

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС ТАЪЛИМ
ВАЗИРЛИГИ**

Ўзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари университети

II Инглиз филология факультети

Инглиз стилистикаси кафедраси

Таржима назарияси ва амалиёти фани буйича

МАЪРУЗА МАТНИ

Тошкент - 2010

Тузувчилар:

**катта ўқитувчи Касимова А.А.
катта ўқитувчи Эгамбердиева Н.Х.**

Такризчилар:

**катта ўқитувчи Абдурахманова Д.И.
доцент Мўминов О.М.**

**PLAN –CONTENT OF THE LECTURES ON THE
«THEORY OF TRANSLATION»**

Hours	Titles	
2 hours	Lecture № I Introduction lecture..... 1. The subject matter of the theory translation. 2. The main directions in the history linguistic theory of translation	4-6
2 hours	Lecture № II The basic problems of translation	7-10
2 hours	Lecture № III Principles of translation levels of equivalence The communication process.....	11-15
2 hours	Lecture № IV Semantic and pragmatic aspects of translation. The rendering of the words of national /Local/ coloring.	16-20
2 hours	Lecture № V Lexical problems of Translation Types of Lexical Transformations.	21-24
2 hours	Lecture № VI Phraseological problems of translation. Phraseological conformities.....	25-28
2 hours	Lecture № VII Grammatical problems of translation. Grammatical correspondences.....	29-32
2 hours	Lecture № VIII Types of grammatical transformations.	33-35
16 hours		

THE LECTURES ON THE ASPECT OF “THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TRANSLATION”

LECTURE № I

Problems for discussion:

1. The subject matter of the theory of translation.
2. The main directions in the history of linguistic theory of translation.
3. The nature of translation.
4. Linguistic and extralinguistic aspects of translation.

INTRODUCTION

The last decade saw considerable headway in the development of the linguistic theory of the translation.

A number of fundamental contributions to this theory have been recently made both in our country and abroad.

Theoretical studies in translation have kept abreast with the recent advances in linguistics which provided some new insights into the mechanism of translation and the factors determining it.

The theory of translation has benefited from new syntactic and semantic models in linguistics and from development of such hyphenated disciplines as psycho – and – socio – linguistics. Equally insightful was the contribution to the theory of translation by semiotics, a general theory of sign systems.

A condensation of the major problems of translation introduces the reader to basic concepts and defines the terminology.

The subjects discussed include the subject – matter of the theory of translation and the nature of translating, semantic and pragmatic aspects of translation/these lectures were written by I.D.Shvaytser/, Grammatical problems of translation and grammatical transformations (L.S.Barkhudarov), Lexical problems of translation and lexical transformations (A.M.Fiterman), Stylistics aspects of translation and its socio - regional problems (A.D.Shveitser).

The summary of the lecture is based on the syllables of foreign scholars: prof.A.Neubet, prof.E.Nida, prof. Roger. T.Bell’s view points on theory and practical of translation.

& 1. THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE THEORY OF TRANSLATION.

The theory of translation is subdivided into general theory, dealing with the general characteristics of translation, regardless of its type, and special branches, concerned with a theoretical description and analyses of the various types of translation, such as the translation of fiction poetry, technical and scientific literature, official documents, etc.

The general theory of translation has a clearly defined subject matter; the process of translating in its entirety, including its results with due regard for all the factors affecting it. Each special branch depends and specifies the general theory for it is the job of the general theory to reflect what is common to all types and varieties

of translation while the special branches are mainly concerned with the specifics of each genre.

The general theory of translation is an interdisciplinary area, predominantly linguistic, but also closely allied to philology, sociology, ethnography and etc. It is based on the application of linguistics theory to a specific type of speech behavior, i.e. translating. It differs from contrastive linguistics in that the former seem to compare different language systems with a view to determining their similarities and distinctive features while the theory of translation has a subject matter of its own (the process of translation) and uses the data of contrastive linguistics merely as a point of departure.

& 2. THE MAIN DIRECTIONS IN THE HISTORY LINGUISTIC THEORY OF TRANSLATION

The earliest linguistics theory of translation was developed by Russian scholars Y.L.Retsker and A.V.Fedorov who pioneered in a linguistic analysis of translation problems. Their theory came to be known as the theory of regular correspondences.

Translation, they argued, is inconceivable without a sound linguistic basis, and this study of linguistic phenomena and the establishment of certain correspondences between the language of the original and that of the translation. The authors of this theory were mainly concerned with the typology of relationship between linguistic units equivalents – permanent correspondences not sensitive to context such as The League of Nations – Лига Наций, and context - Sensitive variant correspondences, such as Slander – клевета нового поколения/ but also investigated some of the translation techniques, such as as antonymic translation (see below, thus mapping out some ways of dealing with translation as a process.

In the 60 th some linguistics /N.U.Rozentsveig in Russia and L.E.Nida in the USA / proposed a theoretical model of translation based on generative or transformational grammar. E.Nida subdivided the process of translation into 3 stages; analysis where an ambiguous surface structure is transformed into non-ambiguous kernel sentences to facilitate semantic interpretation / the foundation of school/ somebody founded a school or a school has a foundation / transfer where equivalent in the target language are found at a kernel or near – kernel level and restructuring where target – language kernel sentences are transformed into surface structures.

It is true that in some cases it is necessary to paraphrase the source – language structure to facilitate its translation. Such transformations come in handy especially when the target – language, /e.g. He stood with his feet planted wide apart; he stood, his feet were planted wide apart = Он стоял, его ноги были широко расставлены; он стоял, широко расставив ноги.

But transformations in terms of generative are not the only type of paraphrases used in translation. What is more, in some cases, especially when close parallels exist between the Source – and target language structures, they are not even necessary.

The structural model of translation is based on analysis in linguistics developed others. It is based on the assumption that languages are somewhat different sets of semantic components /constituents of meaning/ to describe identical extra – linguistic situations, Russian verbs of motion contain the component of move but not always the direction of movement while their English equivalents are often neutral, the direction of / Вот он идёт - Here he comes / Here he goes/.

The structural model provides some interesting insights into the mechanism of translation, especially when a situation is described in different semantic categories of /проточный пруд and spring – fed pond/ but does not seem to apply to sentences going beyond a mere description of a situation.

Different translation models complement each other and should therefore be combined in analyzing of translation as a process.

& 3. THE NATURE OF TRANSLATION

Translation is the expression in target language of what has been said in source language preserving stylistic and semantic equivalence.

Traditionally under translation is understood:

1. the process, activity of reproduction source language originally in target language.
2. the product of the process of translation.

Translators must have:

- a. knowledge of the languages / at least 2 languages /
- b. cultural background: ability to interpret the text
- c. the background of the subject knowledge of techniques, transformations and procedures of quality translation.

The translator decodes messages transmitted in one language and records them in another.

Translation may be viewed. As a interlingual communicative act in which at least 3 participants are involved: the sender of source / the author of the source language message/, the translator who acts individual capacity of the receptor of the source – language message and as the sender of the equivalent target – language / message /, and the receptor of the target – language /translation/. If the original was not intended for a foreign- language receptor there is one more participant: the source – language receptor for whom the message was originally produced.

Translation as such consists in producing a text / message / in the target language, equivalent to the original text /message/ in the source language. Translation as an interlingual communicative act includes 2 phrases: communication between the sender and the translator and communication between the translator and the receptor of the newly produced target – language text. In the first phrase the translator acting as a source – language receptor, analysis the original message. Extracting the information contained in it.

In the second stage, the translator acts as a target – language sender, producing an equivalent message in the target – language and re – directing it to the target language receptor.

In producing the target – language text the translator changes its plane of expression / linguistic form/ while its plane of context / meaning / should remain unchanged. In fact, an equivalent / target – language/ message, should match the original in the plane of content. The message, produced by the translator, should make practically the same response in the target – language receptor as the original message in the source language receptor. That means, above all, that whatever the text says and whatever it implies should be understood in the same way by both the source – language user for whom it was originally intended and by the target – language user. It is therefore the translator’s duty to make available to the target language receptor the maximum amount of information carried by linguistic signs, including both their denotational / referential/ meanings / i.e. information about the extralinguistic reality which they denote / and their emotive – stylistic connotation.

& 4. LINGUISTIC AND EXTRALINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION

However the information conveyed by linguistic signs alone, i.e. the messages overtly expressed in the text, would not be sufficient for adequate translation. Some linguists distinguish between what they call translation, based solely on the meaning expressed by linguistic signs, and involving recourse to extralinguistic information. In fact, the two are very closely intertwined and in most cases effective translation is impossible without an adequate knowledge of the speech – act situation and the situation described in the text. The phrase “Two on the aisle” / Два места ближе к проходу/ would hardly make much sense unless it is known that the conversation takes place at a box – office / speech act situation /. The phrase “ Поворотом рычага установить момент поступления воздуха в цилиндр” was translated “turn the handle until the air comes into the cylinder” because the translator was familiar with the situation described in the text knowledge of the subject is one of the prerequisites of an adequate translation.

