

INTERPRETATIONAL ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Shukurova Zakhro Farxodovna

teacher of English theory and practice department
of Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the interpretational analysis of phraseological units. Furthermore, given paper briefly defines and provides explanations to some of the phraseological linguistic units in different contexts.

Keywords: idioms, phraseological units, phraseologism, stabilization, lexemes, lexical associations, phraseological meaning.

The phraseological unit as a stable combination of words with a fully or partially figurative meaning is an extremely complex many-sided language unit. Stability and figurativeness are intrinsic features of any phraseological unit in all its innumerable varied representations in discourse. For purposes of analysis, it is essential not only to have a clear idea of the concept of the phraseological unit as a separate entity, but also to establish terms for denoting various types of form of the phraseological units and to reflect their meaning and function.

Idioms cannot be seen only as a separate part of a linguistics, that can be used, or not used, because they form an essential part of a general dictionary of both languages. At present, it is very important to monitor the replenishment of the Uzbek and English phraseological fund, because idioms appear at great speed, which is due to the development of branches of science, the introduction of new technologies, political games and military conflicts, the influence of which is also essential for English and Uzbek people. At present, the formation of idioms is important by rethinking stable phrases of a non-idiomatic nature, i.e., terminological combinations from the field of science, technology, sports. Such combinations are easily metaphorizable and as a result of figurative-metaphorical use obtain stable meaningful values, gradually acquiring all signs of idioms, adding their structures.

Phraseological units such as “**Pul pulni topar, vaqting ketdi – naqding ketdi**” are interpreted on the basis of the specific meanings of the lexemes they contain, and they are also perceived in the form of a free link. Free association and figurativeness in the phraseological unit formed on this basis is the motivational (logical) basis, the criterion that maintains the connection between them. The phraseological units “**no**

money – no swiss, your money or your life” form a phraseological meaning based on the semantic transformation of the free link. The phraseological units **“easy come - easy go, money begets money”** are also phraseologized on the basis of the semantic transformation of the free link. Compounds like “mad money, make a killing” are not based on free connections, they are not perceived as free connections, it is practically impossible to perform actions like **“make a buck, sock away, pony up, spend a fortune”** in human activity. In this case, the use of a phrase in a non-specific way, on the basis of semantic transformation, forms a meaning specific to the phraseological unit. That is, links that are not interpreted on the basis of the lexeme specific meanings in the context, that do not take into account the lexeme-specific lexical meanings, appear in compounds. The meaning inherent in such phraseological units represents a meaning contrary to the meaning of the lexemes in the structure. The meaning in the phraseological units ‘square accounts, squirrel away’ is not explained on the basis of the meanings specific to the lexemes in these links, the meanings specific to the phraseological unit are formed due to semantic transformation. The factor that connects them with free connections is semantic transformation and imagery.

Hence, the differential criterion that distinguishes phraseological units from free association is semantic transformation and imagery. First of all, it should be noted that in the process of phraseologization, the meaning of free connection changes. The compound **“take up a collection”** is derived from the mutually compatible spiritual combination of the ‘take up’ and ‘collection’ lexemes that make them up only in the form of a free binding, retaining their lexical meanings and acquiring a meaning that represents the action associated with gathering or taking up a collection. This creates a meaning that can be interpreted on the basis of lexeme-specific meanings. In the process of phraseologization, the meaning of the free link is completely changed, and the meaning of **“gathering money or goods for charitable purposes”**, which is not specific to the lexemes in it, is formed. Phraseologisms are therefore divided into types such as interpretable and unexplained on the basis of lexeme-specific meanings. Therefore, what language factors are the basis for the formation of phraseological meaning. First of all, it should be noted that the free connection and the phraseology formed on this basis are figuratively connected. Image is a motivational (logical) basis and a criterion that maintains the connection between them.

In phraseology, this or that action, the reflection of the event, the image must be embodied. Phraseologization is not only a linguistic phenomenon, but also a product of the development of the human mind and should be considered as a linguistic-philosophical phenomenon. It is also present in philosophical observation in the process of phraseologization. The recognition of a lexeme as a linguistic unit and as a linguistic phenomenon has left no one in traditional linguistics in doubt. H. Nematov

and R. Rasulov¹ state that the main feature of a lexeme is its "readiness", that is, it is not artificial. Indeed, lexemes denote and express things, signs, quantities, actions, states, and features in reality, and are distinguished by their readiness for all members of society. It should be noted that the phraseological units have undergone a process of interconnection, syntactic relations, until they become stagnant in the language and become intelligible to the owners of the language that represents a particular meaning. This process takes place in speech.

