The Categories of Proximity of the Russian Language to Uzbek in the Field of Phraseology

Mavlonova Nargiza Alisherovna
Senior teacher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT

The present article investigates viewpoints of scientists and linguists upon the notion of phraseological units and their definitions. The author demonstrates their discordance in defining the object of investigation of phraseology as a branch of linguistic science.

KEYWORDS: *motiveness, usus, constitutive conception, idiomatic, correlative, lexic-semantic, predication, invariant, structural-semiotic.*

Proximity category (PC) is a type of equivalence of the Uzbek correspondence to the Russian phrase combination, determined depending on the nature of the influence of the Russian language on the Uzbek language or the lack of it.

The problem of the equivalence of phraseological units of different languages has long attracted the attention of researchers, but only in recent years have significant advances been made in this area. In the works of E.M. Solodukho, A.D. Reichstein and Yu.P. Solodub is attracted by the lack of pragmatism characteristic of previous works, the breadth of theoretical constructions, the desire to comprehend the linguistic nature of convergence and internationalization of phraseological units. The mentioned works can be used as a starting point for a further global study of the compatibility of lexemes in modern languages in order to identify a universal phraseological fund and specific phraseological series or isolated phrase combinations inherent only in certain languages. The mentioned works can be used as a starting point for a further global study of the compatibility of lexemes in modern languages in order to identify a universal phraseological fund and specific phraseological series or isolated phrase combinations inherent only in certain languages.

1) The authors rely on phraseographic publications that reflect a narrow understanding of the object of phraseology, and compare only those phraseological units that serve mainly for connotative (subjective, evaluative, emotionally expressive) designation of objects and concepts [14]; 2) Researchers do not sufficiently differentiate the typology of similarities/differences: only tracing papers and independent formations stand out. [13].

A group of Uzbek phraseologists seeks to avoid these shortcomings, turning to a comparative analysis of FC on the material of Russian, Uzbek, French, ancient Greek and some other languages. Comparison of 4000 phraseological correspondences (PhC) of the Russian language with their correspondences in the Uzbek language led us to the need to distinguish the following PCs of the Russian language from Uzbek in the field of phraseology: 1) absolute equivalents of Russian phrases in the Uzbek language (AE), 2) calques of Russian FC in the Uzbek language (C), 3) semi-calques of Russian PhC in the Uzbek language (SC), 4) Uzbek PhC, Russian-induced induced formations (IF), 5) Uzbek PhC, inherent in it and not coinciding in semantic structure with equivalent or in meaning of the FS of the Russian language - independent formations (IF), 6) PhC of the Uzbek language, inherent in it from time immemorial, but coinciding in semantic structure with the PhC of the Russian language equivalent to them in meaning - independent identical formations (IIF), 7) Description of Russian phrase combinations by non-phraseological means of the Uzbek language

(D.).

In the subsequent presentation, the mentioned design bureaus will be characterized in detail and brought into line with the information available at our disposal and about the intralingual idiomaticity(II) of the PhC of the Russian and Uzbek languages and the Russian- Uzbek interlingual idiomaticity (II).

Absolute equivalents of Russian phrases in the Uzbek language.

Our judgment about absolute equivalents (literal translations) is based on the doctrine of the compatibility of lexemes by M.M. Kopylenko and Z.D. Popova. AE includes Uzbek Phrasiology correspondences containing denotative semes D1 and D2.

Let us turn to examples from the modern Uzbek language. The lexeme "sovrin", which carries the seme D1 (gift), forms a FS with the lexemes "моддий рағбатлантириш" following the pattern of compatibility of the Russian language lexemes "monetary award", international award". The Russian origin of the named Uzbek phrase combinations is obvious, since they implement the D2 sememe of the lexeme "rag'bat" (premium), which was previously absent in the semantic system of the Uzbek language. Our opinion is supported by the fact that for the expression of the concept of "prize" in the Uzbek language there is a univerb "mukofot", and for the concept of "reward" there is an assimilated xenonym "awards". As for the combination of Russian lexemes "valuable gift" (D1D1), it is expressed in the Uzbek language adequately by the phrase "qimmatli mukofot" (D1D1) and is a fact of absolute reproduction of the lexeme and sememe compatibility of lexemes of the Russian language.

