

# PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH THE MEANING OF “MENTAL PROCESSES” IN MODERN ENGLISH

**Galimullina L.T.,**

**Amaliy ingliz tili kafedrası o‘qituvchisi**

The article analyzes phraseological units of the English language with the meaning of cognitive processes. The classification of phraseological units of the research corpus presented in the article is an attempt to systematize the research corpus by identifying the conceptual criteria “description of the process and result of cognition.

**Аннотация** В статье произведён анализ фразеологических единиц английского языка со значением когнитивных процессов. Представленная в статье классификация фразеологических единиц исследовательского корпуса представляет собой попытку систематизации исследовательского корпуса выявив концептуальные критерии «описание процесса и результата когниции.

**Annotatsiya** Maqolada ingliz tilining kognitiv jarayonlarning ma'nosi bilan frazeologik birliklari tahlil qilinadi.

**Key terms:** discursive-cognitive, cognitive process, cognition, gestalt.

**Ключевые термины:** дискурсивно-когнитивный, процесс познания, когниция, гештальт.

**Tayanchiboralar:** diskursiv-kognitiv, kognitiv jarayon, geshtalt.

For many decades, phraseology of different languages of the world has been the subject of numerous studies. Moreover, for the traditional science of language, the main task is to identify the fundamental differences in the semantics of the phraseological unit itself and its components [4, 6, 7], the structure of the content of this meaning, as well as the method of organizing the internal form of a phraseological unit [3, 5]. However, the mode of research is

shifting from traditional to cognitive. Scientists point to the need for a systematic, comprehensive approach to the meaning, in general, and to the meaning of phraseological units, in particular. In other words, according to contemporary linguists, an objective study of the phraseological fund is possible only by taking into account an integrated approach involving not only purely linguistic knowledge but also data from sciences related to linguistics. Phraseological units of mental processes that nominate the process of cognition are complex both from the point of view of psychology and from the point of view of linguistics since it has some diversity of content and is very specific in relation to the delineation of its boundaries. In order to study this problem, we turn to the data of cognitive psychology and social sciences, as well as lexicographic information, which allows us to identify the specifics of the conceptualization of mental processes with their subsequent verbalization.

An analysis of lexicographic data of the modern English language shows that cognition is a process of acquiring knowledge, including the processing of information that comes through perceptual channels (“the mental action or process of acquiring knowledge and understanding through thought, experience, and the senses” [8], and the knowledge itself, stored in the cognitive structures of the individual’s consciousness (“a perception, sensation, idea, or intuition resulting from the process of cognition” [8]). However, such a detailed description of the process and result of obtaining knowledge in everyday consciousness purposefully, in comparison with highly specialized scientific analysis does not occur. Moreover, the concept of “cognition” occurs complexly, as one arising from the other. Such a holistic reflection of the reality of cognition at the conceptual level is the best possible indication of the presence of Gestalt as a mental structure responsible for both the syncretism and holistic perception of the concept in question, which contains both the process and the result, and for the nomination of these givens through linguistic units.

Selection of appropriate phraseological units (hereinafter referred to as PU) was carried out (i.e. with a continuous sample) according to the ability of a unit to functionally or systematically designate the situation of cognition in syncretism (the unity of the cognition process and its result) and/or discreteness (each of the processes of obtaining knowledge separately), that is, according to the ability to update the components “process of obtaining knowledge” and “result” at a systemic or functional level. As a result of the procedure described above, diverse morphological features and semantic content of phraseological units of modern English. Thus, the selected phraseological units can be ranked based on their component composition into the following groups:

