LINGUOCULTUROLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SEMANTIC FEATURES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Tamara Kavilova, Yulduz Abdurazzoqova
JSPI, Jizzakh, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Summary: The comparative analysis of phraseological expressions of Russian and English languages with semantic components made it possible to clearly imagine how diverse they are in their semantics and expressiveness.The theoretical analysis showed that a phraseological unit is a vivid figurative expression with a rethought semantics of its components, the originality of which is based on various grammatical, lexical, semantic dependencies between them, and the specificity of phraseological meaning is determined by the properties of words - lexical components of a phraseological unit, and internal phraseological connections.

Keywords: phraseological units, structural-semantic analysis, significative-denotative component, semes.

INTRODUCTION

The issues of semantics of phraseological units have recently attracted more and more attention of researchers of phraseology. Along with the problems of the general theory of phraseological semantics, a number of issues related to the semantic categories of phraseological units are being solved, including the problem of the semantic organization of phraseological units.

Grading and measuring the semantic complexity of phraseological units is an underdeveloped problem. As is known, the phraseological units of each of the compared languages are characterized by unequal complexity of semantics. Only a part of phraseological units is identified by individual lexemes, while most of them can be defined only with the help of a phrase, a detailed description. Each phraseological unit is characterized by a specific set of meaning units, minimal semantic components - seme, integral and differential. If integral semes are the most general and serve as the basis for combining phraseological units into certain phraseological-semantic groups and subgroups, then differential semes are additional semantic features and reflect secondary properties and characteristics of the designated phenomenon.

Phraseological meaning is an exceptionally complex phenomenon and, of course, it can in no way be considered as a mechanical sum of its constituent components. The semantic structure of a phraseological unit can be represented as a microsystem, all elements of which are in close connection and interdependence with each other. The semantic originality of

phraseological units lies in the specificity of the combination of seme. Thus, semes act not only as constituents of the main semantic components of phraseological units, but also as links between them. They are the minimum units of the semantics of phraseological units and perform a sense-determining or sense-forming function. If, when comparing phraseological units, the allocation of minimal semantic components comes to the fore, then when comparing phraseological subgroups, consideration of the phraseological-semantic paradigm comes to the fore. As a result of the comparison, a set of semantic components is revealed that determine the features of the semantics of phraseological units selected for analysis in English and Russian.

Integral semes act as general ones that determine the possibility of including one or another phraseological unit in a certain phraseological-semantic subgroup and serve as the basis for combining and comparing the meanings of the phraseological units under consideration. Differential semes are identified on the basis of a comparison of phraseological units that are included in only one phraseological-semantic subgroup, and are of a particular nature. Comparative analysis is aimed at identifying fundamental similarities or differences in the seme organization of the phraseological meaning of the studied units in English and Russian. Now let's move on to the definition of the significative-denotative and connotative components of the phraseologicalunits. "Under the denotative component of the meaningwe understand the part of the meaning of the sign, reflecting in a generalized form the objects and phenomena of extralinguistic reality. The denotative component is based on a concept that characterizes an extralinguistic object. So, already in the very definition of denotation, a clear indication is given of the relationship between two complex and contradictory phenomena - meaning and concept. (The question of their relationship and differentiation is still the subject of study by a number of scientists). According to this definition, it is through the concept that the denotative component of meaning correlates with extralinguistic reality. The concept, according to the Leninist theory of reflection, reflects reality in all the diversity of its manifestations. In turn, the significative component of the meaning "corresponds to the complex of features that make up the content of the concept."

Further, it should be noted that "the concept ... does not include all the countless signs of a defined kind of objects (in our study of the properties and manifestations of the human personality), but only those that are recognized by society as essential and generalized." From this point of view, a more detailed consideration of certain phraseological and semantic subgroups of phraseological units is of interest in order to determine the identities and differences in the concepts expressed by the phraseological units of the English and Russian languages, due to purely extralinguistic factors.

