Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

OFFICIAL STYLISTIC UNITS, IDIOMATIC CONSTRUCTIONS, AND THEIR TRANSLATION PROBLEMS

PhD, Associate Professor
E.T. Tursunnazarova
Head of the Department of English Translation Theory
Faculty of Translation Studies
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Abstract: This article analyzes the linguistic and pragmatic features of official stylistic units and idiomatic constructions. It examines translation problems related to stylistic units in English and Uzbek official discourse, issues of idiomatic equivalence, and strategies for translating idiomatic expressions. Furthermore, the study investigates the importance of cultural and pragmatic adaptation in the translation process.

Key words: official style, idiomatic construction, translation problems, pragmatics, discourse, equivalence.

Translation is a multidimensional linguistic activity that involves not only lexical substitution but also the transfer of stylistic, pragmatic, and cultural meanings. In official and institutional communication, stylistic precision and semantic accuracy become especially significant because official discourse is characterized by formality, standardization, and communicative responsibility. At the same time, idiomatic constructions represent one of the most complex aspects of translation due to their figurative meaning, cultural specificity, and contextual variability.

The translation of official stylistic units and idiomatic expressions therefore requires an integrative approach that combines linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and intercultural communication. According to Eugene Nida, successful translation depends on achieving “dynamic equivalence,” where the translated text produces a communicative effect similar to that of the source text. This principle is particularly relevant in translating official discourse and idiomatic language because literal translation often fails to preserve pragmatic meaning.

Official stylistic units are linguistic elements commonly used in governmental, legal, diplomatic, and administrative communication. These units are characterized by:

- terminological precision;
- syntactic formality;
- lexical neutrality;
- institutional standardization;
- pragmatic restraint.

Official discourse aims to maintain objectivity, authority, and procedural clarity. Therefore, official stylistic units often rely on fixed expressions and standardized structures. Examples include:

- “in accordance with”;
- “hereby declares”;
- “pursuant to the regulations”;
- “subject to approval”;
- “with reference to.”

Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

Such constructions function as markers of institutional communication and contribute to textual cohesion and legal precision. Mikhail Bakhtin[8] emphasizes that every speech genre develops its own stylistic conventions shaped by social and institutional contexts. Official discourse therefore possesses a distinct linguistic system that differs significantly from everyday communication.
In English-Uzbek translation, official stylistic units frequently require structural transformation because English official discourse tends to use concise syntactic forms, whereas Uzbek official language often employs expanded explanatory constructions. For example: "The agreement shall enter into force upon signature" may require adaptive translation to preserve legal and procedural clarity in Uzbek administrative discourse. Idiomatic constructions are fixed or semi-fixed expressions whose meanings cannot be understood through the direct interpretation of individual lexical components. Idioms represent culturally embedded linguistic phenomena and therefore pose substantial difficulties in translation.
According to Fernando Poyatos[9], idiomatic expressions reflect the cultural memory and communicative traditions of a speech community. Consequently, idioms carry both semantic and sociocultural meanings. Idiomatic constructions perform several communicative functions:

- expressive function;
- evaluative function;
- emotional function;
- persuasive function;
- stylistic intensification. Examples such as: "to break the ice"; "to see eye to eye"; "a double-edged sword"; "to be on the same page" cannot be translated word-for-word without losing their communicative significance. For instance, the English idiom: "to break the ice" when translated literally into Uzbek would sound unnatural. Instead, translators must search for functional or pragmatic equivalents that preserve communicative intention.

