



IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI

ISSN 3060-5059



VOL.3 № 4

2026

TILSHUNOSLIKDA FRAZEOLOGIK BIRLIKLARNING TARKIBIY VA SEMANTIK XUSUSIYATLARI

Asqarova Nilufar Sobitxon qizi

Mirzo Ulugʻbek nomidagi Oʻzbekiston Milliy universiteti, magistrant

Khursanov Nurislom Iskandarovich

Renaissance universiteti, dotsent (DSc)

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada frazeologik birliklarning tarkibiy va semantik xususiyatlari lingvistik tizimning alohida toifasi sifatida koʻrib chiqiladi. Rus-Sovet frazeologik stipendiyalarida oʻrnatilgan anʼanalarga hamda kognitiv tilshunoslikning hissalariga asoslanib, tadqiqotda frazeologik birliklar tashkil etiladigan asosiy tarkibiy modellar, ularning majoziy maʼnosini asoslaydigan semantik mexanizmlar tahlil qilinadi. Rasmiy barqarorlik va semantik oʻzgarish oʻrtasidagi munosabatlarga, idiomatiklik darajasini aniqlashda ichki motivatsiyaning roliga alohida eʼtibor qaratilgan.

Kalit soʻzlar: frazeologik birliklar, tarkibiy xususiyatlar, semantik xususiyatlar, idiomatiklik, kompozitsiyasizlik, kognitiv tilshunoslik, frazeologik tasnif.

СТРУКТУРНО-СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ В ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ

Аскарова Нилуфар Собитхон кизи

Национальный университет Узбекистана имени Мирзо Улугбека, магистрант

Хурсанов Нурислом Искандарович

Университет Renaissance, доцент (DSc)

Аннотация

В настоящей статье рассматриваются структурные и семантические свойства фразеологических единиц как отдельной категории языковой системы. Опираясь на устоявшиеся традиции русско-советской фразеологической науки, а также на достижения когнитивной лингвистики, в исследовании анализируются основные структурные модели, с помощью которых организованы фразеологические единицы, и семантические механизмы, лежащие в основе их переносного значения. Особое внимание уделяется взаимосвязи между формальной стабильностью и семантической трансформацией, роли внутренней мотивации в определении степени идиоматичности.

Ключевые слова: фразеологические единицы, структурные особенности, семантические особенности, идиоматичность, несоставность, когнитивная лингвистика, фразеологическая классификация.

STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC FEATURES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN LINGUISTICS

Asqarova Nilufar Sobitxon qizi

National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, Master Student

Khursanov Nurislom Iskandarovich

Renaissance University, Associate Professor (DSc)

Abstract

The present article examines the structural and semantic properties of phraseological units as a distinct category of the linguistic system. Drawing on established traditions in Russian Soviet phraseological scholarship as well as contributions from cognitive linguistics, the study analyses the principal structural models through which phraseological units are organized, the semantic mechanisms that underpin their figurative meaning. Special attention is devoted to the relationship between formal stability and semantic transformation, the role of internal motivation in determining the degree of idiomaticity.

Keywords: phraseological units, structural features, semantic features, idiomaticity, non-compositionality, cognitive linguistics, phraseological classification.

Among the many layers that constitute the lexical architecture of a language, phraseological units present scholars with one of the most analytically demanding objects of inquiry. Unlike single lexical items, whose meanings are generally recoverable from their morphological structure, and unlike free syntactic combinations, whose meanings are compositionally derived from the meanings of their parts, phraseological units occupy an intermediate and often irreducible position. They possess the outward form of syntagmatic sequences yet function semantically and pragmatically as holistic signs. This peculiar duality—syntactic plurality combined with semantic unity—has motivated more than a century of scholarly debate concerning the definition, classification, and theoretical status of phraseological units. The field of phraseology, established as an autonomous linguistic discipline largely through the foundational contributions of V.V. Vinogradov in the mid-twentieth century, has since expanded considerably, incorporating insights from typology, cognitive science, corpus linguistics, and cross-cultural semantics.

