



MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC – METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL



ANTHROPOCENTRIC PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH A COMPOSITIONAL STRUCTURE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Anora Jabbarova

PhD, Associate Professor

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

Jizzakh, Uzbekistan

E-mail address: jabbarova.anora86@gmail.com

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: anthropocentric phraseological units, linguistics, comparative phraseological units, adjective phraseological units, coordinative connection, components.

Received: 15.11.23

Accepted: 30.11.23

Published: 5.12.23

Abstract: An examination of adjectival phrases with a compositional structure shows that they are characterized by the ability to form words. This fact alone does not prove that these phrases are complex words, since the ability to form words is also characteristic of many variable combinations of words (cf. long hair - long-haired; strong mind - strong-minded; "many years" - "many years" etc.), which does not at all turn them into complex words, since these variable formations are characterized by separate forms (longer hair, longest hair, her hair is long, long and curly hair, etc.).

INTRODUCTION

Adjective phrases with a coordinative structure are not formed according to the structural-semantic model, they are stable formations with a re-interpreted meaning and they should be considered as phraseological units.

According to O.E.D- (the Oxford English Dictionary), compound words are formed from the following adjective phraseological units:

down and out 1) “exhausted, unable to continue the further fight” (in boxing), “in a helpless state,” “without strength”; 2) “defeated”, “complete ruin in life”,

“ruined”, “knocked out of the rut”, “thrown overboard of life”, “impoverished” (down-and-outer; down-and-outness);

free and easy “free”, “relaxed”; “alien to convention, prejudice” (free-and-easiness);

hard and fast (hard-and-fastness);

high and mighty “arrogant”, “arrogant”, “arrogant” (high-and-mightiness);

out and out “completely finished”, “burnt through”, “seasoned”, “notorious” {out-and-outer}.

These phraseological units are also found in hyphenated spelling.

penny wise and pound foolish "penny-wise-pound-foolishness".

It is folly... to cripple and maim our own people by the penny-wise-pound-foolishness of 'two penny-half-penny' education. (Westminster Gazette, O.E.D.)

These complex words are extremely rarely used and we only encountered them in the dictionary.

In some adjective phrases about the compositional structure, the components are used in their literal meanings, which does not make it possible to classify such phrases as phraseological units: fair and square “honest”; null and void legal “lost legal force”, “invalid”; prim and proper "cute", "mannerly"; safe and sound "safe and sound".

Among the adjective phraseological units with a coordinative structure, two-member phrases predominate: alive and kicking “full of life”, “cheerful” (cf. "living smoking room"); dead and gone “long past”, “a thing of the past”, “long out of use”.

The only phraseological unit with a more complex structure, besides the already mentioned penny wise and pound foolish, is the phrase penny plain and two pence coloured.

Types of coordinative connection of adjective components
phraseological units

Among these phraseological units, there are three types of coordinative connections of components: connective connection, connective-adversative

connection and connective-separation connection. With a complete rethinking of turnover, these connections are weakened.

Connective connection

This type of connection is observed in the following types of idioms:

1. in paronymic phraseological units: dead and gone; free and easy; high and mighty;
2. in phraseological units, the components of which belong to a close semantic sphere: alive and rickety; penny plain and two pence coloured; up and coming; up and doing.

Connective-adversative connection

This type of connection is observed in paired antonymous phraseological units: gentle and simple “people of every rank”.

The phraseological units *spick and span* “fashionable”, “elegant”, “brand new” contain two archaisms.

The original full form was *spick and span new*, which is an emphatic variant of *span-new* - a calque of Old Norse *span-nyr* “completely new”. The meaning of the lexeme *spick* in this phraseological unit is not clear.

There was a word *spick*, which meant 1) “fat”; 2) “lavender”, but it cannot be said that it was used here. There is no doubt that the presence of alliteration contributed to the use of the word *spick* in this phraseological unit.

Connection-disconnection connection

The connection-disconnection connection is observed in the phrase common or garden joke. “ordinary”, “most ordinary”, “clichéd”, “hackneyed”.

I imagine they'd soon realize that I was not quite the common or garden chartered accountant. (W. S. Maugham)

Euphonic means are not used in phraseological units of this structural type, except for alliteration in the phraseological units *penny plain and two pence colored* and *spick and span*.