The translation of technical and amount of technical and scientific knowledge.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF CONTROL:

1. What is translation?
2. What subjects is the translation of theory and practice based on?
3. What is the subject matter of the theory of translation?
4. What are the main directions in the history of translation?
5. What are the main features of the nature of translation?
6. What linguistic and extralinguistic aspects of translation do you know?

Recommended literature:

1. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and translation. M. 1975.
2. Shvaytser A.D. Translation and linguistics .M. 1973.

3. Levitskaya T.R, Fiterman A.M. The problem of Translation on the material of the contemporary English language. M. 1974.
4. Nida.E. Towards a science of translation. Leiden. 1964.
5. Roger. N. Bell. Translation and translating . (Theory and practice). London, New York. 1995.

LECTURE № II

Problems for discussion:

1. The basic problems of translation.
2. The types of lexical meanings and their realization within a context.
3. The choice of a word among synonyms.
4. The problem of translation of international words.
5. The problem of translation of neologisms.
6. Antonymic translation.

&1.THE BASIC PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION

The difference between educational and professional translation is as follows:

The aim of professional translation is to acquaint the reader with the original work of fiction; educational translation as a linguistic subject at the special institute and at school is one of the methods of more conscious and profound study of the foreign language by the way of showing up in the English text lexical, grammar and stylistic peculiarities of the English language.

Before speaking of the basic principles of translating process the concept of the term “faithfulness of translation” should be determined.

The translation is considered to be faithful when the content of the book, its stylistic peculiarities are rendered by the linguistic means of the native language. It means that very often we have to use such linguistic categories of the native language, which formally don't coincide with those of the English language but have the same emotional and psychological effect on the Russian reader.

The process of educational translation presents 4 stages:

1. First of all the text should be thoroughly understood. It means that the student should be acquainted with the whole book, should have some knowledge of the history of literature and mode of life of the people from whose language the translation is being done.
2. The student should realize the stylistic functions of lexical and grammar and phonetic phenomena which are used to express the content of the text.
3. Then the work on the choice of corresponding means of expression in the native language should be done.
4. The last stage is a work on the Russian or Uzbek text.

&2.THE CHOICE OF THE WORD.

THE TYPES OF LEXICAL MEANING.

The choice of the word is one of the most difficult problems of translation which is closely connected with the following problems.

2.1. THE LOGICAL MEANING OF THE WORD.

Any grammatical phenomena or stylistic peculiarities do not always coincide with those of the foreign language as well as the meaning of the separate words which are lexical equivalents. The main meaning of the English word “table” coincides with that of the Russian language. But the Russian “стол

” has one additional meaning: “питание” “пансион” means while in English we have the special words to express the idea: “board”, “room and board”. At same time English “table” has the additional meaning to “таблица”.

table	стол	board
таблица	питание	room and board
пансион		

1. 2. INDEPENDENT AND CONNECTED MEANING OF WORD.

The logical meaning of the word may be both independent and connected with other words. The latter can be understood in the given combination of words.

A color bar – цветной /ярко окрашенный/ барьер was seen in the distance.

There exist a color bar (расовая дискриминация) in the South Africa.

2.3. .EMOTIVE MEANING OF THE WORD.

A lot of words may acquire emotive meaning and the same word in different sentences may be rendered by different words.

- China is a large country(страна)

- We are ready to die for our country(родина)

While translating one should take into consideration on that in different languages the words which are lexical equivalents may arouse quite different associations.

For Russians “зима” means snow and frost, for Englishmen - fog and cold wind.

“Она ходит павой перед ним”- Дело Артамоновых.

For Russians “пава” arouses the idea of something beautiful, stately, majestic, proud /a sama – to величава, выступает будто павы -Пушкин /.

For Englishmen “peahen” has nothing in common with these associations. That’s why it’s quite correct to translate the sentence as follows:

- “She poses proudly before him / to pose – позировать/

2.4. THE MEANING OF THE WORD AND ITS USE.

The meaning of the word shouldn’t be mixed with its use. Sometimes even a monosemantic word can be combined with a lot of words and is rendered in Russian by different words:

A young man	Молодой человек
A young child	Маленький ребёнок
Young in a crime	Неопытный преступник
The night is young	Началась ночь
Department of justice	Министерство юстиции
Ministry of defense	Министерство Обороны
Board of trade	Министерство торговли
Admiralty	Морское министерство
The First Lord of Admiralty	Военно- Морской министр
Chancellor	Министр финансов
War office	Военное Министерство
A bad headache	Сильная головная боль
A bad mistake	Грубая ошибка

A bad weather	Плохая погода
A bad debt	Невозвращённый долг
A bad accident	Тяжёлый / несчастный/ случай
A bad wound	Тяжёлая ран

2.5. .CONTEXT

The word in the sentence may acquire so-called contextual meaning. It may be not constant, as a rule we can't find the contextual meaning of the word in the dictionary. But it always has something in common with the main meaning of the word.

“In the atomic war common and children will be first hostage.” The dictionary gives only one meaning of the given word-“золотник”, but in the given sentence the word acquires a new meaning: “жертва”. It's a great difficulty to find out the contextual meaning of the word as the dictionary only gives hints how to search for the necessary word in our native town language.

The majority of the words are known to be polysemantic and the context becomes especially important while translating polysemantic words as translating in different languages is quite different.

While translating one should remember he may use the words not included in the dictionary because it's impossible to include in the dictionary all the correct meanings of the word, which it may acquire in the context.

“He was developing grammatical nerves” – У него развивалось грамматическое чутьё.

We can find a lot of meanings of the word “nerves” “нервы, сила, мужество, хладнокровие, дерзость, нахальство” but in our text it is rendered as “чутьё”.

The student are to make out that thoughts, reflections should be translated not by separate words. So it's quite possible and natural either to introduce some words and even:

- I lit my candle at the watchman's/ Dickens/-Я зажёл свою свечу от фонаря ночного сторожа.
Sentences or omit them if one can manage without them.

&3.SYNONYMS

Besides finding the exact meaning of the word the students should be able to choose the necessary word from corresponding number of synonyms in the native language.

-“She was brave about it.”

“Brave” means “храбрый”, “смелый”, “благородный”, “прекрасный” sentence and other words can be used in translating the given sentence and other words should be given preference too: “отважный”, “мужественный”.

The English language is very rich in synonyms. Synonymous pairs are very characteristic of the English language. They are more emphatic.

-The weak and humble Jewo. (“The Path of Thunder” page 80)

&4. THE TRANSLATION OF INTERNATIONAL WORDS

Those words which have similar form and meaning in different languages are called international words.

Some of them completely coincide in their meaning /such as football, diplomacy, artillery/ some of them partially.

They may be different in their stylistic coloring e.g. “businessman”, “cosmopolitan” are neutral in English while in Russian they have negative meaning. Some of them have entirely different meaning:

compositor – наборщик

conductor – дирижёр, кондуктор

These words are called pseudointernational words:

решительный- dramatic

pathetic – 1) трогательный
2) политический
наука и техника – science and technology

&5. TRANSLATION OF NEOLOGISMS

The English language is very rich in neologisms – the word has been created recently and perhaps will not live in the language for a long time. It is very seldom that we find equivalent for the translation of neologisms and for the most part we use descriptive translation and word-for-word translation /people of good will, top level talks.

We usually make out the meaning of the new words with the help of the context, but it is also necessary to take into consideration the way of their formation.

&6. TRANSLATION WITH THE HELP OF ANTONYMS

The translation with the help of antonyms can't be escaped in case of different structure peculiarities of the English, Uzbek and Russian languages.

1. The combination of negative prefixes with negative particles – litotes/widely used in English but not typical of the Russian language.

He was not unfriendly to a particular type of prisoner.

-“Soames, with his set lips and his square chin, was not unlike a bulldog” /Galm. The Man of Property/...

2. Negative conjunctions “until” and “unless” used with negation:

The United States didn't enter the war until April 1917 – Соединённые Штаты вступили в войну только в апреле 1917 г

Questions –for self-control:

1. Is there any difference in the aim of educational and professional translation?
2. What does the term “faithfulness of translation” mean?
3. What meaning is important in translation, dictionary or contextual? Why?
4. Say a few words about the international and pseudointernational words?
5. What is the main problem in translating neologisms?
6. What can you say about the role of antonymous translation?

Recommended literature

1. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and Translation. M. 1975.
2. Catford I.C. A Linguistic theory of translation. L.N/Y.
3. Shvaytser A.D. Translation and Linguistics. M.1973.
4. Levitskaya T.R, Fiterman A.M. The problems of translation on the material of the contemporary English language. M.1974.
5. Nida.E. Towards a science of translation. Leiden. 1964.
6. Roger. N. Bell. Translation and translating. Theory and practice. London, New York. 1995.
7. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasiga kirish. T. 1978.
8. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. T. 1983.

LECTURE №III

PROBLEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. PRINCIPLES OF TRANSLATION
2. LEVELS OF EQUIVALENCE. ADEQUATE TRANSLATION
3. EQUIVALENCE. SEMANTIC AND STYLISTIC
4. TRANSLATION AS A COMMUNICATION PROCESS

PRINCIPLES OF TRANSLATION LEVELS OF EQUIVALENCE AND THE CONCEPT OF ADEQUATE TRANSLATION

& 1. PRINCIPLES OF TRANSLATION

Although this is a theoretical subject we think that the following guidelines will help the students to evaluate their own work on translation. Below are some general principles which are relevant to all translation.

