

**THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION  
OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN  
THE UZBEK STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY**

On the right of manuscript

**CHORIEVA FOTIMA TOLIB KIZI**

**NATIONAL-SPECIFIC PROPERTIES OF INTERJECTIONAL  
PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS**

**DISSERTATION PAPER**

Dissertation for Master's Degree

Linguistics (the English language

Specialty: 5A120102

The work has been discussed  
and recommended for defence

The Head of Department

Ph.D.Galieva M.R

---

“ ” \_\_\_\_\_ 2014

**Scientific supervisor:**

**Associated** professor

**Ikromov T.T.**

Tashkent-2014

**CONTENT:**

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Chapter I. Phraseological theories in modern linguistics.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1. Phraseological theories created in the Commonwealth countries.....	9
1.2 Phraseological theories created in the European countries.....	22
Conclusion .....	26
<b>Chapter II Interjectional phraseological units in modern English, Uzbek and Russian.....</b>	<b>27</b>
2.1 The analysis of the research works devoted to the interjections.....	27
2.2 Structural properties of Interjectional Phraseological units in the English ,Uzbek and Russian languages.....	35
2.3 Semantic properties s of Interjectional phraseological units in English, Russian and Uzbek.....	44
Conclusion .....	57
<b>Chapter III. Linguocultural peculiarities of the Interjectional Phraseological Units in the English, Uzbek and Russian languages.....</b>	<b>.....</b>
3.1 Cultural linguistics and its main notions.....	58
3.2 Linguocultural features of the InPhU in English ,Uzbek and Russian .....	66
Conclusion .....	79
<b>Chapter IV . Summary.....</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Chapter V. Bibliography.....</b>	<b>84</b>

## **Introduction.**

As the prestige of our independent Republic of Uzbekistan is raising around the world, political, cultural and economical relations are developing, and learning foreign languages helps to make oral and written speech fluently and to exchange ideas easily. While speaking about the national model of social progress, President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov dwelled on: „It shouldn't be forgotten that the country and the nation can achieve prosperous future, progress, peace, by preparing knowledgeable, professionally qualified and zealous person, real patriots of their country, and upbringing them with huge spiritual inheritance of national culture, of course introducing them into the treasure of world science and culture “<sup>1</sup>So, it gives a lot of opportunities to make research works, connected with other nation's culture of course comparing it with the culture of our nation, its traditions, forming and restoring spiritual wealth of the Uzbek nation. And also „National Program for Preparing Specialists “ is of great value, which is preparing specialists in all fields of the national economy and science, meeting the requirements of information technologies era (1997).

Moreover, today's one of the main requirement is to learn and have a good command of some foreign languages and to be able to use them in the professional activity. As our President I.A.Karimov said: “During independent years a lot of academic lyceums and professional colleges as well as higher educational institutions have been opened and they are equipped with up-to-date logistics and students who are studying there, getting acquainted with the skills and knowledge of modern professions and sciences as well as enlightenment and thousands of these students are already able to speak two or three foreign languages and on the example of our such young specialists we can witness our dreams and strivings are giving their fruitful harvest”.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> И.А.Каримов Узбекистан по пути углубление экономических реформ Т.: 1995 с238

<sup>2</sup> I.Karimov “Yuksak ma'naviyat yengilmas kuch” Т.:2008,

On the basis of above-said, we have chosen as the theme of our dissertation paper “National-specific features of interjectional phraseological units ” on the material of the English, Uzbek and Russian languages.

**The topicality of the research work:** After the independence of our country the role of scientific researches is increasing, including that in the philological field. Besides that topicality of the research work is connected with dealing with the Uzbek culture, origin and progressing of the nation, which are paid particular attention by the President at the XIV session of Oliy Majlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan. This research work deals with not only phraseology itself, but also cultural linguistics, which is developing at present and studies the relations between language and culture. The notion of national mentality is connected with the notion of language world picture, which comes into existence with the help of the influence of semantic fields, appeared in semantic branch of the language. Semantic fields are reflected in all language levels, but essential role belongs to lexicology and phraseology. Because every phraseological unit in a certain language is connected with that nation's specific traditions, psychology, mode of life, mentality. [further phraseological units are given as PhU]. PhU are the main tools, denoting figurativeness, expressiveness and emotiveness, they serve to raise the expressive efficiency of fictional and journalistic texts. So that PhU are of great importance from stylistic point of view. PhU suits to the spirit of the age as efficient and meaningful units. Currently during the time of independence and restoring national traditions, our people should know the language, especially the state language – the Uzbek language at first and foreign languages as well, including that, the English language deeply and they should be able to express their opinion figuratively and touchingly. And it proves once more the research works belonging to phraseology are really actual and important. To express the relations, events and positions, communication in society clearly, plainly, emotively and shortly interjectional words and interjectional phraseological units are of great value [further interjectional phraseological units are referred as InPhU]. In English interjectional

phraseological units are well-studied field by structurally, semantically, but their cultural, national features are not revealed so well. To study InPhU gives the possibility of defining in what level of their importance in human beings' life. In addition to that, although the deeper PhU are studied by many researchers, the more features of InPhU are discovered by approaching this issue deeply. English phraseologisms are considered broad-compassed. It's possible to analyze from different points of view. The famous linguist Ferdinand de Saussure's idea: „the whole language mechanism circles around only similarities and dissimilarities“ – is relevant completely. It's certain, phraseological fund of the language forms a certain system, the deeper knowledge is got about all parts, the more contribution it is done to phraseology and it assists to be a base of solving some problematic issues in it. The above-mentioned ideas determine the actuality of the research work.

**The scientific novelty of the research.** As a result of investigating English, Uzbek and Russian InPhU, the following scientific novelties have been obtained:

- The structural properties of InPhU, including that the features, belonging to their grammatical content are exposed and structural models of InPhU are defined;
- Semantic groups of InPhU are clarified
- InPhU have been analyzed, their cognitive and cultural aspects are revealed;
- Paradigmatic connections of InPhU are analyzed, and polysemy, synonymy among InPhU are studied and their specific features are shown;
- For the first time the linguocultural aspects of InPhU in this research work have been uncovered;
- The dictionary meanings of InPhU are looked through. The extracts which include InPhU are found, and we dwelled on about their equivalents in translation.

**The aim and objectives of the research.** The aim of the work is to study English, Uzbek and Russian interjectional phraseological units from the structural and semantic points of view, to define the cultural specificities and it includes the following tasks:

- to study theories, questions of phraseology and their main objectives and to get acquainted with the classifications of PhU
- to get acquainted with the scholars' opinion about interjectional words and InPhU;
- to analyze InPhU semantically, i.e. while forming the general meanings of InPhU, the role of their components;
- Classification of InPhU into different semantic groups and to show their properties by subdividing them into subgroups;
- On the basis of analyzing the components of InPhU , to reveal or describe the national- cultural specificities of them.

- To compare English ,Uzbek and Russian InPhU on the basis of collected materials.

**The method of the research.** To systematize the collected InPhU during the research, to analyze them using descriptive and componential analysis methods; to find the similarities and dissimilarities of InPhU among in English in Uzbek or Russian by comparative-typological method; to analyze InPhU quantitatively , statistical method has been broadly utilized

**Methodological basis of the research.** President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.A.Karimov's works, the law „About the Education“ ,and the Law „ About National Program about Preparing Specialists “ of the Republic of Uzbekistan and other managing and normative documents and decrees which cover strategic directions in the field of science, upbringing and culture are considered the scientific methodological basis of the research. Studying numerous linguist-scientists' research works has played very important role in preparing the dissertation paper. It includes the works by A.V.Koonin,V.A.Maslova , G.N. Babich, A.Nikolay, Sh.Rahmatullayev and others.

**The main conditions which lead to the defence.**

- The InPhU are closely related with the nation's traditions, history, mode of life;
- Some InPhU can be synonyms of the words;
- Polysemy ,synonymy, antonymy can be observed among InPhU.

**-The object of the research** is interjectional phraseological units in the English, Uzbek and Russian languages

**The subject of the research** is structural features and semantic properties of InPhU, and their linguocultural facets .

**The source of the research.** More than 300 InPhU, which are collected from more than 5 explanatory and phraseological dictionaries are considered the main base of the research. They are chosen from English and Uzbek explanatory dictionaries and the following phraseological vocabularies: А.В.Кунин. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь (3-изд. М., 1967), Ш.Рахматуллаев. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли фразеологик луғати (Тошкент «Ўқитувчи», 1978), С.И.Лубенская «Большой русско-английский фразеологический словарь». (М.: Аст-пресс, 2004, 1018 с серия«Фундаментальные словари») , Richard A.Spears Common American phrases (McGrawHill-2003).

**The theoretical importance of the research.** The results of the analysis of InPhU are of great importance to develop the theories of cultural linguistics, cognitive linguistics, anthropolinguistics , linguopragmatics, and phraseology.

**The practical importance of the research.** It is possible to use collected material and their analysis, while giving the lectures and seminars on lexicology and compiling dictionaries. Moreover, relying on the results of analysis, one can study words and set expressions , and PhU belonging to other lexical-semantic groups.

**The results of the research , that have been announced.** On the basis of the theme of the dissertation paper three articles in the English language have been published:the article under the title of „Semantic features of Interjectional phraseological units in English” and „Structural-semantic properties of interjectional phraseological units in English” , „National-specific properties of interjectional phraseological units in English “ .

**The structure of the research.** The dissertation consists of the introduction, three chapters, summary and the list of used literature , total volume is 90 pages.

In the **Introduction** part the information about the actuality, scientific novelty, aim and tasks of the research, methods used in the research, its theoretical and practical importance and the structure of the dissertation are given.

The **first chapter** of the dissertation is devoted to the survey of the research works and the main issues of Phraseology and phraseological units, which are considered its objective. In this chapter the origin of phraseology, linguists, who contributed to this branch and their contribution, criteria of classifying phraseological units, different classifications of phraseological units are analyzed.

In the **second chapter** of the dissertation the interjectional phraseological units which are considered the main issue of the research are studied. In this chapter the structural and semantic analysis of InPhU are presented on the basis of the collected examples. According to the results the InPhU are divided into some groups. We apply the statistical method as well.

In the **third chapter** cultural linguistics, which managed to turn into an actual issue of philology and its main notions are particularly represented. And relying on this information in the paragraphs within this chapter the national-cultural specificities of InPhU are described.

In the **conclusion** the results of the investigation are presented.

## Chapter I. Phraseological theories in modern linguistics

### 1.1. Phraseological theories created in the Commonwealth countries

Phraseology in current time - actually an independent, quickly developing branch of linguistics. Problems of phraseology cover wide circle of questions: status of phraseology (independent level or part of lexical system), its borderline, differential features of PhU in comparison with the word or word combination, source of phraseology, transformation of phraseological units in the text and etc. What is phraseology itself? If we pay attention to the term „*phraseology*”, it is particular branch of language science. The word „phraseology“ is derived from two Greek words: *phrasis* – expression and *logos* – science, word by word it means „science about expressions”. The objective of phraseology is encountered fully stable word combinations, the components of which lose their meaning, taken separately and only express a certain meaning together. These expressions have partially or completely figurative meanings and are called phraseologisms or phraseological units, moreover for calling them other terms are also used: idiom (while translating from Greek means „specificity”), phraseological units.

Phraseologisms exist in the language, being connected with the lexical system of the language closely, because it assists to understand their construction better, their formation and usage in speech. Phraseological units fill the gaps in lexical system of language, which can't provide naming people's activity and knowledge entirely. Phraseology is the treasure of the language. The history of the nation, specificity of culture and mode of life are reflected with the help of phraseologisms. Phraseological units often carry clear national character.<sup>2</sup> Phraseology, reflecting the experience of the nation, which is lasting for many centuries, specific material and spiritual culture conveys national specificity of the language. For example, in our country „white gold“ is used for calling cotton, but „black gold” is for oil, and in the West under the meaning „white gold“ is understood porcelain, and „

---

<sup>2</sup>В.А.Кунин Курс фразеологии английского языка изд. Феникс 2005 стр 6

black gold “is for coal”. As we witness, phraseological units also serve to show the nation’s culture. In phrase-formation the human factor plays the main role, because paying attention to that, majority of phraseologisms are related with human beings, their different field of activities. Phraseologisms --- highly –informative units of the language, they cannot be accepted as „ornament and „excess”. Phraseologism– is one of the language universals, as well there’s no any language without set phrases.

In the last decades comparative phraseology is progressing. Contrastive linguistics deals with comparing language systems in all levels being independent from genetic and typological belonging of compared languages with the aim of defining their structural and functional feature, similarities and dissimilarities in language structure, their classification, systematization.

Comparative phraseology as the branch of contrastive linguistics deals with comparative-typological study of the phraseology of two or more languages with the aim of defining existing similarities and dissimilarities among them. The problems of comparative phraseology include the issues of typological research of the phraseology of two or more languages, to study their structural, grammatical, semantical, stylistic and other peculiarities comparatively of phraseologisms in different languages, comparative study of borrowed PhU, phraseological parallels in different languages and etc. Comparative phraseology is one of the most perspective and fast-developing section of phraseology. Its problems always expand, besides it languages remain the object of comparison. Especially very important researches in this field of linguistics are reflected in the works of M.M.Kopilenko, V.M.Mokienko, A.V. Kunin, V.V.Vinogradov, Sh.Rakhmatullayev and others.<sup>3</sup>

Although in current time phraseology turns into the most developing discipline of linguistics, within it there are a lot of unsolved problems, some theories remain as hypotheses, phraseology hasn’t come to clear solution to the range of questions, belonging to the theory of phraseology, its size and content. Its units are called by

---

<sup>3</sup> М.К.Халикова Фразеология как выразитель национально культурной семантики канд. дисс Т.: 1999 с26

different terms – phrasemes, fixed expressions, idiomatic expressions, fixed setphrases, phraseologisms, phraseological units, metaphorical collocations, inseparable semantic combinations, idioms, set expressions and others.

As for the origin of phraseology, the founder of the theory of phraseology is considered the Swiss linguist, Bally Charles (1865-1947). Bally systematized word combinations in his books named after „Essays on stylistics” and „French stylistics”. Bally wrote the chapter about phraseology in his books on stylistics. In his first book he defined four groups of word combinations: 1) free word groups (les groupement libres) 2) traditional phrases (les groupement usuels) 3) phraseological series (les series phraseologiques)- word groups in which the words, those are situated next to each other having one meaning. 4) phraseological units (les unites phraseologiques)- word combinations in which words lose their direct meaning and express one inseparable notion. Bally classified word combinations according to their stability: the collocation in which the components have independent meaning and the collocation, in which the components lose such freedom. Bally divided these groups schematically, but didn't offer their detailed description. In his next work „French stylistics”, Bally analysed traditional phrases and phraseological series and within these two types of collocations. He established two main groups of the collocations: 1) free word groups 2) phraseological units, the components of which always are used for denoting single meaning. All components as a whole have new meanings, which don't correspond to their direct ones. Bally indicated that such constructions may be compared with chemical reaction and confirmed that if the unit is encountered common enough, thus in this case collocation is equal with a simple word. Bally put idiomaticity of word combinations depending on its word-identifier. This opinion of Ch. Bally was laid on the base of defining phraseological fusions and developing the theory of equivalence of phraseological units to words. Since that time Bally's research on phraseology is stepping forward. But the other scholars' works, devoted to phraseology managed to help further development of phraseological researches. The conception of Ch. Bally is met in plenty of works of

such authors: Vinogradov , Budagov , Amosova , Nazaryan <sup>4</sup>. Ch.Bally used the term *phraseologie* in the meaning of *branch of stylistics, dealing with word combination*” but this term was not justified in the works of West European and American linguists and was used in different three meanings:

a) choice of words, form , wording (формулировка); b) language, syllable (slog), style; c) expression, word combination.

The issue of phraseology as the language discipline was firstly presented in well – known Russian linguist E.D. Polivanov’s researches . E.D.Polivanov returned to this question repeatedly and confirmed that lexis deals with individual lexical meaning of a word, morphology – grammatical meaning of the word, syntax- formal meaning of word combination. ,, And then the requirement to the particular branch appears, if we compare it with syntax, this time not all types of word combinations are meant and only the individual meanings of these word combinations, like lexis deals with individual meaning of the word. This branch of linguistics , as the collection of the problems(issues) in this phenomenon and I add the name of phraseology(show that for this meaning another term is suggested ,, idiomaticity” ).

E.D.Polivanov considered , that phraseology occupies particular and stable position (like phonetics , morphology and etc.) in further linguistic literature - when in successive formulation of different problems of this science , casual gaps disappear.

The prediction of E.D.Polivanov has been realized in current days.

B.A.Larin was the first scholar after Polivanov, raising the question on phraseology as a linguistic discipline. ,, Phraseology is still on the stage of ,, hidden development” and now it has not been formed as a complete science. The

---

<sup>4</sup> В.А.Кунин Курс фразеологии английского языка, Феникс 2005 стр 11

separation of this discipline is necessary for us, owing to having its separate objective.<sup>5</sup>

The contribution of V.V.Vinogradov caused or "hitted" to appear majority of works on phraseology in different languages. Such collection of systematized facts – one of the premises, which lead to create phraseology as a linguistic discipline.

In the field of studying phraseology of different languages Russian scholars are number first around the world. It is said persuasively 15255 works on phraseology were published in Russia from 1918 to 1986.

As this science is developing, different hypotheses came into existence on it. Until present time the scholars' opinion are not the same and it can be observed in defining phraseological units (PhU): „Phraseological unit - is fixed expressive combination of lexemes, which have one single meaning“ (V.I.Mokienko), and phraseologism –is the figure of speech, consisting of inseparable unit of nominative meaning and extra signs“(A.Abdullaev), „phraseological unit - a stable word-group characterized by a completely or partially transferred meaning (A.V. Koonin).<sup>6</sup> As for the classification of phraseological units, it's clear there are different classifications in linguistic literature. Particularly, the most expanding one is considered the classification of V.V.Vinogradov, in his classification the motivation of components of phraseological units is considered as the base.

