

O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI
OLIV VA O'RTA MAXSUS TA'LIM VAZIRLIGI
NAMANGAN DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI

“Ilmoyaga ruxsat etildi”
Magistratura bo'limi boshlig'i,
dotsent **G'. A. Doliev**
“ ” _____ **2019 yil**



5A140500-Lingvistika (ingliz tili) mutaxassislik magistranti
Abdullayeva Dildora Shuxratovna

«INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDA SODDA QOLIPLI FRAZELOGIZMLARNING
LINGVOPRAGMATIK JIHATI »
Mavzusidagi

MAGISTRLIK DISSERTATSIYA

ISHI

Kafedra mudiri  kat.o'qit. S.Daminjanov
MDI raxbari:  dots. V.Vositov.

Namangan-2019

Contents

Introduction.....	3-7
Chapter I Linguopragmatics as a new direction of modern linguistics	
§1.1. General notes on Linguopragmatics.....	8-14
§1.2 . The pragmatic approach to the phraseological units.....	15-24
Summary.....	24-25
Chapter II Phraseological units	
§2.1. Phraseology as a constituent part of lexicology.....	26-40
§2.2. Vinogradov's Classification of Phraseological Unit.....	41-45
Summary.....	45
Chapter III Linguopragmatic features of phraseological units	
§3.1. Toward an understanding of Phraseological units and Pragmatic functions.....	46-50
§3.2. Examples for linguopragmatic meaning of phraseological units.....	51-57
Summary.....	57-58
Conclusion.....	59-60
The list of used literature.....	61-66

Introduction

Nowadays, great attention is given to learning a foreign language by majority of people. Especially English language is being learned as a second language by the people of most countries. The President of our country Shavkat Mirziyoyev pays special attention to this sphere too, which has an important place in ensuring the future of the country and its development. In the Decree of President of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev «On Uzbekistan»s development Strategy «is mentioned about achieving major improvement of in quality of general secondary education, facilitating in-depth study of foreign languages, computer science, and other important and popular disciplines¹. However, learning language is not just learning the words in target language but also being familiar with phrases, idioms, proverbs and phraseological units of its.

Everyone wants his speech to be rich, emotional and expressive. One of the main ways to achieve this is a reasonable use of different phraseological expressions, idioms, proverbs, sayings, colourful expressions.

The founder of the theory of phraseology is a Swiss linguist Charles Bally. Bally was the first who systematized the combination of the words in his books “Studies of the Stylistics” and “French Stylistics”. Ch. Bally explored the sphere of linguistics and phraseology in the French language, however, his attempt to systematize and classify phraseological units led to the series of other studies in the phraseological sphere in other languages, including English.²

Even today this sphere is in the focus of many researches. So, in his book “The Course of the Modern English Phraseology”, A. V. Kunin investigated a wide range of phraseological characteristics, methods of their studies, phraseological systemacy and presents classifications of idiomatic expressions

¹ President Decree 4947 “ On Uzbekistan»s development Strategy” February 7, 2017.

² Kunin, A. V. (1990) The course of the modern English phraseology, Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 380 p

according to their features. V. Komissarov studied the methods of translating phraseological units.³

Phraseological units are considerable parts of any language. Therefore they are studied by plenty of scholars. For example, Russian scholars V.V. Vinogradov, A.I. Smidnitoski, H. N. Asomova and Uzbek scholars Sh. Rahmatullayev, A. E. Mamatov, B. Yo'ldoshev conducted a research on this sphere of linguistics. Their works and researches play significant role in the development of phraseology. Even nowadays, this field of linguistics attracts great many of scholars' attention. One of English linguists A.B. Pittman gives such definition to the phraseological units in one of his works: "A group of words in a fixed order that is different from the meaning of each word understood on its own"⁴. In fact, idioms can never be translated into another language word for word. Otherwise, they lose their semantic meaning. For instance, if we translate the idiom "Lend an ear" into Uzbek word by word, it means "qulog'ini qarzga bermoq". Because, the word "lend" means to let someone borrow something that belongs to you for a short time. However, in this work you can see this kind of phraseological units with its equivalents in Uzbek language.

The dissertation paper is devoted to the problem of Linguopragmatic features of simple structured phraseologisms . As theory of linguopragmatics of special interest to the researchers, from the end of the XXth century till the present times, Pragmalinguistics has become one of the most important directions in modern linguistics. Theory of linguopragmatics plays an important role in this study. Theory of pragmatic meaning is studied by such scientists as George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, Chudinov I. S, Ashurova D. U, Kubryakova E.C, V. Z. Demyankov and many others. The principal difference of linguopragmatics from traditional one lies in the cognitive approach to the

³ Komissarov, V. N. (2004) Modern translation, Moscow: ETC, 424 p.

⁴ Urantayeva N.B., Nurmatova M.R., Polvanova N.M. The comparative analyze of English-Uzbek idioms. ISSN 2072-0297 Молодой учёный № 19 (153) / 2017.

nature of the phenomenon. Pragmalinguistics is understood as way of thinking; as perception of the world. Linguopragmatics is operated by domains and there exist certain prototypes that can be represented by numerous smaller types of phraseological units.

The novelty of the research lies in the following:

- Linguopragmatics is regarded not only as a logistics, but as a way of thinking and cognition
- The main assumptions of conceptual blending and conceptual domains have been applied to conceptual analysis of cognitive linguistics
- The special features of linguopragmatics in phraseology ; simple structured phraseologies have been analyzed.

The topicality of the research is defined by the pragmatical approach to linguistics regarded as one of the main ways of human cognition.

The aim of the work is to discuss the cognitive essence of phraseologies , its types and utilization in different text types. To reach the aim, the following objectives were set:

- To study the main problems and notions of Pragmalinguistics and its branches
- To define the term Linguopragmatics and to reveal the difference between logistics and linguistics
- To describe types of phraseological units
- To discuss the theory of conceptual blending and conceptual domains
- To analyze the peculiar features of linguopragmatis in Simple structured phraseological units
- To describe the special features of pragmatic meanings in phraseological units
- To investigate conceptual structure of pragmatics in contexts.

The object of the research is to consider the ways of translating English simple structured phraseological units and to explain the prevalence of one method over the other in the process of translation into Uzbek.

The subject of the investigation is the pragmatic nature of phraseological units and its specific features in different text types.

Methodological basis of the given dissertation paper is works of such scholars as G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, Kubryakova, V. Z. Demyankov; Chudinov, Kunin and many others.

The methods of investigation that are used in this work are linguopragmatical conceptual analysis including cognitive mapping and conceptual blending. The language materials are works of fiction by British and American writers (O.Wilde, E. Hemingway, O. Henry) and newspapers articles.

Theoretical value of the dissertation lies in the fact that the research is done in the framework of a new modern trend- Pragmalinguistics.

The results of the research make a certain contribution in the development of Linguopragmatics and Theory of pragmatic meaning that it might help in the further research of this field; different definitions and typologies of Linguopragmatics suggested by different scholars were gathered in this work.

Practical value is that the results of the research can be used at the lectures and seminars in Pragmalinguistics, Text Linguistics, Cognitive Linguistics and Stylistics.

The structure of the dissertation paper is the following: introduction, 3 chapters, conclusion, bibliography. The introduction describes the dissertation paper, its novelty, aim and objectives, theoretical and practical value, etc. The first chapter deals with theoretical data connected with the theory of pragmatics: Pragma Linguistics and its branches; The notion of linguopragmatics; Typology of linguopragmatics The second chapter analyzes the examples of phraseology

that were found I different sources: Linguopragmatics in Fictional Text; Linguopragmatics in Newspaper Text; Linguopragmatics in Poetry or in Dictionaries .In the conclusion the researcher summarized the main points of the dissertation paper and the results that were made.

Chapter I Linguopragmatics as a New Direction of Modern Linguistics.

§1.1. General notes on Linguopragmatics.

One of the most conspicuous direction of linguistics in the XXI century is a connection between linguistics and pragmatics in both structure and logical meaning. This issue should be viewed and analyzed from multiple perspectives. How language represents the world has long been, and still is, a major concern of philosophers of language. Many philosophers, such as Leibniz, Frege, Russell, the early Wittgenstein, and Carnap, have thought that understanding the structure of language could illuminate the nature of reality; they developed the so-called referential theory of meaning. At first Pirs wrote about pragmatics in XIX century, but the main parameters linked to philosophy of pragmatics was formulated by Morris in 1920. Later, modern linguistic oriented pragmatics was developed under influenced ideas of Nitgenshteyn and the theory of speech acts.⁵

Speech act theory is now receiving great attention and valid theoretical proposals from cognitive linguistics. In this article we will try to describe possible approaches to the description of pragmalinguistics as a system of science of Linguistics and connection with semantics, tasks and practical role of pragemas.

According to Ariel "Pragmatics derives via Latin *pragmaticus* from the Greek *πραγματικός* (*pragmatikos*), meaning amongst others "fit for action", which comes from *πρᾶγμα* (*pragma*), "deed, act", and that from *πράσσω* (*prassō*), "to pass over, to practise, to achieve".⁶

Linguistics in pragmatics: the study of features of language use related to speakers' knowledge of the structure and expressive resources of the language itself rather than of the social context.⁷

⁵ Safarov.Sh .(2006)Cognitive linguistics.-Jizzakh:Sangzor., -91 p Прагмалингвистика. -Т.:ЎзМЕ, 2006, - 286

⁶ Ariel Mira.(2010). Research survey in linguistics. Cambridge University Press.

⁷ Oxford Living Dictionaries.online dictionary. en.oxforddictionaries.com.

Linguistic pragmatics do not have a clear form. It includes a set of issues related to the speaker and the listener, their interaction in the speech process. Linguistic pragmatism includes a realistic expression of social activity. Uzbek linguistics has conducted some research on the pragmatic aspects, the relationship between the speaker and the listener, the interaction of participants in the speech act, and their influence on ethical emotions. The problems of linguistic pragmatics does not have their own interpretation.⁸ As a part of Pragmatics and a part of the linguistic science, the word pragmaling seems to be a natural thing to say about the category of units.

There are two pragmalingvistic units: 1. Informema.

2. Pragmema.

Pragmalingvistic units are directly affected by language units and functional language areas. The pragmats come into opposition with the information-gathering function. Pragmemas are always pragmatic information carriers.

Example: 1. *To let the cat out of the bag-* (idiom)

- a) To let some secret become known- (pragmema)
- b) Allow the cat to go out from bag-(informema)

2. *The police are barking up the wrong tree as usual-Idiom*

a) They suspect somebody who has nothing to do with the crime-pragmema.

b) they are barking to the tree-informema

the ambiguity of these interesting word-groups may lead to an amusing misunderstanding, especially for children who are apt to accept words at their face value.

Nowadays, pragmatic studies are more varied than before. One area of increasing interest is historical pragmatics which, like general diachronic studies, depends heavily upon corpus data. For example, Arnovick examines the

⁸ Nurmonov, A., Hakimov M. Лингвистик прагматиканинг назарий шаклланиши // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти.-Тошкент.2001. -№4. –Б.54-58.

speech event of parting, focusing on the development of Goodbye, which was originally an explicit blessing God be with you. She finds that the formal development from God be with you to Goodbye is linked to functional shifts. Arnovick's study shows that the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century marked as crucial period during which the blessing declined and the closing form Goodbye increased in frequency.⁹

Incomplete words, pronouns, the specific meaning of nouns are clarified only in the text, in public speaking. Also, there are words that are not indistinguishable. Because these words are linked to the text or speech situation.

Morris states, "Pragmatics came to linguistics from semiotics-the theory of sign system, and distinguished with three directions: semantics (sign of meaning), syntactics (sign of connection) and pragmatics (sign and person)". Basically, Morris is saying that linguopragmatics is the symbolic languages which indicates common meaning in particular area.¹⁰

Example: *Posters depicting running wild goats on the road*- symbolize the caution that drivers must observe, and at the same time indicate a danger, an accident can occur if drivers are not careful in California.

Pragmatics is a network of linguistic spheres, namely, a science network that studies the use of speech units in combination with other non-zero tools in the speech process, and its effectiveness.

