

# The Comparative Adjectival Phraseological Units Describing Person's Character in English and Karakalpak Languages

**Khudaibergenov Azamat Abdikalikovich**

Nukus State Pedagogical Institute, Nukus, Uzbekistan

**Abstract:** *The article studies the methods and peculiar properties of comparative adjectival phraseological units describing person's character in English and karakalpak languages, also reveals the regularities of phrases with the concept «person».*

**Keywords:** Phraseological units, phraseological forms, adjectival comparatives, semantic and functional properties, concept «person»

## 1. Introduction

It is known that phraseology is considered as a science that studies the meaning, form and use of constant combinations of verbal signs in the speech of native speakers of a given language. Phraseology is an independent linguistic discipline that studies all types of permanent signs that exist in a given language and function in the speech of its speakers, as well as limitations in the combination of words and verbal meanings that create these combinations.

Phraseology is a treasure trove of language. PU reflects the history of the people, the originality of its culture and way of life. Therefore, phraseological units often have a distinctly national character. They are the majority in the phraseological fund of any language.[4,277]

This article aims to generalize the existing theoretical experience in studying the category of phraseological units with a component from the concept of PERSON (CCP), the presence of which in the phraseological form gives the basis for separating them into an independent semantic-structural group.

For adjective comparisons, as well as for comparisons of other types, a two-dimensional meaning is characteristic: one is compared with another. This structure of meaning distinguishes it as a phraseological meaning of a special kind, namely comparative. [1,26]

The first component of adjective comparisons is usually used in its basic literal meaning. The function of the second component is always amplifying, since it denotes the degree of features expressed by the first component.

The first component is called the comparison base, and the second is the comparison object. Union as is a bundle. The subject of comparison is a variable element located in the text.

(as) good as gold – good, noble, golden (person);

Gertrude Morel was very ill when the boy was born. Morel was good to her, as good as gold.

Gertrude Morel is the subject of comparison, good is the basis of comparison, gold is the object of comparison, as is the bundle. [8, 208]

Therefore, adjective comparisons arise in the language because there is a need to transfer additional information in comparison with the information transmitted by the first components of comparisons taken separately.

There are comparative phrases used only with a comparative adjective:

more dead than alive - half-dead (from fatigue), mortally tired (not to be confused with the Russian “neither alive nor dead”).

FE: more honored in the breach than (in) the observance (Shakespeare science) is one of the few non-face expressions. This phraseological unit means “more often violated than observed” (about the law, custom, etc.).

To my mind the afternoon call is a convention more honored in the breach than the observance.

The figurativeness of the phrase arises due to the fact that in speech the comparison refers to a different class of objects, phenomena or persons, which denotes its second component, for example, he is as brave as a lion.

Imagery is created due to the comparison of a person with a lion, but if we compare, say, a lioness with a lion, then the imagery of comparison disappears and instead of a figurative comparison (simile) the non-figurative (comparison) appears.

Comparisons are usually phraseological units with a pronounced estimated value, both positive and negative, for example, (as) bold (or brave) as a lion - brave as a lion; (as) fierce as a tiger - as fierce as a tiger; (as) pretty as a picture - as good as a picture, etc.

## 2. Materials and methods

As it is important in research various methods of analyses, it has been used lexico-semantic, comparative, contrastive methods of analysis in the article.

Volume 10 Issue 2, February 2021

[www.ijsr.net](http://www.ijsr.net)

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

### 3. Results of the Research and their Discussion

The nature of the assessment depends on the semantics of the first component. In some cases, the semantics of the second component plays a decisive role, for example, (as) fat as a pig - fat, fed like a pig, like a hog and (as) fat as butter - plump.

Adjective comparisons are two-component. A lexeme or a combination of lexemes can act as the second component, as in verbal comparative phraseological units. We give examples of adjective phraseological units with the second component - a combination of lexemes: (as) different as chalk from cheese - completely different; (as) plain as the nose on your face - as clear as two times two is four, etc.

Adjective comparisons denote the most diverse qualities and properties of both people and objects and phenomena.

Examples of adjective comparisons related to people: (as) cool as a cucumber - completely calm, unperturbed; (as) brown as a berry - very tanned, chocolate-colored (the word brown in this comparison retains its obsolete meaning "dark"); (as) pretty as a picture - as good as a picture; (as) true as steel - betrayed in body and soul; (as) ugly as sin - as terrible as a mortal sin; (as) vain as a peacock - proud, vain, important as a peacock; (as) wise as Solomon - wise as Solomon; (as) yellow as a guinea - yellow as lemon, etc.

Comparisons are usually monosemantic. But there are comparisons with two phraseosemantic variants. Polysemantic comparisons are extremely rare.

In comparisons of this type, the second component performs not only an amplifying function, but also a value differentiator.

