

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 4.971
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 12 Volume: 80

Published: 25.12.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Dildora Shuxratovna Abdullayeva
Namangan State University
Teacher
northern-light@inbox.ru

Fotima Abduvosiyevna Rafikova
Namangan State University
Teacher
rafikovafotima@gmail.com

Muzaffar Odiljono'g'li Obilov
Namangan State University
Teacher
m-obilov@mail.ru

THE STUDY OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS UNDER THE HEADING OF LINGUOPRAGMATICS

Abstract: *The article discusses the limitations of translating from Uzbek into English and vice versa in one area of what has been termed General pragmatics or Language in Use. The main purpose of the article is to define and explain the meaning of this term, and why we need it. The research explored comparative method in both finding the theory and suitable examples. The finding of the research shows the impact of pragmatics in real life conversation. While socializing people really need pragmatic meaning for understanding speaker's attitude, feeling and thoughts. Theoretical contributions and practical implications are presented by phraseological units, idioms and authentic dialogues, and drew a conclusion, opposite meaning of semantics argued as pragmatics.*

Key words: *simple structured units, symbolic meaning, pragmema, informema, anthropocentric, speech portrait of a person, pragmatic failure.*

Language: English

Citation: Abdullayeva, D. S., Rafikova, F. A., & Obilov, M. O. (2019). The study of phraseological units under the heading of linguopragmatics. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 12 (80), 262-266.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-12-80-52> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

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

The founder of the theory of phraseology is a Swiss linguist Charles Bally. Bally was the first who systematized the combination of the words in his books "Studies of the Stylistics" and "French Stylistics". Ch. Bally explored the sphere of linguistics and phraseology in the French language, however, his attempt to systematize and classify

phraseological units led to the series of other studies in the phraseological sphere in other languages, including English.

Even today this sphere is in the focus of many researches. So, in his book "The Course of the Modern English Phraseology", A. V. Kunin investigated a wide range of phraseological characteristics, methods of their studies, phraseological system and presents classifications of idiomatic expressions according to their features (1990). Komissarov contributed in this field by studying the methods of translating phraseological units (2004).

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Materials and Methods

The methods of investigation that are used in this work are linguopragmatical conceptual analysis including cognitive mapping and conceptual blending. Methodological basis of the given article is works of such scholars as G. Lakoff and M. Johnson, Kubryakova, V. Z. Demyankov; Chudinov, Kunin and many others. Phraseological units are considerable parts of any language. Therefore, they are studied by plenty of scholars. For example, Russian scholars V.V. Vinogradov, A.I. Smidnitoski, H. N. Asomova and Uzbek scholars Sh. Rahmatullayev, A. E. Mamatov, B. Yo'ldoshev conducted a research on this sphere of linguistics. Their works and researches play significant role in the development of phraseology. Even nowadays, this field of linguistics attracts great many of scholars' attention. A.B. Pittman defines phraseological units in his works as a group of words in a fixed order that is different from the meaning of each word understood on its own (Urantaeva N, 2017). In fact, idioms can never be translated into another language word for word. Otherwise, they lose their semantic meaning. For instance, if we translate the idiom "Lend an ear" into Uzbek word by word, it means "qulog'iniqarzgabermoq". Because, the word "lend" means to let someone borrow something that belongs to you for a short time. However, in this work you can see this kind of phraseological units with its equivalents in Uzbek language.

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

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

comparison of phraseological units in the anthropocentric paradigm expanding the study by the large group of phraseological idioms. The comparison will be continued, and the conclusions of the proposed research have a premature character. As an example: "wallflower" translating word by word the meaning is flower is hung on the wall –informema.

Girl who was not invited to dance (in a party)-pragmema.

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

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

Different philosophers of language described Linguopragmatics differently.

By concluding all the views, we can point out the following aspects and approaches:

The relations between a sign and its users (Morris,1978)

Contextual conditionality, language usage, language in the context (Susov,1985)

Speech impact on the addressee, the factors influencing successful and effective communication (Kisilyova,1978)

Interpretative aspects of speech communication (Arutyunova,1989)

Language as a tool of a purposeful communicative activity (Grays,1985)

The problem of mutual understanding and appropriateness of language use (Dijk T.A van,1977)

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

Findings

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

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	ПИИЦ (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

the linguistic science, the word pragmaling seems to be a natural thing to say about the category of units.

There are two pragmalingvistic units:

1. Informema.
2. Pragmema.

As an example: “wallflower” translating word by word the meaning is flower is hung on the wall – informema.

Girl who was not invited to dance (in a party)-pragmema.

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

The phraseological idioms are determined by social and political aspects, traditions, customs, cultural values which create similar thematic domains in all investigated languages. The cultural concepts in the research will be described within a broader anthropocentric paradigm since it includes the cultural dimension; and its central assumption is that every language, especially its figurative meanings is connected with the reflection of the world-view shared by the linguistic knowledge about the reality. Cultural concepts in anthropocentric phraseology of the proposed research are abstract notions such as, for instance, intellectual ability, emotional and expressive aspects, empathy and other positive traits of human nature as well as bad sides of human nature, which construct the world-picture in a culturally specific way. Both concepts proper and sub-concepts are involved. It is noteworthy indeed that “their specificity is implemented mostly at the cognitive, not the semantic level because cultural background refers to information that is most difficult to formalize, as it is connected with semantics in a very indirect and still unexplored way” as, for instance, in the paradigm the traits of character with the positive meaning in the sub-concept smart, capable: Uzbek.: kallabor1) someone is very smart, capable; 2) to do something after proper consideration: Mening ham kallabor!;

Rus.: голова на плечах; compare: сголовой: – У тебя есть погоны и голова наплечах – иди и зарабатывай, сказал в интервью сотрудниками института один московский милиционер ; Eng.: a bright chap (girl); a person with a head on his shoulders; to use one’s head (loaf) when doing something: Matthew, the eldest, is quite a bright chap and Emma, the next one age-wise, is all right but learning the recorder .

