

LEXICAL AND PHRASEOLOGICAL FEATURES IN TRANSLATION STUDIES OF PHRASES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Dilnoza Karshieva,
Associate Professor, Samarkand Campus of ISFT Institute, Uzbekistan

Nafisa Kubaeva,
Researcher, Samarkand Campus of ISFT Institute, Uzbekistan

Djanzakova Matluba,
Researcher, SamSU academic lyceum, Uzbekistan

Abstract

The most important issue we focus on is the methods of translating phraseological units. Each individual case of translating a phraseological unit is a task for a translator that must be solved in the most optimal way. Such solutions are the methods of translating phraseological units. In this thesis, we consider the methods of translating phraseological units with the component "body part" in the English language, since the names of body parts are among the most frequently used words in the formation of phraseological units. This lexical-semantic group is also distinguished by its extreme figurativeness and expressiveness.

Keywords: verbal phraseological units, phraseological composition, structural organization, structural-syntactic role, lexical role, syntactic patterns.

In modern English, postpositions enter into a very large number of combinations of different types. The number of combinations in which a postposition is one of the components has been continuously increasing in English since the beginning of the New Anglican period and continues to grow. In modern English, the number of combinations of postpositions with verbs is especially large [1]. Their number is steadily increasing. This is evidenced by books and dictionaries devoted to phrasal verbs and their use. Along with the increase in number, the frequency of their use also increases. This indicates that they perform the necessary function due to greater conciseness and, at the same time, greater expressiveness. Phrasal verbs are widely used not only in colloquial English. Many of these verbs have become an integral part of the language of newspapers, law and economics [2]. This is explained by the fact that many phrasal verbs have changed their "face" over time, that is, they have moved from one stylistic layer to another, acquired new meanings and lost old ones. Some phrasal verbs have become more frequently used than "simple" verbs, which are their synonyms. The use of phrasal verbs is also characteristic of the official business style, namely legal documents and articles [3]. The general similarity of the structural and syntactic organization of phraseological units of the compared languages is manifested in a uniform set of fundamental syntactic schemes on

which phraseological units are built - predicative, subordinate, coordinative, etc. [4]. In both languages, phraseological units are formed on the basis of minimal or close to minimal structural schemes of phrases and sentences. The commonality is also observed in the stability of the structural and syntactic aspect of all categories of phraseological units in their inability to undergo standard transformations characteristic of these structures in their regular meaning. The distribution of phraseological components according to their general categorical affiliation is also similar. Interlingual differences partly repeat the differences between the primary, structural-syntactic systems of both languages, and partly have a phraseological character [5]:

1) In English phraseology there are significantly more verbal phraseological units (about 75% of the phraseological composition, in Uzbek - 55%) and, on average, the proportion of the verb in the structural organization of the phraseological unit is higher (0.9 verbs per phraseological unit, cf. 0.65 in Uzbek). Mainly due to this, the average volume of an English phraseological unit is larger than that of an Uzbek one [6]. Thus, the structural-syntactic role of the verb in English phraseology is expressed more strongly, and the lexical role is weaker than in Uzbek phraseology.

2) Against the background of significant functional and semantic similarity of sets of specific structural and syntactic patterns used in phraseological structures of both languages, the differences seem more specific and affect individual patterns that do not have a direct correspondence in the compared language [10]. In general, the differences in the structural and syntactic organization of the phraseology of the compared languages are most noticeable at the sentence level; they correspond to the general language specificity and especially the increased two-part nature and verbosity of the sentence in English [6].

3) Structural and syntactic stability (non-transformability) is characteristic of phraseological units of both languages. It is weakened in semantically articulated phraseological units, since their components have semantic autonomy and regular syntactic relations "come to life" between them [7].

In English, the proportion of semantically articulated phraseological units is higher than in Uzbek, hence the somewhat more noticeable departure from absolute structural and syntactic stability in English phraseology.

In both languages, phraseological units have the greatest specific weight where the subject is talking about phenomena of the objective world that evoke the greatest internal participation, personal interest and emotional experience [8]. Highly phraseological classes in both English and Uzbek cover all aspects of human mental activity, interpersonal social relations (e.g., feelings, character traits, thinking, ethics, etc.). And vice versa, phraseology is not typical for semantic classes that unite nomenclature names of a purely denotative nature and relate to areas of reality (e.g., classes of inorganic nature, science, writing).

It can be assumed that such a general quantitative distribution of phraseological units by semantic classes is characteristic not only of English and Uzbek, and, possibly, represents a phraseological universal [9].

The interlingual functional-semantic similarity of phraseology in English and Uzbek also extends to more specific phraseological semantic groups: "misfortune", "happiness", "success", "failure", "surprise", "hatred", "stupid", "censure, disapproval", "love", "drunkenness", etc.

Both languages are also characterized by the repeatedly noted semantic asymmetry of the phraseological system, i.e. the predominance of phraseological units with a negative evaluative meaning. This phenomenon can be explained mainly by the acute emotional and verbal-cognitive reaction of people to negative facts.

Only a few minor quantitative differences were identified. Thus, in the jargons and colloquial speech of the English language, the expressive naming of specific persons and objects with the help of phraseological units is more widely used.

References:

1. Muminovna, A. K. (2023). The role of translation in science. *Texas Journal of Philology, Culture and History*, 25, 60-62.
2. Mamatqulova, K. A., Amanullayeva, K. M., & qizi Shuhratova, V. J. Considerations for teaching Japanese literature.
3. Nafisa, K., & Matluba, D. (2023). PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS OF RESEARCH INTO THE PROBLEM OF BILINGUAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING. *Conferencea*, 31-34.
4. Tasheva D.S., Kubaeva N.A. Modern educational technologies in the aspect of a student-centered approach in teaching foreign languages. *Eurasian Journal of Learning and Academic Teaching*. Volume 12|, 2022. -p.35. www.geniusjournals.org
5. Kholbaeva D.D., Tasheva D.S. Pedagogical techniques and methods of forming interest in the lessons of the Russian language. *Web of scientist: international scientific research journal*, ISSN: 2776-0979, Volume 3, Issue 3, Mar., 2022. -p.238
6. Kholbaeva, D., & Tasheva, D. (2022). Theoretical And Practical Aspects Of Monitoring The Acquisition Of Knowledge, Skills And Abilities By Students In The Russian Language In Universities. *Евразийский журнал социальных наук, философии и культуры*, 2(11), 115-118.
7. Dilorom Tasheva. Approaches and principles of teaching Russian language. *International Conference on Innovative Technology and Future Trends in Education*. San Francisco, USA. July, 30th 2021. -p. 7. <https://conferencea.org>
8. Tasheva Dilorom, Djanzakova Matluba. The role of literary text in teaching the Russian language. *International Multidisciplinary Conference*. Manchester, England. 25th December 2023. -p.19. <https://conferencea.org>

9. Bakhtieva, R., & Abdualieva, D. (2023, November). Methods of health of the social and spiritual environment in educational institutions and new development technologies. In International Conference on Science, Engineering & Technology (Vol. 1, No. 6, pp. 15-16).
10. Rustamovna, A. D. (2023). RUSSIAN AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN COMMUNICATIONS. American Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development, 21, 119-123.