- Phrases with the mind component: *bear in mind, bring/call someone/something to mind, keep something in mind etc;*
- phraseological units with the attention/heed component: *attract [sb's] attention, call attention to smb, pay attention, pay no heed etc;*
- Phrase with the eye/ear component: *catch someone's eye, have an eye in one's head, have an eye out for smb, see eye to eye [with], with one's eyes shut, smb.'s ear etc;*
- Phrase with the “body part” component: *call down the wrath of God on smb.'s head, call one's hand, catch it in the neck, have a bone, have an old head on young shoulders, have something on the brain, hide one's head, keep a firm hand on, with all one's heart, with egg on one's face etc;*
- Phrase with the component “specific object of reality”: *catch old birds with chaff, come back to earth, call a spade a spade, call to arms, do one's nut, drag a red herring across the path, draw a curtain on smth, draw a long bow, draw the line [at], drop the handkerchief, food for thought, food for reflection, have all one's buttons on, smell a rat, show one's teeth etc;*
- Phrase with the “abstract object” component: *call down curses upon smb, call it quits, catch a shadow and let go a substance, catch/take someone unawares,*

*come a cropper, come down to bed-rock, do honor to, do justice to, do oneself justice, do smb. a bad turn, do wonders, dree one's weird, dry as dust, gain an advantage of smb, gain the wind of, food for thought, food for reflection, , without a second thought, without a shadow of a doubt etc;*

– Phrase phrases with apredicative component: *bear in mind, bring/call someone/something to mind, call attention to smb, catch me, catch someone on the hop, catch/take someone unawares, come back to earth, come up against, do credit to smb., do dirt to smb., dohonor to, do it on one's head, do justice to, do one's bit, do one's block, do one's nut etc.*

In addition, a conceptual analysis of each phraseological unit selected as empirical material also allows for a semantic classification based on the criterion of the absence of actualization of any gestalt component. In this regard, the following groups can be distinguished:

– Phrase phrases that do not actualize the “attention” component: *bear in mind, bring/call someone/something to mind, call down curses upon smb., call down the wrath of God on smb's head, catch it in the neck, come down to bed-rock, [come] hell or high water etc;*

– phraseological units that do not actualize the “perception” component: *bring/call someone/something to mind, call a spade a spade, call down curses upon smb., call down the wrath of God on smb.'s head, call one's hand, catch someone on the hop, come back to earth, do honor to etc;*

– phraseological units that do not actualize the “mental activity” component: *call one's hand, call to arms, catch someone's eye, catch someone on the hop, do dirt to smb., draw blank, draw into one's shell etc;*

– Phrase phrases that do not update the “memory” component: *call attention to smb., call down curses upon smb., call down the wrath of God on smb.'s head, call it quits, call one's hand, catch me, catch/take someone unawares, [come] hell or high water etc.*

– Phrase phrases that do not actualize the “imagination” component: *attract [smb's] attention, bear in mind, call a spade a spade, call attention to smb., call it quits, call one's hand, catch it in the neck, catch me etc.*

The above classification of phraseological units of the research corpus represents a primary attempt to systematize the research corpus; it is not and cannot be the only one, since the choice of the cognitive approach as a priority allows us to most objectively and fully consider the specifics of the object of study, which is brought into the perspective of real scientific research. Nevertheless, as a result of contextual, lexicographic, and conceptual analysis, it is possible to delineate the boundaries of the research corpus by identifying conceptual criteria “description of the process and result of cognition”, primary ranking according to the component composition and semantical features.

### References

1. Википедия. Свободная энциклопедия. – Режим доступа: <http://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/>
2. Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / под общ. ред. Е. С. Кубряковой. – М.: Изд-во филол. фак. МГУ, 1996.
3. Мокиенко, В. М. Историческая фразеология: Этнография или лингвистика? / В. М. Мокиенко // Вопросы языкознания. 1973. №2.
4. Молотков, А. И. Основы фразеологии русского языка. – Л.: Наука, 1977.
5. Солодуб, Ю. П. Фразеологизмы со значением качественной оценки лица в современном русском языке // Русский язык в школе. 1982, №3.
6. Степанов, Ю. С. Основы общего языкознания. – М., 1975.
7. Федоров, А. И. Сибирская диалектная фразеология. – Новосибирск: Наука, 1980. Энциклопедия эпистемологии и философии науки.

British & World English dictionary