• [ɣ] became [j] (a voiced palatal fricative; it would later become [j], but not before the loss of older /j/ in certain positions discussed below)

The contexts for palatalisation were sometimes different for different sounds:

• Before /i, iː, j/, for example:

○ *cīdan* ("to chide"), *bēċ* ("books", from earlier */ˈboːkiz/), *sēċan* ("seek", from earlier */ˈsoːkijanã/) (/k/ > /tʃ/)*bryċġ* ("bridge", from earlier West Germanic */ˈbruggjo:/ after Proto-Germanic */bruɣjoː/) ([gg] > [ddʒ])*ġiefþ* ("gives") ([ɣ] > [j])

List of used literature

1. Sh.M.Mirziyoyev. President Decree 4947 «On Uzbekistan's development Strategy " February 7, 2017. p.87-88

2. Arakin V.D. The History of English Language, 2003.Old English/Anglo-Saxon (Englisc). p.129.

3. *Baker, Peter S. (2007).* Introduction to Old English *(2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.* ISBN 978-1-4051-5272-3. *p.233*

4. *Campbell, A. (1959). Old English Grammar.* Oxford*:* Oxford University Press*.* ISBN 0-19-811943-7. *p.98-102.*

5. Cercignani, Fausto *(1983). "The Development of */k/ and */sk/ in Old English". Journal of English and Germanic Philology. 82 (3): p.313–323.*

6. Lass, Roger *(27 January 2000).* The Cambridge History of the English Language Volume 3. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 64.*

7. Юсупов, О. (2019). Инглиз лексик дублетларининг лингвокультурологик таҳлили. *Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование*, (3 (72)), 69-73.

8. Tukhtasinov, I., & Otabek, Y. (2022). Teaching a Foreign Language According to Age Groups. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, *22*(2), 238-246.

9. Jabbarovna, S. N. (2020). DISCURSIVE-PRAGMATIC AND LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF THE EVENT OF THE EVALUATION CATEGORY IN THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF THE WORLD (IN THE MATERIAL IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES). *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, *17*(7), 8303-8312.

10.Sulaymanova, N. J. (2020). ABOUT DIVIDING SYNTACTIC SEMANTIC FEATURES OF COMPONENTS. In *НАУКА И ИННОВАЦИИ В XXI ВЕКЕ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ, ОТКРЫТИЯ И ДОСТИЖЕНИЯ* (pp. 124-128).

11.Yusupov, O. Y. (2021). The russification legacy of historical monuments of Uzbekistan. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *5*(S1), 1535-1539.

12.Сулайманова, Н. Ж. (2019). ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ БАРЬЕРЫ И МЕТОДЫ ИХ ПРЕОДОЛЕНИЯ В ПРОЦЕССЕ ОБУЧЕНИЯ ИНОСТРАННЫМ ЯЗЫКАМ. In *Россия-Узбекистан. Международные образовательные и социально-культурные технологии: векторы развития* (pp. 220-221).

THE USAGE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH PROPER NAMES

Xushmuradova Xolida (master degree student)
SamSIFL, teacher
Ochilova Noila Farmonovna

Annotation: The analysis of language means used to reflect cultural realias is a topical problem of modern linguistics development. Among its important directions is the studyof the phraseological consistency. The analysis of systemic connections and relations within the limits of phraseological units is of the primary importance. Among the least investigated aspects of phraseological unit analysis are those connected with the nature and the peculiarities of its constituent parts. This fact points to the ***topicality*** of the paper, which **aims** a tthe analysis of phraseological units with proper names in the English language. The primary **task** of the study is to consider syntactical characteristics of the phraseological units with the component proper name.

Keywords: Proper names, phraseological units, language, analysis, method.

Proper names are very important units of communication. Their functional and social significance is proved by the fact that there is no a single person without a name [1, p. 3]. Proper name is the means of individualization and identification of a number of geographical objects, playing an important role in the

lifeof society. This point to the necessity of athorough analysis of the nature of proper names, their role and place in the languages system [2, 217].

