

TYPICAL SEMANTIC SPECIFICITIES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH “MONEY” COMPONENT IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Polvanova Mahzuna Farxadovna

**Uzbekistan World State Languages University
English second faculty-2, Senior teacher
Uzbekistan, Tashkent**

Abstract:

Phraseological units are considered by many researchers as the colorful side of the language. Therefore, learners must see the language through rose-colored glasses to learn every single item that leads to proficiency. In fact, the level of command of phraseological units serves as an important indicator of L2 proficiency. And the main points of studying semantic specificities of phraseological units are that they are often unpredictable in meaning, that is, their definition cannot always be derived from the literal meanings of the constituent parts. Phraseological units, which are a part of phraseology and are largely figurative in nature, are widely spread in human language. This article deals with the forms of phraseological units denoting “money” in their components and semantic features in the English and Uzbek languages. Moreover in this issue we investigated the compatibility of the concept of monetary system and with the characteristic properties of phraseological systems of these two languages.

Key words: phraseological units, monosemantic, polysemantic, equivalent, denotative aspects, connotative aspects, semantic structure, prototype, component, etimological analysis, phraseosemantic groups, semantic classification.

Introduction

Recently, in the works devoted to the problems of phraseology, there are allegations that the words included in the phraseological unit, in many attitudes or even completely lose their word status. Now we can call them components, although more recently they were called more cautiously - words - components. Using the term "component" we argue that the elements of a phraseological unit are not words. This proof was preceded by works claiming that the components of a phraseological unit are completely or partially devoid of categorical features of the word and, first of all, their separately lexical meaning. Since the phraseological units related meaning is a semantic phenomenon, the ways of its occurrence, naturally, should be sought in the action of the semantic laws of the language, in the change of the meanings of words, as well as in their compatibility with each other. There are turns in which one of the components has a phraseological related meaning, which manifests itself only in connection with a strictly defined range of concepts and their verbal designations. Moreover, for such a restriction, emphasized V. Vinogradov, as if there are no grounds in the logical or real nature of the designated objects, actions, phenomena. [V. Vinogradov, 1953] These restrictions are created by the laws of the connection of verbal meanings inherent in a given language. Such combinations are not equivalent to words, since the same component in different distributions has different meanings; for example: *for my money, money talks* or in the Uzbek language, such as *to'qqizpuldekqilib tushuntirib bermoq* (means explanation in details), etc. [Sh. Rakhmatullaev, 2013] In this given examples from the Uzbek language in the first case, the "pul" has a meaning. Based on the assumption that

phraseology studies the compatibility of lexemes of all types, we conducted a study of compatibility, lexemes denoting the concept of a monetary unit in English and Uzbek, which made

1. V.V Vinogradov, *On some issues of Russian historical lexicology*. (P.185-210) 1953. № 5.
2. Sh. Rakhmatullaev «O'zbektiliningizohlifrazeologiklug'ati». Tashkent. 2013.

it possible to draw conclusions regarding the characteristic properties of the phraseological systems of the two mentioned languages.

There is no doubt that the problem of meaning in language is the most controversial issue among linguists and researches. Since we study phraseology as an independent linguistic discipline which began its existence, another discussion has begun in the linguistic world, and dedicated to the difference in lexical meaning and phraseological meaning. The fact is that the complexity of lexical semantics and the diversity of semantic classes of words do not exclude the selection of the lexical meaning of a word, which allows us to establish the diversity of this meaning. A similar principle is observed in the field of phraseology. The fact that a semantic feature of phraseological meaning is highlighted makes it possible to establish its main varieties: the idiomatic meaning, the idio-phraseological meaning, and the phraseological meaning in accordance with the three classes of phraseological units. [A.V.Kunin, 1996]. These meanings are included in the phraseological microsystem of the language and provide an opportunity to find out their varieties in accordance with the semantic features of the phraseological units characteristic of each class of phraseological units. We adhere to a very productive idea put forward by a linguist and that the phraseological sense cannot be realized without the existence of certain structures, that is, it is impossible to study the features of phraseological units with “money” component without knowing their structure. Obviously, determining the status of a phraseological meaning is very important, because it will prevent some authors from substituting the concept of these terms, will prevent them from seeing “phraseological meaning” at all semantic levels of the language, including the lexical level. As it is, the specificity of a phraseological meaning is established on a purely semantic basis without due regard for phraseological units with a “monetary” component and its structural features. Although phraseological units exist within the boundaries of certain structures, all the specific features of the phraseological meaning cannot be reduced only to the relationship between the meaning and its structure. It is known that monostructural constructions can differ in their meaning, and vice versa, polystructural constructions can be close in their semantics. As we have mentioned above phraseological meaning has a certain degree of conditional independence, which should not be mixed in those relationships that can easily occur when the structure is absolutized.

