

RUSSIAN PHRASEOLOGY AS AN OBJECT OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING

Bogdanovich Gennady Aleksandrovich**Kosimov Ulugbek Abdullaevich****Karabayeva Aziza Sadykovna**

Teachers, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Republic of Uzbekistan

Annotation:the article examines Russian phraseology as an object of research and teaching. The idea is expressed about the ambiguity of the term “phraseology” itself and the need to create an academic-type phraseological dictionary.

Key words: phraseology, semantics, phraseological unit, component.

The research attention of Russian philologists has long and more than once focused on a peculiar semantic phenomenon - the presence in a word, in addition to absolute meanings, also such meanings that arise as a result of related uses of the word. On the basis of this, the idea of recognizing context as a decisive factor in the creation of lexical-grammatical relations was born and is being developed, which cannot be ignored not only in the lexicological or grammatical study of a word and the patterns associated with it, but even in the lexicographical approach to it, that is, when descriptions of words in dictionaries, whether explanatory or bilingual translation dictionaries.

Numerous and versatile studies of the word, primarily its semasiological studies, bring phraseology out of its latent state, turning it into an independent branch of the science of language with an independent object of study - the phraseological unit. But while noting this gratifying fact, we have to make a reservation: despite the large number of works that have appeared over the past decade, there is still no very noticeable progress in phraseology, this young branch of linguistic science. In the interests of phraseology, as well as those who are engaged in it or intends to engage in it, it would be useful to reveal the reason for its relatively slow progressive movement. Without setting ourselves such a task in its entirety, we will dwell only on some aspects of the issue. From our point of view, the terminological disorder that can be observed in works on phraseology, on the one hand, and the unjustifiably great attention that was paid to the systematization of phraseological material of the Russian language, or rather even its classification, in relation to other no less interesting, and perhaps more important questions, such as the question of the sources of Russian phraseology, the ways of its development, the semantic transformation of types and categories of phraseological units, or the relationship between a word and a phraseological unit, etc., impoverished the results of many phraseological studies. The compositional beginning of each, even a small article on a phraseological topic, which has become traditional, also attracts attention, consisting in a steady repetition - a retelling of what was previously written in this area, a peculiar technique of retardation, freeing the author from the need to think independently and involve independently obtained material for research.

It is well known how difficult it is to formulate a definition of a word as such, an individual word. Meanwhile, the concept of the word *implicite* is contained in the term *philology* itself, not to mention the fact that any branch of philology deals with the word, studies it from one side or another. Therefore, it is not surprising that a phraseological unit, being a field of intersection of semantic, stylistic and grammatical lines, still does not have a generally accepted definition and, in essence, has not yet become a term. The complexity of the object itself allows for the inevitability of such a phenomenon for some period of time, but, unfortunately, it has acquired a permanent character, and as a result, the overwhelming number of works on Russian phraseology allows for an unjustifiably broad, and thereby very an indefinite understanding combined with the idea of a phraseological unit or phraseological unit.

The vagueness of the concept of “phraseological unit” is completely undesirable and is by no means inevitable. It not only interferes with the descriptive characterization of phraseological objects, depriving it of a logical perspective, but, what is much more important, it prevents deepening into the subject of research. A motley collection of different types of objects, completely inevitable at the early stage of collecting, only hampers the researcher with unnecessary bulkiness and prevents him from intensively studying true phraseological objects with their inherent semantic-stylistic specificity and patterns of development. It is undeniable, for example, that terminological expressions like: *деревянное масло, железная дорога, зеленое мыло, летучая мышь, липкий пластырь, шариковая ручка* (wooden oil, railway, green soap, bat, sticky plaster, ballpoint pen, etc.) being lexicalized units of language, are to some extent similar to the expressions: *больное место чье-либо, живой портрет чей-либо, злой язык, золотое дно, кисейная барышня* (someone’s sore spot, a living portrait of someone, an evil tongue, a gold mine, a muslin young lady, etc.) but their similarity does not at all extend to their identity as phraseological objects of speech use. For example, *железная дорога* (the railway) and *злой язык* (the evil language) semantically do not lie on the same plane, and hence the different stylistic roles in the contexts of their use, their different functioning. Their semantic similarity lies only in the fact that they designate one undifferentiated concept that absorbs the meanings of their components - terms. Just as *железная дорога* (the railway) is not opposed to *деревянной или каменной дорог* (a wooden or stone road), so the phraseological unit *злой язык* (the evil language) is not opposed to the combination *good language*. But this is where their similarity ends as idiomatic facts of language, belonging: the first to the field of terminology, and the second to the repertoire of means of stylistic expressiveness of the Russian language. *Железная дорога* (the railway) being a complex term, it is likened to monosyllabic terms and, like ordinary terms, is not an object of phraseology [3, 218; 5, 150].

