

## Aspects Of Modern Phraseology

Musaev Abdukarim Sulaimanovich<sup>1</sup>, Islyamova Lenara<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Musaev Abdukarim Sulaymanovich, teacher of Jizzakh State Pedagogy University <sup>2</sup>Islyamova Lenara, PhD, Associate professor of Jizzakh State Pedagogy University

**Article History:** Received: 11 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 16 April 2021

**ABSTRACT.** This article examines the problems of the modern scientific paradigm in relation to structural linguistics. What is the role of structural linguistics in cognitive-cultural linguistics research. "Non-classical" phraseology is primarily associated with the study of linguocultural aspects of linguistic pictures of the world.

**KEYWORDS:** phraseology, linguistic picture of the world, concept, consciousness, discourse, grammatical categories of language, semantics.

Phraseology is a language subsystem that was actively studied in the second half of the twentieth century both in Russian studies and in Uzbek linguistics, which is reflected in the works of V.V. Vinogradov, S.I. Ozhegova, V.L. Arkhangelsky, V.P. Zhukova, A.I. Molotkova, V.N. Telia, M.M. Kopylenko, Z.D. Popova, V.M. Mokienko, N.M. Shanskiy, A.N. Tikhonova A.M. Bushuya, E.A. Malinovsky, T.A. Bushui, N.A. Semenova, M.I. Umarchodzaeva, L.I. Roizenon, A.N. Tikhonova, Sh. Rakhmatullaeva, M.A. Sadykova and many others.

However, in recent decades, a number of phraseologists have become aware of the exhaustion of the traditional, mainly system-structural, paradigm for describing phraseology (in Russian studies, this paradigm is associated primarily with the concept of V.V. Vinogradov). "At the beginning of the 1970s, in phraseology, as in other disciplines of European linguistics, the structural-systemic period with the predominance of empirical and classifying methods comes to an end. It was replaced by anthropocentric phraseology <...> Drawing a clear demarcation line between these epochal periods, of course, is impossible, and there is no particular need for this. There is no doubt only that a new paradigm arises where the simple formulation of the method used to describe and classify the properties of phraseological units, obtained on the basis of empirical data, grows into the formulation of theoretical premises of anthropocentric phraseology "[1, p. 22]. The new paradigm of N.F. Alefirenko calls it cognitive-discursive, one can also call it cognitive-cultural. In any case, the anthropocentric approach to phraseology, as well as to other linguistic tiers, is associated with cognitive linguistics.

According to N.F. Alefirenko "paradoxically, but its forerunner can also be called the linguistic psychologism of the 19th century, since the focus of researchers was on the psycholinguistic mechanisms of the generation and functioning of phraseological units, and the ideas of V. von Humboldt and A. Potebnya, and the Prague functional-communicative linguistics" [ 1, p. 22]. In our opinion, there is no paradox here: both the concept of Humboldt and the interpretation of his teaching on the inner form of the language of A.A. Potebney, and functional linguistics (especially in the field of word formation) were aimed at studying the content side of the language, at the correlation of reality, concepts and linguistic units proper in all the richness of their national identity. Another thing is that these powerful linguistic concepts were temporarily pushed aside by the relevance of the concepts of F. de Saussure and the structuralists.

In this sense, cognitivism - the interpretation of a person as an actor, actively perceiving and producing information - is quite consistent with the concept of a human linguist by W. von Humboldt. Therefore, for any interpretation of cognitive linguistics, it will obviously be relevant to understand it as a science that studies "superdeep semantics". In fact, cognitive linguistics has absorbed a number of areas of semantic research: the cognitive direction in linguistics did not develop from scratch, it received wide recognition precisely because it addresses "the topics that have always worried Russian linguistics: language and thinking, the main functions of language, roles a person in language and the role of language for a person "[3, p. 11]. In particular, "A. A. Potebnya perfectly understood the role of language in the processes of learning new things, in the processes of formation and development of human knowledge about the world on the basis of psychological processes of apperception and association, on the basis of a person's ideas of different strengths about phenomena that have names in the language "[3, p. 9].

Cognitive linguistics in no way can be considered a single, integral scientific direction. "The material of linguo-cognitive analysis is language, and the goals of such research in different specific areas (schools) of cognitive linguistics can differ - from an in-depth study of language using a cognitive categorical and terminological apparatus to concrete modeling of the content and structure of individual concepts as units of national consciousness (conceptosphere)" [8, p. 12]. Z.D. Popova and I.A. Sternin distinguishes the following main areas of cognitive linguistics:

- cultural
- linguocultural
- logical
- semantic-cognitive
- philosophical and semiotic [8, p. sixteen].

"Each of these areas can be considered already sufficiently formed in modern linguistics, they all have their own methodological principles (they are united primarily by the theoretical idea of the concept as a unit of consciousness)" [8, p. 17].

