

LINGUACULTUROLOGY OF STABLE PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH ADJECTIVE COMPONENTS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Kholmatova Malika Ibadullayevna

Teacher of Foreign language Department, Jizzakh Polytechnic Institute

Master student, Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Email: malika1xolmatova@mail.ru

Follow this and additional works at: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/tziuj> Part of the Higher Education Administration Commons

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal by an authorized editor of 2030 Uzbekistan Research Online

LINGUACULTUROLOGY OF STABLE PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH ADJECTIVE COMPONENTS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Kholmatova Malika Ibadullayevna

Teacher of Foreign language Department, Jizzakh Polytechnic Institute

Master student, Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Email: malika1xolmatova@mail.ru

Abstract: The article is devoted to the semantic and lingua-culturological features of phraseological units with adjective components in the English and Uzbek languages. Etymological and cultural features of phraseological units are considered on the example of the Uzbek and English languages. The author of the article analyses linguistic material illustrating the validity of the theoretical theses and semantic features of phraseological units in Uzbek, because they are enough studied in detail in various languages. The author aims to analyze the linguistic cultural aspects of stable phraseological units with adjective components and approves that linguistic culture and other aspects are usually implemented through manifestations of pragmalinguistic aspects in discourse.

Key words: lingua-cultural, phrases. phraseological units (PU), translation, mentality, nation, synonyms, emotionally expressive, pragmalinguistic parameter, components, semantic meaning, discourse, universal, adverbial components.

INTRODUCTION

When considering the problem of interaction between language and culture, we fully accept the well-known postulate that phraseology is layer of the language

system, which most clearly reflects the worldview, behavior, perception of the surrounding reality, as well as interpersonal relationships of people.

Each nation has its own cultural vision of the world, which is due way of life, habits, traditions, nature, worldview, traits of the national character. Belonging to a certain culture forms the mentality of the people, in any culture there are cultural meanings inherent only to it, enshrined in language, moral standards, beliefs, features behavior. There is an opinion that representatives of one nation have common personality traits, types of thinking, behavior patterns, then and determines the national character of a nation. The connection between language and culture is carried out through cultural connotation, which arises as a result of the interpretation of the associative-figurative foundations of phraseology by correlating it with cultural national standards and stereotypes reflecting the national mentality.

MATERIALS AND LITERATURE REVIEW

V.A. Maslova believes that, “The phraseological component of the language is not only reproducing the elements and features of cultural and national understanding of the world, but also shapes them. And each phraseological unit, if it contains a cultural connotation, contributes to the overall mosaic picture of national culture [5, p. 198].

According to D. O. Dobrovolsky, “in the study of national cultural specifics of phraseological units within the framework of a comparative approach it seems appropriate only to refer to the plan content, since the plan of expression for units of different languages is different in definition.” In terms of the content of phraseological units (especially in the case of their synchronously felt motivation) highlight the actual value and figurative component, the study of which seems to be the most significant, since, “firstly, it is here that non-trivial differences between languages... and, secondly, differences of this kind more likely to be culturally motivated”. [2, p. 37].

E. E. Chikina in the article "Identification of national and cultural specificity Phraseological Units: Modern Approaches" considers linguocultural, contrastive, linguoculturological and cognitive approaches to the disclosure of national and cultural content phraseological units [1, p. 4]. The author emphasizes that all four approaches are a single whole and can be represented as stages of PU analysis:

1) identification of non-equivalent valence extralinguistic factors reflected in phraseological units;

2) identification of structural and semantic features of interlingual phraseological analogues;

3) identification of national-cultural connotations of keywords and cultural concepts contained in phraseological units. The author emphasizes that such an integrated approach from particular to the general can give a complete picture of national-cultural features of the phraseological system of the language.

Yu. E. Prokhorov, considering the issues of national-cultural specifics of verbal communication, highlights its socio-cultural stereotypes. They are defined as "sociocultural marked unit of mental-lingual complex of a representative of a certain ethnic culture, implemented in speech communication in the form of a normative local association to standard for a given culture of the situation of communication. With this understanding the stereotype acts as a kind of "model", "sample" [6, p. 98].

