

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF BINOMIAL PHRASES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: SEMANTIC AND STRUCTURAL ASPECTS

Ermатов Shohruh Rakhimovich

*English language teacher,
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Andijan, Uzbekistan*

*Email: shahermatov@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-3606-2142*

Annotation: This article explores the semantic and structural aspects of binomial phrases in English and Uzbek through a comparative-linguistic approach. Binomial phrases, characterized by their fixed or semi-fixed word order, rhythmic balance, and semantic integrity, are analyzed to identify patterns of stability, reversibility, and meaning shifts. The study considers phonological, semantic, and frequency-based principles in binomial formation, examining their cognitive and cultural implications in both languages. Additionally, the article investigates the role of metonymic shifts, idiomaticity, and historical linguistic development in shaping binomial expressions. By leveraging corpus-based data and theoretical perspectives from phraseology and cognitive linguistics, the research provides insights into the cross-linguistic features of binomials and their role in language economy and cultural representation.

Key Language: Binomial phrase, Phraseological unit, Semantic integrity, Structural stability, Reversibility and irreversibility, Cognitive and cultural implications, Phonological arrangement, Idiomatic and non-idiomatic expressions, Corpus-based analysis, Linguistic economy, Cross-linguistic features.

The Semantics and Structure of Binomial Derivatives in Internal Context

According to many contemporary researchers, linguistic expressions serve as a material shell that consolidates the meaning associated with them. They reflect elements of extralinguistic reality, including fragments and situations (as emphasized in V.N. Teliya's work) [Teliya, 1996: 1991]. Binomial derivatives, as phraseological units within language structure, are primarily associated with conceptual imagery and meaning. This is reflected in their core components.

A similar approach reveals the dual-layered nature of binomial semantics, as described by M. Bierwisch [Bierwisch, 1983]:

1. **Paradigmatic relationships between core components and the operational meaning of conjunctions**, forming the "referential content" that constitutes the potential semantic layer of binomials.
2. **Interrelation of component meanings**, which contributes to the formation of "conceptual content," forming the external "real" semantic layer of binomial derivatives.

Studying the dialectical unity of these semantic layers provides a more comprehensive understanding of the phraseological nature of binomial derivatives.

Semantic Relationships Between Core Components

The semantic relationships between binomial components vary significantly and require close examination. J.Malkiel [Malkiel, 1959] identified five types of relationships, which apply to both English and Uzbek binomials:

1. Synonymy (A and B are close synonyms)

- **English Examples:** *death and destruction, null and void*
- **Uzbek Examples:** *xavf va xatar* (danger and risk), *sharoit va imkoniyat* (conditions and opportunities)

These binomials serve to enhance emphasis and provide stylistic reinforcement.

2. Complementarity (A and B complement each other)

- **English Examples:** *elbows and knees, food and drink*
- **Uzbek Examples:** *non va suv* (bread and water), *qog'oz va qalam* (pen and paper)

In these cases, A and B are not synonymous but together represent a unified concept.

3. Antonymy (A and B are opposites)

- **English Examples:** *to be or not to be, dead or alive, up and down*
- **Uzbek Examples:** *tirik yo o'lik* (alive or dead), *oq va qora* (white and black), *foydasiz bor yoki yo'q* (with help or without)

These binomials highlight contrasts and often carry rhetorical or dramatic effects.

4. Hierarchical Relationship (B is part of A or its opposite)

- **English Examples:** *genus and species, fun and games, dollars and cents*
- **Uzbek Examples:** *millat va elat* (nation and people), *tizim va qonun* (system and law)

Such binomials illustrate a subset-superordinate relationship, reinforcing classification or taxonomy.

5. Causality (B results from A, either as a possibility or an inevitability)

- **English Examples:** *rise and fall, shoot and kill, injured and dead*
- **Uzbek Examples:** *yo'qotish va yutuq* (loss and gain), *o'yin va g'alaba* (game and victory)

These binomials express a cause-effect relationship, where the second component is often the outcome of the first.

Further Refinements in Classification

While Malkiel's classification provides a strong foundation, subsequent studies have refined it. Some scholars have proposed excluding the last two categories and focusing on three main types:

1. **Antonyms:** *dead and alive, heaven and hell* (*o'lik va tirik, Jannat va do'zah*), where the conjunction *and* highlights the opposition.
2. **Enumeration:** *calm, and collected* (*tinch va hotirjam*), which can extend beyond two components.

Binomials in both English and Uzbek share similar structural and semantic features, yet they exhibit differences in their formation, usage, and meaning due to linguistic and cultural distinctions. This paper aims to explore these similarities and differences, particularly focusing on synonymy, opposition, reduplication, metonymic relations, and hierarchical structures.

Synonymy in Binomials

In both English and Uzbek, binomial phrases often consist of synonymous components that reinforce meaning. These pairs tend to emphasize a particular quality or concept, enhancing the expressiveness of speech.