The process of stabilization and willing participation in speech as a unit of language is the second stage in the formation of phraseological units. Hence, phraseological units functioned to participate in the speech process even before they became a linguistic phenomenon. So far, there is no consensus among linguists in determining the scope of phraseological units. Most linguists include in the scope of phraseology all stable compounds - proverbs, sayings, idiomatic compounds, non-idiomatic combinations of words, stable phraseological groups and pairs of words, and believe that the common feature that unites them is stability and readiness in language.

Such an approach makes it possible to consider all lexical units that have a portable meaning as a whole as phraseological units and expands the phraseological object. In Uzbek linguistics, two semantic types of phrases, such as phraseological integrity and phraseological confusion, are distinguished on the basis of the relationship between the meaning understood from the phrase as a whole and the meanings of the lexemes in it. A phrase that is not interpreted on the basis of the specific meanings of the lexemes in its structure, which do not take into account the lexical meanings specific to these lexemes, is called a phraseological confusion.

Linguists such as A.N. Kononov², E.I. Ubryatova, N.A. Baskakov, considering that phraseological units are functionally close to words, recognize them as lexical word combinations or lexical units (lexical associations). E.V. Sevortyan³ considers phraseological units as lexematic compounds or closed compounds with lexical meaning. Researchers' recognition of lexical phrases makes it necessary to determine the relationship of phraseological units to lexemes. Phraseological units are interpreted as lexical units in most definitions. Since lexical units are dates, they must also have lexical meaning. In the scientific literature, fixed word combinations include different types of compound words, lexemic phrases, grammaticalized phrases, phraseological combinations. Some scientific works classify idioms of lexical-phraseological type, i.e., phraseological units with specific lexical meaning, as well as idioms of pure phraseological type, all phraseological units without specific lexical meaning.

¹ H. Nematov, R. Rasulov. O'zbek tili sistem leksikologiyasi asoslari. Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1995

² A.N. Kononov. Zarubejnaya Tyurkologiya. Moscow: Nauka, 1986

³ E.V. Sevortyan. Etymological Dictionary of Turkic Languages. Moscow: Nauka, 1978

However, observations suggest that phraseological units may not have a specific lexical meaning. But the idea that these meanings are expressed explicitly in one place and more abstractly in another is close to the truth. As Polish linguist K.M.Gyulumyants stated: “One of the reasons for the transition of free compounds to stable compounds is the process of lexicalization”. In lexemes in the field of phraseology, we say that the semantic meanings of the individual components of a compound gradually become imperceptible, and that the phrases have a common meaning that overlaps the meanings of the compound parts.

As we recognize, the meaning of phraseological integrity derives from the general meaning of the lexical meanings of the units within it, and they are an alternative to a particular lexeme that exists in the language. Thus, the meaning understood from phraseological units is not merely a sum of the lexical meanings peculiar to the words they contain, but manifests itself as a superlative meaning, and at the same time as a figurative meaning. This is also observed in the lexicalization process. Even in the process of lexicalization, the lexemes in the compound lose their independence. In the process of phraseology and lexicalization, not one word, but a compound and two or more lexemes are involved in its composition. Due to the phenomena of phraseology and lexicalization, new derivative meanings emerge. They can also be lexical units that are considered alternatives to completely new or existing lexemes and also perform a function in speech. The formation of phraseological units is also a speech process, which is called **phraseologization**, and it should be noted that this process has much in common with the phenomenon of lexicalization.

Recently, in the works devoted to the problems of phraseology, there are allegations that the words included in the phraseological unit, in many attitudes or even completely lose their word status. Now we can call them components, although more recently they were called more cautiously – words-components. Using the term “component” we argue that the elements of a phraseological unit are not considered as words. This proof was preceded by the works claiming that the components of a phraseological unit are completely or partially devoid of categorical features of the word and, first of all, their separately lexical meaning. Since, the phraseological units related to meaning is a semantic phenomenon, the ways of its occurrence, naturally, should be sought in the action of the semantic laws of the language, in the change of the meanings of words, as well as in their compatibility with each other. There are turns in which one of the components has phraseological related meaning, which manifests itself only in connection with a strictly defined range of concepts and their verbal designations.

