TEACHING PHRASEOLOGY CONDUCTING THEORY AND PRACTICE

Norbekova Rano

Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute

norbekovarano@jspi.uz

Abstract: This article illustrates the order of application of existing phraseological units in English, both theoretically and practically. In addition, brilliant teaching methods are also presented together in phraseology, which in turn contains important information on how to improve the ability of teachers and students to understand phraseology. The problem of understanding the meaning of phraseological unity is related to our ability to increase our knowledge of the world diachronically. Therefore, it is very useful and important for the readers to cover this topic in detail through different views of the phraseological units used with the help of real-life examples. The authors emphasize the importance of phraseological research because it demonstrates the interrelationship between language and society.

Keywords: phraseology; word components; phraseological unit; semantic; meaning; teaching phraseology; comparative phraseology; methods of teaching phraseology; phraseological expression; idioms; idiomatical expression.

INTRODUCTION

The field that is the source of confusion in the acquisition of a second language is the field of phraseology, which is defined as the study of phrases and the phraseological unit consisting of at least two words.

It is very difficult to define the meaning of a phraseological unit because it is associated with many linguistic and linguistic aspects - logical and psychological, historical and philosophical.

Vocabulary and syntax or vocabulary (part of phraseology) and grammar are traditionally viewed as discrete aspects of language in teaching, but an increasing number of scholars from different theoretical camps in practical linguistics and in

the acquisition of a second language, the two are in fact inseparable (e.g., cognitive linguists, constructivists, and corpus linguists) [9, p. 17].

The importance of phraseological research is constantly discussed, as it demonstrates the interrelationship between language and society. The article is devoted to the problem of the meaning of word components in a phraseological unit. Taking into account all possible perspectives, the authors adhere to four types of word groups in phraseological units: real words are word components that have a literal meaning; potential words are word components with weak meanings; "Old" words are word components that have a re-understood meaning; "Ghost words" - with word components that are not present in the language [1, p. 23].

The vocabulary of the English language consists of words and their equivalents, which are not created by the speakers but are used as a ready-made linguistic unit. Such units are characterized primarily by the contradiction between the semantic integrity of the whole and the formal independence of its parts. It is very difficult to draw a sharp line between the free word combinations created by the speaker in the speaking process and the phraseological units used as ready. As a rule, it can be indicated that there are different "barrier" levels or different levels of constraints. This is the subject of phraseology research, but some of these theoretical aspects are very important for teaching foreign languages. In speech, phraseological units have meaning related to emotions and evaluation [14, p. 28]. Connotation is determined only by the social, ideological attitude of the speaker, so the evaluative component of such connotation is subjective. Knowledge of phraseological units, proverbs and sayings in English enriches students 'vocabulary and helps them to realize the figurative system of English, humorous humor in English, and expand their cultural culture.

THE MAIN PART

Phraseological research contributes to the relevance of this article not only linguistically but also epistemologically, as they clearly show the interrelationship between language and society.

"But if we want to accurately describe the semantic use that is accepted and defined in any speech community, we only need to describe it. We can achieve the result by applying collective assessments that are accepted in the community," therefore, we must take public opinion into account. One thing can have different descriptions in different civilizations. Such semantic definitions must have serious consequences for the formal analysis of language units. Linguistic and the idea of interdependence of more linguistic meanings, especially in word semantics, is not new. This issue has been raised in a very general sense in the articles of classical linguists and philosophers and has attracted the attention of modern scholars [15, p. 39].

Studies of the modern English dictionary by scholars of various disciplines show that the additional linguistic reference of a word affects its linguistic features. However, such forms of influence are less well known and a number of research problems are not limited to neighboring areas.

Phraseological value is a category that can be interpreted differently depending on the understanding of the essence of the phraseological unit, its components, and the scope of the phraseology.

The definition of phraseological meaning stems from the essence of phraseological unity. According to A.V. Kunin, a phraseological unit is a combination of words that completely or partially change their meanings. Hence, character, stability, and the changing meanings of words in a combination above the word level, along with other language units, are the criteria for phraseological units, which determine their particular position in the language structure [5, p. 75].

It is well known that phrases that have become phraseological units are incorporated into complex semantic processes. Phraseologists have not yet reached a consensus on the mechanism and laws of changing the semantic essence of the word components of phraseological units. The study of the formal semantic structure of a phraseological unit, i.e., its plane of content and plane of expression, represents a separate issue. In other words, the question arises as to how the

elements of the semantics of phraseological units are classified as lexical components, i.e., the semantic combination of the phraseological unit and the degree of semantic division.

