PHRASEOLOGY AS A SUBSYSTEM OF THE LANGUAGE

Abdazova A'loxon Rivojiddin qizi
Student, group 2102 Department of information service and public relations
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
E-mail: gg0786320@gmail.com

Annotation. Phraseology means the branch of linguistics managing stable word mixes described by a specific transaction of significance. Notwithstanding contrasts of assessment, most creators concur upon certain focuses concerning the unmistakable elements of phraseological units, for example, Uprightness (or transaction) of importance implies that none of the saying parts is independently connected with any referents of genuine reality, and the significance of the entire unit can't be reasoned from the implications of its parts; Solidness (lexical and syntactic) implies that no lexical replacement is conceivable in an expression in correlation with free or variable word-mixes (with an exemption of certain situations when such replacements are made by the creator purposefully).
Keywords: phraseology, phraseological units, lexical stability, semantic structure, syntactic variations, idiomatic expressions, phraseological security, lexicalization.

Introduction. The investigations directed during the 1990s showed that the significance of a saying isn't by and largely indistinguishable from its strict rework given in the word reference section. For that reason, we might talk about the lexical adaptability of numerous units assuming they are utilized imaginatively. Lexical dependability is generally joined by syntactic strength which restricts any linguistic changes;[1]

Distinguishableness implies that the design of a saying isn't something inseparable, certain changes are conceivable inside specific limits. Here we meet with the supposed lexical and syntactic variations. For models: "as eager as a wolf (as a tracker)", "as protected as a house (houses)" in English, «как (будто, словно, точно) в воду опушенный», «оседлать своего (любимого) конька», «раскидывать умом (мозгами) Раскинуть (пораскинуть) умом (мозгами)» in Russian. Expressivity and emotiveness imply that sayings are additionally portrayed by complex shading. All in

---

[1] Bushuy, Tatyana. Umumiy tilshunoslik. — O'quv qo'llanma. — Samarqand: SamDChTI, 2002. — 50 b.

all, they inspire feelings or add expressiveness. Overall phraseological units, regardless of whether they present a specific example, don't create new expressions. They are novel. Interlanguage examination, the point of which is the openness of phraseological congruities, frames the premise of various hypothetical and applied patterns of present-day phonetic exploration, including the hypothesis and practice of paleography. Yet, the subject of deciding the elements of interlanguage phraseological congruities as the principle idea and the standard of picking phraseological reciprocals and analogs as the perspective ideas is currently at issue. The examination of exceptional writing during the last many years shows that most language specialists think about the occurrence of semantic design, linguistic (or grammatical) association and componential (lexeme) structure the principle measures in characterizing the sorts of interlanguage phraseological similarities/variations with the undoubted supremacy of semantic construction. Contrasting the three methodologies examined above (semantic, useful, and context-oriented) we have more than adequate ground to presume that share especially for all intents and purposes as the principle models of phraseological units seem, by all accounts, to be something very similar, for example, steadiness and phraseology or absence of inspiration. It ought to be noted anyway that these measures as expounded in the three methodologies are adequate primarily to single out outrageous cases: profoundly colloquial non-variable and free (or variable) word-gatherings.

In this way formality, female horse's home, and so forth. According to the semantic methodology have a place with style and are portrayed as combinations as they are non-roused. According to the practical methodology they are likewise viewed as phraseological units in light of their linguistic (syntactic) indistinguishability and because they work, in discourse as word counterparts. According to the relevant methodology administrative noise, horse's home, and so forth make up a gathering of phraseological units alluded to as sayings because of the inconceivability of any adjustment of the 'fixed setting' and their semantic indistinguishability. The situation with the greater part of word-gatherings anyway can't be chosen with assurance with the assistance of these models because, generally speaking, we need to bargain not with comp1ete phraseology and solidness but with a specific level of these distinctive elements of phraseological units. No genuine rules of the level of phraseology and steadiness have at this point been recommended. Along these lines, e.g., to win a triumph according to the semantic methodology is a phraseological blend since it is inspired and permits specific changeability to win, to acquire, a triumph. According to the practical methodology, it's anything but a phraseological unit as the level of

semantic and linguistic indistinguishability is lacking for the word-gathering to work as a word-same.[2]

Little hours as indicated by the logical methodology it is of strict significance. If anyway we characterize it continuing from the practical methodology is a word-bunches which are to some extent roused is chosen distinctively relying upon which of the rules of phraseological units is applied. There is as yet one more way to deal with the issue of diction in which an endeavor is made to defeat the inadequacy of the phraseological hypotheses talked about above. The fundamental highlights of this new methodology which is currently pretty much generally acknowledged by Soviet language specialists are according to the following: Expressiveness is viewed as an independent part of etymology and, not as a piece of lexicology. Expressiveness manages a phraseological subsystem of language and not with secluded phraseological units. 3. Diction is worried about a wide range of set articulations. 4. Set articulations are partitioned into three classes: phraseological units (for example administrative noise, female horse's home, and so on), phraseomatic units (for example win a triumph, send off a mission, and so forth), and marginal cases having a place with the blended class. The primary differentiation between the first and the subsequent classes is semantic: phraseological units have completely or somewhat moved implications while parts of, phraseomatic units are utilized in their exacting implications.

