# CLASSIFICATION CONCEPTS IN PHRASEOLOGICAL ASPECTS

**¹Zaynab Karimova Abduamitovna**
Gulistan State University
aynabkarimova@gmail.com
**²Barno Turdikulova**
Gulistan State University
**³Muxiddinova Saboxat Axmadjanovna**
Gulistan State University

| ARTICLE INFO | ABSTRACT |
|---|---|

**ABSTRACT**

*From the standpoint of current linguistics, phraseological units may be classified based on their distinct characteristics. Phraseological units are classified based on their etymological, structural-semantic, and motivational-level significance, as well as which word group they are represented by in linguistic works. The wealth of Uzbek phraseology is as rich in national and borrowed, terminological and non-terminological units as the resource of English phraseology. Phraseological units, structural-semantic meaning, motivational level meaning, terminological units, and non-terminological units are key terms.*

Linguistic science's viewpoint on phraseological units would be intriguing. The initial step is sorting and classifying these components, which are various.

Which traits should be the classification system's main criteria? The structural? The semantics? Highly stable? Your origins?

The foregoing explanation should have showed that a phraseological unit is complicated with multiple key qualities that may be analyzed from different viewpoints. Thus, academics have created several concept-based categorization systems. "Thematic" phraseological unit classification uses original material. Many English and American idiom guides, phrase books, etc. use it. "Source" means human action, natural life, natural events, etc. Thus, L.P. Smith grouped idioms used by sailors, fishermen, warriors, and hunters by occupation and circumstance. Smith covers food, farm, and animal idioms. Sports, arts, and expressions abound.

"Etymological" classification is this method. When we discuss a word's or word-group's etymology, we usually mean whether it's native or borrowed and where it comes from. Smith does focus on foreign idioms, but this is just a tiny part of his categorization scheme. The underlying concept has no etymology.

Smith notes that English language is rich in seafarer-related words. Most of them now have metaphorical meanings unrelated to sailors or the sea. Examples follow. How can I be a judge if I'm all at sea? I'm afraid I'm all at sea with this issue. V.H. Collins compares the picture to a boat being tossed about without control and its occupants unaware of their location.

It's sink or swim—everything depends on him.

In danger in deep water.

Low water, on the rocks, and financially stressed.

I don't like you, but we're in the same boat, so I'll do all I can to aid you. Lifeboats are the metaphor.

To sail under false colors—to behave as a friend while holding hostile intentions. An hostile ship approaches its target while carrying the flag ("colours") of a fake friendly nation.

showing one's real colors. Again, the comparison is a ship displaying its national flag at the mast.

Striking one's colors means surrendering and admitting defeat. Ships surrender by lowering their flags.

To fearlessly conquer hurdles and withstand the storm.

Surrendering to the storm is defeat.

Three sheets to the wind—intoxicated.

Drunk halfway across the Atlantic.

As said, some idioms no longer have direct nautical connections, although some retain sea romance and adventure. "Ride out the storm or breakers ahead!" conjures images of pirate brigs, sea battles, and amazing discoveries.

Thematic categorization of phraseological units has merit, but it overlooks language aspects. Russian phraseological research is crucial. Academician V.V. Vinogradov's contributions to linguistics have been noted.

Some linguists consider this prominent scholar's phraseological unit categorization technique antiquated, however it was the first semantic classification system. Semantics are crucial in phraseological units. Current research also tend to ignore them. Thus, investigating phraseological unit semantics is commendable.

Vinogradov categorizes phraseological units by semantic coherence. Partially transplanted units are the least cohesive. Semantic cohesion increases when a phraseological unit's meaning diverges from its component components. Vinogradov classifies phraseological units as combinations, unities, and fusions. Phraseological pairings change the meaning of words. They're obviously motivated if the unit's meaning may be easily determined from its members'.

For instance, to be at wit's end, to be excellent at something, to have a bite, to come off a poor second, to come to a sticky finish, to look a sight, to take something for granted, to keep one's word, to stick at nothing, gospel truth, bosom buddies.

Syntactical functions classify phraseological units. The traditional structural technique classifies phraseological units as follows.

A. Oral. To flee, get an edge, speak through one's hat, sing and dance over something, or sit well.

B. Weighty. Calf love, white lie, lofty order, birds of a feather, passage, red tape, brown study.

C. Adjective. Strong, clean, fresh, and safe. In this group the socalled comparative word-groups are particularly expressive and sometimes amusing in their unanticipated and capricious associations: (as) cool as a cucumber, (as) nervous as a cat, (as) weak as a kitten, (as) good as gold (usu. spoken about children), (as) pretty as a picture, as large as life, (as)

slippery as an eel, (as) thick as thieves, (as) drunk as an owl (si.), (as) mad as a hatter/a hare in March.

D. Adverb. E.g. high and low, by hook or by crook, for love or money, in cold blood, in the dead of night, between the devil and the deep sea (whenever danger approaches),

My God! by God! Thanks George! Oh my! Oh my! sakes live! (Amer.)

Professor Smirnitsky's fascinating classification method for English phraseological units combines structural and semantic aspects [12]. This classification approach organizes phraseological units by number and semantic value of elements. Two big clusters:

A. one-summit units with one significant element (e.g., to give up, make out, pull out, feel fatigued, be terrified); B. two-summit and multi-summit units with two or more main characteristics (dark art, first night, common sense, fishing in hazardous waters).

