

**O‘ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI  
OLIV VA O‘RTA MAXSUS TA‘LIM VAZIRLIGI**

**NAMANGAN DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI**

**«Himoyaga ruxsat etildi»  
Ingliz filologiyasi fakulteti dekani,**

\_\_\_\_\_ p.f.n. S.Misirov

«\_\_» \_\_\_\_\_ 2019 y.

**5120100 – Filologiya va tillarni o‘qitish (ingliz tili)  
ta‘lim yo‘nalishi bitiruvchisi**

**UMARXANOVA NIGORA UMARJON QIZINING**

**“THE SEMANTICS OF FLORA IN PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS  
AND ITS PROBLEM IN TRANSLATION INTO UZBEK”**

**mavzusidagi**

**BITIRUV MALAKAVIY ISHI**

**«Himoyaga tavsiya etildi»**

**Ingliz tili va adabiyoti  
kafedrasi mudiri**

\_\_\_\_\_ o‘qit. B.Soliev

«\_\_» \_\_\_\_\_ 2019 y.

**BMI rahbari: Ingliz tili va adabiyoti**

**kafedrasi katta o‘qituvchisi**

\_\_\_\_\_ Yo.Nazarova

«\_\_» \_\_\_\_\_ 2019 y.

**Namangan – 2019**

**CHAPTER 1. BASIC CONCEPTS OF LINGUOCULTURAL STUDIES. PHRASEOLOGICAL UNIT AS ONE OF THE OBJECTS OF ITS STUDY**

**1.1. Anthropocentrism - a new paradigm in linguistics**

**1.2 Cultural linguistics as part of anthropological linguistics**

**1.3 Fundamental concepts of cultural linguistics**

**1.4. Idiom as an object of study**

**CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTER 1**

**CHAPTER 2. ENGLISH PHRASEOLOGY WITH FLORISTIC COMPONENT**

**2.1. Phrase formative phraseological units with floristic component**

**2.2. The value of phraseological units with floristic component**

**2.3. Evaluation as a component of phraseological meaning units**

**2.4. Expressiveness of phraseological units with floristic component**

**2.5. Use of phraseological units with floristic component when learning**

**English**

**CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTER 2**

**General conclusion**

**Bibliography**

## **Introduction**

**The actuality of the work.** The focus of many modern works on linguistics is a person. This approach involves learning the language from the point of view of the interaction of man and language, their influence on each other. It is impossible to imagine a person without language, just as a language outside a person - their connection is inseparable. Language is one of the basic properties of man, the most important tool for his cognitive activity. The formation of a picture of the world takes place in the process of interaction between the world and man, through the interrelations of language and thinking. Language is closely connected with knowledge and is the main subject of cognitive linguistics.

Of particular interest are studies in the field of phraseology, because the phraseological foundation of a language mainly affects precisely those aspects of reality that are associated with a person, his psychological, emotional, and physical characteristics.

In addition, the phraseological foundation of the language is a reflection of the national culture, it manifests the peculiarity of this or that people, its stereotypes, the way of figurative thinking of people, the specificity of their world view and psychology.

In all languages, the basis of many phraseological units are the names of plants, as well as everyday realities associated with the world of flora. Phraseological units (FE) with a floristic component reflect the centuries-old human observations of the world of flora, convey the attitude of people to this area of reality. Thus, the phraseological composition of each language clearly conveys the main features of the national culture and worldview of the people.

The totality of a person's knowledge of the world is "a picture of the world" in a broad sense, and the position of a person in this case will be formulated as a world view, which is a system of a person's attitudes and beliefs that are formed throughout his life.

Speaking of phraseology with a floristic component, it should be noted that the term “floristic” is used in our work in a broad sense, denoting any plant component included in a phraseological unit.

Thus, the relevance of our research is due to the important role of plants in human life, which is reflected in the language.

Based on the above, we have defined the goal, objectives, object and subject of research.

**The aim of our study** is to study the linguistic and cultural characteristics of English phraseology with a floristic component and further analysis of phraseological units with this component.

To achieve this goal it is necessary to solve the **following tasks**:

1) to study and compare the theoretical material on this topic; select phraseological units with a floristic component using lexicographical sources and compile a card file;

2) to determine the phrase-forming activity of phraseological units with this component.

3) to identify the participation of the floristic component in the formation of the values of phraseological units, as well as in the formation of some cultural connotations.

4) to develop exercises for schoolchildren and students in the study of phraseology with this component.

**The object of the study** is the linguocultural aspect of the English units with the floristic component.

**The subject of the study** is all types of floristic (phytophoric, plant) phraseological units of the English language.

**The research methods** are the method of phraseological identification, component analysis, analysis of dictionary and encyclopedic data, methods of description and interpretation, elements of statistical processing of the material.

# **CHAPTER 1. BASIC CONCEPTS OF LINGUO-CULTURAL STUDIES. PHRASEOLOGICAL UNIT AS ONE OF THE OBJECTS OF ITS STUDY**

## **1.1. Anthropocentrism - a new paradigm in linguistics**

The idea of the anthropocentricity of language today can be considered generally accepted: for many language constructs, the idea of a person acts as a natural reference point.

This scientific paradigm, which took shape at the turn of the millennium, brought new challenges in the study of language. It requires new methods of its description, new approaches in the analysis of its units, categories, rules.

The question of the paradigm as a model for posing problems and a set of techniques for solving them arose before researchers after the publication of the famous book by T. Kuhn “The Structure of Scientific Revolutions” in 1962. T. Kuhn proposed to consider the paradigm as a scientific community, guided in its research activities by certain knowledge and approaches to the object of study - the language. In the humanities and in particular in linguistics, paradigms at one and the same time imprint one another and coexist ignoring each other.

Usually there are three scientific paradigms - comparative historical, systemic structural and anthropocentric.

The comparative historical paradigm was the first scientific paradigm in linguistics, because the comparative historical method was the first special method of learning a language.

In the system-structural paradigm, attention was focused on the subject, thing, name, so the word was in the center of attention. Even in the third millennium, it is possible to explore the language as part of the system-structural paradigm, because this paradigm continues to exist in linguistics, and the number of its followers is very large. In the framework of this paradigm, textbooks are still being created and various reference books are being written. The most valuable source of information not only for modern linguists, but also for future generations

of researchers are fundamental research carried out within the framework of this paradigm. The anthropocentric paradigm is the transfer of the interests of the researcher from objects to the subject of knowledge, i.e. analyzes the person in the language and the language in the person.

The idea of the anthropocentricity of a language is fundamental in modern linguistics. At present, the goal of linguistic analysis is no longer simply the identification of various characteristics of a language system.

Language - the most complex phenomenon. E. Benveniste several decades ago wrote that the properties of a language are very peculiar, that a language has not one but several structures, and each of them could be the basis for the emergence of holistic linguistics. [Benveniste] Language is a multilateral phenomenon that has arisen in society: it is both a system and an anti-system, an activity and its product, spirit and matter, a spontaneously developing object and an ordered phenomenon. It is arbitrary and produced, etc. Characterizing the language from opposite sides, we reveal its whole essence.

In order to reflect the most complex essence of the language, Yu. S. Stepanov laid it out into several images: 1) language as an individual language 2) language as a member of the family of languages 3) language as a structure 4) language as a system 5) language as a type and character 6) language as a computer; 7) language as a space of thought and as a result of complex cognitive activity of a person. [YU. S. Stepanov] According to the seventh image, language, firstly, is the result of the activity of the people; secondly, the result of the creative activity of the individual and the result of the activity of the normalizers of the language (the state, the institutions that produce the norms and rules).

To these images at the end of XX century. one more was added: language as a product of culture, its important component, the condition of existence, and the factor of the formation of cultural codes.

From the standpoint of the anthropocentric paradigm, a person perceives the world through the awareness of himself, his activity in it.

Realizing oneself with the measure of all things gives a person the right to create in his consciousness an anthropozetrichesky order of things, which can be investigated not on a domestic, but on a scientific level. The order in the head, in the mind of a person determines his spiritual essence, the motives of actions, the hierarchy of values. All this can be understood in the study of human speech, turns and expressions used most often by him.

In the process of forming a new scientific paradigm, a thesis was proclaimed, saying that the world is a collection of facts, not things [L. Wittgenstein]. The language was gradually refocused on the fact, the event, and the focus of attention was on the identity of the native speaker. The new paradigm implies new installations and goals of language research, new basic concepts and methods. In the anthropocentric paradigm, the ways of constructing the subject of linguistic research have changed, the very approach to choosing general principles and research methods has changed for the better, several competing metalanguages of linguistic description have appeared [R. M. Frumkin].

