

СЎЗ САЊАТИ ХАЛҚАРО ЖУРНАЛИ

9 ЖИЛД, 1 СОН

МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА

ТОМ 9, НОМЕР 1

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF WORD ART

VOLUME 9, ISSUE 1



СЎЗ САНЪАТИ ХАЛҚАРО ЖУРНАЛИ

МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА | INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF WORD ART

№1 (2026) DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.26739/2181-9297-2026-1>

Бош муҳаррир:
Тўхтасинов Илҳом
п.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Бош муҳаррир ўринбосари:

Главный редактор:
Тухтасинов Илхом
д.п.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Заместитель главного редактора:

Editor in Chief:
Tuhtasinov Ilhom
DSc. Professor (Uzbekistan)

Deputy Chief Editor

ТАҲРИРИЙ МАСЛАҲАТ КЕНГАШИ

Назаров Бахтиёр
академик. (Ўзбекистон)

Якуб Умарўғли
ф.ф.д., профессор (Туркия)

Алмаз Улви Биннатова
ф.ф.д., профессор (Озарбайжон)

Бокиева Гуландом
ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Миннуллин Ким
ф.ф.д., профессор (Татаристон)

Махмудов Низомиддин
ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Керимов Исмаил
ф.ф.д., профессор (Россия)

Жўраев Маматкул
ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Куренов Рахиммамед
к.ф.н. (Туркменистон)

Кристофер Жеймс Форт
Мичиган университети (АҚШ)

Умархўжаев Мухтор
ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Мирзаев Ибодулло
ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Болтабоев Ҳамидулла
ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Дўстмухаммедов Хуршид
ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Лиходзиевский А.С.
ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Сиддикова Ирода
ф.ф.д., профессор (Ўзбекистон)

Шнукашвили Тамар
ф.ф.д. (Грузия)

Туробов Бекпулат
масъул қотиб, PhD, доцент
(Ўзбекистон)

Мўминова Маъсума Ғолиб қизи
ф.ф.д., (PhD) вб. доцент

РЕДАКЦИОННЫЙ СОВЕТ

Назаров Бахтиёр
академик. (Ўзбекистан)

Якуб Умар оғли
д.ф.н., профессор (Туркия)

Алмаз Улви Биннатова
д.ф.н., профессор (Азербайджан)

Бакиева Гуландом
д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Миннуллин Ким
д.ф.н., профессор (Татарстан)

Махмудов Низомиддин
д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Керимов Исмаил
д.ф.н., профессор (Россия)

Джўраев Маматкул
д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Куренов Рахиммамед
к.ф.н. (Туркменистан)

Кристофер Джеймс Форт
Университет Мичигана (США)

Умархаджаев Мухтар
д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Мирзаев Ибодулло
д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Балтабаев Ҳамидулла
д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Дўстмухаммедов Хуршид
д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Лиходзиевский А.С.
д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Сиддикова Ирода
д.ф.н., профессор (Ўзбекистан)

Шнукашвили Тамар
д.ф.н. (Грузия)

Туробов Бекпулат
отв. секретарь, PhD, доцент
(Ўзбекистан)

Муминова Масума Ғолиб қизи
PhD и.о. доцент

EDITORIAL BOARD

Bakhtiyor Nazarov
academician. (Uzbekistan)

Yakub Umarogli
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Turkey)

Almaz Ulvi Binnatova
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Azerbaijan)

Bakieva Gulandom
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Uzbekistan)

Minnulin Kim
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Tatarstan)

Mahmudov Nizomiddin
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Uzbekistan)

Kerimov Ismail
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Russia)

Juraev Mamatkul
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Uzbekistan)

Kurenov Rakhimmamed
Ph.D. Ass. Prof. (Turkmenistan)

Christopher James Fort
University of Michigan (USA)

Umarchodjaev Mukhtar
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Uzbekistan)

Mirzaev Ibodulla
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Uzbekistan)

Boltaboev Hamidulla
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Uzbekistan)

Dustmuhammadov Khurshid
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Uzbekistan)

Lixodzievsky A.S.
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Uzbekistan)

Siddiqova Iroda
Doc. of philol. scien., prof. (Uzbekistan)

Shiukashvili Tamar
Doc. of philol. scien. (Georgia)

Turobov Bekpulat
PhD Ass. prof. Senior Secretary
(Uzbekistan)

