

Challenges in Translating Figurative Phraseological Units

Mirsagatova Pokiza Avazbek Kizi

Senior lecturer of the Department of Translation Theory and Comparative Linguistics
at the Faculty of Foreign Philology at the National University of Uzbekistan

Article Information

Received: February 06, 2023

Accepted: March 07, 2023

Published: April 10, 2023

Keywords: *phraseological units, translation methods, equivalents, analogues, turn of speech, speech style, literary translation.*

ABSTRACT

This article discusses the difficulties of translating figurative phraseological units. Phraseological units related to the bookish style of speech have not previously been subjected to detailed study. Translation of phraseological units, especially figurative ones, presents significant difficulties. This is explained by the fact that many of them are bright, emotionally rich phrases belonging to a certain speech style and often bearing a pronounced national character. When translating stable combinations of words, one should also take into account the peculiarities of the context in which they are used. Many English phraseological units are characterized by ambiguity and stylistic diversity, which complicates their translation.

The issues of the interaction of language and thinking, the relationship between meaning and meaning remain relevant to this day, continuing to arouse the interest of many researchers. The problem of translating phraseological units is especially difficult, because it is very difficult to convey in a foreign language and foreign culture all the shades of the semantics of one or another phraseological unit without losing its national flavor, stylistic and cultural-historical specificity. The translator can come closer to understanding phraseological semantics, however, in order to express the thoughts of native speakers as clearly and freshly as they were expressed, rich experience and skill are needed. That is why the problem of translating phraseological units is still considered unresolved, since there is no unambiguous, standard translation option for all occasions. Moreover, even if there is an equivalent phraseological correspondence, the translator often has to look for other ways of translation, since this equivalent is not suitable for the given context. It should also be noted that knowledge of etymology plays an important role in translation, which allows one to easily guess the meaning of the phraseological units under consideration.

Phraseological units fill niches in the lexical system of the language, which cannot fully provide the name of the aspects of reality known to man, and in many cases are the only designations for objects, properties, processes, states, situations, etc. The formation of phraseological units weakens the contradiction between the needs of thinking and limited the lexical resources of the language. In those cases where a phraseological unit has a lexical synonym, they usually differ stylistically.

Phraseology is a treasure trove of any language. Phraseological units reflect the history of the people, the originality of their culture and way of life. Phraseologisms often have a clearly national character. So, for example, along with purely national phraseological units in English phraseology, there are many international phraseological units. The English phraseological fund is a complex conglomeration of original and borrowed phraseological units with a clear predominance of the former. In some phraseological units, archaic elements are preserved - representatives of previous eras.

Phraseological units are highly informative units of the language. This is one of the linguistic universals, which is why the issue of translating phraseological units is of particular importance in the science of translation. There are different opinions about how a work of fiction should be translated from the original language. Some believe that what is expressed by the author should be re-expressed by the translator (A. Pushkin); others sometimes suggest moving away from the words of the original on purpose in order to be closer to it (N. Gogol); still others say that one should not translate words, and even sometimes the meaning, the main thing is to convey the impression (A. Tolstoy); the latter urge to translate laughter into laughter, a smile into a smile, etc. (K. Chukovsky). But at the same time - and this does not contradict the principle of translatability (since a part is perceived only as part of the whole) - in any work of art there are elements of the text that, relatively speaking, cannot be translated. In this case, we are talking about the impossibility of a formal translation. One of the categories of "untranslatable" is phraseology.

It is of exceptional importance for the science of translation, since in the "scale of untranslatability" or "difficulty in translatability" phraseological units, or phraseological units (PU), occupy almost the first place: the "untranslatability" of phraseology is noted by all specialists among the characteristic features of stable units; and what is most important, the practical translator faces the difficulty of translating phraseological units at every step.

In order to theoretically talk about the methods of translation of phraseological units, it is necessary to classify the entire phraseology of a given language according to some reasonable criterion into groups, within which one or another method, one or another approach to the transfer of phraseological units would be observed as predominant. Many authors take linguistic classifications as a starting point, built mainly on the criteria of the in decomposability of a phraseological unit, the fusion of its components, depending on which and on a number of additional features - motivation for meaning, metaphor - the place of phraseological units in one of the following sections is determined: phraseological fusions (idioms), phraseological units (metaphorical units), phraseological combinations and phraseological expressions (Sh. Balli, V. V. Vinogradov, B. A. Larin, N. M. Shanskiy).

