International Journal of Central Asian Studies Volume 19. 2015

The Problem or Structural Study of the Uzbek Phraseologisms

Shodiya Azizovna Ganieva
Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The article presents the issues of the development of phraseology, theoretical problems of the Uzbek phraseology. It deals with the problem of the position of phraseologisms in the system of set expressions, and also it studies the semantic content of phraseological units, their integral and differential features. The author defines modeling phraseologisms on the basis of these features.

Key words: phraseological theory, a categorical meaning of phraseologism, the corpus of set syntactic expressions, semantic transpositivity, an emotional-expressive seme, a phraseological sense, a phraseological model.

Phraseology appeared in the 40s of the 20th century as a separate branch of linguistics. In the development of this field the ideas on free and closed connection of words which were given in the works of the well-known Russian linguists as A.Potebnja, I.Sreznevsky, A.Shakhmatov, and F.Fortunatov were supporting points. The French scholar Ch.Bally also contributed significantly for the growth of phraseology. He included particular chapters focused on the investigation on word combinations, i.e. phraseologisms into his work "French Stylistics". He divided two peculiarities of phraseological word combinations as external (unreliable or just false) and internal (essential mark) peculiarities. According to his viewpoint, structural features of the

word combinations are external and the semantic character of them is considered as internal peculiarities. Phraseology should study mostly this semantic nature, the internal peculiarities of phraseologisms (Bally.1984). F.de Saussure, while writing about syntagma and its nature in his "Course on General Linguistics", he states that there are such ready-made word combinations in the language, their usual characteristics depends on their meaning and syntactical features. They cannot be used without readiness, as they are used in ready-made, according to traditions (Saussure, 1977). Moreover, the Russian linguists as Y.A.Polivanov, S.I.Abakumov, and L.A.Bulakhovsky also made their contribution for the development of the subject.

In the formulating and development of the phraseological theory the role of V.Vinogradov is very great. He (Vinogradov, 1947) exactly defined the main concepts, goals and objectives which are characteristic to this branch of linguistics. The three-componential classification of phraseologisms appeared. This classification is based on the relationship between a form and a content of phraseologisms and depends on the degree of waning of the relationship among lexemes in the structure of a phraseologism.

In the 70s of the last century major attention of the researchers focused on similarities and differences between phraseologisms and words and word combinations, also the classification of phraseologisms and defining their categorical features (Molotkov, 1977). Within the investigation of phraseological units the years of 1970s took a significant place. In the late 70s the study of phreseologisms on the viewpoint of structural-semantic approach appeared (Djukov, 1978). In those years particular research methods which clarified systematic nature of phraseologisms and based on distributive analysis were developed. Moreover, M.M.Kopilenko's and Z.M.Popova's new school related to the concept that phraseology was the subject of word combinations appeared (Kopilenko, Popova, 1972).

The theoretical problems of the Uzbek phraseology were raised in the works of Y.Polivanov. he studied the phraseology of the Russian and some oriental languages and gave the idea of separating phraseology as an independent linguistic branch. As Polivanov emphasises, a new formulating phraseology branch should take place for lexicology as important as syntax for morphology. As he stated: "...the need for developing a new field which is equal to syntax is felt, however, if syntax studies types and properties of word combinations, a new formulating branch will investigate concrete, individual lexical properties of word combinations which are based on the interrelationship of lexemes". He called this new formulating field as phraseology or idiomatics (Polyvanov, 1928).

Since that the problem of the research of phraseological units has been attracting Uzbek linguists' attention. Numerous monographical investigations on this question have been introduced. Within these works the issues as formulating phraseological units, their distinctive features, development, stylistic aspects, etymological properties, and also comparing them with phraseological units of some other languages are studied. For this field, espcially the contribution of Sh.Rakhmatullaev, B.Yuldashev, Abdumurod Mamatov, Abdugafur Mamatov, Sh.Almamatova is great (Rakhmatullev, 1978; Yuldashev, 1993 and 2007; Mamatov, 2000; Almamatova, 2008). Sh.Rakhmatullaev investigated semantic features, relations on form and content in phraseologisms and he also created an explanatory dictionary of Uzbek phraseologisms in a monographic way. B.Yuldashev studied stylistic characteristics of phraseologisms, and A.Mamatov conrtibuted for the development of Uzbek phraseology by his researches on formation of phraseologisms.

