IQRO JURNALI , IQRO JOURNAL, ИКРО ЖУРНАЛИ
ISSN:2181-4341| wordlyknowledge.uz/index.php/iqro
Volume 22 Issue 02 IYUL 2026

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK IDIOMATIC EXPRESSIONS: SEMANTIC EQUIVALENCE AND CULTURAL CONCEPTUALIZATION

Irgasheva Ezoza
Master's Student, Department of Foreign Language and Literature
AIFU University,Uzbekistan
E-mail: ezozaabbosova596@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21694125

Abstract: Idiomatic expressions represent an important component of language that reflects not only linguistic structure but also cultural and cognitive patterns of communication. Due to their figurative nature and semantic complexity, idioms present challenges in translation, language learning, and cross-cultural interpretation. This study aims to conduct a contrastive analysis of idiomatic expressions in English and Uzbek with particular emphasis on semantic equivalence and cultural conceptualization. The research employed a qualitative descriptive design based on principles of contrastive linguistics and cognitive-semantic analysis. A corpus of 80 idiomatic expressions was compiled from English and Uzbek lexicographic and academic sources. The selected idioms were analyzed and classified according to three categories of equivalence: fully equivalent, partially equivalent, and non-equivalent expressions. The findings revealed that partially equivalent idioms constituted the dominant category, indicating that similar meanings are frequently expressed through different lexical and metaphorical structures. Fully equivalent idioms demonstrated shared conceptual patterns, whereas non-equivalent idioms reflected culturally specific ways of interpreting experience. The analysis also showed that idiomatic meaning is strongly influenced by metaphorical conceptualization and sociocultural context. The study concludes that idiomatic equivalence extends beyond literal linguistic correspondence and requires consideration of semantic, pragmatic, and cultural dimensions. The findings contribute to contrastive linguistics, phraseological studies, translation research, and foreign language education by providing insights into the relationship between language, culture, and figurative meaning.
Keywords: idiomatic expressions; contrastive analysis; semantic equivalence; cultural conceptualization; English language; Uzbek language; phraseology.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi idiomatik ifodalar semantik ekvivalentlik hamda madaniy konseptualizatsiya nuqtai nazaridan kontrastiv tahlil qilinadi. Idiomalar tilning obrazli va madaniy jihatdan belgilangan birliklari sifatida tarjima, chet tilini o‘rganish hamda madaniyatlararo muloqot jarayonida muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi. Idiomatik birliklarning ma’nosi ko‘pincha tarkibiy qismlarining lug‘aviy ma’nosi orqali to‘liq anglashilmasligi sababli ularni qiyosiy o‘rganish alohida ilmiy qiziqish uyg‘otadi. Tadqiqotda kontrastiv lingvistika va kognitiv-semantik tahlil tamoyillariga asoslangan sifatli tavsifiy metod qo‘llanildi. Tadqiqot korpusi ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridan tanlab olingan 80 ta idiomatik ifodadan tashkil topdi. Tanlangan birliklar semantik moslik darajasiga ko‘ra to‘liq ekvivalent, qisman ekvivalent va ekvivalentsiz idiomalar guruhlariga ajratildi. Natijalar qisman ekvivalent idiomalar eng katta ulushni tashkil qilishini ko‘rsatdi. Tahlil shuningdek idiomatik ma’no shakllanishida metaforik tafakkur va madaniy omillarning muhim rol o‘ynashini aniqladi. To‘liq ekvivalent idiomalar umumiy konseptual tajribani aks ettirsa, ekvivalentsiz birliklar madaniy o‘ziga xoslikni namoyon etdi. Tadqiqot natijalari kontrastiv tilshunoslik, frazeologiya, tarjimashunoslik hamda chet tilini o‘qitish metodikasiga ilmiy hissa qo‘shadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: idiomatik ifodalar; kontrastiv tahlil; semantik ekvivalentlik; madaniy konseptualizatsiya; ingliz tili; o‘zbek tili; frazeologiya.

