ТЕРМИЗ ДАВЛАТ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA’LIM

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

Илмий-инновацион журнал

Jurnal OAK Rayosatining 2022-yil 30-sentabrdagi 325/6-son qarori bilan filologiya fanlari bo‘yicha doktorlik dissertatsiyalari asosiy ilmiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlar ro‘yxatiga kiritilgan

2021-yildan buyon nashr etiladi

2026 / № 3.1–3

Termiz – 2026

Muassis:
Termiz davlat universiteti

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

ILMIY-INNOVATSION JURNAL

O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Administratsiyasi huzuridagi Axborot va ommaviy kommunikatsiyalar agentligi tomonidan 2020 yil 19 oktyabrda 1122 raqami bilan ro'yxatga olingan. Matnlarda foydalanilgan misol, ko'chirma va ma'lumotlar aniqligi uchun mualliflar javobgardir. Jurnaldan ko'chirib bosilganda manba qayd etilishi shart.

Bosishga ruxsat etildi: 20.06.2026
Qog'oz bichimi: 70x85
Bosma tabog'i: 5.94
Ofset bosma. Ofset qog'ozi
Adadi: 100
Bahosi kelishilgan narxda
Buyurtma: 155-son

«TerDU bosmaxonasi»da chop etildi
Termiz shahri, Barkamol avlod ko'chasi, 43-uy

Tahririyat manzili:
190111, Termiz shahri,
Barkamol avlod ko'chasi, 43.
Telefon: +998990 377 77 23,
+99895 986 07 77

E-mail:
philologicalresearch@umail.uz

Rasmiy sayt:
https://journaltersu.uz

BOSH MUHARRIR:
Abduqodir TOSHQULOV,
iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor

TAHRIR HAY'ATI:

Bekpo'lat Umurqulov, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor (bosh muharrir o'rinbosari)
Shoxista Maxmaraimova, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor (mas'ul muharrir)
O'ral Xoliyorov, f.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Olmos Ulviy Binnatova, f.f.d., professor (Ozarbayjon)
Karl Rayxl, f.f.d., professor (Germaniya)
Vali Savash yelok, f.f.d., professor (Turkiya)
Dorota Silviya, f.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent (Polsha)
Zabita Mahammad qizi Teymurlu, filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, dotsent (Ozarbayjon)
Tarana Imomverdi qizi Xojieva, filologiya fanlari doktori, professor (Ozarbayjon),
Muslihiddin Muhiddinov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Ibodulla Mirzayev, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Abdi Mamatov f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Suyun Karimov f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Muhammadxon Hakimov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Nafas Shodmonov f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Dilmurod Quronov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Murodqosim Abdiyev, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Baxtiyor Mengliyev, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Normat Y o'ldoshev, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Baxtiyor Xolmuxamedov, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Bobonazar Murtazayev, f.f.n., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Asqar Eshmo'minov, f.f.d., professor (O'zbekiston)
Obidjon Shofiyev, f.f.f.d. (PhD), dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Zafar Umurqulov, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Nurali Amonturdiyev, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Hakim Ahmedov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Abdulla Xudoyqulov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Ahad Shukurov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Eshnazar Jabborov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Abdumurod Arslonov, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Sirojiddin Turdimurodov, filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Umida Raximova, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Gulchehra Begmatova, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Nargis Qurbonazarova, filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Muyassar Xolova, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Shoira Omonturdiyeva, f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)
Sherzod Turdiqulov, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Alibek Omonturdiyev, f.f.f.d. (PhD) (O'zbekiston)
Humayun Nadim Muhammad, f.f.f.d., dotsent (O'zbekiston)

Texnik muharrir: Bahodir To'raliyev

Учредитель:
Термезский государственный университет

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM
ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

НАУЧНО-ИННОВАЦИОННЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ

Зарегистрировано Агентством информации и массовых коммуникаций при Администрации Президента Республики Узбекистан от 19 октября 2020 года под номером 1122.

Авторы несут ответственность за точность приведенных в текстах примеров, отрывков и данных. Необходимо указывать источник при копировании из журнала.