Researchers in the field of phraseology agree that two extreme views initially emerged as a result of an intense discussion of the semantic properties of the components of a phraseological unit:

1. Phraseological components do not have a common meaning with words, they have specific features only, not as independent units of meaning to phraseological units.

2. Phraseological components do not have significant semantic differences from words: both are carriers of separate semantics, phraseologically connected meanings [3, p. 36]

According to A.V. Zhukov argues that a common shortcoming of the above considerations is that "the absoluteness of the various properties of components that are not in fact common to all components, have been revealed to a different degree, or have a potential property" [16, p. 48].

The verbal character of the components is determined by V.P. does not support. Zhukov, A.I. Molotkov, A.L.Oniani, E.X. Rott, V.N. Telia and other scholars believe that the components of phraseological units lose their interrelationship with the object, including the previously existing lexical meaning and nominative function.

V.P. In support of his view, Zhukov writes that the components of a fixed expression do not have the appropriate semantic features of the words, although different fixed expressions indicate degrees of approximation (or distance) from the words [16, p. 78].

A.I. Molotkov adheres to the sharpest positions on the issue under consideration, denying the verbal nature of the components of the phraseological unit not only from the plane of content, but also from the plane of expression: "components of fixed expressions depend not only on the essence of words but also on lexical

meaning as well as in terms of form ... the components of the fixed unit have lost various grammatical categories specific to the genetic source - the word ... the component retains only the phonetic appearance of the word, its phonetic appearance " [6, p. 32].

A.L.Oniani also applies the first view, and believes that when the components of phraseological units are combined with words only for the plane of expression, it is impossible to combine the components of a fixed unit in the concept of a word. The author emphasizes that the components of phraseological units cannot be considered to have not only simple words but also specific uses [7, p. 25].

E.X. Rott describes phraseological units as "pre-words" and calls them "monema" because they lose their character, the nature of the word, and become only a constituent part. E.X. Rott argues that the components are included in idioms only as "constituents" by "shaking" the semantics in their composition, and that the components of phrases that act as monems represent elements that have lost their "word character," meaning that they are pre-words [10, p. 22].

V.N.'s early articles also denied the verbal nature of the components of phraseological units. Telia believes that the components of fixed expressions-expressions can only be called conditionally words because their components are devoid of reference and system correlation and are like morphemes in the words "pillow, taste (meaning)" experienced the process of etymologization measurement [13, p. 99].

A common feature of all theories about the equivalence of phraseological units to words is that the semantics of phraseological units and words are very close to the ground, as if they have a lexical meaning, a one-sided approach in the analysis of phraseological units or their only characteristic is considered to be semantic monolithic nature. N. N. Amosova first challenged the theory of the equivalence of phraseological units to words [3, p. 55]. In recent years, this theory has become less and less supported.

From linguistic research and individual linguistic experience, they conclude that the predominant part of phraseological units is transparent, i.e., has an internal form that is formed, which is an important part of fixed expressions determined by their lexical meanings and components.

The authors point out that it is never surprising, no matter how paradoxical, the new, global value, its components, and the semantics of their possibilities, which typically operate in a communicative and speech environment.

As for the role of components in the semantics of phraseological units, L.I. Stepanova rightly points out: "In the analysis of the semantics of a component from the diachronic state, it is necessary to determine the functions of word combinations, the role they play. In the general semantics of phraseological units" [12, p. 51].

V.M. Savitsky acknowledges the strong arguments put forward by both sides, which makes us think that a single solution to the issue raised is not possible. He follows the idea that the lexical components of phraseological units have a secondary character. In his view, "the point is that they have both verbal and nonverbal features" [11, p. 78]. But then the author partially denies the validity of this problem and writes that the question of whether the lexical components of phraseological units are words cannot be put "in general," that is, in relation to all phraseological units. First, it is necessary to determine what structural and semantic class of phraseological units it discusses, and second, what semiotic level it implies [4, p. 56].

Defining a component as "not a one-dimensional but a multidimensional phenomenon," A.V. Zhukov argues that "the complex and conflicting nature of the component requires a complex and comprehensive approach" [16, p. 48]

A.V. Zhukov proposes a classification based on the semantic features of the components, "a type of projection of the semantic structure of the source word according to the semantic structure of the fixed expression that determines the degree to which these genetic features are preserved" [16, p. 65].