- a) Meaning. The translation should reflect accurately the meaning of the original text. Nothing should be arbitrarily added or removed, though occasionally part of the meaning can be “transposed”, for example: He has limp with fatigue..

Ask yourself:

is the meaning of the original text clear? if not what does the uncertainty mean? are any words “loaded”, that is, are there any underlying implications?/ “correct me if I’m wrong...” suggests I know I’m right”/.

- Is the dictionary meaning of a particular word the most suitable one?/ should *субверсия* be subversion in English?/
- does anything in the translation sound unnatural or forced?

- b) Form. The ordering of words and idea in the translation should match the original as closely as possible/ this is particularly important in translating legal documents, guarantees, contracts and etc./ But differences in language structure often require changes in the form and order of words. When the doubt underline in the original text the words on which the main stress falls.

- c) Register. Languages often differ greatly in their levels of formality in a given context /say the business letter/. To resolve these differences, the translator must distinguish between formal or fixed expressions/ *Le vous prie , madame, d’agrier l’expression de mes sentiments distinguis, or please find enclosed/* and personal expressions in which the written or speaker sets the tone.

Consider also:

- would any expression in the original sound too formal /informal , cold /warm , personal / impersonal / ... if translated literally
- What is the intention of the speaker or writer / to persuade / dissuade, apologize /criticize?/ Does come through in the translation?

- d) Source language influence. One of the most frequent criticisms of translation is that “It doesn’t sound natural. This is because the translator’s thoughts and choice of words are too strongly molded by the original text.

A good way of shaking of the source language /SC/ influence a few sentences aloud, from memory. This will suggest natural, patterns of thought in the first language /LI/ which may not come to mind when the eye is fixed on the SL text.

- e) Style and clarity. The translator should not change the style of the original. But if the text is stoppily written, for the reader’s sake, correct the defects.

- f) Idioms. Idiomatic expressions are notoriously untranslatable. These include similes, metaphors, verbs and sayings /as good as gold/, jargon, slang, colloquialisms / user – friendly, the Big Apple,

Yuppie, etc/, and / in English/ phrasal verbs. If the expressions cannot be directly translated, try any of the following:

- retain the original word, in inverted commas: “yuppie” replace the original expression, with a literal expression in brackets; Indian summer /dry, hazy weather in late autumn/
- use a close equivalent: talk of the devil = veek na oratima/literally/ the wolf at the door.
- use a non- idiomatic or plain prose translation: a lot over the top = undue excessive.

The golden rule is: if the idiom does work in the LI, do not force it into the translation./The principles outlined above are adopted from Frederic Fuller, the translator’s handbook. For more detailed comments, see Peter Newmark: Approaches to translation./

&2.LEVELS OF EQUIVALENCE AND CONCEPT OF ADEQUATE TRANSLATION.

LEVELS OF EQUIVALENCE: This problem was briefly discussed in previous lecture in connection with the distinction between semantic and programmatic equivalence. In the theory of translation. For instance: V.G.Gark and I.N.Levin distinguish the following types of equivalents: formal semantic and situational. Formal equivalence may be illustrated by speech cases as: The sun disappeared behind a cloud – солнце скрылось за тучей.

Here we find similarity of words and forms in addition to the similarity. The differences in the plane of expression are in fact, those determined by overall structural differences between Russian and English. The use of articles in English, the use of perfective aspect, gender, forms, etc., in Russian.

Semantic equivalence exists when the same meanings are expressed in the two languages in a way. Example:- Troops were airlifted to the battlefield- войска были перебросены по воздуху на поле.

The English word “airfield” contains the same meaning as the Russian phrase перебросить по воздуху. Although different linguistic devices are used in Russian and in English /a word group and a compound word/ the sum of semantic components is the same situational equivalence is established between that both linguistic devices but, nevertheless, describe the same extralinguistic situation: to let someone pass- уступит дорогу. It should be noted that formal equivalence alone is insufficient. In fact the above examples pertain to two types of semantic equivalence:

1. Semantic equivalence and formal equivalence.
2. Semantic equivalence without formal equivalence.

As to “situational equivalence”, it is in our view another variety of semantic equivalence that differs from the first type in that it is based on the same semantic components may be semantically equivalent /a+b/=c+d/, upside down= вверх ногами.

We shall therefore speak of two types of semantic equivalence; componential /identity of semantic components/ and referential /referential equivalence of semantic components/. The later is preferable to “situational equivalence” for descriptions of the same situation are not necessary semantically equivalent.

We may thus distinguish the following levels of equivalence:

Formal equivalence	Semantic equivalence	Pragmatic equivalence	Component equivalence
+	+	+	+
-	+	+	+
-	-	+	+
-	-	-	+

&3.EQUIVALENCE SEMANTIC AND STYLISTIC.

Let us add to the definitions we have given so far a third which, in its extended form, takes us directly into the problem we must address: the nature of equivalence.

Translation is the replacement of a representation of a text in one language by a representation of an equivalent text in a second language.

The authors continue and make the problem of equivalence very plain.

Texts in different languages can be equivalent in different degrees/ fully or partially equivalent/ in respect of different levels of presentation /equivalent in respect of context, of semantics, of grammar, of lexic, etc./ and at different ranks /word-for-word, phrase-for-phrase, sentence-for-sentence/.

It is apparent and has been for a very long time indeed, that the ideal of total equivalence is a chimera. Languages are different from each other; they are different in form having distinct codes and rules regulating the construction of grammatical stretches of language and these forms have different meanings.

To shift from one language from another is, by definition, to alter the forms. Further, the contrasting forms convey meanings which cannot but fail to coincide totally; there is no absolute synonymy between words in the same language, so why should anyone be surprised to discover a lack of synonymy between languages?

Something is always lost / or, might one suggest “gained”?/ in process and translators can find themselves being accused of reproducing only part of original and so “betraying” the authors intentions. Hence the traitorous nature ascribed to the translator by the notorious Italian proverb: Traduttore traditore. If equivalence is to be “preserved” at a particular level at all costs, which level is to be? What are the alternatives? The answer, it turns out, hinges on the dual nature of language itself. Language is a formal structure – a code –which consists of elements which can combine to signal semantic “sense” and, at the same time,

a communication system which uses the forms of the code to refer to entities/in the word/and create signals which possess communicative “value”.

The translator has the option, then, of focusing on finding formal equivalents which “preserve” the context –free semantic sense of the text at the expense of its context-sensitive communicative value of the text at the expense of its context- free semantic sense.

Each of these questions defines one or more parameters of variation.

What is the message contained in the text; the content of the signal; the propositional content of the speech act. Why? orients us towards the intention of the sender, the purpose for which the text was issued, the illocutionary forces of the speech acts which constitutes the underlying structure of the text, the discourse. These run the whole gamut from informing through persuading to flattering... and, as we shall see, it is rare for a text to possess a single function. Multiply functions are the norm rather than the exception for adult language so our task as receivers of text, is to find out the primary function from those which are secondary. When? is concerned with the time of the communication realized in the text and setting it in its historical context; contemporary or set in the recent or remote past or future.How? is ambiguous, since it can refer to:

- a) manner of delivery; the tenor of the discourse; serious; flippant or ironic.
- b) medium of communication; the mode of the discourse; the channel.
- c) verbal / non-verbal, speech/ writing – selection to carry the signal.

Where? is concerned with the place of communication the physical location of the speech level realized in the context.

Who? refers to the participants involved in the communication; the sender or receiver/s/. Both spoken and written texts will reveal to a greater or lesser extent characteristics of the speaker or writer as an individual and also, by inference, the attitude the sender adopts in relation to the receiver/s/ and to the message being transmitted; tabulated above are the following major types of translation equivalence/ formal equivalence + semantic componential equivalence +pragmatic equivalence; semantic componential and/or referential equivalence +pragmatic equivalence; pragmatic equivalence alone.

Pragmatic equivalence which implies a close fit between communicative intent and the receptor’s response is required at all levels of equivalence. It may sometimes appear alone, without formal or semantic equivalence, as in the case: С днём рождения! – Many happy returns of the day!

& 4. TRANSLATION AS A COMMUNICATION PROCESS

The translator, as we have been saying, is by definition a communicator who involved in written communication. We might, therefore, begin by providing a rough, general model of the process of written communication before moving on to the special and particularly problematic process in which translators are involved.

The model of communication process may contain 9 steps which take us from encoding the message through its transmission and reception to the decoding of the message by the receiver. It provides us with a starting point for the exclamation of the process of communication, always limited to the monolingual and, by implicating, to dyadic interaction; one sender and one receiver:



Monolingual communication. Even with these limitations, however, it contains within it the elements and process which need to be explained and raises a large number of questions which require an answer. If we are to succeed at all in our attempt to make sense of the phenomenon of translation. We could describe this process in terms of 9 steps:

1. the sender selects message and code
2. encodes message
3. selects channel
4. transmits signal containing message
5. receiver receives signal containing message
6. recognizes code
7. decodes signal
8. retrieves message
9. comprehends message.