Summit component parts of speech classify each major grouping's phraseological pieces. Thus, one-summit units are classified as follows: a) verbal-adverbial units, where the semantic and grammatical centers coincide in the first constituent (e.g. to give up); b) units, where the semantic center is in the second constituent and the grammatical center in the first (e.g. to be tired); and c) prepositional-substantive units, which are equivalent to adverbs or copulas.

Professor Koonin, Russia's top English phraseologist, highlighted this categorization approach's inconsistencies. First, the classification into phraseological units (non-idiomatic) and idioms violates Professor Smirnitsky's main phraseological unit condition: it must be idiomatic. Professor Koonin also rejects include word-groups like black art, best person, and first night in phraseology (Professor Smirnitsky's two-summit phraseological units) since they have no significance. Postpositional verbs like give up are also phraseological components, however this is unsubstantiated.

Russian phraseology theory's newest innovation is Professor A. V. Koonin's phraseological unit categorization. The categorization considers phraseological unit stability and the associated structural-semantic principle.

Structural-semantic characteristics divide phraseological units into four communication functions.

1. Coordinative phrases like wear and tear, well, and terrific are nominative phraseological units.

As the crow flies, see how the country lays, and ships that pass in the night are first-class predicative word-groups.

2. Passive-voice verbal word-groups form sentences in nominative-communicative phraseological units.

Interjectional word-groups are phrases.

Proverbs are phrases.

Phraseological units split these four groups. Subgroups have additional structural-semantic meaning rubrics based on element connections and whether meaning is completely or partly conveyed.

The categorization scheme objectively depicts phraseological units. It uses modern scientific criteria to classify all important phraseological unit components.

## References:

1.  Abduamitovna, K. Z. (2018). Psychological aspects of teaching foreign language to kids. Проблемы педагогики, (3 (35)), 105-106.

2.  Karimova, Z. A. (2017). PHRASEOLOGY AS A BRANCH OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE. Наука и образование сегодня, (5), 43-44.

3.  Abduamitovna, K. Z. (2023). Interpersonal Skills in English Teaching. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture, 4(4), 238-240.

4.  Zaynab, K. (2022). Achieving Effectiveness Through the Use of Digital Technologies in Learning English. Czech Journal of Multidisciplinary Innovations, 12, 27-30.

5.  Z.Karimova. (2022). THE PROBLEM OF COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN LINGUISTIC AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7330298

6.  Zaynab, K. (2022, March). THE IMPORTANCE OF LINGUISTIC FEATURES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK. In Conference Zone (pp. 144-145).

7.  Zaynab, K. (2022). Phraseology: Linguistic features at English and uzbek. Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal, 3(3), 385-389.

8.  Abduamitovna, K. Z. (2019). The problems of equivalence in phraseological units within the translation of "Baburnoma" into English. Вестник науки и образования, (3-2 (57)), 42-44.

9.  Barno, T. (2022). Lexical-Semantic Features of Geological Terms and Lexemes in English and Uzbek Languages. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture, 3(12), 148-152.

10. Turdikulova, B. T., & Akhmedov, O. S. (2022). Prospects for the Development of Dictionaries of Geological Terms and Their Features. International Journal of Social Science Research and Review, 5(5), 7-12.

11. Allayorov, A. I., Islikov, S. H., & Turdikulova, B. T. (2021). XXI CENTURY-THE CENTURY OF INTELLECTUAL YOUTH. Экономика и социум, (2-1 (81)), 56-62.

12. Saporbayevich, A. O., & Toirkulovna, T. B. Translating Methods of English Geological Terms and the Problem of Computer Lexicography. International Journal on Integrated Education, 4(4), 1-4.

13. Toirkulovna, T. B. . (2023). CONCEPT OF TERM AND TERMINOLOGY. Horizon: Journal of Humanity and Artificial Intelligence, 2(4), 299–302. Retrieved from http://univerpubl.com/index.php/horizon/article/view/1287

14. Турдикулова, Б. (2023). ИНГЛИЗ ВА ЎЗБЕК ТИЛЛАРИДА ГЕОЛОГИК ТЕРМИНИНОЛОГИЯДА ПОЛИСЕМИЯ ҲОДИСАСИ. Science and innovation, 2(Special Issue 4), 282-283.

15. Toirkulovna, T. B. (2019). The problem of translation of allusions related to painting in S. Maugham's "the Moon and Sixpence". Достижения науки и образования, (13 (54)), 35-36.

16. Toirkulovna, T. B., & Bakhodirovna, K. M. (2019). Preserving modality in translation of "the Moon and Sixpence" by S. Maugham. Достижения науки и образования, (13 (54)), 39-40.

17. Xolmuxamatovich, Y. A. (2022). ELEKTRON TA'LIM MUHITIDA TARMOQ TEXNOLOGIYALARI FANINI O'QITISHNING METODIK TA'MINOTINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH. Gospodarka i Innowacje., 23, 26-28.

18. Ayderovich, K. E., & Xolmuxamatovich, Y. A. (2022). THE LINGUISTIC PICTURE OF THE WORLD AS A REFLECTION OF THE MENTAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ETHNOS. Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal, 3 (02), 672–674.

19. Yusupov, A. (2022). TA'LIM JARAYONINI ZAMONAVIY AXBOROT KOMMUNIKATSIYA TEXNOLOGIYALARIDAN FOYDALANILGAN HOLDA TASHKIL QILISH. Science and innovation, 1(B8), 462-466.