

FUNCTIONAL SEMANTIC FIELD OF WORDS EXPRESSING COLOR AND IMAGE IN  
ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Tursunova Mashhura Avazbek qizi

MA student of UzSWLU

## ANNOATION

This article presents information about functional semantic fields in general as well as demonstrates the distinguishing characteristics of those fields in Uzbek and English languages. Moreover, a number of various researchers' findings on the theme of language expressing color and image are discussed and developed throughout the paper.

**Key words:** *functional semantic field, colors, Uzbek language, English language, linguo-culture, image, religion, environment*

A variety of factors necessitate the study of the national and cultural characteristics of one of the eastern languages, Uzbek, and one of the major European languages in terms of mankind and world culture, English. To begin with, Uzbekistan and the United Kingdom have had a long intercultural discussion that has resulted in the formation of interethnic contacts in a variety of disciplines, including diplomacy, art, and literature. Second, the economic, political, demographic, and other aspects of these civilizations' growth allow us to claim that they have both shared characteristics and ethnographic uniqueness. Finally, from a linguistic standpoint, Uzbek and English are two distinct types: agglutinative and analytical, respectively, resulting in structural distinctions, particularly in their semantic systems.

Using the resources from the two linguocultures, we may investigate the national and cultural characteristics of native speakers' speech behavior and, as a result, discover similar and unique aspects in the operation of the functional-semantic field of attachment in the Uzbek and English languages.

The functional-semantic field of affection is one of the underdeveloped problems in modern linguistics of the languages studied, and no detailed coverage of the national-cultural characteristics of this field has been made within the framework of the English and Uzbek languages based on a comparative-typological analysis to date. The study of the national and cultural peculiarities of the functional-semantic field of attachment in the Uzbek and English languages is one of the key aims of this research.

The functional-semantic field is a system of multi-level language means (morphological, syntactic, word-formation, lexical, as well as integrated lexico-syntactic, etc.) that interact based on the commonality of their functions based on particular semantic categories. The functional-semantic field encompasses not only the basic systems of grammatical units, classes, and categories, but also the parts of their surroundings that correspond to the same semantic category. "Semantic field" is a phrase used in linguistics to refer to a group of linguistic units that are linked by a shared (integral) semantic property; in other words, they share a non-trivial value component.

We got an idea of the presence of common and national-cultural characteristics of the English and Uzbek forms of affection, which were reflected in the semantic structure of the functional-semantic field of derogation, after studying the materials collected as a result of familiarization with regional geography literature, explanatory dictionaries, and the use of information presented on Internet pages. Let us examine the main typological features of the English and Uzbek languages, as well as the distinctive features of their national character, in order to determine the degree to which these features influence the nature of verbal communication

and the communicative behavior of people in the two sociocultural environments under consideration. Because of their exposure to European culture, particularly Protestant culture, the British people have developed their own distinct national identity. The Uzbek people had their own distinct ethnic traits during the period, deeply influenced by Eastern culture and the Islamic religion. Both folk's speech reflects these national and cultural distinctive features in the display of sentiments with soft words or attitude toward loved ones.

The national-cultural aspects of the functional-semantic field of attachment were detected in the following groupings of terms in the languages under investigation: zoonyms, flora, bodily parts, food, celestial bodies, colors, national literary heroes and historical personalities, and so on. Representatives of the animal world frequently compare character, appearance, and human features, as evidenced by expressions of love and affection for loved ones and relatives in the studied languages (hen, calf, chicken, mouse, chick, duck, puss, dove, ladybird, bird, lamb, chuck / toychoq, b'ytalok, toylok, k'yzichok, kulun, arslon).

Moving on to the following section of this article, it's important to understand the key characteristics of color identification in Uzbek and English. According to Hays and Parkins (1970), there is a clear hierarchy of relative importance of color designations in the European linguocultural area, with white being the most significant and frequently used, followed by black, red, green, blue, yellow, brown, pink, purple, and orange (with slight variations in individual languages). After conducting a linguistic investigation, M. Ganikhodjaeva comes to the conclusion that black, white, red, blue, green, and yellow are the most active color adjectives in the Old Türkic, Old Türkic, and Old Uzbek languages (dialects). According to the author's estimates, black (qora in Uzbek) has the highest frequency of occurrence per 100 pages of text, with an average frequency of 18.8; oq (white) - equivalent to 15.8; qizil (red) - 6.89; ko'k (blue) - 3.5; yashil (green) and sariq (yellow) - 2.5. In the 3-volume ancient Türkic dictionary of M. Kashgari "Diwana lukat-at turik" we also find the following color names: aq 'white' (M.K. I, 257); kek 'blue' (M.K. I, 132), qara 'black' (M.K. I, 382); qizil 'red' 19 (M.K. I, 408); qonur 'brown' (M.K. III, 363); sariy 'yellow' (M.K. I, 374); jasil 'green' (M.K. Sh, 19).

As we can see from the examples above, each researcher defines primary colors and the number of colors differently, and there are variations in the division of the color continuum, which can be explained by the practical importance of distinguishing the corresponding color in a person's living and working environment. This means that a more detailed or, opposite, a more broad reflection of reality in the language is required in practice. It's also common knowledge that correctly translating (transferring) words of color designations from one language to another is difficult since there is no color designation comparable in another language for the color designation of one language. As a result, in Russian, Uzbek ko'k equates to blue and light-blue, while in English, just one word blue. In ordinary life, Uzbek people can not necessarily differentiate between blue and green: the term "ko'k", which means "blue," may also mean "green," though there are analogous words such as yashil, etc.

In general, the semantics of terms for color designations in the Uzbek and English languages have many distinguishing characteristics, but they are also common. In compared to the English language, the Uzbek language's semantic field of color names has the most layer-forming capabilities and various interpretations. The semantic closeness of hue identification terms in the two languages is also evident at the level of phraseologically linked meanings. In these languages, the majority of phraseological units describe a person and, in most cases, indicate his negative characteristics.

## REFERENCE

1. Frumkina R.M. On the method of studying the semantics of color designation - Semiotics and informatics, issue 10. BUTIUTU, 1978, pp. 142-162.
2. Vasilevich A.P. The study of vocabulary in a psycholinguistic experiment: On the material of color designation in lang. different systems / Ed. Telia V.N .; Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Institute of Linguistics. M .: Nauka, 1987.- 140s.
3. Worf B. The Phonetic Value of Certain Characters in Maya Writing.- Cambridge, 1933
4. Maerz A, Payl M.R. Dictionary of Color, Mc. Graw-Hill, №Y, 1930.- 207p
5. Vasilevich A.P. Psycholinguistic significance of color words in different languages / Experimental research in psycholinguistics. M., 1982.