A semantic specificity of phraseology is a value category, which is interpreted differently depending on the understanding of the nature of the phraseological unit, its components and the scope of phraseology. As you know, phrases with the component denoting “money”, which turn into phraseological units, are included in complex semantic processes. Phraseologists have not yet come to a common opinion about the mechanism and patterns of changing the semantic essence of the words-components of phraseological units. The formal semantic structure of a phraseological unit, as well as the study of its content level and plane of expression, is a special question. In other words, the question is how the elements of the semantics of phraseological units are classified according to their lexical components, the degree of semantic combination, and the semantic separation of the phraseological unit. Needless to say such units are primarily characterized by the contradiction that exists between the semantic integrity of the whole and the formal independence of its parts. It is very difficult to establish a clear boundary between the free phrases that the speaker generates in the process of speech and phraseological units used as ready-made ones. As a rule, it can be shown that there are different degrees of “setting” or different degrees of semantic groups. This is a subject of studying semantic features of phraseology, but some of these theoretical aspects are very important for learning languages.

The semantic structure of phraseological units is wider than its meaning, since they are not limited to significant, denotative and connotative aspects, but also are determined by the internal form, the construction of the whole education, the type of its grammatical meaning. Connotation is determined only by the social, ideological position of the speaker, therefore the estimated component of such connotation is subjective. Additionally the semantic structure of words belonging to the same lexico-grammatical category, and to the words of the corresponding

3. Kunin, A.V. (1996) *A course on modern English phraseology*. Dubna: Published: Feniks
phraseological units, for example, nouns - substantial phraseological units, never completely coincides. This is confirmed by the analysis of mismatched components of the semantic structures of the above entities. In this regard, it can be said that each type of phraseological unit has some common features; some degree of rethinking meaning and phraseological abstraction, based on individual forms or whole parts within the above phraseological structures. The semantic structure of each word is very complex. V.V. Vinogradov wrote: "The complexity of the semantic structure of a word lies in the diversity of its relationships and living interactions with other lexical connections of the language system, so it is very difficult to distinguish and convey all meanings, shades of the word, even during a certain period of development of the language. "[V. Vinogradov, 1953]. Although idioms are inferior to words in the sense of ambiguity; the semantic structure of phraseological units is also extremely complex. This is due to the rethinking of the nature of various aspects in it, the uniformity of phraseological units and the complexity of their structure, the variety of which is very important and can range from single-phrase phraseological units to complex sentences. Knowledge of English phraseological units, proverbs and sayings enriches students' vocabulary and helps them to comprehend the figurative system of the English language. , master English humor and expand your language skills.