**Semantic classification of phraseological units** was suggested by acad.

Vinogradov V.V., who developed some points first advanced by the Swiss scientist Charles Bally. He described phraseological units as lexical complexes which cannot be freely made up in speech, but are reproduced as ready-made units. The meaning of such expressions as distinguished from the meaning of free combinations is idiomatic. The classification is based on the motivation degree of the unit. According to the degree of idiomatic meaning of various groups of phraseological units, Vinogradov V.V. classified them as follows:

<sup>5</sup>В.А.Кунин Курс фразеология английского языка феникс 2005 стр 13

<sup>6</sup>М.К.Халикова Фразеология как выразитель национально культурной семантики Канд,Дисс Т.: 1999 с28

- a) Phraseological fusions are units whose meaning cannot be deduced from the meanings of their component parts, the meaning of phraseological fusions is unmotivated at the present stage of language development, e.g. *red tape*, *mare's nest*, *My aunt!* The meaning of the components is completely absorbed by the meaning of the whole;
- b) phraseological unities are expressions the meaning of which can be deduced from the meanings of their components; the meaning of the whole is based on the transferred meanings of the components, e.g. *to show one's teeth*(*to be unfriendly*), *to stand to one's guns*(*to refuse to change one's opinion*), etc. They are motivated expressions;
- c) phraseological combinations are traditional word groups. Word combinations are combined with their original meaning, e.g. *to meet the demands*, *to take a liking*. The components are limited in the ability to combine with each other by some linguistic factors.

**Structural classification of Phraseological units** was suggested by prof.

Smirnitskiy A.I., who worked out this classification, described phraseological units as highly idiomatic set expressions functioning as word equivalents and characterized by their semantic and grammatical unity. Prof. Smirnitskiy suggested three classes of stereotyped phrases: **traditional phrases** (*nice distinction*, *rough sketch*), **phraseological combinations** (*to get up*), **idioms** (*to wash one's dirty linen in public*), but only the second group is given in a detailed analysis.<sup>7</sup>

He classified phraseological combinations according to their structure into two large groups: (1) one-top (one summit) phraseological units, which he compared with derived words and (2) two-top phraseological units, which he compared with compound words. Prof. Smirnitskiy further subdivided one-top units into: verb-adverb phraseological units (*to bring up*), phraseological units of the type (*to be up to*), prepositional-substantive units *by heart*

Prof. Smirnitskiy classified two-top phraseological units into:

---

<sup>7</sup>Halliday M.A., Colin Y. Lexicology. A short introduction. London 2007 p75

- (a) attributive-nominal(*brain trust*), (b) verb-nominal phrases(*to know the ropes*), (c) phraseological repetitions (*ups and downs*) (d) adverbial multi-top units (*every other day*)

**Functional classification of PhU** was suggested by prof. Arnold I.V. based on the grammatical unity typical of all phraseological units and on their functioning in the language as word equivalents. Phraseological units are subdivided into: noun equivalents(*maiden name, the arm of the law, all the world and his wife, green room*), verb equivalents(*take advantage, to give up, pick and choose*), adjective equivalents(*high and mighty*), adverb equivalents(*once in a blue moon, tooth and nail*), phraseological units functioning like prepositions (*in consequence of*), phraseological units functioning like interjections(*My eye!*) There is one more type of combinations, also introduced into discourse ready-made, but differing from all the types given above, as they are syntactically shaped liked sentences: *The sky is the limit!*

**Contextual classification of phraseological units** belongs to prof. Amosova N.N. She considers phraseological units to be units of fixed context. Fixed context is characterized by a specific and unchanging sequence of definite lexical components and peculiar relationship between them. Units of fixed context are subdivided into two types: **phrasemes and idioms**.

Phrasemes are as a rule two-member word-groups in which one of the members has a particular meaning dependent on the second component as it is found only in the given context. Phrasemes are always binary, e.g. in *small talk*, one of the components has a phraseologically bound meaning, the other serves as the distinguishing context.

Idioms are distinguished from phrasemes by the idiomaticity of the whole word-group. They are semantically and grammatically inseparable units. *mare's nest*- a false discovery. The difference between phrasemes and idioms is based on semantic relationship without accepting the structural approach and the demarcation line between the two groups seems rather subjective.

**Structural-semantic classification of PhU** was suggested by prof. Kunin. A detailed functional, semantic and structural classification is developed by prof.

Kunin A.V. .He thinks that phraseology is an independent branch of linguistics and not a part of lexicology and it deals with all types of set expressions. A.V.Kunin divides them into three classes : phraseological units, phraseomatic units and borderline (mixed) cases . The main distinction between the first and the second classes is semantic: phraseological units have fully or partly transferred meaning while phraseomatic units are used in their literal meaning. Phraseological and phraseomatic units are characterized by phraseological stability that distinguishes them from free phrases and compound words . Professor Kunin A.V. develops the theory of stability. Prof.Kunin considers stability a complex notion that consists of the following aspects: 1) stability of usage – phraseological units are reproduced as ready-made , they are not created in speech. 2) Lexical stability means that the components of phraseological units are either irreplaceable or partially replaceable within the bounds of phraseological variance: lexical, grammatical , positional , quantitative, mixed variants 3)semantic stability is based on the lexical stability of phraseological units. In spite of all occasional changes the meaning of a phraseological unit is preserved. It may be only specified, made more precise , weakened or strengthened. 4) syntactic stability. Prof.Kunin considers that any set expression that lacks one of these aspects of stability cannot be regarded as a phraseological unit. Phraseological units are subdivided into four classes according to the function in communication determined by structural-semantic characteristics:

a)nominative phraseological units b) nominative-communicative phraseological units  
c)interjectional phraseological units d) communicative phraseological units.<sup>8</sup>

As well as other phraseological units proverbs and sayings are introduced in speech ready-made, their components are constant and their meaning is traditional and mostly figurative. Proverbs often form the basis for phraseological units . Generally the proverbs and sayings are emotionally colored. Belonging of proverbs and sayings to phraseologisms are proved in the works of Koonin A.V. and G.T.Salyamov.

---

<sup>8</sup>Г.Н.БабичLexicology: a current guide М.:2008 с106

In his book titled “Theoretical course on phraseology”, he supports the following methods, presented by different scholars.

**Methods of studying phraseological units:** „ Method is a certain approach to the phenomenon under study, a certain complex of positions, scientific and purely technical ways, used for learning this phenomenon. That’s why method is always encountered as a system”.<sup>9</sup>

Phraseologism – has a more significantly - complicated formation than the word. Peculiarities of phraseologisms, their difference from variable word combinations, analysis of types and their meaning, structure, dependence of components, usual and occasional usage require particular methods of investigation. Taking into the account of many-sided character of phraseological units, not only a particular method can deal with them. But a phraseologist, who hasn’t accepted a certain special method, uses the dialectal method commonly, principles of which are applied in the sphere of phraseology.

Firstly N.N.Amosova came up with the suggestion of the method of the study of phraseological units. She created **contextual method** of investigating phraseologisms. The main principles of this method can be applied as the base of any method, dealing with phraseology :maximum objectivity in consideration of studying the phenomena, the necessity of taking into account the specificities of the language phenomenon, investigating phraseological units according to their usage in speech, the clarification of the characteristics of lexical meanings of component words in the realization of nominating the given set phrase, studying contextual interaction of the words in their combination, setting the levels of stability of content and the structure of the phraseological units.

However, some factors in contextual method cause to appear objections.

1. Contextual method isn’t interested with the dialectal studying of phenomena. It has to consider the facts of the language
2. The distribution of phraseologisms isn’t used and their systematization and stability aren’t studied.

---

<sup>9</sup>В.А.Кунин Курс фразеология английского языка Феникс 2005 стр 35

3. It isn't correct to agree with the statement of N.N.Amosova, that „ the essence of phraseological phenomenon can't be reached by the observation of its historical development". There's not any phenomenon, which can be understandable without observing its historical development. Even while looking through the phenomena synchronically, it's necessary to use additional historical data.

So, the disadvantage of the contextual method shouldn't decrease its value. From the creators of the first methods of researching PhU, it is impossible to require the solution of all methodological problems. Improvement of this method should be relied on the skill of a range of researchers.

Then while studying PhU, V.L.Arhangalskiy suggested the **variational** method.

The peculiarities of this method are considered to be:

1. Attempt to use the position of materialistic dialectics while investigating the language - phenomena and to synthesize the positions of traditional language studying and methods of structural linguistics;
2. The overall studying the peculiarities of the components of phraseological units, clarifying phraseological level of language structure, the author's attention to constant and variable components of PhU;
3. Approach to phraseology as the system and researching real variations of PhU, which are observed in concrete speech acts in a certain chronological period;
4. Highlighting phraseological meaning as the particular linguistic category;

It's necessary to mark the importance of variational method undoubtedly. The disadvantages of this method is revealed in the works of L. Jelmslev, which V.L.Arhangalski put the classification of phraseologisms on the base of dialectics of elements and structure have remained underestimated. V.L.Arhangalski didn't develop the procedure of variational method.

**Complicative method** of phraseological research was created by S.G.Gavrin. The method is called **complicative**, according to S.G.Gavrin, any set phrase (i.e any

language unit , referring to phraseology ) is considered complicated , as they are semantically and functionally complicated.<sup>10</sup>

The following tasks refer to complicative method , with the term of S.G.Gavrin :

- 1) The task of informing expressive-figurative quality of set phrase
- 2) The task of localizing the set phrase by omitting (removing) some components;
- 3) The task of condensing and systematizing the effect of cognitive activity of the human being.

Correspondingly with it, three types of special complicated ones are differentiated :

1) expressive , but figurative 2) elliptical 3) cognitive(aphorisms , terms and nomenclature /top-level -names) .

Besides it , S.G.Gavrin demonstrated unspecialized set expressions. this group cover , restrictives, word collocations i.e. one of the components of which is equal with only a word or with several words and idioms , i.e. phraseological fusions.

The following principles are considered the base of complicative method:

- 1) The specificity of PhU are revealed in the ways of forming its semantic structure (defining the main and complicated function)
- 2) Phraseological structure is determined with the help of separating stable complicated collocations from unstable ones on the basis of signs of stability , repeatability and usage
- 3) Functional properties of complicative ones determine the peculiarities of their semantic structure and so that the important principle of complicative method is studying semantic and functional features with their close interrelationship, exposing their interdependence ; the main feature of this principle- to reveal the relations between “ semantic structure – speech function”.
- 4) Complicative phraseological quality of language units are situated on definite systematic relation , which is considered to be the main principle of system definition of phraseology in functional – semantic aspect.

---

<sup>10</sup> В.А.Кунин Курс фразеология английского языка Феникс 2005 стр 36

S.G.Gavrin defined four types of principles, which are the basis of complicative method. The analysis of his book shows that two more principles can be added to these ones - semantic operation of forming phraseologisms, and forming complicative models of expressive-figurative phraseology, set-ellipsis as well. The disadvantage of complicative method – is the absence of procedure and principles of realization of phraseologisms in speech.

S.G.Gavrin established the complicativeness with the help of Russian materials, with it he contributed to general theory of phraseology.

Functional-semantic complicativeness is peculiar to words as well, to different speech patterns, variable and invariable – stable word collocations. The researches for criteria of separating phraseological complicativeness and other types of complicativeness should go on. It is one of the primary directions of developing the theory of phraseology relying on the materials of different languages. Studying complicativeness should cover the fields of phraseology, in which complicativeness has not been looked through. Phraseoformation and occasional usage of PhU belong to it. Investigating complicativeness in these fields has begun recently. Later study of complicativeness, especially in onomasiological aspect, undoubtedly, can improve the methods of researching phraseology.

**Structural-typological method** of analysis of phraseological system of different languages was created by D.O.Dobrovolski [1990]. On the assumption of the notion of structural typology as “inner” typology, structural-typological analysis of phraseology is determined as direction logically, studying inner organization of phraseological system of different languages, distracting from extralinguistic and genetic factors.

From all possible peculiarities of inner organization of phraseological system, the most suitable meaning for structural typology possesses the dependence of principles of organizing phraseological system of this or that language from typological specificities of other subsystems of the language. Particularly, on the basis of this position, it's possible to put and solve the question, that how meaningful phraseological system is for linguistic typology as a whole.

Structural-typological analysis of phraseology covers the following levels:

1. In the first level, it's necessary to choose forming typological series (ryad) for the analysis of the language, i.e. languages, principally likeness, but differing from one another on some typological important signs.
2. Further, it's necessary to select the leading typological sign, which is considered the base of typological series (i.e. typological dominant).
3. Then formulating the main hypothesis of the research, i.e. working hypothesis about that, grading the main typological signs of selected materials for language analysis influences on inner structure of phraseological system of these languages
4. And at last, it's necessary to analyze phraseological system of selected languages with the aim of checking hypotheses in use.

In the works of Dobrovolski [1990] on the basis of this method phraseological systems of the German, English and Dutch languages were analyzed. The main hypotheses is formulated as the following: the more analytic the language is, the more regular its phraseological system is.

**Regularity of phraseology** is understood with appearing systematic connection. The degree of regularity of phraseological system supports the intensity of the action of structural-combinatorial principle in its inner organization. In other words, the more regular the phraseology of this or that language is, the more often phraseologization serve as a communication tool.

Working on the basis of structural-typological analysis of phraseology, D.O. Dobrovolski sets the range of implications.

**Implication** – is a logical operation, connecting two utterances in a complicated one by logical links “if .. that”, “the more... the better”.

Those are the researches, devoted to phraseological science in the Commonwealth of Independent states.

## 1.2. Phraseological theories created in the European countries

Phraseology, as the linguistic discipline has developed in the European countries. Although it has been studied in the Commonwealth countries more comprehensively, the origin of this science goes back to Europe (Swiss scholar Ch.Bally).

In Great Britain and the USA numerous phraseological dictionaries have been published. Phraseological data also are being presented in a lot of explanatory dictionaries for instance , in the series of Oxford dictionaries , and in the dictionaries of Hornby and in American dictionary ,, The Random House Dictionary of the English Language” and others.

Phraseological units were studied in many prominent European linguists’ works [Weinreich 1964 ; Makkai 1972; Smit 1959].

Within the world of linguistics Makkai is one of world's major experts on idiom structure of English idioms (*Idiom Structure in English*, 1972; *A Dictionary of American Idioms*, 1975-1995; his 1978 “Idiomacy as a Language Universal,” as well his 2011 “On Redefining the Idiom” which offers a theoretical refinement on his original theories). Makkai has contributed over a hundred linguistic articles to numerous journals, and in 1974 he was the principal founder of *LACUS*, the Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States . Perhaps the area of Makkai's linguistics research that needs to be singled out for readers of this journal is his work in *Ecolinguistics* (1992), where he uses ecology of language as a metaphor for the study of interactions between any language and its environment, i.e., the society” (cf. Fill 1997).<sup>11</sup>

In the European countries the object of phraseology was accepted as „ idiom” and then they are grouped according to the structure. Adam Makkai defines the (**lexemic**) idiom as a “polylexonic lexeme which is made up of more than one minimal free form or (morphological) word, each lexon of which can occur in other environments as the realization of a monolexonic lexeme.” Thus, *kick the bucket* and *bite the dust* are idioms:<sup>1</sup>*kick the bucket* has nothing to do with the physical act of

<sup>11</sup>L. O.Vassari Adam Makkai: Polyglot linguist, poet and literary translator between languages. Essay in E-journal v. 6 p2

kicking; no actual bucket is involved; and therefore, there can be no deixis involved, which is what *the* normally signals. Conversely, *kith and kin* ‘acquaintances and relatives’ is a pseudo-idiom, because *kith* occurs nowhere else and with no other meaning in English. The lexemic idiom provides the central datum for consideration herein. Makkai also defines a **sememic** idiom, a member of a second idiomaticity area, to account for expressions like *don’t count your chickens before they’re hatched*. The **sememic** idiom differs from the **lexemic** in two important ways. First, it is at a higher (more abstract, closer to meaning) linguistic level, second, the function words in a sememic idiom (e.g., *before*) have exactly and only their normal language function. The consequences of this observation are extensively discussed by Makkai (1972). The general considerations of the lexemic idiom cover the logical consequences of the sememic<sup>12</sup>. The idiom is a broad concept, stretching from proverbs and even institutionalized or often-quoted metaphors to words like *hot dog* and *understand*. It is so broad, so apparently unbounded a concept that the methodology of its description in logical terms is not immediately obvious. However, the process of description detailed above shows that idioms can be described by a certain configuration of logical relationships with a regular, patterned relation of these configurations to sememic, lexemic, and morphemic strata. Makkai (1978) explores in detail the occurrence of idioms in several unrelated languages (French, Hungarian, Thai, etc.). All these languages have idioms of both types. Though the case is not closed, it seems likely that idioms occur in all dialects of all languages. If stratificational theory is right about the structure of language, then all linguistic universals must be logical (and probably neurological and biological) in nature. They must also have semiotic and cultural/anthropological function. A great deal could be said in these areas. But however interesting this may be, I concentrate exclusively on the logical relations and their consequences.

They seem to act very much like normal language, but they are quite different in many ways. It’s been said that “If natural language had been designed by a logician,

---

<sup>12</sup><http://google.books>W. J.Sullivan Some logical consequences of Makkai’s ” idiomaticity as a language universal” p 144

idioms would not exist”<sup>13</sup> But they do exist, and not only that, they represent a rich vein in language behavior, so they cry out for explanation. Though they have been dismissed by many theorists to various extents, some have seen the need for theories of language to adequately explain the behavior of idioms, and, moreover, the potential for what analysis of idioms can tell us about language itself.

Put as simply as possible, an idiom is a fixed expression whose meaning cannot be taken as a combination of the meanings of its component parts. They are also, as mentioned, fixed expressions, to the extent that the elements which make up the idioms are limited in the kinds of variability they are able to demonstrate.

Idioms are odd ducks<sup>14</sup>. Idioms can also be found comprising nearly any kind of syntactic phrase, right up to a full sentence (DiSciullo 1987), and it has been widely noted that they tend to exhibit similar syntax to non- idiomatic phrases (Van Gestel 1995, Fellbaum 1993, Abeille 1995).

As for the part of the definition of an idiom that it is a non-compositional form, that is, that its meaning cannot be compositionally computed from its parts. This suggests that the way many idioms have found their way into language is as dead metaphors - once robust figurative tropes, their associations have now been severed rendering their meaning arbitrary to modern speakers.

Gibbs (1995) takes issue with this explanation, though. He argues that for many idioms, there still is a real figurative connection between idioms and the literal. It is inaccurate to call idioms non-compositional because people’s metaphorical understanding plays a significant role in how they interpret idiomatic discourse. He cites several cognition experiments on idiom processing, as well as ideas of primary conceptual metaphors and visual schemas. Moreover, he argues for a recognition that “many idioms are analyzable with their components *independently* contributing to what these phrases mean literally” . Compositional computation of an idiom’s parts can lead to an interpretation of an idiom then.

