

МЕДИЦИНА, ПЕДАГОГИКА И ТЕХНОЛОГИЯ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

Researchbib Impact factor: 11.79/2024

SJIF 2024 = 5.444

Том 2, Выпуск 10

WAYS AND DIFFICULTIES OF TRANSLATING THE PHRASEOLOGICAL EQUIVALENCE

Abdazova A'loxon Rivojiddin qizi

Student, group 2102 Department of information
service and public relations

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

E-mail: gg0786320@gmail.com

Annotation. This paper explores the complexities involved in translating English phraseological units, focusing on challenges in interpreting them into Uzbek and Russian. Phraseological units often have metaphorical meanings that cannot be easily derived from their literal components. The paper analyzes the variations in translation based on the structure, lexical composition, and syntax of phraseological units, highlighting issues of homonymy, synonymy, and idiomatic expressions. Different methods of translation, including word-for-word, analogous, and descriptive translations, are discussed, emphasizing the need for careful context consideration. The study underscores the importance of preserving the figurative meaning and stylistic nuances of phraseological units while adapting them to target languages.

Keywords: phraseological units, translation, idiomatic expressions, metaphor, context, figurative meaning, lexical composition.

Introduction. Translation of English phraseological units makes numerous hardships. While interpreting the English phraseological units we can be seen that every one of the colloquialisms has various capacities. If the saying is in a predicate in English, however, it very well may be converted into Uzbek as a thing or descriptive word. We should see deciphering methods of English phraseological units into English and Uzbek. English phraseological units deciphered by action words: Бир камбағалнинг қарзи бор эди, ночорликдан, қўли калталиқдан сотяпти ховлини...-An unfortunate man had a few obligations and he is experiencing the same thing he had been expected too much Э, ховли жанжали денглар, бундан осон иш борми? Тоғ

МЕДИЦИНА, ПЕДАГОГИКА И ТЕХНОЛОГИЯ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

Researchbib Impact factor: 11.79/2024

SJIF 2024 = 5.444

Том 2, Выпуск 10

тоққа қовушмас, аммо одам одамга қовушар.-А, I comprehend that is a fight for the house.¹

That is exceptionally simple to settle. Maybe mountains don't float back to one another however individuals float back to one another Олло таоло ўзи шифо берсин, чиқмаган жондан умид; ноумид шайтон.-I trust, Allah will give me recuperate from this ailment. We should not waste tons of effort and waste our time Бир оз жим ўтиргандан кейин: "Юрган йўлдан топади, ўтирган қайдан топади", деб кўяди ўзига ўзи. -She saved quietness for quite a while and afterward said: "A man who goes out will make a living and that who stays at home will not." Йўқ, бундай бўлмайди иш, улар (бойлар) ҳам борсин, биз билан бирга борсин, ана шунда чурқ этмай кетаверамиз, кўпга келган тўй деб жўнаймиз.-No, it isn't done like that. Tell them (the pedigreed) to go with us as well and all things considered, we will go there saying that is the average at best. English phraseological units deciphered by the thing: Йўқ, бундай бўлмайди иш, улар (бойлар) ҳам борсин, биз билан бирга борсин, ана шунда чурқ этмай кетаверамиз, кўпга келган тўй деб жўнаймиз.-No, it isn't done like that. Tell them (the pedigreed) to go with us as well and all things considered, we will go there saying that is the average. *Париларим хабар қилди, бутун иллатлар чиқиб кетади. Тан соғлиқ туман бойлик!*-My heavenly messengers have quite recently made it known, all illnesses will escape him soon and he will be alive and kicking once more *Кетдик қорин ҳам шундай очдики, пиёэзнинг пўсти бўлиб кетди, дейди Турғун бизни кетишга қистаб.* - I'm ravenous, I am a creature into food now, - says Turgun and demanded leaving. Phraseological joins are to some degree non-persuaded as their significance can typically be seen through the figurative importance of the entire phraseological unit. For instance, to show one's teeth, to wash one's filthy cloth out in the open assuming deciphered as semantically roused through the joined lexical importance of the part words would normally lead one to get these in their strict significance. The figurative significance of the entire unit, in any case, promptly proposes 'take a compromising tone' or 'show a goal to harm' for going on the defensive toward 'talk about or unveil

