

## INTER-LANGUAGE CORRESPONDENCE AND SOURCES OF COMPARISON IN DIFFERENT-SYSTEM LANGUAGES

G. A. Usenova

*PhD, Senior Lecturer, Department of Distance Learning of  
Humanitarian and Social Disciplines, NSPI Uzbekistan, Nukus*

**Abstract.** The given article is about interlanguage correspondence and sources of comparison in English, Russian and Karakalpak languages. Comparisons are classified into three groups: equivalent, partially equivalent, non-equivalent. There are given examples from literary texts.

**Keywords:** stylistic device, comparison, English, Russian, Karakalpak languages.

The stylistic device comparison is one of the most common tropes that has existed since the time of Homer, and therefore it is no coincidence that much attention was paid to it in rhetoric. Comparison is a linguistic phenomenon in which the meaning of one word or a group of words is specified by the meaning of other words by comparing the corresponding concepts on the basis of a feature common to them [1:18].

A comparative analysis of comparisons in languages of different systems shows that they have interlingual correspondences.

Although non-equivalence and incomplete equivalence is a common phenomenon, it is assumed that most words in different languages are equivalent, they are based on an interlingual lexical concept. This layer of vocabulary is the easiest to learn and translate. But the language does not consist of concepts, but of words, and the semantics of the word is not limited to the lexical concept alone. The semantics of a word is conditioned by its lexical-phraseological compatibility and various sociolinguistic connotations, "lexical background" [2:64-66].

The question of how certain concepts are reflected in the language and to what extent the lexical detailing of these concepts is due to social factors is of considerable interest to learners of the English language.

We divided all analyzed comparisons into three groups: 1) equivalent, i.e. coinciding in content and figurative structure among different peoples, 2) partially equivalent, i.e. coinciding in content, but having different samples

(source) and 3) non-equivalent, i.e. not coinciding but in content and figurative structure.

As can be seen from the examples in some comparisons, the sources of comparison are the same objects in different languages (For example: *as coward as a hare*- *трусливый как заяц* - *qoyanday qorqak*; *as cunning as a fox*- *хитрая как лиса* - *tülkidey*). But there are comparisons in which the sources are completely different objects, this is due to extralinguistic factors. Comparisons of this nature are of the greatest interest for intercultural communication. Non-equivalent comparisons give an idea of the most striking differences in the cultures of different peoples.

For example: Russian expression “*голодный как волк*” in English corresponds *as hungry as a bear*, “*хладнокровный как лёд*” in English corresponds *as cool as a cucumber*, “*ведрами пьёт*” corresponds *as drunk as a lord*.

The phrase *as drunk as a lord* (*to drink like a lord*) for an English learner may seem incomprehensible and unexpected, and even offensive in relation to British nobles. But having appeared once, she reserved the right to exist. In English, there is another expression *A lord usually drank like a fish* reflecting the period of time when the lords, compared to young people of their circle, had a habit of drinking a lot and were distinguished by excessive alcohol consumption. In the expression *as cool as a cucumber*, the word *cool* has nothing to do with temperature, i.e. to the cold, it is associated with the temperament of a person (*cool* - collected), the word *cool* means collected, able to control himself. For example:

1. I only know the chap is as cool as cucumber. (J.Galsworthy).
2. Plans flashed in her mind like fireworks. He looked happy... feeling like the sun. (E.L.Doctorow).
3. There were great filamented spurts of jism that traced the air like bullets and settled slowly over Evelyn in her bed like falling ticker tape (E.L. Doctorow).



We consider examples in the Karakalpak language:

1. “Qoldan tigilgen kostyumlari tap qobizdın qabınday japsırılıp, olpı-solpı kishkenelikten etek beti ádewir tarılıp, qarnı ġarbız sıyaqlı dop-domalaq bolıp qalıptı”.

The given examples show that the comparison can be sociolinguistically conditioned, i.e. reflect the culture and realities of a particular people. In an example in the Karakalpak language, clothes are compared with a case for the national instrument qobiz.

In the works of English, Russian and Karakalpak writers, animals and birds are often sources of comparison. For example:

1. She was a stout powerful middle-aged woman with a face like a lion, foot like a rhino. (I. Murdoch).
2. He is as beautiful as a weather-cock (O.Wilde).
3. She thinks I am as mild as a kitten and as good-natured as the family-cow. (J.London).
4. Да старый старичок  
Худой как зайцы зимние... (Н. Некрасов)
5. Подушка, как лягушка  
Ускакала от грязнули. (К.И. Чуковский)
6. Altawı bir jerge jámlesip, arıslanday qoydı da jep tasladı.
7. Molla alaqlap, bizlerdın keshikkenimizge kúyip, tıshqan ańlıġan pıshıqtay, jalańlap otır eken.

Based on the foregoing, we can conclude that comparison is one of the most common expressive means that create imagery and expressiveness in a work of art.

Thus, a comparative study of stylistic devices is of great interest for research, since it shows common similar features in different languages of different peoples and cultures, despite the fact that they belong to different groups of languages (English - to the Germanic group, Russian - to the Slavic group and

the Karakalpak language - to the Turkic languages). On the other hand, a comparative study of stylistic devices makes it possible to see the distinctive, specific features inherent only in a given language, people or culture.

References:

1. Feldman D.N. Comparison as a linguo-stylistic means. In collection "Problems of Linguistics of Foreign Literature". Riga, 1978.
2. Vereshchagin V.M. Kostomarov V.G. Language and culture 4th edition. Moscow 1990.