Аннотация: В данной статье проводится контрастивный анализ идиоматических выражений английского и узбекского языков с акцентом на семантическую эквивалентность и культурную концептуализацию. Идиомы рассматриваются как образные и культурно обусловленные языковые единицы, играющие важную роль в переводе, изучении иностранных языков и межкультурной коммуникации. Поскольку значение идиоматических выражений не всегда может быть определено через прямое значение их компонентов, их сравнительное исследование представляет особый научный интерес. В исследовании использован качественный описательный метод, основанный на принципах контрастивной лингвистики и когнитивно-семантического анализа. Корпус исследования включал 80 идиоматических выражений, отобранных из английских и узбекских лексикографических и научных источников. Выбранные единицы были классифицированы по степени семантического соответствия на полностью эквивалентные, частично эквивалентные и неэквивалентные идиомы. Результаты показали, что наиболее распространённой группой являются частично эквивалентные идиомы. Анализ также подтвердил важную роль метафорического мышления и культурных факторов в формировании идиоматического значения. Полностью эквивалентные идиомы отражают общие концептуальные модели, тогда как неэквивалентные единицы демонстрируют культурную специфику языков. Результаты исследования вносят вклад в развитие контрастивной лингвистики, фразеологии, переводоведения и методики преподавания иностранных языков.

Ключевые слова: идиоматические выражения; контрастивный анализ; семантическая эквивалентность; культурная концептуализация; английский язык; узбекский язык; фразеология.

Introduction. Idiomatic expressions constitute one of the most distinctive and culturally embedded components of language. Unlike literal expressions, idioms convey meanings that cannot always be interpreted through the direct meanings of their individual lexical elements. Their figurative nature makes them an important subject of linguistic inquiry, particularly in phraseology, cognitive linguistics, translation studies, and intercultural communication (Fernando, 1996).

The study of idiomatic language has developed significantly in contemporary linguistic research. Earlier approaches primarily examined idioms as fixed lexical units characterized by semantic opacity and structural stability (Moon, 1998).

Later developments in cognitive linguistics expanded this understanding and proposed that idioms are motivated by conceptual structures rather than arbitrary linguistic conventions. From this perspective, idiomatic expressions reflect how speakers perceive reality and organize experience through metaphorical thinking (Gibbs, 1994).

Recent studies have also emphasized the relationship between language and culture in the formation and interpretation of idiomatic meaning. Since idioms frequently emerge from historical experience, social practice, and collective cultural knowledge, their meanings often extend beyond linguistic boundaries. Consequently, comparative studies of idioms provide valuable insights into both universal cognitive tendencies and language-specific cultural conceptualizations (Kövecses, 2010; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003).

Contrastive linguistic analysis has become an effective methodological approach for identifying similarities and differences across languages. Through comparison of semantic

structure, metaphorical representation, and pragmatic usage, researchers are able to explain how equivalent meanings may be expressed through different linguistic forms. Such analysis is particularly relevant in the context of translation studies and foreign language learning, where idiomatic competence remains one of the major challenges (Glucksberg, 2001). English and Uzbek represent two linguistically and culturally distinct systems, which makes their idiomatic expressions especially suitable for comparative investigation. English idioms frequently originate from literary traditions, historical developments, and social interaction patterns, whereas Uzbek idiomatic expressions often preserve traditional values, collective identity, and culturally specific patterns of communication (Rahmatullayev, 1992; Mahmudov, 2012).

Although previous studies have examined idioms from semantic, cognitive, and translational perspectives, limited attention has been given to systematic contrastive analysis of English and Uzbek idiomatic expressions with emphasis on semantic equivalence and cultural conceptualization. Existing research frequently focuses on translation outcomes while providing less attention to the mechanisms through which equivalent and non-equivalent idiomatic meanings are constructed across languages (Dobrovol'skij & Piirainen, 2005).

Therefore, the present study aims to conduct a contrastive analysis of idiomatic expressions in English and Uzbek by examining semantic equivalence and cultural conceptualization. The objectives of the study are: (1) to identify similarities and differences in idiomatic meaning; (2) to classify idioms according to levels of equivalence; (3) to examine cultural factors influencing idiomatic interpretation; and (4) to discuss implications for translation studies and language education.

