

PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS AND THE LEXICALIZATION PHENOMENON**Linguistics**

Keywords: phraseological units, lexemization, portable meaning, language unit, speech unit, lexeme, phrase, stagnation, phraseological unit, phraseological intersection.

Kholmukhamedov Bakhtiyar Farhodovich

Teacher of the Samarkand State University. City Samarkand, Uzbekistan.

Abstract

This article comments on the lexeism of phraseological units in Uzbek linguistics. Examples of cases of stagnation and crossing phrases that are easily included in speech as a unit of language are described. Two semantic types of phrases based on the relationship between the meaning of a phrase and the meaning of lexemes in it were distinguished in the article: 1) phraseological integrity and 2) phraseological disorder. It has been observed that a meaning understood from phraseological units is a superficial, tolerable meaning and that it is a process of lexemization, and that the derivation of a complex meaning is an expression of conflicting meanings. A proper understanding of phraseological units is a logical mistake, exaggerating and exaggerating the action that was taken, and trying to explain the existence of common similarities and similarities that connect movements with the concept of a cluster. It has been argued that phraseological units are a product of the lexemization of linguistic units.

One of the pressing issues in Uzbek linguistics is the relation of phraseological units (hereinafter PU) to lexemization. According to sources, phrases equal to the sentence from a semantic point of view mean a single generalized meaning and are a phraseological unit that is easily entered into speech, has a figurative meaning, for example, «*tomdan tarasha tushganday, oyog'ini qo'liga olmoq, sichqonning ini ming tanga*» [2, p.124; 4, p.56.] We also mean by the term PU units that are easily accessible in the language and which are conveyed in such a way that the word is connective or expressive.

In this regard, the question of whether PUs is a language unit or a speech unit should be considered as such, since this is important from the point of view. In most descriptions, PUs is interpreted as a vocabulary unit that integrates easily into speech. «The phraseological meaning, which is understood in the totality or sentence of PU, allows us to consider it as a semantic unit, and not as a syntactic unit (unit of speech)» [5, p. 10].

Consequently, PUs are formed both in terms of content and in terms of expression before they are included in a specific speech, in which case they are understood and accepted by native speakers. This means that the readiness of the PU for speech requires recognition of them as a language unit.

Since we strive to study the ratio of the PU to the phenomenon of Lexicalization, as we said above, the consideration of these units as unity units requires certain accuracy. Because the very fact that the interpretation of the PU as a linguistic phenomenon makes it impossible to determine its relationship to **lexicalization**. Of course, in this case, we must ask ourselves whether PUs is really a language phenomenon. The fact that the lexeme is a linguistic phenomenon as a

lexicon element of linguistic construction it does not raise doubts in traditional linguistics. But a systemic linguistic perspective broadens our understanding of this.

H.Nematov and R.Rasulov, summarizing the systematic lexicological approach in Uzbek linguistics and presenting their theoretical considerations, write: «...«Readiness» of lexemes, it seems to us, corresponds to the concepts of «roots», «root words» of traditional linguistics. But this is not so. Indeed, the «root words» and «roots» of traditional linguistics are some of the language tokens that are found in speech» [3, p. 387].

What if we consider at the token as a word? The word «appearance of a token in speech with a specific form and function». This is the smallest unit of speech that has a sound envelope, which expresses the concept of objective events or the relationship between them and is used in various grammatical meanings and functions [5, p. 95].

H. Nematov and R. Rasulov also recognize that the word is a unit of speech. «This is a manifestation of a certain form, meaning and function, determined by the relations of similarity and neighborhood of lexemes and derived words» [3, p. 54].

What prevents us from calling PU a speech module at the beginning? How and when did these words connect out of speech? It is known that they have undergone some kind of interconnection and syntactic relations and until they become stagnant in the language, do not express a certain meaning and become understandable to the native speaker. Obviously, this combination is realized only in speech. The second step in the formation of these units is to participate in a ready-made form in speech as a unit of language. Thus, they were involved in the speech process until they became such, that is, a linguistic phenomenon.

To summarize the above, all transferable dictionary units can be considered as PU. However, in order to avoid diversity and strive for clarity, we will work on the following idea of Sh.Rahmatullaev, namely: There are two semantic types of phrases based on the relationship between the meaning understood by the phrase and the token in its meaning: 1) phraseological integrity, 2) phraseological ratio.

