



Features of Phraseological Units in Translation Studies

Ubaydullayeva Sabrina Shuhratovna¹, Nizomova Sarvinoz Faxriddin kizi²

^{1,2} Student of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: The article considers the main methods and techniques for translating phraseological units from the source language into the target language. The importance of the translator's personality when performing translation is emphasized.

Key words: phraseological equivalents, linguistic classification, predominance, phraseological unit, source language, target language, phraseological translation, non-phraseological translation, translator.

The study of the features of the translation of phraseological units is appropriate to begin with the definition of the phraseological units themselves. According to A. V. Kulin, phraseological units (PU) are stable combinations of lexemes with a completely or partially rethought meaning [7]. The most common features of phraseological units are called "linguistic stability, semantic integrity and separate design" [3]. The decisive factor in the consolidation of phraseological units in the language is its figurativeness, which corresponds to one of the trends in the development of the language - the tendency to expressiveness.

Phraseological units fill niches in the lexical system of the language, which cannot fully provide the name of the aspects of reality known to man, and in many cases are the only designations for objects, properties, processes, states, situations, etc. The formation of phraseological units weakens the contradiction between the needs of thinking and limited lexical resources of the language. In those cases where a phraseological unit has a lexical synonym, they usually differ in stylistic terms.

Phraseology is a treasure trove of any language. Phraseological units reflect the history of the people, the originality of their culture and way of life. Phraseologisms often have a clearly national character. So, for example, along with purely national phraseological units in English phraseology, there are many international phraseological units.

The English phraseological fund is a complex conglomeration of native and borrowed phraseological units with a clear predominance of the former. In some phraseological units, archaic elements are preserved - representatives of previous eras. Phraseological units are highly informative units of the language. This is one of the linguistic universals.

That is why the issue of translating phraseological units is of particular importance in the science of translation. There are different opinions about how a work of fiction should be translated from the original language. Some believe that what is expressed by the author should be re-expressed by the translator (A. Pushkin); others sometimes suggest moving away from the words of the original on purpose in order to be closer to it (N. Gogol); others say that one should not translate words, and even sometimes the meaning, the main thing is to convey the impression (A. Tolstoy); the latter urge to translate laughter into laughter, a smile into a smile, etc. (K. Chukovsky).

But at the same time - and this does not contradict the principle of translatability (since a part is perceived only as part of the whole) - in any work of art there are elements of the text that, relatively speaking, cannot be translated. In this case, we are talking about the impossibility of a formal translation. One of the categories of "untranslatable" is phraseology.

It is of exceptional importance for the science of translation, since in the "scale of untranslatability" or "difficulty in translatability" phraseological units, or phraseological units (PU), occupy almost the first place: the "untranslatability" of phraseology is noted by all specialists among the characteristic features of stable units; and most importantly - the translator-practitioner faces the difficulty of translating phraseological units at every step.

In order to theoretically talk about the methods of translation of phraseological units, it is necessary to classify the entire phraseology of a given language according to some reasonable criterion into groups, within which one or another method, one or another approach to the transfer of phraseological units would be observed as predominant. Many authors take linguistic classifications as a starting point, built mainly on the criteria of the indecomposability of a phraseological unit, the fusion of its components, depending on which and on a number of additional features - meaning motivation, metaphor, etc. - the place of phraseological units in one of the following sections is determined: phraseological fusions (idioms), phraseological units (metaphorical units), phraseological combinations and phraseological expressions (Sh. Balli, V. V. Vinogradov, B. A. Larin, N. M. Shansky). The work of L. V. Fedorov can be considered indicative of the creative use of such a classification in the theory and practice of translation. Having examined the main linguistic schemes for that time (1968), he stops at the one proposed by V. V. Vinogradov and comprehends it from the point of view of translation studies. For example, he notes the lack of clear boundaries between individual rubrics, "different degrees of motivation, transparency of the internal form and national specificity" of unities, which may require the translator to "approximately the same approach as idioms." The same classification is "very convenient for the theory and practice of translation" and, according to Ya. I. Retsker, who, however, takes only unity and fusion from it, believing that unequal translation methods should be applied to these two groups of phraseological units: "the translation of phraseological unity should, if possible, be figurative", and the translation of phraseological fusion "is carried out mainly by the method of holistic transformation".