So, turnover (as) weak as water means:

- 1) Weak, frail: Sir, I am just getting well of a fever, and I am as weak as water.
- 2) weak-willed, weak-willed, weak-willed: You're very of swearing and blistering and threatening, but when it comes to the point you're as weak as water [5, 219]

The comparison (as) sober as a judge also has two phraseological and semantic variants that characterize a person from different sides: 1) completely sober; = in neither eye; 2) sober in judgment, sane.

A comparative phraseological unit can denote a property of an object and a property of a person, for example, (as) hard as a bone -

- 1) Hard as Stone: Owing to the intense cold the ground was as hard as a bone.
- 2) cruel, ruthless: It's not much use your expecting any generosity or kindness from him. It's as hard as a bone in anything that concerns his own interests.

(As) sharp as a needle -

- 1) Sharp as a knife: How the boys admired that knife, the vicious shape of it and its shininess, the point was as sharp as a needle.
- 2) Observant, insightful: I know a solicitor here - he's a patient of mine - of the name of Gooch, a fat fellow but sharp as a needle.

Some other adjective comparisons have a similar semantic structure: (as) light as a feather - light as a feather (about an object or a person); as like as two peas - similar as two peas (about objects or people); (as) slippery as an eel - slippery as an eel (about a slippery object or about a dodging, quirky person); (as) tough as old boots - 1) tough as a sole (about food, etc.); 2) very hardy, persistent (about a person); hard (about a person). [9,270]

Adjective comparisons can be treated like a person. So for an animal, for example, (as) free as (the) air - free as the wind (about a human or an animal).

PU (as) dead as a doornail (or as mutton) refers both to a person and to a custom, tradition, etc.:

- 1) Without any signs of life, lifeless; died finally, "cover": Old Marley was as dead as a doornail;
- 2) Turned into a dead letter, lost its power, its main properties, out of use, disappeared without a trace: Mr. Crabbe was as dead as mutton, but Mr. Crabbe continued to write moral stories in rhymed couplets. [3,390].

The word dead in the first phraseosemantic version is used literally and in the second, metaphorically. A similar phenomenon is observed in the above comparisons of (as) slippery as an eel and (as) tough as old boots.

In these and similar turns of phrase, the meaning of the whole phraseological unit is a kind of combination of a partially rethought and completely rethought phraseosemantic variants of the comparative type. Polysemy of similar phraseological units associated with polysemy of their first components.

Phraseological units characterizing a person in the Karakalpak language Phraseomicropole "Man" constitutes an essential part of the phraseomacropolis "Inspiration" in Karakalpak phraseology.

**Адалға қарысы жоқ** ("Poor", "having nothing"); **ығбалы жатқан** ("Unhappy", unlucky) and others.

Phraseologization of free phrases as a result of the expansion of specific, figurative meanings is typical. So, in phraseological units new, generalized meanings arise: **жуўылмаған қасықтай** ("Interfering where he shouldn't", "sticking his nose everywhere" (literally "like an unwashed spoon")); **шок басқандай** ("As if stung" (lit. "as if stepped on coals")); **шандыры шыққан** ("Very thin", "emaciated", "skin and bones"); **ишинен тынған** ("Cunning", "on your mind"); **қарабас (лы)** ("lonely" (lit. "black head"))).

Some phraseological units with a component from the concept "person" are predisposed to the development of their

derivational capabilities, as a result of which there are groups of phraseological units that are relative in terms of derivation: **ак аяқ** (“Deceiver”, “cunning” (lit. “white foot”));

Phrase groupings are formed and based on the commonality of one figuratively played out word-component:

**Ак; аккөкирек** (“Good-natured”, “gullible” (lit. “white chest”));

**Ант; антурған** (“Damned”, “unfortunate” (lit. “beaten by an oath”));

**Қара: қарабасы** (“Lonely” (lit. “his black head”)), **қара маңлай** (“Unfortunate” (lit. “black forehead”)), etc. [2,367]

As a result, a predisposition to modeling is noted in phraseology.

Wed phraseological formulas of wishes, spells, congratulations, greetings, etc. using participles as– ғыр// -қыр. The initial component of such phraseological units is a noun in the main case with the affix of belonging mainly to the second or third person. The next component is a future participle with -ғыр// -қыр.

**Үйи жанғыр, дузым урғыр** (“Damned” (lit. “so that the salt would punish him”)), **қараң батқыр** (“lost” (lit. “so that his silhouette disappeared”)), **қарасы батқыр** (“Unfortunate” (lit. “so that black crushes”)), **жағы қарысқыр** (“Unfortunate”, “disgusting” (lit. “so that you can check him / her”));

It is noteworthy that in the Karakalpak language, some of the modeled marked phraseological units with a component from the concept "person" are predominantly anthropological in nature and belong to the most ancient layers of the Karakalpak phraseological fund.

It is this group of phraseological units with a component from the concept "person" that constitute phraseological units with verbal derivatives on –ғыш –ма/-ме: **жан алғыш** (“villain”, “evil”), **қан сорғыш** (“despot”, “cruel”), **тил алғыш** (“obedient”).