There has been a great amount of discussion on the boundary between semantics and pragmatics, and there are many different formalizations of aspects of pragmatics linked to context dependence. Particularly interesting cases are the discussions on the semantics of indexical and the problem of referential descriptions, a topic developed after the theories of Donnellan. A proper logical theory of formal pragmatics has been developed by DallaPozza, according to which it is possible to connect classical semantics (treating propositional contents as true or false) and intuitionistic semantics (dealing with

⁹Ken Hyland (2006). *English for Academic Purposes*. New edition. University of Sydney, Australia. ISBN-10: 0415358701

¹⁰Morris, Ч.У. *Значение и означивание // Семантика*. – Москва, – С.

illocutionary forces). The presentation of a formal treatment of pragmatics appears to be a development of the Fregean idea of assertion sign as formal sign of the act of assertion.¹¹

Linguistics, Literature, Sociology, Psychology, Ethics and Aesthetics, and other disciplines, separate elements from the system of speech from the same system and analyze the distinctive element in the same way (using it in the same position) . Pragmatics learns that the discourse, which is a manifestation of human activity in various systems, is interpreted as a single unit of these elements as a microsystem. This is to say that all the elements loaded with affection marks associated with the inner feeling of the speech unit into the pragmatic area, and expresses the attitude of the person to the target.

V. Dresslar, "Pragmatics is not related to Linguistics. It is incorrect to mix them"¹². Most linguists will probably disagree with this assertion, but there are countless scientists who are pragmatically languishing. Most of them consider pragmatic as a linguistic one, a kind of language school, and a special aspect of speech and language learning. Scientists who interpret Pragmatism as a branch of linguistics, still are not able to give a clear answer for simple questions like: "What is Pragmatics?", "What is the source of its study? ", "What aspects of the multilingual speeches does it learn? ".

Accordingly, pragmatics are somewhat new in the field of sociology and semantics. When it comes to the topic of Semantics, most of us will readily agree that it could not explain enough verbal speech to explain the social linguistic and other non-linguistic components, which led to pragmatism. When the relationship between the speech and the text is very strong, it is necessary to implement pragmatics in the context of the speech, in relation to the text. In a syntactic device, the analysis of descriptive words is based on semantics, while non-descriptive words are analyzed by pragmatics. In other words, Semantics is

¹¹ Ken Hyland (2006). English for Academic Purposes. New edition. University of Sydney, Australia. ISBN-10: 0415358701

¹² Sh. Safarov. Nutqning etnosotsiopragsmatik tahlili asoslari. –Samarqand, 2007. -18-19-bet

the literal meaning of an idea whereas pragmatics is the implied meaning of the given idea.¹³

Thus, the relationship between the subject and the meaning of the subject relates to pragmatics. The talk is a conceptual concept of linguistic pragmatism, which is indistinguishable from the point of view, such as text, speech situation. In a language communicants' mentality and behavior are expressed through communication; it also contributes to culture and society development and mutual understanding among people.

Example 1

- Little Johnnie(crying): Mummy, mummy, my auntie Jane is dead.
- Mother: Nonsense, child! She phoned me 5 minutes ago.
- Little Johnnie: But I heard Mrs. Brown say that her neighbours *cut her dead*.

To cut somebody dead means 'to rudely ignore somebody; to pretend not to know or recognize him'-pragmema

Example 2

T: It seems to me you need to do a lot of drawing.

S: Yeah.

T: Right. A lot of drawing.

S: Mm.

T: In different ways, story form, exploring colour .. All those things.

When a tutor says, "It seems to me you need to do a lot of drawing..." he or she expects the student either to justify why he or she hasn't done a lot of drawing, or to accede to the implicit exhortation to do a lot of drawing. In the one case, this is likely to involve providing some extenuating circumstance, which might include, for example, that the student wants to do some reading on a particular topic or become more familiar with a particular artist's work before doing his or her own drawing. The alternative scenario is that the student affirms his or her

¹³ Evans V., Green M. Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction. - Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006

intention to do a lot more drawing from that point on. A simple ‘yes’ which in the cross-cultural situation may simply mark that the student has understood what the tutor is saying does not really give the impression of sufficient commitment, and the demonstration of commitment is one of the necessary prerequisites for the student to obtain a positive assessment.¹⁴

Common sense seems to dictate that the object of any science is studied from three points of view: the internal state of the object, its associative ability and its usefulness to human. The 2011 article, “Pragmalinguistics in the system of Linguistic Sciences” by G.G.Matveeva defines that Pragmalinguistics (Linguopragmatics) is a linguistic discipline, based on the anthropocentric principle. It takes its place in the system of linguistic disciplines, and its object is to study the conditions and manifestations of verbal communication, and with the practical role of identifying the speech portrait of a person.

The main task of pragmalinguistics is to answer three questions:¹⁵

1. Why do communicants begin their verbal communication?
2. Why is a verbal communication of communicants realized in this particular way?
3. How do communicants act in a speech communication?

In short, the modern linguistics is based on the principle of anthropocentric paradigm, which contains ”human factor” in the study of language. This paradigm puts forward the new approaches to the research of language which are implemented within a number of new disciplines, such as cognitive linguistics, text linguistics, linguoculturology, linguopersonology, linguopragmatics and etc. These branches of linguistics need to be studied separately, indeed.the Pragmatic meaning is also plays an important role as semantic one while overcoming pragmatic failure in the act of speech.

¹⁴ Hiraga, M. K. and Fujii (2003) L2 Pragmatics in Academic Discourse: A Case Study of Tutorials in Britain. Tutorials in Britain

¹⁵ Matveeva,G.(2011). *Pragmalinguistics in the System of Linguistic Science*

§1.2. The pragmatic approach to the phraseological units.

The study of phraseology as means of communicative interaction in the sociocultural context puts forward the problem of pragmaphraseology. Before proceeding with the discussion of the problem, it is necessary to ascertain some assumptions of linguopragmatics.

Linguopragmatics is one of the trends of communicative linguistics, which in its general sense can be defined as a science studying language factors within the sphere of human activity with an accent on psychological, social and cultural aspects of language functioning. There is a variety of definitions concerning linguopragmatics. Summing up all the views, we can point out the following aspects and approaches:

- The relations between a sign and its users.¹⁶
- Contextual conditionality, language usage, language in the context.¹⁷
- Speech impact on the addressee, the factors influencing successful and effective communication.¹⁸
- Interpretative aspects of speech communication.¹⁹
- Language as a tool of a purposeful communicative activity.²⁰
- The problem of mutual understanding and appropriateness of language use.²¹

It is necessary to note that all these aspects are by no means incompatible. They present linguopragmatic researches in a variety of domains which are mutually complementary. The analysis of the linguistic literature has

¹⁶ Morris Ch.W. Foundations of the theory of signs.-Chicago.

¹⁷ Susov N. Языковое общение и лингвистика \ \ Прагматические и семантические аспекты синтаксиса. Сб.науч.трудов Калининского ГУ, Калинин.

¹⁸ Kiselyova L.A Вопросы речевого воздействия.-Л

¹⁹ Arutyunova N.,Raducheva Ye.Истоки, проблемы и категории прагматики\ Новое в зарубежной лингвистике.- Вып XVI.

²⁰ Grays G. Логика и речевое общение\ \ Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып.16.Лингвистическая прагматика.

²¹ Dijk T.A van. Text and Context\ \ Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. L, N.Y:Longman

shown that linguo-pragmatics embraces a wide range of problems, but for linguistics the most relevant of them are:

- speech strategies and speech impact;
- pragmatic intentions and their types;
- appropriateness and effectiveness of textual communication.

Before proceeding with the analysis these problems, it should be stressed that the pragmatic approach to the text requires the term “discourse”. It should be stressed here that this term is rather ambiguous, and is still under discussion. There are many views, approaches, trends. Despite the multitude of discourse definitions the idea of its situational interpretation receives strong scientific support. It means that discourse should be analyzed in a complex combination of social, psychological, cultural conditions of communication. In other words, as Karasik V. has put it, within the framework of linguopragmatics.²²

So, discourse pragmatics raises the question of situational interpretation which, in its turn, introduces the notion of a communicative-pragmatic situation. The communicative-pragmatic situation is understood as a complex of external conditions and circumstances of communication. According to E.S. Aznaurova the communicative-pragmatic situation can be presented by a chain questions: who-what-where-when-how-why-to whom.²³ The most relevant parameters of the communicative-pragmatic situation in the literary discourse are:

- Circumstance and place of the communicative act;
- The subject and aim of communication;
- Social, ethnic, individual, characteristics of the communicants;
- Role and personal relations between the communicants.

In the process of discourse analysis the role of intentional factors as well as those of linguistic personality should be particularly emphasized.

²² Karasik V. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. М. Гнозис, 2004

²³ Aznaurova E.S. Прагматика слова. -Ташкент: Фан, 1988

Language contains a large number of items represented by types of prefabricated units, called multi-word units, phraseological units, or fixed expressions. Multi-word units are well-established lexical combinations which consist of one or more word forms or lexemes, so common in normal language that they “may well be the basic organizing principle in language production”.²⁴ These multi-word units raise a variety of formal, syntactic, semantic, situational, and stylistic aspects.

A distinct group of multi-word units is represented by idiomatic expressions which constitute a special category of lexical items presenting a fixed structure, a greater rigidity (represented by ready-made structures with small range for variability), structural complexity, as well as a specific behaviour in language use. An idiom is usually defined as a sequence of words functioning as a single unit whose meaning cannot be inferred from the meaning of the parts. Thus, according to the Webster Dictionary, an idiom is “an expression established in the usage of a language that is peculiar to itself either in grammatical construction or in having a meaning that cannot be derived as a whole from the conjoined meanings of its elements”.²⁵

When discussing idiomaticity, sociolinguistic and pragmatic aspects of language use need to be considered. Numerous researchers, who have been concerned with the sociolinguistic, pragmatic and psycholinguistic views of idiomaticity, have attempted to answer two questions:

1. What can be said appropriately; and
2. How it is to be said. These two parameters were analysed in some detail by Ch. Fillmore, P. Kay and J. O’Conner in the article Regularity and idiomaticity

²⁴ McCarthy, Michael J., Vocabulary, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990. (McCarthy 1990)

²⁵ Webster’s Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged, Merriam-Webster, 1993.

in grammatical constructions: the case of ‘let alone’²⁶. The former aspect referring to ‘What can be said appropriately’ reflects the pragmatic sense, while the latter aspect referring to ‘How it is to be said’ concerns form. The pragmatic dimension has been applied to the classification and analysis of idiomatic expressions, leading to a division into those which are used in set social situations and those which are not. Pragmatic idioms (also referred to as routines, social formulas or gambits) can be defined as lexical items and expressions whose occurrence is determined by a particular social situation²⁷. Another linguist, Jürg Strässler, discussed the pragmatic aspect of idioms in his study *Idioms in English. A Pragmatic Analysis*²⁸. Considering the pragmatic route as an intermediate step in the sociolinguistic direction, he defined the idiom as a functional element of language, namely, as a pragmatic phenomenon, i.e. something that is judged from the point of view of the language user. A significant contribution to the analysis of routine formulas was made by Florian Coulmas (1979, 1981) who elaborated this concept as initially proposed by W. Chafe (1968). According to Coulmas, an adequate description of a community’s sociolinguistic behaviour must include: (i.) idiomaticity, (ii.) routine (formulas), and (iii.) collocability, which are considered to be significant properties of expression. The language variation which depends on a number of factors, such as, the situation, the topic, the subject or the activity (register) is also reflected in the use of idioms.

