

## **DIFFERENTIAL SIGNS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS OF THE RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES.**

**Ikromkhonova Maftuna Maksudjon kizi,**

student of master's degree of Linguistics of English language, Ferghana State University,  
Ferghana, Uzbekistan, [atun4ik@gmail.com](mailto:atun4ik@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** The work implies analyzing approaches to the identification of phraseological units as a special linguistic unit by researchers of Russian and English phraseology, to identify the features of structural and semantic types of phraseological units in the compared languages.

**Key words:** phraseological unit, cultural linguistics, differential signs, linguoculturology, integral meaning, semantic integrity, idiomaticity.

The actuality of the research is determined by the insufficient development of theoretical problems of phraseology and insufficient study of the semantics of phraseological units, which is reflected in the disagreements that take place in matters of composition, boundaries and methods of studying phraseological units in theory and lexicographic practice.

The purpose of this thesis research is to conduct a systematic comparative-typological analysis of Russian and English phraseological units in structural-semantic and thematic-linguoculturological aspects.

Recently, comparative research in the field of phraseology has become the most relevant. Identifying similarities and differences in the systems of different languages is important for creating the basis for effective intercultural communication.

Attention to the issues of comparative linguistics is quite understandable: it makes it possible to better understand the mechanism of functioning of a separate phenomenon in each language and use the information obtained for a comprehensive contrast description of the compared languages.

Of particular interest among such comparisons and comparisons are studies in the field of phraseology, in which the peculiarity of life, lifestyle, mentality of a particular people is most visibly manifested, because phraseology "condenses the entire complex of culture and psychology of a given people, the unique way of its way of thinking" (L.I. Roizenzon).

Comparative study of phraseological units allows solving a number of complex and still not unambiguously resolved issues of identifying interlanguage identities and differences between two distantly related languages - Russian and English. The significant commonality of the European way of life, the ever-increasing cultural and economic ties between Russia and English-speaking countries are reflected in the phraseology of the two languages compared.

Of great importance is the comparison of phraseological pictures of the world of peoples, which is based on the study of the thematic and ideographic semantics of phraseological units and the identification of their figurative and motivational foundations, cultural sources of the formation of their semantics. In domestic and foreign linguistics, there are widely presented works on the study of the national identity of the phraseological fund on the material of different languages, including in comparative terms.

The uniqueness of the phraseological picture of the world in each national language lies in the special ratio of the general, typological and nationally specific. The comparative method helps

to find out the essence of common language categories, as well as the features of each of the compared languages that may go unnoticed when analyzing intra-linguistic material.

The stability of phraseological turns has not yet received a generally accepted explanation and definition in phraseology. Without the development of sustainability problems, it is impossible to establish the boundaries of phraseology and the formation of phraseology as a linguistic discipline.

The works of S. Bally served as an incentive for the independent development of the problems of Romance phraseology in Russian linguistics. S. Bally is one of the first researchers who developed the doctrine of stable groups of words on the material of the French language, and the works of V.V. Vinogradov are a special step in the development of the theory of "indecomposable combinations". The significance of V.V. Vinogradov's concept lies in a more reasonable definition of phraseological units as lexical complexes with a special semantic peculiarity, in the translation of phraseology problems from a descriptive plan to a theoretical one. The most common term for the common name of all phrases related to phraseology is the term "phraseological unit", introduced by academician V.V. Vinogradov [72]. This term is successful as a common name for all phenomena that are part of the phraseological composition of the language.

Researchers of phraseological composition call the specific meaning of phraseological turns in different ways: a single integral meaning of phraseological turns, a single integral meaning of merges and unities and the analytical meaning of combinations (V.V. Vinogradov), the integrity of the nomination (O.S. Akhmanova), semantic solidity, generalizing metaphorical meaning (S.I. Abakumov); semantic integrity, idiomaticity (A.I. Smirnitsky), integral representation, surplus value (B.A. Larin). Phraseology is an integral structure and therefore only a complex of structural features can serve as a sufficient basis for determining the essential characteristics of phraseological units and their various types. One of the next tasks of phraseology is to display the entire variety of types, which previously requires the study of the very nature of the stability of phraseological turns as a basis for classifying the same type of objects.

The functional identity of phraseological turns and words served as the basis for defining the stability of phraseological units as "reproducibility in finished form" [79, 206], it should be noted that the aspect of stability is not highlighted in this definition.

The identification of stability and reproducibility removes the need to establish the structural phraseological composition of the language, on the basis of which it is only possible to determine its systemic properties in one language or in different languages.

The understanding of reproducibility as a consequence of the special structural organization of phraseological turns was expressed by F. de Saussure: "... we meet with a huge number of expressions relating, of course, to the language, these are those completely ready-made utterances in which custom forbids changing anything, even if it is possible, on reflection, to distinguish significant parts in them {get married, etc.}. Approximately the same applies to such expressions as "to lay for a tie", "to take aim", "carelessly", or as "due to the fact that"; "despite the fact that", etc. Such turns cannot be improvised, they are handed over ready-made according to tradition" [180, p. 122].

