

LINGUOCULTURAL APPROACH TO TEACHING THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Rasulov Ilkhom Inamovich

Kokand State Pedagogical Institute

ARTICLE INFO.

Keywords: educational translation, national mentality, cultural studies, national realities, non-equivalent vocabulary, interference.

Abstract

the article discusses some issues of using educational translation and the role of the linguocultural approach to increasing the effectiveness of teaching the Russian language to Uzbek schoolchildren.

<http://www.gospodarkainnowacje.pl/> © 2023 LWAB.

Introduction

A comparative study of any fragment of the linguistic wealth of a people provides a wealth of material that allows one to get an idea of the similarities and differences in the verbal transmission of the system of values that underlie the spiritual world of each people. The vocabulary captures the rich historical experience of the people, it reflects ideas related to the work, life and culture of people.

Since language is associated with the national mentality and serves as a means of communication, a means of learning, a means of social communication; It not only reflects the peculiarities of the national mentality, but also shapes it; the problem of cultural assimilation of the Russian language by Uzbek schoolchildren arises.

In this regard, linguoculturology is becoming relevant - a science that arose at the intersection of linguistics and cultural studies, studying the relationship and interaction of culture and language.[5]. Linguoculturology is based on the theory of the semantic field, since I.M. Sheina claims that "the field is the main structure that organizes the thesaurus of a language."

Linguocultural teaching of the Russian language involves the effective use of educational translation in Russian lessons. The use of educational translation, to a certain extent, relates to all the main goals of teaching Russian to students in Uzbek schools [1].

In Russian language curricula and textbooks for schools with Uzbek as the language of instruction, insufficient attention is paid to the use of translation techniques and methods in linguistic and cultural teaching of the Russian language.

Students believe that a text is translated if an equivalent is selected for each word, and are little interested in what happened in the end, whether there is any meaning in the translated text. Such translation negatively affects the acquisition of the Russian language.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to consider the features of the linguocultural approach when using

educational translation in Russian language lessons. To ensure that educational translation does not reduce the effectiveness of the lesson, V.I. Andriyanova suggests observing the following rules: 1) translation should not be the only way to work on studying a text. The material being studied must be activated by students answering questions and by retelling. Students must be required to firmly master, quickly and confidently apply knowledge of the lexical and grammatical material of the text; 2) it is necessary to ensure that students translate, consciously delving into the meaning of sentences as a whole and each word separately [3].

Materials and research methods

The successful use of educational translation largely depends on the degree of compliance with the subjective interests of the students themselves. Various types of educational translation are widely used to satisfy certain motives for learning a language: cognitive, subject-functional, aesthetic, entertainment, etc. The correct balance of educational translation, monolingual speech training and practice contributes to the formation of the necessary motivational base, which effectively influences the language learning process as a whole [6].

Results and its discussion

Let us turn to the problem of translating words denoting national realities. In every language there are words that reflect the connection between language and culture and are a cultural component of the semantics of a linguistic unit. The role of words-realities in the process of intercultural communication is quite important. When teaching any second language, an important role is played by familiarizing students with national realities that express the life, culture, and characteristics of a given people.

As a linguistic phenomenon, realias belong to the national cultural vocabulary and are called non-equivalent vocabulary, that is, they do not require translation, since they are part of background knowledge and are of significant interest when studying the interaction of language and culture. According to E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov "non-equivalent vocabulary is words used to express concepts that are absent in another culture and in another language, words related to private cultural elements, i.e. to cultural elements characteristic only of the culture of a given people, which have no equivalents outside the language to which they belong" [5, 53]. A characteristic feature of national realities is their untranslatability, therefore realia words are usually acquired by interpreting their meanings.

Based on this, when teaching a second language, special attention should be paid to national realities, which will simultaneously introduce the national and cultural flavor of a given people: customs, rituals, objects and concepts of art, way of life, literature and folklore. For example, words expressing the national characteristics of the Uzbek people, such as atlas, adras (names of fabrics); palov, somsa, sumalak, patir, shavla, manti (food names), chopon, to'n (clothing names), kurash (kind of sport), dutor, doira (names of musical instruments), mahalla, viloyat, hokimiyat (names of the social and political system) have now entered the vocabulary of many peoples. Also indispensable are borrowed words from the Russian language, such as: ruchka, papka, parta, sumka, mashina, poezd, samolyot, stol, stul, kofta, yubka, gulyash, salat, borsh, bulka, chay, chaynik, pirojnoe and many others.

It should be noted that in some textbooks sometimes these "untranslated" words are given in a translated version, which led to a distortion of the meanings of these words. Thus, the words to'n and chopon are translated as xalat, kosa - big cup, tog'a - uncle, amma - aunt (paternal), ko'rpa - blanket, ko'rpacha - small blanket, etc. It should be noted that these translations do not match their original meanings and create misconceptions about these things. For example, to'n and chopon are men's outerwear, while xalat is women's homewear. Or the ko'rpacha is not a small blanket, since the blanket is used for covering, and the ko'rpacha is spread on the floor and is used for sitting.

