

**THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS IN THE COMPARISON OF
PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH ANONYMOUS COMPONENTS IN
ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK**

Rashidova Aysulu Abdikarim qizi,
Karakalpakstan, Nukus, Karakalpak
State University, Doctoral student
Email: aysulu_19.93@mail.ru

DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14270775>

Annotation: *The article presents information about the theoretical basis for comparatively studying phraseological units with anonymous components in English and Karakalpak languages. Phraseological units are one form of vocabulary enrichment—multi-word expressions that become cohesive, repeatable language units after partial or total reinterpretation of their component meanings. In reality, almost no language lacks phraseological units.*

Keywords: *phraseological units, phraseological component, anonymous component, idiom, proverb.*

Recent comparative studies have increasingly examined phraseological units across many languages, regardless of their genetic relationship (e.g., Karakalpak and English). This methodology for examining phraseological units is robust, as comparisons elucidate both the similarities and distinctions among languages. D.O. Dobrovolsky observes that "the perspective of perceiving the world through linguistic imagery, as reflected in the phraseological system, although profoundly national, is nonetheless based on universal logical-psychological and linguistic principles common to all humans" [1, 334]. A comparative investigation of linguistic events uncovers typological parallels among structurally varied languages, irrespective of their origins.

Some works in phraseology categorize phraseological units (including numerous proverbs and sayings) into theme groupings. These categories link together phraseological units based on a certain notion, such as "work activity," "human character," "appearance," "food," and so on. For example, E.F. Arsentyeva's monograph presents the findings of a comparative examination of phraseological units describing a person's character, appearance, and intellectual capacities using English and Russian materials [2, 16]. As a result, within such a "field," multiple stable expressions emerge that, despite variances in lexical content, are linked by a common concept—human activity, character, social standing, family links, and so on.

There are additional studies that look at the presence of a specific component with a specific meaning rather than the semantics of the phraseological unit (for example, a zoo component designating animal names or an ornithonym component relating to bird names). In this scenario, the analysis comprises phraseological units

of multiple semantic categories with no semantic unity, as well as structurally heterogeneous phraseological units. However, by employing a certain phraseological component as a foundation, researchers remain limited to a specific topic group.

Similarly to lexico-semantic fields, such collections of phraseological units are referred to as phraseo-semantic fields. Classifying phraseological units based on specific traits enables us to construct a cognitive representation of a person in both "positive" and "negative" versions. This technique helps to capture national qualities, mentality, and other aspects of identification based on other criteria (such as antonyms like 'everything - nothing,' 'eternity - moment,' and 'life - death'.

Phraseological units containing antonymous components are distinct and unique language entities in terms of both structure and semantics. Research on such units necessitates careful material selection and, as a result, a clear perspective on several fundamental issues in both phraseological and lexical theory. These essential concerns, in our opinion, include the concept of phraseological units, the notion of a phraseological unit component, certain general issues concerning phraseological and lexical antonymy, and equivalence when comparing phraseological units in two genetically unrelated languages.

D. Bolinger and J.B. Sykes define idioms as "... groups of words with fixed meanings that cannot be derived from the meanings of the individual components" and "... a feature of phraseology... characterized by a meaning that cannot be deduced from the meanings of the individual elements" [3, 12-13] in the preface to the "Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms", edited by A.P. Cowie, R. Mackin, and I.R. McCaig (2000).

In the introduction to the "Dictionary of American Idioms: 8000 Expressions", Adam Makkai defines an idiom as "a new, unpredictable meaning of a group of words, each of which has its own individual meaning" [4, 2]. The author divides idioms into three categories: lexemic idioms, phraseological units, and proverbs having separate meanings. He defines "lexemic idioms" as idiomatic utterances that belong to the same grammatical class. For example, he believes that certain idioms are intrinsically verb-like, such as "get away with, get up, work out, turn in".