We ought not, however, to assume that this is a simple, unidirectional and linear process nor that each step must be completed before the next can be started.

Processing is by its very nature both cycling / the sender/ sends more message at the receiver takes over the sender's role/ and cooperative/ the sender may well begin again at step 1 while the receiver is no future advanced than step 5 or 6.

The model of translating process is as follows:

1. Translator receives signal I containing message
2. Recognizes
3. Decodes signal I
4. Retrieves message
5. Comprehends message
6. Translator selects code II
7. Encodes message by means of code II
8. Selects channel
9. Transmits signal II containing message.

We might commit here. There are several crucial points of difference between the monolingual communication and bilingual communication involving translation/we are sticking to written communication in both cases/: there are two codes, two signals/ or utterances or texts/ and given what we have been saying about the impossibility of 100 % equivalence, the sets or content/ i.e more than one message/.

It follows, then that in our modeling of translating, we shall need two kinds of explanation:

1. Psycholinguistic explanation which focuses mainly on steps 7 – decoding and encoding – and,

2. A more text – linguistic or sociolinguistic explanation which succeeds more on the participants, on the nature of the message and on the ways on which the resources of the code are drawn upon by uses to create – carrying signals and the fact socio-cultural approach is required to set the process in context.

Questions for self control:

1. What are general principles which are relevant to all translation? Name them.
2. What are the reasons for using translation in the classroom?
3. Speak about the levels of equivalence.
4. What is semantic equivalence?
5. What is stylistic equivalence?
6. What is formal equivalence?
7. What is situational equivalence?
8. What is a communication process?

Recommended literature

1. Alan Duff. Translation. Oxford University press. 1972.
2. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and Translation. M.1975.
3. Frederick Fuller. The translation's handbook. L.N/Y.
4. Catford I.C. A Linguistic theory of translation. L.N/Y.
5. Peter Newmark. Approaches to translation. London.
6. Shvaytser A.D. Translation and Linguistics. M. 1973
7. Levitskaya T.R, Fiterman A.M. The problems of translation on the material of the contemporary English language. M.1974.
8. Nida.E. Towards a science of translation. Leiden. 1964.
9. Roger. N. Bell. Translation and translating. Theory and practice. London, New York. 1995.
10. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasiga kirish. T. 1978.
11. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. T. 1983.

LECTURE № IV

SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION

Problems for discussion:

1. The role of semantic, syntactic and pragmatic relations.
2. The effect of the pragmatic motivation of the original message.
3. The effect of the receptor of the text relation
4. The effect of the translator's angle of view
5. The problem of translatability
6. The rendering of the words of national colouring
7. The way of rendering realities

& 1. THE ROLE OF SEMANTIC, SYNTACTIC AND PRAGMATIC RELATIONS

Semantics /the science investigating the general properties of sign system/ distinguish the following types of relations:

1. semantic (sign to object),
2. syntactic(sign to sign),
3. pragmatic(sign to man).

One of the two texts / the original and its translation should be semantically equivalent sets a relationship between the linguistic science and their denotata (referents). The goal of translation is to produce a text, bearing the same relation to the extralinguistic situation as the original. Semantic equivalence of message does not necessary to imply semantic identify of each linguistic sign. Semantically equivalent utterances include not only those, made up of the semantically identical signs/ as for instance, He lives in Paris – У Парижда яшайди, but also utterances comprising different sets of signs which in the theory totality at up denotates the same types of relationship to the extralinguistic world and denote the same extralinguistic situation (e.g. Wet paint – Эҳтиёт булинг. Буялган).

Semantic relation effect translation both in the initial stage of analysis and in producing the target – language text.of the translator to As distinct from semantic relations, syntactic relations are important only at the stage of analysis since relations between linguistic signs are essential for their semantic interpretation (e.g. Bill hits John and John hits Bill). But also they may be occasionally preserved in translation, the translator does not set himself this goal, very often and syntactically non-equivalent utterances prove to be semantically equivalent: He was considered invisible – Уни енгилмас хисоблашарди.

Pragmatic relations are superimposed on semantic relations and play an equally important role in analyzing the original text, and in producing an equivalent text in the target language. Semantically equivalent message do not necessary mean the same thing to the source and target language receptors, and therefore are not necessary pragmatically equivalent. The phrases “ He made 15 yard and run”- « У 15 ярдга сакради» are semantically equivalent for they denote the same situation but the American reader, familiar with American football will extract far more information from it then Uzbek counterpart who would neither understand the aim of the manourre nor appreciate the football player's performance. The pragmatic problem, involved in translation, arise from three types of pragmatic relations. The relation of the source – language sender to the original message; the relation of the target – language receptor to the target – language message and the relation both messages.

& 2. THE EFFECT OF THE PRAGMATIC MOTIVATION OF THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE

The first type of relations amount to the sender's communicative intent or the pragmatic motivation of the original message. The translator, in other words, should be aware whether the message is a statement of fact a request, an entreaty or a joke. Very often the speaker's communicative intent differs from what of fact in which case it would be translated as "Мен билмайман" but also expression or hesitation "Сизга нима десам экан?". "What gives?" in American slang may either a question "Нима янгиликлар бор?" or just a greeting "Салом". "Is Mr. Brown there, please" is not a question but a distinguished request "Телефонга жаноб Браунни чакириб юборсангиз".

& 3. THE EFFECT OF THE RECEPTOR TO THE TEXT RELATION.

Prof. A. Newbert / Text and Translation/ has proposed a classification of texts depending on their orientation towards different types of receptors: Texts, Intended for "domestic consumption" /local advertising, legislation, home news, etc./, texts intended primarily for the source – language receptor but having also a universal human appeal / belle- letters/ and texts without any specific national addresses / scientific literature/.

Typically, in written translation the translator deals with the text, not intended for target- language audience and therefore subject to pragmatic adaptations. Allowances are made for sociocultural; psychological and other differences in their background knowledge.

According to E. Nida / Linguistics and ethnology in translation problems/ /Language in culture and society; Language structure and translation./, "snow" –white is translated into one of the African languages as a feathers of a "white heron." Pragmatic factors mat effect the scope of semantic information conveyed in translating. Differences in background knowledge call for the addition of deletion of some information / e.g. "Part of the nuclear station in Cuberland has been closed down"-«Каберленд элетростанциясидаги атом электростанциясининг бир кисми ёпилган эди»; "According to Newsweek"- "Ньюсвик журналининг хабар беришича"/. Some cultural realize may be translated by their functional analogies/Америка империализмининг жандарми -a watchdog of US imperialism – from story about the 7 th US Fleet/

& 4. THE EFFECT OF THE TRANSLATOR'S ANGLE OF VIEW

Another pragmatic factor relevant to translation, is the socio-psychological and ideological orientation of the translator himself.

Translation is a process, determined by quite a number of factors. In addition to conveying the semantic information, contained in the text, the detonational meanings and emotive-stylistic connotations, the translator has to take into account the author's communicative intent the type of an audience for which the message is intended socio-psiological characteristics and back-ground of knowledge. A process governed by so many variables cannot have a single outcome.

A process, governed by so many variable cannot have a single outcome. What is more, the synonymic and paraphrasing potential of language is so high that these may be several ways of describing the same extralinguistic situation, and even though they be not quite identical, the differences may be neutralized by the context. It should also be remembered that the translator's decision may very depend on the receptor/ of the translation of realia, for the specialists and for the laymen/ and the purpose of translation.

If the old and the modernized version of the Bible: a woman, who had an evil spirit in her that had kept her such for 18 years... . A woman who for 18 years had been ill from some psychological cause. Also the poetic translation of Shakespeare by Pasternak and the scholarly translation by prof. Morozov.

& 5. THE PROBLEM OF TRANSLATABILITY

Conflicting views have been expressed by linguists concerning the problem of translatability ranging from entirely negative stand, typical of national spirit and the nation's world view and therefore regarded translation as an impossible task, to an unqualified positive attitude, found in many contemporary writings on translation. The very fact that translation makes interlingual communication, possible is in argument in favor of translatability.

Yet it is an oversimplification to claim that every meaningful element of the text is translatable.

In the preface to the "Adventures of Huckleberry Finn" Mark Twain says, that he had reproduced in the book "painstakingly and with the ..." support of personal familiarity the shadings of a number of dialects/The Missouri Negro dialects the backwoods – South- Western dialect, the Pike- country dialect, etc.../. Naturally none of these fine distinctions can be reflected in the translation.

Yet by using colloquial and substandard forms the translator can give an adequate impression of the character's socio and educational status and will render the most essential, functional characteristics of these dialects features.

& 6. THE RENDERING OF THE WORDS OF NATIONAL/ LOCAL/ COLOURING

National or local coloring is one of the main features of national peculiarities in literature. Here belong the following elements:

1. The world denoting things peculiar to the social and material life of the Nation// реалии /- star chamber- въездная палата; камин; дилитанс; клуб.
2. Proper names, geographical denominations, names of streets, big shops, theatres.
3. The way of greetings, formulas of politeness/ Hello, sir /
4. Linear measures, liquid measures, day measures /мера сыпучих тел /.