Among the classified types of component markers (connotative, archaic and relict, prepositional, in particular, etc.) special attention is paid to the issue of components marked with symbolic symbols. Although the author points out that "there is no very clear criterion, according to which some words are recognized as symbols before they become a component, while others do not," but the original symbolic meaning of the component the semantics of a fixed phrase that is at least partially preserved and reproduced regularly in many phraseological units. Moreover, even if a word with a symbolic meaning in the language is updated, its semantics can vary widely [8, p. 25].

A.V. Kunin also sees the need for a comprehensive approach that allows for the identification of systematic differences and a system of common features in this regard. In his view, the semantic structure of a fixed phrase and the semantic structure of a word are in no way exhausting. Important elements of semantic structure, in addition to meaning, are the structures of total formation in general, its grammatical appearance, and connections in system language [5, p. 33].

With the analysis of V.P.'s documents Zhukov, A.I. Smirnitskiy, E.I., N.N. Amosova suggests the following classification of word types in phraseological units according to their semantic properties [5, p. 40].

3. Real words, i.e. lexemes that have a literal meaning of the components.

4. Potential words, i.e. lexemes with weakened lexical meaning and weakened syntactic functions. Potential words are found as part of a fully or partially redefined motivational phraseological unit with a living inner form. The literal meaning of the components "shows" their re-understood meaning. The components of similar phraseological units are semantically richer than similar words in their free use.

5. The words "former", i.e., redefined components of phraseological fusion.

6. Ghosts, like mutton in location, return to their mutton. The word muttons does not exist in English, but means the shield of French moutons and occurs only in this phraseological unit. Ghost words are a very rare occurrence.

At the present stage of the development of phraseology, from the standpoint of cognitive linguistics, this problem is interpreted as follows means the result of a mystery combinatorial analysis of the components of the phrasal verb and their phrasal verbs and contextual, situational and encyclopedic data [2, p. 46].

A review of the views on the components of the above phraseological units, the linguistic status of the word, once again shows that the component of the phraseological unit is complex and multifaceted, and it is necessary to define the main positions of any research affects the results and outcomes.

CONCLUSION

All possible views are discussed, and four types of words are identified in phraseological units: real words, potential words, "previous" words, ghost words. The process of forming phraseological units is theoretically and practically complex and continuous, related to the development of civilization, and the teaching of phraseology must take into account both linguistic and non-linguistic aspects. Successful foreign language teaching implies knowledge of the methodology and theory of language teaching. Phraseology teaching is part of the cultural approach to foreign language teaching and word ordering, and phraseology is a linguistic approach to teaching vocabulary in English according to its component structure. Thus teaching phraseology is an important practice created for perfect language learning.

REFERENCES

1. Avaliani, Yu.Yu., Emirova, A.M. (1971) On a semantic structure of phraseological units. (pp. 29-34) In Issues of phraseology IV: Papers of the Navoi Samarkand State University. Issue 217.

2. Alefirenko, N.F (2008). Phraseology and cognitive science in terms of linguistic postmodernism. Belgorod, Belgorod State University.

3. Amosova, N.N. (2013) Fundamentals of English phraseology. Moscow. Librokom.

4. Gvozdarev, Yu.A. (1977). Fundamentals of the Russian word formation. Rostov-on-Don. Hoey, M. (2005). Lexical priming. New York, NY: Routledge

5. Kunin, A.V. (2005) A course on modern English phraseology. Dubna: Feniks +.

6. Molotkov, A.I. (1977) Fundamentals of Russian phraseology. Leningrad.

7. Oniani, A.L. (1970) A fixed unit and a word based on Kartvelian languages (pp. 134-142.). In Issues on phraseology III. Papers of the Navoi Samarkand State University, New Series. Samarkand. Issue 178.

8. Raikhshtein, A.D. (1980) A comparative analysis of German and Russian phraseology. Moscow.

9. Romer, U. (2009). The inseparability of lexis and grammar. Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics.

10. Rott, E. Kh. (1972) A word and its relation to a component of a kernel phraseoloheme (on a kernel of phraseology).(pp.123-128) In Issues on phraseology V, part I: Papers of the Navoi Samarkand State University, New Series. Samarkand. Issue 219.

11. Usmonovna– N. R. Speech exercises as a means of forming grammatic skills Norbekova RU Email: Norbekova685@ scientifictext. ru..

12. Нарбекова, Р. У. (2019). Motivating language learners to succeed.

In *Актуальные проблемы теоретической и прикладной филологии* (pp. 134-138).