Разрешено к печати: 20.06.2026
Размер бумаги; 70x85
Печатный лист: 5.94
Офсетная печать: Офсетная бумага
Тираж: 100. Цена договорная
Заказ: 155

Печатано в «Типографии ТерГУ»
ул. Баркамол авлод 43, г. Термез

Адрес редакции:
190111, г.Термез, ул. Баркамол авлод, 43.
Телефон: +998990 377 77 23, +99895 986 07 77

E-mail:
philologicalresearch@umail.uz

Официальный сайт:
https://journaltersu.uz

ГЛАВНЫЙ РЕДАКТОР:
Абдукадир ТАШКУЛОВ,
доктор экономических наук, профессор

РЕДАКЦИОННАЯ КОЛЛЕГИЯ:

Бекпулат Умуркулов, доктор филологических наук, профессор (зам. главного редактора)
Шохиста Махмараимова, доктор филологических наук, профессор (ответственный редактор)
Урал Холияров, ф.ф.ф.д. (. PhD), доцент (Узбекистан)
Олмос Улвий Биннатова, д.ф.н., профессор (Азербайджан)
Карл Райхл, д.ф.н., профессор (Германия)
Вали Саваш Елок, д.ф.н., профессор (Турция)
Дорота Сильвия, PhD, доцент (Польша)
Забита Магомед кызы Теймурлу, доктор философии по филологии, доцент (Азербайджан)
Тарана Имамверди гызы Хаджиева, доктор наук, профессор (Азербайджан)
Муслихиддин Мухиддинов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Ибодулла Мирзаев, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Абди Маматов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Суюн Каримов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Мухаммадхон Хакимов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Нафас Шодмонов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Дилмурод Куронов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Мурадкасим Абдиев, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Бахтиёр Менглиев, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Нормат Юлдашев, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Бахтиёр Холмухамедов, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Бобоназар Муртазаев, к.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Аскар Эшмуминов, д.ф.н., профессор (Узбекистан)
Обиджон Шофиев, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD), доцент (Узбекистан)
Зафар Умуркулов, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Нурали Амонтурдиев, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Хаким Ахмедов, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Абдулла Худайкулов, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Ахад Шукуров, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Эшназар Джаббаров, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Абдумурод Арслонов, д. ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Сирожиддин Турдимуродов, доктор наук, доцент (Узбекистан)
Умида Рахимова, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Гульчехра Бегматова, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Наргис Курбаназарова, доктор наук, доцент (Узбекистан)
Муяссар Холова, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Шаира Амонтурдиева, д.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)
Шерзад Турдикулов, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Алибек Омонтурдиев, д.ф.ф.н. (PhD) (Узбекистан)
Хумаюн Надим Мухаммад, д.ф.ф.н., доцент (Узбекистан)

Технический редактор: Баходир Туралиев

Institutor:
Termez State University

PHILOLOGICAL RESEARCH: LANGUAGE, LITERATURE, EDUCATION

FILOLOGIK TADQIQOTLAR: TIL, ADABIYOT, TA'LIM

ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ: ЯЗЫК, ЛИТЕРАТУРА, ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ

SCIENTIFIC-INNOVATIONAL JOURNAL

Registered by the Agency for Information and Mass Communications under the President's Administration of the of the Republic of Uzbekistan on October 19, 2020 under number 1122.

The authors are responsible for the accuracy of the examples, passages and data provided in the texts. The source must be specified when copying from the journal.

Approved for printing: 20.06.2026
Size of the paper: 70x85
Printed sheet: 5.94. Offset printing.
Offset paper. Circulation: 100
Price is negotiable
Order: 155. Printed at the «Printing House of the TerSU»
43, Barkamol avlod str. Termez city.

Address of Editorial Office:
190111, Barkamol avlod str., 43,
Termez city.
Phone: +998990 377 77 23,
+99895 986 07 77