The translation of reality usually presents some difficulties. It's necessary to have a thorough knowledge of the life of the nation to avoid ridiculous mistakes. Here are some ways of translating the words of local coloring: by translator / cab –кеб, ser- сеп/. It helps to preserve foreign coloring in the translation, but the word translated should be clear to the reader. Otherwise, the disruptive translation is desirable.

-“A tall man entered the room. He wore a tweed coat and a pair of hob- nails”

-“Tweed” – a kind of Scottish woolen stuff dyed into two colors.

-«В комнату вошёл высокий человек. На нём была куртка сшитая из твида и подбитые гвоздями сапоги».

But for the Russian and Uzbek readers it is not clear what the word “tweed” means that's why it's better to translate the sentence as follows:

В комнату вошёл высокий человек, одетый в шерстяную куртку.

But if we have no idea of the context we can't say if the translation is correct. First of all we should find out for what reason the author mentioned the fact that the coat was made of tweed. After the reading the story we learn that the person who entered the room was a detective distinguished as a pleasant. So the translation should be as follows:

-В комнату вошёл человек, одетый в простую крестьянскую куртку.

If the author wanted to accentuate that it was cold outside he should have translated it as follows:

-В комнату вошёл человек, одетый в тёплую шерстяную куртку.

7. THE WAYS OF RENDERING REALIAES.

Proper names, geographical denominations are rendered as a rule by means of transliteration, but we should take into account concerning historical proper names, geographical denominations, etc.

William the conquer – Вильгельм завоеватель

King Charles I – Карл I

/ But Charles Darwin – Чарлз Дарвин /

Hamlet – Гамлет

Paris- Париж

England - Англия.

The names of political parties and state offices are usually not translated. The names of newspapers and journals are usually translated, as well as the names of firms and companies:

House of Commons – Палата общин

Security council – Совет безопасности

But Scotland yard – Скотленд ярд / управление Лондонской полиции/

Intelligence service – интележенс сервис/развед управления Англии/

But: modern languages - модерн ленгвижес

New time - новое время

We translate the proper names which make some semantic meanings:
dramatic / театральное/ persons of “The Scoll for scandal” by Sheridan.

Sir Peter Teazle /ворс /

Sir Oliver Surface

Sir Harry Bumpier- /амортизатор, прибор, смягчающий удары/

Sir Benjamin Backbite –/ to blackbite - злословить за стеной, клеветать/

Joseph Surface

Charles Surface

Careless

Snake

Crabtree / crab- дикая яблоня/

Jady sneerwall- / to sneer – глушиться/

Mrs. Candour- / искренность, прямота/

Formulas of politeness are rendered by means of transliterations. But in official documents and informations “Господин” and “Госпожа” are usually used.

As for as linear measures, liquid measures and etc. They are usually rendered by means of transliteration, but the tradition is also taken into consideration:

A pound of sterling – фунт стерлинг

Ounce – унция

Mile- миля

Pint –пинта

Some peculiarities of English measures are not reflected in Russian:

Six months- полгода

Eighteen month –полтора года

Fortnight- две недели

The peculiarities of the English language are extremely exact indications of measures, which seem for Russian quite unusual:

He could take nothing for dinner but a partridge with an imperial “cab”.

1. Наёмный экипаж /we want for example to stress that the hero was rich/
2. Кеб /we have for an object to preserve national coloring/
3. Извозчик / russian coloring /
4. Такси /modern life/

Questions for self –control:

1. What is the role of semantic, stylistic and pragmatic relations in translation?
2. What is the effects of the pragmatic motivation of the original message?
3. Speak about the effect of the receptor to the text relation.
4. What are the main features of rendering of the words of national colouring?
5. How do you understand the problem of translatability?

6. What is pragmatics?

Recommended literature

1. Alan Duff. Translation. Oxford University press. 1972.
2. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and Translation. M.1975.
3. Frederick Fuller. The translation's handbook. L.N/Y.
4. Catford I.C. F Linguistic theory of translation. L.N/Y.
5. Peter Newmark. Approaches to translation. London.
6. Pragmatics and translation. M.1990
7. Levitskaya T.R, Fiterman A.M. The problems of translation on the material of the contemporary English language. M.1974.
8. Language Transfer Cross – Linguistic influence in language learning. Cambridge University Press. 1993.
9. Nida.E. Towards a science of translation. Leiden. 1964
10. Nida.E. Linguistics and ethnology in translation problems. Language structure and Translation. Atanford. 1975.
11. Roger. N. Bell. Translation and translating . Theory and practice. London, New York. 1995.
12. Shvaytser A.D. Translation and Linguistics. M. 1973
13. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasiga kirish. T. 1978.
14. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. T. 1983.
15. Tommola Q. Translation as a psycho-linguistic Process. L.1986.

LECTURE № V

LEXICAL PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION

PROBLEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Lexical problems of translation. Complete lexical correspondences.
2. Partial lexical correspondences.
3. Types of lexical transformations.
4. Absence of lexical correspondences.

&1. LEXICAL PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION.

Due to the semantic features of language the meaning of words, their usage, ability to combine with other words, associations awakened by them, the “place” they hold in the lexical system of a language do not concur for the most part. All the same “ideas” expressed by words coincide in most cases, though the means of expression differ.

As it is impossible to embrace all the cases of semantic differences between two languages, we shall restrict this course to the most typical features.

The principal types of lexical correspondences between two languages are as follows:

- I. Complete correspondences.
- II. Partial correspondences
- III. The absence of correspondences

COMPLETE LEXICAL CORRESPONDENCES

Complete correspondences of lexical units of two languages can rarely be found. As a rule they belong to the following lexical groups.

1. Proper names and geographical denominations;
2. Scientific and technical terms / with the exception of terminological polysemy/;
3. The months and days of the week, numerals.

&3. PARTIAL LEXICAL CORRESPONDENCES

While translating the lexical units partial correspondences mostly occur. That happens when a word in the language of the original conforms to several equivalents in the language it is translated into. The reasons of these facts are the following.

1. Most words in a language are polysemantic, and the system of word – meaning in one language does not concur with the same system in another language completely

/ compare the nouns “house” and “table” in English, Uzbek and Russian/. That’s why the selection of a word in the process of translating is determined by the context.

2. The specification of synonymous order which pertain the selection of words. However, it is necessary to allow for the nature of the semantic signs which

an order of synonyms is based on consequently, it is advisable to account for the concurring meanings of members in synonymic order, the difference in textural and stylistic meanings, and the ability of individual components of orders of synonyms to combine: e.g. dismiss, discharge / bookish/, sack, fire / colloquial/ the edge of the table – the rim of the moon; ишдан бушатмок / адабий тилда /, хайдамок /огиздаги нуткда/, столнинг чети / кирраси/, ойнинг кирраси / чети/.

3. Each word effects the meaning of the object it designates. Not unfrequently languages “select” different properties and signs to describe the same denotations. The way, each language creates its own “picture of the word”, is known as “various principles of dividing reality into parts”. Despite the difference of signs, both languages reflect one and the same phenomenon adequately and to the same extent, which

must be taken into account when translating words of this kinds, as equivalence is not identical to having the same meaning /e.g. compare: hot milk skin on it – каймок тутган иссиқ суг – горячее молоко с пенкой/.

4. The differences of semantic content of the equivalent words in two languages. These words can be divided into three sub – groups:

- a. words with a differentiated / undifferentiated/ meaning: e.g. in English: to swim/ of a human being/ , to sail / of a ship/, to float / of an inanimate object/; in Uzbek: сузмок /одамлар хакида/, сузмок /кема хакида/ сув юзида калкиб юрмок /предмет тугрисиди/; in Russian: плавать, плыть
- b. words with a “broad” sense; verbs of state / to be/, perception and brainwork /to see, to understand/, verbs of action and speech / to go, to say/, partially desemantized words /thing, case/.
- c. “adverbial verbs” with a composite structure, which have a semantic content, expressing action and nature at the same time: e.g. The train whistled out of the station.- Поезд хуштак чалиб станциядан жунаб кетди. – Дав свисток, поезд отошёл от станции.

5. Most difficulties are encountered when translating the so called pseudo – international words i.e. words which are similar in form in both languages, but differ in meaning or use. The regular correspondence of such words, in spelling and sometimes in articulation / in compliance with the regularities of each language. Coupled with the structure of word-building in both languages may lead to a false identification /e.g. English moment, in Uzbek - лахза; in Russian – момент, важность, значительность/.

6. Each language has its own typical rules of combinability. The latter is limited by the system of the language. A language has generally established traditional combinations which do not concur with corresponding ones in another language.

Adjectives offer considerable difficulties in the process of translation, that is explained by the specific ability of English adjectives to combine. It does not always coincide with their combinability in Uzbek or Russian languages on account of differences in their semantic structure and valence. Frequently one and the same adjective in English combines with a number of nouns, while in Uzbek and in Russian different adjectives are used in combinations of this kind. For this reason it is not easy to translate English adjectives which are more capable of combining than their Uzbek and Russian equivalents /A bad headache, a bad mistake .../каттик бош огриги, купол хато...; сильная головная боль, грубая ошибка./

A specific feature of the combinability of English nouns is that some of them can function as the subject of a sentence, indicating one who acts, though they do not belong to a lexico- semantic category Nomina Agentis. This tends to the “predicate – adverbial modifier” construction being replaced by that of the “subject – predicate”.

