WEB OF SCIENTIST: INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH JOURNAL
ISSN: 2776-0979, Volume 3, Issue 4, April., 2022

INTERACTIVE APPOINTMENTS OF THE IDIOMS IN ENGLISH AND THEIR ALTERNATIVES IN UZBEK

D. Usmonova
Senior Teacher, Uzbek State University of World Languages

Samijonov Muxammadali
Master student of Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Annotation
Idiom is part of language which can be found in daily conversation. It can be found in spoken language and written text. In written text, the idiom is used in mass media, novel, song, poetry, short story, etc. The use of idiom in some works is to make the language becomes more beautiful, playful, interesting, etc. The problem is not all of the speakers understand about idiom especially nonnative speakers.

Keywords: genesis, idioms, nonnative speakers, mass media, novel, song, poetry, short story.

Introduction

There is type of expression which is frequently included in the category of idiom, but which, it will be argued, ought to be kept distinct, and that is what is sometimes called “frozen” or “dead” metaphor. The topic of metaphor is too board to receive a detailed treatment here.

Let us simply say that a metaphor induces the hearer (or reader) to view a thing, state of affairs, or whatever, as being like something else, by applying to the former linguistic expressions which are more normally employed in references to the latter. In, for instance, *the huge locomotive snorted and belched its way across the plain* we are invited to look at the locomotive as if it were a gigantic animal. This, of course, changes our perception of it, and it seems to take on characteristics such as “temperamental”, “dangerous when roused”, “difficult to control”, and so on. The metaphorical strategy of interpretation is most likely to be triggered of by a perception of incongruity or inappropriateness in the sentence when interpreted literally. If, however a metaphor is used sufficiently frequently with a particular meaning, it loses its characteristic flavor, or piquancy, its capacity to surprise and hearers encode the metaphorical meaning as one of the standard sense of the expression. Interpreting it then no longer requires the activation of the metaphorical strategy, working through the literal meaning but merely requires the looking up, as it were of a dictionary entry, in much

the same way presumably, the idioms are interpreted. However, very often the link with the original 'live' metaphor, and the hence with the literal meanings of the parts, is not wholly lost. Dead metaphors for which this is true can be 'reviewed' by substituting for one or more of their constituent parts elements which (in the literal uses) are near synonyms, or paraphrases. Consider the following pairs of sentences:
They tried to sweeten the pill.
They tried to sugar the medicine.
You must have taken leave of your senses.
You must have left your senses behind
We shall leave no stone unturned in our search for the culprit.
We shall look under every stone in our search for the culprit.
The first sentence in each pair contains a dead metaphor; in the second sentence, the metaphor is revitalized by the substitution of a near-synonym or paraphrases. The same process carried out on true idioms dramatically demonstrates the difference between the two types of expression:
John pulled his sister's leg.
John tugged at his sister's leg.
Tonight we are going to paint the town red.
Tonight we are going to color the city scarlet.
They took us to the cleaners.
They took us to the laundry.

Something similar happen in translating. A literal rendering of an idiom is very rarely capable of serving as even an approximate translation; it is mostly likely to be either uninterruptable, or quite unrelated in meaning to the original expression. Consider the French idioms "faire des gorges chaudes de quelque chose" and «donner sa langue au chat ». A literal translation of the first is scarcely interpretable; *to make warm throats of something ;* the second translates into something a little easier to construe; *to give one's tongue to the cat. B*ut neither of these translations gives the slightest clue to the idiomatic meaning of the original French expression; the first means "to laugh loudly and maliciously at something" and the second "to give up" (eg. When asked a riddle). (It is by no means uncommon unrelated idiom in one language to be at least roughly equivalent to a lexically unrelated idiom in another language: The French *monter un bateau a quelqu'un* is quite close to *to pull someone's leg, or to have someone on.* Whether lexically unrelated idioms can ever be considered exact translation equivalents, however, is debatable). Literal translation fares rather better with dead metaphors; the results are usually a little odd, but are nonetheless interpretable in the

manner of live metaphors. In the following, the first sentences are dead metaphors, and the second sentences are literal translations:
Why keep a dog and bark yourself?
Pourquoi avoir un chien et aboyer soi-meme?
You are barking up the wrong tree.
Ce n'est pas a cet arbre la que vous devez aboyer.
Il a change son cheval borgne pour un aveugle.
He has changed his one-eyed horse for a blind one.
Il etait prêt a aller decrocher la lune pour elle.
He was ready to go and unhook the moon for her.

Interestingly a high proportion of dead metaphors have similar (although not identical) dead metaphor equivalents:
To put the cat among the pigeons.
Mettre le luop dans la bergerie.
A cat may look at a queen.
Un chien peut bien regarder un eveque.
Let sleeping dog lie.
Ne pas revieller le chat qui dort.

To call a spade a spade.
Appeler un chat un chat.

