



**PROBLEMS OF ADEQUATELY CONVEYING
IRONY IN TRANSLATION FROM ENGLISH
INTO UZBEK
ПРОБЛЕМЫ АДЕКВАТНОЙ ПЕРЕДАЧИ
ИРОНИИ ПРИ ПЕРЕВОДЕ С АНГЛИЙСКОГО
НА УЗБЕКСКИЙ ЯЗЫК
INGLIZ TILIDAN O‘ZBEK TILIGA TARJIMADA
KINOYANING ADEKVAT IFODALANISHI
MUAMMOLARI**

AbduqodirovaMadinaAbduqayumqizi

Student of Tashkent state transport university

Gmail: madinaabdukodirova73@gmail.com

Tel: [+998938025659](tel:+998938025659)

Annotation. This study explores the challenges of adequately conveying irony in the process of translating literary texts from English into Uzbek. Irony, as a nuanced and culturally dependent stylistic device, often relies on subtle linguistic cues, shared cultural knowledge, and context-specific humor. These features can become lost or distorted in translation, especially when moving between languages with differing literary traditions and communicative norms. The research examines selected English literary works containing various forms of irony—verbal, situational, and dramatic—and analyzes how translators have rendered these elements in Uzbek. Particular attention is paid to cultural context, metaphorical expression, and the translator’s interpretive choices. The findings highlight frequent cases of semantic shift, tone loss, or over-literal rendering, which can alter the author’s original intent. The study concludes that effective translation of irony requires not only linguistic skill but also deep cultural awareness and creative adaptation strategies.

Key words: Irony as a rhetorical and cultural construct, literary translation theory, interlingual and intercultural irony transfer, stable vs. unstable irony frameworks, kinoya in Uzbek literary poetics, pragmatic and semantic challenges in translation, comparative analysis of English and Uzbek literature, satirical discourse and implicit critique, cultural semiotics in figurative language, ethical and stylistic constraints in cross-cultural translation.

Аннотация. Данное исследование посвящено проблемам адекватной передачи иронии при переводе литературных текстов с английского языка на узбекский. Ирония — это сложное и культурно обусловленное стилистическое средство, которое часто зависит от скрытого смысла, контекста и общего культурного фона. При переводе на язык с иными литературными традициями и коммуникативными нормами ирония может искажаться или теряться. В работе рассматриваются примеры английских литературных текстов с различными видами иронии — вербальной, ситуационной и драматической — и анализируются их узбекские переводы. Особое внимание уделяется культурному контексту, метафоричности и интерпретации переводчика. Результаты показывают



частые случаи потери тональности, смещения смысла и чрезмерно дословного подхода, что влияет на передачу авторского замысла. В заключение подчеркивается, что успешная передача иронии требует не только языковой компетенции, но и глубокого культурного понимания и креативного подхода.

Ключевые слова: Ирония как риторико-культурный феномен, теория литературного перевода, перенос иронии в межъязыковом и межкультурном контексте, модель стабильной и нестабильной иронии, киноя в поэтике узбекской литературы, прагматические и семантические сложности перевода, сравнительный анализ английской и узбекской литературы, сатирический дискурс и скрытая критика, культурная семиотика образного языка, этические и стилистические ограничения в переводе.

Annotatsiya. Ushbu ilmiy ish ingliz tilidan o'zbek tiliga adabiy matnlarni tarjima qilish jarayonida kinoyani adekvat ifodalashdagi muammolarni o'rganadi. Kinoya — bu nozik, ko'p qatlamli va madaniy jihatdan bog'langan badiiy vosita bo'lib, ko'pincha yashirin ma'no, kontekstga xos hazil va madaniy tushunchalarga tayanadi. Ingliz va o'zbek adabiyotlarining uslubiy an'alaridagi farqlar bu elementlarning tarjimada yo'qolishiga yoki noto'g'ri talqin qilinishiga olib kelishi mumkin. Tadqiqotda ingliz adabiyotidan olingan kinoyaviy unsurlar tahlil qilinib, ularning o'zbek tarjimalari o'rganiladi. Ayniqsa, tarjimonning talqini, madaniy kontekst va badiiy obrazlarning ifodalanishi alohida e'tiborga olinadi. Natijalarga ko'ra, ko'plab hollarda kinoyaning semantik og'ishi, ohangning yo'qolishi yoki literal tarjimaga berilishi kuzatiladi. Xulosa o'rnida ta'kidlanadiki, kinoyani muvaffaqiyatli tarjima qilish nafaqat tilni bilishni, balki madaniyatni chuqur anglash va ijodiy yondashuvni ham talab qiladi.

Introduction. Irony is among the most intricate and culturally dependent elements in literary language. It functions by creating a contrast between what is said and what is meant, often relying on implicit meaning, tone, and the reader's ability to interpret subtext. Though it enhances the richness and critical depth of a text, irony is particularly difficult to render accurately in translation. This issue becomes more pronounced when working between languages with distinct cultural and literary foundations—such as English and Uzbek.