Mo'minova Ma'suma
PhD Acting Docent
(Uzbekistan)

PageMaker | Верстка | Саҳифаловчи: Хуршид Мирзахмедов

Контакт редакций журналов. www.tadqiqot.uz
ООО Tadqiqot город Ташкент,
улица Амира Темура пр.1, дом-2.
Web: <http://www.tadqiqot.uz/>; E-mail: info@tadqiqot.uz
Тел: (+998-94) 404-0000

Editorial staff of the journals of www.tadqiqot.uz
Tadqiqot LLC The city of Tashkent,
Amir Temur Street pr.1, House 2.
Web: <http://www.tadqiqot.uz/>; E-mail: info@tadqiqot.uz
Phone: (+998-94) 404-0000

1. Tursunova Parvina Mamurjonovna NUTQIY HUSHMUOMALALIK IFODALANISHIDA YOLG‘ON ISHLATILISHINING PRAGMATIK XUSUSIYATLARI (ISPAN TILI MATERIALLARI ASOSIDA).....	5
2. Умурова Гузал Хотамовна ПСИХОЛОГИЯ ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОГО ТВОРЧЕСТВА - ЗНАЧИМОСТЬ КОМПЛЕКСНОГО ПОДХОДА К ИЗУЧЕНИЮ И ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ТВОРЧЕСКОЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ.....	10
3. Даминова Фазода Ирисовна ТЕОРЕТИКО-ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЕ И МИРОВОЗЗРЕНЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ ДРЕВНЕРУССКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ.....	15
4. Рахматова Гулнора Турсиновна ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ И РАЗВИТИЕ НАУЧНО-ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОЙ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ В УЗБЕКСКОМ И РУССКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ: РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ КОРПУСНОГО АНАЛИЗА.....	22
5. Усманова Салиха Юлдашевна ИЗ ИСТОРИИ ИЗУЧЕНИЯ ВВОДНО-МОДАЛЬНЫХ ЕДИНИЦ В РУССКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИИ.....	32
6. Ибаев Анвар Журабекович ФРАЗЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ ОККАЗИОНАЛЬНАЯ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ И ЕЁ ТИПЫ.....	41
7. Т.А.Эргашева СОЛИҚ РЕЗИДЕНТИ ТУШУНЧАСИНИНГ ХАЛҚАРО ҲУЖЖАТЛАРДАГИ ПРАГМАЛИНГВИСТИК ТАҲЛИЛИ.....	47
8. Nomozov Abdiaziz Mustaqimovich ARAB VA INGLIZ MUROJAAT SHAKLLARINING QIYOSIY-PRAGMATIK TAHLILI: ZAMONAVIY KOMMUNIKATSIYA KONTEKSTIDA.....	52
9. Davlatova Hulkaroy Uktamovna RAQAMLI MUHITDA BOLALIK: ZAMONAVIY SHAROITDA TIL O‘ZLASHTIRISH OMILLARI.....	58
10. Abdunazarova Maftuna Fakhriddinovna PRAGMATIC AND FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS IN DIALOGIC DISCOURSE.....	64
11. Nomozov Abdiaziz Mustaqimovich ARAB VA INGLIZ MUROJAAT SHAKLLARINING QIYOSIY-PRAGMATIK TAHLILI: ZAMONAVIY KOMMUNIKATSIYA KONTEKSTIDA.....	71
12. Nilufar Abduraxmonova, Abdullayeva Shakhnoza Rakhimjon qizi ONTOLOGICAL MODELING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TERMS IN UZBEK.....	77
13. Aybibi ISKANDAROVA O‘ZBEK KORPUSSHUNOSLIGIDA PARALLEL KORPUSGA OID TADQIQOTLAR VA ULARNING LINGVISTIK AHAMIYATI.....	87
14. Abdullaeva Sanobar Bakhrillaevna THEORETICAL STUDY OF PHRASEOLOGY IN THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM.....	93
15. Воҳидов Абдувахоб САМАРҚАНД ТОЖИКЛАРИ ШЕВАСИ ФРАЗЕОЛОГИК ЖУФТ ТАРКИБЛАРИ ҲАҚИДА БАЪЗИ МУЛОҲАЗАЛАР.....	99
16. Усманова Салиха Юлдашевна, Мирзаева Шахло Ризаевна ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ГЛАГОЛОВ, СПОСОБНЫХ ПРИНИМАТЬ ПРЕДИКАТНЫЙ АКТАНТ.....	104

