

## FORMATION AND FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PHRASEOLOGISMS IN UZBEK LANGUAGE

Narmuratov Zayniddin Radjabovich

Termiz State University

zayniddin.terstu@mail.ru

### Abstract:

this article deals with some issues of studying the phraseology of Turkic languages, the history of the study of Uzbek phraseology and phraseography were briefly reviewed.

**Keywords:** phrase, phraseologism, phraseological formation, phraseology, fixed phrase, idiom, phraseology and phraseography.

### Introduction

Phraseological unit phrases, idiom is very ancient in terms of its origin, but the history of the science of phraseology (phraseology) spans several hundred years.

Researchers have been dealing with phraseological units in Russian linguistics since the 18th century. For example, M.V. Lomonosov, while creating a plan for the dictionary of the Russian literary language, emphasized that, along with words, "folk (Russian) proverbs", "phrases" and "idioms" should find their expression. By the 60s and 80s of the 20th century, phraseology grew rapidly in Uzbek linguistics as well as in foreign linguistics.

Because the history of the science of Russian phraseology is widely explained in the scientific studies of V. L. Arkhangelsky, E. Kh. Roth, V. N. Telia, L. I. Royzenzon, E. A. Malinovsky<sup>1</sup> we will touch on this issue very briefly, after that we will think about some theoretical directions, scientific studies, phraseological dictionaries that have arisen in Turkic studies, including Uzbek linguistics, related to phraseology and phraseography.

The first researcher of the theory of phraseology is undoubtedly the Swiss-French linguist Charles Balli (1865-1947). In his works "Essay on Stylistics" (1905) and "French Stylistics" (1909), he included special chapters on the study of word combinations, that is, phraseologisms. He distinguished between external and internal signs of phraseological associations. According to his theory, the structural features of such associations are external signs, and their semantic nature is considered internal signs. Phraseology should mainly deal with the study of the semantic nature and internal signs of phraseological associations<sup>2</sup>. Ф. De Saussure, speaking about the syntagma and its signs in the work "General Linguistics Course" (1916), said that there are such ready-made combinations ("ready-made speech") in the language, the unique character of which comes from

<sup>1</sup> Масаланинг ўрганилиш тарихи ҳақида қаранг: Архангельский В.Л. Устойчивые фразы в современном русском языке. - Ростов-на-Дону, 1964. – С. 8-54; Телия В.Н. Фразеология // Теоретические проблемы советского языкознания. - М., Наука, 1968. – С. 257-277; Ройзензон Л.И. Лекции по общей и русской фразеологии. - Самарканд, 1971. – С. 5-76; Малиновский Е.А. Формирование русской фразеологии и фразеологии. АДД. – Алматы, 1995. – С. 3-52; Малиновский Е.А. Формирование русской фразеологической теории в XX веке. Монография. – Самарканд, 2007. – С. 4 - 131 ва бошқалар.

<sup>2</sup> Қаранг: Кунин А.В. Теория фразеологии Шарля Балли // Иностранные языки в школе, 1966, № 3. – С. 17-23; Назарян А.Г. Фразеология современного французского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, 1987. – С. 6-8.



their meaning and syntactic features. It is said that they cannot be improvised (used without preparation), because such compounds are used ready-made, according to tradition<sup>3</sup>.

In general, the history of the development of the science of phraseology can be studied chronologically in three periods:

First period. It covers the period from the middle of the XX century to the 30s of the XX century. This period is associated with the scientific activities of M.V. Lomonosov, V.I. Dal, A.A. Potebnya, F.F. Fortunatov, F.I. Buslaev, Sh.Bally, A.A. Shakhmatov.

It is worth noting that in the first period, phraseology served more as an object of lexicography, that is, of practical lexicology. During this period, special attention was paid to reflecting (codifying) more FBs in dictionaries, explaining their meaning, etymology, interpretation.

Second period. E.D. Polivanov, V.V. Vinogradov, S.I. Abakumov, G.K. Danilov, G.O. Vinokur, V.N. Derzhavin, A.I. Efimov, A. Ya. Rozhansky, I. It developed in connection with the scientific activities of scientists such as E. Anichkov and includes the 30s-50s of the 20th century. This period can also be called the period of formation of phraseology as an independent linguistic field.

The third period starts from the 60s of the 20th century and continues until now. This period is characterized by the use of new methods in phraseological research, the rapid development of phraseological theory and the emergence of many phraseological experts<sup>4</sup>.

It is noteworthy that prof. E.A. Malinovsky in his monograph "The Formation of Russian Phraseological Theory in the 20th Century" (Samarkand, 2007) studied the history of the formation of phraseological theory in Russian linguistics in the 20th century as follows: a) It emerged in Russian linguistics at the beginning of the 20th century (1900-1920). phraseological doctrine; b) the development of phraseology in Russian linguistics in the pre-war period (1920-1940); v) the development of phraseology in Russian linguistics in the 50s and 60s of the 20th century; g) The development of phraseology in Russian linguistics in the 70s and 80s of the 20th century.