In the 20-30s, phrase combinations "bolalar uyi", "balalar bogchasi", "balalar maydonchasi" appeared in the Uzbek language, corresponding to the Russian phrase combinations "orphanage", "kindergarten", playground", which did not previously exist in Uzbek language. In the modern Uzbek language, in accordance with the internal resources of its development, there is a need to nominate certain concepts and phenomena and new combinations have arisen that absolutely reproduce the lexeme and sememe compatibility of the Russian language and do not violate the norm of the Uzbek language. If it is necessary to transfer any information from L1 to L2, the equivalent elements of these languages are matched. With the complete coincidence of lexeme and sememe compatibility in L1 and L2, we are dealing with an adequate translation, the result of which is a combination of lexemes, which we call AE (qimmatli mukofot - a valuable gift, faol ishtirok etish - active participation, rezha bazharilishi - fulfill the plan, ilmiy aloqa – scientific connections, etc.). The case of the formation of absolute equivalents in the perceiving language covers combinations consisting of lexemes that carry denotative semes (D1, occasionally D2).

Some scientists C and AE refer to formations of the same series [17].

We support the opinion of D.Yu. Altaibaeva, who believes "....that neologisms - tracing papers and absolute equivalents - are innovations of a different order" [1]. The statement of E.M. Solodukho is true, one of the few researchers who notes that "the process of formation of phraseological units according to foreign language samples cannot be considered as a one-act, mechanical translation from one language to another" [24] .

Despite the fact that in the process of enriching the lexical-semantic system of the language, C and AE, appearing, as a rule, simultaneously, they play the same role - they replenish the vocabulary of the language, we do not attribute them to formations of the same series.

AE is PhC formed in the Uzbek language under the influence of the Russian language, absolutely reproducing the token and sememe compatibility of Russian PhC.

Calque of Russian phrase combinations in the Uzbek language.

In the process of historical development, peoples enter into language contacts with each other, which inevitably leads to the borrowing of foreign vocabulary and phraseology. I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay said on this occasion that "there is not and cannot be a single pure unmixed linguistic whole"[5].

Analyzing the general trends in the development of the Turkic literary languages, N.A. Baskakov notes: Expansion of the public functions of national languages, associated with the expansion of the network of secondary schools, higher educational institutions, the growth of the press, fiction, scientific and socio-political literature, the development of theater, radio broadcasting in these languages"[4].

As a result of the direct contact of the Russian and Uzbek languages, along with the borrowing of words, in the Uzbek literary language phraseological phrases are formed K-phrase combinations. The emergence of K-phrase combinations is explained primarily by the need to name new concepts, objects, etc. K-phrase combinations replenish and expand the phraseological fund of the Uzbek language and have been the object of scientific analysis for a long time. But there is still no single view on the problem of tracing.

W. Weinreich, N.M. Shansky, A.A. Reformatsky, G.Musabayeva, M.M.Fomina, L.A.Bulakhovsky. E.Shaahmedov, P.A.Sleptsov, L.I. Barannikova and others, with minor variations, define phraseological tracing as a borrowed or literal translation of expressions into constituent parts [3;7;8;16;20;23;26;27;28;]. These definitions include the concept of translation and borrowing of the exemplary model. But if to translate means "to express accurately and completely by means of one language what is already expressed by means of another language in an inseparable unity of content and form", then the concept of "translation" excludes the concept of "borrowing".

L. Galdi L. Bloomfield, V.V. Vinogradov, G.I. Pyadusova consider tracing as the creation of phraseological phrases based on the model of foreign language expressions.[6;9;10;19.].A. Rosseti and L.P. Efremov interpret sound tracing papers as a reproduction of the motivation or internal form of foreign words and expressions (A. Rosetti, speaking about the principle of tracing words, extends it to combinations of words)[11;21.]. According to V. Pisani, Y. S. Maslov, S. Isaev and L. N. Semenova, tracing papers are words and constructions formed from original material according to the structural model of a foreign language sample[12;18.].