Methods. This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design to investigate semantic and cultural correspondences between English and Uzbek idiomatic expressions. Since idioms represent figurative and culturally embedded linguistic units, qualitative analysis was considered the most appropriate approach for examining conceptual meaning and cross-linguistic equivalence (Creswell, 2014). The research was conducted within the theoretical framework of contrastive linguistics and cognitive-semantic analysis. Contrastive analysis was selected as the principal method because it allows systematic comparison of linguistic units from different languages and facilitates identification of similarities and differences in meaning, structure, and cultural representation (Croft & Cruse, 2004). The corpus of the study consisted of 80 idiomatic expressions collected from English and Uzbek lexicographic and academic sources. English idioms were selected from recognized idiom dictionaries and linguistic publications (Fernando, 1996; Moon, 1998), while Uzbek idiomatic expressions were obtained from phraseological dictionaries and scholarly materials devoted to Uzbek phraseology (Rahmatullayev, 1992).

The selection of idioms was based on three criteria:

(1) frequency of usage in everyday communication;

(2) semantic clarity and interpretability; and

(3) the possibility of establishing cross-linguistic comparison.

Data collection and analysis were completed in four stages.

During the first stage, idiomatic expressions were identified and compiled into an English–Uzbek comparative corpus.

During the second stage, semantic analysis was performed to determine equivalence relationships between selected idioms. Semantic equivalence was interpreted as correspondence in meaning rather than direct lexical similarity (Glucksberg, 2001).

During the third stage, the collected expressions were classified into three categories:

- **Fully equivalent idioms** — expressions demonstrating similarity in meaning and metaphorical structure;

- **Partially equivalent idioms** — expressions conveying similar meanings through different lexical or figurative forms;
- **Non-equivalent idioms** — expressions without direct correspondence that require functional interpretation

During the final stage, cognitive-semantic interpretation was applied to examine metaphorical conceptualization and identify cultural factors influencing idiomatic meaning. This analytical stage was informed by principles of conceptual metaphor theory and cognitive linguistic interpretation (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; Kövecses, 2010). The findings were interpreted through comparative evaluation of lexical composition, semantic structure, figurative imagery, and pragmatic usage. Particular attention was given to the role of cultural conceptualization in determining equivalence between English and Uzbek idiomatic expressions. This methodological approach made it possible to investigate idiomatic meaning beyond literal translation and to reveal both universal and culturally specific patterns of figurative language.

Results. The contrastive analysis of English and Uzbek idiomatic expressions demonstrated varying degrees of semantic and cultural equivalence. Based on the analytical procedure adopted in this study, the selected idioms were grouped into three categories: fully equivalent idioms, partially equivalent idioms, and non-equivalent idioms. This classification was guided by semantic equivalence principles and contrastive linguistic interpretation (Glucksberg, 2001; Croft & Cruse, 2004).

The findings indicated that partially equivalent idioms represented the largest category within the corpus, while fully equivalent idioms occurred less frequently. Non-equivalent idioms appeared as culturally marked expressions that required interpretative rather than direct translation. Similar observations regarding figurative meaning and cultural dependency have been discussed in studies of idiomatic interpretation (Dobrovol'skij & Piirainen, 2005).

The distribution of idioms according to equivalence categories is presented below.

Table 1. Distribution of Idiomatic Equivalence Categories

Equivalence Category	Characteristics	Percentage
Fully equivalent	Similar meaning and metaphorical structure	18%
Partially equivalent	Equivalent meaning expressed through different lexical and figurative forms	54%
Non-equivalent	Absence of direct semantic correspondence	28%

Source: Compiled by the author based on contrastive analysis findings.

The percentages were calculated based on a corpus of 80 idiomatic expressions compiled for the study.

The category of fully equivalent idioms included expressions demonstrating close semantic and conceptual correspondence across both languages.

Table 2. Examples of Fully equivalent idioms

English Idiom	Uzbek Equivalent
Kill two birds with one stone	Bir o'q bilan ikki quyonni urmoq
Actions speak louder than words	Amal gapdan ustun

Source: *Compiled by the author.*

These examples indicate that some conceptual patterns are shared despite linguistic differences and support observations concerning common cognitive experience across languages (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003).

Partially equivalent idioms constituted the dominant category. These expressions preserved communicative meaning while differing in lexical form or figurative representation.

Table 3. Examples of Partially equivalent idioms

English Idiom	Uzbek Equivalent
Spill the beans	Sirni oshkor qilmoq
Break the ice	Suhbatni boshlab bermoq
Burn the midnight oil	Tonggacha ishlamoq

Source: *Compiled by the author.*

The prevalence of partial equivalence suggests that idiomatic meaning often transcends literal lexical correspondence and relies on functional interpretation (Fernando, 1996).

