

COGNITIVE-PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS (BASED ON SPANISH LANGUAGE MATERIAL)

Vaxidova Anastasiya

Teacher of

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: The article examines the peculiarities of phraseological units in the Spanish language. In the article, the cognitive and pragmatic features of intensifying phraseological units, ways of increasing them, the role of the studied units in reflecting the subjective feelings and evaluations of the addresser, as well as methods of optimizing the speech strategy to increase the effect on the receiver are discussed.

Key words: phraseological units, Spanish language, cognitive features, pragmatic features, semantics.

INTRODUCTION. When studying intensifying phraseological units, the sphere of interest of modern scientists most often falls into phraseological intensifiers and intensifiers, as well as problems of syntactic idioms and those structural and semantic transformations of a phraseological unit that help increase its expressiveness. As for the definition of cognitive and pragmatic characteristics of phraseological units, here we highlight works based on the principle of anthropocentrism, in which phraseological units are studied either from the position of modeling their evaluative semantics, which conveys a versatile assessment of a person, his external and internal qualities, or according to their role and purpose in verbal communication. human activity. It should be noted that intensifying phraseological units, representing a distinctive characteristic of an emotional linguistic personality, actively contribute to the implementation of a speech strategy of enhanced influence on communication participants.

Literature review and methodology. At the same time, comparative phraseological units, along with increasing the degree of manifestation of the attribute, to a certain extent concretize the attribute itself, making it more prominent and tangible, however, this concretization occurs based on the perception of the addresser. It is noteworthy that this approach is fully consistent with the position of those researchers who believe that phraseological units actualize not so much an action or sign, but rather their high degree, and not so much real actions and signs as the idea of them. Consequently, intensifying phraseological units, like other phraseological units, do not depict the world, but appeal directly to the emotions and imagination of a person, and through them to an awareness of reality through intentional experience, for example:

...con nuestros remiendos y nuestras armas gastadas, ... nuestras enfermedades y nuestra miseria, no éramos sino la carne de cañon... [17].

In our opinion, such phraseological units belong to the area of intersection of the functional-semantic fields of intensity and evaluation, which determines the specificity of their pragmatic constant, which is expressed in their expressiveness. According to their semantic content, the units under study can be conditionally divided into several groups, for example: structures in which the basis for comparison is the physical properties of inanimate objects (fuerte como un roble); phraseological units based on comparison with natural phenomena (llover a cantaros); comparative

formations, including the names of representatives of the fauna, when the basis for comparison is their habits, typical features, dominant physical qualities (*rápido como un abanto*).

Intensifying phraseological units, playing a certain role in the general system of means of expressing the category of intensity, have a high pragmatic potential, which modern authors associate, first of all, with their imagery and connotative senses in the meaning of phraseological units. It is obvious that the potential imagery of a phraseological unit allows, by means of the nomination itself, to give speech an expressive-evaluative orientation, reflecting the subjective feelings and assessments of the addresser, while simultaneously optimizing his speech strategy by increasing the total illocutionary power of the utterance.

As for the relationship between denotative and connotative components in the meanings of phraseological units, different opinions are expressed on this issue in the linguistic literature. According to the author's point of view, the question of which macrocomponent predominates in the semantics of phraseological units should be considered on specific linguistic material.

So, the study of the features of the pragmatic component of phraseological units proves that they, conveying information about the emotional-evaluative perception of reality by the subject of speech, are intended to enhance the transmission of the intentionality of communicants, i.e., they can convey various emotionally charged communicative intentions of the speaker. At the same time, the intensifying meaning of phraseological units, according to some authors, is formed as a result of cognitive transformations in such structures as frames and prototypes.

Within the framework of our work, of particular interest is the study of the characteristics of phraseological units from the perspective of the prototype, since the meaning of the prototype is most often visible through the semantics of a phraseological unit, despite the high degree of abstraction that is characteristic of most units related to means of expressing the category of intensity, cf.: *como (el) un diablo, como un madero, hecho un loco, un hambre canina*, etc.

Metaphorical rethinking of the prototype plays a large role in the formation of such phraseological units, and therefore in their meaning both the sense of intensity and the underlying prototype of a phraseological unit are distinguished, which, as a rule, is understood as “not only linguistic units or variable combinations of words, but also various kinds of associative relationships, i.e., a fund of general knowledge associated with historical traditions, facts, realities, religious beliefs and their attributes” [5, p. 51].

