
DIFFICULTIES AND WAYS OF TRANSLATION OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7812346>

Parpibayev Botirali Rahimjon o'g'li

English language teacher,

Academic Lyceum under Namangan State University

Abstract.

Phraseological units present a variety of challenges during translation because of their language and cultural specificity. The term "interlinguistic equivalence" is used to describe a variety of relationships between linguistic units. Whole equivalents, partial equivalents, phraseological parallels, and non-equivalents can all be identified from a contrastive perspective. Phraseological gaps, also known as lacunary units, are made up of fixed expressions that are only present in the source language and do not have phraseological equivalents. They must be translated non-phraseologically because there are no units of the supplied source language in the target language. Their equivalents are either words or loose groups of lexical objects; however, the units may be deleted in some situations. The paper focuses on problems of translating phraseological units and a few strategies, including transposition, substitution, omission and compensation, in dealing with difficulties, while discussing the translation of such units.

Key words.

gap, lacuna, phraseological unit, equivalent, translation, transposition, omission, substitution, compensation.

The translation of phraseological units from one language into another one is a difficult task due to semantic richness, emotionality, expressiveness, rethinking and figurativeness. When translating phraseological units, it is necessary to convey their meaning and reflect their figurativeness, finding a similar expression in target language, while preserving the transitivity of meaning, the expressiveness of phraseological unit, its stability. The translation of phraseological units is considered as a complex language process that requires careful study and a special approach. The purpose of the article is to describe results of a comparative typological analysis of insufficiently studied phraseological expressions and their translation.

There are a few theoretical views of scholars in the field of translating phraseological units. A lacuna is a gap that can appear in a variety of human endeavors, including communication, translation (Sorokin, Markovina 1989), and advertising (Wipprecht 2005). (Grodzki 2003). The idea of gaps has been studied in Russian linguistics since the 19th century. However, it should be noted that only with the growth of ethno-psycholinguistics in the 1970s and 1980s did it become a key idea in Russian intercultural communication studies. A comparable gap concept was put forth by American linguist Kenneth L. Hale, it is important to note. He referred to the absence of numerals and color designations in the language of Australian aboriginals as gaps in his essay titled Gaps in Grammar and Culture (Hale 1975).

Gap units are particularly difficult to translate because of a variety of reasons. They lose some of their stylistic elements as well as other aspects, including evaluative markedness, since they lack phraseological analogues in the target language (Szerszunowicz 2010). Second, it is unknown what referential gaps mean, which increases the difficulty of the translation because it frequently necessitates the incorporation of aspects of the source language readers' cultural knowledge. Furthermore, the translator's job is made more difficult by the lack of lexicographic descriptions, particularly in bilingual phraseographic works.

Moreover, in the phraseological units is communicated the particular outlook, a method of judgment, the element sees; they show the life and life, soul and temper, habits and customs, convictions and strange notions. Etymological and social examination of phraseological units is married to outside factors: the set of experiences of the country, its way of life, regular daily existence, and so forth the Study of phraseological units in the etymological furthermore, social perspective assists with explaining, and at times to set up extra semantic shades with public and social semantics.

Therefore, issues of translating phraseological units from English into Uzbek, considering their etymological and social attributes, is viewed as quite possibly the most troublesome sorts of interpretation changes. The object of interpretation isn't a language framework as a deliberation, be that as it may, a particular discourse work in another dialect (the first content), based on which another discourse work in another dialect (the interpretation text) is made. The reason for the interpretation is to familiarize the peruser (or audience) who doesn't have the foggiest idea about the first language as intently as conceivable with this content (or the substance of oral discourse).

In addition, problems of phraseology are extremely important both for practice and for translation theory; they often present great practical difficulties and arouse great theoretical interest, since they are related to the difference in semantic and stylistic functions performed in different languages by words of the same real meaning, and to the difference in combinations that such words enter into in different languages. This paper discusses only some of the many problems of translating phraseological units. It is usually accepted to indicate the equivalent of a phraseological unit to a word. However, the theory of complete equivalence is becoming obsolete. This does not mean that phraseological units and words have nothing in common, which is considered by the theory of correlation of certain types of phraseological units and words, which, however, is based on slightly different principles. The most characteristic for phraseological turns of stable combinations of words are in principle equal in meaning to a single word, differing from it, as a rule, by a certain expressive and stylistic coloring. As previously said, the translator examines the translation as whole rather than just the instance of the idiom. The means required in the target language to realize a specific source language unit of translation determine whether and how the fixed expression is represented in the translation. The following strategies can be used to translate phraseological units: compensation, substitution, transmission, and omission. Regardless of the technique used, it may be assumed that the loss in the case of lacunary units happens during translation.

The translation by paraphrase is considered a more adequate strategy than the literal translation. It has also been referred to as zero equivalence. It corresponds to 'transposition', which is "the process of replacing one word class with another without changing the meaning of the message". In the case of a phraseological unit, it is substituted by a string of words, with no idiomatic character, which expresses the global sense conveyed by the original unit. In this case, the meaning is rendered, although the formal aspect, including the stylistic effect produced by the phraseological unit, is lost. It is also a good solution when the use of phraseological units in the target language text does not seem appropriate because of differences in stylistic preferences of the source and target languages.

