery is derived from the way internal organs and body parts—referred to as somatic components—function. Nonetheless, certain discrepancies in the meaning of



individual components can be found because of the unique characteristics of the linguistic representation of the world in each of the languages under consideration.

Thus, for instance, phraseological units with a hand component are considered in English. The hand has a direct role in both an individual's external and internal (introspective) activities. A person's hand facilitates the performance of numerous tasks.

The following groups can be distinguished:

1. Activity: try your hand at.
2. Labor, labor force: to join hands together.
3. Characteristics of a person: a safe pair of hands; to give a hand.
4. Possibility and lack thereof: hands are tied (control); get out of hand.

The evaluation of the attitude, that provides details about the national mindset and ethnoculture of a country, is a part of the phraseological meaning's cultural component. Phraseology, in general, is a vivid representation of a country's culture, way of life, level of enlightenment, and national mentality. Phraseology, in general, is a vivid representation of a country's culture, way of life, level of enlightenment, and national mindset. The ability of linguistic signs to reflect the national and cultural mindset of their speakers is an indication of their abilities to serve as the "language" of culture.

Numerous facets of human life have been covered by phraseological units.

Discussion. According to Professor A. V. Kunin, the most prominent authority on English phraseology issues, a phraseological unit is defined as a stable word group with a fully or partially transferred meaning. This definition is the foundation for a great deal of Russian scholars' research in the field of phraseology today.

Somatisms are understood as a component of the somatic code of culture, a cultural sign that conveys cultural information and serves as the foundation for how phraseological units are viewed. The hand somatis is the most common type. Head, eye, face, foot, nose, finger, and heart follow. Although they are not as frequently used, the remaining somatizations—leg, arm, back, bone, brain, ear, tooth, skin, shoulder, neck, and tongue—have a high phrase-forming activity.

The majority of Russian scholars now recognize the semantic criterion as the primary one for differentiating phraseological units from free word groups, and they base their research in phraseology on professor A.V. Koonin's definition of a phraseological unit [3], who is the foremost expert on issues pertaining to English phraseology:

A stable word group with entirely or partially transferred meaning is called a phraseological unit. close at hand—as soon as feasible, as early as feasible, as rapidly as feasible; turn from control, spin out of control, or go completely out of control; The second kind of restriction is the prohibition against adding any new elements to a phraseological unit's structure. Such modifications are possible in a free word group without changing the statement's overall meaning:

Word groups known as somatic phraseological units have entirely altered meanings; that is, the meaning of the unit differs from the meanings of its component words. keep a hand in everything; to participate in and exert influence over many different activities: To learn more about it, talk to John — he's got a finger in every pie; have eyes in the back of your head — to seem to be able to sense what is going on behind or outside of one's field of vision: I



don't have eyes in the back of my head; keep an eye on something — to look after someone or something and make sure that they are safe: Will you keep an eye on the baby? lie through one's teeth — to tell someone something that you know is completely false:

The student will lie through his teeth in order to get a higher mark;

long arm of the law — the police, the law: He couldn't escape the long arm of the law;

look somebody in the eye — to talk to someone in an honest way that shows no doubts: I looked the old lady in the eye when I asked her to stop crying at me;

not have a leg to stand on — to have no chance of proving that something is true: If your witness is abroad, you don't have a leg to stand on;

The semantics of phraseological units with the "eye" component in the compared languages is associated with the topic of visual perception. Through sight, a person acquires the bulk of his knowledge about reality, which is reflected in the partial juxtaposition of the semantic structure of the word "see" in different languages, which signals such concepts as "understand", "represent": to be all eyes;

to open somebody's eyes to smth; to run one's eye over something.

Eyes are also important expressers of emotions and feelings, therefore, there is a large number of phraseological units with this component, reflecting a change in a person's emotional state: one's eyes flash fire; the envy / green / evil eye - evil eye; to cry one's eyes out - cry out eyes. The imagery and meaning of the majority of somatic phraseological units with the "ear" component are also determined by the nature of the physiological function of the corresponding organ: to close one's ears to something; to be all ears.

