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Abstract. The current article is devoted to the particular theoretical views of the notion of frame as well as it focuses on the and the theory of conceptual metaphor. Moreover, it deals with the specialized frame, slot and terminal characteristics which might be involved in most common used phraseological units, particularly, on the examples of English, Russian and Uzbek sentences and collocations. As it’s obviously seen that phraseological units contain deep sense, which have roots in the culture of nation. They reflect people’s way of thinking and perception of the world. They are considered to be “codes” of culture, its specific laconic and witty language. The metaphorical aspects of any idiom or phraseological unit is universal for each analyzed language. These particular peculiarities and some special characteristics of phrasemes are outlined in this article as well.
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INTRODUCTION

According to the theory of Sh. Safarov, “there is no doubt that the language system, which is the source of knowledge and its application, transmission and, ultimately, the means of its formation, is an object of cognitive analysis ... The existence of knowledge is a product of language. Language itself is a product of the cognitive system. The content is formed as a result of mental activity. Therefore,
cooperation in such areas as linguistics, psychology, sociology, cultural studies is a phenomenon that occurs on the basis of cognitive activity ”[1, 9].

In modern scientific research, in particular, linguistic concepts, frame modeling as an opportunity for structuring knowledge has become widespread. In the frame structure are allocated separate slots, which can be filled with specific information. Distinguish between frame script and frame schema, which are distinguished by the static / dynamic nature of the knowledge frame presented. Recently, in the mainstream of the cognitive direction, frame modeling has been repeatedly introduced to the analysis of phraseological units, where the slot, according to M. Alefirenko, “sets a certain parameter, a kind of position that can be filled with specific information in the semantic structure of the phraseme” [2, 13].

In linguistics, a frame is considered as a phraseological unit model. Scientists often see the frame modeling of phraseological units in the reproduction of dynamic and static logically ordered components of the script and in the establishment of the features of the variant verbalization of the slots of the invariant frame, which is the basis for the formation of the phraseological unit. Idioms can represent one frame model in different ways, verbalizing different numbers of slots with different components.

Phraseological units reflect, first of all, various processes of cognition by the animate subject of the surrounding world and itself in it [3, 30]. As an example of the application of the frame approach to the analysis of semantics phraseological units [4, 52] we shall consider the frame ‘mental activity’ on the material of the English language. Frame semantics is discovered through background knowledge that reflects a highly specialized area of human activity. Background knowledge or presuppositions, ideas about the role of the designated phenomenon in the system of value orientations of the linguocultural community play a leading role in the formation of the semantics of these units, as well as in linguistic communication, in the process of interaction between communicants [5].

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Let us consider the structure of the frame “mental activity” on the basis of comparing collocations of English and phrases of the Russian and Uzbek languages [6, 134]. This frame includes two subframes - ‘subject’ and ‘content’, which are specified by the corresponding slots and terminals. The structure of the “subject” subframe includes the slots ‘qualitative assessment of the subject’, ‘qualitative assessment of the thinking process’ and ‘state of thinking’.

The 'qualitative assessment of the subject' slot covers the terminals: 'mind', 'stupidity', 'madness', filled with the corresponding phraseological units: (smart) - a man of sense, mental giant, as wise as Solomon, as wise as an owl, as sharp as a needle, mind of great capacity, be clear in one's mind; be in one's right mind; be of sound mind - разумный человек, умственный гигант, мудрый, как Соломон, Мудрый, как сова, острый, как игла, ум большой способности, будьте ясны в своем уме; будьте в здравом уме; будьте в здравом уме – оқил инсон, юксак иктидор эгаси, Салмондек ақлли, бойкушдай ақлли, ақли ўткір, хар нарсага етадиган ақл, фиқри тиниклик, фикран согломлик.

Terminal (stupid) - smart as paint, smart as a steel trap, bright as a young buck, wise guy, smart alec (k), wisenheimer, mental midget, smart guy, bright specimen, as clever as a cartload of monkeys, as clever as a wagonload of monkeys; - умный, как краска, умный, как стальной капкан, умный, как молодой олень, умный парень, умный Алек, мудрый геймер, умственный карлик, умный парень, яркий образец, умный, как телега с обезьянами – ақли сочи каби киска, алифни калтак дейди, Али десанг, Вали дейди, девор бўлмаса кўчани кўради.

Terminal (crazy) - bereft of reason - (сумасшедший) - лишенный разума – ақлдан бегона, томи кеган, бошига курт тушган.

