



PRAGMATIC LOSSES IN LITERAL TRANSLATION AND PHRASEOLOGICAL COMPENSATION STRATEGIES (BASED ON ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGE MATERIALS)

Khonsaidova Maktuba Makhamadalievna
Chirchik State Pedagogical University,
Department of Linguistics and
English Language Teaching Methodology
szakirovmaktuba@gmail.com

Abstract

This article comprehensively analyses the phenomenon of pragmatic losses in literary translation and the linguo-pragmatic foundations of phraseological compensation strategies for their elimination. Pragmatic equivalence is one of the main categories of translation theory, which implies not only the correspondence of semantic meaning, but also the adequate reflection of the communicative intention, expressive-stylistic features, emotional impact and cultural connotations of the original text in the translated text. Pragmatic losses that arise in the translation process are associated with differences between language systems, cultural models and cognitive concepts, and are especially clearly manifested in the translation of phraseological units. During the study, the linguistic, pragmatic and extralinguistic factors of pragmatic losses are identified, and their impact on the adequacy of translation is substantiated on the basis of scientific and theoretical sources. Also, the pragmatic component of phraseological units with an anthropocentric nature is studied using the comparative-analytical method based on materials from the English and Uzbek languages. The emotional-expressive, evaluative and cultural-pragmatic properties of phraseological units and the main strategies for compensating for pragmatic losses that occur in their translation, including semantic compensation,



stylistic compensation, phraseological equivalence and cultural compensation, are determined.

The results of the study show that pragmatic compensation is one of the important means of ensuring communicative equivalence in the translation process, which serves to restore the pragmatic effect, stylistic colour and communicative function of the original text in the translated text. The results of this article serve to develop scientific research in the fields of translation theory, linguo-pragmatics, phraseology and comparative translation studies, as well as to provide a deeper understanding of the mechanisms for ensuring pragmatic adequacy in the practice of literary translation.

Keywords: Pragmatic loss, pragmatic equivalence, pragmatic compensation, phraseological unit, literary translation, linguo-pragmatics, anthropocentrism, communicative equivalence, cultural connotation.

Introduction

Phraseological units are one of the most complex, multi-layered and pragmatically richest elements of the language system. They include not only semantic meaning, but also expressive, stylistic, evaluative and cultural components. Therefore, phraseological units are of particular scientific importance as linguistic units that clearly reflect the anthropocentric nature of the language. The main feature of phraseological units is that their general meaning is formed not from the individual lexical meaning of their components, but as a result of their holistic semantic and pragmatic integration. This requires special attention to the study of the pragmatic properties of phraseological units in the translation process. From a pragmatic point of view, phraseological units perform the function of not only transmitting information in the communicative process, but also expressing the attitude, emotional state and evaluative position of the participant in the speech. This shows that the pragmatic component occupies an important place in the semantics of phraseological units.

Geoffrey Leech defines pragmatic meaning as the meaning associated with the communicative effect of language units in a speech situation. From this perspective, phraseological units perform not only a nominative, but also a



communicative-pragmatic function. For example, the components of the phraseological unit “He has a heart of stone” in English, when taken separately, mean “heart” - heart, “stone” - stone. However, this unit pragmatically expresses the fact that a person is insensitive, merciless and cold-blooded. The full pragmatic equivalent of this phraseological unit in Uzbek is the expression “stone-hearted”. Here, not only semantic, but also pragmatic equivalence is observed between the two languages. Both units perform the function of negatively assessing a person’s character, having an emotional impact and expressive evaluation. This indicates that the pragmatic component of phraseological units is based on cognitive universality between language and culture.

The pragmatic component of phraseological units is especially clearly manifested in units that express human character and behaviour. For example, the phraseological unit “He is a wolf in sheep’s clothing” in English expresses a hypocritical and deceitful character of a person. Although a word-for-word rendering of this unit is “he is a wolf in sheep’s clothing”, its pragmatic meaning expresses the contradiction between a person’s appearance and his inner essence. The same phraseological model exists in the Uzbek language, expressed by the expression “a wolf in sheep’s clothing”. This unit also has a negative evaluative, warning and expressive pragmatic component. The pragmatic component of phraseological units is often associated with emotional evaluation. For example, the phraseological unit “He kicked the bucket” in English expresses the death of a person in a euphemistic and stylistically mild form. The literal translation of this unit “he kicked the bucket” completely loses its pragmatic meaning and is considered communicatively incorrect. The pragmatic equivalent of this unit in Uzbek is the expressions “he died” or “he passed away”. Here, pragmatic equivalence is ensured through euphemistic and stylistic compensation. The pragmatic component of phraseological units is often also associated with the cultural context. For example, the phraseological unit “He lost face” in English indicates that a person has lost his social reputation. Although the literal translation of this unit is “he lost his face”, its pragmatic meaning expresses a decrease in a person’s status and respect in society. In Uzbek, this pragmatic meaning is expressed through expressions such as “he lost his reputation”, “he



was ashamed”. Here, the communicative effect is preserved through pragmatic compensation. The pragmatic component of phraseological units has an anthropocentric nature and is associated with the psychological state, emotional experience and cognitive activity of a person. For example, the phraseological unit “He is hot-headed” in English expresses the character of a person who quickly gets angry. The pragmatic equivalent of this unit in Uzbek is the expressions “he is a hot-headed person”, “he is a hot-tempered person”. These units reflect the anthropocentric pragmatic component by expressing the psychological characteristics of a person. The main problem in the translation of phraseological units is to preserve their pragmatic component. As Mona Baker noted, phraseological units are among the units that pose the greatest difficulties in translation, since they are directly related to the cultural, pragmatic and cognitive characteristics of the language. If a phraseological unit is translated literally, its pragmatic component is lost, and as a result, the translation becomes communicatively ineffective. Therefore, the translator must use pragmatic compensation strategies.

Pragmatic compensation is the process of restoring the stylistic, emotional, or cultural component lost in translation through other linguistic means. For example, the phraseological unit “He spilled the beans” in English means revealing a secret. Although the literal translation of this unit is “he spilled the beans”, its pragmatic equivalent is the phrase “he revealed the secret”. Here, equivalence is ensured through semantic and pragmatic compensation. The pragmatic component of phraseological units plays a crucial role in ensuring the adequacy of translation. Peter Newmark emphasizes that the main task of translation is to preserve the pragmatic effect of the original text. This requires the translator to have not only linguistic, but also pragmatic, cultural, and cognitive competence. Thus, phraseological units constitute the most pragmatically rich layer of the language. They reflect human emotions, character, social relations and cultural experience. Preservation of the pragmatic component of these units in the translation process ensures the adequacy and communicative effectiveness of the translation.



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 2, February, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.***

References

1. Кунин А.В. Курс фразеологии современного английского языка. - Москва: Высшая школа, 1996.
2. Leech G. Principles of Pragmatics. - London: Longman, 1983.
3. Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. - London: Routledge, 1992
4. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. - New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.
5. Nida E. Toward a Science of Translating. -Leiden: Brill, 1964.
6. Catford J.C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. - London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
7. Levinson S.C. Pragmatics. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
8. Виноградов В.В. Русский язык. - Москва: Высшая школа, 1977.
9. Vinay J.P., Darbelnet J. Comparative Stylistics of French and English. - Amsterdam, 1958.
10. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. - New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.