According to Yu. E. Prokhorov, the stereotype of verbal communication can be implemented "and in the form of a speech cliché (traditionally, these units include all types of stable phrases and phrases - phraseological units, proverbs, sayings, idioms, literary quotations, etc.) and in the form verbalized / non-verbalized stamp of consciousness, acting a signal that the participants in communication belong to the same sociocultural space." [6, p. 58]

In general, the national and cultural originality of phraseological units, is seen in the fact that they contain a complex of naive ideas native speakers about a

particular standard, stereotype, concept during periods formation of national culture.

Identification of the national and cultural identity of phraseological units is one of the urgent problems of modern linguistics. In connection with the constant growth of interest of phraseologists in this issue the number of methods for studying phraseology is also increasing. So way, to study the national and cultural identity of linguistic units of indirect nomination, it is necessary, first of all, to choose an approach for their consideration. Currently, there are several different areas in linguistics (linguacultural studies, contrastive approach, linguaculturology and cognitive linguistics), contributing to identifying the national and cultural specificity of phraseological units and having “a different methodological base, different methods studies with different coverage phraseological material. [3, p. 26; 4, p. 200].

Following E.E. Chikina, we believe that modern research methods national and cultural identity of phraseological units can be combined into a single whole and presented as stages of analysis phraseological units:

identification of non-equivalent extralinguistic factors reflected in phraseological units; separation of structural semantic features of interlingual phraseological analogues;

identification of national and cultural connotations of keywords and concepts cultures contained in phraseological units; identification of features national division of the language picture of the world and features functioning of the national mentality as a lingua-creative thinking.

Thus, the complex use of several approaches (lingua-culturological and cognitive) allows us to consider the analyzed units as a result of the interaction of language, national culture and thinking, to reveal their nationally specific peculiarities.

As S.G. Ter-Minasova, it is not the difference between the objects themselves in different cultures, and the difference in cultural concepts about these objects and

phenomena as they live and function in different worlds and cultures [9, p. 384]. The phraseological unit does not exist outside the ethnos, in the mind which developed certain stamps of interpretations, that is, stereotypes. This statement is confirmed by comparison borrowed phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages.

If we proceed from the constant interconnection of all system-forming elements in the language, then it can be argued that phraseological units are formed on the basis of units of the lower tier, that is, through the integration of words. From the point of view of the upper, phraseological units themselves with adverbial components, like words, turn into parts that make up a sentence.

Chinese researcher YU Wang categorizes English phrases into eight categories in term of syntax.

1. Sentence idioms. – Butter wouldn't melt in your mouth. Your chickens come home to roost.
2. Semi-sentence idioms -Take the bad with the good.
3. Verbal phrases.- Beat up; come across.
4. Prepositional phrases.- By the dozen; in doubt.
5. Nominal idioms.- Good faith; a golden handshake.
6. Adjective idioms.- Far and away; full of beans.
7. Word in pairs.- Aches and pains; safe and sound.
8. Fixed similes.- Flat as a pancake; poor as a church mouse.

In the book “Uzbek phraseological dictionary”, Sh.Rakhmatullayev mentions that, the main part of the phrases in Uzbek linguistics consists of phraseological units with verb, as well as noun-component, adjective-component and adverbial phrases.

As one of the prominent linguists who studied this topic, M. Umarkhojaev, notes in his works, sentences directly integrate phraseological units, and free phrases bring words into sentences, since a free phrase as an intermediary between a word and a sentence plays a special role in the word has become a constituent of

the sentence. Phraseologisms with adjective components are included in the sentence in the finished form in the same way as the word, in the form of a linguistic unit or syntagma [12, p. 96].

Based on the foregoing, it can be noted that the actually existing phraseological system of the language is linguistically distinguished by its sign features. The units of the phraseological system, due to the fact that they have isomorphic features similar to the features of the units of all linguistic language levels, are a component located between the lexeme and the sentence.

If the meaning of a word is associated with its constituent sum of morphemes (belonging to a certain part of speech, valence and distribution, denotative-significative dependence), then in phraseological units this phenomenon has a different character. In fact, phraseological units are a figuratively directed denotative-significative integrity based on the integration of the meanings of its constituent components.

Based on the integration of phraseological units in the language, a new unit of integral meaning arises. At the same time, some integrated components of the phrase, and sometimes all components, lose their basic properties. The higher the level of integration, the further away from their original meaning the words that make up phraseological units, and vice versa, the lower the level of integration, the closer the phrase will be to a free phrase and a free sentence [10, p. 6-12; 7, p. 345-400].