In English, somatic phraseological units with this component are associated with a secret, a desire to find it out: to keep one's ears open; walls have ears. In English, ears are also a symbol of something extreme (this is due to their marked location, both on the head and vertically: this part of the body is located above all others): to be over head and ears in love; to be up to one's ears in trouble.

The semantics of the somatic component "face" is associated with the status, dignity of a person: slap in the face; to save face.

It can also be noted that in the English language the face reflects the emotional state: to have face like thunder; to put on a brave face. The nose is a relatively small organ and the only one that protrudes on the face. Somatic phraseological units with this component often have the meaning of proximity, as well as obtaining information: see no further than the end of one's nose; nose to tail. There are phraseological units in the language, denoting a negative assessment of a person currying favor with others: brown nose – sneaky.

Results. There are also equivalent phraseological units, in the semantics of which aggressive action against another person is reflected: to give somebody a bloody nose. In the analyzed language, somatic phraseological units with a semantic field "superiority" are widely represented: to look down one's nose at somebody; to look down with one's nose in the air; toffee-nosed; thumb one's nose at someone or something. The opposite picture is observed with respect to somatic phraseological units that have the lexeme "finger". English phraseological units with this component are more active. Here are some examples: to have a finger in the pie; to twist around one's finger; to have sticky fingers. Thus, the nature of the functions of body parts and organs, called somatic components, determines the imagery of



most somatic phraseology. However, due to the peculiarities of the linguistic picture of the world of the language under consideration, some discrepancies in the connotations of individual components were identified. Phraseological activity of many English somatic lexemes is similar to the corresponding Russian lexemes.

Conclusions. In summary, the translator's job is to comprehend the original text's meaning and convey it in a different language utilizing the same meaning—that is, the system of values. Semantic losses are unavoidable in such instances because there is an interlanguage transformation taking place, or the substitution of one sign system for another. They must be minimized by the translator in order to guarantee a higher level of equivalency between the original and translated texts, which is not feasible without conducting a number of translation transformations.

References:

1. Manerko L. From human body parts to the embodiment of spatial conceptualization in English idioms. The 4 th UK Cognitive Linguistics Conference.2014 , P. 195-213.
2. Papi M.B. Idiomatic and figurative uses of "hand" in English and "muno" in Italian: embodiment and cultural filters. Main Session Talks. Pisa, 2013.
3. Sirojiddinov Sh. Odilova G. Badiiy tarjima asoslari. Monografiya.-T. Mumtoz so'z. -2011.-B
4. O`zbek tilining izohli lug`ati. K – harfi. B446,471,406,446 M – harfi. B 535
5. Source: <https://proverbicals.com/proverbs>
6. Source: <https://proverbicals.com/head-proverbs>
7. <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/beam>
8. Акуленко В.В. Лексические средства категория интенсивности качественного признака в современном русском языке (на материале имен прилагательных): автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. – Киев: 1987. – 25 с.
9. Балли Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. – М.: Издательство иностранной литературы, 1955. – 416 с.
10. Виноградов В. В. Основные типы лексических значений слова. // Вопр. языкознания. 1953. № 5.
11. Виноградов В.В. Основные понятия русской фразеологии как лингвистической дисциплины. Избранные труды. Лексикология и лексикография. – Москва, 1977. – 267 с.
12. Воркачев С.Г. Лингвокультурология. Языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании // Филологические науки. - М., 2001. - №1. - С. 64-72.
13. Гак В.Г. Метафора: универсальное и специфическое // Метафора в языке и тексте. – М.: 1988. – С. 11-26.
14. Кунин А.В. Большой англо-русский фразеологический словарь. – М.: Русский язык – Медиа; 5-е издание, 2006. 502с.
15. Кунин А.В. Фразеология современного английского языка. – М.: международные отношения,1972. – 187с.
16. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. – М.: Академия, 2001. – 207 с.



17. Телия В.Н. О методологических основаниях лингвокультурологии // Логика, методология, философия науки. Тезисы докладов. М.-Обнинск, 1995. Б.90.