

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION
OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN**

URGENCH STATE UNIVERSITY

On the right of manuscript

U.D.C.:81'255.2

SABIROVA KOMILA MAQSUDOVNA

Translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian

Dissertation

for defending master's degree

5A220102 – Linguistics (the English language)

Scientific supervisor:

Dr. Ermetova J. I.



Urgench-2014

CONTENTS

Introduction	4
Chapter one. Theoretical basis of the research of polysemantic words	
1.1. The problem of polysemy in the English and Russian language systems.....	10
1.2. Investigation of the problem of polysemy by English and Russian linguists...	14
1.3. New approaches to the study of polysemy in the present day English and Russian languages.....	23
Conclusion for chapter one.....	27
Chapter two. Lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words	
2.1. Lexical transformations in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian.....	29
2.2. Contextually bound polysemantic words in the English and Russian languages.....	35
2.3. Comparative analyse of the interaction of polysemantic words and their semantic structures in the English and Russian languages.....	41
Conclusion for chapter two.....	47
Chapter three. Grammatical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words	
3.1. Polysemantic words in passive voice construction and their comparison in English and Russian.....	49
3.2. Comparative analyse of usage of polysemantic verbs “to be” and “to have” in English and polysemantic verbs “быть” and “иметь” in Russian.....	55
3.3. Conversion as a part of polysemy in the English and Russian languages.....	60
Conclusion for chapter three.....	67
Chapter four. Stylistic difficulties of translation of polysemantic words	

4.1. The method of stylistic compensation in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian.....	69
4.2. The influence of polysemy in translating stylistically-marked language units from English into Russian.....	76
4.3. Handling the expressional effect of the original text with the help of polysemantic words.....	81
Conclusion for chapter four.....	87
Conclusion	89
Used literature	93
Appendix	101

Introduction

Development of a science as a whole and a linguistic science, in particular, is connected not only to the decision of actual scientific problems, but also with features internal and foreign policy of the state, the maintenance of the state educational standards which are to the generators of progress providing social, economic society. It forms the society capable quickly to adapt in the modern world.

After the independence of our republic there have been adopted new Laws and new Resolutions. For the first time in the history of our country, there was adopted “The Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan on Education” and “The Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan on the National Program of Personnel Training System”. Therefore the task of education, the task of upbringing a new generation capable of national renaissance will remain the prerogative of the state and constitute a priority. At the present time great importance is attached to learning and teaching foreign languages.

The problem has become more actual after December 10, 2012 when the resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.A. Karimov “On the measures of improving the system of foreign languages” PR – 1875 was issued [4;1].

As President I.A. Karimov states: "Currently it is difficult to assess the value of a profound knowledge of foreign languages of our people for our country which is striving to take a worthy place in the world community; for our nation sees its great future in harmony and cooperation with foreign partners" [5;8-9].

The present dissertation deals with the translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian which presents a certain interest both for theoretical investigation and for practical usage of the language.

We have the full ground to approve that many linguists have brought their invaluable contribution to studying the various properties of polysemantic words used in the language with great frequency. (For more detail see: A. I. Smirnitsky, I.V. Arnold, V.G. Gak, O. S. Akhmanova, R.S Ginsburg, S. S. Khidekel, G. Yu. Knyazeva, A. N. Ivanov, A. N. Koonin, N.N. Belyaevskaya, N. D. Arutyunova, Y. D. Apresyan, Ye. S. Kublyakova, D.U. Ashurova, M. I. Rasulova, J. Lyons, J. Lakoff, R. Lakoff, J. Palmer, M. Baker, S. Levinson, W. Chafe and many others.) Their works have created necessary theoretical preconditions for the analyses of the semantic structure of the words in the present day English.

The topicality of the investigation is expressed on the one hand by the profound interest in learning the semantic structure of the polysemantic words which are widely used to demonstrate linguistic richness of modern English vocabulary on the other hand by the necessity of further improvement of the investigation on the ways of polysemantic words translation from one language into another.

The object of the given investigation is polysemantic words in English and Russian and the different structural types of the sentences with the system of polysemantic words in the English and Russian languages.

The subject is lexical, grammatical and stylistic difficulties of the translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian.

The scope of this research is based on detailed study of lexical, grammatical and stylistic difficulties of the translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian, differences in the shades of their meanings and the frequency of their usage in different types of the discourse.

According to the general aim the following particular **tasks** are put forward:

1. To give a detailed analyses of the theoretical basis of the research of polysemantic words.
2. To analyse the problem of polysemy in the English and Russian language systems.

3. To describe the investigation of the problem of polysemy by English and Russian linguists.

To reveal lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian.

4. To reveal grammatical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian.
5. To reveal stylistic difficulties of translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian.

The hypothesis of this research is that the linguistic phenomenon named as polysemy, that is the words having more than two meanings in the dictionary are greatly used in the language, creating great difficulties not only for the learners of the language but also for the speakers of the language whom the language is called a native one. The problem of correct translation of the polysemantic words can only be solved if we apply the newest and the latest method of investigation applied in lexicology and in linguistics in general. Comprehensive analyses should be used and corresponding tasks put forward in the investigation due to the complexity of the problem under discussion in this dissertation.

Methodological basis of research is decrees and orders of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan about the development of languages, education and science, the national program on a professional training and also basic researches in the field of the theory of linguistics, in particular lexicology and translation theory.

According to the theme the present dissertation includes the following **materials**:

1. Different monographs, dissertations, scientific articles on linguistics, translation theory and neighboring fields written by foreign and our scholars.
2. Different types of explanatory, encyclopedic and translation dictionaries of the English language compiled in the last two decades.
3. The fiction books published in the last two centuries and written by leading American, British and Russian authors.

The methods of investigation used in this research are as following:

-Complex approach to the study of polysemantic words in English and Russian.

-Translational method to analyse the difficulties of translation of polysemantic words.

-Componential analysis, applied to investigate the semes in the semantic structure of the words.

Theoretical value of the dissertation is that it can serve as a basis for studying lexical, grammatical, stylistic structure of polysemantic words using the new methods of investigation applied in linguistics. It will allow obtaining a deep understanding on the importance of the functional aspect and translation problems of polysemantic words, because this kind of words are most commonly used in the language developing more and more new meanings in different types of discourse.

Practical value of this work is that the material results and practical recommendations can be used in planning and delivering lectures and practical classes on translation theory, lexicology, and comparative stylistics, linguistic typology of the English and Russian languages. Materials and conclusions of the dissertation present certain interest and can be used in preparing new manuals for the theory of translation study courses and can serve the basis for further scientific investigations in this sphere.

The scientific novelty of the work is determined by the new approach to the analysis of translation difficulties of polysemantic words using the methods and procedures of analysis applied in translation theory, also by the concrete results of investigation which give light to some problems of lexical, grammatical and stylistic difficulties of translation of polysemantic words.

The structure of the dissertation. The present dissertation consists of an introduction, four chapters, a conclusion, the list of used literature and an appendix. Each chapter is followed by a conclusion. Introduction tells us about the brief plot of the dissertation. It contains the information about the actuality of the

dissertation, the object and subject of the dissertation, the aims and tasks, the main hypothesis and problems, methodological basis and the materials used in the dissertation, methods of the investigation, theoretical and practical values, the scientific novelty and the structure of the work.

The first chapter is devoted to theoretical basis of the research of polysemantic words. In 1.1. we analyzed the problem of polysemy in the English and Russian languages. In 1.2. we provided the information about the investigation of the problem of polysemy by English and Russian linguists. Here we presented the information about the depth of the investigation made in this sphere of the research, compared opinions of English and Russian linguists and analyzed the existing results. In 1.3. we analyzed new approaches to the study of polysemy in the present day English and Russian languages and revealed two ways of it: diachronically and synchronically.

The second chapter is devoted to the lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words. In 2.1. we presented lexical transformations in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian. Here we pointed out the problem of changing the semantic core of a translated word. In 2.2. we analyzed contextually bound polysemantic words in the English and Russian languages. On the basis of various examples we revealed the role of context in choosing the correct meaning of polysemantic words. In 2.3. we made comparative analyse of the interaction of polysemantic words and their semantic structures in the English and Russian languages. On the basis of comparative analyse the similarities and differences of polysemantic words semantic structures of two languages were revealed.

The third chapter is devoted to the grammatical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words. In 3.1. we investigated polysemantic words in passive voice construction and compared them in English and Russian. Here we emphasized the problem of difference between English and Russian passive forms both in type of form constructions and in frequency. In 3.2. we analyzed specific features of translation of polysemantic verbs “to be” and “to have” from English into Russian.

With the help of different examples we made an attempt to show the semantic possibilities of these verbs, ways of their appliance in English and methods of expressing them in Russian. In 3.3. we discussed the linguistic phenomenon – conversion and found out it as a part of polysemy in English and Russian.

Conversion gives an opportunity to word present different parts of speech, as a result this word becomes polysemantic.

The fourth chapter is devoted to stylistic difficulties of translation of polysemantic words. In 4.1. the method of stylistic compensation in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian was analyzed. This method allows finding out the most suitable meaning of translated polysemantic word instead of giving its equivalent of original text. In 4.2. the influence of polysemy in translating stylistically-marked language units from English into Russian was shown on the basis of different examples. Stylistically-marked units exist in each language and widely used in literature to describe various situations. The variety of polysemantic words meanings can help to find out correct translation of the given word. In 4.3. we discussed the problem of handling the expressional effect of the original text while translating it into another language. Here we showed how the features of polysemantic words to possess plenty of meanings can help to save the expressional effect of the original text.

The conclusion contains information about the main results of the dissertation, their scientific and practical value and the solution of investigated problem. All the references are given in the list of used literature. The tables with the most common and frequently used polysemantic words and their meanings are presented in tables of appendix.