The slot ‘qualitative assessment of the thinking process’ includes the terminal “way of thinking”, represented by phraseological units: - think inside the box, on the same page, on the same wavelength - думать логически, нестандартное мышление – мантиқий фикр юритиш, ностандарт фикрлаш; think outside the box - думать творчески – ижодий фикрлаш; have a mind of one’s own - думать критически –
танкидий фикр; think positively, think optimistically, think big - думать позитивно – ижобий фикрлаш; think negatively - думать негативно - салбий фикр; think twice about something - подумать, как следует – яхшилаб йилаб кўриш; think out (something) – упущения в мысли – назардан кочириш; to have a long think about smth – чересчур замысловатое рассуждение – чалкаш фикр; to think hard – тугодумие – суст фикрлаш.

The subframe 'content' includes the slot 'qualitative assessment of the content of thinking' and the terminal 'state of mind', which is filled with the corresponding phraseological units: испытывать сомнение - шубҳа остига олиш - don't bet on it, be lost (or at a loss) for words, be miles away, in a fog, one's thoughts are in a muddle, scramble sb's brains, mental jam, mental / writer's block, at (one's) wits' end, not know if / whether one is coming or going and not to know what to do for the best, his mind / brain was reeling, make sb's head spin / swim / reel, look at sth / be like a deer (caught) in the headlights and look at smth / be like a rabbit (caught) in the headlights; сходить с ума - ақлдан жудо бўлиш, телбаномо бўлиш, жинни бўлиш - flip smb's lid, flip one’s wig, flip one’s top, flip one’s bananas, flip one’s bean, flip out, flip, to lose one’s head, go crazy, blow one's mind - не ставьте на это – бунга урғу берманг; не теряйтесь в словах – сўздан адашманг, сўздан тойиб кетманг, пойма-пой гапириш; будто за много миль отсюда - боғдан келсанг, тогдаш келади; ментальный затор – аклий парокандалик; его ум / мозг шатался – томи кетиб колган.

An important feature of phraseological units is metaphoricity, imagery. Metaphor is a connection between the dictionary meaning of a word and the contextual-logical one based on attributing the inherent property of one thing to another, which was initially devoid of it. In the famous work "Metaphors We Live by" American linguists J. Lakoff and M. Johnson developed a concept that created a certain systematic description of the process of metaphorization as a kind of cognitive process of comprehending reality. The founders of the theory of conceptual metaphor are J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, the fundamental work (1980, translated into Russian -
1987) became the basis for most researchers of the phenomenon of metaphor. According to the concept of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson, “... a metaphor permeates our entire daily life and manifests itself not only in language, but also in thinking and action. Our everyday conceptual system, within the framework of which we think and act, is metaphorical in its essence” [7, 387]. The merit of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson is to substantiate the fact that the metaphor is not limited to the sphere of language, but also extends to the sphere of thinking. “Human thinking processes are largely metaphorical ... Metaphors as linguistic expressions become possible precisely because there are metaphors in the conceptual system of man.”

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The hypothesis of the existence of a relationship between the understanding of foreign language metaphors and the presence in the recipient language of expressions that are raised to similar cognitive structures can be illustrated with the following examples: the English collocation “to sit on the phone” is similar in meaning to the expression “сидеть на телефоне” and “телефонга ёпишиб олиш”.

Phraseological units may contain a verbal destructive component. The concept of “destruction” is contained in the Russian idiom “ломать голову”, in the English collocation “to cudgel one’s brains over smth. (literally, beat your brains with a stick)” and the Uzbek phraseme “боши ғовлаб кетди”.

The cognitive theory of metaphor explains why some English collocations are easy to understand and borrow, while others are not. It depends on the nature of identification in the recipient language of conceptual metaphors. For example, the idiom in Russian “ловить кого-либо на слове” is identical in meaning to the English expression “to take someone at his words”. This metaphorical meaning corresponds to the Uzbek phraseme “тилидан тутилиш”. However, not all metaphorical English collocations can be conveyed using the equivalent expressions of the Russian language. For example, the collocations “to vanish into thin air” (to disappear in a strange, mystical way) do not find cognitive analogues in the Russian language and are perceived as an opaque construction. However, in the Uzbek
language there is an expression “кўздан зим-зиё бўлди”, to a certain extent it is identical in meaning to English.

