L.E.HAJIYEVA
Doctor of Philosophy
e-mail: leyla.suleymanova.78@bk.ru

Azerbaijan University of Languages
(Baku, R.Bahbudov street, 134)

:10.62021/0026-0028.2024.2.088

THE SUBJECT OF PHRASEOLOGY AND THE PROBLEM OF ITS SYSTEMATIC STUDY

Summary. *At the present stage of development of phraseology, interest has especially intensified in the development of theoretical directions and trends that make it possible to look with different eyes at the rich phraseological material accumulated over centuries and subject it to more careful comprehension and research. And above all, this is reflected in the boundaries of research, which are noticeably expanding, differentiating in the development of phraseology into a number of its individual subsystems.*

Key words: *phraseology, idiom, phrase, semantic, linguistic*

Research on phraseology, becoming more and more relevant and independent, has already brought significant results and significantly advanced the understanding of this complex linguistic phenomenon. The complexity of phraseology lies not only in the polysemantic interpretation of the term itself. It is due to the contradictory nature of its units: being linguistic units they at the same time seem to go beyond the resources of language in their methods of formation and linguistic designation of phenomena and objects of the reality around us.

The roots of the study of phraseology also go back to the works of I.A.Baudouin de Courtenay, A.V.Shcherba, A.A.Potebnya, F.I.Buslaeva, I.I.Sreznevsky. The linguistic heritage of these scientists in the field of phraseology served as a prerequisite for its further research.

In terms of time, one could roughly distinguish three main periods in the development of the theoretical foundations of phraseology as a linguistic science. The first includes the period of appearance of works from M.I.Michelson (1903-1904) – Sh. Bally (1905) to the works of V.V.Vinogradov.

The second period is relatively short, from V.V. Vinogradov (1946-1947) to the works of B.A.Larin (1956) and A.I.Smirnitsky (1956).

And, finally, the third period from A.I. Smirnitsky to the present, in which, however, the works of N.N. stand out. Amosova (1962-1963), A.V.Kunin (1964, 1970, 1972), V.P.Zhukova (1968, 1978).

At the present stage of development of phraseology, interest has especially intensified in the development of theoretical directions and trends that make it possible to look with different eyes at the rich phraseological material accumulated over centuries and subject it to more careful comprehension and research. And above all, this is reflected in the boundaries of research, which are noticeably expanding, differentiating in the development of phraseology into a number of its individual subsystems.

Observation and comparison of various language materials led us to the conclusion that whatever the scope (narrow or wide) of the direction in the study of the phraseological fund of languages, it should include stable verbal complexes of a phraseological and non-phraseological nature. All this should be included in one linguistic discipline - phraseology, which has as its subject a phraseological unit.

It is known that close in meaning to a phraseme is a phrase introduced into linguistics by V.V.Vinogradov as the antithesis of an idiom. V.V.Vinogradov wrote: "An idiom differs from a phrase in the complete absence of lexical and semantic individuality of parts, in the singularity and obligatory nature of their connection in a given lexical unity. A phrase can become a completely free concatenation of a word." [1, p. 24]

N.N.Amosova believed that the phraseological composition of a language includes phrasemes and idioms. Phraseme is an expression with a phraseologically related meaning, that is, a meaning in which a semantically realized word depends on a constant, the only possible demonstrative minimum. Idiom - when the entire composition of the expression is both an indicative minimum and a semantically realizable element of a constant context. [2, p. 72] As for the "idiom" or "idiomatic expressions", in the post-Soviet space they do not have such wide circulation as they acquired abroad. So, in particular, C.Hockett pays great attention to the idiom, idiomaticity. Charles Hockett uses the term "idiom" as a comprehensive one for such lexicographic and syntactic phenomena, the meaning of which cannot be predicted from their structure [3, pp. 171-173]. The original concept of the notion of idiom is set out in an article by W.Chafe, who believes that the importance of idioms in a language cannot be questioned. Idioms, continues W.Chafe, are a widespread phenomenon in language, although marginal, and linguistics is obliged to find an explanation for them [4, pp. 109-127]. F.Householder calls the idiom "the basic or elementary unit" with the help of which a sentence is constructed. [5, pp. 231-239] W.Weinreich defines an idiom as a phraseological unit consisting of at least two components in which a choice of reverse, contextual submeanings is possible. However, as a premise for the analysis of the idiom, U.Weinreich puts forward the same position as that of other authors cited above: "an idiom as a complex expression, the meaning of which cannot be derived from its constituent components." [6, pp. 4-5].