But if tracing papers are a "special type of borrowing", in which a "model, sample" of a foreign language turnover is reproduced, then it remains unknown; that are borrowed, according to the model of which the foreign turnover is reproduced.

Traditionally, "semantic" calques are considered to be a phenomenon distinct from other types of calques. Researchers argue that in the case of semantic tracing, it is not a structural language unit that is borrowed, but a meaning. There is an opinion that the basis of semantic borrowing is figurativeness, expressiveness, sound, metaphor (V.V. Veselitsky, E.M. Solodukho), that during semantic tracing, secondary, usually figurative, meanings are borrowed (G. Hütl-Worth)

The above definitions of semantic tracing do not answer the question: how is the "borrowing of meaning" from L1 to L2? "We believe that the "semantic" tracing paper in L2 is the result of borrowing not the meaning of the equivalent lexeme L1, but one of its lexical-semantic variants, the establishment of which requires context, distribution"[2]. Consequently, semantic calque in the interpretation of these authors is nothing more than phraseological calque in our understanding, and it is based on the transfer from L1 of the nature of the distribution of the meanings of lexemes, their semantic connections and on the creation of similar semantic fields in L2.

D.Yu.Altaibaeva argues that semantic tracing or borrowing of wide compatibility is practically

understood as unlimited reproduction in L2 of phrase combinations L1.

We consider the concept of M. M. Kopylenko to be the most acceptable: Any foreign language influence in the lexico-semantic sphere of a particular language is reflected either in the form of the appearance of foreign lexemes (xenonyms) in it, or in the form of tracing. Tracing refers to borrowing: a) the word-formation structure of lexemes (word-forming tracing papers), b) wide compatibility of lexemes (semantic tracing papers), c) limited compatibility of lexemes (phraseological tracing papers-nests), d) individual compatibility of lexemes (individual phraseological tracing papers)"[15].

The essence of borrowing the compatibility of lexemes lies in the fact that L2 lexemes, equivalent to L1 lexemes, are combined according to the pattern inherent in the L1 language. So, tracing takes place in the translation. Which is a necessary condition for its implementation, but under no circumstances can it be identified with translation.

Yu.S. Sorokin, speaking of tracing, compares it with literal translation and distinguishes them for the reason that "... in literal translation we are dealing with a simple comparison of the speech of units of one language, and in tracing we are talking about the appearance of new constant units in one language under the influence of another"[25].

Any process of borrowing (including the borrowing of compatibility - tracing) is based on the fact of comparing the units R1 and R2, and it is impossible to talk about the appearance of a constant unit of the language - K - phrase combinations at the time of innovation, because in order to become one, it must enter the norm through the use.

Thus, if it is necessary to transfer information from L1 and L2, equivalent elements of the two languages are compared. Absolute reproduction of lexeme and sememe compatibility - AE, which we talked about above. But there are cases when the token compatibility coincides, and the sememe compatibility is violated. In these cases, we are dealing with tracing. Sememe analysis of a number of FS of their Uzbek correspondences clearly illustrates the mechanism of phraseological tracing - violation of the sememe in L2: scientific - K1, ilmiy - K1; sleeve - D2, rakhbar-D1; scientific -K1, ilmiy - K1, legacy-D2, meros -D1. In the process of translating these and similar combinations into the perceiving, i.e. in the Uzbek language, it was not the secondary sememes of the Russian lexemes "teacher", "heritage", but the primary sememes of the Uzbek lexemes yetakchi-"guide", "meros"- "heritage" that became actual.

When tracing the semes of Uzbek lexemes under the influence of the Russian language, they undergo a semantic shift to the degree of D2 and K1. The semantic shift can affect all lexemes: white gold (D2D2) оқ oltin-(D2K1); in the full sense of the word (K1K1K1) - suzning tulik manosida (D2K1K1) or not all: work plan (D2K1) - ish rezhasi (D1K1); drop out of school (K1D1) -ўқishni tashlash (D1D2).

