

## **THE COMPLEXITIES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNIT CLASSIFICATION**

**Ataeva Gulchekhra Bakhtiyorovna,**  
assistant, PhD student,  
Department of Foreign Languages  
Tashkent State Transport University  
E-mail: [gulchekhra.ataeva@gmail.com](mailto:gulchekhra.ataeva@gmail.com)

**Annotatsiya.** Ushbu maqolada frazeologik birikmalarning turli xil tasniflari va ta’riflari ko’rib chiqilgan. Tilshunoslar tomonidan qo’llaniladigan turli tasniflash usullarini o’rganish orqali frazeologiyaning murakkab olami yoritilgan. Frazeologik birikmalarning murakkabligi ko’p so’zli ifodaning yaxlit ma’nosini tahlil qilish va uning alohida tarkibiy qismlarining ma’nolarini tahlil qilish o’rtasidagi muvozanatni to’g’ri talqin qilib bilishdadir.

Tadqiqotda frazeologik birliklarning keng qo’llanilishiga urg’u berilgan hamda tasniflashning turlicha yondashuvlari, jumladan, strukturaviy va semantik xususiyatlariga, barqaror va idiomatic ifodalarga, takrorlanuvchanlikka, ommaboplikka asoslangan yondashuvlarga tayanib tahlil qilingan.

Frazeologik birliklarni samarali tasniflashga konnotatsiya komponentlarini qo’llash orqali erishiladi, ularning har biri unga yangi mazmun bag’ishlaydi va xalqning milliy-madaniy tajribasi va an’analari haqida ma’lumot beradi.

**Tayanch so’zlar:** frazeologiya, tasnif, ko’p so’zli iboralar, semantika, idioma, turg’un so’z brikmalari, omonimiya.

**Аннотация.** В данном исследовании освещается мир фразеологии, исследуя различные методы и классификации используемые лингвистами. Основное внимание уделяется балансу между анализом целостного значения многокомпонентного выражения и разбором значений его отдельных компонентов. Исследование анализирует различные подходы к классификации, включая те, которые основаны на структурно-семантических особенностях, стабильности и идиоматичности, воспроизводимости, а также популярности, подчеркивая широкое признание и использование фразеологических единиц.

Предоставляя основу для эффективной классификации фразеологических единиц, оно способствует разработке учебных материалов по языку и облегчает выполнение задач, таких как анализ тональности и машинный перевод, что является важным для понимания тонкостей фигуративного языка.

**Ключевые слова:** фразеология, словосочетание, многокомпонентные выражения, семантика, идиома, омонимия.

**Abstract.** This study delves into the intricate world of phraseology, exploring the various classification methods used by linguists. The core tension lies in the balance between analyzing the holistic meaning of a multi-word expression and dissecting the meanings of its individual components.

*The research analyzes various classification approaches, including those based on structural-semantic features, stability and idiomaticity, reproducibility, popularity highlighting the widespread recognition and usage of phraseological units.*

*By providing foundation for effective phraseological units' classification, it aids in developing language learning materials and facilitates tasks like sentiment analysis and machine translation, all crucial for understanding the nuances of figurative language.*

**Keywords:** *phraseology, classification, multi-word expressions, semantics, idiom, stability, semantics.*

The phraseological composition of a language is classified according to various principles: structural-semantic, grammatical, functional-stylistic. At the forefront of phraseology classification is the structural-semantic principle, derived from V.V. Vinogradov's classification criteria, based on the criteria of semantic cohesion or analyticity of phraseological meanings.

A phraseological unit (PU) possesses a set of features that distinguish it from both a word and a free word combination. Most scholars highlight the stability of PUs as one of the main distinguishing features for classification.

In L. Bulakhovsky's research, a genetic classification has been defined, involving groupings of phraseological material based on sources of origin. Thus, by this criterion, L. Bulakhovsky identifies 8 main groups of phraseological units:

- 1) proverbs and sayings;
- 2) professionalisms that have acquired metaphorical usage;
- 3) established expressions from anecdotes, jokes, etc.;
- 4) quotations and images from the "Old" and "New" Testaments;
- 5) numerous reminiscences of antiquity;
- 6) translations of common foreign expressions;
- 7) winged words of indigenous and foreign writers;
- 8) pointed phrases of outstanding individuals [5: 52].

Such a classification is useful from the perspective of historical study of phraseology, but, unfortunately, it cannot cover all phraseological units, as it is often difficult, even in specialized research, to precisely establish the source of the origin of a particular expression.

Another genetic classification of PUs was proposed by V. Mokienko, who divided them into two groups - natural and conditional. He classified into the first group phraseological units that arise independently in different languages (reflecting natural phenomena, the animal and plant world, physical and mental states of humans), and into the second group - expressions that are conditioned by the



specifics of national development and reflect the facts of the material and spiritual culture of a particular people.