It was stated that a word combination and a phraseologism are similar materially, they both are composed by combining two or more words, and also was pointed that an important differential feature

depends on the syntactic relationship between components of them is stable or free as well. Thus, the stability of the syntactic relationship of the components of a phraseologism, their existance in the language before a speech is pronounced, introducing them into a speech as a ready-made material was emphasised.

The corpus of stable word combinations was separated as a system by Ch.Bally (1961) and he stressed that this system is a separated language level and this level is called the phraseological level. The very stability and steadiness were assumed as a basis in defining the corpus of phraseologisms and in classifying them. Consequently, the scope of phraseologisms was extended.

Although both in the Russian linguistics and the study of Turkic languages phraseology was acknowledged as an independent branch of linguistics, only in the 50s of the last century and a phraseme (or a phraseologism) has been considered as a unit of it, there appeared two directions in interpreting the essence and content of phraseologisms.

The supporters of the first direction recognize all stable word combinations of language as phraseologisms. Proverbs, sayings, idiomatic units and others are included in this system. As the integral features of these units are considered “stability”, “ready-made existance in language”.

Although S.Kenesboev (1954) combines idioms, proverbs and sayings into one paradigm as stable combinations, he also defines that idioms are different from proverbs and sayings. As he suggests, idioms are distinguished from proverbs and sayings in the sense of basing on a figurative meaning wholly, and this over figurative meaning is not connected with the meanings of private components that materially form a phraseologism.

As we see, S.Kenesboyev bases on the concepts of V.Vinogradov (1947) when he defines the content of phraseologisms, proves diffences from proverbs and sayings, and when he classifies

phraseologiasms as a phraseological mixture, a phraseological entire, a phraseological compuond, etc.

S.Muratov (1990) states that phraseologisms are distinguished from free word combinations according to the following features: 1) semantic integrity; 2) figurativeness; 3) having an extended sense.

So that, the phraseologism is in common with proverbs, sayings and aphorisms because they all have the property of stability, vice versa it has some features which make it different from them.

Sh.Rakhmatullaev (1970) regards a phraseologism as a lexical unit consisting of more than one lexical stem, equal to a word combination or a clause by its structure, semantically equivalent to a word, and wholly denoting an over figurative meaning. A.Khojiev (1985) considers that a phraseologism is a lexical unit which is equal to a word combination or a clause by its structure, semantically a whole entire, delivering a meaning in an integrated way, not created while a speech process, but introduced into language as a ready-made item; and is a type of stable word combinations with a figurative meaning. R.Rasulov and H.Berdiyorov (1982) write about it fhe followings: “The linguists, who narrowly understand the object of study of phraseology, are separating phraseological units from proverbs and sayings and explaining their own properties, and differences between one another”.

Supporters of this concept of comprehension of phraseologisms suggest a term “paremia” as well. In this case, paremia includes all stable word combinations. A phaseologism is interpreted as a type of paremias. Such as Kh.Berdiyarov and R.Rasulov (1982) separate pareomilogy that studies paroemia and phraseology that studies phrasemes, however, they emphasize that paroemilogy and phraseology are connected to each other and “pareomilogy studies all expressions in the language and phraseology as its part studies only stable word groups which have a figurative meaning”. According to this concept, there is hypo-hyperonimic relation between paremia and phraseolosm, so paremia is a

hypernym, phraseologism is a hyponym. “Semantic transpositivity” serves as a distinctive feature of them besides “hypo-hypernymy”. Regarding to semantic transpositivity paremia and phraseologism become privative opposite. In the pair of opposites, a paremia which forms the left member is considered weaker on this feature and unmarked, a phraseologism composing the right member is a strong, marked element. As for paremias and phraseologisms, the properties “stability” and “readiness” are integral, the feature “semantic transpositivity” is a differential feature and both of these two units are distinguished on one feature. Stable combinations do not limit with dividing into only phraseologisms and paremias firstly as wholeness, these two types subdivide as well. Some researchers recognize proverbs, sayings and aphorisms units what are united into one class, one paradigm according to a certain integral feature and simultaneously, separated units that are distinguished by certain differential features.

