DEVELOPMENTAL STAGES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Temirova Shoxsanam Komilovna
Master student of SamSIFL

Annotation: This article explores the developmental stages of phraseological units, examining the processes of their emergence, stabilization, and evolution. It delves into the linguistic and socio-cultural factors influencing these stages, analyzing different theoretical perspectives and providing concrete examples.

Key words: Phraseology, phraseological units, idioms, proverbs.

Men can not build the future without knowing their history. There are many saying and proverbs about time and history. Most of them indicate that history is crucial in building future. From our nation many ancestors also said much about time and history. For illustration Amir Temur said,:"no history no future". Every time when we want to investigate something, we should know the history of it. History gives us basic knowledge about the theme that under the investigation and shows correct way to choose appropriate side of a field. Phraseology is on of the most interesting field that many linguists choose this field as the subject of their works. The interest for this field are increasing day by day from its first developmental stages.

The term of phraseology has a Greek origin, "phrasis"-"expression", and "logos"-"study" This term was suggested by Charles Bally in the twentieth century. Charles Bally has a great contribution in the field of stylistics. He used the term of the phraseology in his book that named "precis de stylistique"(1905). This book of the author was very famous and translated into many languages. Charles Bally indicated phraseology as a branch of stylistics As a result the term of phraseology was became known to the world and attracted many linguists and philologists. In this way, the term of phraseology came into Russian phraseology in 1930s.Y.D. Polivanov defined phraseology as a separate linguistic discipline. There are different approaches to the definition for the word.

 European tradition: a branch of linguistics that studies stable word groups with partially or fully transferred meanings. This definitions are given by Ye. D.Polivanov,V.Vinogradov,A.V.Kunin

Russian linguists and philologists did significant works in the field of phraseology.

Chronologically, investigation in this field in Russian phraseology can be classified as following:

l.   From 1940s-1980s is called Vinogradov's phraseological tradition. In this period of time began with the first significant works of V. Vinogradov in this sphere. Vinogradov and his followers try to find answer for two questions
1.   What is phraseology?
2.   How can phrasemes be classified?
II. From 1960s up to present. In this period the most significant work in this field were done by Mel'cuk and his colleagues. Mel'cuk appreciate the idea of phraseology is combinational properties of lexical units. His researches based on Vinogradov's theory

III. the period begun from 1980 and up to now. It called russian present day phraseology. In this period researches try to investigate phraseology by the help of cognitive, cultural, and ethnographical sides. The main problem in russian phraseology were;

- Classification of phrasemes and the conceptual apparatus of phraseology
- Cognitive aspect of phraseology
- Combinational properties of lexical units
- Lexicographic approaches
- Cognitive based approach
- Ethno-cultural approaches

Phraseology was developed in Russia earlier. In the 1960 the term phraseology was appeared in German linguistics. After that works that done by Arnold and other linguists was a hit in developing phraseology in English linguistics. But more suitable for our work and the most comprehensive approach to phraseology was suggested by Russian linguist Koonin A.V. By phraseology Koonin A.V. meant "the branch of linguistics dealing with stable word-combinations characterized by a specific transference of meaning".

There are different combinations of words. As it is pointed out by Ginzburg R.S., the component members in word-groups, such as a week ago, man of wisdom, take lessons, kind to people, seem to possess greater semantic and structural independence. Word-groups of this type are defined as free or variable word-groups or phrases and are habitually studied in syntax. The degree of structural and semantic cohesion of word-groups may vary. Some word-groups, for example: at least, point of view, by means of take place, seem to be functionally and semantically inseparable. Such word-groups are usually described as set- phrases, word equivalents or phraseological units and are traditionally regarded as the subject matter of the branch of lexicological science that studies phraseology. The border-line between free or variable word-groups and phraseological units is not clearly defined. The so-called free word-groups are only relatively free as collectability of their member-words is fundamentally delimited by their lexical and grammatical valence which makes at least some of them very close to set-phrases. Phraseological units are comparatively stable and semantically inseparable. Between the extremes of complete motivation and variability of member-words on the one hand and lack of motivation combined with complete stability of the lexical components and grammatical structure on the other hand there are innumerable border-line cases. In a phraseological unit words are not independent. They form set-expressions, in which neither words nor the order of words can be changed. Free combinations are created by the speaker. Phraseological units are used by the speaker in a ready form, without any changes. The whole phraseological unit has a meaning which may be quite different from the meaning of its components, and therefore the whole unit, and not separate words, has the function of a part of the sentence.4[]

And one more point: free word combinations can never be polysemantic, while there are polysemantic phraseological units.5[]

For example: To take the words out of somebody's mouth:

1. to make someone conscious of a possible problem or danger so they will not be hurt;