---

<sup>13</sup>P. N. Johnson-Laird .A collection of works on idioms.p6

<sup>14</sup>[http://: google books](http://google.books).Tim Ifill.Seeking the nature of idioms. A study in Idiomatic Structure 2002 p2

This is stronger than the explanation which I adopted of transparency - that many idioms have the same syntactic structure both in their idiomatic form and in a non-idiomatic form. Gibbs's view suggests that not only may there be an overlap in form, but a very real connection between the two forms. If components do have stronger independent meanings than has been before recognized, it can certainly have an effect on ideas of idioms' syntax, as well as the notion of fixedness. It presents a very different model of idiomatic behavior as Gibbs (1993) points out, "Idiomatic language is remarkably complex and each phrase demands its own analysis in terms of its syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and conceptual properties." This analysis is valuable, as it presents a minimal structure that seems to be common to all idioms. And the study of idioms can tell us increasingly more about the nature of fixed expressions, figurative language, and finally, of language itself.

### **Conclusion.**

From this chapter, devoted to phraseology and its theories, we can conclude that this branch of linguistics need to be studied separately, indeed. Because like other sciences , it has its own tasks and objectives. As everybody knows, the establishment or origin of phraseology is connected with the name of Swiss scholar Charlie Ballie. In his book under the name of "French stylistics", he introduced the term *phraseologie* and its several units, i.e. four groups of word collocations. Following his theory, the attention to this science have increased. In the Commonwealth countries a lot of scholars dealt with theoretical issues of phraseology, such as V.V.Vinogradov, A.V.Kunin, N.N.Amosova, E.D.Polivanov, I.V.Arnold, A.I.Smirnitskiy and others. And in this line, it's relevant to state that E.D.Polivanov's contribution to phraseology is overwhelmingly huge. Different classifications of PhU based on different criteria were presented by the above-mentioned scholars. According to these criteria, their classifications of PhU differ from one another completely. As for the phraseological theories, created in European countries, it is not difficult to notice that the researches, dedicated to this

science is not so many as in the Commonwealth countries. Phraseological units were studied in many prominent European linguist's works , including that Weinrich, Makkai, Smith. Among them Adam Makkai is one of the greatest scholars, who researched on idioms. His book named “Idiom structure in English”, published in 1972, “A dictionary of American Idioms”, published in 1975-1995, “Idiomacy as a Language Universal” and “On Redefining the Idiom” contributed to clarify the properties of idioms. He defines two types of idioms, that is lexemic and sememic. Despite less quantity of phraseological theories in European countries, lots of dictionary of idioms have been published so far. Now here’s some of them are presented: in the series of Oxford dictionaries , and in the scholastic dictionaries of Hornby and in American dictionary ,, The Random House Dictionary of the English Language” and others. At present time phraseology is in the focus of linguistics and its objectives, phraseological units or idioms are being investigated by plenty of scholars.

## Chapter II. Interjectional phraseological units in modern English, Uzbek and Russian

### 2.1. The analysis of the research works devoted to the interjections

Language, as a perfect tool of communication, is a very complex symbolic system organized into a structure the elements of which have definite relationships among themselves and with the structure as a whole. The elements of language are usually easy to establish and there is a number of hierarchically ordered organizational units or building blocks that we can speak of, starting from distinctive features, phonemes, morphemes, words, phrases to sentences/utterances.<sup>15</sup>

However, probably every single day in our common language communication with the others we use forms which cannot be easily and distinctly defined as words, but which have to be considered as phonemic clusters with or without characteristic meaning assigned to convey various messages. But these messages are not necessarily thoughts and ideas any longer, but rather emotions, feelings and attitudes. Forms with emotional charge and expressive value used in communication to signal this emotiveness are called *interjections*.

Interjections, as one of the marginal and perhaps least discussed upon classes of words, are the focus of the investigation. The fact that interjections exist in language sufficiently accounts for their importance, which has largely been neglected in linguistics.

Moreover, mastering any language would be incomplete without being able to understand perfectly and use appropriately this kind of communicative elements. Perhaps the most intriguing question in relation to interjections is whether they should be treated as separate words or one-word sentences/utterances. In the grammar books of the different language, interjections are usually spared only a couple of sentences of description and are most often classified with other classes of

---

<sup>15</sup> V. Z. Jovanovic the form, position and meaning of interjections in English 2004 p2

uninflected words, considered to be exclamatory sounds or outcries of pain, surprise, anger, pleasure, etc. uttered to express strong emotion or feeling.

As many authors in philology and linguistics suggest, interjections might have been among the first utterances or words used by humans at the dawn of language emergence. The expressiveness and simplicity of such forms of communication may be among the reasons for that. It is not difficult to imagine how complex and almost awkward language might be if we were to obliterate this means of expression from our everyday communication. A simple *Ouch!* would have to be substituted with, for example, "This thing you are doing to me is considerably hurtful", which is quite long, let alone its being rather awkward or even humorous.

Being in the focus of linguists, interjections were investigated by numerous scholars, such as O.O.Shaxmatov, L.V.Shcherba, V.V.Vinogradov, O.S.Kubryakova, L.A.Bulakhovskiy, F.Ameika, E.Goffman, Sh.Rakhmatullaev, A.V.Koonin and others.

According to V.V. Vinogradov, interjections are put in equal level with words as the signs of thought. Interjections form a lively and rich layer of purely subjective communication symbols, particularly, the symbols, which serve to express emotional-volitional reaction of the subject to the occurring event or phenomena. Expressing the emotion, mood, volitional motivation, interjections do not mean and nominate them, but not possessing nominal function, interjections possess collections of meaning content. Moreover, academic Vinogradov V.V. stated that interjectional words also serve to reflect emotional attitude of humanity, social group or rank which is connected with intellectual activity. The function of interjections is not only to show emotion, but also to uncover human being's intellect<sup>16</sup>. With these words V.V.Vinogradov denied the linguist J. Vandries' opinion that interjectional words belonged to the sphere of emotional language, differing from intellectual one.

---

<sup>16</sup> В.В.Виноградов Русский язык М.:1972 с585

The Russian scholar A.V.Koonin is considered one of the linguists, who contributed to the development of the theory of interjections. Expressive meaning is relevant to the semantics of interjections and so that interjectional phraseological units can belong to idiomaticity. InPhU express emotive and evaluative meaning. Connotative aspect of interjections is formed with the help of components of emotiveness (expressiveness, intensiveness, evaluativeness). Dwelling on denotative aspect of interjectional semantics appears relating with interjections in every particular context from extralinguistic point of view, briefly, the meaning of interjections is deduced from context situation. In both cases interjections express private attitude of a human being to the things of the outer world and sometimes to himself or herself.<sup>17</sup> He added the InPhU as a separate group into the classification of PhU.

As for the definition of this part of speech, the term *interjection*, as it is stated in the OED, entered the English language probably in the 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup> century from Latin *interjicere* (-jacere) with the meaning *to throw or cast between*, from *inter between* + *jacere to throw*.

A lexicographers' definition of interjections provides the following explanations: 1. The utterance of ejaculations expressive of emotion; an ejaculation or exclamation.<sup>18</sup>

2. Grammarian's definition. A natural ejaculation expressive of some feeling or emotion, used or viewed as a Part of Speech.

The definition somehow reflects the dual nature of interjections in language. When we consider the forms *Oh!* or *Phooey!*, we can see that we have to speak in terms of a definitely separate class of elements which share the qualities of not having any inflection typical of them, and that they are largely suggestive of sensations, attitudes and states of mind. Aside from these, there are no other

---

<sup>17</sup> В.А.Кунин Курс фразеология английского языка феникс 2005 стр 420

<sup>18</sup> V. Z. Jovanovic "The form, position and meaning of interjections in English" 2004 p6

characteristics, nor are there any other language functions that these forms can perform. On the other hand, depending on the context, interjections can form sentences and utterances that consist of one or two words without the subject-predicate relation

It is not very easy to judge whether interjections are an open or a closed set of words, since they form a relatively stable group of easily identifiable words and phrases with particular communicative function. Interjections of English make up a set of over 500 words or one-word utterances speakers use on various occasions. However, it is not difficult to imagine new interjections complementing the existing contingent, as opposed to pronouns. New interjectional forms continue to appear in the language of popular culture, comic-strips, and pop music, for instance. The younger urban population can be said to be the nucleus of speakers for producing new and expressive interjections as part of their unique linguistic identity. On the other hand, it is either by the creativity of the speakers of language or by borrowing (although there already exist original interjections which express the same meaning) that new interjections enter a language. As for the important morphological feature of interjections is the one stated by G. Curme, that interjections have no distinctive forms which would indicate their function. These words go along the line of the statement that interjections belong to the class of uninflected words, words that do not possess any systematic set of inflectional endings which signal different grammatical categories. On the other hand, they are sometimes made of two or more words or stems. Quite often, interjections that are used in everyday speech present a combination of two independent interjections : *Oh, God! Goodness gracious! Lord Harry!*

We can say that the usual sentential position of interjections is at the beginning of the sentence and this position is often said to be *independent*, which means that they are not grammatically or functionally related to any other word classes of the sentence, nor do they have any syntactical relation to another clause. They are independent elements of sentences/ utterances, only loosely linked with the sentence they appear

in, if they are separated from the rest with a comma<sup>19</sup>. An interjection can be a part of a simple statement that makes a proposition of sorts, not necessarily ended with an exclamation mark. The English language abounds in variously shaped and semantically diverse one-word interjections. The majority of interjections are originally English, whereas a considerable number have entered the language from other languages (adios! Bejasus, bejesus!), or are normally used in English with the same meaning as in the language of origin. The languages, mostly borrowed from are French, Spanish, German, Arabic and Hebrew, and it was largely American English that served as the springboard for most of those. Around ten percent of approximately 550 interjections existing and used in English today are from other languages, not counting the specific ones used by English language speakers in Ireland and Scotland. These generally belong to the domain of social conventions and elements of language typical of certain cultural areas.<sup>20</sup> The interjections of English can be grouped into several sets based on their pragmatic value. The largest group would incorporate more situation-oriented interjections with restricted pragmatic purpose. They are uttered on specific, non-frequent occasions such as during definite social activities, playing certain games or performing rituals and we can say that they border on the so-called language formulae. **gad! gadso! gar!**- a mild oath, surprise, disgust, etc. **gadzooks!** - {archaic} a mild oath. **golly! gorry!** - substituted for **god!** in oaths or exclamations, expressive of surprise, etc. **gosh!**- surprise, wonder, etc. **haith!**- [Scotland] a quasi-oath: a deformation of **faith! i' faith!**

Interjections are studied in the Uzbek language also. In the Uzbek language interjections are investigated in the works of Sh.Rakhmatullaev. According to him, the interjectional words are language units, which express a human being's emotion. Mostly it's difficult to define what kind of emotion is denoted by this part of speech, but the meaning of the line is deduced based on the context.

Most interjections are said in different tones, and in this case they serve to express different emotions (here's the polysemy of InPhU is meant, which is

<sup>19</sup>[http:// google.com. wikipedia](http://google.com.wikipedia)

<sup>20</sup> V. Z. Jovanovic "The form, position and meaning of interjections in English" 2004, p21

discussed in 3.3section). The different meanings of interjections are clarified in the context, in other words a certain interjection means joy in one context, and in another situation it may mean vice versa. Sh.Rahmatullaev also mentioned that the second type of interjections are called exclamations. Differing from emotive interjections, they denote to exclaim to do or not to do a certain action. According to that they are split into two: 1)the interjections, which claim to do the action 2)the interjections which claim not to do the action. Mainly the both ones are designed for animals and domestic birds.<sup>21</sup>

The third group of interjections are considered as the communication units. They are not encountered pure interjections, they still preserve their lexemic peculiarities and serve to denote the following meanings:

1. For denoting greeting and saying goodbye
2. For denoting congratulation, will, gratefulness
3. For evaluating positively, praising someone.

And T.T Ikramov in his research work, devoted to the PhU in the imperative form, dwelled on the InPhU, particularly. The InPhU, consisting of derivative, non-derivative interjections and other interjectional PhU as one of the language units, which express the feeling of a human, emotion, volition, which present specific attitude of the person to the objective reality. Although InPhU have a verb component in their form, as the Verbal PhU, predication disappears, which is preserved in VPhU. InPhU can't combine with its surrounding, losing the direct meaning of their components, InPhU denote special expressive meaning. And it is also stated in this research work, the stability of all components including the verb of the InPhU, in imperative mood express a certain emotion, losing their direct meaning of its components.<sup>22</sup>

Generally speaking, the emotion is considered one of the most important qualities of the human being, so that, the sphere of understanding should be investigated seriously and deeply [M.K.Xudayberganova]. The issue of emotional

<sup>21</sup>Sh.Rahmatullaev Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili T.: b139

<sup>22</sup>Т.Т.Икрамов Фразеологические единицы с фиксированным глагольным компонентом в императиве в современном английском языке. Автореферат канд.дисс. М.:1978 с6-7

state and feeling is in the center of linguists, PhU can also express the emotion, as interjections. Because, the emotiveness exists in all levels of the language and it should be confirmed that “actually, the linguistic aspect of the research about the form of expressing emotion requires the analysis of all levels of language systems: word formation, morphological, syntactical, lexical ones” are accepted undoubtedly. But accepting this thesis about multi-aspectness of language category of emotiveness is lacking serious theoretical basis and it is to be mentioned that it is now on the stage of progress, although there are a lot of investigations about it. In the works of V.V.Vinogradov, Y.M. Galkina Fedoruk, A.A. Ufimseva, Y.M.Lotman, L.V.Vasileva, V.G.Gak we can come across a lot of interesting investigations about the words, expressing the emotion of the human being. In addition to that, D.V. Yurchenko dealt with setting usual and occasional usage of phraseologisms, the influence of the context to broaden the components of phraseological units.

I.V.Zvikova stated that in phraseological semantics, consisted of gender component can express different elements of emotions, reflecting sympathy, trust, accusation.<sup>23</sup>

The phraseologisms, expressing emotion in Russian are studied in the research of N.B.Shvelidze. This research covers complex analysis of PhU, consisting of not only semantic characteristics, but also structural-grammatical analysis of phraseologisms from functional point of view. According to the researchers, semantic field of phraseological units, denoting the emotions, which are presented as the groups of emotional state and as the groups of emotional attitude of the person.

As we witness, in most cases, the linguists, dealing with the verbalizations of emotions in the language, draw attention to investigate word classes or particular lexemes, calling the emotions or prefer to connect the notion of emotions with evaluativeness and often limit the emotional lexics with the words. The research

---

<sup>23</sup>Б.Х.Реимов Фразеологические единицы английского языка, характеризующие эмоциональное состояние человека Т.:2005 с22

work, which suits our issue, by G.M. Ataeva drew the main attention to InPhU and clarified the parameters, according to which they should be presented in the dictionaries. Interjections communicate attitudinal information, relating to the emotional or mental state of the speaker. In some instances the attitude might be genuinely propositional: say, an attitude of questioning or regret, or an emotional attitude directed at embedded propositional content. However, sometimes the emotional attitude is expressed not toward an embedded proposition, but toward a percept or object which is the cause of a feeling or sensation. In some instances, what is expressed is merely a feeling or sensation with no propositional content. In these latter cases, what is communicated is extremely vague: in relevance-theoretic terms it will involve only a marginal increase in the manifestness of a wide range of assumptions, where an assumption is manifest to an individual if it is capable of being inferred. Such vagueness is captured by the procedural account proposed earlier: the greater the range of attitudinal concepts activated by the procedure, the greater the vagueness.

How do interjections communicate? Interjections are partly natural and partly coded. They fall at various points along a continuum between showing and saying. The continuum captures the partly natural, partly coded nature of interjections, together with their heterogeneity and marginal linguistic status. Seeing interjections in this way, we should not be surprised that the attitudes they communicate are not always propositional. Nor should we be surprised that they are too nebulous to be paraphrased in fixed conceptual terms: they are partly natural responses.

### 2.3 Structural properties of Interjectional Phraseological Units in the English, Uzbek and Russian languages

It is not secret to us, under any kind of structure or form, some meaning exists. The structure is accounted for the outer form, and the meaning is the inner form of the language. It is observed in the research works of numerous linguists, such as Wilhelm von Humboldt, Ferdinand de Saussure, Frans Boas and others. They prove the inseparable relation between the structure and the meaning. The German linguist stated that every word, existing in any language came into existence relying on some factors, such as, mode of life of the nation, behavior, tradition and etc. Ferdinand de Saussure nearly gave similar opinion but he described the language as the system of signs. These two scholars arose these issues with the aim of creating general linguistics and they succeeded in carrying out this task. Getting acquainted with their precious ideas about the language, we witness, in the language the structure is also of great importance. For being the topic of our research work, interjections possess their own structure in the English, Uzbek and Russian languages. This issue is observed in some research works of the linguists T.T.Ikramov, V.Z. Jovanovic, K. O. Vyacheslavivna and others

V. Z.Jovanovic in his research work under the title of “The form, position and meaning of interjections in English”, analyzed the structure of interjections. Interjections are sound sequences, words, typical phrases or clauses which can be realized as utterances signaled in speech by being produced with greater intensity, stress and pitch, and as sentences in writing by an exclamation mark. ***Wow! This looks wonderful!***

On the phonological level interjections predominantly consist of the regular vowel and consonant phonemes of the language. Some of them, however, have phonological features which lie outside the regular system of the language, such as the glottal phoneme in *ugh!* /u:x/ or /ax/ or the alveolar click in *tut-tut!* and *whew!*, which, for instance, contains a bilabial fricative /ʃiu/ or /\$:/, etc. Sometimes

interjections can make whole clusters of closely related forms which have identical meaning but differ in terms of pronunciation or spelling. Usually the difference is insignificant and consists of one or two different phonemes or letters: *keno! keeno! kino! quino! orpardi! pardie! pardy! perdie!*

A number of interjections, primarily interjections that have originated through simple and compound nouns, have clear markers for the category of number, namely the plural morpheme {-s}. This section includes interjections such as: *balls! fiddlesticks! havers! heads up! horsefeathers! rats! spells!*, etc.