English Examples:

- *Cool, calm, and collected*

- *Round and about*
- *Clean and tidy*

Uzbek Examples:

- *Tinch va osoyishta* (peaceful and calm)
- *Obdon va puxta* (thorough and careful)
- *Toza va ozoda* (clean and tidy)

In both languages, these binomials serve as emphatic structures that strengthen the core meaning of the phrase. However, Uzbek binomials tend to reflect a more poetic or traditional connotation, whereas English ones often follow a structured collocational pattern.

Antonymy in Binomials

Some binomial expressions rely on opposition, where the first component is conceptually or semantically countered by the second.

English Examples:

- *Rich and poor*
- *Sooner or later*
- *Haves and have-nots*

Uzbek Examples:

- *Boy va kambag'al* (rich and poor)
- *Erta yoki kech* (sooner or later)
- *Bor va yo'q* (have and have-not)

While both languages use antonymic binomials, Uzbek expressions often incorporate additional poetic or folk elements, emphasizing moral or philosophical contrasts.

Reduplication-Based Binomials

Reduplication plays a significant role in both languages, especially in binomial phrases that enhance emphasis.

English Examples:

- *Again and again*
- *Day by day*
- *Little by little*

Uzbek Examples:

- *Yana va yana* (again and again)
- *Kundan kun* (day by day)
- *Oz ozdan* (little by little)

Uzbek reduplication-based binomials often include phonetic harmony and euphony, whereas English ones rely on prepositions (*by, and*) to maintain rhythmic balance.

Metonymic Relations in Binomials

Some binomial phrases are constructed through metonymic relations, where one component complements or extends the meaning of the other.

English Examples:

- *Footloose and fancy-free*
- *Name and fame*
- *Say or do*

Uzbek Examples:

- *Oyoq va qo'li chaqqon* (footloose and fancy-free)

- *Ism va sharaf* (name and fame)
- *So 'z va amal* (say and do)

Uzbek metonymic binomials frequently rely on traditional proverbs and aphorisms, making them culturally bound expressions.

Hierarchical Relations in Binomials

Certain binomial structures display hierarchical relationships, where one component is a subset or a defining feature of the other.

English Examples:

- *Fantasy and fiction*
- *Gambling and betting*
- *Daily and weekly*

Uzbek Examples:

- *Xayol va adabiyot* (fantasy and fiction)
- *Qimor va garov* (gambling and betting)
- *Kunlik va haftalik* (daily and weekly)

While both languages use hierarchical relations in binomial phrases, English often distinguishes them through genre or domain-specific expressions, whereas Uzbek ones tend to maintain a more descriptive and explanatory structure.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek binomials reveals both structural and functional similarities, particularly in synonymy, antonymy, reduplication, metonymic, and hierarchical relations. However, cultural and linguistic differences influence their formation, with Uzbek binomials exhibiting stronger poetic and traditional elements. Understanding these nuances enhances cross-linguistic comprehension and contributes to phraseological studies.

Both English and Uzbek binomial phrases exhibit structural and semantic similarities, particularly in their reliance on synonymy, complementarity, antonymy, hierarchy, and causality. However, differences arise due to cultural, cognitive, and linguistic factors. The study of these structures provides deeper insights into phraseological stabilization and variation across languages.

Bibliography

Books and Monographs:

1. Malkiel, Y. (1959). Studies in Binomial Expressions in Romance Languages. *Lingua*, 8(2), 113-160.
2. Teliya, V. P. (1988). *Phraseology as a System of Language*. Moscow: Nauka.
3. Apresean, Yu. D. (1995). *Lexical Semantics: Synonymy, Antonymy, Polysemy, Paraphrasing*. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
4. Paducheva, E. V. (2004). *Dynamic Models in Semantics*. Moscow: Yazyki Slavyanskoy Kultury.
5. Palmer, F. R. (1981). *Semantics: A New Outline*. Cambridge University Press.

Articles and Research Papers:

6. Waugh, L. (1982). Marked and Unmarked: A Semiotic Perspective. *Semiotica*, 38(3-4), 299-318.
7. Benczes, R. (2006). Creative Compounding in English: The Semantics of Metaphorical and Metonymical Noun-Noun Combinations. *Amsterdam: John Benjamins*.
8. Gries, S. T. (2011). Processing Formulaic Language: A Quantitative Perspective. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, 9, 167-197.
9. Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Guz, W. (2020). Recurrent Multiword Expressions: The Case of Binomial Pairs. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 16(2), 287-314.

Comparative Linguistics and Uzbek Sources:

11. Bo'ronov, X. (2010). *O'zbek Tilining Frazeologik Lug'ati*. Toshkent: Fan.
12. Ganiev, J. (2004). Binomial Constructions in Uzbek and Their Semantic Features. *Uzbek Linguistics Journal*, 3(1), 45-57.
13. Karimov, U. (2016). Comparative Analysis of Phraseological Units in Uzbek and English. *Philological Studies*, 24(2), 78-92.
14. Xudoyberganov, S. (2021). Structural and Semantic Features of Uzbek Binomials. *Uzbek Language and Literature*, 5, 102-118.

Online and Corpus-Based Sources:

15. Davies, M. (2008). The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). Retrieved from <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>
16. The British National Corpus (BNC). Available at: <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>
17. Uzbek National Corpus. Available at: <https://corpus.uzbekcorpus.uz>