Chapter one

Theoretical basis of the research of polysemantic words

1.1. The problem of polysemy in the English and Russian language systems

Language is defined as a human system of communication that uses arbitrary signals, such as voice sounds, gestures, or written symbols. But frankly speaking, language is far too complicated, intriguing, and mysterious to be adequately explained by a brief definition. The organic function of the language is to carry meaning. Most of the problems in linguistic science are intimately bound to question of semasiology and call for scientific analysis of communication in words. The study of words is not exclusively a study of roots and stems, of prefixes or suffixes. The mysterious world of words is an object of scientific investigation [13; 25].

Theoretical problems of linguistic form and meaning as relevant to the progressive development of language have attracted the attention of scholars, philosophers and grammarians since the times of Plato and Aristotle. From those times sameness of meaning was not very easy to deal with but there seemed nothing inherently difficult about difference of meaning. The situation is the same nowadays. Not only different words have different meanings; it's also the case that the same word may have a set of meanings. This phenomenon is called polysemy.

Polysemy is the ability of words to have more than one meaning and the words having several meanings are called polysemantic. Most words of the English and Russian languages are polysemantic. Highly developed polysemy is one of the characteristic features of the English and Russian language systems. It should be noted that the wealth of expressive resources of a language largely depends on the degree to which polysemy has developed in the language. Sometimes people who are not very well informed in linguistic matters claim that a language is lacking in

words if the need arises for the same word to be applied to several different phenomena. In actual fact, it is exactly the opposite: if each word is found to be capable of conveying at least two concepts instead of one, the expressive potential of the whole vocabulary increases twofold. Hence, a well-developed polysemy is a great advantage in a language.

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that the number of sound combinations that human speech organs can produce is limited. Therefore at a certain stage of language development the production of new words by morphological means is limited as well, and polysemy becomes increasingly important for enriching the vocabulary. From this, it should be clear that the process of enriching the vocabulary does not consist merely in adding new words to it, but, also, in the constant development of polysemy.

The system of meanings of any polysemantic word develops gradually, mostly over the centuries, as more and more new meanings are added to old ones, or out some of them. So the complicated processes of polysemy development involve both the appearance of new meanings and the loss of old ones. Yet, the general tendency with English and Russian vocabulary systems at the modern stage of their history is to increase the total number of its meanings and in this way to provide for a quantitative and qualitative growth of the language's expressive resources.

There are two causes of development of new meanings. First is the historical one: different kinds of changes in a nation's social life, in its culture, knowledge, technology, arts lead to gaps appearing in the vocabularies which beg to be filled. Newly created objects, new concepts and phenomena must be named: word-building and borrowing foreign ones. New meanings can also be developed due to linguistic factors - the second cause. Linguistically speaking, the development of new meanings, and also a complete change of meaning, may be caused through the influence of other words, mostly of synonyms.

The process of development of a new meaning is traditionally termed transference. Some scholars mistakenly use the term "transference of meaning"

which is a serious mistake. It is very important to note that in any case of semantic change it is not the meaning but the word that is being transferred from one referent into another (from a horse-drawn vehicle into a railway car). The result of such transference is the appearance of new meaning [9; 112].

Words often sign not of one but of several things. The linguistic mechanism works naturally in many ways to prevent ambiguity and provide the clue to distinguish the necessary meaning. It's also important to take into consideration the significance of the context, linguistic or non-linguistic; many ambiguities are never noticed because the various possible meanings are excluded by the situation. Important observations in this area of the vocabulary have been made by contextual, distributional and transformational analysis [16; 185].

The problem of polysemy, in other words, the use of the same word in two or more distinct meanings is relevant to a number of other important questions. These are: the development of different types of synonyms, as a result of semantic transpositions of lexical units and homonymy.

Defining polysemy as a linguistic development, Charles Bally made distinction between its two aspects: first, when one linguistic sign has several meanings, and then, when meaning is expressed by several linguistic signs.

Words may grow in connotative power in accordance with the nature with the meanings connected with them. In the power of connotation lies the reserve force of language. Without this language would lose much of its expressivity and flexibility.

The frequency of polysemy in different languages is a variable depending on various factors. Languages where derivation and composition are sparingly used tend to fill the gaps in vocabulary by adding new meaning to existing terms.

Polysemy more often occurs in generic words than in specific terms whose meanings are less subject to variation [7; 214-215].

It is extremely important not to lose sight of the fact that few words have simple meanings. Practically most words have, besides their direct meaning, a fringe of associated meanings. As a matter of fact, language owes very much of its

expressive power to the ideas and emotions associated with words. There are usually a variety of associated meanings which appear in varying degrees of prominence determined by the context.

The course followed by words used in different context and the shifts of meaning presents a major interest in contrastive lexicology and typological study of languages.

Some meanings invariably come to the fore when we hear the word in actual speech or see in written. Other meanings make themselves evident only when the word is used in certain contexts. The context makes the meaning explicit, in other words, brings them out. This is not to say that polysemantic words have meanings only in context. As has already been emphatically stressed the semantic structure of the word is a dialectic entity and involves dialectical permanency and invariability [14; 126-127].

Meaning should always be understood as involving the relation of language to the rest of the world and such meaningfulness is an essential part of the definition of language.

The distributional analysis of meaning makes it possible to reveal a great deal about the total functioning and use of words in a language. It gives sufficient evidence to recognize that part of the total meaning of many words in all languages is to be determined by their relations with other words in both the basic dimensions of linguistic analysis, syntagmatic and paradigmatic. Words as individual lexical items are structurally related to each other [14; 129].

A special interest is presented by the polysemantic words whose meaning is based on a wide notional basis. Such lexical units can be used as function words revealing the tendency to partial or complete semantic depletion.

The importance of studying the phenomenon of polysemy is obvious because it is the object of confusion and in order to provide a quantitative and qualitative growth of the language's expressive resources it is extremely important to investigate the semantic changes in the system of meanings in the English and Russian language systems. To understand a text, learners need to know words and

knowing a word involves knowing: its spoken and written contexts of use its patterns with words of related meaning.

1.2. Investigation of the problem of polysemy by English and Russian linguists

The researches of the multiplicity of meanings began in eighteenth century and were continued in the nineteenth century. The most important investment in this century was made by Bréal whose research into polysemy marked a new starting point: he shifted the study of polysemy away from lexicography and etymology and investigated polysemy as the always synchronic pattern of meaning surrounding a word is itself he ever changing result of semantic change [6; 154].

The important researches in the sphere of polysemy were also made by Lyon who considers polysemy and homonymy as two types of lexical ambiguity and introduce some criteria for deciding when it is polysemy and when it is homonymy. One criterion is etymological information about the lexical item in question. Lexical items with the same origin are considered as polysemantic, whereas if they have evolved from distinct lexemes in some earlier stage of the language then they are regarded as homonymous [15; 123-124].

Lexical meaning of every word depends upon the part of speech to which the word belongs. Every word may be used in a limiting set of syntactical functions, and with the definite valency. It has a definite set of grammatical meanings, and a definite set of forms.

Every lexico-grammatical group of words or class is characterized by its own lexico-grammatical meaning, forming, as it were, the common denominator of all the meanings of the words which belongs to this group. The lexico-grammatical meaning may be also regarded as a feature according to which these words are grouped together. Many recent investigations are devoted to establishing word classes on the basis of similarity of distribution.

In the lexical meaning of every separate word the lexico-grammatical meaning common to all the words of the class to which this word belongs is

enriched by additional features and becomes particularized [6; 205-206].

In summing up this point, we note that the complexity of the notion is determined by the relationships of the extra-linguistic reality reflected in human consciousness. The structure of every separate meaning depends on the linguistic syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationships because meaning is an inherent component of language. The complexity of every word meaning is due to the fact that it combines lexical meaning with lexico-grammatical meaning and sometimes with emotional coloring, stylistic peculiarities and connotations born from previous usage.

Defining polysemy as a linguistic development, Charles Bally made distinction between its two aspects: first, when one linguistic sign has several meanings, and then, when meaning is expressed by several linguistic signs.

Words may grow in connotative power in accordance with the nature with the meanings connected with them. In the power of connotation lies the reserve force of language. Without this language would lose much of its expressivity and flexibility.

The frequency of polysemy in different languages is a variable depending on various factors. Languages where derivation and composition are sparingly used tend to fill the gaps in vocabulary by adding new meaning to existing terms.

The modern term polysemy was popularized by Bréal in 1887. Most modern linguists dealing with the problem of polysemy refer to the crucial date, but they rarely look further back into the past.

The “roots” of the concept of polysemy lie in the Greek philosophy, that is, the debate surrounding the problem of naturalness or arbitrariness of signs as debated in Plato’s (429-347B.C.) *Cratylus*. In his account of Plato’s contribution to linguistics, Fred Householder points out that Democritus (460-mid-4th century B.C.) offered four arguments in favour of arbitrariness:

- 1) homonymy or polysemy — the same sequence of phonemes may be associated with two or more unrelated meanings;
- 2) polyonymy or isorophy — the existence of synonyms;

- 3) metonymy — the fact that words and meaning change;
- 4) nonymy — the non-existence of single words for simple or familiar ideas.

Polysemy meant primarily what was later to be called “homonymy”, referring to the multiple, but unrelated meaning of a word. Bréal still subsumed homonymy under the heading of polysemy [18; 25].

The term polyonymy was also used by the Stoics studying how one and the same object may receive many different names, how it can become “manynamed” or polyonomous.

During the Middle Ages the interpretation by the Holy Scriptures came up against the problem of polysemy that was acknowledged, but one that had been tampted (by the theory of four senses).

The first who used the term polysemous in a relatively modern sense was Dante, who wrote about polysemous character of a poem: “Istius operis non est simplex sensus, immo dici potest polysemum, hoc est plurium sensum” (“this work doesn’t have one simple meaning, on the contrary, I say that it can be polysemous, that is can have many meanings”) [22; 176].