E-mail:
philologicalresearch@umail.uz

Official website:
https://journaltersu.uz

EDITOR IN-CHIEF:
Abdukodir TASHKULOV,
doctor of economic sciences, professor

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Bekpulat Umurkulov, doctor of philological sciences, professor (Uzbekistan) (deputy chief editor)
Shohista Makhmaraimova, doctor of philological sciences, professor (Uzbekistan) (editor-in-chief)
Ural Kholiyorov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Olmos Ulviy Binnatova, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Azerbaijan)
Karl Rayxl, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Germany)
Vali Salvash Elok, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Turkey)
Dorota Silvia, PhD, associate professor (Poland)
Zabita Magomed kyzy Teymurlu, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Azerbaijan)
Tarana Imamverdi gizi Khadzhieva, Doctor of Sciences, Professor (Azerbaijan)
Muslihiddin Mukhiddinov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Ibodulla Mirzaev, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Abdi Mmatov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Suyun Karimov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Muhammadkhon Khakimov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Nafas Shodmonov, doct.of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Dilmurod Kuronov, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Muradkasim Abdiyev, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Bakhtiyor Mengliev, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Normat Yuldashev, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Bakhtiyor Kholmukhamedov, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Bobonazar Murtazaev, cand.of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Askar Eshmuminov, doct. of philol. sciences, professor (Uzbekistan)
Obidjon Shofiev, PhD, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Zafar Umurkulov, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Nurali Amonturdiev, PhD (Uzbekistan)
Hakim Akhmedov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Abdulla Khudaykulov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Ahad Shukurov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Eshnazar Jabbarov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Abdumurod Arslonov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Sirojiddin Turdimurodov, Doctor of Sciences, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Umida Rakhimova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (Uzbekistan)
Gulchekhra Begmatova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (Uzbekistan)
Nargis Kurbanazarova, Doctor of Sciences, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Muyassar Kholova, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Shoira Omonturdiyeva, doct. of philol. sciences, associate professor (Uzbekistan)
Sherzod Turdikulov, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)
Alibek Omonturdiev, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (Uzbekistan)
Humayun Nadim Muhammad, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology, Associate Professor (Uzbekistan)

Technical editor: Bakhodir Turaliyev

МУНДАРИЖА

TILSHUNOSLIK

LUTFULLAYEVA DURDONA
Lisoniy assotsiatsiyalarda milliy tafakkurning voqelanishi
(Vatan assotsiativ maydoni misolida) 7

MIRZAYEV IBODULLA
Xomskiyning “Til va ong” asari, generativ tilshunoslik konsepsiyasi
va professor Baxtiyor Mengliyevning tarjimonlik mahorati....10

ҚУРОНОВ ДИЛМУРОД
Бадиий диалог таржимасида коммуникатив вазиятни тўғри англаш зарурати
(Чўлпоннинг «Кеча ва кундуз» романининг янги русча нашри мисолида) 16

ЧЎТМАТОВ ЖЎРАБЕК ОМОНОВИЧ
«Ҳикмат» сўзининг араб лексикографик манбалари асосидаги лексик-семантик таҳлили.... 19

ЧОРИЕВ ТАВАККАЛ РАВШАНОВИЧ
Абдураҳмон Жомий ва Алишер Навоий идиостилида
«Саг//ит» концептининг лингвопоэтик хусусиятлари....25

UMURQULOV ZAFAR BEKPO‘LATOVICH
Alisher Navoiy ijodida so‘z qadri va nutq odobi talqini....34

UBAYDULLAYEV ALISHER ABDUSALOMOVICH
Ogahiy tarjimasidagi asarlar leksikasining tarixiy-etimologik tahlili
(“Axloqu-l-Muhsiniyn” asari misolida) 37

IBRAGIMOV SHEXROZBEK TO‘LQINJON O‘G‘LI
Tashbih va epitetlarning pragmatik talqini: tarjimada ekspressivlik va
stilistik ekvivalentlik....41

IBRAGIMOV JASURBEK TULKINJON O‘G‘LI
Jangovorlik, jasorat va jismoniy kuchga oid epitetlar
(“Beowulf” ingliz eposi misolida)....47

NAZAROVA ZIYODA KATTAYEVNA
Frazeologizmlarning yondosh birliklar bilan o‘zaro aloqasi 51

QOBILOV MIRZIYO ESHNOZAR O‘G‘LI
O‘z qatlamga oid antroponimlar tasnifi 55

ISRAILOVA SAODAT TURAPOVNA
Rang komponentli birliklarning mental birliklarda aksi....58

RO‘ZIMATOVA DILNOZA
Rasmiy munosabatlarda murojaat birliklarining shaxs ijtimoiy maqomining ifodalanishi....62

XUSANOVA NAFISA ZOKIRJON QIZI
Ertak janrida dialogning strukturaviy va funksional poetikasi
(Ingliz va o‘zbek xalq ertaklari misolida)....65

XABIBULLAYEVA FAZILAT XABIBULLO QIZI
“Boburnoma”dagi saroy-ma’muriy xizmat unvonlarining inglizcha tarjimalarda berilishi 69

MUSTAFAYEV ELYOR ODIL UGLI
Theoretical foundations for the classification of phraseological units in english 73