V. Vinogradov based his definition of phraseological units on a structural feature, which includes stability, reproducibility in speech of word combinations as ready-made units. By the stability of a phraseological unit, he means the stability of word combinations as a result of the lexical-semantic characteristics of these words.

Other researchers of phraseology specify and clarify V. Vinogradov's point of view, for example, E. Ivannikova, who believes that "the stability of a phraseological unit caused by lexicalization represents a stability of a different nature than the stability caused by phraseologization, which necessitates distinguishing phraseological stability from lexical stability" [8: 80].

The concept of A. Kunin is also based on the notion of stability. Since stability is characteristic not only of PUs, in his opinion, it is worth distinguishing phraseological stability from other types of stability.

He believes that the concept of stability is not based on any single feature but requires a comprehensive approach, and phraseological stability "is based on its various types of invariance, i.e. the immutability of certain elements in all normative changes" [5:46]. A. Kunin identifies the following types of phraseological stability or invariance:

- 1) Usage;
- 2) at the structural-semantic level;
- 3) at the semantic level;
- 4) at the lexical level;
- 5) at the syntactic level

I. Melchuk distinguishes two main features of PUs - stability and idiomaticity or non-motivation. According to Melchuk, stability and idiomaticity are completely independent concepts, i.e., a phrase can be stable but non-idiomatic, and vice versa. Based on his concept, he identifies four types of phraseological units:

- 1) Stable idiomatic expressions;
- 2) Stable non-idiomatic expressions;
- 3) Unstable idiomatic expressions;
- 4) Unstable non-idiomatic expressions [9: 79].

N. Shansky considers not only stability but also reproducibility as differential features of a phraseological unit distinguishing it from a free combination of words. In his opinion, "the property of reproducibility explains all the other features equally

inherent in words and phraseological expressions: first of all, the stability of composition and structure and the integrity of meaning" [9: 22].

The concept of reproducibility is specified by L. Royzenzon. In his opinion, it cannot be said that the same phenomenon - reproducibility - is characteristic for all phraseological units and for free combinations. He introduces the concept of "phraseological reproducibility". "Phraseological reproducibility is not just the repetition in the language of what is in the language system, but only such a property of verbal components when a given expression always appears in the same stable form, being opposed to another form of the same lexical combination" [11:104].

V. Arkhangel'sky provides seventeen characteristics that characterize PUs. However, he believes that "the most important essential and differential characteristic of a phraseological unit is the concept of popularity" [2:125]. In his opinion, the concept of popularity is inseparably linked to the concept of reproducibility of a phraseological expression and is its main condition. "A phraseological unit is reproduced in the speech of speakers of the given language precisely because it is known to the linguistic community and is passed down from generation to generation as a complete structure" [2:125].

Reproducibility is not the main characteristic for all lexicologists. I. Chernysheva does not recognize reproducibility as the main characteristic of PUs, believing that there is also reproducibility of such lexical units (LUs) that are not phraseological.

Thus, at the present stage of the development of phraseological science, the theory of phraseology can be conditionally reduced to narrow and broad understandings of phraseology. For the first time, the concept of phraseology in the narrow and broad sense of the word was introduced by S. Ozhegov in 1957 in the article "On the Structure of Phraseology," however, there is still no consensus on this issue. The fact is that a phraseological unit, like any other unit of language, is characterized from three sides: from the point of view of content, formal-structural organization, and function [6:53]. In accordance with this, we should not simply talk about narrow and broad understanding of phraseology, but about three criteria of such understanding [6:54], since linguists evaluate PUs precisely from these three aspects. Let's consider all three criteria.

The first one is related to the semantic structure of the phraseological expression. Thus, some supporters of a narrow understanding of phraseology consider integrity, indivisibility of its meaning as the main characteristic of a phraseological unit. Therefore, one of the categorical (differential) characteristics of a phraseological



expression, according to A. Molotkov, is the presence of lexical meaning in a phraseological expression (in the phraseological expression as a whole, not in each component separately) [10:22]. According to Zhukov, "a phraseological expression... is understood as a stable and separately reproduced unit, consisting of components, endowed with a complete (or, less often, partially complete) meaning" [7:39].

V. Vinogradov, the founder of phraseology as a science, also understands phraseology in a narrow sense. He distinguishes phraseological units according to the degree of semantic cohesion of the components included in the phraseological unit, into three groups:

1) phraseological blends 2) phraseological units 3) phraseological combinations.

Phraseological units are semantically indivisible phraseological units, their integral meaning motivated by the meaning of the components. In them, the meaning of the whole is connected with the understanding of the internal figurative core of the phrase, the potential meaning of words. Phraseological combinations are "a type of phrases created by the realization of related meanings of words" [3:24-25]. They are not unconditional semantic units. In them, the meanings of words are more clearly delineated, sharper, they are analytical. Typically, they consist of two components: one retains its direct nominative meaning, while the other appears in a figurative, phraseologically related meaning, manifesting itself only in combination with certain words.

