



Journal Website:  
<https://theusajournals.com/index.php/ajps>

Copyright: Original  
content from this work  
may be used under the  
terms of the creative  
commons attributes  
4.0 licence.

## TRANSLATION PROBLEMS OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES AND COMPONENTS OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS

Submission Date: Sep 20, 2024, Accepted Date: Sep 25, 2024,

Published Date: Sep 30, 2024

Crossref doi: <https://doi.org/10.37547/ajps/Volume04Issue09-14>

Tairova Maxfuza Abdusattorovna

Independent researcher at the Department of English Language and Literature at Termez State University, Uzbekistan

### ABSTRACT

This article examines the problems of representation of geographical names and components of phraseological units in English, Russian and Uzbek languages, as well as their theoretical and practical significance. The penetration of geographical names and phraseological units from English literature into Uzbek literature is explained.

### KEYWORDS

Phraseological units, toponyms, equivalent, form and content, artistic and visual means, linguistic means, adequate, original, functional, poetic.

### INTRODUCTION

Various geographical names can also serve as components of phraseological units. For example, in Uzbek phraseological units, names of cities, villages, rivers, and deserts located in the territory of Uzbekistan are found. The components of English and Russian phraseological units, however, are mostly comprised of geographical names located in England and Russia. The toponyms used in phraseological units

symbolize the qualities and characteristics they evoke, such as distance, generosity, or piety. For instance, the Uzbek phraseological units “Beva xotinga Buxorodan it huradi” (A dog barks from Bukhara at a widow) and “Onasini Uchqo‘rg‘ondan ko‘rsatmoq” (Showing someone’s mother from Uchqo‘rg‘on) include the geographical names “Bukhara” and “Uchqo‘rg‘on”, while the Russian phraseological units “до Москвы не

перевешаешь” (You can’t outweigh Moscow) and “Кричать во всю Ивановскую” (To shout at the top of one’s voice in Ivanovskaya) feature the names “Moscow” and “Ivanovskaya”. These are geographical names from Uzbekistan and Russia, respectively. Similarly, the names of cities like “Kyiv”, “Baghdad”, and “Rome” in the Russian phraseological unit “язык до Киева доведет” (The tongue will get you to Kyiv), the Uzbek phrase “Tuxumi Bagdoddan kslibdimi?” (Did his egg come from Baghdad?), and the English expression “When in Rome, do as the Romans do” represent cities that have been associated with the Uzbek, Russian, and English peoples through long-standing relations. As a result, certain ideas about these cities have developed, allowing them to acquire symbolic meanings within phraseological units.

The issue of translating phraseological units with national-historical characteristics is one of the least explored problems in translation theory. In research dedicated to the translation of linguistic tools with national features, thoughts on this topic are not sufficiently represented. There is a notable lack of specific studies that shed light on this matter in today’s scholarship. Some authors, in relevant sections of their research, analyze all types of phraseological units as nationally significant linguistic tools and, when discussing their translation, refer to phraseological units with national characteristics. Thus, this viewpoint fundamentally differs from the opinions of most

scholars regarding the scope of nationally colored phraseological units.

## METHODS

Phraseological equivalents or alternative variants in two languages that are similar in meaning cannot always replace each other in translation. The reason for this lies in the fact that some phraseological units contain components that reflect the cultural concepts of the people to whom they belong.

Some nationally specific phraseological units do not have equivalents in the target language. Such language units in Uzbek translation practice are interpreted using various established methods. These methods, while having positive aspects, also possess certain disadvantages. The success of the translation depends on the appropriate and skillful use of these methods.

The most exemplary methods for translating nationally specific phraseological units into Uzbek include:

**1. Translation through calquing (literal translation).** If the internal meaning and figurative basis of the original phraseological unit are logically grounded and clearly visible, and if they are created based on people’s life experiences, such phraseological units are often translated using the calquing method. In such cases, not only the semantic-stylistic characteristics of the corresponding phraseological unit in the target

language are preserved, but also its national uniqueness and socio-cultural features are recreated.

