

## **COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN COGNITIVE ASPECT**

Tanikulova Adiba Fakhriddin kizi,  
Researcher of SamSIFL, Uzbekistan

### **Abstract**

Some scientists include all stable combinations of words in the phraseological units of the English language, while others limit the list of phraseological units to only a certain group of stable phrases. Some scientists include proverbs, sayings, catchphrases and expressions, and aphorisms in the phraseological composition of the language, while others do not. Very often, phraseological units of the English language include various descriptive and analytical figures of speech, complex conjunctions, complex prepositions, and compound terms. This thesis identifies comparative analysis of phraseological units in cognitive aspect.

**Keywords:** phraseological unities, scientific terms, catchphrases, puns, literary quotations, proverbs, sayings, inclusion, and non-reinterpreted phrases, phraseological expressions.

Some scientists call phraseological units not only phrases such as a humped nose, a thick magazine, early morning, a nervous face, oppressive melancholy, squinting your eyes, lowering your head, etc., but even individual words such as nonsense, confusion, abracadabra, nonsense, etc., called “one-word idioms” [1].

Obviously, with such different views on phraseological units and on the composition of such units in the language, it is very difficult to draw a correct conclusion about the current state of phraseology of the English language as a scientific discipline. Only one thing is indisputable: this can be judged objectively, taking into account both the theoretical level of work on phraseology and the state of practical study of phraseological units of the language, especially the lexicographic description of phraseological units, which has been carried out for a long time [2].

Many scientists note the fact that the history of the formation of certain ideas about phraseological units as a unit of language and, accordingly, about their composition in the language, or, more precisely, the history of phraseology as a science, should be considered separately, and its objective presentation is possible under one condition - preliminary clear clarification of the positions from which it will be covered [9].

Many note the varying degrees of consistency and objectivity of researchers of English language phraseology.

A turning point in the study of phraseology of various languages was the famous works of Academician. V.V. Vinogradov, dedicated to English phraseology. The influence of this

scientist's works on almost all research in the field of phraseology was enormous. According to the remark of N.N. Amosova, "the concept of academician. V.V. Vinogradov is a special stage in the development of the history of "indecomposable combinations", higher than the fact that thanks to it phraseological units received a more reasonable definition, namely as lexical complexes with a special semantic originality" [3].

V.V. Vinogradov identified three types of phraseological units:

1. Phraseological adjuncts, or idioms, are unmotivated units that act as equivalents of words, for example, sharpening your skis, carelessly, through a tree stump, cranberry like that, no matter how, etc.

2. Phraseological units are motivated units with a single holistic meaning arising from the fusion of the meanings of lexical components. Phraseological unities allow the expansion of components through substitute "packaging material and act as potential equivalents of words," for example, keep a stone in your bosom, swim shallowly, the first pancake is lumpy, swim against the current, etc.

V.V. Vinogradov also includes in phraseological units verbal groups that are terms, for example, rectum, question mark, rest home, ambulance, struggle for existence, etc. [4].

3. Phraseological combinations are phrases in which one of the components has a phraseologically associated meaning that appears only in connection with a strictly defined range of concepts and their verbal designations. Such phrases are not equivalent words, since each of their components has different meanings, for example, fear takes, melancholy takes, envy takes, laughter takes, etc. But one cannot say: joy takes, pleasure takes, etc. [5].

Despite the fact that V.V. Vinogradov's works on phraseological issues played a huge positive role, it should be noted that the further development of the theory of phraseology urgently requires moving forward.

The views of V.V. Vinogradov in the field of phraseology caused critical comments from a number of scientists. Thus, N.N. Amosova emphasizes that using the concept of "stability of a verbal complex" in the form of an axiom that requires neither definition nor clarification cannot be explained by the specifics of English material [6].

Criticism was caused by the wide and diverse composition of the category of phraseological unities, including technical and scientific terms, catchphrases, puns, literary quotations, proverbs and sayings. It is noted that the inclusion of both rethought and non-reinterpreted phrases in phraseological units is inappropriate [9].

To the three types of phraseological units N.M. Shansky added one more - phraseological expressions. Phraseological expressions are understood as phrases that are stable in their composition and use, which are not only semantically distinct, but also consist entirely of

words with a free meaning, for example, be afraid of wolves, do not go into the forest; not all that glitters is gold, etc.

S.G. Gavrin widely understands the scope of phraseology, approaching the phraseological system from the point of view of functional-semantic complicativeness. S.G. Gavrin includes in phraseology all stable and variable-stable combinations of words that meet the criteria of functional-semantic complicativeness [10].

Regarding the scope of phraseology, scientists have different points of view. This is explained by the exceptional complexity of the object of study and the existence in the English language of a number of transitional cases located between classical phraseological units and free (variable) combinations of words. It is also of great importance from what angle a scientist approaches the classification of phraseological units. For A.I. Smirnitsky, for example, one of the most important parameters of phraseology was the equivalence of phraseological units to a word, for N.N. Amosova it was the type of constant context, for S.G. Gavrina - functional-semantic complicativeness [7].

