



**PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS RELATED TO
INTELLECT IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK**

Ne'matova Charos Akrom qizi

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Faculty of Foreign Languages of Payariq

+998942852105

nematovac82@gmail.com

Abstract: This study explores the pragmatic characteristics of phraseological units associated with the concept of intellect in English and Uzbek. Phraseological expressions, as culturally embedded linguistic units, reflect not only semantic meaning but also speakers' communicative intentions, attitudes, and evaluations. The research focuses on how such expressions function in discourse, how their meanings are shaped by context, and how cultural factors influence their pragmatic interpretation. A comparative analysis reveals both similarities and differences in the conceptualization of intellect across the two languages. The findings demonstrate that while some phraseological units share universal cognitive metaphors, others are deeply rooted in national-cultural contexts, resulting in partial or non-equivalence.

Keywords: Phraseological units, pragmatics, intellect, cognitive metaphor, semantic meaning, cross-cultural analysis, communicative function.

**ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ,
СВЯЗАННЫХ С ИНТЕЛЛЕКТОМ, В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ
ЯЗЫКАХ**

Ne'matova Charos Akrom qizi

Самаркандский государственный институт иностранных языков

Факультет иностранных языков Пайарык

+998942852105

nematovac82@gmail.com

Аннотация: Настоящее исследование изучает прагматические характеристики фразеологических единиц, связанных с понятием интеллекта в английском и узбекском языках. Фразеологические выражения, будучи лингвистическими единицами, глубоко укорененными в культуре, отражают не только семантическое значение, но и коммуникативные намерения, установки и оценки говорящих. Исследование сосредоточено на том, как такие выражения функционируют в дискурсе, как их значения формируются контекстом, и как культурные факторы влияют на их прагматическую интерпретацию. Сравнительный анализ выявляет как сходства, так и

различия в концептуализации интеллекта в двух языках. Результаты показывают, что в то время как некоторые фразеологические единицы разделяют универсальные когнитивные метафоры, другие глубоко укоренены в национально-культурных контекстах, что приводит к частичной или полной неэквивалентности.

Ключевые слова: Фразеологические единицы, прагматика, интеллект, когнитивная метафора, семантическое значение, межкультурный анализ, коммуникативная функция.

INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDAGI INTELLEKTNI IFODALOVCHI IBORAVIY BIRLIKLARNING PRAGMATIK TAHLILI

Ne'matova Charos Akrom qizi
Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti
Payariq xorijiy tillar fakulteti
+998942852105
nematovac82@gmail.com


Annotatsiya: Ushbu tadqiqot ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi intellekt tushunchasi bilan bog‘liq iboraviy birliklarning pragmatik xususiyatlarini o‘rganadi. Iboraviy ifodalar, madaniyatga chuqur singib ketgan lingvistik birliklar sifatida, nafaqat semantik ma’noga, balki so‘zlovchilarning kommunikativ niyatlari, qarashlari va baholarini ham aks ettiradi. Tadqiqot bunday ifodalarning nutqda qanday ishlashiga, ularning ma’nolari kontekst orqali qanday shakllanishiga va madaniy omillar ularning pragmatik talqiniga qanday ta’sir qilishiga qaratilgan. Qiyosiy tahlil ikki til o‘rtasidagi intellektni tushunishda ham o‘xshashliklarni, ham farqlarni ochib beradi. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, ba’zi iboraviy birliklar universal kognitiv metaforalarni o‘rtoq bo‘lsa-da, boshqalari milliy-madaniy kontekstlarga chuqur ildiz otgan bo‘lib, bu qisman yoki to‘liq ekvivalentlikning yo‘qligiga olib keladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: Iboraviy birliklar, pragmatika, intellekt, kognitiv metafora, semantik ma’no, qiyosiy-madaniy tahlil, kommunikativ funksiya.

Introduction

Phraseological units represent one of the most expressive and culturally significant layers of language, serving as a bridge between linguistic structure and human cognition. In modern linguistics, the role of phraseology has been widely discussed by international scholars. For instance, Fernando argues that idiomatic expressions are context-dependent and function as carriers of implicit meaning shaped by communicative situations. Similarly, Gläser highlights the stylistic and pragmatic potential of phraseological units, emphasizing their role in discourse.





Uzbek linguistics also provides substantial contributions to the study of phraseology. Rahmatullayev emphasizes the national-cultural specificity of Uzbek phraseological units, noting their strong connection to everyday life and traditional worldview. Narimonova further explores the relationship between English and Uzbek phraseological expressions, pointing out that equivalence between them is often influenced by pragmatic and cultural differences rather than purely linguistic factors.

Literature Review

The study of phraseological units has evolved significantly, incorporating semantic, structural, and pragmatic approaches. Early research primarily focused on the structural classification of idioms, while more recent studies emphasize their cognitive and communicative functions.