The next row is represented by such conceptual correlates as “a hard nut to crack” the expression “крепкий орешек” - “tough nut”. In the Uzbek language, to convey this metaphorical meaning, the expression "тош бодом" (literally strong almond) is used. All these examples indicate the presence of cognitively determined discrepancies in the compared languages. Such differences are not accidental and, of course, indicate the specifics of the understanding of certain fragments of reality by the corresponding linguistic communities. The analysis showed that in these languages most of the considered conceptual metaphors coincide. This confirms the fact that the metaphorical mechanism has a universal nature, and hence an extra-linguistic origin, namely the universal cognitive-logical connections inherent in man.

English metaphors are not always similar to Russian ones. They show a special mentality, cultural baggage and peculiarities of the language. Therefore, the study of metaphors is useful not only for the development of the English language, but also for a better understanding of the English-speaking culture.

Metaphors can be used both in oral speech and in writing - in literary texts. For example, from the British or Americans you can often hear such expressions as «кипеть от возмущения» — boiling mad, «музыка для ушей» (приятно слышать) – music to the ears, «чистое небо» (нет угроз) – clear skies. And such metaphors as melt away – «растаять» (about thoughts, feelings and other immaterial things), a dagger to my heart – «нож в сердце» или move heaven and earth – «свернуть горы», are often used in books [8 , 16].

English metaphors can consist of one, two or several words: a mindgame - игры разума, головоломки – бошқотирма ўйинлар, narrow-minded - узкий разум, предвзятый – тор фикр, soul-searching - поиски в душе», самоанализ – ўз қалбини тушуниш. Most metaphors are two or more words that create a lively and interesting metaphorical expression. For example, to fire someone’s enthusiasm – возбудить, буквально «зажечь» энтузиазм – ташаббус уйготиш.
Phrasemosemiosis is a speech-thinking activity aimed at indirectly derived representation of subjective-interpretive concepts as part of frames that represent certain discursive situations in the cognitive-pragmatic space of the text.

For example, the adjective aggressive in English, depending on the context, can have both negative and positive connotations. For example: aggressive war / policy - aggressive war / politics. This phrase creates a negative emphasis. However, the phrase aggressive expediting strategy - offensive / assertive / active / decisive strategy to accelerate the supply of equipment and materials creates a positive emphasis [9,193].

CONCLUSION

The metaphor is created on the basis of various types of similarity of shape, color, sound, etc. [10, 61]. It can be embodied in any semantic part of speech: These thoughts melted away – Эти мысли растаяли – Бу фикрлар гўё эриб кетгандек бўлди.

Frequent metaphors tend to lose their expressiveness. From this point of view, we distinguish between true (when we perceive both meanings at the same time) and extinct metaphors (half-living double perception with the loss of originality): a wall between two people – стена между двумя людьми - икки одам ўртасидаги девор, dead metaphors.

True metaphors are inherent in poetry and emotional prose, extinct - in journalism and rhetoric.

The expanded metaphor contains several figurative expressions at the same time: A woman is a foreign land - Женщина это другая планета – Аёл киши бу бошка бир олам.

Although he there settles young the man will never understand its customs, politics and tongue И хоть знаком с ней с детства он - мужчина никогда не поймёт её обычаи, политику и язык – Эркак киши аёл билан бир умр яшаган бўлса хам унинг бож-хирожи, сиёсати ва тилини хеч қачон тушунмайди.
Expanded metaphors can be prompting when accompanying ones are given instead of the main image. Such metaphors can be riddles.

The principle of conceptual integration is at the heart of many linguistic units (derivatives and compound words, phraseological units), as well as stylistic devices (metaphor, metonymy, allusion, antonomasies, antithesis, epithet, comparison, paraphrase, etc.) [11, 78].

The anthropocentric orientation of language research served as an incentive for the development and strengthening of the position of linguistic pragmatics at the end of the twentieth century, which considers the relationship between linguistic units and the conditions of their use in a certain communicative-pragmatic space in which the sender (addressee) and recipient (addressee) of the text interact. This allows us to speak about the emergence of communicative-pragmatic phraseology at the end of the 20th century [12, 115].

Researchers pay attention to the study of cognitive and linguistic and cultural aspects of phraseology [13, 76].

The pragmalinguistic aspect of the study of phraseological units is in the focus of attention of researchers in Uzbekistan [14, 260]. The problems of PU research are often carried out within the framework of the gemeneutic approach and are aimed at the interpretation of a literary text and individual concepts of the language [15].
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