Semantic Complications In Metaphorization As An Act Of Derivation (Based On The Materials Of English)

Shomurodova Shahlo Jahonovna

Candidate of Philological sciences, Associate professor of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The recently increased interest in the polysemy of linguistic forms is a natural consequence of the change in orientations and values within the framework of the new linguistic ideology of cognitivism, for whose representatives the issues of polysemy are as important as the substantiation of the general principles of the cognitive approach. Cognitive science in Uzbekistan relies on the methods of conceptual analysis, with the aim of establishing the structure behind the considered linguistic form. One of the main directions of the new paradigm of scientific knowledge in Russian linguistics is also the concept of the linguistic picture of the world in the works of various authors.
Keywords: language semantics, metophorization, language derivation, semantic transformation, language units.

1. INTRODUCTION

Metaphoric formation is accompanied in the language by various kinds of semantic transformations of the constituent components of language units, which leads to the figurative and semantic enrichment of the source material (A.M. Bushuy, 1980, pp. 53-54). Such a phenomenon may well be regarded as specific derivational acts that require their own special study. (G. Backman, 1991, pp. 11-12). And yet, when we look at metaphors in the world's languages, wehave the distinct impression that there is a large number of non universal metaphors as well, and that they may be just as numerousas the universal ones, if not more so. In other words, variation inmetaphor appears to be just as important and commonas universality *[Kovecses Z. Metaphor in culture. Universality and variation. Cambridge University Press.2005. P.3].*

So, for example, the separation of the numerals - components from their countable definiteness, as a rule, is accompanied by the introduction of some new semantic shades into the global meaning of metaphoric units that are absent in the numeral of an unstable turnover:

thecityofthesevenhills– "Rome";

it is six of one and half of dozen of the other = "It's the same thing";   "What's on the head, what's on the forehead";

everything is at sixes and sevens = "everything is upside down."

At the same time, many numerals that make up language units create so-called complex semantic and functional complications, which is a relevant sign of phraseological unit derivation.

it is a game at which turo can play at that game (= "let's see who takes."

It can be assumed that the formation of a certain number of metaphoric units occurs in the process of speech practice on the basis of the principles of analogy. For example, the semantics of the following metaphors of modern English:

The seven Wonders of the World;

The city of the seven hills = "Rome";

This seven year (s) day = all this long time;

The seven virtues;

The seven deadly sins;

Everything is at sixes and sevens = all-top;

Withsixofeverything = legally married (about a woman), etc.

The above is confirmed, in particular, by the fact that the organization of synonymous series according to structural models of the same type is also found in paremiological units. In addition, as observations show, the models of synonymous series of metaphors retain their stability in many languages, including heterogeneous systems, which indicates the universality of the formation of synonymous series of different languages (E. Wiegand, 1998, p. 20-21).

Along with exact (or complete) analogues of language units, there are non-partial (or approximate) copies, i.e. translated from one language to another foreign language paremiological units, the lexical and grammatical composition of which is transferred with some deviations from the unit-prototype. In lexicographic and translation practice, such (non-partial) language units are called "phraseological analogues."

Metaphors have the ability to undergo various changes in their composition, and this variation occurs due to the permissible interchange of only components in the metaphoric structure, while its other components are usually constant. In this case, the dimensional transformations of the components in the composition of language unit in the overwhelming majority of cases does not violate the shaped structures of the corresponding stable revolutions.

For example:

be (all) at sixes and sevens = "in disarray; be in disrepair";

setonsixandseven

set on cingue and sice (put on the highest numbers when playing dice, i.e. "risk everything, put everything on the line")

In modern English, an abbreviated phrase is more common, for example:

"We had an awful rush today", Daphne explained wearily. "Fifty men for lunch and more men for dinner, and everything in the kitchen at sixes andsevens" (K. S. Prichard. WingedSeeds, ch. XXIV).

The semantic-derivational complication of the figurative basis of paremiological units is facilitated by all kinds of duplication in the paremiological form of the components of one part of the speech category. Semantic structure is modelled in terms of the theoretical construct of the lexicalconcept, which constitutes a unit of semantic structure. Linguistic content represents the informational form that conceptualstructure takes for direct representation in language.*[Vyvyan Evans, Stephanie Pourcel. New Directions in Cognitive Linguistics. John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam / Philadelphia. 2009. P.32].* For instance, typical examples of paremiological units in modern English, where combinations of numbers are available:

Three in One, One in Three = Holy Trinity.

to strike twelve the first time (all at once) = immediately detect your abilities;

anger gave him the strength of ten = tenfold;

two in distress makes sorrow - last Shared grief is half grief.