МУНДАРИЖА

TURSUNOVA DILSHODA XOLDIN QIZI
“O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati”da qurol-aslaha nomi bilan bog‘liq folklorizmlar 77

YAVKOCHEVA FERUZA HUSAN QIZI
Types of english speech-language pathology dictionaries according to semantic relations 81

SHUKUROV RAHMATILLO MIRZATILLAYEVICH
Farg‘ona viloyati tarixiy oykonim, gidronim va oronimlarining leksik-semantik tasnifi hamda sotsiolingvistik tahlili 86

XALIQULOVA MUSHARRAF EGAMNAZAR QIZI
Maqol lingvistik, kognitiv va madaniy fenomen sifatida 90

O‘RAZOV ALISHER DONIYOROVICH
O‘zbek tilida substantiv leksemalar semantik shajarasining ifodalanishida pragmatik omillar 93

DJURAYEVA MAXBUBA USMANOVNA
Emotsiya, konsept va emotsional konsept tushunchalarining lingvistik talqini 96

ADABIYOTSHUNOSLIK

ABDULLAEV RAMAZON
Муиззий ва Ҳофиз шеъриятида адабий таъсир ва ижодий ворислик. 99

ARSLONOV ABDIMUROD KAROMATOVICH
“Qisasi Rabg‘uziy” asari poetikasi va badiiy-estetik xususiyatlari xususida.....104

АЛИМАРДОН ҲАЙИТОВ
Али Қушчининг ўғли ҳам олим бўлган.....108

DR. DONIYOR K. KELDIYOROV
Wounded memory and hybrid identity in Khaled Hosseini’s the kite runner.....112

IBRAGIMOV JAVOHIR TO‘LQINJON O‘G‘LI
Harold Lambning “Tamerlane: the earth shaker” romanida amir temur xarakterining badiiy ifodasi 116

RAXIMOVA UMIDA SOLIYEVNA
Ona obrazining ramziy va mifopoetik talqini: inglizzabon va o‘zbek adabiyoti misolida 121

MNAJATDINOVA MAKARYA
Hozirgi qoraqalpoq xotin-qizlar lirikasida psixologik metamorfoza 126

JIENBAEV MUSA AZATBAEVICH
XX-XXI asr lirikasida Odissey obrazining transformatsiyasi.....130

RADJABOVA MUXTASAR DAVRANBEKOVNA
Arab tilida talabalarning yozuv malakasini rivojlantirishda o‘yin texnologiyalarining tatbiqi.....134

Filologik tadqiqotlar: til, adabiyot, ta'lim. 2026; 9
ISNN: 2181-1741 (Print)
ISNN: 2181-1725

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH

Mustafayev Elyor Odil ugli,
Independent Researcher at Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Phraseology is a field of linguistics that studies semantically and structurally complex units occupying a distinctive place in the lexical system of a language. One of the essential characteristics of phraseological units is that, although they consist of two or more components, they are often reproduced in speech as ready-made expressions and convey a certain degree of semantic integrity. Therefore, distinguishing phraseological units from free word combinations and classifying them into particular groups remains one of the fundamental issues in the theory of phraseology. In English linguistics, the use of such terms as *idiom, fixed expression, set expression, phraseological unit, multi-word expression,* and *collocation* further complicates the problem of defining the boundaries of this linguistic phenomenon. Since different linguistic schools employ different approaches to the study of phraseological units, no single unified theory of phraseology has yet been established. While some approaches regard semantic motivation as the principal criterion, others give priority to structural-grammatical organization, functional properties, stability, or contextual use. According to L. Vilkaitė, although linguists investigate essentially the same phenomenon, they approach and define it from different perspectives, and different terms are frequently used interchangeably.[1]

The heterogeneous nature of phraseological units further complicates their classification. Z. Kövecses characterizes the linguistic expressions commonly grouped under the category of idioms as a "mixed bag", encompassing metaphorical expressions such as *spill the beans*, metonymic expressions such as *throw up one's hands*, pairs of words such as *cats and dogs*, idioms with "it" such as *live it up,* similes such as *as easy as pie,* and proverbs such as *a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.*[2] This diversity demonstrates that phraseological expressions do not constitute a structurally or semantically homogeneous category and, therefore, cannot always be adequately classified according to a single criterion.