It is believed that the possibilities of achieving a full-fledged dictionary translation of phraseological units depend mainly on the relationship between the units of the source language (FL) and the target language (LT):

- 1) PU has in the TL an exact, context-independent, full-fledged correspondence (semantic meaning + connotations);
- 2) phraseological units can be transferred to TL by one correspondence or another, usually with some deviations from a full-fledged translation;
- 3) PU has no equivalents or analogues in the TL and is untranslatable in dictionary order.

Simplifying the scheme somewhat, we can say that phraseological units are translated either by phraseological units (the first two points) - phraseological translation, or by other means (in the absence of phraseological equivalents and analogues) - non-phraseological translation.

Between solutions, for example, depending on some characteristic features and types of phraseological units (figurative - non-figurative phraseology, phraseological units of proverbial - non-proverbial type), translation, taking into account the style, color, language, authorship of individual units, etc. These additional aspects will more fully represent the problem of translation. PhU, will expand and facilitate the choice of the most appropriate technique.

Consider first the phraseological translation.

Phraseological translation involves the use of stable units in the translation text of varying degrees of proximity between the FL unit and the corresponding TL unit - from a complete and absolute equivalent to an approximate phraseological correspondence.

In order to talk further about this method of translation, let's define the phraseological equivalent. Phraseological equivalent -

this is a phraseological unit in TL, in all respects equivalent to the translated unit. As a rule, regardless of the context, it should have the same denotative and connotative meanings as i.e. there should be no differences between correlative phraseological units in terms of semantic content, stylistic reference, metaphor and emotionally expressive coloring, they should have approximately the same component composition, have a number of the same lexical and grammatical indicators: compatibility (for example, in relation to the requirement of animation / inanimate), belonging to one grammatical category, usage, connection with contextual satellite words, etc.; and another - the lack of national flavor.

We are talking, in essence, about complete and absolute equivalence. All these are already existing, relatively few units, work with which is reduced to their discovery in the PU; the decisive role in this work for the most part belongs to the excellent command of the TL and dictionaries.

An incomplete (partial) phraseological equivalent is such a unit of the TL, which is the equivalent, complete and absolute, of the correlative multi-valued unit in the FL, but not in all its meanings.

There are relatively few partial equivalents, since in general the phenomenon of polysemy is less characteristic of phraseology. Cases of relative phraseological equivalence are much more common.

The relative phraseological equivalent is inferior to the absolute one only in that it differs from the original phraseological unit in some of the indicators: other, often synonymous components, small changes in form, a change in syntactic construction, etc. Otherwise, it is a full match of the translated phraseological unit, "relativity which is obscured by the context. The difference may be, for example, in compatibility, in the unequal lexico-semantic content of individual components.

In other cases, the equivalent may differ from the original PU in terms of composition; for example, the same image can be expressed more economically or more extensively. Images can be very close, touching, for example, "lightning" - "thunder"; very distant, but logically comparable: for example, a Russian, a Bulgarian and a Frenchman see "similarity" in "two drops of water", for a German and a Czech it is "two eggs", and for an Englishman - "two peas".

But the images of two analogues (in FL and TL) may not have anything in common as images, which does not prevent the equivalents from performing their function properly in translation.

In principle, the ability to convey phraseological units with analogs with imagery that has absolutely no common ground in FL and TL is mainly due to the fact that for the most part these are erased or semi-erased metaphors that are not perceived or, rather, are perceived subconsciously by a native speaker. The degree of brightness of the image - from very low to zero in phraseological unions, and in units is higher, but rarely reaching intensity in a free combination - is one of the main prerequisites for choosing a translation technique between analogue and tracing paper.

Finally, there are extremely frequent differences that arise in cases of using such translation techniques as various kinds of transformations such as antonymic translation, concretization and generalization, which, like lexical ones, phraseological units also lend themselves to.

Phraseological equivalents can also be conditionally attributed to individual equivalents. Not finding a complete correspondence in the TL, the translator is sometimes forced to resort to word creation, shaping in the spirit of the unit being translated a new, own phraseological unit, reminiscent of "natural" as much as possible. If the reader accepts such a "fake", then it is possible to convey the content and style of the translated unit in a fairly "phraseological" form.

Individual phraseological units, if they are masterfully "made", have indicators of ordinary phraseological units, differing from it only in one, the most important indicator - they are not reproducible. So here we are talking about contextual translation.

Phraseological equivalents and analogues are found most often in the following groups of stable units.

1. International phraseology - phraseological units that entered the languages of many peoples from historical (mainly ancient), mythological, literary sources, were borrowed from language to language or arose among different peoples independently due to the commonality of human thinking, the proximity of certain moments of social life, labor activity, production, development of science and arts.