Moreover, for such a restriction, emphasized by V.Vinogradov, as if there are no grounds in the logical or real nature of the designated objects, actions, phenomena

(V. Vinogradov, 1953). These restrictions are created by the laws of the connection of verbal meanings inherent in a given language. Such combinations are not equivalent to words, since the same component in different distributions has different meanings: for example, for my money, money talks in the Uzbek language, such as “to‘qqiz puldek qilib tushuntirib bermoq” (meaning: explanation in details) (SH. Rakhmatullayev¹, 2003). In the given example from the Uzbek language in the first case, the word “pul” has a particular meaning.

Based on the assumption that phraseology studies the compatibility of lexemes of all types, we conducted a study of compatibility of lexemes denoting the concept of a monetary unit in English and Uzbek, which made Sh. Rakhmatullayev on some issues of Uzbek historical lexicology (2003). It becomes possible to draw conclusions regarding the characteristic properties of the phraseological systems of the two mentioned languages. There is no doubt that the problem of meaning in language is the most controversial issue among linguists and researchers. Since we study phraseology as an independent linguistic discipline which began its existence, another discussion has begun in the linguistic world, and dedicated to the difference in lexical meaning and phraseological meaning.

The fact is that the complexity of lexical semantics and the diversity of semantic classes of words do not exclude the selection of the lexical meaning of a word, which allows us to establish the diversity of this meaning. A similar principle is observed in the field of phraseology. The fact that a semantic feature of phraseological meaning is highlighted makes it possible to establish its main varieties: the idiomatic meaning, the idio-phraseological meaning and the phraseological meaning in accordance with the three classes of phraseological units (A.V. Kunin, 1966). These meanings are included in the phraseological microsystem of the language and provide an opportunity to find out their varieties in accordance with the semantic features of the phraseological units characteristic of each class of phraseological units.

We adhere to a very productive idea put forward by a linguist and that the phraseological sense can not be realized without the existence of certain structures, that is, it is impossible to study the features of phraseological units with “money” component without knowing their structure. Obviously, determining the status of a phraseological is very important, because it will prevent some authors from substituting the concept of these terms, will prevent them from seeing “phraseological meaning” at all semantic levels of the language, including the lexical level. As it is, the specificity of a phraseological meaning is established on a purely semantic basis without due regard for phraseological units with a monetary component and its structural features.

¹ Sh. Rakhmatullayev. Etymological Dictionary of the Uzbek Language. Tashkent: University, 2003

Although phraseological units exist within the boundaries of certain structures, all the specific features of the phraseological meaning can not be deduced only to the relationship between the meaning and its structure. It is known that monostructural constructions can differ in their meaning.

REFERENCES:

1. Shukurova Z. F., Innovative methods and their role in teaching foreign languages, 2021. Образование и наука в XXI веке (ISSN 2658-7998);
2. Michael McCarthy, Felicity O'Dell. English Idioms in Use. Cambridge University Press, 1994. -p.6;
3. N.M. Shanskiy. Lexics and Phraseology of Modern Russian Language. Manual for part-time students. Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1957;
4. P.A. Cowie. Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990;
5. R.W. Gibbs. Why idioms are not dead metaphors. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993;
6. R.W. Langacker. Grammar and Conceptualization. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000;
7. V.A. Kabulianskiy, K.G. Savelyeva. Concise dictionary of modern English Idioms. Moscow: Astrel, 2007;
8. Y. Treis. Names of Khoisan languages and their variants; Language, Identity and Conceptualization among the Khoisan. Koln: Rudiger Koppe, 1998;
9. Z. Saliyeva, L. Nurboyev. The Dictionary of English-Uzbek Proverbs. LAP Lambert: Academic Publishing, 2011;
10. A.M. Joodi. A study of the problems of learning and translating Idioms. Journal of College Education for Women, Vol 3, 2012;
11. E. P. Kazakova. Ways to Enhance the transparency of the internal form of the Phraseology of the English business discourse, 2012;
12. Akhmanova, M. O. Lexicology. Theory and Method. Moscow: Visshaya Shkola, 1972;
13. L. L. Nelyubin Explanatory translation dictionary. Home. "Languages of the World". ... M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2003. -- P. 320;
14. Telia, V.I. Metaphorization and its role in the creation of a linguistic picture of the world. Moscow, 1982.