Two large and distinct groups can be distinguished within the entirety of the English interjections on the grounds of their phonemic contents, their immediate origin and their overall formal characteristics. First, we may separate a group which we may call the group of interjections proper, words like *aha! auh! bah! boo! coo! cor! eeeek! eh! gee! gee-whiz! ha! ha-ha! ho! hooey! hoo-ha! hoy! huh! hullo! hum! oho! ooh! oops! uh! uh-huh! uh-uh!* These short forms are usually one or two syllable segments with no particular referents, but with indisputable purpose in language communication.

The second segment can be composed of interjections which can be said to have originated from other parts of speech, predominantly nouns and adjectives, words like *begone! behold! bingo! blast! blimey! bother! bullshit! crazy! crikey! damnation! the devil! doggone! god! good! goodness! gracious! grand! hell! honestly! indeed! look! nonsense! silence! so! sod! soft! son of a bitch! son of a gun! upon my soul! up with! upsy-daisey! well! woe! no wonder!* These have more word-like or phrase-like forms with identifiable referents outside language or figurative meaning and are clearly suggestive of emotional reactions to linguistic or non-linguistic stimuli. They present oaths, warnings, orders, instructions or value judgments. Even though they normally belong to other word classes, their repeated use in particular situational contexts and with corresponding prosodic features and intensity qualified them for the classification in this word class.

According to O.V. Kaptyurova, interjections are different structurally and connected genetically as :a)interjections, expressing short scream (*ah, oh, alas, eh, heigh*) b)meaningful parts of speech (*good, come, look, well*) c) words, connecting with etiquettes(*good morning, thank you, excuse me, so long* d) phraseological units(*how do you do*).Among them she divided interjections as 1)interjections consisting of one word: *bah, chut, ouch, tut; cool, bet, damn, greetings, indeed* 2) interjections, which consist of two or more words: *my God, blast it, see you, good egg, catch me doing that.*<sup>24</sup>And T.T Ikramov investigated the InPhU in imperative mood in his research work and divided them into three: a)interjectional PhU, generated from imperative sentences, which form the most percentage of InPhU b) formed by potential PhU, which mean before they are used in other meaning, but now denotes totally another c) the InPhU, which are formed by themselves, in other words, before this interjection is used for other situation and later it begins to be used for expressing different notion.<sup>25</sup>

For our research we managed to find many examples for InPhU and we usedphraseological dictionaries compiled by Koonin A.V., Lubenskaya, Sh.Rakhmatullaev, and Uzbek explanatory dictionaries, English fictional books. Relying on these materials, we split InPhU in three languages as the following. At first, we can find the following structures of InPhU in English: 1) Verb+Pronoun 2)Verb+ preposition 3) V+Preposition 4) Noun + verb 5) Pronoun+ Verb 6)Verb+ Verb 7) Pronoun + noun 8) Adjective + noun and etc.

In the structure of **Verb + pronoun**: *Beat it! Catch me! Don't tell me! Curse it! Damn it all! Search me! Bless me! Wait for it! Dash it all! Draw it mild! Burst him! Burst them!*

In **Noun+Verb** or sentence structure: *Woe betide you! Marry come up! God bless you(me , my life, my soul)!Queen Anne is dead! Lord knows! The devil take it! God*

<sup>24</sup> Е.В.Каптюрова Междометия современного английского языка . Автореферат канд. Дисс. Киев 2005 с6

<sup>25</sup>Т.Т.Икрамов Фразеологические единицы с фиксированным глагольным компонентом в императиве в современном английском языке . Автореферат канд. Дисс .М.:1978 с 15

*save the mark! God bless the mark!*

In **pronoun+Verb** structure: *I told you !I know your type! You are telling me! It will make you flip! If that don't beat all! That surpasses everything! Don't you know it! I say! That's going too far! That tears it! That takes the cake! You said it! It blows my mind! It's you! That's the last straw! Well , I'll be!*

In **Verb+Verb+(pronoun/noun)** structure: *Lo and behold! Stand and deliver! Go chase yourself! Go fly a kite! Go lay an egg! Go jump in the lake!*

In **Verb+pronoun+Noun** structure: *zip your lip! (zip it up!)Keep your shirt on! Bite your tongue! Hold your horses! Tell it to the marines! Take it from me! Fry your eggs! Be your age! Put it on ice! Mind your step! Shut your face! Watch my smoke!*

In **preposition+ (proper )Noun/ pronoun+ noun**: *By the Lord Harry! By George! By Golly! By God's light! By good/this light! For goodness' sake! Upon my word! Upon my Sam! By Heaven! By Good Heavens! By thunder/ lightning! On your way! Very like a whale! For pity's sake! For Pete's sake! Over my dead body! Down the hatch!*

In **Verb+ Noun** structure(most In PhU in this structure are observed in imperative case): *Dog my cats! Watch the birdie! Have a heart! Break a leg! Go to blazes! Go to Jericho! Go to pot! Don't give up the ship! Don't push me! Don't sweat it! Get the lead out! Shake the lead out! Cut the cackle! Stop the music! Stop the presses! Bag it! Can it! The jumping Moses! Starve the lizards! Cut the comedy! Cut the funny stuff! Stone the wombats! May damnation take him! Shake a leg! Mind your step! Keep your hair on! Thank God! Thank goodness! Say cheese!* <sup>26</sup>In **adjective + Noun**

structure: *Nice going! Good job! The same old game! Good Heavens! A real knockout! A fine kettle of fish! Hot diggety (dog)! Great Scott! Holy cow! Holy Mackerel! Holy Moses! Good Lord!***Verb +preposition** structure: *Dig in! dig up! Butt out! Cheer up! come on! Come off it! Be off! For crying out loud!*

**Noun +preposition structure**: *Bottoms up! Hands off! Heads up! Thumbs up! breakers ahead!*

**Pronoun+Noun** structure: *my aunt! what a nerve! Your granny! My timbers!*

<sup>26</sup> А.В.Кунин Большой англо-русский фразеологический словарь. М.:1984

**(Possessive pronoun) Noun+(preposition)+ Noun structure:** *(to)hell with that! More power to you! My oath! Honest to God! Christ's foot! My service to you! A penny for your thoughts! More power to your elbow! Ye gods and little fishes! Hell's bells(and buckets of blood)! God's blood! Sharp's the word!*

The rest structures of InPhU are considered occasional, but they are also of great importance for revealing the essence of our research work.

**Noun +Prep+ Pronoun:** *Bully for you!***Pronoun+ pronoun+ Verb structure :**

*There it goes! There you are!*

**Pronoun+**

**pronounstructure:** *There , there*

**Interjection +interjection:***boy howdy!*

**Interjection +verb:** *Gee whiz!*

**Interjection+ Verb structure:** *Dammit to hell!*

**Verb+ adverb structure:** *Hold hard!*

**Complicated(compound) structure:** *Come on in , the water's fine!*

The structure of interjections in the Uzbek language is given in the book "Morphology" by Buranov M. and Mirmuhamedov T. . They split the interjectional words into two according to their form: the interjections, consisting of an only word or simple-root interjections(*eh, oh, uh, voy, kisht, pisht, vuy, olg'a , yasha, do'st, tasanno, rahmat, and etc.*) and compound interjections , which consist of two or more roots (*Xudoga shukur, o'lay agar, voy o'lay, Xudo ursin* and others). Comparing it with the English interjections, they are nearly the same according to their form. The following structures are discovered while analysing the examples in Uzbek:

**Noun +Verb structure in the Imperative mood:** *Xudo(Ollo) shifo bersin! Suvday serob bo'ling! Xudo rahmat qilsin! Ko'ziga ko'rinarmidi?! Ko'zi qiyadi! Esim qursin! Xudo xayring(iz)ni bersin! Xudo ko'rsatmasin! Qandingni ur! Jir bitdi-da! Boshiga uradimi! Stansang ishlaydimi!?Qirchiningdan qiyilgur! Xudo ko'tarsin! Beti*

*qursin! Ko'zing teshilgur! Toshingni ter! Tuyog'ingni shiqillat! Xazon bo'lgur! Qulog'iga kiradimi! Ovozing o'chgur! Shov-shuv ko'tarma! Baraka topkur! Xudo asrasin! Gap tamom! Yuragi dov beradimi! Yuragiga sig'armidi?! Otimni boshqa qo'yaman(ing)! Inson emasman! Jin ursin! Og'zingni yum! Sho'ri qursin! Ado bo'lgur!* <sup>27</sup>**Verb+(verb)** structure: *Xit qilib yubording! Gumdon bo'lgur! Dab bo'l! Qarab tur! Oling, oldirmang!*

**Noun+Noun+Verb** structure: *Boshing toshdan bo'lsin! Sadqai odam ket!*

*Yelka(si)ning chuquri ko'rsin!*

**Noun+Noun** structure: *Sarvari*

*koinot! Og'zingga moy! Bo'rimisiz, tulkimisiz?! Interjection+Noun+Verb* structure:

*Dodingni Xudoga ayt!*

**Noun+Noun+Noun:** *To'rt tomoning qibla!*

**Adverb+verb:** *Xush endi! Xush kelibsiz!* **Noun+interjection:** *Xudoga shukur! Voy*

*o'lay! Yo pirim! Yo Razzoq! Oxiri voy!* **Adjective+ noun:** *Oq yo'l!*

**Modal word+ verb:** *Bor bo'ling! Bor ekansiz-ku! Yo'q bo'lgur! Yo'qni yo'ndiraymi!*

**Noun+ Modal word:** *Kun yo'q! Gap yo'q!*

**Pronoun+ Verb:** *O'ziga ursin! Ana bo'lamasa! Ana xolos!*

**InPhU in complicated sentence structure:** *Gap kelganda, otangni ayama! Kalning nimasi bor, temir tarog'I bor! Oling, oldirmang! Yotib qolguncha, otib qol! O'lar bo'lsam, o'lar bo'ldim! Cholni ko'rib bobom dema! Og'zingdan chiqib, yoqangga yopishsin!*

The Russian language is also considered rich in interjectional phraseological units.

Now we'll look through the structures of Russian InPhU:!  
**Verb+noun** structure:

*Отсохни руки и ноги! Живут же люди!! Не рассказывайте сказок! Пошёл к чёрту Открыл Америку! Раздуй тебя горой! Умру от смеха! Побойтесь Бога! Видит Бог!*

**Verb+ adverb:** *убирайся*

*отсюда! Иди по дальше!*

**Verb+ pronoun:** *разрази меня*

*гром! Будьте вы прокляты! чур меня!*

**Noun +verb:** *обстановка благоприятствует! Что я вам говорила! Понятие не имею! Так я поверил! Я вас спрашиваю!*  
**Noun+adverb:** *руки прочь! Жив*

<sup>27</sup>Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати 2005 I,II,III,IV,Vтом

*курилка!*<sup>28</sup> **Adjective +noun:** *весёлая история! Хорошенкое дело! Честное слово! Ядрёна вошь! Хорош гусь!*

**Pronoun+verb:** *вон куда хватил! Себе можете представить!* **Pronoun+noun** *вот чудеса! Вот это здорово! Так держать! Вот тебе крест!* **Interjection +verb:** *чёрт возьми! Чёрт под(б)ери!*

**Noun+pronoun:** *Боже мой! (за)ваши здоровье! Батюшки мой(светы)!*

**Verb+Verb:** *хватить трепаться! Хватить лежать!*<sup>29</sup>

Thus for our survey we have collected InPhU in three languages in different quantity. In the English language we managed to find approximately more than 170 units and used 150 InPhU for its structural analysis. Here are the results of the structural analysis of the InPhU in English:

Noun+ verb –	10%	adjective+ noun	7%,
pronoun+ Verb	10%,	Verb +preposition	5%
verb+ verb	5%	noun+ preposition	6%
Verb+(pronoun)+ noun-	10%	Pronoun +noun	3%
preposition+ noun+ noun	11%	noun/pronoun+(prep)+noun-	11%
verb+ noun	20%	the structure, which include interjectional words	2%

<sup>28</sup> Лубенская АСТ Большой русско-английский словарь Пресс книга М.:2004

<sup>29</sup> Молотков А.И. Фразеологический словарь русского языка М.:1967 с543

The results of the structural analysis of the Uzbek Interjectional Phraseological Units:

Noun+ verb –	47%	adverb+ verb	3%,
verb+ Verb	7%	noun +interjection	7%
noun+ noun+ verb	4%	Adjective +noun	2%
Noun+ noun-	4%	Modal word +verb	6%
interjection+ noun+ verb	2%	noun+ modal word	3%
Noun+ noun+ noun	1%	compound sentence structu.	10%
Pronoun+verb	4%		

And in the Russian language the results are the following:

verb + Noun	20%	Pronoun+ verb	5%,
Verb+ adverb	5%,	Verb +verb	6%
noun+ verb	13%	noun+ pronoun	8%
Verb+ pronoun	7%	Pronoun +noun	11%

Noun+ adverb	6%	the structure, which include interjectional words	9%
Adjective+ noun	12%		

As we witness the results in the scheme, in three languages there are some similarities and dissimilarities. And in our opinion, InPhU in the imperative mood in three languages form the main percentage, and it confirms the idea of prof. V.V.Vinogradov in his book “The Russian language”. The following structures of InPhU can be met in three languages:

Noun+ Verb, Verb+ Verb, Adjective +Verb, Noun+ Noun, Pronoun+ Verb constructions. But Verb+ Noun and phrases, which contain interjectional words structure are observed in the English and Russian languages, but not in Uzbek. And some constructions, as Pron+ Verb, Verb+ Pronoun+ Noun, Preposition+ Noun + Noun, Verb+Noun, Verb+ Preposition, Noun+Preposition are peculiar to the English language only.

Adverb+ Verb, Noun+ Interjection, Noun+Noun+Verb, Interjection+ Noun+Verb, Noun+Noun+Noun, Modal Word + Verb, Noun+ Modal Word constructions are found only in Uzbek. Modal Word constructions are found only in this language during our observation.

In the Russian language we can observe Verb+ Adverb, Verb+ Preposition, Noun+ Adverb, Pronoun+ Noun, Noun+Pronoun structures. To conclude, in all three compared languages we managed to discover more than ten different structures.

## 2.1. Semantic properties of Interjectional phraseological units in English Uzbek and Russian

It has to be taken for granted that interjections in all languages have some kind of meaning, otherwise they would probably not find their way in the language jungle and be soon discarded as redundant. It may be argued, however, whether this meaning is intrinsic, the meaning which people have assigned to these forms or only onomatopoeic, as echoism involves words whose very form is imitative of the natural sounds from the environment and are only meant to refer to these sounds and actions thereby. Probably both. The meaning of interjections has been fairly established since each and every interjection is uttered in a particular language and situational context. However, we have to admit that there are exclamatory sounds which stand only for representation of particular sonar segments of the environment, such as *zomster!*, for example, and have no other special meaning. Everything in language has meaning which can be interpreted, if nothing else than as representing this or that sound as produced by this or that entity. Therefore, saying that particular interjections mean nothing is not utterly correct. In this respect, certain authors claim that interjections "...are purely emotive words which have no referential content nor any particularly significant grammatical function".<sup>30</sup>

The researcher Vladimir Z. Jovanovic presents an attempt at grouping interjections according to their meaning, or rather, according to the predominant semantic features that their meaning is composed of. Thus, the group of interjections that have certain emotional expressive potential can be further diversified into different emotions that particular interjections are indicative of these emotions. This scheme covers both interjectional words and interjectional phraseological units.

**[ANGER]** damn! damnation! the devil! doggone! fuck! ha! hang it!  
hell! hunh! rats! shit! what! zounds!

**[ANNOYANCE]** bother ! damn! damnation! deuce! drat! drot! mercy! merde!  
oof! ouf(f)! ouch! rot! son of a bitch! spells! tut! tut-tut! zut!

---

<sup>30</sup>R. Quirk, et al. (1972) *A Contemporary Grammar of English*, Longman group, London, pp 413-414.

[**APPROVAL**] hear! hear! hubba-hubba! hurrah! keno! ole! so!

[**CONTEMPT**] bah! boo! booh! faugh! hum! humph! hunh! paff! paf! pah!

pfui! pho! phoh! phoo! phooey! pish! poof! pouf! pouff! pooh! prut! prute! pshaw!  
puff! poff! quotha! rot! sho! shoo!

[DELIGHT] shuh! shah! soh! tcha! tchah! tchu! tchuh! tuh! tush! tusch! tusche! tuch! yech! zut!

ah! ach! coo! coo-er! goody! goody goody! whacko! wacko! whizzo! wizzo! yippee!  
yip-ee!

[DISGUST] aargh! bah! faugh! fuck! gad! humph! pah! phew! phooey! pish! pshaw! pugh! rot!

[ENTHUSIASM] shit! shoot! ugh! yech! yuck! hubba-hubba! wahoo! zowie! eeeek! oh! oh, no!

[FEAR] chut! gah! pish! pooh! pshaw! psht! pshut! tcha! tchah! tchu! tchuh! tut! tut-tut! why!  
zut!

[IMPATIENCE] here ! here! why!

[INDIGNATION] cor! corks! doggone! hell! hoot! lord! lor'! lor! lors!lordy! lord me! merde!  
[IRRITATION]

[JOY] sapperment! shit! upon my word!

[PAIN] heyday! hurrah! ole! whee! whoop! whoopee! yippee!

[PITY] ah! oh! ouch! ow! wow! yipe! yow!

[PLEASURE] alas! dear! dear me! ewhow! lackaday! lackadaisy! las! och! oche! wellaway!  
[RELIEF] welladay! welliday!

aha! boy! crazy! doggone! good! heigh! ho! wow! yum! yum- yum!

[SORROW] whew! whoof!

[SURPRISE] alas! ay! eh! hech! heck! heh! lackaday! lackadaisy! las! mavrone! och! oche!  
wellaway! welladay! welliday! wirra!

ah! alack! blimey! boy! caramba! coo! cor! dear! dear me! deuce! the devil!  
doggone! gad! gee! gee-whiz! golly! good! goodness! gracious! gosh! ha! heck!  
heigh! heigh-ho! hey! heyday! ho! hollo! hoo-ha! huh! humph! indeed! jiminy! lord!  
man! mercy! my! nu! od! oh! oho! oh, no! phew! say! shit! so! son of a bitch! upon  
[SYMPATHY] my soul! well! what! whoof! whoosh! why! upon my word! wow! yow! zounds!  
[TRIUMPH] now! tsk!

[WONDER] aha! ha! hurrah! ole! so!

