



LINGUOCULTURAL ASPECTS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS TRANSLATION IN THE LITERAL ENGLISH AND UZBEK CONTEXT

Zuxriddin Boboxonov

<https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7923689>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 03rd May 2023

Accepted: 10th May 2023

Online: 11th May 2023

KEY WORDS

ABSTRACT

The research is based on comparison of literal context on the linguistic phenomenon of phraseological units. In the article we clarify the essence and peculiarities of definitions usage in the aspect of the competent approach of the literal English-Uzbek language translation. The work specifies the definition of phraseological units, systematizes the frequency of their use in the field of English-Uzbek translation. Here are considered basic methods of phraseological unit's translation of literal English language context. Particular emphasis is placed on the analysis of literal communication. New phraseologisms in literal context are semantic markers of actual cultural life of modern society. Specifically, it is very important to translate them into other languages.

1.Introduction

Obtaining information about the cultures and lengthy histories of two or more representative nations has long been a goal of translation as a means of communication between people and nations. The importance of translation in modern culture and national development is growing. Through translation, people from many countries can learn more about the way of life, the culture, the history, and the social accomplishments of a particular nation. Every country has specific unique speech quirks that are passed down from generation to generation. Inextricably associated with the spiritual culture, habits, profession, living circumstances, desires, and attitude toward reality of the people of a specific language are some of these idiosyncrasies and phraseological units with onomastic components. The study's goal is to look into linguo-cultural elements of phraseological units in literal English and Uzbek contexts.

Literature review

2.1 Literal translation

Translated works of art that have been translated into another linguistic culture as a part of the national literature have a substantial positive impact on its growth and development. The literary text can only convey the knowledge embedded in it to another culture through translation. The sharing of cultural and spiritual values between other



linguistic cultures (peoples) is greatly facilitated by the translation of literary works, which serves as the connecting thread in this discourse. Since the production of translations of literary works occasionally far exceeded the circulation of the original itself, literary texts actually became the first international mass communication medium. *“Translation is not a way of getting acquainted with individual work of arts, but it is a means of historical communication of cultures and peoples”* (Mezhova, 2012).

The history of translations is viewed in the first place as a sophisticated instance of cross-cultural aesthetic communication, a dialogue between great cultures that reflects the interaction of not only different national linguistic representations of the world but also the artistic models of the world developed by the creators of the original works and the translators of those works (Obolenskaya, 2006). The majority of researchers view the theory of translation as a branch of linguistics (A. Fedorov, L. Barkhugifts, V. Komissarov, J. Retsker), where “translation is a process of bilingual communication” (Mezhova, 2012), “translation is a type of linguistic mediation, in which a text is created in the target language, equivalent to the original” (Obolenskaya, 2006), etc. For the sake of this study, translation (of fiction) is viewed as a cultural product that contains a variety of cultures, mindsets, literary eras, and traditions. The specific role that translation plays in the development of culture, science, literature, and the language itself has recently come to be the focus of culture studies of tourism. A. D. Schweitzer defined translation as a “unidirectional and two-phase the process of inter language and intercultural communication... replacing the primary text in another linguistic and cultural environment” (Obolenskaya, 2006). As a result, in our opinion, the cultural character of the translation was detected. It emerges as a key factor in the translation of a literary work into another language. M. M. Bakhtin formulated the following thesis: “The life of events in the text, are the true essence, always develops at the boundary of two consciousnesses, two subjects” (Bakhtin, 1979).

2.2 Linguo-cultural aspects of phraseological units

Linguoculturology is a discipline that studies the manifestation, reflection and fixation of culture in language (VOROBYOV, 1999). The linguo-cultural approach to the explanation of a word in a text “is descriptive in its essence, a particular phenomenon is axiomatically qualified as culturally significant, and the explanation is transferred from the sphere of language to the sphere of history, mythology, and folklore. From the unique and specific form of world fixing with language signs, the idiomatic character of the language sign acts as the linguocultural language coordinate.

PhU, or phraseological unit, is a general term that refers to all multi-word units in language that do not have meaning that can be retrieved or decoded as the sum of the meanings of each of their component words. Although lexicographers disagree on the format that multi-word units must take when they are recorded in dictionaries, sometimes marginally and other times greatly, the canonical form of PhUs, also known as citation form, is simply a lexicographic norm. Mainly for this reason we suggest, in its stead, the use of the term “lexicographic form”. The corpus, a selection of articles from the on-line versions of The Guardian and The Observer of nearly 8 million tokens, represents a clear-cut chunk of written English from the quality press in the UK from 2003 to 2007



According to Arsenteva's footsteps, we identified four factors that create emotionality in phraseological units:

1. *Component composition factor.* In this case, we are talking about the transmission of longitudinal emosems of lexemes, which are part of the phraseological units. For example, the English jargon of the component "dumb" disregarded emotion is consistent with the same disregarded emotion in "dumb bunny" "stupid, stupid girl." This criterion does not play such a significant role in the occurrence of emotionality in phraseological units.

2. *Evaluation criteria for phraseological units.* It is known that emotions are divided into positive and negative forms, so in the linguistic literature they are divided into "emotional-evaluative significance", "evaluative emotionality", "emotional evaluation", "emotive-evaluative relationship", reclamation and peer assessment. Naturally, negative emotions do not occur without negative evaluation relationships. For example, stupidity is valued as a negative trait in any human community and causes negative emotions, such as disapproval, disregard, contempt, hatred, etc. For example, more (people) know Tom Fool than Tom Fool. The sensitivity of being aware and in turn sensitive, sharp - is appreciated, for example, the Admirable Crichton. At the same time, we have identified many phraseological units that have a neutral evaluation emotion. This evidence proves that among the phraseologies under study there are a large number of phraseological units that describe human mental activity. For example, make head or tail of something. (understand something), turn smth over in one's mind.

