

## PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF PHRASEOLOGIES

*Abdunabiyev Akmal Akramovich*  
*Termez State University*

**Abstract.** Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi frazeologik birliklarning pragmalingvistika, lingvokulturologiya kabi xususiyatlari tadqiq etilgan.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** Frazeologiya, pragmalingvistika, lingvokulturologiya

**Abstract.** In this article the characteristics of phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages, such as pragmalinguistics and linguoculturology, are studied.

**Key words:** Phraseology, pragmalinguistics, linguoculturology

The term pragmatics was introduced to linguistics in the 60s and 70s of the twentieth century by linguists such as Ch. Pierce, R. Carnap, Ch. Morris, L. Wittgenstein, and was interpreted as a specific branch of linguistics. S. Levinson describes: “Pragmatics is a field that looks at the linguistic structure and studies the grammatical (coded) interactions between language and context, ... pragmatics is the study of all hidden aspects of meaning that semantic theory does not cover, ... analyzes the ability to select sentences appropriately to form a context ”[6, P.9-24].

The subject of pragmatics at the level of phraseology are primarily such components of the semantics of phraseological units as evaluative and emotive. However, the pragmatics of phraseological units can be understood more broadly as the summing of “connotations (social, cultural, ethical, historical, emotive, expressive, evaluative, associative). In general, pragmatics is determined by the need to choose linguistic means (in our case, phraseological units) speaking to express a wide variety of intentions.

Thus, pragmatics can be characterized in the most general form as the attitude of speakers to the signs of the language ”[2]. Pragmatic information was revealed and described mainly at the semantic, stylistic, grammatical levels. As for phraseology, there is a very small number of works in which pragmatics was the direct subject of description ”[3]. There are still many questions regarding the pragmatics of phraseological units that have not yet been resolved. Many components of pragmatic information contained in phraseological units were not identified, the mechanism of interaction of pragmatic elements with other components of the semantics of phraseological units, in particular, denotation, motivational and functional-style components, was not described, types of implementation of pragmatic information in phraseological units (explicit and implicit) were not clarified identification form); it is also necessary to clarify how cultural and national features of phraseological units influence the formation of pragmatic information, etc.

“Linguopragmatics (or pragmatics) is a branch of linguistics and semiotics that studies the situations and ways in which context influences meaning. Pragmatics includes the theory of speech act, the process of engaging in communication, interaction in conversation, and other features related to language in speech mode. In addition to linguistics and semiotics, this field is also related to philosophy, sociology and anthropology”[4, P.148].

Sh. Safarov clearly showed the role of pragmatics in linguistics and described the field of pragmatics as follows: “Pragmatism is a separate branch of linguistics, the study of the selection of linguistic units, their use and the impact of these units on the participants of communication. ... The main idea of linguistic analysis is also to determine the nature of language in relation to its application in practical activities, or in other words, in the context of the function it performs. The concept of task (function) is the basis of a pragmalinguistic approach to language analysis”[5, P.78].

Accordingly, A.M. Emirova describes the pragmatic meaning as a "speaker listener" relationship. “Pragmatic meaning is not only a description of the subject and its properties, but also a means of expressing the feelings and thoughts that take place in the inner and outer world of the speaker (aimed at the listener). In other words, pragmatic meaning is a set of speech and language units that deliver emotional and intellectual capabilities to the listener, depending on the social and psychological state of the speaker.

Pragmatic meaning is always focused on the listener and has a positive or negative effect on the listener's behavior and personality. ” The somatic phraseological units have various meaning. Every person perceives the meaning of these words differently: «beauty is only skin deep», exactly, as deep as the skin, shallow, superficial. It is argued that beauty is also a subjunctive concept cause everyone interprets beauty in their own way: «Beauty is in the eye of the beholder», different people see beauty in different way, what one person finds beautiful may not appeal to another person

- It is better to be unpleasant but good than to be nice but bad person. To have nothing between the/your ears (inf.) ‘to be stupid- ахмоқ, ақлсиз бұлмоқ; миянгда хеч нима йўқ; soft in the head (inf.) (stupid and crazy)

- ; хом калла. a brain box - ума палата to have a good head on your shoulders ‘to be clever’ голова на плечах,

