GOSPODARKA I INNOWACJE



Volume: 36 | 2023
Economy and Innovation

ISSN: 2545-0573

For more information contact: editor@gospodarkainnowacje.pl

INTERMETHING PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS AS A SPECIAL TYPE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN THE MODERN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Nortojiyeva M. I.

student of the Faculty of Russian Language and Literature Kokand State Pedagogical Institute Uzbekistan, Kokand

ARTICLEINFO.

Key concepts: phraseological units of the Russian language, interjections, categories of phraseological units, modern Russian language, comparison.

Annotation

This article considers interjectional phraseological units as a special category of phraseological units in the modern Russian language.

http://www.gospodarkainnowacje.pl/ © 2023 LWAB.

Among derivative interjections, a significant place is occupied by phraseological units, which are called interjectional phraseological units (IPU). A.I. Germanovichwrote: "The process of interjection is nowhere more noticeable than in the field of phraseology. The phraseological fund of any language is a layer of the language both from a linguistic and methodological point of view. Phraseologisms, especially idioms, always contain an emotional charge that creates the basis for interjection. LL Kulikova, comprehensively considering the process of interjection, notes that this process is very long and gradual, as a result of which derivatives of interjection appear.

- 1. Many IPEs arise both as phraseological units and as interjections at the same time: Well, well!, Ugh, the abyss! and etc.
- 2. Some IPUs were formed by transition to interjections of free word complexes. The proof of this is the existence of homonymous MPEs and free combinations: Tell me please!, Keep your karma" wider! And etc.
- 3. IPE can be formed as a result of the ellipsis of some free and phraseological phrases and sentences: All the best! (of I wish you all the best!), Cheers! (From I drink to your health!) And others (Ippolitova, 1973, 38-39).

Traditionally, interjectional phraseology, as well as all interjections, included words and expressions that are colorful in semantic terms: not only expressing various emotions, sensations {My God!; Here's another!; God bless!; Damn it! etc.), but also expressions of will {Easy on the turns!; Jokes aside!, So that the spirit does not smell! etc.), as well as serving the sphere of speech etiquette {The world of an honest company!; Ours to you with a brush!; Hello!; To your health!; Bread and salt! and etc.). The degree of interjection for each MFE is different. Some of these units have completely passed into the category of interjections from both semantic, and morphological, and syntactic points of view, while others still partially, to a greater or lesser extent, realize the meaning of those words that are part of the IPE, the meanings of these words create - bright figurative motivation of this phraseological unit.

For example, if you compare the MFE Devil with two! and Good morning!, then the first combination

Kielce: Laboratorium Wiedzy Artur Borcuch



is characterized from the point of view of semantics by a pronounced emotional meaning, here the semantic and grammatical meanings of the words hell, s, two are completely erased; it is characterized by immutability. In the second combination, the meanings of the words kind ('good, excellent') and morning ('beginning of the day') are still understood, in the afternoon we will not use the greeting Good morning!, but say Good afternoon! or Good evening! The closest to free combinations of words will be MPE, which are formulas of speech etiquette {God help!; Good health!; To <good> health!; Good morning!; My regards!; Welcome!; Happy to stay! and etc.).

They have a number of features that are inherent in phraseological units, for example, stability, and reproducibility; traditionally they are classified as interjections. Although they do not express emotions and expressions of will, many linguists distinguish them in a special category of interjections (Vinogradov,.).

These IPEs in certain speech situations play the role of "verbal performative signs used to establish speech contact and maintain polite, friendly or official relations in communication" (Balakai, 1993, 9). Completely turned into interjections phraseological units, expressing, as a rule, our emotional reactions to certain phenomena of reality {Here's another!; Tree sticks!; By God!; For no benefits / treasures / <in the world>!; Well well!; Tell me please!; Pip on your tongue!; Damn bald!; What a devilry /devil/!; Fuyou <well-you>!; Joke to say. etc.). About all MPU, regardless of the degree of their motivation, it can be said that their linguistic value lies in the fact that "they are effective means of expressing emotions, acting not by the logical meaning of individual words, but by the general emotional meaning."