Among the pragmalinguistic aspects phraseological units (PU) with adjective components that appear in the discourse can be as follows:

1. PU express in the discourse modal wearing.
2. phraseological units are found in the discourse of moral criteria.
3. PU manifest in the discourse of intellectual criteria.
4. PU express aesthetic discourse criterion.
5. PU reflect in the discourse dynamic criterion.
6. PU find a criterion in the discourse normativity.

7. PU express in the discourse the criterion of emotional rationality.

8. PU manifest in the discourse the criterion of worth.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Consider from this position some phraseological units in Uzbek and Russian languages. The Uzbek language has a stable combination “Тилда тишлаб, орқада опичлаб” (literally: biting on the tongue, wearing on the backs), it means to cherish like the apple of an eye. For instance: Мен бу болани тилимда тишлаб, орқамда опичлаб катта қилдим (Uzbek-Russian dictionary). The fact that the cultural concept sphere is one nationality differs sharply from another, especially clearly manifested in the values of phraseological units, their translation in dictionaries [12, p. 34].

If we take this particular case, then in Russian culture in particular and in European the culture as a whole, biting a child is perceived as savagery. Therefore, in Russian this phrase in the dictionary is translated as follows: *«Я вырастил этого ребенка, постоянно заботясь о нем и всячески оберегая»*. There are no words «тишлаш» - bite, "опичлаш" - wear on backs at all here, so how in European culture to wear someone on the backs is not considered something positive.

Exceptions can only be made if when the orderlies carry out the wounded on their backs soldier from the battlefield. In Asian culture, in particular, in Chinese, Japanese, Korean - a healthy person century may well wear another on the backs. In European culture, mothers carry the child on the hands, mostly in special devices, and not on the backs. In the Uzbek language there is a stable expression “Томдан тараша тушгандек” (literally: as if a chock had fallen from the roof). It means unexpectedly. For example: «Томдан тараша тушгандек қилиб, сельпо раиси Авазматов мени тўсатдан ишдан бўшатиб юборди». (“Tabbasum”, collection).

Since ancient times, in Uzbek culture, houses were built with a flat roof and covered with clay. On hot summer nights on the roof it was possible to sleep on it,

it was possible to dry fruits on it, in some cases small haystacks were laid out on the roof. No more cargo laid, because the roof could not withstand. Chock is a piece of wood that appears when splitting wood. No one will chop wood on the roof, so the chock on the roof cannot appear and, moreover, fall from it to the ground. That is, the probability of an accident is zero. The main element of this PU is a flat roof. In European, including in English culture, roofs are not flat. Who will build flat roofs in a climate with abundant rainfall? Therefore, no one in thoughts, the idea that chop wood on the roof. Thus, the appearance of phraseological units is due to the peculiar aspects of the everyday culture of a particular people. Uzbeks live in a hot and dry climate, so flat roofs are common. a business. A flat, clay-covered roof keeps the house and people from the heat in summer, and in winter by cold. As proof of all that has been said, it is enough to cite the Russian translation the above phrase: "Chairman of the general store Avazmatov that, for no reason, suddenly took yes and removed me from work."

In the translation, the phraseological unit itself is absent, and its meaning is conveyed in simple words when the help of their free combination. Stereotypes of behavior of heroes can be different in different cultures, which can see in the following examples. For example: the meaning of the phrase "Тузoқ узиб кетмоқ" can be translated as "run away by all means", in the Russian version of the PU it sounds like this: "Of those who bite off their paw and leave the trap." In Uzbek culture, the fox can break the net of a trap, and in Europe, the fox will bite off its paw and run away. Why? Because there are traps in the east made of ropes or leather, and in European culture - from iron. Rope or leather whips can be chewed off, but not iron. That's why the only way to escape from the trap is to bite off your own paw. This difference in cultures is fully reflected with the help of linguistic means. "Туя гўшти ёмоқ" - eat camel meat. This PU means a very slow execution of an action, a delay in the process. For example: «Қанийди, ўзимиздаги туя гўшти еган ҳаммом ишга тушса-ю, биз бу ташвишлардан қутулсак» (From the magazine "Mushtum"). This PU corresponds to the Russian

phrase «черепаший шаг», and in English the phrase ‘till the cows come home. In Russian, this is the meaning is transmitted with the help of the image of a skull-hee, and in English - cows. This is due the originality of the habitat, life and existence formation of the people. English and Russian live in northern regions with rather cold climate. This is as a primary manifests itself in the nomination of traditional concepts, the formation of primary forms of words and expressions. Camels cannot live in a cold area, but some species of turtles can be found. slow motion inherent in the turtle and the Russians use the image this animal, speaking of slowness.