When presenting his poem to Cangrante della Scala, Dante makes immediately clear that it has to be read as a “polysemous” (“polysemantic”) message. One of the most celebrated examples of what Dante means of polysemy is given in his analyses of some verses of Psalm, in “Exit Israel de Aegypto”. Following the medieval theory, Dante says concerning the fierst verse of the Psalm: “ If we look at the letter it means the exodus of the sons of Israel from Egypt at the time of Moses; if we look at the allegory, it means our redemption through Christ; if we look at the moral sense it means the conversation of soul from the misery of sin to the state of grace; if we look at the mystical sense it means the departure of sanctified spirit from the servitude of his corruption to the freedom of eternal glory” [22; 192-193].

Thinking about meaning, language and it’s relation to the real and figurative word advanced enormously during the Renaissance, but real research into the

multiplicity of meaning only began in the 18th century, with the study of neologisms, synonyms and the figures of speech.

Bréal observed modern meaning of the word, yesterday's and today's meaning, with which we first become familiar—something recently rediscovered in England. In 1985, the department of English at the Birmingham ran of computer analysis of words as they are actually used in English and came up with the surprising results. The primary dictionary meanings of words are often far from the sense in which they were actually used. Keep, for instance, is usually defined as to retain, but in fact the word is much more often employed in the sense of continuing, as in “keep cool” and “keep smiling”. See is only rarely required in the sense of utilizing one's eyes, but much more often used to express the idea of knowing, as in “I see what you mean” [12; 83].

Language understanding and language acquisition follow the opposite route of language change. In both cases, the last, not the first or primitive meaning of a word is a basic meaning.

In Anglo-American world, polysemy was rediscovered with the advent of cognitive semantics in 1980s. Cognitive linguists began to reconnect synchronic and diachronic research into meaning.

Bréal knew that, diachronically, polysemy stems from the fact that the new meaning or values that words acquire in use do not automatically eliminate the old ones — polysemy is therefore the result of semantic innovation. The new and the old meanings exist in the parallel. And yet, synchronically, or in language use, polysemy doesn't really exist — sense selection in the comprehension process is not a problem at all. In the context of discourse a word has one meaning — except, one should point out, in jokes and puns. The most important factor that brings about the multiplication of meaning diachronically and that helps to “reduce” the multiplicity of meaning synchronically is the context of discourse. We understand polysemantic words because the words are always used in the context of a discourse and a situation, which eliminate all the adjoining meaning in favour of only one in question [12; 91].

However, in the constant dialectical relation between synchrony and diachrony, and between meaning and understanding incremental changes in the meaning of words occur having understood a word in a certain context in a slightly divergent way, become themselves speakers and might use a word in the newly understood way in yet another context, which again bring about different types of understanding, and so on. In the long run, these slightly variations in use and uptake may lead to major semantic changes.

Bréal was fascinated by the fact that when talking to each other we neither get confused by the multiplicity of meaning that a word may have, nor are we bothered with the etymological ancestry of a word, traced by historical dictionaries. The scientist was acutely aware of the fact that semantic, cognitive and developmental side of the language was not yet on a par with the advances made in the study of phonetics, of the more physiological side of language. With Bréal semantics as a linguistic discipline made a first step into the future, the future in which we are still participating and to which we are still contributing beyond the end of the 20th century.

There followed a period of polysemous latency, so to speak, after the advent of transformational generative grammar with its focus on syntax and later feature semantics. Polysemy was illustrated by the research undertaken by Hans Blumerberg, Uriel Weireich, Harald Weireich, James McCawley, and Charles Fillmore.

Russian linguists also paid great attention to the investigations in the semantic sphere. The linguists who devoted numbers of their researches to the problem of polysemy were A.I. Smirnitsky, A.A. Shakhmatov, D.N. Ushakov, A.A. Peshkovskiy, R.S. Ginsburg, G.Y. Knyazeva, A.A. Reformatskiy, L.Y. Maksimov, A.N. Koonin, A.N. Ivanov.

In their works they presented an overview of polysemy with reference to different models employed for understanding and interpreting the problem at hand.

For example D.N. Ushakov in his work discusses the word meanings. He addresses one of the central problems of lexical semantics: the sensitivity of word

meaning to context which creates difficulties for the description of the content of the meaning of a word. There, he illustrates the symptoms of distinctness in sense modules of words with close reference to antagonism and discreteness. Ushakov suggests for unity/integrity of the meaning of a word. He illustrates the difference of views of a single element by different perceptors, introduces the idea of discontinuity in word meaning where he argues that there are a few factors which play important roles in case of discontinuity of word meaning. The first source of discontinuity is sub-sense of words; the second one is the facets, while the third one is what he calls 'ways of seeing' (WOS). To substantiate his first proposition (sub-sense), he furnishes some examples which support his argument. The idea of superordinate and co-hyponyms further strengthens his proposition. The properties of facets, illustrated here, are based on discreteness and unity. The WOS are classified as seeing something meronymically, taxonomically, and in terms of its interactions with other things. In conclusion, following Lyons, Ushakov states that there is no such thing as 'the meaning of a word' in isolation from particular contexts: decontextualization of meaning is variable, and in principle, always incomplete [87; 30-51].

A.N. Koonin describes polysemy with an example of a lexical item obtained from different dictionaries either compiled manually or developed compiling data. In his works he showed how dictionaries can recognize multiple senses of a single word. He observed and analyzed corpus attestations of a word comparing with the citations obtained from major dictionaries of Russian. Different figures and tables are furnished to support his argument that the number of sense distinctions that show up in the corpus far exceeds the number of distinctions that are provided in the dictionaries. Moreover, the dictionaries fail to capture many varied metaphorical uses of the words to be found. He argues that lexical semantics is in a poor position to solve the problem of polysemy because polysemy is a prototypical concept having a few marked features which probably can be accessed if an investigation on polysemy includes corpus-based lexicography, combinational properties of lexical items and the design of inference systems built on natural

language texts [26; 111-128].

A.I. Smirnitsky considered polysemy as a processing system, the goal of which is to produce a useful linguistic analysis of any piece of text passed to it. He refers to a system he uses for word sense disambiguation and postulate if word sense disambiguation is at all feasible. He described his system which encompasses a set of methodologies for sorting, weighing and navigating through linguistic representations produced during the analysis of a corpus. His system combines in a natural way paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and statistical information, encoding a sophisticated analysis of the linguistic context in which each corpus token appears. He shows how his system can efficiently deal with polysemy and word sense disambiguation. His works are mainly concerned with different distribution of words in topical context, and sense discrimination and labeling. In conclusion, he argues that his system provides the representational capabilities needed to capture sense modulation to allow the free acquisition of new words, new meanings, and information about how words are actually used by speakers [47; 21-36].

This principled polysemy approach was also considered by British linguists Tyler and Evan who targeted the first of the two problem areas. First, they proposed criteria to determine when two usages constitute different senses, aiming at doing more justice to the role of context and distinguishing polysemy from vagueness; second, they proposed criteria to identify the prototype, or sanctioning sense, of a polysemantic category. As for the former, for some usage to count as a distinct sense of word it must contain additional meaning not apparent in other senses associated with this word (the meaning criterion) and it will feature unique or highly distinctive syntagmatic/collocational patterns (the concept elaboration criterion) and similarly distinctive structural dependencies (the grammatical criterion); the latter two criteria, thus, make an implicit reference to the study of corpus data. As for the latter, Evans (2004) lists four linguistic criteria (mentions additional empirical evidence of the type discussed by Lakoff) diachronic primacy, predominance in the lexical network, predictability regarding

other senses, and – for time – a sense involving experience at the phenomenological level for over – relations to other prepositions.

This approach is promising as it is among the first to propose more rigorous decision principles; on the other hand, it is clear that the concept elaboration and the grammatical criterion as well as many of the prototype criteria (which, curiously, do not feature acquisitional primacy although this should be more relevant to speakers than etymology) are gradable and may not converge just as the more traditional criteria. Nonetheless, the proposed criteria will probably help make decisions more replicably especially as more empirical evidence guiding linguists' decision is gathered.

The majority of the contributors have rightly appreciated the importance of a huge database in the form of meaning in the whole process of sense disambiguation of polysemantic words. Let us hope that such recognition of meaning will enable researchers to be more empirical in approach towards linguistic studies both in theoretical and applied domains.

In the context of corpus-based computational analysis of meanings of words, the last principle of the classical approach is probably defunctional because corpus-based approach is entirely empirical where multiple finer shades of sense of particular words can be retrieved if its different contextual uses are appropriately referred. It is now almost certain that the context of words can provide so much of information which might not be available from the words if isolated from their contexts of occurrence. Moreover, contextual information performs an important role in word sense disambiguation as well as in actual sense retrieval. This notion might have inspired J.R. Firth to make such proverbial comments like “Meaning is not a hidden mental process. It is simply a complex of contextual relations the meaning of a word can be known by the company it keeps. The main concern of descriptive linguistics is to make statements of meaning. There is no meanings of words, apart from human participants in a social context” [28; 13-29] etc.

It is understood that the approaches proposed by Dolan and Schuetze can be relevant and useful for information retrieval where the task is to match the query

context similar to contexts in the database of documents, but is not clear to us how the application of such models would be fruitful in machine translation without extensive manual intervention in the form of encoding (at word, phrase or sentence level). The description of the factors involved is really an essential aspect for matching of senses of the translation-equivalents in bilingual corporations. It is equally important, as Biber, Conrad and Reppen show, for capturing multiple semantic senses of a single word even in a monolingual corpus.

Most of scientists consider term as a word or word-group, denoting special notions in the definite sphere of knowledge or professional activity [18; 34, 75; 29, 20; 63, 43; 4-18, 12; 359]. But translational and lexico-graphic practice shows that many of them are used in different spheres of science and life and have more than one meaning. An important feature of the modern stage of scientific and technical progress is in the mutual penetration of special terminology from one sphere of knowledge into others. That is why great attention is paid to the contro-versial problem of polysemy in English terminology.

