

THE STUDY OF THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN STATE IN PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS.

M.M.Nazarov

Urgench State University

PhD student

Annotation: *This article discusses the concept of human state which is used in the formation of the phrases denoting human condition and points of views of different scholars on the concept of human state. During the study of phraseological units denoting human mental condition, we used different methods of analysis like sociolinguistic analysis and comparative psycholinguistic analysis, synthesis, comparison, abstraction, generalization, systematization, and classification.*

Key words: *state, human state, phrases, phraseological units, human mental condition, phrases, analysis, synthesis, comparison, abstraction, generalization, systematization, classification*

Introduction. The phraseological fund of each language is considered to be a valuable source of information about the culture and mentality of the nation. They reflect social and historical events, moral and spiritual and cultural norms, religious ideas, national traditions and customs, cultural stereotypes and archetypes of a particular nation, which are passed down from generation to generation. Phraseological units always indirectly reflect the worldview of the people, the organization of society and the ideology of their time.

Literature review. According to F. Ya. Buslaev, phraseological units are their own little world, they are short, wise expressions containing moral rules and truthful thoughts that are passed down from ancestors to generations. They are the soul of any national language, which expresses the unique spirit of the nation through unique images¹⁴³.

Phraseological units are of particular importance in creating the linguistic landscape of the world. More precisely, phrases are part of the linguistic landscape of the world, they are a "mirror of people's lives". The nature of phraseological units is closely connected with the knowledge, life experience and cultural and historical traditions of people who speak this language. The semantics of phraseological units is oriented towards the description of a person and his activity¹⁴⁴. In this article, we will focus on the phraseology that reflects the human state.

It is known that the concept of "state" is actually a synonym for the words "virtue" and "property", and therefore served only to distinguish between the initial qualities and properties of various existing things. The first explanation of this concept was given by the famous philosopher Aristotle, who called the state a changeable "characteristic" and was able to distinguish the "characteristics" of things from their features. In addition, he believed that any state of the object is manifested only in certain respects.

¹⁴³ Буслаев Ф. И. Русские пословицы и поговорки, собранные и объясненные. – М.: 1954. – С. 37.

¹⁴⁴ Фразеологический словарь русского литературного языка / Под ред. А. И.Федорова. – М., 1996; Образные средства русского языка / Под ред. В.Н.Телия. – М., 1995.

Almost many philosophers base their interpretation of the concept of "state" on the viewpoint of Kant and Hegel. When I. Kant says "state", he understands specific forms of existence - rest, change, balance, movement, etc.¹⁴⁵ According to him, "change" is a way of existence of one and the same object; however, the change only applies to the state of that object, and the object itself remains unchanged. Thus, Kant contrasts the state of continuous change with the relatively stable aspect of matter. It follows from this that a relatively stable body is matter, any change of which is the emergence of a new state.

A holistic philosophical view of the "state" was revealed by G. Hegel. The concept of "state" is similar to the levels of quality, quantity and measurement, manifested in the emergence of a changeable, substratum being¹⁴⁶. In other words, the concept of "state" for Hegel is a homogeneous philosophical category, as noted above. This is a big breakthrough compared to the views of Aristotle, who equated states with types of emotions. Summarizing the existing ideas and points of view on the concept of "state", philosophers usually define "state" as follows: a certain time, reflected in its own form of existence.

In psychology, "state" began to be studied in the mid-30s in the framework of sports psychology. The first publication about the "state" was an article by O. A. Chernikov "Starting Fever" (1937), published in 1937¹⁴⁷. In general psychology, the "state" was reflected in the article by N.D. Levitov "The problem of the mental state" and the monograph "On mental states"¹⁴⁸. In particular, "state" is a classification of mental activity and behavior in a certain period of time.

I.P. Pavlov considers the state to be the only object of psychology research. P.S. Kupalov considers it a conditioned reflex arising in connection with the influence of an external factor¹⁴⁹. For example: *to lose heart* – ўзб. *руҳи чўккан*; *drive wild* – ўзб. *ақлдан оздирмоқ*; *lose one's temper* - ўзини йўқотиб қўйиши (эсанкираб қолиш).