The present article contributes to the field of linguistics by offering a systematic account of the structural and semantic features that characterize phraseological units as a distinct class. Rather than treating structure and semantics as parallel but separate dimensions of description, this study emphasizes their interdependence and demonstrates that the formal organization of phraseological units is inseparable from their semantic integrity.

Definitional Parameters of Phraseological Units

Any rigorous structural or semantic analysis of phraseological units must begin with the question of delimitation: what distinguishes a phraseological unit from other types of fixed or formulaic language, on the one hand, and from free syntactic combinations, on the other? The scholarly literature converges, with some variation in emphasis, on three defining properties: stability of form, reproducibility as a ready-made unit in discourse, and semantic non-compositionality—that is, the impossibility of deriving the meaning of the whole by simply summing the meanings of the individual components.

Stability of form refers to the resistance of a phraseological unit to lexical substitution, syntactic transformation, or morphological variation without a corresponding loss or alteration of its established meaning. This property is a matter of degree rather than an absolute threshold. Some expressions, such as proverbial formulas or fused idioms, tolerate virtually no variation; others, classified by Kunin as phraseological collocations or by Vinogradov as phraseological combinations, permit limited substitution within a constrained range of lexical options.

Semantic non-compositionality, perhaps the most theoretically significant of the three criteria, captures the observation that the meaning of a phraseological unit cannot be predicted from a straightforward combination of the literal meanings of its constituent words. The expression *to kick the bucket*, for instance, conveys the concept of death through a figurative mapping that has become lexicalized and is no longer transparent to the native speaker. Non-compositionality is, like stability, gradable: some units retain a degree of semantic motivation through recoverable metaphorical or metonymic relationships, while others are fully opaque.

Structural Features of Phraseological Units

The structural organization of phraseological units has been examined through several complementary frameworks, each foregrounding different aspects of their formal architecture. From a syntactic perspective, phraseological units can be broadly divided into those that are structurally equivalent to a word group—nominal, verbal, adjectival, adverbial, and prepositional—and those that are structurally equivalent to a sentence, such as proverbial expressions, communicative formulas, and clichéd utterances.

Nominal phraseological units, constituted around a head noun with one or more modifiers, are among the most numerous in both English and Uzbek. Examples such as *a white elephant* and *a storm in a teacup* in English, as well as their Uzbek equivalents, demonstrate that the nominal model is particularly hospitable to figurative meaning, perhaps because noun phrases are naturally predisposed to the construction of reference, including figurative reference to abstract concepts or situations.

Verbal phraseological units, organized around a verbal nucleus with one or more obligatory complements, are especially prominent in dramatic dialogue and in the expression of events, states, and processes. The degree of structural cohesion in verbal phraseological units varies considerably: some allow passivization and nominal transformation, while others resist virtually all syntactic manipulation without becoming ungrammatical or semantically incoherent.

Semantic Features and Mechanisms of Figurative Meaning

The semantic dimension of phraseological units is inseparable from the cognitive processes through which figurative meaning is constructed, conventionalized, and transmitted across generations of speakers. The dominant contemporary approach to this question, developed within the framework of cognitive linguistics and most influentially articulated by Lakoff and Johnson, holds that figurative meaning is not an ornamental deviation from a supposedly literal baseline, but rather a fundamental feature of human conceptualization.

Conceptual metaphor theory proposes that a large portion of the figurative vocabulary of any language is organized by systematic mappings between conceptual domains. When a speaker of English uses the idiom *to be under pressure*, they activate a metaphorical mapping from the physical domain of force and containment onto the psychological domain of emotional or cognitive stress. The structural logic of the source domain is projected onto the target domain, thereby yielding an inferential framework through which the stress situation is understood.