17. Zaynutdinova Durdona Asatovna ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AS A TOOL FOR DEVELOPING COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (Evidence from EFL Settings in the Republic of Uzbekistan).....	109
18. Atabayeva Zarnigor Bakhran kizi THE DEMONIZATION OF DORIAN GRAY: AESTHETICISM, MORAL DECLINE, AND THE DUALITY OF HUMAN NATURE IN VICTORIAN LITERATURE.....	118
19. Ochilova Noila Farmonovna O‘ZBEK ADABIYOTSHUNOSLIGIDA “OTA”KONSEPTINING TALQINI.....	122
20. Abduraxmonova Sohiba Aktam qizi BOLALAR NUTQINING O‘RGANILISHI (ESKI NAZARIYALARDAN ZAMONAVIY YONDASHUVLARGACHA).....	126
21. Sharipov Raufjon Elmurod o‘g‘li AKADEMIK G‘ANIJON ABDURAHMONOVNING “TARIXIY SINTAKSIS” ASARIDA QO‘SHMA GAPLAR EVOLYUTSIYASI.....	130
22. Said-Axmedova Shoxista Nuritdinovna AGENTLIK TUSHUNCHASINING LINGVISTIK TADQIQI.....	135
23. Nilufar Abduraxmonova, Nilufar Botirova SIYOSIY SOHAGA DOIR TARJIMA LUG‘ATINI SHAKLLANTIRISHDA PARALLEL MATNLARNING KONTEKSTUAL TAHLILI.....	141
24. N.M.Shamuradova INGLIZ TILIDA SO‘Z ODOBINI IFODALOVCHI MAQOLLARNING DISKURSIV-PRAGMATIK XUSUSIYATLARI.....	148
25. Sevinch Sherzodovna Xolmirzayeva ITALYAN TILIDAGI KO‘P MA‘NOLI SO‘ZLARNING TARJIMADA MA‘NO FARQLANISHI.....	152
26. Башарова Лейла РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИЯ И ВОСПРИЯТИЕ АНТРОПОМОРФНЫХ ЖИВОТНЫХ В ДЕТСКИХ КНИГАХ И ИХ ВЛИЯНИЕ НА СОЗНАНИЕ И РАЗВИТИЕ РЕБЕНКА.....	158
27. Ivanova Alena Yadmagievna TACTILE GESTURES IN CHINESE EVERYDAY COMMUNICATION: TYPOLOGY, FUNCTIONS, CULTURAL MARKEDNESS.....	165
28. Ozoda Tojiboyeva, Xasanova Shaxodat Xamza qizi O‘ZBEK MUMTOZ ADABIYOTIDA HADISLARDAN FOYDALANISH AN‘ANASI.....	175
29. Asqar Abdullaev SYNTACTIC STRUCTURES: ESSENCE, TYPES, AND STUDIES IN GLOBAL LINGUISTICS.....	180
30. Nuraliyeva Ozoda Narbayevna FOLKLOR MATNLARIDA IQLIM HODISALARINING RAMZIY BADIYATI.....	185
31. Сабина Авазжоновна Махмудова ОСОБЕННОСТИ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИИ КОНЦЕПТА «ВОЙНА» В РОМАНЕ Р. ОЛДИНГТОНА «СМЕРТЬ ГЕРОЯ».....	193
32. Nasrullayev Javohirxon Ravshanxonovich RAQAMLI HUQUQIY MULOQOTDA YURIDIK TERMINLARNING IJTIMOY-LISONIY MOSLASHUVI.....	200



ISSN: 2181-9297

www.tadqiqot.uz

Abdullaeva Sanobar Bakhrillaevna


Samarkand state institute of foreign languages

Doctor of Philosophy on Philological Sciences (PhD)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5093-5934>

Email: sanobar-abdullaeva@mail.ru

THEORETICAL STUDY OF PHRASEOLOGY IN THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM

 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20814859>

ABSTRACT

This article explores theoretical issues of phraseological units from anthropocentric point of view. We examine how different scientists researched anthropocentric methods of studying of phraseology. Anthropocentric approach becomes popular in modern linguistics because it studies relationship between human and language. There are main peculiarities of phraseology such as linguistic and extralinguistic which demonstrate emotions, brightness of the certain culture or nation via language. Linguistic features are stability, motivation, idiomaticity, and extralinguistic aspects include relation of phraseological units with culture, history, religion, lifestyle of the people. According to linguists, phraseological units have different types and degrees of stability, motivation, idiomaticity which reflected in our article.

