

To the Question of the History of Phraseological Units

Kimsanova Madina

Student of the Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan, Kokand

Article Information

Received: February 06, 2023

Accepted: March 07, 2023

Published: April 10, 2023

Keywords: *phraseological units, phraseological units, phraseological unions, phraseological combinations.*

ABSTRACT

This article reveals some classifications of phraseological units, and gives special differences between them, reveals the meaning of phraseological terms.

The term phraseology was introduced by the Swiss scientist C. Bally (1865-1947) in the meaning of "a section of stylistics that studies related combinations." In the future, the study of phraseology was widely developed in Russian linguistics in the 1940s-80s on the material of the predominantly Russian language. Phraseologism, phraseological unit, phraseological turnover are semantically indivisible, stable combinations of words, which are characterized by the constancy of a special integral meaning, component composition and fixation in the memory of the speaker.

The term "phraseological meaning" was proposed in 1964 by V.L. Arkhangelsky and A.V. Kunin independently of each other. The existence of phraseological meaning as a linguistic category is the subject of discussion among researchers of phraseology. According to the theory of equivalence, phraseological units are assigned a lexical meaning, since, apart from being separately formed, they do not differ significantly from words in lexical-semantic terms, or, in any case, have a meaning similar to the lexical meaning of a word. The nomination of the phenomena of reality by phraseological units is connected with the internal form of phraseological units, which reflects in the mind a holistic image of the situation. The internal form is a fundamental component of the semantics of a phraseological unit, because it (or rather its image) is a source of semantic motivation, cultural connotation, emotiveness, evaluativeness and stylistic characteristics of a phraseological unit. There are two main points of view on the concept of "phraseology".

According to the first, most common point of view, phraseology includes any verbal combination that has one degree or another of stability. The second point of view, formulated by S.I. Ozhegov, opens up opportunities for a narrower and therefore more precise definition of the

concept of the volume of phraseology as a special phenomenon of language. Representatives of a narrow understanding of the boundaries of phraseology exclude from the object of study of phraseology stable verbal complexes that are correlated with predicative units of the language, i.e. sentences, as well as proverbs, sayings, aphorisms, etc. In our work, we adhere to a broad understanding of the scope of phraseology. There are many classifications of phraseological units. The classification of phraseological units is quite widespread in terms of their semantic unity of the components of Acad. V.V. Vinogradov, who laid the foundation for the scientific development of phraseological units of the Russian language. According to this classification, all phraseological units from the point of view of the semantic unity of the components are divided into three categories: phraseological fusions, phraseological units and phraseological combinations.

Phraseological fusions are semantically indivisible turns, the meaning of which is completely independent of their lexical composition, of the meanings of their components. The number of adhesions includes such turns as beat the bucks, play the fool, rub the glasses, ate the dog, sharpen the hair, remember your name, in the middle of nowhere, etc. Among the phraseological fusions, the most clearly distinguished are turns that are easily opposed to free phrases of an equivalent composition: ate a dog, put a pig, wash the bones, bring under the monastery.

Phraseological unions, according to V.V. Vinogradov, are characterized by the absolute non-derivation of the value of the whole from the values of the constituent components. To phraseological unions V.V. Vinogradov also attributed such turns, in which individual components (significant and official) still retain echoes of their original former meaning, for example: do not cherish the soul, neither to the village nor to the city, to keep it with an iron fist, on the side of the burn, etc. The second category includes phraseological units, the general meaning of which follows from the meaning of the constituent parts. This category is called phraseological units, the vast majority of which was formed as a result of a metaphorical rethinking of free phrases: to shoulder, to see through, white crow, pawed goose, blood with milk, not far off. Not all phraseological units are distinguished by the same degree of semantic indecomposability. On the periphery of this category are turns that are not currently imposed on a free phrase. In their composition, at least one of the components is semantic, semantically marked, for example: "on a friendly footing" "in friendly relations", on an equal footing "as an equal with an equal".

There is a close interaction between unions and unities: unities are gradually reborn into unions. At the same time, the brighter and more expressive the inner form, the slower the process of such rebirth proceeds, and vice versa. Phraseological fusions have lost their inner form, therefore their meaning is holistic and unmotivated, in contrast to this, in phraseological units, the inner form is retained, easily understood, which is why the overall meaning is holistically motivated. Unions, unlike unities, contain various archaic elements. It is more difficult to assign any specific meaning to the components of a union than to the components of a unity. In addition, phraseological fusions can enter into synonymous relations with phraseological units of a different lexical direction. An example is the phraseologism "beat the buckets", which enters into synonymous relations with phraseological units: play the fool, chase the bum, spit on the ceiling, count the crows, based on this, you can see that the same meaning is assigned to different components in this situation.

To phraseological units V.V. Vinogradov counted proverbs, sayings, proverbial - proverbial expressions, such as: not to fat, I would live; Fedot, but not that one; there is no silver lining, etc. Thus, the category of phraseological units turned out to be heterogeneous in composition and degree of semantic solidarity. A special place belongs to phraseological combinations. These include reproducible phrases consisting of two significant words, one of which has an independent, and the other has a related meaning, for example: pay attention, fall into need, provide assistance. Phraseological combinations are qualitatively different from adhesions and

unities both in terms of structural organization and in a semantic sense: a) phraseological combinations have a fundamentally two-term structure (alphabet truth, crackling frost, reopen wounds); adhesions and unity often have a complex structure (stepping on a pet corn, inclining in all cases, etc.); b) words - components in the composition of phraseological combinations mainly convey an abstract meaning, which is why the phraseological combination as a whole acquires an abstract - analytical content (pay attention, cause anger, etc.); c) words - components easily realize and update their meaning, for example: "He made a good impression" and "The impression he made was good." Components of unions and unities are deprived of this possibility. Thus, many words with a phraseologically related meaning are gradually transformed into words with a free meaning; the components of fusions and unities become ordinary words only under special linguistic conditions. Consequently, a phraseological unit remains a phraseological unit until the intra-phrasal meaning of the component becomes generally accepted.

References

1. Yusufovna, Y. S. (2023). Phraseological units in the course of russian as a foreign language: on the issue of selection conditions and methods of study. *OpenAccessRepository*, 9(1), 193-197.
2. Юлдашева, С. Ю. (2021). Функционально-семантическое поле наречных фразеологизмов. *Мировая наука*, (12 (57)), 202-204.
3. Yusufovna, Y. S. (2022). The Phenomenon of Ambiguity in the Phraseological System of the Russian Language. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY*, 3(11), 165-169.
4. Юлдашева, С. Ю. (2022). Явление Синонимии Во Фразеологической Системе Русского Языка. *CentralAsianJournalofLiterature, PhilosophyandCulture*, 3(11), 296-299.
5. Мирзаянусова, З. И. (2015). Обогащение словарно-фразеологического запаса учащихся. In *Молодежь и наука: реальность и будущее* (pp. 423-424).