¹ Березин Ф. М. О парадигмах в истории языкознания XX в. // Лингвистические исследования в конце XX в. Сб. обзоров. — М.: ИНИОН РАН, 2001. — С. 9-25

МЕДИЦИНА, ПЕДАГОГИКА И ТЕХНОЛОГИЯ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

Researchbib Impact factor: 11.79/2024

SJIF 2024 = 5.444

Том 2, Выпуск 10

one's fights' for wash one's messy material in broad daylight. Phraseological solidarities are when in doubt, set apart by a nearly serious level of strength of the lexical parts.

Consequently, e.g., according to the perspective of Russian speakers such word-bunches as take tea, be careful, and so forth, are frequently alluded to in diction as the Russian translation counterparts of these word-gatherings (пить чай, заботиться) don't contain the constant translation reciprocals of the action word take. French speakers, in any case, are not liable to find anything colloquial about these word-bunches as there are comparative lexical units in the French language (cf. prendre du the prendre soin). This way to deal with idiomaticity might be named interlingual as it includes a correlation, unequivocal, or understanding of two distinct languages. The term idiomaticity is likewise perceived as the absence of inspiration according to the perspective of local speakers. As here we are worried about the English language, this suggests that main those word-bunches are to be alluded to expressiveness which is felt as non-inspired, synchronically, by English speakers, for example, administrative noise, die and so forth. This way to deal with idiomaticity might be named interlingual. As such the judgment as to idiomaticity is passed inside the structure of the language concerned, not from an external perspective. It is promptly seen that characterization of genuine etymological material into free word-gatherings and phraseological units to a great extent relies on the specific importance we join to the term idiomaticity. It will be reviewed, for instance, that ongoing collocations are word-bunches whose parts or individuals have explicit and restricted lexical, valency, generally speaking, basically not the same as the lexical valency of related words in the Russian language. Various constant collocations, for example, weighty downpour, awful mix-up, be careful and others might be felt by Russian speakers as exceptionally English and subsequently informal, though they are not seen as such by English speakers in whose primary language the lexical valency of part words weighty, awful, take surmises their collocability with a downpour, botch, care. 3. The standard of dependability is additionally censured as not truly solid in recognizing phraseological units from other word-bunches routinely alluded to as diction. We notice standard replacement of something like one of the lexical parts. In to project something in someone's teeth, for example, the action word

МЕДИЦИНА, ПЕДАГОГИКА И ТЕХНОЛОГИЯ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

Researchbib Impact factor: 11.79/2024

SJIF 2024 = 5.444

Том 2, Выпуск 10

cast might be supplanted by toss; to take a choice is found close by with to settle on a choice; not to mind a two penny is only one of the potential variations of the expression, though in others the thing two pence might be supplanted by different things, for example, farthing, button, pin, sixpence, fig, and so on.²

It is additionally contended that the strength of lexical parts doesn't surmise the absence of inspiration. The word-bunch shrugs one's shoulders, e.g., don't permit the replacement of one or the other shrug or shoulders; the significance of the word-bunch, in any case, is effectively deducible from the implications of the part words, thus the word-bunch is totally spurred, however steady. Informal word-gatherings might be variable, all things considered, or stable. It was seen that, e.g., to project something in someone's teeth is a profoundly informal yet factor word-bunch as the constituent part cast might be supplanted by excursion or toss; the word-bunch administrative noise is both exceptionally colloquial and stable. It follows that dependability and idiomaticity might be viewed as two distinct parts of word-gatherings. Solidness is a fundamental component of set phrases both persuaded and non-spurred. Idiomaticity is a distinctive component of phraseological units or expressions which contain both stable set expressions and variable word-gatherings. The two elements are not fundamentally unrelated and might be covering, but rather are not reliant. The strength of word-gatherings might be seen as far as consistency of event of part words. In this manner, e.g., the action word shrug predicts the event of the thing's shoulders and the action word grip in the event of either clenching hands or teeth. The level of consistency or likelihood of event of part words is different in various word-gatherings. We might expect, e.g., that the action word shrug predicts with 100% likelihood the event of the thing shoulders, as no other thing can follow this specific action word. The likelihood of event of the thing care for the action word cast isn't so high since cast might be followed by look as well as by look, light, parcels, and a few different things. The steadiness of the word-bunch in holding one's clenched hands is higher than in projected a look but lower than in shrugging