Moreover , Ikramov T.T in his research dwelled on semantic properties of InPhU particularly. According to him:” the analysis of semantic peculiarities of InPhU shows

that in the language there is no pure emotive interjections. Any emotion brings some evaluation, or saying more correctly it had better to call emotive-evaluative interjections. Interjections – are not direct expression of emotion, therefore not any emotional mark, not passed through cognition filter cannot be expressed directly in the language system. Emotional moment in its pure view can refer to the physiology or psychology or as for phonological expression to complex, keeping the feature of not entering language system. “ He splits InPhU into the following phraseo-semantic groups based on his analysis:

- 1) Emotive-evaluative InPhU, which assist to express negative and positive emotions and speaker’s attitude to the certain object or idea (Bless my heart! Thank God!) Among them, abusive or offensive InPhU, (*Damn your eyes!*) which are originated from incantations and curses in genetic plan, help to express rage, resentment, indignation should be marked particularly. From quantitative point of view, these InPhU are considered the biggest group.
- 2) The InPhU, expressing will, desire, impetus, volition for carrying out some action: [pull devil! Pull baker!] Volitional InPhU express only general idea of impetus, and so that the most concrete action remains clear in context.
- 3) InPhU, which express confirmation/negation (God forbid you, if ..! Be cripes, if..)
- 4) InPhU- formulae of social etiquettes (God bless you! Touch the wood!), differing from other phraseo-semantic groups of InPhU, because their components keep their nominative function in certain degree, and these InPhU are used in some generally accepted situations. <sup>31</sup>

While analyzing semantically of InPhU, we have to pay attention to the notion of phraseological polysemy. In his monolingual Uzbek phraseological dictionary, Sh.Rakhmatullaev defined the very notion as the following: the peculiarity of giving more than an only meaning belongs to language units, we meet this phenomenon in most PhU. the most polysemantic set expressions have two different meanings; PhU,

---

<sup>31</sup>Т.Т.Икрамов Фразеологические единицы с фиксированным глагольным компонентом в императиве в современном английском языке. Автореферат канд. Дисс. М.:1978 с 19

which have three, four or more meanings also exist. *Boshga qilich kelsa ham* has one meaning, *aqli yetadi* has two meanings, the idiom *bo'yniga qo'ymoq* has three meanings and etc. Phraseological polysemy also possess direct meaning and indirect (derivative) meaning and they are differentiated, as exist in lexical polysemy. In lexical polysemy, direct meaning suits denotative meaning, and derivative meaning fits to connotative meaning, and the difference between them is that in phraseological polysemy the direct meaning is also considered figurative, the cause of it is that any phraseological unit was created or came into existence as the connotative meaning. In polysemantic PhU their meanings appear based on close connection between the meanings. Shortly saying the third meaning appears depending on the second one. But sometimes we witness the exception, some phraseological units were formed as the result of getting different images (for describing totally different thing) every time. As an example, he indicated *ikki qo'lini burniga tiqib*, which has two meanings: 1) not getting anything for smth 2) not doing anything, to be an idle.

Or it's possible to prove it with the components of PhU. The components participate in one meaning for denoting a certain meaning, and in the second or third meaning the component is present in totally different meaning. In *xayol(i)ga kelmoq*, we can discover two meanings: 1) to guess, to dream 2) remember, come to memory. The component *xayol* within this PhU in the first meaning it is connected with "idea, opinion", and in the second meaning, of course with "memory".<sup>32</sup>

In his research on PhU, Ikramov T.T also dwelled on the polysemy of InPhU. He mentioned that polysemy of emotive-expressive InPhU possess the natures, those have interjections as *ah, oh* and interjections as "Come!". It's impossible to set primary and secondary particular meanings within them. The polysemy of InPhU is understood as their ability to express some various emotions, both positive and negative. One of the reasons of polysemy of InPhU is considered the loss of their components' nominative meaning for expressing figuratively. He grouped the polysemantic InPhU into three: 1) the InPhU, expressing only positive emotions:

---

<sup>32</sup> Ш.Рахматуллаев Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғатияю Т.:1978 б 6

*Thank God! Thank goodness!* 2) the InPhU, expressing only negative emotions: *the deuce take it! Go to blazes!* The PhU in this group, their meaning and stylistic characteristics depends on primary nominative meaning of the components. For example, the meaning of the “hell” consists of negative sense of emotive- evaluative direction, which stipulates the meaning of *Go to hell!* The first two groups of InPhU – mononucleus: in their semantic nucleus either positive or negative meaning is deduced. The third type InPhU which can represent controversial emotions (ambivalency), express pity, malice, rage, joy, delight depending on the context. *Damn it all! Hang it all!*

Generally, in all types of InPhU the role of the context is embodied. For the first two groups of InPhU context is appeared as actualizer-concretizer. General direction of the meaning of InPhU is clear, and context plays the role as the definer of a certain meaning in syntagmatic chain. For the third type context is found as actualizer-differentiator- concretizer of InPhU meaning.<sup>33</sup>

In the research work by an Ukrainian Kapyurava O.V. under the title “Interjections in modern English”, semantically they are split into three groups: **expressive**, **directive**, **representative**. She paid more attention to expressive interjections. She divided and subdivided the first group, expressive interjections. In accordance with expressing human’s emotion, interjections are divided into two: positive and negative, which are further subdivided into several groups as well. And according to addressing expression, they are grouped into two main groups, which are the InPhU, expressing different psychological states, pleasant or unpleasant for people.<sup>34</sup> As for **directive** interjections, they are addressed to somebody, in other words they express command, order. And representative interjections express the intensification of their speech, category.

Russian linguist Shaxmatov A.A. divided interjectional words into three groups primarily: 1) interjections, expressing general excitement of the speaker and

<sup>33</sup>Т.Т.Икрамов Фразеологические единицы с фиксированным глагольным компонентом в императиве в современном английском языке . Автореферат канд. Дисс .М.:1978 с 20

<sup>34</sup>Е.В.Каптюрова Междометия современного английского языка . Автореферат канд. Дисс. Киев 2005 с11

connecting with emotions 2) interjections, expressing a certain feeling or sense 3) interjections, expressing volition, i.e. command, demand, impetus, addressing to interlocutor. V.V. Vinogradov defined ten primary categories of interjections: 1) the interjections, expressing feeling and emotion 2) it doesn't include emotional interjections, but covers nouns, which express the signs of interjections in the context like *батюшки! Глупости!* 3) the interjections, which express emotion and evaluation: *дело табак! Плево едело!* 4) this type is formed by the words, which express volition, impetus: *вонь! Долой! стоп! марш!* 5) the interjections which emerge emotive-expressive attitude to the interlocutor. These interjections come with modality sometimes: *да, конечно! Вот ещё! право! черта с два!* 6) interjections, connected with etiquettes: *мерси! спасибо! извиняюсь!* 7) the next type includes offensive or rude interjections: *черт побери! Черт возьми!* 8) vocative interjections: *Господи мой!* 9) sound-imitation interjections: *бац бац! Хлоп!* 10) the last group is considered "interjectional verb form", used for denoting clear expressive signs in the meaning of past tense. This type helps to create the emotive state of the human in a certain situation at that moment and instead of verb, interjection carries out its function expressively: "*Я её окликнул ... она вдруг хлоп на диван*". The interjections are being increased more and more at the expense of phraseological units and fusions, idioms which express complicated complex of feeling, emotive evaluation and volition. Semantic analysis of interjections helps to expose the essence of language phenomena, which form and expand the category of interjections.<sup>35</sup>

As we witness, a lot of linguists divide the InPhU into different groups according to their own point of view, i.e. approach. And Russian scholar A.V. Kunin stated that in communication, most interjections depend on the extra-linguistic factors indirectly. And the interjections as *like hell!* and *my foot!* are clarified based on the intention of the situation. Among InPhU, such constructions as *by the lord Harry* (the Lord Harry – facetious nickname of the devil) exist in the language. This construction is used for

<sup>35</sup> В.В.Виноградов. Русский язык. М.: 1972 с 595

emphasizing the utterance and expresses indignation, rage and anger.

“ I am not going to take him at once, he is to finish his educational cramming before then,” said Mr. Bounderby. “By *the Lord Harry* ,he’ll have enough of it first and last”(Ch.Dickens).

You didn’t do it and you don’t intend to, but *by the Lord Harry*, I want to know why (F.Norris).

In the first example, the function of interjection is purely intensifying. In the second one it expresses the indignation of the speaker. Some InPh idioms express two types of emotions: surprise and pity. To this group, the American idiom *sakes alive !* refers. “How much did that big chair cost?” “Seventy-seven dollars!” “seve – *sakes alive!*”(surprise) . “*Sakes alive*, Nell!” Mrs.Tarrington said. “Why are you throwing turnip peelings over your shoulder?”(E.Caldwell).

Considered typical idioms in the English language *By George!*(saint George, considered as the patron of the England), *by Jove!* And etc. such kind of interjections express a wide scope of the emotions belong to: surprise, delight, pity, rage and others. Reduplicated interjection *hear, hear!* , which expresses *right, right*, and *no listen, listen*: “He will be only pleased to do me a favor.” Bundle nearly said: “*Hear, hear,*” but checked herself (A.Christie). Moreover this interjection is used for giving the author’s notes and is written in brackets as the following:

As you know, in this country we not only ill-use animals-(“*Hear,hear*”)- but to a very much greater and more nationally disastrous extent will use men and women (“*Hear, hear*”) (G.B.Shaw). or like that, prof. A.V.Kunin gave the example “*come, come*” in his book<sup>36</sup>

A range of interjectional constructions or patterns, spreading in communicative speech, are used only in the content of sentence-replica and present high emotional negation. For instance: *like hell! My foot!* some imperative InPhU as *go to blazes! Go to Jericho! Go to Hell! Go to Pot!* are not considered to be semantic diffusively.

---

<sup>36</sup>В.А.Кунин Курс фразеология английского языка феникс 2005 стр 426

These constructions express negative emotions and in positive situations they can't be used.

In addition to that, we know, some InPhU express more than one meaning, they are polysemantic. As for polysemantic InPhU, their concrete meaning is deduced only in context. Here are some examples of InPhU, which we come across during the research: *dog my cats!* This interjection is encountered as emotive interjectional PhU expressing confirmation and pity.

**Pity:** Dog my cats if it ain't [= isn't] all I kin [= can] do... (M. Twain, 'Pudd'nhead Wilson', ch. III)

Dog my cats, if she ain't gettin' so she's as bad 'bout chewin' the rag as poor Lena was - God rest her poor soul! (J. Conroy, 'The Disinherited', part III, ch. VI)

**Confirmation:**

I began to feel sorry for Hubby, dog my cats if I didn't. (O. Henry, 'The Four Million', 'Memories of a Yellow Dog')

Or *By George!* should also be added to the polysemantic range. This InPhU expresses different emotions:

**Surprise:**

I didn't get to bed till three and I don't know how I got there then. By George, I was squiffy. (W. S. Maugham, 'Of Human Bondage', ch. 37)

By George, how wonderful! What a girl! (Th. Dreiser, 'The Financier', ch. XVIII)

**Delight:**

"*By George*, but you can dance, though," cried Inigo enthusiastically (J.B.Priestley).

**Pity:**

*By George*, it's foggy: they were going, indeed, at a snail's pace... (J.Galsworthy)

It couldn't be, *by George*, that she was deceiving him. (Th. Dreiser, 'Sister Carrie', ch. XX)

**Confirmation:**

By George! I'll do something in the world yet! (A. Conan Doyle)

“*God bless you!*” denote different meanings. Its polysemantic feature is that the denotative and connotative meanings are not related. On the one hand it belongs to emotional, on the other hand it serves to express social etiquette. We’ll see it on the basis of examples:

**Surprise:**

“ God bless you” said Mr. Peter Hope What’s it? (J.K.Jerome “Tommy and C. story the first”).

**Etiquette:**

He sneezed twice loudly and he saw Riker jump a little at the noise “God bless you” Burnecker said. (I.Shaw The young lions ch26)

For our semantic analysis, we collected plenty of examples for InPhU from phraseological dictionaries, explanatory ones, and English fictional books, belonging to many scholars. Based on these examples, we split InPhU into the following groups:

**1 InPhU, expressing emotion.** While analyzing this group. We didn’t split InPhU into groups, which express positive or negative emotiveness. Because most InPhU, included into this group are considered polysemantic, in one context it serves to express positive feeling, and in another context negative feeling. At the end of this paragraph we dwelled on in detail on this issue.

The InPhU, coming into this group: *Bless me! Boy howdy! My oath! Marry come up! Queen Anne is dead! Holy cow! Holy Mackerel! Holy cats! For pity’s sake(s)! by Heaven! Heavens above/ alive! God bless you! God bless my life! Good Lord! Lord love you! Great Scott! Hot d(z)iggety! Good Heavens! Do tell! Lo and behold! Woe betide you! Christ’s foot! the jumping Moses! My aunt! dog my cats! Very like a whale! by Golly! Stone the wombats! Long live! Down with! Ye Gods and little fishes!*

*Good Lord* , I didn’t know you were upset about your change of job  
(Ch.Dickens.Thursday afternoons. Ch IX).

*Marry come up!* There are some people more jealous than I. (H.Fielding “Joseph Andrews part IV chapter I”)

Rachel: I got an “A”! Hot diggety dog! Henry: Good for you ( CAPIEC)

**2. Abusive InPhU, which express cruelty and rage only:** *Curse it! Starve the lizards! Go to hell! Dammit to hell! Goddammit! By the Lord Harry! Son of a bitch! Gee whiz! Hell’s bells! Dod burn!*

Hurstwood: “She has that property in her name” he kept saying himself. “What a fool trick it was. *Curse it!* What a fool move that was “. (T.D. Sister Carrie p 216)

*Goddamn (it)* , how much longer will it take? (CALD).

The effort sent her backward a few inches. “Son of a bitch, there has to be a real knock to this. Ahh...”

3)The InPhU, expressing confirmation –belief: *for goodness’ sake! I assure you! I swear! I bet! Mark my words! there you are! I told you! so there! Dog my cats! By thunder! By may fay! By George ! By god’s light! By good light! Upon my word! Upon my Sam(my)! Lord knows! By golly!*

“He says he’s married” said Winfred. “Whom to, *for goodness’ sake?*”(J. Galsworthy in Chancery pIII chIX)

You can go if you want to, but why don’t you think it over? *Lord knows*, I don’t want to stop you! (T.Dreiser Sister Carrie p 260)

*Upon my word* and honor, Captain Gills, it would be a charity to give me the pleasure of your acquaintance. (Ch.Dickens “Dombey and Son”)

“I’ll not do it” declared Mrs. Cowperwood emphatically. I’ll never do it never, *so there*. (Th.Dreiser the financiers ch LVI)

**4. The InPhU, which express volition, desire and command or imperative**

InPhU. As this group obtain the most part of InPhU, they are: *there, there! Let her go, Gallagher! Don’t give up the ship! Don’t push me! Don’t sweat it! Shake the lead out! Get off with you! Come off it! Come on! (be) on your way! Come and get it! Go chase yourself! Go fly a kite! Go jump in the lake! Hold your horses! Bite your tongue! Zip your lip! Keep your shirt on! Up with you! Sharp’s the word! Look alive!*

*Come on in, the water's fine! Draw it mild! Cut the comedy! Stop the music! Bag it! dig up! Dig in! hold hard!*

I phoned the hospital and found out that my brother was worse and I went up there and I was with him – when-“ *there, there*” he said. It’s going to be all right

(E.S.Gardner The Clue of the Forgotten Murder ch 16)

- I think I’m flunking algebra!
- *Don’t sweat it!* Everybody is having a rough time.
- Good grief! I just stepped on the cat’s tail, but I guess you heard (CAI p38)

*Sharp’s the word* or we’ll never do it (J.B.Priestly The good companions)

Why are you rushing off like that? *Hold hard!* I’ll be ready in a moment. (SPI)

5. **The InPhU, expressing the evaluation**, and this group is subdivided into two:

**Positive** evaluation: *well done! Bully for you! That takes the cake! Nice going! good job! A fine (pretty, nice) kettle of fish! Thumbs up!*

**Negative** evaluation: *Your granny (grandmother)! Tell it to the marines! That tears it!*

The proprietress was surprised at their paying or she was struggling with an effort to charge nothing, but she took the money in her thin cupped hand.” God be with you” she said. “ *Thumbs up!*” said Harold.(J.Lindsay. “we shall return” ch XV).

The climate is all right when it isn’t too dry and too wet – it suits my wife fine, but sir when they talk about making your fortune all I can say is *tell it to the marines*. (J.Galsworthy. Silver spoon)

When she had gone Soames reached for the letter “ a pretty kettle of fish” he muttered (J.Galsworthy)

“ What a performance!” cheered John. “*That takes the cake*” . (CAI p165).

6. The last group are considered the **InPhU, used in a certain social situations**:  
*More power to your elbow! Bottoms up! down the hatch! Here’s mud in your eye! Say cheese! Break a leg! Cheer up! My service to you! God bless you!Excuse me! So long! Good morning! I beg your pardon! More power to you! Take it easy! Touch the wood! Stand and deliver! God save you!*

Broadbent: my plan, sir, will be to take a little money out of England and spend it in Ireland. Tim: *More power to your elbow* (B.Shaw “John Bull’s other island” act I)

She sipped her wine. “Drink it all down. *Bottoms up!* Like this, see?” (S.Heym The Crusaders, book II)

Bill: The big show is tonight. I hope I don’t forget my lines.

Jill: *Break a leg*, Bill. Mark: I’m nervous about my solo. Bob: you’ll do great. Don’t worry. *Break a leg!* (CAmPh p 14)

*My service to you*, Mr. Morton he said filling one horn of ale for himself and handing another to his prisoner (W. Scott. Old Mortality).

Two men, who had been lurking among some copse, started up as she advanced and met her on the road in a menacing manner. “Stand and deliver” said one of them (W.Scott The heart of Midlothian) .

