

**COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH ANTONYMOUS
COMPONENTS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK**

Xayrullayeva Sevara Bobirovna

Master's degree student Foreign Language and a Social Sciences, Asia International University,
Uzbekistan.

E-mail: sevarakhayrullayeva09@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18377149>

Abstract. Phraseological units containing semantic oppositions constitute an expressive and culturally marked part of language, reflecting both universal cognitive patterns and national linguistic worldviews. This thesis is devoted to a comparative analysis of phraseological units containing antonymous components in English, Uzbek, and Russian. Phraseological units with antonymic elements constitute an expressive and culturally significant part of the lexical system of a language. They reflect universal cognitive oppositions as well as national and linguocultural features specific to each language. The study examines semantic, structural, and functional characteristics of such phraseological units and identifies similarities and differences among the three languages. Special attention is paid to issues of classification and translation equivalence.

Key words: Phraseology, antonymy, phraseological units, comparative linguistics, linguoculture, English language, Uzbek language, Russian language.

Introduction.

Phraseological units represent stable combinations of words whose meaning is often figurative and not fully deducible from the meanings of their individual components (Sinclair, 1991, p. 20). In modern linguistics, phraseology is regarded as an important means of expressing national identity, cultural values, and emotional evaluation (Vinogradov, 1947, pp. 45–50).

Among different types of phraseological units, those that contain antonymous components are of particular interest because they are based on semantic opposition, which strengthens expressiveness and contrast (Mel'čuk, 1995, pp. 110–115).

Antonymy is one of the fundamental semantic relations in language. It reflects binary oppositions such as good and evil, truth and falsehood, happiness and sorrow, which play a key role in human cognition (Kunin, 2002, pp. 60–63).

When antonymic elements function within phraseological units, they form vivid images and convey evaluative and pragmatic meanings (Moon, 1998, pp. 91–93). Therefore, a comparative study of phraseological units with antonymous components in English, Uzbek, and Russian is both relevant and necessary (Djurayeva, 2022, pp. 15–17).

The aim of this thesis is to analyze phraseological units with antonymous components in a comparative aspect and to identify their semantic, structural, and linguocultural features.

The object of the research is phraseological units in the three languages, while the subject is their antonymous components and functional characteristics (Samadova, 2025, pp. 48–50).

Main part.

Phraseological Units with Antonymous Components

Phraseological units with antonymous components are stable expressions that include lexical elements with opposite meanings. These oppositions may be expressed explicitly through direct antonyms or implicitly through contextual contrast (Fernando, 1996, p. 47). Such units often perform expressive, evaluative, and stylistic functions in speech (Mel'čuk, 1995, pp. 120–123).

In English, phraseological units such as from rags to riches or neither here nor there demonstrate semantic opposition within a fixed structure (Moon, 1998, pp. 92–95). Russian phraseological units like *ни жив ни мёртв* or *из крайности в крайность* also rely on contrast to intensify meaning (Vinogradov, 1947, pp. 55–60). Uzbek phraseological units similarly reflect antonymic relations, often connected with everyday life, moral values, and national traditions (O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati, 2009, pp. 10–12).

The comparative analysis of English, Uzbek, and Russian phraseological units reveals both common and language-specific features. From a semantic point of view, all three languages use antonymic oppositions to express evaluation, exaggeration, emotional tension, and irony (Mel'čuk, 1995, pp. 115–118). This similarity can be explained by universal cognitive mechanisms shared by different cultures (Kunin, 2002, pp. 62–63).

However, differences emerge at the structural and linguocultural levels. English phraseological units tend to be concise and metaphorical, while Russian units are often emotionally rich and stylistically marked (Vinogradov, 1947, pp. 60–65). Uzbek phraseological units are deeply connected with national customs, social relations, and traditional imagery (O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati, 2009, pp. 15–20). These distinctions reflect the cultural and historical development of each language (Djurayeva, 2022, pp. 22–25).

The translation of phraseological units with antonymous components presents certain difficulties. Full equivalence between languages is relatively rare, as imagery and cultural associations often differ (Samadova, 2025, pp. 50–55). In many cases, translators must use functional equivalents or descriptive translation to convey the intended meaning (Fernando, 1996, p. 50; Moon, 1998, pp. 95–96). A comparative approach helps to identify translation strategies that ensure semantic adequacy and cultural appropriateness (Kunin, 2002, pp. 65–66).

Conclusion.

In conclusion, phraseological units with antonymous components represent an important part of the phraseological system of English, Uzbek, and Russian. They reflect both universal cognitive oppositions and language-specific linguocultural features.

The comparative analysis demonstrates that antonymy plays a crucial role in the formation of expressive and evaluative meanings within phraseological units. The results of this study may be applied in comparative linguistics, translation studies, and language teaching.

Further research may focus on corpus-based analysis and the expansion of comparative material (Mel'čuk, 1995, pp. 130–132).

The list of used literature.

1. Vinogradov, V. V. Russian Phraseology. Moscow: State Publishing House, 1947, pp. 45–78.

2. Mel'čuk, I. A. *Phraseology and Lexical Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995, pp. 102–136.
3. Fernando, C. *Idioms and Idiomaticity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, pp. 23–67.
4. Moon, R. *Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English: A Corpus-based Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998, pp. 89–124.
5. Sinclair, J. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 15–54.
6. Kunin, A. V. *English Phraseology*. Moscow: Higher School, 2002, pp. 58–93.
7. Djurayeva, I. G. Comparative studies of English and Uzbek phraseological units. *Tashkent: Pedagogical University Journal*, 2022, pp. 12–30.
8. Samadova, V. B. Linguistic analysis of phraseological units with antonymous components. *Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 2025, 2(1), pp. 45–62.
9. O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia, 2009, pp. 5–98.
10. Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 112–145.