² Бушуй А.М. Заметки о фразеологической системности (словность, деривация, кодификация) // Studia Russica. IV. Budapest, 1981. —С. 181-222

МЕДИЦИНА, ПЕДАГОГИКА И ТЕХНОЛОГИЯ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

Researchbib Impact factor: 11.79/2024

SJIF 2024 = 5.444

Том 2, Выпуск 10

one's shoulders as the action word grasp predicts the event of either clenched hands or teeth. It is contended that the strength of all word-gatherings might be genuinely determined and the word bunches where security surpasses a specific breaking point (say half) might be named set-phrases. Consistency of event might be determined comparable to at least one than one constituent of the word-bunch. Accordingly, e.g., the level of likelihood of event of the thing bull after the action word take is extremely low and may essentially be assessed at nothing. The two-part words take the bull, in any case, to anticipate the event by the horns with an exceptionally serious level of likelihood.

Soundness seen as far as likelihood of event appears to be a more dependable basis in separating between set-expressions and variable or free word-gatherings, yet can't be depended upon single out phraseological units. Deciphering a phraseological unit is not a simple matter as it relies upon a few variables: different combinability of words, homonymy, synonymy, the polysemy of phraseological units, and the presence of dishonestly indistinguishable units, which makes it important to consider the specific situation. Additionally, an enormous number of phraseological units have an elaborate expressive part in importance, which generally has a particular public element. The in advance referred to decides the need to get to know the fundamental standards of the overall hypothesis of diction. The accompanying kinds of phraseological units might be noticed: phrasemes and colloquialisms. A unit of steady setting comprising reliant and consistent markers might be known as a phraseme. A colloquialism is a unit of consistent setting which is portrayed by the vital importance of the entire and by debilitated implications of the parts, and in which the dependant and the demonstrating components are indistinguishable and equivalent to the entire lexical construction of the expression. Any sort of phraseological unit can be introduced as an unequivocal miniature framework. During the time spent deciphering phraseological units, useful semantics are chosen by contrasting two explicit phonetic standards. These standards uncover components of resemblance and differentiation. Certain pieces of these frameworks might relate in structure and content (totally or somewhat) or have no adequacy. The principal kinds of phraseological congruities are according to the following: Complete similarities. Halfway congruities. Absence of similarities. Complete

МЕДИЦИНА, ПЕДАГОГИКА И ТЕХНОЛОГИЯ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

Researchbib Impact factor: 11.79/2024

SJIF 2024 = 5.444

Том 2, Выпуск 10

similarities. Complete fortuitous events of structure and content in phraseological units are seldom met with.

"Dark ice" - qora sovuq - silniy moroz

"To carry oil to fire" - alangaga yog' quymoq-podlit maslo v ogon.

"To lose one's head"- (doim) gangib qolmoq - poderyat golovu.

Incomplete congruities of phraseological units in two languages expect to be lexical syntactic and lexico-linguistic different with the personality of significance and style for example their metaphorically close, yet differ in lexical organization morphological number and syntactic plan of the request words.