The mentioned before subgroup also involves such feature of character as capability: Uzbek: *qo’ligul*: –Qo’ligulusta Umar yana birbor o’z mahoratini namoyon etdi; Rus.: *золотые руки*: У него золотые руки! Хотите/ он и вам такую машину сделает? Молодец! Золотые руки. Любо-дорого глядеть/ куда он за что-нибудь берётся, мастер на все руки: Он и хормейстер, и концертмейстер, и режиссёр драмкружка; играл на всех инструментах и в изобразительном искусстве разбирался, – словом, одарённая личность, мастер на все руки, энтузиаст своего дела, сумел увлечь и других; Eng.: *somebody is good hand at any job; some body can do anything with hishands*. The phraseological units of that subgroup are common to all investigated languages because of the same factors of logical and psychological nature.

We can see further examples in the table below which shows English idioms with appropriate equivalence.

The most important function of any language unit, including phraseological, is the pragmatic function, i.e. purposeful impact of the language mark on the addressee. The section focuses on the pragmatic aspect of the functioning of phraseological units, the mastery of which is a prerequisite for effective communication. According to the principle of anthropocentrism, the main factor regulating the development and functioning of phraseological units is the human factor in the language. Human speech becomes a point of reference in the analysis of the functional and pragmatic aspects of phraseological unit

Table 1.

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

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 4.971	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

This section discusses the pragmatic potential of simple structured phraseological units. Their functional significance is beyond doubt, since they have such pragmatically relevant properties as the complexity of the semantic structure and the ability to associate. Idiom, as a rule, are used in cases where the subject of speech is necessary to express an emotional relationship to the subject of thought, to produce a certain pragmatic effect on the recipient. The term “pragmatics” was introduced into scientific use by one of the founders of semiotics — the general theory of signs — Ch. Morris, who divided semiotics into semantics, syntactic and pragmatics, understanding the latter as a teaching about attitudes signs to their interpreters, that is, to those who use sign systems (Ariel M. 2010)

Thus, pragmatics studies the behavior of signs in real communication processes. If semantics shows what a person says, what statement means, then a pragmatist seeks to reveal the conditions and the purpose for which person speaks in this case. The pragmatic potential of language and communication, according to N.I. Formanovskaya is associated with the attitude of a person to linguistic signs, with the expression of his attitudes, assessments, emotions, and intentions during the production (and perception) of speech actions in statements and discourses.

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

action, namely: subject, purpose, method, means, result, conditions, etc. The subject of the speech act - the speaker - produces a statement designed to be perceived by the addressee - the listener. The statement acts simultaneously as a product of the speech act, and as a tool to achieve a specific goal. Depending on the circumstances or on the conditions in which the speech act is performed, he can either achieve the goal and thus be successful, or not achieve it. The interaction of the speech act and the context is the main core of pragmatic research, and the formulation of the rules of this interaction is its main task. Pragmatic interests begin where the connection between the context and the speech act is as intense as possible. In recent years, interest in issues related to the functioning of phraseological units in various communicative conditions has increased. A special place here takes a communicative and pragmatic study of phraseology, aimed at the study of speech activity using phraseological units. Speech activity was considered as one of the forms of life. It was again realized that “not only language paints a picture of the world ..., but life also provides the key to understanding many phenomena of language and speech. This direction of relations became decisive for pragmatic research. The pragmatic function of phraseological units is a targeted impact on the addressee. Being implemented in context, it is closely related to the stylistic function of phraseological units. Based on the communicative and pragmatic attitudes of the texts under study, the main pragmatic parameters can be considered as expressiveness, conceptuality and subtextual information.

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

To conclude, we admit that, in many cases, we deal with similar logical and semantic patterns in all investigated languages because of the existence of the same human universal spirit, of a resembling ontological experience, of a common European identity. We could also assert, on the basis of the previously analyzed descriptive material, that there are unique phraseological units in the culture and mentality of each community, determined by different economic, social, historical and psychological aspects. Since phraseology in comparative linguo-cultural studies is still relatively young field of research, much more corpora are necessary to learn

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 4.971	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PИHИЦ (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

and understand the national spirit of the certain ethnic group through cultural concepts. This is one of the first attempts when these languages –Uzbek, English and Russian have been compared. Therefore, the prospects of further investigation relate to the

comparison of phraseological units in the anthropocentric paradigm expanding the study by the large group of phraseological idioms. The comparison will be continued, and the conclusions of the proposed research have a premature character.

References:

1. Ariel, M. (2010). *Research survey in linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Ashurova, D.U. (2012). *Text of linguistics*. Tashkent: “Tashakkurqanoti”.
3. Dijk, T. (n.d.). *A van. Text and Context \ \ Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. L, N.Y:Longman.
4. Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics. An Introduction*. - Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
5. Hiraga, M.K., & Fujii (2013). *L2 Pragmatics in Academic Discourse: A Case Study of Tutorials in Britain*. Tutorials in Britain.
6. Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purpose*. New edition. University of Sydney, Australia. ISBN-10:0415358701
7. Komissarov, V. N. (2004). *Modern translation*. (p.424). Moscow: ETC.
8. Kunin, A. V. (1990). *The course of the modern English phraseology*. (p.380). Moscow: Visshayashkola.
9. Matveeva, G. (2011). *Pragmalinguistics in the System of Linguistic Sciences*.
10. Urantayeva, N.B., Nurmatova, M.R., & Polvanova, N.M. (2017). The comparative analyzes of English-Uzbek idioms. ISSN 2072-0297 *molodoi ucheniy № 19 (153)*.