Sh. Bally wrote that, depending on the degree of cohesion of words, the loss of their independent meanings, phrases have varying degrees of stability between two extreme cases: variable combinations of words and combinations in which words completely lose their independence. It is important to note the following: "a phrase enters the language as a whole when it reaches the highest degree of cohesion [44, p. 89]. Sh. Bally identified two types of phraseological units: phraseological groups, the stability of which has a usualistic and stylistic

character, and phraseological units, the stability of which is due to the fact that "the connections between the elements of phraseological turnover are not created by the speaker, just like the meanings of the elements themselves - figuratively speaking, the mechanism is rusty" [44, p. 101].

Observations show that the stability of phraseological turns is not so much the immutability of turns (external signs), as certain properties of internal, structural signs that determine the nature of reproducibility of phraseological units.

The stability of phraseological turnover, according to V.L. Arkhangelsky, is a set of restrictions in the choice of phraseological variables inherent in its members, which are not characteristic of the same members as part of a theoretically possible free equivalent of phraseological turnover [33]. This concept of stability allows you to penetrate deeper into the structure of phraseology as a complex structure. The stability of phraseological turns has different structural features. The different nature of the stability of idioms and phraseological units of other types is manifested in their lexico-grammatical, syntactic and lexico-semantic features.

## REFERENCES

1. W. O. Beeman, Philosophy of linguistics, Linguistics and anthropology, 531-551 (2012).
2. J. McAlpine, J. Myles, System, Capturing phraseology an online dictionary for advanced users of English as a second language: a response to user needs 31, 71-84 (2003).
3. N. Riemer, Language and communication, Cognitive linguistics and the public mind; idealist doctrines, materialist histories 64, 38-52 (2013).
  - a. V. Zykova Perception of verbal communication reflected in Russian and English phraseology: towards a new theory of Phraseologism-formation, Procedia – social behavioral science 236, 139-145 (2016).
4. R. Taukebaeva, Zh Isaeva, B. Ospanova, Sh. Karsybekova, A. Emekbaeva, A Pakizat, Linguistic Analyze of characters in the proverbs and sayings, Procedia - social behavioral science 143, 634-637 (2014).
5. L. Williams, Ch. Bannister, M. Arribas-Ayllon, A. Preece, I. Spasic, The role of idioms in sentiment analysis, Expert system with applications 42, 7375-7385 (2015).
6. Z. Fotovantia, M. Guodarzi, Idioms comprehension in English as a foreign language: analyzability in focus, Journal of Pragmatics 42, 1397-1411 (2010).
7. J. Ayto, Idioms, Encyclopedia of language and linguistics, 518-521 (2006).
8. J. Wassmann, A. Bender, Anthropology,
9. International encyclopedia of the social &
10. behavioral sciences, 16-22 (2015)
11. 2. M. Danesi, Anthropology, International
12. encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences,
13. 169-175 (2015)
14. 3. H.E. Manelis Klein, Anthropological linguistics:
15. overview, Encyclopedia of language & linguistics,
16. 296-304 (2006)
17. 4. W.O. Beeman, Philosophy of linguistics, Linguistics
18. and anthropology, 531-551 (2012)
19. 5. J. McAlpine, J. Myles, System, Capturing
20. phraseology an online dictionary for advanced users
21. of English as a second language: a response to user
22. needs 31, 71-84 (2003)
23. 6. N. Riemer, Language and communication,

24. Cognitive linguistics and the public mind: idealist
25. doctrines, materialist histories 64, 38-52 (2019)
26. 7. I.V. Zykova, Perception of verbal communication
27. reflected in Russian and English phraseology:
28. towards a new theory of Phraseologism-formation,
29. Procedia – social and behavioral sciences 236, 139-
30. 145 (2016)
31. J. Wassmann, A. Bender, Anthropology,
32. International encyclopedia of the social &
33. behavioral sciences, 16-22 (2015)
34. 2. M. Danesi, Anthropology, International
35. encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences,
36. 169-175 (2015)
37. 3. H.E. Manelis Klein, Anthropological linguistics:
38. overview, Encyclopedia of language & linguistics,
39. 296-304 (2006)
40. 4. W.O. Beeman, Philosophy of linguistics, Linguistics
41. and anthropology, 531-551 (2012)
42. 5. J. McAlpine, J. Myles, System, Capturing
43. phraseology an online dictionary for advanced users
44. of English as a second language: a response to user
45. needs 31, 71-84 (2003)
46. 6. N. Riemer, Language and communication,
47. Cognitive linguistics and the public mind: idealist
48. doctrines, materialist histories 64, 38-52 (2019)
49. 7. I.V. Zykova, Perception of verbal communication
50. reflected in Russian and English phraseology:
51. towards a new theory of Phraseologism-formation,
52. Procedia – social and behavioral sciences 236, 139-
53. 145 (2016)
54. J. Wassmann, A. Bender, Anthropology,
55. International encyclopedia of the social &
56. behavioral sciences, 16-22 (2015)
57. 2. M. Danesi, Anthropology, International
58. encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences,
59. 169-175 (2015)
60. 3. H.E. Manelis Klein, Anthropological linguistics:
61. overview, Encyclopedia of language & linguistics,
62. 296-304 (2006)
63. 4. W.O. Beeman, Philosophy of linguistics, Linguistics
64. and anthropology, 531-551 (2012)
65. 5. J. McAlpine, J. Myles, System, Capturing
66. phraseology an online dictionary for advanced users
67. of English as a second language: a response to user
68. needs 31, 71-84 (2003)
69. 6. N. Riemer, Language and communication,
70. Cognitive linguistics and the public mind: idealist
71. doctrines, materialist histories 64, 38-52 (2019)