A.I. Smirnitsky was the first among Russian researchers who focused on sentences that can be treated as complete equations, for example, How would you do? Or then again I beseech you to excuse; It takes different types to make the world; Can the panther change his spots? They vary from every one of the mixes up until this point talked about because they are not identical to words in appropriation and are semantically analyzable. The equations examined by N. N. Amosova are running against the norm semantically explicit, for example, quiet down 'shut up or tell it to the marines (one of the proposed beginnings is told that to the pony marines; such a corps being non-existent, as marines are maritime power, the last articulation signifies 'tell it to somebody who doesn't exist because rel individuals won't trust it') frequently such recipes, officially indistinguishable from sentences, are in actuality utilized distinctly as additions into different sentences: the cap fits 'the assertion is valid' (for example "He referred to me a liar as."- "Indeed, you ought to be aware of the cup fits."). Talking about set phrases it is above all else important to separate between metaphorical and non-allegorical set phrases. Non-non-literal set phrases are interpreted as indicated by the principles that have previously been examined regarding words and free expressions. The really core value here is to recollect the standards of TL³. Metaphorical set phrases merit unique conversation. The primary quirk of these phraseological units is

³ Бытёва Т. И. Семасиологическая интерпретация системных отношений в лексико-семантических группах // Вопросы исследования лексики и фразеологии сибирских говоров. — Красноярск: КГПИ, 2006. — С. 130-152.

МЕДИЦИНА, ПЕДАГОГИКА И ТЕХНОЛОГИЯ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

Researchbib Impact factor: 11.79/2024

SJIF 2024 = 5.444

Том 2, Выпуск 10

their particular implying that regularly can't be found from the implications of their components.

Conclusion. It is the significance of the entire, not of discrete words, that ought to be delivered in interpretation. In light of symbolism, phraseological units make the text more expressive; they are likewise frequently liable for elaborate shading of the text. Since the text in TL should be as expressive as it seems to be in SL and described by a similar elaborate shading, it turns out to be vital to find a sufficient variety of interpreting for each phraseological unit. Informal or phraseological articulations are primarily, lexically and semantically fixed expressions or sentences having general importance, which isn't made up by the number of implications of their part parts. A basic element of colloquial (phraseological) articulations is their allegorical, i.e., figurative nature and utilization. Interpretation of phraseologies is an exceptionally muddled issue. The right interpretation is specified by observing the most concordant and comparable words that are generally denied shading in the interpretation as a typical lexical unit.

REFERENCES:

1. Берёзин Ф. М. О парадигмах в истории языкознания XX в. // Лингвистические исследования в конце XX в. Сб. обзоров. — М.: ИНИОН РАН, 2001. — С. 9-25.
2. Бушуй А.М. Заметки о фразеологической системности (словность, деривация, кодификация) // Studia Russica. IV. Budapest, 1981. — С. 181-222
3. Бытева Т. И. Семасиологическая интерпретация системных отношений в лексико-семантических группах // Вопросы исследования лексики и фразеологии сибирских говоров. — Красноярск: КГПИ, 2006. — С. 130-152.
4. Amosova, N. N. (1963). Essays on English Phraseology. Leningrad State University Press.
5. Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. Routledge.
6. Cowie, A. P., & Mackin, R. (1975). Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English. Oxford University Press.
7. Fernando, C., & Flavell, R. (1981). On Idiom: Critical Views and Perspectives. University of Exeter Press.

МЕДИЦИНА, ПЕДАГОГИКА И ТЕХНОЛОГИЯ: ТЕОРИЯ И ПРАКТИКА

Researchbib Impact factor: 11.79/2024

SJIF 2024 = 5.444

Том 2, Выпуск 10

8. Kunin, A. V. (1996). English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary. Russian Language Publishers.
9. Larson, M. L. (1984). Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence. University Press of America.
10. Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. Prentice Hall.
11. Smirnitsky, A. I. (1956). Lexicology of the English Language. Moscow State University Press.
12. Vinogradov, V. V. (1947). Russian Stylistics and Phraseology. Moscow State University Press.
13. Zykova, I. V. (2008). A Practical Course in English Lexicology. Academy Publishing House.