Most English phraseological units are marked and based on grammatical models of comparativeness:

- 1) phraseological units that are in form a positive degree of adjectives: light as a feather; as like as two peas; as old as hills; as pure as lily;
- 2) phraseological units that are in form a comparative degree of adjectives: blood is thicker than water; better late than never; doing is better than saying;
- 3) phraseological units that are in form a superlative degree of comparison of adjectives: of the blackest (or deepest) dye; one's (the) uttermost farthing; put smb on his best behavior;
- 4) marked with comparative lexemes: shed blood like water; speak a different language; all the same:
- 5) unmarked phraseological units express comparativeness implicitly: act (or play) the ass; in advance.

A complete selection of a significant number of works of English and American fiction of the 19th-20th centuries. made it possible to clarify the composition of the English GKFU and give it an objective historical and stylistic description.

A certain amount of HCFE for one reason or another in the present tense is falling out of use, and they are being replaced by new verbal comparisons.

Here are two lists of GCFEs, the first of which indicates verbal comparisons that have actually already fallen out of use, but which, according to lexicographical tradition, continue to be recorded in dictionaries (cf. To agree like harp and harrow, to blush like a black (blue) dog, to go like split, to lie like a gasmeter, to walk like a Virginia fence, etc.).

The second list lists GCFUs that have not yet been lexicographically registered, although they are characterized by a relatively high frequency of use. (Cf. to burn like fire, to beat like a drum, to fit like a skin, to show somebody aside like an (old) glove (shoe), etc.).

Being an integral part of the phraseological fund of the English language, English GCFUs exhibit both features specific to this class of phraseological units, as

well as common features that unite them with phraseological units of other types of stable verbal complexes (L.I. Roizenzon).

Particularly close to GCFU are adjectival CFU (AKFE), which is manifested both in some similar structural features (obligatory two-componentity in GCFU and AKFE), and in the presence of a semantically common second component of CFU. For example: to run like a hare - (as) fast as a hare; to live like a king - (as) happy as a king; to sing like a lark - (as) gay as a lark; and etc.

Analysis of the factual material showed that the degree of structural and semantic similarity between GCFE and ACFE may be even greater high, avg. to watch somebody like a hawk - (as) watchful as a hawk; to change like a weathercock - (as) changeable as a weathercock.

However, such CFUs occupy a very modest place in the phraseological fund of the English language. In all noted cases of coincidence of the second component, the latter, as a rule, consists of one word (noun). It is also characteristic that all these nouns are very frequent words. (We establish their frequency using the Thorndike and Lodge reference book).

Observations show that the verbal and adjectival specificity of such expressions imposes restrictions on the combinability properties of the subjective components of the GCFE, in particular, the definitions (expressed by adjectives, numerals) for these nominal components cannot coincide in the ECFE. Wed: to come back again like a bad penny (halfpenny) - (as) neat as a ninepence.

It must be emphasized that the similarities between GCFE and ACFE are not limited to the above features. In particular, our observations have shown that in verbal comparisons the conjunction as (characteristic of adjective CFUs) is used relatively rarely, and in adjective phrases the conjunction like is used, which, as we said above, is an indispensable structural ingredient of the GKFU of the English language.

Ex: Didn't say "Don't you really understand? I'm strong. I'm as strong as a bull. (A.Cristle).

Their sound inspired by Enzinger to remark "He's goddamned strong, like a bull" (S.Heym).

Doctor says 'twill come as a them in the night. But she's ready (E. Philpotts).

An analysis of the aspectual, tense and voicing features of the use of GCFE in the English language showed that the verbs of the studied comparisons are most often used in the personal form. In this case, verbs are used mainly in the form of simple tenses (for example, in the tenses of the Indefinite group in 689 cases out of 850, i.e. in 81%).

There are absolutely no examples in which verbs - components of GCFE - would appear in the tense forms Future Continions or Future Perfect. Very rarely HCFE are used in the passive voice.

Modern English grammars speak very sparingly about the functions performed by verbal comparisons in a sentence. There is no consensus on how to qualify the functional word like itself, which forms the vast majority of verbal comparisons in English. Thus, P.Roberts considers like to be a preposition, R.W.Pence classifies it as an adjective and preposition, Ralph B.Long classifies it as an adjunct. And only S.O.Curme and B.A.Ilyish consider like as a union. Taking into account the functions of this word in verbal comparisons, we also consider it a conjunction (cf. the similar functions of the conjunction as forming both verbal and adjective CFUs).