72. 7. I.V. Zykova, Perception of verbal communication
73. reflected in Russian and English phraseology:
74. towards a new theory of Phraseologism-formation,
75. Procedia – social and behavioral sciences 236, 139-
76. 145 (2016)
77. J. Wassmann, A. Bender, Anthropology,
78. International encyclopedia of the social &
79. behavioral sciences, 16-22 (2015)
80. 2. M. Danesi, Anthropology, International
81. encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences,
82. 169-175 (2015)
83. 3. H.E. Manelis Klein, Anthropological linguistics:
84. overview, Encyclopedia of language & linguistics,
85. 296-304 (2006)
86. 4. W.O. Beeman, Philosophy of linguistics, Linguistics
87. and anthropology, 531-551 (2012)
88. 5. J. McAlpine, J. Myles, System, Capturing
89. phraseology an online dictionary for advanced users
90. of English as a second language: a response to user
91. needs 31, 71-84 (2003)
92. 6. N. Riemer, Language and communication,
93. Cognitive linguistics and the public mind: idealist
94. doctrines, materialist histories 64, 38-52 (2019)
95. 7. I.V. Zykova, Perception of verbal communication
96. reflected in Russian and English phraseology:
97. towards a new theory of Phraseologism-formation,
98. Procedia – social and behavioral sciences 236, 139-
99. 145 (2016)
100. J. Wassmann, A. Bender, Anthropology,
101. International encyclopedia of the social &
102. behavioral sciences, 16-22 (2015)
103. 2. M. Danesi, Anthropology, International
104. encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences,
105. 169-175 (2015)
106. 3. H.E. Manelis Klein, Anthropological linguistics:
107. overview, Encyclopedia of language & linguistics,
108. 296-304 (2006)
109. 4. W.O. Beeman, Philosophy of linguistics, Linguistics
110. and anthropology, 531-551 (2012)
111. 5. J. McAlpine, J. Myles, System, Capturing
112. phraseology an online dictionary for advanced users
113. of English as a second language: a response to user
114. needs 31, 71-84 (2003)
115. 6. N. Riemer, Language and communication,
116. Cognitive linguistics and the public mind: idealist
117. doctrines, materialist histories 64, 38-52 (2019)
118. 7. I.V. Zykova, Perception of verbal communication
119. reflected in Russian and English phraseology:

120. towards a new theory of Phraseologism-formation,
121. Procedia – social and behavioral sciences 236, 139-
122. 145 (2016)
123. J. Wassmann, A. Bender, Anthropology,
124. International encyclopedia of the social &
125. behavioral sciences, 16-22 (2015)
126. 2. M. Danesi, Anthropology, International
127. encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences,
128. 169-175 (2015)
129. 3. H.E. Manelis Klein, Anthropological linguistics:
130. overview, Encyclopedia of language & linguistics,
131. 296-304 (2006)
132. 4. W.O. Beeman, Philosophy of linguistics, Linguistics
133. and anthropology, 531-551 (2012)
134. 5. J. McAlpine, J. Myles, System, Capturing
135. phraseology an online dictionary for advanced users
136. of English as a second language: a response to user
137. needs 31, 71-84 (2003)
138. 6. N. Riemer, Language and communication,
139. Cognitive linguistics and the public mind: idealist
140. doctrines, materialist histories 64, 38-52 (2019)
141. 7. I.V. Zytkova, Perception of verbal communication
142. reflected in Russian and English phraseology:
143. towards a new theory of Phraseologism-formation,
144. Procedia – social and behavioral sciences 236, 139-
145. 145 (2016)
146. J. Wassmann, A. Bender, Anthropology,
147. International encyclopedia of the social &
148. behavioral sciences, 16-22 (2015)
149. 2. M. Danesi, Anthropology, International
150. encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences,
151. 169-175 (2015)
152. 3. H.E. Manelis Klein, Anthropological linguistics:
153. overview, Encyclopedia of language & linguistics,
154. 296-304 (2006)
155. 4. W.O. Beeman, Philosophy of linguistics, Linguistics
156. and anthropology, 531-551 (2012)
157. 5. J. McAlpine, J. Myles, System, Capturing
158. phraseology an online dictionary for advanced users
159. of English as a second language: a response to user
160. needs 31, 71-84 (2003)
161. 6. N. Riemer, Language and communication,
162. Cognitive linguistics and the public mind: idealist
163. doctrines, materialist histories 64, 38-52 (2019)
164. 7. I.V. Zytkova, Perception of verbal communication
165. reflected in Russian and English phraseology:
166. towards a new theory of Phraseologism-formation,
167. Procedia – social and behavioral sciences 236, 139-

