



SEMANTICS, MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Urinova Dildora Bekmakhmatovna

The teacher of Shakhrisabz State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract. Phraseological units constitute an integral part of language, embodying the collective wisdom, culture, and linguistic heritage of a community. This article delves into the intricate relationship between semantics, morphology, and syntax within phraseological units. It explores how these linguistic phenomena intersect and interact to create meaning and coherence in discourse.

Keywords: phraseological units, idioms, semantics, morphology, syntax, language structure, linguistic analysis, figurative language, cultural nuances, communication, linguistic heritage, semantic transparency, morphological opacity, syntactic flexibility, cross-cultural understanding.

Annotatsiya. Frazеологик birliklar tilning ajralmas qismini tashkil etib, jamiyatning umumiy donoligi, madaniyati va til merosini o'zida mujassamlashtiradi. Ushbu maqolada frazeologik birliklar ichidagi semantika, morfologiya va sintaksis o'rtasidagi murakkab munosabatlar ko'rib chiqiladi. Bu lingvistik hodisalarning nutqda ma'no va izchillikni yaratish uchun qanday kesishishi va o'zaro ta'sirini o'rganadi.

Tayanch so'zlar: frazeologik birliklar, idiomalar, semantika, morfologiya, sintaksis, til tuzilishi, lingvistik tahlil, obrazli til, madaniy nuanslar, aloqa, lingvistik meros, semantik shaffoflik, morfologik shaffoflik, sintaktik moslashuvchanlik, madaniyatlararo tushunish.

Абстракт. Фразеологические единицы составляют неотъемлемую часть языка, воплощая в себе коллективный разум, культуру и языковое наследие сообщества. В этой статье рассматриваются сложные взаимоотношения между семантикой, морфологией и синтаксисом внутри фразеологических единиц. Он исследует, как эти лингвистические явления пересекаются и взаимодействуют, создавая смысл и последовательность в дискурсе.

Ключевые слова: фразеологизмы, идиомы, семантика, морфология, синтаксис, структура языка, лингвистический анализ, образный язык, культурные нюансы, коммуникация, языковое наследие, семантическая прозрачность, морфологическая непрозрачность, синтаксическая гибкость, межкультурное понимание.

Syntactic phraseology assumes “a complex diachronic process, the essence of which consists in an asymmetric combination of words, when the expression plan formed according to the laws of syntax does not correspond to the semantic integrity of the content plan” [1, 30-31]. This is a lingua creative process of integration of the syntactic-semantic structure of predicative formations caused by the phrase-forming interaction of semantic-grammatical and lexical components. In general, syntactic phraseology is the formation of stable combinations of syntactic units, which causes several structural and grammatical changes, in particular, a change in the order of words (violation of the preposition of the subject about the predicate characteristic of the Russian language).

V.I. Kodukhov noted the following main features of the phenomenon of syntactic phraseology: it consists in the loss of the usual syntactic motivation and articulateness, in the lexical and morphological stiffness of the syntactic model, in the acquisition of a secondary syntactic function by



the form of the word and the syntactic construction. Although there is a significant structural and functional difference between the vocabulary of a language and its syntactic structure, this does not mean that they are not related to each other, that they have nothing in common. This commonality consists in the fact that the word (lexeme) and syntactic construction represent an indissoluble unity of meaning and its expression (a form of existence) [2, 125]. As a result of the process of syntactic phraseology, semantic, paradigmatic, and syntagmatic fullness is lost, and units undergo deformation, turning into secondary units of the language having a secondary form and secondary content. Syntactic phraseology, correlating with the models of phrases and sentences, remains the means of language that organizes and conveys any new thought; syntactic decomposability changes, remains. The result of the process of syntactic phraseology is the emergence of new syntactic models with secondary syntactic meaning and form.