Defining the significative-denotative component of the phraseological meaning, it is necessary to note the fact that, according to modern ideas, it, reflecting the complexity of the concept expressed by the phraseological unit, can include both integral and differential semes.

However, highlighting the integral and differential semes that form the significative-denotative meaning of phraseological units, it is also necessary to single out semes that determine the connotative meaning of phraseological units, "since the formation of phraseological units in the language system is primarily due to the fact that they perform an

expressive function (except for nominative and communicative) , the act of indirect nomination is complicated by the estimated characteristics of the object of the nomination" . In other words, the unity of the rational and the emotional in thinking and language is directly reflected in the significative-denotative and connotative components of meaning.

The high significance of the connotative-pragmatic aspect in phraseological semantics is largely due to the two-dimensional nature of the semantic structure of all phraseological units. built on figurative rethinking. At the same time, the connotative-pragmatic aspect acts as a result of the interaction of both plans in the meaning of phraseological units - deactualized concrete-objective and actual figuratively rethought. This interaction (and the corresponding measure of evaluation and expressiveness) is the more intense, the more clearly the two planes contradict each other.

The expressive component is decoded in dictionary definitions with the help of intensives, i.e. lexical units (expressing a greater degree of a feature compared to the norm. Intensives, as a rule, are adverbs (especially adverbs of degree), adjectives, nouns or verbs containing seme "intensity" or having an amplifying element in their semantics (expressives according to N. A. Lukyanova), for example: be at (deadly) feud with srnh — «смертельно враждовать, быть на ножах с кем-л.»; full (stewed) to the gitts — «мертвецки пьян»; make the most of smth— «использовать что-л. наилучшим образом, максимально»; not to have a shirt to one's back — «впасть в крайнюю нищету»; соль земли — «самое главное, самое ценное, самое важное»; золотой (денежный) мешок —«очень богатый человек»; гол как сокол — «страшно беден»; сгонять семь потов с кого — «изнурять, изматывать тяжелой работой».

Thus, the meaning intensifier can be expressed explicitly or implicitly, i.e. "veiled". In some cases, when analyzing phraseological-semantic subgroups, in order to identify an expressive component, it is advisable to resort to identifying semantic oppositions in which one of the phraseological units contains a more pronounced feature than the other. And, finally, the last component of connotation - functional and stylistic, testifies to the belonging of a phraseological unit to a particular style of speech, its prevalence and usage.

Most researchers distinguish 3 classes of phraseological units depending on the predominant scope of their use: bookish, colloquial and neutral or interstyle.

Book phraseological units include phraseological units that are predominantly or exclusively used in written speech, i.e. in poetic, journalistic, scientific, official business areas of communication, etc., for example: отойти в вечность, lit.— в значении «умереть»; the world, theflesh and the devil, lit.— «стремление к удовольствиям, чувственные наслаждения, порочные наклонности»;serve God and Mammon, lit.— «служить богу и мамоне».

The structure of phraseological units with the "head" component:

- Unimodal: – off the top of one's head – lit. сверху до головы (быстро, недумая, спонтанно) ; to eat one's head off – lit.. съесть с головы (поедать, сколько душе угодно);headsup! – lit.. голову вверх! – берегись! (предупреждение, что что-то падает);flat–headed – плоскоголовый;weakheaded – lit.. слабоголовый (слабоумный);aheadcase –lit.. блок в голове (безумный, сумасшедший);hophead –

пьяница, пропащий

- Bimodal: – king Charles's head – голова короля Карла (навязчивая идея или предмет); carry head to Newcastle – нести голову в Ньюкасл (ср. «в Тулу со своим самоваром»); hit the nail on the head – ударить ногтем по голове (попасть не в бровь, а в глаз); heads or tails – lit. головы или звосты (орёл или решка); to cudgel one's brains over something –lit. к дубине мозги (ломать над чем-нибудь голову) ; with a sick head on healthy – с больной головы на здоровую

- Multimodal: – to get somebody (or something) out of one's head – выкинуть кого-то (что-то) из голвы; to have an old head on young shoulders – иметь старую голову на молодых плечах (быть очень умудренным) ; to get something out of one's head – выкинуть из головы; two heads are – одна голова хорошо, а две лучше; to be over head and ears in love – влюбиться по уши; to bury one's head in the sand – зарыть голову в песок; to beat one's head against a brick wall – прошибать стену, лезть на рожон; put the cart before the horse's head – торопиться; to keep a civil tongue in one's head – говорить вежливо, учтиво; beat one's head against a brick wall – прошибать стену лбом.