From this it follows that the formation of the anthropocentric paradigm led to the fact that linguistic problems turned towards man and his place in culture, because the focus of culture and cultural tradition is the linguistic person in its diversity: I-physical, I-social, I-intellectual, I-emotional, I-speech-thinking. These variations of the I have different forms of manifestation, for example, the I-emotional can manifest itself in various social and psychological roles. The phrase Today the bright sun shines contains the following thoughts: I-physical will experience the beneficial effects of the sun's rays; I know it is intellectual and sends this information to the interlocutor (I am social), taking care of him (I am emotional); telling him about it, I am speech-thinking. Influencing any of these variations of I, it is possible to influence all other sides of the addressee's personality. Therefore, the linguistic personality appears in communication as multidimensional, and this correlates with the strategies and tactics of verbal communication, with the social and psychological roles of communicants, the cultural sense of the information included in the communication. Man cognizes the

world around him, only by separating himself from this world, he as if opposes the “I” to everything that is “not-I”. The very structure of our thinking and language is as follows: any act of thought and thought presupposes the recognition of the existence of the world, while reporting the presence of an act of reflecting the world as a subject. [Maslova V.A. 2001]

Based on the above, it should be remembered that the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics is something that cannot be ignored, even if the researcher works in the traditional system-structural paradigm.

So, the anthropocentric paradigm puts a person in the first place, and language is considered the main constitutive characteristic of a person, his most important component. The intellect of man, like man himself, cannot be imagined outside language and language ability as the ability to produce and perceive speech. If language were not part of the thought processes, if it could not create new mental spaces, then the person would not have gone beyond the directly observable. The text created by man expresses the movement of human thought, builds possible worlds, captures in itself the dynamics of thought and the ways of its presentation by means of language.

The main directions of modern linguistics, which are formed within the framework of this paradigm, are cognitive linguistics and cultural linguistics, which should be “oriented on the cultural factor in language and on the language factor in man” [VNTeliya]. From this it follows that cultural linguistics is the product of the anthropocentric paradigm in linguistics, which has been developing recently.

The basic concepts of cognitive linguistics are the concepts of information and its processing by the human mind, the concepts of knowledge structures and their representation in human consciousness and language forms. If cognitive linguistics, together with cognitive psychology and cognitive sociology, constitute cognitive science, try to answer the question of how the human mind is organized in principle, how a person perceives the world, what information about the world becomes knowledge, how mental spaces are created, linguoculturology is given to



a person in culture and his language. Here it is necessary to give answers to many questions: how does a person see the world, what is the role of a symbol in a culture, what is the role of phraseologisms in the representation of culture, why are they necessary for a person?

Linguoculturology studies language as part of culture. This is a certain vision of the world through the prism of the national language, when the language expresses a specific national mentality.

Cultural and historical content permeates all linguistics, because the subject of linguistics is language, which is the condition, foundation and product of culture.

Among the linguistic disciplines, the most cultural-linguistic are linguistic historical: social dialectology, ethnolinguistics, style, vocabulary, phraseology, semantics, translation theory, etc.

## **1.2 Cultural linguistics as part of anthropological linguistics**

The problem of correlation and interrelation of language, culture and people is interdisciplinary. Its solution is possible only with the help of the efforts of several sciences - philosophy, sociology, ethnolinguistics and linguistic culturology. For example, linguistic philosophy deals with issues of ethnic linguistic thinking. Psycholinguistics, etc. deals with the specifics of ethnic, social or group communication in the linguistic aspect.

Language is very closely connected with culture: it grows into it, develops in it, expresses it.

Based on this idea, a new science of linguoculturology has emerged, which can be considered an independent direction of linguistics, formed in the 90s of the 20th century. The concept of "linguoculturology" appeared in the last decades in connection with the work of the phraseological school headed by V.N.Teliya, the works of Yu.S.Stepanov, A.D. Arutyunova, V.V. Vorobiova, V.Shakleina, V.A. Maslova and other scientists. Cultural studies explores the self-consciousness of a

person in relation to nature, society, history, art, and other spheres of social and cultural life, while linguistics considers the worldview reflected and fixed in language in the form of mental models of the linguistic picture of the world. The subject of cultural linguistics is language and culture, which interact with each other.

Linguoculturology is a branch of linguistics that originated at the junction of linguistics and cultural studies. It explores the manifestations of the culture of the people, reflected and fixed in the language. Ethnolinguistics and sociolinguistics are closely related to linguoculturology. V.N.Telia even considers linguoculturology as one of the sections of ethnolinguistics. Nevertheless, these are fundamentally different sciences.

It was ethno-linguistics that VA Zvegintsev described as a direction that focuses on the study of the links of language with culture, customs of the people, and the social structure of society.

The culture of mankind is a complex of folk cultures. They are diverse, due to the fact that the actions of different peoples, aimed at meeting the same needs, are different. Ethnic originality is manifested in all spheres: in the work of people, in rest, gastronomic habits, in the way they speak in different situations, etc. For example, they believe that the most important feature of Russians is collectivism; as a result, they are distinguished by a sense of belonging to a particular society, warmth and emotionality. These particular features of Russian culture are reflected in the Russian language. According to A. Wezhbitskaya, Russian is more emotional than English and has a richer composition of lexical and grammatical expressions for their distinction. [Wezhbitskaya 1996: 201-231]

Language is a means of accumulating and storing culturally significant information. In some units, such information for a modern native speaker is implicit, hidden by secular changes, and therefore, can be extracted only indirectly. But it exists and “works” on a subconscious level.

The concept of linguistic culturology is as follows. V.N.Telia considers that its object is universal cultural information, and not only purely national. We are only interested in the cultural information inherent in a particular people.

### **1.3 Fundamental concepts of cultural linguistics**

The formation of a picture of the world takes place in the process of interaction between the world and man, mediated by the relationship between language and thinking. Language is closely related to cognition and is the main subject of cognitive linguistics. In the works of modern linguists-cognitives, language is considered as a general cognitive mechanism.

The language reflects all the paths of the conceptual assimilation of the world by man throughout its history. This is a complex way of obtaining thoughts, knowledge, and a complex mechanism of speech and verbal design of thought. Language being a mobile and flexible tool, changes under the influence of people and circumstances. Only through language can a person understand the world and himself. But at the same time, the relationship of language and thought is contradictory:

on the one hand, they are one, and on the other hand, thinking and language are independent.

Language is responsible for the formation of thought. A person is in essence all the time in his own linguistic space, and does not go beyond it. However, the key position in the formation of thinking belongs to external reality, while language is only a form of expression.

In modern cognitive linguistics, there are various approaches and directions for such research. An important role for this scientific direction belongs to the relationship of linguistic forms and their mental representations in the context of a specific culture, which forms the linguistic picture of the world.

In fact, the linguistic picture of the world is defined as the totality of all knowledge about the world, which is reflected in the language, and as a way to obtain new information and its interpretation.

The linguistic picture of the world is a special method of conceptualizing reality and passing it through linguistic forms. This concept has a huge variety of interpretations. Cognitologists to this day do not have a clear opinion about this phenomenon. The linguistic picture of the world realizes the mediating function in the development of language and speech activity.

The concept of the linguistic picture of the world originates from the ideas about the inner form of the language of V. Von Humboldt and his followers. V. Von Humboldt was one of the first linguistic scholars who drew attention to the national content of language and thinking, noting that different languages are for the nations apparatuses for their special thinking and perception.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, he considered language a way of expressing the individual world-view of a people. American structuralists later developed his idea. Researchers Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf regarded language as a phenomenon by which a person forms views about the world around them. Structuralists considered language as a natural science object, which is outside of culture and society. But these scientists were united in the conviction that all people see the world differently, through the prism of their native language.

The concept of "linguistic picture of the world" was first introduced by Leo Weisgerber, from the beginning of the 30s. XX century, who developed the theory in which the linguistic picture of the world was closely connected with the peculiarities of the external environment of the existence of an ethnos. Later, the scientist singled out the worldview component of the linguistic picture of the world, and noted the creative role of language as a strong factor shaping a person's views about the world.

In connection with the thesaurus research of vocabulary, the problem of the linguistic picture of the world was reflected in the works of Russian linguists.