In our opinion, both phraseme and idiom are the essence of a variety of phraseological units that correspond in general terms to the definition given by A.V.Kunin: "A phraseological unit is a stable combination of lexemes with a completely or partially rethought meaning" [7, p. 8]. Focusing on such a definition makes it possible to avoid inconsistencies in understanding the object of phraseology itself, and to focus the researcher's attention on a deep study of the nature of phraseological semantics in its various manifestations, that is, in relation to varieties of phraseological units. Signs of phraseological motivation, as one of the stages of phrase formation, are elements or a mechanism of motivation in which the actualization of invariants of the language system develops into invariants of the stability of certain semantic, lexical, structural-semantic and syntactic connections of its elements. This approach makes it possible to detect certain qualitative differences between these units when analyzing them. These differences predetermine the classification of semantic classes – parts of speech in phraseology, the semantic structure of phraseological semantic groups and semantic categories [8, pp. 45-50].

A retrospective look at research on phraseology gives us reason to assert that not a single phraseological concept or direction has bypassed the word, and the facts of the language indicate that this is unlikely to be avoided in the future. Phraseology is always lexical, and without taking into account vocabulary its study is hardly possible [9, pp. 23-25].

Thus, when expressing a semantic feature, the presence of certain semantic phraseological series, a kind of microseries with some verbs, is observed. The most common type are models with the verb to be. Models of this verb with an adjective most often indicate the presence of some attribute or state, positive or negative depending on the meaning of the adjective itself: be green (or blue) about the gills (look sick), be red about the gills (look healthy); be quick in the uptake (think quickly), be slow in the uptake (think slowly). The adverbs hard, dead, down, badly indicate the intensity of the presence of the attribute: be hard pushed for money (strongly, urgently need money), be dead nuts on (doted on your soul), be down on one's uppers (come to a full), etc.

A number of models relate to a physical state with a common semantic feature “to be upset”, “to be unhealthy”: be off the hinges, be off one’s onion, be off one’s chump, be off one’s feed, be off one’s nut, be off one’s base, be off one’s beam [10, pp. 9-12].

In other words, in such microseries there is such a semantic proximity of meanings that goes beyond synonymous relations and represents an element of hypo-hyperonymic connections of phraseological units, that is, the relationship of a more general meaning of units to a more specific one and vice versa. In other words, in such microseries there is such a semantic proximity of meanings that goes beyond synonymous relations and represents an element of hypo-hyperonymic connections of phraseological units, that is, the relationship of a more general meaning of units to a more specific one and vice versa. For example, microseries with the verb *to feel.* From unit feel something in one’s bones with a general meaning come phraseological units that convey the different nature of this state: feel mean (to feel guilty), feel small (to feel humiliated), feel cheap (to feel awkward), feel low (to feel depressed), feel strongly about (to feel a feeling of hostility), feel pride in (to feel proud), feel shaky (to feel insecure), feel at home in some place (to feel at home), feel like a fish out of water (to feel out of your element), feel funny (to feel unwell), feel seedy (to feel bad), feel slack (to be, to feel feeling tired), etc. [11, pp.74-76].

Against the background of such semantic connections, synonymous, antonymic, polysemantic and homonymous relations look like special cases of hypo-hyperonymic connections.

In this regard, the problem of phraseological units and words is the most important since the word itself and the various units behind it contain all their semantic and structural originality: word and lexeme, word and word form, word and phrase, sentence. So, for example, if we analyze the class of verbal structural-semantic models by groups of verbs that form the model, we will see that all the verbs included in the models can be divided according to a semantic feature that generally conveys one or another meaning. For example, groups of verbs that act as a formative element and express:

1) meaning of “receipt”, “acquisition”, “acceptance” – find, get, take, receive, accept, acquire, adopt;

2) meaning of "speaking" – speak, tell, say, talk, chatter, declare, ask, answer;

3) the meaning of mental action – think, believe, understand, know, grasp;

4) the meaning of feelings, emotions – feel, love, hate, smile, cry, weep, laugh, call, care, curse, quarrel;

5) meaning of physical condition – drink, eat, feed, jump, live, look, see, shiver, sing, sleep, read, write;

6) the meaning of “presence”, “preservation”, “retention” – have, hold, keep, present, be, preserve;

7) the meaning of “emergence”, “birth”, “appearance”, “arrival” – arise, arrive, appear, come, begin, enter, start;

8) meaning "movement" – go, move, ride, quit, run, leave, pass;

9) the meaning of “assumption”, “possibility”, “permission”, “consent” – admit, agree, assume, let and etc.

In this regard, each phraseological unit is considered as a member of a certain phraseological paradigm, which unites them on the basis of one or another common semantic feature. Accordingly, the inclusion of a unit in such a group predetermines its semantic connections [12, pp. 56-59].

