Kidirniyazova P.S.
Nukus Mining Institute
Saparniyazova D.E.
Karakalpak State University

EFFECTIVE METHODS OF TEACHING PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Abstract: article discuss about effective methods of teaching phraseological units.

Key words: dependencies of components, contradictions of the object, the clarification of the nature, constant and variable components of phraseological units, extralinguistic, versatility.

Phraseologisms are much more complex formations than words. Features of phraseologisms, their differences from variable combinations of words, analysis of the types of their meanings, structure, dependencies of components, usual and occasional use require special methods of study. Due to the versatility of phraseology, no single method can claim a monopoly position. But no matter what special method the phraseologist uses, he uses the general provisions of the dialectical method, the principles of which are concretized in the field of phraseology. Particular attention is paid to the contradictions of the object, which are the driving force of its development.

A method of studying FE was first proposed by N.N. Amosova [6, pp. 71 - 72]. She developed a contextual method for studying phraseologisms. The basic principles of this method should form the basis of any method of studying phraseology: maximum objectivity in the consideration of the phenomena under study, the need to take into account the specifics of the language being studied, the study of phraseological units in the conditions of their speech use, the clarification of the nature of the participation of lexical meanings of words in the

implementation of this phrase of the nomination, the study of the contextual interaction of words in their combinations, the establishment of the degree of consolidation of the composition and structure of this Phrases.

However, some provisions of the contextual method are objectionable.

1. The contextological method does not take into account the dialectics of the phenomena under study. And it should be taken into account in the scientific analysis of the facts of language, even when considering them synchronously.

2. Distribution of phraseologisms is not used and their consistency and stability are not studied.

3. It is impossible to agree with the statement of N.N. Amosova that "the essence of a phraseological phenomenon cannot be extracted from observation of its historical dynamics." No phenomenon can be fully understood without observing its historical dynamics.

Even when considering phenomena in synchronous terms, it is necessary to attract additional historical data where it is necessary. It should be borne in mind that the shortcomings of the contextual method should not of its own dignity. The creator of the first method of studying FE cannot be required to solve all methodological problems.

Features of the proposed method are:

1) the desire to use the provisions of materialistic dialectics in the consideration of linguistic phenomena and to synthesize the provisions of traditional linguistics and methods of structural linguistics;

2) a comprehensive study of the features of the components of phraseological units, the allocation of the phraseological level of the language structure, the attention that the author pays to the constant and variable components of phraseological units;

3) approach to phraseology as a system and study of real variations of phraseological units that are observed in specific acts of communication in a certain chronological period;

4) allocation of phraseological meaning as a special linguistic category.

It is necessary to note the indisputable advantages of the variational method, which are also visible from a simple enumeration of its characteristic features. The disadvantages of the variational method include the author's excessive enthusiasm for the system of dependencies identified by L. Elmslev, which V.L. Arkhangelsky puts as the basis for the classification of phraseologisms, and underestimation of the dialectic of elements and structure. V.L. Arkhangelsky did not develop the procedures of the variational method.

The complicative method of studying phraseology was developed by S.G. Gavrin [Gavrin, 1974, p. 21]. The method is called complementary, since, according to S.G. Gavrin, any stable combination of words (that is, any linguistic unit related to phraseology) is complementary, since it is semantically and functionally complicated. The complicative tasks, according to the terminology of S.G. Gavrin, include:

1) the task to inform the combination of words of expressive-figurative qualities ("wolf in sheep's clothing"; "drink a bitter cup");

2) the task to localize the combination of words by truncating some components ("came, saw, won"; "who is whom");

3) the task of condensing and systematizing the results of human cognitive activity ("truth is born in an argument"; "productive forces"; "quantum generator", "English lock", "toilet soap").

In accordance with this, three types of specialized combinations of words, or complements, are distinguished: expressive-shaped, elliptical and epistemological (aphorisms, compound terms and nomenclatural names). In addition, S.G. Gavrin identifies non-specialized stable turnovers. These include restrictive, i.e. phrases, one of the components of which is combined with only one word or with several words ("bosom friend", "fool the head", "full beard", "reins of power", etc.), and idioms, i.e. phraseological fusions ("throw a glove", "cast bullets", "pull a canner", etc.). S.G. Gavrin also distinguishes mixed types of complements, for example, "the apple from the apple tree falls not far away" (two composite features -

expressive-shaped and epistemological); "if you get hungry, you will guess" (three composite signs - expressive-shaped, elliptical and epistemological).

The basis of the compilation method is the following principles:

1. The specificity of the phraseological unit is revealed by dissecting its semantic structure (identifying the basic and complementary functions).