N.N. Amosova, as well as A.I. Smirnitsky, is characterized by a narrow understanding of the scope of phraseology, while S.G. Gavrin is characterized by a broad one. A broad understanding of the scope of phraseology is now predominant. We will also proceed from a broad understanding of phraseology, the object of which is all stable combinations of words with a complex meaning.

Among the works on phraseology, where the limitation of the composition of phraseological units in the English language is carried out most consistently, we can cite the works of M.T. Tagiyev [8]. By distinguishing phraseological units into a special class of units according to the nature of their connections with words in speech, M.T. Tagiyev excludes from the composition of phraseological units many combinations of words that other authors include in phraseology. In the object of phraseology, he does not include, in particular, analytical combinations, proverbial expressions, popular sayings, compound terms, as well as combinations with a word with a phraseologically related meaning.

From the author's point of view, "the combination becomes phraseological, i.e. qualitatively new if it forms its own environment on the basis of its own structural connection" [11]. From this point of view, the phrases squint eyes, sunken cheeks, hopeless situation, bosom friend, sworn enemy, etc. are not phraseological units. In these combinations, one of the components appears in a direct nominative meaning, and this component retains its independence both semantically and grammatically [12]. This is a narrow approach to understanding the scope of phraseology. The debatability and ambiguity in the approaches indicate how broad, open and important the problem of the boundaries, volume and composition of units of phraseology of the English language is.



Thus, the composition of phraseological units in a language, like the lexical composition, is historically mobile. For example, the number of phraseological units may change (due to the loss of obsolete ones or the formation of new ones), the ratio between groups, categories of phraseological units, between active and passive stock, etc. In this regard, the most important features of phraseological units are their renewability, sustainability and well-known nature. Apparently, other features common to all phraseological units are difficult to determine. We also proceed from these criteria when determining whether proverbs, catchphrases, compound terms, names and other stable verbal complexes belong to the phraseological composition.

### References:

1. Tasheva Dilorom, Djanzakova Matluba. The role of literary text in teaching the Russian language. International Multidisciplinary Conference. Manchester, England. 25th December 2023. -p.19. <https://conferencea.org>
2. Kholbaeva D.D., Tasheva D.S. Pedagogical techniques and methods of forming interest in the lessons of the Russian language. Web of scientist: international scientific research journal, ISSN: 2776-0979, Volume 3, Issue 3, Mar., 2022. -p.238
3. Kholbaeva, D., & Tasheva, D. (2022). Theoretical And Practical Aspects Of Monitoring The Acquisition Of Knowledge, Skills And Abilities By Students In The Russian Language In Universities. Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры, 2(11), 115-118.
4. Tasheva, D. (2022). Methods Of Using Didactic Materials To Enhance Activities In The Russian Language Lessons. Ta'lim Va Rivojlanish Tahlili Onlayn Ilmiy Jurnali, 2(1), 325-328.
5. Shaymanova, Y. T., & Qarshiboyeva, Z. A. (2022). RUS OLIMI AN SAMOYLOVICHNING SHARQ TILLARINI O'RGANISHGA QO'SHGAN HISSASI. Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 2(Special Issue 24), 365-372.
6. Shaymanova, Y., & Qarshiboyeva, Z. (2023). O'zbek Tilidagi Neologizmlarning Tasnifi Classification Of Neologisms In The Uzbek Language. Qishloq Xo'jaligi, Atrof-Muhit Va Barqaror Rivojlanish Milliy Konferensiyasi, 93-96.
7. Yulduz, S. (2023). Baho mazmunini ifodalovchi birliklarning gap tarkibida ifodalanishi. Qishloq Xo'jaligi, Atrof-Muhit Va Barqaror Rivojlanish Milliy Konferensiyasi, 48-51.
8. Abduvaxabovna, K. Z. (2022). Some Lingpoopetic Features Of Rhetorical Interrogative Sentences. Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 10(4), 721-724.

9. Mamatkulovna, U. D. (2023). Analysis of Pedagogical Aspects in the Study of the Problem of Bilingual in Teaching the Russian Language. Periodica Journal of Modern Philosophy, Social Sciences and Humanities, 17, 94-96.
10. Mamatkulovna, U. D. (2023). CULTUROLOGICAL APPROACH IN TEACHING THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development, 14, 62-65.
11. GR Bozorova, Effective ways to teach the life and creativity of Muhammad Yusuf in school literature education. Международный журнал языка, образования, перевода 3 (2). 2022.
12. Khaydarovna, Ullieva Sanobar, Umarova Dilfuza Mamatkulovna, and Allayarova Dilfuza Klichevna. "Artistic Character As A Personality Model: Methods Of Linguistic Representation Of The Human Image." The Seybold Report (2023).