

Phraseological Units with a Zoonym Component in the Modern Russian Language

Sharipov Sokhib Salimovich

Teacher of Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

Nuriddinova Nargiza Zamonovna

Master student of Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan

Abstract:

This work is devoted to the study of phraseological units containing a zoonym component in their structure. The article analyzes the corpus of zonyms that are part of phraseological units, determines their phraseological activity. The concepts of the image of a phraseological unit and its internal form are divorced, the ratio of units with a transparent and opaque internal form is analyzed, the analysis of the semantic unity of the components of these units is carried out. The interpretative nature of phraseological units with a zoonym component is considered from the point of view of their belonging to different thematic groups, the quantitative composition of phraseological units in these groups is analyzed. Analysis of the structural organization describes the grammatical constructions that represent these phraseological units, reveals the most numerous of them.

Keywords: phraseological units with a zoonym component, phrase-forming activity, image, internal form, semantic unity of components, thematic classification, structural analysis.

I. Introduction.

We live in close connection with the environment around us, from infancy we get acquainted with representatives of the animal world, and their images accompany us all our lives. This work is devoted to the study of phraseological units (PU) containing a zoonym component in their structure. In linguistics, the term zoonym is used in a broad and narrow sense. In the first case, it covers the names of animals (*dog, pike*), their nicknames (*Murka, Zhuchka*), the names of animal body parts (*mane, paw*), words derived from the names of animals (*pork, lamb*), objects related to animals (*pasture, barn*). In a narrow sense, this term includes only the names of animals in the direct meaning. We adhere to a narrow approach, however, in our study, adjectives derived from animal names are equated to zonyms: bearish, veal, as well as words with a generalized meaning: *animal, fish*, etc.

The issue of belonging of one or another stable combination to phraseological units is also disputable. We adhere to a broad understanding of phraseology and include in the study not only phraseological units in the "narrow" sense (fusions, unity, combinations), but also other stable combinations (proverbs, sayings, etc.), which are figurative in nature and are equated to phraseological units functionally.

Thus, a comprehensive study of phraseological units with a zoonym component helps to identify the areas of interaction between man and nature, to reveal the ways in which a person perceives himself and his environment through the prism of observations of the animal world, and also to present and analyze the ways of this interaction through language.

II. Materials and methods.

The purpose of this study is to describe the content diversity of phraseological units with a zoonym component in the Russian language, their semantic, thematic and structural analysis. To achieve this goal, the following tasks are solved:

- 1) to identify a corpus of phraseological units with a zoonym component in Russian;
- 2) to determine the phrase-forming activity of zoonyms in the composition of phraseological units of the Russian language;
- 3) identify phraseological units with a transparent and opaque inner form;
- 4) to give a thematic classification of phraseological units with a zoonym component;
- 5) consider the structural characteristics of the considered phraseological units.

III. Discussion and results.

Zoonyms as separate lexical units and as components of set expressions are widely represented in all languages of the world. The language material of this study is more than 600 phraseological units of the Russian language, in which there is a zoonymic component. The selection was carried out mainly from Michelson's Big Explanatory Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language [1], A. I. Molotov's Phraseological Dictionary of the Russian Language [2], and V. M. Mokienko's Big Dictionary of Russian Sayings [3]. The considered units are divided into 84 phraseological nests, the quantitative composition of which varies from 1 to 48 units. Some animal species are represented by names that differ in gender, age or other characteristics, for example, *horse - mare - horse - gelding*. This explains the difference between the number of species (84) and animal names (102). Different names of the same species convey different shades of meaning, however, phraseological units, which include variants of the name of the same species, belong to us to the same phraseological nest.

In the process of formation of phraseological units, zoonyms of the Russian language behave differently. The highest frequency components are zoonyms *баран / овца (27), бык / корова / теленок (28), волк (35), козел / коза (22), конь / кобыла / мерин / лошадь / пегас (42), кот / кошка (26), муха (22), петух / курица / цыплята (33), птица / птенец (29), свинья (22), собака / пес (48)*. The most common in the composition of phraseological units are lexical units denoting domestic animals, the least common lexical units denoting birds and fish.

In Russian phraseology, the names of animals are used as symbols, that is, the image or habits of an animal are transferred to a person or objects of the surrounding reality, and a zoonym acquires a generally accepted associative meaning. Thus, over time, the symbol-animal is filled with deep social and spiritual content, which is realized in phraseological units.