2. The phraseological composition is distinguished by distinguishing stable composite combinations from unstable ones on the basis of signs of stability, reproducibility and use.

3. The functional properties of complements are determined by the properties of their semantic structure, so the most important principle of the compilation method is the study of semantic and functional features in their close relationship, the disclosure of their interdependence; the main point of this principle is the identification of the connection "semantic structure - speech function".

4. The complicative phraseological qualities of language units are in certain system relations, which is the basis of the principle of systematic description of phraseology in the functional-semantic aspect.

S.G. Gavrin identified four principles that formed the basis of the compilation method. Analysis of his book shows that two more semantic principles can be added to these principles Operations of formation of phraseologisms (for example, the operation of matching sems, leading to the formation of comparisons, the operation of combining sems, leading to the formation of metaphors and metonyms, and other operations), as well as the formation of composite models of expressive-figurative phraseology, stable ellipses, etc. The disadvantages of the compilation method are the lack of procedures and principles for the speech implementation of phraseologisms.

S.G. Gavrin on the material of the Russian language laid the foundation for the study of compilation, which made a great contribution to the general theory of phraseology. Functional-semantic complementarity is also characteristic of words, individual-author's turns, variable and variable-stable combinations of words. The search for criteria for distinguishing between phraseological complementarity and

other types of compilation should continue. This is one of the main directions in the development of the theory of phraseology on the material of various languages. The study of complementarity should also cover those areas of phraseology in which complicity has not yet been considered. These include, for example, phrase formation and occasional use of FE. The study of compliance in these areas is just beginning. [8; 9]. Further study of complementarity, in particular, in the onomasiological aspect, will undoubtedly contribute to the improvement of methods for the study of phraseology.

The structural and typological method of analyzing the phraseological systems of various languages was developed by D.O. Dobrovolsky [Dobrovolsky, 1990]. Based on the understanding of structural typology as a typology of "internal", it is logical to define the structural and typological analysis of phraseology as a direction that studies the internal organization of the phraseological system of various languages in distraction from extralinguistic and genetic factors.

Of all the possible features of the internal organization of the phraseological system, the most important for the structural typology are the dependencies of the principles of organization of the phraseological system of a language on the typological specificity of other ("primary" in relation to phraseology) subsystems of the language. It is on the basis of this provision that it is possible to raise and solve the question of how significant the phraseological system (the principles of its structure) is for linguistic typology as a whole. The structural and typological analysis of phraseology includes the following stages:

1. At the first stage, it is necessary to choose for analysis the languages that form a typological series, that is, languages that are fundamentally similar, but differ from each other in any one typologically important feature.

2. Next, it is necessary to highlight the leading typological feature, which is the basis of the typological series (i.e. typological dominant).

3. Then it is required to formulate a basic hypothesis of the study, i.e. a working hypothesis about how the gradation of the leading typological feature in

the languages selected for analysis affects the internal organization of the phraseological system of these languages.

4. Finally, it is necessary to analyze the phraseological systems of the selected languages in order to test the working hypothesis.

In the work [5] according to this methodology, the phraseological systems of the German, English and Dutch languages were analyzed. The basis on which these languages can be built into a typological series is the degree of analytism of the language system. The basic hypothesis is formulated as follows: the more analytical the language, the more regular its phraseological system (under other similar conditions).

The regularity of phraseology is understood as a manifestation of systemic relations in it. The degree of regularity of the phraseological system is determined by the intensity of the action of the structural-combinatorial principle in its internal organization. In other words, the more regular the phraseology of a particular language, the more often phraseology goes already well-trodden paths, using linguistically worked out structural samples, combining a relatively limited "building material".

The structural and typological regularity revealed as a result of the analysis, according to which there is a direct relationship between the measure of regularity of the phraseological system and the degree of analyticity of the language system, includes, in turn, a number of more particular implicative correlations:

1. The longer and more complex the word in the language on average (the richer its formativeфонд), the more diverse and unique is the constitutive composition of his phraseological system, and it is less regular. The more analytical the language, the more regular the constitutive composition of the phraseologisms of this language.

2. The more analytical the language, the stronger the effect of the structural-combinatorial principle in the organization of the elements of the system of this language and, in particular, its phraseology.

There is a direct relationship between the degree of analytism of the language and the degree of orderliness, articulation of the formal-semantic organization of its phraseological system. Developing the basics of the structural and typological analysis of phraseology, D.O. Dobrovolsky established a number of implications. Implication is a logical operation that connects two statements into a complex utterance by means of a logical copula "if ... then", and in quantitative "the more ... the less" or "the less ... the more."