The term phraseology designates the discipline as well as its object, the set or totality of phraseologic units in a given language. According to the origin of phraseologisms, a line has been drawn between two areas of investigation, namely, linguistic phraseology understood as "a community's means of expression" and

literary phraseology including “aphorisms, witticism, word combinations with an accidental character, belonging to certain writers, outstanding people”.

As an autonomous discipline, the object of research of phraseology consists in phraseologic units from a given language (or a group of languages).

For the translation of phraseological units which contain culture-bound elements there are several strategies that can be used, especially when the expression is paraphrased. Rodica Dimitriu considers that cultural plurality “has given rise to specific translation strategies through which cultural difference is highlighted.” Two such strategies are ‘transcription’ (cultural borrowing or assimilation), or what Newmark calls ‘transference’, and ‘calque’ (literal translation). The purpose of these strategies is to retain some local colour, but while the second one does not completely block comprehension, in the first one the message will in most cases be at best vague, if not entirely opaque. For this reason Newmark mentions that it is a good practice to employ two or more translation strategies at the same time, in order to avoid possible misunderstandings. For example, ‘transference’ is usually accompanied by ‘naturalisation’. There are other strategies that can be used for different purposes: ‘neutralisation’, in which case the cultural flavour is lost, but the meaning becomes clear. It can be in the form of either translation by a more general item (a superordinate) or by a more neutral, less expressive item.

E.g.: ‘a jack of all trades’ (a person who can do many different kinds of work, but perhaps does not do them very well) – (neutralisation)

Or the translator might opt for ‘cultural substitution’, by replacing the culture-specific item with a target language one which does not have the same meaning, but is likely to have a similar impact on the target reader.

E.g.: ‘Work like a beaver’ – ‘Work very energetically and hard’

Another strategy is the translation by omission, when a phraseological unit may sometimes be omitted altogether in the target text. This strategy can be used either because it has no adequate equivalent, it cannot be easily paraphrased or for stylistic reasons.

This strategy is usually accompanied by compensation, which is seen as “the technique of making up for the translation loss of important source text features by approximating their effects in the target text through means other than those used in the source text”. In this case, the omission of a phraseological unit at some point in a target text can be compensated by the introduction of another unit in a

different part of the text, thus maintaining the idiomatic character of the text. This type of compensation is referred to as compensation in place

Conclusion

Phraseological units are elements that are crucial for the text's meaning and stylistics due to their characteristics. Thus, it is very crucial to find suitable translation methods. The units of lacunary character among all groups of equivalents seem to be the most problematic group: first, they might not be recognized as fixed phrases by the translation; second, they lack phraseological equivalents, so they must be translated using either words or a combination of words made specifically for the translation. When presented with such a unit, the translator must perform a multifaceted examination of the translation unit to determine the best translation method. It is common for the translation of a certain phraseological unit in a text to depend on how that phraseological unit is expressed in the target language. The best translation strategy for a lacunary idiom depends on the context: in certain texts, a literal translation is most effective, whilst in others, substitution or omission work well. To make the text easier for the intended readers to understand, various intra- or extratextual amplifications can be added.

In conclusion, it should be stressed that from the standpoint of comparison, the phenomena of lacunarity is inextricably linked to loss, which in the case of translation should be made up for by other factors. Consequently, despite the fact that translating absolute gap units is incredibly challenging, every effort must be taken to reduce the impact of loss in the translated text.

REFERENCES:

1. Dejica, D. 2010. "Idiomatic expressions". In "Approaching the information universe for translation purposes: the atomistic perspective". In Romanian Journal of English Studies, (7), pp. 266-278.
2. Grodzki, Erika. 2003. Using Lacuna Theory to Detect Cultural Differences in American and German Automotive Advertising. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
3. Hale, Kenneth L. 1975. Gaps in Grammar and Culture. In: Linguistics and Anthropology. In Honour of C. F. Voegelin. Kinkade Dale M. et al. (eds). Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press. 295-315.
4. Sorokin, Jurij; Markovina, Irina. 1989. Nacional'no-kul'turnaja specifika chudožestvennogo teksta. Konspekt lekcij. Moskva: "Nauka".

5. Spears A. Richard. American Idioms Dictionary. – Lincolnwood, Illinois, USA: National Textbook Company, 1991. – 464 p.

6. Szerszunowicz, Joanna. 2010. Evaluation in Culture-Bound Proverbs and Proverbial Expressions as a Translation Problem. In: 3° Colóquio Interdisciplinar sobre Provérbios – ACTAS. 2nd Interdisciplinary Colloquium on Proverbs – PROCEEDINGS. Soares, Rui JB; Lauhakangas, Outi (eds). Tavira: Tipografia Tavirense. 222–234.

7. Wipprecht, Claudia. 2005. The concept of ‘field’ and ‘gap’. Norderstedt: GRIN Verlag.

Internet resources:

8. www.bohemika.com – Phraseological combinations and fusions.

9. www.schwabe.ch – Phraseological Units.

10. www.corpus.bham.ac.uk – the Determination of Phraseological Units.