

The Operational Structure of the Techniques of Translating French Phraseological Units and the Psychological Origins of the Difficulties of Mastering these Techniques for Uzbek-Russian Bilinguals

Alimova Gulnoza Ramizidinovna

University of World Languages of the Republic of Uzbekistan Department of Theory of the French Language

Annotation

The first operation which interests us - recognition, identification of a phraseological unit - can be entirely connected with the concept of a "feature" of this unit, because in the interpretation of psychologists, recognition is "accounting for a fundamental feature or their system". Due to very complex nature of such a linguistic unit as phraseology, it has several signs, which together determine the criteria for the allocation of Fe. These criteria can be derived from the definitions of a phraseological unit.

Keywords: language units, definitions, semantic features, idiom, inseparability, metaphor, isolation.

Introduction: As N.M. Shansky noted that [231:1] neither in the works of the founder of phraseology - Sh. Bally, nor in the thoughts of academician V.V. Vinogradov the concept of phraseology is not fully elucidated.

The object of the research is the process of learning how to translate French phraseological units of Uzbek-Russian bilinguals in a language university.

The subject of the study is the methodological basis of French phraseological units as a model that generalizes the system of educational actions and operations (exercises) for mastering the methods of translation of French phraseological units by Uzbek-Russian bilinguals.

Though, from a detailed description of Ch. Bally of linguistic units attributed by F. de Saussure to stable combinations that "cannot be improvised, but are transmitted ready-made according to tradition", the following criteria ascribed to Ch. Bally's phraseological units follow : 1) strength, stability or cohesion of components; 2) different degrees of this cohesion; 3) the presence of phraseological units of both external (structural) and internal (semantic) features; 4) the leading role of semantic features for the integral meaning of the entire phraseological phrase.[272:6] From a no less detailed description of the three types of phraseological units, V.V. Vinogradov, i.e. phraseological fusions (or idioms), units and combinations, the criteria on the basis of which he singles out phraseological units follow: 1) stability of the lexical structure or components of the phraseological unit in the form of stagnation; 2) three degrees of semantic cohesion of words included in the phraseological unit; 3) complete or partial in decomposability of the general meaning of a phraseological unit as a lexical meaning; 4) the absence or presence of a motivation for the general meaning of a phraseological unit; 5) three degrees of synthetic-analytical nature of the structural

relations of the components of phraseological units [312:2].

Probably, common internal features can be considered: rethinking the meaning; value integrity; the integrity of reproduction and entry into a constant context, and we will attribute to private internal features: metaphorical and emotionally expressive imagery, idiomaticity, similarity and untranslatability. It seems possible that such a rubrication of internal particular signs as dividing them into causal and investigative ones. This possibility was suggested by the thought of S.I. Ozhegov on the criterion of untranslatability in L.A. Bulakhovsky: "This criterion is indisputable, but it is only ... a consequence of the peculiarities of the linguistic structure of phraseology" [145:3]. Following S.I. Ozhegov, we will attribute the criterion of untranslatability of phraseological units to a particular internal investigative feature, and we will consider the general internal criteria and the remaining three private internal features to be causal. Recalling that feature differentiation is a priori subject to the idea of phraseological unit recognition, let us summarize the discussion in the form of a diagram showing the systemic nature of the selected features that help to recognize phraseological units. Stability as a system of the following signs of semantic and lexical-grammatical stability of phraseological units.

1. External common: separate design and functional correlation.
2. Internal general (causal): rethinking the meaning, the integrity of the meaning, the integrity of the reproduction and entry into a permanent context.
3. Internal private (investigative): metaphorical, idiomatic, similar and untranslatable. Having an idea of the systemic correlation of features by which phraseological units are recognized, let's proceed directly to the creation of such a nomenclature of French phraseological units, which will be the linguistic basis of the developed teaching methodology. Therefore, it is necessary to find out what types (kinds, classes) are distinguished in the phraseology of the French language, how these types are linguistically complex and how these types correlate with the varieties of phraseological units and non-phraseological phrases, which are Russian and Uzbek equivalents of French phraseological units.

Turning to the works of other linguists, we see that the proposed definitions of a specific phraseological unit or simply a phraseological unit are built according to the most diverse features or criteria, which are taken as leading ones. However, the sign of the stability of the phrase remains unchanged for almost all authors, although the stability of the phraseological unit is revealed in different ways. At the same time, as it will become clear later, different interpretations of stability lead some linguists to a "broad" understanding of phraseology, i.e. to the indistinguishability of a stable combination and phraseological unit, others - to a "narrow" understanding, because to a strict delimitation of a phraseological unit from a stable combination.

