PHRASEOLOGY IS A SPECIFIC BRANCH OF LINGUISTICS

Visola Samadova
Assistant Teacher of Termiz State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract

In this article is discussed phraseology as a language subsystem both in Russia and Uzbek linguists. The article also gives information about the periods of development of phraseology.

Keywords: subsystem, approach, phraseologiques, idioms, semi-idioms, phraseological units, idiomacity

Introduction

Phraseology is a language subsystem and area that was actively studied in the second half of the twentieth century both in Russian studies and in Uzbek linguistics, which is reflected in the works of V.V.Vinogradov, S.I.Ozhegova, V.L.Arkhangelskiy, V.P.Zhukova, A.I.Molotkova, V.N.Telia, M.M.Kopylenko, Z.D.Popova, V.M.Mokienko, N.M.Shanskiy, A.N.Tikhonova, A.M.Bushuya, E.A.Malinovskiy, T.A.Bushui, N.A.Semenova, M.I.Umarkhodzhayeva, L.I.Rozeison, A.N.Tikhonova, Sh.Rakhmatullayeva, M.A.Sadykova and many others.

Phraseology (from "way of speaking" and "study of") is a scholarly approach to language which developed in the twentieth century. It took notion of locutions phraseologiques entered Russian lexicology and lexicography in the 1930s and 1940s and was subsequently developed in the former Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries. From the late 1960s on it established itself (East) German linguistics but was also sporadically approached in English linguistics. The earliest English adaptations of phraseology are Weinreich (1969) within the approach of transformational grammar, Arnold (1973) ,and Lipka (1992). In Great Britain as well as other Western European countries, phraseology has steadily been developed over the last twenty years. The activities of the European Society of Phraseology (EUROPHRAS) and the European Association for Lexicography (EURALEX) with their regular conventions and publications attest to the prolific European interest in phraseology. European scholarship in phraseology is more active than in North America. Bibliographies of recent studies on English and general phraseology are included in Welte (1990) and specially collected in Cowie & Howarth (1996) whose bibliography is reproduced and continued on the internet and provides a rich source of the most recent publications in the field[7].

As to phraseological units they have the definite program of functioning which is predetermined by their essence itself. Some functions are constant, for example, inherent in all phraseological units in any conditions of their realization, other functions are variable, peculiar only to some classes of phraseological units. Communicative, cognitive and nominative functions refer to the constant functions.

The communicative function of phraseological units as their ability to serve as communicative or message means. Communication presupposes a mutual exchange of statements, and message presupposes the transfer of information without feedback with the reader or the listener.

"The process of cognition also includes such forms of cognitive activity", Cognitive and nominative functions are realized within the limits of communicative function, forming a dialectic unity, and all other functions are realized within the limits of the given functions. The hierarchy of the functional aspect of the phraseological system is shown in it[8].

There is a certain divergence of opinion as to the essential features of phraseological units as distinguished from other word-groups and the nature of phrases that can be properly termed "phraseological units". The habitual terms "set-phrases", "idioms", "word-equivalents" are sometimes treated differently by different linguists. However these terms reflect to certain extend the main debatable points of phraseology which centre in the divergent views concerning the nature and essential features of phraseological units as distinguished from the so-called free word-groups.

The term "set expression" implies that the basic criterion of differentiation is stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure of word-groups. The term "word-equivalent" stresses not only semantic but also functional inseparability of certain word-groups, their compatibility to function in speech as single words.

The term "idioms" generally implies that the essential property of the linguistic units under consideration is idiomaticity or lack of motivation. Uriel Weinreich expresses his view that an idiom is a complex phrase, the meaning of which cannot be derived from the meanings of its elements. He developed a more truthful supposition, claiming that an idiom is a subset of a phraseological unit. Ray Jackendoff and Charles Fillmore offered a fairly broad definition of the idiom, which, in Fillmore's words, reads as follows:"...an idiomatic expression or construction is something a language user could fail to know while knowing everything else in the language". Chafe also lists four features of idioms that make them anomalies in the traditional language unit paradigm: non-compositionality, transformational defectiveness, ungrammaticality and frequency asymmetry.

The term "idiom", both in this country and abroad, is mostly applied to phraseological units with completely transferred meanings, that is, to the ones in which the meaning of the whole unit does not correspond to the current meanings of the components.

According to the type of meaning phraseological units may be classified into:

-Idioms;

-Semi-idioms;

-Phraseological units.

Idioms are phraseological units with a transferred meaning. They can be completely or partially transferred (red tape).

Semi-idioms are phraseological units with two phraseosemantic meanings: terminological and transferred (chain reaction, to lay down the arms).

Phraseomatic units are not transferred at all. Their meanings are literal.

Other types of phraseological units are also distinguished:

-Phrases with a unique combination of components (born companion)

-Phrases with descriptive meaning;

-Phrases with phraseomatic and bound meaning (to pay attention to);

-Set expressions (clichés) (the beginning of the end);

-Preposition-noun phrases (for good, at least;)

-Terminological expressions (general ticket, civil war).

Semantic complexity is one of the only the most essential most essential qualities of phraseological units. It's resulted from the complicated interaction of the component meanings (meaning of prototype, of semantic structure etc.)