The derivational connection of the meaning of a phraseological unit with the meaning of the prototype, in the understanding of many researchers, forms the basis of the internal form of a phraseological unit, which represents such a significative content of the re-interpreted linguistic unit, which is directly related to the epistemological image of the cognizable and named object [9]. Consequently, the internal form of intensifying phraseological units appears as a mediator between the new meaning of intensity and correlation with reality through the subject-logical meaning of a free combination of words. The main property of the movement from the prototype to the new meaning (or meanings) implied by it, as E. Yu. Kunitsyna believes, is the presence of an irrational moment (the main parameter of the internal form), which is quite comparable to the transition from one level of cognition to another [6].

Discussion and results. With regard to the intensifying meaning of phraseological units, it should be said that it is recognized, first of all, as a consequence of the process of metaphorization, which is closely connected with the feeling of similarity of the created typical image of reality with some “concrete” figurative-associative idea of another reality, its prototype. At the same time, metaphor is intended to recognize various aspects of some concepts in terms of others, as well as to identify and create similarities between two dissimilar phenomena based on their implicit / explicit comparison. With the assumption of similarity and resemblance, the movement of thought begins, which, building them into an analogy, then synthesizes a new concept, which, on the basis of metaphor, receives the form of intensifying meaning [5; 9]. Thus, the recipient is faced with the task

of comprehending this or that phraseological unit, giving preference to one of those potential meanings that can be realized within the framework of the corresponding metaphorical predication.

According to the analysis of factual material, a major role in this case is played by a correct understanding of the communicative situation and context, which help limit the number of possible meanings of phraseological units to a minimum. In terms of reflecting the subjective feelings and assessments of the speaker in a speech act containing phraseological units, it can be argued that phraseological units, enhancing the expressiveness of the utterance, can serve as an indicator of the pragmatic attitude of the addresser. The specified quality of phraseological units is realized through the subjectification of emotional phraseological assessment and personal interpretation of specific reality through the prism of a phraseological image. It is no coincidence that, analyzing the discursive distribution of phraseological intensifiers in modern English (phrases such as *as the devil*, *like a shot*, *like crazy*, *like a house afire*, *like one o'clock*, etc.), A. V. Fedoryuk comes to the conclusion that in discourse they behave as signs of illocution, that is, they indicate exactly how the proposition in a statement should be understood. At the same time, in a systemic linguistic description, these units are most often presented as signs of secondary predication. This property, according to the researcher, is their symbolic specificity [12].

Los bultos, con los ojos ya más sosegados, iban marchando pero aun quedaban algunos aferrados al ataúd como las moscas al papel matamoscas [13].

The ghosts with already calm eyes all left, but some remained glued to the coffin, like sticky flies [3].

Despite the coincidence of individual components, it should be recognized that the phraseology used in the translation leads to a distortion of the author's pragmatic attitude. M. Delibes writes that people remained drawn to the coffin like flies to sticky paper (*al papel matamoscas*), unable to tear themselves away (an indication of the consequence that an unusual degree of manifestation of the symptom leads to). The Russian phraseology "sticky flies" has the exact opposite meaning and corresponds to such Spanish phraseological units as *como las moscas en verano*, *más pegajoso (pesado) que las moscas*, *como moscas a la miel*, etc.

In the Spanish and Uzbek languages there are phraseological units in which "the figurative meaning is based both on the logical-substantive content of a stable comparison and on the direct meaning of other components of the comparative formula" [7, p. 32]. For example: *más valiente que un león*, *como moscas a la miel*, *dulce como el acitrón* or *brave like a lion*, *like bees (flies) for honey*, *sweet like honey*, etc.

Optimization of speech strategies and increased expressiveness of the attributive feature are most clearly manifested when using phraseological units containing explicit comparison, for example:

Esperad, que tan buen pan hacen aquí como en Francia [14].

Wait, our bread is baked no worse than in other places [1].

At the same time, a high degree of manifestation of the trait is realized both through comparison and through its exaggeration. In the latter case, as was shown earlier, there is an indication of the consequence that a similar degree of intensity of the attribute/quality leads to. It is also worth noting the fact that phraseological units containing not an explicit, but an implicit comparison are characterized by a lower degree of expression of the attribute, which reduces their pragmatic potential, for example:

Y, por favor, no me vengas con... cuentos chinos... [13].

Thus, to intensify the feature, create the effect of expressiveness and enhance the pragmatic potential of the statement, you can use the imagery of phraseological units based on comparison, which is characterized by semantic duality and a metaphorical mode of expression. At the same

time, metaphor, being one of the cognitive models of cognition (this position is supported by such researchers as N. D. Arutyunova, A. N. Baranov, H. Ortega Gasset, P. B. Parshin, etc.), is capable of reflecting the characteristics of national -cultural mentality and specificity of the national conceptual sphere: *más feo que el sargento de Urtera; es más fresco que una lechuga; como la tripa de Jorge*, etc. When transferred to another language environment, in particular during the translation process, it is quite difficult to preserve information about the emotional and evaluative perception of reality by the subject of speech, as well as the degree of expressiveness inherent in the original phraseological unit, cf.:

Me gustaría veros con una mujer... un poco ligera de cascos... [13].