- The strike closed most of the schools in New – York.
- Иш ташлаш натижасида Нью-Йоркдаги мактабларнинг купчилиги ёпилди.
- В результате забастовки большинство школ Нью – Йорка было закрыто.

Of no less significance is the habitual use of a word, which is bound up with the history of the language and the formation and the development of its lexical system. This gave shapes to cliches peculiar to each language, which are used for describing particular situations/ e.g. in English “ Wet point”, in Uzbek “Эхтиёт булинг, буялган”, in Russian “Осторожно, окрашено”.

&3. TYPES OF LEXICAL TRANSFORMATIONS.

In order to attain equivalence, despite the differences in formal and semantic system of two languages, the translator is obliged to do various linguistic transformations. Their aims are to ensure that the text imparts all the knowledge inferred in the original text, without violating the rules of the language it is translated into the following 3 elementary types are seemed most suitable for describing all kinds of lexical transformations:

- I. lexical substitution;
- II. supplementation;
- III. omissions / dropping/

1. Lexical substitution.

1. In substitutions of lexical units words and stable word combinations are replaced by others which are not their equivalents. More often 3 cases are met with:

- a) A concrete definition – replacing a word with a broad sense by one of a narrower meaning: He is at school – Он учиться в школе; У мактабда укийди. He is in the army – Он служит в армии; У армияда хизмат килади.
- b) Generalization- replacing a word's narrow meaning by one with a broad sense: A Navajo blanket – жун адёл; индийское одеяло.
- c) An integral transformation: How do you do – Салом; Здравствуйте

2. Antonymous translation is a complex lexico – grammatical substitution of a positive construction for the negative one / and vice – versa/, which is coupled with a replacement of a word by its antonym when translated / Keep off grass – Майса устидан юрманг – Не ходите по траве./

3. Compensation is used when certain elements in the original text cannot be expressed in terms of the language it is translated into. In cases of this kind the same information is communicated by other or another place to as to make up the semantic deficiency:

“He was ashamed of his parents..., because they said don't” and “she don't”... /Celindjer/ - У уз онасидан уяларди, чунки улар сузларни нотугри талаффуз килардилар- Он стеснялся своих родителей, потому что они говорили “хочут” и “хотите”(перевод Раи Ковалёвой).

II. Supplementations. A formal inexpressibility of semantic components is the reason most met with for using supplementation as a way of lexical transformation. A formal inexpressibility of certain semantic components is especially of English word combinations N + N and Adj + N

Pay claim -Иш хаккини ошириш талаби, требование повысить заработную плату
Logical computer- Логик операцияларни бажарувчи хисоблаш машинаси, компьютер.

III. Omissions/ dropping /. In the process of lexical transformation of omission generally words with a surplus meaning are omitted / e.g. Components of typically English pair – synonyms, possessive pronouns and exact measures/ in order to give a more concrete expressions. To raise one's eye – brows – ялт этиб карамок ; поднять брови – в знак изумления/.

&4.ABSENCE OF LEXICAL CORRESPONDENCES

Realiae are words denoting objects, phenomena and so on, which are typical of people. In order to render correctly the designation of objects referred to in the original and image associated with them it is necessary to know the tenor of life epoch and specific features of the country depicted in the original work. The following groups of words can be regarded as having no equivalents: 1. realiae of everyday life – words denoting objects, phenomena etc, which typical of a people / cab, fire – place/; 2. Proper names and geographical denominations; 3. Addresses and greetings; 4. The titles of journals, magazines and newspapers; 5. Weights, linear measures and etc.

When dealing with realiae it is necessary to take special account of the pragmatic aspect of the translation because “the knowledge gained by experience” of the participants of the communicative act turns out to be different. As a result, much of which is easily understood by an Englishmen is in comprehensible to an Uzbek or Russian readers or experts the opposite influence upon them. It is particularly important to allow for the pragmatic factor when translating fiction, foreign political propaganda material and advertisements of articles for export.

Below are three principle ways of translating words denoting specific realiae:

1. Transliteration / complete or partial /, i.e., the direct use of word denoting realiae or its roots in the spelling or in combination with suffixes of the mother tongue / cab, дуппи, сандал, изба /;

2. Creation of new single or complex word for denoting an object on the basis of elements and morphological relationships in the mother tongue / skyscraper – осмон улар, небоскрёб /;

3. Use of a word denoting sometimes close to / though not identical with / realia of another language. It represents an approximate translation specified by the context, which is something on the verge of description/ peddler – таркатувчи, торговец-разносчик /.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-CONTROL:

1. What are the principal types of lexical correspondences between the two languages?
2. What lexical units are liable for complete lexical correspondences?
3. What cases refer to partial lexical correspondences?
4. What is understood under lexical substitution?
5. In what cases is supplementation is applied?
6. What are cases of absence of lexical correspondences?

RECOMMENDED LITERATURE:

1. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and Translation. M.1975.
2. Frederick Fuller. The translation's handbook. L.N/Y.
3. Catford I.C. F Linguistic theory of translation. L.N/Y.
4. Peter Newmark. Approaches to translation. London.
5. Levitskaya T.R, Fiterman A.M. The problems of translation on the material of the contemporary English language. M.1974.
6. Language Transfer Cross – Linguistic influence in language learning. Cambridge University Press. 1993.
7. Nida.E. Towards a science of translation. Leiden. 1964
8. Nida.E. Linguistics and ethnology in translation problems. Language structure and Translation. Atanford. 1975.
9. Roger. N. Bell. Translation and translating. Theory and practice. London, New York. 1995.
10. Shvaytser A.D. Translation and Linguistics. M. 1973
11. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasiga kirish. T. 1978.
12. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. T. 1983.

LECTURE № VI

PHRASEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION

PROBLEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Complete conformities in phraseological units.
2. Partial conformities in phraseological units.
3. Translation of phraseological units with n phraseological conformities:
 - verbatim translation;
 - translation by analogy;
 - descriptive translation.

Translating a phraseological unit is not an easy matter as it depends on several factors: different combinability of words, homonymy, polysemy, synonymy of phraseological units and presence of falsely identical units, which makes it necessary to take into account of the context. Besides, a large number of phraseological units have a stylistic – expressive component in meaning, which usually has a specific national feature. The afore-cited determines the necessary to get acquainted with the main principles of the general theory of phraseology.

The following types of phraseological units may be observed: phrasemes and idioms. A unit of constant context consists of a dependent and constant indicators may be called a phraseme. An idiom is a unit of constant context which is characterized by an integral meaning of the whole and by weakened meanings of the components, and in which the dependant and the indicating elements are identical and equal to the whole lexical structure of the phrase.

Any type of phraseological unit can be presented as a definite micro- system. In the process of translating of phraseological units functional adequate linguistic units are selected / by comparing two specific linguistic principles. These principles reveal elements of likeness and distinction. Certain parts of these systems may correspond in form and content (completely or partially) or have no adequacy.

The main types of phraseological conformities are as follows:

- I. Complete conformities
- II. Partial conformities
- III. Absence of conformities

&.I. COMPLETE CONFORMITIES.

_ Complete coincidence of form and content in phraseological units is rarely met with.

1. Black frost / phraseme/
 - кора совук
 - сильный мороз
2. To bring oil to fire/idiom/
 - алангага ёг куймок
 - подлить масло в огонь
3. To lose one's head/ idiom/
 - гангиб колмок
 - потерять голову

I. PARTIAL CONFORMITIES. Partial conformities of phraseological units in two languages assume lexical, grammatical and lexico- grammatical differences with identity of meaning and style, i.e. they are figuratively close but differ in lexical composition, morphologic number and syntactic arrangement of the order of words. One may find:

- 1) Partial lexical conformities by lexic parameters/ lexical composition/
 - a)- To get out of bed on the wrong foot / idiom/

- Чап ёни билан турмок
- Встать с левой ноги

- b)- To have one's heat in one's boots /idiom/
 - Юраги оркасига кетмок
 - Душа в пятку ушла

- c) – To lose one's temper / phraseme/
 - Сабри чидамок
 - Выйти из себя, потерять терпение

- d)- To dance to somebody's pipe / idiom/
 - Бировнинг ногорасига уйнамок
 - Играть под чью –либо дудочку

- 2) Partial conformities by grammatical parameters
- 3) Differing as to morphological arrangement / number/
 - a. To fish in troubled waters./ idiom/
 - лойка сувда балик тутмок
 - ловить рыбу в мутной воде

 - b. From head to foot / idiom/
 - бошдан оёгигача
 - с ног до головы

 - c. To agree like cats and dogs / phraseme/
 - ит мушукдек яшамок
 - жить как кошка с собакой

 - d. To keep one's head /idiom/
 - узини йукотмаслик
 - не потерять голову

- 4. Duffering as to syntactical arrangement
 - a. Strike while the iron is hot.
 - темирни кизигида бос
 - куй железо пока горячо

 - b. Egyptian darkness
 - коп-коронги зимистон / гордек коронги /
 - тьма египетская

 - c. Armed to teeth
 - тиш – тирногигача куролланган
 - вооружённый до зубов

 - d. All is not gold that glitters
 - барча ялтираган нарса олтин эмас
 - не всё золото, что блестит

&3.ABSENCE OF CONFORMITIES

Many English phraseological units have no phraseological conformities in Uzbek and Russian. In the first instance this concerns phraseological units based on realiae. When translating units of this kind it is advisable to use the following types of translation:

- A. A verbatim word for word translation.
- B. Translation by analogy.
- C. Descriptive translation.

