

The Current State Of Phraseological Translation Studies And Issues In Translating Phraseological Units

Jabbarova Anora Javliyevna

PhD in Philological Sciences, Professor Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Received: 22 March 2026; **Accepted:** 29 April 2026; **Published:** 20 May 2026

Abstract: This article examines the current state of phraseological translation studies and the major issues involved in translating phraseological units across languages. Particular attention is paid to the semantic, stylistic, cultural, and pragmatic characteristics of phraseological units and their role in intercultural communication. The study analyzes the views and classifications proposed by prominent scholars in the field of phraseology and translation studies, including approaches to phraseological equivalence, analogy, descriptive translation, calque, and combined translation methods. The research highlights the difficulties that arise in translating lacunar and culturally marked phraseological units, especially in English–Uzbek comparative contexts. The article also discusses the influence of grammatical, lexical, and syntactic differences between languages on the translation process. It is argued that successful translation of phraseological units requires preserving not only denotative meaning but also figurative imagery, emotional coloring, and national-cultural specificity. The findings demonstrate that phraseological translation remains one of the most complex areas of translation studies due to the multidimensional nature of phraseological meaning and the interaction between language and culture.

Keywords: Phraseological units, phraseology, phraseological translation, translation studies, equivalence, phraseological analogues, calque translation, descriptive translation, intercultural communication, lacunarity, English–Uzbek translation, semantic transformation.

Introduction: The comparative study of phraseological expressions plays an important role in multilingual systems and includes the investigation of methods for identifying and translating phraseological units in different languages. In particular, the ways of expressing the phraseological units of one language in another language occupy a significant place. The studies conducted by Russian scholars in this field are devoted to the problems of translating phraseological units, among which the works of E.F. Arsentyeva, L.K. Bayramova, V.N. Komissarov, A.V. Kunin, A.D. Reykhshteyn, E.M. Solodukho, X. Solodub, N.L. Shadrin and other researchers deserve special attention [Arsentyeva, 1993, 2006; Bayramova, 1982; Komissarov, 2013; Kunin, 1972; Reykhshteyn, 1980; Solodukho, 1974; Solodub, 1986; Shadrin, 1991].

Over the last decade, researchers have paid particular

attention to studying the interlingual relationships of phraseological units. A number of dissertations have been devoted to this issue [Saliyeva, 2005; Jolobova, 2005; Chernov, 2008; Kovshova, 2009; Konoplyeva, 2009; Ferzilyayeva, 2010; Zykov, 2014]. Interest in this issue is associated with several factors. On the one hand, it is explained by the increasing complexity of translating phraseological units, since idiomatic expressions always reflect national and cultural characteristics and provide information about traditions, stereotypes, and symbols.

All scholars dealing with phraseological issues, as well as researchers studying various aspects of translation, emphasize the complexity of the process of phraseological translation. On the other hand, translation is important not only as a means of transferring linguistic units, but also as a way of

conveying cultural information. Therefore, we will examine in detail the translation variants of phraseological units from English into Russian and vice versa. First, an analytical approach to the scholarly works of researchers who have studied the problem of translating phraseological units is required.

Methods of Translating Phraseological Units: An English–Uzbek Comparison

The translation of phraseological units is a complex linguistic phenomenon that requires not only semantic equivalence but also the preservation of imagery, expressiveness, and national-cultural components. Therefore, several methods are used in the translation process, and their selection depends on the type of phraseological unit, its lacunar nature, and the context.

In the translation of phraseological units, along with the calque method, the partial calque method is also used. In the partial calque method, one part of the phraseological unit is translated literally, while the remaining part is conveyed through free translation or descriptive expression. As a result, in some cases, the structural components of the phraseological unit may change, and its syntactic and grammatical structure may be adapted to the norms of the target language.

Partial Calque Method

The following translations of English phraseological units into Uzbek may serve as examples of the partial calque method:

- The mark of Cain – Qobilning izi;
- Joseph's coat – Yusufning kiyimi.

The main advantage of this method is that it allows the preservation of the original imagery of the phraseological unit while also conveying its national and cultural characteristics. At the same time, the analysis of phraseological units describing a person's appearance shows that units translated through the calque or partial calque method are relatively rare in English–Uzbek translation practice. This situation can be explained by the differences in figurative thinking and descriptive traditions between the languages.

