

LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN TRANSLATION

Abdukahhorova Shahrizoda Muhammadjon kizi

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Students of foreign language and literature group 2102, 3rd year

Alibekova Dilrabo Abdiraimovna

Teacher of the integrated course of teaching foreign languages

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present paper is to show some problems of translation phraseological units from English into Uzbek language in view of them linguacultural features. The language culture of the person is formed at interaction of phenomena "culture of language" and "culture of speech ". In its basis the knowledge of norms of written and oral speech, semantic and expressive opportunities of system, study of exemplary art, publicistic and some other texts lays.

Keywords: Phraseological units, linguaculturalogy, equivalent, culture of speech, transformation, component.

INTRODUCTION

We live in a period of globalization, so the importance of knowledge of foreign languages is increasing every day. As a result, research on the problems of communication between cultures and peoples is becoming more and more intensive. Thus, language, being an important means of concentrating information about the world, at the same time acts as the most important sign of a particular people. It is in language that the mentality of the people, their psychology, customs and mores are most clearly expressed. It is a means of creating national literature, the main repository of information about a particular people.

The national mentality is manifested in the reflection of the peculiarities of life, customs, history and culture, mainly phraseological units. One of the features of proverbs is to give people an assessment of the objective phenomena of reality, thereby expressing the worldview. In the phraseological units is expressed the peculiar mindset, a way of judgment, the feature views; they manifest the life and life, spirit and temper, manners and customs, beliefs and superstitions. Linguistic and cultural analysis of phraseological units is wedded to external factors: the history of the country, its culture, everyday life, etc. the Study of phraseological units in the linguistic and cultural aspect helps to clarify, and in some cases to establish additional semantic shades with national and cultural semantics. Phraseological units, proverbs and sayings react to all phenomena of reality, reflect the life and worldview of the people in all its diversity,

they convey every day, social, philosophical, religious, moral, ethical, and aesthetic views of the people. And with this task proverbs cope very successfully. Their subject matter is truly limitless. They cover absolutely all aspects of human life, the most diverse relationships between different phenomena of reality. In the idiomatics of the language, that is, in the layer that is, by definition, nationally specific, the system of values, public morality, attitude to the world, to people, to other peoples is displayed. Phraseological units most clearly illustrate the way of life, geographical location, history, and traditions of a particular community United by a single culture. In traditionally oriented linguistics, such problems and tasks are constantly being posed and formed that can no longer be solved by means and methods that are ingrained in science, but require the use of syncretic logical-linguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic methods for studying the linguistics of a text. In our opinion, linguoculturology as a special area of analysis is brought to life by such a statement of the question. Problems of translating phraseological units from English into Uzbek, taking into account their linguistic and cultural characteristics, is considered to be one of the most difficult types of translation transformations. The object of translation is not a language system as an abstraction, but a specific speech work in another language (the original text), on the basis of which another speech work in another language (the translation text) is created. The purpose of the translation is to acquaint the reader (or listener) who does not know the original language as closely as possible with this text (or the content of oral speech). To translate means to express correctly and fully by means of one language what has already been expressed by means of another language. Achieving translation equivalence (translation adequacy), despite the differences in the formal and semantic systems of the two languages, requires the translator to first of all be able to make numerous and high-quality interlanguage transformations - so-called translation transformations - so that the translation text conveys all the information contained in the source text as fully as possible, while strictly observing the norms of the translating language.

The phraseology of any language is a valuable linguistic heritage that reflects the vision of the world, national culture, customs and beliefs, fantasy and history of the people who speak it. Problems of phraseology are extremely important both for practice and for translation theory;

they often present great practical difficulties and arouse great theoretical interest, since they are related to the difference in semantic and stylistic functions performed in different languages by words of the same real meaning, and to the difference in combinations that such words enter into in different languages. This paper discusses only some of the many problems of translating phraseological units.

A. V. Koonin gives the following definition of phraseological units: "a Phraseological unit is a stable combination of words with a completely or partially reinterpreted meaning" (Koonin,1996: 5).

