



Journal Website:
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajps>

Copyright: Original
content from this work
may be used under the
terms of the creative
commons attributes
4.0 licence.

CLASSIFICATION OF SIMPLE AND COMPLEX PAREMIOLOGICAL UNITS

Submission Date: October 20, 2024, **Accepted Date:** October 25, 2024,

Published Date: October 30, 2024

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume04Issue10-32>

Fayzullayeva Dilnoza Narimovna

PhD, Associate Professor at Department of Uzbek Language and Literature at Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

In this article, simple and complex paremiological phraseological combinations, concepts of nationality, culture, mentality are inextricably linked with language, and they are analyzed in different genres of paremiological language.

KEYWORDS

People, culture, image, society, era, language, phrase, proverb, history, speech, work, dictionary.

INTRODUCTION

Simple paremiological units consist of a single component. By “component,” we refer to relatively simple clauses within a compound sentence, and the term “component” is used to designate these. Additionally, the parts [sentence elements] that make up each component are conditionally referred to as “elements.” From this perspective, paremiological units made up of one component are divided into several types based on the number of elements they contain: two-element, three-element, four-element,

five-element. Simple proverbs with five or more elements are rare in spoken language.

However, they must have two centers of intonation. For example: “A fool’s is in his mouth.” In this paremiological unit, both the subject and predicate are expressed, and each proverb has two elements [parts of the sentence] with two centers of intonation, which stand out in speech through intonation. When we expand the above proverb, the following complete sentence is formed: “A fool’s wisdom lies in his

mouth.” In forming this complete sentence, intonation plays a crucial role in filling in the omitted parts. Additionally, even when the subject or predicate is not explicitly present in paremiological units, an intonational separation into two parts still occurs: “Turn-taking is orderly,” “Food needs salt, salt needs measurement.” Here, intonation plays a key role, conveying the complete thought by pronouncing modifiers and complements like “in turn,” “with salt,” and “with measurement” with a predicative intonation. Conversely, this phenomenon can also occur when the subject is not expressed. For example: “Don’t search for friends, find your friend’s friend,” “If you don’t like work, don’t give out food,” “Don’t search for gold, search for skill,” “Don’t associate with the unworthy, don’t lean on the unloving,” and others.

Paremiological units consist of at least two logical centers. Words that convey the main content of the proverb may serve as primary parts or not. Consider these examples: “A friend is food for the soul,” “The lazy is a friend to the enemy,” “Gold does not rust,” “Misguided brings madness,” “Blessing is in unity,” “The envious are never happy.” These proverbs consist of two parts – subject and predicate. Proverbs with two logical centers may contain only the predicate part but still show two logical centers: “Spur your horse,” “Return from the mill whole,” “Don’t worry about your coat at the wedding,” “Trouble is absent in honesty,” “Respect those you know not.” Some proverbs lack

both subject and predicate components yet still display two logical centers through intonation, such as “to the fool / a stick,” “to the wise / a hint,” “to the stick / a cloth,” “to the nag / an addition.” Intonation plays a crucial role in establishing these two centers. Simple paremiological units can range from single-element proverbs to those with six or seven elements.

Analysis of epic language confirms the division of paremiological units into simple and complex types. As mentioned earlier, proverbs composed of one component are referred to as simple paremiological units. Based on the number of elements in simple paremiological units used in epic language, we categorize them as follows:

1. Three-element paremiological units: “No betrayal of trust” [“Kuntug’mish,” p. 185].
2. Four-element paremiological units: “No strength in fleeing enemy” [“Kuntug’mish,” p. 250]; “Comforting the poor is a blessing” [“Kuntug’mish,” p. 137].
3. Five-element paremiological units: “The nightingale befriends the garden’s rose” [“Kuntug’mish,” p. 137]; “These words are not fitting for friend or foe” [“Kuntug’mish,” p. 156]; “In exile, wounds may come from coin or strength” [“Kuntug’mish,” p. 139].

Complex paremiological units contain two or more components. In Uzbek, the majority of paremiological units range from two to four components. Proverbs with five or more components are very rare. Notably, each component of complex paremiological units resembles simple sentences in structure and semantics, akin to compound and complex sentences. Additionally, each component of complex paremiological units is made up of several elements, usually two, three, or four. Complex paremiological units are categorized into six types based on the number of components they contain.

In the epic language, complex paremiological units with two, three, and four components are observed, while proverbs with five or more components are absent. Complex paremiological units in the epic language, based on the number of components, are categorized as follows:

1. Two-component paremiological units: “A piece of glass cannot value a jewel, only a jeweler knows gold’s worth” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 170]; “The childless day is empty, poverty blinds the generous” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 170]; “Fortune does not return to the brave, a brave man’s rights are not forgotten by the enemy” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 154]; “Shortage has its perfection, Arrogance has its downfall” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 190]; “Trust, dear, is man’s soul, the warrior’s heart does not fear the sword” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 160]; “I was wise, I became straw, I

was gold, I became iron” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 186]; “Fear of death is the coward’s work, the brave does not recall his tongue” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 256].

2. Three-component paremiological units: “Never walk with the enemy, in sleep, my secret spread to the world, I entered the arena alone in search of the brave” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 252]; “The face of the good is heaven, the deeds of the bad are burdensome, asking for a horse, seeking lineage, are traditions” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 219]; “The steel spear may not lie under the snow, if you sharpen your iron spear, it might break, a brave man does not leave love” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 177].

3. Four-component paremiological units: “Troubles fall upon the brave, ‘Who knows unless you tell, who sees unless you reveal’” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 187]; “When protected by God, no calamity, when cursed by God, no cure” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 168]; “Do not walk the paths of the lesser, my son, do not forget my advice, do not pass without greeting, do not burden the weak” [“Kuntug‘mish,” p. 240].

Paremiological units emerge as reflections of life experiences from a specific era, refined as they pass from language to language. Some proverbs specific to a certain period may become outdated and fall out of use, while others are preserved in a set form, becoming fixed units in the language. Paremiological units, like other linguistic units, consist of words and serve to



convey specific meanings, whether literal or metaphorical. For instance, in the epic “Alpomish”: “The elder’s bag is ninety, And thus he roams the field as a storm.” This expression, with its exaggeration, vividly portrays the heroic size of Alpomish.

Paremiology studies various types of expressions within a language. Phraseology is also part of paremiology, but there is a notable distinction between them. Phraseology is limited to studying stable idiomatic expressions, while paremiology examines both set expressions and idiomatic phrases in both literal and figurative senses.

REFERENCES

1. M.Korduell. Psixologiya A-Ya.Slovar-spravochnik.- Moskva: Fair-press.2000.S.-448.
2. Shomaqsudov Sh., Shorahmedov Sh. Ma’nolar mahzani. –Toshkent: O’zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2001. –B.63.
3. Berdiyurov H. Rasulov R. O’zbek tilining paremiologik lug’ati. –Toshkent: O’qituvchi, 1984, 16-bet. Abdiyev M. Soha leksikasining sistem tahlili muammolari: Monografiya. – Toshkent: Xalq merosi, 2004. – 118 b.
4. Abdurahmonov X. O’zbek xalq og’zaki ijodi asarlarining sintaktik xususiyatlari bo’yicha kuzatishlar. –Toshkent: Fan, 1971. – 184 b.
5. Abdurahmonov G’. Atamaologiya muammolari // O’zbek tili atamaologiyasi va uning taraqqiyot perespektivalari. –Toshkent: Fan, 1984.– 160 b.
6. Abdurahimov M. Qisqacha o’zbekcha-ruscha frazeologik lug’at. –Toshkent: O’qituvchi, 1980. – 184 b.