Some linguists emphasise that proverbs, sayings and aphorisms are different names of one phenomenon and disclaim that they are different units. At present, most authors identify distinctive properties that are particular for each of them and stress that they are different units. Consequently, proverbs, sayings and aphorisms are considered as members of paremias. The features “stability”, “readiness” and “semantic transpositivity” are considered as their integral properties. If one regards these three features as the main properties of paremias and also forming a paradigm, in this case, riddles should be included into this paradigm too. Because riddles also embody the abovementioned the paradigm forming three properties. Although these units form one paradigm on the basis of the three features, each member of the paradigm is distinguished from one another on certain differential properties. Therefore they possess the right to live as a separated unit in the system of the paradigm.

As a distinctive feature between a proverb and a saying the qualities "being used in a figurative meaning" and "semantic transpositivity" are accounted. At the same time, there is mentioned that proverbs are neutral to this feature as some of them can be used figuratively while the others do not deliver a figurarive meaning. Therefore, several researchers state, one group of proverbs are combined with sayings and and they lose their differential property, as the result, one cannot realise that one stable unit which is used in its own sense is a proverb or a saying. Thus, in the "Wordbook of the Uzbek Language" (1981) the property "informative completeness", not the the property "semantic transpositivity", is given as the differential feature between proverbs and sayings and this feature serves to distinguish exactly the members of the opposition.

In the "Enciclopaedic dictionary" (1988) with two volumes an analogical definition is given for proverbs. In this case, proverbs possess the feature "informative completeness", according to this feature they are the strong member of this opposition, sayings are characterised not having this property. This member is considered weaker than the property that was the basis for the opposition.

In the paradigm of stable word combinations (paremias) proverbs and aphorisms are also close. In the "Workbook of the Uzbek language" (1981) the definition for aphorisms is as follows: "a short, consice phrase, a dictum with a deep meaning". As for Kh.Berdiyarov and R.Rasulov (1981), aphorisms are "a dictum that delivers a generalised idea, and with a clear meaning"; and they state that aphorisms are of two types – speech and language aphorisms. As they define, speech aphorisms are characteristic for only one speaker; popular, public aphorisms are considered language aphorisms. Riddles are characterised with the main properties as "stability", "readiness" and "puzzling". The last property serves for distiinguishing riddles from the other stable units.

Phraseologisms are differed according to their property "semantic transpositivity" from proverbs, sayings, aphorisms, riddles that are included into the paradigm of paremias. Several proverbs approach to phraseologisms as they possess a figurative meaning. The transposisition from proverbs to phraseologisms is accounted as the middle point in the process of phraseologisation. Such a middle point also occurs between proverbs and aphorisms.

Phrasemes are word combinations that are specific for expressive, axiological functions of language and according to the nominative viewpoint they form one paradigm with lexemes. For instance, *sevinmok, kuvonmok, ogzini tanobi kochmok* mean "to be glad" in English. The first two of them are lexemes, the third of them is considered a phraseologism and they are all in the synonymic relationship as being different names for one state. They can be distinct only on the bases of possessing the emotional-expressive seme or not possessing it. The first two lexemes do not possess this seme, the phraseologism possesses it. The emotional-expressive seme can be characteristic to a phoneme, a morpheme, a lexeme, however, all of phraseologisms are marked with this seme.

The opportunity of symbolizing an object appears with the ability of abstracting, that ability is only characteristic for a human. A prominent French researcher states that a man has the ability of symbolizing and this ability helps to develop a concept. A human uses symbols that are established by himself as well. Symbols are accepted through sense organs and one should understand their meanings and interpret them too.

From the viewpoint of the systematic approach to language, abstracting is pertinent to all levels of language and this is eqully related to the units of phonological, morphemical, morphological and syntactical levels.