In the sphere of phraseology, the problem is even more confused than in the lexicon, due to the complexity of the semantic structure of phraseological units, the structural diversity of the prototypes of phraseology, the high proportion of internal form and connotation in the structure of phraseological meaning and complexity of the composition of phraseology. When we are analyzing it is extremely important to take into account the nature of the prototype of a phraseological unit, including the extra linguistic factors preceding the appearance of phraseological units. A semantic feature is established by imposing the phraseological units on their prototypes, if they coincide in lexical composition and comparing them in the absence of such a coincidence. Changing the meaning of phraseological units that have not passed the variable word combination stage can be established by comparing the meaning of a phraseological unit with the literal meanings of its components. Vocabulary definitions can also be used; for example: *marry money*- 'a rich wife' or *puliyuqningko'ziyuq* – means 'money makes eyes blind'. With a partial comprehension of components with literal meaning in the composition of phraseological units, it is usually included in the definition. In order to formulate the definition of rethinking should highlight its most important features by considering the main types of this process. Depending on the nature of rethinking, linguistic techniques that are used in this case, as well as on the features of object designation, two main types of semantic features of phraseological units can be distinguished: rethinking inherent in the secondary nomination and reinterpretation that has places in the tertiary nomination. Rethinking characteristic of the secondary phraseological nomination can be both simple and complex. By simple form, the phraseological units are formed, the prototypes of which are variable phrases whose meanings are mediated. For example: *more kicks than half pence* – 'punishment instead of gratitude' (someone does good to someone, and in return receives punishment), *penny for your thoughts* – 'take care of the money for a rainy day' (everyone should have money for stock). [Collins. N,1960].

As well as a simple form of rethinking is also observed in cases where the second phraseological variant is derived from the first, which has literal meaning. This type is characteristic of ideofazomatic revolutions, for example: 1) *pay with the same coin*; means 'will respond with the same act.'

Other examples to this type: To have a heart of gold - 1) have a golden heart;
2) to be gracious, noble;

4. Vinogradov, V.V. (1953) *On some issues of Russian historical lexicology. (Pp.185-210) In Bulletin of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Language and Literature Section. vol. 12, Moscow.*

5. Collins V. N. *A book of English Idioms with Explanations London. 1960.-C.750.*

The other side of coin - 1) the other side of the coin;

2) against anyone's point of view;

Among classified types of components' markers (connotative, archaic and relict, prepositional, particular and others) a special interest is given to an issue on symbolically marked components. Although the author states that "there are not quite clear criteria, in accordance with which some words, before they become components, are acknowledged as symbols, and others are not", but an original symbolic meaning of the component is at least partially kept in semantics of the fixed phrase and quite regularly reproduced in many phraseological units. Moreover, even if a symbolically meaning word is updated in the language, it can vary its semantics to a rather broad extent (Zhukov, 1996).

These examples are metaphorical phraseological units. Metaphorical rethinking is the transition from one denotation to another, associated with it on the basis of real or imagined similarity. Complicated rethinking in the secondary phraseological nomination arises just like simple reinterpretation, by converting the literal meaning of the prototype. But with complex transformations, there is always a complicating factor, for example: the non-motivated value of phraseological units, associations with extra linguistic factors as a preliminary link in the process of rethinking. Unmotivated value does not interfere with communication, as it is supported by the tradition of use. An example of a non-motivated phraseological unit can be the phraseological unit, which means "monetary unit" in the analyzed languages. For instance: *Bayibudunyo* – *pulliohirator* in English *penny pig*, *yellow boy* (*gold coin*). A complex rethinking of unmotivated phraseological units cannot be an object of direct observation, but is established on the basis of a diachronic etymological analysis. Thus, rethinking involves a shift in meaning, not a narrowing or expansion, in other words, semantic processes are associated with changes in the scope of the concept. The analysis of phraseological meaning implies a seminal analysis of the semantic structure of phraseological units. The classification of phraseological meaning is based on the identification of various types of rethinking and taking into account the structures in which they are implemented. The degree of abstraction of meaning is distinguished depending on the nature of abstraction on the lexical and grammatical meaning of the components of phraseology, on the prototype of the phraseologism and on the meaning of the syntactic construction. In the next group of examples, we see that the concept of a monetary unit is considered in the meaning of the entire phraseological units and given comparative data of English and Uzbek phraseological units with a 'money' component in English and Uzbek languages by phrase-semantic groups.

For example; 1) hard cash – money in cash
2) pocket money - money for expenses

- 3) money makes the man - no money, no respect

These examples have values that are directly related to the money concept.