Observations have shown that there are fundamental differences between comparisons (variable phrases) and comparisons-phraseologisms. In the first case, each component of the comparison acts as a separate member of the sentence. As for comparative phraseological units, they form a single whole in syntactic and semantic respects, and therefore they are usually considered as one member of the sentence (see statements by A.I. Smirnitsky, I.V. Arnold, A.M. Babkin, S. I. Ozhegova, V.N. Telia, etc.).

Taking into account the role played by the verbal component of the GCFE (it is always the grammatical center of the entire phraseological unit), it should be recognized that verbal comparisons perform syntactic functions in sentences that are characteristic of a significant verb.

In both simple and complex sentences, GCFE, if its verbal component is in personal form, performs the functions of a predicate. Compare: They're dying like flies (W.S. Maugham).

The syntactic functions of GCFE with verbs in non-finite form are more diverse.

Thus, GCFE with a verb in the infinitive can act as: a) the second member of a compound verbal predicate. Wed:

I have cut out the booze and tobacco - for you - I really have. But I used to drink like a fish (S.Lewis).

b) the second member of a compound verbal modal predicate. Wed: Oh! I could read him like a book (J. Conrad).

c) the second member of a complex complement. Wed: "And a black fellow too" went on

the old seaman, "I have seen them die like flies (J.Conrad).

d) predicative phrase "nominative case with infinitive". Wed: At Orleans... this woman... was seen to cry like a child from the pain of it (B.Shaw).

With the first component in the form of a participle, GCFE most often acts as a definition. Wed:

The alarm, running through the house like fire, caught the two gentlemen next (W.Collins).

and can also perform the functions of circumstance. Wed:

Roaring like a mad bull the red faced one arose (S.Chaplin), and the absolute participial phrase. Wed:

The noise of the combat was terrific - each of the three combatants swearing like troopers (Ch.Dickens).

The absence of examples in which the participle acts as the second member of a complex object (as noted in the verbal component in the infinitive form) leads to the idea that such a function is not typical for GCFU with the first component in the participle form. In cases where the first component of the GCFE has the form of a gerund, a stable verbal comparison performs the function of the second member of a

compound verbal aspectual predicate. Wed: I... took to crying like a sick baby (A.S.Stephens).

As a result of studying the structural features of English GKFU, several (8) structural types of verbal comparisons were identified. The most common type is the one built according to the formula “verb + like (as) + noun”. Compare: to drink like a fish, to laugh like a hyena, to work like a horse, etc.

The absolute majority of GCFUs of the English language do not show deviations in morphological terms. However, in a number of cases of using verbal comparisons, there is a deviation from the grammatical norms of modern English. Compare: a) lack of agreement in number: Next morning we started out for the reef again. We'd sleep like a log (K.S. Prichard). Shep took the boots off the dead man and said they fitted him like a glove (R.L.Taylor), b) lack of agreement in gender: She said "I'm afraid you'll have to wait until Monday, Elizabeth..." I was outraged and ready to fight like a tiger for my two days (E.Flynn).

In each language there is, relatively speaking, a certain “phraseological space” (“phraseological continuum” - L.I. Roizenzon), which is filled in different ways with phraseological units. Observations show that existing phraseological types fill this continuum in different ways. Thus, adjective CFUs fill this space better (more fully) than other phraseological types when it comes, for example, to reflecting and characterizing human sensations. At the same time, there are many cases when GCFE have an advantage in this regard over ACFE or other types of phraseological units.

The functioning of identical comparisons in different languages (interlinguistic comparativeness), most often arising on the basis of extralinguistic material (cf.: English to tremble like an aspen leaf; Uzbek Terakning bargidek titramok (dir-dir titramok); Russian. tremble like an aspen leaf; French Trembler comme la (une) feuille; German Zittern wie Espenlaub; Czech Tresec se jako osikovy list; Ukrainian Tremtiti yak aspen leaf, etc.) suggests the existence of comparative universals. However, confirmation of this hypothesis requires careful and special scientific research, which, naturally, could not be fully realized.

