



## **Problems of Translating Phraseological Units**

**Хикматова Дилрабо Пулатовна**

Lecturer at the Department of Russian Language and Literature, Faculty of Philology, Bukhara State University

**Annotation:** *The article considers the broad integration and enrichment of cultures, the need to assess linguistic phenomena based on comparative analysis. Phraseological units are of great importance not only for enriching the lexical composition, but also for creating wide opportunities in expressing various semantic shades, concretization, strengthening the multiplicity and sequence of actions, productivity, diversity in the presentation of thoughts.*

**Keywords:** *intercultural contacts, anthropocentric orientation, somatism, phraseology.*

Phraseological units are of great importance not only for enriching the lexical composition, but also for creating ample opportunities for expressing various shades of meaning, concretization, enhancing the repetition and sequence of actions, productivity, and diversity in the presentation of thoughts.

The interaction of the languages of the Slavic and Turkic groups has been little studied, and therefore is most attractive and relevant in the context of expanding the boundaries of communication and searching for new ways of dialogue between different world cultures. Phraseological semantic concepts are difficult to reduce simply to the function of communication and communication, because they concentrate the experience of many centuries, the mental experience of the people.

Analysis of specific concepts allows us to identify the typological, universal uniqueness of phraseological units of the compared languages. Phraseologisms-somatisms arise as a result of figurative comprehension of phrases naming various actions and states involving parts of the body. The main purpose of phraseological units - emotional and expressive impact - determines the dominant role of the components of connotation, which is the semantic dominant and the original system characteristic of the main core of the phraseological corpus. Semantic complexity can be traced at all levels of phraseological meaning. As a result of the fact that the nominee of phraseological units is, as a rule, a situation, units of this level are characterized by the presence of a so-called primary complex denotation as a more detailed fragment of reality compared to a separate process, action or state.

Phraseological units carry a larger amount of information than lexical units and, as a result, they are more significant in communicative terms.

Connotation is the original feature of phraseological units with a somatic meaning, while in lexical units it most often manifests itself only in certain contexts, and, secondly, in the complexity of all the constituent components of the connotation of phraseological units and their increased significance. Increased expressiveness is a distinctive characteristic of a phraseological unit in comparison with lexical units and is due to the fact that phraseological units often serve to figuratively evaluate signs or phenomena of reality that are distinguished from a number of similar ones based on the intensity of the course of actions, that is, they do not correspond to the socially and individually accepted norm.

The internal form of a phraseological unit is characterized by relatively increased stability and functional significance for semantics; a phraseological unit is closely related to motivation, which indicates the method of its representation in phraseological meaning. And therefore, the isolation of such important phenomena as the internal form, the motivation of a phraseological unit into a single microsystem and the recognition of this system as an independent component of the meanings of a phraseological unit is an important step towards the further development of the theory of phraseological meanings.

Due to its separate design, differing in its greater capacity, information content and degree of detail, the imagery of a phraseological unit serves as the most important factor in the formation of the emotional-expressive meaning of a phraseological unit. The features of interlingual structural-semantic equivalents of phraseological units generally depend on the coincidences and discrepancies in the structure of their meaning. It should be noted that the contextual connections of phraseological units are also characterized by a greater degree of contextual attachment, a change in the combinatory ability of phraseological units as its structure and semantics become more complex.

The uniqueness of the sphere of their use (colloquial, vernacular, etc.) largely depends on which somatic components are involved in the formation of the semantic structure of phrasemes, and this sphere is closely interconnected with the semantic nature of phraseological units, when Russian and Uzbek linguistic personality equally express one's own inner world, but style turns into a means of characterological assessment outside the existing object (person). Characteristic assessment is also saturated with a high degree of emotivity and expressiveness in the Russian language, as in the Uzbek language.

Identification of genetic prototypes of a phraseological unit with a somatic component allows us to establish their connection with the history of the people, reflecting the national identity of its material and spiritual culture. The coincidence of imagery of somatic phraseological units in the Russian and Uzbek languages is explained not only by borrowing, but also by general patterns that lead to the emergence of similar phraseological units that demonstrate the universal nature of the transfer of somatic lexemes, their functional-semantic dynamics in the composition of phraseological units.