The phraseological unit is formed in the course of the special linguistic process - phraseologization. As a result of phraseologisation, a proper name loses its initial semantics. It is important to note that phraseologization of a proper name is of holistic character. This means that phraseological meaning is not not formed and synthesized from the figurative, "specific"or any other meanings, but appears due to semantic conversion, "transcoding" of the source proper name in general.

Phraseological units with proper names arecharacterized by the following types of systemic relations: a) variability; b) synonymy; c) antonymy; d) polysemy.

The peculiarity of a proper nameas a part of a phraseological unit is largelypreconditioned by the structural organization of the latter. Having lost the normativemeans of identification, a proper name in somecases becomes the symbol of a numberof items (*Big Ben*), in others – it becomes a means of evaluativecharacteristics *(Dr.Jekylt and Dr. Hyde)*. Thecharacteristics of a phraseological unit in terms of semanticinteraction of components also depends on the structural-semantic properties of thephraseological unit. Thereexist the following types of phraseological units with proper names:

a) they are the homonyms coinciding with free phrases or sentences (*by the LordHarry*);

b) associated with obsolescence, disappearance of a certain kind of social practice, the loss of realia (*custom of Kent*);

c) having unusual combinations of meanings of components, i.e. such phraseologisms in which there is a known semanticin compatibility (*all my eye and Betty Martin*).

Such units become semantically indecomposable units. The components in such phraseological units are not only deprived of semantic information but also usually do not predetermine stylistic coloring of a phraseologism.

According to the performed syntactic function and thecorrelation with theact ofcommunication, phraseological units (PhUs) with proper names (PNs) can be divided into three groups:

1. nominative phraseologisms;
2. interjectional phraseologisms;
3. communicative phraseologisms.

When classifying nominative PhUs with PNs into parts of speech, they are divided into the corresponding classes according to semantic-functional meaning: object, action, attributiveness, adverbiality. Accordingly, among the nominative PhUs with PNs, one can distinguish a group of substantive PhUs with the meaning of objectivity, a group of verbal PhUs with the meaning of action and state, a group of adverbial PhUs with the meaning of circumstance, a group of adjectival PhUs with the meaning of quality.

Within each functional-semantic group, PhUs with PNs are divided accordingmorphological and syntactic features into the structural and semantic models, which are the patterns for other PhUs with PNs.

The group of substantive PhUs with PNs with the meaning of objectivity

The semantic characteristics of objects and phenomena in this group is specified by a PN performing the function of apposition (*fartherAbraham*), prepositional *determination* (*Jerusalem artichoke*).

Apart from this, PhUs with PN with the meaning of objectivity may be formedaround the proper name as a nucleus, but also they may haveother determiners, mainly adjectives in preposition (*longEliza*).

The objectivity is also reflected in coordinative combinations including two homogenous proper names: two anthroponyms (*Adam and Eve*), or two toponyms (*Sodom and Gomorrah*), connected by means of the conjunction «and». There exist also multi-component substantive PhUs with PNs with the meaning of characteristic traits of objectiveness: *Tot, Dick and Harry*.

PhUs with PN with the meaning of objectiveness differ in the character of dependence of components. Thus, the following grammatical variants are possible: *Damocles sword=the sword of Damocles.*

The group of verbal PhUs with PNs with the meaning of action

The proper name in this group combines with the verb performing the syntactic function of the object or adverbial modifier (*to live in Timbuktu*).

The group of adverbial PhUs with PNs with the meaning of circumstance

The proper name in this group of phraseological units performs the function of various adverbial modifiers (place, manner, time) (*since Adam was a boy*).

The group of PhUs with PNs with the communicative meaning includes sayings, commonly used proverbs and popular expressions, represented by the syntactic structure of simple and complex sentences. The component composition of sayings often includes pronoun or other elements (mainly adverb)

indicating toa situation or phenomenon (*I'm from Missouri, you've got to show me*).