1. Lexical Translation

The lexical translation of phraseological units is carried out with the help of one or several synonymous words. This method serves to convey the main, that is, the denotative meaning of the phraseological unit;

however, its connotative and expressive aspects are often not fully preserved.

The following examples clearly illustrate this:

- Knock-them-dead / Drop-dead (Am., slang) – wonderful, astonishing, bold;
- A glamour puss / a glamour girl (obsolete) – a beautiful girl;
- Smarty pants – a boy who behaves as if he is very clever;
- The outer man (humorous) – outward appearance, clothing;
- A freak of nature – an unusual or extraordinary person;
- Bunch of fives (jargon) – fist.

As can be seen from these examples, lexical translation simplifies the figurative basis of the phraseological unit and, in some cases, weakens its stylistic or emotional coloring.

2. Descriptive (Explanatory) Translation

In the descriptive translation method, the meaning of a phraseological unit is expressed through free phrases or fully descriptive sentences. This method helps convey the meaning accurately; however, imagery and expressiveness are often lost.

The following examples demonstrate the characteristics of descriptive translation:

- A man of your inches – a person of the same height as you;
- A sweater girl – a well-shaped girl;
- Mutton dressed as lamb (Brit., informal) – a middle-aged woman trying to appear younger;
- Looks like a drowned rat – looking very miserable and exhausted, like a drowned rat;
- Blood and milk – healthy and fresh-looking appearance;
- A skeleton with shoulders – a broad-shouldered and muscular person.

This method is especially effective in translating lacunar phraseological units, as it ensures semantic clarity.

3. Combined Translation

The combined translation method is based on

integrating several translation techniques in order to convey the meaning of a phraseological unit more fully and accurately. This method usually combines elements of lexical and descriptive translation or descriptive translation and partial calque.

The following examples demonstrate the effectiveness of combined translation:

- love handles / spare tyre – fat deposits around the waist (a “spare tire,” accumulation of fat around the waist);
- designer stubble – fashionable beard (a beard left unshaven for two or three days);
- blue noses – “blue noses” (a nickname for Canadians, especially the inhabitants of Nova Scotia);
- a wooden Indian – “wooden Indian” (a quiet and reserved person; referring to wooden Indian figures placed in front of shops).

This method makes it possible to preserve not only the meaning of the phraseological unit, but also, to some extent, its cultural and figurative components.

The process of translating phraseological units in the English–Uzbek comparison shows that lexical and descriptive translation methods are the most frequently used means. Calque and partial calque methods occur relatively rarely and are mainly applied to phraseological units with strong cultural markers.

The main difficulty in translating lacunar phraseological units lies in accurately and fully conveying their semantic, figurative, and national-cultural features into another language. Therefore, preserving not only the denotative meaning but also the connotative and expressive aspects of phraseological units is of great scientific and practical importance in the translation process.

Methods of Translating Phraseological Units

Various approaches exist in the process of translating phraseological units. Most scholars believe that the translation of phraseological units should be based on the degree of connection between their constituent components. From this perspective, it is important to determine whether phraseological units function as phraseological combinations, idiomatic expressions, or other types of units, as well as to identify the appropriate translation method.

Among the supporters of this theory are Charles Bally,

Viktor Vinogradov, Boris Larin, Nikolay Shansky and others [Balli, 1961; Vinogradov, 1977; Larin, 1977; Shanskiy, 2012]. However, modern researchers emphasize that the criteria for translating phraseological units cannot be determined solely by the degree of interconnection between their components.

N.L. Shadrin states that when translating phraseological units, it is necessary to take into account their semantic, stylistic, and genetic characteristics. In his monograph *Comparative Analysis of Somatic Phraseology*, he identifies eight types of equivalence in translation and classifies them as follows [Shadrin, 1991: 24–34]:

1. Equivalents
2. Analogues
3. Synonymous equivalents
4. Permanent lexical correspondences
5. Contextual analogues
6. Occasional lexical correspondences
7. Descriptive translation
8. Calques

In addition, the theory proposed by Y.P. Solodub concerning the classification of structural and typological relations of phraseological units also deserves attention. The scholar divides phraseological equivalents into three types:

1. Interlingual phraseological equivalents – units that correspond semantically and stylistically.
2. First-level phraseosemantic equivalents – phraseological units that are close in meaning but do not fully correspond.
3. Second-level phraseological-semantic equivalents – units expressed through a common phraseological model.