We also try to take into account these periodization principles to a certain extent when researching the problems of the formation and development of Uzbek phraseology and phraseography in the 20th century.

In general, phraseology has become one of the fastest growing branches of linguistics in recent years. This field attracts the attention of scientists from many Commonwealth countries. For example, linguists are studying the nature and formation methods of phraseological units. (A.M. Babkin, Yu.A. Gvozdev), determine the nature of phraseological meaning (V.P. Zhukov, N.M. Shansky, A.M. Melerovich, V.A. Yatselenko), mutually synonymous, antonymic, they are studying the features of variants, homonymy (M.I. Sidorenko, E.I. Dibrova), the morphological structure and paradigmatics of phrases (V.P. Zhukov, A.M. Chepasova, L.V. Semenkova, A.V. Zhukov, V. .N.Grishanova), the syntactic function of FBs in the sentence (S.G.Gavrin, L.A.Kim, O.V.Shavkunova, V.M.Burmakov), comparative, structural-typological analysis of phrases (Yu.P.

<sup>3</sup> Фердинанд де Соссюр. Курс общей лингвистики // Фердинанд де Соссюр Труды по языкознанию. - М.: Прогресс, 1977. - С. 157.

<sup>4</sup> Бу ҳақда қаранг: Ройзензон Л.И., Малиновский Е.А., Хаютин А.Д. Очерки по истории становления фразеологии как лингвистической дисциплины. - Самарканд, 1975,. - С. 5-70; Малиновский Е.А. История изучения проблем фразеологии в русском языкознании. - Ташкент: Фан, 1991. - С. 5-92; Малиновский Е.А. Формирование русской фразеологии и фразеографии. АДД. - Алматы, 1995. - С. 3-52; Малиновский Е.А. Формирование русской фразеологической теории в XX веке. Монография. - Самарканд, 2007. - С. 4 - 131



Solodub, R.I. Popovich), issues of international phraseology (V.V. Akulenko, E.M. Solodukho), phraseology of artistic and journalistic style (V.N. Vakurov, M.A. Bakina, A.G. Lomov, I.Ya. Lepeshev), communicative FBs -studying in a pragmatic aspect (V.N. Teliya, A.M. Emirova), creating textbooks and manuals on phraseology (A.V. Kunin, N.M. Shansky, V.P. Zhukov, Yu.A. Gvozdev, V. .M.Mokienko, A.M.Bushuy, A.M.Fomina), studying the history of the formation of phraseology and phraseography (L.I. Royzenzon, M.M. Kopilenko, V.L. Arkhangelsky, E.H. Roth, V .N.Teliya, V.P.Zhukov, E.A.Malinovsky) a number of works have been carried out. The achievements of the former Soviet Germanistics and Romanistics have also gained a special value in taking a strong place of phraseology in world linguistics. In this field, the English phraseology of N.N. Amosova, A.V. Kunin, I.I. Chernisheva, A.D. Reichstein, German phraseology of M.D. Gorodnikova, V.G. Gakk, N.N. Kirillova, Z. French phraseology of N. Levit, A.G. Nazaryan, Ya.I. Retsker, G.G. Sokolova, I.N. Timeskova, E.M. Wolff, V.S. Vinogradov, A.V. Suprun, N. It is worth noting the works of N. Kurchatkina on Spanish phraseology and T.Z. Cherdantseva on Italian phraseology.

Over the next forty years, in the Commonwealth of Nations, Azerbaijani (K. Yu. Aliev, G. A. Bayramov, A. Gurbanov, N. R. Ragimzade, S. A. Khalilov), Armenian (P. S. Bediryan, E. U. Gevorkyan) , A.A. Murvalyan, A.M. Sukiasyan), Bashkir (Z.G. Uraksin), Belarusian (A.S. Aksamitov, A.M. Bazylenko, F.M. Yankovsky), Georgian (M.K. Andronikashvili, A.L. Oniani, A.A. Takaishvili), Kabardin (Kabardin-Circassian A.G. Emuzov, B.M. Kardanov), Kazakh (S.K. Kenesbaev, R. Sarsembaev, S. Tulekova), Karachay-Bulgarian (Z.K. Jarashueva), Karakalpak (E. Berdimuradov, S.T. Nauruzbaeva), Kyrgyz (B. Kerimjanova, Dj. Osmonova, D. Shukurov, A. Saparbaev, A. Nazarov), sand (L .S. Arkitskaya), Kurdish (Yu. Yu. Avaliani, M. Kh. Khamoyan), Latvian (E.K. Kagayne, E. Kokare, L.Ya. Orlovskaya), Lezgin (A.G. Gyulmagomedov), Lithuanian (B. Kalinauskas, Ya. Lipskene), Mari (F.T. Gracheva, E.S .Yakimova), Moldovan (R.S. Shirmankina), Ossetian (M.I. Isaev, I.A. Khugaev), Tajik (Kh. Majidov, I. Hasanov, S. V. Khusenova, N. Joraev), Tatar (G.Kh. Akhatov, G.Kh. Akhunzyanov, K.S. Sabirov), Turkmen (A. Abdurahmonova, K. Babaev, G. Achilova, O. Nazarov, A. Annamamedov), Turkish (R.R. Yusipova) .Skripnik, G.M.Udovnichenko), Persian (Yu.A.Rubinchik), Chuvash (Yu.F.Efimov, M.F.Chernov), Estonian (F.Vakk, A.A.Krikmann) are significant in phraseology things came to the square.