Comparative studies based on the material of different languages (both related,

and not related), which, in particular, will help to identify the reasons for the creation of such expressions, and in some cases will allow us to establish the history of their origin.

When studying phraseological units of various types, the question always arises about the relationships that exist between phraseological units and the word. And in our time, this problem continues to be the focus of attention of phraseologists, although many works are devoted to this issue.

For a long time, most scientists adhered to the theory of the equivalence of phraseological units to words. In recent years, the theory of correlation of phraseological units with words has become more widespread. (A.V. Kunin. On the correlation of a phraseological unit with a word. Issue 178. Samarkand, 1970).

As for GKFE, they all semantically correlate not with a word, but with a phrase. This first of all means that, semantically, GCFUs cannot be identified by words.

Ex: to fight shy of - avoid, avoid, dodge and to fight like a lion - fight, fight like a lion, etc. They are connected with the word GCFE insofar as the nominative meaning of the entire verbal comparison basically coincides with the meaning or one of the meanings (in the case of polysemy) of the corresponding verb. Wed: to grin - to grin like Cheshire cat; to fight - to fight like a lion. The semantic correlation between the GCFE and the word, in fact, is exhausted by this.

There is an analysis of the definitions that are provided with verbal comparisons in English explanatory dictionaries (thus we avoid definitions of GCFE and find out how the English themselves perceive their meanings). As a result of this analysis, it was possible to establish that all GCFUs, without exception, are defined only through phrases and, therefore, are closer to them than to words. And although, as we have already said, there is a certain connection between the GKFE and the word (verb), in the English language there is still no sememe that would be formally expressed in one word and would convey the meaning of the entire phraseological unit - verbal comparison. Wed: to fight like kilkeny cats: to fight fiercely (V.H.Collins), to fight to the bitter end (B.L.K. Henderson), to fight with determination to the bitter end (E.Radford), to fight even into mutual destruction (E

.Partridge), to fight till the combatants are all torn to pieces (J.M.Dixon), to fight to the point of mutual destruction (A.M.Hyamson), to fight till both sides have lost their all (E.C.Brewer), etc.

The semantic analysis of GCFU as a whole is preceded by a component analysis, in which attention is paid to the particular use of verbs (the first component) and nouns (the second component), their etymology and a semantic classification of the verbal and nominal components of GCFU is given.

Our comparative analysis showed that verbs - the first components of the GCFE - are more frequent than nouns - the second components. Thus, about 80% of the verbs studied are included in the first two thousand most frequently used words of the English language (Analysis is carried out based on data from the reference book E.L. Thorndike and I.Lorge, The Teacher's Word Book of 30,000 words, New York, 1944), while for nouns this figure is 44.2%.

As for the origin of words - components of GCFE, for verbs words of Anglo-Saxon origin account for 80%, for nouns - 58%.

Since the semantic analysis of the GCFE was carried out by classes of verbs, all verbs are divided into: A) verbs used in the GCFE with one meaning and B) verbs used in the GCFE with several meanings.

Nine verbs (to come, to go, to hang, to run, to shake, to spring, to stand to stick, to work) are especially considered as having multiple meanings.

Classification of nouns - second components of GCFE

structured as follows: I-class - nouns denoting living beings, class II nouns denoting inanimate objects.

I-class is divided into: 1. Nouns denoting a person and his body parts; 2. Nouns denoting the animal world. Class II is divided into: 1. Nouns denoting specific objects;

2. Nouns denoting abstract concepts.

In turn, these groups are divided into a number of subgroups.

As a result of the component analysis of the GCFU of the English language from the point of view of the above semantic-thematic classification of the reference

words of these expressions, we were convinced that they are all closely related to the daily life of a person and reflect various aspects of his activity.

In the course of a general analysis of GCFEs, their scope of use, the history of their origin, usage, connection with verbal comparisons in other languages, etc. were established. All this was illustrated with factual material.

The study of internal and external phraseological connections of English GCFUs sums up the semantic analysis of the PUs studied in the work.

It is known that any phraseological unit has internal and external phraseological connections (L.I. Roizenzon. Syntax and phraseology. Collection of "Problems to Syntax", Lvov, 1963.). From this point of view, the GCFEs of the English language are also of some interest. Internal phraseological connections usually appear quite clearly, which is largely facilitated by the stable nature of the components of phraseological units.