One of the most important drawbacks of polysemantic words is that there is sometimes a chance of misunderstanding when a word is used in a certain meaning but accepted by a listener or a reader in another [10; 7]. Generally speaking, it is common knowledge that context is a powerful preventative against any misunderstanding of meanings [16; 139]. Each individual meaning of the word can be determined by a context, the minimal stretch of speech. This is not to imply that polysemantic words have meanings only in context. The semantic structure of the word has an objective existence as a dialectical entity which embodies dialectical permanency and variability.

1.3. New approaches to the study of polysemy in the present day

English and Russian languages

As a result of the researches mentioned above approaches to the study of polysemy in English and Russian can be seen from two ways: diachronically, synchronically. If polysemy is analyzed diachronically it is understood as the development of the semantic structure of the word or we establish how the meaning of the word has changed whether it has got new meanings in the course of the development of the language. From the point of view one of the meanings of the word will be primary meanings; that is such a meaning of a word which was first registered. All other meanings are secondary meanings. The term secondary meanings show that the meaning appeared in the language after the primary meaning was already established.

Example: The primary meaning of the word

a) *fox* is *лиса, лисица* but such meanings of this word as *лисий мех, первокурсник* are secondary meanings.

b) *eye* the primary is *глаз*, secondary is *взгляд, глазок в двери, ушко иголки, петельки*.

c) *father* the primary meaning is *отец* secondary meaning is *старейший член семьи, родоначальник, духовный отец* and etc.

Synchronically polysemy is understood as the coexistence of various meanings of the word at a certain historical period of the development of English. Synchronically the main problem of polysemy is to establish whether all the meanings of polysemantic word are equally important. Linguists divide the meanings of polysemantic word into two: the major meaning of a word, the minor meaning of a word. In most cases the surrounding context points out quite clearly which of the meanings of polysemantic word is intended:

1. It is a *fox*. Here *it* shows that the word *fox* is used in the meaning of *лиса*.

2. She is a *fox*. The presence of *she* shows that *fox* is in the meaning of *хитрый*.

3. She will *fox* him. We find the meaning from the position of *fox*. It stands after the auxiliary verb *will* and the direct object *him*. Here it is used in the meaning of *обманывать*.

The meaning which is not dependent on context is the major meaning of polysemantic word and the meanings which are dependent on the context are minor meanings. By context we mean the minimal stretch of speech determining each individual meaning of the word.

The comparative study of the frequency value of different meanings of polysemantic words shows that the frequency value of individual meanings is different. Example: the meaning of the word *table- стол* (a piece of furniture) possesses the highest frequency value and comprises 52% of all uses of this word [25; 78].

The frequency of polysemy in different languages is a variable depending on a number of factors. The progress of civilization will make it necessary not only to form new words but to add fresh meanings to old ones; in Breal's formula, the more senses a term has accumulated the more diverse aspects of intellectual and social activity it represents. It would be interesting to explore over a wider field the relation between polysemy and cultural progress. Mean while, the frequency of polysemy will also depend on purely linguistic factors. As already noted, languages where derivation and composition are sparingly used will tend to fill gaps in vocabulary by adding new meanings to existing terms. Similarly polysemy will arise more often in generic words whose meaning varies according to context than in specific terms whose sense is less subject to variation. The relative frequency of polysemy in various languages may thus provide a further criterion for semantic typology, though once again it is hard to see now this feature could be exactly measured [20; 134].

All the types discussed depend upon some comparison between the earlier (whether extinct or still in use) and the new meaning of the given word. This comparison may be based on the difference between notions expressed or referents in the real word that are pointed out, on the type of psychological association at work, on evaluation of the latter by the speaker or, possibly, on some other feature. The order in which various types are described will follow more or less closely the diachronic classifications on M. Breal and M. Paul. No attempt at a new classification is considered necessary. There seems to be no point in augmenting the number unsatisfactory schemes already offered in literature. The treatment is therefore traditional.

M. Breal was probably the first to emphasize the fact that in passing from general usage into special sphere of communication a word as a rule undergoes some sort of specialization of its meaning. Polysemantic word *case*, for instance, alongside its general meaning of circumstances in which a person or a thing is possesses special meanings; in law (a law suit), in grammar (possessive case), in medicine (a patient, an illness) [18; 93].

The general not specialized meaning is also very frequent in present day English. The process reverse to specialization is termed generalization and widening of meaning. In that case the scope of the new notion is wider than that of the original one whereas the content of the notion is proper. In most cases generalization is combined with a higher order of abstraction than in the notion expressed by the earlier meaning. The transition from a concrete meaning to an abstract one is a most frequent feature in the semantic history of words. The change may be explained as occasioned by situations in which not all the features of the notions rendered are of equal importance for the message [18; 101].

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish the instances of generalization combined with a fading of lexical meaning ousted by the grammatical or by the emotional meaning that take its place. These phenomena are closely connected with the peculiar characteristics of grammatical structure typical of each individual language. One observes them, for instance, studying the semantic history of the

English auxiliary and semi –auxiliary verbs, especially *have, do, shall, will, turn, go* and that of some English prepositions and adverbs which in the course of time have come to express grammatical relations.

An exact definition of any basic term is no easy task altogether. In the case of lexical meaning it becomes especially difficult due to the complexity of the process by which language and human conscience serve to reflect outward reality and to adapt it to human needs. The definition of lexical meaning has been attempted more than once in accordance with the main principles of different linguistic schools. The disciples of F. de Saussure consider meaning to be the relation between the object or notion named and the name itself. Descriptive linguistics of the Bloomfieldian trend defines the meaning as the situation in which the word is uttered. Both ways of approach afford no possibility of a further investigation of semantic problems in strictly linguistic terms and therefore, if taken as a basis for general linguistic theory, give no insight into the mechanism of meaning.

Synchronically we understood polysemy as the coexistence of various meanings of the same word at a certain period of the development of the English language. These two approaches are promising in the study of polysemy as they are among the first to propose more rigorous decision principles to the problem of polysemy in the English and Russian language systems. On the other hand, it is clear that the concept elaboration and the grammatical criterion as well as many of the prototype criteria (which curiously do not feature acquisition primacy although this should be more relevant to speakers than etymology) are gradable and may not converge just as the more traditional criteria. Nonetheless, the proposed criteria will probably help to make decisions more replicable especially as more empirical evidence guiding linguists' decisions.

Conclusion for chapter one

Language tends to change in time and space. These universal characteristics of language are permanent interest of scholarship. The most important function of any language is to carry the meaning. But as we know not only the sound-form but also the meaning of the word is changed in the course of historical development of a language. It happened under the influence of many factors. Change of meaning is affected through association between the existing meaning and the new one. This association is generally based on the similarity or the contiguity of meanings. Due to numeral changes of meaning such a phenomenon as multiplicity of word meanings or polysemy appeared.

The first chapter of present dissertation is devoted to theoretical basis of the research of polysemantic words. In 1.1. we analyzed the problem of polysemy in the English and Russian language systems and made following conclusions: polysemy is certainly not an anomaly. Most English and Russian words are polysemantic. It should be commented that the wealth of representative resources of a language largely depends on the extent to which polysemy has developed in the language. Sometimes uninformed in linguistic people claim that a language is lacking in words if the need arises for the same word to be laid on to several different phenomena. In real fact it is exactly the opposite: if each word is found to be capable of conveying at least two concepts instead of one, the expressive potential of the whole vocabulary increases twofold. Hence, well-developed polysemy is a great advantage in a language.

Polysemy is inherent in the very nature of words and concepts as every object and every notion has many features and a concept reflected in a word always contains a generalisation of several traits of the object. Some of these traits or components of meaning are common with other objects. Hence the possibility of using the same name in secondary nomination for objects possessing common

features which are sometimes only implied in the original meaning. A word when acquiring new meaning or meanings may also retain, and most often retains the previous meaning.

In 1.2. we provided the information about the investigation of the problem of polysemy by English and Russian linguists. Here we presented the information about the depth of the investigation made in this sphere of the research, compared opinions of English and Russian linguists and analyzed the existing results.

Although only in the nineteenth century Bréal turned to polysemy as a phenomenon of language use, language acquisition and language change. The linguist wanted to establish semantics as a new branch of general linguistics, independent of etymology and lexicography. Bréal stated that new meanings of words eliminate old ones or exist with them in parallel. It means that the main source of the polysemy is the semantic innovation. Many other famous linguists were engaged in the studies of meaning and polysemy.

In 1.3. we analyzed new approaches to the study of polysemy in the present day English and Russian languages and revealed two ways of it: diachronically and synchronically. If polysemy is analyzed diachronically it is understood as the development of the semantic structure of the word or we establish how the meaning of the word has changed whether it has got new meanings in the course of the development of the language. Synchronically we understood polysemy as the coexistence of various meanings of the same word at a certain period of the development of the English language.

A.N. Koonin describes polysemy with an example of a lexical item obtained from different dictionaries, while A.I. Smirnitsky considered polysemy as a processing system, the goal of which is to produce a useful linguistic analysis of any piece of text passed to it. The majority of the contributors have rightly appreciated the importance of a huge database in the form of meaning in the whole process of sense disambiguation of polysemantic words.

So, in general both English and Russian linguists examined polysemy, and contrasted a range of current approaches, and highlighted many unresolved

problems in the theoretical understanding of polysemy and the present computational challenges. In essence, their works will be highly useful for those who are working in the area of polysemy and word sense disambiguation.

