



## The Study of The Comparative Phraseological Structures of The Russian Language in Comparison With Uzbek

*A.Sh.Usmonov*

*Bukhara state university teacher*

*Email: sitorabonu.savriddinovna93@mail.ru*

### ABSTRACT

Authors are encouraged to study comparative phraseological units with similar units in Uzbek, taking into account national audiences. It should be noted that the study should focus on the phraseological units. That is separately mentioned and important attention should be paid their spiritual and grammatical features, as well as what kind of grammar category.

### ARTICLE INFO

*Article history:*

Received 15 Feb 2021

Received in revised form 7 March 2021

Accepted 31 March 2021

### *Keywords:*

phraseology, comparative phraseological units, grammatically supporting component, seam, paying word, adverbial FU, adjectival FU, predicative FU.

© 2021 Hosting by Research Parks. All rights reserved.

### Introduction

The formation of phraseology, as an independent area of linguistics, made it possible to include it in university and school programs. This in turn, creates a condition for the introduction and development of a new industry in the method of teaching the Russian and Uzbek language methods for studying the phraseological tier of the language.

In recent years, many articles and textbooks aimed at studying phraseology of both Russian and Uzbek languages have been published. They illuminate various theoretical problems associated with the determination of the volume and boundaries of phraseology, a satellite classification included in its units, the semantic classification of phraseological units, the characteristics of their use in artwork and a number of other issues.

## Main Part

On the other hand, special attention is paid to improving the technique of teaching phraseology. This article is just devoted to the study of one group of phraseological units - the so-called comparative structures of phraseological nature. This is due to the fact that at present, when learning foreign languages, the thematic principle is put forward to the fore. When a detailed analysis is subject to any one small group of units, united or semantic or grammatical community. The purpose of our work is the comparative characteristics of sustainable comparisons of the Russian language in comparison with Uzbek.

Formal features of comparative phraseological units (hereinafter FE) are that in Russian in their composition there is a comparative union как, and in Uzbek - affix *дай/дек*. From a semantic point of view, they are united by the fact that in terms of the content of such units there is a value of comparison or likelihood.

It should be noted that comparative designs appear on the basis of a comparison of two real phenomena. However, over time, as a result of the violation of the elements of the lexical formula, they lose their initial semantics and begin to be used with a new, already phraseological value, which is fixed behind this design. The comparative value is stored only in the models of FE in their free (non-related) use.

For example: *как курица лапой* («casually»), *как сивый мерин* («unlessless»), *как снег на голову* («unexpectedo»), *как две капли воды* («similar»); *тўйган қўзидай* («carefree »), *осмондан тушгандай* («Suddenly»), *оғзига талқон солгандай* («silently»), *ўрта қўлдай* («malobespain»), *ўт билан сувдай* («various») и т.п.

It should be noted that in Uzbek language Comparative affix *дай/дек* The FE has different from their use in a free combination. The reason for this is that in unrelated phrases, this affix forms a new grammatical form of the final lexeme, and in sustainable phrases it refers to the whole phrase in general, forming a new vocabulary unit. It would be right, in our opinion, to represent this kind of fairy in the following form: (тўйган қўзи)дай, (осмондан тушган)дай, (оғзига талқон солган)дай, (ўрта қўл)дай, (ўт билан сув)дай, and so on.

The study of the semantic structure of the Competitive FE requires a versatile approach, because Their meaning is significantly different from the value identifying them with a lexeme: the holistic value of Fe does not follow from the simple addition of the values of the components of its components. In addition, the categorical class attitude of phraseological units, first of all, depends on the holistic value of the entire FE as a whole, for its external grammatical form, and in particular, the essay attribution of the grammatically reference component does not always coincide with its total content plan. For example, despite the fact that in such phraseologizams, like *как божий день*, *как дважды два четыре*, *как из рога изобилия*, *как бог на душу положит*; (кумга сув сепган)дай, (холвачининг тешаси)дай, (оёғи куйган товукдай, (ўту пахта)дай etc. There are no lexemes related to the category of naster, they generally belong to the category of adverbial faces. Therefore, the classifies of phraseological units to a particular phrase-grammatical discharge on the basis of a caper characteristic of the grammatically reference component is not entirely true.

In the process of the work of students and students over the comparative fee there are a number

of problems: the ability to determine the lexico-grammar composition of FE, distinguish between phraseological units from the corresponding expressions in their free use, distinguish between comparative turns from the homonymous comparative designs of phraseological nature, to identify their syntactic function in the proposal, their Stylistic use in speech and a number of other issues.

The study of comparative Fe requires students and students to work with dictionaries, because There are both general, distinctive features between the holistic value of Fe and the components of its components. However, in our opinion, here it should be more emphasis on their differential features. In particular, it should be borne in mind that, in contrast to the lexical units in the semantic structure, there are two seeds: one of them expresses the real value of phraseologism, the other only makes an additional shade of the value. For example: «Suddenly» - как гром среди ясного неба («Completely unexpected»), «various» - как небо и земля («Absolutely different»); «Suddenly» - (томдан тараша тушган)дай («Completely unexpected»), «Fast» - лаби лабига тегмай («very fast») etc.