The number depends on the meaning: the importance of the function of parts of the body: the thematic diversity of groups of phraseological units. The most productive are lexemes-somatisms: the functions of which in the human body are most clear: the ease of their rethinking is also connected with this. Somatism lexemes can have a new use in each specific language: associated with the symbolization of denotations. Phraseological units with somatic components in the Russian and Uzbek languages are divided into the following groups:

1. Phraseological units with somatic components, characterizing the human condition (**рус.** волосы встают дыбом (about the state of horror: strong fear: when a person was very frightened: horrified: shocked): **узб** tepa sochi tikka bo'ldi);
2. Phraseological units with somatic components, reflecting traditional symbolism associated with body parts: **русск.** потирать руки (to experience satisfaction, gloating about something); Uzbek - no analogue, Russian. throw up your hands (to be extremely surprised, to be perplexed, to express your confusion, to be helpless in any situation, to express with a gesture your inability to find a way out of a difficult situation, to solve any complex problem); Uzbek adequate to throw up your hands, slap yourself on the thighs (qo'lni yuvib, qo'ltiqqa urmoq);
3. Phraseological units with somatic components, expressing a person's attitude to the environment, relationships between people, Russian. show claws (the same as show teeth - meaning to prepare, fight back, outwardly show your evil nature, hostile intentions, readiness to fight back). In the Uzbek language, eyesore is used in this meaning - to'nini teskari kiyib oldi;
4. Phraseological units with somatic components associated with assessment: uma palata (about a very smart person) in the Uzbek language – aql g'ij-g'ij.

A modern approach to the study of phraseological systems of differently structured languages involves their analysis on the basis of the idioethnic theory of phraseology. The fundamental concept of this theory is the concept of a phraseological sign. Unlike a variable combination of words, the creation of a phraseological turn stems from the intention of “eternity”. A phraseological unit becomes a phrase whose mental substrate already includes the presumption of what allows the actualization of new semes. Statements with phraseological somatic units have strictly defined grammatical parameters. Their accounting is based on the determination of deictic coordinates, in the center of which stands either the speaker or the observer, since the semantic-syntactic organization of sentences or figures of speech contains social-role, spatial and temporal indicators of evaluation. By “deictic space” we mean the constitution accompanying the communicative act; the elements of this space in each specific case are filled by “pragmatic variables”

The center of deictic space in primary deixis is the speaker (observer); in secondary deixis, the meaning of the expression reveals (locals) the observer himself. Thus, deictic space is the system of spatial, temporal coordinates and landmarks of social-role relations between the speaker and the addressee that are relevant for the speech situation.

The structure of the concept of a phraseological sign is multicomponent. These components are distributed between three blocks, corresponding to the three components of human existence - language, thinking, and the objective world. The main unit of study of phraseology as a substrate is the phraseological paradigm of a particular word. In idioethnic phraseology, the word in a phraseological unit is a phraseolexe; it is intended to reflect the lack of independence of a phraseolexa, in contrast to a lexeme. The combination of phraseolex forms a phraseolexicon. General phraseolexes are usually called isolexes, and idioethnic ones are called idiolexes. A phraseological paradigm is a set of phraseological units united by the same phraseology; it is a purely idio-ethnic phenomenon. During the study, not a single case of coincidence of the phraseological paradigm of two languages was registered. Already in this fact there are prerequisites for the idioethnicity of phraseology as a whole. In a phraseoseme, as any discrete unit of the content plan, one must first of all see the noema, in abstraction from its material clothing, that is, the atomic phrase with which it is associated. This connection is one-way implicative: rigid from form to meaning, and not rigid from meaning to form.

The coincidence of imagery of somatic phraseological units in the compared languages is explained not only by borrowing, but also by general patterns that lead to the emergence of similar phraseological units that demonstrate the universal nature of the transfer of somatic lexemes, their functional-semantic dynamics in the composition of phraseological units.