A. VERBATUM TRANSLATION is possible when the way of thinking / in the phraseological unit / does not bear a specific national feature.

1. To call things by their true names / idiom /

- хар нарсани уз номи билан атамок
- называть все вещи своими именами

2. The arms race / phraseme/

- куролланиш пойгаси
- гонка вооружений

3. Cold war / idiom/

- совук уруш
- холодная война

B. TRANSLATING BY ANALOGY; this way of translating is resorted to when the phraseological unit has a specific national realiae.

1. “ Dick” said the dwarf, thrashing his head in at the door – “ my pet, my pupil, the apple of my eye hey”. /Ch. Dickens “ The Old Curiosity Shop” ch 1 / idiom//.

- “Дик, азизим, толибим, кузимнинг нури”- хурсандлигидан хитоб килди митти одам эшикка бошини сукиб
- “Дик, – воскликнул карлик, просовывая голову в дверь,- мой любимец, мой ученик, свет моих очей”

2. To pull somebody’s leg / idiom/

- мазах килмок
- одурачить кого-либо.

C. DESCRIPTIVE TRANSLATION i.e. translating phraseological units by a free combination of words is possible when the phraseological unit has a particular national feature and has no analogy in the language it is to be translated into.

1. To enter the house / phraseme /

- парламент аъзоси булмок
- стать членом парламента

2. To cross the flour of the house / idiom/

- бир партиядан бошка партияга утиб кетмок
- перейти с одной партии в другую

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-CONTROL:

- 1.What is a phraseological unit and what types of them do you know?
- 2 .What is understood under conformities in phraseological units?
Is it rare or often met?

3. What cases refer to partial conformities?
4. What are the mechanisms of translating phraseological units with no phraseological conformities?
5. In what cases can we apply descriptive translation?

RECOMMENDED LITERATURE:

1. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and translation. M. 1975.
2. Shvaytser A.D. Translation and linguistics .M. 1973.
3. Levitskaya T.R, Fiterman A.M. The problem of Translation on the material of the contemporary English language. M. 1974
4. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasiga kirish. T. 1978.
5. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. T. 1983.
6. Мусаев К. Лексико-фразеологические вопросы художественного перевода. Т.: 1980

LECTURE №VII

GRAMMATICAL PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION

PROBLEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Levels of grammatical correspondence.
2. Morphological correspondence:
 - Complete;
 - Partial;
 - Absence of morphological correspondence.
3. Syntactic correspondence:
 - Complete;
 - Partial;
 - Absence of syntactic correspondence.

&1. LEVELS OF GRAMMATICAL CORRESPONDENCE

Every language has a specific system which differs from that of any others. This is all the more so with respect to English, Uzbek and Russian, whose grammatical systems are typologically and genetically heterogeneous. English and Russian belong to the Germanic and Slavonic groups respectively in the Indo-European family of languages. The Uzbek language patronize to the Turkish group of the Altaic family. Concerning the morphological type both English and Russian are inflected, though the former is notable for its analytical character and the latter for its synthetic character in the main, Uzbek is an agglutinative language.

As to grammar the principle means of expression in languages possessing in analytical character / English / is the order of words and use of function words / though all the four basic grammatical means – grammatical inflections, function words, word order and intonation pattern are found in any languages/. The other two means are of secondary importance.

The grammatical inflections are the principal means used in such languages as Russian and Uzbek, though the rest of grammatical means are also used but they are of less frequency than the grammatical inflections.

The comparison of the following examples will help to illustrate the difference between the language considered;

The hunter killed the wolf
Овчи бурини улдирди
Охотник убил волка

In English the order of words is fixed. The model of simple declarative sentences in this language is as follows.

SUBJECT - PREDICATE

This means that the subject /S/ is placed in the first position /V/ - in the second position. If the predicate is expressed by a transitive verb when in the third position we find the object / O/ that is:

S - Vtr - O

Any violation of the order of the word brings about a change or distortion of the meaning. The corresponding Russian sentence adheres to the pattern S – Vtr – O. But it permits the transposition of the word i.e.

Охотник убил волка
Волка убил охотник.

These patterns are not equivalent. The first allows transposition of words, which leads to stylistic marking / characteristic of poetry/. Besides, the ending “NI” expresses an additional meaning of definiteness. The second pattern doesn't tolerate transposition of words.

The principal types of grammatical correspondences between two languages are as follows:

- a. complete correspondence
- b. partial correspondence
- c. the absence of correspondence.

&2. MORPHOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCE

a. COMPLETE MORPHOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Complete morphological correspondence is observed when in the languages considered there are identical, grammatical categories with identical particular meanings.

In all the three languages there is a grammatical category of number. Both the general categorial and particular meanings are alike:

NUMBER	
SINGULAR	PLURAL

Such correspondence may be called complete.

b.PARTIAL MORPHOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCE

Partial morphological correspondence is observed when in the languages examined there are grammatical categories ways identical categorial meanings but with some differences in the particular meanings.

In the languages considered there is a grammatical category of case in nouns. Though the categorial meaning is identical in all three languages the particular meanings are different both from the point of view of their number and the meanings they express. English has 2 particular meanings while Uzbek and Russian have 6. Though latter two languages have the same quantity of particular cases, their meanings do not coincide.

The differences in the case system or in any other grammatical categories are usually expressed by other means in languages.

c.ABSENCE OF MORPHOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Absence of morphological correspondence is observed when there are corresponding grammatical categories in the languages examined. As for instance in Uzbek there is a grammatical category of possessiveness, which shows the affixation of things to one of the three grammatical persons, e.g. :

Uzbek
Китоб – им
Китоб – инг
Китоб – и

This grammatical category is neither found in English nor in Russian. These languages use pronouns for this purpose.

English	Russian
My book	моя книга
Your book	твоя книга
His / her book	его / её книга

In English we use certain grammatical means to express a definite and indefinite meanings, that is articles. But there are no equivalent grammatical means in Uzbek and Russian. They use lexical or syntactic means to express those meanings. / see substitution/

&3. SYNTACTIC CORRESPONDENCE
a. COMPLETE SYNTACTIC CORRESPONDENCE

By complete syntactic correspondence is understood the conformity in structure and sequence of words in word – combinations and sentences.

Complete syntactic correspondence is rarely to be found in the languages examined here. However, the pattern adj +noun is used in word –combination: red flags – кизил байроқлар, красные знамёна. The same may be said of sentences in cases when the predicate of the simple sentences is expressed by an intransitive verb: he laughed – у кулди , он засмеялся.

b.PARTIAL SYNTACTIC CORRESPONDENCE

By partial syntactic correspondence in word – combinations is understood the conformity in meaning but discrepancy in the structure of phase.

Partial syntactic correspondence in word- combinations are found in this following patterns.

1. Attributes formed by the collocation of words.

Owing to the fact that English is poor in grammatical inflections, attributes are widely formed by means of mere collocation of words in accordance with the pattern N(1)+N(2) which expressed the following type of relations.

English	Attributive Uzbek	Russian
Glass – tube N (1) + N(2)	шиша- найча N(1)+ N(2)	стеклянная трубочка ADJ + N
In this example English and Uzbek translation is unmarked while Russian is marked.		
		Possessive

English	Uzbek	Russian
House –plan N(1)+ N(2)	а)уй плани N (1)+N (2) (n) б)уйнинг плани N(1нинг)+N(2) (n)	план дома N(1)+ N(2) (a)

The Uzbek and Russian versions are marked, while English is unmarked. Besides, in Russian the transposition is observed.

As it is seen in the examples cited, languages differ as to the way they express these relations, though they maintain identical relations between the components of word –combinations.

1. word – combination whose first component is expressed by a numeral.

One book	Битта китоб	Одна книга
Two books	Иккита китоб	Две книги
Three books	Учта китоб	Три книги
Four books	Туртта китоб	Четыре книги
Five books	Бешта китоб	Пять книг

The order of words in these combinations is the same in all the three languages, though the manner of expressing plurality differs in the second components.

Compare:

English	Uzbek	Russian
Num + N (pl)	Num + N sing	from two to five
Num + N(sin) rod. p		
From five on		
Num + N (pl) rod.p		

2. As is seen in English and Russian the second components are grammatically marked, though the markers do not coincide.

In Uzbek it is unmarked.

3. Partial syntactic correspondence is also observed in complete polycomponent prepositional attributes with inner predication as in the following examples:

This is to be or not to be a struggle – Хаёт мамот кураши, борьба не на жизнь а на смерть Go-to – hell voice - Дагал овоз, грубый голос

By partial syntactic correspondence in sentences is understood the divergence in the order of the words, omission or partial substitution of parts of sentences:

It is forbidden to smoke here – бу ерда чекиш ман килинган, курить здесь запрещено.