Chapter two

Lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words

2.1. Lexical transformations in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian

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

Great number of works were devoted to the subject matter of the theory of translation, semantic and pragmatic aspects of translation, the nature of translation theory. As an example we can name I.D.Shvaytser “Semantic and pragmatic aspects of translation”, L.S.Barkhudarov “Grammatical problems of translation and grammatical transformations”, A.M.Fiterman “Lexical problems of translation and lexical transformations”, A.D.Shveitser “Stylistics aspects of translation and its socio - regional problems”, etc.

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. 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 reason of this fact is 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.

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. Lexical transformations change the semantic core of a translated polysemantic word. They can be classified into the following groups:

1. **Lexical substitution** or putting one word in place of another. It often results from the different semantic structures of the source language and target language words. Thus polysemantic word *young* is not always translated as *молодой*; rather, it depends on its word combinability: *молодой картофель* is equal to *new potatoes*. This translation equivalent is predetermined by the word combination it is used in.

Deliberate lexical substitution as a translation technique of polysemantic words can be of several subtypes:

a) Specification or lexical transformation of polysemantic words with a wider meaning with words of a narrower meaning: *Will you do the room?* – *Ты уберешься в комнате?* *I'll get the papers on the way home.* – *Я куплю газеты по дороге домой.* The underlined English polysemantic words have larger scopes of meaning than their Russian counterparts and their particular semantics is recognized from the context.

b) Generalization or lexical transformation of polysemantic words of a narrower meaning with those of a wider meaning: *People don't like to be stared at.* – *Людам не нравится, когда на них смотрят.* If we compare the semantic structure of the English and Russian verbs, we can see that the English polysemantic verb *stare* specifies the action of seeing expressed by the Russian verb. The Russian *смотреть* can imply staring, facing, eyeing, etc. The specific meaning in the Russian sentence can be expressed by the adverb *пристально*.

c) Differentiation is a rather rare technique of lexical transformation. It takes place when we substitute polysemantic word by another one with parallel meaning, denoting a similar species: *bamboo curtain* – *железный занавес*. Both *bamboo*

and *железо* (*iron*) are materials known for their hard nature. They are used figuratively to denote the barriers between the Western and Communist countries (*bamboo curtain* in reference to China, *железный занавес* in reference to other Comecon (Council for Mutual Economic Aid) states. There are no hyponymic relations between the notions of *bamboo* and *iron* (though the referential area of *железный занавес* is of course much wider than that of *bamboo curtain*.)

d) Modulation is a logical development of the notion expressed by the word: *But outside it was raining.* — *Но на улице шел дождь.* The primary equivalent of the polysemantic word *outside* is *снаружи*. But it is impossible to say in Russian *Ho снаружи шел дождь*. By means of unsophisticated logical operation the translator finds another equivalent: *на улице*. Thus he takes into consideration a tradition of the word combination and acceptability of collocation. He is aided in this by the metonymical closeness of word meanings based on contiguity of the two notions.

2. Lexical compensation is a deliberate introduction of some additional element in the target text to make up for the loss of a similar element in the source text. The main reason for this transformation is a vocabulary lacuna in the target language. For example, one of the Galsworthy's characters was called *a leopardess*. But there is no one-word equivalent of the same stylistic coloring in Russian. Therefore, the translator compensated the word by using the word *тигрица* to characterize the lady.

3. Metaphoric transformations are based on transferring the meaning due to the similarity of notions. The target language can re-metaphorize polysemantic word or a phrase by using the same image *Don't dirty your hands with that money!* — *He марай рук этими деньгами!* or a different one *Он вернет нам деньги, когда рак свистнет.* — *He will pay us our money back when hell freezes over.* The source language metaphor can be destroyed if there is no similar idiom in the target language: *Весна уже на пороге.* — *Spring is coming very soon.* Or, on the contrary, the target text is metaphorized either to compensate a stylistically marked word or phrase whose coloring was lost for some reason, or merely to express a

source language lacuna: *Он решил начать жить по-новому. – He decided to turn over a new life.*

Lexical transformations are also caused by necessity to concretize polysemantic word while translating. It is characteristic to English language the availability of polysemantic words with wide spread meaning. They can be nouns, adjectives and verbs, for example: *thing, point, stiff; nice, fine, bad; to say, to go, to come, to get.*

Translation of these polysemantic words depends on the context, which helps to identify their concrete meaning. Usually they are translated by various Russian words that have concrete meaning (importance). Practically it refers to verbs – to verbs of speech and verbs of movement. Concrete lexical meaning (importance), this or that the lexical-semantic variant of a verb depends on structure and lexical meaning of polysemantic words that distribute them.

At the by-election victory went to the Labor candidate.

На дополнительных выборах победа досталась лейбористам (победу одержал кандидат от лейбористской партии).

Sometimes it is necessary to concretize some polysemantic words due to different qualitative distinction the generalizing words have in languages. The following polysemantic words belong to them: *meal* and *трапеза* that usually illustrate this phenomenon and the words *limbs* and *члены*, from which *limbs* is widely common, and Russian word the *члены* has much narrower usage.

The following problem which demands careful consideration in lexical transformations of translation is problem of polysemantic words combinability. In all languages there are typical norms of polysemantic word combinability. The concept of norm is relative, on the one hand, with system of language, and on the other hand, it is closely connected with speech, in which the originality of speech formation is displayed. Each language can form uncountable number new polysemantic word combinations that will be understood by its bearers. In any language there exists generally accepted tradition of polysemantic word

combinations, which do not coincide with the corresponding tradition of word combinations in the other languages.

And it makes look for similarly accepted polysemantic word combinations in the target language. The main part combined words usually coincides in translation, but the second one is frequently translated by a word possessing other logical meaning, but performing the same function, as for example, *trains run – поезда ходят*, rich feeding – *обильная пища*.

The wider is the semantic volume of polysemantic word, the wider is its combinability, thus due to this feature it can interact with various word forms and word combinations. And this feature enables the translator to use his creativity in translation.

Along with traditional combinations in languages unexpected combinations are also possible, but they are quite clear, for they follow generally accepted semantic models of polysemantic word combinability. This phenomenon – the connection of polysemantic words with completely various semantic features – is peculiar to all languages, but in each language it has various rules and traditions. In English language such unexpected polysemantic word combinations are formed very easily. It is probably caused by conversion and easiness in formation of new words in various ways, heterogeneity of languages vocabulary and some other reasons. Not only poets and writers, but also journalists frequently create unexpected polysemantic word combination that makes their statements significantly vivid and original. The unexpectedness of word usage is closely connected with expressiveness of the statement.

Unexpected usage of polysemantic word combinations hardens the task of translators, for words interrelate in combinations not only with one word, but also with a large number of other words of the sentence.

The use of polysemantic adjective *sharp* in particular context can be unexpected: none of its meanings given in dictionaries gives the description of a hand. The difficulty of its translation is aggravated by presence of the second definition *white*, which excludes translation by words *костлявый* and *сухой*.

The last feature of lexical transformations in translation of polysemantic words to be discussed in this dissertation is traditional word usage for every language and which causes frequent lexical transformations. This traditional usage is to some extent related to another approach to the phenomena of reality. For example: *The military base is built on terraces rising from the lake.* For Russian the traditional use will be: *Военная база построена на террасах, спускающихся к озеру.* In this case preposition is omitted in translation because as the originality of the English word usage required complete transformation.

Divergences in the semantic structure of polysemantic words of the source and target languages are one of the primary cases of lexical transformations. These divergences or dissimilitudes are connected with certain peculiar features of polysemantic word or a group of words. Even words which seem to have the same meaning in the two languages are not semantically identical. The primary meanings of correlated polysemantic words often coincide while their derivative meanings do not. Thus there is only partial correspondence in the structures of polysemantic words as their lexical semantic variants do not cover one another. Semantic correlation is not to be interpreted as semantic identity and one-to-one correspondence between the semantic structures of correlated polysemantic words in the two languages is hardly ever possible.

Such partial correspondence may be illustrated by the following analysis of the correlated words *table* and *стол*. Their primary meanings denoting the same article of furniture are identical. But their secondary meanings diverge. Other lexical semantic variants of the word *table* are: part of the machine-tool; slab of wood (stone); matter written on this; level area, plateau; palm of hand, indicating character of fortune, etc. Lexical semantic variants of the word *стол* are: еда, пища, (шведский стол, диетический стол); учреждение, отдел в канцелярии (паспортный стол, стол находок) etc.

Not infrequently the primary meaning (and sometimes the derivative meanings as well) of an English polysemantic word consist of more than one semantic component or some, forming the so-called “bundles” of semantic

elements. This is usually reflected in dictionaries which give more than one Russian equivalent of each English polysemantic word.

2.2. Contextually bound polysemantic words in English and Russian languages

A polysemantic word, as has been shown, is a word having several meanings or lexical-semantic variants. These lexical-semantic variants possess both lexical and grammatical features which are closely interwoven. These different meanings or lexical-semantic variants of polysemantic words are revealed in the context. By the term “context” is understood the minimum stretch of speech determining each individual meaning of a word.

The context individualizes the meaning of polysemantic word, brings it out and reveals the intended lexical-semantic variant. It is in this sense that we say that the meaning of a polysemantic word is determined by the context. The term context comprises both the *narrow* or micro context and the *wide* or macro context. The narrow context implies sentence or even a word combination, e.g.: *bright star* – *яркая звезда*; *bright wine* – *прозрачное вино*; *bright day* – *светлый день*; *bright reply* – *блестящий ответ*; *a bright boy* – *способный,мышленный мальчик*. The following examples illustrate the importance of the context in translation.

The construction of the UNO was no simple or easy task.

This explains the peculiar construction of the Security Council.

In the first sentence the word *construction* has the meaning of “act of devising and forming” in the second sentence the meaning is “structure”.

These different contexts bring out different lexical-semantic variants of the word *construction* which are reflected in the Russian translation.

Создание ООН было не простой и не легкой задачей.

Это объясняет своеобразную структуру Совета Безопасности.

