



**PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH A COLORATIVE COMPONENT AS A
FRAGMENT OF THE LINGUISTIC PICTURE OF THE WORLD (BASED ON
THE MATERIAL OF RUSSIAN, ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK
LANGUAGES)**

***Djumamuratov K.
Nukus, Uzbekistan***

PhD Student, Berdakh Karakalpak State University

Abstract: *The study examines phraseologisms in the English, Karakalpak, and Russian languages that have a colorative component. The comparative study of languages from various language families and the analysis of phraseologisms – which are the aspects that most vividly express the cultural peculiarity of ethnic groups – are prerequisites for the work’s relevance. The comprehensive examination of phraseological units demonstrates the scientific novelty. The study’s theoretical significance stems from its examination of the phraseological equivalence issue. The comparative approach and the lexicographic analysis method are the main research techniques.*

Keywords: *equivalence, symbol, evaluativeness, phraseology, phraseologism and colorative component.*

The choice of the topic is due to the fact that the Russian, English and Karakalpak language cultures have a large number of phraseological units containing a deep inner meaning. Color is one of the environmental factors affecting a person. Color characteristics are the most important component of the visual perception process. Color designations are a way of self-expression. Scientists have formulated 9 main functions of color, among which, in our opinion, the most important are the following: aesthetic, expressive, communicative and identification. The object of the study was phraseological units with a colorative component in the Russian, English and Karakalpak languages.

The results of a person’s cognition of the objective world in the course of his life are recorded in the so-called picture of the world. The term was introduced in the XIX-XX centuries by G. Hertz and M. The Planck concerning the physical picture of the world, a in the field of linguistics arose thanks to the scientific works of researcher L. Weisgerber. This phenomenon is interpreted by anthropologist Robert Redfield as a worldview characteristic of a certain ethnic group; it is a certain, subjective vision of oneself, one’s actions, life and the world. A picture of the world is «a certain image of the world that is never its mirror image» [5, p. 60].

A person’s perception of the world and himself is reflected in language, which is the most important way of forming and storing knowledge, since ethnic realities have a direct impact on language and its semantics. That is why the linguistic reflection of reality differs from reality as such. The totality of ideas about the world received by mankind as a result of not only cognition of reality, but also of life activity as a whole, captured in a linguistic form, is defined as a linguistic picture of the world. For the first time this term was introduced by V. von Humboldt, whose doctrine of a special worldview arose within the framework of classical German philosophy in the early nineteenth century.



The study of the linguistic picture of the world was carried out by such linguists as F. Schlegel, A.A. Potebnya, E. Sepir, B.L. Wharf. Among the Russian researchers, one can single out F.F. Fortunatov, N.D. Arutyunova, Yu.N. Karaulov.

This linguistic phenomenon causes linguists a large number of questions due to the variety of interpretations. Due to the fact that scientists, tracing the linguistic picture of the world, focus on certain aspects of the concept, definitions cannot become generally accepted, however, the whole variety of interpretations is reduced to a narrow and broad understanding of the phenomenon:

1. The linguistic picture of the world is understood as a subjective perception of the objective world through the prism of linguistic activity.
2. The linguistic picture of the world is understood as a kind of scheme of perception of reality, fixed in the language.

Thus, according to the assumption of linguist V.A.Maslova, the linguistic picture of the world is a formative link of human self- and world perception, setting the norms of behavior in society and reflecting the perception of the surrounding world: «it is the linguistic picture of the world that determines communicative behavior, understanding of the external world and the inner world of a person. It reflects the way of speech-thinking activity characteristic of a particular epoch, with its spiritual, cultural and national values» [3, p.65].

The phraseological picture of the world is an integral part of the linguistic picture of the world, since phraseological units often reflect the national character. Phraseological units are reproducible phrases that have a holistic meaning. «The phraseological fund of the language is a valuable source of information about the culture and mentality of the people, in which the people's ideas about myths, customs, rituals, habits, morals, behavior are preserved» [3, p.43]. Thus, phraseological units secondary reflect the vision of the world not of individuals or social groups, but of the whole people, his social system, ideology.

Phraseology as an independent branch of lexicology arose under the influence of Sh . Bali, and the beginning of the development of Russian phraseology was founded by V.V. Vinogradov. The linguist classifies phraseological units from the point of view of semantic fusion of components into three categories: merges, unities and combinations. Researcher N.M.Shansky expanded the classification by adding a new category – phraseological expressions. Recently, many scientific papers have appeared (A.V.Kunin, V.N.Telia, D.N.Shmelev), which highlight phraseological problems from the point of view of semantics, morphology and syntax. However, the field of phraseology raises a large number of questions due to the fact that different concepts of this field are interpreted differently by different researchers, and the terms are not interpreted unambiguously.

In our study, we consider such linguistic units that, by their adjacency with words and free combinations of words, have a certain, only for them characteristic set of differential features:

1. reproducibility;
2. sustainability;
3. integrity of the value;
4. impermeability;



5. the presence of two or more percussion components.