-каллеси жойида, ақл билан иш кўрадиган одам; to get your head on your shoulders ‘to be clever’ – ақли бұлмоқ; to get your head around smth (inf.) ‘to be able to understand smth’

-бирор нарсага жавоб беришга тайёр ; калавани учини топмоқ [6, p. 608]. take matters into your own hands ‘to deal with a problem yourself because the people who should have dealt with it have failed to do so’

- хамма ишни ўз қўлига олмоқ; wash your hands of — ‘to end one’s association with someone or something’ умқть руки

- қўлини ювиб қўлтиғига урмоқ; give someone the glad hand — илиқ, дўстона кутиб олмоқ; give somebody a hand — to help someone do something, especially something that involves physical effort (often + with) - қўл чўзмоқ. lift a hand (against someone or something) and raise a hand (against someone or something) – to threaten (to strike) someone or something кулингизни кутаринг (бирор ким ёки бирор нарсага карши)–бирор кишини ёки бирор нарсани куркитиш (уриш) учун; қўл кўтармоқ. sit on one’s hands — to do nothing; to fail to help сидеть сложа руки - қўлини қовуштириб ўтирмоқ; [7, P. 692].

To be skin and bone/bones – to be extremely thin терисидан суягига; a bag of bones – a person or animal that is extremely thin- қоқ суяк can’t take/keep your eyes off sb/smth; to catch sb’s eye; to be easy on the eye- кўз остига олмоқ; To be all brawn and no brains ‘to be physically strong but not very intelligent - жисмонан бакувват, аклан заиф. [6, P. 608.]

I agree he’s got a good body, but he’s all brawn and no brains – мен унинг бакувват танаси борлигига кўшиламан, аммо у жисмонан кучли, аклан заифдир. Мисолдаги brawn соматизми талқини қуйидагича: ‘physical strength, especially when compared with mental skill and intelligence’ Middle English, from Anglo- French braon flesh, muscle, of Germanic origin. In addition, phraseology is an inexhaustible source of knowledge of the language as a developing and changing system. It contains both modern language formations and the most ancient language forms and constructions.

Therefore, for those who are interested in the history and culture of the English people, phraseology is one of the most fascinating and entertaining areas of the language.

Consequently, phraseological units, like a word, perform in the language the functions of a means of communication and tasks in terms of functional nomination. Another feature is the presence in them of elements of both the lower and upper levels. If the meaning of a word is associated with its constituent sum of morphemes (belonging to a certain part of speech, valence and distribution, denotative-significative dependence), then in phraseological units this phenomenon has a different character.

In fact, phraseological units are a figuratively directed denotative-significative integrity based on the integration of the meanings of its constituent components. On the basis of the integration of phraseological units in the language, a new unit of integral meaning arises. However, some of the integrated components of the phrase, and sometimes all of the components, lose their basic properties. The higher the level of integration, the further away from their original meaning the words that make up phraseological units, and vice versa, the lower the level of integration, the closer the

phrase will be to a free phrase and a free sentence. Let us turn to the analysis of linguistic material illustrating the validity of the above theoretical theses.

Where in our main task is not to study the structural or semantic features of phraseological units in the Uzbek language, because they have been studied in sufficient detail on various linguistic material. Here we aim to analyze the lingo-cultural aspects of phraseological units. Linguocultural aspects are usually realized through the manifestation of pragmalinguistic aspects in discourse.

In Uzbek culture, since ancient times, houses were built with a flat roof and covered with clay. On hot summer nights, you could sleep on the roof, you could dry fruit on it, in some cases small haystacks were laid out on the roof. They didn't put any more cargo, because the roof could not withstand it. A chock is a piece of wood that appears when firewood is split. No one will chop wood on the roof, so a lump cannot appear on the roof, much less fall from it to the ground. That is, the probability of an accident is zero. The main element of this PU is a flat roof. In European, including English culture, roofs are never flat. Who is going to build flat roofs in a rainfall climate? Therefore, no one can think of the idea of chopping wood on the roof.