A phrase that is interpreted based on lexeme-like meanings, which is the common denominator of these lexical meanings, is called *phraseological integrity*. A phrase that cannot be interpreted on the basis of lexeme-like meanings and does not take lexeme-like meanings into account is called a phraseological ratio [6, p. 74-76].

As with all language units, PU has the same meaning. The outline of the expression explains its construction. At least two independent words (token) are included in this device, and these syntactically related words are essentially equivalent to a combination or sentence [5, p. 9-10].

Therefore, if they are in terms of expression, in the form of words or phrases, they are equivalent to a token in terms of content (meaning cannot always be clearly understood). Researchers call these aspects referring to PU as *lexical phrases*: «... According to the content plan, PUs are close to lexical units (words), but from the point of view of the expression plan they are closer to syntactic units (sentences). But PU is not quite equal to words, phrases and words» [7, p. 6]. A deeper understanding of the meaning of these statements is also important in determining the relationship of PU to Lexicalization. Hence the connection of these units with word formation.

In the process of trying to understand the essence of PU, conflicting ideas arose. Our task is not to analyze them. Therefore, we dwell only on those points that are relevant to the topic. In most PU definitions, they are interpreted as a lexical unit. Since the lexical unit is a unit, they must also have a lexical meaning. B. Yuldashev having analyzed the monograph of S.N. Muratov «Sustainable phrases in the Turkic languages» (M., 1960) drew on his long-standing ideas. For example, the following regular expressions: a) different types of joint words; b) lexical phrases; c) grammatical phrases; d) recalling the introduction of phraseological compounds, he states: «From the point of view of whether the PU has a specific vocabulary meaning», S.N. Muratov divides them into two groups: a) the idiom of the lexico-phraseological type (PU with a certain dictionary meaning); b) idioms of pure phraseological type (PUs without a special dictionary).

As we understand, the division into such groups is the result of efforts aimed at a deeper understanding of the nature of PU. In fact, they cannot but have a definite vocabulary meaning. But the idea that these meanings are expressed in one clear and somewhat abstract form is close to the truth.

Sh. Rahmatullaev mentioned that the syntactic connection between words in a phrase retains its strength and does not die, but is internal. For example, an expression of the *ko'ngl(i) og'ridi* is equivalent to an internal syntactic construct (consisting of the relationship between the subject and the predicate), and the variant of *ko'ngl(i)ni og'ritmoq* of the same expression is equivalent to the compound (relation of the complementary to the supplement). It can be seen that the grammatical change in one component requires an alternative change in the other component, so that the equivalent state of the sentence is equal to the connection. There are many expressions for the syntax of these types: *ko'z(i) ko'r, qulog'(i) kar bo'ldi – ko'z(i)ni ko'r, qulog'(i)ni kar qilmoq; ko'z(i)ni moshdek ochmoq – ko'z(i) moshdek ochildi* [5, p. 10].

Sh. Rahmatullev's analysis shows that there may be partial changes in the structure of the PU during speech. «The phrase is used as a *fixed link* because it is integrated into speech and does not lose its integrity outside speech» [4, p. 9]. The difficulty is that when expressions are considered as free connections, it is necessary to recognize the syntactic relationships within the expression. The fact that there is a syntactic link between units with grammatical connections does not allow us to talk about Lexicalization. The issue requires resolution and clarity. Thus, it is necessary to decide whether the PU is a free compound or stable.

In the lecture «Evolution of the semantics of some static compounds in the Polish language» K.G.Gulumanz stated: «One of the reasons for the transition of free compounds to stable compounds is the Lexicalization process. In the field of phraseology, we say that the individual components of a compound have a gradual sense of the semantic meanings of a compound and that phrases generally have a common meaning over the meanings of the constituent parts» [1, p. 239-242].

This understanding of the problem further clarifies the reaction of the PU to Lexicalization. In the end, the syntactic relationship between the parts of the PU limits and expands the scope of the phenomenon of Lexicalization in them. We can talk about PU only if they comply with existing token rules.