Semantic transparency is particularly important in the study of phraseological units. For example, the meaning of the English phraseological unit *spill the beans*, meaning "to reveal a secret," cannot be derived from the literal meanings of its individual components, spill and beans. By contrast, in a combination such as take a risk, the components retain a relatively high degree of semantic independence. Thus, phraseological units vary in their degree of idiomaticity, and this gradation constitutes an important criterion for their classification.

R. Moon's corpus-based research demonstrates that phraseological units cannot be regarded as completely invariable expressions. Drawing on authentic texts and corpus data, Moon examines fixed expressions and idioms in terms of their form, frequency, variation, and discourse functions, thereby demonstrating the interrelationship between their structural properties and actual usage.[3]

The study aims to provide a comparative examination of the major approaches to the classification of English phraseological units, identify the criteria underlying these classifications, and develop an integrative classification framework for their comprehensive description. The study employs descriptive, comparative-typological, structural-semantic, and componential methods of analysis. The major theoretical approaches to English phraseology are compared to identify the criteria underlying different classification systems. Particular attention is paid to corpus-based approaches and their contribution to contemporary phraseological classification.

The research material consists of English phraseological units with diverse structure, meaning and semantic type, such as *spill the beans, kick the bucket, break the ice, give someone a hand, keep an eye on, take a risk, make up one's mind, red tape, by and*

[1] Vilkaitė L. Formulaic language is not all the same: comparing the frequency of idiomatic phrases, collocations, lexical bundles, and phrasal verbs // Taikomoji kalbotyra. – 2016. – No. 8. – P. 29.
[2] Kövecses Z. Metaphor: A Practical Introduction. – 2nd ed. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. – P. 231.
3 Moon R. Fixed Expressions and Idioms in English: A Corpus-Based Approach. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. – P. 120–124.

large, once in a blue moon and others.

The material was selected according to the following criteria: semantic integrity, degree of motivation, grammatical structure, and reproduction as ready-made units of language.

Methodologically, the classifications are compared according to four principal criteria: (1) the semantic criterion, which concerns the extent to which phraseological meaning can be derived from the meanings of the individual components; (2) the structural-grammatical criterion, which concerns the syntactic pattern and dominant component of a phraseological unit; (3) the functional criterion, which determines the nominative or communicative function performed by the unit in speech; and (4) the corpus-contextual criterion, which considers the stability, variability, and functional characteristics of phraseological units in actual discourse. This multidimensional approach makes it possible to determine which aspect of a phraseological unit is captured by each classification rather than treating any single criterion as universally dominant.

The Semantic Principle of Classifying Phraseological Units

Throughout the development of phraseological theory, the semantic principle has occupied a central position in the classification of phraseological units. Ch. Bally made a significant contribution to the study of phraseological combinations by considering their degree of stability and semantic cohesion[1]. Building on the semantic principle, V.V. Vinogradov classified phraseological units according to their degree of semantic motivation into **phraseological fusions, phraseological unities,** and **phraseological combinations**[2]. When Vinogradov's classification is applied to English phraseology, semantic differences among phraseological units become particularly evident. For example, the meaning "to die" expressed by *kick the bucket* cannot be derived from the literal meanings of "kick" and "bucket". Consequently, the expression exhibits a high degree of idiomaticity. By contrast, *break the ice,* meaning "to overcome initial social awkwardness and facilitate communication," retains a certain degree of figurative motivation, since a metaphorical relationship can be established between breaking physical ice and removing a communicative barrier. In *take a risk*, the overall meaning remains relatively transparent despite restrictions on lexical combinability. Thus, the continuum between compositionality and idiomaticity constitutes an important parameter in the semantic classification of phraseological units.

Structural-Grammatical Classification

Whereas semantic classification focuses on the formation and motivation of phraseological meaning, structural classification examines the grammatical organization of phraseological units. From a structural perspective, English phraseological units can be classified according to their dominant component and syntactic pattern. One of the most common patterns is V + N/NP, as in spill the beans, where the verb functions as the grammatical centre of the construction.

The idiom *break the ice* follows the V + Det + N pattern, consisting of the verb *break* followed by the noun phrase *the ice*, in which the functions as the determiner and *ice* as the nominal head.

The V + PP pattern is exemplified by *come to terms*, in which the verb is followed by a prepositional phrase. Another structural type is the binomial construction, in which two components are linked by a coordinating conjunction, as in *by and large*. English phraseology also includes nominal patterns such as Adj + N *(red tape)* and prepositional patterns such as Prep + NP *(in hot water)*. Structural classification therefore focuses primarily on the grammatical organization and dominant component of a phraseological unit.

