

Methodology of Teaching Phraseological Units

Akbarova Mohinur Alisher qizi

Farg'ona davlat universiteti
3-kurs bakalavr phraseology

Annotation: Although the author states that “there are not quite clear criteria, in accordance with which some words, before they become components, are acknowledged as symbols, and others are not”, but an original symbolic meaning of the component is at least partially kept in semantics of the fixed phrase and quite regularly reproduced in many phraseological units. Moreover, even if a symbolically meaning word is updated in the language, it can vary its semantics to a rather broad extent (Zhukov,1996). A.V. Kunin also believes that it is necessary to take an integrated approach to this issue, which provides a possibility to determine a system of regular differences and common features. In his opinion, the semantic structure of the fixed phrase and the semantic structure of the word are by no means exhausted by their meanings only. Important elements of the semantic structure, in addition to the meaning, are structures of a total formation in general, its grammatical appearance and system language bonds (Kunin, 2005).

Analyzing papers of V.P. Zhukov, A.I. Smirnitsky, E.I., N.N. Amosova, he suggests the following classification of types of words in phraseological units depending on a character of their meaning (Kunin, 2005). 3. Real words, namely lexemes having a literal meaning of components. 4. Potential words, namely lexemes having a weakened lexical meaning and weakened syntax functions. Potential words are found as part of fully or partially re-comprehended motivated phraseological units with a living inner form. A literal meaning of components is “shown through” their re-comprehended meaning. Components of similar phraseological units are rich in terms of semantics as compared to similar words in their free usage. 5. “Former” words, namely re-comprehended components of phraseological fusions. 6. Ghost-words like muttons in the locution return to one’s muttons. The word muttons does not exist in English, but represents a calque from the French moutons and is found in this phraseological unit only. Ghost-words are an extremely rare phenomenon. At a current stage of development of phraseology, from positions of cognitive linguistics, this problem is interpreted as follows: “A meaning content of the phraseme represents a result of interaction between its linguistic meaning (a semantic amalgam formed by re-comprehended meanings of lexical components of the phraseme and their phraseme-forming combinatorial analysis) and contextual, situational and encyclopedic information” (Alefirenko, 2008). The above review of different opinions on a character of components of phraseological units shows once again that a linguistic status of the word, the component in the phraseological unit is complex and has many aspects, and it is necessary to determine basic positions of any research, as it influences the progress and results of such research.

Conclusion

All possible points of view are discussed and four types of words in phraseological units are defined: real words, potential words, “former” words, ghost-words. The process of phraseological units forming is complicated and continuous theoretically and practically that is connected with the development of civilization and teaching phraseology should consider both linguistic and extra linguistic aspects.

A.D. Raikhshtein defines three main types of a semantic value of separate components in phraseological units having a well-rounded image: negative, indirect and direct (Raikhshtein, 1980). Yu.A. Gvozdarev believes that it is words that serve as components of fixed phrases and notes on this issue that “components keep a definite value, without which phraseological units would inevitably lose their inner form, imagery” (Gvozdarev, 1977). Phraseological semantic series in the language, which contain the same component in different phraseological locutions, do show hidden or, in the terminology of Yu.A. Gvozdarev, implicit values of phraseological unit components. A thesis on a failure to derive a common (“global”) value of phraseological units from

semantics of their components does not satisfy Yu.Yu. Avaliani, A.M. Emirova either (Avaliani, 1971). Judging by linguistic research and individual language experience, they come to a conclusion that a prevailing part of phraseological units has rather a transparent, i.e. derivable inner form, which is sufficient to state that a significant part of fixed phrases is determined by lexical meanings of their components. The authors state that a new, global value is never surprising, no matter how paradoxical it might seem to be from a range of semantics of its components and their possibilities which usually acts in a communicative and speech environment. Regarding the issue on a role of components in semantics of phraseological units, L.I. Stepanova fairly states, “when analyzing semantics of a component from a position of diachrony, it is necessary to define functions of words-components in building phrases, the role which they played in general semantics of phraseological units” (Stepanova, 1996). V.M. Savitsky acknowledges powerful arguments offered by both parties, which make us suppose that the raised issue cannot be solved uniquely. He adheres to the point that lexical components of phraseological units have a dual nature. In his opinion, “the point is that they have both word and non-word properties” (Savitsky, 1993).

But then the author partially denies the validity of this problem and writes that “the issue on whether lexical components of phraseological units are words cannot be put “in general”, i.e. in relation to all phraseological units. It is necessary to stipulate, firstly, what structural and semantic class of phraseological units is discussed, and, secondly, what semiotic level is meant” (Savitsky, 1993). The author, supporting his views on a status of lexical components of phraseological units, writes that in the process of building a phrase a changeable combination of lexemes is transformed into a new quality – a phraseological unit. Lexemes, entering into qualitative new relations, bonds and acquiring new properties, implicitly keep some old relations, bonds and properties. Functions of phraseological units in speech reveal both old (word) properties related to figurative and expressive functions of phraseological units and new (specific) properties related to a nominative function. Thus, the author explains a dual character of lexical components, clarifying that at the first semiotic level (in the plane of expression) lexical components have independent meanings. At the second semiotic level (in a plane of content) a word and (in a semiological aspect) sign status of lexical components depends on a structural and semantic class of the phraseological unit, whether it is analytic or synthetic (Savitsky, 1993).