The work of L. V. Fedorov can be considered indicative of the creative use of such a classification in the theory and practice of translation. Having examined the main linguistic schemes for that time (1968), he stops at the one proposed by V. V. Vinogradov and comprehends it from the point of view of translation studies. For example, he notes the lack of clear boundaries between individual rubrics, "different degrees of motivation, transparency of the internal form and national specificity" of unities, which may require the translator to "approximately the same approach as idioms". The same classification is "very convenient for the theory and practice of translation" and, according to I. Retsker, who, however, takes only unity and fusion from it, believing that unequal translation methods should be applied to these two groups of phraseological units: "the translation of phraseological unity should, if possible, be figurative", and the translation of phraseological fusion "is carried out mainly by the method of holistic transformation".

It is believed that the possibilities of achieving a full-fledged dictionary translation of phraseological units depend mainly on the relationship between the units of the source language

(SL) and the target language (TL):

- 1) phraseological unit has an exact, context-independent, full-fledged correspondence (semantic meaning + connotations) in the TL;
- 2) phraseological units can be transferred to TL by one correspondence or another, usually with some deviations from a full-fledged translation;
- 3) PU has no equivalents or analogues in the TL and is untranslatable in dictionary order.

Simplifying the scheme somewhat, we can say that phraseological units are translated either by phraseological units (the first two points) - phraseological translation, or by other means (in the absence of phraseological equivalents and analogues) - non-phraseological translation. Between them there are many intermediate, medium solutions, for example, depending on some characteristic features and types of phraseological units (figurative - non-figurative phraseology, phraseological units of proverbial - non-proverb type), translation, taking into account the style, color, language, authorship of individual units, etc. These additional aspects will more fully represent the problem of translation of phraseological units, expand and facilitate the choice of the most appropriate method.

Phraseological translation involves the use in the text of the translation of stable units of varying degrees of proximity between the unit of the SL and the corresponding unit of the TL - from a complete and absolute equivalent to an approximate phraseological correspondence.

In order to talk further about this method of translation, let's define the phraseological equivalent. Phraseological equivalent is a phraseological unit in TL, in all respects equivalent to the translated unit. As a rule, regardless of the context, it should have the same denotative and connotative meanings, there should be no differences between correlative phraseological units in terms of semantic content, stylistic reference, metaphorical and emotionally expressive coloring, they should have approximately the same component composition, to have a number of identical lexical and grammatical indicators: compatibility (for example, in relation to the requirement of animateness / inanimateness), belonging to the same grammatical category, usage, connection with contextual satellite words; and another - the lack of national color.

We are talking, in essence, about complete and absolute equivalence. All these are already existing, relatively few units, work with which is reduced to their discovery in the PU; the decisive role in this work for the most part belongs to the excellent command of the TL and dictionaries.

An incomplete (partial) phraseological equivalent is such a unit of the TL, which is an equivalent, complete and absolute, a correlative multi-valued unit in and I, but not in all its meanings.

For example, Slaughter of the Innocents, a well-known Bibleism, fully corresponds to the massacre of babies in Russian, but this Russian unit is only a partial equivalent, since in English the PU has another meaning - the jargon "non-consideration of bills due to lack of time (at the end of the parliamentary session)".

There are relatively few partial equivalents, since in general the phenomenon of polysemy is less characteristic of phraseology. Cases of relative phraseological equivalence are much more common.

The relative phraseological equivalent is inferior to the absolute one only in that it differs from the original phraseological unit in some of the indicators: other, often synonymous components, small changes in form, a change in syntactic construction, etc. Otherwise, it is a full match of the translated phraseological unit, "relativity which is obscured by the context. The difference may be, for example, in compatibility, in the unequal lexico-semantic content of individual components.

In other cases, the equivalent may differ from the original PU in terms of composition; for example, the same image can be expressed more economically or more extensively. Images can be very close, touching, for example, "lightning" - "thunder"; very distant, but logically comparable: for example, a Russian, a Bulgarian and a Frenchman see "similarity" in "two drops of water", for a German and a Czech it is "two eggs", and for an Englishman - "two peas".

But the images of two analogues (in SL and TL) may not have anything in common as images, which does not prevent the equivalents from performing their function properly in translation.

In principle, the ability to convey phraseological units with analogues with figurativeness, which has absolutely no common ground in SL and TL, is mainly due to the fact that for the most part these are erased or semi-erased metaphors that are not perceived or, rather, perceived subconsciously by a native speaker. The degree of brightness of the image - from very low to zero in phraseological fusions, and in units is higher, but rarely reaching intensity in free combination - is one of the main prerequisites for choosing the method of translation between analogue and tracing paper.