2. to say just what someone else was about to say

Following Koonin's definition, the term phraseological unit is defined as follows: "A phraseological unit is a stable combination of words with a fully or partially transferred meaning".6[] This definition stresses two distinctive and inherent features of phraseological units: their stability (lexical and grammatical)and transference of meaning, which differentiate them from stable word combinations of non-phraseological character and free word groups. As it was determined by Arnold I.V., most general features of phraseological units are "language stability

and semantic integrity".7[] Shmelyov D.N. points out that "idiomaticity is the major factor of forming of phraseological units in language and it meets one of the tendencies of a language development - the tendency of expressiveness". Amosova N.N. called phraseological units "fixed context units, i.e. units in which it is impossible to substitute any of the components without changing the meaning not only of the whole unit but also of the elements that remain intact". Ginzburg R.S. in her turn gave the next definition: "Functionally and semantically inseparable units are usually called phraseological units. The lexical components in phraseological units are stable and they are nonmotivated i.e. its meaning cannot be deduced from the meaning of its components and they do not allow their lexical components to be changed or substituted".8[] Collins V. H. writes: "in standard spoken and written English of today phraseological unit is an established and essential element that is used with care, ornaments and enriches the language".9[] Akhmanova O.S. noted that "words have several structural forms, but in phraseological units only one of the components has all the forms of the paradigm of the part of speech it belongs to. For example: to go to bed, goes to bed, went to bed, gone to bed, going to bed, etc., the rest of the components do not change their form. Phraseological unit is a compound denomination which has the following formal features - relative stability in structure of components and their arrangement, the limited permeability, two or more immediacy; it carries out all basic language functions, similarly to a word: nominative, pragmatic and constructive, - and that is why it possesses semantic integrity, such feature as reproducibility".[10.57]

In 50-60s phraseologists' efforts were directed on finding differential features of phraseological units and determination of volume and border-lines of phraseology on this basis. Those features were: impossibility of word for word translation, stability, idiomaticity, figurativeness etc. Comparative study of phraseological unit and a word allowed to establish signs of their similarity and difference. Archangelskiy V.L. relates all steady combinations of words, which correlate with a word and the sentence to phraseology of language. Shanskiy N.M. has the similar opinion he considers reproducibility to be the basic property of set phrases. He said that it radically separates phraseological units from free combinations of words and at the same time pulls them together with words of the language standard. Also Shanskiy N.M. considers that obligatory over conditional is the basic feature of phraseological units and he understood it as feature of phraseological units not to have less than two stresses. Proceeding from these differential features Shanskiy N.M. gives the following definitions of phraseological units:

1. Phraseological units are ready made formations which are taken from memory as a whole;

2. Phraseological units are units constant in structure and semantics;

3. Phraseological units are sound units where components have two or more stresses;

4. Phraseological units are divisible formations where components are realized by speakers as words.

Following these definitions, any language unit possessing the above attributes is a set phrase system character of phraseology and about redundancy of phraseological units in system of language. For example, Nikitin V.M. writes: "Phraseological units reveal themselves as an excessive, superfluous speech material when they enter into synonymous relations with words and that is why can be considered as the phenomenon of style of speech, but not language system". Supporters of the given

theory develop Ch.Bally's concept about identification of phraseological units with a word which repeatedly was criticized in the linguistic literature, for example, in Koonin's article "About

correlation of phraseological unit with a word". The criteria of identification which was offered by Ch.Bally, Koonin A.V. represented unacceptable for definition of essence of phraseology as it does not reflect specificities of phraseological units of language.

Phraseological units can be classified according to the ways they are formed,according to the degree of the motivation of their meaning, according to theirstructure and according to their part-of-speech meaning. Many various approaches have been used but in spite of this fact the place of set expressions in the vocabulary and the boundaries of this level is still one of the great controversial issues of present day linguistics. English and American scholars treat set expressions mostly as a problem of applied linguistics, they have concentrated their efforts on compiling dictionaries of idiomatic phrases. Their object is chiefly practical: they furnish anyone (native or foreigner) with a guide to colloquial phrases, because they consider them an important characteristic feature of natural spoken English and a stumbling block for foreigners. From one side the approach is didactic and it is stylistic from another one.

LIST OF USED LITERATURES

1.Allerton Derek J. The Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Status of Proper Names. // Journal of Pragmatics. – 1997. - № 11. – P. 61–92

2.Altenberg Bengt. On the Phraseology of Spoken English: The Evidence of Recurrent Word-Combinations // Phraseology. Ed. A.P.Cowie. –Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. – 204 p.

3.Brewer E.C. Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. – Philadelphia; London: James Brodie, 2003. – 1440 p.

4.Carroll John M. toward a Functional Theory of Names and Naming. Linguistics. – 1993. – 341–371 p

5. Collins V.H. A Book of English Idioms. With Explanations. – London: Longman, 1998. – 258 p.

6. Gläser Rosamarie. The Stylistic Potential of Phraseological Units in the Light of Genre Analysis. In: Cowie Anthony Paul: Phraseology. Theory, Analysis and Applications. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. – P. 125–143

7. Кунин А.В. Основные понятия английской фразеологии как лингвистической дисциплины Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. Изд 3-е, испр. В двух книгах. – Москва, 1967. – Т.1 – 1233 с.; Т.2 – 1264 с.

8. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. –2-е изд. перераб. – Москва: Высшая школа, 1996. – 156 с.