Thus, the emergence of phraseological units is due to the peculiar aspects of the everyday culture of a particular people. Uzbeks live in hot and dry climates, so flat roofs are common. A flat, clay-coated roof keeps the house and people from the heat in summer and from the cold in winter. As proof of all that has been said, it is enough to cite the Russian translation of the above phrase: "The chairman of the general store, Avazmatov, for no reason, for no reason, suddenly took and removed me from work." In the translation, the phraseological unit itself is absent, and its meaning is conveyed in simple words using their free combination. The stereotypes of the heroes' behavior can be different in different cultures, which can be seen in the following examples. For example: "zit his paw and leave the trap." In Uzbek culture, the fox can break the trap's nets, and in the European culture, the fox will bite off its paw and flee. Why? Because in the east, traps are made of ropes or leather, while in European culture they are made of iron. Rope or leather lashes can be gnawed off, but not iron.

Therefore, the only way to escape from the trap is to gnaw off your own paw. This cultural difference is fully reflected through linguistic means. This phraseological unit corresponds to the Russian phrase "a snail's step", and in English the phrase "till the cows come home". In Russian, this meaning is conveyed using the image of a turtle, and in English - a cow. This is due to the originality of the habitat, way of life and the existence of the people. The British and Russians live in the northern regions with a fairly cold climate.

This, as a primary feature, manifests itself in the nomination of traditional concepts, the formation of primary forms of words and expressions. Camels cannot live in the cold area, but some species of turtles can be found. Slow movement is inherent in the turtle

and the Russians use the image of this animal, speaking of slowness. In the area of the Uzbek linguoculture there is also a turtle, and in this language it means slowness.

But in this context, it is useonly as a synonym for the concept of camel. It is from this point of view that such phrases that exist in the Uzbek conceptsphere, such as "When a camel's tail touches the ground" (when the camel's tail touches the ground), "tuyani yut, lekin dumi ozingdan qurinib turmasin" (swallow the camel, but so that its tail does not visible from your mouth). "Tuya suyib, chor-lasang kham kelmaidi" (he will not come, even if you call, having killed a camel and organized a feast), "Tuya kancha balsa - yagrini shuncha" (What a camel is, such is its back). They are alien to European culture, because, not knowing about the habits of a camel, a person does not know about the signs associated with it. But this conclusion cannot be called absolutely correct.

Because some animals not found in England have nevertheless become were stuck in the PU object. For example: to shed crocodile tears - shed crocodile tears: "Take no notice of her crocodile tears. She is not in the less concerned about your injury "(W. Saroyan). As you know, having swallowed its prey, the crocodile sheds tears. Those who do not know the physiological reasons for this phenomenon mistakenly think that the predator is crying out of pity for the swallowed prey. In fact, the reason is that after a hearty meal in the animal's body, all organs and glands begin to work, including those responsible for lacrimation. It is with the help of tears that the crocodile gets rid of the infections brought along with the prey. This is proven by science. The reason for the appearance of this phraseological unit in the English language was that during the period of colonialism, the British captured large territories in Asia, Africa, North America and Australia.

Acquaintance with the nature of those regions was the reason for the emergence of this kind of phraseological units. Let's take another example. The phrase "to work like a horse" is translated into Russian by the phrase "to work like a horse", and into Uzbek: "to work like a donkey." The fact is that among the common Uzbek people a donkey, that is, a donkey, was more common than a horse - an expensive animal that wealthy people and servants of wealthy nobles could afford. The horse did not do the work of a donkey, and for the most part served only as a means of transport for the rich. And all the black work was carried out with the help of donkeys, which were harnessed to carts and carts, loaded with loads, forced to rotate the mill wheels. There were relatively fewer horses than donkeys, their meat was considered edible, so there was a different attitude to horses than to donkeys.

Above, we analyzed phraseological units with the names of animals in the composition, now we will consider the linguocultural aspects of phraseological units, whose components in semantic meaning belong to other groups. The manifestation of

pragmalinguistic categories in phraseological units is the norm for the semantic system of the language.