Finally, there are extremely frequent differences that arise in cases of using such translation techniques as various kinds of transformations such as antonymic translation, concretization and generalization, which, like lexical ones, phraseological units also lend themselves to.

Phraseological equivalents can also be conditionally attributed to individual equivalents. Not finding a complete correspondence in the TL, the translator is sometimes forced to resort to word creation, shaping in the spirit of the unit being translated a new, own phraseological unit, reminiscent of "natural" as much as possible. If the reader accepts such a "fake", then it is possible to convey the content and style of the translated unit in a fairly "phraseological" form.

Individual phraseological units, if they are masterfully "made", have the characteristics of a conventional phraseological unit, differing from it only in one, the most important indicator - they are not reproducible. Therefore, we are talking about contextual translation here.

Phraseological equivalents and analogues are found most often in the following groups of stable units.

1. International phraseology - phraseological units that entered the languages of many peoples from historical (mainly ancient), mythological, literary sources, were borrowed from language to language, or arose among different peoples independently from one another due to the commonality of human thinking, the proximity of certain moments of social life, labor activity, production, development of science and arts.

Many of these units are winged expressions. Among them there are many associated with historical or mythological figures. For example, "Achilles' heel" in Russian, English and German has the same meaning.

The mere belonging of a phraseological unit to international is not enough to ensure its correct translation:

Firstly, not all "international units" included in one language are also found in other languages.

Secondly, despite the same way of translation - tracing, there are still minor formal differences between the equivalents (the phrase is a compound word, the prepositional is a non-prepositional construction, different suffixation, etc.), and this sometimes significantly complicates the translator. For example, the Russian equivalent of a scapegoat is English. *scapegoat* - translation of a compound word (which is much more common in German).

Thirdly, although relatively rare, there can be more than one equivalent, and then the translator cannot automatically replace his unit with an equivalent one. All these "but" impose a strict requirement on the translator: to check every doubtful case in dictionaries.

2. Stable comparisons. Many nations say: *sings like a nightingale, bold like a lion, stubborn like a donkey, drunk like a pig*, etc. But for the same qualities, along with these images, there are others that are unusual for the TL. The comparison with the "nightingale" is clearly not suitable for countries where it is not known, and the translator must think very well before introducing an unusual image. The rest of the comparisons require the same - to translate with their own, familiar, or to keep the "exotic": for example, the British and French see stubbornness rather in a mule, and the donkey is also a symbol of stupidity; as for drunkenness, along with the pig, many other images appear among different peoples: a French (*ivre comme*) a song thrush, a monk (*franciscain, templier*) or a slice of bread in broth.

3. Compound terms. Compound terms (including compound names) are a special group of phraseological units that, in any case, require equivalents in the TL. However, since the terminological beginning prevails over the phraseological in them, we present them here with the proviso that they are always translated by equivalents, but not necessarily by phraseological ones: many compound terms in one language have one-word equivalents in another (compare: Russian *шестерня*, English *gear*).

4. Grammatical phraseology. Grammatical phraseology is a conventional name for separate-shaped parts of speech, mainly compound prepositions and conjunctions. Prepositions for (what), in connection with (what), unions since, due to the fact that, while, etc., like terms, require an equivalent in TL, but also not necessarily phraseological. Among them there are also units of international distribution, such as English: *in accordance with, with the exception of*, etc.

Thus, in order to correctly translate PU from SL to TL, the translator must not only have excellent knowledge of languages, but also have complete knowledge of the history and culture of countries, be a good psychologist and be able to correctly use all kinds of dictionaries.

References

1. Abdullaeva N.K., Sulonov I.S. (2021). Ways of translating phraseological units of the book style of the Uzbek, English and German languages. *Philology and Culture*, (1 (35)), 31-34.
2. Boltaeva N. Comparative analysis of phraseological units. Kazan: Kazan Publishing House. un-ta, 2019. 123 p.
3. Pochueva N.N. (2020). Difficulties in translating figurative phraseological units and possible solutions to this problem. *International scientific review*, (LXVI), 52-56.
4. Khakimbekov M.L., Furkatova B.T. (2022). Difficulties of the literary translation of phraseological units. *Актуальные проблемы гуманитарных и естественных наук*, (2-1), 161-163.
5. Sharipov M. R. (2019). Features of the translation of phraseological units. *Proceedings of the Penza State Pedagogical University*. V. G. Belinsky, (15).