This problem was studied by G.A. Brutyan, S.A. Vasiliev, G.V. Kolshansky, N.I. Sukalenko, E.S. Yakovlev, M. Black, D. Hymes.

In 1988 the collective monograph "The human factor in language. Language and picture of the world" (M, 1988) was printed. At present, the picture of the

world is examined in the works of N.D. Arutyunova, Yu.D. Apresyan, A. Vezhbitskaya, V.V. Morkovkina, Yu.S. Stepanova, V.N. Telia, N.F. Alefirenko. So, the linguistic picture of the world is mental-lingual education, knowledge of the surrounding reality, fixed in the individual or collective consciousness, represented by linguistic means.

The peculiarities of the linguistic picture of the world and its nature are determined by language, since this is the main way of becoming understanding of the world. In the course of his activity, a person comprehends the objective world and fixes the results of knowledge in a word. The collection of this knowledge, reflected in linguistic form, is the linguistic picture of the world, which is also called “linguistic intermediate world”, “linguistic representation of the world”, “linguistic model of the world”.

The language picture of the world is dual in nature. On the one hand, the living conditions of people, the material world around them are determined by their consciousness and behavior, which is reflected in their language picture of the world; on the other hand, a person perceives the world primarily through the forms of the native language, its semantics and grammar, which determines the structures of thinking and behavior.

From all the above, we can conclude that the linguistic picture of the world is a subjective image of the objective world, it includes the features of the human way of knowing the world, that is, anthropocentrism, which is filled with language. This is nothing but a global, holistic image of the world, which is the result of a person’s spiritual activity. And this picture appears as a result of human contact with the world around it [Goncharova 2012: 400-402].

Culture develops with the evolution of the language. But the history of a language does not repeat the history of culture, but only has its imprint on it in vocabulary and phraseology (connotation of culture). In linguistics in the last decade of the twentieth century, the development of the theory of cultural connotation has become very popular. This concept can be applied to units of the phraseological and parmlical composition of the language. Their characteristic

feature is the figuratively situational motivation associated with the worldview of native speakers. According to E. Benvenista, cultural connotation can be an indicator of belonging to any cultural-ethnic group, people. [Benvenist 1974] In the semantics of any language there is a reflection of common cultural universals, as well as a feature of the culture of each individual people. The peculiar culture of the people explains the peculiarities of the national-specific component of the linguistic mentality. The nature of cultural connotation is represented in the following way: Cultural terms of a word belong only to a specific language, therefore the meaning of a word can be understood in its entirety only in the context of a specific national culture ... Each language and culture has its own specific concepts, connotations. The system of their occurrence is associated with the strengthening of certain aspects of value. The determining factor here is the brightness of the inner form of the word, and the stable associations that arise at its base. The peculiarity of the assessment picture of the world of each national-cultural community is determined precisely by the complex of cultural connotations inherent in this community. Therefore, cultural connotations are not only information about the cultural distinctive features of a certain people, but also the “evaluative aura” [Maslova 1997] of linguistic culture.

Cultural connotation is an additional feature in relation to the denotative value, which carries information about the national-cultural experience. It is this experience that establishes the specific features of a language at all its levels. It is because of the specificity of language in the minds of its speakers a certain linguistic picture of the world appears, through the prism of which a person sees the world [Maslova 1997]. Differences in cultures can influence the fact that in different languages words with the same subject correlation can differ in their emotional and evaluative shades (that is, coinciding in denotation differ in connotative semantics). From this it follows that the function of cultural connotation is the introduction into the conceptual system of a language that is not universal, common to all languages and determines the specifics of a particular language.

The phenomenon of “stereotype” itself is considered not only in the works of linguists, but also in sociologists, cognitologists, ethnographers, psychologists, ethnopsycholinguists.

Representatives of these sciences focus their attention on those properties of the stereotype that they notice from the standpoint of their field of study. Therefore, social, mental, cultural, ethnocultural, communication stereotypes, etc. are distinguished. For example, social stereotypes appear as stereotypes of thinking and human behavior. Ethnocultural stereotypes are a general idea of the features that characterize any people. German orderly, Russian

“Maybe”, the Chinese ceremonies, the fieryness of the Italians, the stubbornness of the Finns, the Polish gallantry - the stereotypical opinions about the whole people, which are transferred to each individual representative.

There are autostereotypes that reflect what people think about themselves, as well as heterostereotypes that belong to another people. The latter are more critical. For example, the fact that his people considered prudence, the other can be perceived as greed. People take ethnocultural stereotypes as models, and consider that they need to conform so that they “don’t look at all”. Due to the fact that stereotypes very strongly influence people, they also form character traits that are reflected in the stereotype.

Experts in the field of ethnic psychology, who study ethno-cultural stereotypes, believe that highly developed economically nations distinguish such qualities as efficiency, intelligence, enterprise, and nations with less developed economies - kindness and hospitality. This confirms the study of SG Ter-Minasova, according to the results of which, in England, professionalism, hard work, responsibility are more valuable, and in Russia hospitality, sociability, justice [Ter-Minasova, 2000: 255].

N.V. Ufimtseva distinguishes between ethnic and cultural stereotypes: the former are inaccessible to self-reflection of the “naive” member of an ethnos and are facts of behavior and the collective unconscious, they cannot be specifically

trained, while the latter are on the contrary self-reflective and are facts of behavior, individual unconscious and conscious, it is already possible to teach.

For the first time the concept of stereotype was used by W. Lippmann in 1922.

He believed that these were orderly, sketchy, certain cultures.

“Pictures of the world” in the head of a person, with the help of which less effort is expended in perceiving complex objects of the world. With this understanding of the stereotype, two of its main features are distinguished - determinability by culture, and a means of reducing labor effort and, accordingly, language means.

In cognitive linguistics and ethnolinguistics, the concept of stereotype refers to the content side of language and culture, i.e. this is a mental (mental) stereotype that correlates with the “naive picture of the world”. Such an understanding of stereotype is found in the works of E. Bartminsky and his school. The language picture of the world and the language stereotype correlate with it as a part and whole. A language stereotype is understood as a judgment or several judgments that relate to a particular object of an extra-linguistic picture of the world, a subjectively determined representation of a subject in which descriptive and evaluative signs coexist and which is the result of interpreting reality within socially developed cognitive models. But also a linguistic stereotype can be considered not only a judgment, but also any stable expression that has several words in its composition (for example, stable comparison, cliché, etc.).

The use of such stereotypes facilitates and simplifies communication.

VV Krasnykh divides stereotypes into two types — stereotypes — images and stereotypes — situations. Stereotypes-images: a worker bee, a sheep-stubborn. Stereotypes-situations: ticket - composter, stork - cabbage.

Stereotypes always have a national character, and if there are analogues in other cultures, then these are quasi-stereotypes, because, coinciding as a whole, they differ in some aspects, details that are of fundamental importance.



So, a stereotype is a certain fragment of a conceptual picture of the world, a mental “picture”, a stable national-cultural view of a subject or situation. But this is not only a mental image, but also its verbal envelope. Belonging to a particular culture is determined precisely by the presence of a basic stereotypical basis of knowledge, repeated in the process of socialization of the individual in this society, therefore stereotypes are considered important, representative names in culture. Stereotype - the phenomenon of language and speech, a stabilizing factor. It allows, on the one hand, to store and transform some of the dominant components of a given culture, and on the other, to manifest itself among “its” and at the same time identify “its”.

The basis of the formation of ethnic consciousness and culture as regulators of human behavior are both innate and acquired in the process of socialization, i.e. cultural stereotypes learned from the moment when a person began to identify himself with a particular people, culture and realize himself as a part of them.

The mechanism for the formation of stereotypes are many cognitive processes, because stereotypes perform a number of cognitive functions — the function of schematization and simplification, the function of forming and storing group ideology, etc.

The culture-sphere of a certain people carries elements of a stereotypical character, which, as a rule, are not perceived by the bearers of another culture. These elements of Yu. A. Sorokin and I.Yu. Markovin are called spaces or lacunae: everything that the recipient did not understand in the foreign cultural text serves as a signal of the presence in the text of the national-specific cultural elements in which the text was created, namely the lacunae.

The sustainability and vitality of a culture is determined by the development of structures that determine its unity and integrity. The integrity of culture implies the development of stereotypes of culture of the general picture of the world - that is, stereotypes of goal setting, behavior, perception, understanding, communication, etc. The frequency of occurrence of certain phenomena and objects in people's lives, often expressed in longer human contacts with these

objects in comparison with others, is important in the formation of stereotypes in comparison with others, which leads to stereotyping similar objects.