Many of these units are related to catch phrases.

One belonging of a phraseological unit to international is not enough to ensure its correct translation. Firstly, not all "international units" included in one language are also found in other languages. Secondly, despite the same way of translation - tracing, there are still minor formal differences between the equivalents (phrase - compound word, prepositional - non-prepositional construction, different suffixation, etc.), and this sometimes significantly complicates the translator. For example, the Russian equivalent of a scapegoat is English. Scapegoat - translation with a compound word (which is much more common in German).

2. Stable comparisons. Many nations say: sings like a nightingale, bold like a lion, stubborn like a donkey, drunk like a pig, etc. But for the same qualities, along with these images, there are others that are unusual for the PJ. The comparison with the "nightingale" is clearly not suitable for countries where it is not known, and the translator must think very well before introducing an unusual image. Other comparisons require the same - to translate with their own, familiar, or preserve the "exotic": for example, the British and French see stubbornness rather in a mule, and a donkey is also a symbol of stupidity; as for drunkenness, along with the pig, many other images appear among different peoples: fr. (drunk like) a song thrush, a monk (Franciscan, Templar) or a slice of bread in broth.
3. Compound terms. Compound terms are a special group of phraseological units that require in any case equivalents in TL. However, since the terminological beginning prevails over the phraseological one in them, we present them here with the caveat that they are always translated by equivalents, but not necessarily phraseological ones: many compound terms in one language have one-word equivalents in another.
4. Grammatical phraseology. Grammatical phraseology is a conditional name for separately formed parts of speech, mainly compound prepositions and conjunctions. Prepositions for (what), in connection with (what), unions since, due to the fact that, while, etc., like terms, require an equivalent in TL, but also not necessarily phraseological.

Now let's talk about non-phraseological translation in more detail.

Non-phraseological translation conveys this phraseological unit with the help of lexical rather than phraseological means of the TL.

It is usually resorted to, only after making sure that none of the phraseological equivalents or analogues can be used. Such a translation, even taking into account the compensatory possibilities of the context, can hardly be called complete: there are always some losses (figurativeness, expressiveness, connotation, aphorism, shades of meaning), which makes translators turn to it only in case of emergency.

Non-phraseological translation includes:

1. Lexical translation. Strict lexical translation is applicable, as a rule, in those cases when a given concept is indicated in one language by a phraseological unit, and in another - by a word.

Such a translation, although not entirely painless, is also amenable to phraseological units, which in the FL have synonymous words. These are mostly idioms, that is, combinations denoting objects or concepts. In contrast to the "single-word" and closer to what is called a free translation, the semantic content of phraseological units can be conveyed by a variable phrase. Such translations quite satisfactorily fulfill their role in the dictionary, indicating the exact semantic meaning of the unit. However, in the context, any correspondence should acquire a "phraseological form" or, at least, a stylistic coloring and expressiveness close to the original.

In a word, even in the lexical translation of phraseological units, one should always strive to get closer to the phraseological one, to convey at least some of its elements or sides.

2. Calque or literal translation, is usually preferred in those cases when other methods, in particular phraseological ones, cannot convey the phraseological unit in its semantic-stylistic and expressive-emotional meaning, and for one reason or another it is desirable to “bring” the figurative basis to the reader.

Calque is possible only when a literal translation can convey to the reader the true content of the entire phraseological unit (and not the meaning of its constituent parts). This is feasible, firstly, in relation to figurative phraseological units, mainly phraseological units that have retained metaphor; you can trace, secondly, a number of proverbs and, first of all, those that do not have subtext. This technique can, thirdly, convey some stable comparisons, but only after making sure that the carrier of the TL will perceive them correctly.

3. Descriptive translation. The descriptive translation of PU comes down, in fact, to the translation of not the phraseological unit itself, but its interpretation, as is often the case with units that do not have equivalents in the TL. These can be explanations, comparisons, descriptions, interpretations - all means that convey the content of phraseological units in the most clear and concise form, all with the same invariable desire for phraseology.

In the context, this way of translation has no independent meaning.

Speaking about the methods of translation of phraseological units and the choice between them, it remains to specify two more concepts: contextual translation and selective translation.

In applying contextual translation to phraseology, A. Kunin uses the term "overtone translation", and J. Retsker uses the term "contextual replacement".

Most often, we remember contextual translation, of course, in the absence of equivalents and analogues - when a phraseological unit has to be conveyed by non-phraseological means.

