

The Representation Of Numerative Units In The Phraseological Worldview: A Comparative Study Of English And Karakalpak Languages

Aimukhammetova Aziza Makhsetbaevna

Doctoral student of Nukus State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

Received: 18 March 2026; **Accepted:** 23 April 2026; **Published:** 20 May 2026

Abstract: This article investigates the representation of numerative units in the phraseological worldview of English and Karakalpak languages from a comparative linguocultural perspective. The study focuses on the symbolic, semantic, emotional, and cultural functions of numerals within phraseological units. Comparative, descriptive, semantic, and linguocultural methods were employed during the research. The findings demonstrate that numerals such as one, two, seven, and hundred function as important symbolic elements expressing unity, duality, exaggeration, emotional intensity, and cultural worldview. Furthermore, the analysis revealed both universal cognitive tendencies and ethnocultural peculiarities in English and Karakalpak phraseology.

Keywords: Phraseology, numerative units, symbolism, linguoculture, English language, Karakalpak language, comparative linguistics.

Introduction: Phraseology represents one of the richest and most expressive layers of language because it preserves historical memory, cultural experience, national mentality, and collective cognition within stable linguistic units. In modern linguistics, phraseological units are regarded not merely as combinations of words, but as complex semantic formations reflecting the worldview of a particular linguistic community. Consequently, phraseology has become an important field of interdisciplinary research connecting linguistics, cognitive science, ethnolinguistics, and cultural studies.

The theoretical foundations of phraseological studies were established by numerous scholars. In Russian linguistics, V. V. Vinogradov classified phraseological units according to their semantic cohesion and emphasized their indivisible figurative meaning. According to Vinogradov, phraseological expressions function as ready-made linguistic units whose meanings cannot be interpreted through the meanings of individual components alone [7, 296-304]. Similarly, A. V. Kunin considered phraseology a special subsystem of language characterized by semantic stability,

reproducibility, and expressive imagery [6, 143-148]. Furthermore, Charles Bally emphasized the emotional and stylistic value of phraseological expressions, arguing that phraseology reflects the national spirit and emotional culture of a people [1]. From a cognitive linguistic perspective, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson argued that metaphorical and symbolic structures shape human conceptualization of reality [5]. Therefore, phraseological units containing numerals should be understood not only as linguistic forms, but also as conceptual and cultural models organizing human experience. Likewise, Wilhelm von Humboldt viewed language as a reflection of national worldview, which means that phraseological symbolism reveals the cultural perception of reality within a linguistic community [4].

In Turkic linguistics, phraseological theory also occupies an important position. Karakalpak scholars describe phraseological units as stable figurative constructions possessing semantic integrity and emotional expressiveness [2, 157-161]. In particular, J. Eshbaev notes that phraseological combinations differ from ordinary word combinations because they form generalized figurative meanings and function as

semantically indivisible units [3].

Among the numerous structural components of phraseological units, numerative elements occupy a particularly important place. Numerals in phraseology frequently lose their direct quantitative meaning and acquire symbolic, metaphorical, evaluative, and emotional functions. Thus, numbers become instruments for expressing exaggeration, completeness, limitation, duality, morality, social relations, and emotional intensity.

Therefore, comparative analysis of numerative phraseological units makes it possible to identify both universal cognitive tendencies and culture-specific conceptual features.

Methodology

The present research employs several interconnected linguistic methods in order to investigate the representation of numerative units in English and Karakalpak phraseology. First of all, the descriptive method was applied to collect, classify, and systematize phraseological units containing numerals in both languages. English and Karakalpak examples were selected from phraseological dictionaries, literary texts, and linguistic studies. Consequently, the research corpus included phraseological units reflecting various semantic and cultural meanings of numerals.

Furthermore, the comparative method played a central role in the study because it enabled the identification of similarities and differences between English and Karakalpak phraseological systems. In particular, the analysis focused on structural organization, figurative meaning, symbolic interpretation, and stylistic function of numerative phraseological units. Thus, the study examined how identical numerals may express different cultural meanings in different linguistic communities.

In addition, semantic analysis was conducted in order to reveal how numerals lose their direct quantitative meaning and acquire metaphorical and symbolic functions within phraseological constructions. According to phraseological theory, stable expressions function as semantically indivisible units whose meanings cannot be interpreted through separate lexical components alone. Therefore, numerals were analyzed as symbolic elements contributing to the overall figurative meaning of phraseological units.