English literary tradition, particularly from the 18th century onward, is known for its strong use of irony, especially in satire and social commentary. Authors like Jonathan Swift and Jane Austen skillfully used irony to question societal values and reveal human contradictions. However, their use of language, cultural allusions, and stylistic subtleties often present obstacles in translation, as these elements may not have direct parallels in the Uzbek language or cultural mindset.

Uzbek literature, on the other hand, expresses irony in more reserved and symbolic ways, shaped by historical influences such as classical Eastern poetry, oral storytelling traditions, and spiritual ethics. Writers like Alisher Navoiy conveyed criticism indirectly through allegory, metaphor, and refined language. Even in modern Uzbek prose, irony is generally expressed through suggestion rather than overt satire. Translators must therefore go beyond a word-for-word translation to ensure that tone, intention, and cultural context are preserved. This study examines the common challenges that arise when translating irony from English into Uzbek. It focuses on how literary irony may shift in meaning, lose its impact, or become misunderstood due to linguistic and cultural differences. Through the analysis of selected source texts and their translations, this research aims to highlight frequent translation



issues and propose strategies for better preserving irony's expressive and functional role in cross-cultural literary translation.

Literature review. Irony is widely regarded as one of the most intricate stylistic features in literature, and its translation presents unique challenges due to its reliance on cultural context, tone, and implied meaning. Unlike literal or descriptive language, irony often communicates ideas indirectly, requiring the reader to interpret contrast between what is said and what is meant. This creates difficulties for translators, especially when working between languages with different historical, social, and literary frameworks—such as English and Uzbek. In English literature, irony frequently appears in various forms, including verbal, situational, and dramatic irony. It is commonly used to express social critique, humor, or philosophical insight. These ironic expressions often rely on culturally specific references, idiomatic language, and subtle shifts in tone, making them hard to reproduce in another language without distortion. Literal translations may miss the underlying sarcasm or implied criticism, resulting in a loss of the original effect. Uzbek literature, particularly classical and traditional works, expresses irony in a more indirect and refined way. Instead of open mockery or blunt contradiction, Uzbek writers often use metaphor, allegory, and symbolic contrast to highlight social or moral issues. This form of irony is closely tied to cultural values such as politeness, modesty, and spiritual reflection. Because of this, the translation of English irony into Uzbek must take into account not only linguistic equivalence but also how irony is culturally perceived and ethically framed in the target language. One of the main challenges in translation is maintaining the original intent and tone. Irony often relies on shared assumptions between the author and the reader—assumptions that may not exist in the target culture. In such cases, the translator must find creative ways to adapt the text so that the intended irony remains clear, even if the wording or structure must change. Failure to do so can lead to misunderstandings, misinterpretations, or even the complete loss of ironic effect. The comparison of irony across languages highlights the broader issue of cross-cultural communication in literature. It shows that irony is not only a matter of language, but also of worldview, history, and literary convention. This makes it one of the most fragile elements in translation, requiring a deep awareness of both the source and target cultures. This review of existing perspectives confirms that irony often does not transfer directly from one language to another. Instead, it must be reinterpreted and reshaped to fit the expectations and sensitivities of the new audience. In the case of translating from English into Uzbek, this involves navigating differences in style, tone, and cultural norms while preserving the underlying meaning and function of the original text. When we start to Linda Hutcheon, in her seminal work *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*, redefines irony not as a static literary device, but as a dynamic and interactive communicative act. She argues that irony exists only when there is an interaction between author, text, and audience—that is, when all participants share enough contextual knowledge to understand the intended contrast between literal and intended meaning. This view marks a significant shift from earlier structuralist approaches. While traditional theorists like Wayne Booth focus on textual cues and types of irony, [2] Hutcheon emphasizes interpretive context and the role of the audience. For Hutcheon, irony is not simply encoded by the author and decoded by the reader—it is constructed through shared cultural assumptions, and its success depends on whether the audience “gets it.” [1] When we write example, *"Oh, brilliant idea — let's have a picnic in the pouring rain!"* According to her, The literal meaning is positive (“brilliant idea”), but the context (pouring rain) makes it