With that he blew out his candle – у шамни учирди, он задул свечи (P.Stivenson)

c. ABSENCE OF SYNTACTIC CORRESPONDENCE

By absence of syntactic correspondence we mean lack of certain syntactic construction in the target languages, which were used in the Source language. In English this concerns syntactic constructions with non- finite forms of the verb, which compose the extended part of a sentence with an incomplete or secondary predications.

The semantic function of predicative construction can be formulated as intercommunication and interconditionality of actions or states with different subjects.

These constructions have no formal grammatical connection with the main parts of sentences though there is always a conformity between them. The degree of attendance of action or condition in predicative constructions determines the choice of complex, compound or simple in translation. Compare : I heard the door open... –Эшик очилганини эшитдим, Я услышал как открылась дверь.

In the English sentences the predicative construction which functions as an object is composed of a noun in the common case and an infinitive. In Uzbek this construction corresponds to the word-combination “эшик очилганини” which carries out the same function, though there is neither structural nor morphological conformity: it is a word combination expressed by a noun and participle. Thus, an English predicative construction when translated into Uzbek gets nominalized. In Russian this construction is expressed by a complex sentence with a subordinate object clause.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-CONTROL:

1. What family of languages do the English, Uzbek and Russian languages belong to? How does it accounts for peculiarities of grammatical systems of these languages?
2. What are the levels of morphological correspondences?
3. How would you deal with cases of absence of morphological correspondence?
4. What are the mechanisms of translating cases with absence of syntactic correspondence?

RECOMMENDED LITERATURE:

1. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and translation. M. 1975.
2. Shvaytser A.D. Translation and linguistics .M. 1973.
3. Levitskaya T.R, Fiterman A.M. The problem of Translation on the material of the contemporary English language. M. 1974.
4. Nida.E. Towards a science of translation. Leiden. 1964.
5. Roger. N. Bell. Translation and translating . (Theory and practice). London, New York. 1995.
6. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasiga kirish. T. 1978.
7. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. T. 1983.

LECTURES №VIII

PROBLEMS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. Types of grammatical transformations.
2. Substitution as a type of grammatical transformation.
3. The mechanism of transposition..
4. Omission and addition as types of grammatical transformations.

&1.TYPES OF GRAMMATICAL TRANSFORMATIONS

In order to attain the fullest information from one language into another one is obliged to resort numerous interlinguistic lexical and grammatical transformations.

Grammatical transformations are as follows:

1. substitution;
2. transposition;
3. omission;
4. supplementation.

The cited types of elementary transformations as such are rarely used in the process of translating. Usually they combine with each other, assuming the nature of “complex” interlinguistic transformations.

&2. SUBSTITUTION AS A TYPE OF GRAMMATICAL TRANSFORMATION.

By substitution we understand the substitution of one part of speech by another or one form of a word by another. Consequently, there are two kinds of substitutions constituting a grammatical type of transformations; substitution of parts of speech and the grammatical form of a word. Transformation by substitution may be necessitated by several reasons: the absence of one or an other grammatical form or construction in the target language; lack of coincidence in the use of corresponding form and construction as well as lexical reasons – different combinability and use of words, lack of a part of speech with the same meaning.

An example of the substitution of a word-form may be the interpretation of the meaning of the grammatical category of posteriority of the English verb, which is presented in two particular meanings: absolute posteriority /he says he will come / and relative posteriority / he said he would come /. Uzbek and Russian verbs do not possess word form of this kind and communicate their meaning with use of other grammatical means: У келишини айтаяпти. Он говорит, что придёт.

У келишини айтди. Он сказал, что придёт.

In Uzbek the meaning of this category is expressed by a substantivized participle ending in – jak or by the infinitive ending in –(i)sh; in Russian the future tense form of a verb is used.

There are two types of substitution of parts of speech; obligatory and non-obligatory. The obligatory substitution is observed when in the target language there are no part of speech corresponding to that used in the source language e.g. the English articles and may be used for emphasis. In cases of the kind it is necessary to substitute them with functionally – adequate means of expression in Uzbek and Russian.

E.g. When we were in Majorca, there was a Msr. Leech there and she was telling us most wonderful things about you. (A.Christie).

Биз Малоркада булганимизда, у ерда кандайдир миссис Лич бор эди. У бизга Сиз тугрингизда жуда куп кизикарли нарсаларни айтиб берди.

Когда мы были в Малорке, там была некая миссис Лич, которая рассказывала очень много интересного о Вас.

In Uzbek and Russian an indefinite pronoun is used for translating the indefinite article.

Non obligatory substitution is a substitution undertaken by the needs or demandes of the context: The climb had been easier than he expected.

Кутарилиш у кутгандан осонрок булди.

Подняться оказалось легче, чем он ожидал.

A noun in the English sentence is substituted by infinitives in the Uzbek and Russian languages.

&3. TRANSPOSITION

“Transposition” (as a type of transformation used in translations) is understood to be the change of position/order) of linguistic elements in the Target language in comparison with a Source language.

Transposition (change in the structure of a sentence / is necessitated by the difference in the structure of the language(fixed or free order of words etc), in the semantic of a sentence, and others. There are two types of transpositions; transposition (or substitution) of parts of a sentence and transposition occasioned by the change of types of syntactic connection in composite sentence.

Examples:

Active defenders of the national interests of their people, the Communists, are at the same time true internationalists.(W. Foster).

Коммунистлар уз халкларининг миллий манфаатларини химоя киладилар ва айни бир вақтда улар хақиқий интернационалистлар ҳамдир.

Активно защищая национальные интересы своего народа, коммунисты в то же время являются истинными интернационалистами.

The first component of the English attributive word-combination “active defenders” is an adverb while the second becomes the predicate when translated into Uzbek. In Russian the same word – combination is expressed by an adverbial word combination. The means used to express the semantic core of a statement by not be identical.

In English the indefinite article, the construction it is ...that (who) inversions of different kinds are used for this purpose, while the order of words is the most frequent means of expression in Uzbek and Russian: words, communicating new information are not placed at the beginning of the sentence:

A big scarlet Rolls Royce had just stopped in front of the local post office. (A.Christie).

Махаллий алоқа булими олдида кизилрангдаги катта Ролс Ройс автомашинаси тухтади.

У местного почтового отделения остановилась комфортабельная автомашина алого цвета Ролс Ройс.

In the English sentences the semantic core is expressed by the indefinite article while in Uzbek and Russian it is assigned to the second and third places accordingly.

When translating English component sentences into Uzbek and Russian, the principal and subordinate clauses may be transposed. This is explained by the fact that the order of words in compound sentences does not always coincide in the languages considered. Compare:

A remarkable air of relief overspread her countenance as soon as she saw me. (R.Stevenson).

Мени куриши биланок, унинг юзида энгил тортганлик аломати пайдо булди.

Как только она увидела меня, на её лице выразилось чувство облегчения.

&4. OMISSION AND ADDITION.

As a type of grammatical transformation – omission is necessitated by grammatical redundancy of certain forms in two languages.

He raised his hand.

У кулини кутарди.

Он поднял руку.

Addition, as a type of grammatical transformation can be met with in cases of formal inexpressiveness of grammatical or semantic components in the language of the original text.

Also, there was an awkward hesitancy at times, as he essayed the new words he had learnt.

Баъзида у яқиндагина урганган янги сузларини талаффуз қилишда хозирланиб, тухтаб қоларди.

Иногда он запинаясь, готовясь произнести слова, которые он только недавно выучил.

The meaning of the verbal form is expressed in Russian by the words “только недавно”, and in Uzbek by the adverb “якиндагина”.

It must be emphasized that the division into lexical and grammatical transformations is, to a great extent, approximate and conditional. In some cases a transformation can be interpreted as one or another type of elementary transformation. In practice the cited types of lexical and grammatical transformations are seldom met with in “pure form”. Frequently they combine to form complex transformations.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-CONTROL:

1. What are the main types of grammatical transformations?
2. What is the mechanism of substitution?
3. What is the mechanism of transposition?
4. In what cases do we apply one of the following grammatical transformations: omission or addition?

RECOMMENDED LITERATURE:

1. Alan Duff. Translation. Oxford University press. 1972.
2. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and Translation. M.1975.
3. Frederick Fuller. The translation's handbook. L.N/Y.
4. Catford I.C. F Linguistic theory of translation. L.N/Y.
5. Peter Newmark. Approaches to translation. London.
6. Pragmatics and translation. M.1990
7. Levitskaya T.R, Fiterman A.M. The problems of translation on the material of the contemporary English language. M.1974.
8. Language Transfer Cross – Linguistic influence in language learning. Cambridge University Press. 1993.
9. Nida.E. Towards a science of translation. Leiden. 1964
10. Nida.E. Linguistics and ethnology in translation problems. Language structure and Translation. Atanford. 1975.
11. Roger. N. Bell. Translation and translating . Theory and practice. London, New York. 1995.
12. Shvaytser A.D. Translation and Linguistics. M. 1973
13. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasiga kirish. T. 1978.
14. Salomov G. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. T. 1983.
15. Tommola Q. Translation as a psycho-linguistic Process. L.1986.