The intensity of metaphorization, manifested in the modeling of phraseological units, contributes to the development of semantic-figurative playing, like samples with support component "one".

be all one to smb.; be at one (with smb.); be one too many; be one too for smb.; cushy one, a; Evil One, the; hot one, a; one and all; one and only, the; one by one, onein a thousand; one is not built that way; one or two; one too many (or too much) for smb. and etc.

The above-mentioned semantic complications contribute to derivational versification in the metaphoric system of the language.

When selecting material for phraseological derivation research and, above all, in order to distinguish derivatives from phraseological variants, it is necessary to proceed from three main prerequisites, which predetermine the methodology for analyzing text and metaphoric data:

1) the presence of both material and semantic transformations of the original unit, necessary for the recognition in a number of structures of a derived formation from an independent language unit - a derivative;

2) in the presence of transformations in terms of expression, changes in terms of content are considered sufficient to recognize the status of a metaphoric unit - a derivative, if they affect in a derivatively related series the subject-logical aspect of the meaning of the original language unit;

3) transformations in the connotative aspect of meaning are recognized as insignificant changes in the content plan and therefore do not lead to the formation of a language unit - a derivative.

Thus, the insignificance of differences in the connotative aspect of meaning for establishing the identity and difference of paremiological units has been repeatedly emphasized by linguists, including in a stylistic sense. The only exceptions are rare cases when connotative discrepancies are accompanied by changes in their environment in the text and, therefore, do not allow interchangeability in context.

Different circumstances give rise to the creation of a new derivative. Paremiologization in the broad sense of the word, both primary and secondary, enriches the language with bright, expressive language units and contributes to filling gaps in the spheres of nomination and connotation [1; 27].

Therefore, carrying out the analysis in a synchronous plan, it is advisable (if possible) to involve historical data, which in some cases make it possible to determine the time of the appearance of a particular paremiological unit and to trace the path of its subsequent development.

For example, the creation of paremiological units in the American version is closely connected with the development of the state and political system of the United States, their history. In this regard, the study of the origins of metaphors helps to understand their nature and makes it possible to get to know more deeply the life of the people [5; 30]. Let's analyze examples of derivatively labeled paremiological units, where various characteristic aspects of life in the history of Americans are clearly traced:

put one's money on a scratched horse ["put on the wrong horse", "miscalculate", "miscalculate"],

a spoiler party ["a party created to take away some of the votes from the Republican and Democratic Party in the elections"] and Australians:

so poor he's licking paint off the fence ["he became impoverished", "he reached the handle"].

The acceptance by the society of some neologisms and, on the contrary, the rejection of others, is a phenomenon that depends on many factors, first of all, on the extent to which a given derivative corresponds to the goals of the nomination set for it. In our research, we restrict ourselves to the problems of linguistic metaphoric derivation, which generates new units of conventional nomination, and focus on the lexicographic information.

For an optimal study of the secondary nomination in the field of paremiology, it is advisable to proceed from rethinking as the dominant property of the semantic structure of language units. The generation of new units of nomination during primary metaphorization is associated with the transition of semantic functions from the denotation of a linguistic unit to

another denotation, which is an abstraction from the first. In such considered conditions of primary metaphorization, one can speak rather of a speech unit as a prototype, and not a linguistic unit itself. Only as a result of the superposition of two plans does a stable figurative nominative unit of the metaphorical variety appear [4; 76].

When a new paremiological unit is generated as a result of secondary metaphorization, the mechanism for the formation of a new designation function is already completely different. In this case, rethinking already exists in the original language unit, undergoing further figurative-semantic complication in the derived metaphorical unit [1; 26].