Phraseological idioms reflect the objective reality in the imagination of the particular cultural community. Due to this they are important as a source of the cultural concepts, i e. the information about specific national characteristics of the certain language and cultural environment, therefore “the cultural

²⁶ Fillmore, Charles, Kay, Paul and O’Conner, J., “Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: the case of ‘let alone’”, in *Language* 64, 1988, 521-538. (Fillmore, Kay and O’Conner 1988)

²⁷ Gramley, Stephan, Patzold, Kurt-Michael, *A Survey of Modern English*, London, Routledge, 1992. (Gramley, Patzold 1992)

²⁸ Strässler, Jürg, *Idioms in English: A pragmatic analysis*, Tübingen, Günter Narr.

information incorporated in phraseological phrases need to be taken into account” .²⁹

Because of the complex nature of a phraseological unit with a number of specific features there exist a lot of different classification systems provided by different scholars and based on different principles. Within traditional approach the major tasks are connected with the systematization of the phraseological fund of a language in accordance with semantic criteria. The semantic approach is focused on the importance of idiomatic, functional and contextual aspects. In the classical works of the majority of leading researchers much attention has been paid to the study of inner structure of phraseological unit. Within the inner-connected semantic constituents or components there have been distinguished three main constituents: signification, denotation, and connotation³⁰ or six interrelated macro-components: descriptive, evaluative, motivational, emotive, stylistic, grammatical .³¹

However, many relevant issues within traditional approaches remained outside the range of interests: “these approaches have no way of accounting for how phraseological meaning is formed, how cultural or sociocultural information is encoded and stored during its creation and then is retrieved by speakers while using phraseologisms in actual communication, as well as how the mechanisms of the phraseological processing work. Neither has the special nature of the phraseological imagery nor its genesis been subject to an exhaustive description”.³² As prominent scholars claim, in classical researches on phraseology the study of phraseological semantics was confined, to a great extent, to rather general observations .³³

²⁹ Cowie, A., 2001. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

³⁰ Кунин [Kunin], A., 1996. *Курс фразеологии современного английского языка [Phraseology of Contemporary English]*, М.: Высш. шк./ Дубна: Изд. центр Феникс, р.381.

³¹ Телия [Teliya], B., 1988. *Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира [Metaphorization and its Role in Creating a Linguistic Picture of the World]* in *Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира*, (отв. ред., Серебренников, Б., М.): Наука, pp.173–203.

³² . Zyкова, I., 2016. *The Phraseological Meaning Construal in the Traditional vs Cognitive Culture-oriented Perspectives*. In: *Language Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow. The Journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, vol. I (2), pp.253– 286. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lart-2016-0015>

³³ Баранов [Baranov], A., Добровольский [Dobrovolskij], Д., 2013. *Основы фразеологии (краткий курс) [Fundamentals of Phraseology (the short course)]*. М: Флинта; Наука, р.312.

At the end of the 20th century with the development of cognitive linguistics the traditional view of phraseological meaning began to alter as the researchers have shifted their interest to learn and understand the national spirit of the certain ethnic group through anthropocentric phraseological units. A significant role of anthropocentric phraseological units in the representation of a cultural mentality, as well as in reflecting the national and cultural identity have been taken into account. All that gave a rise to the development of the new direction, i. e. the anthropocentric phraseology as the research of interaction between linguistic and extralinguistic meanings of phraseologism³⁴, because it verbalizes the national spirit of the nation, that allows to identify the peculiarities of the mental world of the certain ethnic group, its culture and to learn about different stages of its cultural development.

Such prominent scholars as A. Cowie (2001), S. Koziara (2002), R. Palmatier (1995), S. Ter-Mynasova (2000), I. Vidović-Bolt (2008), W. Wysoczański (2006), also focus on the connection of language and thought, consciousness, culture and society. The linguistic and cultural approach to understanding the concept implies that it consists of two parts, i. e. the conceptual one and the cultural background. The conceptual part of the concept is the basis of lexical meaning of the word, but the cultural layer includes the axiological evaluation, associations, abstraction, etc. The cultural concept reflects the ethnic representation of linguistic knowledge.

Since these problems have not been the subject of much attention of linguists, studying cultural, functional and pragmatic peculiarities of anthropocentric phraseologisms in related Uzbek, Russian and English languages is the valid subject in the modern linguistic research. It is also essential for effective communication, so that the national cultural factors of a single speech environment are important in the communication process.

³⁴ Алефиренко [Aliefirenko], Н., 2008. Фразеология в свете современных лингвистических парадигм [Phraseology in the light of modern linguistic paradigms], М.: ООО «Элпис», р.271.

The conceptual image of the world is reflected in human activities, cognitive processes to present the world, knowledge and understanding of the world by the members of the certain society. These images and knowledge are widely represented in phraseology of the certain society, because each lexical unit which is involved into the verbalization of concepts, stores some knowledge during ages. The phraseological layer of language preserving national and cultural characteristics of the specific language and cultural environment reveals the nature of the ethnic community, nation, nations. More than that, due to the phraseological units the unique national cultural treasure is passed down from generation to generation. Wilhelm von Humboldt was the first one to make the connection between language and culture. For the philosopher, the interlocutors of the particular cultural community are capable to contribute to the formation of a collective cultural identity through specific ethnic concepts, which the famous scholar called the spirit of nation ³⁵. Also E. Sapir was one of the first as well to postulate explicitly that language represents and conceptualizes reality in a culturally specific manner .³⁶

Cultural concepts have anthropological nature because they as the mental formations are focused on spirituality, subjectivity and the inner world of the native speaker of the particular language. That is why the most complete national concepts are revealed in the anthropocentric phraseological units. As for modern linguists “phraseology is the only domain of the linguistic study which illustrates the correlation between language and culture” .³⁷

The phraseological idioms are determined by social and political aspects, traditions, customs, cultural values which create similar thematic domains in all investigated languages. The cultural concepts in the research will be described within a broader anthropocentric paradigm since it includes the cultural

³⁵ Гумбольдт [Humboldt], В. О различии строения человеческих языков и его влиянии на духовное развитие человечества [On the Difference between the Structure of Human Language and its Influence on the Spiritual Development of Mankind], pp.37–296. in: Избранные труды по языкознанию, М.: Прогресс, p.400.

³⁶ Wierzbicka, A., Sapir a współczesne językoznawstwo, W: Sapir, Edward ;Kultura, Język Osobowość, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, pp.5–31.

³⁷ Cowie, A., 2001. Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications Oxford: Oxford University Press

dimension; and its central assumption is that every language, especially its figurative meanings is connected with the reflection of the world-view shared by the linguistic knowledge about the reality. Cultural concepts in anthropocentric phraseology of the proposed research are abstract notions such as, for instance, intellectual ability, emotional and expressive aspects, empathy and other positive traits of human nature as well as bad sides of human nature which construct the world-picture in a culturally specific way. Both concepts proper and sub-concepts are involved. It is noteworthy indeed that “their specificity is implemented mostly at the cognitive, not the semantic level because cultural background refers to information that is most difficult to formalize, as it is connected with semantics in a very indirect and still unexplored way”³⁸ as, for instance, in the paradigm the traits of character with the positive meaning in the sub-concept smart, capable: Uzbek.: *kalla bor*(1) someone is very smart, capable; 2) to do something after proper consideration: *Mening ham kallam bor!*; Rus.: *голова на плечах*; compare: *с головой*: – У тебя есть погоны и голова на плечах – иди и зарабатывай, – сказал в интервью сотрудникам института один московский милиционер ;³⁹ Eng.: a bright chap (girl); a person with a head on his shoulders; to use one’s head (loaf) when doing something: Matthew, the eldest, is quite a bright chap and Emma, the next one age-wise, is all right but learning the recorder .⁴⁰

The mentioned before subgroup also involves such feature of character as capability: Uzbek.: *qo’li gul*: –*Qo’li gul usta Umar yana bir bor o’z mahoratini namoyon etdi*; Rus.: *золотые руки*: У него золотые руки! Хотите/ он и вам такую машину сделает? Молодец! Золотые руки. Любо-дорого глядеть/ куда он за что-нибудь берётся, мастер на все руки: Он и хормейстер, и концертмейстер, и режиссёр драмкружка; играл на всех инструментах и в

³⁸ Гнатюк [Hnatiuk], Л., 2013. Технологии міжперсонального спілкування у міжкультурній взаємодії [Technology of Interpersonal Communication in Intercultural Interaction] Донецьк: Вид-во Ноулідж, р.336

³⁹ Национальный корпус русского языка [The National Corpus of Russian Language]. Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН. Available at www.ruscorpora.ru/ [Accessed date 29 August 2015]

⁴⁰ Time Corpus: 100 Million Words, 1923–2016 [online]. Brigham Young University. Available at <http://corpus.byu.edu/time/> [Accessed date 20 August 2015].

изобразительном искусстве разбирался, – словом, одарённая личность, мастер на все руки, энтузиаст своего дела, сумел увлечь и других ⁴¹; Eng.: *somebody is good hand at any job; somebody can do anything with his hands.* The phraseological units of that subgroup are common to all investigated languages because of the same factors of logical and psychological nature. They were borrowed from the common sources, for example, more often they describe the positive qualities of men in connection with the manual physical work; mentioning of certain physical activities are typical for the contexts in which they are used.

Cultural connotation plays a significant role in the appropriate interpretation of phraseological idioms. It arises from an associative relation between the image contained in the inner form of a language sign and the content of a cultural pattern. For instance, on the one hand, in the English linguo-cultural environment phraseologism pigeon-livered in the positive meaning little as a dove, sensitive as a dove is associated with a tiny pigeon chest. But there also exist a few phraseological nominations, for instance, to pluck as a pigeon; to fleece a pigeon with the negative pragmatic meaning to deceive a naive person⁴². They are correlated with negative traits of human nature. On the other hand, there exist a lot of idioms with the component a dove. The lexical unit dove always has a positive value. It began from the biblical events. That lies in the fact that lexical unit dove was used in the biblical story about the Flood. The dove brought good news to the Noah's family that the water went down. Since then the lexical unit dove in English and in other languages has been used as a symbol of goodness, peace, sensitivity, love and it is also reflected in some other anthropocentric phraseologisms, for instance, a pair of turtle-doves⁴³, as well as: Rus.: *голубь мира; голубиная кротость; наивен как голубь*; Вечное молчание и голубиная кротость ее глаз говорили за ее незащитность. Eng.:

⁴¹ Рыбаков [Rybakov], A., Тяжелый песок // Национальный корпус русского языка [The National Corpus of Russian Language]: Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН., Available at www.ruscorpora.ru/ [Accessed 29 August 2015].

⁴² Bartel, R., *Metaphors and Symbols*. New York: Council of Teachers.

⁴³ Palmatier, R., 1995. *Speaking of Animals: A Dictionary of Animal Metaphors*. London: Greenwood Press.

the dove of peace; as harmless as a dove; as innocent as a dove; pigeon-livered; to pluck as a pigeon; to fleece a pigeon. Thus, the metaphorical component голубь which in English is used in two forms dove and pigeon should be considered as a significant component of linguo-cultural connotation. Although the above phraseological units exhibit more similar values common to the analyzed languages, such as: soft-hearted, kind, delicate, sensitive, peaceful, at the same time some significant differences are noticed in the other metaphor nominations within a given paradigm of phraseological idioms. They do not always suppose a perfect equivalence of phraseological units from one language to another, as the individuals from each community select different elements from their own culture in order to create idioms with a significant degree of expressivity. There are animals, instruments, objects which have a specific reference in the immediate universe for the certain community, as there are components particularly important for the life of that ethnic group. Compare: Uzb: *qo'uday muloyim; chumoliga ozor bermaydigan*; Rus.: *ласковый как теленок, ласковая как кошка; мухи не обидит – Ислам мягкий, застенчивый, что называется, мухи не обидит.* Eng.: *pigeon-livered; cuddly as a bear; pussy cat; gentle as a lamb; he cannot say boo to a goose; sb would not hurt (harm) a fly.*

Cultural connotation also arises from the interpretation of concepts or sub-concepts. For instance, in Uzbek and English within the meaning of submissive, gentle the word lamb is the key component of idioms, in Russian, the component теленок appears in such anthropocentric idioms, because a cow, not a sheep in Russia was a symbol of prosperity. The same is not true about, for instance, Britain, where feeding of sheep was high on the list, because it brought big profits. In all analyzed cultures there is an interesting comparison of the gentle person with a cat. As for the English expression pussy cat it is assumed

that “puss is the equivalent to Rus. кис-кис , the expression which is used to draw the cats’ attention”⁴⁴

To conclude, we admit that, in many cases, we deal with similar logical and semantic patterns in all investigated languages because of the existence of the same human universal spirit, of a resembling ontological experience, of a common European identity. We could also assert, on the basis of the previously analyzed descriptive material, that there are unique phraseological units in the culture and mentality of each community, determined by different economic, social, historical and psychological aspects. Since phraseology in comparative linguo-cultural studies is still relatively young field of research, much more corpora are necessary to learn and understand the national spirit of the certain ethnic group through cultural concepts. This is one of the first attempts when these languages –Uzbek, English and Russian have been compared. Therefore, the prospects of further investigation are connected with the comparison of phraseological units in the anthropocentric paradigm expanding the study by the large group of phraseological idioms. The comparison will be continued and the conclusions of the proposed research have a premature character.