3. *Semantic criteria.* Like the evaluation criterion, the semantic criterion is one of the most basic of all the criteria. The semantics of an image, internal form, or prototype embedded in phraseological units lays the groundwork for the emergence of phraseological units that have this. Thus, the phraseological units acquire an unacceptable emosema in the balmy (barmy) on the crumpet through the observed internal forms.

2.3 The semantic analysis of phraseological units

PhUs have traditionally been regarded as fixed and non-compositional and their constituent parts as non-analysable. More recent phraseological research has shown that there is a cline of fixedness and that therefore there are multi-word units which are more fixed than others. Most idioms are definitely not lexically frozen if we understand this concept as total frozenness since "at least 90% of V-NP idioms, including many usually regarded as completely frozen, appear to allow some form of (syntactically) internal modification" (Nicolas, 1995) and are regularly lexically modified either through substitution or insertion, or both. Syntactic flexibility, lexical substitution and lexical insertion in PhUs can be explained if we consider that these units are not simply long words but that their constituents have a meaning of their own (Glucksberg, 2003). This characteristic, a sort of semantic autonomy assigned to the core constituent(s) of multi-word units, has been identified as the analysability of idioms (Langacker, 1987; Gibbs, 1995; Langlotz, 2006; Stathi, 2007). The compositional view of idiom representation regards them as having a "motivated semantic structure" and states that "this structure influences their syntactic and lexical flexibility" (Langlotz, 2006).

1. Methodology



To explore our research objectives introduced in Literature review section, it was used a sequential explanatory mixed methods design that consisted of a descriptive analysis. This approach allowed us to further understand and explain results by exploring the context in languages in more depth (Creswell et al., 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

2. Research analysis and discussion

Some idioms are translated with the help of partial (relative) equivalence. According to E. F. Arsentyeva, such idiomatic expressions are characterized by the minor differences in terms of phraseological expression of the identical semantics that can have a componential or morphological character (Arsentyeva, 1989: 100) The classification of phraseological units also includes the theoretical information a translator needs to be able to recognize phraseological units in a document, assess it, and then provide the best correct translation possible for the given situation. The best method is to take phraseological units into account from three perspectives: semantic, structural-grammatical, and component. The following categories are identified based on the marked levels:

1) phraseological equivalents (full and partial) - phraseological units with identical semantics, structural and grammatical organization and with identical component composition; Red book – qizil kitob; The black prince – qora shaxzoda; Black list – qora ro'yxat; Black diamonds – qora olmos; Keep quiet – jimlik saqlamoq; Make conversation – suhbat qurmoq; Milk cow – sog'in sigir. First think, then speak – avval o'yla, keyin so'yla; The dog bark, but caravan goes on – it hurar, karvon o'tar; Step by step – qadamba qadam.

2) phraseological analogs (full and partial) - phraseological units that express the same or a similar meaning yet differ completely in terms of how similar their internal forms are; A black hen lays a white egg – qora sigir oq sut berar. Cut the melon – foydani bo'lmoq. Put smb/smith to the test – tekshirib ko'rmoq; Red meat – qo'y go'shti; Take a fancy to smb – maftun bo'lmoq; Talk turkey – ochiqdan ochiq gapirmoq.

3) non-equivalent phraseological units- phraseological units that do not have correspondences in the phraseological system of another language. To throw up one's cap – do'ppisini osmonga otmoq. Come Yorkshire over smb – aldamoq, nonni tuya qilmoq, Green room – teatrda kiyim almashtiradigan xona;

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, linguacultural aspects can be translated differently based on their meanings in informative and literal contexts. Furthermore, their translation is changed according to the translation methods. Because, the compositional view of idiom representation regards them as having a "motivated semantic structure" and states that "this structure influences their syntactic and lexical flexibility". This syntactic and lexical flexibility are not adopted equally to informative and literal contexts. That's why they should be carefully translated taking all semantic meanings into account.

References:

1. Bakhtin M.M. Aesthetics of verbal creativity. M.: Publishing house "Art", 1979. 424 p.
2. Valgina N.S. Text Theory: a training manual. M.: Logos, 2004. 280 s.
2. Glucksberg S., 2003, Understanding Figurative Language, Oxford University Press, Oxford.



3. Langacker R. W., 1987, Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume 1, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
4. Langlotz A., 2006a, Idiomatic Creativity: a Cognitive-Linguistic Model of Idiom Representation and Idiom-Variation in English, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
5. Langlotz A., 2006b, "Occasional adnominal idiom modification – a cognitive linguistic approach", IJES, 6, 1, pp. 85-108.
6. Mezhova M.V. The problem of culturological equivalence of a word in the translation of a literary text // Bulletin State University of Culture and Arts. 2012. No. 20. P. 78-82.
7. Nicolas T., 1995, "Semantics of idiom modification", in M. Everaert, E-J van der Linden, A.
8. Obolenskaya Yu.L. Literary translation and intercultural communication. M.: Higher school, 2006. 335 s.
9. VINOGRADOV, V. V. Main types of lexical meanings of the word. 1953. n. 5, p. 88-119.