As a result, phraseology was formed as a separate, independent field of linguistics. As N.N. Amosova, a well-known phraseologist at the time, rightly noted, "the formation and development of this linguistic field is the result of the research of many phraseologists on different languages"<sup>5</sup>. Since the phraseological material is complex and multi-faceted, in recent years it has been studied using various methods and methods. At this point, it is necessary to highlight the following methods and methods of learning FBs: identification method (Sh.Balli, A.V.Kunin), contextual method (N.N.Amosova), variational method (V.L. Arkhangelsky), phraseological application method (V.P. Zhukov), structural-typological method (L.I. Royzenzon, Yu.Yu. Avaliani, Yu.P. Solodub), such as the complicative method (S.G. Gavrin), the method of learning phrases based on semantic frameworks (M.T. Tagiev), the method of learning lexemes and phrases into

<sup>5</sup> Амосова Н.Н. Теоретическое и практическое значение фразеологии как особой отрасли языкознания // Проблемы фразеологии и задачи ее изучения в высшей и средней школе. Тезисы докладов межвузовской конференции. – Череповец, 1965. – С. 3.



denotative and connotative terms (M.M. Kopilenko, Z.D. Popova). These methods and methods complement each other and allow a deeper understanding of the various aspects of phraseological units, paradigmatic and syntagmatic features, valence (cohesion) possibilities<sup>6</sup>. Such increased interest in phraseological unit is due to the fact that the object of study, that is, phraseology, is a unique linguistic unit. Because according to the plan of content, FBs are close to lexical units (words), in terms of the plan of expression they are close to syntactic units (phrases, sentences). But phraseological unit is not equivalent to a word, a phrase, or a sentence. The study of phraseological issues undoubtedly led to its formation as an independent linguistic field, enriched the science of linguistics theoretically and practically. But it should not be concluded that there are no unexplored problems in the field of phraseology.

In this work, we would like to briefly review some issues of the study of the phraseology of Turkic languages, the history of the study of Uzbek phraseology and phraseography. In this monographic study, a phrase, phraseological unit, or phrase is understood as a stable lexical-semantic unit, similar in structure to a phrase or a sentence, having a generalized meaning, the components of which partially or fully convey a mobile meaning.

#### THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Архангельский В.Л. Устойчивые фразы в современном русском языке. - Ростов-на-Дону, 1964. – С. 8-54.
2. Телия В.Н. Фразеология // Теоретические проблемы советского языкознания. - М., Наука, 1968. – С. 257-277.
3. Ройзензон Л.И. Лекции по общей и русской фразеологии. - Самарканд, 1971. – С. 5-76.
4. Малиновский Е.А. Формирование русской фразеологии и фразеологии. АДД. – Алматы, 1995. – С. 3-52.
5. Малиновский Е.А. Формирование русской фразеологической теории в XX веке. Монография. – Самарканд, 2007. – С. 4 -131.
6. Кунин А.В. Теория фразеологии Шарля Балли // Иностранные языки в школе, 1966, № 3. – С. 17-23.
7. Назарян А.Г. Фразеология современного французского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, 1987. – С. 6-8.
8. Фердинанд де Соссюр. Курс общей лингвистики // Фердинанд де Соссюр Труды по языкознанию. - М.: Прогресс, 1977. – С. 157.
9. Ройзензон Л.И., Малиновский Е.А., Хаютин А.Д. Очерки по истории становления фразеологии как лингвистической дисциплины. - Самарканд, 1975,. – С. 5-70.
10. Амосова Н.Н. Теоретическое и практическое значение фразеологии как особой отрасли языкознания // Проблемы фразеологии и задачи ее изучения в высшей и средней школе. Тезисы докладов межвузовской конференции. – Череповец, 1965. – С. 3.
11. Попов Р.Н. Методы исследования фразеологического состава языка (учебное пособие). – Курск. Изд-во Курского пед. ин-та, 1976. – 84 с.

<sup>6</sup> ФБларни ўрганиш методлари хақида қаранг: Попов Р.Н. Методы исследования фразеологического состава языка (учебное пособие). – Курск. Изд-во Курского пед. ин-та, 1976. – 84 с.