The importance of the context for translation is obvious. The micro context implies not only lexical but also syntactical ambient elements, e.g.: *the elm stood before the house* – *перед домом стоял вяз*; *he stood a whisky and soda* – *он угостил меня виски с содовой водой*.

The context or the situation not only reveals the intended meaning of a polysemantic word but also its concrete or abstract, its direct or transferred meaning.

A dictator relies upon his army and police force. – direct meaning

Диктатор опирается на свою армию и полицию.

The whole army of words – *вся масса слов* – transferred meaning.

An army of insects – *туча насекомых* – transferred meaning

The so-called contextual meaning is always individual, occasional and context-bound. It lives only in its context and disappears if the context is altered. The contextual meaning of polysemantic word is usually semantically richer than the dictionary meaning because of the connections which it arouses.

In an atomic war women and children will be the first hostages.

Первыми жертвами в атомной войне будут женщины и дети.

The dictionary meaning of the word *hostage* is *заложник*, but in this context it is synonymous with *victim* as every hostage might become a victim and die. Thus the contextual meaning of polysemantic word is not arbitrary; it is inherent in its semantic structure and is brought out by the writer who is able to perceive its potentialities.

In translation polysemantic words context is essential for guessing the meaning of a word. For example, a macrocontext is very important for translating newspaper headlines which are characterized by ellipses not only of structural polysemantic words but also of notional parts of the sentence.

It is obligatory for a translator to take into account, along with the context, the contextual situation, which is often called background knowledge.

Over time, a contextual meaning may become a normative meaning fixed by the dictionary. This occurred, for instance, with the word *dear*. All dictionaries

translated it as *дорогой, милый, любимый*. But in the phrase *my dear* this word is used as a term of a very formal address and, therefore, corresponds to the Russian *глубокоуважаемый*, which has recently been fixed by the 3-volume New English-Russian Dictionary, edited by Y. Apresyan.

To find an occasional equivalent to a word, a logical method of interpolation is used. The contextual meaning of a word, expressed by the occasional equivalent, is found by studying the whole semantic structure of the word and deducing the appropriate meaning from the two adjacent meanings fixed in the dictionary.

For example, in the sentence *the waves lap the granite of the embankment* the word *lap* contextualizes its two meanings at the same time: to drink by taking up with quick movements of the tongue, which corresponds to the Russian *лакать, жадно пить, глотать* and to move or hit with little waves and soft sounds, corresponding to the Russian *плескаться*. The first meaning brings up an image of some kind of creature. The image is retained with the interpolated equivalent in translation: *волны лизут гранит набережной*.

Above mentioned examples clearly show that context prevents from any misunderstanding of meanings. For instance, polysemantic adjective *dull*, if used out of context, would mean different things to different people or nothing at all. It is only in combination with other words that it reveals its actual meaning: *a dull pupil, a dull play, dull weather*, etc. Sometimes, however, such a minimum context fails to reveal the meaning of the word, and it may be correctly interpreted only through a second-degree context as in the following example:

The man was large but his wife was even fatter.

The word *fatter* here serves as a kind of indicator pointing that large describes a stout man and not a big one.

Current research in semantics is largely based on the assumption that one of the more promising methods of investigating the semantic structure of a word is by studying the word's linear relationships with other words in typical contexts - its combinability or collocability.

Scholars have established that the semantics of polysemantic words which regularly appear in common contexts are correlated and, therefore, one of the words within such a pair can be studied through the other [26; 58].

In lexical contexts of primary importance are the lexical groups combined with the polysemantic word under consideration. This can be shown by analyzing different lexical contexts in which polysemantic words, e. g. *heavy* or *come* are used. The adjective *heavy* in isolation is understood as meaning of great weight *heavy cargo, heavy book* etc. When combined with the lexical group of words denoting natural phenomena such as *wind, storm, snow*, it means striking, falling with force, abundant as can be seen from the contexts *heavy rain, wind, snow* etc. In combination with the words *industry, arms, artillery* polysemantic adjective *heavy* has the meaning of the larger kind of something as in *heavy artillery*.

The polysemantic word *come* in isolation has primarily the meaning to arrive, move toward. When we join it the lexical group of prepositions we have more meanings we can imagine, even one preposition, for example *in* and we have nine meanings: *come in*: a) to enter, b) sport to get finish, c) to become fashionable, d) to be found as useful, etc.

In grammatical contexts it is the grammatical structure of the context that serves to determine various individual meanings of a polysemantic word. One of the meanings of polysemantic verb *to make* is to force and can be found only in the grammatical context possessing the structure *to make somebody to do something* or in simpler terms this particular meaning occurs only if the verb *to make* is followed by a noun and the infinitive of some other verb, e.g. *to make somebody laugh, go, write*. Another meaning of this polysemantic verb is to become, to turn out to be is observed in the contexts of a different structure, e. g. *make* followed by an adjective and a noun *to make a good wife, to make a good teacher*.

In a number of contexts, however, we find that both the lexical and grammatical aspects should be taken into consideration. The grammatical structure of the context although indicative of the difference between the meaning of the

word in this structure and the meaning of the same word in a different grammatical structure may be insufficient to indicate in which of its individual meanings of the word in question is used.

Dealing with verbal contexts we consider only linguistic factors: lexical groups of words, syntactic structure of the context and so on. There are cases, however, when the meaning of a polysemantic word is ultimately determined not by these linguistic factors, but by the actual speech situation in which this word is used.

The polysemantic noun *ring* in such context may possess the meaning of a piece of precious metal or a call on the telephone. The meanings of the verb *to get* in this linguistic context may be interpreted as possess or understand depending on the actual situation in which these words are used. It should be pointed out however such cases, though possible, are not actually very numerous. The linguistic context is by far a more potent factor in determining word meaning.

It is of interest to note that not only the denotational but also the connotational component of meaning may be affected by the context. Any polysemantic word which as a language unit is emotively neutral may in certain contexts acquire emotive implications. Compare *fire* in *to insure one's property against fire* and *fire* as a call for help. Another good example is stylistically and emotively neutral polysemantic noun *wall* which acquires laughable emotive implication in William Shakespeare's "Midsummer Night's Dream" in the context: "*O wall, o sweet and lovely wall*". Here we clearly perceive the combined effect of both the linguistic and the extra-linguistic contexts. The polysemantic word *wall* doesn't ordinarily occur in combination with the adjectives, *sweet* and *lovely*. So the peculiar lexical context accounts for the possibility of emotive overtones which are made explicit by the context of situation.

Contextual meaning of a polysemantic word in many instances depends on the character of semantic context, on the semantics of the words combining with it. Occasional meanings, suddenly originated in the context are not always arbitrary –

its is based into the semantic structure of polysemantic word. In contextual usage of a word in poetry or prose – often point to the author’s penetration into the depth of the word’s semantic structure. For paradigmatic and semantic relations it is characteristic to any polysemantic words and the lexical potential of words to be revealed in both cases. But revealing these potentials of polysemantic words is closely connected with the specificity of lexical-semantic aspects of every language and here forth we may observe the difficulty of translation of contextual meaning of words. What is possible in one language maybe impossible in another because of its difference in semantic structure and its usage.

Another one very interesting contextual meaning of *exploitation* will be given in the following example:

Britain’s worldwide exploitation was shaken to the roots by Colonial Liberation Movements.

The contextual meaning of the given polysemantic word originated metonymically – any colonial system lives on exploitation, which comprises basis of colonial power. The corresponding Russian *эксплуатация* can not be used in this contextual meaning, the contextual surroundings of *exploitation* (worldwide, shaken to the roots) also prevents it. The only possible variant of translation is by means of metonymic transposition – substitution:

Колониальное могущество Англии было подорвано (потрясено до основания) национально-освободительным движением во всех колониях.

Contextual meaning of polysemantic word is always effective semantically and stylistically owing to its unexpectedness as well. It often used in stylistic purposes and therefore a translator runs into two obstacles: he should avoid and at the same time not to break the norms of translation. The meanings determined by lexical contexts are sometimes referred to as lexically bound meanings which imply that such meanings are to be found only in certain lexical contexts.

All this leads us to the conclusion that context is a good and reliable key to the meaning of the polysemantic word.

2.3. Comparative analyse of the interaction of polysemantic words and their semantic structures in the English and Russian languages

The semantic structure of polysemantic word is a set of regular meanings featured in a dictionary's entry. Polysemantic words corresponding to each other in their primary meanings are usually non-equivalent in other meaning, which is seen in their word combinations. Let us, for example, compare the translation of polysemantic words *brother* and *брат*. They correspond in their primary meaning: a man or boy with the same parents as another person but in other meanings there are different equivalents:

- Брат: 2. a son of one's aunt or uncle = *двоюродный брат* – *cousin*
3. people sharing the same job = *братья-писатели* – *fellow-writers*
4. familiar or patronizing term of address = *Ну, брат...* – *old man, my lad*
5. a man whose job is to care for people who are ill or injured, especially in hospital = *брат милосердия* – *male nurse*
6. a person = *(два яблока) на брата* – *(two apples) a head*

- Brother: 2. a person sharing the same job = *brother in arms* – *собрат по оружию*
brother-doctor – *коллега-доктор*
3. one who lives in a monastery or convent but is at a low level and usually does the simplest work for the organization = *lay brother* – *послушник*
4. a man who is married to one's sister, or to the sister of one's wife or husband = *brother-in-law* – *(sister's husband) зять, (wife's brother) шурин, (husband's brother) деверь, (wife's sister's husband) свояк*

Even those polysemantic words having the same referential meaning are not full equivalents as far as their connotation is concerned. Thus, an English-Russian

dictionary gives two translations for the polysemantic word *dog*: *собака, нёс*. The former translation equivalent is neutral; the latter is colloquial, expressive. Since the English word *dog* is more general, it is only a partial equivalent to *нёс*.