These close equivalents among dead metaphors can present the translator with a delimma (one of many). If he translates word-for-word, he will achieve greater fidelity in one respect (mettre le chat parmi les pigeons, for instance, evokes the same picture as put the cat among the pigeons), but to the detriment of fidelity in another respect (*Faire cela, c'est mettre le chat parmi les pigeons* is a live metaphor, while *Faire cela, c'est mettre le luop dans la bergerie* is not); if, however, he puts a greater value on the latter type of fidelity, then he must sacrifice the former.
Not surprisingly dead metaphor as a rule present a fewer problems to foreign learners of a language than idioms do. Their interpretability, however, must not be exaggerated; their meanings are not necessarily wholly predictable no first acquaintance. Indeed, some only can be appreciated as metaphors with hindsight, as it were; it is only when the figurative meaning is pointed out that the path from the literal to metaphorical meaning becomes traceable.

While dead metaphors and idioms must be distinguished, it should also be recognized that they have certain characteristics in common. (It is probable that the majority of idioms began their lives as metaphors; and synchronically, transitional cases, which are idioms for some and metaphors for others, are not uncommon). Dead metaphors have in common with idioms that their constituent elements do not, in the straightforward sense, yield recurrent semantic contrasts: consider, for instance, the contact *stone/knob in We shall leave no – unturned*. They are not, therefore, semantically transparent. On the other hand, the effect of synonymous substitution and the continuing relevance of their literal meanings make it unsatisfactory simply to call them "opaque". We shall therefore describe them as "translucent". (It should be noted that translucency is not the same as the semi-opacity of, for example, *fish and chips*). Dead metaphors also have a certain syntactic rigidity the quality of being dead is closely tied to a particular syntactic form, and with any modification the metaphor springs to life:

Compare:

He has one foot in the grave.

One of his feet is in the grave.

Even if translucency and opacity can be satisfactorily distinguished, it is not necessarily the case that a particular expression can be unambiguously characterized as one or another. This is because the two properties may coexist in one and the same expression. Take the case of:

She gave him a piece of her mind.

A good part of meaning of this expression is accessible via normal metaphorical interpretation – it may be inferred that some opinion has been communicated. But a crucial element of meaning cannot be construed in this way, namely, the negative, scolding aspect; because of this, the expression *to give someone a piece of one's mind* must be considered semi-opaque – and, by the same token, only semi-translucent.

Because of their non-transparency and syntactic frozenness we shall consider dead metaphors to be minimal lexical units.

We use idioms to express something that other words do not express as clearly or as cleverly. We often use an image or symbol to describe something as clearly as possible and thus make our point as effectively as possible. For example, "in a nutshell" suggest the idea of having all the information contained within very words. Idioms tend to be informal and are best used in spoken rather then written English.

Idioms: the good news.

Sometimes idioms are very easy for learners to understand because there are similar expressions in the speaker's mother tongue. For example:

He always goes at things like a bull in a china shop.

Sometimes you can guess the meaning of new idioms from context. For example what do you think these idioms mean?

1. He was on the carpet last week for being late for work three times.
2. She made a marvelous speech to the conference. *She took delegates.*
3. It was extremely long report. *It took me three hours to wade through.*
4. I believe we should talk openly and frankly about the project warts and all.
5. Let is call it day. *I am very tired and we have covered the main points of the meeting I think.*

However, idioms can often be very difficult to understand. You may be able to guess the meaning from context but if not it is not easy to know the meaning. Many idioms for instance, come from favorite British activities such as fighting, sailing hunting and playing games. As well as being quite specialist in meaning, some of the words in idioms were used two or three hundred years ago or longer and can be a little obscure. Here are some examples;

However, idioms can be often be very difficult to understand. You may be able to guess the meaning from context but if not easy to know the meaning. Many idioms, for instance, come from favorite British activities such as fighting, sailing, hunting and playing games. As well as being quite specialist in meaning.

Some of the words in idioms were used two or three hundred years ago or longer and can be a little obscure. Here some examples:

Now let's see some idioms and their explanations and usage in examples:

All right (1) expression of reluctant agreement.

A: "Come to the party with me. please"

B: "Oh, all right: I do not want to, but I will".

All right (2). Fair, not particularly good.

A: "How is your chemistry class?".

B: "It is all right, I guess, but it is not the best class I have ever had".

All right (3). Unharmed, in satisfactory condition.

A: "You do not look normal. Are you all right?".

B: "Yes but I have a headache".

And then some: and much more besides.

A: "I'd guess your new computer cost about $ 2000".

B: "It cost that much and then some because I also bought extra things".

As easy as pie: very easy.