The formation of new language units (The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English-2008; Fowler-2008; Hornby-1999; etc.) is associated in the process of semantic derivation with the transition of semantic functions from the paremiological unit denotation to another denotation, where another denotation is not an abstraction from the first, but, being determined by it, is an essential modification of it. The type of rethinking is set by the initial unit, which is in a relationship of formal and semantic invariance with the derivative of the language unit, if there is a synchronous or diachronic prototype, for example: paremiological unit *kiss of death - kiss of life,* obsolete language unit *all the fat is in the fire - the fat is in the fire.*

In the course of researching a number of basic explanatory dictionaries of English language (Longman, 1988; G. Mallinson, 1999; T. McArthur, 1991; The New National Dictionary, 1999; The Oxford English Dictionary, 1999; etc.), we have identified some regularly actualized features of semantic transformations in the process of semantic derivation from the typology of one-structured derivation.

1. Derivation of the same analogs: "man Friday" [a loyal and hardworking servant or helper], "girl Friday" [a female secretary or a helper in an office who does all the useful and important jobs that the man in charge wants done].

Derivative productivity of semantic units "girl Friday" is due to the relations of formal (Friday) and semantic [meaning of usefulness, irreplaceability - loyal, hardworking (useful, important)] invariance in which these paremiological units are located. The change in the lexical filling of the position of the first term of unit "man Friday" with the word "girl", which differs from it in one parameter –that is gender, - entailed a change in the subject-logical aspect of the meaning of the entire initial paremiological unit. In addition, a certain narrowing of the meaning (secretary) is observed in the derivative lexical unit. The resulting new unit "girl Friday" is an independent nominative sign denoting a concept that has no other unambiguous name.

2. Derivation, which is based on a change in the subject-logical aspect of the meaning of paremiological units along the line state-action, action-state (in the expression: logical units - correlates).

When identifying such a variety of semantic derivatives, it is difficult to distinguish between true metaphors and paremiological units that arose according to the semantic model. The fact is that the semantic model itself has developed, as it seems, on the basis of derivative formations. Therefore, in the case of rather late paremiological units (correlating in these relations), we can assume that these are formations according to the model, and not derivatives, if the dictionary data (quotations from fiction, press, etc.) fix their relatively simultaneous occurrence, in contrast to from a significant interval in time.

3. Derivation by contrast.

Referring to the paremiological unit "kiss of death" [apparently friendly act causing ruin, disastrous consequences] of biblical origin and its derivative paremiological unit "kiss of life" [mouth to mouth method of artificial respiration, also fig.] [1, p. 24], then the relations of formal and semantic invariance here are due to a single figurative basis, a

semantic   feature,   according   to   which   they   are   opposed: kissthatbringsruin, disastrousconsequences-kissthatbringsair, life.

Replacing the second term of the original language unit with the antonym of the word life entailed changes in the subject-logical aspect of the meaning of the entire initial paremiological unit.

The polysemy of such semantic units of the American version developed in two ways. One of them is the development of polysemy based on the general English basis:

to be on the road:

1) Brit. "To be on the road, tour, travel";

2) Amer. "to drive around";

3) Amer. "To wander";

to take water:

1) Brit. "Enter the water and swim" (also totakethewater);

2) Brit. "To be launched" (about the ship);

3) Amer. "Retreat, move back, yield; take back your words";

The second way of development of polysemyis their complicationfigurative-semantic structure in the process of functioning of paremiological units belonging to the American version like *to lower the boom.*

The first meaning of unit *"to strike, knocking down"* is the result of rethinking the phrase, taken from combat sports. Then this unit acquires the second meaning *"to punish, to make a severe reprimand, to punish, to criticize strongly, to demand obedience, to deal severely"* and the third meaning "to*hinder the success of another".*

Not all meanings are equally used, not all of them havethe same valence, they all have one or another of their own individual stylistic function (3,57).

Paremiological unit "totakeitonthechin" in its first meaning is not used and is replaced by paremiological unit "to take it" "to receive blows, beatings". The second meaning "to suffer complete defeat" is widely used in modern language.

Paremiological unit polysemy develops in two ways: polysemy based on the general English basis (to be on the road - "to be on the road, tour, travel," "drive around", "wander", etc.) and the complication of their semantic structure in the process of functioning [to be (go) on the boom - "to live in poverty, to live like a vagabond; beg "; "Lead a dissolute life"; "To be in distress"]. The study shows that out of 800 neoplasms, about 100 are ambiguous. Moreover, most of them have two meanings that arose as a result of parallel metaphorical shifts.