The classification type is highly important in distinguishing the so-called verbal phraseological units: *lose one's head, keep an eye on somebody, give someone a hand, and make up one's mind.* In these units, the verbal component is the grammatical center and underlies the basic syntactic framework of the whole formation. The overall phraseological meaning cannot be explained solely by the semantics of the verbal component; it stems from the semantic relations of all constituent parts of the phraseological formation as the unit of both structural and semantic nature.

Moon examines the lexical and grammatical structures of fixed expressions in English and demonstrates a close relationship between their lexico-grammatical form and degree of stability. A substantial part of her monograph is devoted specifically to the lexico-grammatical characteristics of fixed expressions and idioms.

The Degree of Idiomaticity in Ch. Fernando's Classification

The classification developed by Ch. Fernando occupies an important position in English phraseology. Fernando classifies idioms according to their degree

[1] Bally Ch. Traité de stylistique française. – Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1909.

[2] Виноградов В.В. Об основных типах фразеологических единиц в русском языке // Избранные труды. Лексикология и лексикография. – М.: Наука, 1977. – С. 143.

of semantic transparency and idiomaticity into **pure idioms, semi-idioms,** and **literal idioms**.[1]

In **pure idioms**, the lexical meanings of the individual components do not provide sufficient clues to the phraseological meaning of the expression as a whole. For example, *spill the beans*, meaning 'to reveal a secret', is a pure idiom because its overall meaning cannot be derived from the literal meanings of "spill" and "beans". Thus, the expression exhibits a high degree of idiomaticity.

In **semi-idioms**, at least one component retains its literal meaning, while another acquires a specialized or figurative meaning within the expression. Consequently, semi-idioms are semantically more transparent than pure idioms, although their overall meanings are not entirely predictable from the meanings of their individual components.

Literal idioms, by contrast, are relatively transparent expressions whose overall meanings can largely be understood from the literal meanings of their components. Nevertheless, such expressions are conventionalized and exhibit a certain degree of lexical and structural stability. Fernando's classification is particularly significant because it presents idiomaticity as a gradable phenomenon rather than as a simple binary distinction between idiomatic and non-idiomatic expressions.

A.V. Kunin's Functional Approach

Kunin pays particular attention to the classification of phraseological units according to their nominative and communicative functions[2]. From a functional perspective, phraseological units may be classified as nominative, nominative-communicative, interjectional-modal, and communicative units. This approach demonstrates that phraseological classification cannot be restricted solely to the question of how phraseological meaning is formed. An equally important consideration is the function that a phraseological unit performs in speech.

R. Moon and the Corpus-Contextual Approach

Moon's corpus-based approach significantly expands traditional views of phraseological stability by examining fixed expressions and idioms in authentic language use. Her analysis considers their frequency, lexico-grammatical form, variation, semantic properties, metaphorical motivation, and discourse functions.

By making use of corpora, she has tried to discover the frequency, lexical-grammatical forms, variations, semantic polyvalence, metaphorical motivation and discourse use of phraseological units.

This has led to an important reconsideration of the concept of stability, which occupies a central position in traditional phraseology. According to Moon's corpus-based findings, approximately 40% of the phraseological units in her database exhibited lexical variation or institutionalized transformations, while approximately 14% had two or more variants of their canonical forms. These findings suggest that treating phraseological units as completely invariable is methodologically restrictive. Rather, a phraseological unit may undergo contextual variation while retaining its essential structural and semantic core.

The analysis demonstrates that English phraseological units cannot be adequately classified according to a single criterion, since their semantic, structural, functional, and contextual properties are closely interrelated.

This is due to the inherent coexistence of all semantic, lexical, grammatical, functional and discourse-related factors in a phraseological unit. For instance, *break the ice* can be structurally classified as a V + Det + N construction; however, this structural description does not account for its figurative motivation. From a semantic perspective, the expression can also be analysed in terms of its figurative motivation. Although semantic analysis can explain the development of its idiomatic meaning, it does not fully account for its grammatical function or discourse-specific use. Similarly, *keep an eye on somebody* can be classified based on its lexical-grammatical structure as a verbal phraseological unit. From a cognitive-semantic perspective, the component *eye* participates in a metonymically motivated conceptualization in which the organ of vision stands for the activity of watching or monitoring.