...I wish you would meet a frivolous woman...

...di, pedazo de holgazán... [13].

...tell me, you such a lazy person...

As we see, the translator, instead of phraseological units, used other means of enhancing the degree of intensity of the attribute, in particular nouns and intensifying adjectives, which weakened the pragmatic effect of the statements on the recipient. It is noteworthy that phraseological units with the *pedazo* component, having a structure such as *pedazo de barbaro*, *pedazo de alcornoque*, etc., are frequent in spoken Spanish speech. At the same time, an example in the translation text, where the lexeme *hombre* serves as one of the components of the phraseological unit, deserves special attention:

Yes, say at least something in parting, you stone man!

[11].

¡Pero dinos algo por vía de despedida, hombre de pedernal!

Representing the implementation of one of the most frequent structures of Spanish phraseological units that convey the emotional and evaluative characteristics of a person, the expression *hombre de pedernal* arouses interest from different points of view. Firstly, this is the image itself, which underlies the Spanish and Uzbek phraseological units, as well as the correspondence of those associations that are associated with it in one and the other metaphorical picture of the world.

Conclusion. Summarizing the analysis, it is necessary to emphasize that despite the variety of types of phraseological units used as a means of intensification, the mechanism for enhancing their pragmatic potential with the help of various structural transformations operates, as a rule, within the framework of the directions presented above: resuscitation (or replacement) of the metaphorical image, introducing new connotations, increasing the degree of expressiveness of phraseological units and its actualization in a given context (communicative situation). The potential imagery of a phraseological unit, responding to the elementary need to diversify speech by means of the nomination itself, gives it an expressive-evaluative orientation, reflecting the subjective feelings of the addresser, the peculiarities of his national-cultural mentality, and at the same time optimizing his speech strategy by increasing the total illocutionary power of the utterance. At the same time, those phraseological units that contain explicit comparison realize their cognitive-pragmatic potential most effectively.

REFERENCES:

1. Galdos B. P. *Donya Perfecta* / trans. from Spanish S. Vafa, A. Starostina. – M.: Khud. Lit-ra, 2006. – P. 217–384.
2. Geraskina N. P. Phraseological configurations in parliamentary speeches (based on the material of substantive phraseological units in modern English): dis. ...cand. Philol. Sci. – 2008. – P. 105

3. Delibes M. Five hours with Mario / trans. from Spanish E. Lyubimova. – Progress, 2005. – P. 250–430.
4. Spanish-Russian phraseological dictionary. Diccionario fraseológico español-ruso / ed. E. I. Levintova. – 2005. 1077 p.
5. Kunin A.V. Course of phraseology of modern English. – 2nd ed. – M.: Higher Shola; Dubna: Phoenix, 2006. – 381 p.
6. Kunitsyna E. Yu. Historical and functional aspect of Shakespeareanisms: dis. ...cand. Philol. Sci. – 2008. – 212 p.
7. Lebedeva L. A. Stable comparisons of the Russian language in phraseology and phraseography. – Krasnodar: KSU, 2009. – 196 p.
8. Ozhegov S.I., Shvedova N.Yu. Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language. – 4th ed. – M.: Azbukovnik, 2009. – 944 p.
9. Teliya V.N. Secondary nomination and its types // Language nomination. Types of names. – 2007. – P. 129–221.
10. Telia V. N. Phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects. – M.: School “Languages of Russian Culture”, 1996. – 288 p.
11. Turgenev I. S. Smoke // Complete. collection op. and letters: in 30 volumes - T. 7. - M.: Nauka, 1978. - P. 249–407.
12. Fedoryuk A. V. Functional and pragmatic aspects of phraseological intensifiers in modern English: dis. ...cand. Philol. Sci. – Irkutsk, 2001. – 198 p.
13. Delibes M. Cinco horas con Mario. – Barcelona: Ediciones Destino, 1992. – 296 p.
14. Galdós B. P. Doña Perfecta. – La Habana: Editorial Pueblo y Educación, 1974. – 270 p.
15. Martinez Calvo L. Diccionario español-ruso. – Barcelona: Sopena, 1975. – 1916 p.
16. Moliner M. Diccionario de Uso del Español. – Madrid: Gredos, 2004. – 2 vols. – 1519; 1597 p.
17. Turgeniev I. S. Humo / trans. F. Alted Fonseca. – Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1971. – 203 p.
18. Pérez-Reverte A. El Sol de Breda. – Madrid: Punto de Lectura. – 2008. – 256 p.