In the area of Uzbek linguistic culture, there is a tortoise, and in this language it also means slowness. But in this context, it is used only as a synonym for the concept camel. It is from this point of view that such phrases existing in the Uzbek concept sphere, how “Туянинг думи ерга текканда” (when camel's tail touches the ground, “туяни ют, лекин думи оғзингдан кўриниб турмасин” (swallow a camel, but so that its tail was not visible from your mouth). “Туя сўйиб, чорласанг ҳам келмайди” (will not come even if you will call, slaughtering a camel and organizing feast), “Туя қанча бўлса – орқаси шунча”. (What a camel is, such is its back). They are alien European culture, because, not knowing about habits of a camel, a person does not know about the signs associated with it. But this conclusion cannot be called absolutely true. Because some animals are not found in England, nevertheless turned into an object of phraseological units. For example: to shed crocodile tears - "Take no notice of her crocodile tears. She is not in the less concerned about your injury” (W. Saroyan).

As you know, after swallowing the prey, the crocodile sheds tear. Those who do not know the physiological causes of this phenomenon, mistakenly think that predator cries in pity for the swallowed victim. In fact, the reason is that after a hearty meal in the animal's body, all organs and glands begin to work, including those responsible for lacrimation. Exactly with the help of tears, the crocodile gets rid of infections brought along with the prey. This has been proven by science. The

reason for the appearance of this PU in English language was that during the period of colonialism, the British captured large territories in Asia, Africa, North America and Australia. Acquaintance with the nature of those parts and caused this kind of phraseological units. Let's consider one more example. Phrase “to work like a horse” – translates into Russian phrase as follows “работать ка лошадь” and in Uzbek English: "work like a donkey". The fact, that among the simple Uzbek people a donkey, that is, the donkey was more common than the horse - an expensive animal that they could afford allow wealthy people and servants of wealthy nobles. The horse didn't do the job donkey and for the most part served only as a vehicle for the rich. And all black work was carried out with the help of donkeys, which were harnessed to wagons and carts, loaded with loads, forced to rotate mill wheels. There were comparatively fewer horses than donkeys, their meat was considered edible, so there was a different attitude towards horses than towards a donkey.

Above, we analyzed phraseological units with the names of animals in the composition, now consider linguacultural aspects of phraseological units, whose components by semantic meaning belong to to other groups. “Кўз бўямоқ” (literally: to paint the eyes) - semantic component of PU, on the first the view seems that it should have a universal character, but this is not always the case. For example: “Йўқолинглар, ифлослар, бизнинг кўзларимизни бўйй олмайсизлар, сизга бу ерда ўрин йўқ” (Get out, you bastards, you can't bullshit us, you don't belong here). In English there is a phrase “to throw dust in someone's eye” - to deceive, "powder brains" and so on. [3, p. 36]

In Uzbek, as well as in English, phraseological units express modal meanings between different subjects participating in the discourse. More precisely, the speaker can express his attitude towards the object or personal speech that is being discussed; that is, it in mini-contexts can express the meanings of probability, possibility, obligation. For example, “Кичкина деманг бизни, кўтариб урамиз сизни” (do not tell that we are small, we will lift you up and hit you earth), - in this

phraseological unit physical and intellectual ability, that is, it means that "we have enough strength and mind to win this fight." "Кемага тушганнинг жони бир" (Those who got on the ship, life and soul are one). This PU expresses the meaning of inevitability. I.e the outcome of this position is precisely known. These are just some of the modal meanings expressed by phraseological units. The meaning of inevitability can also be seen in such phraseological units, how "Етимнинг оғзи ошга етганда бурни қонайди" (as soon as the orphan starts eating pilaf, how does he get nosebleeds?) "Иши йўқ ит суғорар" (an idler waters a dog from idleness), "Teshik kuloq eshitadi" (leaky ear, sure to hear), "Khatga tushding – ўтга тушдинг" (got into the list - caught fire).