The terminological issue is not a matter of dispute over words when it comes to the basic terms of a particular science, especially at the time of its formation. The question also arose about the term phraseology to designate the corresponding linguistic discipline. As you know, the word phraseology is not unambiguous. In the general literary language, it denotes certain speech material: political phraseology (I. S. Aksakov), pompous phraseology (A. R. Kugel), cliché phraseology (P. P. Pertsov). Involuntary protest is caused by the sublime phraseology that frames an account of this deeply personal conflict (Izvestia, March 10, 1965).

It would hardly occur to anyone to eradicate the word phraseology in the indicated meaning, which has acquired a venerable age, from general use; therefore, linguists will have to come to terms with the ambiguity of the term phraseology, although this is not very convenient in various respects. The word phraseology in its collective meaning, like the word terminology, has firmly entered into the everyday life of philologists, and to object to this, as Prof. B.A. Larin, perhaps, is pointless. I.E. Anichkov was right when he wrote about this: “He expresses the wish that this term should cease to be used in its basic, primary collective meaning, characteristic of it in all European languages, which, of course, is hopeless” [1, 27].

Without objecting to the use of the term phraseology in the meaning of “stable phraseology and characteristic combinations of words of a particular language or author,” one should, however, resolutely condemn the formulaic and stable topics of theses and candidate’s dissertations such as: “Phraseology Nekrasov, Mamina-Sibiriyak, Leonov, etc.” or “Phraseology of “Fairy Tales of Saltykov-Shchedrin”, “A Boring Story” by Chekhov, etc.” Such problems, as many years of experience have shown, are unlikely to justify themselves if we ignore the qualifying role of such works for their authors. Hundreds of works written on similar topics could not be generalized; in most cases, even the material itself, extracted by the authors of the works from certain texts, was not useful. Such a waste of research energy, even for novice scientists, can hardly be considered sufficiently prudent.

The deepening of phraseology as a branch of linguistics, in which we are currently primarily

interested, will largely depend on the intensive development of new materials with a differential approach to them. The time for studying based on the mobilization of phraseological resources from one's own active stock and applying for additions to explanatory dictionaries for Russian phraseology has certainly passed.

When referring to the phraseological fund of a language, its traditionality and stability are usually emphasized. This property is undeniable - it catches the eye. However, an approach to phraseological phenomena and facts only under the sign of their traditionality risks being one-sided. The attentive gaze of the researcher notices an equally characteristic feature of phraseological units of the Russian language: next to the historical variability of lexical idioms, for example, there is a certain flexibility and dialecticity, manifested in the lively use of phraseological units. This property determines the development of the phraseological stock of the language, its life and historical variability. But such observations require extensive living material of the modern language or abundant specially developed materials of its historical past.

In modern Russian there is an expression to go through fire and water, sometimes receiving the addition: and copper pipes. Apparently, it is associated with a wide range of biblical borrowings and represents an echo of the motive of testing (Cf. Book of the Prophet Isaiah, 43, 2). In the "Dictionary of the Modern Russian Literary Language" it is interpreted under the word "to go through": "to experience, to endure a lot." The author of the interpretation, by focusing attention not on the meaning, but on what resulted in the meaning, made a logical mistake. For modern usage, synonyms for this expression are the words experienced, sophisticated. It is precisely the highest degree of experience and sophistication that it is intended to convey:

«В его Казарине чувствовался человек, умудренный опытом жизни, *прошедший*, как говорится, *через огонь, воду и медные трубы*» ("In his Kazarin one could feel a man wise by the experience of life, who, as they say, had gone through fire, water and copper pipes.") (Юрьев, Записки, I, «Маскарад», 3). — Есть вещи, которые даже нашему брату, в семи водах мытому, *прошедшему и огонь и медные трубы*, забыть невозможно (There are things that even our brother, washed in the seven waters, who has gone through fire and copper pipes, cannot forget) (Герман, Дорогой мой человек, 12).

It should be said, however, that the concept of "experience", without a derogatory connotation of disapproval, developed in the expression under consideration relatively recently. V.I.Dal in the collection of «Пословицы русского народа» (Proverbs of the Russian people) places it not under the heading «опыт» ("experience"), but among such expressions, which he united under the heading «расторопность» ("quickness").

In his dictionary the word *расторопный* (efficient) is interpreted — «смышленный на дело и везде поспевающий» ("smart for business and keeping up with everything"). In the collection of proverbs, *прошел огонь и воду* (fire and water) have passed through and stands on the same level as *за словом в карман не полезет* (the word will not reach into your pocket) and *знает, где раки зимуют* (knows where crayfish spend the winter). Under the word, *опыт* (experience) is given: *из семи печей хлеб едал, на коне и под конем бывал, старого воробья на мякине не проведешь* (I ate bread from seven ovens, I was on a horse and under a horse, you can't fool an old sparrow on chaff), and etc.