Thus, a single phraseological unit may encompass a set of several classification parameters.

Moon's research also demonstrates that phraseological stability should be regarded as a relative rather than an absolute property. Since a great percentage of phraseological items appear in forms containing variation, phraseological units may no longer be considered "unchangeable ready-made formulas". Moreover, the selection and use of phraseological units are closely related to discourse and to the relationship between the speaker or writer and the addressee.

Based on the comparative analysis, the study proposes *a four-stage* integrative model for classifying English phraseological units:

Stage I. Structural Identification: This step involves determining the grammatical construction of the phraseological unit (e.g. V + N, V + NP, Adj + N,

[1] Fernando Ch. Idioms and Idiomaticity. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. – P. 35–37.

[2] Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. – 2-е изд., перераб. – М.: Высшая школа, 1996. – 381 с.

Prep + N etc.).

Stage II. Semantic Motivation: At this stage, the degree to which the overall meaning of the phraseological unit can be attributed to that of its constituents is determined: transparency, partial motivation, full idiomaticity can be arranged on a cline.

Stage III. Functional Description: here the nominating, communicative, evaluating, modal etc. function of the units is determined.

Stage IV. Contextual and Corpus-Based Analysis: it is at this stage the frequency, variation, transformation and use of a given phraseological unit in actual discourse are examined.

The advantages of such an integrative approach are: it unites the traditional classification criteria on the basis of semantics and structure with that based on corpora. Currently, there is also a growing interest in describing phraseological units through the interplay between their structural and semantic characteristics. In this sense, it seems justified to treat classification not as a process of assigning phraseological units to disparate categories, but rather as a task of specifying the relations among their form, meaning, function, and context.

The development of the theory of phraseological classification in English shows a gradual shift from classifications based predominantly on a single criterion towards multidimensional models that describe phraseological units in terms of several interrelated parameters. While semantic cohesion and the degree of motivation occupy central positions in the traditions associated with Ch. Bally and V.V. Vinogradov, A.I. Smirnitsky developed a structural-semantic approach in which the organization of phraseological units is considered in relation to the number and semantic significance of their constituent elements. He distinguished between one-summit phraseological units, containing one semantically significant constituent, and two-summit or multi-summit units, containing two or more such constituents. His approach thus demonstrates the relationship between the structural organization of a phraseological unit and the semantic status of its components[1]. A.V. Kunin, in turn, placed greater emphasis on the functional properties of phraseological units, particularly their nominative and communicative functions. Ch. Fernando systematized the gradational nature of idiomaticity, whereas R. Moon demonstrated the relationship between phraseological stability, variation, and discourse use through corpus-based analysis. Taken together, these approaches illustrate the gradual development of phraseological classification from relatively single-criterion models towards a more comprehensive and multidimensional understanding of phraseological units.

The findings of the study lead to several conclusions. First, although semantic integrity and motivation are fundamental characteristics of phraseological units, neither criterion alone provides a sufficient basis for their comprehensive classification. Second, structural-grammatical classification adequately describes the formal organization of phraseological units but does not fully account for their degree of idiomaticity. Third, functional classification extends the analysis by considering the roles that phraseological units perform in speech. Finally, corpus-based analysis demonstrates that phraseological units are neither completely static nor absolutely fixed but may exhibit considerable variation in actual language use.

Consequently, an integrative framework combining semantic, structural, functional, and corpus-based characteristics is required for the classification of English phraseological units. This model makes it possible to describe a phraseological unit not merely as a fixed linguistic expression but as a multidimensional linguistic phenomenon characterized by structural and semantic properties, specific communicative functions, and the potential for contextual variation.

Rezyume. Ushbu maqolada ingliz tilidagi frazeologik birliklarni tasniflashning asosiy nazariy yondashuvlari tahlil qilingan. Tadqiqotda frazeologik birliklarning semantik, struktur-grammatik, funksional va korpusga asoslangan tasniflari qiyosiy jihatdan ko‘rib chiqilgan. Turli tasnif mezonlarining o‘ziga xos xususiyatlari aniqlanib, frazeologik birliklarning murakkab tabiatini tavsiflashda ularni o‘zaro uyg‘un holda qo‘llash zarurligi asoslangan. Tadqiqot natijasida ingliz tilidagi frazeologik birliklarni tasniflashning integrativ modeli taklif etilgan.