Keywords: linguistics, phraseological units, culture, lifestyle, paradigm, anthropocentric paradigm, cognitive, emotional

Abdullayeva Sanobar Baxrillayevna

Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti

Filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5093-5934>

Email: sanobar-abdullaeva@mail.ru

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada frazeologik birliklarning nazariy masalalari antroposentrik nuqtai nazardan ko'rib chiqilgan. Turli olimlar frazeologiyani o'rganish uchun antroposentrik usullarni qanday o'rganganliklarini ko'rib chiqilgan. Antroposentrik yondashuv zamonaviy tilshunoslikda mashhur bo'lib ketdi, chunki u odamlar va til o'rtasidagi munosabatni o'rganadi. Frazeologiya til orqali ma'lum bir madaniyat yoki millatning hissiyotini va jonliligini namoyish etuvchi asosiy lingvistik va ekstralingvistik xususiyatlarga ega. Lingvistik xususiyatlarga barqarorlik, motivatsiya va idiomatiklik kiradi, ekstralingvistik jihatlarga esa frazeologik birliklarning madaniyat, tarix, din va turmush tarzi bilan bog'liqligi kiradi. Tilshunoslarning fikriga ko'ra, frazeologik birliklar turli xil turlar va darajalarda barqarorlik, motivatsiya va idiomatiklikka ega bo'lganligi maqolada aks etgan. Kalit so'zlar: tilshunoslik, frazeologik birliklar, madaniyat, turmush tarzi, paradigma, antroposentrik paradigma, kognitiv, emotsional

Абдуллаева Санобар БахриллаевнаСамаркандский институт иностранных языков
Доктор философии (PhD) по филологическим наукам
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5093-5934>
Email: sanobar-abdullaeva@mail.ru**АННОТАЦИЯ**

В данной статье рассматриваются теоретические вопросы фразеологических единиц с антропоцентрической точки зрения. Мы исследуем, как различные ученые изучали антропоцентрические методы исследования фразеологии. Антропоцентрический подход стал популярным в современной лингвистике, поскольку он изучает взаимосвязь между человеком и языком. Существуют основные особенности фразеологии, такие как лингвистические и экстралингвистические, которые демонстрируют эмоции, яркость определенной культуры или нации посредством языка. Лингвистические особенности включают стабильность, мотивацию, идиоматичность, а экстралингвистические аспекты включают связь фразеологических единиц с культурой, историей, религией, образом жизни людей. По мнению лингвистов, фразеологические единицы имеют различные типы и степени стабильности, мотивации и идиоматичности, что отражено в нашей статье.

Ключевые слова: лингвистика, фразеологические единицы, культура, образ жизни, парадигма, антропоцентрическая парадигма, когнитивный, эмоциональный

INTRODUCTION. Being a branch of linguistics that studies stable word combinations (phraseological units), their origin, structure, meaning and functioning in language, phraseology attracts the attention of linguists in the aspect of linguocultology, pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, etc. Phraseological units are characterized by several important features: stability, integrity of meaning, imagery. This gives the language expressiveness and emotional intensity, national and cultural specifics, in other words, phraseological units reflect the peculiarities of the worldview, traditions and history of a particular people.

Phraseology deals with the classification of phraseological units, the study of their origin (etymology), including historical and social contexts, and the analysis of their role in creating literary style and artistic expression.

In the world phraseological science there are schools of outstanding linguists studying stylistic, system-structural, functional, socio-cultural, lexicographic features of set phrases. Among them are such scientists as A. Mackay, Sh. Bally, L. Smith, V.V. Vinogradov, F.F. Fortunatov, A.A. Potebnya, N.Sh. Shansky, F.I. Buslaev, N.N. Amosova, A.V. Kunin, V.N. Telia, E.F. Arsenyeva.