The most productive somatisms turn out to be those whose functions are most clear to the speaker, and this is naturally associated with the ease of their rethinking. Somatic components may have a different use in each specific language, associated with different symbolization of denotations. Once in the figurative structure of phraseological units, these words deepen in their functions, and the language community accepts this as a given.

Phraseological paradigms cannot be studied without taking into account the factor of the close relationship of grammatical and transformational parameters. The question of what optional elements a phraseological unit can collect, what modifications it undergoes with a particular set of options, how the problem of synonymy affects the phraseme, should be linked to such correlates as: changeability/immunity; compression/expansion, variant/invariant, etc.

Reinterpretation of somatisms, as a rule, in both languages occurs due to the extreme concentration of figurative meaning; Due to this, the phraseo-lex begins to move away from the denotative nature of the word and the methods of syntactic connection of words in phrases and sentences. Phraseolexics like *tushgan* {wet} lead to such a series of reinterpretations as in Russian: мокрая курица, мокрое место оставить, глаза на мокром месте; in Uzbek: *suvga tushgan mushukday* (букв.: стать как мокрая мышь) - вымокнуть до нитки; All this shows how important it is to resolve issues of synonymy and variation. To understand their grammatical paradigmatics, it is important to take into account the factor of their semantic and "syntactic" modelability, unmodelability), synchrony (diachrony), closedness (openness) of their figurative meaning and meaning.

Interlingual synonymous series are widely represented among phraseological units of a verbal and adverbial nature, this is explained by their greatest productivity in both the Russian and Chuvash languages. In terms of the number of synonyms in one row, compared languages often do not coincide. In some cases, only a few correspond to a wide synonymous range of Russian phraseological units; For Christ's sake, for God's sake, for the sake of all that is holy. – *xudo yo'liga, Alloh roziligi uchun* и т.д. Interlingual phraseological analogies among substantive and adjective phraseological units such as golden hands are infrequent – *oltin qo'llar*. Russian-Uzbek phraseological parallels can completely coincide both in semantics and in internal form, that is, in the image that forms the basis for a stable combination of words and in grammatical structure. For example, *boshdan oyoq* -(from head to toe); get on the tongue – *tilidan tutildi*, еле-эле душа в теле – *joni halqumiga keldi*; etc.

There is a significant number of parallel groups whose members coincide or are similar in semantic structure. In particular, in the Chuvash language, as in Russian, somatisms are actively involved in the formation of a number of phraseological units. An explanation for this phenomenon is provided by extralinguistic factors: the common functions of body parts, the role of the senses in the process of human cognition of the surrounding reality.

Especially often, the words act components of phraseological units in the compared languages as hand – *qo'l*, eye – *ko'z*, heart - *yurak*, , head - *bosh*, leg - *oyoq*.

Identification of genetic prototypes of phraseological units with a somatic component allows us to establish their connection with the history of the people, reflecting the national identity of their material and spiritual culture. The coincidence of imagery of somatic phraseological units in the

Russian and Chuvash languages is explained not only by borrowing, but also by general patterns that lead to the emergence of similar phraseological units that demonstrate the universal nature of the transfer of somatic lexemes, their functional-semantic dynamics in the composition of phraseological units.

**List of used literature:**

1. Alefirenko N.F. Phraseology in the system of modern Russian language / N.F. Alefirenko. Volgograd, 1993. - 247 p.
2. Aldaibani A.A. Comparative analysis of phraseological units expressing human intellectual abilities in the English and Russian languages: Author's abstract. dis. . Ph.D. Philol. Sciences / A.A. Aldaibani. Kazan: KSU, 2003. 25 p.
3. P. Andreychuk N.I. The relationship between the semantics of phraseological units and complex words in modern English (based on somatic phraseological units): Dis. . Ph.D. Philol. Sciences/ N.I.Andreychuk; Odessa University Odessa, 1986 211 p.
4. Dobrovolsky D.O. Comparative phraseology (based on Germanic languages). Course of lectures / Vladimir: Vladimir Pedagogical Publishing House. University, 1990.-80 p.
5. Pavlenko T.L. Phraseological units with an oxymoronic combination of component words / Phraseological units and words in the Russian language. - Rostov n/D, 1983. - pp. 41-49.