From the foregoing it follows that the stereotype is peculiar to the consciousness and language of the representative of culture, it is a kind of core of culture, its bright representative, and therefore a support of the individual in the dialogue of cultures.

The most striking linguistic feature, which reflects the culture of the people, are phraseological units and pararemas, metaphors and symbols. For example, mythologies, archetypes, standards, stereotypes, customs, rituals, and beliefs are fixed in the language.

The national-cultural identity of phraseological units, metaphors, and symbols is formed through cultural connotations.

#### **1.4. Idiom as an object of study**

Phraseology is the science of phraseological units (idioms), i.e. about stable combinations of words with complicated semantics that are not generated by generating structural and semantic models of variable combinations.

Phraseological units fill the gaps in the lexical system of the language, which does not have the ability to fully ensure the name of the (new) sides of reality known by man, and in many cases are the only symbols of objects, properties, processes, states, situations, etc. The formation of idioms weakens the contradiction between the needs of thinking and the limited lexical resources of the language. In cases where the phraseological unit has a lexical synonym, they usually differ in stylistic terms. Phraseology is a treasure trove of language. The idiom reflects the history of the people, especially its culture and way of life. Idioms quite often have a brightly national character. In English phraseology there are also purely national phraseological units, as well as many international phraseological units. The English phraseological foundation is a complex system of primordial and borrowed phraseological units, in which the original are more dominant. In some idioms preserved archaic elements of previous eras.

In phrase formation, a very large role is played by the human factor, since the overwhelming majority of phraseological units are associated with a person, with various spheres of his activity. The addressee factor is the most important link in communication. In addition, man seeks to endow objects of the external world with human features, including inanimate ones. S. Bally said that the imperfection of the human mind is expressed in the fact that man seeks to spiritualize what surrounds him. Man can not allow the thought that nature is not alive and soulless. His imagination constantly ascribes the features of the living to inanimate objects, as well as to all the objects of the external world, traits and aspirations that are characteristic of his personality [Sh. Bally 1961: 221].

Phraseological units are highly informative language units. They should not be considered as “decorations” or “excesses”. This interpretation of idioms is found in some works and now it is already outdated. Phraseological units are one of the language universals, since there are no languages without phraseological units. English phraseology is very diverse and has a long history.

Modern English is an analytical language. Excessive analyticism of the English language permeates his entire phraseology, affecting the structure of phraseological units.

An attribute of analyticism is the widespread in English language attributive use of phraseological units of various structural types.

It is necessary to take into account that along with the predominant elements of analytism in English phraseology there are elements of synthetism (for example, the extensive use of adjectives in a comparative degree).

Phraseology is a very complex phenomenon, its study requires its own method of research, and the use of data from other sciences - lexicology, stylistics, grammar, phonetics, history, philosophy, history of language, logic and regional studies.

Opinions of linguists on some issues of phraseology do not coincide. Nevertheless, the important task of linguists working in the field of phraseology is

to unite efforts and find common ground in the interests of both the theory of phraseology and the practice of teaching foreign languages.

The phraseological unit, or phraseological unit, is the general name of semantically related combinations of words and sentences, which, unlike the syntactic structures similar to them in form, are not reproduced in accordance with the basic laws of choice and combination when organizing a statement, but are reproduced in speech in a fixed semantic correlation structure and a certain lexical and grammatical composition. [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary]

There is no general opinion on the nature of phraseology. In modern foreign linguistics, stable expressions are often considered as stylistic means, figures of speech, although Sh. Balli pointed to special features of phraseological units. Some scientists believe that idioms and phraseological combinations with a clearly fixed order of components can be attributed to phraseological units, and other types of stable combinations are already non-phraseological. Most controversy is the inclusion in the phraseological composition of popular expressions, proverbs, sayings.

Adherents of a narrow understanding of phraseology (A.I. Molotkov, V.P. Zhukov, N.N. Amosova) do not include such language units as part of phraseology. Adherents of a broad approach (V. V. Vinogradov, N.

M. Shansky, V. G. Kostomarov, I. I. Chernyshev) refer them to phraseology.

The formation of idiom always happens with the interaction

all components of the combination. Phraseological units are almost always bright figurative expressions. Rethinking the entire lexico-grammatical composition or one of the components is an essential feature of a phraseological unit, manifested in the non-derivability of the meaning of a phraseological unit from the direct meanings of its constituent words and the impossibility of a “literal” translation of the phraseological unit into Russian.

The most important aspect of the theory of phraseology is the stability of phraseological units. Without this, it is impossible to establish the boundaries of phraseology, as well as its formation as a linguistic discipline.

For the correct understanding of sustainability, the statement of W. Ross Ashby is of great importance. He states that all meanings of the concept

“Stability” is associated with the basic idea of invariance. This idea lies in the fact that some properties (invariants) of the system remain unchanged, despite the consistent change of the system as a whole [Ashby 1959: 109].

Phraseological stability is the amount of invariance, which is peculiar to various aspects of phraseological units. It determines their reproducibility in finished form and identity with all the usual and occasional changes.

This definition is based on the understanding of the stability of phraseological units as a dynamic phenomenon, since it makes it possible to distinguish different degrees of stability. The maximum degree of stability is inherent in such phraseological units that do not allow any regulatory changes. Then come the substantive phraseological units with a composing structure. The list is completed by the high stability of phraseological units, which is facilitated by a number of factors (for example, the presence of obsolete words in their composition). Maximum stability can be a benchmark taken as 100% [Kunin 1970: 122].

As regards the separation of forms, following the statement of Akhmanova, we can say that this is “a feature of the structure of syntactic unity, consisting in the fact that its constituent units are separate words” [Akhmanova 1966: 376], i.e. grammatically defined components.

The integrity of the word is based on the presence of a general grammatical design for all constituent elements.

The concepts of “separate form” and “integrity” were proposed by A.I. Smirnitsky [Smirnitsky 1952: 202]. They have proven to be very useful in the study of phraseology.

Variable phrases and sentences have the maximum form of separation. Their composition contains immutable words, as well as words that allow for various morphological changes. The very structure of variable combinations of words is an indicator of their separate form, when it is unusual for complex words.

Due to the maximum separation of variable combinations of words, they may contain any compound words. The use of complex words in the composition of phraseological units is very limited.

A.I. Smirnitsky emphasizes that phraseological units differ from the “classical” ones in that they are separately-shaped: otherwise, they would not be allocated to a special group at all. [Smirnitsky 1952: 202].

In English, it is often difficult to distinguish between a word and a foundation; therefore, it is important to develop clearer criteria for the integrity of words and the separation of phraseologisms. This will help determine the nature of their components. Determining the nature of the elements is quite important, since the nature of the structure is determined by the nature of the elements.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTER 1**

This chapter is devoted to the study of phenomena and concepts that are theoretically significant for this study.

When writing the theoretical part of our work, we used the works of such famous linguists as Alexander Kunin, Vladimir Grigorievich Hak, Viktor Vladimirovich Vinogradov, Veriya Nickolaevna Telia, Elena Fridrikhovna Arsentieva, Valentina Avloamovna Maslova.

The following conclusions were formulated:

1) English phraseology fits into the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm and is of considerable interest for cultural linguistics, since linguo-cultural studies study language as part of a culture, as a specific national mentality.

2) The most important operational concepts of linguoculturology that can be successfully used to study phraseology with a floristic component are the linguistic picture of the world, cultural connotation, stereotype.

The language picture of the world in this study is understood as a global, holistic image of the world, the sum of all knowledge of the world, which is reflected in the language. Under cultural connotation, an indicator of belonging to a cultural and ethnic group, a sign that carries information about national and cultural experience and determines the specifics of a given specific language. A

stereotype is commonly understood as a stable fragment of a picture of the world, a mental picture, a certain image that exists in the mass consciousness, which allows, on the one hand, to store and transform some of the dominant components of a given culture, and on the other, to manifest itself among “our own” and at the same time identify his.

3) For the study, the concept of a phraseological picture of the world is used, which is understood as the so-called microworld in a language with its own characteristic features in terms of expression and content.

4) To study floristic phraseology, the definition of phraseological units is used as highly informative language units with a stable combination of tokens and a fully or partially rethought meaning.

5) When studying the phraseological units, one should distinguish in the structure of its values the denotative, significative and connotative aspect, and also take into account its internal form and main characteristics, such as stability, separate form.