Or the Russian word *дохлый* is not a full equivalent of the English *dead*, as is given by the Oxford Russian dictionary. *Дохлый* is a very informal, expressive word, whereas *dead* is its neutral counterpart.

Not only the denotative (referential) meaning of polysemantic word, but also its connotative shades should be taken into account in translating:

- Emotional coloring: *doggie – нёсик, bunny – заенька*. The Russian language is known to be abundant in diminutive suffixes (*солнышко, ложечка, чашечка*). Since these suffixes are not as typical in English as in Russian, they are lost in translation: *День склонялся к вечеру. По небу медленно ползли легкие розовые облачка. (В. Арсеньев) - Evening was near, and light pink clouds crept slowly across the sky. (Transl. by V. Shneerson.)*
- Stylistic overtone: *to begin* (neutral) vs. *to commence* (poetic); *husband* (informal) – *spouse* (formal); *спать* (neutral) – *почивать* (poetic);
- Associations: nations have different associations connected with this or that word. Thus, in English polysemantic word *blue* is often associated with something unpleasant: *to look blue – иметь унылый вид; to be blue – иметь плохое настроение; to tell blue stories – рассказывать неприличные истории; to be in a blue funk – быть в ужасной панике; to be in the blue – пойти по плохой дорожке; to burn blue – быть дурным предзнаменованием*. The word *blue* corresponds to the Russian adjectives *синий* and *голубой*. *Синий* is often associated with unpleasant things: *синий от холода (blue with cold), синий чулок (blue stocking), гори оно синим пламенем (to the hell with something)*. *Голубой* has usually positive connotations: *голубые мечты (sweet dreams), голубой песец (blue fox), голубой экран (TV screen); на блюдечке с голубой каемочкой (on a silver platter)*.

Another example: in English, *a chicken* is used derogatory to refer to a cowardly person: *Why won't you jump? Are you a chicken?* In Russian, *цыпленок* is associated with a helpless little creature and is often referred to a small child that needs help.

In translation, the connotative meaning is sometimes lost either because of the neutral text that requires no expressiveness or because of the lacking connotative equivalent (*to commence* – *начинать*; *вечер* – *yesterday*). Usually, these connotatively partial equivalents are compensated in the text (within the same sentence or even in the surrounding sentences). We can illustrate it by the following sentence from Mark Twain's "Tom Sawyer". In the episode of fighting with a Model Boy, Tom teases the boy about his hat: "*Smarty! You think you are some, now, don't you? Oh, what a hat!*" And the boy answers, *You can **lump** that hat if you don't like it. I dare you to knock it off – and anybody that I'll take a dare will suck eggs.*" In the Russian text, the highly colloquial, slangish words and expressions are compensated by slang words and very informal syntactic constructions in both Tom's utterance and the boy's sentence:

- *Ишь, **вырядился!** Подумаешь, какой важный! Еще и в шляпе!*
- *Возьми да и сбей, если не нравится. Попробуй, сбей – тогда узнаешь.*

Polysemantic words do not combine if they do not match speech norms, i.e. their word combinability is beyond the norm. Thus, in Russian we say *молодой картофель* but we cannot say in English *young potatoes*, as the word *potatoes* requires the adjective *new* (*new potatoes*). Polysemantic words in their primary meaning cannot be combined together if their near context is not taken into consideration. The Russians say "*Не пейте сырой воды*", which cannot be rendered by the phrase "*Don't drink raw water*" because English-speaking people use in this case quite a different word combination: "*unboiled water*". So in translation we have to substitute one word for another that naturally fits the context.

Intralinguistic meaning is also revealed in puns, or plays upon polysemantic words, which make most puzzling tasks for a translator. In this case a translator

cannot use translation equivalents but has to compensate a word by another one that can be also played upon. For example, to translate a children's riddle into English: *Why is a book like a king? – Because it has many pages.* (where the word *page* is associated with two homonymous meanings: 1) *страница*, 2) *паж*), a translator compensated the homonymous *page* by the Russian homonym *глава* (1.*head*, 2.*chapter*): *Что общего между книгой и драконом? – У обеих несколько глав.*

The difference in word semantic structures is of a linguistic nature. The meanings of the source language and target language words do not coincide. Even one meaning in reference to different objects is verbalized by different words. For example, polysemantic word *heavy* implies a great amount or quantity of something and, depending on what the 'something' is, it corresponds to different Russian words:

heavy books – *тяжелые книги*;

heavy crop – *богатый урожай*;

heavy sky – *затянутое небо*;

heavy traffic – *большое движение*;

heavy rain – *сильный дождь*;

heavy sea – *бурное море*;

heavy penalty – *суровое наказание*.

Different situations can be named similarly in one language and differently in another language: *провести операцию* – *to perform an operation* (in a hospital); *to carry out / conduct an operation* (on the battlefield).

Varieties of English predetermine different collocations: in British English, people say they *have a bath*; whereas Americans *take a bath*. The British *take a decision*, Canadians and Americans *make a decision*. In Russian, it is *принимать ванну* и *принимать решение* respectively.

Typologically, English and Russian are opposites as far as their tendencies towards meaning generalization / specification and implicit / explicit expression are concerned.

The English language tends to express more general, abstract meanings than does Russian, whose words are more specific, having an additional seme. Therefore, in translating polysemantic words from English into Russian, we often employ a transformation of specification: *Old birds are not to be caught with chaff.* – *Старого воробья на мякине не проведешь.* The specified subject is typical of a corresponding Russian proverb. *He went to the shop to get some milk.* – *Он пошел в магазин купить молока.* In this sentence, polysemantic verb *to get* corresponds to the Russian *получать*, with a seme added (*получать за деньги = покупать*). Sometimes a translator has to offer two specified words: (Waiter) *Would you like to take anything?* – *Не хотите ли чего-нибудь выпить или закусить?*

Another contrast is manifested by the tendencies towards implicit and explicit expression. English tends to be implicit and laconic, which means it verbalizes less than Russian. On the other hand, the Russian language is more explicit than English, since it tends to express overtly all the elements of the situation named. Therefore, Russian translations are usually of greater volume than their English source texts. Examples, both of texts and separate sentences and phrases, can be numerous, one instance being the Russian phrase *контроль за ходом проекта* that corresponds to a very compressive English phrase *the Project Control*.

The so called “adverbial polysemantic verbs” is another example of interaction of semantic structures of polysemantic words in the English language. Adverbial verbs are verbs of complex semantics: they express simultaneously two meanings – that of an action and that of its characteristics. For example, *to stare* – *смотреть пристально*; *to shrill* – *пронзительно кричать*. A translation equivalent is usually represented in the dictionary either by a verb and adverb or by a simple verb of complex semantics (*to stare* – *уставиться*), or by a verb and prepositional phrase: *to rumble* – *ехать с грохотом*.

Some polysemantic verbs become adverbial only in context. For example, the verb *to roar* by itself denotes making a long and loud noise and is equal to *реветь, громыхать*. In the sentence *Tanks roared into the city*, the verb indicates

not only producing a loud noise, but also moving. So the sentence corresponds to the Russian *Танки с грохотом въехали в город*. The sense of movement is easily recognized by the preposition *into*. The same role is performed by a postpositional element of a phrasal verb: *The old jalopy clanked up the hill*. – *Старый драндулет с лязгом поднимался в гору*.

Semantically, adverbial polysemantic verbs can be classified into the following groups:

1. Polysemantic verbs expressing movement accompanied by some sound: *to jingle* – *мчаться, звеня бубенцами*; *to creak* – *двигаться со скрипом*; *to bang* – *с хлопком*, etc. These verbs are usually translated with the help of an adverbial participle (деепричастие) or a prepositional and nominal group.
2. Polysemantic verbs expressing a shift from one place into another: *He danced her out into a quiet corridor*. – *Танцуя с ней, он увел ее в пустой коридор*. *The servant bowed the guests out as they left*. – *Слуга с поклонами проводил гостей*. So in this case, either an adverbial participle or a prepositional phrase is used. When it has a metaphoric meaning, the verb can be translated with a simile: *He stormed out of the restaurant*. – *Он, как ураган, вылетел из ресторана*.
3. Polysemantic verbs expressing transition from one state to another: *The train slid to a halt*. – *Поезд плавно остановился*. The adverbial feature is rendered in Russian by an adverb.
4. Polysemantic causative verbs: *The slaves were whipped into work*. – *Рабов заставили работать с помощью кнута*. (translation with a prepositional phrase). *The threat angered him into activity*. – *Эта угроза пробудила его гнев и заставила действовать*. (translated with parallel verbs). *He refused to be blackmailed into silence*. – *Он отказался молчать, несмотря на шантаж*. (translated through substituting parts of speech). *He teased her out of making a scene*. – *Он подтрунивал над ней, чтобы она не устроила ему сцены*. (translated with a subordinate clause).

Polysemantic verbs expressing cause and effect: *Quietly she sang herself that night into fame.* – *Она так пела, что незаметно для себя в тот вечер стала знаменитой певицей.* (translated through a sentence partitioning).

Conclusion for chapter two

The second chapter of present dissertation is devoted to the lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian. In 2.1. we analyzed lexical transformations in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian and came to the following conclusions: 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: lexical substitution, lexical compensation and metaphoric transformations.

Each word affects the meaning of the object it designates. Not infrequently 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.

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.

In 2.2. we presented contextually bound polysemantic words and revealed the impact of the context in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian. Contextual meaning of polysemantic word in many instances depends on the character of semantic context, on the semantics of the words combining with it.

Occasional meanings, suddenly originated in the context are not always arbitrary – its is based into the semantic structure of polysemantic word.

In a number of contexts, however, we find that both the lexical and grammatical aspects should be taken into consideration. The grammatical structure of the context although indicative of the difference between the meaning of the word in this structure and the meaning of the same word in a different grammatical structure may be insufficient to indicate in which of its individual meaning of the word in question is used.