It is much more difficult to judge the external phraseological connections of phraseological units (i.e., the connection between a phraseological unit (GKFU) and the subject of the action).

The change in the paradigmatic form of the adjective in phraseological units is considered the formation of the adjective in adjectival comparative phraseological units (CFU).

Categorical forms of degrees of comparison are relative in nature, because denote the quality of an object that is characteristic of it to a greater extent than another (comparative degree) and the highest degree of quality (superlative degree). To express these meanings in English, the formative suffixes -er and -est, as well as analytical forms with more and most, are used. However, in the studied material, cases were found when formative suffixes and analytical constructions do not realize their meaning, do not indicate a relative degree of quality, and also do not indicate an absolute degree of quality, relative. This phenomenon is observed in KFE. One of the indicators of the separate form of CFU is the morphological change in their adjectival component, its use to a comparative degree. Among the CFUs, two types can be distinguished, differing in the function performed by the comparison support: 1)

CFUs of the intensifying type (as mad as a hatter) and 2) a small group of CFUs of the descriptive type (as good one's word). In intensifying-type CFEs, the second component characterizes the properties represented by the first member and is reinterpreted into an intensifying element. The definitions given in various dictionaries also indicate the enhancing function of the substantive component of the CFU. It endows the adjective with which it is phraseologically associated, regardless of a high degree of quality or attribute, with an elative meaning. This property is widely used by CFU in fiction as expressive means of language.

However, the frequent repetition of CFUs to some extent weakens the expressive power of their impact. As a result, techniques for communicating additional expression to KFE have been developed in speech. One of them is the formation of the adjective, its use in the comparative degree (with the subsequent replacement of the conjunction as with the conjunction than). Such changes are impoastic in nature and represent a transformation of CFU:

Then Connie, everything in her world and life seemed worn out, and her dissatisfaction was older than the hills. (D.Lawrence, "Lady Chatted ey's Lover" ch.5, p.50.)

KFU in their original form express an absolute attribute without reference to any other homogeneous object endowed with the same attribute, i.e. have an elative meaning. The elative meaning of an adjective in CFU is not logically combined with the formation of the comparative degree, although formally it is quite possible due to the syntagmatic connection of comparison between the components of CFU. Overcoming the incompatibility between meaning and grammatical form, noted in lexical units, also takes place in CFU.

The transformation carried out by forming the adjective is also observed in descriptive-type CFUs. In cases where the comparative degree suffix realizes its grammatical meaning and the change in form itself does not conflict with usage, the formation of the adjective should be considered as usual (change of the adjective in the KFU as large as life in the meanings "life size", "natural size", "normal values"):

... and on the stage were a number of actors, moving silently to and fro, and Wearing masks which they kept turned toward the auditorium. These masks were a little larger than life, and this fact accounted for the extraordinary impression of the closeness which and received when and first opened the door (I. Murdoch, "Under the hef").

If the comparative degree suffix does not realize its grammatical meaning when changing the form of an adjective in descriptive KFUs, then such a change should be regarded as occasional. In descriptive CFUs, an occasional change in the form of the adjective leads to a change in the meaning of the CFU to the opposite: as large as life - "natural", larger than life - "unnatural": all her emotions are quite sincere, but she cannot help being a little larger than Ufe (J.B.Priestley, "Eden End" act 1) or to the emergence of an additional meaning: as good as a feast - "enough", buffer than a feast - "more than enough":

There were also very few materials accessible to a man like me to form judgment from Butting such a case and verily believe that a fettle is as good as a feast - perhaps better (J.Conrad, "Chance", p. 1, ch 11)

However, the uniqueness of contextual connections between members of comparative phraseological units and their heterogeneous nature make it necessary to distinguish them into a special group.

First of all, among them it is easy to notice a whole series of units that meet the characteristics of idioms, i.e. having a holistic meaning and even completely demotivated: as happy as a king "tipsy"; as deaf as an ass "deprived of musical ear"; as large as life "in person"; as greedy as a hawk "very hungry", etc. The integral meaning of these units grows from the weakening of their components, and the adjective in them is as semantically dependent as the nominal member.

