

Principles and Methods of Contrastive Phraseology

Mavlonova Nargiza Alisherovna

Associate professor (PhD) of Samarcand state institute of foreign languages

Abstract. *This article examines the current state and significance of contrastive phraseology in comparing genetically unrelated languages. It highlights the limited development of theoretical foundations in this field and emphasizes the importance of analyzing phraseological units through structural-semantic, typological, and cultural perspectives. The study reviews major scholarly contributions, outlines key methodological principles, and stresses the need for pedagogical and lexicographic resources—particularly for Uzbek-speaking learners. The article concludes that deeper comparative-typological research is essential for understanding interlingual phraseological correspondences and improving translation and teaching practices.*

Key words: *contrastive phraseology, phraseological units, typology, interlingual comparison, phraseological imagery, national-cultural specificity, translation studies, lexicography, Uzbek language, comparative.*

The comparative study of the phraseological wealth of languages belonging to different systems is attracting increasing attention from both foreign and domestic linguists. This is explained by a number of theoretical and applied reasons, as well as by the growing cultural contacts that involve the most diverse languages of the world. Although extensive research is being carried out in this direction, two-sided linguistic signs of different levels still remain outside the linguists' focus, among which phraseologisms are the least explored from the standpoint of general phraseological theory as well as in contrastive studies. Therefore, with regard to the phraseological system, the tasks of contrastive analysis are especially relevant, since linguistic literature lacks a unified view on the correlation of similarities and differences within the phraseological inventories of languages that are not genetically related.

The works devoted to the general theory of phraseology provide an opportunity for a more comprehensive study of its structural-semantic and stylistic characteristics. It should be noted that the comparative-contrastive study of phraseologisms plays an important role in the overall corpus of phraseological research and is still in the process of formation.

L.I. Roizenson and Yu.Yu. Avaliani, the authors of the first theoretical work on contrastive phraseology, identify the most important specific aspects of phraseological study:

- a) **the comparative aspect**, which analyzes similar phraseological facts in related languages;
- b) **the contrastive aspect**, which deals with unrelated languages and determines phraseological equivalents, for example for translation purposes, and also presupposes the study of phraseology according to semantic groups;
- c) **the structural-typological aspect**, aimed at studying the peculiarities of phraseological imagery both in related and unrelated languages;

d) **the areal aspect**, which examines the interaction and convergence of phraseology in languages that form a geographical, linguistic or cultural-historical community, for instance the European phraseological area, the Central Asian phraseological area, etc.

In another article, Yu.Yu.Avaliani considers the structural and typological foundations of the subordination of the structural component of phraseological units to linguistic regularities, including the peculiarities of grammatical structure and typological analogies of figurative structures, and reveals the regularity of correlation between the identified grammatical structure and its lexical filling.

The first fundamental research in the field of contrastive phraseology is A.D. Reichstein's monograph devoted to the systemic and structural comparison of phraseological units of German and Russian. The author identifies three main problems:

- a) the essence of the most significant and profound similarities and differences between the phraseological systems of two or more languages;
- b) how these similarities and differences manifest themselves in the main aspects of language—functional-semantic, formal-semantic, and structural;
- c) which intralinguistic and extralinguistic factors condition them.

When theoretically substantiating the contrastive study of phraseological systems, it is necessary, based on the theory of phraseology, to single out the main functional feature of phraseological units that plays a leading role in contrastive analysis, and also determine the aspect of the compared languages that may become the object of more in-depth study as a result of contrastive examination. In addition, interlingual comparison of phraseological systems should be conducted on the basis of the figurative dimension embodied within the phraseological system of each language. The study of imagery in phraseological units of different languages contributes to the creation of a structural-typological classification of phraseological units at the interlingual level and to the identification of international phraseology. From the perspective of figurative interpretation of interlingual phraseology, the problem of the emergence of typologically identical images in structurally different languages can be reinterpreted, as well as the foundations of their semantic modeling can be developed.

The contrastive study of languages of different systems is undoubtedly a difficult task, which can be solved only through the combined efforts of many linguists engaged in contrastive research of unrelated languages on different levels of the linguistic system, “since it is impossible to compare all linguistic facts of the compared languages simultaneously; each aspect of the language requires its own approach.”

It should be noted that phraseologisms remain the least explored both from the standpoint of general phraseological theory and in contrastive studies. In connection with this, contrastive phraseology must be examined from the perspective of foreign-language teaching methodology, phraseographic practice, translation studies, and also as an integral part of comparative typology, since its consideration from these viewpoints would be useful for both theory and practice of phraseology.

1. The contrastive analysis of the phraseological subsystem of a language still remains a minimally developed area, although, as D.O. Dobrovolsky notes, “to master the phraseology of a foreign language means to achieve a high degree of proficiency in it.” The necessity of studying phraseology is obvious because it is within the phraseological system of a language that its specific national characteristics manifest themselves most vividly. It should also be emphasized that contrastive studies of phraseology in unrelated languages acquire special applied importance, since the lexicogrammatical structure of a foreign language differs sharply from that of the native language.

Of particular interest is the phenomenon of interference in the sphere of phraseology, since without studying the specific features of the national culture of the compared languages one cannot fully comprehend the meanings of phraseologisms from a linguocultural perspective, as the semantics of

phraseological units reflects the unique way of life, culture, customs and traditions of different peoples.

Given the insufficient development of theoretical foundations of contrastive phraseology of foreign and Uzbek languages, it should be emphasized that Uzbek-speaking students need the creation of educational and methodological materials in Uzbek that include sections on phraseology, phraseological minimums, and recommendations for successfully mastering such a complex phenomenon as phraseology, including the selection of phraseological units for active learning.

