

PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS – EXPRESSIONS OF CULTURAL SIGNS

*Soyibjon Toshtonov**Researcher, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages*soyibjontoshtonov@gmail.com

Annotation: Figurative visions of the world are reflected in examples of folk art, in particular, in phraseology. This is where the tradition of reflecting reality, characteristic of representatives of certain cultures, their culture of communication and spiritual maturity is realized. The implementation of euphemistic content through phraseological units is a phenomenon that shows the culture of communication and the level of speech.

Keywords: tradition, value, duty, national languages, phraseology, imagery, potential.

In the process of reasoning about the nature of the sign and the system of signs of the language, about the position of phraseological units in this system - phraseological units were recognized as units that carry a national-cultural feature, in contrast to other linguistic units. Such recognition is based on generally accepted ideas about the nature of figuratively motivated means of language, in particular, based on the opinion of such scientists as A.A.Potebnya, V.V.Vinogradov, Yu.Lotman, V.N.Telia, N.Berdyayev, A.Ufimtseva, L.Roizenzon, it is noted that the language arose on the basis of ideas about the importance of a national view, national thinking, traditions and values in the emergence of phraseological units in national languages.

Since phraseological units are a product of figurative nomination, resulting from the relationship of phenomena of reality, then in this process the connecting element of nomination is the personal factor. According to the interpretation of Professor N. Makhmudov¹ language is considered a complex, perfect phenomenon in which there is also a magnificent nation, within which a person lives. It should be noted that the language and its speaker are in such a dialectical connection that it is impossible to imagine them separately from each other. For the unique features of the people, such as originality, national mentality, culture, spirituality, style of thinking and the principle of life itself, discipline and methodology of perception, find their true embodiment in this people. Moreover, the human child, standing on this path, sees, hears and perceives the outside world in full accordance with his iron discipline². All the national, mental and cultural characteristics of the people listed by the linguist undoubtedly manifest themselves in linguistic units, especially in figurative expressions – figurative words, phrases.

Phraseologisms included in the lexical fund of each language have the same complex structure as words. Y.Karaulov, discussing the structure of a word, noted its complexity in that it “has a certain semantic structure, is complicated by social and emotional-expressive components of

¹Маҳмудов Н. Ўхшатишлар ва миллий нигоҳ // Маҳмудов Н. Тил тилсими тадқиқи. –Тошкент: Мумтоз сўз, 2017. – Б. 166.

²Маҳмудов Н. Ўша асар. –Б. 167.

meaning, is an element of cognition, forms certain ideas about the Universe, has figurative potential, semantic fragmentariness, is based on phonetic patterns and will be designated in different languages by the same different words³.

Applying these arguments of Yu.Karaulov to phraseological units, idioms, behind the social and emotional-expressive component of meaning, the features of “hidden” connotations are revealed, reflecting the attitude of the speaker/listener to the expressed; in the “being of knowledge” and this is considered not only in the formation of concepts about the Universe, but also the connection with the accompanying knowledge, ensuring the addition of meanings when combining words in a sentence, here one can see not only potential, but also reality.

It is clear from this that the connotations that constitute the structure of idioms open the way for the figurative realization of the speaker's ideas about the universe. Alternatively, these connotations also exclude national-cultural identity. For this reason, connotations, especially cultural connotations, are assessed as a way of realizing culture as a linguistic character. Thus, the researcher F.Usmanov sees in Teliya's idea that connotation is a usual or occasional essence, included in the semantics of linguistic units and reflecting the emotional-evaluative attitude of the subject of speech to objectivity, as well as an addition to this, Yu.V.Apresyan believes that the connotative meaning of a lexeme comes from its sememe of the lexeme, based on the presentation of insignificant but stable character traits that reflect the evaluative attitude adopted by this language community to the expressed concept and are not part of the denotation, recognizes the emergence of a lexeme with its application in practice in connection with its speech intensity, the blurring of its denotative meaning with the predominance of the connotative meaning of the lexeme⁴.

Because the semantics of the name, expression and task in the composition of the lexeme sememes are in a mutual dialectical relationship and are inversely proportional (proportional in reverse)⁵, since each sememe of the lexeme contains a divisor, strengthening, clarification, exaggeration of some of these semes leads to weakening of other semes.

Y.D.Apresyan, reflecting on lexicographic problems within the framework of the theory of integral description of language, pays special attention to the connotative meaning of the word. He notes that connotation, characterizing the main or initial meaning of words, is figuratively realized in metaphors and analogies, in derivative words, phraseological units, some types of syntactic constructions, in the movement of one or another unit in relation to another in the semantic structure⁶. Also about The role of phraseological units in the realization of this objective linguistic connotation is

³Караулов Ю.Н. Предисловие. Русская языковая личность и задачи её изучения // Язык и личность. –М.: Наука, 1989. –С.3-26.

⁴Усманов Ф. Ўзбек тилидаги ўхшатишларнинг лингвомаданий тадқиқи. Филол.фан...докт.(PhD) дисс. Тошкент, 2020. –Б.49.

⁵Неъматов Х., Расулов Р. Ўзбек тили систем лексикологияси асослари. –Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1995. –Б. 63.

⁶Апресян Ю.Д. Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография / Избранные труды, том II. –М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1995. –С.163.

especially recognized. Consequently, the connotative meaning is expressed as a kind of “national view” in how a native speaker expresses his vision of the universe. For this reason, phraseological units, which are a kind of linguistic shell of the connotative meaning, are interpreted as folk stereotypes.

The thesis on the reflection of the national spirit in language was first put forward by the German scientist W. von Humboldt, who promoted this idea in his research, and then it was developed by other linguists. Studying their views, F. Usmanov suggests that the concept of “national spirit”, mentioned by outstanding philosophers and linguists, should be understood as “national view”, interpreting it as follows: “National view is a view of the world, and not a worldview that is viewed through the veil of culture. Therefore, language reflects not only a “simple” picture of the world, but also a value attitude to its nodes”⁷. On the other hand, a linguist, emphasizing the importance of analyzing the concept of connotation through the prism of culture, sees its reason in the fact that the national-cultural knowledge of a nation is transmitted to the next generation through stable units of language, especially analogies. Therefore, in linguacultural studies, national-cultural connotation is defined as the interpretation of the semantic nodes of linguistic units in the context of rules, norms, stereotypes of culture, that is, “national-cultural connotation is the semantic facets of linguistic units through the prism of a national view, stable cultural views”⁸.

List of references:

1. Маҳмудов Н. Ўхшатишлар ва миллий нигоҳ // Маҳмудов Н. Тил тилсими тадқиқи. – Тошкент: Мумтоз сўз, 2017. –Б. 166.
2. Караулов Ю.Н. Предисловие. Русская языковая личность и задачи её изучения // Язык и личность. –М.: Наука, 1989. –С.3-26.
3. Усманов Ф. Ўзбек тилидаги ўхшатишларнинг лингвомаданий тадқиқи. Филол.фан...докт.(PhD) дисс. Тошкент, 2020. –Б.49.
4. Неъматов Х., Расулов Р. Ўзбек тили систем лексикологияси асослари. –Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1995. –Б. 63.
5. Апресян Ю.Д. Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография / Избранные труды, том II. –М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1995. –С.163

⁷Усманов Ф. Ўша асар. –Б.51.

⁸Усманов Ф. Ўша асар. –Б.51.