Other units are phrasemes, but phrasemes of a special kind. In them, the first - adjectival or adverbial - component retains its meaning in all its intensity; the second, nominal component, representing the support of comparison, undergoes a weakening of its own lexical meaning and is reinterpreted into an intensifying element. This is especially noticeable in cases where the motivation for comparison seems clearly conditional and arbitrary. Wed: as cold as a key, as dead as Queen Ann, mad as a

hatter, as old as the hills, as silent as a mouse, as dead as a door-nail, bold as brass, etc.

The proper meaning of a nominal member becomes so insignificant over time that in English colloquial speech a curious single-vertex phraseological unit as anything “as I don’t know what” arose, the meaning of which is pure intensification without the slightest admixture of objective meaning (cf.: as sure as anything, as angry as anything, etc.). So, here there is a constant context in which one member is semantically intense and independent, and the second is lexically weakened, and its weakening depends on its connection with the first component and precisely gg.sh in a certain construction (cf. mad as a hatter, but, a mad hatter).

The contextual connection characteristic of such comparative combinations corresponds to the contextual connection between the elements of the phraseme: one component is semantically independent of the second, while the second is entirely dependent on the first and on the specific meaning of the syntactic relation to it. Consequently, the meaning of the second component is phraseologically related. But unlike phrasemes of other structural types, in comparative phrasemes the result of phraseological connection of the second component is not a shift, but a weakening of its meaning. This is their contextual specificity.

CONCLUSION

In fact, the same process occurs in motivated, stable comparisons, which at first glance differ from free, “creative” comparisons only in their cliché, inherent appearance of a “finished product.” Compare: as pale, as marble, as quick as lightning, as slippery as an eel, etc. And in them, too, the nominal member turns into a conditional intensifier in relation to the word associated with it, expressing a qualitative attribute. Compare: as pale as marble - extremely pale, as dry as a bone - dry to the utmost degree, etc. All of these are stable combinations on the way to becoming a phraseme.

A special contextual connection is characteristic of comparative phraseological units in which the second member of the comparison is expressed by a phrase (such

as as greedy as a cow in a clover, as happy as a clam at high tide). But we will return to them when discussing the issue of the boundaries of a phraseological unit.

These are the structural types of English phraseological units, considered from a contextological point of view.

REFERENCES:

1. Rakhmatullaev Sh. An explanatory phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language. -T.: Teacher, 1978. -10 p.
 2. Rakhmatullaev Sh. Some issues of Uzbek phraseology (polysemy, synonymy, variation, antonymy, homonymy and homonymy in phraseological units). -T.: Science, 1966. -264 p.
 3. A.V. Kunin. Phraseology of the modern English language. M., 1986,-35 p.
 4. Kunin A.V. Course phraseology of modern English language. -74 p.
 5. Rakhmatullaev Sh. Phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language.-10 b.
- Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal ISSN: 2181-1547 (E) / 2181-6131 (P) <http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index124>
6. Nazaryan A.G. Phraseology of the modern French language, —225-231 p.
 7. Rakhmatullaev Sh. Some issues of Uzbek phraseology (polysemy, synonymy, variation, antonymy, homonymy and homonymy in phraseological units). -T.: Science, 1966. -P. 264.
 8. Mamatov.A. Phraseology of the Uzbek language. Study guide. -T.: Navroz, 2019. - 217 p.
 9. Mamatov A.E. Problems of lexical and phraseological norms in modern Uzbek literary language. -T., 1991. -p. 239-246.
 10. Mamatov.A. Phraseology of the Uzbek language. Study guide. -T.: Navroz, 2019. -234 p.
 11. Rakhmatullaev Sh. Some issues of Uzbek phraseology: Philology. science. dr. dis. ... autoref. -T., 1966. -46 p.
 12. Rakhmatullaev Sh. Phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language. -T., 1992. - 46 p.

13. Jabbarova, A. (2023). LINGUISTIC FOUNDATIONS OF EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIVENESS. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*, 4(05), 118–124.

14. Jabbarova, A. (2021). TRANSFORMATION AND DEFORMATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS AS A MEANS OF CREATING EXPRESSIVITY, EFFICIENCY AND STYLISTIC. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 4(3).

15. Jabbarova, A. J. (2020). Linguoculturological Analysis Of Phraseological Units And Different Approaches To Linguoculturology. *The American Journal of Interdisciplinary Innovations and Research*, 2(08), 20-24.