At the same time, although the overwhelming majority of phraseological units semantically oriented to a person in English and Russian languages are unambiguous, when considering the semantics of phraseological units, one cannot avoid the issue of the peculiarities of the semantic structure of a polysemantic phraseological unit. "The semantic structure of a multi-valued phraseological unit should be considered not as a mechanical and random combination of two or more meanings, but as a completely organized, ordered unity in which individual meanings (semes) are "interrelated and interdependent". All individual meanings of multi-valued phraseological units are equivalent and occupy an equal position in their semantic structure.

Only by comparing the combinations of semes that determine the individual meanings of polysemantic phraseological units does it become possible to single out the features of these meanings in the form of an indication of the features that distinguish them. In some cases, when the ambiguity of phraseological units is the result of a secondary shift, all meanings of phraseological units can be attributed to one phraseological-semantic subgroup. In other cases, when the difference between the values of one phraseological unit indicates the presence of a significant number of differential semes, they are distributed among various subgroups.

Bibliography

1. Сопоставительно-семантические исследования русского языка/ Под ред.З.Д. Поповой. – Воронеж, 1979, 1980.
2. Стернина Марина Абрамовна. Семантические типы наречного слова(на материале пространственных наречий английского и русского языков).1984.
3. Хаустова Элеонора Дмитриевна. Когнитивные классификаторы в семантическом пространстве языка (на материале лексико-семантического поля «фрукты и овощи» в русском и английском языках). 1999
4. Шукина Нелли Федоровна. Структурация лексико-семантического поля субъективно-модальных состояний в аспекте изучения языкового сознания (на

материале английского и русского языков). 1982

5. Razfar, A. Applying linguistics in the classroom: a sociocultural approach /A. Razfar. – New York : Routledge, 2014. – 324 p.

6. Stubbs, M. An example of frequent English phraseology: distribution,structures and functions / M. Stubbs // Language & computer. – 2007. – Vol. 62,Issue 1. – p. 89–105.

7. Tamara Kavilova, Gulnoz Murotova, Digital technologies and information-communication competence of a foreign languages' teacher. , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №97 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

8. Tamara Kavilova, Interactive forms and methods in teaching a foreign language , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №23 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

9. Tamara Kavilova, Modern methods of teaching a foreign language , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №19 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

10. Tamara Kavilova, Speech culture and communication effectiveness , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №59 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

11. Tamara Kavilova, Actual problems of teaching a foreign language , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив№19 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

12. Tamara Kavilova, Guljaxon Umrzoqova Theory of the concept of speech act. , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №31 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

13. Tamara Kavilova, The formation of speech skills in foreign language lessons , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №23 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

14. Tamara Kavilova, The concept of the cultural component of meaning. , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №59 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

15. Tamara Kavilova, Using the Internet at lessons of foreign languages . , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №32 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

16. Tamara Kavilova, To the question of the correct formulation of the dialogical speech , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №23 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

17. Tamara Kavilova, The role of reading fiction in the study of a foreign language , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №23 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

18. Tamara Kavilova, Teaching dialogic speech in french classes , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №23 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

19. Tamara Kavilova, The use of role-playing in the formation of foreign language competence of students. , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №94 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz)

20. Tamara Kavilova, About linguistic reconstruction , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №32 (science.i-юдedu.uz, jspi.uz)

21. Tamara Kavilova, The internet in the process of teaching a foreign language , Архив Научных Публикаций JSPI: 2020: Архив №25 (science.i-edu.uz, jspi.uz).