There are different interpretations of the term "human condition" in the specialized literature. In the explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language, the term "state" is explained as having such meanings as "an emerging, existing situation, state or physical or mental expression, appearance, image, sound, strength, medicine, ability, power"¹⁵⁰. "The Merriam-Webster English Dictionary defines a "condition" as "a state of being"¹⁵¹.

In the Psychological Dictionary, "the human condition" is defined in its most common form as "a characteristic feature of any system that reflects its position in relation to agreed objects in its environment."

N.D. Levitov, the first researcher of the "mental state", without claiming to fully define the word "state" and emphasizing the high level of the problem of solving this issue, calls the activity of cognition of the "state" the main criterion, dividing it into emotional and arbitrary based on the analogy of mental processes. At the same time, he emphasized that

¹⁴⁵ Кант И. Критика чистого разума (Соф идрок танқиди) // Соч.: В 6-ти т. Т. 3. - М.: Наука, 1964. - Б.336-500.

¹⁴⁶ Гегель Г. В. Наука логики (Мантқиқ илми) // Соч. Т. 1. - М.; Л.: Мысль, 1930. - Б.452.

¹⁴⁷ Черникова О.А. Исследование эмоциональной устойчивости в условиях напряженной деятельности. - М., 1966. Т.П. - В. 507.

¹⁴⁸ Левитов Н.Д. От фрустрации к агрессии // Психологический журнал. - 1990.-№5.-С.12.

¹⁴⁹ Павлов И.П. Лекции о работе больших полушарий головного мозга. - М., 1949.-С. 17-34.

¹⁵⁰ Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. А.Мадвалиев таҳрири остида (2006-2008)

¹⁵¹ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/condition>

the mental state can be distinguished by similarities in behavior, categories and forms, as well as by types of activity (play, study, sports)¹⁵².

In addition to the above, N.D. Levitov suggests that the following be taken into account:

– Individual and situational circumstances. First, the individual characteristics of a person; secondly, situations that can cause a non-specific reaction in a person are expressed.

– The condition is subdivided into deep and superficial depending on the strength of its influence on the behavior and experiences of a person. At this point, passion was recognized by N. D. Levitov as a deeper state of mind.

– Status - positive and negative impact on a person.

– Status – long and short.

– Status is a conscious process.

In conclusion, it is difficult to say that the state has changed today. Nevertheless, there is a lot of research on this issue: monographs by N. A. Lukyanov, V. I. Shakhovskiy, Yu. G. Babenko, dissertations by M. D. Samedova, N. B. Shvelidze, A. M. Garifullin, etc. Now linguists are faced with the need to study the psycholinguistic aspects of the "state" and the factors that determine them, including the place of the factor of the human psyche.

USED LITERATURE:

1. Буслаев Ф. И. Русские пословицы и поговорки, собранные и объясненные – М.: 1954. – С.37.
 2. Фразеологический словарь русского литературного языка / Под ред. А. И.Федорова. – М., 1996; Образные средства русского языка / Под ред. В.Н.Телия. – М., 1995.
 3. Кант И. Критика чистого разума (Соф идрок танкиди) // Соч.: В 6т. Т. 3. - М.: Наука, 1964. - С.336-500.
 4. Гегель Г. В. Наука логики (Мантик илми) // Соч. Т. 1. – М.; Л.: Мысль, 1930. – С.452.
 5. Черникова О.А. Исследование эмоциональной устойчивости в условиях напряженной деятельности // 18-Халқаро Психология Конгрессидан тезислари. – М., 1966. Т.П. – С.507.
 6. Левитов Н.Д. От фрустрации к агрессии // Психологический журнал. – 1990. – № 5. – С.12.
 7. Павлов И.П. Лекции о работе больших полушарий головного мозга. – М., 1949. – С.17-34.
 8. Ўзбек тилининг изоҳли луғати. А.Мадвалиев таҳрири остида (2006-2008)
 9. Левитов Н.Д. От фрустрации к агрессии // Психологический журнал. – 1990. – №5. – С.12.
- Used e-resource
10. <https://www.merriam-webster.com>

¹⁵² Левитов Н.Д. От фрустрации к агрессии // Психологический журнал. - 1990.-№5.-С.12.