In PU, people, animals, things or phenomena are nominated from the standpoint of the norm. For example: "Zigirdek kichik" (as small as a flaxseed), "Zuvalasi bir joidan olingan" (two pair of boots), "Zigir yogi ichgan odamdek" (as a person who drank linseed oil), Zigir yogi ichmaganda boogilib gapir-masdi (if would not drink flaxseed oil, would not wheeze like that). "Ishlar mikhdek" (deeds are good as a nail) and so on. More precisely, if the state is normal, then no one would evaluate it, describe it, or give an emotionally expressive assessment. The thing is that the concept of the norm in different cultures is different. Based on this representatives of different cultures assess the same situation differently. For example, in the Uzbek language there is phraseological unit "Meshchon otang-dan ulug" (the guest is higher than the father), but in European culture the guest is not so exalted, therefore phraseological units associated with the guest are rare. Consider another phraseological unit that demonstrates cultural differences.

In English there is phrase "to make a confession", meaning repentance. It has two synonyms: 1) to come clean; 2) to make a clean breast. Repentance among Christians is usually performed in churches, in special rooms where a church worker cannot see a person who has come to repent of his sins. The representative of the clergy and the person do not see each other and talk through the window. Guaranteed the secret of repentance. But in some cases, the ministers of the churches violate this rule and bring to the appropriate authorities what should have been kept secret, and as a result, a person who repented of sins may suffer. In the Uzbek and Islamic culture in general, there is no such thing.

Those who would like to repent of their sins do not go to the representatives of the clergy, but perform repentance during prayer, reading special prayers to themselves. Recently, some young Uzbek writers have been trying to present something similar in their works, when their heroes repent of their sins. But this is nothing more than an imitation of Western culture.

We can see further examples in the table below which shows English idioms with appropriate equivalence.

**Table1**

English idioms	Equivalentents in Uzbek languages
To take a mountain out of a molehill	Pashshadan fil yasamoq
A piece of cake	Oddiy masala
Care killed the cat	Ish qaritmaydi, gam qaritadi
Many hands make light work	Ko`pdan quyon qochib qutulmas

The most important function of any language unit, including phraseological, is the pragmatic function, i.e. purposeful impact of the language mark on the addressee. The section focuses on the pragmatic aspect of the functioning of phraseological units, the mastery of which is prerequisite for effective communication.

According to the principle of anthropocentrism, the main factor regulating the development and functioning of phraseological units is the human factor in the language. Human speech becomes a point of reference in the analysis of the functional and pragmatic aspects of phraseological units.

Thus, pragmatics studies the behavior of signs in real communication process. If semantics shows what a person says, what statement means, then a pragmatist seeks to reveal the conditions and the purpose for which person speaks in this case. The pragmatic potential of language and communication, according to N.I. Formanovskaya is associated with the attitude of a person to linguistic signs, with the expression of his attitudes, assessments, emotions, and intensions during the production (and perception) of speech actions in statements and discourses.

#### THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Кунин А. В. Английская фразеология. – М.: Изд. Высшая школа, 1970. – 344 с. 46.
2. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. – Москва: Высшая школа, 1986. – 336 с.
3. Латипов О.Ж. Анализ семантической структуры тематического пространства «домашние животные» в разносистемных языках (На материале русского, узбекского и таджикского языков): Автореф. дис. канд.филол.наук. – Т., 1997. – 28 с.
4. Латыпова Л.Ч. Роль английских и русских фразеологических единиц в формировании модальности в тексте: Автореф. дис.канд.филол.наук. – Волгоград, 2002. – 20 с.
5. Лясота Ю. Н. Английская зоосема. Изд. Дальневосточного университета. – Владивосток, 1984.– 116 с.
6. Малоха М.Ф. Фразеология и национальная картина мира. Фразеологизмы с компонентом-названием дерева в восточнославянских и польском языках: Автореф. дис. канд. филол. наук. – Минск, 1996. – 23с.
7. Маматов А.Э. Вариантлаш фразеологик шаклланишнингвоситаси сифатида// Тил ва адабиёт таълими. – Тошкент, 1999. - 5-6 сон. – Б. 71- 76.
8. Cowie A. P. Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications. USA, Oxford University Press, 2012. – 272 p.
9. Dundes A. On the structure of the Proverb, in Mieder, W. & A. Dundes. The Wisdom of many: Essays of the Proverb. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press. 1994. – 352 б.
10. English proverbs and sayings with their meaning. EFL net.com – 2013 (<https://sng1lib.org/book/3066027/149907?id=3066027&secret=149907&dsources=recommend>).