Moreover, contextual analysis was used to determine the communicative and emotional functions of phraseological expressions in discourse. Through this method, the research identified cases of exaggeration, evaluation, irony, emotional intensification, and cultural symbolism. At the same time, the

linguocultural approach allowed the researcher to interpret numerical symbolism in relation to folklore, traditions, social values, and collective worldview.

Finally, all collected examples were grouped according to their semantic and symbolic functions. Consequently, the integration of comparative, semantic, descriptive, and linguocultural methods ensured a comprehensive analysis of numerative phraseological units in English and Karakalpak languages.

Results

The comparative analysis demonstrated that numerative phraseological units in English and Karakalpak languages reflect not only quantitative meaning, but also cultural symbolism, emotional evaluation, and collective worldview. First of all, the research revealed that numerals in phraseology frequently lose their direct mathematical meaning and acquire metaphorical and expressive functions. Consequently, phraseological units with numerative components become important linguocultural markers representing social relations, emotional conditions, morality, and national mentality.

Furthermore, the numeral *bir* (“one”) occupies a particularly productive position in Karakalpak phraseology. Many expressions with *bir* symbolize unity, sameness, limitation, or psychological condition. For example, *bir pul bolıw* metaphorically means becoming weak, exhausted, or emotionally ruined, whereas *bir sazdırıń bózi bolıw* expresses sameness and uniformity among people. Similarly, *bir sóylew* refers to consistency and stability in speech or behavior, while *bir tutam bolıw* metaphorically describes becoming weak, thin, or physically exhausted. Additionally, expressions such as *bir tirnaqqa zar bolıw* reflect deep emotional desire or longing for a child. These examples demonstrate that the numeral *bir* often intensifies emotional and evaluative meanings in Karakalpak phraseology.

Likewise, English phraseological units containing the numeral *one* express uniqueness, individuality, or emotional limitation. Expressions such as *one in a million*, *one-sided argument*, and *at one’s wit’s end* illustrate semantic parallels with Karakalpak figurative constructions.

Moreover, the numeral *eki* (“two”) frequently symbolizes duality, contradiction, cooperation, hesitation, or emotional instability. In English phraseology, expressions like *two-faced*, *two heads* are better than one, and *kill two birds with one stone* represent hypocrisy, cooperation, and efficiency. Similarly, the Karakalpak dictionary contains numerous emotionally expressive examples involving *eki*. For

instance, eki kózi tórt bolıw means anxiously waiting for someone, while eki oyli bolıw expresses doubt or uncertainty. In addition, eki sóylew refers to lying or inconsistency in speech, whereas eki qolin kóteriw symbolizes surrender or submission. Another vivid example, bir oq penen eki qoyandı atıw, corresponds directly to the English expression kill two birds with one stone, emphasizing successful completion of two goals simultaneously.

The analysis additionally revealed several phraseological expressions connected with social behavior and emotional condition. For example, eki iyniniń jalı bolıw describes an arrogant or unpleasant person, while eki kózin almay refers to staring continuously at someone or something. Likewise, eki qat bolıw metaphorically means becoming pregnant, and eki qolli jaǵasında bolıw expresses fear, anxiety, or astonishment. Thus, the numeral eki functions as a powerful symbolic marker of psychological and interpersonal relations.

Furthermore, larger numerals and numerative imagery are actively used for exaggeration and stylistic intensification. English phraseological units such as a hundred times, thanks a million, and a thousand apologies strengthen emotional expressiveness. Similarly, Karakalpak expressions employ numerals metaphorically in order to intensify emotional coloring and figurative imagery.

Additionally, the phraseological material demonstrates that Karakalpak numerative expressions are closely associated with folklore traditions, oral discourse, and emotional evaluation. Many of the expressions possess vivid figurative imagery and semantic stability. According to the dictionary material, phraseological units function as indivisible semantic constructions whose meanings remain stable and cannot be interpreted literally. Therefore, numerals in phraseology serve not only grammatical or lexical purposes, but also symbolic and cultural functions.

Finally, the results confirmed that numerative phraseological units in English and Karakalpak languages reflect both universal cognitive tendencies and culture-specific conceptualizations. While certain numerical symbols such as one and two demonstrate universal meanings connected with unity and duality, other phraseological constructions preserve unique ethnocultural perceptions characteristic of each linguistic community.

Discussion. The comparative analysis demonstrated that numerative phraseological units play an important role in shaping the phraseological worldview of both English and Karakalpak languages. First of all, the study revealed that numerals in phraseology rarely preserve

only their direct quantitative meaning. Instead, they acquire figurative, symbolic, emotional, and evaluative functions. Therefore, numerative phraseological units should be interpreted as cultural and cognitive symbols reflecting collective worldview and national mentality.