The peculiarity of phraseology of syntactic phraseological units is the fact that they are formed by partial or complete of the supporting components of the phrase syntactic scheme. Some schemes allow for a wide variety of lexical and morphological content, while others are characterized by its strict regulation. Thus, the concept of a structural scheme (structural basis, phrase scheme) turns out to be important when distinguishing individual classes of syntactic phraseological units, as well as when separating them from free syntactic formations. The presence of samples (models) allows phraseologized syntactic constructions not only to function widely in the speech of communicants, but also to be reproduced again and again. In the structure of the phrase scheme, mandatory and optional components are distinguished, characterized by varying degrees of lexical and morphological variation. Mandatory components are divided into immutable and mutable. They undergo complete or partial defeminization in the process of phraseologization, they are characterized by strict positional fixation, and these components are characterized by large lexical and grammatical restrictions compared to optional components. The supporting components are “a frozen form that has broken away from the paradigm of the corresponding word and, to one degree or another, has lost its lexical and categorical meanings” [5, 95]. The “phraseology” of the meaning is common to all specific constructions formed according to this model. In constructions constructed according to a phraseologies syntactic scheme, “the meanings of the reference words are shifted” and the phrase scheme (phrase model) acts as a disciplining principle, thereby helping the speaker, firstly, in the mental activity of lexical filling of the scheme to create new syntactic phraseological units, secondly, in achieving rapid mutual understanding with other people when introducing these units into speech.

In the sphere of syntactic phraseology, there is a strict regulation of the syntactic construction of constructions, the violation of which will lead to the destruction of the structure of the phrase syntactic scheme, and at the same time to the loss of meaning objectified by these constructions, while the communicant is free to choose the lexical content of the scheme. It is in this that the speaker’s desire for the “creation” of the unit is manifested. “We freely put any lexical content into the syntactic model” [6, 87]. This allows us to consider syntactic phraseology both as a unit of speech (utterance) and as a unit of language. So, the phrase scheme (phrase model) is a kind of mechanism by which stable combinations of the same type are created. The nature of such a mechanism is revealed in the light of the isomorphism existing between the relations “language – speech”, on the one hand, and “consciousness – thinking”, on the other: when analyzing a phrase scheme (phrase model), it is



important to know not only the mechanisms of language that create speech but also the mechanisms of consciousness that produce thinking.

Modern languages are rich in syntactic phraseological units of various types. These formations are found both in the field of simple and complex sentences. The need to distinguish such structural types of phraseologized formations was pointed out by L.I. Roizenzon, V.L. Arkhangel'sky, V.I. Kodukhov and several other researchers: "It is necessary to distinguish phraseologized constructions organized according to the model of a simple sentence and according to the model of a complex sentence" [4, 202]. V.I. Kodukhov, in turn, believed that "syntactic phraseologization can cover both the syntactic model as a whole and its parts or its elements" [2, 130].

At the same time, the phraseosyntactic scheme is defined as a communicative predicative unit of syntax, which is a reproducible non-free syntactic scheme characterized by the presence of a dictum or/and modus proposition, expressing a segmented conceptual semantic content, permeable, propagated, combined with other statements in the text according to traditional rules. Syntactic phraseological units have a complex semantic structure, which has a specific relationship "signifier – signified". According to S.I. Pirunova, the ratio of the signifier, which is represented by the syntactic semantics proper (that is, the meaning of the grammatical form), and the signified is asymmetric. This asymmetry arises due to the appearance of a phraseological component in the semantic structure of the phraseologized construction in the process of phraseology. Structural, semantic and functional changes in the process of phraseology of the components of syntactic constructions, with the help of which the syntactic semantics itself is set, entail changes in semantics that are not syntactic. As a consequence, a phraseological component appears in the semantic structure of free syntactic constructions, which turns free structures into phraseologized ones. The meaning of the phraseologized construction is characterized by the mixing of several semantic lines, and the emergence of their complex combination. To the main semantic line expressed explicitly, additional ones expressed implicitly are added, which allows the speaker to more adequately convey various semantic shades.

Morphological division is such a phenomenon that one of the elements (but other than the last in compound words) is subject to morphological change. This issue was investigated by Amosova, Kunin and others, Amosova gives the following examples:

- 1) *He played second fiddle to her in feeling father's heart*
- 2) *She dislikes playing second fiddle.*
"to play second fiddle-includes the second level slave part
- 3) *It must be more fun to have a skeleton in the clipboard.*
A skeleton in the clipboard – the phrase family means you.

Until now, the semantic nature of phraseology, semantic classification, types according to the relationship of form and meaning, and methodological features have been the source of much scientific research. But phraseology "were not classified in our linguistics by specific word categories, and their grammatical features were not sufficiently studied" [3, 151].