⁴⁴ Тер-Минасова, С. 2000. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация [Language and Intercultural Communication] М.: Слово, р.624.

Chapter II Phraseological units.

§2.1. Phraseology as a constituent part of lexicology

Phraseology is a branch of lexicology that studies sequence of words that are semantically and often syntactically restricted and they function as single units similar to individual words. Phraseology received increasing attention in the English-speaking world. Linguistic competence also includes a familiarity with restricted collocations (like break the rules), idioms (like spill the beans in a non-literal sense) and proverbs (like Revenge is sweet), as well as the ability to produce or understand metaphorical interpretations.

Vinogradov's classification of phraseological units:

a) phraseological combinations – are word – groups with a partially changed meaning. They may be said to be clearly motivated, that is the meaning of the units can be easily deduced from the meanings of its constituents.

Ex. to be good at smth., to have a bite....

b) unities – are word – groups with a completely changed meaning, that is, the meaning of the unit doesn't correspond to the meanings of its constituent parts.

Ex. to lose one's head (to be out of one's mind), to lose one's heart to smb. (to fall in love).

c) fusions – are word – groups with a completely changed meaning but, in contrast to the units, they are demotivated, that is, their meaning can't be

deduced from the meanings of its constituent parts.

Ex. to come a cropper (to come to disaster).

The Koonin's classification is the latest outstanding achievement in the Russian theory of phraseology.

I. Nominative phraseological units – are represented by word – groups, including the ones with one meaningful word, and coordinative phrases of the type wear and tear, well and good.

II. Nominative – communicative phraseological units – include word – groups, of the type to break the ice – the ice is broken

III. Phraseological units – which are neither nominative nor communicative include interjectional word – groups.

IV. Communicative phraseological units – are represented by proverbs and sayings

Everyone wants his speech to be rich, emotional and expressive. One of the main ways to achieve this is a reasonable use of different phraseological expressions, idioms, proverbs, sayings, colourful expressions.

Confusion about the terminology: Most Ukrainian scholars use the term **phraseological unit** (фразеологічна одиниця). It was first introduced by Russian scholar V.V. Vinogradov. The term **idiom** widely used by western scholars has comparatively recently found its way into Ukrainian phraseology. Other terms are set-expressions, set-phrases, phrases, fixed word-groups, collocations.

The criteria for distinguishing between FWGs and set-phrases:

- **Criterion of stability of the lexical components and lack of motivation.** The constituents of FWG may vary according to communication needs. Member-words of PU are always reproduced as single unchangeable collocations.

E.g. the constituent *red* in the free word-group *red flower* may be substituted for by any other adjective denoting color, without essentially changing the denotational meaning of the word-group.

But in the PU *red tape* (bureaucratic methods) no substitution like this is possible, a change of the adjective would involve a **complete change** in the meaning of the whole group.

- **Criterion of function.** PUs function as word-equivalents. Their denotational meaning belongs to the word group as a single **semantically inseparable unity** and grammatical meaning i.e. the part-of-speech meaning is belonging to the word-group as a **whole** irrespective of the part-of-speech meaning of the component words.

E.g.: the free word group *a long day* and the phraseological unit *in the long run*.

- **Criterion of context.** FWGs make up variable contexts. PU makes up a fixed context.

E. g. in FWG *small town/room* the adj. *small* has the meaning “**not large**” but in PU *small hours* the meaning of *small* has nothing to do with the size (early hours from 1 to 4 a.m.).

- **Criterion of idiomaticity.** PUs are ready-made phrases registered in dictionaries. FWGs are made up spontaneously. The task of distinguishing between FWG and PU is further complicated by the existence of a great number of marginal cases, the so-called semi-fixed or semi-free word-groups, also called nonphraseological word-groups which share with PUs their structural stability but lack their semantic unity and figurativeness.

E. g. *to go to school, to go by bus, to commit suicide*

- **Other major criteria** for distinguishing between PU and FWG: **semantic and structural.**

e.g. *A Cambridge don: I'm told they're inviting more American professors to this university. Isn't it rather carrying coals to Newcastle?*

to carry coals to Newcastle - "to take something to a place where it is already plentiful and not needed"

e.g. *This cargo ship is carrying coal to Liverpool.*

The semantic difference of the two word groups: *is carrying coal* is used in the direct sense in the second context. The first context has nothing to do either with coal or with transporting it, and the meaning of the whole word-group is something entirely **new** and far removed from the current meanings of the constituents.

The meanings of the constituents in a PU merge to produce an entirely new meaning:

e.g. *to have a bee in one's bonnet* means to have an obsession about something; to be eccentric or even a little mad. The humorous metaphoric comparison with a person who is distracted by a bee continually buzzing under their cap has become erased and half-forgotten, and the speakers using the expression hardly think of bees or bonnets but accept it in its transferred sense: "obsessed, eccentric".

That is what is meant when phraseological units are said to be characterized by **semantic unity**. In the traditional approach, PUs have been defined as word-groups **conveying a single concept**, whereas in FWG each meaningful component stands for a **separate concept**.

This feature makes PU similar to words: both words and PU possess **semantic unity**.

The structural criterion

Structural invariability is an essential feature of PUs, though some of them possess it to a lesser degree than others. Structural invariability of PU finds expression in a number of restrictions.

Restriction in substitution

No word can be substituted for any meaningful component of a PU **without destroying its sense**.

The second type of restriction is **the restriction in introducing any additional components into the structure of a PU**.

The third type of structural restrictions in PU is **grammatical invariability**.

To find fault with somebody

e. g. *The teacher always found fault with the boy (is not correct)*

V. Vinogradov classifies phraseological units into three classes:

- **phraseological combinations/collocations**
- **phraseological unities**
- **phraseological fusions.**

Phraseological combinations are word-groups with a **partially changed meaning**. They are clearly motivated, that is, the meaning of the unit can be **easily deduced** from the meanings of its constituents,

e.g. *to be at one's wits' end,*

to be good at something,

to have a bite,

to come to a sticky end

Phraseological unities are word-groups with a **completely changed meaning**. The meaning of the unit **does not** correspond to the meanings of its constituent parts. They are **motivated** units. The meaning of the whole unit can be deduced from the meanings of the constituent parts. The metaphor, on which the shift of meaning is based, **is clear** and transparent,

e.g. *to stick to one's guns*– to be true to one's views or convictions. It is connected with the image is that of a gunner or gun crew who do not desert their guns even if a battle seems lost;

to sit on the fence– in discussion, politics, etc. refrain from committing oneself to either side;

catch/clutch at a straw/straws– when in extreme danger, avail oneself of even the slightest chance of rescue;

to lose one's head– to be at a loss about what to do; to be out of one's mind);

to lose one's heart to smb.– to fall in love.

Phraseological fusions are word-groups with a **completely changed meaning** but in contrast to the unities, they are **demotivated**. Their meaning

cannot be deduced from the meanings of the constituent parts. The metaphor, on which the shift of meaning was based, has **lost its clarity** and is obscure,

e.g. *to come a cropper* –to come to disaster;

at sixes and sevens– in confusion or in disagreement;

to set one's cap at smb. – to try and attract a man (about girls and women)

to pull one's leg;

to kick the bucket;

red tape.

Let's examine how some fusions originated.

Red Tape

This is a very common idiomatic expression. We use the term "**red tape**" to denote anything that may delay or hold us up, whatever the process may be. It also refers to a lot of unnecessary bureaucracy or paperwork.

This term originated from the fact that legal and official documents were tied up or bound with red cloth tape in 16th and continuing up to the 19th century. The difficulty of accessing these documents led to the current idiomatic expression.

If you want to say that something is being delayed due to red tape, you'd say, "The budget approval for this project is tied up in red tape."

Usually around election time, politicians promise to reduce bureaucracy by saying that they will cut the red tape in government.

Kick the Bucket

Phrase is used to say that someone is dead or has deceased. The actual origin of the term is from England and dates back to the late Middle Ages. A corpse would be laid out and a bucket of holy water placed at its feet. Visitors then could sprinkle the deceased with holy water. Other explanations (suicide,

execution) came later to explain an idiom, the origin of which has ceased mainly as a result of the English reformation.

"To Kick the Bucket" is explained by Bishop Abbot Horne in 1949, in his booklet "Relics of Popery" Catholic Truth Society. He adds "Many other explanations of this saying have been given by persons who are unacquainted with Catholic Custom."

Other sources explain that the term is derived from the times when suicides were common by a person preparing to hang himself/herself and used a bucket to stand on and then kicked the bucket when suicide was desired.

Ole' Charlie kicked the bucket today, we better prepare for his funeral.

Pigs to be slaughtered are bled, that is the blood is drained from the body. One way this is accomplished is to hang the pig upside down from a bar (by one foot) that used to be known as a "buchet", a French word for it. The pig's throat was cut or opened with a sharp spike, and it would rapidly be bled. In its death throes, it would always kick the bucket.

To pull one's leg

If you try to pull someone's leg, you try and make them believe something that isn't true. "You're pulling my leg!" is another way of saying "I don't believe what you're saying" or "You must be joking!"

It often has humorous associations but the origin of the expression has nothing to do with making jokes or telling funny stories. It has its origins in the criminal world of 18th and 19th century London. In those days street robbers often worked in gangs of two. One would trip up the unsuspecting victim and the other would remove his money and other valuables while he was lying on the ground. The robber didn't literally pull the victim's leg but caused him to stumble and fall and then lose his valuables. If your leg is pulled now, you don't lose your money but you might betray your ignorance and lose your temper.

V. Vinogradov's classification system does not take into account the **structural** characteristics of PUs. The border-line separating unities from

fusions is **vague** and even subjective. One and the same phraseological unit may appear motivated to one person (and therefore be labeled as a unity) and demotivated to another (and be regarded as a fusion).

The structural principle

The structural principle of classifying phraseological units is based on their ability to perform the same syntactical functions as words. In the traditional structural approach, the following principal groups of phraseological units are distinguishable:

Verbal (the head word is a verb)

e.g. to run for one's (dear) life,

to get (win) the upper hand

Nominative (the head word is a noun)

e.g. dog's life,

cat-and-dog life,

calf love,

white lie,

birds of a feather.

Adjectival (the head word is an adjective) *e.g. high and mighty, brand new, safe and sound.*

In this group the so-called comparative word-groups are particularly expressive :

(as) cool as acucumber,

(as) nervous as a cat,

(as) weak as a kitten,

(as) good as gold,

(as) pretty as a picture,

as large as life,

(as) slippery as an eel,

(as) drunk as an owl (sl.),

(as) mad as a hatter/a hare in March.

Adverbial

*e.g. by hook or by crook,
in coldblood,
in the dead of night,
between the devil and the deep sea.*

Interjectional

*e.g. My God!
By George!
Good heavens!
Goodness gracious!*

Structural & semantic principles

A.I. Smirnitsky offered a classification system for English PUs **combining the structural and the semantic principles**. Phraseological units in this classification system are grouped according to **the number and semantic** significance of their constituent parts. Phraseological units in his classification system are grouped according to **the number and semantic** significance of their constituent parts. Two large groups are established:

One-summit units, which have one meaningful constituent,

*e. g. to give up,
to make out,
to pull out,
to be tired,
to be surprised.*

Two-summit and multi-summit units which have two or more meaningful constituents,

e. g. black art, first night,

*common sense,
to fish in troubled waters.*

Within each of these large groups the phraseological units are classified according to **the category of parts of speech** of the summit constituent. So, **one-summit units** are subdivided into:

a) *verbal-adverbial* units equivalent to verbs in which the semantic and the grammatical centers coincide in the first constituent, e.g. *to give up*;

b) units *equivalent to verbs* which have their semantic centre in the second constituent and their grammatical centre in the first, e.g. *to be tired*;

c) *prepositional-substantive* units equivalent either to adverbs or to copulas and having their semantic centre in the substantive constituent and no grammatical centre, e.g. *by heart, by means of*.

Two-summit and multi-summit phraseological units are classified into:

a) *attributive-substantive* two-summit units equivalent to nouns, e.g. *black art*;

b) *verbal-substantive* two-summit units equivalent to verbs, e.g. *to take the floor*;

c) *phraseological repetitions* equivalent to adverbs, e.g. *now or never*;

d) *adverbial multi-summit* units, e.g. *every other day*.