In addition, analyzing the semantic structure of a comparative fee, we also found such units that express only an amplifying tint of the value. Compare: Absolutely, completely; - беда как, как божий день, как маков цвет; (сув сепган)дай, (сув билан хаво)дек, (отнинг қашқаси)дек etc.

eg: Во-первых, городничий глуп как сивый мерин (т.е. «совершенно глуп»); (Н.Гоголь, Ревизор); Латофатнинг кули теккан ер ёғ тушса ялагудек топ-тоза (т.е. «совершенно чисто») булмайд колмас эди. (С.Анарбоев, Умр)

As can be seen from the above examples, they are darled with lexical importance, but only an increase in the quality of those lexes, which are due to.

According to A. Khodjiyev, such words as жуда (very), энг (most), қоқ (quite), ғоят (absolutely), сал (Not really) etc. In combination with adverbs and adjectives, they do not possess an independent lexical value[1]. In our opinion, with the presentation of the phraseological material, the teacher must rely on such faces that are real meaning. This is necessary and because this kind of phraseological units, when used without words, supporters are implemented in speech with other semantics and go to a completely different phrasecela - a grammatical discharge. For instance: Ему *как нельзя лучше* (из разговорной речи); Гуё хамма ёк *сув сепгандай*. (И. Рахимов, Хилола)

Competitive Fe, like words, in the sentence, one or another syntactic function is performed. However, both at school, and in the university audience, in syntax analysis, this teachers pay little attention. The reason for this is the fact that it is very difficult to determine the phrasecela - the grammatical class attitude. And this largely determines the syntactic function of phraseologism. From the point of view of the categorical standards, the comparative Fe is correlated with three phrasecular - grammatical discharges.

The main group is the nareny FE: как снежный ком, как за каменной стеной, как собак нерезанных, как зеницу ока; (оёғи куйган товук)дай, (ит билан мушук)дай, (кўз қорачиғи)дай, (хамирдан қил суғурган)дай и т.п.

The naren character of such units in Uzbek language is confirmed by at least the fact that in most textbooks on the description of the grammatical system of the Uzbek language, Affixa Dai / Dec is presented as a word-forming adventure affix.[2]

The same position is maintained in Russian. According to a fair statement by L.D. Ignateva,

"... The Union" How "arises from the adverb, denoting the image of the action, retains the value of the image, the method of action and is an indication of the image" [3]

Included in this group, the proposal is performed by functions of different circumstances. For example: ... Первая дочь как две капли воды была похожа на бабушку. (С Аксаков, Семейная хроника); Онам шўрлик оёғи куйган товукдай югуриб юргандур (Н.Сафаров, Эрк элчилари).

The second group of comparative Fe is presented by adjective units. Basically, they express a qualitative characteristic of the face: как стеклышко, как сонная муха, как в воду опущенный, как из-за угла мешком прибитый; *ўрта қўлдай жувон, ердан бичиб олгандай киши, холвачининг тешасидай одам, бир қошиқ сув билан ютгудай киз* etc. As the material collected by us shows, in the sentence, they act as a definition or as a faithful. For instance: Ты будешь принимать человека, который как небо от земли от тебя, о котором сам знаешь, что он дурен. (Н.Гоголь, Мертвые души.); Уларгаям мактанган экан, Иклима опанинг уйида бир пари ўтирибди, бир қошиқ сув билан ютгудей деб. (Ш.Холмирзаев, Кил куприк.).

The third group (insignificant in its composition) includes comparative facies with a state value - these are the so-called predicative: как с гуся вода, как свинцом налита; (ёғ томса ялагу)дай. (сув сепган)дай и т.п. This kind of units perform only in the functions of the facility. for instance: Ну, что же ты, словно воды в рот набрала, - говорит. (К.Федин, Первые радости); Пеш тушганини пеш олиб турадим дейман, - уйлай кетди у, - қачон қарасанг ховлиси ёғ томса ялагудай. (Р Файзий Хазрати инсон.).

### Conclusion

From the above examples, it can be seen that the comparative fee act as one member of the sentence and thereby subordinate to the general principle of syntactic parsing. Despite the fact that in school and university textbooks, this type of work is provided, nevertheless, more attention is paid to the analysis of their semantic and grammatical properties. The definition of the syntactic function of phraseological units in the text remains beyond the attention of the teacher, although the study of the students's knowledge of students has a very important role playing a very important role. Thus, the study of phraseological units in general, and the comparative fairy in particular should be directed from simple to complex and should be carried out constantly, and not from the case. A comprehensive analysis of comparative designs will help the disciples to enrich their speech, make it expressive and colorful.

### References

1. Абдурахмонов Ш. ва б. Хозирги узбек адабий тили, 1-қисм. Т., 1980. С.401-402.
2. Мирзаев М., С Усманов, И.Расулов. Узбек тили. Т.: Укитувчи, 1978,- С. 160; Узбек тили грамматикаси. 1 т. Т.: "Фан", 1975. -С.-531.
3. Игнатъева Л.Д.. Преобразование союза «как» при фразеологизации сравнительных конструкций// Проблемы фразеологии. Тула, 1980 - С. 81