It is necessary to distinguish between the concepts of image and internal form. L. A. Korolova proposed the following definition: "A linguistic image is a two-dimensional image created by means of a language, which is based on the expression of one object through another" [4, 151]. That is, the phraseological image is not a passive reflection of surrounding objects, but the result of the creative work of human consciousness; it is a connection between a real object and an idea, a representation.

Under the internal form, we consider the motivational connection between the components of a phraseological unit and its integral meaning. If the value of the expression can be deduced from the

value of the components, then the internal form is transparent, for example, healthy as an ox. If motivational connections are lost over time, then a process of demotivation occurs, the meaning of the expression is encoded by a zoonym word, it is impossible to explain the source of the emergence of a phraseological unit without etymological analysis, for example, *how to build chickens* or *Yoshkin cat* in expressions. Such units have hidden cultural information.

The internal form of a phraseological unit with a zoonym component is perceived through the image of an animal, which underlies the nomination of an object, person or situation of objective reality by a phraseological unit. The description of the appearance, actions and states of animals is used as a figurative rod to characterize the actions and deeds of people in various life situations. The images used in phraseological units are a reflection of direct contacts with animals, observations of them, and also go into the distant past, into the customs, traditions and beliefs of the people. Ideas about some animals change over time, customs; rituals are no longer held, forgotten and become unknown to modern people, thus the number of phraseological units in the language increases, which seem unmotivated and opaque from the point of view of a modern native speaker.

In most phraseological units, the signs that are the basis of the internal form are obvious: *нем как рыба* (about a silent person), *первая ласточка* (about the first manifestations of something); there are much fewer expressions, the meaning of which cannot be understood, knowing the meanings of the words included in them: *крокодила объесться* (be angry, merciless), *оседлать Пегаса* (do poetry). Depending on the degree of connectivity of the components, all phraseological units can be conditionally divided into 4 groups: phraseological unions, unity, combinations and expressions. The classification of the first three types of phraseological units according to the degree of semantic unity was proposed by the famous linguist, academician V. V. Vinogradov. It was supplemented by academician N. M. Shansky, who introduced the fourth type into scientific use - phraseological expressions - proverbs and sayings (paremias) [5]. In order to determine the ratio of phraseological units with a transparent and opaque internal form, we examined and analyzed phraseological units with a zoonym component in Russian from the point of view of the semantic unity of the components.

Phraseological fusions are semantically indivisible phraseological turns in which the integral meaning is not at all derived from the individual meanings of their constituent words. For example, the phraseological turnover of *вола вертеть* in the meaning of "to mislead" is an unmotivated and conditional designation of objective reality along with the phrase "to speak absurdities, nonsense." The words that make up the fusions can retain grammatical independence: "Meanwhile, we are someone with a lamb *барашком в бумажке*, someone with a bower, someone with tears ..." [6]; "And there you will have to stick it in, and in another place you will give a lamb in *a piece of paper* ..." [6]. However, such changes in grammatical forms do not affect the meaning of the fusion.

Cohesion is the last stage of phraseologisation of an expression, when the motivation for creating a phraseological unit is not realized by native speakers, that is, they are absolutely indecomposable units, and most often they are equivalents of words.

Phraseological units, as well as phraseological fusions, are semantically indivisible wholes, however, their meanings are derivatives, i.e., they follow from the semantics of the words that form them, for example: *ворон считать, как белка в колесе*. Phraseological units differ from homonymous free combinations of words in figurativeness. Such combinations of words as *a cash cow*, *kill two birds with one stone* are equally possible both as phraseological units (then these will be figurative expressions), and as ordinary free combinations of words (then these words will be used in their direct, nominal meanings).

The components of phraseological units can be separated from each other by inserting other words. For example: “Harry Moore, by all appearances, *a shot American sparrow*, unlike omnivores, heavy from the falling crows of the Boulevard Ring, did not experience alternative torments for a second” [6]. This ability is characteristic only for phraseological units and distinguishes them from fusions, combinations and expressions.

In phraseological combinations there are words with both free and related use. In the turnover of *волчий амтестам*, the word "certificate" has a free use. It can be combined not only with the word "wolf", but also with other words. A feature of combinations is the ability of words with phraseologically related meanings to be replaced by synonyms (*телячий восторг* – immense delight). Another distinguishing feature of combinations is their binomial structure: *воробьиная ночь, свиная дорога*; adhesions and unities often have a complex structure.