A.I. Smirnitsky also distinguishes **proper phraseological units** which, in his classification system, are units with non-figurative meanings, and **idioms**, units with transferred meanings based on a metaphor.

A.V. Koonin, the leading Russian authority on English phraseology pointed out certain inconsistencies in this classification system. First of all, the subdivision into phraseological units (as non-idiomatic units) and idioms contradicts the leading criterion of a phraseological unit suggested by A.I. Smirnitsky: It should be idiomatic. A.V. Koonin also objects to the inclusion of such wordgroups as *black art, best man, first night* in phraseology (in Smirnitsky's classification system, they are the two-summit phraseological units) as all these word-groups are not characterized by a transferred meaning.

It is also pointed out that verbs with post-positions (e.g. *give up*) are included in the classification but their status as phraseological units is not supported by any convincing argument.

Contextual classification

The classification is based on **the combined structural-semantic principle** and it also considers **the quotient of stability of phraseological units**. Phraseological units are subdivided into the following four classes according to their function in communication determined by their structural-semantic characteristics.

1. **Nominative phraseological units** are represented by word-groups, including the ones with one meaningful word, and coordinative phrases of the type *wear and tear, well and good*. The first class also includes word-groups with a predicative structure, such as *as the crow flies*, and, also, predicative phrases of the type *see how the land lies, ships that pass in the night*.

2. **Nominative-communicative phraseological units** include word-groups of the type *to break the ice – the ice is broken*, that is, verbal word-groups which are transformed into a sentence when the verb is used in the Passive Voice.

3. **Phraseological units** which are neither nominative nor communicative include **interjectional word-groups**.

4. **Communicative phraseological units**: proverbs and sayings.

These four classes are divided into sub-groups according to the type of structure of the phraseological unit. The sub-groups include further rubrics representing types of structural-semantic meanings according to the kind of relations between the constituents and to either full or partial transference of meaning. The classification system includes a considerable number of subtypes and gradations and reflects the wealth of types of phraseological units existing in the language. It is based on truly scientific and modern criteria and represents an earnest attempt to take into account all the relevant aspects of phraseological units and combine them within the borders of one classification system.

Ways of forming phraseological units

A.V. Koonin classified phraseological units according to the way they are formed, pointing out **primary and secondary ways of forming phraseological units.**

Primary ways of forming phraseological units are those when a unit is formed on the basis of a free word-group:

- a) most productive in Modern English is the formation of phraseological units **by means of transferring the meaning of terminological word-groups**, e.g. *launching pad, to link up*;
- b) a large group of phraseological units was formed **from free word-groups by transforming their meaning**, e.g. *granny farm, Trojan horse*;
- c) phraseological units can be formed **by means of alliteration**, e.g. *a sad sack, culture vulture, fudge and nudge*;
- d) they can be formed **by means of expressiveness, especially it is characteristic for forming interjections**, e.g. *My aunt! Hear, hear!*;
- e) by means of distorting a word group, e.g. *odds and ends*;
- f) by using archaisms, e.g. *in brown study*;
- g) by using a sentence in a different sphere of life, e.g. *that cock won't fight*;
- h) by using some unreal image, e.g. *to have butterflies in the stomach, to have green fingers*;
- i) by using expressions of writers or politicians in everyday life, e.g. *corridors of power, American dream, the winds of change*).

Secondary ways of forming phraseological units are those when a phraseological unit is formed on the basis of another phraseological unit. They are:

- a) **conversion**, e.g. *to vote with one's feet* → *vote with one's feet*;
- b) **changing the grammar form**, e.g. *make hay while the sun shines* → *make hay while the sun shines*;

- c) **analogy**, e.g. *curiosity killed the cat* → *care killed the cat*
- d) **contrast**, e.g. *acute surgery* → *cold surgery*;
- e) **shortening of proverbs and sayings**, e.g. *you can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear* → *a sow's ear*;
- f) **borrowing phraseological units from other languages, either as translation loans**, e.g. *living space* (German), *to take the bull by the horns* (Latin);
- or by means of phonetic borrowings**, e.g. *sotto voce* (Italian), *corpse d'elite* (French)

The founder of the theory of phraseology is a Swiss linguist Charles Bally. Bally was the first who systematized the combination of the words in his books “Studies of the Stylistics” and “French Stylistics”. Ch. Bally explored the sphere of linguistics and phraseology in the French language, however, his attempt to systematize and classify phraseological units led to the series of other studies in the phraseological sphere in other languages, including English ⁴⁵. Even today this sphere is in the focus of many researches. So, in his book “The Course of the Modern English Phraseology”, A. V. Kunin investigated a wide range of phraseological characteristics, methods of their studies, phraseological systemacy and presents classifications of idiomatic expressions according to their features. V. N. Komissarov studied the methods of translating phraseological units. ⁴⁶

The translation of idiomatic expressions is not only the interpretation of the denotative meaning, but also the preservation of connotative characteristics.

V. N. Komissarov tells about three correspondence types with figurative phraseological units of the originals.

1. Phraseological equivalents.

In this case, a similar idiom that corresponds to all the parameters of the original idiomatic expression is meant. However, there are two factors to be

⁴⁵ Kunin, A. V. (1990) The course of the modern English phraseology, Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 380 p

⁴⁶ Komissarov, V. N. (2004) Modern translation, Moscow: ETC, 424 p.

considered: phraseological equivalents are relatively few and when the same idiom is borrowed by two languages, its meaning may be changed in one of them, and these idioms may be “false friends of the translator” – similar in form but different in content”.

2. Phraseological analogies.

This is an idiom with the same figurative meaning as the original, although based on a different form. Here the author also notes some limitations. Firstly, it is necessary to ascertain that emotional and stylistic meanings of the idiom are kept. Secondly, this method of translation is not suitable when the idiom that is to be translated has an explicit pronounced national character .

3. The calque of the foreign language figurative unit.

The author believes that the calque allows to keep the original imagery and makes it possible to overcome the difficulties that arise when the image in original is made to create an extended metaphor.

Maryna Novikova adds the descriptive method to three above-mentioned methods of translation.⁴⁷ This method of translation is used when the target language has no similar images, as in the source language, such as culture-specific elements, historical events, etc. S. I. Vlahov and S. P. Florin give such a definition to a phraseological equivalent: this is an idiom, that is equivalent with all the indicators of the unit under translation. As a rule, regardless of context, it must have the same denotative and connotative meanings.⁴⁸ For example, the English quantitative idiomatic expression “sixth sense” has an absolute equivalent in Uzbek «oltinchi sezgi ». Both in English and Uzbek languages this concept means the colloquial designation of any sense of a human or an animal, in addition to five “major” ones: sight, hearing, smell, touch and taste. Idioms have the same component composition, structural and grammatical organization as belonging to the group substantival phraseological units and have the structure adj + n. An idiom “All eyes and ears” has an absolute

⁴⁷Novikova, M. G. (2012) *The Measure of the Meaning, Actual Articulation and Appropriateness of the Translation*, Moscow: FLINTA: Nauka, 208 p.

⁴⁸Vlahov, S. I. (2009) *Untranslatable in Translation*, Moscow: “R. Valent”, 360 p

equivalent in Uzbek as well – «Ko`z-quloq bo`lmoq». They have the same connotative meaning, grammatical and structural organization. The following phraseological units also have absolute equivalents: “one for all, and all for one” – «bir kishi hamma uchun, hamma bir kishi uchun », “one on one” – «birga bir », “Give ear” – «Quloq tutmoq», “Have big ears” – «Qulog`ini ding qilmoq ».

However, in English language there are some phraseological units which do not have their equivalents with the same component. But, Uzbek language offers other idioms with different components and they can give the same meaning with those English ones.

Table 1

English idioms	Meaning	Equivalents in Uzbek language
Coming out of one's ears	In great or excess quantity	Boshidan oshiq
Wet behind the ears	Inexperienced; not seasoned; new; just beginning; immature, especially in judgment.	Ona suti og`zidan ketmagan
Make one's ears burn	If something makes your ears burn, you are embarrassed by what you hear, especially if the conversation is about you.	Hijolat tortmoq.
Ear to the ground	Pursuing the practice or having the characteristic of carefully gathering information; well-informed.	Ko`pni ko`rgan

In conclusion, we can say that phraseological units are extremely important parts of linguistics in any language. Additionally, the usage of idioms is so common in the field of translation since it has more benefits for translators and interpreters. But, while translating them from one language into another they

should be careful about their meaning and pay attention to find the most suitable equivalent of these idioms instead of translating them word for word.

§2.2 Vinogradov's Classification of Phraseological Units

Phraseology is one of the sources that enlarges and enriches vocabulary. It is the most colourful part of vocabulary system, and it represents the peculiar vision of the world by this speaking community. It reflects the history of the nation, the customs and traditions of the people speaking the language.

Phraseology forms a special subsystem in the vocabulary system which units are called differently by different linguists. There can be met such terms as phraseological units, phraseologisms, set expressions, idioms. Thus these terms can be used interchangeably.

It should be noted that when we speak about phraseological units we mean a word group consisting of two or more words, e.g. *Black Death*, *to show one's teeth*. It is necessary to differentiate between free word groups and phraseologisms.

By using semantic approach we see that the meaning of a free word group is the sum of literal meanings of words this free word group consists of. So, a word group is lexically motivated, e.g. *fresh juice*, *buy a car*. Phraseological units are also modeled according to patterns existing in the language, but the meaning of a phraseological unit is not just a sum of literal meanings of the

components. Such a word group is lexically non-motivated, e.g. *red tape*, *take part*. The degree of motivation can vary from non-motivated to partial and complete. Completely motivated word groups are not in the focus of attention of phraseology. Partially motivated and completely non-motivated word groups are considered to be phraseological units or idioms.

Thus, phraseological units can be defined as stable word groups with a specialized meaning of the whole. The following features can be singled out from this definition:

- **Stability.** The usage of a phraseological unit is not subject to free variations, and grammatical structure of phraseological units is also stable to a certain extent, e.g. *red tape* NOT *red tapes*. Stability makes phraseological units more similar to words, rather than free word combinations.

- **Idiomacity.** The meaning of the whole is not deducible from the sum of the meanings of the parts.

- **Reproducibility.** Phraseological units are used in speech as single unchangeable / ready-made collocations.

In lexicology there are different opinions on phraseology: how it should be defined, classified, described, and analyzed. The word “phraseology” has very different meanings in Russia and in Great Britain or the United States.

Phraseology as a branch of linguistics has thoroughly been worked out by Russian linguists. V.V. Vinogradov defined phraseological units as expressions where the meaning of one element is dependent on the other, irrespective of the structure and properties of the unit. A.I. Smirnitsky regarded them as set expressions which do not possess expressiveness or emotional colouring.

The opposite approach was expressed by I.V. Arnold considering phraseologisms as imaginative, expressive and emotional units of the language.

N.N. Amosova calls such expressions fixed context units, i.e. units in which it is impossible to substitute any of the elements without changing the meaning not only of the whole unit, but also of the elements that remain intact.

While in English and American linguistics no special branch of study exists, and the term “phraseology” has mainly a stylistic meaning. According to Webster's dictionary phraseology is “mode of expression, peculiarities of diction, i.e. choice and arrangement of words and phrases characteristic of some author or some literary work”.

As far as semantic motivation is concerned phraseological units are extremely varied from motivated, e.g. *black dress*, to partially motivated, e.g. *to have broad shoulders* or to demotivated like *tit for tat*, *red tape*. (Lexical and grammatical stability of phraseological units is displayed by the fact that no substitution of any elements is possible in the stereotyped set expressions, which differ in many other respects: *all the world and his wife*, *red tape*, *calf love*, *heads or tails*, *first night*, *to gild the pill*, *to hope for the best*, *busy as a bee*, *fair and square*, *stuff and non sense*, *time and again*, *to and fro*).

Russian academician V.V. Vinogradov developed his original classification in the field of Russian phraseology. The classification is based upon the motivation of the unit, i.e. the relationship existing between the meaning of the whole and the meaning of its component parts. Phraseological units can be classified into three principle groups according to the degree of motivation: phraseological combinations, phraseological unities, and phraseological fusions.