Identifying isomorphism between the internal structures of a new investigating object and another object which is familiar to wide

scientific society and clarifying the nature of that unknown object according to this isomorphism is of great importance. There are such kinds of close similarities among lexemes and phrasemes (phraseologisms). It can be seen obviously in both of nominative functions and the semantic content of lexemes and phrasemes.

Just as the semes "categorical meaning", "being a part of speech" are the components of the semantic content of lexemes, the seme "categorical meaning" is accounted as the part of the phraseological meaning. This sense is put on the naming (denotative) sense of phraseologisms and includes several generalized meanings as "objectness", "being an action/a process", "being an attribute" in itself. As a categorical meaning manifests the dependence of lexemes on a certain lexical-grammatical group, it also points at the dependence of phraseologisms on a certain phraseological=grammatical group. For example, while the phraseologism *ich-etini yemoq* (to suffer) answers the question *what to do?* and possesses the property of a verb, and phraseologisms as *kuzidan kon okkan, vajohati khunuk* (angry), *yog tushsa yalagudek* (very clean) acquire the adjectival meaning. In accordance with these general meaning and grammatical property phraseologisms can be classified into noun-phraseologisms, adjective-phraseologisms, and adverb-phraseologisms. It shows that the categorical meaning is the meaning what is closely associated with grammatical and lexical meanings and stands between them. Because the categorical meaning cannot be imagined apart from the significative meaning in both the lexeme sememe and the sememe of phraseology. Simultaneously, this significative seme serves as the pivot (supporting point) in uniting these lexemes and phraseologisms into certain lexical-grammatical, phraseological-grammatical classes. For instance, in verb-phraseologisms, a verb component of phraseological units can function as an indicator of the categorical meaning. Particularly, the verbal property of the phraseological units *kulini chuzmok* (to be reconciled),

oyogini uzatmok (to die) is defined on the basis of the verb lexemes *chuzmok* (to extend) and *uzatmok* (to stretch).

It is known that in the semantic structure of phraseologisms features of combining the phraseological meaning is separately distinctive. These features take place in different phraseologisms as their constituent. According to the opinion of V.Djukov, while differential semantic features show the semantic peculiarity of phraseologisms, integral (combining) semantic features show the similarity of one phraseologism to another one. Integral and differential functions of the semes that compose the semantic content of phraseologisms are of great importance within explaining the systematic character of the phraseologisms, classifying into certain phraseological-grammatical group in any language. The seme which is defined as the integral seme possesses a hierarchical property. The seme that functions as the differential seme for members of the phraseological semantic group in a higher level performs the function of the integral seme in the next level of classification. This is why the integral (combinig) function of phraseosemes is comparative.

For instance, if in semantic classifying the phraseologisms *кўзини сузмоқ, ўзига жалб қилмоқ, уруғи қуримоқ иштаҳаси карнай* the seme "person" is a differential seme, in the phraseologisms as *кўзини сузмоқ, қошини учирмоқ, лабини бурмоқ, кўзини ўйнатмоқ, оёғини учида кўрсатмоқ* the seme "person" serves as a combining seme.

Phraseological units possess a certain formal structure and they possess certain semantics as well. The formal structure and the semantic structure can be similar in several phraseologisms. For example, phraseologisms related to a person and phraseologisms not related to a person. The integral feature for the phraseologisms related to a person is a feature "person" and the abovementioned feature serves as the basis of semantic modeling. The symbolic reflection of the model also bases on

the integral feature. Therefore this semantic can be presented by the symbol *Ph**p.***

According to A.Losev, a model must have the feature of regularly sequence of these or those language elements. Therefore he regards the principle of smashing language elements which have the feature of regularly sequence as the important principle of defining linguistic models. Thus, any model has the property of hierarchical dividing as it is an integrity. For instance, $\boldsymbol{Ph_p}$ is divided into phraseologisms expressing a feature of the person $\boldsymbol{Ph_{p\ f}}$, phraseologisms expressing a state of the person $\boldsymbol{Ph_{p\ s}}$ and so on. Consequentially, $\boldsymbol{Ph_{p\ f}}$ is also divided into small subgroups. In every stage of subgrouping one seme serves as the means that constituting a model.