Phraseological expressions have figurativeness, which, however, is derived from the semantically meaningful words that make up such expressions with free use: *Пуганая ворона куста боится* (The frightened crow is afraid of the bush). The main feature that distinguishes phraseological expressions from ordinary sentences is that in the process of communication they are not formed by the speaker, but are reproduced as ready-made units with a constant composition and meaning.

The considered groups are not frozen in their composition. Over time, fragments of proverbs, used independently without an edifying part, can acquire a generalized figurative meaning, practically divorced from the original. Such units move from phraseological expressions to other groups, for example, phraseological units. Such a transition can be traced on the example of the proverb *Лучше синица в руке, чем журавль в небе* (Better a titmouse in the hand than a crane in the sky). Taken separately, the expression pie in the sky is used to denote something indefinite, far from being realized. In the following example, “Do you think he will ever get married anyway? - I guess. So what? - And the fact that there will be a crane in the sky. Think for yourself: there are few suitors in the world, and we are missing out on such a profitable candidate of sciences, without five minutes” [6], another meaning is realized - something very profitable.

The results of the analysis of the degree of semantic fusion of the components of the phraseological units under consideration are presented in **Table 1**.

Table 1. Phraseological units of the Russian language with a zoonym component according to the degree of semantic fusion of the components

FU groups	phraseological fusions	phraseological units	phraseological combinations	phraseological expressions
Number of units	13,5 %	29,3 %	7,1 %	50,1 %

IV. Conclusion.

Zoonyms as part of phraseological units encode the culture, traditions and history of the people. Thus, phraseological units with a zoonym component reflect the specifics of the conscious worldview of native speakers. Despite the diversity of the animal world, phraseological units of the Russian language include a limited number of animals that concentrate symbolic meaning in themselves and form a national linguistic picture of the world. Phrase-forming activity is greater for lexemes denoting domestic animals, less for lexemes denoting birds and fish, which indicate the influence of the degree of participation of the animal in human life, its daily activities.

References:

1. Михельсон, М. И. Большой толково-фразеологический словарь русского языка Михельсона [Электронный ресурс]. – Электр. дан. – ETS Publishing house, 2004. – 2208 с. – 1 электрон. Опт. диск (CD-ROM).
2. Молотков, А. И. Фразеологический словарь русского языка / А. И. Молотков. – М. : Русский язык, 1986. – 544 с.
3. Мокиенко, В. М. Большой словарь русских поговорок / В. М. Мокиенко, Т. Г. Никитина. – М. : ЗАО «Олма Медиа Групп», 2007. – 784 с.
4. Савицкий, В. М. Основы общей теории идиоматики / В. М. Савицкий. – М. : Гнозис, 2006. – 208 с.
5. Меликян, В. Ю. Синтаксическая фразеология русского языка [Электронный ресурс] : учеб. Пособие / В. Ю. Меликян. – М: ФЛИНТА, 2013. – 351 с.
6. Национальный корпус русского языка [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа : <http://search.ruscorpora.ru> – Дата доступа : 21.05.2015.
7. Urayeva D., Nazarova G. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES AND MYTHOLOGISMS IN THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERATURE //Philology Matters. – 2021. – Т. 2021. – №. 1. – С. 3-21.
8. Ураева Д. С. Назарова Г. П. ИНГЛИЗ ВА ЎЗБЕК АДАБИЁТИДА ҚУШЛАР ОБРАЗИ //МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА. – 2020. – Т. 3. – №. 4.
9. Uraeva D., Kabulova Z. INFLUENCE OF UZBEK LITERATURE ON ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT OF KARAKALPAK MODERN POETRY //КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ, ИСКУССТВОВЕДЕНИЕ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ: СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ВЗГЛЯДЫ И НАУЧНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ. – 2019. – С. 94-98.
10. Bahronovna R. G. Epic Interpretations of the Image of Trees in Uzbek Folk Tales //European Journal of Life Safety and Stability (2660-9630). – 2021. – Т. 12. – С. 330-334.
11. Qizi R. G. B. OZBEK FOLKLORIDA TOL OBRAZINING O'ZIGA XOS TALQINLARI //НамДУ илмий ахборотномаси. – 2020. – Т. 1. – С. 5,311-319.