From the many definitions of the concept, we choose the definition of R.M. Frumkina's concept is a verbalized concept reflected in the categories of culture.

With the exception of the logical direction, all the listed areas can be attributed to the study of phraseology, and it should be emphasized that it was in traditional phraseology that the foundations of culturological and linguoculturological directions were laid (especially in comparative phraseology, in diachronic phraseology, in the study of etymology and the internal form of phraseological units), as well as semantic-cognitive (for example, when studying the specifics of the structure and semantics of verbal, substantive, adjective and adverbial phraseological units).

"Non-classical" phraseology is primarily associated with the study of linguocultural aspects of linguistic pictures of the world, for example, specific Russian concepts are identified, expressed through phraseological units. However, the choice of such concepts often seems to be random, insufficiently systematic. However, often the choice of such concepts seems to be random, not sufficiently systematic.

From our point of view, there are other aspects of cognitive linguistics as applied to phraseology. Cognitive research, to a certain extent, inherits work on the analysis of linguistic categories, the internal form of a word and phraseological units, on component analysis, semiotics, the study of semantic fields, and psycholinguistics. According to E.S. Kubryakova, the tasks of cognitive science "include the description / study of knowledge representation systems and information processing and processing processes, and - at the same time - the study of the general principles of organizing human cognitive abilities into a single mental mechanism, and the establishment of their relationship and interaction" [3, p. 8-9].

This approach is quite applicable to the study of phraseology, for example, to clarify the reasons for a significant restructuring of the part-of-speech system of phraseological units in comparison with the lexical system, to determine the cognitive foundations of the specificity of the part-of-speech classification of phraseological units in the Russian language, to identify their cognitive-discursive potential, as well as to study the role of grammatical categories in formal meaningful organization of phraseological units (PU) of various ethnic languages.

As you know, in the Russian language, the part-of-speech composition of phraseological units differs significantly from the corresponding composition of lexical units, in which nouns, adjectives and verbs dominate. Among phraseological units, verbal and adverbial phraseological units dominate, which is a significant restructuring of the system of parts of speech at the phraseological level [7].

Phraseological units of ethnic languages can be considered as specific cognitive structures, in each language organized into a certain conceptual sphere, which is an essential part of the linguistic picture of the world. In general, the part of speech affiliation and the structural type of phraseological units turn out to be very significant in the cognitive-discursive aspect. Phraseological units are one of the forms of cognitive "packing" of knowledge and means of pragmatic influence, and the type of this "packing" (verbal phraseological units, substantive, adjective, adverbial, their structure) is not indifferent for fine deep semantics.

In our opinion, the sharp opposition of the systemic-structural and cognitive approaches, which is characteristic of the concepts of a number of modern phraseologists, is not constructive. The study of the phraseological conceptual sphere in the aspect of represented concepts, in principle, cannot be divorced from the analysis of the structural types of the presentation of phraseological units [5].

An important role in the formation of not only the grammatical form, but also the semantics of phraseological units is played by the classifying grammatical categories of different languages. In the Russian language, in relation to verbal phraseological units, such categories are the categories of the type and voice.

#### REFERENCE:

1. Alefirenko N.F. Phraseology in the light of modern linguistic paradigms: Monograph. - M.: Elpis, 2008. -- 271 p.
2. Dzhumanova D.R. Features of the semantic structure of phraseological units // Semantics of linguistic units and context // Materials of the scientific-practical conference. - Tashkent, 2009. - pp. 57-59.
3. Kubryakova E. S. Language and knowledge. - M.: Languages of Slavic cultures, 2004. -- 556 p.

4. Kunin A.V. A course of phraseology of modern English. - M.: Higher school, 1986. -- 336 p.
5. Melerovich A.M. Isomorphism between semantics and the form of a phraseological unit and the principles of constructing dictionary definitions // Word - consciousness - culture. - M.: Flinta, 2006. -- p. 31-40.
6. Mokienko V.M. Images of Russian speech: Historical and etymological sketches of phraseology. 3rd ed., Rev. - M.: Flinta: Nauka, 2009. -- 464 p.
7. Musaev A.S. Partial classification of phraseological units and the specificity of verbal phraseological units // Bulletin of Samarkand State University. - Samarkand: SamSU, 2011. - No. 6. - p. 58-62.
8. Popova Z.D., Sternin I.A. Cognitive linguistics. - M.: Ast: East - West, 2007. -- 314 p.
9. Tikhonov A.N. Species correlations in modern Russian. // Typology of the species: problems, searches, solutions. - M.: Languages of Russian culture, 1998. -- p. 466-477.
10. Khusnutdinov A.A. Phraseological unit in the grammatical structure of the language. - Kostroma: Bulletin of Kostroma State University, 2015. - pp. 158-162.