Phraseological and phraseomatic units are not viewed as word counterparts yet some of them are treated as word connects. Phraseological and phraseomatic units are set articulations and their phraseological security recognizes them from free expressions and compound words. Phraseological and phraseomatic units are comprised of expressions of various levels of wordness relying upon the sort of set articulations they are utilized in. (cf. for example little hours and formality). Their underlying separateness, a significant variable of their solidness, recognizes them from compound words (E.g. contrasting blackbird and underground market). Strength of purpose implies that set articulations are imitated instant and not made in discourse. They are not components of individual styles of discourse but rather language units. Lexical soundness implies that the parts of set articulations are either indispensable (for example formality, horse's home) or party replaceable inside the limits of phraseological or phraseomatic fluctuation: lexical (for example a skeleton in the

---

[2] Chafe W. L. Meaning and the structure of language.— Chicago:Universityof ChicagoPress, 2007.— 524 p.

cabinet - a carefully guarded secret); syntactic (for example to be in profound water - to be in profound waters); positional (for example head over ears - over head and ears), quantitative (for example to lead someone a dance-to lead someone a beautiful dance), blended variations (for example raise (work up) a hornets' home around one's ears-excite (work up) the home of hornets).

Semantic security depends on the lexical solidness of set articulations. In any event, when incidental changes are acquainted it is protected by mean of set articulation. It might just be indicated, made more exact, debilitated, or reinforced. As such regardless of all periodic phraseological and phraseomatic units, as recognized from free expressions, remain semantically invariant or are annihilated. For instance, the replacement of the verbal part in the free expression to bring up an issue by the action word to settle (to settle an inquiry) changes the importance of the expression, no such change happens in to raise (work up) a hornets' home around one's ears. A basic piece of this approach is a technique for phraseological ID which assists with singling out set articulations in Modern English. The diachronic part of expressiveness has hardly been explored. Only a couple of focal points might be momentarily surveyed regarding the beginning of diction has barely been researched. Only a couple of focal points might be momentarily surveyed regarding the beginning of phraseological units and the manners in which they show up in language. It is accepted that practically everything expression can be followed back to free word-bunches which over the authentic advancement of the English language have procured semantic and syntactic course of grammaticalization or lexicalization. Instances of grammaticalization might be delineated by the change of free word-bunches made out of the action word have a thing (pronoun) and Participle II of another action word into the syntactic structure of the Present Perfect in Modern English. The level of semantic and linguistic indistinguishability in this logical word structure is high to such an extent that the part has appeared to have no lexical importance of its own. The term lexicalization infers that the word-bunch being talked about forms into a word-same, for example, a phraseological unit or a compound word. These two equal lines of lexicalization of free word-gatherings can be shown by the diachronic examination of, e.g., the compound word all things considered and the phraseological unit in demonstrating hatred for (of). The two of them can be followed back to fundamentally indistinguishable free expressions.

Conclusion. In conclusion, phraseology plays a crucial role in understanding the intricacies of stable word combinations, which are defined by their transaction of meaning, lexical and syntactic stability, and expressivity. Despite the diversity of

approaches in analyzing phraseological units, key elements such as the integrity of meaning and lexical immutability remain central. These units, often idiomatic in nature, cannot be understood by simply analyzing their individual components, as their meaning emerges from the whole expression. Furthermore, phraseological units exhibit varying degrees of stability and flexibility, with some allowing limited lexical or syntactic variations. The study of phraseological units across languages, especially in an interlanguage context, reveals patterns of similarities and differences, further highlighting their importance in both theoretical and applied linguistics. The ongoing exploration of the diachronic development of these expressions continues to contribute to a deeper understanding of language evolution and structure.

REFERENCES:

1. Bushuy, Tatyana. Umumiy tilshunoslik. — O'quv qo'llanma. — Samarqand: SamDChTI, 2002. — 50 b.
2. Chafe W. L. Meaning and the structure of language.— Chicago:Universityof ChicagoPress, 2007.— 524 p.
3. Moon, R. (1998). Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English: Structural and Functional Perspectives. Oxford University Press.
4. Gläser, R. (2005). Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications. In A. Renouf & A. Sinclair (Eds.), Language and Computers: Studies in Practical Linguistics (pp. 17-37). Brill.
5. Lang, J. (2000). Phraseology: A New Approach to Phraseological Units. In A. Z. Dziubalska-Kolaczyk & J. Weckwerth (Eds.), Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication (pp. 135-145). Peter Lang.
6. Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use. Cambridge University Press.