V. N. Komissarov tells about three correspondence types with figurative phraseological units of the originals. (Kobiakova, 2017:4)

1. Phraseological equivalents. In this case, a similar idiom that corresponds to all the parameters of the original idiomatic expression is meant. However, there are two factors to be considered: phraseological equivalents are relatively few and when the same idiom is borrowed by two languages, its meaning may be changed in one of them, and these idioms may be "false friends of the translator" – similar in form but different in content" (Komissarov,2004: 172).

2. Phraseological analogies. This is an idiom with the same figurative meaning as the original, although based on a different form. Here the author also notes some limitations. Firstly, it is necessary to ascertain that emotional and stylistic meanings of the idiom are kept. Secondly, this method of translation is not suitable when the idiom that is to be translated has an explicit pronounced national character (Komissarov,2004: 174).

3. The calque of the foreign language figurative unit. The author believes that the calque allows keeping the original imagery and makes it possible to overcome the difficulties that arise when the image in original is made to create an extended metaphor (Komissarov,2004: 174).

It is usually accepted to indicate the equivalent of a phraseological unit to a word. However, the theory of complete equivalence is becoming obsolete. This does not mean that phraseological units and words have nothing in common, which is considered by the theory of correlation of certain types of phraseological units and words, which, however, is based on slightly different principles. The most characteristic for phraseological turns of stable combinations of words are in principle equal in meaning to a single word, differing from it, as a rule, by a certain expressive and stylistic coloring. Some idioms are translated with the help of partial (relative) equivalence. According to E. F. Arsentyeva, such idiomatic expressions are characterized by the minor differences in terms of phraseological expression of the identical semantics that can have a componential or morphological character (Arsentyeva, 1989: 100)

The classification of phraseological units also contains the necessary theoretical knowledge for the translator, with which we can identify the phraseological units in the text, then analyze it and, based on the analysis, give the most accurate translation in this context. The most legitimate approach is to consider phraseological units in three aspects: semantic, structuralgrammatical, and component. Taking into account the marked levels, the following types are distinguished:

1) phraseological equivalents (full and partial) - phraseological units with identical semantics, structural and grammatical organization and with identical component composition;

Red book – Қизил китоб; The black prince – Қора шаҳзода; Black list – Қора рўйхат;

Black diamonds – Қора олтин; Keep quiet – сир сақламоқ; Make conversation –

Маъносиз суҳбатлашмоқ; Milk cow – Соғин сигир.

First think, then speak – Аввал ўйла, кейин сўйла; The dog bark, but caravan goes on

– Ит хурап, карвон ўтар; Step by step – Қадам ба қадам.

2) phraseological analogs (full and partial) - phraseological units that express the same or similar meaning, but are characterized by a complete difference in the approximate similarity of the internal form;

A black hen lays a white egg – Қора сигир оқ сут берап.

Cut the melon – фойдани бўлмоқ.

Put smb/smth to the test – Текшириб кўрмоқ; Red meat – Қўй гўшти; Take a fancy to

smb – Мафтун бўлмоқ; Talk turkey – Очикдан-очик гапирмоқ.

3) non-equivalent phraseological units- phraseological units that do not have correspondences in the phraseological system of another language.

To throw up one's cap – дўпписини осмонга отмоқ.

Come Yorkshire over smb – Алдамоқ, нонни туя қилмоқ

Betweenhawk and buzzard – Оила аъзолари ва хизматкорлар ўртасидаги ўринни эгаллаган инсон; Green room – Театрда артистларнинг кийинадиган, ясанадиган хонаси;

Harley Street – Шифокорлар, тиббиёт дунёси [Лондондаги кўпгина машҳур докторлар яшайдиган кўча]; Gretna Green marriage – Уйдан қочган севишганлар ўртасидаги турмуш;

Since phraseology stands out for its functions in language and speech, it requires a special approach in the translation process. The main difficulty is that no dictionary can provide for all the false uses of phraseology in the context. Phraseological units, similar in internal form in different languages, are not always identical in meaning as a result of their reinterpretation, so you can not rely on the similarity of the figurative basis. But when an expression still retains its connection with the sphere in which it was born, the translator has to look for such a phraseological units in the Uzbek language. Techniques for translating phraseological units vary from complete replacement of imagery to complete preservation of the image in translation. And yet, what is common and characteristic of all is the preservation of imagery in translation.