The phraseology of the French language in linguistics has been widely and fully studied by A.G. Nazaryan, as noted earlier. Let us turn to his work, which provides a detailed study of French phraseological units [134:4], which allows not only to understand the essence of different types of phraseological units, but also to compile their nomenclature in the form of a glossary. The latter is possible due to the fact that A.G. Nazaryan, firstly, not one, but several classifications are given, and, secondly, these classifications are interconnected in content, logically, and terminologically, despite the different criteria for their creation. For the purpose of a compact presentation of those features that are attributed to phraseological units

in numerous definitions of this unit, we summarize these definitions in the form of a table. Which of the linguists includes which feature (criterion) of phraseological units in the definition of phraseological units?

1. Separate design - A.I. Smirnitsky (164, p. 208), A. V. Kunin (100, p. 24), I. I. Chernysheva (188, p. 7), A. G. Nazaryan (134, p. 51), O. S. Akhmanova (20, p. 503), V. P. Zhukov (73, p. 6) and many other linguists
2. Integrity of meaning - O.S. Akhmanova (20, 503, 19. 169), S.I. Ozhegov (145, p.198-199), V.P. G. Gak and Ya. I. Retsker (51, p. 5) others.
3. Rethinking the values of the components - I.I. Chernysheva (188. p. 7), A. V. Kunin (103, p. 8, 100, p. 24), A. G. Nazaryan (134, p. 51)
4. Metaphor, expressiveness, emotionality - B.A. Larin (104, p. 222), V. I. Kodukhov (86, p. 201), A. A. Reformatsky (154, p. 96), T.Z. Cherdantseva (186, p. 5).
5. Reproducibility in finished form - N.M. Shansky (192, p. 27) B.N. Golovin (58, p. 109), V. P. Zhukov (73, p. 6), V. N. Teliya (36, p. 610).
6. Entry into a permanent context - N.N. Amosova (10, p. 58).
7. Untranslatability - A.A. Reformatsky (154, p. 96), R.A. Budagov (38, p. 112), L. A. Bulakhovsky (39, p. 34).
8. Idiomaticity - O. Jespersen (69, p. 23), A. H. Gardiner (208, p. 34), A. I. Smirnitsky (164, p. 201), M. Ra (220, p. 6), V.G. Gak (53, p. 239).
9. Similarity, non-normativity - L.P. Smith (165. P. 181), P. Gyro (209, p. 6), A. A. Reformatsky (154, p. 95)
10. Functional correlation with a word, phrase, sentence - S.I. Ozhegov (145, p. 199); A.I. Smirnitsky (164, p. 210); O.S. Akhmanova (19, p. 168); A.G. Nazaryan (134, p. 60); V.I. Kodukhov (85, p. 147); A.V.Kunin (103, p.4) and many others.

Three other criteria of V.V. Vinogradov (i.e., the degree of semantic solidarity, in decomposability of meaning and motivation) are directly (3) connected precisely with those eight criteria that do not manifest themselves externally, but constitute the internal essence of phraseological units, characterizing its semantics, and not its structure, the connection of these three features V.V. Vinogradov with separate form and functional correlation can be recognized as only indirect (b; 7). In the works of the founder of Soviet linguistics, Mamatov A.E., the requirement of the adequacy of translation is defended, which is formed as follows: to express correctly and completely by means of one language what has already been expressed earlier by means of another language. [58:9]

Conclusion: From the foregoing, we can draw a conclusion that is important for further research on the nature of the features of phraseological units:

Among the ten features considered, it is possible to distinguish, external features of phraseological units, namely, separate design and functional correlation. The remaining eight features can be called internal features of phraseological units. However, these internal features are not homogeneous due to the fact that some of them apply to all phraseological units without exception, which are implied common signs, while others appear only in relation to some part of phraseological units, i.e. these are private signs. As for the external

signs mentioned above, they, apparently, can be called common to all phraseological units.

Bibliography:

1. Shansky N. M. "Phraseology of the modern Russian language" M., 1969, 231s.
2. Vinogradov V.V. "Basic concepts of Russian phraseology as a linguistic unit" - In the book: Selected Works. -M. 1977, 312s.
3. Bulakhovsky L.A. "Introduction to linguistics". -M., 1953, part 2 179s, 145s.
4. Nazaryan A. G. "The history of the development of French phraseology". -M., 1981,
5. Ozhegov S. I. "On the structure of phraseology." - Vkn: Lexicology. Lexicography. Culture of speech. -M. 1974, 352 p.
6. Saussure F. de. Course of general linguistics. - M., 1933, 272s.
7. Borodulina M. K., Minina N. M. "Fundamentals of teaching foreign languages in language universities. -M., 1968, 118 p.
8. Ganshina K. A. "Methods of Teaching French". - M. 1946, 260 p.
9. Mamatov A.E. "Essays on French Phraseological Stylistics" Tashkent Ed. "Ukituvchi" 1989 58s.
10. Bally S. "French style" M., 1961
11. Akhmanova O. S. "Dictionary of linguistic terms" M., 1966, 607p.
12. Belyaev B. V. "Essays on the psychology of teaching foreign languages" - M., 1959, 174 p.