Resume. This article examines the major theoretical approaches to the classification of phraseological units in English. Semantic, structural-grammatical, functional, and corpus-based classifications of phraseological units are comparatively analyzed. The study identifies the specific features of different classification

[1] Смирницкий А. И. Лексикология английского языка. – Москва: Издательство литературы на иностранных языках, 1956. – С. 212.

criteria and demonstrates the need to integrate them in order to describe the complex nature of phraseological units. As a result, an integrative model for the classification of English phraseological units is proposed.

Резюме. В данной статье рассматриваются основные теоретические подходы к классификации фразеологических единиц английского языка. В исследовании проводится сравнительный анализ семантической, структурно-грамматической, функциональной и корпусной классификаций фразеологических единиц. Выявляются особенности различных критериев классификации и обосновывается необходимость их комплексного применения для описания сложной природы фразеологических единиц. В результате исследования предлагается интегративная модель классификации фразеологических единиц английского языка.

Filologik tadqiqotlar: til, adabiyot, ta'lim. 2026; 9
ISNN: 2181-1741 (Print)
ISNN: 2181-1725

"O'ZBEK TILINING IZOHLI LUG'ATI"DA QUROL-ASLAHA NOMI BILAN BOG'LIQ FOLKLORIZMLAR

Tursunova Dilshoda Xoldin qizi,
Samarqand davlat pedagogika instituti,
o'zbek tili va adabiyoti kafedrasi o'qituvchisi

Respublikamiz mustaqillikka erishib, milliy qadriyatlarimiz, tarixiy an'analarimiz va umrboqiy udumlarimizni qayta tiklash va ommalashtirish imkoni tug'ilgan bir paytda folklorga xos so'zlarning lug'aviy boyligini jadal suratda to'plash va o'rganish yanada dolzarb vazifaga aylandi. Bunday chora-tadbirlar umumadabiy o'zbek tilining lug'aviy boyligini yanada to'ldirish uchun xizmat qiladi.

Folklorizm – yozma adabiyotda qo'llangan og'zaki poetik ijod materiali. Ilmiy adabiyotlarda folklorizm "ikkinchi shakl" atamasi bilan ham yuritiladi. Yozma adabiyotda qo'llangan muallif yoki personaj nutqida qo'llangan xalq maqollari, maqol hamda iboralar oddiy folklorizm sanaladi. Ijodkorning folklorga xos tasvir uslubiga ergashishi, folklor materialidan o'z asarida foydalanishi, folklorga mansub syujet yoki motivni asariga olib kirishi va boshqalar murakkab folklorizm hisoblanadi.[1]

"O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati"dagi folklorizmlarning tarixiy qimmatini yana ham chuqurroq anglashda, ular mansub bo'lgan leksik-tematik guruhlarni aniqlash muhimdir. Chunki folklorizmlarning ko'pchiligi o'zining mavzuviy doirasiga ko'ra tarixiy ahamiyat kasb etadi. Shu bois quyida "O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati"da berilgan qurol-aslaha nomi bilan bog'liq folklorizmlarning semantikasi xususida imkon qadar batafsilroq to'xtalib o'tamiz.

Tahlil qilinayotgan birliklarning semantik maydoni muhim. Ularning katta qismi qurol-aslaha, jang, himoya vositasi va harbiy anjomlarga aloqador. Bu holat tasodifiy emas: o'zbek dostonlarida qahramonlik, jang, lashkar, ot-ulov va harbiy marosimlar tasviri katta o'rin egallaydi. Natijada tarixiy harbiy leksika folklor tilida uzoq vaqt saqlanib, keyinchalik umumadabiy til uchun arxaik yoki folklor belgili birlikka aylangan. "O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati"da ayrim birliklarning *"folk."* belgisi bilan berilishi ularning hozirgi til tizimidagi uslubiy maqomini ko'rsatadi. Masalan, **yov-yaroq** "qurol-aslaha, qurollar" ma'nosida, **jeva** "qurol-aslaha" ma'nosida, **choroyna** esa "to'rt parcha", "yassi temirdan yasaladigan himoya moslamasi" sifatida qayd etilgan. Bu lug'aviy tavsiflar folklorizmlarning semantik maydonini belgilash uchun asos bo'la oladi.

[1] Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси. Ф ҳарфи. – Тошкент: "Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси" давлат илмий нашриёти. 2000-2005. – 197 б.