But at the same time, the standard and traditional in the original must be transferred to the standard and traditional in the translation. When translating, it is important to observe the stylistic uniformity of the original text. Along with the absence of a corresponding phraseological units in the Uzbek language, it may seem that an Uzbek phraseological units that has the same semantic content does not correspond to English. Of course, ideally, you should strive for full equivalence of the means used, but in practice, you often have to sacrifice functional and stylistic correspondence to preserve expressiveness. It is very important that phraseological substitutions in translation convey the national flavor of the original language. The original, which is full of phraseological phrases, must retain its phraseological richness and quality. In accordance with the scheme of V. G. Gak and Yu. I. Lvin, there are three types of equivalence: formal, semantic and situational (Gak.1970:59). In formal equivalence, common values in two languages are expressed in similar language forms. In fact, all three categories of equivalence are the result of various translation operations: in the first case, we were talking about the simplest of these operations - substitution, i.e. substitution of signs of the translation language instead of signs of the source language, and in the second and third-about operations of a more complex type-translation transformations.

One of the requirements that has long been put forward by the theory and practice of translation is the requirement of equivalence of texts — one and the final. Equivalence is provided by transformation, provided that the latter are semantically or pragmatically motivated. Freedom in translation is allowed only when necessary. The study of the types and methods of translation transformations occupies one of the Central places in the translation process. By translation transformation, we mean a departure from the use of isomorphic means available in both languages. Translation transformations can be caused by various factors. The term "transformation" is used in translation studies in a figurative sense. In fact, we are talking about the relationship between the original and final language expressions, about the replacement of one form of expression with another in the process of translation, a replacement that we figuratively call transformation, or transformation. In formal equivalence, common values in two languages are expressed in similar language forms. In fact, all three categories of equivalence are the result of various translation operations: in the first case, we were talking about the simplest of these operations - substitution, i.e. substitution of signs of the translation language instead of signs of the source language, and in the second and third-about operations of a more complex type-translation transformations. The positive value of this theory lies primarily in the fact that instead of vague and often subjectively colored arguments about the adequacy of translation, it first proposed and justified an approach to translation problems based on linguistic principles. Another equally important advantage of this theory is that it is based on a

wealth of practical experience of translators. Summarizing the above, it should be noted that the value of the theory of regular correspondences goes far beyond the simple statement of some regular, repetitive relationships between the units of comparable languages. "Natural correspondences" is not an exact name, since we are talking about both types of natural correspondences between units of two languages (equivalents, variant correspondences), and about regularities directly related to the translation process. The regularities of the translation process are considered based on the relationship between individual units of the text (except for the antonymic translation, which provides for a combined lexical and syntactic transformation). In some cases, the theory of regular correspondences goes beyond the comparison of individual units and outlines ways to solve complex translation problems.

The stability of phraseological units does not always help to solve the problem of influencing the audience. But we should not assume that the transformation of phraseology is only the result of replacing one component with another. It can also be the result of other types of decomposition of phraseological units, for example, wedging. This indicates the need to study the process of decomposition of phraseological units in the theory of translation. Without knowledge and deep understanding of this process in both languages, the translator will increasingly face the fact of untranslatability. Moreover, there may be errors. Thus, the decomposition of phraseological units poses a number of problems for the translator, which can be solved by comparative study of languages in the field of speech functioning. In conclusion, the task of the translator is to understand the meaning of the source text and express the same meaning (more precisely, the system of values) by means of a different language. In this case, an interlanguage transformation occurs, i.e., the replacement of one sign system with another, which leads to inevitable semantic losses. The translator must keep them to a minimum, i.e. ensure a greater degree of equivalence between the source text and the translation text, which is impossible without performing various translation transformations.

REFERENCES:

1. Gak V. G., Lvin Yu. I. translation Course: French. Moscow, 1970.- 59p.
2. Koonin A.V. phraseology Course of the modern English language. - Moscow: Higher school, 1996. - 5s.
3. Komissarov V.N. Modern translation. - M.: ETC, 2004. – 424p.
4. Kobiakova I.K. Translation aspects of quantitative phraseological units. – Research gate. 2017.- p.4.
5. Arsentjeva Y.F. Comparative analysis of phraseological units – Kazan, 1989. – 126p.