

CORE OF STRUCTURAL AND GRAMMATICAL FEATURES OF IDIOMATIC EXPRESSIONS

D.F. Abulkhayirov

Samarkand economy and service institute
"Teaching languages" department teacher,
Dostonbey958@gmail.com

Achilbayev Diyorjon Jamshid ugli

Samarkand Institute of Economy
and Service, student

***Annotation:** Phraseology-phraseological units with the same structure and function of comparative research in the study of general and specific features of the studied languages (verbal, adjectival, comparative, phraseological units with sentence content, phraseological units of different structural models), phraseological units whose components are the same (somatisms, onomastic), (components, verbs of action, color components, etc.), having the same type of symbolic meaning (fields and groups of phraseological units with the same semantics) and work is carried out on all phraseological funds of languages. The results of the study show that the study of the entire phraseological system, which is characterized by complexity and inconsistency, can be successful only through an in-depth analysis of individual microsystems that have a common feature and have their own characteristic of the system as a whole. Possible taking this into account, we have chosen for analysis numerous (and typical for any language) subsystems of phraseological units semantically oriented to the person in English and Uzbek.*

***Key words:** Phraseology, semantics, specific features, linguistic factors, grammatical construction*

The choice of this subsystem as an object of study is not accidental. First, as recognized by most phrenologists, the linguistic essence of a phraseological unit is mainly determined by its semantics, so it seems most reasonable to choose phraseological units for analysis on a semantic basis.

Second, A.D. As Reichstein noted, the phraseological system as a whole clearly demonstrates the origin and functioning of the dual anthropocentrism, that is, the semantic orientation of the structural lexeme as components to the individual, and especially the collective phraseological units in their meaning.

Thirdly, this phraseological subsystem is a clear example of the influence of not only linguistic, but also extra linguistic factors in the language. Indeed, in the language compared on both sides, the phraseological units of this subsystem cover areas of general conceptual correlation. Their analysis, regardless of their linguistic affiliation, reveals both the common features inherent in the human community and the unique features arising from purely additive languages as linguistic factors.

Structural-grammatical comparative analysis of phraseological units is aimed at determining their structural-grammatical parallels and differences in English and Uzbek languages.

From the point of view of expression, phraseological units have a certain structural and grammatical construction, which is made up of free phrases or sentence models that exist in a given language. It is known that phraseological units do not differ from ordinary word combinations according to their structure. They are modeled on certain free syntactic constructions that exist in the language now or existed in the past. The analysis of the structural and grammatical organization of phraseological units is carried out taking into account the following features.

1. Morphological expression of the main component of phraseological units; this criterion is comparatively observed by the majority of researchers of phraseological units.

2. The main component of phraseological units means a grammatically independent component that refers to a certain part of speech and determines its function. There are such types of phraseological units as substantive, verbal, adjective as a concrete member of the proposal.

3. Syntagmatic structure of phraseological units, that is, phraseological units are organized in the form of phrases or sentences of a different type of syntactic connection (coordinating or subordinate).

Such an approach to the consideration of phraseological units was developed by N. Amosova, E.N. Pokrovskaya, V.F. We can find it in the works of Sknar and other linguists.

4. Attributive and objective phraseological units are distinguished from the syntactic subordinate connections of phraseological units.

5. Methods of expression of syntactic relations (coordination, control, contiguity) are formed. On the one hand, input methods as a component of a language in the expression of syntactic connections, on the one hand, reflect its typology, and on the other hand, have their own characteristics that allow to determine the typological characteristics of the language at the level of phrases.

6. FBs are distinguished according to the positions of the dependent component of the FB in relation to the content, that is, in the front postposition or in the postposition with the dependent component. The last three features were identified by Professor V.D. It was separated by Arakin for typological comparison of Uzbek and English phrases and used by E. Babayev for comparative analysis of figurative comparative phrases (comparative phraseological units) in modern English and Uzbek languages.

Taking into account all the mentioned features, in our opinion, it provides the most complete structural and grammatical description of phraseological units semantically oriented to the person in the Uzbek and English languages.

The main structural features of languages directly leave their mark on the structural-grammatical structure of phraseological units. Among them we should note the following:

1) presence of indefinite or definite article in most phraseological units of the English language as a grammatical category characteristic of English;

2) the system of pronounced cases of Uzbek phraseological units and the presence of only two cases (generic and possessive) in English phraseological units: English meanings of Uzbek cases are conveyed through prepositional compounds.

3) the frequent use of the component "one's" in English phraseological units, in this context it is replaced by a personal pronoun in the objective case as required by the situation, and its complete incompatibility with the reflexive pronoun in the Uzbek language.

The list of used literature

1. Amosova N.N. "Basic English Phraseology". - Leningrad: Leningrad University, 1961.
2. KurzonDennis "Sexist and Nonsexist Language in Legal Texts: the state of the art // International Journal of the Sociology of Language". Volume 1989, Issue 80. – p.p. 99-114. (online: 30/07/2009)
3. Siedl J., McMordie W. English Idioms and How to Use Them. - M., 1983. - 265 p.
4. Emirova A.M. "Russian phraseology and communicative aspect". - Tashkent: Science, 1988. - 90 p.
5. CCDI - Anglo-Russian slovar ustoychivyx slovosochetaniy = Collins COBUILD Dictionary of Idioms. - M.: OOO "Izd-vo ACT"; OOO "Izd-vo Astrel", 2004. - 751 p.
6. Parsons T. The Structure and Social Action. – New York: McGraw, 1951.

7. Kurzon Dennis "Sexist and Nonsexist Language in Legal Texts: the state of the art // International Journal of the Sociology of Language". Volume 1989, Issue 80. – p.p. 99-114. (online: 30/07/2009)
8. Ayupova P.A. "Phraseological meaning and lexicographic description in context". Kazan: 2008. -148p.
9. Borkowski, P. The Great Russian-English Dictionary of Idioms and Set Expressions / P. Borkowski. - London, Borkowski, 1973.
10. Brewer, E.C. Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. Centenary edition (completely revised) / E.C. Brewer. - London: Cassell, 1977.
11. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=jFRsmDMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=jFRsmDMAAAAJ:_FxGoFyzp5QC
12. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=jFRsmDMAAAAJ&citation_for_view=jFRsmDMAAAAJ:roLk4NBRz8UC