Y.P. Solodub developed the concept of a general phraseological model, emphasizing that this model should be regarded as a generalized scheme of logical-semantic structure. Such an approach makes it possible to conduct an in-depth study of the equivalence of certain phraseological units in different languages [Solodub, 1986].

Johann Reyhstein comparatively studied Russian phraseological units alongside German and classified

interlingual relations of phraseological units into several types:

1. Identification – absolute similarity according to all parameters;
2. Lexical dispersion or systemic synonymy – general similarity despite certain differences in meaning and syntactic model;
3. Ideographic synonymy – relative semantic closeness of two phraseological units due to the presence of some semantic differences;
4. Hyperonymy-hyponymy – phraseological units sharing a common meaning, while one possesses a more specific semantic content;
5. Stylistic synonymy – similarity in meaning despite stylistic differences;
6. Polysemy and homonymy – the existence of certain distinctions within a common meaning;
7. Enantiosemy – semantic opposition despite a shared semantic structure [Reychshteyn, 1980].

Reychshteyn emphasizes that the above-mentioned types of phraseological correspondence in German can be observed in two main cases:

1. According to certain aspects of their formal-semantic structure – lexical and structural-syntactic interrelation [Reychshteyn, 1980, p. 24];
2. According to their overall composition – namely, their denotative and connotative-pragmatic meaning (functional-semantic correlation) [Reychshteyn, 1980, p. 24].

Alexander Kunin considers the following methods for translating phraseological units from English into Russian:

1. Translation by equivalent – using a Russian phraseological unit that fully corresponds to the English one both in form and meaning;
2. Translation by analogy – replacing the English phraseological unit with a synonymous Russian phraseological unit, although differences in imagery may exist;
3. Descriptive translation – applied when no equivalent or corresponding phraseological unit exists, in which case the meaning of the English phraseological unit is expressed through free word combinations in Russian;

4. Antonymic translation – when a phraseological unit with a positive meaning is rendered through a negative construction in Russian or vice versa;
5. Literal translation (calque method) – used when other translation methods are impossible and when it is necessary to preserve the figurative basis of the phraseological unit;
6. Combined translation – combining several translation methods, for example, calque and descriptive translation;
7. Clarification in translation – using additional explanatory words when translating a phraseological unit;
8. Compensation – if a word or image is lost in translation, it is compensated for through other contextual elements [Kunin, 1972].

It is also necessary to analyze the approach to the translation of phraseological units proposed by Elena Arsentiyeva. In the process of studying the methods of translating phraseological units in Russian and English, she focused on three aspects: semantic, structural, and grammatical. According to her, the semantic factor plays the central role, since the semantic specificity or difference of phraseological units is connected with the set of minimal semantic components determining their meaning [Arsentiyeva, 1993, p. 179].

From a structural and grammatical perspective, it is important to identify the models of phraseological units and determine the features specific to each language. At the level of structural components, tendencies of similarity and divergence are revealed. According to E.F. Arsentiyeva, the component level of phraseological units is the most variable factor and reflects the characteristics peculiar to each language.

Based on these principles, E.F. Arsentiyeva distinguishes three types of interlingual relations of phraseological units:

1. Complete and partial phraseological equivalents – these are units identical in meaning, structure, and grammatical model, containing the same expressive and stylistic components. Partial equivalents, however, may differ in form of expression.
2. Phraseological analogues – these may also be complete or partial. This group includes phraseological units that are not fully equivalent but correspond

semantically.

3. Phraseological units without equivalents – these are phraseological units that do not have a direct counterpart in the compared language.

In general, it should be emphasized that the analysis of the views of various scholars has significantly contributed to the understanding of the problem of interlingual phraseological relations. The inconsistencies found in researchers' classifications demonstrate the complexity and ambiguity of this issue.