Thus, the information obtained during the study of theoretical sources allows us to understand the problems of anthropocentric phraseology, study some issues of the linguoculturological specifics of a person’s language, as well as penetrate deeper into the nature of floristic phraseological units, determine their place in the phraseological body of the English language.

## **CHAPTER 2. ENGLISH PHRASEOLOGY WITH FLORISTIC COMPONENTS**

### **2.1. Phrase formative phraseological units with floristic component**

Phraseological units with a floristic component reflect human observations of the world of flora for many centuries, convey the attitude of people to their surrounding nature and become the cultural foundation of the language.

Phraseological units with a floristic component (or further floronym) belong to a specific subject group.

"Flora", and reflect a certain sphere of the material world. They are relatively stable in semantic terms, their value does not change within the boundaries of special use.

T.D. Baryshnikova represents floronym as a unit of the whole macrofield of the botanical terminology of a particular language. [Baryshnikova T.D. 1999]

N. B. Kudryavtseva under floronyms understands - the designation of trees, shrubs, indoor and garden plants. [Kudryavtseva NB 2004]

Ss Shumbasova floronyma considers as names of trees, bushes, grasses, flowers, vegetables, berries and other crops, their generic, specific, varietal names, concepts denoting the form of vegetation (grass, shrub, tree, flower, etc.) [Shumbasova S .WITH. 2012]

From the foregoing it follows that in the present work the term floronym is used as the basic one and has the meaning - the names of flowers, shrubs, trees, fruit, berries, vegetables, garden and their fruits.

The method of continuous sampling from the explanatory and phraseological dictionaries of the English language (Longman dictionary, English Idioms & idiomatic expressions. 2014., Dictionary of American idioms. - SPb., Izd- in "Lan". Original: A.Mackey, M.T. Botker, J.I.Gates. 1997.) 72 units with a floristic component of them 17 (23.6%) with a "rose" component (for example, a rose without a thorn - "rose without thorns", English rose - "English rose", real English lady, bed of roses - "easy, happy life"), 11 (15.3%) - with the component "apple" (for example, an apple of another tree is a completely different thing, an apple-pie



order is a sample, an ideal order is, the apple of one's eye is the apple of an eye), 8 (11.1%) with the “nut” component (a hard (tough) nut - “tough nut”, the nuts and bolts - the basis of the basics), 5 (7%) - with the “tree” component (family tree is the family tree, flourish like a bay tree - flourish, shake the pagoda- tree - get rich quick), as well as 31 units with various other components (Be full of beans-be full of energy, Couch potato- a slacker, a sluggard, (As) cool as a cucumber-a very discreet person, etc.)

Thus, the most frequently encountered in phraseological terms are floronyms with the “rose” component, then floronyms with the “apple” component, followed by the “nut” and “tree” components.

The most seldom found were florony with components “bean”, “potato”, “cucumber”, etc.

## **2.2. The value of phraseological units with floristic component**

Idiom - a product of secondary (indirect) nomination, i.e. unit of the language of mediated and characterizing naming: A rotten apple- used for someone who is a dishonest or immoral and who has a bad effect on others (dishonest, immoral person), Couch potato- use much mental or physical energy, such as watching television.

The results of the primary nomination are recognized by native speakers as primitives.

The performance of such nominations can only be revealed through etymological or instrumental analysis.

The results of the secondary nomination are perceived as derived by morphological composition, or meaning. The methods of secondary nomination and differ depending on the language means used to create new names, as well as on the nature of the “name - reality” relationship.

The secondary nomination is based on the associative nature of human thinking. Associations by similarity or adjacency (in acts of secondary nomination) are established between certain properties of the components of the non-linguistic

series (such components are displayed in the existing meaning of the name) and features of the new denoted (such denoted by means of rethinking its meaning).

Reconsideration of values in the course of a secondary nomination takes place in accordance with the logical form of the tropes (metaphor, metonymy) For example: Couch potato (lazy tongue) is a metaphor. Most often it is the metaphor that underlies the rethinking of the meaning of phraseological units.

By analyzing the vocabulary definitions, we established the values of the phraseological units of the group under study. The subject of consideration was the lexical-semantic features, the metaphorical nature of phraseological units with the floristic component, the functional use of these units as a means of characterizing a person, as well as possible options for their translation into Russian. The overwhelming majority of the studied units characterize one or another side of a person's vital activity, his appearance, character, or quality.

a rose without a thorn- "rose without thorns", "exceptional phenomenon" from the poem "Girl from Richmond Hill"

(‘The Lass of Richmond Hill’) by Irish poet and playwright L. MacNelly (L. MacNelly, 1752-1820):

That girl was an exceptional case. Clever, kind and beautiful - a rose without a thorn. - It was extraordinary girl. Clever, kind and beautiful - perfection itself. This phraseological unit describes the qualities of a person.

With a rose, they usually compare a young woman. Thus, the phraseological units:

English rose- "An English beautiful girl" -

"English Rose", a real English lady; a rose between two thorns - a (beautiful) woman among men is also applicable when describing a man.

The phraseological unit as fresh as a rose - "blooming, looking beautiful" - is often used as a compliment and most often applicable to girls.

Health is also associated with a rose (healthy complexion): have roses in one's cheeks - to have a blush full cheek.

They also describe human qualities and phraseological units with other components. For example, a hard (tough) nut - "a toughie".

Apple polisher - "toad".

A rotten apple - "used by someone who is dishonest or immoral and who has a bad effect on others" - "immoral person".

Be full of beans 1) "live, energetic".

Sb knows how many beans make it, how much it costs, knows what it means. "

Couch potato - someone who spends a lot of time sitting on her head.

("As") - "very restrained person"

The grass roots are ordinary people in an organization, rather than the leaders (often used in politics) - "from the bottom"

Thus, all the above phraseological units one way or another describe a person (appearance, character, any qualities).

Were also identified phraseological units that describe the situation:

For example,

Come up roses-

"If you've come up with roses

shake the pagoda-tree -

"To find a source of easy enrichment; to become absurdly rich in a short time." - get rich quick

You cant compare the apple and the oranges- "used in order to say that the two things are completely different."

A banana skin is a situation where it can be a stupid.- "ambush, a setup"

Go beetroot- spoken to become red in the face because you are embarrassed.

It is clear that it is clear that it is not a problem. -"to beat around the bush"

It is good enough.- to do useless business

Play "Gooseberry BrE" ("also be a gooseberry") - "Be the third superfluous"

Thus, by analyzing vocabulary definitions, it was found that phraseological units with a floristic component can be divided into two groups by meaning:

describing a person (appearance, character, qualities, his behavior) and applicable to any situation or describing a situation or phenomenon.

The first group turned out to be more numerous (63.6%), the second group - 36.4%. Human behavior is reflected in the language of situations where participants adhere to or do not adhere to certain norms adopted in society.

It as well as the sociocultural phenomenon acquires a wide range of reflection at the lexical and phraseological levels of the language. In phraseology, human behavior is structured figuratively and acquires its figurative expression in units of secondary nomination.

Phraseological units, meaning human behavior, awaken in the minds of native speakers a specific set of information about a person, a connection with life situations, events of the history and culture of a people. Their expressiveness is associated with the mapping of the norms of behavior of a people, which are fixed in the public consciousness and are passed on from generation to generation using lexical and phraseological units. They are usually used to convey positive or negative traits of a person's character. Evaluation of human behavior, his actions, appearance, character traits is very important for cultures of different nations, so we observe the overwhelming majority of phraseological units with this component.

### **2.3. Evaluation as a component of phraseological meaning units**

Modern society attaches great importance to the value side of life. The appraisal approach to the surrounding reality is formed in all members of society. It forms the attitude and determines the organization of practical knowledge and actions, both of each individual and of entire social groups of people. Assessment as a process of establishing the value relationship of the subject to the object, as the basis for the formation and structuring of values has a cognitive nature and is an integral part of the process of reflecting reality.

Estimation refers to a component of connotation, which fixes in the meaning of a word information about a positive or negative attitude towards a particular object or phenomenon. There are 2 types of assessment: intellectual (or logical) and emotional. Intellectual appraisal is part of denotation, it is included in the designation subject and, thus, is considered part of the denotative aspect of lexical meaning.

With a rose, they usually compare a young woman. Thus, the phraseological units:

English rose-

"An English girl with a beautiful girl" -

"English Rose", a real English lady;

a rose between two thorns - (beautiful) woman among men is also applicable when describing a man and have a positive rating.