If we ask this question, can we also require tokens for all PUs in the Uzbek language? No, of course not. Based on the classification of Sh.Rahmatullaev, we first consider the phraseological unit. As a rule, the meaning of phraseological integrity proceeds from the general meaning of the lexical meanings of units in it, and they are an alternative to a certain lexeme in a language. For example: *avj olmoq* – a) rivojlanmoq. *Brigadada agrotexnika qoidalariga to‘la rioya qilingani uchun g‘ozalar barq urib avj olmoqda* (R.Fayziy); b) zo‘raymoq, kuchaymoq. *Otishmalar tamom bo‘layotgandek bir nafas pasayar va yana avj olar edi* (P.Tursun); c) azob chekmoq – suffer. *Brigadir ko‘p vaqtlardan buyon jigar kasalidan azob chekardi* (Sh.Rashidov). (Explanatory phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language, p. 23)

As the examples show, the phrase *avj olmoq* coincides with the words *avjlanmoq/avjlanish* and *azob chekmoq* coincides with *azoblanmoq*. But it’s just a more impressive, imaginative look. The requirements for the Lexicalization phenomenon are known from the previous parts that we mentioned. Because of this phenomenon, a new unit of language must be formed, which means a new understanding of the language. Is this requirement met? It is difficult to answer the question positively.

However, it cannot be denied that a new expression of an existing phenomenon or concept has appeared. Enough to list PU, such as the *boshi aylanmoq*, *boshidan kechirmoq*, *boshi bukilmog*, *boshi egilmog*, *boshiga yetmoq*, *boshiga kelmoq*, *boshiga chiqmoq*, *boshidan kechirmog*, *boshini achitmoq*, *boshini yemoq*, *boshini suqmoq*, *boshini tiqmoq*, *bosh qotirmog*, *boshi qotmog*, *boshini qotirmog*, *boshi shishmog/g‘ovlamog*, *bosh qo‘shmog*, *boshini qo‘shmog* with the component *bosh*.

We look at other PUs of the same type in the letters A and B in the explanatory phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language: *avra-astarini ag‘darmog* - expose all your work (pages 24 and 28 of the dictionary. After that, only pages will be displayed); *amamning buzog‘i* - slobbery (26), *anqoning urug‘i* - difficult to find (27), *aravani olib qochmog* - brag (27), *arpasini xom o‘rmog* - to do something bad (27), *belga tepmog* - to disturb (36), *bel bog‘lamog* - get ready, go seriously (35), *beli og‘rimog/beli og‘rimaydi* - back pain (36), *bel ushlamog/bel bog‘lamog* -

compete (36-37), *bel og'ritmoq* - suffer (37), *bir yostiqa bosh qo'ymoq* - live a family life (39), *bir o'q bilan ikki quyonni urmoq* - do two things at the same time with one goal (40,44), *boshi aylanmoq* - be wasteful, lose your balance (45), *boshdan oyoq* - complete, whole (15), *bosh og'riq* - excessive concern (55) and so on. There are many such PUs in the dictionary. But how do they differ from previously analyzed PUs such as *avj olmoq*, *azob chekmoq*? Firstly, they are not the only words.

In other words, their alternative can be either one word or another PU. Secondly, their meanings, based on their displacement, come only from a combination of two words. This is what matters to us. Because in Lexicalization there is also such a phenomenon. Analysis gives us reason to believe that this type of PU is also a product of the Lexicalization of linguistic units.

Thirdly, the fact that these types of compounds were originally correctly meaningful in the Uzbek language, and that the transferable meaning is the second stage in the development of meaning in a composite language unit. Some of them are still used literally: *yeng shimarmoq*, *yoqadan tutmoq*, *og'zini ochmoq*, *og'zini yopmoq*. Compare: ***Ammamning buzog'ini yetaklab bozorga olib bordim*** (from conversation) – *Bu ishni Keldiyevga topshirdim. Taniysiz-a, ammamning buzog'i. Shunaqa mayda-chuydani topshirmasam, jiddiy ishlarni eplay olmaydi.* (Tohir Malik. *Shaytanat*), *Ot hurkib, aravani olib qochdi* (from conversation) – *Aravani olib qochding, og'ayni. Gapga ham amirkon moyi surtib, g'irchillatvoradigan bo'psan-da* (S.Ahmad. *Oriyat*), *O'tgan yili arpa xom o'rildi, natijada ularning aksariyat qismi panglab ketdi* (from conversation) *Nimaga unga osilasan, arpani xom o'rganmi?* – *dedi Anvar, qorini kuzatib qaytgach* (Tohir Malik. *Shaytanat*.)