Non-equivalent idioms demonstrated the strongest cultural specificity and lacked direct lexical equivalents.

Table 4. Examples of Non-equivalent idioms

English Idiom	Uzbek Interpretation
Once in a blue moon	Juda kam hollarda
Cost an arm and a leg	Juda qimmat turmoq
Under the weather	O‘zini yomon his qilmoq

Source: *Compiled by the author.*

The analysis also revealed observable differences in metaphorical representation. English idioms more frequently relied on symbolic and historically developed imagery, whereas Uzbek idiomatic expressions demonstrated stronger connections with traditional cultural values and everyday experience (Rahmatullayev, 1992; Mahmudov, 2012).

Overall, the results showed that semantic equivalence between English and Uzbek idioms exists on different levels and is influenced by both linguistic and cultural factors.

Discussion. The findings of the present study demonstrate that idiomatic equivalence between English and Uzbek cannot be understood as absolute lexical correspondence but should be interpreted through semantic and cultural dimensions. The predominance of partially equivalent idioms indicates that languages may convey similar communicative intentions while employing different metaphorical and lexical structures. This observation supports previous studies emphasizing that idiomatic meaning extends beyond literal interpretation and depends on conceptual organization (Fernando, 1996; Glucksberg, 2001).

The occurrence of fully equivalent idioms suggests the existence of shared conceptual patterns across languages. Such similarities may result from common human experience and universal cognitive mechanisms involved in figurative language processing. Cognitive linguistic theory explains that metaphorical expressions often emerge from embodied experience and conceptual mapping processes rather than arbitrary linguistic formation (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003; Gibbs, 1994).

At the same time, the considerable proportion of partially equivalent and non-equivalent idioms confirms the importance of cultural conceptualization in shaping idiomatic meaning. The findings indicate that although English and Uzbek may communicate comparable ideas, the linguistic realization of those ideas often differs due to historical, social, and cultural influences. Similar conclusions have been reported in studies of cross-cultural figurative language and conceptual metaphor (Kövecses, 2010; Dobrovol’skij & Piirainen, 2005).

The analysis also revealed differences in metaphorical representation between the two languages. English idiomatic expressions frequently preserve symbolic imagery associated with literary tradition and historical development, whereas Uzbek idioms demonstrate stronger connections with social values, collective identity, and everyday cultural practices. This tendency corresponds to observations in Uzbek linguistic studies emphasizing the cultural foundations of phraseological units (Rahmatullayev, 1992; Mahmudov, 2012).

From the perspective of translation studies, the findings suggest that direct lexical translation of idioms may lead to semantic loss and communicative inaccuracy. Functional and semantic equivalence therefore appears to be a more effective strategy for preserving intended meaning across languages. Similar arguments have been advanced in previous research on idiomatic interpretation and language transfer (Cacciari & Tabossi, 1988; Cooper, 1999).

The findings also have pedagogical implications for foreign language education. Since idiomatic competence contributes significantly to communicative effectiveness and intercultural awareness, language teaching should integrate cultural interpretation alongside vocabulary and grammar instruction. Exposure to contrastive analysis may improve learners' understanding of figurative meaning and support the development of intercultural communicative competence (Irujo, 1986; Boers, 2008).

Overall, the study confirms that English and Uzbek idiomatic systems demonstrate both universal conceptual tendencies and culturally specific patterns. These findings contribute to contrastive linguistics, phraseological studies, translation research, and language teaching methodology by providing a broader understanding of the relationship between language, culture, and figurative meaning.

Conclusion. The present study examined English and Uzbek idiomatic expressions through contrastive analysis with particular emphasis on semantic equivalence and cultural conceptualization. The findings demonstrated that idiomatic correspondence between the two languages exists at different levels and cannot be explained solely through lexical similarity. The analysis identified three major categories of idiomatic equivalence: fully equivalent, partially equivalent, and non-equivalent expressions. The results showed that partially equivalent idioms constitute the most frequent category, indicating that similar communicative meanings are often expressed through different metaphorical and linguistic structures. The study further revealed that idiomatic meaning is strongly influenced by cultural background and conceptual patterns. While some expressions reflect universal cognitive tendencies, many idioms remain culture-dependent and require interpretation within their specific linguistic and social contexts.