Selective translation is considered not as a translation of a "stable combination of words through one of the possible phraseological synonyms", but rather more broadly - as an inevitable initial stage of any translation of a stable combination, and translation in general. They choose, usually based on dictionary (known, generally accepted - it is not necessary to refer to the dictionary for them) correspondences, first of all, options, i.e. synonyms or close meanings of multi-valued phraseological units.

When choosing, all indicators of the original PU are taken into account and, last but not least, its style and color; sometimes it is the stylistic inconsistency or the presence of color that does not allow the seemingly most suitable unit to be translated.

And so, we examined the main ways and techniques of translating phraseological units. We have seen that the problems associated with this are considered by different linguists in different ways, different methods of translation are recommended, and there are dissenting opinions. Different situations may require different approaches. But the main role here belongs to the personality of the translator himself. He must feel himself a part of the culture in the language of the representatives of which this or that text is written, he must get used to it, make the only possible and at the same time unique version of the translation.

LITERATURE

1. Англо-русский словарь устойчивых словосочетаний = Collins Cobuild dictionary «Издательство Астрель», 2004. 752 с.
2. Арнольд И. В. Семантическая структура слова в современном английском языке и методика её исследования (на материале имени существительного). Л.: Просвещение, 1966. 192 с.
3. Арнольд И. В. Стилистика современного английского языка. Л.: Просвещение, 1973. 301 с.

4. Арсеньева Е. Ф. Сопоставительный анализ фразеологических единиц. Казань: Изд-во Казан. ун-та, 1989. 123 с.
5. Виноградов В. В. Русский язык. М.: Высш. шк., 1972. 613 с.
6. Влахов С., Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. М., 1980. 226 с.
7. Кунин А. В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. М.: Высш. шк., 1986. 396 с.
8. Sherzodovich, A. S., & Jamshedovich, B. F. THE MAIN FEATURES OF THE TRANSLATION OF LITERARY TEXT. *Sciencepublish. org*, 16.
9. Daminov Navruz, K. (2022). About Some Errors in the Process of Simultaneous Interpretation. <https://literature.academicjournal.io/index.php/literature/article/view/446>, 2(8), 1-7.
10. Daminov, N. K. (2022). Using Interpreting Strategies in Teaching Simultaneous Translation. *European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science*, 12, 40-47.
11. Kudratovich, D. N. (2023). СИНХРОН ТАРЖИМА ҚИЛИШДА ҚЎЛЛАНИЛАДИГАН АЙРИМ УСУЛЛАР ТАСНИФИ. *IQRO JURNALI*, 1(2), 322-330.
12. Kuldoshev, U. U. (2022). MODERN TRANSLATION STUDIES: PROCEDURES, PRINCIPLES AND STRATEGIES. *ВЕСТНИК МАГИСТРАТУРЫ*, 111.
13. Кулдошов, У. У. (2021). Таржимада Конверсивлик Ва Антонимлик Муносабатининг Берилиши. *Международный Журнал Искусство Слова*, 4(1-2).
14. Қўлдошов, Ў. Ў. (2022). БАДИИЙ ТАРЖИМАНИНГ ЛИНГВОМАДАНИЙ ЖИҲАТЛАРИ ТАҲЛИЛИ. *Academic research in educational sciences*, 3(1), 670-678.
15. Daminova, N. K. (2022). YOSHLARDA INSONPARVARLIK FAZILATLARINI SHAKLLANTIRISH-DAVR TALABI. *Journal of Integrated Education and Research*, 1(7), 169-171.
16. Mukhtarova, B. D., & Kudratova, D. N. (2022). Professional socialization of youth in family education. *European Scholar Journal*, 3(3), 92-94.
17. KUDRATOVNA, D. N. (2022). Improving the pedagogical content of professional socialization of youth and students in the context of globalization. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*.
18. Nosirova, K. A. (2022). NEWSPAPER STYLE. THE TRANSLATION ISSUES OF LEXICAL UNITS AND WORD COMBINATIONS IN NEWSPAPER TEXTS. *Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(2), 285-287.
19. Касимова, А. Н. (2022). TRANSLATION METHODS AND TECHNIQUES OF PUBLICISTIC MATERIALS. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 5(3).
20. Эркинов, С. Э. (2011). Семантико-тематический принцип изучения профессионализмов в английском языке (по данным лексики и фразеологии военной сферы). *Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного гуманитарно-педагогического университета*, (5), 337-347.