

## A CORPUS-BASED COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF COLLOCATIONAL PATTERNS AND SEMANTIC PROSODY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Qarazoqova Robiya

Master student of TerSPI

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20484920>

**Abstract:** The findings reveal that although both languages exhibit systematic collocational preferences, semantic prosodies are often shaped by language-specific cultural, historical, and pragmatic factors. English lexical items frequently demonstrate stable positive or negative semantic prosodies through repeated contextual associations, whereas Uzbek expressions tend to reflect sociocultural values and discourse traditions. The study contributes to corpus linguistics, contrastive linguistics, translation studies, and language teaching by highlighting how collocation and semantic prosody influence meaning construction across languages.

**Keywords:** semantic prosody, corpus linguistics, collocation, English language, Uzbek language, comparative analysis, corpus-based research, discourse analysis

### Introduction

Corpus linguistics has become an important methodological framework for examining language use in authentic contexts. Large electronic corpora enable researchers to investigate lexical patterns, phraseology, and semantic relationships that may not be visible through introspection alone. Among the central concepts in corpus linguistics are collocation and semantic prosody. Although numerous studies have examined collocation and semantic prosody in English, comparative investigations involving Uzbek remain limited. Therefore, this study aims to explore how collocational patterns and semantic prosodies operate in English and Uzbek and to identify cross-linguistic similarities and differences.

### Literature Review

The concept of collocation was first systematically discussed by Firth (1957), who emphasized that the meaning of a word can be understood through its habitual associations. Later, Sinclair (1991) demonstrated the significance of corpus evidence in identifying lexical patterns and phraseological structures.

Semantic prosody emerged as a key area of corpus-based research through the works of Sinclair (1991), Louw (1993), and Stubbs (2001). Researchers found that words often develop evaluative meanings through repeated contextual usage. For instance, the English verb *cause* is frequently associated with undesirable events such as *problems*, *damage*, and *death*, resulting in a predominantly negative semantic prosody.

In Uzbek linguistics, studies on collocation have focused primarily on phraseological units, lexical compatibility, and semantic relationships. However, corpus-based investigations of semantic prosody remain relatively underdeveloped. This gap highlights the need for comparative research that integrates modern corpus methodologies.

### Methodology

The study employs a corpus-based comparative methodology. Data were collected from English and Uzbek corpora containing contemporary written texts, including newspapers, literature, academic materials, and online publications.

The research involved the following stages:

1. Selection of target lexical items frequently occurring in both languages.
2. Extraction of concordance lines and collocational patterns.

3. Statistical analysis of collocate frequencies.
4. Identification of positive, negative, and neutral semantic prosodies.
5. Cross-linguistic comparison of findings.

The analysis focused on lexical items equivalent to English verbs such as *cause*, *provide*, and *commit*, as well as their Uzbek counterparts.

### **Results and Discussion**

#### **Collocational Patterns in English**

The analysis demonstrates that English lexical items display strong collocational preferences. For example:

- *Cause* frequently co-occurs with *problem*, *damage*, *concern*, and *difficulty*.
- *Commit* commonly appears with *crime*, *murder*, and *fraud*.
- *Provide* often collocates with *support*, *information*, and *assistance*.

These patterns indicate that lexical meaning is closely linked to recurring contextual environments.

#### **Collocational Patterns in Uzbek**

The Uzbek corpus reveals similar tendencies. Certain verbs consistently co-occur with specific nouns and expressions. For instance:

- *sabab bo'lmoq* often appears with words denoting difficulties or social issues.
- *ta'minlamoq* frequently occurs with nouns related to support, development, and opportunities.
- *amalg oshirmoq* commonly collocates with activities, projects, and reforms.

The findings suggest that collocational restrictions are an essential feature of Uzbek lexical organization.

#### **Semantic Prosody in English**

The English corpus shows clear semantic prosodies:

- *Cause* exhibits a predominantly negative semantic prosody.
- *Provide* demonstrates a positive semantic prosody.
- *Commit* carries a strongly negative semantic prosody due to its association with criminal acts.

These semantic tendencies influence readers' perceptions and contribute to discourse meaning.

#### **Semantic Prosody in Uzbek**

In Uzbek, semantic prosody is similarly observable but often reflects cultural and social values. Expressions associated with development, education, cooperation, and prosperity generally display positive semantic prosodies. Conversely, words connected with corruption, unemployment, and social problems exhibit negative semantic prosodies.

Unlike English, where semantic prosody is often highly lexicalized, Uzbek semantic prosody appears more dependent on contextual and discourse-related factors.

### **Conclusion**

This corpus-based comparative study demonstrates that collocational patterns and semantic prosody play a crucial role in meaning construction in both English and Uzbek. The findings reveal significant similarities in lexical co-occurrence patterns but also highlight important differences in the development and interpretation of semantic prosodies. English semantic prosodies tend to be more conventionalized through repeated lexical associations, whereas Uzbek semantic prosodies are often shaped by cultural and contextual influences.

### Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in Linguistics 1934–1951*. Oxford University Press.
2. Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford University Press.
3. Louw, B. (1993). Irony in the Text or Insincerity in the Writer? The Diagnostic Potential of Semantic Prosodies. In M. Baker, G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and Technology*. John Benjamins.
4. Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and Phrases: Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics*. Blackwell.
5. McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Baker, P. (2006). *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. Continuum.
8. Partington, A. (2004). “Utterly Content in Each Other’s Company”: Semantic Prosody and Semantic Preference. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 9(1), 131–156.
9. Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. John Benjamins.
10. Gries, S. T. (2013). *Statistics for Linguistics with R*. Mouton de Gruyter.