The findings highlight the importance of integrating semantic, cultural, and cognitive approaches in the analysis of figurative language. In addition, the study demonstrates practical implications for translation studies and foreign language education, emphasizing the need to prioritize communicative and functional equivalence over literal translation. This research contributes to the field of contrastive linguistics by providing a comparative perspective on English and Uzbek idiomatic systems. Future studies may expand the corpus size and investigate idiomatic expressions across literary discourse, media language, and spoken interaction in order to obtain broader cross-cultural insights.

References

1. Abdurahmonov, G. (2008). *Tilshunoslik nazariyasi*. Toshkent. https://n.ziyouz.com/
2. Barcelona, A. (2003). *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://www.degruyter.com/
3. Boers, F. (2008). *Language awareness and metaphorical competence*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://www.degruyter.com/

4. Cacciari, C., & Tabossi, P. (1988). The comprehension of idioms. *Journal of Memory and Language, 27*(6), 668–683.https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(88)90014-9
5. Cooper, T. C. (1999). Processing of idioms by L2 learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 233–262. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587719
6. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications. https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book246125
7. Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/
8. Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/
9. Dirven, R., & Pörings, R. (2002). *Metaphor and metonymy in comparison and contrast*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. https://www.degruyter.com/
10. Dobrovol'skij, D., & Piirainen, E. (2005). *Figurative language: Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives*. Elsevier. https://shop.elsevier.com/
11. Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh University Press. https://edinburghuniversitypress.com/
12. Fernando, C. (1996). *Idioms and idiomaticity*. Oxford University Press. https://books.google.com/books/about/Idioms_and_Idiomaticity.html?id=5lViAAAAMAAJ
13. Fillmore, C. J., Kay, P., & O'Connor, M. C. (1988). Regularity and idiomaticity. *Language, 64*(3), 501–538. https://www.jstor.org/stable/414531
14. Geeraerts, D. (2010). *Theories of lexical semantics*. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/
15. Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Poetics_of_Mind.html?id=Y0ZyQgAACAAJ
16. Glucksberg, S. (2001). *Understanding figurative language: From metaphors to idioms*. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/understanding-figurative-language-9780195111095
17. Irujo, S. (1986). A piece of cake: Learning and teaching idioms. *ELT Journal, 40*(3), 236–242. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/40.3.236
18. Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A practical introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/metaphor-9780199738632
19. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press. https://press.uchicago.edu/
20. Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/
21. Langlotz, A. (2006). *Idiomatic creativity: A cognitive-linguistic model of idiom representation and interpretation*. John Benjamins. https://benjamins.com/catalog/clscc.17
22. Mahmudov, N. (2012). *Til va madaniyat*. Toshkent. https://ziyouz.uz/
23. Mieder, W. (2004). *Proverbs: A handbook*. Greenwood Press. https://www.bloomsbury.com/
24. Moon, R. (1998). *Fixed expressions and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach*. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/fixed-expressions-and-idioms-in-english-9780198236146

25. Norrick, N. R. (1985). *How proverbs mean*. Mouton. https://www.degruyter.com/
26. Nunberg, G., Sag, I. A., & Wasow, T. (1994). Idioms. *Language, 70*(3), 491–538. https://www.jstor.org/stable/416483
27. Palmer, G. B. (1996). *Toward a theory of cultural linguistics*. University of Texas Press. https://utpress.utexas.edu/
28. Rahmatullayev, S. (1992). *O‘zbek tilining frazeologik lug‘ati*. Toshkent. https://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA52816976
29. Safarov, Sh. (2006). *Pragmalingvistika*. Toshkent. https://ziyouz.uz/
30. Wierzbicka, A. (1992). *Semantics, culture and cognition*. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/
31. Yo‘ldoshev, B. (2013). *O‘zbek frazeologiyasi va frazeografiyasining dolzarb muammolari*. Samarqand: SamDU nashri. https://oefen.uz/uz/documents/diplom-ishlar/umumiy/h-va-p-harfiga-oid-iboralarning-o-zbek-tili-frazeologik-lug-ati-da-izohlanish-tamoyillari