Another of the concepts implemented in PU is a moral criterion, and this pragmatic function is also quite widely common. For example: "Қир кўйлакка кишан ёқа" (to dirty shirt shackled collar), "Айтмаган жойга йўнмаган таёқ" (don't go where not invited), "Алдагани бола яхши" (it is better to deceive a child), "Онасини кўр, қизини ол" (Look at the mother and marry the daughter) "Аравасига тушдингми ашуласини ҳам айтасан" (Since you got into his cart, you will sing along to him) and so on.

Another pragmalinguistic parameter is an intellectual criterion, according to which the speaker, using phraseological units, gives a rational assessment of something, whether it is a person, any quality or relationship. For example: "Бақироқ туянинг бори яхши, бақириб тургани ундан-да яхши" (well there is noisy camel, and the fact that he sometimes calls out is even better). "Дўппини олиб қўйиб бир ўйламоқ" (take off the skullcap and think carefully), "Ёлғонни сувдек симиради" (drinks lies like water), "Zar kadrini zargar biladi" (the jeweler knows the price of gold), "Ипидан игнасиғача" (fully), "Йўлга солмоқ" (direct to true path).

The next pragmalinguistic parameter is an aesthetic criterion that is quite widespread in the world of phraseological units. For example: "Итнинг туваги олтин" (a dog has even a golden pot), "Дўпписи яримта" (half a skullcap at him),

“Даққи Юнусдан қолган” (antediluvian, left over from the time king Pea), “Тапга пишган” (language is good suspended), “егани олдида емагани кетида” (what he ate - in front of him, what he didn’t eat - behind him, that is, very prosperous), “Етти қовун пишиғи” (before that there are seven more seasons collecting melons) and so on.

With pragmalinguistic categorization the dynamic criterion is the action, expressed in PU. There are many examples of this. For example: “Хамирдан қил суғургандек” (easy, how to pull a hair out of dough), “Ҳукизнинг қулоғига тамбур чертмоқ” (play a musical instrument before ox ears), “Ҳода ютган” (who swallowed log), “Эшикдан хайдасангб деразадан киради” (if you drive it through the door, it will climb into the window).

The manifestation of pragmalinguistic categories in phraseological units is the norm for semantic language systems. In FE people, animals, things or phenomena are nominated from the standpoint of the norm. For example: “зиғирдек кичик” (small, like a flaxseed), “зуваласи бир жойдан олинган” (two pair of boots), “зиғир ёғи ичган одамдек” (as a person who drank flaxseed oil), зиғир ёғи ичмаганда бўғилиб гапирмасди (if you hadn’t drunk linseed oil, you wouldn’t would be so hoarse). “ишлар михдек” (cases good as a nail) and so on. More precisely, if condition is normal, then no one would have him evaluate, describe or give an emotionally expressive assessment. The thing is that the concept of norm in different cultures is different. Based on this, representatives of different cultures, in different ways evaluate the same situation. For example, in the Uzbek language there is a phraseological phrase “меҳмон отангдан улуғ” (the guest is higher than the father), but in European culture the guest is not exalted so much so that the PUs associated with the guest are rare.

In the process of our learning of adjective-component phrases in English, they are mainly used as a determiner or as a predicate, and in Uzbek they are used as attributive adjectives. According to their grammatical and morphological structure, we can divide them as follows;

1. Adjectival component with positive degree. Big mouth-katta og`iz; An old chestnut-siyqasi chiqqan gap.
2. Adjectival component with comparative degree. Blood is thicker than water-etni tirnoqdan ajratib bo`lmas.
3. Adjectival component with superlative degree. Your nearest and dearest-yaqin qadrdonlar.
4. Adjectival component with comparative phrases. As gentle as a lamb-qo`zichoqdek yuvosh.
5. Adjectival component associated with “and”. Alive and well-soppa sog`, hayot va sog`lom. [13]