- 1) to be rolling in the money - to be rich, very rich
- 2) Money wise - deft
- 3) Shilling shocker-bad picture
- 4) Pulbermasmarakabuzar -means 'mean, greedy'

As can be seen, the given phraseological units are characterized with the meaning of the state and moral qualities of a person.

- 1) Lend your money and lose your friend- to split up

6. Zhukov, A.V. (1996) *Transitive phraseological phenomenon of in the Russian language*. Novgorod.

- 2) Penny wise - clever, smart
- 3) Pultopgunchaaql top- means 'money is not everything'

The process of phraseological units forming is complicated and continuous theoretically and practically that is connected with the development of civilization and teaching phraseology should consider both linguistic and extra linguistic aspects. Successful foreign language teaching presupposes knowing both the methodology of teaching and the theory of the language. Gaining the knowledge of phraseological units with components denoting "money" is a part of cultural approach to foreign teaching and organizing vocabulary, according to structure of linguistic approach in English and Uzbek languages. Therefore the major sources of phraseological units are the experience of the common people, literary works, religious scripture, translated loans, and history. So we can grab some basic information of English and Uzbek culture through semantic features of phraseological units with 'money' component, which plays an important role in cross-cultural communication. In addition to this group, the analysis allowed us to identify the phraseological units with the meaning of knowledge and the concept of friendship.

The semantic features and function of phraseological units with 'money' component is to teach and advise people what they see in their lives. Many English and Uzbek phraseological units guide people to adopt a correct attitude towards life and to take a proper way to get along well with others. Some other expressions tell people what to do and how to do it, so the phraseological units with 'money' component guide people's daily life.

All in all the semantic specificities of English and Uzbek phraseological units with a component denoting a "monetary system" by semantic subgroups allowed us to establish about ten semantic subgroups in English, as well as in Uzbek. Phraseological units that express a place, profession, human condition, moral quality, intellectuality, friendship, and others were investigated in these subgroups. And by this way we may see their influence not only on the theoretical sphere, but also we have a good opportunity to introduce with the social and cultural life of both countries

Reference:

1. Sh. Rakhmatullaev «O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati». Tashkent. 2013.
2. Kunin, A.V. (2005) *A course on modern English phraseology*. Dubna: Published: Feniks +.

3. Vinogradov, V.V. (1953) On some issues of Russian historical lexicology. (Pp.185-210) In Bulletin of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Language and Literature Sectio. vol. 12, Moscow.
4. Collins V. N. A book of English Idioms with Explanations London. 1960.-C.750.
5. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.-p.46.
6. Zhukov, A.V. (1996) *Transitive phraseological phenomenon of in the Russian language*. Novgorod.
7. Smirnitsky, A.I. (1956) English phraseology. Moscow.
8. Amosova, N.N. (2013) Fundamentals of English phraseology. Moscow. Librokom.
9. Kunin, A. (2005). English-Russian phrasebook. 6th edition M.: Living language.
10. Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms. – Cambridge University Press, 1998. – 587 p.
11. Collins COBUILD Dictionary of Idioms. – M.: OOO “AST Press”: 2004. – 751 p. 7. Longman dictionary of contemporary English. – Essex: Longman House, 1995/ - 1668 p.
12. Glucksberg, Sam. Understanding Figurative Language: From Metaphor to Idioms. Oxford: OxfordUniversityPress, 2001. Print.
13. Glucksberg, Sam. “Idiom Meanings and AllusionalContent. “Idioms: Processing, Structure and Interpretation. Ed. Cristina Cacciari. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1993.-p. 3-16. Print.
14. 26.Smith, L. P. Words and Idioms: Studies in the English Language.-London: Longman Co,2001
15. Online-Dictionary LINGVO.
16. 35.Macmillian Dictionary Phrasal verbs *Plus*2005
17. Stoyanova, Inga. “Semantic Aspects of English Body Idioms.” Diss. IRIM Chisinau, 2009.-p.62.
18. Ed. Cristina Cacciari. Structure and Interpretation. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1993.-p.145.