Phraseological combinations are partially motivated; they contain one component used in its direct meaning while the other is used figuratively: *break a rule*, *break a law*, *break a promise*. In this group of phraseological units some substitutions are possible which do not destroy the meaning of metaphoric element. In these expressions the words *rule*, *law*, *promise* are used in their direct meanings, while the meaning of the verb *break* is kept intact and used metaphorically, i.e. partially motivated.

Phraseological unities are much more numerous in the English language. They are also partially non-motivated. The meaning of phraseological unities can usually be understood through the metaphoric meaning of the whole phraseologisms, e.g. *to stick (to stand) to one's guns* – “to refuse to change one's

statements or opinions in the face of opposition, implying courage and integrity”, *a hard nut to crack* – “a person or thing that is difficult to understand or influence”.

Phraseological fusions are completely non-motivated word groups representing the highest degree of blending together, e.g. *tit for tat*. The meaning of components is completely absorbed by the meaning of the whole, by its expressiveness and emotional properties. Phraseological fusions are specific for every language and do not lend themselves to literal translation into other languages, e.g. *white elephant* – “expensive but useless thing”. Phraseological fusions can not be understood and always require using a dictionary.

The analysis of the origin of phraseological units may contribute to a better understanding of meaning of a phraseological unit. According to the origin all phraseological units fall into two groups: native and borrowed.

The main sources of **native** phraseological units are:

- terminological and professional units of the language, e.g. navigation: *to cut the painter* – “to become independent”, *to lower one’s colours* – “to give in”;
- British literature, e.g. *the green-eyed monster* – “jealousy” (W. Shakespeare);
- British traditions and customs, e.g. *baker’s dozen* – “a group of thirteen”. In the past British merchants of bread received from bakers 13 loaves of bread instead of 12. The 13th loaf was merchant’s profit;
- legends and superstitions, e.g. *a black sheep* – “a less successful or more immoral person in a family or in a group”. People believed that a black sheep was marked by the devil;
- historical facts and events, personalities, e.g. *to do a Thatcher* – “to stay in power as prime minister for three consecutive terms”, *to carry coals to Newcastle* – “to take something to a place where there is plenty of it available”. Newcastle is known as a city in Northern England where a lot of coal was produced.

- phenomena and facts of everyday life concerning different spheres such as sport, environment, food, etc., e.g. *to get a head start* – “start before all others” from horse racing (sport), *to eat one’s words* – “to admit that something you said was wrong”.

The main sources of **borrowed** phraseological units are as follows:

- the Holy Script, e.g. *the kiss of Judas* – “any display of affection whose purpose is to conceal any act of treachery”;

- ancient legends and myths belonging to different religious or cultural traditions, e.g. *Achilles’ heel* – “a weak part of something, especially of someone’s character, which is easy for other people to attack”;

- facts and events of the world history, e.g. *to meet one’s Waterloo* – “to be faced with, esp. after previous success, a final defeat, a difficulty or an obstacle one cannot overcome” (from the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo in 1815);

- variants of the English language, e.g. *a hole card* – “a secret advantage that is ready to use when you need it” (American);

- other languages (classical and modern), e.g. *the fair sex* – “women”, from French: *le beau sex*; *let the cat out of the bag* – “reveal a secret carelessly or by mistake”, from German: *die Katze aus dem Sack lassen*.

Phraseological transference is a complete or partial change of meaning of an initial word group as a result of which the word group acquires a new meaning and turns into a phraseological unit. Phraseological transference is mainly based on metaphor, metonymy, simile, etc.:

1. Transference based on **metaphor** is a likening of one object (phenomenon, action) of reality to another, which is associated with it on the basis of real or imaginable resemblance, e.g. *to join the majority* – “to die”, *fat cat* – “a wealthy and powerful person, especially a businessman or politician”.

2. Transference based on **metonymy** is based on contiguity of properties, relations, etc. of two objects. The transfer of name is conditioned by close

connections between two objects; the idea about one object is integrally linked with the idea about the other object, e.g. *a silk stocking* – “a rich, well-dressed man”. Here we see the replacement of the genuine object (a man) by the article of clothing which was very fashionable and popular among the men in the past.

3. Transference based on **simile** is the intensification of some feature of an object (phenomenon, thing) denoted by a phraseological unit by comparing it with another object (phenomenon, thing) belonging to an entirely different class in order to show resemblance, e.g. *as like as two peas, as old as the hills*.

In conclusion, we can say that phraseological units are extremely important parts of linguistics in any language. Additionally, the usage of idioms is so common in the field of translation since it has more benefits for translators and interpreters. But, while translating them from one language into another they should be careful about their meaning and pay attention to find the most suitable equivalent of these idioms instead of translating them word for word.

Chapter III Linguopragmatic features of phraseological units.

§3.1. Toward an understanding of Phraseological units and Pragmatic functions

It has become fairly well established that phraseological units can facilitate second language speakers to learn a language. They may help speakers appear more nativelike, as they provides ready-made chunks of language ⁴⁹ which are appropriate to specific contexts. Pedagogic implications can be found, in writing academic works and in several areas related to academic communication .⁵⁰ Many researchers have assumed that the use of fixed expressions represents fluent linguistic production in both spoken language ⁵¹, and written or academic texts.⁵²

⁴⁹ A. Wray, *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

⁵⁰ D. Biber and F. Barbieri, "Lexical bundles in university spoken and written register," *English for Specific Purposes*. vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 263-286, 2007. S. Conrad and D. Biber, "The frequency and use of lexical bundles in conversation and academic prose," *Lexicographica*. vol. 20, pp. 56-71, 2004. V. Cortes, "Lexical bundles in published and student disciplinary writing: Examples from history and biology," *English for Specific Purposes*. vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 397-423, 2004. example from a writing intensive history class," *Linguistics and Education*. vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 391-406, 2007. V. Cortes, "The purpose of this study is to: Connecting lexical bundles and moves in research article introductions," *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 33-43, 2013. K. Hyland, "Academic clusters: Text patterning in published and postgraduate writing," *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 41-62, 2008. J. Li, and N. Schmitt, "The development of collocation use in academic texts by advanced L2 learners: A multiple case study approach," in *Perspectives on formulaic language: Acquisition and communication*, D. Wood, Ed. Continuum: New York, 2010, pp. 22-46

⁵¹ A. Pawley and F.H. Syder, "Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency," in *Language and communication*, J.C. Richards and R.W. Schmitt, Eds. Longman: London, . 191-230

⁵² D. Biber, S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finegan, *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*, Pearson: Harlow, 1999.

Phraseological patterns are defined in certain ways. In essence, they are combinations of three or more words that are identified in a corpus of natural language by means of corpus analysis software programs. Researchers may use different terms referring to studies of phraseology. For instance, Altenberg⁵³ preferred to use the term “recurrent word-combinations” in investigating word patterns typically recurring in spoken English. The term “lexical bundles” was first defined in 1999 by Biber and his colleagues to describe the patterns of “words that show a statistical tendency to co-occur”. Erman and Warren⁵⁴ stated that they were “combinations of at least two words favored by native speakers in preference to an alternative combination which could have been equivalent had there been no conventionalization”. Based on our intuition, the word units considered to be lexical bundles must be unrecognized by language speakers and researchers. Fixed expressions or so-called idiomatic phrases that have fixed meanings and can be understood by language speakers cannot be included because lexical bundles are distinct from those⁵⁵.

To identify multiword combinations, a frequencybased method is most appropriate for large corpora of hundreds of thousands of words. In fact, researchers set certain criteria before scanning and analyzing a corpus, which cutoffs can generally range from 10 to 40 occurrences per million words.⁵⁶ However, it has some limitations for use with small data sets, and using frequency alone as a criterion for formulaicity might not give any information about the psycholinguistic validity of the formula. It may yield meaningless combinations of words for functional analyses. In this regard, for Thai novice researchers and graduate students, writing a research article and getting it

⁵³ B. Altenberg, "On the phraseology of spoken English: The evidence of recurrent word-combinations," in *Phraseology: Theory, analysis and applications*, A.P. Cowie, Ed. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1998

⁵⁴ B. Erman and B. Warren, "The idiom principle and the open choice principle: Text-Interdisciplinary," *Journal for the Study of Discourse*. vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 29-62, 2000.

⁵⁵ A. Wray, "Identifying formulaic language: Persistent challenges and new opportunities," in *Formulaic language volume 1: Distribution and historical change*, R. Corrigan, et al., Eds. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, 2009, pp. 27-51

⁵⁶ R. Simpson-Vlach and N.C. Ellis, "An academic formulas list: New methods in phraseology research," *Applied Linguistics*. vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 487-512, 2010

accepted for publishing in a peer-reviewed journal are vital. The task, however, may be difficult for them as article writers are expected to use language which is appropriate to their discipline and writing convention. Since phraseology has been claimed that it facilitates the development of long term language ability, and permits a learner to more easily use frequent word units for meaning reference, two specific objectives of the present study are: 1) to identify phraseological patterns appear in research articles indexed in the TCI database, and 2) to classify the phraseological patterns generated with pragmatic functions.

As shown by the findings of the current study, a combination of Hyland's functional classification and Biber et al.'s⁵⁷ taxonomies was appropriate and useful, revealing characteristics and pragmatic functions of the phraseological patterns identified, including research-oriented, text-oriented and stance-oriented functions. Even though this study focuses on three-word n-grams, which is distinctive from previous studies investigating four-word bundles, most of the findings presented are partly in accordance with several previous studies⁵⁸. A possible reason explaining this finding is that Biber et al.'s taxonomy was derived from analyzing a huge corpus, including a mixture of various disciplines and registers, including written and spoken texts, while Hyland's classification was designed specifically for lexical units found in academic writing. A combination of these and an inductive approach, thus, nicely fits the phraseological patterns found in the corpus of articles in this study. The present study also shows that a combination of a corpus-based approach and qualitative analysis is helpful in identifying phraseological units since they are not necessarily formulaic just because they occur together often in a corpus of specific contexts. The results generated by this study, thus, have generated a number of important implications for graduate students and novice writers in

⁵⁷ D. Biber, S. Conrad and V. Cortes, "If you look at...: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks," *Applied Linguistics*. vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 371-405, 2004

⁵⁸ P. Durrant, "Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation in university students' writing: Mapping the territories," *Applied Linguistics*. pp. 1-30, 2015. Y. Wei and L. Lei, "Lexical bundles in the academic writing of advanced Chinese EFL learners," *RELC journal*. vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 155-166, 2011.

reading and drafting articles. The pragmatic functions of phraseological patterns identified can serve as a reference for raising writers' awareness when interpreting underlying meanings of academic texts and materials in general, particularly articles published in the TCI database. Showing how a pragmatic function can be operationalized to allow for creating meanings in different situational contexts is in response to Biber et al.⁵⁹, who succinctly noted that corpus-based analyses must go beyond simple counts of linguistic features, but that it is crucial to include qualitative, functional interpretations of quantitative patterns. I believe that these approaches are not desirable, as the process is time-consuming, but can, to some extent, be fruitful, particularly with the genre-specific corpus used in this study, in facilitating the task of article writing. Pedagogically, the knowledge obtained from the current study may serve as a useful basis for preparing manuscript drafts for journal submission. Instructors can integrate knowledge from this study with the use of authentic texts to demonstrate how phraseological patterns are frequently used, as well as the functions they perform in context. In other words, graduate students should be encouraged to associate those functions and forms within the context of language use. The present study has a contribution to awareness-raising of the functions of repeated patterned-expressions in academic texts, and how they may enhance students' overall expertise in writing English for publication. Material designers and practitioners can consider a combination of quantitative and qualitative aspects in selecting useful phrases, including the identification of their pragmatic functions, as a reference in developing textbooks and classroom materials.

Conclusion. The present study set out to investigate the use of phraseological patterns and their functions in applied linguistics research articles. As generated by the SketchEngine, unlike previous studies investigating four-word bundles

⁵⁹ D. Biber, U. Connor and T.A. Upton, *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007

,⁶⁰ the current study specifically explored the quantitative distribution of three-word n-grams in the corpus of the selected research articles, as they were considered psycholinguistically unproblematic and pedagogically interesting . This paper has also outlined the methodological processes and important considerations, including qualitative perspectives and judgments from EAP instructors, rather than simply extracting frequent words from a corpus in selecting a list of three-word n-grams. The methods used here could, thus, ensure that the phraseological patterns generated are pedagogically motivated and merit the pedagogic purposes. Bringing all of those strands together — quantitative frequency, and qualitative judgments about what are meaningful phrases, and inputs from experts in the field to consider those useful phrases - demonstrates a thorough perspective on conducting textual analysis to receive in-depth and specific information, verify the outcomes and ensure that the results of this study are accurate and reliable.