Phraseological blends are characterized by a high degree of semantic cohesion of the components, as their integral meaning is "completely independent of their lexical composition, of the meanings of their components, and just as conditionally and arbitrarily as the meaning of an unmotivated word - a sign" [3:47].

B. Larin's semantic classification of phraseological units in terms of diachrony reflects the stages of development and restructuring of primitive original word combinations. It includes:

- a) variable word combinations;
- b) stable word combinations, distinguished by stereotypicality, traditionality, and metaphorical reinterpretation;
- c) idioms, which, compared to stable metaphorical word combinations, have a more distorted, abbreviated, and distant lexical and grammatical composition, as well as a weakening of the semantic divisibility that determines their metaphorical nature, i.e., semantic dualism.

N. Shansky, a proponent of a broad understanding of phraseology, believes that phraseological units are "reproduced in a finished form language unit consisting of two or more accented components of a verbal nature, fixed (i.e., constant) in its meaning, composition, and structure. Based on this definition, proverbs, sayings, winged words, scientific terms, jargon, etc., can also be included in phraseology. Based on V. Vinogradov's classification of phraseological units, he divides them into four groups:

- 1) phraseological blends,
- 2) phraseological units,
- 3) phraseological combinations, and
- 4) phraseological expressions.

As an additional classification group of V. Vinogradov, a phraseological expression is understood as "a stable in its composition and usage phraseological phrase, which not only is semantically segmented but also consists entirely of words with free meanings. Phraseological expressions differ from phraseological combinations in that they do not contain words with phraseologically related meanings" [1:35].

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the world of phraseology continues to be a fascinating battleground for classification. Scholars grapple with the tension between analyzing the holistic meaning of a multi-word expression and dissecting the meanings of its individual components. Stability, the established form of the phrase, and the nature of its meaning – literal or figurative – all play a crucial role. However, the real essence of the research lies in determining the weight given to individual words versus the overall, often non-compositional, meaning of the phraseological unit. The very complexity of these expressions, defying straightforward analysis, ensures that the study and research about the most effective classification approach will undoubtedly continue to inspire further exploration.

### **References:**

1. Arutyunova, I. D. (1990). Metafora i diskurs [Metaphor and discourse]. In 'Teoriya metafory' [Theory of metaphor]. Moscow: Progress. (pp. 320)
2. Arkhangel'skiy, V. L. (2004). Ustoychivye frazy v sovremennom russkom yazyke. Osnovy teorii ustoychivyx fraz i problemy obshchey frazeologii [Stable phrases in modern Russian language. Fundamentals of the theory of stable phrases and problems of general phraseology]. Rostov-na-Dono (pp. 260)



3. Berdnikova, T. A. (2003). Somaticheskaya frazeologiya kak otrazhenie naivnykh predstavleniy o chelovecheskom tele [Somatic phraseology as a reflection of naive ideas about the human body]. ‘Voprosy russkogo yazykoznaneya’ [Questions of Russian linguistics], X, 85–94.
4. Berezin, F. M. (1984). Istoriya lingvisticheskikh ucheniy: Uchebnik dlya filol. spets. vuzov [History of linguistic doctrines: Textbook for philological specialty universities] (2nd ed.). Moscow: Vyssh. shk. (pp. 319)
5. Bykova, S. A. (2003). Frazeologiya yaponskogo yazyka i dialekty [Phraseology of the Japanese language and dialects]. ‘Vostochnoye yazykovedeniye’ [Oriental linguistics], (pp. 60–66)
6. Vinogradov, V. (1998). Idiolekt [Idiolect]. In ‘Russkiy yazyk. Entsiklopediya’ [Russian language. Encyclopedia] (2nd ed.). Moscow: Bolshaya Rossiyskaya entsiklopediya; Drofa. (pp. 144–145)
7. Vinogradov, V. V. (1963). ‘Stilistika. Teoriya poeticheskoy rechi’ [Stylistics. Theory of poetic speech]. Moscow (pp. 200)
8. Vinogradov, V. S. (2004). ‘Perevod. Obshchiye i leksicheskiye voprosy’ [Translation. General and lexical issues]. Moscow: Drofa. (pp. 189-200)
9. Galkina-Fedoruk, E. I. (1958). Ob ekspressivnosti i emotsionalnosti v yazyke [On expressiveness and emotionality in language]. In ‘Sbornik statey po yazykoznaniiu’ [Collection of articles on linguistics]. Moscow.
10. Gorodetskaya, I. V. (2007). Somaticheskii komponent frazeologizmov russkogo i frantsuzskogo yazykov [Somatic component of phraseologisms in Russian and French languages]. ‘Vestnik Stavropol'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta’ [Bulletin of Stavropol State University], 51, 162–168.
11. Larin, B. A. (1956). Ocherki po frazeologii [Essays on phraseology]. In ‘Ocherki po leksikologii, frazeologii i stilistike’ [Essays on lexicology, phraseology, and stylistics] Leningrad: LGU. No. 198, pp. 200–224