Kunin provides a comprehensive theoretical framework for English phraseology, defining phraseological units as stable combinations with figurative meaning. He distinguishes between different types of idioms based on their semantic cohesion and structural stability. This structural approach laid the foundation for further pragmatic and cognitive studies [5, 87].

Fernando expands this perspective by focusing on idiomaticity and its role in communication. She argues that idioms function as pragmatic markers that convey speaker attitudes and intentions [1, 265]. Similarly, highlights the importance of context in interpreting meaning, noting that phraseological units often carry evaluative and expressive functions beyond their literal interpretation. From a cognitive standpoint, Lakoff and Johnson introduce the theory of conceptual metaphor, which explains how abstract concepts such as intellect are understood through concrete experiences. Gibbs further develops this idea by demonstrating how figurative language reflects mental processes and cultural knowledge [3, 276].

In Uzbek linguistics, Rahmatullayev provides one of the earliest systematic studies of phraseology, emphasizing the semantic richness and cultural significance of Uzbek idioms [2, 84]. Mamatov examines the semantic and functional features of phraseological units, highlighting their role in expressing evaluation and emotional attitude [8, 156]. Narimonova specifically addresses the issue of equivalence between English and Uzbek phraseological expressions. She argues that differences in cultural background and pragmatic usage often result in partial or non-equivalence, which poses challenges for translation and interpretation [4, 92].

Methodology

The research adopts a qualitative, comparative, and pragmatically oriented methodology to analyze phraseological units related to intellect in English and Uzbek. The methodological framework is designed to ensure consistency with the conceptual focus on pragmatics and cognitive interpretation.



First, the data collection process involves selecting phraseological units from dictionaries, literary texts, and corpora based on their relevance to the concept of intellect. These include expressions related to thinking, intelligence, memory, and understanding [6, 24].

Second, a descriptive method is used to classify the selected units according to their semantic and functional characteristics. This step ensures that all analyzed examples correspond to the central concept of intellect [7, 127].

Third, a comparative analysis is conducted to identify similarities and differences between English and Uzbek phraseological units. This includes examining equivalent, partially equivalent, and non-equivalent expressions, with particular attention to cultural and pragmatic factors [9, 98]

Fourth, a pragmatic analysis is applied to investigate how these units function in communication. The analysis focuses on:

1. speaker intention,
2. contextual meaning,
3. evaluative and expressive functions,
4. pragmatic effects such as irony, emphasis, and politeness.

Finally, the analysis is conducted within authentic discourse contexts, ensuring that interpretations reflect real language use rather than isolated meanings. This integrated methodology allows for a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between phraseology, pragmatics, and cognition.

Conclusion

The present study has examined the pragmatic features of phraseological units related to the concept of intellect in English and Uzbek, highlighting their role as culturally and cognitively significant elements of language. The analysis demonstrates that such phraseological units are not limited to expressing abstract mental processes but also function as important pragmatic tools that convey speakers' attitudes, evaluations, and communicative intentions in various discourse contexts.

The comparative investigation reveals that both English and Uzbek languages employ a wide range of phraseological expressions to conceptualize intellect, including thinking, understanding, memory, and intelligence. In many cases, these expressions are based on universal cognitive mechanisms, particularly metaphorical thinking, which allows abstract notions to be understood through concrete experiences. This confirms the idea proposed in cognitive linguistics that human thought is largely metaphor-driven and reflected in language.

In conclusion, the research highlights the intricate relationship between language, cognition, and culture in the formation and use of phraseological units. The results contribute to the development of cross-cultural pragmatics and contrastive linguistics by providing a deeper understanding of how intellect is conceptualized and expressed in different linguistic traditions. Furthermore, the findings may have practical implications for translation studies, language teaching, and intercultural communication, where accurate interpretation of phraseological units is essential.



References:

- *Fernando, Ch.* Idioms and Idiomaticity. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. – 265 p. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780194371943.001.0001>
- *Rahmatullayev, Sh.* *O'zbek tilining frazeologik lug'ati.* – Toshkent: Fan, 1985. – 84 b.
- *Lakoff, G., Johnson, M.* *Metaphors We Live By.* – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. – 276 p. <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo3637992.html>
- *Narimonova, Z.* *Ingliz tilidagi frazeologik ifodalar va ularning o'zbek tilidagi ekvivalenti.* – Toshkent: Lingvistika jurnali, 2007. – 92 b.
- *Kunin, A. V.* *English Phraseology: Theoretical and Practical Aspects.* – Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola, 1984. – 87 p.
- *Cruse, D. A.* *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics.* – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. – 24-27 p.
- *Gibbs, R. W.* *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding.* – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. – 127-132 p. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620693>
- *Mamatov, A.* *O'zbek tilida frazeologizmlar va ularning semantik xususiyatlari.* – Toshkent: Universitet, 2010. – 156 b.
- *Sharipov, D.* *O'zbek frazeologiyasining lingvokognitiv tahlili.* – Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy universiteti nashriyoti, 2016. – 98-103 b.