⁶⁰ Grabowski, "Keywords and lexical bundles within English pharmaceutical discourse: A corpus-driven description," *English for Specific Purposes*. vol. 38, pp. 23- 33, 2015

§3.2. The comparative analyze of English-Uzbek simple phraseological units

Nowadays, great attention is given to learning a foreign language by majority of people. Especially English language is being learned as a second language by the people of most countries. However, learning language is not just learning the words in target language but also being familiar with phrases, idioms, proverbs and phraseological units of its. Phraseological units are considerable parts of any language. Therefore they are studied by plenty of scholars. For example, Russian scholars V.V. Vinogradov, A.I. Smidnitoski, H. N. Asomova and Uzbek scholars Sh. Rahmatullayev, A. E. Mamatov, B. Yo'ldoshev conducted a research on this sphere of linguistics. Their works and researches play significant role in the development of phraseology. Even nowadays, this field of linguistics attracts great many of scholars' attention. One of English linguists A.B. Pittman gives such definition to the phraseological units in one of his works: "A group of words in a fixed order that is different from the meaning of each word understood on its own". In fact, idioms can never be translated into another language word for word. Otherwise, they lose their semantic meaning. For instance, if we translate the idiom "Lend an ear" into Uzbek word by word, it means "qulog'ini qarzga bermoq". Because, the word "lend" means to let someone borrow something that belongs to you for a

short time. However, in the table below you can see that this idiom has its equivalent in Uzbek language. In this dissertation paper we are going to discuss some phraseological units on body parts of human being. There are so many idioms on several parts of human body in English dictionary such as “Longman”, “Macmillan” and “Oxford”. For example, eye, ear, head, hand, leg, shoulder, knee, tongue and etc. But this article is devoted to analyze just the phraseological units with the component of “ear”. In those English dictionaries we can face to more than 40 idioms which are used with the component “ear”. Most of them have equivalents in Uzbek language with the same component. For example, in the table below you can see some of them:

Table 1

English idioms	Meaning	Equivalents in Uzbek language
Are your ears burning?	Said about someone who wasn't present but was the topic of discussion.	Qulog`i qizimoq
All eyes and ears	To be attentive.	Ko`z-quloq bo`lmoq
All ears	To be waiting eagerly to hear about something.	Jon qulog`i bilan tinglamoq
Be all ears	To listen to carefully or eagerly; to anticipate.	Butun vujudi bilan quloqqa aylanmoq..
Give ear	To listen: to devote one's attention to an auditory event.	Quloq tutmoq.
Go in one ear and out the other..	Said about something which is heard and then quickly forgotten	U qulog`idan kirib bu qulog`idan chiqmoq.
Grin from ear to ear	If someone is grinning from ear to ear, they look very satisfied and happy.	Og`zi qulog`ida
Have big ears	To be nosy and listen to other people's	Qulog`ini ding qilmoq.

	private conversation.	
Lend an ear	To listen carefully and sympathetically.	Jon qulog`i bilan tinglamoq.
Music to one's ears	Some good news; a spoken expression which is pleasing;	Qulog`iga moydek yoqmoq.
Prick up your ears	If you prick up your ears, you suddenly pay attention to what is being said..	Qulog`i ding bo`lmoq
Smile from ear to ear	A large smile.	Og`zi qulog`iga yetmoq.
Walls have ears, shoes have tongues	Be careful what you say and who you speak to.	Devorning ham qulog`i bor
Easy on the ear	Something pleasant to listen to.	Qulog`iga yoqmoq
Cloth ears	If you don't listen to people, they may suggest you have cloth ears	Qulog`i tom bitgan.

However, in English language there are some phraseological units which do not have their equivalents with the same component. But, Uzbek language offers other idioms with different components and they can give the same meaning with those English ones.

Table 2

English idioms	Meaning	Equivalents in Uzbek language
Coming out of one's ears	In great or excess quantity	Boshidan oshiq
Wet behind the ears	Inexperienced; not seasoned; new; just beginning; immature, especially in judgment.	Ona suti og`zidan ketmagan
Make one's ears burn	If something makes your ears burn, you are embarrassed by what you	Hijolat tortmoq.

	hear, especially if the conversation is about you.	
Ear to the ground	Pursuing the practice or having the characteristic of carefully gathering information; well-informed.	Ko`pni ko`rgan

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 a 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.

This section discusses the pragmatic potential of simple structured phraseological units. Their functional significance is beyond doubt, since they have such pragmatically relevant properties as the complexity of the semantic structure and the ability to associate. Idiom, as a rule, are used in cases where the subject of speech is necessary to express an emotional relationship to the subject of thought, to produce a certain pragmatic effect on the recipient. The term “pragmatics” was introduced into scientific use by one of the founders of semiotics — the general theory of signs — Ch. Morris, who divided semiotics into semantics, syntactics and pragmatics, understanding the latter as a teaching about attitudes signs to their interpreters, that is, to those who use sign systems.

Thus, pragmatics studies the behavior of signs in real communication processes. If semantics shows what a person says, what a particular statement means, then a pragmatist seeks to reveal the conditions and the purpose for which person speaks in a particular 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 intentions during the production (and perception) of speech actions in statements and discourses.

According to R.S. Stolnaker, formal pragmatics can become no less exact science than modern logical syntax or logical semantics, as it "allows you to chart a new approach to the study of some philosophical problems that cannot be solved within the framework of traditional formal semantics, and clarifies the relation of logic and formal semantics to the study of natural language." If the syntax deals with the study of the sentence, and the semantics examines the propositions, the pragmatist studies the speech acts and the contexts in which they are implemented. According to the theory of communication, any text has a pragmatic setting. A textually finished piece of text, as a context, is a product of language communication. In the context, all attitudes and intentions implemented by the speaker in a speech strategy are most clearly manifested. The fact that the pragmatic information formulated in the text can be represented by both verbal and non-verbal means allows us to introduce the concept of a communicative-pragmatic context. In this kind of context, one can single out parameters related to the quality of the utterance, the scope of the language, the relations between the communicants, etc. The meaning of phraseological units is revealed precisely in a pragmatic context. The context is in the relation of complementarity to another pragmatic concept for the pragmatist - the speech act. According to G. Austin, a speech act is a type of action, and when analyzing it, essentially the same categories are used that are necessary to characterize and evaluate any action, namely: subject, purpose, method, means, result, conditions, etc. . The subject of the speech act - the speaker - produces a statement designed to be perceived by the addressee - the listener. The statement acts simultaneously as a product of the speech act, and as a tool to achieve a specific goal. Depending on the circumstances or on the conditions in which the speech act is performed, he can either achieve the goal and thus be successful, or not achieve it. The interaction of the speech act and

the context is the main core of pragmatic research, and the formulation of the rules of this interaction is its main task. Pragmatic interests begin where the connection between the context and the speech act is as intense as possible. In recent years, interest in issues related to the functioning of phraseological units in various communicative conditions has increased. A special place here takes a communicative and pragmatic study of phraseology, aimed at the study of speech activity using phraseological units. Speech activity was considered as one of the forms of life. It was again realized that “not only language paints a picture of the world ..., but life also provides the key to understanding many phenomena of language and speech.” This direction of relations became decisive for pragmatic research. The pragmatic function of phraseological units is a “targeted impact on the addressee. Being implemented in context, it is closely related to the stylistic function of phraseological units. Based on the communicative and pragmatic attitudes of the texts under study, the main pragmatic parameters can be considered as expressiveness, conceptuality and subtextual information. In the texts under consideration, each PU of professional or terminological origin performs a certain communicative task and possesses a certain communicative task. For example: “I heard by accident he was on the rocks; that ’show I make him that allowance. It’s a little idea of himself. ” In the considered context, the marine terminologism to be on the rocks “Kunni kechirmo”, “to be aground”, that is, in cramped financial circumstances, is used to assess the difficult situation in which the main character finds himself, causing aground, that is, in distress. In the context, the speaker’s subjective-assessment modality is traced, namely, sympathy for the protagonist. The context surrounding the phraseological units (hopeless little old chap; no idea of himself) reinforces its pragmatic attitude. Metaphorical terminology can be used to indirectly characterize a third person. In such cases, they aim to cause the same feeling-attitude of the addressee as the speaker himself expresses. For example: "Prime Minister, Tony Blair, was probably playing for the last week, according to British journalist and broadcaster Mark Lawson." According to

British journalist and broadcaster Mark Lawson, the prime minister, Tony Blair, was probably looking for cheap popularity among the Israeli public when he spoke eloquently against Iraq last week. In this context, theatrical terminology to play to the gallery is used in the metaphorical meaning of “seek cheap popularity”, implicitly expressing the negative attitude of the journalist to the Prime Minister of Britain, associated with his policies in Iran. The pragmatic task of phraseological units in the given context, besides expressing one's opinion, is also the conviction of the perceiver, imposing his impression on him. The pragmatic function of rethought terminology in this case is a function of direct speech influence. A negative assessment in the characterization of a third person is also observed in the following example: “He would have been a short fuse when he was pulling out a little bit.” Interpreting the meaning of the idiom to have a short fuse, “jahli chiqdi (achchig’i) keldi”, “быть вспыльчивым по любому поводу,” we can say that in this context it is a person who does not know how to control his emotions. may relate to the positive qualities of a person. The negative attitude towards the described third party is enhanced by the most pragmatic situation. In uzb. Language: “Fozil afandining gazeta xabaridan chiqqan jahli anovilarning bahonalaridan keyin avjiga mindi”. Thus, in addition to a simple description of the hero, the idiom realizes its pragmatic potential, expressing the negative attitude of the speaker to the person, and causing the addressee to react appropriately to the addressee's intention. In Uzbek and Russian languages, professional and terminological phraseological units may also have a certain pragmatic potential. For example: “Он был взят на пушку каким-то юным следователем военной прокуратуры. А это и есть грубейшее нарушение моих инструкций” Using the military idiom “to take (take) the gun” in the metaphorical meaning “to deceive”, “yoqasini ushlamoq”, the addressee evokes a disapproving attitude towards the young investigator of the military prosecutor’s office described by the recipient. Pragmatically, the idiom is aimed at creating a negative attitude and feeling of condemnation of a person who is capable of deceiving and violating instructions. Astronomical

terminologism “звезда первой величины” realizes the pragmatic potential inherent in its use. In this case, the estimated modality is positive. " В своей отрасли он был звездой первой величины " Communicative determination of the phraseological units is to cause the recipient positive emotions (interest, admiration) to the person, who in the context is called a star of the first magnitude. In the considered terminological phraseological expressiveness of expressiveness is expressed clearly. The pragmatic prerequisite of phraseological units can completely change under the influence of context. Take, for example, the idiom that emerged from the professional language of tailors, “to be needle-dressed,” which has a positive meaning inherent in its pattern, in the story “Старушка у окна” by D. Zantaria. Talking about the TV show that the old woman watches, the author writes: In the context, the emotions of the speaker's feelings are verbally reflected, and it is completely obvious that the subjective-estimated modality of an idiom is a negative attitude towards a person dressed with a needle. Having considered the pragmatic potential of phraseological units in various contexts, it can be concluded that the communicative possibilities of metaphorical terminological phraseological units have no boundaries. In this case, the realization of the pragmatic function of phraseological units of a terminological origin occurs only within the framework of the communicative process.

In conclusion, we can say that phraseological units are extremely important parts of linguistics in any language. Additionally, the usage of idioms is so common in the field of translation since it has more benefits for translators and interpreters. But, while translating them from one language into another they should be careful about their meaning and pay attention to find the most suitable equivalent of these idioms instead of translating them word for word.

Conclusion

The present work is dedicated to the analysis of linguopragmatic features of simple phraseological units and study their usage peculiarities in Uzbek and English.

The modern linguistics is based on the principle of anthropocentric paradigm, which contains "human factor" in the study of language. This paradigm puts forward the new approaches to the research of language which are implemented within a number of new disciplines, such as cognitive linguistics, text linguistics, linguoculturology, linguopersonology, linguopragmatics and etc. These branches of linguistics need to be studied separately, indeed. The Pragmatic meaning is also plays an important role as semantic one while overcoming pragmatic failure in the act of speech.