Phraseological meaning contains background information[9]. It covers only the most essential features of the object it nominates. It corresponds to the basic concept, to semantic nucleus of the unit. It is the invariant of information conveyed by semantically complicated word combinations and which is not derived from the lecical meanings of the conjoined lexical components.

According to the class the word-combination belongs to, it is singled out:

-idiomatic meaning;

-idiophraseomatic meaning;

-phraseomatic meaning.

The information conveyed by phraseological units is thoroughly organized and is very complicated. It is characterized by:

1) multilevel structure;

2) structure of a field (nucleus+periphery);

3) block-schema.

It contains 3 macro-components which correspond to a certain type of information they convey;

-the grammatical block;

-the phraseological meaning proper;

-motivational macro-component (phraseological imagery; the inner form of the phraseological unit; motivation).

Phraseological unit is a non-motivated word-group that cannot be freely made up in speech but is reproduced as a ready made unit.

Reproducibility is regular use of phraseological units in speech as single unchangeable collocations. Idiomacity is the quality of phraseological unit, when the meaning of the whole is not deducible from the sum of the meanings of the parts.

Stability of a phraseological unit implies that it exists as a ready-made linguistic unit which does not allow of any variability of its lexical components of grammatical structure. Phraseology is one of the sources of vocabulary enlargement and enrichment. It is the most colourful part of vocabulary system, and it describes the peculiar vision of the world by this speaking community. It reflects the history of the nation, the customs and traditions of the people speaking the language. Phraseology forms a special subsystem in the vocabulary system. The units of the subsystem are called differently: phraseological units, phraseologisms, set expressions, idioms. The classification which will be distributed here is found on the fact that phraseology is regarded as a self-contained branch of linguistics and not as a part of lexicology.

Phraseological units are not modeled according to regular linguistic patterns, they are reproduced ready-made, e.g.to read between this lines, a hard nut to crack. Each phraseological unit represents a word group with a unique combination of components, which make up a single specific meaning. The integral meaning of the phraseological units is not just a combination of literal meanings of the components. The meaning is not reduced to the mere sum of their meanings. Phraseological units are defined as stable word groups with a specialized meaning of the whole. The meaning can be partially or completely transferred. Some features are usually stressed by this definition:

-Stability, the basic quality of all phraseological units. The usage of phraseological units is not subject to free variations, and grammatical structure of phraseological units is also stable to a certain extent, e.g., we say "red tape", but not "red tapes". Phraseological meaning may be motivated by the meaning of components, but not confined. Stability makes phraseological units more similar to words, rather than free word combinations. Correct understanding of the units depends on the background information.

-Idiomaticity, the quality of a phraseological unit, when the meaning of the whole is not deducible from the sum of the meanings of the parts.

-Reproducibility is a regular use of phraseological units in speech as single unchangeable collocations.

In his classification V.V.Vinogradov developed some points which were first advanced by Swiss linguist Charles Bally. The classification is based on the motivation of the unit, i.e., the relationship existing between the meaning of the whole and the meaning of its parts. The degree of motivation is correlated with the rigidity, indivisibility, and semantic unity of the expression, i.e., with the possibility of changing the form or the order of components, and of substituting the whole by a single word. According to the type motivation three types of phraseological units are suggested: phraseological combinations, phraseological unities, and phraseological fusions.

Phraseological combinations are partially motivated, they contain one component used in its direct meaning while the other is used figuratively: meet the demand, meet the necessity, meet the requirements. In this group of phraseological units some substitutions are possible which do not destroy the meaning of metaphoric element. More examples: to attain success, to have success, to lose success. These substitutions are not synonymical and the meaning of the whole changes, while the meaning of the noun success and the verb meet are kept intact.

Phraseological unities are much more numerous. They are partially non-motivated. Their meaning can usually be perceived through the metaphoric meaning of the whole phraseological unit, e.g., to stick (to stand) to one's guns-to refuse to change one's statements or opinions in the face of opposition, implying courage and integrity.

Phraseological fusions are completely non-motivated word-groups representing the highest degree of blending together, e.g., tit for tat. The meaning of components is components is completely absorbed by the meaning of the whole, by its expressiveness and emotional properties. Phraseological fusions are specific for every language and do not lend themselves to literal translation into other languages, e.g., white elephant-expensive but useless thing.

References:

1. Федуленкова Т.Н. Английская фразеология: Курс лекций. – Архангельск, 2000

2. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь.-М.:1967.

3. Барабаш Т. А.Грамматика английского языка.-М.:Высшая школа, 1983.

4. Dictionary of Familiar Quotations.-London:Tophi Books, cop. 2019.-256 p

5. Kulgavova L.V. Systemic meanings of words vs.speaker's subjective senses(paradigmatic aspect)/L.V.Kulgavova//Modern Science.-2019.- № 9-1. – P. 218-220.

6. Soft Hearts and Hard Feet.-URL: https://www.bibleinoneyear.org/bioy /commentary/943 (дата обращения: 25.09.2019).

7. Samadova V. LINGUOCULTUROLOGY AS A MODERN BRANCH OF GENERAL LINGUISTICS // Интернаука. – 2021. – №. 18-4. – С. 46-47.

8. SAMADOVA V.B.Q. Ter S. U. SPEECH FORMULAS AND VARIABLES IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES.

9. Visola SAMADOVA ANTONYMY IN PHRASEOLOGY//World Bulletin of Social Sciences Том: 27 С.162-164.