

PHRASEOSEMANTIC FIELD THEORY IN COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS: STRUCTURAL, COGNITIVE AND LINGUOCULTURAL DIMENSIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Zulhumor Mirzayeva

Lecturer of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Annotation: *Phraseosemantic field theory represents one of the most productive paradigms in contemporary phraseology. It allows phraseological units to be analyzed not as isolated idiomatic formations but as interconnected semantic systems organized around conceptual nuclei. This article examines theoretical foundations of phraseosemantic field theory and its application in comparative English and Uzbek linguistics. The study explores structural organization, cognitive modeling, axiological stratification and linguocultural specificity of phraseosemantic fields. Particular attention is devoted to isomorphic and allomorphic features across languages. The findings demonstrate that phraseosemantic fields reveal universal cognitive mechanisms while simultaneously reflecting national cultural identity.*

Keywords: *phraseosemantic field, phraseology, semantic nucleus, microfield, isomorphism, allomorphism, linguoculture, comparative linguistics*

The concept of semantic field originates from structural linguistics, particularly from the works of J. Trier [1], who proposed that lexical units form interconnected semantic systems rather than isolated meanings. Later developments in phraseology extended this theory to phraseological units, giving rise to phraseosemantic field theory.

In phraseology, a phraseosemantic field is defined as a structured set of phraseological units united by a common semantic invariant and organized around a conceptual nucleus. Unlike lexical fields, phraseosemantic fields demonstrate higher expressive density and evaluative charge because phraseological units inherently carry connotative and cultural components.

Russian linguistic tradition significantly contributed to the development of systematic phraseology [2]. Vinogradov's classification of phraseological units laid the structural groundwork. Later linguocultural interpretations by Telia emphasized that phraseological systems reflect national worldview [3]. Cognitive linguistics further enriched the theory by explaining phraseological clustering through conceptual metaphors [4].

In Uzbek linguistics, phraseosemantic field theory has been developed through comparative and linguocultural research. It has been applied to analyze evaluative, anthropocentric and axiological domains, demonstrating that

phraseological units function as cultural semantic complexes rather than simple idioms.

Phraseosemantic fields possess a hierarchical organization in which the semantic nucleus forms the conceptual core expressing the invariant meaning, the near periphery includes units that partially overlap with the nucleus through metaphorical extension, and the far periphery contains context dependent or culturally marked expressions indirectly connected to the central semantic domain. The semantic nucleus includes phraseological units that most clearly express the invariant meaning. These units demonstrate high frequency and minimal contextual dependency.

The near periphery contains units with partial semantic overlap or metaphorical extension. They may introduce stylistic or evaluative nuances.

The far periphery includes occasional, contextually activated or culturally marked expressions whose connection with the nucleus is indirect but conceptually traceable.

This hierarchical organization ensures dynamic flexibility. Phraseosemantic fields are not static systems. They evolve under sociocultural and discursive influences.

Comparative analysis of English and Uzbek phraseosemantic fields reveals structural isomorphism in hierarchical organization. Both languages demonstrate nucleus and peripheral stratification. However, differences emerge in density and evaluative distribution.

English phraseosemantic fields often display higher variability due to extensive borrowing and global discourse interaction. Uzbek fields tend to preserve stronger ethnocultural cohesion rooted in traditional imagery.

From a cognitive perspective, phraseosemantic fields are grounded in conceptual metaphors and embodied experience [4]. Phraseological clustering occurs because multiple idioms share a common metaphorical schema.

For example, within many languages the conceptual metaphor knowledge is light structures a wide phraseosemantic field. English expressions such as “to shed light on something cluster” around illumination metaphor. Uzbek expressions involving *yorug' fikr* or *ko'zi ochiq* reflect similar conceptualization.

Another productive model is “Mind as sharp instrument”. This metaphor generates phraseological clusters across languages, though with varying evaluative intensity. Cognitive modeling explains why phraseological units are not randomly distributed. They emerge from shared conceptual frames. These frames are culturally shaped but cognitively grounded.

Comparative analysis demonstrates that English often foregrounds dynamic metaphors emphasizing movement and innovation. Uzbek phraseosemantic fields

frequently integrate stability, maturity and social equilibrium into cognitive imagery.

Thus, phraseosemantic field theory integrates structural semantics with cognitive linguistics, revealing both universality and cultural relativity.

Phraseosemantic fields are carriers of axiological evaluation. They encode collective attitudes toward social norms, morality, intelligence, health or power.

In English phraseosemantic fields often reflect individualistic orientation. Idioms may highlight personal success, competitiveness or autonomy.

In Uzbek phraseosemantic fields frequently integrate communal ethics and moral responsibility. Evaluative orientation may emphasize harmony, modesty and respect for hierarchy.

These differences demonstrate allomorphy at the level of cultural interpretation. While structural organization remains comparable, value systems embedded in phraseosemantic fields differ.

Linguocultural specificity also manifests through symbolic imagery. Animal metaphors, somatic components and natural phenomena may carry different cultural associations across languages. Therefore, phraseosemantic field theory functions not only as structural model but also as analytical tool for cultural identity research.

Comparative phraseosemantic analysis identifies two fundamental phenomena. Isomorphism refers to structural similarity. Both English and Uzbek organize phraseological units into hierarchical semantic clusters around conceptual nuclei. Allomorphy refers to divergence in imagery, evaluation and pragmatic distribution. Cultural history, social structure and communicative norms influence these divergences.

For instance, global English discourse encourages innovation oriented idiomatic expansion. Uzbek phraseosemantic systems demonstrate stronger continuity with oral tradition and paremiological heritage. Isomorphic patterns confirm universal cognitive mechanisms. Allomorphic patterns reveal national specificity. This duality strengthens the theoretical validity of phraseosemantic field analysis in comparative linguistics.

Phraseosemantic fields are not closed systems. They evolve under influence of media discourse, digital communication and globalization.

English phraseosemantic systems rapidly expand through metaphorical innovation and hybrid constructions. Uzbek phraseological development increasingly interacts with global discourse while maintaining cultural core.

Digital discourse accelerates peripheral expansion of phraseosemantic fields. New metaphorical expressions may enter near periphery and gradually stabilize in

nucleus through repeated usage. Thus phraseosemantic field theory must account for diachronic transformation and sociolinguistic change.

Phraseosemantic field theory demonstrates significant theoretical advantages, as it integrates structural, cognitive and cultural analysis into a unified framework, explains idiomatic clustering through conceptual modeling, provides methodological tools for comparative typology, enables evaluation of translation equivalence at a systemic level, and transforms phraseology from descriptive cataloging into structured semantic analysis.

Conclusion. Phraseosemantic field theory represents a productive paradigm in contemporary comparative linguistics. It reveals that phraseological units function as interconnected semantic systems organized around conceptual invariants.

Comparative analysis of English and Uzbek demonstrates structural isomorphism in hierarchical organization and conceptual modeling. At the same time, axiological orientation and cultural symbolism display significant allomorphic divergence.

Phraseosemantic fields therefore embody both universal cognitive principles and national cultural identity. Their study contributes to theoretical linguistics, linguocultural research and translation studies.

Future research may integrate corpus linguistics and quantitative modeling to further refine systemic parameters of phraseosemantic organization.

REFERENCES:

1. Trier J. Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1931. P. 1-25.
2. Виноградов В. В. Основные типы фразеологических единиц русского языка. Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1947. С. 15-42.
3. Телия В. Н. Русская фразеология: семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. Москва: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. С. 27-65.
4. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. P. 3-32.