The main implications identified by D.O. Dobrovolsky have the following features: the fewer diverse formivities in the language, the more often random coincidences of sound and graphic structures leading to homonymy are possible; the more developed the semantic way of word formation, the fewer different formatives in the language; the more analytical the language, the stronger the effect of the tendency to form conversion pairs; the more analytical the language, the less likely it is that it contains phraseologisms with an anomaly of the word forms of the components; the higher the analytism of the language, the more regular the phraseological system, the higher its orderliness and the formation of series and series, as well as the repeated use of the same lexical elements as components of phraseologisms.

Thus, the methodology of analysis is based on the identification of implicative dependencies between the features of the organization of various elements of the language structure, which makes it possible to connect phraseological features to the typological model of a particular language. It should be borne in mind that along with the predominant elements of analyticism in English phraseology, there are also elements of synthetism, which include, for example, the widespread use of adjectives to a comparative degree in adjective comparisons.

The method of phraseological analysis is a method of synchronous research in statics and dynamics and allows, if necessary, the involvement of historical data.

"A synchronous description of a particular state of language is often realized not in the form of some photographic image, but, correlating with a more or less

long period of development, takes into account the facts of language evolution" [3, p. 11Z]. Analysis is carried out both by induction, i.e. from the particular to the general, and by deduction, i.e. from the general to the particular. The principles of the theory of phraseology are formulated by the author on the basis of induction, i.e. on the analysis of factual material, and on the experience of other researchers. Data obtained by induction can be used deductively.

The method of phraseological analysis involves the allocation of essential features of the plan of content and the plan of expression, which allows you to move from substance to form and determines the boundaries between different classes of phraseologisms. The proposed method takes into account that English phraseology is analytical in nature with elements of synthetism.

When conducting a linguistic description, one should proceed from quantitative parameters: simplicity, i.e. minimal use of rules, and completeness, i.e. the maximum possible coverage of phraseologisms of various structural types. With the help of the phraseological method, various aspects of phraseology are analyzed, which makes it possible to study the phraseological fund of the English language throughout its versatility. Below are the most important aspects of the study of phraseology.

REFERENCES:

1. Identification of phraseologisms with the help of indicators of their stability and establishment of indicators of various degrees of stability.

2. Approach to phraseological stability as a complex phenomenon: the study of the stability of the use of phraseologisms, the stability of their meaning, lexical composition, morphological and syntactic stability, as well as the impossibility of forming phraseologisms according to the generative structural-semantic model of variable word combination. Consideration of the stability of idiomatisms as a starting point for studying the stability of phraseologisms of other types. Establishment of the separateness of phraseologisms in accordance with the put forward usual and occasional indicators of separate formation.

3. Differentiation of phraseologisms from complex words, variable combinations of words and individual-author's turns-quotes and formations of an intermediate nature.

4. Analysis of system connections in the field of phraseology (hierarchy, synonymy, antonymy, etc.).

5. Analysis of phraseological semantics (identification of aspects and sem in the phraseological meaning, analysis of phraseological abstraction, phraseological rethinking, internal form of phraseologisms).

6. Structural-semantic classification of phraseologisms in accordance with the put forward parameters of stability. The analysis of English phraseologisms within the framework of this classification involves the study of their analytical and some synthetic features.

7. Separation of component dependencies based on their lexical and semantic or only semantic invariance.

8. Highlighting different methods of phrase formation.

9. Analysis of phrase-forming models in phraseology.

10. Contextual analysis of the usual and occasional use of FE.

11. Allocation of different types of distribution of phraseologisms.

12. Analysis of the functions of phraseologisms.

Literature

1. Vinogradov V. V. Basic concepts of russian phraseology as a linguistic discipline. Leningrad, LGU, 1964.

2. Vinogradov V.V.Russkii yazyk. Grammatical doctrine of the word. The main types of phraseological units in Russian language. Moscow, 1972.

3. Vereshchagin E.M., Kostomarov V.G. Language and culture. Izd 4-e. Moscow, 1990.

4. Galieva M.R. Verbalization of the word conceptual sphere in English, Uzbek and Russian language pictures of the world. Diss. I've been nominated. degree of cand. filol. Sciences. Tashkent, 2009.

5. Selected proverbs and sayings of the peoples of the East. Moscow, 1966.

6. Zykina I.V. Chelovek- kul'tura-slovo. RJ. Social sciences and humanities. Episode 6. Linguistics. №2, 2006.

7. Ayimbetov K., Nietullaev T. Qaraqalpaq ḫalıq naqıl-maqalları. Nókis 1982.

8. Berdimuratov E. Házirgi qaraqalpaq tili. Sózlik. Nókis, 1964.

9. Berdimuratov E. Házirgi zaman qaraqalpaq tiliniń leksikologiyası. Nókis, 1968.