

FLORISTIC WORLD RELATED PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS: BASIC CONCEPTS

Mirzasobirov Muxriddin Adxamjon o‘g‘li

Farg‘ona davlat universiteti, Lingvistika (ingliz tili) 2-bosqich magistranti

Nurmatova Munisxon Mashrabovna

Farg‘ona davlat universiteti, ingliz tili kafedrası o‘qıtuvchisi

Yusupova Sabohat A‘zamjonovna

Farg‘ona Davlat Universiteti, ingliz tili kafedrası o‘qıtuvchisi

ABSTRACT

The following article discusses the primary concepts related to the phraseological units that reflect the floristic world and emphasizes the importance of the usage of such phraseological units in linguistics and human life in general. Moreover, the paper presents information on approaches to the study of floristic world related phraseological units and their characteristics.

Key words: phraseological units, phraseology, flora, floristic, phytonyms, concept, translation, connotative

Phraseology (from the Greek phrasis, “expression,” and logos, ‘teaching,’) is a branch of linguistics that analyzes the phraseological composition of a language (that is, the whole of all phraseological units). Although phraseological units are made up of numerous words, they are comparable to words in terms of meaning (the full phraseological unit, not its component words) and usage in speech (the phraseological unit is one of the sentences), hence they are studied under lexicology. A free phrase’s meaning is made up of the meanings of its constituent words, which may be swapped

out or substituted with terms that have similar meanings. A phraseological unit's meaning is not determined by the meanings of its constituent words, and the components of a phraseological unit are rarely interchangeable or replaceable.

An essential property of the structure is semantic integrity, component consistency, and structural consistency. Phraseological units are ready-made units in the language system; they are not formed during the speaking process, but are recovered from memory in a final state.

In modern linguistics, the practical, theoretical, cultural knowledge, and experience encoded in the language are now widely acknowledged and important. This scientific paradigm presents new problems in the study of language, necessitating new ways for describing it, as well as new approaches to analyzing its units, categories, and rules. Language is thought to be a powerful tool.

Plants are the universal emblem of the living earth and the cyclical process of birth, death, and rebirth in all civilizations. Plants represent life, the circle of life, sustenance, plenty, passivity, and immobility. So, in the process of investigating the phraseological units that represent the world's floristic image, it's vital to understand the particular and fundamental notions linked with this field of phraseology. The fact that the great majority of the analyzed units are anthropocentrically oriented, that is, they define one or more aspects of human existence and activity, determines the first point.

A metaphorical reinterpretation of the floristic component is also one approach to establish the phraseological meaning of units of a particular group. There is a replacement of classes, a weakening of differential semes, reflecting their general qualities, and a simultaneous actualization of prospective semes in their meaning throughout the metaphorization process. A nominative function is actively performed by floral metaphor. Many physical items' fundamental names are derived from it, including human and animal bodily parts, artifacts, and inanimate nature objects. Furthermore, the floristic metaphor generates a large number of secondary metaphorical names for people, animals, and inanimate objects that express a quality.

Evaluation, which is required, develops a qualitative attribute of a person, is one of the primary aspects of the phraseological meaning of floristic units. Researchers are now defining the nature of this category, its structure, the distinction of forms of evaluation, and the systematization of methods of expression in many ways, recognizing the status of an independent language category for evaluation. Indeed, even in the definition of the category, the issues of the category's relationship to modality, expressiveness, emotionality, and pragmatic potential, in other words, the problem of distinguishing it from borderline, that is, related categories and defining inventory actual estimated values, remain unclear enough. The evaluative connotation is subject to occasional changes under the influence of the context.

It's worth noting that the phraseological units linked with the floristic world serve as markers of the national worldview, allowing for the identification of the linguistic community's universal and distinctive characteristics. Phraseological units represent man's centuries-old observations of the world of flora, express people's attitudes toward this region of reality, and so serve as each language's cultural and national resource.

When discussing the process of floristic phraseological unit translation, it's vital to remember that semantic isomorphism between phraseological units should always be attained. As a result, resolving grammatical discrepancies between languages results in semantic-component isomorphism of speech meanings. The effect of eliminating systemic lexical-syntactic disparities between languages is semantic-referential isomorphism of speech. In the great majority of situations, full semantic isomorphism is only accomplished by using the combined technique of translation when translating floristic phraseological units from one language to another. Combined translation is the use of phraseological analogues, descriptive, lexical translation, and/or tracing to combine two or more forms of translation in the presence of phraseological matches. Certain shades of meaning may be lost if this is not done. Despite the presence of identical denotative (and, in some circumstances, connotative) features of meaning, the

two languages' phraseological units have differing text-forming potencies, resulting in the development of semantic analogues on occasion.

REFERENCES:

1. Alekseeva L.M., Mishlanova S.L. Metaphorical model "plant" in medical texts. // Anthropocentric approach to language. Sat. scientific works. Perm, 1998, 4.2, pp. 120-130.
2. Blinova Olga Iosifovna, Razina Anastasia Stepanovna Two-word phytonyms in linguoculturological coverage // Vestn. Volume. state university Cultural studies and art history. 2011. №1.
3. Gak V.G. On the typology of linguistic nominations. // Language nomination. General issues. Rep. ed. B.A. Serebrennikov and A.A. Ufimtsev. M., 1977. - S. 230-293.
4. J.Arnold I.V. The semantic structure of the word in modern English and the methodology for its study (on the material of the noun). Abstract Ph.D. thesis Sciences. - L., 1966. - 33 p.
5. Jackendoff R. Semantics and Cognition. Cambridge (Mass), 1993. -273 p.
6. Lakoff J., Johnson M. Metaphors we live by. Per. from English. / ed. and with a preface by A.N. Baranov. M.: Editorial URSS, 2004. - 252 p.
7. Azimjon Latifjon ogli Melikuziev. (2022). HISTORICAL AND MODERN CLASSIFICATION OF PARALINGUISTICS. *Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research*, 3(10), 126–128. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/UAH57>
8. Khakimov, M. K., & ugli Melikuziev, A. L. (2022). The History of Paralinguistic Researches. *International Journal of Culture and Modernity*, 13, 90-95.
9. ogli Melikuziev, A. L. (2022). HISTORICAL AND MODERN CLASSIFICATION OF PARALINGUISTICS. *Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research*, 3(10), 126-128.
10. Mukhammad, K. K., & ogli Melikuziev, A. L. (2022, December). THE ESSENCE OF NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION. In *INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES* (Vol. 1, No. 19, pp. 91-93).