Recently, the influence of American English on other varieties, in particular on British, has been increasing. So, about 150 verbal paremiological unitunits-Americanisms were borrowed by the British version. Wed the following samples:

• playfulness: join the angels ["go to a better world", "die"];

• with the bark on ["uncouth", "rude", "not shining in manners"];

• irony: carry the banner ["to wander all night long without shelter" (about the unemployed)];

• dismissiveness: (as) independent as a hog on ice ["impudent", "self-confident, cheeky person"]; half horse and half alligator ["the nickname of the backwoods in Kentucky"]; high muck-a-muck ["arrogant"], etc.

Based on the studied material, we can conclude that synonymous series of verbal paremiological units (such as to take the contest, to take the cake, to go to the bath with "compete with someone, challenge, compete", etc.) are typical for the phraseology of the English language). Their different stylistic attribution is noted, as well as the ability to enter into several different synonymous series, forming a complex microsystem.

Paremiology in American English is seen as an important concretion of colloquial units. This is evidenced by the use of many metaphorical units (the expressions "colloquial", "colloquial vernacular", "slang", etc.). At the same time, American dictionaries often contain indirect evidence of the colloquial nature of metaphorical units. For example, various variations and elliptical transformations of the component composition of a large number of paremiological unit are shown. They convincingly indicate that the paremiological units of the language stand out among other categories of its units with a special dynamism and active use. In the same way, they are characterized by the interdependent realization of two opposite tendencies: the striving for cliché form, on the one hand, and for updating the component composition of paremiologicalunits, on the other.

The main classification feature of units, the American version is semantic. It allows not only to reveal in the context significant fragments of the reflection of extra-linguistic reality by means of paremiology, but also to solve the fundamentally important task of the semantic unit of the language in comparison with the vocabulary.

In American dictionaries, this is convincingly shown by examples of typical variations in the component composition of lexical units. At the same time, if the transition of a number of components to the category of optional or generally redundant indicates their semantic leveling, then the variant renewal of core image-bearing components can be considered from the point of view of maintaining significant initial word characteristics. In addition to the use of various kinds of comments about the functional use of a particular metaphorical unit, some special techniques are also used, which make it possible to demonstrate in all clarity the functional specificity of a particular unit in the context of an explanatory dictionary. Another method of demonstrating in the explanatory dictionary the ways of functional implementation of individual units is a list of their most likely paradigmatic forms of use. In particular, some metaphors may vary in the expression of the subject.

As a rule, semantical units used in colloquial use are considered as units of a semantical order. For this, all possible labels and remarks are used that characterize various stable features of paremiological units in general. These are indications of the figurative, figurative meaning of paremiological units, their stability (relative reproducibility of paremiological forms), or it is indicated that units are colloquial expressions used with various semantic - modal (emotional, emphatic) shades of meaning [2, p.93].

American dictionaries are distinguished by careful grouping of paremiological units. Information about the most common paremiological units of the language is especially valuable here. Explanatory dictionaries pay extremely close attention to such paremiological units. As a result, it is these dictionaries that reveal in the most detailed way the paremiological unit system of the language in terms of semantic, modal-expressive, stylistic and functional characteristics.

For the most part, the bulk of paremiological units of the language is distinguished by a clichéd structure, which is prone to significant implicit transformation in the conditions of lively colloquial speech.

The literary layer of Americanparemiologicalunits indicates the predisposition of figurative semantic units to renew their expressive capabilities. This is usually achieved by showing a minimum of variable vibrations of the core components of the semantic form. As a rule, such processes of paremiological component renewal proceed within the same stylistic perspective and with the preservation of the figurative dominant.

Paremiological units are used in the literature as a means of interpreting the various meanings of the described words. First of all, this is their use in modal functions. In this case, paremiological units serve as an illustration of the implementation of this or that meaning of a given word [1, p.5].

For an explanatory dictionary, the depth of disclosure of the stylistic nature of metaphor is indicative. It should be noted that under the conditions of lively colloquial speech, metaphors are distinguished by extremely complex stylistic characteristics. In fact, only explanatory dictionaries manage to reveal the stylistic nature of paremiology in all the variety of its manifestations.