Alongside conceptual metaphor, metonymy constitutes a second primary mechanism in the semantic organization of phraseological units. Metonymic motivation operates through relations of contiguity rather than similarity: a part stands for a whole, a cause for its effect, an instrument for the action performed with it, or a cultural symbol for the concept it conventionally represents. Many phraseological units that appear semantically arbitrary upon initial inspection prove, under etymological and cognitive analysis, to be metonymically motivated by cultural scenarios, historical events, or professional practices that have since receded from everyday awareness.

The Interaction of Structure and Semantics

Having reviewed the structural and semantic dimensions of phraseological units, it becomes clear that the interaction between them reflects their integrated linguistic nature. Structural fixedness is not merely a formal characteristic but also a consequence of semantic unity, since any modification of components may disrupt the established figurative meaning. Idiomatic expressions resist substitution because their meanings depend on culturally and cognitively grounded associations rather than on literal interpretation.

At the same time, the degree of semantic non-compositionality often determines structural flexibility. Highly idiomatic units tend to be more rigid, whereas partially motivated expressions allow limited variation. This reciprocal relationship demonstrates that structural and semantic features cannot be analyzed independently. Their interaction is essential for

understanding how phraseological units function in language and provides a solid foundation for further comparative and cognitive research across different linguistic systems.

Methodology and Discussion

The present study adopts a qualitative and comparative approach to the analysis of phraseological units by focusing on their structural and semantic properties in English and Uzbek. The research is grounded in both traditional phraseological theory and modern cognitive-linguistic frameworks. The analysis was conducted in two stages. First, phraseological units were classified according to their structural patterns, including nominal, verbal, adjectival, and other semantic-syntactic types. Second, their semantic properties were examined with particular attention to non-compositionality, internal motivation, and figurative mechanisms such as metaphor and metonymy. The analysis demonstrates that fixed expressions exhibit both structural and semantic unity in English and Uzbek. From a semantic perspective, non-compositionality emerges as a defining feature, though it occurs in varying degrees. Some phraseological units retain partial semantic transparency due to underlying metaphorical or metonymic motivation, while others are fully idiomatic and resistant to literal interpretation. This supports the view that idiomaticity should be regarded as a gradient phenomenon rather than an absolute category. The findings align with the cognitive-linguistic framework proposed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, according to which figurative meaning is grounded in conceptual mappings. At the same time, cross-linguistic comparison reveals culturally specific features, particularly in Uzbek phraseology. This demonstrates that phraseological units reflect both universal cognitive mechanisms and culture-bound conceptualizations, and it highlights the necessity of integrating structural and semantic approaches in linguistic analysis.

Conclusion

The analysis demonstrates that phraseological units represent a complex interaction of structural and semantic features that cannot be studied in isolation. Their defining properties include structural stability, semantic non-compositionality, and cognitive motivation. Traditional classifications and modern cognitive approaches together provide a comprehensive understanding of their nature. The integration of these perspectives allows for a more accurate interpretation of phraseological units as dynamic linguistic phenomena.

This approach is particularly relevant for comparative studies of English and Uzbek, where both universal and culture-specific features can be observed. Ultimately, the study highlights the importance of combining structural and semantic analysis within a unified theoretical framework.

REFERENCES

- a. Vinogradov V. V. On the main types of phraseological units in the Russian language // *Lexicology and Lexicography*. — Moscow: Nauka, 1977. — P. 140–161.
- b. Kunin A. V. *Course of phraseology of the modern English language*. — Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1996. — 381 p.
- c. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. — 242 p.
- d. Dobrovol'skij D., Piirainen E. *Figurative language: cross-cultural and cross-linguistic perspectives*. — Oxford: Elsevier, 2005. — 420 p.
- e. Telia V. N. *Russian phraseology: semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects*. — Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kultury, 1996. — 288 p.
- f. Rakhmatullayev Sh. *Phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language*. — Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1992. — 400 p.
- g. Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A. *Theoretical grammar of the Uzbek language*. — Tashkent: O'qituvchi, 1995. — 228 p.