The phraseological unit as fresh as a rose - "blooming, looking beautiful" - is as fresh as a rose, often used as a compliment and most often applicable to girls.

In general, a rose is associated with something pleasant, light and beautiful, therefore most of the phraseological units with the component "rose" bear a positive appraisal in their meaning. Proof of this can serve such phraseological units, bed of roses - "

A pleasant easy place, job, or position; an easy life "- "easy, happy life. " Finally, health is associated with a rose, and more specifically, a healthy complexion: have roses in one's cheeks - to have a flush in the whole cheek.

Phraseological units with another component can also carry a positive assessment. For example, Be full of beans 1) "live, energetic".

The following phraseological units have a negative rating:

Apple polisher - "toad".

A rotten apple - "used by someone who is dishonest or immoral and who has a bad effect on others" - "immoral person".

Go bananas- 1) spoken to become very angry or excited. 2) spoken to start working correctly. " "Get mad, get mad ".

It is “to mean nothing, not to value anything.”

Couch potato - someone who spends a lot of time sitting on her head.

Play “Gooseberry BrE” (“also be a gooseberry”) - “Be the third superfluous”

The grass roots are ordinary people in an organization, rather than the leaders (often used in politics) - “from the bottom”

In our sample, phraseological units with a neutral coloration were also found: For example,

(“As”) - “very restrained person”

Thus, in the course of analyzing the data of phraseological units, it was revealed that our sample contains phraseological units with both positive 17 (40.5%) and negative 21 (50%) and neutral 4 (9.5%) estimates. With a negative assessment turned out to be more. We also found out that in our sample there are only PU with emotionally estimated values.

“Our and others” is one of the main concepts of culture. These concepts are universal in nature, because they are inherent in artistic creativity, scientific and domestic thinking. The basis of any comparison and juxtaposition are the mechanisms of identity and difference of one’s own and others.

The juxtaposition of "one's own - alien" has the form of "deep - surface". Its familiar, deep, familiar; the alien is strange, unknown, superficial, unknown. A person, by his nature, perceives everything native from a positive point of view, and someone else, even on a subconscious mind, causes negative emotions. This opposition permeates the entire culture and is one of the most important concepts of any national world perception and attitude.

The natural environment differs significantly in different parts of the Earth by the features of climate, flora and fauna, and landscape. Penetrating into the sphere of human activity, the natural environment is drawn into the sphere of the cultural interests of people and get names that reflect the public experience of native speakers, their subjective and pragmatic evaluations.

Features of the geographical position of England, its climate, agriculture and labor activity are reflected in a number of phraseological units with floristic component. Their imagery is determined by the history of the people, way of life.

As L.V. Melnik notes, the national-cultural connotation of phraseological units with a floristic component is primarily due to culturally-marked components, national symbols, and a deep cultural-national context.

For example, the rose occupies a special position in the cultural tradition of the English people. The Longman Dictionary of Language and Culture states that the rose is perceived by the British as a typical English flower. It is depicted on the national emblem of England, hence the nickname of the country ("The Land of Rose" - "Country of the Rose." This floristic nickname also has such an event in the history of Great Britain as a long internecine war in the 15th century. The War of the Roses - "War Scarlet and White Roses "(scarlet and white roses were depicted on the arms of the warring parties - Lancaster and York).

England for a long time was under the influence of the Roman Empire, so many customs and traditions of ancient Rome left their mark on the English language. In ancient Rome, the rose was considered a symbol of luxury, happy and serene life. This fact is reflected in some phraseological units with the rose component. For example,

bed of roses - easy, happy life, gather roses to pick flowers of pleasure. Characteristic of the floral phraseology of the English language is the notion of a rose as a symbol of female beauty: a rose between two thorns is a (beautiful) woman among men, have roses in one's cheeks - to have a blush full cheek, and as fresh as a rose - is as fresh as a rose.

Next, we consider phraseological units with the tree component.

The image of a tree in phraseology is of great importance for world culture. In the mythological systems of many cultures, including English, in a single vegetative manner, embodying universal concept of the world, stands the world or "cosmic" tree (the tree of the world, the cosmic tree), which forms a kind of vertical link connecting the earth and sky.

Nationally specific to English phraseology with the floral component is also a symbol of the tree (especially its apex) as the embodiment of a high social status, material wealth, for example: flourish like a bay tree, flourish, shake the pagoda-tree flourish.

Oak was the main sacred tree of the ancient Germans, so the phraseological units, which include the name of this tree, have pronounced positive connotations. Composed as English phraseological units, the oak symbolizes strength, courage.

For example, great oaks from little acorns grow- big grows out of a small, and a heart of oak is a brave, courageous man.

Thus, it can be concluded marking of floral components in the composition phraseological units of the English language, which can manifest itself at the level of their symbolism, based on stereotypes and standards. This once again confirms the fact that “their” components in phraseological units are regarded as something positive and positive.

#### **2.4. Expressiveness of phraseological units with floristic component**

Many scientists recognize the expressiveness of phraseological units as one of the categorical properties of phraseological units. It should be noted that in literature found a different interpretation of this term. According to L.E.

Kruglikova needs to distinguish between the expressiveness of speech and the expressiveness of language units, because the scope of the first term is much wider. By expressiveness in a broad sense is meant the specific function of some language units is the impact function.

In this approach, units can be considered expressive, which in addition to nominative and significative functions (respectively, the notation and generalization functions) carry a pragmatic function (influence function), i.e. these are such units, the main purpose of which is to influence the interlocutor, and not just to name one or another element of reality. [Kruglikov 1988: 53]. According to this concept, all PUs possess the quality of expressiveness. Some scholars have identified the term “expressiveness” with the term “emotionality” or “evaluation.”



O.S. Akhmanova, for example, treats expressiveness as expressive and imaginative properties of speech, which distinguish it from the stylistically neutral, and give imagery and emotional paint [Akhmanova 1966: 324].

The reason for the appearance of expressiveness can be various factors, for example, appraisal, imagery, emotiveness, component composition, structural-syntactic features of phraseological units. [Safina 2003: 10].

Phraseological expressiveness is one of the main components of connotation. Its main purpose is to enhance the expressed trait, the selection of a number of similar and, as a result, a pragmatic impact on the recipient. It should be borne in mind that partly the value of expressiveness can realize itself in significant-denotative component through this intensity of Safina 2003: 11].

From the standpoint of expressivity, PU can be classified by different criteria. So, V.N. Vakurov emphasizes quality, quantitative and qualitative-quantitative expressive units of YuVakurov 1983: 23].

1. quantitative (quantitative) expressive values inherent in the PU, in the denotative meaning of which is expressed a high degree of manifestation of the trait.

2. qualitative (qualitative) expressive values; PU

The second group is formed with the help of additional shades of meaning that flow from the specifics of the image that forms the basis of phraseological units.

3. qualitative and quantitative expressive values; The phraseological units of the third group combine semes of quantitative and qualitative expressiveness in themselves: the intensity, intensity of actions, signs characteristic of this phraseological units, combined with a high degree of manifestation of signs of objects or actions.

From the above it follows that this classification of phraseological units within the framework of

categories of expressiveness are based on different criteria, but the leading

the role of manifestation of a high degree of expressiveness in phraseological units belongs to the imaginative component built on associative thinking, so how image compression is the main nerve of emotional reaction and expressive effects.

In our work we will use the two main ones, in our opinion, criteria for the separation of phraseological units by expressiveness:

1) qualitative (or figurative) and 2) quantitative (intensifying).

The quantitative criterion of expressiveness is easy to determine by the presence in the definition of such words as many, little, few, very, as well as the presence of degrees of comparison of adjectives and adverbs. For example, Go bananas- spoken to become very angry or excited; Not amount to a hill of beans (no amount of a row of beans) - to be worth it little importance; Be it up lot of energy; Beat the bushes (often used in business); Couch potato- someone who spends a lot of time mental or physical energy, such as watching television; The grass is (always) greener (on the other side of fence seems to be you have; Know your onions BrE- old-fashioned- used in order to say that someone knows about their job or main activity; Small potatoes- used compared with other things or people of the same kind.