Consider another phraseological unit with adjective components that demonstrates cultural differences. In English there is a phrase “to make a confession”, meaning repentance. It has two synonyms: 1) to come clean (clear); 2) to make a clean breast (purify the soul). Repentance among Christians is usually done in churches, in special rooms where the church worker cannot see the visitor repent of a person's sins. Representative clergy and man do not see each other and talking through the window. The mystery of repentance is guaranteed. But in some cases, ministers of churches violate this rule and report to the appropriate authorities that had to be kept secret and as a result, a person who repented of sins may get injured. In Uzbek and Islamic culture in general there is no such. Those who would like to repent of their sins do not go to the representatives of the clergy, but they perform repentance during prayer, reading special prayers to yourself. Recently, some young Uzbek writers are trying to present in their works something similar when they heroes repent of their sins. But it's nothing but imitation of Western culture. From what has been said, it can be seen that cultural rooted in the minds of the people much deeper, what linguists think.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the units of the phraseological fund with adjective components are a special, specific layer of vocabulary, which has a variety of structure, performing

different functions in speech and endowed with a special semantic coherence. The semantics of phraseological units is very closely related to the context. and, as a rule, is endowed with an expressive component of meaning.

In addition, phraseology has its own paradigmatics (synonyms, antonyms, semantic-syntactic variants, phraseological-semantic groups) and syntagmatics (phrases in the form of a phrase), valency and distribution (phraseological derivation), they form a complete system as a result of interaction. Consequently, phraseological units, like the word, perform the functions of a means of communication and tasks in terms of functional nomination in the language. Another feature of them is the presence of both lower and upper level elements in them.

RECOMENDATION

Phraseological units with adjective components form an open flexible system, with the possibility of moving combinations closer to the core or further from it, up to before leaving the phraseological fund. The phraseological system in each language has its own characteristics and differs from the lexical system in the way its units are formed, since phraseological units consist of words and are equal in structure to a phrase or sentence. The fact that words and phraseological units can be used as a sentence is their general similarity. However, the units of the phraseological system are close to the sentence level in their structural form, and some of them in their functions.

Usually linguists do not pay attention for the study of linguacultural phraseological units similar to by value, but rather tend to look for phraseological units' exotic character. Such an aspiration can't be called wrong. However, when study of cultural difference, the focus should not be on the search for concepts, available in one language and absent in different, but available in both languages, but manifested in different ways.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Chikina E.E. Identification of the national-cultural specifics of phraseological units: modern // International scientific- practical journal "INTERCULTUR@L-NET": Vladimir, 2004.)
- [2]. Dobrovolsky DO. National and cultural specificity in phraseology // Questions of linguistics. M., 1997. - No. 6. pp. 37-48.
- [3]. Khakimova, G. E. Phraseological units; etymology of cognitive aspects / G. E. Khaki- mov // Uzmu khabarlari. - 2014. - No. 5. - B. 3–41.
- [4]. Maslova, V. A. Linguistics / V. A. Maslova. - M., 2004. - 204 p.
- [5]. (Maslova V. A. Linguoculturology: textbook allowance for students. higher textbook establishments. M.: 9, p. 87)
- [6]. Prokhorov Yu.E., Linguistic and regional studies. Cultural studies. Country Studies: Theory and practice of teaching Rus. lang. as a foreign language: Method. allowance for Russian students and teachers of Russian. lang. foreigners / Yu. E. Prokhorov; In-t rus. lang. them. A. S. Pushkin, 108 p. 1998.
- [7]. Shmeleva T. M. Noun polystandards in English stable comparisons / T. M. Shmeleva // Actual problems of psycholinguistics. - Tver, 1996. 4. Rakhmatullaev, Sh. - T., 2003. - 485 P. 5.
- [8]. Smith, W. Y. The Oxford Dictionary of English proverbs / W. Y. Smith. – Oxford, 1936.
- [9]. (Ter-Minasova S.G. Language and intercultural communication. M.: Slovo, 2000. 624 p.
- [10]. Telia V. N. Primary tasks and methodological problems studies of the phraseological composition of the language in the context of culture. // Phraseology in the context of culture. M., 1999. P. 6-12.
- [11]. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English language. – Boston, 2010.
- [12]. Umarkhodzhaev, M. I. Fundamentals of phraseography / M. I. Umarkhodzhaev. - T., 1983. - 144 p.

[13]. Kholmatova M.I. Ingliz va o`zbek tillaridagi sifat komponentli frazemalarning lingvokulturologik qiyosiy tahlili. DOI: 10.24412/2181-1385-2021-12-1391-1397