Uzbek linguists such as A.E. Mamatov, S. Shomaksudov, A.T. Bushuy, S. Rakhmatullaev, D. Khudaiberganova, M. Sadikova, M. Umarchodzhayeva made a significant contribution to the development of phraseological science.

ANTHROPOCENTRIC ASPECT OF PHRASEOLOGICAL STUDIES. In the late 20th and early 21st centuries, the anthropocentric paradigm replaced the system-structural and static research models in linguistic science (Vorkachev 2001: 64).

According to T. Kuhn's concept, the reasons for the paradigm shift are as follows:

- a) the previous paradigm is unable to adequately describe and explain linguistic reality;
- b) science in its current state ceases to meet the current needs of society (Lukin 2015: 10).

The gradual transition from structuralism to anthropocentrism in linguistics is largely due to the change in priorities and methodological guidelines that emerged in the science of language in the second half of the XX – early XXI century. Structuralism, which was based on the works of Ferdinand de Saussure and subsequent schools such as the Prague School or Copenhagen Glossematics, considered language as a formal system of signs abstracted from the native speaker and the context of its use. This direction emphasized the internal structure of the language, its syntactic and semantic relations, without fully considering the role of man as a subject using the language.

However, the second half of the 20th century brought changes related to the development of cognitive science, psycholinguistics, and cognitive linguistics. Language began to be considered not only as a system of signs, but also as a part of thought processes reflecting mental concepts and categorization of experience. The cognitive turn in linguistics has led to a shift in attention to how a person recognizes, interprets, and uses linguistic signs in the context of their perception of the world. In addition, there was an interest in pragmatics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis, which focused on the functioning of language in real communicative situations. Language was no longer just a set of abstract forms, but an instrument of interaction determined by context, speaker's intentions, and social and cultural aspects of communication. Linguistics began to study language as a part of human life, its use in specific socio-cultural conditions, rather than as an isolated system. Along with this, there is a growing interest in interdisciplinary approaches, when linguistics interacted with philosophy, anthropology, cultural studies, psychology, and neuroscience. These fields emphasized that language is not only a structural system, but also a means of expressing human experience, thought processes, perception, and social interactions.

Thus, anthropocentrism in linguistics began to replace structuralism, as new approaches began to require consideration of the human factor: language as a tool for creating and interpreting meanings, and not just as a formal system. This shift was caused by the need to better understand the role of humans in the process of communication, perception, and meaning-making.

Anthropocentrism is, in fact, a philosophical and cultural concept in which a person and his interests are considered as central, dominating the perception and understanding of the world. In the dictionary of linguistic terms by S.S. Safarov, anthropocentrism is understood as the study of the language system from the point of view of meeting human needs [Sh. Safarov, 2023, b. 20]. The anthropocentric approach to language involves revealing the peculiarities of the thinking of a particular people and reflecting their unique national identity (Mamatov 2020: 24-32). The concept of the anthropocentricity of language is central to modern linguistics. It involves the study of man in language and language in man (Maslova 2001: 3). This approach allows us to consider language as an integral part of human consciousness, culture and worldview.

LINGUISTIC AND EXTRALINGUISTIC MEANINGS OF ANTHROPOCENTRIC PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS. Phraseologisms of anthropocentric nature have both linguistic and extralinguistic meanings that manifest themselves in language and culture through their connection with human life, emotions, actions, and perception of the world. The Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics notes that the word “linguistic” refers to an approach that characterizes the properties of the science of linguistics (Crystal 2008: 282). In the linguistic sense, anthropocentric phraseologisms are characterized by stability of meaning, semantic motivation, and invariability of form, including the metaphorical nature of expressions, their idiomaticity, and emotional coloring. They are fixed in the lexical content of the phraseologism, its grammar, and structure, conveying meanings associated with a person, his qualities, actions, or states.

The stability of phraseological units implies their immutability and is connected with the concept of invariance, i.e. even with successive changes of the system, its invariants retain their stability (Kunin 1996: 24). A.V. Kunin, in his work, points out that different classes of phraseological units have both general and specific features of stability, due to which they are used in an unchanged form. Four main features of stability constitute the minimum level of phraseological stability: stability of use, semantic complexity, separate design, inability to be formed according to the original structural-semantic model of free combination of words (Kunin 1996: 24-25).