In these cases, the unity of form and content in the original phraseological unit is fully restored, enriching the reader's understanding of the original text and its language. The translation reflects the stable stylistic and artistic-expressive means used in the original language, and sometimes the author's distinctive creative style is further illuminated. This method also creates a foundation for the enrichment of the target language.

**2. Phraseological units based on customs, traditions, and moral norms.** Phraseological units that are based on customs, traditions, or moral norms accepted by a people, as well as those that include the names of clothing or food, often have a national character. When discussing types of food, the primary consideration is whether the food in question is halal (permissible) or haram (forbidden). The name of the forbidden product forms the national characteristic of the expression. Adequate interpretation of such linguistic tools requires not only linguistic knowledge but also non-linguistic awareness among the participants in communication—the speakers of the target language.

For example, while frog meat is considered a delicacy by the French, in China, this distinction belongs to snake meat. In the past, Russians did not eat horse meat, while true Muslims do not consume pork.

Although beef is consumed by almost all peoples of the world, Hindus do not eat it, as cows are regarded as sacred in their culture. The effort to improve and develop the culture of national languages should also extend to the language of literary translation. Just as the original language must be pure and culturally refined, so too must the translation language be equally elegant and at the cultural level of the original. Only when the speech level of the author and their characters is accurately reflected can the reader form a proper understanding of the language of the work, and this, in turn, complements their judgment of its ideological and artistic value.

If phraseological units of the original and target languages, which belong to phraseological wholes and are similar in meaning, contain components that give them a national character, and these components are found in the languages of many peoples, then according to Sergey Vlahov and Sider Florin [5, 93], such phraseological units can be considered as characteristic of the country, having spread beyond the borders of a particular country and disseminated over a wide area. In translation, one equivalent unit can replace another.

For example, “kamishsurnay” (reed pipe) is a musical instrument of Western European peoples, while “nog‘ora” (drum) is found not only among Uzbeks but also among many Eastern peoples. The names of these musical instruments, used as components of

phraseological units (as in the Russian expression “Плясать под чью-либо дудку” – to dance to someone's pipe), imbue them with a national character. Nevertheless, using such equivalence in translation does not lend a distinct national color to the text. This is because these components serve to denote similar objects used by many peoples, thus extending beyond a narrow national context. In the eyes of the reader, they appear as neutral elements in terms of nationality.

All the requirements placed on the original language also apply to the target language, and literary translation especially assumes a creative nature in terms of language, as the unity of content and function of the original is recreated through the laws, lexical, and phraseological tools of the target language. Professor S. Ibrohimov's words: “Unfortunately, in the use of our current written and spoken literary language, there is widespread deviation from the established norms of the literary language in almost all areas: neglect of grammatical, lexical, stylistic, orthographic, and orthoepic rules continues. These issues negatively affect the culture of our speech and its development. Therefore, the struggle to improve and develop language and speech culture is a cultural task of national importance” are also relevant to the language of literary translation.

The level of cultural refinement in the language of translation demands the correct and appropriate use

of existing grammatical rules and lexical-stylistic tools. The modern Uzbek literary language is one of the languages that has significantly advanced in terms of its vocabulary, grammatical structure, and stylistic capability, capable of fully and fluently expressing even the most complex thoughts. In the past, it provided a rich lexical treasure trove for the creation of masterpieces by great wordsmiths like Navoi, Bobur, Muqimiy, and Furqat, and although it has developed even further in our time, many writers and translators in their work commit unacceptable mistakes such as “failing to use words appropriately to convey the intended meaning or overloading speech with unnecessary words,” as well as deviations from grammatical, and sometimes phonetic-orthoepic, rules—practices that contradict the norms of speech culture.

## DISCUSSION

In translation studies, the potential of lexical and phraseological units is vast. Making errors in translating these lexical and phraseological units can fail to convey the meaning of the work and create confusion.