One of the primary difficulties in translating official stylistic units concerns the preservation of institutional tone and legal precision. Official discourse is highly sensitive to semantic nuance because even minor lexical inaccuracies may alter administrative or legal meaning. Peter Newmark[10] argues that official texts require semantic translation strategies that prioritize accuracy and contextual equivalence. However, strict literalism may reduce stylistic naturalness in the target language.
Translation problems often emerge in the following areas: syntactic asymmetry; institutional terminology; culture-specific administrative concepts; pragmatic politeness formulas; legal phraseology. For example, English official documents frequently employ passive constructions: "The application has been approved." In Uzbek administrative style, active or explanatory forms may be preferred depending on institutional conventions. Another issue concerns diplomatic language, where indirectness and politeness play essential roles. Expressions such as: "We highly appreciate your cooperation" require careful pragmatic adaptation to maintain diplomatic etiquette in translation. Idiomatic constructions present even greater challenges because they are deeply connected with cultural worldview and

[8] Bakhtin M. M. Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. - Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. - 208 p
[9] Poyatos F. Nonverbal Communication across Disciplines. - Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002. - 412 p
[10] Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. - New York: Prentice Hall, 1988. - 292 p

figurative cognition. Literal translation usually distorts idiomatic meaning and may create communicative confusion. Mona Baker[11] identifies several strategies for translating idioms:

- using an idiom with similar meaning and form;
- using an idiom with similar meaning but different form;
- paraphrasing;
- omission;
- cultural substitution.

The choice of strategy depends on contextual, pragmatic, and cultural factors. For example, the English idiom: “to kill two birds with one stone” has a close Uzbek equivalent: “bir o‘q bilan ikki quyonni urmoq.” In such cases, equivalent idiomatic imagery facilitates successful translation. However, many idioms lack direct counterparts and therefore require descriptive translation.

Another major issue concerns idioms in political and managerial discourse. Institutional communication occasionally incorporates metaphorical language to soften criticism or enhance persuasive effect. Translators must therefore preserve both pragmatic intention and stylistic appropriateness. Pragmatic adaptation is essential in translating both official stylistic units and idiomatic constructions. Translation is not only a linguistic process but also an act of intercultural mediation.

Lawrence Venuti[12] distinguishes between domestication and foreignization as two major translation strategies. In official discourse, domestication often becomes necessary to ensure institutional clarity and reader comprehension. Conversely, excessive domestication may erase cultural specificity. The translator must therefore balance:

- semantic accuracy;
- stylistic naturalness;
- institutional conventions;
- cultural authenticity;
- communicative effectiveness.

In multilingual administrative environments, successful translation contributes to diplomatic communication, legal transparency, and intercultural understanding.

In conclusion, official stylistic units and idiomatic constructions represent complex linguistic phenomena that require careful translation strategies. Official discourse demands semantic precision, institutional consistency, and pragmatic adequacy, whereas idiomatic constructions require cultural interpretation and contextual adaptation. The study demonstrates that translation problems emerge due to linguistic asymmetry, cultural specificity, pragmatic variation, and discourse conventions between English and Uzbek. Consequently, translators must possess not only linguistic competence but also intercultural, pragmatic, and discursive awareness. Future research should focus on comparative studies of official discourse, corpus-based analysis of idiomatic translation, and the development of digital resources for institutional and phraseological translation.

REFERENCES

1. Nida E. A. Toward a Science of Translating. - Leiden: Brill, 1964. - 331 p.
2. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. - New York: Prentice Hall, 1988. - 292 p.
3. Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. - London: Routledge, 2018. - 394 p.

[11] Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. - London: Routledge, 2018. - 394 p
[12] Venuti L. The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation. - London: Routledge, 2008. - 353 p

4. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. - London: Routledge, 2008. - 353 p.
5. Hatim B., Mason I. Discourse and the Translator. - London: Longman, 1990. - 258 p.
6. Bakhtin M. M. Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. - Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. - 208 p.
7. Poyatos F. Nonverbal Communication across Disciplines. - Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002. - 412 p.
8. Komissarov B. H. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). - М.: Высшая школа, 1990. - 253 с.
9. Munday J. Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications. - London: Routledge, 2016. - 395 p.
10. Jakobson R. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation // Brower R. A. (ed.) On Translation. - Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. - P. 232–239.