Slovak linguist P. Kvetko classifies the stability of idioms from a semantic point of view. The following variations of changeable idioms are distinguished: grammatical, lexical, spelling, geographical (Kvetko 2009:104-105).

From the above opinions of scientists, it is clear that the stability of phraseological units is not a rigid immutability, but rather a tendency to reproduce in a certain form. At the level of dictionaries and theoretical descriptions, idioms appear fixed, but in real language they demonstrate variability. This shows that stability is not an absolute property, but a relative characteristic that depends on the context.

Phraseological units are motivated. H. Barkema believes that motivation depends on the speakers' judgment of the relationship between the literal and conceptual figurative meanings of idiomatic expressions (Barkema 1996: 129). Analyzing phraseological semantics in context, N.Sh. Amriddinova indicates that semantic motivation is determined by the transmission of the internal structure of a phraseological unit, which in turn is characterized by separate design and the impossibility of determining the meaning of a phraseological unit based on the meanings of its individual components (Amriddinova 2021: 50).

The Swedish scientist M.H. Svensson's opinion, the phenomenon of motivation of expressions is flexible and subjective. It is connected with the possibility of analyzing the contribution of individual components to the overall meaning of the expression, however, this process depends on the perception of native speakers (Svensson 2008: 83).

Another linguistic meaning of phraseological units is idiomaticity. The idiomaticity of a phraseological unit is that its meaning cannot be fully determined based only on the meanings of the individual words of which it consists (Zinchenko 2007: 32). Ch. Filmore notes that understanding idiomatic expressions requires deep knowledge of the language (Filmore 1988: 501-538).

The concept of "extralinguistic" means "outside the language system", as well as phenomena that have a certain meaning in the functioning of language (Safarov 2023: 104).

Extralinguistic meanings go outside of language, linking phraseological units with culture, history, social environment and psychology. Phraseologisms become carriers of ethnocultural information, allowing us to explore how different peoples perceive human nature and interact with the world around them.

Dealing with the cultural connotation of English idioms, Wang Yang argues that language is a mandatory element of culture because it preserves and transmits its values as well as plays a crucial role in its existence (Wang Yan 2017: 16).

A number of phraseological units and proverbs arose on a religious basis. According to M.R. Galieva, the religious worldview represents a special view of the world, which, along with the national worldview, forms a unique worldview, moral values and spiritual insight characteristic of a particular nation in its attitude to the surrounding reality (Galieva 2023: 101).

Phraseological units reflect national and cultural characteristics by describing lifestyle of the people, their traditions, customs, values. L.A. Sidorova and A.A. Ivanova studied the traditions and customs of the English people. They noted that phraseological units demonstrate love for family and home, reverent attitude to religion and the tea ceremony, careful attitude to time, originality, reasonable handling of money, love for animals (Sidorova, Ivanova 2021: 287-289).

Kyrgyz scientists U.K. Kadyrkulova and A. Asanbayeva, in their study on phraseological units reflecting the nomadic way of life of the Kyrgyz people, identify the main cultural codes among Kyrgyz phraseological units: vegetative, zoomorphic, somatic, subject, food, color, temporal (Kadyrkulova, Asanbayeva 2018: 172-174).

CONCLUSION. Language becomes a tool through which a person makes sense of the world around him, expresses his emotions, values and social attitudes. Within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm, the processes reflecting the interrelation of language with human cognitive activity, mental models and individual experience are investigated.

So, phraseological units are filled with linguistic and extralinguistic meanings to varying degrees. They interact and complement each other, because people's language and worldview are inseparable.

References:

1. Амриддинова Н.Ш. Принципы актуализации фразеологической семантики в контексте (на материале современного английского языка): (PhD) дисс. ... докт. филос. по фил. наук. – Самарканд, 2021. – 173 с.