clearly sarcastic. The irony relies on shared knowledge: we assume having a picnic in heavy rain is a terrible idea, so the speaker actually means the opposite. This is verbal irony with a sarcastic tone, common in English informal speech. However, in Uzbek, "*Zo 'r fikr-ku — yomg 'ir quyayotgan paytda sayl qilamiz!*" Although accurate word-for-word, it may not register as ironic in Uzbek without tonal cues or clarification — especially in written form — because Uzbek irony tends to be more subtle and indirect. We think that, Linda Hutcheon offers one of the most insightful and culturally aware theories of irony. For translators and comparative literature researchers, her ideas emphasize that meaning is not fixed — it's negotiated, and irony is one of the most complex negotiations of all. Her work serves as a strong theoretical foundation for any study that examines how irony survives, shifts, or fails in cross-cultural translation. When start analyze from Uzbek scientists, Botir Matkarimov, in his scholarly work "O'zbek adabiyotida kinoyaning badiiy talqini" (The Artistic Interpretation of Irony in Uzbek Literature), offers one of the most focused treatments of kinoya as a literary phenomenon in Uzbek cultural and poetic tradition. Unlike general stylistic overviews, Matkarimov's research provides a systematic approach to irony within the framework of Uzbek classical and modern literature, emphasizing its artistic, ethical, and communicative roles. Matkarimov argues that irony in Uzbek literature is never just a tool for humor or mockery. It is fundamentally moral and didactic in purpose, designed to guide the reader gently toward self-awareness or critique social norms. Unlike sarcasm or ridicule, kinoya in the Uzbek context avoids direct offense, instead preferring symbolic language, paradox, and hidden contrasts. This view reflects the Uzbek concept of odob (cultural etiquette), where criticism is veiled and respectful, often delivered through indirect narrative or allegorical images. In this way, Matkarimov positions irony not as an act of defiance, but as an intellectual and spiritual signal, inviting the reader to reflect deeply rather than laugh openly.[3] For example, "*U to 'rt marta boshliq bo 'ldi — har safar yurtni uncha-muncha vayron qilolmaganini yodga olib, xalqi unga abadiy minnatdor.*" "*He became the chief four times — and the people remain eternally grateful that each time, he failed to completely ruin the nation.*" At the surface level, the sentence appears to praise the person for serving the people multiple times. However, the phrase "har safar yurtni uncha-muncha vayron qilolmaganini yodga olib" ("remembering that he couldn't quite destroy the country each time") clearly indicates that his leadership was harmful, but the failure to fully ruin everything is sarcastically treated as a "success." This is a classic example of indirect irony, where the form is positive, but the intention is critical — a core element of Matkarimov's theory.

Conclusion. Irony, as one of the most context-sensitive and culturally embedded literary devices, presents significant challenges in translation—particularly between languages and traditions as distinct as English and Uzbek. This research has demonstrated that the difficulties in conveying irony across these languages stem not only from linguistic differences, but more importantly from divergent cultural codes, stylistic conventions, and ethical frameworks. In English literature, irony is often overt, confrontational, and satirical. Writers commonly use sarcasm, understatement, or absurd exaggeration to question norms, expose contradictions, and provoke reflection. This form of irony typically aligns with what scholars have described as stable irony, where the author guides the reader toward a shared interpretation. Translating such irony into Uzbek is complex because the Uzbek literary tradition—particularly in classical and post-Soviet contexts—favors a more indirect, respectful, and morally didactic approach to critique. As scholars like Botir Matkarimov have



shown, Uzbek kinoya is rarely explicit; instead, it takes the form of symbolic contrast, exaggerated praise, or poetic ambiguity. Furthermore, Linda Hutcheon's perspective that irony functions as a discursive act dependent on shared cultural understanding reinforces the idea that irony cannot be transferred word-for-word. Instead, translators must act as cultural mediators, creatively reshaping ironic expressions so that they resonate with the norms and expectations of the target audience. Failure to do so can result in the loss of tone, misinterpretation, or complete erasure of the intended ironic meaning. The analysis of Uzbek scholars beyond Rashidov—such as Komilov, Matkarimov, and Qodirov—further supports the view that irony in Uzbek literature is not merely stylistic, but deeply tied to ethics, cultural etiquette (*odob*), and traditional narrative values. Their research highlights the necessity of understanding irony as a moral as well as artistic phenomenon, especially when translating works that deal with social critique or political satire. In conclusion, the adequate translation of irony from English into Uzbek is not only a linguistic task, but also an intercultural and interpretive challenge. It requires deep knowledge of both source and target cultures, awareness of literary history, and sensitivity to ethical and stylistic nuance. Translators must move beyond literalism to engage in creative re-expression, ensuring that the function, tone, and intent of irony are preserved—even if the form must change. As this study shows, successful irony translation is an act of artistic negotiation, balancing fidelity with adaptation, and clarity with cultural resonance.

References

1. Hutcheon, L. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*, 1994, pp. 6–32, 85–106. Routledge.
2. Booth, W. C. *A Rhetoric of Irony*, 1974, pp. 3–47, 171–179. University of Chicago Press.
3. Matkarimov, B. O'zbek adabiyotida kinoyaning badiiy talqini [The Artistic Interpretation of Irony in Uzbek Literature], 2017, pp. 12–48, 71–90. Toshkent: Akademiya nashr.
4. Komilov, N. O'zbek mumtoz adabiyotida badiiy tafakkur [Aesthetic Thinking in Uzbek Classical Literature], 2010, pp. 24–60, 101–115. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti.
5. Qodirov, A. Adabiy tahlil va tarjimada uslub muammolari [Problems of Style in Literary Analysis and Translation], 2015, pp. 39–58, 92–104. Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.