We confirm that there are various classifications of interlingual relations of phraseological units. On the one hand, the materials studied by phraseologists may differ (for example, phraseological units-somatisms, Biblical phraseological units, phraseological units describing gender relations, animal-related phraseological units, and others). Therefore, scholars rely on the semantic characteristics of phraseological units during the classification process.

On the other hand, different languages possess their own specific grammatical, lexical, and syntactic structures, which directly influence the process of determining the types of phraseological relations. In general, all classifications of the interlingual system can be represented as follows:

1. Phraseological equivalents (complete and partial);
2. Phraseological analogues;
3. Non-equivalent phraseological units.

In order to conduct a deeper analysis of the methods of translating phraseological units, we rely on the above-mentioned types of interlingual relations. At the same time, it should be noted that inconsistencies in the structure of phraseological units are connected with the specific features of the languages under consideration.

The specific features of the English language system include the following:

1. Two cases: common and possessive;
2. Absence of grammatical gender;
3. The existence of two types of articles: definite and indefinite;
4. Expression of situational relations through

prepositions and word order;

5. Use of the verb “to be” as part of communicative units.

The specific features of the Uzbek language include the following:

1. Six cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, and prepositional;
2. Absence of grammatical gender;
3. Absence of articles;
4. Categories of verb forms (perfective and imperfective);
5. Free word order in sentences and phrases;
6. Absence of linking verbs in sentences.

Conclusion. Within the general system of Uzbek phraseological units, phraseologisms expressing emotions occupy a special and important place. These phraseological units primarily serve in literary texts to reveal the inner psychological state, emotional experiences, and external behavior of characters through figurative, expressive, and evaluative means. Research findings indicate that phraseologisms with emotional content clearly demonstrate the anthropocentric nature of the Uzbek language and reflect the worldview, emotional experience, and national-cultural thinking of its speakers.

Phraseological units used in a figurative sense acquire strong imagery and emotional coloring through the process of semantic transformation, extending beyond their original nominative meaning. As a result, they make it possible to accurately express human behavior in society, attitudes toward specific situations, as well as emotional evaluations of other people and phenomena. This activates not only the nominative but also the pragmatic and evaluative functions of phraseological units.

References

1. Arsentyeva, E.F. (1993). *Sopostavitelnyy analiz frazeologicheskikh yedinit: na materiale angliyskogo i russkogo yazykov*. Kazan: Kazan State University.
2. Arsentyeva, E.F. (2006). *Phraseology and Phraseography in a Comparative Aspect: On the Material of Russian and English Languages*. Kazan: Kazan State University.

3. Bally, Ch. (1961). French Stylistics. Moscow: Foreign Literature Publishing House.
4. Bayramova, L.K. (1982). Frazelogicheskiye yedinitsey v sopostavitel'nom aspekte. Kazan: Kazan University Press.
5. Komissarov, V.N. (2013). Modern Translation Studies. Moscow: R. Valent.
6. Kunin, A.V. (1972). Phraseology of Modern English. Moscow: Higher School.
7. Kunin, A.V. (1996). A Course in Modern English Phraseology. Moscow: Higher School.
8. Larin, B.A. (1977). History of the Russian Language and General Linguistics. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
9. Reykhshteyn, A.D. (1980). Comparative Analysis of German and Russian Phraseology. Moscow: Higher School.
10. Shadrin, N.L. (1991). Comparative Analysis of Somatic Phraseology. Kazan: Kazan University Press.
11. Shanskiy, N.M. (2012). Phraseology of the Modern Russian Language. Moscow: Librokom.
12. Solodub, Y.P. (1986). Russian Phraseology as an Object of Comparative Structural-Typological Research. Moscow: Nauka.
13. Solodukho, E.M. (1974). Problems of Comparative Study of Borrowed Phraseology. Kazan: Kazan University Press.
14. Vinogradov, V.V. (1977). Selected Works: Lexicology and Lexicography. Moscow: Nauka.
15. Dobrovolsky, D., & Piirainen, E. (2005). Figurative Language: Cross-Cultural and Cross-Linguistic Perspectives. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
16. Baker, M. (2018). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
17. Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall.
18. Nida, E.A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
19. Fernando, C. (1996). Idioms and Idiomaticity. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
20. Cowie, A.P. (1998). Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications. Oxford: Oxford University Press.