During the time when G'. G'ulom lived and created, there were very few direct translators from Western European and other languages. Writers translated using an intermediary language, namely Russian. G'. G'ulom did not work directly with the Russian text of a

specific author; rather, when translating Shakespeare's works, he primarily relied on the Russian translations of B. Pasternak, Lozinskiy, and Shchepkina-Kupernik. The academic writer G'. G'ulom, who took on such a complex task, not only accurately conveyed Shakespeare's intentions and objectives but also encountered some of the same shortcomings found in the Russian translations.

For instance, in the translation of Desdemona's preparation for bed (from W. Shakespeare's "Othello"), it sounds utterly illogical that she asks Emilia for a "tun" (a type of clothing worn by Uzbek men in public) instead of a nightgown, as it appears in the translation.

Give me my nightly wearing, and adieu. (1, 108)	Дай мне одеться на ночь и прощай (2, 97).	Mening kechki tunimni bering, so'ngra sizga xayr (3, 105).
---	---	--

Before the emergence of Shakespeare's theater, the fool was already a staple character of the English stage. However, it was Shakespeare who discovered that beneath the motley, patchwork costume of the fool, there was a sharp intellect and a loyal heart.

The fool's profession was to entertain the ruler with his jokes and antics. This role also shaped the way he spoke. His remarks were always based on wordplay, puns, attention-grabbing comparisons, and innuendos, making them as challenging to convey in translation as they were inevitable.

An elderly King Lear, having resolutely decided to "remove the burdens of state from his shaking neck," divides his kingdom among his daughters. The fool understands well that Lear's actions are shortsighted

and will lead to tragic consequences. From the very beginning, the fool tries to help Lear grasp this truth, expressing his thoughts as usual through puns and jokes. One of the fool's remarks in English is based on the various meanings of the word "crown," which has several meanings in English: a royal crown, the top of the head (skull), a bald spot, the flat, round end of an egg (its base), a coin, and the corona (ring of light around the sun).

Let's analyze this passage in the Russian translation on which the Uzbek version is based:

Шут: Дяденька, дай мне яйцо, а я за него дам тебе две коронки.

Лир: Что же это за коронки?



Шут: Да вот, разрежу яйцо пополам и съем его, останутся от яйца две коронки. А когда ты разломал свою коронку пополам и отдал обе половины, то всё равно что перенёс через грязь своего осла на собственной спине. Мало ума было в твоей плешиевой кроне, раз ты снял и отдал золотую корону (2. 106).

Uzbek translator G'afur G'ulom followed the same approach. However, the word "toj" (crown) in Uzbek has only one meaning (a crown worn on the head). The context helps clarify the meaning of the conversation, of course, but the artistic effect of Shakespeare's wordplay is lost.

Fool: Uncle, give me an egg, and in exchange, I'll give you two crowns.

Lear: What kind of crowns are those?

Fool: It's simple. I'll cut the egg in two, eat the middle, and the remaining egg shell will give you two crowns. When you broke your own crown in two and gave away both halves, it was like carrying your donkey across the mud on your own back. By taking off and giving away your golden crown, it shows that there was little wisdom in your bald crown (4).

## RESULTS

We have no intention of diminishing the great work of the talented Uzbek poet and skilled translator G'afur G'ulom, as in this case, the mistakes made by the

Russian translator resulted in the Uzbek translation not being as successful as it could have been. G'. G'ulom adhered to the rules of realia in his translations and made an effort to preserve the spirit, customs, and history of Shakespeare's era.

As we analyze the translation experiences discussed above, we realize how proficient G'. G'ulom was in mastering his native language. The poet's translations, created through an intermediary language, are fluent and understandable in Uzbek. However, had the poet been just as proficient in the original language, these works might have been elevated to an even higher level.

When a translator uses a certain expression during the translation process, they must ask themselves whether they can convey the meaning as is, or if it is necessary to express the thought differently in order to more fully reflect the meaning and stylistic function of the original while maintaining natural resonance. The rich practical experience based on living speech and its cultural norms provides a positive answer to such a question. In translation, striving to create functional harmony between the elements of two languages, rather than merely seeking material equivalence, always leads the translator to produce adequate expressions. Functionally equivalent expressions may be similar or different in form.