"I thought you said this was a difficult problem. It is not. In fact, it is as easy as pie".
At the eleventh hour: at the list minute, almost too late.
"Yes, I got the work done in time. I finished it at the eleventh hour, but I was not late".
Bad mouth: say unkind, embarrassing (and probably untrue) thinks about someone.
A: "I do not believe what Bob said. Why is he had bad – mouthing me".
B: "He is probably jealous of your success".
Be a piece of cake: be very easy.
"Bob said the test was difficult, but I thought it was a piece of cake".
Be a piece of cake: be eager to hear what someone has to say.
A: "I just got an e-mail message from our old friend sally".
B: "Tell me what she said. I am ears".
Be broke: be without money.
"No I cannot lend you ten dollars. I am completely broke until pay day".
Be fed up with (someone or something): be out of patient (with someone or something); be very tired of someone or something.
"Bill you are too careless with your work. I am fed up with apologizing for your mistake?"
Be in and out: be at and away from place during a particular time.
"Could we postpone our meeting until to tomorrow?"
"I expect to be in and out of the office of the day today".
Be on the road: be traveling.
"I cannot see you until around 4 o'clock. My meeting won't be over until then".
Be up and running: (for technological process) be operational: be ready to use.
"Dave is cafe on the web ha sheen up and running since. December 1995."
The term collocation will be used to refer to sequences of lexical items which habitually co-occur, but which are nonetheless fully transparent in the sense that each lexical constituent is also a semantic constituent. Such expressions as (to pick a semantic area at random) *fine weather, torrential rain light drizzle, high winds* are example of collocations.
There are of course easy to distinguish from idioms; nonetheless, they do have a kind of semantic cohesion – the constituent elements are to varying degree, mutually selective. The semantic integrity or cohesion of a collocation is the more marked if the meaning carried by one of its constituent elements is highly restricted contextually, and different from its meaning in more neutral contexts. Consider the case of *heavy in heavy drinker.*
This sense of *heavy* requires fairly narrowly defined contextual conditions: one may speak of a *heavy smoker, or a heavy drug-user,* a car may be *heavy on petrol, etc.* for

this sense of heavy to be selected, the notion of "consumption" in the immediate environment seems to be a prerequisite. In a neutral context like *it is – heavy* has a different meaning.

We are still, however, in the realms of transparent sequences, because each constituent produces a recurrent semantic contrast:

Heavy (He is a - smoker)= heavy (They were - drinkers)
Light light
Drinker (He is a heavy -)= drinker (they are light - s)
Smoker smoker

Semantic cohesiveness is even tighter if the meaning of one of the elements of a collocation requires a particular lexical item in its immediate context (cases where all the elements are uniquely selective in this way seem not to occur). Such is the case with, for example, *foot the bill and curry favour*. With expressions such as these, we are obviously approaching another transitional area bordering on idiom. It has already been argued in some detail that *foot the bill* is semantically transparent. It is also un-idiom-like in the fact that *bill* is fairly freely modifiable:

I am expected to foot the bill

Yet it has some distinctly idiom-like characteristics, too. One of these is that *foot* (in the relevant sense) demands the presence of a specific lexical partner; pronominal anaphoric reference to a previously occurring *bill* apparently will not do:

Son: *I have just got the bill for the car repairs.*
Father: I hope you do not expect me to foot it.

Furthermore, it resists interruption:

I am expected not only to foot, but also to add up, all the bills.

Collocation like *foot the bill and curry favour*, whose constituents do not like to be separated, may be termed "bound collocations". Although they display some of the characteristics properties of idioms, bound collocations are nevertheless, as far as we are concerned, lexically complex.

The List of Used Literature

1. Арнольд И. В. "Лексикология современного английского языка." М.: 1959.
2. Бархударов Л.С., "Язык и перевод". М., 1975.
3. Бархударов Л.С., Рецкер Я.И., "Курс лекций по теории перевода," 1-й МГПИИЯ, М., 1968.
4. Белинский В.Г., Собр. соч., СПБ, 1896, т. 1.
5. Галперин И.Р., "Информативность единиц языка." М., 1974.
6. Жуковский В.А., "Предисловие к «Дон Кихоту»". М., 1805.

7. Кузьмин С., “Употребление - главное звено механизма переводческих показателей” (на примере фразеологизмов). Тетради переводчика, М., 1972.
8. Hockett Charles F. A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.
9. Eshboeva D., 2019. CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHER'S PROBLEM-SOLVING SKILLS. In Pedagogika i psikhologiya v sovremennom mire: teoreticheskiye i prakticheskiye issledovaniya. Pp. 196-199.
10. Makkai A. Idiom Structure in English. Hague: Mouton, 1972. P. 28.
11. Amanova N. F. (2022). effective method of teaching. Conference Zone, 53–55. Retrieved from http://www.conferencezone.org/index.php/cz/article/view/124
12. Furkatovna, A. N., & Furkatovna, A. F. (2021, January). innovative activity in the field of tourism. In Euro-Asia Conferences (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 308-309). http://papers.euroasiaconference.com/index.php/eac/article/view/97
13. Amanova N.F Amanova F.F (2022) Malum bir maqsadga qaratilgan va maxsuslashgan til. https:// conf.iscience.uz/ index.php/yumti/ article/view/118/110