As for the InPhU in the Uzbek language, we gave the same semantic classification .  
**Emotive-expressive InPhU :** *Yo pirim! Yo Razzoq! Ana xolos! Xudoga shukur! Voy o’lay! Sarvari koinot! Oxiri voy! Kun yo’q! Sho’ri qursin! Suvday serob bo’ling! Ana bo’lmasa!*

**The InPhU, expressing confirmation, belief:***Inson emasman! Otimni boshqa qo’yaman! Gap tamom! Xudo haqqi! Chin so’zim! Qasam ichaman!*

**Abusive InPhU:** *Tuyog’ingni shiqillat! Ko’zing teshilgur !Ovozingni o’chir! Xudo ko’tarsin! Beti qursin!Og’z ingdan chiqib, yoqangga yopishsin! Ado bo’lgur!Qirchiningdan qiyilgur!*

**The InPhU, expressing volition, desire, command:***To’rt tomoning qibla! Yotib qolguncha, otib qol! Xudo ko’rsatmasin! Xudo asrasin! Xudo xayringni bersin! Boshing toshdan bo’lsin! Qarab tur! Yashasin!*

**Evaluative-expressive InPhU:** *Bo’rimisiz, tulkimisiz?!*

**Positive:** *Og’zingga moy! Gap yo’q! Qandingni ursin! Barakalla! Yashavor! Do’o’st!*

**Negative:** *Sadqai odam ket! Jin ursin!*

**The InPhU, used as etiquettes:** *Oq yo’l! Bor bo’ling! Xush endi! Xush kelibsiz! Xudo rahmat qilsin! Xudo shifo bersin!Rahmat! Sog’ bo’ling! Assalomu alaykum!*

We can add more Interjectional phraseological units to the range of these groups. The dissimilar property of Uzbek InPhU, we can witness, in some cases proverbs or saying turn into InPhU, such as *Cholni ko'rib bobom dema! Kalning nimasi bor? - temir tarog'i bor!* It is the result of the context, of course .

As for Russian InPhU, we find this classification relevant, having analyzed our collected examples.

**Emotive-expressive InPhU :** *Боже мой! Боже милостивый! Вот те на! Велика важность! Подумаешь! Вот чудеса! Вот вы где! Ага! Подумать только! Батюшки мои!*

**The InPhU, expressing confirmation, belief:** *Клянусь Богом! Честное слово! Видит Бог! Так то вот! Разрази меня гром! Без вас знаю! Ради бога!*

**Abusive InPhU:** *Чёрт побери! Чёрта с два! Чёрт возьми! Проклятие!*

**The InPhU, expressing volition, desire, command:** *Побойтесь Бога! Хватить лежать ! начинайте, обстановка благоприятствует! Руки прочь! Убирайтесь прочь! Успокойся!*

**Evaluative-expressive InPhU:**

**Positive:** *Жив курилка! Вот это здорово! Отлично! Чепуха!*

**Negative:** *веселенкая история! Хорошенькое дело! О чём задумаешь! Хорош гусь!!*

**The InPhU, used as etiquettes:** *За ваше здоровье! (пейте) до дна! Желаю успеха! Кошелёк или жизнь! До свидания! С лёгким паром!*

As the result of the research, six semantic groups of InPhU are defined: expressing emotion, volition, confirmation, evaluation, abusive, social etiquettes.

Thus , we may come across plenty of polysemantic InPhU like above- analyzed ones in the English languages. For instance: By Golly! By the Lord Harry! By Heaven! My aunt! Thanks God!

In conclusion , it's relevant to mention most InPhU assist to express our idea euphonically and figuratively.

## Conclusion

Interjections express emotions, feelings and attitudes of the human being to the outer world. They were investigated by a lot of scholars. For instance: A.V.Kunin, Vladimir Z.Jovanovic, Kaptyurova O., Sh.Rakhmatullaev, T.T.Ikramov and others. Sometimes interjections consist of one word, a phrase and sentence, in other words their structure is different. Firstly, A.V.Kunin included the InPhU into his classification of PhU. It was a noticeable contribution to the progress of phraseology. Approaching them from semantic point of view is also fruitful. In the research works by different authors, their classification is presented in a different way. As you get acquainted in the main part of the chapter, the Uzbek linguist T.T.Ikramov divided them into three, and the Ukrainian researcher Kaptyurova O.V. split them into these groups and some groups were subdivided by her then. Sh. Rakhmatullaev split them as exclamatory and emotive InPhU. Moreover, the polysemantic features of InPhU were explained by A.V.Koonin with examples in his “Theoretical course on phraseology”. While analyzing English, Uzbek and Russian examples, we witness it. As for structural and semantic properties of InPhU in these three languages, we come across similarities and dissimilarities as well. As for structural properties, we succeeded in discovering more than ten structures in all three languages. Noun+ Verb, Verb+ Verb, Adjective +Verb, Noun+ Noun, Pronoun+ Verb construction are universal constructions..But Verb+ Noun and phrases, which contain interjectional words structure are observed only in English and Russian languages, but not in Uzbek. And some constructions, as Pronoun+ Verb, Verb+ Pronoun+ Noun, Preposition+ Noun + Noun, Verb+Noun, Verb+ Preposition, Noun+ Preposition are peculiar to the English language only. As the result of semantic analysis of InPhU in English, Uzbek and Russian, six semantic groups have been identified.: emotive, volitional, abusive, confirmation, InPhU, used as etiquette units, evaluative InPhU. Within evaluative InPhU, positive and negative InPhU are clarified.Among these groups the most percentage of interjections is considered emotive and volitional InPhU in English, Uzbek and Russian.

### Chapter III. Linguocultural peculiarities of the Interjectional Phraseological Units in the English, Uzbek and Russian languages

#### 3.1. Cultural linguistics and its main notions

In the past fifty years or so, the overlapping interests of linguistics and other disciplines resulted in the setting up of new branches, sometimes popularly called 'hyphenated', to stress their interdisciplinary nature. Among them, some of the most prominent ones are psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, anthropological linguistics, sociolinguistics, text linguistics, cultural linguistics, cognitive linguistics, and applied linguistics, and it is primarily in some of these fields that we should look for the research focused on the relationship between language and extralinguistic elements which may be subsumed under the term '*culture*'. Defining culture or just providing references to at least some of the major literature dealing with it goes far beyond the aim of this paper. For our purpose it will suffice to quote a few dictionary definitions and point to the main elements of the relevant senses of the word. Thus, Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, as 5a/, defines culture as 'the integrated pattern of human knowledge, belief and behaviour that depends upon man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations'. Another usage in the same dictionary, stresses the social aspect of culture and defines it as 'the customary beliefs, social forms, and material traits of a racial, religious or social group'. The OED, in a similar vein, states that culture is 'a particular form, stage, or type of intellectual development or civilization in a society; a society or group characterized by its distinctive customs, achievements, products, outlook, etc.' It almost goes without saying that there can hardly be any learning or transmitting knowledge or intellectual development without language. Nor can a society or a group function without language.<sup>37</sup>

Combining the areas of study, language and culture, we come up with a seemingly ambiguous phrase 'language and culture studies'. Cultural Linguistics is a

---

<sup>37</sup>Biljana Mistic Ilic language and culture studies. Linguistics and Literature, 2004, p3

multidisciplinary area of research that explores the relationship between language, culture, and conceptualisation. This discipline is distinct from, but related to, cognitive linguistics, and is also related to other disciplines such as anthropology and cognitive psychology<sup>38</sup>.

In current time the relationship between language and culture is peculiar for linguistic investigations. It's important to draw the attention to that the language can be considered as the form of understanding, representing the outlook of the nation. And I.G.Olshanskiy confirmed that "the language – is a part of the culture, the main instrument of its acquisition and the owner of specific features of national mentality". The entrance or coming into existence of cultural linguistics, which aims at studying "interrelationship and interaction of language and culture" separates it from a range of scientific disciplines.

Actually, every language reflects, covers and sends some message, in which the spiritual, social and cultural life of the speakers of this language is embodied. In 1901, D.N.Ovsyaniko Kulikovskiy in his article under the name of "About the importance of scientific linguistics for psychological thinking" underlined fairly that "the word in any national language isn't just a word, coming to help people with expressing their idea and feeling. The function of the word in a national language is closely connected with the very process cognition". A.A.Potebnya confirmed that the "psychology of the nation should indicate the possibilities of different nations' characteristics and the structure of the languages as the trace of general laws of national life".

There's an ancient history in developing the problems of interrelationship between language and culture. In these lines, V.fon Gumboldt's opinion is worth mentioning particularly. In accordance with his idea: "the cognition of original life and inner structure of a particular language depends on the skill of realizing the features of national spirit completely".<sup>39</sup> On the basis of thesis of fast-moving "energetic

---

<sup>38</sup>[http://: google.com](http://google.com). Farzad Sharifian's theory on cultural linguistics

<sup>39</sup> М.К.Халикова Фразеология как выразитель национально культурной семантики канд. дисс Т.: 1999 с 15

linguistics”, the idea about that “national language possesses its style of appropriating the reality in nominating process, and therefore doesn’t only reflect but also form the outlook of the nation- speakers of the language. E.Sepir and L.Worfa said about the language :” The language has its own ambiance. The people, speaking in this language belong to some race, i.e some groups of human society, which is different from other groups with their specificities . Language doesn’t exist apart from the culture”.

The humanity always feel the power of the language , which is able to reflect the reality also. The word is considered to be a creative power in all cultures.

The language reflects the mentality of the nation – speakers of the nation and is included into the “culture”. But as “cultural phenomenon”, it’s remaining more unclear.V.N.Telia defined it with the term “cultural –marked connotations”, which is connected with the meaning of the word, which associates with etalon, stereotypes , symbols and etc. with the help of figurative motivation. E.O.Oparina also gave the similar idea , but used the term “cultural background”.

According to the ideas of those scholars, national-cultural semantics participates in all language levels :in phonetics, grammar, lexics and wordformation. E.Sapir wrote: ”Every language has its own unique collection of art expressions. The complex of special aesthetic factors are hidden within it - phonetic, rhythmical, symbolic , mythological ones, which don’t suit another different language. Study the phonetic system carefully and at first its dynamic features and you can say, what type of versification develops in it or what type of versification should develop and will develop later”.

The ambiguous phrase 'language and culture studies' is actually the title of an academic course which is offered at many universities, especially in the USA, and is, most unambiguously and undisputedly, devoted to the study of the relationship between language and culture. Mostly, it is an introductory course, a prerequisite for higher courses such as Linguistic Anthropology, Sociology or even Cognitive

Studies. The structure of the course may vary, as well as the particular points of emphasis, but they are chiefly comparative and examine the ways different cultures and languages represent, organize and express thought, knowledge and emotion, discussing topics that range from the culturally specific to the universal. In their more ambitious versions, these courses also offer a broader perspective on the importance of theories of language for explaining and understanding culture across multiple disciplines, including social and literary theories (to the extent they focus on culture and performance).

The language is closely related with the culture: it is formed in it, develops within it and expresses it. On the basis of this idea, a new science, linguoculturology, appeared. The term “linguoculturology” came into existence, in connection with phraseological research works by V.N.Teliya, Y.U.Stepanova, A.D.Arutyunova, V.A.Maslova and others. At the end of XXth century cultural linguistics began to occupy the place of country-study. Culture and language are considered the studying objects of cultural linguistics. If culture-study investigates self-consciousness of the human being about the nature, society, history, art and other spheres of their social and cultural life, and linguistics observes outlook, which is reflected and fixed in the language in the model of language world picture, thus language and culture are the studying objects of this science.

The language serves as gaining and saving cultural-significant information. In some units, this information for modern speakers is implicit or hidden, but it works in the level of cognition. The word “culture” is derived from Latin *colore*, which means upbringing, progress, since XVIII c. under this notion, everything, which appeared thanks to human activity is expressed. V.A.Maslova revealed the connections between language and culture:<sup>40</sup> Language is the fact of the culture, because: 1) it is the part of the culture, which we follow after our ancestors; 2) the main instrument, by which we form the culture; 3) l

---

<sup>40</sup> В.А.Маслова Лингвокултурология М.:2001 с59

language –most important from all phenomena of cultural system or if we want to understand the essence of the culture – science, religion, literature , then those should be accepted as codes.

Language is part of matrix of meanings, beliefs and values that extend beyond knowledge of grammar. Language is more than an individual possession, capability or „ instrument” that represents experience.”<sup>41</sup>

N.I.Jinkin stated: Language – is the content of the culture and its weapon, indeed , it’s our spirit , the reflection of culture; it expresses specific features of national mentality clearly. The language possesses the mechanism, which is able to open the sphere of cognition before humanity..

Phraseological units, considered one of the language units , reflecting the dynamic process of developing culture of the nation in its semantics, fix and send cultural features and stereotypes, etalons and archetypes from generation to generation.<sup>42</sup> Phraseologisms, according to F.I.Buslaev, - unique microworld, which contain ethical rules and healthy mind, expressed in short aphorisms, which are created by ancestors for descendants.”

Phraseology describes the fragment of language world picture. PhU is always addressed to the subject, i.e. they are not only for describing the world , and also for interpreting, evaluating and expressing subjective attitude to it. This very feature differs phraseologisms and metaphors from other nominative units.

V.N.Teliya writes that phraseological content of the language – it is “the mirror, in which linguocultural universals identify their national self- consciousness”. The inner form of majority of phraseologisms consists of the ideas, which give them cultural-national coloring. For example, Russian phraseologism *сбоку припеку* which means not necessary, extra part, which can’t be eaten, it sometimes appears while bread is being baked.

---

<sup>41</sup> Deborah Schiffrin . Approaches to discourse. Blackwell publishing. 1994 -2005 p412

<sup>42</sup>В.А.МасловаЛингвокультурологияМ.:2001 с82

Cognitive linguist Ronald Langacker has described language as “an essential instrument and component of culture, whose reflection in linguistic structure is pervasive and quite significant”. Similarly, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson have argued that cultural knowledge in the form of conventional images feeds into idioms based on metaphors. Moreover, complex categories are structured by experiential domains, which may be culture-specific (Lakoff 1987). These statements by influential cognitive linguistic theorists suggest that language is embedded in culture. Similarly, cognitive anthropologists have emphasized the cultural grounding of language and thought.

Language is a cultural activity and, at the same time, an instrument for organizing other cultural domains. Speakers take account of discourse situations, which are structured by culture. Paul Friedrich referred to this nexus of language and culture as *linguaculture* and Michael Agar called it *languaculture*. Language is shaped not only by special and general innate potentials, but also by physical and sociocultural experiences. It is the concurrence of language-as-culture and language-governed-by-culture that warrants an approach called *cultural linguistics* (Palmer 1996).

As Kurtyka pointed out, probably none of culture-specific models is radically new to language teachers. Many teachers focus on culture as an important component of their instruction. It is just that others have not put it all together within a theory of languaculture. Human minds are neuro-chemical networks governed by attentional and emotional processes. They are intentional and intersubjective. Language and gesture are highly coordinated symbolic actions of minds constrained by society, culture and history as well as neurophysiology. This is the holistic framework for cultural linguistics. Projects in applied cognitive linguistics commonly refer to the theory of attention and categorization, by focusing, for example, on cognitive constraints on schemas, basic concepts, prototypes, metaphors and complex categories. Projects in applied cultural linguistics focus on *cultural* constraints on the same metasemantic field.<sup>43</sup> One of the main notions of cultural linguistics is considered “*stereotype*”, which is described in Russian linguist V.A.Maslova’s

---

<sup>43</sup>Gary B.Palmer and Farzad Sharifian Applied cultural linguistics 2007p15

book “Linguoculturology” in detail. The phenomenon “stereotype” is investigated in the works of sociologists and linguists, ethnographers [U.Lippman, I.S.Konn, J.Kollen, Y.D.Apresyan and etc]. The notion „stereotype” was firstly used by U.Lippman in 1922, who considered it as ordered, schematic determiner of culture “world picture” in the human mind, which economizes its effort while perceiving the complex objects of the world. For perceiving the stereotype in such meaning, its two important features are defined—culture-determiner and is the tool of the economy of labor effort, and appropriately, language factor. It’s like that if the algorithm solution of mathematic task save human mind, the stereotypes “economize” the personality.

In cognitive linguistics and ethnolinguistics the term refers to the content of the language and culture, i.e. is understood as mental stereotype, which correlated with “naïve picture of the world”. Such understanding of the stereotype is met in the works of E.Bartminskiy and his school; language world picture and language stereotype is as part and whole, language stereotype is understood as a statement or several statements of the world, subjective determination of imagining the object. Nowadays, we consider language stereotype not only as the statement or several statements, but any fixed expression, consisting of some words, for example, fixed comparison, cliché and so on.: the complexion of the Caucasian is described grey as moon. The usage of such stereotypes facilitate and simplify the communication, economizing the energy of communicators. V.V.Krasnix divided stereotypes into two forms: stereotype-images and stereotype-situations. Examples for stereotype-images in Russian: a bee- toiler, hard-worker, a sheep- stubborn; for stereotype-situations: ticket- punch[komposter], stork-[cabbage]. Briefly saying, stereotype is a mental figure and its verbal covering. We are living in the world of stereotypes, binding us with culture. Stereotypes lie in the speech act of the speaker, we can deduce the geographic position, the resident’s culture and other aspects of his or her place with the help of the very process [speech].

An extremely significant role in the world picture representation is assigned to

culture relevant language units- linguoculturemes. Linguocultureme- is a complex, interlevel language unit, a dialectical unit of both linguistic and extralinguistic factors, the correlation between the form of a verbal sign, its semantic content and cultural sense. Most clear language features, in which the culture of the nation is reflected are encountered phraseologisms and paremii, metaphors, and symbols. For instance, mythology, archetypes, etalons, stereotypes, customs, rituals, religious beliefs. National-cultural peculiarities of PhU, metaphors, symbols are formed by means of cultural connotation. Moreover, the language isn't considered keeper of the culture, thus it's a dynamic process. The unit of the language – the word is considered only the signal, function of which – to improve human consciousness, to affect certain concepts<sup>44</sup>. The language is considered only the mechanism, which managed to code and interpret the culture. The real keepers or savers of the culture is considered texts. Not language, but text reflects the spiritual world of humanity. Especially the text is connected with culture, the text saves information about history, ethnography, national psychology, national behavior, shortly everything which cover the content of the culture.

---

<sup>44</sup> В.А.Маслова Лингвокультурология М.:2001 с111

### 3.2 Linguocultural features of the InPhU in English ,Uzbek and Russian

As a human being is growing and living in a certain ambiance , this ambiance influences on his or her nature, of course. A human being may change his or her character to positive and negative side under the influence of the social factors. And strong and stable nature keeps the human being connected with bad environment. Realizing occurring events and things through the language, studying them in a cognitive aspect, language and culture , traditions and customs, mentality, psychology, the mode of life, education and upbringing are considered the actual problems at present. These problems are studied especially while comparing and it is called “Comparative linguoculturology ”.