Furthermore, the analysis showed that some numerical meanings are universal across linguistic cultures. For example, the numeral one in both English and Karakalpak phraseology often symbolizes unity, individuality, limitation, or concentration. Expressions such as one in a million and bir sóylew emphasize uniqueness and consistency. Similarly, the numeral two frequently reflects duality, contradiction, hesitation, or interpersonal relations. English phraseological units like two-faced and Karakalpak expressions such as eki sóylew both express negative evaluation connected with dishonesty and inconsistency. Consequently, these similarities indicate the existence of common cognitive mechanisms in human conceptualization.

At the same time, important ethnocultural differences were also identified. English phraseology generally demonstrates stronger tendencies toward communicative economy, idiomatic compression, and pragmatic expressiveness. In contrast, Karakalpak phraseological units preserve closer connections with folklore traditions, oral culture, and collective social experience. Expressions such as eki kózi tórt bolıw, bir tırnaqqa zar bolıw, and jeti qat jer contain vivid emotional and cultural imagery deeply rooted in traditional worldview.

Moreover, the research confirmed the semantic stability of phraseological constructions. According to the Karakalpak phraseological dictionary, phraseological units function as indivisible semantic structures whose components cannot easily be replaced. Therefore, numerals within phraseological units maintain fixed symbolic meanings and contribute significantly to figurative interpretation.

Finally, the study demonstrated that numerative phraseological units perform expressive, evaluative, symbolic, and cognitive functions simultaneously. Consequently, they represent not only linguistic phenomena, but also important linguocultural markers reflecting the historical experience, emotional perception, and conceptual worldview of English and Karakalpak speech communities.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the comparative analysis of numerative phraseological units in English and Karakalpak languages demonstrated that numerals occupy an important position in the phraseological worldview of both linguistic cultures. Although numbers originally function as quantitative indicators, within

phraseological structures they acquire figurative, symbolic, emotional, and evaluative meanings. Therefore, numerative phraseological units should be regarded not merely as linguistic combinations, but also as reflections of collective cognition, cultural traditions, and national mentality.

Furthermore, the study revealed that both English and Karakalpak languages employ numerals to express concepts such as unity, duality, exaggeration, emotional intensity, hesitation, social evaluation, and psychological condition. For instance, the numeral one frequently symbolizes uniqueness or unity, whereas the numeral two often reflects contradiction, cooperation, or instability. Similarly, larger numerals such as hundred and thousand are commonly used to intensify emotional and stylistic expressiveness.

At the same time, the research identified important ethnocultural differences between the two phraseological systems. English phraseology tends to demonstrate pragmatic compression and communicative economy, while Karakalpak phraseological units preserve stronger connections with folklore traditions, oral speech culture, and traditional worldview. Expressions such as *eki kózi tórt bolıw*, *bir pul bolıw*, and *bir tırnaqqa zar bolıw* illustrate the emotional richness and symbolic depth characteristic of Karakalpak phraseology.

Moreover, the study confirmed that phraseological units possess semantic stability and indivisible figurative meaning. Consequently, numerals within phraseological structures become fixed symbolic components contributing to the overall imagery and cultural significance of expressions.

Finally, the research proved that numerative phraseological units function as important linguocultural markers transmitting historical experience, social values, emotional perception, and collective worldview from generation to generation. Thus, the investigation of numerative symbolism in phraseology contributes significantly to comparative linguistics, cognitive linguistics, ethnolinguistics, and intercultural communication studies.

References

1. Bally, C. (1921). *Traité de stylistique française* (Vol. 2). C. Winter
2. Bazarbaevna, A. G. (2026, February). SANLIQLAR MENEN KELGEN FRAZELOGIZMLERDE MILLIY ÚRPÁDET, DÁSTÚRLERDİN SÁWLELENIWI. In *Conferences* (Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 157-161).
3. Eshbaev, J. *Qaraqalpaq tiliniń qısqasha frazeologiyalıq sózligi*. Nókis: Qaraqalpaqstan baspası, 1985.

4. Humboldt, V. V. (1985). *Language and philosophy of culture*. M.: Progress, 452.
5. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: Univ. Press, Chicago/IL.
6. Zerkina, N., & Kostina, N. (2015). English phraseology in teaching: Interrelation of theory and practice. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 143-148.
7. Пушкина, К. В., & Николаева, Н. В. (2017). Сопоставительный анализ фразеологических единиц с соматическим компонентом в английском, русском и чувашском языках. *Вестник Чувашского университета*, (2), 296-304.