The interpretation of the stylistic nature of paremiological units is carried out by American explanatory dictionaries in parallel with the description of the semantic and functional features [2, p.92]. Thus, in the semantization of paremiology, taking into account the stylistic and functional features of the meanings and shades of meanings distinguished in lexical units receives in the dictionary the necessary differentiating feature, through which one meaning clearly differs from the other. In other words, the involvement of stylistic information in a set of parameters for interpreting the linguistic nature of metaphors contributes to the disclosure of systemic relations in the explanatory dictionary both within all paremiological units of the language, and within each of them separately.

Sets of stylistic relationships of various paremiological units allow building the very structure of describing the entire nature of paremiological units as a whole. So, within the description of one single paremiological unit, a common stylistic feature is found, inherent in all its meanings and functional realizations. Then the facts of various kinds of stylistic differentiations are established, which are especially indicative, relevant only to any individual of the meanings [3,38-39].

Stylistic qualifications can be common for several paremiological units (for example, synonyms). On the other hand, it is the individual stylistic characteristic of paremiological units that serves its well-known differentiation in the synonymous row: "Hold on! (colloq.), stop !, wait! " ...

Similarly, in the paremiological unit series, American explanatory dictionaries of the English language also concretize slangs: "Beat it! (slang), go away!".

It should be emphasized that the explanatory dictionary is characterized by a broader historical display of the perspective of stylistic features that are possible in the system of language paremiology.

The greatest difficulty in distinguishing between variance and synonymy is presented by various kinds of stylistic factors, such as expressiveness, emotionality, imagery, functional orientation, and others, observed during derivational modification of the lexical composition of paremiological units. The attitude of researchers to the phenomena under consideration depends on how these factors are assessed. Those who see these factors as one of the main features of paremiological units consider them incompatible with the concept of identity. They qualify absolutely identical units as variants. For them, the identity of phraseological units remains as long as there are no very noticeable semantic and stylistic differences between the options. Moreover, a particularly important role is given to the unity of the image between the options. In other words, the stylistic aspect is carried out by such researchers into the field of synonymy: the stylistic feature serves to differentiate synonyms.

Other researchers have a broader understanding of variance. In their opinion, variants are relatively identical units, which to one degree or another may differ in stylistic parameters. Certain modifications here do not violate the identity of the options. The stylistic aspect of meaning for these researchers serves to differentiate options or both options and synonyms at the same time. Consequently, the typology of options is also significantly expanding [2,62].

Some supporters of this broad understanding of variance, paying special attention to the degree of modification when varying the lexical composition of phraseological units, divide the variants into completely identical, relatively identical and stylistic ones.

Variation is understood even more broadly by those who highlight variants in both aspects of paremiological units: both in terms of expression and in terms of content.

Three types of variance are established: a) variants of the signifying idioms, b) variants of the signified idioms, c) two-sided variance, when both the form and content of paremiological units vary simultaneously. Along with stylistic differences between the options, a complete mismatch in their lexical composition is also allowed.

In understanding variance and synonymy, it is advisable to be guided by the principle of invariance, which not only most adequately reflects the essence of these phenomena, but also allows you to establish the identity of the options and see their difference from synonyms [2, 62]. Therefore, when considering variance, we [following A.V.Kunin] believe that the invariant should be present in both aspects of the variants both in terms of their expression and in terms of their content. Highlighting the invariant in terms of content, we consider the meaning of paremiological units as a complex concept, consisting of denotative, significative and stylistic aspects. For semantic meaning, not only the first two aspects are important, but no less important is the stylistic aspect, which either dominates over the denotative and significative aspects, or is closely intertwined with them.

For example, the phrase *put the hard word (acid) on* has two meanings: 1) "beg for money from someone", "ask for a favor" and 2) "to molest the girls", which are implemented by both options. On the other hand, it cannot be considered variants of the unit like silly as a (cut) snake and mad as a (cut) snake. Both the first phraseological unit and the second are used in the meaning of "stupid as a stump". However, paremiological unit*mad as a (cut) snake* also has a second meaning "angry, furious" [Dictionary of Contemporary English, p.118]. In this case, the concept of invariant does not duplicate the concept of identity, because invariance remains the guiding principle for establishing the degree of identity of units, their similarity and difference.

Inequality that does not violate the identity of the options is observed in the COP only in three dimensions:

1) Variants may differ in quantitative terms as more frequent and less frequent. For example, the option for all the tea in China ("for nothing, for no good") has a higher frequency than the option for all the rice in China.