So, in this research this part is considered very pompous one. The task of this part is to investigate national, cultural and linguistic features of InPhU deeply. This one , of course, requires revealing the problems, connected with linguocultural and cognitive aspects, i.e. relation with culture. The function of denoting or nominating a certain thing in the language depends on its communicative objective. And interjectional PhU serve to make a colorful utterance, and to raise their expressiveness, emotiveness hugely. Speaking about the emotiveness, in the last years of the previous century, the Russian linguist V.I.Shakhovskiy established the emotiology branch of linguistic science , which is based on emotive categories. According to this branch of linguistics, the terms “emotionality” and “emotiveness” should be studied separately. Emotionality means the psychological characteristics of the person, the state and forming process of his or her emotional sphere. But emotiveness belongs to the linguistic property of word and sentences, and it causes to awake a certain feeling, sense (emotion) on the person. That’s why we should call emotive , not emotional interjectional PhU.

Before analyzing the collected examples, we have to mention D.Kristall’s idea. He took into the account that PhU are related with the special peculiarities,

belonging to the nation, the culture, the life, traditions and the psychology of the nation and called them “national idioms”<sup>45</sup>. And analyzing the InPhU from linguocultural point of view, we should take into consideration their etymological aspect too. A.V.Kunin in his research works studied phraseological units from the etymological point of view. He grouped PhU, having analyzed as the following:

1) The PhU, reflecting the English people’s traditions:

by bell – belonging to the one shape; book and candle- directly; this phrase is said after praying in the church; beat the air- to lose energy in vain, this phrase used to be said usually while shaking with the weapon as the sign of victory

2) Some phrases in the English language are related with writers’, investigators’ and prominent person’s names:

according to Corcor – right, ok! E. Corcor (1631-1675) is the author of arithmetic book. The admirable Crighton- scientist; used for male scientists, depends on the Scott scientist James Crighton in the XVI century.

3) the units, denoting beliefs, superstitions:

black sheep – the person, who brought misfortune to the family. In accordance with ancient tradition, black sheep was the symbol of devil.

4) And some PhU are related with historical events:

as well be hanged for a sheep as for a lamb- this one depends on hanging penalty for robbing a sheep according to the ancient English law.

This issue was also investigated in Russian scholar I.V. Arnold’s researches, which she carries out on PhU. According to her, PhU comes into existence in the systems of different communications and later moves or passes to general language. The main sources of emergence of PhU are encountered social-cultural life. For instance: to *blow off steam* is borrowed from technical sphere and means to expose one’s feelings and *to be at the sea* – no to know what to do, borrowed from sea sphere. from commercial sphere- *to be in low waters*- to remain without any money.

---

<sup>45</sup>Hakimova G. Zoonomik komponentli frazeologik birliklarning tahlili T.: 2008 b44

So, based on these facts , our task is to analyze the Interjectional Phraseological units from linguo-cultural point of view .

The English interjectional phraseological unit „ *tell it to the marines!*” means nonsense, rubbish , not trustful and the component *marine* (full form *horsemarines* ) in this PhU is used in English myths, it isn't an existing creature. The participation of “horsemarine” implies to the English mythology. But the Uzbek people use “*ertagingni yosh bolaga ayt* “ as to give this meaning, not as “*buni dengiz o'tliq qo'shiniga ayt* ”. Cause of using the word *child* (yosh bola) in Uzbek , a child is understood as a very innocent and trustful creature. a)The climate's all right when it isn't too dry or too wet- it suits my wife fine ,but ,sir when they talk about making your fortune all I can say is *tell it to the marines!* (J.Galsworthy. Silver Spoon)

In American English *break a leg!* is used to encourage a performer before a performance, traditionally it's bad luck to wish a performer good luck, so the performer is wished bad luck in hopes of causing good luck. But in our nation to wish, even to think about bad luck may lead to misfortune, so that *Omad yor bo'lsin!* *Sen buni albatta uddalaysan!* phrases like these are usually utilized as encouraging expressions.

b) Bill: The big show is tonight. I hope I don't forget my lines Jane: Break a leg, Bill (Common Amer. Phrases in everyday context p14).

*Queen Anne is dead !* in English means too old news. If somebody tells you about some event, which has already happened, as the reply to it, this phrase is used. In this InPhU it isn't difficult to notice the history of England is reflected. . Anne became Queen of England, Scotland and Ireland from 8March 1702 to 1 May 1707. Neither in Russian nor in Uzbek we can't give this InPhU with the component Queen Anne. Because she doesn't belong to these two nations' history or culture. Its equivalent in Russian is “*Открыл Америку!* “, but in the Uzbek language it has no special equivalent.

d) The most depressing *rumours* are about here as to the next production – Julius Caesar or some such obsolete rubbish. Will nothing persuade H.I that *Queen Anne is dead?* (B. Shaw, Ellen Terry and B. Sh. Correspondence).

*Marry come up!* is used in expressing indignation, surprise or contempt. Actually in XIV the name of the Virgin Mary was used as an oath<sup>5</sup>. According to the Bible, Mary (18BC- 41AD) was a Jewish woman, she is identified as the mother of Jesus through divine intervention. The religion of the English people is embodied in this PHU. In Uzbek it suits to *Yo tavba! Tavba qildim!* setcollocations which belong to the Muslim religion. But in its Russian equivalent, it isn't connected with religion we notice: “*вот те на!; подумаешь!*”.

d) *Marry come up!* There are some people more jealous than I. (H. Fielding, Joseph Andrew “)

“*My aunt*” is used for expressing surprise or amazement. Glancing at the origin of this interjection “*aunt*” is first recorded as being used as a mild exclamation in 1888, simply as “*my aunt*”. In English other expressions with the component “*aunt*” exist Aunt Sally, Aunt Edna, Aunt Emma, Aunt Fanny. This InPhU is derived from the names of holy and sacred aunts, whom one may come across while studying the religion. They were considered the saints. Later other variants of this InPhU came into existence, as “*My giddy aunt*”, “*my sainted aunt*” and etc.

*Upon my Sam(my)!* is used to express confirmation and the component *Sam* in this InPhU substitutes “the name of the God” or “God has heard” and here's under the word *Sam* the God is implied and is equal to “for the god's sake”. In Uzbek it corresponds to *Chin so'zim! Agar yolg'on gapirayotgan bo'lsam, Xudo ursin!* And in Russian: *честное слово! Даю слово, что..!*

If it comes to that. Well, *upon my Sammy!* You don't understand my feelings, let me tell you Veronica (A. Coppard Tales “That fellow Tolstoy”).

*The Jumping Moses*” is used for expressing indignation, surprise. The component “*Moses*” means (fl. c. 14th - 13th centuries BC), Hebrew prophet and lawgiver;

brother of Aaron. According to the biblical account, he was born in Egypt and led the Israelites across the desert toward the Promised Land. During the journey he was inspired by God on Mount Sinai to write down the Ten Commandments on tablets of stone (Exod. 20).

When Tuby and I go, then you go- how d'you know I'd want to go? *God's Jumping Moses, girl!*(J.B.Priestley. London)

*Thumbs up!* is an evaluative interjection and is used for expressing positive assessment and means “very good, Ok”. It's said that its origin is connected with gladiatorial contests of Ancient Rome and another fact that it is originated from entering Jean-leon Jerome's 1872 painting “Pollice Verso” and it's assessed by the crowd by thump up and thumb down. After then this gesture begin to internationalize and is widely used around the world, but in fact it belongs to the English nation and reflects their tradition. But while evaluating something positively Russian or Uzbek people may use this gesture, but this kind of InPhU doesn't exist in both languages' vocabulary.

The proprietress was surprised at their paying or she was struggling with an effort to charge nothing, but she took the money in her thin cupped hand. “God be with you” she said. “*Thumbs up!*” said Harold.(J.Lindsay. We Shall Return ch XV)

*A fine (pretty) kettle of fish!* is used ironically to show an unsuccessful deed, belonging to evaluative interjection according to our classification. The origin of it is so interesting: there was a kiddle device , which is well-known from the time Plantagenets(the dynasty in Britain ) to catch a fish. Royal officers had the perquisite to trap fish in kiddles, but poachers raided the traps of fish, frequently destroying the kiddles in the process . Possibly an official came upon a destroyed trap and exclaimed “that's a pretty kettle of fish” and its meaning “a pretty sorry state of affairs” and the phrase was born so. A little extract from the British history is embodied in this interjectional phrase.

When she had gone, Soames reached for the letter. “*A pretty kettle of fish*” he muttered (J. Galsworthy) .

An American InPhU “*Great Scott*” expresses surprise and pity. Here’s Scott is the name of American general Walter Scott (1786-1866), who was the candidate for Presidency of the USA. We witness the outstanding person’s name can be reflected in the content of idioms, exposing the history.

- “*Great Scott!* You bought a truck!” shrieked Mary.
- the water heater just exploded.
- *Great Scott!* What do we do now!

Observing the Uzbek InPhU, we can witness such geographic, historical and religious factors. In the Uzbek language *Xizrni yo ’qlasak bo ’lar ekan!* is used when you are speaking about somebody , he or she appears at that moment. The component *Xizr* is the name of the saint in the Muslim religion , and it’s said if somebody sees *Xizr* , he or she will have good luck. But in English its analogue is *talk of the devil and he will appear* and here is totally different expression. In Uzbek the *devil* (*shayton*) is a very derogatory and insulting word towards the human being. So that in any case it’s not relevant to use *devil* in the Uzbek language.

The Uzbek InPhU “*To ’rt tomoning qibla!*” is used for saying to somebody that he or she is free where to go or for expelling somebody. It expresses indignation.

Analyzing it, in Islam religion “qibla” is considered the only side, where the sun sets (the West), and looking at this side the Muslim people pray. “qibla” can’t be all four Poles. In this InPhU the culture of the Uzbeks finds its reflection.

Or “*Tuyog ’ingni shiqillat*” is used to express indignation and for driving somebody away. We know “tuyoq” (hoof) belongs to only animals and cattle, and cause of using “tuyoq ”(hoof) instead of “oyoq”(foot) is that in ancient times and also still, of course, the Uzbek people are engaged in cattle breeding. So that, the meaning “oyoq” is moved to “tuyoq” in figurative meaning ironically. And it hints the Uzbek people are dealing with cattle from ancient times.

“*Ko'zing teshilgur!*” InPhU is considered an abusive one. This is used for expressing rage and anger and it is very rude one. It is used if one stares or looks at somebody, something wrong will happen with that person. Moreover, in the Uzbek nation, a newborn baby is saved from the glance of unknown people. They say, an eye has the power, which can do people harm. This PhU is used while somebody is staring at you or your belongings, and you're angry with him or her. It means somebody's glance influences your activity badly. This attitude is reflected in this InPhU and it is connected with superstition and belief.

In the Uzbek language there are several InPhU, used for asking help from the God. Instead of the God, the names of pirs (religious word, name of saints) are used. For instance: *Yo Razzoq! Yo Hakim! Yo Pirim!* These three InPhU are connected with the religion and history of the Uzbeks. The word “Pir” is used in the meaning of “Saint” and in addition to that, this word also means “religious master” or “leader”. And dwelling on the second InPhU “*Yo Hakim*”, the component “*Hakim*” (985-1021) was the caliph, being from the dynasty of Fotimiys. During his reign, he pursued Christian and Jewish people and also expelled Sunnite Muslims too. He announced that “the Allah” was embodied in his body in 1017. They say, he disappeared secretly while going for a walk. Including that “Razzoq” is also considered one of the caliphs, who contributed to the progress of the Muslim religion. Thus, their names are kept in the nation's language, revealing their religion and history.

One more InPhU “*Og'zingga moy!*” is used for good evaluation. Here's the component “moy” is meant “the fatty part of the meat”. Glancing at the history, meat is consumed by the Uzbeks so much and was encountered the best meal. Ordinary people didn't manage to eat meat as much as they want. The meat was prepared while inviting some honorable guests. The fatty part of the meat was very tasty and was consumed with big appetite. So that the word “moy” is used for good evaluation or when somebody brings very good news, it is said as a praise. If you remember in English the very meaning is given with “this takes the cake”, but in Uzbek differently. The traces of the ancient mode of life was presented here.

Concluding our Uzbek InPhU analysis, besides linguistic factors, extralinguistic factors, such as historical, religious, cultural ones also play the important role in realizing InPhU. They assist to demonstrate the nation's culture as well.

In the Russian language “*Батюшки мой!*” expresses surprise and amazement. It is an equivalent to “*Goodness*” “*Mother of God*”, in the English language. Analysis of the word “Батюшки” shows that, it is considered the colloquial form of “father” in the Russian language and moreover in the history the priest was addressed with the very word in the Christian orthodox church.

“Держи карман шире!” expresses negative emotion or fully describing, used to inform somebody that his/her hopes are in vain. In the Russian language the word “карман” which means “pocket” denoted any kind of sack or bag in XVII-XIX centuries, which pinned to the clothes from outside. And also this kind of pockets could be fastened on the saddle of horses. According to the demand or requirement this pocket can be broadened. And at present, this idiom is used for denoting mocking-ironical meaning. “Какой же я олух!- воскликнул он, - на какую попался! Кабы ты проиграл, стал бы ты себе простреливать руку- как же, держи карман! “(Тургенев. Отрывки из воспоминаний своих и чужих).

“Кишка тонка!” is an expression, used when somebody is short of energy, power, and is not able to do something. It is considered an encouraging PHU. This expression is considered pure Russian and came into existence under the opinion that any difficulty or trouble can do harm or overstrain intestine. From the medical point of view while coming across the difficulty may cause prolapsus of the rectum. “Вот мы на заводе делаем трактора для вас. Бедняку и середняку-одиночке купить трактор слабо: кишка тонка!”(ШолоховПоднятаяцелина).

«Жив курилка!», this expression began to be used towards the people since recent period, for those, who finished their activity and disappeared somewhere died. But actually, they are alive and deal with former affair. It expresses strong surprise and amazement. Its origin is connected with old Russian game under the name “Kurilka”,

which is translated into English “smoker”. This game was played in the XIX century. The rule of the game is as the following: the members of the game made circle and according to turn in the circle they have to hand burning or smoking splinter or straw to one another of course with the condition of singing a song, (жив, жив Курилка, жив, жив, не умер Жив, Жив Курилка- ножки тоненьки, а жить так хочется) in succession. If the splinter is quenched or put out in a certain player, that one is loser of the game. So, the national Russian game is reflected in this InPhU. “Я так давно к вам не писал, что вы можете меня почитать умершим. Но еще жив курилка!” (Жуковский, письмо А.Ф. Бриггену). Another Russian InPhU “Куча Мала” is also encountered the extract from old Russian national game.

“*Черта с два*” is used to express categorical negation and disagreement. In the English language “черт” is translated as “devil”. And in Russian number two is encountered dangerous, devilish, which is associated with death. It is believed that the same two or double things may bring bad luck or death. And if the hen lays two eggs a day, it means that one of the members of the family may die. And they say, the devil can be beaten only once and two times it is beaten it will revive and even redouble. That’s why this attitude is embodied in the InPhU “*Черта с два*” expressing negative emotion. – Домой? да ! Черта с два! Почему мне знать дорогу? (Пушкин, Гусар)

It is not secret to us that being one of the language unit , phraseological units are also connected with non-linguistic or extra-linguistic factors. These extra-linguistic factors are differentiated while analyzing what kind of PhU , we are comparing. For example, the PhU, which express the appearance or character of the human being is more related with geographical and cultural factors.

So, in our research work, on analyzing English InPhU , we come across the following extra-linguistic factors:

**Religious factors** have been related with these InPhU: *By the Lord Harry! By George! By Golly! Ye Gods and little fishes! Go to Jericho! Hell’s bells! God’s*

*blood! Good Lord! My aunt! God bless you! The jumping Moses! Upon my Sammy! Holy mackerel! Lord knows! By God's light! Honest to God! Marry come up! Good heavens! (To)hell with that!*

- 1) The dog stopped, on the point a forepaw held up. “*By Golly*”, he’s hit a scent. Come on! Squealed Kennicott (S. Lewis Main Street).
- 2) *Good Heavens*, no! We are not in love with one another (B.Shaw “An Unsocial Socialist” chXVI)
- 3) You didn’t do it and you don’t intend to and *by the Lord Harry*, I want to know why! (Norris the Octopus ch.IV)
- 4) Do you know anything about books? Yes, Sir I am a good bookkeeper. “*Holy Moses!*”. Our job is getting rid of them. My firm are publishers. (J.Galsworthy White Monkey part 2)
- 5) *Marry come up!* There are some people more jealous than I. (H.Fielding “Joseph Andrews” p IV ch I).