As a phraseological unit consists of certain formal and semantic components, it has internal structures in the both sides. In the semantic structure of phraseologisms the integral sides of the phraseological meaning are clearly separated. Categorical, grade, emphasizing, and partially, animated-unanimated meanings of phraseological units function as this type of meaning (Djukov, 1972).

For example, the phraseologism *kuli uzun* (omnipotent) constitutes one semantic group with the phraseologisms *kuzi ochilmok* (to understand at last), *tarvuzi kulidan tushmok* (to become sad after something happens) by the integral seme “person”. At the same time, according to the seme “a part of speech” this phraseologism is different. If *kuli uzun* (omnipotent) is included into adjectival words, *kuzi ochilmok* (to understand at last), *tarvuzi kulidan tushmok* (to become sad after something happens) belong to verb-phraseologisms. Moreover, two phraseologisms *kuzi ochilmok* (to understand at last) and *kulida kutarmok* (to respect) which are in one paradigm due to being verb-phraseologisms, they are different as the first one expresses a state and the second expresses a physical action. So that, in the next level of

subgrouping the semes “a state” or “an action” serve as differential semes.

As it has been mentioned above, a categorical meaning is considered as the important component of the phraseological meaning. As in the lexical system, hierarchical structure of phraseologisms is observed in the phraseological system. The categorical meaning takes the highest stage in the semantic hierarchical structure of phraseologisms. The categorical meaning of phraseologisms has abstraction in the high level and includes the phraseologisms’ feature ‘belonging to a grammatical category’. The phraseologisms which have the same categorical meaning merge in one large paradigm and denote to the certain part of speech that phraseologisms belong to.

Phraseologisms are divided into several types according to their semantic features. The first group of phraseologisms consists of the phraseological units in which the categorical meaning can be seen obviously by the semantic leading component in the structure of the phraseologism. For example, in the phraseologism *ogzi kulogida* (word by word translation: one’s mouth is in his ear – grinning from ear to ear) the leading component is the word *kulogida* (in his ear) and by this word the general meaning and adjectival categorical meaning is noticeable. The phraseologisms in which their categorical meaning cannot be seen by their support component constitute the second group. For instance, although in the phraseologism *oyogidan ut chaknagan* the leading component is the verb *chaknamok*, the part of speech seme of the whole unit is accounted as an adjective and the phraseologism is included into adjective-phraseologisms with its meaning “frolicsome”.

In the range of phraseological units the phraseologisms with the evaluative seme added to the categorical meaning is very important. Because phraseological units seldom can be stylistically neutral. According to this, axiological marked elements take a significant place in the paradigm of phrasemes. The members of paradigm can be

classified as axiological neutral members and axiological marked members. For example, in spite of the phraseologism *gurida tungiz kopmok* () forms one paradigm with the phraseologisms *kuzini yummok, olamdan ketmok* (to die), the first member of the paradigm differs from the others by possessing the evaluative seme or not possessing it. The first member possesses this seme, the others do not.

Initially we can divide phraseological units into two groups according to their stylistic-emotional state, that is as axiological neutral and axiological marked elements. In their own class axiological marked elements are opposed on the basis of positive and negative features. The phraseological units which joined on the character of positive grade can be defined as a euphemistic member; the phraseologisms which joined on the feature of negative grade can be defined as a dysphemistic member.

The process of phraseologisation is tightly connected with the deactualization of components of phraseological units. The level of deactualization of components of a phraseologism is various. Consequently, the level of semantic integrating of the parts of the phraseological unit is also different. The components of some phraseologisms lost their syntactical functions and semantic independence and so closely joined and integrated, they became one entire lexeme. Hence, they take place as the member of one paradigm with lexical units in the language system. For instance, in the phraseologism *oyogini kuliga olib kelmok* (to come quickly) the components lost their semantic independence and changed into one lexeme “quickly”. In some of them the semantic independence of components and the syntactical relation of these components can be felt. For instance, the meaning of the components and the syntactic relationship of them are kept to a certain extent in the phraseologism *kulini kutarmok* with the sense “to surrender”. Consequently, phraseologization is a dynamical process, and the level of integrating

grows gradually. As phraseologisation is a dynamical process, the concepts *a semantic center* and *a phraseological center* are of great importance in this process. These concepts serve as support points in modeling phraseologisms as well.