Also, a cup is used for tea, and the Uzbek kosa is used for food. Therefore, it cannot in any way be

called a large cup.

As can be seen from the above examples, mistakes are made under the influence of linguistic interference of the native language, and they must be eliminated from the very beginning of teaching the Russian language.

Let us turn to the national-cultural specificity of the lexical-semantic fields “person/odam” in the phraseological system of the Russian and Uzbek languages. Equivalent translation of phraseological units of the Russian language when teaching Uzbek schoolchildren is a sought-after task. For a deep mastery of phraseological units in the Uzbek audience, it is important to study phraseology based on the ideographic principle, namely, on specific topics and conceptual fields. At the same time, we remember that the translation of phraseological units requires the selection of equivalent units in the language into which it is translated.

Lexico-semantic fields (LSF) of the concept “person/odam” in the phraseology of the Russian and Uzbek languages:

<i>LSF “good, smart, knowledgeable / bad, stupid, ignorant person”:</i>	
kurskiy solovey, bolshoe serdtse, dubina stoerosovaya, pen' berezoviy, golova sadovaya, shut goroxoviy, sosud skudel'niy, Foma neveruyushiy, shkura barabannaya, olux sarya nebesnogo, gore lukovoe	og'ir karvon, ayolmand kishi, bekorchi xuja, mayda gap, ochiq qul, oq kungil, temir tirnoq, tirik ta'viya, xira pashsha, shur tumshuq, yumshoq supurgi, yuraksiz odam
<i>LSF “rich, simple-minded / poor, cunning”:</i>	
beden kak serkovnaya mish, lishniy rot, golodniy kak volk, krotkiy kak ovtsa, smirniy kak telenok, nem kak mogila, odin kak perst, podvijniy kak rtut', toshya kak kil'ka, otkritaya dusha, produvnaya bestiya, sluga dvux gospod	it g'ajigan oshiqdek, it talagan gadoydek, buyi nomoz asrning soyasidek, suvga tushgan mushukdek, arvoxda uxshagan, suvga tushgan bulka nondek, boshi xumdek, xirsdek baquvvat, do'ppisi yarimta, rangi siniq
<i>LSF “high social status/low social status; hostile/close, friendly relations</i>	
belaya kost, vajnaya ptitsa, krupnaya ptitsa, shishka na rovnom meste, chelovek s bolshoy bukvi, ptitsa visokogo poleta, ptitsa nizkogo poleta	beli baquvvat, burni osmonda, bo'yni qisiq, bo'yni yo'g'on, katta og'iz, avzoyi buzuq, asabi joyida, achchig'i burnini ustida, tagi past

As the selection of phraseological units characterizing a person in Russian linguistic culture showed, there are more quantitatively more expressions condemning a person for bad behavior, for a bad attitude towards people, for laziness than laudatory ones. Such statistics reflect the mentality of the Russian people, which in many ways is close to the Uzbek mentality.

Conclusions

Lexical-semantic analysis of phraseological units and the phenomenon of opposition in them will serve a better understanding of the Russian language, and the study of the lexical-semantic fields of the two compared languages allows us to even more fully reveal the linguistic picture of the world of these thematic groups.

Properly organized translation work significantly increases the interest of students in learning their native and Russian languages, in comparing and contrasting them. Educational translation, promoting better acquisition of both languages and counteracting interference, can become a significant factor in increasing the effectiveness of teaching the Russian language.

Used sources:

1. Abdrakhmanova I.E. Translation as a means of teaching in the lessons of the native Russian language in grades 7-9 of secondary schools. - M., 1996. - 188 p.
2. Azizov A.A. Comparative grammar of Russian and Uzbek languages. T. Ukituvchi, 1983. - 239 p.
3. Andriyanova V.I. Improving the teaching of Russian oral speech to Uzbek schoolchildren. Tashkent: Fan, 1988. - 93 p.
4. Vereshchagin E.M., Kostomarov V.G. Language and culture: Linguistic and regional studies in teaching Russian as a foreign language. - Moscow: Russian language, 1983. -269 p.
5. Popovich I.Yu., Bulgarova B.A., Kruchkovich S.M. Educational translation as a way of teaching Russian to foreign philologists-Russians // Polylinguality and transcultural practices. - 2013. - No. 4. - pp. 135-143
6. Rasulova Matluba Khamzaevna. Educational Translation At Russian Language Lessons In Uzbek School// Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 14 (3) <https://jett.labosfor.com>. ISSN 1989 – 9572 DOI: 10.47750/jett.2023.14.03.056
7. Rasulov Ilhom Inamovich. Lexico-Semantic Fields In Russian And Uzbek Languages// Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 14 (3) <https://jett.labosfor.com/> ISSN 1989 – 9572 DOI: 10.47750/jett.2023.14.03.057
8. Rasulov Ilkhom Inamovich. PHRASEOLOGISTS WITH THE MEANING OF MORAL AND ETHICAL ASSESSMENT OF A PERSON <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10043240>// International Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities. Finland Academic Research Science Publishers ISSN: 2945-4492. Volume-11| Issue-10| 2023 Published: |22-10-2023|