According to A. Makkai, many idiomatic idioms serve as nominative units. For example, "hot dog" ("sausage in bread") and "White House" ("the official residence of the United States president") are nouns. Some idioms function as adjectives; for example, "pepper and salt" refers to "graying black or dark hair" and specifies hair color. Many of these expressions function as adverbs, such as "like a breeze" ("easily") and "hammer and tongs" ("violently"). Thus, Makkai's "lexemic idioms" are phraseological units whose overall meanings can be stated by a single word, and he classifies them according to their respective parts of speech. The second, and most common category of idioms, contains expressions like "to fly off the handle" ("to lose self-control") and "to blow one's stack" ("to become enraged"). These idioms, known as "tournures" (from French), are spoken expressions that do not belong to a single grammatical class and hence must be translated using a set of words rather

than a single word. One well-known example is the expression “to kick the bucket” (“to die”). According to Makkai, the form of such idiomatic statements is fixed; several are completely “frozen” and cannot be utilized in any other way. However, the example “to kick the bucket” poses some concerns, as this idiom may potentially be translated as a single word, “die,” and ascribed to a specific component of speech—a verb. This shows that the ability to translate a single word or phrase is not a credible criterion for classifying phraseological units into distinct groups.

Another significant category of idioms is proverbs, such as “don't count your chickens before they're hatched” (meaning, “don't celebrate a success before it actually happens, as it may not come to pass”). A comparable Karakalpak saying is “sho'jeni gu'zde sanaymiz” (“chickens are counted in the fall”). Makkai's classification relies on structural properties.

V.V. Vinogradov, on the other hand, is frequently chastised for failing to provide a unifying principle in his classification of phraseological units. For example, Kunin contends that Vinogradov's first two categories are based on the motivation of phraseological units, but the third is based on limited word compatibility. In contrast, S.G. Gavrin believes Vinogradov's classification adheres to a single guiding principle. Despite these competing viewpoints, many academics use Vinogradov's classification to analyze phraseological units across languages. Some linguists, following N.M. Shansky, have expanded Vinogradov's classification to include “phraseological expressions” (what Cowie refers to as “open collocations”), which are also stable but consist of words with independent meanings, distinguishable by their semantic divisibility.

Recently, linguists working on phraseology have begun to emphasize the discursive function of phraseological units, giving numerous classifications based on the type of function. In their work “Speech Formulas in Dialogue,” A.N. Baranov and D.O. Dobrovolsky present a completely new, non-traditional way to identifying phraseological units, one that considers the relationship between specific idioms and the communication scenario. Their taxonomy, like many other language typologies, accommodates overlaps. Their classification is based on communication parameters. The authors contend that neither motivational nor merely structural qualities (such as categorizing idioms into idioms-sentences, idioms-phrases, and so on) convey significant information regarding the functional properties of idioms. On the other hand, semantic categories such as “emotion,” “wealth-poverty,” “truth-lies,” and so on fail to address the relationship between these units and the communication context, commonly known as the situation's pragmatic characteristics. The researchers highlight one of the most essential purposes of idioms—their discursive function—which has not been addressed by previous scholars. A.N. Baranov and D.O. Dobrovolsky classify idioms into the following categories: speech formulas, idioms-comments, idioms-performatives, question formulas, response formulas, and epistemic modality formulas.

S.I. Ozhegov's approach to phraseology takes into account only stable word combinations that are comparable to single words, excluding proverbs and sayings. V.P. Zhukov, a Russian phraseology expert, agrees and points out that in communicative sense, these linguistic elements do not constitute a complete sentence. N.N. Amosova, an English phraseology specialist, eliminates stable statements with a complete predicative structure from phraseology. This restricted interpretation of phraseology is widely recognized in the literature. Linguists who see stability as the primary criterion for phraseologicality include all sorts of stable combinations in phraseology, such as proverbs and sayings [V.L. Arkhangelsky, N.M. Shansky, I.I. Chernyshova]. Other linguists, such as A.V. Kunin and L.F. Kozireva, classify proverbs and sayings as phraseology only if they entail a total or partial reinterpretation of their components. According to E.A. Ivannikova, expressions such as winged words, aphorisms, proverbs, expressions relating to historical events, ancient history, mythology, religious literature, and so on can only be studied in an etymological context, as sources for the creation of a specific phraseological unit.

The modern "Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms" includes commonly used modal phrases, truncated proverbs (such as "a bird in the hand"), sayings, and expressions of political and state figures that are currently used in similar situations, in addition to so-called "pure" idioms and "semi-idioms".

References:

1. Добровольский Д.О. Основы структурно-типологического анализа фразеологии современных германских языков (на материале немецкого, английского и нидерландского языков). Дисс. ... д-ра.филол.наук.: М., 1990. – 334 с.
2. Арсентьева Е.Ф. Русско-английский фразеологический словарь. Издательство «Хэтер», Казань, 1999. – 16 с.
3. Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms. - vol.2. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. -12-13 p.
4. Словарь американских идиом, /под ред. Адама Маккай. - 2000. – 2 с.