For instance, in English and Russian, there are multiple expressions used for greetings at different times of day, such as “how do you do” and «здравствуй(те)», «hallo» and «привет», and “good morning” - «доброе утро», “good afternoon” - «добрый день», “good evening” - «добрый вечер» [7, 56]. However, in Uzbek, all of these functions are expressed by just one word, “salom,” and taking such equivalence into account during translation ensures adequacy. Thus, considering functional harmony in translation ensures the fluency and natural resonance of the text:

1. Good morning // Доброе утро // Salom
2. “Good evening,” he said.
  - Добрый вечер.
  - Добрый вечер, - сказал он.
  - Salom!
  - Salom, - deya javob qildi yigit. [7, 59]

In the practice of some translators, an attempt to distinguish greetings based on time, as in English or Russian, without respecting the cultural norms of the Uzbek language, results in literalism. This undermines the naturalness of the characters' speech and fails to fully convey the original meaning. For instance, expressions like “xayrli erta,” “xayrli kun,” and “xayrli kech,” sometimes encountered in translations or live speech, have not become part of the common Uzbek

vocabulary and are perceived as simple well-wishing exclamations. Unlike the positive and sincere meanings conveyed by the English “good morning,” Russian «доброе утро», or the Uzbek “salom” (assalom, assalomu-alaykum), these expressions lack the same resonance.

For example:

**“Good morning, sir,” said the latter.**

**“Good morning,” said Hurstwood.**

- Доброе утро, сэр! - приветствовал тот.
- Доброе утро! - ответил Герствуд.
- Xayrli erta, ser! - deb so‘rashdi boshqaruvchi.
- Xayrli erta! - javob berdi Gerstvud. [7, 68]

### CONCLUSION

The fact that one single word, “salom,” in Uzbek corresponds to several different expressions in English and Russian does not impoverish the language of the translation. Rather, it highlights the broader functional scope of the Uzbek expression compared to its counterparts. The logical conclusion is that when translating from Uzbek into English or Russian, translators should not restrict themselves to rendering all instances of “salom” as “how do you do” or «здравствуйте». Instead, they should use all available variants in accordance with the norms of their

respective languages. Otherwise, English and Russian translators would fail to approach their work creatively. After all, «здравствуй(те)» and especially “how do you do” are less frequently used expressions in formal speech, and even friends meeting on the street might prefer to greet each other with “hello” or “privet” rather than expressions distinguishing time.

### REFERENCES

1. Вильям Шекспир. Трагедии. Сонеты. Пермь, 1979.
2. Otello. V.Shekspir. Jamol Kamol tarjimasi. Toshkent, " Adabiyoti va san'at nashriyoti ", -1991.
3. V. Shekspir. Korol Lir. T. Shchepkina-Kupernik tarjimasi. “Iskusstvo” Davlat nashriyoti. M-L., 3. V. Shekspir. Pyesalar. Davlat badiiy adabiyot nashriyoti, Toshkent, 1961
4. S. I. Ibroximov. O‘zbek tilining nutq madaniyatiga oid masalalar, “Nutq madaniyatiga oid masalalar” to‘plami. “Fan” nashriyoti, Toshkent. 1973, 19-bet.
5. Влахов Сергей, Флорин Сидер. Непереводимое в переводе. -ИМО, 1980.-3 4 4 с.
6. Маслова В.А. Экспериментальное изучение национально-культурной специфики внешних и внутренних качеств человека (на материале киргизского языка) // Этнопсихоллингвистика. – М., 1988. – 318 с.
7. Мусаев Қ. Инглиз тилидан ўзбек тилига бадий таржиманинг стилистик масалалари: Филол. фан. ном. ... дис. – Самарқанд, 1967. –204 б.
8. Шелестюк Е.В. Семантика художественного образа и символа: Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – М., 1998. –с. 92
9. Шкуратова Т.А. Семантические особенности поэтических символов: Дис. ... канд. филол. наук. – Ростов на Дону, 2000. –с. 76