**Historical factors** have been defined while analyzing the following InPhU : *Hold your horses! A pretty kettle of fish! Great Scott! Queen Anne is dead!*

- 1) The most depressing rumors are about here as to the next production – Julius Caesar or some such obsolete rubbish. Will nothing persuade Henry I. that *Queen Anne is dead?* ( B.Shaw “Ellen Terry” and B.Sh.Correspondence)
- 2) Martin was furious... declaring that he would resign- would denounce- would expose.. “Wait a minute. *Hold your horses*” (S.Lewis Arrowsmith)
- 3) – “*Great Scott!* You bought a truck!” shrieked Mary . – The water heater just exploded! – *Great Scott !* What do we do now?
- 4) **Mythological factors** have been clarified: *tell it to the marines !let her go, Gallagher!*
- 1) The climate’s all right when it isn’t too dry or too wet – it suits my wife fine, but sir when they talk about making your fortune all I can say *is tell it to the marines.*
- 2) Come on, boys, come on! And let her go Gallagher” he called to the band (H.S.Prichard the Roaming Nineties ch 48)

Like that , Uzbek InPhU cover some non-linguistic factors :

- 1) Religious factors** have been defined: *Xudo olsin! Xudo ko'rsatmasin! Xudoga shukur! Xudo xayringni bersin! Xudo asrasin! Xudo rahmat qilsin! Sarvari koinot! Xudoga shukur! Xudo shifo bersin! Yo pirim! To'rt tomoning qibla! Yo Razzoq! Yo Hakim!*
- 1) Ikksidan birini tanlang,- dedi Oyoqiz qat'iyat bilan , - yo ketmon, yo to'rt tomoningiz qibla, boshingiz qaysi tomonga og'sa, o'sha tomonga jo'nang. (Sh.Rashidov Bo'rondan kuchli)
  - 2) *Xudoga shukur*, ko'rpa yostig'im ham yetadi.Dam iliq, dam sovuq tancham bor. Yo'qni yo'ndiramiz, bu ayni maslahat. (Oybek Qutlug' qon)
  - 3) Agar bu kasallik mahalliy xalqqa ham yuqsa bormi, *Xudo ko'rsatmasin*, ana unda ko'rasiz qiyomatni.... (K.Yashin, Hamza)
  - 4) Yo pirim! Sharmanda qilma (bitta-bitta ketadilar) (Hamza.Tanlangan asarlar)

**2)Mode of life factors:** *Og'zingga moy! Tuyog'ingni shiqillat! Suvday serob bo'ling!*

- 1)Uning aytishicha , Zunnunxo'ja quloq qilinibdi! Sidiqjon yalt etib unga qaradi: - Rostmi? Yashang-e, Og'zingga moy! (A.Qahhor Qo'shchinor)
- 2)Qani, tuyog'ingizni shiqillatib qoling! (X.G'ulom Mash'al)

And as for the Russian language,the following extra-linguistic factors belong to:

**1)Religiousfactors:** *Батюшки мои! Не приведи господи! Не дай бог! Что за дьявол! Вот те Христос! Вот тебе крест! Черта с два! Черт возьми! Черт подери! Видит бог! С нами крестная сила!*

- 1) Если при моем возвращения, я найду что твой милый, простой, аристократический тон изменился, разведусь, вот те Христос и пойду в солдаты. (Пушкин, Письмо)
  - 2) Как она хороша, боже мой! И какая язвительная красота! (Гончаров Обрыв)
  - 3)-ну- черт с тобой! И стекольщик исчез, не обидев Евсея своим ругательством (М.Горький Жизнь ненужного человека)
- 2) Traditional factors:** Куча мала! Жив курилка!

1)Когда кричали: «мала куча», то это означало, что кого-нибудь по волили на пол, на этого другого, потом третьего и т.д.(Помяловский).

2)-Ба, жив курилка!- засмеялся губернатор.- Господа, поглядите, наша городская голова идёт. Чехов, Мороз.

**3)Mode of life factors: Мокрая курица!**

Какой вы господин? Вы, сударь, просто мокрая курица. Сидите себе сиднем целый божий день. ( Тургенев, Путешков.)

**4)Historical factors: Держи карман шире!**

Какой же я олух!- воскликнул он,- на какую удочку попался! Кабы ты проиграл, стал бы ты себе простреливать руку- как же держи карман !  
(Тургенев , Отрывки из воспоминаний)

Comparative- typological analysis of InPhU in the English, Uzbek, Russian languages with the aim of defining national- cultural properties of the collected materials indicated that on the basis of national-cultural features of InPhU, in most cases the following extralinguistic factors lie:

1. Historical factors: the names of historical person, or important events are preserved in the components of InPhU.
2. Religious factors: The religion of the nation is embodied in these language units. We have witnessed it in the content of numerous examples.
3. Traditional factors: Different customs, games, modes of life are represented in these three nation's interjections.
4. Literary factors: the title of famous literary works or the names of the heroes or heroines are preserved in the components of InPhU

In this line it's relevant to pin down V.A.Maslova's opinion that phrase-logical units assist to represent the nation's culture, tradition, myth, history and religion and etc. Actually, the InPhU in all three compared languages are specific to the nation, which they belong to. In this case, one actual task is to be very careful while translating these InPhU, for instance, the InPhU "Queen Anne is dead" is not given into Uzbek or Russian word by word translation. They are interpreted according to

the nation's culture, religion and history. Or InPhU "My Aunt" is not translated as "Moya tyotya" or "mening xolajonim". They are not meaningful in both Uzbek and Russian. Here's the "Aunt" has the traces of the saints of the English people, who don't exist in the Russian and Uzbek religion. All the extra-linguistic factors, discovered during the research belong to cultural factors . Religious, historical and literary factors belong to the English language. Religious and mode of life factors have been discovered in the Uzbek InPhU. Religious, historical, traditional factors have been defined while analyzing Russian InPhU.

As Deborah Schiffrin stated in his book " Approaches to discourse" , "language is part of matrix of meanings, beliefs and values that extend beyond knowledge of grammar. Language is more than an individual possession, capability or „ instrument" that represents experience."<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> . Deborah Schiffrin . Approaches to discourse. Blackwell publishing. 1994 -2005 p412

## Conclusion

It is not obscure to anybody, at the late of the XXth century and the beginning of XXI century, new sciences begin to come into existence in the field of linguistics, such as cultural linguistics, cognitive linguistics, which deals with the relation between language and humankind. In current time there are a lot of very actual research works, devoted to these sciences. In these sciences we witness the facilities of the language. One always feel the power of the language, which is able to reflect not only the world, but also reality. A word, existing in every culture has an independent creative power. And it does not appear just. The language is closely related with the culture: it is formed in it, develops within it and express it. Cultural linguistics is studied in the phraseological research works by V.N.Teliya, Y.U.Stepanova, A.D.Arutyunova, V.A.Maslova and others. And this chapter, devoted to cultural linguistics and analysis to define cultural properties of InPhU in three languages is considered the most actual part of our research work.

Phraseological fund of the language is closely connected with the culture of the nation. It was stated by A.V. Maslova. She is the author of the book “Linguoculturology”. And one more scholar D.Crystal emphasized that Phraseological units are called as “national idioms”. Relying on more than 500 collected phraseological units, we attempt to reveal cultural properties of InPhU in English, Uzbek and Russian. While analyzing, the componential method is broadly used. And as the result of this method, we managed to expose the history, tradition, customs and holidays, mode of life or saying with one word the nation’s culture. As the proof of our statement, we can present the followings as a sample: the usage of *Queen Anne*, saints’ name, as *George, Lord Harry*, and moreover presence of *horsemarine, aunt, granny* denote the culture of the nation. And on the basis of InPhU, some non-linguistic factors are found, such as historical, religious, traditional and others. Thus, every language unit serves to demonstrate the culture.

## Summary

At the end of XX century and the beginning of XXI century we can witness remarkably much novelties in all spheres, particularly in linguistics. Cognitive linguistics, cultural linguistics and other linguistic sciences emerged, and deal with studying the relationship between the language and culture. In current time this issue is being more actual one. Our research has dealt with two sciences: phraseology, and cultural linguistics. Modern studies have reported the influence of human factors on language, when the content of linguistic units expanded and enriched emotional components. It is admitted that "language has the heart," but also the "heart has language" one and in order to express emotional experiences and feelings in every language formed special means capable of reflecting the emotional state of the person, to recreate the language picture of the world and the sensory element of objective reality - human.

Idiom is one of the linguistic means of reflection of reality, and the identity of their value lies in the fact that it "regularly than lexical meaning, is used for outer characteristics and enhanced individual and subjective assessment of the facts for the transmission and expression of the emotional state of the speaker. A complicated informative, evaluative element, imagery and other signs of phraseologisms make them "tough nut to crack" for researchers.

Based on the notions of these sciences we have tried to expose the essence of our research work. Mainly during our research work, we dwell on a lot of scholars' ideas on this issue: V.V.Vinogradov, A.V.Kunin, A.Makkai, V.A.Maslova, Farzad Sharifian, Sh.Rakhmatullaev, T.T.Ikramov, E.Kaptyurova, Z.Ivanovic, and others. First of all it is necessary to clarify once again that a phraseologism is valuable. To do this, probably should take into account the fact that "idioms have a special, compared with the word, a specific value, this value (phraseological) is so distinctive than more specific turnover"

This research work also deals with making the basis of interjectional phraseological units . Making contrastive analysis of interjectional phraseological units of different languages (English, Uzbek and Russian) and identifying cultural , semantic , and structural peculiarities are really of great importance. Because , the interjectional phraseological units serve not only to express our emotions, feelings, attitudes to a certain degree but is also considered as one of the factors to determine national – cultural specificity.

- The importance of the research work is laid at this point ; giving interjectional phraseological units in the same meaning in both languages and while analyzing them ,finding out cultural-national features of Interjectional phraseological units forms the significance of the research work. During uncovering and catching the essence of the research work , the connections between the sciences( cultural linguistics , cognitive linguistics , lexicology , phraseology , linguistics ) become more transparent and of course , relying on scholars' ideas. The topicality of the research work is to analyze the English ,Russian and Uzbek interjectional phraseological units , which are included in this work at first from linguistic and then cultural linguistics point of view.

The basic part of the research work is based on some scholars' ideas. At first Koonin's , Amosova's , Arnold,, V.V.Vinogradov, V.A,Maslova and Farzad Sharifian, , Adam Makkai's and etc. Classification of phraseological units were given by a number of linguists , but only Koonin gave the interjectional words as separate type of phraseological units . According to him , interjectional phraseological units also serve to communication ,which can express positive , negative or , saying in a word, evaluative thinking. And moreover , in Uzbek interjectional words are accepted as a separate part of speech and divided into several types according to what meaning they express. The above-mentioned scholars' ideas on cultural linguistics are also dwelled on in theoretical part of the research work .

Main part uncovers the characteristics of interjectional phraseological units , given in the RW in English , Russian and Uzbek , by analyzing deeply . Firstly ,

chosen examples are studied from linguistic point of view, in other words, semantic and structural properties have been exposed as well. And the second step is contrastive analysis, finding out equivalents of those interjectional phraseological units, having the cultural – national features, which form the essence of the paper. To find the answer of the question, why in the Uzbek language it is expressed so, and in English different, although they denote the same meaning. At this point cultural linguistics deals with these kind of „questions”. Phraseology Each language reflects, captures and transmits the content, which in varying degrees, back to the conditions of spiritual, social and cultural life of the people - a native speaker. In 1901 D.N. Ovsyaniko - Kulikovskii in the article "On the Significance of scientific linguistics psychology of thought" rightly emphasized that "the words of any language - it does not pacifiers, coming to the aid of people who can not express their thoughts and feelings. Functions of words in national languages" are closely related with the process of knowledge." A.A. Potebnya argued that "the psychology of the people must show the possibilities of different national characteristics and the structure of language as a consequence of the general laws of national life." Statement of the problem of interaction of language and culture has a long history. Thus, the similarities and dissimilarities of interjectional phraseological units in three languages get revealed.

- In conclusion, it's relevant to emphasize that both linguistic and cultural differences play an important role in the linguistic field. However, the research works devoted to phraseology or cultural linguistics can be found, but the work, which cover the very two sciences and relying on the theoretical materials, analyzing the Uzbek, Russian and English examples contrastively may be found rarely. Therefore, this paper made an investigation on this issue to discover some specificities of interjectional phraseological units in English, Russian and Uzbek.

As a result of dissertation paper, we came to this conclusion while analyzing to find the structural features of InPhU in three languages:

- Noun+ Verb, Verb+ Verb, Adjective +Verb, Noun+ Noun, Pronoun+ Verb constructions. But Verb+ Noun and phrases, which contain interjectional words structure is observed in the English and Russian languages , but not in Uzbek. And some constructions ,as Pron+ Verb , verb+ pronoun+ noun, Preposition+ noun + Noun, Verb+Noun, verb+ preposition, noun+ preposition are peculiar to the English language only.

Adverb+ Verb, Noun+ Interjection, Noun+Noun+Verb, Interjection+ noun+verb, Noun+Noun+Noun, modal word + verb, noun+ modal word constructions are found only in Uzbek. Modal word constructions are found only in this language during our observation.

In the Russian language we can observe Verb+ adverb, verb+ preposition, noun+ adverb, Pronoun+ noun, noun+ pronoun structures. In all three compared languages we managed to discover more than ten different structures.

- About semantic properties , during our investigation, we succeeded in finding six semantic groups. They are : the InPhU, which express emotion, evaluation, confirmation, abusive, etiquette, command or volition.

- As for national-cultural properties of InPhU, we witness even in InPhU of the language ,the nation's culture, tradition, history are reflected the analysis of InPhU, religious, historical, traditional, mode of life factors.

So, it's relevant to emphasize that interjectional phraseological units as the language unit serve to express emotional state of a human being, and besides that reflect national-specific properties of the certain nation.

### Bibliography:

1. I.A.Karimov. "Yuksak ma'naviyat – yengilmas kuch" T.:2008
2. И.А.Каримов Узбекистан по пути углубление экономических реформ. Т.:1995
3. Алефиренко, Н. Ф . Лингвокультурология : Ценностно-смысловое пространство языка . М.: Флинта, 2010, с288
4. Амосова Н.Н. Основы английской фразеологии. Л.:ЛГУ, 1961 с 207
5. Arnold I.V.The English word. М.: Просвещение, 1966- 342р
6. Антрушина Г.Б. , Афанасьева, Морозова Н.Н. Лексикология английского языка М.:2004 стр 287
7. Азизова. Ф Фразеологизмларни таржима қилиш муаммолари. Илмий-амалий анжуман материаллари. Т.: 2007
8. Ахмаджонова. Д Фразеологизмларнинг хусусиятлари. Фразеологизмлар таржимаси таржимашуносликда энг қийин масала. Т.:2007
9. Bell R. Translation and Translating .Theory and practice. London/NewYork:Longman.1991
10. Biljana Mistic Ilic. Language and culture studies- Wonderland through the linguistic looking glass. Facta Universitatis Linguistics and literature Vol3 2004 pp15
- 11.Виноградов Виктор Владимирович. Русский язык. „Высшая школа» М.: 1972 с 615.
- 12.ВежбицкаяА. Язык. Культура.Познание.- М.: Русские словари,1997.- с 404
- 13.Воркачев С.Г. Лингвокультурология. Языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании . Филологическиенауки. М.: 2001.
14. Deborah Schiffrin . Approaches to discourse. Blackwell publishing. 1994 -2005 pp470
- 15.Dreiser Th. Sister Carrie. Higher School Publishing House. М.^ 1968, pp593

- 16.. Farzad Sharifian, Gary B.Palmer . applied cultural linguistics: implications for second language learning and intercultural communication. John Benjamins Publishing company 2007 pp187
- 17.Икрамов Таир Туляганович. Фразеологические единицы с фиксированным глагольным компонентом в императиве в современном английском языке . Автореферат канд. Дисс .М.:1978
18. Каптюрова, Елена Вячеслова . Междометия современного английского языка . Автореферат канд. Дисс. Киев 2005 с21
- 19.. Кунин А. В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. Дубна, Феникс, 2005
- 20..Halliday . M.A.K and Collin Yallop Lexicology. A short introduction. London. New york 2007 p118
- 21.Louise O.Vasvari. Adam Makkai: Polyglot linguist, Poet and Literary Translator Between Languages. Special dedication essay. АНЕА. Vol6 2013 pp6
- 22.Muminov O. Lexicology of the English language. Т.: Мехрдапё, 2008, pp161
- 23.Richard Hudson . language networks: the new word grammar. Oxforduniversitypress 2007 pp 275
24. Панжиева Насиба Нармахматовна . Когнитивный аспект оценочных номинации лица в английском и узбекском языках. Т.: 2004 с 149
- 25.Реимов Б.Х. Фразеологические единицы английского языка характеризующие эмоциональное состояние человека. Т.:2005 с161
- 26.SlyshkinG.G. От текста к символу :лингвокультурные концепты прецедентных текстов в сознании и дискурсею-М., 2000
- 27.Shedroff N. “An overview of understanding’in Information Anxiety2 by Richard saul Wurman.Indianapolis 2001
- 28.Steef Ann Holm. Snowbird. Pocket books. 194, pp375
- 29.Tim Ifill. Seeking the nature of Idioms.A study in idiomatic structure. Haverford College 2002 pp30
- 30.VejbitskayaA. Пониманиякультур через посредство ключевых слов.-М: Языки словянской культуры, 2011

31. Vorkachov S.G. Методологические основания лингвоконцептологии. Воронеж-2002
32. William J. Sullivan. Some logical consequences of Makkai's "Idiomaticity as a language universal" pp154
33. Халикова, Мохира Кундибаевна .канд. дисс. Т.: 1999 с142
34. Ҳақимова Г.Э, Зоонимик компонентли фразеологик бирликларнинг таҳлили (инглиз тили материали асосида) .Т.:2008

### **The English language dictionaries:**

35. Onions C.T. The oxford dictionary of English Etymology. Oxford University Press 1966
36. CIDI- Cambridge International Dictionary of English. Cambridge University Press, 1996
37. Richard A.S. Common American Phrases in everyday contexts. MC Graw Hill-2003 p302
38. WEUD- Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language .New York: Gramery Books, 1996
39. DECI – Dictionary of English colloquial Idioms./ Ed.by F.T.Wood,- London: The Macmillian Press LTD, 1979
40. Macmillian English dictionary for Advanced learners. Second Edition.- Macmillian Publishers Limited, 2007, pp1748
41. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Boston^ Edited by makkai William-publ. By Hangton miff lin. Company, 1979, pp 780

### **The Russian language dictionaries**

42. А.В.Кунин .Большой англо-русский фразеологический словарь. М. «Русский язык» 1984
43. Молотков А.И. Фразеологический словарь русского языка. М.:1967 с543

44. Лубенская АСТ. Большой русско-английский фразеологический словарь. М.:2004

### **The Uzbek language dictionaries**

45. Шавкат Раҳматуллаев. Ўзбек тилининг фразеологик луғати. Т.:1978 б
46. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati: besh jildli, 80000 so'z va so'z birkmasi. Tahrir hay'ati E.Begmatov, A.Madaliyev, N.Mahkamov, T.Mirzayev (rahbar) va boshq..- Т.: “O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi”, Davlat ilmiy nashriyoti – 2007
47. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati: ikkitomli, 60000 taso'z va so'z birkmasi. // S.F. Akobirov, T.A. Aliqulov, S.I. Ibrohimov avab. // Z.M. Ma'ruf ovtahriri ostida. “Rus tili” nashriyoti, -M; 1981

### Internet websites:

48. [www.wikipedia.com](http://www.wikipedia.com)
49. [www.onlinedictionaries.com](http://www.onlinedictionaries.com)
50. [www.ref](http://www.ref).
51. [www.google.com](http://www.google.com)
52. [Kubsta.Ru/docs/lingvoconcept/lingvocult](http://Kubsta.Ru/docs/lingvoconcept/lingvocult)