2. The role of a learner's phraseological dictionary must also be acknowledged; having its own specific purpose, it cannot be replaced by a bilingual phraseological dictionary, which does not always allow one to compensate for students' lack of background knowledge. The creation of special phraseological manuals and dictionaries helps learners master the necessary phraseological minimums included in their curriculum.

3. According to N.L. Shchadrin, "in literary texts phraseological units often carry an ideological and aesthetic load, performing stylistic, semantic and figurative functions, the adequate reproduction of which through another language is one of the essential conditions ensuring overall adequate translation." Therefore, theoretical analysis of phraseology of different languages from the perspective of translation studies is necessary—that is, determining which linguistic changes and transformations occur in the process of translation from one language into another, especially in typologically different languages, in order to achieve adequate translation.

4. The course of comparative typology of the native and foreign languages reveals relationships between different levels of the linguistic system such as theoretical phonetics, grammar, lexicology, and of course the theoretical foundations of phraseology. Unfortunately, in comparative typology courses of various languages, issues of contrastive phraseology have not been given an appropriate place. For example, in the manual *Comparative Typology of German and Russian* by A.L. Zelenitsky and P.F. Monakhov and in V.G. Gak's *Comparative Typology of French and Russian*, only a few pages are devoted to phraseology in a comparative-typological aspect, while in V.D. Arakin's manuals and in the works of J. Buranov this section is completely absent.

The absence of a section on contrastive phraseology represents a significant gap in comparative typology courses because it is phraseologisms—due to many reasons—that broaden students' horizons when they are introduced to the culture and traditions of various peoples. From this, it follows that research aimed at comparative-typological descriptions of the phraseological systems of native and foreign languages should be actively encouraged.

A significant contribution to the development of this field has been made by E.M. Solodukho, Yu.P. Solodub, Yu.A. Gvozdev, and D.O. Dobrovolsky, whose work has significantly advanced the study of interlingual phraseological correspondences.

In particular, Yu.A. Gvozdev identifies the following aspects of contrastive studies:

1. comparison of individual phraseological units of different languages;
2. comparison of phraseology as systems, each specific to its respective language;
3. identification of phraseological formation patterns (in synchronic perspective);
4. identification and comparison of symbol-words within phraseological units, revealing national cultural specificity.

D.O. Dobrovolsky's hypothesis about the dependence of the degree of regularity of a phraseological system on the degree of analyticity or syntheticity of a language is justified by the following principle: the typological features of linguistic subsystems that are primary in relation to phraseology must correlate with the peculiarities of the phraseological system.

A.D. Reichstein proposes the following principles of contrastive analysis:

1. primacy of intralingual phraseological description over interlingual;

2. comparison of intralingual descriptions (the study of phraseology in different languages must follow a unified theory, with similar methods and a common terminological-conceptual apparatus);
3. predominance of identities over differences—analysis must be based on objective similarities of phraseological units, therefore, when establishing correspondences it is necessary first to determine phraseological differences;
4. in two- or three-language descriptions, the analysis should proceed from the previously established sets of functional, semantic and structural phenomena in the compared languages.

Beginning from the 1970s–1980s and later, numerous studies in the field of contrastive phraseology have appeared, mainly dissertations analyzing phraseological units in unrelated languages.

For example, V.M. Mokienko recommends the following methods of contrastive analysis: structural-semantic modeling, structural-nest comparison, semantic-diachronic comparison, semantic-syntactic modeling, equivalent comparison, descriptive-lexicographic comparison, and functional-communicative comparison of phraseological systems in the compared languages. A.V. Zinchenko also contributed greatly to the development of theoretical foundations of interlingual idiomacticity.

General problems of contrastive linguistics have been studied by Uzbek linguists such as J. Buranov, M.A. Abdurazakov, A.A. Abduazizov, N.A. Avazbaev, U.K. Yusupov, and others.

Studies of similarities and differences in the semantics of phraseological units of Uzbek, Russian, English, French, and German, the national-cultural component of phraseological semantics, and factors of phraseological productivity are presented in the works of Uzbek scholars such as Sh. Rakhmatullaev, E. Umarov, B. Yuldashev, M. Sadykova, Yu.Yu. Avaliani, M. Umakhdodjaeva, M. Bobokhodjaeva, A. Mamatov, A. Nosirov, A. Ashurov, M. Azimova, and others. Among other works done in the field of translation studies, one should mention the research of A. Nosirov, N. Tukhtakhodjaeva, R. Shirinova, D. Teshabaeva, and others.

Thus, the Uzbek language, being one of the languages under comparison, is of great interest to linguists engaged in the study of phraseological issues within interlingual processes. Comparative studies conducted on specific phraseological categories, classes, groups and other phenomena are particularly relevant. Research on phraseological units of three or more languages—owing to the methodological complexity involved—is still limited.

Literature:

1. Akushin N.S., Akushina M.G. Winged words; Literary quotations; figurative expressions. - 4th ed., add. -M.: Artist. lit., 1987. -528 p.
2. Mokienko V.M. Slavic philology. - M.: Higher School, 1980.-207 p.
3. Shansky N.M. Zimin V.I., Filippov A.V. Experience of the etymological dictionary of Russian phraseology. -M.: Rus.yaz., 1987. - 240 p.
4. Alisherovna M. N. et al. Principles for Determining the Categories of Proximity of the Russian Language to Uzbek in the Field of Phraseology: Identification of Interlingual Phraseological Accordance //International Journal of Health Sciences. – 2022. – №. V. – C. 1414-1419.
5. Мавлонова Н. А. Теоретические основы исследования межъязыковой фразеологической общности //Jahon ilm-fani taraqqiyotida tarjimashunoslikning ahamiyati. – 2021. – С. 175.