The figurative criterion is determined by the presence of a specific image in a phraseological unit. To this group we attributed following FE:

All PUs with the “rose” component (for example, English rose - “English Rose, the real English lady; have roses in one’s cheeks – have blush full cheek, etc.); A rotten apple- used about someone who is dishonest or immoral and who has a bad effect on others; You cant compare apple and oranges; A banana skin- a situation in which someone important, especially a politician, makes problem, and it is embarrassed or made to seem stupid; Go beetroot- spoken to become reddened because you are embarrassed; (As) cool as a cucumber used where you expect them to be nervous, upset, or embarrassed; Bears fruit it produces the good results that you wanted; Forbidden fruit- used about you are not allowed them; A lot of people are talking or arguing about because it upsets or offends people.

So we can conclude that most the phraseological units selected by us for work have in their based on the image, so the qualitative (figurative) expressiveness in this the sample prevails.

## **2.5. Use of phraseological units with floristic component when learning English**

Phraseological units with floristic component can use for learning a foreign language. One of variety types of exercise is translation.

Translation of phraseological units can be difficult. It happens due to the fact that many of them are bright, emotionally colored turnovers that relate to a specific speech style and have a pronounced national character. When translating phraseological units need to take into account the particular context in which they are used. For many English FE are peculiar ambiguity and stylistic diversity, which complicates them transfer.

Many scholars believe to achieve a full vocabulary transfer must take into account the ratio between the units language (FL) and translation language (CL):

- 1) FE has an exact, full-fledged correspondence in the CL, which is not depends on the context (meaning + connotations);
- 2) IU can be passed on by matching with some deviations from the full translation;
- 3) PU does not have any equivalents or analogs and is not translatable in vocabulary order.

The greatest number of phraseological equivalents we meet in international phraseology. International Phraseology - FE, not included in the languages of many nations from historical, mythological, literary sources. They borrowed from language to language either appeared in different nations independently of one another due to common human thinking, proximity of certain moments social life, work, production, science development and art.

Features of the relationship of language and culture are more pronounced when translation of FE, which are distinguished by a high degree of national colors in shape and content. The main task of the translator in this case, it becomes “cultural-adaptation of microtexts, which allows you to provide "readability" in another culture through the preservation of their equivalence of both semantic and “impressive”, that is equivalence of the impression on the recipient ”.

There are four main ways to translate figurative phraseology:

1. Transfer of English figurative expression to phraseological
2. The use of Russian phraseological unit, similar in meaning to English, but based on a different image. Such idioms called phraseological counterparts.

Here it is necessary to consider first, the stylistic disparity of some analog idioms and, secondly, the national coloring of phraseological units.

Nationally colored idioms need to be translated Russian phraseological units, without national coloring.

3. Literal translation, tracing phraseological units.

This transfer can only be used if tracing is an expression whose imagery is easy perceive Russian readers and it will not create impressions unnaturalness and foreignness of generally accepted norms of Russian language:

4. To explain the meaning of a phraseological unit that does not have analogue and equivalent in the Russian language, the literal translation of which is not possible, you should use a descriptive translation.

Knowledge of phraseological units, and as a result, literate them translation can be successfully applied in practice when teaching students and schoolchildren, in preparing students for the dialogue of cultures, that is communicating with people from different countries. Man needs not only to know the language as a whole, but also its cultural characteristics, history and traditions this country. One of the productive means of developing skills speaking foreign language learners are phraseological units. The purpose of learning to speak using phraseological units is the development of students' ability to according to their real needs and

interests verbal communication in various situations, using phraseological units to revitalize the process of speech.

We suggest the use of the following exercises, when acquaintance of students and schoolchildren with English phraseology:

1) Translation of phraseological units using a dictionary (for example, translate FE Couch potato (couch potato) or (As) cool as a cucumber (discreet person)

2) the task of correlating the English phraseological unit and its equivalent (translation) in Uzbek (for this teacher it is necessary to make a selection of English FE and Uzbek equivalents, Arranging them apart in two columns.

3) the task of determining the evaluation of phraseological units (for this student you should find the definition in the dictionary and determine whether the given phraseological unit carries negative, positive or neutral rating. For example, A rotten apple used about someone who is dishonest or immoral and who has a bad effect on others. By the presence of the word bad in the definition, we see that this FE has a negative rating.)

4) the task of determining the syntactic function of phraseological units in sentence (for example, define the syntactic function of go beetroot in the following sentence:

When he would go beetroot.

Effective exercises for the use of phraseological units in communication are not strictly controlled in nature a teacher. Their goal is to teach schoolchildren to communicate with self-selected phraseological units without relying on sample. You can identify the types of monologue / dialogue that occur in real communication: greeting, praise, censure, story, description, description, accusatory or acquittal speech. In all such forms of verbal communication, phraseological units can be used to diversify speech and make it richer. Therefore, it would be wise to include in the list of possible exercises a task of drawing up a dialogue.

5) the teacher can invite students to create a dialogue in pairs, on a given topic, using a set of phraseological units.

For example, to create a dialogue between the teacher and the student using such PU as an apple-pie order — a model, an ideal order.

It should be noted that such exercises can be applied not only when studying phraseological units with a floristic component, but also with any other component.

Summarizing all the above, and relying on practical experience, we can note that after a detailed working out and fixation of phraseological units in the students' speech with such exercises, it will be very productive and useful to conduct communication activities in the classroom foreign language. The effectiveness of such activities is based on the fact that students are put in the conditions of real communication, in which they need to exchange views on a given topic and use phraseological units.

The basis for communicative events, envisioning the use of phraseological units are real life situations. To this end, in the learning process, situations of real communication in an educational setting should be applied: solving problem tasks, discussions, storytelling, role-playing games.

The use of phraseological units in the formation of oral-speech skills helps to prevent the occurrence of a language barrier in the process of real communication.

Carrying out communication activities using phraseological units greatly enriches the lessons of a foreign language, makes them meaningful for students and maintains an interest in learning a foreign language.

From this it follows that with the regular use of such techniques of working with phraseological units, it becomes possible to achieve certain results in teaching basic communicative speech units in order to form pupils' verbal and speech skills.

## **CONCLUSIONS OF CHAPTER 2**

In this chapter, we have reviewed and analyzed features of phraseological units with floristic component.

We came to the following conclusions:

1) In our work, the method of continuous sampling of intelligent and 72 phraseological dictionaries of the English language were allocated with the floristic component of which 17 (23.6%) with the “rose” component, 11 (15.3%) with the “apple” component, 8 (11.1) - with the “nut”, 5 (7%) - with the “tree” component, as well as 31 units with various other components. Thus, the most common in the phrase-forming plan are floronyms with the “rose” component, then follow the florony with the “apple” component, then the “nut” and “tree” components. The most seldom found were florony with components “bean”, “potato”, “cucumber”, etc.

2) By analyzing the dictionary definitions, we set the values phraseological units of the studied group. Overwhelming Most of the units studied characterize various aspects of a person’s life, his appearance, character or qualities (for example, the beauty and youth of a woman, good health or firmness of character, or immorality and sycophancy). This group was 63.6%. Were also identified phraseological units that describe the situation (for example, to engage in useless work). They were 36.4%.

3) In our sample of phraseological units with floristic component present phraseological units as with positive 17 units (40.5%), and a negative 21 units (50%) and a neutral rating of 4 units (9.5%). However, phraseological units with a negative rating prevail. We also found out that in our sample there are only PU with emotional evaluations, since she expresses the attitude of the speaker to the subject. We did not reveal intellectual assessments, because it is part of the denotation, and no such PUs were found in our card file.

4) In our work, we used two main, in our opinion, criteria for the separation of phraseological units by expressiveness:

1) qualitative (or figurative) and 2) quantitative (intensifying).

The quantitative criterion of expressiveness is easy to determine by the presence in the definition of such words as many, little, few, very, as well as the presence of degrees of comparison of adjectives and adverbs.

The figurative criterion is determined by the presence of a specific image in a phraseological unit. Most PUs from our sample are based on the image, so the qualitative (figurative) expressiveness prevails.



## CONCLUSION

This work is devoted to English phraseology with floristic component.

The purpose of this thesis was to study linguocultural peculiarities of English phraseological units with floristic component and further analysis of phraseological units with this component. Within this goal, we analyzed the basic concepts of the theoretical framework:

"Phraseology", "phraseological unit", "linguistic cultural studies", "linguistic picture of the world", "phraseological picture of the world", "cultural connotation, stereotype, anthropocentric paradigm, "Evaluativeness", and "expressiveness and selected their most successful interpretations in our opinion:

Phraseology is the science of phraseological units.(idioms).

Phraseological units are stable combinations of tokens with fully or partially rethought value.

