



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.

THE PROCESS OF PHRASEOLOGICALIZATION AND ASYMMETRIC DUALISM

Submission Date: February 05, 2023, Accepted Date: February 10, 2023,

Published Date: February 15, 2023

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume03Issue02-03>

Shodiya A. Ganieva

Phd Student Kokand State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the linguistic sign, its structure, the relationship of form and meaning, a general meaning of a phraseological unit, a meaning of the constituent of a phraseological unit, the process of phraseologicalization, asymmetric dualism between the meaning of a phraseological units and the meanings of its components.

KEYWORDS

Linguistic sign, semiology, form and meaning, phraseological unit, concept, acoustic image, asymmetric dualism, oppositional relation, motivational relation, gradation.

INTRODUCTION

It is known that the opposition refers to a certain sign, in which the signs that are the basis for the opposition are separated, that is, the presence or absence of mutually demanding elements shows their symmetric and asymmetric relationship.

In linguistics, there are different opinions about the structure of a linguistic sign among specialists. Some scholars understand a sign separately from the meaning and consider about the relationship of the sign to the meaning, while the supporters of the second view regard the sign as a dual essence and think

about it as a whole consisting of the unity of form and content [6,92].

The great scientist F. de Saussure was the first to admit that language is a system of signs and considered linguistics as one of the semiological sciences. He interpreted the sign as a signifier-signified unit. According to F. de Saussure, the linguistic sign does not consist of the unity of the object and its name, but of the unity of the relationship between the concept and the acoustic image.

These two cases are inextricably linked with the asymmetric dualism of the linguistic sign. The founders of the theory of asymmetric dualism initially studied this phenomenon within the framework of the relationship between the form and content of linguistic units. S.Kartsevsky claims that the sign and the meaning do not completely cover each other. He shows that the sign and the meaning are not compatible at every point: that is, one sign can perform several functions, while the same meaning can be expressed by means of a series of signs. Any sign can be a potential homonym and synonym at the same time, that is, it is formed by the uniting of these two lines of thought [4,85].

A number of phenomena in the language universally apply to all its levels, and asymmetric dualism also is valid not only for the lexical and grammatical levels, but also for the units of the phraseological level. The

formation of the theory of asymmetric dualism is directly related to the asymmetric relationship between the form and content of the linguistic sign. In fact, homonymy, synonymy and polysemy between phraseological units can be said to be manifestations of the asymmetric relationship between the form and content of phraseological units.

Asymmetry is not limited only to the form and content of linguistic units. Such differentiation is evident in phraseological units. In phraseological units, the connection between the general meaning of the phraseology and the internal meaning of the components that make it up is important.

It is known that there is an oppositional relationship between the general meaning of the phraseological unit and the specific meaning of its components. If the members of the opposition demand each other, that is, if the motivational relationship between them is kept, then the opposing members have a symmetric relationship, otherwise, an asymmetric relationship.

There is a motivational relationship between the general meaning of numerous phraseological units and the specific meanings of the components making up them, and there is a correlation between the general meaning and the specific meanings of the components. There is no such motivational relationship between the general meaning of some phraseological units and the specific meaning of the

internal components, in which the meaning of the whole does not emerge through the meanings of the internal components. In some cases, there is an opposition between the general meaning of the phraseological unit and the specific meanings of its internal components. For example, if we pay attention to the internal meanings of the components of the Uzbek phraseological unit of *oyog'ini qo'liga olmoq* (taking one's leg in one's hand), which means “to walk fast”, we can see that this action is impossible. Such phraseological units differ in that they show a strong degree of phraseologization.

Therefore, there is no correlation between the meanings of the components and the general meaning of the phraseologism. This implies that there is an asymmetric relationship between the above meanings. However, the figurative use of the components of the phraseologism in a figurative sense eliminates the imbalance, asymmetric relationship between the general meaning of the phraseology and the specific meanings of the components.

It seems that the asymmetric relationship between the general meaning of phraseologism and the specific meanings of its components is related to the degree of formation of phraseologisms from free combinations, that is, the degree of phraseologization.

According to V.V.Vinogradov, at the initial stage of the phraseologization process, the symmetric relationship

between the general meaning and the specific meanings of the components in phraseological compounds, the existence of motivation is the priority, while in phraseological oppositions, which express the strong level of the phraseologisation process, there is a disconnection of the motivation between the general meaning and the specific meanings of the components, as a result of which the two meanings are formed the priority of the asymmetric relationship is noticeable.

From this point of view, there is a partial motivational relationship between the general meaning of phraseologisms and the internal meanings of the components, and phraseological units represent an intermediate process.

Phraseologisms form a gradual opposition according to the symmetry and asymmetry of general and specific meanings. A member with a strong motivational relationship between the general meaning and the specific meanings of the components, i.e. phraseological compounds is the left pole of the gradation, phraseological units in which the motivational relationship between the general and specific meanings is completely lost, i.e. phraseological conflicts is the right pole of the gradual opposition, the phraseological units in which the specific meanings of the components are partially proportional to the general meaning units, that is, phraseological units, occupy an intermediate position.

It is known that phraseological units are divided into types as a phraseological unity, a phraseological combination, and a phraseological compound based on the relationship between the general meaning of the words they contain. According to A.Mamatov, it is necessary to justify the principles and practical importance of this classification [5,11].

It seems that the process of symmetry-asymmetry refers to the relationship of two opposing units and is a phenomenon characteristic to all levels in the language.

Higher level units of language as a whole consisting of a unity of form and content have symmetry and asymmetry of form and content within the sign and the sign itself. Phraseologisms are also signs that relate to other signs. So, in the phraseological sign, on the one hand, there is a relationship between the form and the content, and on the other hand, there is a relationship between the sign and the sign, and these relationships can be whether symmetric or asymmetric.

CONCLUSION

The capability of expressiveness of any language can be determined by means of phraseological units generalized through a number of semantic commonalities as well. In this case, the analysis of phraseologisms with the help of certain general and specific semes can provide considerable effectivity.

REFERENCES

1. Ganieva Sh. Structural study of Uzbek phraseology. Tashkent: Science. 2013.
2. Yoldoshev B. Functional and stylistic features of phraseological units in the modern Uzbek literary language: Philol. science dr.diss. autoref. - Tashkent, 1993.
3. Yoldoshev B. Issues of Uzbek phraseology and phraseography. - Tashkent: Muharrir, 2013.
4. Kartsevsky S. On the asymmetric dualism of the linguistic sign // V.A. Zvegentssev. History of Linguistics of the 19th-20th Centuries in Essays and Extracts. - M., 1968. - p.85.
5. Mamatov A.E. Issues of Uzbek phraseology formation: Philol. science Ph.D.... diss. autoref. - Tashkent, 2000.
6. Nurmonov A. Selected works. Volume I. - Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2012.
7. Nurmonov A. Selected works. Volume II. - Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2012.
8. Rahmatullaev Sh. An explanatory phraseological dictionary of the Uzbek language. - Tashkent: Teacher, 1978.
9. Nurmonov Sh., Iskanderova Sh. Theory of Linguistics //Tashkent: Fan. - 2008.
10. Ganieva D. A. SYNCRETISM AND POLYFUNCTIONALITY OF AUXILIARY VERBS IN INFLECTIONAL AND AGGLUTINATIVE LANGUAGES //INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT IN



THE GLOBAL SCIENCE. – 2022. – T. 1. – №. 5. – C.

122-131.



OSCAR
PUBLISHING SERVICES