2) Variants may differ in chronological indicators as later and early (but not archaic) existing at a given period of language development. So, for example, of all three variants of paremiological units poke borak (mullock, muck) at ("to make fun of, mock at someone"), the earlier variant is poke borak at. Recently, PU stick one's bib in ("poke your nose into other people's affairs") has a variant of poke one's bib in, which is also recorded in dictionaries.

3) Options may differ in geographical terms as purely regional options that have become widespread in a particular area. For example, Woolloomooloo Yank ("dude posing as an American") is predominantly used in Sydney, while its Fitzroy Yank version is used in Melbourne.

Of course, these factors (under certain conditions) can lead to a violation of the identity of the options and to the emergence of independent units. This tendency can be traced in the development of paremiological units *fair dinkum,* which in the recent past had a variant *square dinkum* and functioned in the meaning of "true, real". However, due to its extremely high frequency, the *fair dinkum* variant acquired another meaning - "Honest!", "By God!" and, consequently, the splitting of the phraseological units into two independent units is obvious here.

So, the structure of a variant paremiologicalunit consists of asymmetric quantities - relative (its external form) and absolute (its content). This allows us to qualify as variants such modifications of paremiological units that have two-sided invariance, which is

minimally manifested in its form and maximally in its content, which are equivalent in their functional, semantic and stylistic parameters and coexist in a given period of language development.

Modifications of a different nature, entailing certain semantic and stylistic transformations, lead to the emergence of independent units, i.e., synonyms [1, 57].

Therefore, synonyms have (in comparison with variants) fewer invariant features. Synonyms do not have a lexical invariant: they must differ in their semantic and / or stylistic properties, even if they partially coincide in their lexical composition.

So, paremiologicalunits*hen pen and sow pen*, despite their lexical and semantic invariant (both paremiological units have the meaning "the place where women gather"), differ in the number of meanings. For example, paremiological unit*hen pen* is also used in the meaning of "women's salon in a hotel".

Paremiologicalunit like *game as Ned Kelly and game as Ginger Meggs,* which, if their common meaning coincides ("brave, courageous"), differ both in their origin and in style - the first is solemn, the second has a humorous shade.

By analyzing synonyms, we abstract from a number of invariant features that are relevant to variants. Nevertheless, for all their differences, the synonyms still retain the identity of the denotative meaning (within a given synonymous group, they all have the same reference correlation). The need for an invariant in terms of expressing options is dictated by the following factors.

First, the presence of a common component in the formal structure of variants contributes to the establishment of their genetic commonality, because all variants of paremiological units go back to the same source, they are varieties of the same paremiological unit. Initially, at the moment of its appearance, phraseological units usually exist without variant.

Then, on the basis of a more or less automated prototype, for various reasons, other options arise that necessarily have a material commonality with the prototype. For example, in the version based on paremiological unit*stone the crows!* ("Damn it! Come on! Stop it!") (Its first appearance is dated in the dictionary in 1918) variants appeared: *starve the crows; stiffen the crows: stiffen the wombats: starve the lizards: starve the wombats: stiffen the lizards*.

Variants of a meaning paremiologicalunit can be considered as a result of a derivational change in its paradigm, as a form and way of existence of paremiological units.

Secondly, the lexical invariant contributes to the variants to be in a relationship of mutually dependent orientation between the variants to the same object. The absence of a lexical invariant leads to the rupture of the formal unity of the options, and to a large extent can affect their semantic identity.

Thirdly, the absence of a lexical invariant makes it extremely difficult to distinguish variants from synonyms, if, for example, units are considered as variants that are stylistically unequal, because a number of synonyms are characterized by the same features. The need for a lexical invariant can be said only if all the components of paremiologicalunits vary simultaneously, which leads to the emergence of a number of variants. Then, the extreme members of the variation series show a complete divergence of the lexical composition, however, their material identity is not lost, since they are interconnected through a chain of intermediate options.

So, paremiological unit*bad trot* ("streak of bad luck, a series of failures") has options tough trot: rough trot: rough run: bad run; since both components of a given paremiological unit vary, then not all variants taken in pairs have a lexical invariant (for example, rough run - tough trot). However, their formal identity is established through other "neighboring" options.