Interjectional phraseological units, on the one hand, being phraseological units, are stable combinations consisting of two or more words that have a holistic meaning; on the other hand, performing the functions of interjections, they have all the signs of interjections: 1) they express various emotions, sensations, will of expression, etc.; 2) are characterized by the immutability of the grammatical form; 3) they are characterized by the important role of intonation for the realization of one or another meaning; 4) from the point of view of syntax, they most often represent a separate indivisible sentence; if they are included in the sentence, then they are an introductory construction, not connected with other words in the sentence by special formal grammatical means. The first attempt to systematically describe these units in Russian was made by VL. Arkhangelsky (Arkhangelsky, 1964, 173-177). He analyzed them from different angles: grammatical structure, meaning, syntactic function. Speaking about the semantics of the MFE, V.L. Arkhangelsky attributed them to the categories of phraseological fusions and phraseological units defined them as units that have an indecomposable meaning. He was the first to propose a semantic classification of the MPE, which he then takes as a basis in his dissertation on interjectional phraseology by N.B. Ippolitova (Ippolitova, 1973, 31-39). V.L. Arkhangelsky singled out seven categories of MFE according to their meaning:

- 1. MFE, or stable phrases expressing emotions: What a horror!, Fathers /, Fathers-lights / etc .;
- 2. MFE, expressing emotions and at the same time assessing the situation: It's tobacco!, Write wasted!, Is it easy! and etc.;
- 3. MFB expressing the will: Easier on the corners!, Closer to the grandfather / etc.;
- 4. MFB, expressing the attitude to the speech of the interlocutor: What to say!, That's it!, We know your brother! And etc.
- 5. MFB, which are used in accordance with the etiquette accepted in society: Bon appetit!, You are welcome! and etc.;
- 6. Expressive-exclamatory MFB and stable phrases expressing the speaker's attitude to various situations: Was not there!, There is nowhere else to go!, Know ours! and etc.;
- 7. Abusive MFB and stable phrases of the same functional orientation: Damn it!, Be wrong!, Pop my eyes! And others. This classification was the first attempt at a semantic systematization of the MFB.

Kielce: Laboratorium Wiedzy Artur Borcuch



In later works devoted to interjectional phraseology, this classification was criticized (Polishchuk, 1988, 12 and others). N.V. Polishchuk, analyzing this classification, notes that a single criterion is not maintained here. Emotion always implies an assessment, so the first, second and sixth categories can be combined into one - emotional-evaluative MFB, with which we completely agree. N.V. Polishchuk notes in relation to the fifth category that the assignment of such expressions to interjections is controversial. We think that PU - formulas of speech etiquette can be attributed to interjections only conditionally. If in emotional MFBs the connotative function prevails over the nominative one, the expression of emotions for them becomes their main and only content, then in this group the connotative function is clearly presented along with the nominative one, the components of these MFBs retained the nominative function; they do not express various emotions in a pure form. MFBs of this type are combined with other MFBs into one category based on common grammatical and syntactic characteristics. For interjectional phraseological units, as well as for interjections, the nominative function is not the main one. Bright connotation contributes to the weakening of the nominative aspect. The main function of these units is an emotive function. This applies primarily to emotional MFEs, and in relation to imperative and especially MFE formulas of speech etiquette, it should be noted that their nominative function is more clearly manifested, which is associated with the complete or partial preservation of the nominative function of the components of these MFEs, but nevertheless here we can talk about the predominance of the connotative function over the nominative one.

Literature:

- 1. Kakharova, N. N. (2022). Verb Prefixes in Russian Language. International Journal of Social Science Research and Review, 5(8), 170-174.
- 2. Yusufovna, Y. S. (2023). Phraseological units in the course of russian as a foreign language: on the issue of selection conditions and methods of study. OpenAccessRepository, 9(1), 193-197.
- 3. Юлдашева, С. Ю. (2023). Фонетический фактор при обучении русскому языку как иностранному учащихся Узбекистана. In НАУКА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ, ИННОВАЦИИ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ И СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ (pp. 88-90).
- 4. Юлдашева, С. Ю. (2022). Явление Синонимии Во Фразеологической Системе Русского Языка. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophyand Culture, 3(11), 296-299.
- 5. Yusufovna, Y. S. (2022). The Phenomenon of Ambiguity in the Phraseological System of the Russian Language. CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HISTORY, 3(11), 165-169.
- 6. Yusufovna, Y. S. (2023). GRAMMATICAL MEANS OF EXPRESSING THE CATEGORY OF TEMPORALITY IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. GospodarkaiInnowacje., 33, 138-141.
- 7. Юлдашева, С. Ю. (2021). Функционально-семантическое поле наречных фразеологизмов. Мировая наука, (12 (57)), 202-204.
- 8. Kakharova, N. N. (2021). On the nature of linguistic variation and its types. Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, 11(11), 507-510.