Linguoculturology is a branch of linguistics that emerged on the junction of linguistics and cultural studies and exploring the manifestations of the culture of the people, which are reflected and entrenched in the language.

language picture of the world - a global, holistic image of the world, the sum of all knowledge of the world, which is reflected in the language, and as a method of obtaining new information and its interpretation.

The phraseological picture of the world is the so-called microworld in language with its own characteristics in terms of expression and content.

Cultural connotation indicator of cultural ethnic group, a sign that carries information about the national-cultural experience and determines the specifics of this particular language.

Stereotype is a stable fragment of the picture of the world, mental a picture, a certain image that exists in the mass consciousness, which allows, on the one hand, to store and transform some of the dominant components of a given culture, and on the other, to manifest itself among "our own" and at the same time recognize "our own".

The anthropocentric paradigm is the switching of interests the researcher from the objects of knowledge on the subject, i.e. analyzed person in language and language in person

Evaluation - evaluation means a component connotations pinning information about a word approving or disapproving (positive or negative) attitude to the designated object or phenomenon.

Expressiveness - by expressiveness in a broad sense. implies a certain function of some language units - the impact function.

In the practical part of our thesis, we investigated phraseological units with floristic component. The method of continuous sampling from the explanatory and phraseological dictionaries of the English language has been allocated 72 units with a floristic component. During the analysis of features of phraseological units with this component, it was revealed: 1) the most commonly used are phraseological units with the component rose, apple, nut, tree;

2) By analyzing the dictionary definitions, we set the values phraseological units of the studied group. Overwhelming most of the units studied characterize one or another side of a person's life, his appearance, character, or qualities (including describing female beauty, youth, and good health); 3) in the course of analyzing the data of phraseological units, it was revealed that in our sample there are phraseological units with positive, negative and neutral evaluation. With a negative assessment turned out to be more. We also found out that in our sample there are only phraseological units with emotional evaluations; 4) English phraseological units with a floral component are nationally labeled, which manifests itself at the level of their symbolism based on stereotypes and standards. Therefore, "their" components in phraseological units are regarded as something positive and positive; 5) the majority of phraseological units with a floristic component are based on an image, therefore, qualitative (figurative) expressiveness in a given the sample prevails.

The analysis of phraseological units with a floristic component allows us to speak of the inseparable connection between man and the natural world. For many

centuries, man has observed the world of flora, thereby forming his own understanding of this area of reality, his attitude, stereotypes and his picture of the world as a whole. Language, in turn, being an essential tool for cognitive activity, helped and helps man with this. Therefore, the study of English phraseology with a floristic component is certainly important and relevant, because this layer of phraseology reflects the national culture of the English people.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Алефиренко, Н.Ф. Теория языка. Вводный курс [Текст] / Н.Ф. Алефиренко – Москва : Академия, 2004. – 368 с.
2. Арсентьева, Е.Ф. Сопоставительный анализ фразеологических единиц [Текст] / Е.Ф. Арсентьева. – Казань : Изд-во Казанского ун-та, 1989.  
– 126 с.
3. Арсентьева, Е.Ф. Фразеология и фразеография в сопоставительном аспекте (на материале русского и английского языков) [Текст] / Е.Ф. Арсентьева. – Казань: Изд-во Казанского ун-та, 2006. –172с.
4. Арутюнова, Н. Д. Предложение и его смысл [Текст] / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – Москва, 1976 . – С. 326– 356.
5. Бабкин, А. М. Русская фразеология: ее развитие и источники [Текст] / А. М. Бабакин – Ленинград : Наука, 1970. – 264 с.
6. Балли, Ш. Французская стилистика [Текст] / Ш. Балли Москва – : Изд-во иностр. лит-ры, 1961. –221 с.
7. Барышникова, Т.Д. Этимологический четырехязычный словарь растений: учеб. пособие [Текст] / Т.Д. Барышникова. – Москва : Альфа-М, 2009. – 224 с.
8. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика [Текст] / Э.Бенвенист. – Москва:1974. – С. 129-140
9. Вакуров, Н.М. Основы стилистики фразеологических единиц [Текст] / Н.М. Вакуров. – Москва :1983. – 105с.
10. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание [Текст] / А. Вежбицкая. – Москва : Русские словари, 1996. - С. 201-231.
11. Виноградов, В. В. Основные типы лексических значений слова ( В кн. Избранные труды) [Текст] / В.В.Виноградов. – Москва : 1997. – С. 162 – 189

12. Водяха, А.А. Эмотивный потенциал фразеологических единиц [Текст] / А.А. Водяха. – Волгоград : Перемена, 1996. – 30с.
13. Гак, В. Г. Сопоставительная лексикология [Текст] / В.Г.Гак. – Москва, 1977. – 60с.
14. Девкин, В.Д. Немецкая разговорная речь : Синтаксис и методика [Текст] / В.Д. Девкин. – Москва : Международные отношения, 1979. – 256 с.
15. Добрыднева, Е.А. Современная русская фразеология : категориальные признаки и коммуникативные свойства [Текст] / Е.А. Добрыднева. – Волгоград : Перемена, 1998. – 90 с.
16. Звегинцев, В. А. Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика [Текст] / В.А.Звегинцев. – Москва : Просвещение, 1967. – 338 с.
17. Кожица, М.Н. Стилистика русского языка [Текст] / М.Н. Кожица. – Москва : Просвещение, 1983. – 223 с.
18. Колшанский Г. В. Соотношение субъективных и объективных факторов в языке [Текст] / Г.В.Колшанский . – Москва: 1975. – 89 с.
19. Кубрякова Е. С. Части речи в ономазиологическом освещении [Текст] / Е. С. Кубрякова . – Москва: 1978. – 50с.
20. Кузнецова, Э.В. Лексикология русского языка [Текст] / Э.В. Кузнецова. – Москва : Высшая школа, 1989. – 216 с.
21. Кунин, А.В. Фразеология современного английского языка [Текст] / А.В. Кунин. – Москва : Высш. шк., 1996. – 380 с.
22. Ларин, Б.А. История русского языка и общее языкознание [Текст] / Б.А.Ларин – Москва:1977. – С. 125–149)

23. Ларин, Б.А. Очерки по фразеологии (о систематизации и методах исследования фразеологических материалов) [Текст] / Б.А.Ларин – Москва:1977. – С. 126-129.

24. Маслова, В. А. Лингвокультурология [Текст] / В. А. Маслова – Москва: Издательский центр Академия, 2001. – 208 с.
25. Мокиенко, В. М. Славянская фразеология [Текст] / В. М. Мокиенко – Москва: Высш. шк., 1989. – 211 с.
26. Серебренникова, Б. А. Языковая номинация [Текст] / Б. А. Серебренникова – Москва: 1977. – 72 с.
27. Степанов, Ю. С. Словарь русской культуры [Текст] / Ю. С. Степанов – Москва: Академический проект, 2004. – С. 42-67.
28. Телия, В. Н. Типы языковых значений: Связанное значение слова в языке / В. Н. Телия – Москва: Наука, 1981. – 269 с.
29. Телия, В. Н. Коннотативный аспект семантики номинативных единиц [Текст] / В. Н. Телия. – Москва : Наука, 1986. – 143 с.
30. Телия, В. Н. Номинация // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь [Текст] / В. Н. Телия. – Москва: 1990. – С. 336—337.
31. Фрумкина Р. М. Психоллингвистика [Текст] / Р. М. Фрумкина – Москва: Академия, 2003. – 320 с.
32. Шумбасова, С. С. Грамматическое структурирование фразеологизмов со- временного английского языка с компонентом- фитонимом [Текст] / С. С. Шумбасова. – Москва: Изд-во МГОУ, 2011. –
- С.  
85–92.  
Список словарей и энциклопедий
33. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь [Текст] / гл. ред. В. Н. Ярцева. – Москва : Большая Российская энциклопедия, 2002. – 709 с.
- 64
34. Longman Dictionary of English Idioms [Текст] / London: Longman, 1979. – P. 287 – 552.
35. Oxford Idioms Dictionary for learners of English [Текст] / Oxford: University Press, 2006. – P. 305– 469.

36. Словарь образных выражений русского языка [Текст] /  
Т.С.Аристова, М.Л.Ковшова и др. Под ред. В.Н.Телия. – М., 1995. –  
С.10-16.

37. The Wordsworth Dictionary of Idioms [Текст] / Wordsworth  
Reference, 1996. – 432 p.