



APPEAL OF PROPER NAMES IN PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS FROM A TYPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Obrueva Gulchehra Hamrakulovna

PhD,

Associate professor of Samarkand State

Institute of Foreign Languages,

Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

There are different approaches to the distinction between proper names and common nouns. this article proposes to consider this problem from the standpoint of typological linguistics, namely, within the framework of the theory of phraseological units.

KEYWORDS: *proper name, common name, category, appeal, phraseological unit.*

DISCUSSION

European languages for many centuries drew bright and expressive images from the Treasury of biblical and ancient myths [1, 220-221]. Phraseological units (PU), which have become international, function in close unity with other categories of language and are subject to the laws of its development [2, 190-192]. In the process of evolution, semantic discrepancies in PU with initially identical semantics often arise.

Thus, the myth of the construction of the tower of Babel is reflected in the phraseology of English and Russian languages or the partially appellative proper name (PN) of the biblical first man Adam became an onomastic component of 12 Russian, 14 English, 12 German, and 14 French phraseological units. Partial appeal of PN in phraseological contexts is based on its well-known encyclopedic meaning, i.e. information about Adam set forth in the Old Testament, as well as in the legends and traditions of apocryphal [early Christian] and biblical literature.

Thus, theoretically, all phraseological meanings of the PN "Adam" should be identical in the language being compared. In reality, there are differences along with coincidences. From 17 phraseological meanings represented in the sum of the languages compared, 10 are in the PU of Russian, 9 in English, 6 in German, and 12 in the PU of French. If we introduce here a kind of selectivity coefficient, deducing it from the ratio of the sum of

phraseological meanings of PN presented at the phraseological level of a given language to the sum of all the different phraseological meanings of PN in comparable languages, then in Russian it will be 0.6, in English – 0.5, in German - 0.3, and in French 0.7.

Thus, in the PU of other comparable languages, the same meaning of the named is does not occur as in the Russian proverb "ХОЗЯИН В ДОМЕ, ЧТО АДАМ В РАЮ" (The master in the house is like Adam in Paradise).

The meaning acquired by this PN in the phrase "in the costume of Adam" in German is revealed in a phrase with a different structure and imagery: *Adam und Eva spielen*, and the English language does not master phraseologically the same component of the encyclopedic meaning of PN, on the basis of which the named phrase Russian and German languages.

Another component of the encyclopedic meaning of this name is converted into the phraseological meaning of PN in all compared languages (though phraseological units can differ structurally), except for German: Russian "ПРОЖИТЬ АДАМОВЫ ЛЕТА", English "as old as Adam", French *vieux comme Adam* ["very old"].

On the other hand, at the phraseological levels [3, 434] of other comparable languages, the meaning acquired by PN in the French phraseological unit *voyager par la diligence d'Adam* = ("travel on your own two") is not represented.



The national identity of each of the compared languages is manifested not only in the selective phraseological “development” of the individual components of the encyclopedic meaning of PN, but also in the very form of its phraseological interpretation, which is reflected in differences in the structural design, imagery, and often in the differing global meanings of phraseological units, containing PN with identical phraseological meanings.

For example, the phraseological meaning that arose on the basis of the same component of the encyclopedic meaning of the PN Adam in the Russian language is revealed in the phraseological unit under Adam, in English since Adam was a boy (lit. “when Adam was a child”), [= ' long ago '], and in German in the PU with a different global meaning: er war mit Adam jung (lit. “he is the same age as Adam”) “he is very old”.

In total, 87 PNs with a specific denotative correlation that are part of the phraseological units of the mapped languages were identified. An analysis of these phraseological units allows us to state some features of isomorphism that manifest themselves:

1) in the coincidence of the phraseological meanings of the onomastic component in different phraseological contexts;

2) in the interlanguage borrowing of phraseological units with PN: the specific gravity of phraseological units ascending to one source is significant.

However, despite the fact that information (the encyclopedic meaning of PN) is exposed to the phraseological “mastering”, which the speakers of the languages being compared have an absolutely equal volume, each language here shows its own identity [4, 110-111], the principle of selectivity, which can be quantified assessment and which is reflected:

1) in the "individual search" of the components of the encyclopedic meaning of the name for their phraseological "development";

2) in the lexical, structural and figurative differences in the phraseological units of the compared languages with the complete coincidence of the phraseological meanings of their PN;

3) in phrase-making based on borrowed phraseological units. For example, the “Hamlet” that arose from the Shakespearean tragedy, which has become the phraseologism in comparable languages that he is Hekube, what is he to him? (personal pronouns here vary) in the meaning of ‘an indifferent attitude to anything, only in German became the basis for further phrase-writing. There is a phrase "it doesn't matter to anyone";

4) finally, the principle of selectivity is also manifested in the fact that in one of the compared languages a partial appeal of this information system

in a phraseological context does not occur at all, although objective prerequisites are present for it: the name is frequency, the encyclopedic meaning is well known to native speakers, and the latter is in contact with languages in which phraseological units operate with a given PN, but does not borrow them.

Thus, comparing the individual fragments of phraseological systems of several languages connected by a single attribute, one can get a visual representation of how, under the influence of the same factors external to phraseological systems, the key points of their convergence appear and, at the same time, the deep national originality of phraseological systems is preserved [5, 88-89].

REFERENCES

1. Balli Sh. *Obshaya lingvistika i voprosy francuzskogo yazyka*. – M.: IIL, 1955. – 416 s.
2. Balli Sh. *Francuzskaya stilistika*. – M.: IIL, 1961. – 394 s.
3. Benvenist E. *Urovni lingvisticheskogo analiza // Novoe v lingvistike*. – M., 1964. – Vyp. 4. – S. 434 - 449.
4. Benvenist E. *Obshaya lingvistika*. – M.: Progress, 1974. – 447 s.
5. Novikov A. L. *Znachenie esteticheskogo znaka // Filologicheskie nauki*. – M., 1999.-№5.- S. 83 - 90.