In general, for phraseological units with a component from the concept "person" of the Karakalpak language, the following structural models for constructing phraseological forms are typical:

1. phraseoform model "substantive in the main case + components бар/жоқ»: **бети жоқ** (“Having no conscience” (lit. “no face”)), **қолы узын** (“supported, helpless” (lit. Long arm)).

Often phraseological units with this model have a definition with them, which is expressed by a noun in a particular case (genitive, dative or local):

**Ушарға қанаты жоқ** («Being in a hurry»),

**Көкирегінде дығы бар** (“offended”, “offended” (lit. “having a spot in the chest”)), **көңлінде кири жоқ**.

2. Model of comparative phraseological form with –дай/-тай:

**Тал шыбықтай** (“Slender”, “thin” (lit. “like a tala twig”)), **егиз қозыдай** (“very similar” (lit. “like twins, sheep”)), **жер менен аспандай** (“Very different” (lit. “like heaven and earth”)).

These phraseological units figuratively convey the constant characteristics of a person. But there are also such comparative phraseological units with –дай, -тай, which focus on situational content:

**Көзге шыққан шүйелдей** (“Annoying” (lit. “like a wart on the eye”)), **жуўылмаған қасықтай** (“Interfering everywhere”, “sticking his nose where he shouldn’t” (lit. “like an unwashed spoon”)).

3. The model of the phrase form “substantive in the main case with the affix of belonging to the 3rd person + adjective in the main case”:

**Аўызы бос** (“Weak-willed” (lit. “soft mouth”)), **бахыты қара** (“Unhappy” (lit. “happiness is black”)), **бети қалын** (“Shameless” (lit. “fat face”)), **дәстурханы мол** (“Hospitable”, “prosperous” (lit. “his abundant tablecloth”)).

Such an anthropological basis for the image-building of phraseological units with a component from the concept "person" in the Karakalpak language is extremely strong. This is also facilitated by the use of many other somatisms in the phraseological form:

**Қол (“hand”): қолы бос** (“Free”, “not having a job” (lit. “free hand”)), **қолы ашық** (“generous”, “kind” (lit. “openhanded”)), **қолы суқ** (“greedy” (lit. “greedy hand”)).

**Тил (“language”): тили келте** (“Guilty”, “dependent on someone” (lit. “short tongue”)).

**Аўыз (“mouth”): аўызынан наны түскен** (“Unhappy” (lit. “who dropped the bread from his mouth”)). [7,106-108] Antonymic connections are noted between phraseological units with a component from the concept of "person" of the Karakalpak language:

шайды жүрек (“coward”)	ер жүрек (“brave”)
көкирегі қара (“malicious”)	ак көкирек (“good-natured”)
сөзге шешен (“eloquent”)	сөзге сәлтек (“ugly”)
қабағы жабық (“angry”)	қабағы ашыңқы (“happy”)

PU with a component from the concept "person" are classified by the present time according to a variety of parameters (True, with varying degrees of completeness of the covered material). [3,390]

Recently, research at the intersection of linguistics and intercultural communication has become more and more active. They are guided by the development of topical issues in the comparative aspect of interlingual similarities and differences in modern conditions and in the context of current communication at the beginning of the 21st century. [6, 89].

However, despite the enormous importance of the study of the content side of linguistic units and the rapid development of its in-depth study as one of the distinctive features, especially of modern linguistic science, as well as numerous attempts at theoretical comprehension of semasiological problems, the semantics of vocabulary and especially phraseology, still remains the least studied problem in linguistics.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Thus, it can be noted that the English and Karakalpak phraseological units of the type under study have been extremely insufficiently studied. In a few works there are only isolated fragments of the description of such phraseological units. Therefore, it is not surprising that so far researchers, in fact, have passed by the qualitative uniqueness with a component from the concept "person" as part of phraseological units, as opposed to using a component from the concept "person" as a lexeme.

#### **References**

- [1] Aleeva G.U. Comparative analysis of phraseological units characterizing a person's appearance in English and Turkish: Abstract of the thesis ... Candidate of Philology. Sciences.- Kazan: KSU, 2009.-26p
- [2] [2] Ainazarova G. The peculiar properties of using phraseological units in artistic compositions. // Language is the key to all knowledge and all nature.- Nukus: Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh, 2010.-367p
- [3] Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse.-Volgograd: Change, 2004.-390 p.
- [4] Muminov O.M. On the question of the role of language in society // Language is the key to all knowledge and all nature. - Nukus: KSU named after Berdakh, 2011.-P 277-279
- [5] Savitsky V.M. English phraseology: Modern problems.-Samara: SSU, 1993.-219 p.
- [6] Safarov Sh. Cognitive linguistics.- Jizzakh: Sangzor, 2006 -89 page.
- [7] Yusupova B.T. The usage of person's body parts together in phraseological units // Problems of teaching and learning linguistics.- Nukus, 2011.- p106-108
- [8] Weinreich U. Problems in the Analysis of Idioms: Substance and Structure of Language.- University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 2004.-p208
- [9] Wiegand E. Contrastive Lexical Semantics.- Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2008.-270 p