The component that performs the function of forming a phraseological meaning in the structure of the phraseologism is the semantic center of this phraseologism. Mainly, content words carry out the function of the semantic center. The semantic center is typical for all phraseologisms and it is indicated by its corresponding with a word which is used freely. For example, the semantic center of the phraseologisms *kuli ochik* (*open-handed*) and *kungli ochik* (*open-hearted*) is the component *ochik* (*open*). The very part corresponds to the words *sakhiy* (*generous*) and *okkungil* (*sincere*) that are used freely. Therefore in semantic modeling of phraseologisms relying on such semantic center is very important. Furthermore, there is another notion about a phraseological center acting for forming a phraseologism as one wholeness.

The component in the structure of the phraseologism which its meaning cannot be defined from the view point of the Modern Uzbek language is considered the phraseological center. Thus, a phraseological center functions as the supporting point for establishing a phraseologism. For example, in the phraseological unit *kari tulki* (a sly person) the meaning of the word *tulki* (fox) is nor equal to the meaning of the word *tulki* that is used freely.

Phraseological and semantic centers are the phenomena that are related, requiring each other and providing the entireness of a phraseologism. While the semantic center anticipates a phraseologism to free compounding, the phraseological center anticipates it to a word (Jukov, 1978: 95). One can form phraseological models according to the both centers.

References

Almamatova, Sh. (2008). *Uzbek tili frazemalarining komponent tahlili.* [Ph.D. dissertation. Institute of Language and Literature under the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, Tashkent]

Bally, Ch. (1961). *Franzuzhskaya stilistika.* Moscow: Nauka.

Djukov, V. (1978). *Semantika frazheologicheskikh oborotov.* Moscow: Prosvesheniye.

Kenesboev, S. (1954). *O neketorikh osobennostyakh frazheologigeskikh yediniz v kazhakhskom yazhike.* Edition of ANKazhSSR. Series of philology and art studies. Vol.I-II. 5-12.

Kopilenko, M., Popova, Z. (1978). *Ocherki po obshey frazheologii.* Voronedj.

Mamatov, A. (2000). *Uzbek tili frazheologizhmlarining shakllanish masalalari.* [Doctoral dissertation. Institute of Language and Literature under the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, Tashkent]

Molotkov, A. (1977). *Osnovy frazheologii russkogo yazika.* Leningrad.

Muratov, S. (1980). *Ustoychiviye slovosochetaniya v tyurkiskikh yazhikakh.* Moscow: Nauka.

Novikov, A. (1983). *Semantika teksta I yeyo formalizhaziya.* Moscow: Nauka.

Nurmonov, A. (2002). *Uzbek tilshunosligi tarikhi.* Tashkent: Ukituvchi. Polivanov,Ye. (1928). *Vvedeniye v yazhikozhnaniye dlya vostokovednikh vuzhov.* Leningrad.

Rahmatullaev, Sh. (1978). *Uzbek tilining izohli frazheologik lughati.* Tashkent: Ukituvchi.

Saussure F.de. (1977). *Kurs obshey lingvistike.* Works on general linguistics. Moscow, Progress.

Uzbek tilining izohli lughati. **(1981).** Moscow, Russkiy yazhyk.

Vinogradov, V. (1947). *Ob osnovnykh tipakh frazheologicheskikh yediniz v russkom yazhyke.* "Akademik A.A.Shakhmatov", Works of commission of Academy of Sciences of the USSR. 3rd edition, Moscow-Leningrad.

Yuldashev, B. (1993). *Hozirgi uzbek adabiy tilida frazheologik birliklarning funksional-uslubiy khususiyatlari.* [Doctoral dissertation. Institute of Language and Literature under the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan, Tashkent]

Received 25 Jan 2015, Screened 15 Sep 2015, Accepted 10 Nov 2015