In the sphere of verbal paremiology, variants with components arise: repose - to repose / rest / retire on one's laurels; take - to have / ply / pull / take / tug the laboring oar; to put on / assume airs. The newest dictionaries reveal the first use of paremiological units (every) Tom, Dick and (or) Harry; in cold blood in this form.

Highlighting the invariant in terms of the content of the options, we consider the meaning of phraseological units as a complex concept, consisting of denotative, significative and stylistic aspects. For paremiological meaning, not only the first two aspects are important, but no less significant is the stylistic aspect, which either dominates over the denotative and significative aspects, or is closely intertwined with them. Despite the heterogeneity of the composition, the stylistic aspect is still a constant value in the semantics of paremiological units. Due to its constant nature in the semantic structure of paremiological units, it is advisable to carry out the identification of variants in all three aspects of semantic meaning.

Based on the studied material, it can be concluded that the specificity of semantic transformations in one-structuredsemantic derivation is characterized by the following features: the presence of a diachronic prototype, the emergence of new meanings in the subject-logical aspect of the meaning of lexical units instead of part of the old meanings, a change in the estimated component of meaning in some cases of derivation, modification of the subject - the logical aspect of the meaning of paremiological units as a result of changes in its connotative aspect.Therefore, we can talk about the identity of the options only when there is a maximum set of invariant features in each of these aspects, which leads to the functional and semantic equivalence of the options. The options should match both in quality and in the number of values.

LITERATURE:
[1]. Backman G. Meaning by Metaphor: An Exploration of Metaphor with a Metaphoric Reading of Two Short Stories by Steven Crane. – Uppsals: (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia: 75), 1991,-200 p.
[2]. Bushuy T.A. Phraseological Equivalentation as a Problem of Contrastive Linguistics.- Sofia, 1996. №1. c.30-35.
[3]. Kaschak, M. Glenberg, A. 2000. Constructing meaning: The role of affordances and grammatical constructionsin sentence comprehension. Journal of Memory and Language. P.508–529.
[4]. Wiegand E. Contrastive Lexical Semantics. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1998. –IX, 270 p.
[5]. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Спорные вопросы семантики.– М.: Гнозис, 2005.– С. 5-6.
[6]. Арнольд И.В. Семантическая структура слова в современном английском языке, с.57.
[7]. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка.- М.: Высшая школа, 1986.-с.62.
[8]. Бушуй Т.А. Фразеосистемность в контрастивном лексическом словаре // Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. – Нукус, 2001. - №5. – С.92-93.
[9]. Добровольский Д.О. Национально – культурная специфика во фразеологии (1) // Вопросы языкознания. –М., 1997. -№6. – С. 37-49.
[10]. Исмаилов А.Р. Прагматика фразеологиии её текстовая актуализация (на материале окказиональных преобразований фразеологических единиц английского языка). Автореф. дисс…. канд. филол. наук.- Ташкент, 2006.-28с.
[11]. Большой англо-русский словарь. – Под общим рук. И.Р. Гальперина.– Т.1-2. – Изд. 2. – М.: Русский язык, 1977. – Т.I. – 822с.; Т.2. – 863с. (БАРС).

[12]. Кунин А.В. Англо-русский фразеологический словарь.–Изд.3-е, испр., в двух книгах.–М.: СЭ, 1967.– Т.1. – 738с.; Т.2. – 739-1264с. (АРФС).

[13]. Кунин А.В. Фразеология современного английского языка. – М.: Международные отношения, 1972. - 288с.

[14]. Колпакова Г.В. Семантика языковой единицы.–Казань: Изд-во Казанск. ун-та, 2004. – 216с.

[15]. Бушуй А.М. Фразеографические основы украинского толкового словаря // Вопросы филологических наук.-М.,2009.-№6.-С.26-30.

[16]. Бушуй Т.А. Фразеосистемность в контрастивном лексическом словаре // Вестник Каракалпакского отделения Академии наук Республики Узбекистан. – Нукус, 2001. - №5. – С.92-93.

[17]. Денисенко С.Н. К вопросу о взаимосвязи слово – и фразеообразования (на материале немецкого языка) // Филологические науки.- М., 1997. №1. – С.54-60.

[18]. Тер-Минасова С. Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация: Учебное пособие. – М.: Слово, 2000.-624с.