We admit that, in many cases, we deal with similar logical and semantic patterns in all investigated languages because of the existence of the same human universal spirit, of a resembling ontological experience, of a common European identity. We could also assert, on the basis of the previously analyzed descriptive material, that there are unique phraseological units in the culture and

mentality of each community, determined by different economic, social, historical and psychological aspects. Since phraseology in comparative linguo-cultural studies is still relatively young field of research, much more corpora are necessary to learn and understand the national spirit of the certain ethnic group through cultural concepts. This is one of the first attempts when these languages –Uzbek, English and Russian have been compared. Therefore, the prospects of further investigation are connected with the comparison of phraseological units in the anthropocentric paradigm expanding the study by the large group of phraseological idioms. The comparison will be continued and the conclusions of the proposed research have a premature character. As an example : Eng “wallflower” translating word by word the meaning is flower is hung on the wall –informema

Uzb: yigitsiz qolgan ayol (kechada).

We can say that phraseological units are extremely important parts of linguistics in any language. Additionally, the usage of idioms is so common in the field of translation since it has more benefits for translators and interpreters. But, while translating them from one language into another they should be careful about their meaning and pay attention to find the most suitable equivalent of these idioms instead of translating them word for word.

The present study set out to investigate the use of phraseological patterns and their functions in applied linguistics research articles. As generated by the SketchEngine, unlike previous studies investigating four-word bundles , the current study specifically explored the quantitative distribution of three-word n-grams in the corpus of the selected research articles, as they were considered psycholinguistically unproblematic and pedagogically interesting . This paper has also outlined the methodological processes and important considerations, including qualitative perspectives and judgments from EAP instructors, rather than simply extracting frequent words from a corpus in selecting a list of three-word n-grams. The methods used here could, thus, ensure that the

phraseological patterns generated are pedagogically motivated and merit the pedagogic purposes. Bringing all of those strands together — quantitative frequency, and qualitative judgments about what are meaningful phrases, and inputs from experts in the field to consider those useful phrases - demonstrates a thorough perspective on conducting textual analysis to receive in-depth and specific information, verify the outcomes and ensure that the results of this study are accurate and reliable.

We can say that phraseological units are extremely important parts of linguistics in any language. Additionally, the usage of idioms is so common in the field of translation since it has more benefits for translators and interpreters. But, while translating them from one language into another they should be careful about their meaning and pay attention to find the most suitable equivalent of these idioms instead of translating them word for word.

References

1. President Decree 4947 “On Uzbekistan’s development Strategy «February 7, 2017.
2. Kunin, A. V. The course of the modern English phraseology, Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, -1990. 400p
3. Komissarov, V. N. Modern translation, Moscow: ETC-2004.450p
4. Urantayeva N.B., Nurmatova M.R., Polvanova N.M. The comparative analyze of English-Uzbek idioms. ISSN 2072-0297 Молодой учёный № 19 (153) / 2017.
5. Safarov, Sh. Cognitive linguistics.-Jizzakh:Sangzor,. - Прагмалингвистика. - Т.:ЎзМЕ, 2008, - 300p
6. Ariel Mira Research survey in linguistics. Cambridge University Press-2010
7. Oxford Living Dictionaries.online dictionary. en.oxforddictionaries.com.
8. Nurmonov, A., Hakimov M. Лингвистик прагматиканинг назарий шаклланиши // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти.-Тошкент.2001. -№4.

9. Ken Hyland English for Academic Purposes. New edition. University of Sydney, Australia. ISBN-10: 0415358701- 2006
 10. Morris , Ч.У. Значение и означивание // Семантика. – Москва, 1984.
 - 11 Ken Hyland. English for Academic Purposes. New edition. University of Sydney, Australia. ISBN-10: 0415358701-2006
 12. Sh. Safarov. Nutqning etnosotsiopragmatik tahlili asoslari. –Samarqand, 2007.
 13. Evans V., Green M. Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction. - Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press - 2006
 14. Hiraga, M. K. and Fujii L2 Pragmatics in Academic Discourse: A Case Study of Tutorials in Britain. Tutorials in Britain - 2003
 15. Matveeva,G. Pragmalinguistics in the System of Linguistic Science - 2011
- Morris Ch.W. Foundations of the theory of signs - Chicago
17. Susov N. Языковое общение и лингвистика \ \ Прагматические и семантические аспекты синтаксиса. Сб.науч.трудов Калининского ГУ, Калинин.
 18. Kiselyova L.A Вопросы речевого воздействия.
 19. Arutyunova N.,Raducheva , проблемы и категории прагматики \ \ Новое в зарубежной лингвистике.- Вып XVI
 20. Grays G. Логика и речевое общение \ \ Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып.16.Лингвистическая прагматика.
 21. Dijk T.A van. Text and Context \ \ Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse. L, N.Y:Longman.
 22. Karasik V. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс.М.Гнозис-2004
 23. Aznaurova E.S. Прагматика слова.-Ташкент: Фан,1988
 24. McCarthy, Michael J., Vocabulary, Oxford, Oxford University Press-1990.
 25. Webster’s Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged, Merriam-Webster 1993.

26. Fillmore, Charles, Kay, Paul and O'Conner, J., "Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: the case of 'let alone'", in *Language* 64-1988.
27. Gramley, Stephan, Patzold, Kurt-Michael, *A Survey of Modern English*, London, Routledge- 1992.
28. Strässler, Jürg, *Idioms in English: A pragmatic analysis*, Tübingen, Günter Narr
29. Cowie, A.,. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications* Oxford: Oxford University Press-2001.
30. Kunin. A.,. *Курс фразеологии современного английского языка* *Phraseology of Contemporary English*, М.: Высш. шк./ Дубна: Феникс-1996 .400p.
31. Teliya, B., *Метафоризация и её роль в создании языковой картины мира* *Metaphorization and its Role in Creating a Linguistic Picture of the World* *Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира*, (отв. ред., Серебренников, Б., М.): Наука,- 1988 pp.173–203.
32. Zyкова, I. *The Phraseological Meaning Construal in the Traditional vs Cognitive Culture-oriented Perspectives*. In: *Language Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow. The Journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, vol. I (2), pp.253– 286. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lart-2016-0015>
33. Baranov, Dobrovol'skij, Д., *Основы фразеологии (краткий курс)* *Fundamentals of Phraseology (the short course)*. М: Флинта; Наука-2013, 312p.
34. Aliefirenko, Н., *Фразеология в свете современных лингвистических парадигм [Phraseology in the light of modern linguistic paradigms]*, М.: ООО «Элпис»- 2008, 271 p.
35. Humboldt. В. *О различии строения человеческих языков и его влиянии на духовное развитие человечества* *On the Difference between the Structure of Human Language and its Influence on the Spiritual Development of*

Mankind, pp.37–296. in: Избранные труды по языкознанию, М.: Прогресс, р.400.

36. Wierzbicka, A., Sapir a współczesne językoznawstwo, W: Sapir, Edward: Kultura, Język Osobowość, Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, pp.5–31.

37. Cowie, A. Phraseology: Theory, Analysis and Applications Oxford: Oxford University Press- 2001.

38. Hnatiuk, L., Технології міжперсонального спілкування у міжкультурній взаємодії Technology of Interpersonal Communication in Intercultural Interaction Донецьк: Вид-во Ноулідж-2013.336р.

39. The National Corpus of Russian Language. Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН. Available at www.ruscorpora.ru/ Accessed date 29 August 2015.

40. Time Corpus: 100 Million Words, Brigham Young University. Available at <http://corpus.byu.edu/time/> Accessed date 20 August 2015.

41. Rybakov, A., Тяжелый песок // [The National Corpus of Russian Language]: Институт русского языка им. В. В. Виноградова РАН., Available at www.ruscorpora.ru/ Accessed date 29 August 2015.

42. Bartel, R. Metaphors and Symbols. New York: Council of Teachers.

43. Palmatier, R., Speaking of Animals: A Dictionary of Animal Metaphors. London: Greenwood-1995.

44. Тер-Минасова, С. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация [Language and Intercultural Communication] М.: Слово- 2000р.624.

45. Kunin, A. V. The course of the modern English phraseology, Moscow: Vysshaya shkola- 1990. 380 p

46. Komissarov, V. N. Modern translation, Moscow: ETC- 2004. 424 p.

47. Novikova, M. G. The Measure of the Meaning, Actual Articulation and Appropriateness of the Translation, Moscow: FLINTA: Nauka- 2012. 208 p.

48. Vlahov, S. I. Untranslatable in Translation, Moscow: “R. Valent”- 2004 360 p.

49. A. Wray, *Formulaic language and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press- 2005.

50. D. Biber and F. Barbieri, "Lexical bundles in university spoken and written register," *English for Specific Purposes*. vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 263-286, 2007. S. Conrad and D. Biber, "The frequency and use of lexical bundles in conversation and academic prose," *Lexicographica*. vol. 20, pp. 56-71, 2004. V. Cortes, "Lexical bundles in published and student disciplinary writing: Examples from history and biology," *English for Specific Purposes*. vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 397-423, 2004. example from a writing intensive history class," *Linguistics and Education*. vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 391-406, 2007. V. Cortes, "The purpose of this study is to: Connecting lexical bundles and moves in research article introductions," *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 33-43, 2013. K. Hyland, "Academic clusters: Text patterning in published and postgraduate writing," *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 41-62, 2008. J. Li, and N. Schmitt, "The development of collocation use in academic texts by advanced L2 learners: A multiple case study approach," in *Perspectives on formulaic language: Acquisition and communication*, D. Wood, Ed. Continuum: New York, 2010, pp. 22-46

51. A. Pawley and F.H. Syder, "Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency," in *Language and communication*, J.C. Richards and R.W. Schmitt, Eds. Longman: London, pp. 191-230

52. D. Biber, S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finegan, *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*, Pearson: Harlow-1999.

53. B. Altenberg, "On the phraseology of spoken English: The evidence of recurrent word-combinations," in *Phraseology: Theory, analysis and applications*, A.P. Cowie, Ed. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1998

54. B. Erman and B. Warren, "The idiom principle and the open choice principle: Text-Interdisciplinary," *Journal for the Study of Discourse*. vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 29-62, 2000.

55. A. Wray, "Identifying formulaic language: Persistent challenges and new opportunities," in Formulaic language volume 1: Distribution and historical change, R. Corrigan, et al., Eds. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, 2009, pp. 27-51
56. R. Simpson-Vlach and N.C. Ellis, "An academic formulas list: New methods in phraseology research," *Applied Linguistics*. vol. 31, no. 4, 600p, 2010
57. D. Biber, S. Conrad and V. Cortes, "If you look at...: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks," *Applied Linguistics*. vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 371-405, 2004
58. P. Durrant, "Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation in university students' writing: Mapping the territories," *Applied Linguistics*. pp. 1-30, 2015.
- Y. Wei and L. Lei, "Lexical bundles in the academic writing of advanced Chinese EFL learners," *RELC journal*. vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 155-166, 2011.
59. D. Biber, U. Connor and T.A. Upton, *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007
60. Grabowski, "Keywords and lexical bundles within English pharmaceutical discourse: A corpus-driven description," *English for Specific Purposes*. vol. 38, pp. 23- 33, 2015
61. Абдуллаева М., Абдурашидов М., Абилов У. Фалсафа қисқача изоҳли луғат.-Тошкент:"Шарқ". –Б.126.
62. Абушенко В.Л. Оценка // Всемирная энциклопедия. Философия. -М. 2001. С.755.
63. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов, М.
64. Большая Российская энциклопедия. –М., 2000. 300 р.
65. Kubryakov YE.S Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов // изд-во МГУ, 1996.187р.
66. Логический словарь / под ред. А.А. Ивина, В.Н. Переверзева, В.В. Петрова. -М.: ДЕФОРТ, 1994.200р.
67. Rahmatullayev Sh. Ўзбек тилининг фразеологик луғати. - Тошкент: Қомуслар бош таҳририяти, 1992. – 382 р.

68. Davydova A.V. Zarojtsa V.F. Психологический словарь / под ред. Стариченок В.Д. Большой лингвистический словарь. – Ростов-на-Дону: Феникс, 2008. 807р.