2. Воркачев С. Г. Лингвокультурология, языковая личность, концепт: становление антропоцентрической парадигмы в языкознании // Филологические науки - 2001 - № 1. - С. 64-72.
3. Зинченко А.В. Идиоматичность как проявление структурно-семантической аналогии единиц лексико-фразеологической системы: на материале адъективных фразеологизмов и прилагательных: автореферат. – Иваново, 2007. – 213 с.
4. Кадыркулова У.К., А Асанбаева А. Фразеологизмы, отражающие кочевой образ жизни кыргызского народа. Вестник Бишкекского гуманитарного университета. – Бишкек: Бишкекский гуманитарный университет им. академика К. Карасаева, 2018. – №3 – С. 172-174.
5. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. Уч. пос. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз.– Дубна: Феникс, 2005. – 488 с.
6. Лукин, О. В. Новые направления современного языкознания: учебное пособие. – Ярославль: РИО ЯГПУ, 2015. – 80 с.
7. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология: учебное пособие. – 2-е изд. пер. и доп. – М.: Юрайт, 2023. – 208 с.
8. Реформатский А.А. Введение в языковедение. - издание 5-е, исправленное. - М.: «Аспект пресс», 2005. - 536 с.
9. Сафаров Ш. Тилшунослик терминлари луғати “Луғат”. – Т.: “Lesson press” нашриёти, 2023. – 356 б.
10. Сидорова Л.А., Иванова А.А. Фразеологические единицы, отражающие традиции и обычаи английского народа // Актуальные вопросы филологии, межкультурной коммуникации и лингводидактики. Сбор. науч. ст. по материалам XXX Международной научно-практической конференции. – Чебоксары: Чувашский государственный педагогический университет им. И.Я. Яковлева, 26 апреля 2021. – апр. – С. 287-289.
11. Barkema H. Idiomaticity and terminology: a multi-dimensional descriptive model // Studia Linguistica. – Nijmegen: Radboud Repository, 1996. – 50/ 2 – P. 125-160.
12. Crystal D. Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. – Oxford: Blackwell Pub. 2008. – 529 p.
13. Dobrovolskiy D., Piirainen E. “Idioms: Motivation and etymology”, Yearbook of Phraseology. – Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2010. – P. 71-96.
14. Filmore, Ch. J., Kay P., O'Connor M. C. Regularity and Idiomaticity in Grammatical Constructions: The Case of Let Alone. – Washington DC: Linguistic Society of America, 1988. - vol. 64, N 3. – P. 501-538.
15. Galieva M.R. National-Cultural Specificity of Biblical Idioms // Нижневартковский филологический вестник. – Нижневартковск: НВГУ, 2023. – №2. – С. 99-110.
16. Kvetko P. English lexicology in theory and practice. – Trnava: Univerzita sv Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave, 2009. – 203 p.
17. Nasrullaeva, N. Z. (2018). The formation of gender concepts in the English and Uzbek phraseological world vision. Abstract of doctoral dissertation. Tashkent, 2018. – 74 p.
18. Nasrullaeva, N. Z. English-Russian-Uzbek dictionary of genderly marked phraseological units. Tashkent: Navruz, 2018. – 142 p.
19. Mamatov A. Anthropocentric study of phraseological units with an adjective component. Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal. – Jizzakh: JSPU, 2020. – 1(01). – P. 24–32.
20. Svensson M.H. A very complex criterion of fixedness: Non-compositionality. // Phraseology : an interdisciplinary perspective. – Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2008. – P. 81-92.
21. Сидорова Л.А., Иванова А.А. Фразеологические единицы, отражающие традиции и обычаи английского народа // Актуальные вопросы филологии, межкультурной коммуникации и лингводидактики. Сбор. науч. ст. по материалам XXX Международной научно-практической конференции. – Чебоксары: Чувашский государственный педагогический университет им. И.Я. Яковлева, 26 апреля 2021. – апр. – С. 287-289.

22. Wang Yan. On Cultural Connotations of English Idioms // Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 121, 3rd International Conference on Humanities and Social Science Research. – Amsterdam: Atlantis Press, 2017. – P.156-159.

СЎЗ САНЪАТИ ХАЛҚАРО ЖУРНАЛИ

МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF WORD ART

Контакт редакций журналов. www.tadqiqot.uz
ООО Тадқиқот город Ташкент,
улица Амира Темура пр.1, дом-2.
Web: <http://www.tadqiqot.uz/>; E-mail: info@tadqiqot.uz
Тел: (+998-94) 404-0000

Editorial staff of the journals of www.tadqiqot.uz
Tadqiqot LLC The city of Tashkent,
Amir Temur Street pr.1, House 2.
Web: <http://www.tadqiqot.uz/>; E-mail: info@tadqiqot.uz
Phone: (+998-94) 404-0000