The question arises: is the new token in the PU language called or is it an alternative to the existing token? Since the language uses the combination of the words *buzoq* to mean *lapashang*, *landavur*, it should be recognized as the new unit of the lexeme. Like PU, it can also be an alternative to another unit that already exists in that language.

Now let's see how the PU relates to the token of the so-called phraseological cross. As a rule, the meaning of this type of PU is not explained by the tokens contained in it, that is, they do not follow from the meaning of words in their content. It may even have the opposite meaning [6, p. 75; 2, p. 125]. For example: *dunyoni suv bossa to'pig'iga chiqmaslik* - extreme neglect (76), *yerga kirib ketmoq* - be kicked (81), *yer tagida ilon qimirlasa, bilmoq* - extremely sensitive and nimble (84), *jonini hovuchlamoq* - worry too much about the possibility of an accident (100), *zardasi qaynamoq* - be angry (106), *ikki oyog'ini bir etikka tiqmoq* - to be in a very difficult situation (111), *ikki qo'lini og'ziga tiqmoq* - excited and trying to achieve more than necessary (113), *ichini it tirnamoq* - discreetly mentally disturbed (116), *ichi qora* - with bad intentions (117), *kulini ko'kka sovurmoq* - decompose, destroy (129), *ko'zining paxtasi chiqmoq* - *ko'zi qinidan chiqmoq* - *ko'zi kosasidan chiqmoq* - anger is reflected in his eyes (145), *oyog'ini qo'liga*

olmoq - to run, *to'nini teskari kiymoq* - stubbornness (238), *o'pkasini qo'ltiqลามoq* - can't find a place.

The fact that such PUs do not follow from the meaning of the words in it resembles the Lexicalization connections of complex units. It is important to know that the notion that a derived meaning does not arise from the meaning of words in a compound applies only to the correct meaning. Even the idea of expressing conflicting meanings in the output (A.Hojiev) is based on Lexicalization and movement of components. This will be a logical mistake, if we understand the PU in the direct sense. None of this can be done in real life. However, the need to exaggerate the progress made requires the unification of linguistic units. No matter how logical their understanding may be, there is a common similarity between actions. We tried to explain this through the concept of *classema*.

Thus, in this form of PU, we also observe a Lexicalization phenomenon and note that their general aspects are as follows: 1. The researchers noted that the meanings understood from PU are not just the sum of the lexical meanings contained in the words they contain, but also as additions as well as figurative meanings [6, p. 7-8]. We also see this in the process of Lexicalization. In both cases, tokens in a compound lose their independence. 2. In the process of phraseology and Lexicalization, two or more tokens are involved not in one word, but in conjunction. 3. Due to the phenomena of phraseology and Lexicalization, new complex meanings are formed. They can also be vocabulary units that are considered completely new or alternative to existing tokens. 4. In both cases, the derivative form acts as a sentence. This allows us to consider the emergence of PUs as a speech process, call it a phrase, and note that the process and the sides of Lexicalization are in the circumstances that we have just listed.

References

1. Gyulumyans, K.M. Evolyutsiya semantiki nekotoryh ustoychivyh sochetaniy pol'skogo yazika / Materiali vsesoyuznoy konferensii po obshemu yazikoznaniyu «Osnovnie problemi evolyutsii yazika». Chast' II. – Samarkand: Fan, 1966. – S. 239-242.
2. Hojiev, A. Tilshunoslik terminlarining izohli lug'ati. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2002.
3. Nematov, H., Rasulov R. O'zbek sistem leksikologiyasi asoslari. –Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1995.
4. Rahmatullaev, Sh. Nutqimiz ko'rki. – Toshkent: Fan, 1970.
5. Rahmatullaev, Sh. O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1978.
6. Tursunov, U., Muxtorov J., Rahmatullaev, Sh. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. Toshkent: O'zbekiston, 1992.
7. Yo'ldoshev B. Frazeologiya tarixidan lavhalar.– Samarqand: Sug'diyona, 1998.