True, we are not going to say that there is absolutely no idea about grammatical features. For Example, Sh. Rakhmatullaev's candidacy work, written in 1952, is a debacle of work on this subject and is still being continued by various scientists. But more attention is paid to their syntactic features, less studied from a morphological point of view. For example, in the literature there is phraseological verb (*aravani quruq olib qochmoq, arpasini xom o'rmoq*), ravish (*bir og'izdan, tomдан tarasha*



tushganday), adjective (*bag'ri keng, yuragi toza*). The presence is emphasized, and the verb is thought about the morphologically, that is, about the relationship of phrasebooks to various forms of vocabulary and communication relations.

Indeed, the accent of phraseology is characteristic of the verb category: to lose his mind, to pale his cup, to raise his head, to cheer up, etc. In this case, it can also be observed that ownership in the first component is also being added and changed. So is it correct to say that such phrasebooks are full verb phrases? Or does not take person-to-person suffixes even if the light-hearted phrase comes in any person: light-hearted (*yuragim\yuraging*).

As you know, when dividing into a word category, semantic, morphological, syntactic signs of a word are relied on. Although it is understood in the phrase above that it is a psychic action from a semantic point of view, it cannot have different forms from the morphological side. Examples show that the morphological nature of verb expressions word is different from the morphological characteristics of verbs. Therefore, it will be necessary to draw up the attitude and paradigm of these expressions for each category of the verb.

In this qualifying work, we tried to draw up the division of phraseology into categories, as well as the attitude and paradigm of each category of categories. Below we will reflect on these.

Paradigmatic forms. The paradigmatic forms of expressions (such as their type, and their conjugation) are first defined by what category they belong to. The main part of phrases is formed by verb phraseological units. When the internal syntactic construction of verb phrases is equal to the combination, such a verb is a phrase: bowed head, like bowed head. If the internal syntactic construction of a phrase is equivalent to a sentence, such a verb phrase cannot be translated and always stands in the form of the III person (this is what the owner who participates in the composition of the phrase requires). For example, the phrase touched by the eye cannot be compared.

These two types of verbs are different in terms of the conjugation of expressions, but in the forms of such categories as declination, and tense, the change occurs in both: bow; when the eye touches, the head tilts, like the eye touches. Many such phrases also come on the aspect with and without being: let's bow, and the head is like an oblique.

In the lexical composition of the verb phraseological units, in addition to the verb word component, another category word also participates. In this possessive affix tool, the verb phrase is given a ratio of one of three persons: *ko'nglim yorishdi, ko'ngling yorishdi, ko'ngli yorishdi*.

The possibility of morphological changes cannot always serve as a clear characteristic, since it only occurs in a limited number of phraseological units (verb and noun).

The issue of syntactic connections between phraseological combinations requires more reflection. All linguistic scientists have said that phraseological combinations represent part of a sentence, but these concepts differ in whether or not they mean the absence of syntactic connections between phraseological combinations. The number of words in a sentence doesn't need to be equal to the number of its fragments. This can be proved by the following qualitative examples expressed by the geneticist group:

The woman who laced too tightly's name.

Or by qualitative statements:

Ah-why-did-I-ever-merry-Yao maads.

Both sentences are made up of only two syntactic elements.



The existence of syntactic connections between phraseological combinations can be proved either by syntactic (transfer) modification (or delimitation), by meeting elements in inversion, or by putting another element in place of the pieces that can be transformed, not breaking them all by phraseological combinations. When we say through a variable element, we understand that an element in phraseological combinations is structurally necessary, but not lexically different. Sometimes these variables are delimited in the case of diversity. This condition is usually indicated in dictionaries through indefinite (conjecture) pronouns, or by giving a circle in parentheses.

References:

1. Abdullaev Sh. Frazelogizmlar tarjimasiga doir (T.Qayipbergenov asarlari misolida) // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti, 2004, 3-son, 188 b.
2. Kodukhov V.I. Methods of linguistic analysis: Lectures on the course "Introduction to Linguistics". L.: Leningrad State. ped. Institute, 1963. – 128 p.
3. Mirtojiev M. O'zbek tili leksikologiyasi va leksikografiyasi, o'quv qo'llanma, Toshkent, 2000 – 80 b.
4. Ахманова О.С. Очерки по общей и русской лексикологии. М.: Учпедгиз, 1957. – 295 с.
5. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. М.: Русские словари, 1996. – 344 с.
6. Виноградов В.В. Фразеология современного английского языка. М.: Учпедгиз, 1972.