The phraseological system most fully reflects the national mentality and peculiarities of any ethnic group. Thus, phraseological units often serve as a means of nominating objects, signs, properties and processes. In our scientific work, we investigate phraseological units with a colorative component. In the cultural tradition of each ethnic group, correspondences have been established between color meanings specific to it, in the presence of universality of color perception by all members of society.

The classification of B. Berlin and P. Kay is well known, who, having studied 78 languages, came to the conclusion that 11 basic colors began to be encoded in the history of any language in a fixed order, and the stages of the appearance of terms represent the stages of linguistic evolution of languages [7, p. 11].

Phraseological units with color meanings have been studied in separate languages, such as Japanese, German, and French, but there is not enough research in several languages. In the study, we consider English, Russian and Karakalpak phraseological units with such color components that, according to the classification of R.M. Frumkina, belong to the main colors, that is, for which the following feature is characteristic: their interpretation is associated with an object for which the possession of this color is typical: black (black), red (red), blue (blue), green (blue), yellow (yellow) and white (white). We also highlight the blue color separately. In the English and Karakalpak languages, one nomination is used to designate blue and blue colors (blue) [6]. We would like to note that in the Karakalpak language the word “kók» sometimes means both blue and green.

In order to identify differences in the meaning of color in the Russian, English and Karakalpak language pictures of the world, it is necessary, using the method of conceptual modeling, to compare phraseological units with the color component of these languages.

In this paper, we will be based on the classification of Y. Solodub [2], which establishes the following types of interlanguage equivalents and analogues that present difficulties in interlanguage and intercultural communication:

1. Absolute equivalents having the same structure, imagery and semantics in Russian and English.

2. Partial equivalents with identical semantics and internal form, different structure or components.

3. Non-equivalent phraseological units that have no analogues in another language. These are idioms belonging to a certain ethnic group, most strongly tied to a certain language.

4. Calcified phraseological units obtained by literal translation from one language to another. The most common are literal translations of phraseological units from ancient mythology and biblical studies.

Comparing Russian, English and Karakalpak phraseological units with the colorative component, we found the following features:

1. phraseological units with full equivalence:

black as night – черный как ночь; red as a beet – красный как свекла; yellow rag – желтая пресса; a black day – qara kún, черный народ – qara xalıq, qara ter – black sweat, as black as a coal – kómir qara, white as milk – sútten aq.

2. phraseological units with partial equivalence:



white as milk – белый как снег; disappear into the blue – в воду кануть; Aqti aq, qarani qara - black and white (it is easy to understand what is right and wrong) black-letter day (a day on which a great incident of misfortune happened or has happened) - qara xat (kelgen kún) red in the face – júzi qızarıw.

3. non-equivalent phraseological units:

the boys in blue – моряки; be in the red - быть в долгу; the red, white and blue – английский флот и армия; mañlayı black-unlucky person, QIP-gold aqsha-a lot of money, júzi sarúayıw-to miss someone / to feel sad.

4. calcified phraseological units:

whited sepulchers – окрашенные гробы (метафорически используется для лицемеров); whiter than snow – белее снега (высшая степень нравственной чистоты).

Thus, we have considered phraseological units with a colorative component in the Russian, English and Karakalpak language pictures of the world. Our analysis allowed us to conclude that the most frequent phraseological units in the compared languages are those belonging to the black, white, red and blue color scheme.

Within the framework of the color meanings included in the phraseological units, there is a similarity between the Russian, English and Karakalpak languages in the number of coloratives. The analyzed phraseological units coincide in structural and grammatical models and types of meaning, which indicates the kinship of the linguocreative thinking of native speakers of these languages. The subject of special attention was non-equivalent phraseological units with a colorative component.

REFERENCES:

1. Кунин, А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь. Москва: Русский язык, 1999. – 512 с. ISBN 5-87-905-042-4.
2. Леонтьев, А.А. Языковое сознание и образ мира. Язык и сознание: парадоксальная рациональность. В: Сборник научных статей. Москва: Институт языкознания РАН, 1993. – С. 16-21.
3. Маслова, В.А. Лингвокультурология. Учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений. Москва: Академия, 2001. – 208 с. ISBN 5-76-95-0745-4
4. Молотков, А.И. Фразеологический словарь русского языка. Москва: Советская энциклопедия, 1968. – 543 с.
5. Серебренников, Б.А. Роль человеческого фактора в языке. Язык и картина мира. Москва: Наука, 1988. – 212 с. ISBN 5-02-010878-2.
6. Фрумкина, Р.М. Психоллингвистика. Учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений. Москва: Академия, 2001. – 25 с. ISBN 978-5-4468-0305-7
7. Berlin, V., Kay, R. Basic Color Terms. Berkley: University of California Press, 1969. – P. 390. ISBN 3-89706-159-7
8. Francis, W., Parkinson, D. Oxford Idioms Dictionary for Learners of English. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. – 509 p. ISBN 2-31478-739-7.
9. Paxratdinov Q., Bekniyazov Q., Qaraqalpaq tilindegi frazeologizmler.
10. Eshbaev J., Qaraqalpaq tiliniń qısqasha frazeologiyalıq sózligi. Nókis, 1985.