PHRASEOSEMANTIC FIELD THEORY IN COMPARATIVE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LINGUISTICS

Zulkhumor Mirzayeva

Lecturer at Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: *This paper examines phraseosemantic field theory as a systemic model in comparative English and Uzbek linguistics. It analyzes hierarchical structure, cognitive modeling and linguocultural specificity of phraseological systems, demonstrating structural isomorphism and axiological divergence across languages within unified semantic domains.*

Keywords: *phraseosemantic field, semantic nucleus, periphery, cognitive metaphor, linguoculture, comparative linguistics.*

Phraseosemantic field theory represents a significant development in modern phraseology, shifting the focus from isolated idiomatic units toward systemic semantic organization. The theoretical roots of field analysis can be traced to structural linguistics, particularly to J. Trier's conception of semantic fields as interconnected lexical systems rather than independent lexical meanings [1]. This structural principle was later extended into phraseology, where idiomatic expressions began to be examined as components of organized semantic domains.

A phraseosemantic field may be defined as a structured system of phraseological units united by a shared semantic invariant and organized hierarchically. Unlike lexical fields, phraseosemantic fields exhibit heightened expressivity, evaluative intensity and cultural embeddedness. They do not merely denote reality but interpret and evaluate it.

The internal organization of a phraseosemantic field typically includes three interconnected zones: semantic nucleus, near periphery and far periphery. The semantic nucleus consists of phraseological units that most directly and clearly express the central conceptual meaning. These units demonstrate high stability, frequent usage and minimal contextual dependency. They function as core representatives of the invariant semantic feature.

The near periphery includes units that partially overlap with the nucleus while introducing metaphorical extensions or stylistic variations. Their semantic connection to the invariant remains strong, but additional evaluative or expressive components appear. The far periphery contains contextually marked or culturally specific units whose relation to the central invariant is indirect yet conceptually traceable. This hierarchical organization reflects both stability and dynamic flexibility within the system.

Cognitive linguistics provides an explanatory mechanism for such clustering. According to conceptual metaphor theory, idiomatic expressions are grounded in embodied cognitive models rather than arbitrary associations [2]. Phraseological units that belong to the same field frequently share a common metaphorical schema. For instance, in many languages intellectual activity is conceptualized through metaphors such as mind is light or

mind is sharp instrument. English expressions like shed light on something or sharp minded cluster around illumination and sharpness metaphors. Uzbek phraseology demonstrates comparable conceptualization through units containing yorug', o'tkir or ravshan. These similarities confirm cognitive isomorphism at the conceptual level.

However, while structural organization and cognitive modeling may appear comparable, linguocultural interpretation reveals important divergences. Phraseological systems function as repositories of national worldview. Telia emphasizes that phraseological units encode cultural codes and value systems embedded in collective consciousness [3]. Comparative analysis shows that English phraseosemantic fields frequently foreground individual achievement, innovation and independence. Idiomatic constructions often evaluate intellectual ability through competitive or performance oriented lenses.

In contrast, Uzbek phraseosemantic systems more frequently integrate communal harmony, ethical maturity and social responsibility into evaluative frameworks. Intellectual competence may be associated not only with cognitive sharpness but also with moral stability and respect for hierarchy. This axiological orientation shapes the distribution and evaluative charge of phraseological units within the field.

Isomorphism and allomorphism thus coexist within comparative phraseosemantic analysis. Isomorphism is observable in hierarchical structure and shared conceptual metaphors. Allomorphism manifests in evaluative priorities, symbolic imagery and pragmatic deployment. Cultural history, social organization and communicative traditions influence these divergences.

Another important dimension concerns pragmatic functioning. Phraseosemantic fields do not operate solely at the level of semantic categorization. They function dynamically within discourse. Phraseological units often perform evaluative speech acts, constructing authority, irony, solidarity or social distance. Their interpretation depends on contextual activation, presupposition and shared cultural knowledge. Therefore phraseosemantic analysis must integrate pragmatic perspective alongside structural and cognitive approaches.

From a methodological standpoint, phraseosemantic field theory offers several advantages. First, it integrates structural semantics with cognitive and cultural analysis into a unified explanatory model. Second, it provides systematic tools for comparative typology by allowing researchers to identify invariant features and divergent evaluative patterns across languages. Third, it enables evaluation of translation equivalence at systemic level. Rather than searching for isolated idiomatic correspondences, translators may analyze entire phraseosemantic domains to determine conceptual compatibility and cultural adequacy.

Furthermore, phraseosemantic fields are dynamic systems subject to diachronic transformation. Media discourse, digital communication and globalization introduce new metaphorical extensions that gradually shift peripheral elements toward the nucleus. English phraseological systems demonstrate rapid innovation due to global communicative expansion. Uzbek phraseology, while interacting with global discourse, maintains stronger

continuity with traditional imagery. This dynamic interplay highlights the need for ongoing corpus based research in field modeling.

In theoretical terms, phraseosemantic field theory transforms phraseology from descriptive cataloging into systemic semantic modeling. Instead of treating idioms as isolated lexical curiosities, it conceptualizes them as structured networks reflecting cognitive universals and cultural particularities. Such perspective deepens understanding of language as an organized semiotic system embedded in social and cultural reality.

In conclusion, phraseosemantic field theory constitutes a productive analytical paradigm in comparative linguistics. It reveals hierarchical organization, cognitive grounding and cultural stratification of phraseological systems in English and Uzbek.

Structural isomorphism coexists with axiological divergence, demonstrating the interaction of universal cognitive mechanisms and national cultural identity. Future research integrating corpus methodology and quantitative modeling may further refine systemic parameters of phraseosemantic organization.

REFERENCES:

1. Trier J. Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes. Heidelberg, 1931. P. 1–25.

2. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago, 1980. P. 3–32.

3. Телия В. Н. Русская фразеология. Москва, 1996. С. 27–65.