So, we consider as tracing paper phrase combinations of the Uzbek language, in which during translation the token compatibility is reproduced, but the sememe compatibility is violated.

K - phrase combinations of the Russian language contribute to the expansion of the social functions of the Uzbek literary language and the replenishment of its resources.

Literature

1. Altaibaeva D.Yu. On the ratio of borrowing, tracing and translation. - News of the Academy of Sciences of the Kaz SSR. Philological series 1978, No. 1, p.36

2. Altaibaeva D.Yu. Phraseological calques, absolute equivalents and induced formations (on the basis of the Russian literary language of the 18th century and the modern Cossack literary language). Annot. Dis. …cand. philol. Sciences. L., 1983 , p.10.

3.   Barannikova L.I. Introduction to linguistics. Saratov. 1973, p. 146.

4.   Baskakov N.A. The development of languages and writing of the peoples of the SSR. - questions of linguistics. 1952, No. 3, p.26.

5.   Baudouin de Courtenay I.A. Selected works on general linguistics. M., 1963. Part 1., p.361.

6.   Блумфильд Л. Язык. М., 1968. С.502, 759.

7.   Bulakhovsky L.A. Introduction to linguistics. M. 1954, p. 123.

8.   Weinreich U. Monolingual and multilingual.- In the book: New in linguistics. M., 1972, p. 44.

9.   Vinogradov V.V. Essays on the history of the Russian literary language of the 17-19 centuries. M., 1938, p.145, 163.

10.   Galdi L. Words of Roman origin in Russian. M., 1958; p.73.

11.   Efremov L.P. Is word-formation tracing a morphemic translation? - In the book: Foreign Linguistics and Literature. Issue 2. Alma-Ata. 1972.

12.   Isaev S. Development of the Kazakh literary language in the Soviet era. Alma-Ata., 1973, pp. 20, 22.

13.   Kopylenko M.M. Typology of Kazakh equivalents to phrase combinations of the Russian language (in print).

14.   Kopylenko M.M., Popova Z.D. Comparative Phraseology: Status and Prospects. – Lexical and Grammatical Components in the Semantics of a Linguistic Sign. Voronezh: VSU, 1983

15.   Kopylenko M.M. Tracing paper of Greek origin in the language of Old Russian writing. - Byzantine time. No. 34, M., 1973, p. 141.

16.   Musabaev G. Modern Kazakh language, v. 1. Lexis. Alma-Ata, 1959. p. 99.

17.   Peisikov L.S. Lexicology of modern Persian. M., 1975.p.59: Sleptsov P.A. Russian lexical borrowings in the Yakut language.M. 1975, p. 104-104.

18.   Pisani V. Etymology M. 1958, p. 67; Maslov Yu.S. Introduction to linguistics. M., 1975, p. 256.266.

19.   Pyadusova G.I. Borrowing as a process of interaction between two language systems. Abstract dis. ... Ph.D., L., 1971.

20.   Reformatsky A.A. Introduction to linguistics. M., 1967, p. 138.

21.   Rosetti A. Mixed language and displacement of languages. - V. book: New in linguistics. Issue 6. M. 1972, p. 119.

22.   Semenova L.N. On the issue of phraseological tracing in Russian / Phraseological gallicisms /.- In the book: Problems of Russian phrase formation. Tula.1973.p.136.

23.   Sleptsov P.A. Russian lexical borrowings in the Yakut language.M. 1975, p.103.

24.   Solodukho E.M. To the question of Phraseological tracing.-In the book. Grammatical structure and phraseological units of the Romano-Germanic languages: Kazan, 1973.p.108.

25.   Sorokin Yu.S. development of the vocabulary of the Russian literary language in the 30s-90s of the 19th century. M.-L., 1965, p.165.

26.   Fomina M.M. Vocabulary of the modern Russian language. M.1973. p.95;

27.   Shaahmedov E. Issues of tracing from Russian into Uzbek. Abstract dis.,.. Ph.D. Sciences. Tashkent, 1974. p. 5.

28.   Shansky N.M. Lexcology of the modern Russian language M., 1972, p. 239.