Analysis of the factual material showed that phraseological units are most associated with the designation of such a concept as “person”. This, in turn, determined the identification of the corresponding paradigms. For example: a) characteristics of a person: big boy (important person), big nose (master, boss), etc.; b) a person’s age: be long in the tooth (to be old), the

evening of life (decline of days), etc.; c) properties and qualities of character: soft in the head (silly), a long head (insightful), etc.; d) state of mind: take offence (to be offended), as black as sin (gloomier than a cloud), etc. Thus, certain phrase-forming groups of vocabulary are identified, differing both in their semantics and in their place in the structure of the language, as well as in the nature of their functioning. Moreover, if we take into account the onomasiological division of the entire vocabulary of a language as a kind of "semantic mapping", which is expressed in general conceptual classes and subclasses, then phraseological paradigms will consist of phraseological series of units united in semantic and thematic groups. The latter groups are of interest because they capture broader layers of linguistic means of expression and consist of several semantic groups, which will accordingly differ in semantic, stylistic, structural and other features that form the basis of their hypo-hyperonymic relations and connections. Such thematic groups will represent a system of units united by a common semantic feature, regardless of the categorical attribution of its constituents, and can be a method of analysis in phraseological studies as a means of revealing not only a separate phraseological unit, but also an entire group against the background of hypo-hyperonymic connections. This is one of the elements of systematicity of phraseological units, based primarily on the relations of opposition between the elements of the phraseological system of modern English.

Scientific result of the work: considering all the above, we can say that every phraseological unit of modern English is considered as a member of a certain phraseological paradigm that unites them on the basis of one or another common semantic sign. Accordingly, the inclusion of a unit in such a group predetermines its semantic relations.

The scientific novelty of the work: the analysis of the factual material in the article showed that phraseological units are most often associated with the definition of a concept such as "person". This, in turn, determined the identification of relevant paradigms.

Application importance of the work: it seems to us that the presented article can be important for everyone interested in the topic "The subject of phraseology and the problem of its systematic study". This article can be used in the teaching of lexicology and methodology of the English language at the bachelor's and master's level of foreign language universities.

Bibliography

1. Виноградова, В.В. Современный русский язык / В.В.Виноградова, – М.: Учпедгиз, − 1938, вып. 1, − 24 с.
2. Амосова, Н.Н. Основы английской фразеологии / Н.Н.Амосова, – Л.: ЛГУ, − 1963, − 72 с.
3. Hockett, Ch. A Course in Modern Linguistics. – New York, −1958, − pp.171-173; − pp.303-318.
4. Chafe, W. Idiomaticity as an Anomaly in the Chomskyan Paradigm / W.Chafe, – Foundations of Language, − 1968, № 4, − pp.109-127.
5. Householder, F. On Linguistic Primes. – Word, Vol. 15, − 1959, − pp. 231-239.
6. Weinreich, U. Problems in the Analysis of Idioms / U.Weinreich, –New York: University California Press. − 1969, − pp. 4-5.
7. Кунин, А.В. Фразеология современного английского языка. Опыт систематизированного описания. – М.: Международные отношения, − 1972, − 8 с.
8. Косова, И.О. Информативно-насыщенные глаголы английского языка в коммуникативном аспекте: автореф. Дис. Канд. Филол. Наук. Волгоград, − 2019.
9. Кунин, А.В. Английская фразеология: Теоретический курс. (дата обращения: 07.04.2018
10. Cowie A.P., Mackin R. Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. Vol. 1: Oxford Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. − Oxford: Oxford University Press, − 1997.
11. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь/ лит.ред. М.Д.Литвинова. М.: Рус.яз., − 1998.
12. Spears, R.A. McGraw-Hill's American Idioms Dictionary. −N.Y.: McGraw Hill, – 2007.
13. Courtney, R. Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs / R.Courtney, −Harlow: Longman, − 1984.
14. https://7universum.com/ru/philology/archive/item/11938
15. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815045012/pdf

L.E.Hacıyeva

Frazeologiyanın predmeti və onun sistemli öyrənilməsi problemi

Xülasə

Frazeologiya ilə bağlı tədqiqatlar getdikcə daha aktual və müstəqil olmaqla artıq mühüm nəticələr vermiş və bu mürəkkəb dil hadisəsinin dərk edilməsini xeyli təkmilləşdirmişdir. Frazeologiyanın mürəkkəbliyi təkcə terminin özünün polisemantik şərhində deyil. Bu, ziddiyyətli təbiətdən irəli gəlir onun vahidlərinin: linqvistik vahidlər olmaqla, onlar eyni zamanda ətrafımızdakı reallıq hadisələrinin və obyektlərinin formalaşma və linqvistik təyinat üsullarında dilin resurslarından kənara çıxırlar.

Açar sözlər: *frazeologiya, idiom, ifadə, semantik, linqvistik*

Л.Э.Гаджиева

Предмет фразеологии и вопрос ее системного изучения

Резюме

Изучение по фразеологии, становясь все более своевременными и самодостаточными, уже принесли значимые достижения и значительно продвинули осознание этой многообразной лингвистической реалии. Многообразность фразеологии заключается не только в полисемичной интерпретации самого понятия. Она обусловлена алогичной чертой ее единиц: являясь языковыми единицыми, они одновременно как бы выходят за рамки возможностей языка по своим методам формирования и языковому определению явлений и объектов окружающей нас реальности.

Ключевые слова*: фразеология, идиома, фраза, семантический, лингвистический*

Rəyçi: filol.f.d., dos. A.S.Seyidova

Redaksiyaya daxil olub: 12.04.2024