As for the Russian literary language of the second half of the 19th - early 20th centuries, in it the phraseological unit *прошел огонь и воду* (has gone through fire) and *медные трубы* (water and copper pipes) are usually used disapprovingly in the sense of "having seen and experienced a lot in life, become a scoundrel, acquire imperfect morality" [2, 63].

Along with the two noted meanings, of which the first is characteristic of modern word usage, this expression is also used to characterize a scoundrel, a scoundrel who has made his way into "high society":

“This is how our morally descriptive novel took shape... with a feeling of lively sympathy, telling about the adventures of a clever, roguish scumbag to the point of moral uncleanness, a scoundrel, who crawled into people *пролезшего в люди сквозь огонь, воду* (through fire, water) and *медные трубы* (copper pipes), in the words of Belinsky: «выходца из собачьей конуры» (“coming from a dog’s kennel”) (В. Ф. Переверзев. Пушкин в борьбе с русским «плутовским романом»).

Пролезть в люди (to crawl into people) and *пройти огонь, воду* (go through fire, water) and *медные трубы* (copper pipes) on the basis of semantic proximity are subject in the given example to a kind of contamination, which is very characteristic of the development of phraseological composition in general.

The phraseological fund of the Russian language has been studied far from sufficiently, both in terms of identification, stock of phraseological units, their descriptive characteristics, and lexicographic interpretation. The absence of an academic-type phraseological dictionary, of course, has a very negative impact on the possibility of phraseological classes in higher educational institutions. The comparative and comparative aspect, which is of exceptional importance in phraseological observations and studies of facts not only of related and unrelated languages, but also belonging to the same language, due to this circumstance cannot be truly developed in practice of working with students. The accumulation of phraseological materials through intensive development of sources becomes all the more important. Such a development can not only provide material for private semantic-stylistic observations, but also serve as the basis for phraseological dictionaries of various designs and types, work on which could be carried out in the collaboration of university departments in the CIS countries. The very creation of local qualified phraseological card files will already be a great advance in the phraseology of the Russian language. Here you can recall the statement of academician. V.V. Vinogradova on the role of materials for creating “the complete stylistics of the modern Russian language”: “the most important and most significant thing for understanding and directing the development processes of the modern Russian language in the historical conditions of the present moment is the targeted and carefully organized preparation of materials to create a complete stylistics of the modern Russian language” [4, 4].

There are essentially no phraseological dictionaries of the Russian language, while a whole series of them is conceivable and necessary: phraseological-synonymous¹⁰), historical phraseological, etymological phraseological. In addition, various stylistic phraseological dictionaries are possible and desirable - manuals on the culture of speech and stylistics of the Russian language. Dictionaries of this nature are extremely labor-intensive, since their implementation requires extensive specialized card indexes, the creation of which is almost backbreaking work for individuals. The experience of lexicographic work carried out in some universities and pedagogical institutes is fully justified, so one can hope that some of the listed phraseological dictionaries, at least the preparation of materials for them, could be included in the plan of scientific work Russian language departments of higher educational institutions. In any case, one thing is certain: teaching and research of Russian phraseology should go hand in hand, mutually enriching.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Anichkov I. E. On the classification, definitions and names of special linguistic sciences. Uch. zap. LGPI named after. Herzen, L., 1958, t. 181, p. 27. (Аничков И. Е. О классификации, определениях и названиях частных языковедческих наук. Уч. зап. ЛГПИ им. Герцена, Л., 1958, т. 181, стр. 27.)
2. Babkin A. M. “Lexicographic development of Russian phraseology.” L., 1964, p. 63. (Бабкин А. М. «Лексикографическая разработка русской фразеологии». Л., 1964, стр. 63.)
3. Larin B. A. Essays on phraseology. Uch. zap. LSU. L., 1956, p. 218 (Ларин Б. А. Очерки по фразеологии. Уч. зап. ЛГУ. Л., 1956, стр. 218)
4. Russian speech, its study and issues of speech culture. “Issues of linguistics”, 1961, IV, p. 4.

(Русская речь, ее изучение и вопросы речевой культуры. «Вопросы языкознания», 1961, IV, стр. 4.)

5. Tolikina E. N. On the systemic relationship between a terminological combination and a phraseological unit. «Problems of phraseology» L., 1964, p. 150. (Толикина. Е. Н. О системном соотношении терминологического сочетания и фразеологической единицы. «Проблемы фразеологии». Л., 1964, стр. 150.)