Popular expressions with the communicative meaning contain the association with the source or the author (*something is rotten in the state of Denmark*).

Thus, proper names is a special language category whose existence is predetermined by the need of identification, individualization of toa large extent similar objects of reality. The structure of this category is determined by the totality of onomastic catefories, each of which serves a well-defined denotative sphere.

REFERENCES

1. Toporov V. N. Some considerations in connection with the construction of theoretical toponomastics / V. N. Toporov // Principles of toponymy. - M.: Nauka, 2014 - 3-21 p.

2. Stupin L.P. On the lexical meaning of proper names / L. P. Stupin // Questions of theory and history of language. - L.: Publishing Houseof Leningrad State University, 2019. - 273 p.

3. Kunin A.V. English-Russian phraseological dictionary. – Ed. 4th, revised and expanded. - M.: Russian language, 2014. - 942 p. (ARFS)

4. Collins V.H. A Book of English Idioms. With Explanations. -London: Longman, 2018. XI.- 258 p.

5. Юсупов, О. (2019). Инглиз лексик дублетларининг лингвокультурологик таҳлили. *Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование*, (3 (72)), 69-73.

6. Tukhtasinov, I., & Otabek, Y. (2022). Teaching a Foreign Language According to Age Groups. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 22(2), 238-246.

7. Jabbarovna, S. N. (2020). DISCURSIVE-PRAGMATIC AND LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF THE EVENT OF THE EVALUATION CATEGORY IN THE LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE OF THE WORLD (IN THE MATERIAL IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES). *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(7), 8303-8312.

8. Sulaymanova, N. J. (2020). ABOUT DIVIDING SYNTACTIC SEMANTIC FEATURES OF COMPONENTS. In *НАУКА И ИННОВАЦИИ В XXI ВЕКЕ: АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ, ОТКРЫТИЯ И ДОСТИЖЕНИЯ* (pp. 124-128).

9. Yusupov, O. Y. (2021). The russification legacy of historical monuments of Uzbekistan. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S1), 1535-1539.

10. Сулайманова, Н. Ж. (2019). ЯЗЫКОВЫЕ БАРЬЕРЫ И МЕТОДЫ ИХ ПРЕОДОЛЕНИЯ В ПРОЦЕССЕ ОБУЧЕНИЯ ИНОСТРАННЫМ ЯЗЫКАМ. In *Россия-Узбекистан. Международные образовательные и социально-культурные технологии: векторы развития* (pp. 220-221).

11. Сулайманова, Н. Ж. (2016). СПОСОБЫ ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ ЛОКАТИВНОСТИ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ. *Актуальные научные исследования в современном мире*, (9-3), 74-77.

12. Yusupov, O., Yoqubjonova, S., & Abduvokhidova, S. (2022). THE BENEFITS OF HAVING OVERALL 7.0 FROM IELTS IN DIFFERENT AREAS OF LIFE. *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 2(5), 213-215.

LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF KINSHIP TERMS

Qoraboyeva Maxfuza Komiljonovna
SamSIFL, Master degree

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to relate formal assessment of kinship terminologies to a higher know-how of who, culturally, are defined as our family. The way in which a kinship terminology constitutes a primarily based totally photo gadget is illustrated with every the American/English and the Shipibo Indian (Peru) kinship terminologies Each of these terminologies can be generated from primitive (or atomic) symbols using certain equations that offer the form its form and in which the form is constrained to meet homes hypothesized to distinguish kinship terminology structures from extraordinary photo structures.

Key words: kinship terms, linguistics analysis, terminology, kinship's culture.

Kinship is generally taken into consideration as based mostly on own circle of relatives tree. One's spouse and children, in effect, are people with whom one has a genealogical connection. This belief of kinship as being based totally mostly on own circle of relatives tree become made particular by W. H. R. Rivers who defined "kinship … as courting it is determined, and can be defined, with the useful resource of genealogies" [1924, 53]. More recently, Scheffler and Lounsbury used the equal idea in their observation