Contextual meaning of polysemantic word is always effective semantically and stylistically owing to its unexpectedness as well. It often used in stylistic purposes and therefore a translator runs into two obstacles: he should avoid and at the same time not to break the norms of translation. The meanings determined by lexical contexts are sometimes referred to as lexically bound meanings which imply that such meanings are to be found only in certain lexical contexts.

In 2.3. we made comparative analyse of the interaction of polysemantic words and their semantic structures in the English and Russian languages and this analyse showed us the following results: the difference in word semantic structures is of a linguistic nature. The meanings of the English language and Russian language polysemantic words do not coincide. Even one meaning in reference to different objects is verbalized by different words. Another contrast is manifested by the tendencies towards implicit and explicit expression. English tends to be implicit and laconic, which means it verbalizes less than Russian. On the other hand, the Russian language is more explicit than English, since it tends to express overtly all the elements of the situation named. Therefore, Russian translations are usually of greater volume than their English source texts. Polysemantic words corresponding to each other in their primary meanings in the English and Russian languages are usually non-equivalent in other meaning, which is seen in their word combinations. Even those polysemantic words having the same referential meaning in both languages are not full equivalents as far as their connotation is concerned.

Chapter three

Grammatical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words

3.1. Polysemantic words in passive voice construction and their comparison in English and Russian

The translation process of polysemantic words from one language into another is inevitable without necessary grammatical transformations. It gets great importance while making translation to add or omit some words since the structures of languages are quite different. Grammatical transformations are characterized by various principles – grammatical and lexical as well, though the principal role is given to grammatical ones.

Sometimes, owing to some reasons some of constructions have wider usage in one languages comparing with other languages. The best example of this is the passive form – widely used in English mostly due to disappearance of word flexion. As a result, both indirect and predicative object maybe transformed into the objects of passive construction.

English and Russian passive forms are different both in type of form constructions and in frequency. English passive voice is used more frequently due to the various types of construction it occurs in. Whereas Russian passive voice construction is formed only by transitive verbs requiring a direct object when used as an active voice structure. With the help of examples we would like to show English passive voice constructions containing polysemantic words and ways of translating them into Russian:

- a) Direct passive: *A book was given to him.* It has a corresponding Russian passive voice form: *Книга была дана ему.*
- b) Indirect passive: *He was given the book.* This form is translated by the corresponding Russian active voice polysemantic verb in the impersonal sentence: *Ему дали эту книгу.*

- c) Prepositional passive: *The article was not referred to.* – *На эту статью не ссылались.* The corresponding Russian impersonal sentence is also with the active polysemantic verb.
- d) Adverbial passive: *The room hasn't been lived in.* When translated into Russian, the passive construction is substituted by an active one, sometimes a subject of the sentence is introduced: *В комнате никто не жил/не живет.*

Thus, only one type of English passive construction has a direct correspondence in Russian. But not all English direct passive constructions can be transformed into Russian passive, since the verb transitivity in English and Russian does not coincide. For example: *to enter the room* – *войти в комнату*, *to join the party* – *вступить в партию*, *to follow somebody* – *следовать за кем-то*, *to attend the meeting* – *присутствовать на собрании*, *to influence somebody* – *влиять на кого-то*: *The next morning this event was reported by all the papers.* – *На следующее утро об этом событии сообщили все газеты.*

Care should be taken when translating English parallel passive polysemantic verbs, since they may correspond in Russian to the verbs of different cases: *He was trusted and respected.* – *Ему доверяли и его уважали.* In this case the Russian sentence requires repetition of the pronominal object (*ему* – *его*); otherwise, the sentence would sound grammatically incorrect (*Ему доверяли и уважали*).

As for passive forms, there are two types in English containing the most frequently used polysemantic verbs: *be*-passive and *get*-passive. The latter is mostly used to indicate the starting point of the action: *They got married.* – *Они поженились.* The polysemantic verb *get*-passive is also used to express negative connotation, when the object of the action undergoes something unpleasant or dangerous: *He got hurt.* – *Он ушибся.* *He got injured in a road accident.* – *Он получил травму во время дорожной аварии.*

In Russian there are also two passive verb forms. They derive from the parallel synthetic and analytical forms: *строился* – *был построен*. The difference between the forms is either semantic or stylistic. As for their meanings, the analytical form denotes a state, whereas the synthetic form expresses a process:

Дом был построен этой бригадой. – Дом строился этой бригадой. In English this difference is rendered by the simple and the progressive forms, respectively: *The house was built by this team. – The house was being built by this team.* When no agent of the action is mentioned, the Russian synthetic polysemantic verb form can be substituted in English by the prepositional noun predicative: *Мост строится с прошлого года. – The bridge has been under construction since last year.* Or the difference between the forms can be stylistic: while the analytical form is used in literary or academic works, the synthetic form in colloquial speech can also denote a fact, not a process, thus corresponding to the English: *The house was built by this team.*

As for the synonymy of the indefinite personal active and passive forms in Russian, the difference lies in style: the passive form is more formal: *George was invited to spend the month of August in Crome. – 1) Джордж был приглашен провести август в Кроуме. 2) Джорджа пригласили провести август в Кроуме.*

One more challenge of translating polysemantic verbs in passive voice construction is the English “double passive”. It takes place when the main predicate is used in the passive voice and the following infinitive is also passive: *The treaty is reported to have been signed by both parties.* In translation, the predicate can be substituted by the active polysemantic verb: *Сообщают, что договор уже подписан обеими сторонами.* The principal clause can also be substituted by a parenthetical one: *Как сообщают, договор уже подписан обеими сторонами.* Or the passive infinitive can be substituted for the active one, so that the sentence subject turns into the sentence object: *The prisoners were ordered to be shot. – Было приказано расстрелять пленников.*

We should notice that the passive-active transformation can not give sufficient result for in passive construction the stress is being made on the object of action and in the active construction the stress is being made on the agent of action. The widespread use of passive construction in English happens often enough because it is explained by unimportance of the doer of that action and it is most

often in newspaper style at the same time the most important is to attract attention to the passage. Since the structure and word order of simple sentence is *subject + predicate + object* the importance of stylistics is bigger then to distinguish the object one chooses the passive construction.

In Russian passive voice construction is more official and commonly used in writing forms rather than in oral speech. That is why this construction is less used in Russian rather than in English. The most difficult cases of translation of polysemantic words in passive voice construction are connected with those polysemantic verbs, which can be used in passive in English, but they cannot be used in passive in Russian. The reason is the difference between semantic structures of two languages. For example: *to give – давать, to offer – предлагать, to grant – предоставлять, to pay – платить, to promise – обещать, to show – показывать, to tell – рассказывать, to teach – преподавать* and others.

She was given a cup of tea. Ей дали чашку чая.

He was offered a trip abroad. Ему предложили заграничную командировку.

She was promised to help. Ей обещали помочь.

These polysemantic verbs always take an object expressed by a noun or an infinitive. The action expressed by the passive predicate passes on the subject and the object. This subject corresponds to the Russian indirect object. For example: *The patient was prescribed* a strict diet. *He was ordered* a change of scene.

We would like to point out that these polysemantic verbs admit of another type of passive construction if the object is expressed by a noun. Thus, we can say not only *I was given a book. He was shown a book, but also A book was given to me, A book was shown to him.* The choice of the construction depends on the logical stress: in *I was given a book. The book shown to him* the person is emphasized.

The Passive Voice is possible with intransitive polysemantic verbs used with preposition: *to account for, to agree upon, to allude in, to arrive at, to call for, to*

call upon, to comment upon, to depend on, to dispose of, to hear of, to insist on, to interfere with, to laugh at, to look down, to look up, to provide for, to put at, to put up with, to read to, to run over, to send for, to speak about, to store at, to talk about.

The following verbal phraseological units can be used in the passive voice: *to find fault with, to lose sight of, to make fun of, to make use of, to pay attention, to put an end to, to set fire to, to take care of.*

Quite peculiar is the case when the subject of the English passive polysemantic predicate corresponds to Russian adverbial modifier. This is the case with the polysemantic verbs *to live* and *to sleep* with the proposition *in*. For example: *The bed was not slept in. The room is not lived in.*

There are a number of polysemantic verbs in English which correspond to intransitive verbs in Russian. They are: *to affect, to answer, to assist, to attend, to follow, to help, to influence, to join, to watch*. These verbs naturally admit of the passive construction while their Russian equivalents cannot be used in the passive voice:

She was greatly affected by the scene.

The report was followed by a discussion.

Such sentences are rendered in Russian by indefinite – personal sentences unless the latter case either the active voice is used which occurs rather seldom or the passive voice.

The combination to be + participle II can denote an action in which case it is a simple predicate expressed by polysemantic verb in the passive voice. It can also denote a state, and then it is a compound nominal predicate consisting of a link verb and a predicative.

As the director was ill, the documents were signed by his assistant.

The compound nominal predicates expressed by the polysemantic verb *to be* and participle II can be translated only by the verb *быть* + краткая форма причастия.

The statue is broken. Статуя разбита.

When I come the papers were signed and lay on the secretary's table. Когда я пришел, документы были подписаны и лежали на столе у секретаря.

The use of tenses is closely connected with meanings combination of polysemantic verb *to be* + *participle II*. For example: *When I came up to the gate, it was already locked. Когда я подошел к воротам они уже были заперты.*

Even though the linguistic category of voice exists in both the source and the target language, it might fulfill a different role and have a different significance in two languages. The transformation of “active” into “passive” can be used when translating polysemantic words from English into Russian:

More light was shed yesterday on the effect gas, which was claimed by Pentagon to be virtually harmless to health.

Вчера поступили дополнительные сведения о вредном действии газа, который, по утверждению Пентагона, якобы не опасен для здоровья.

The phraseological unit *more light was shed* was translated by means of lexical transformation and the passive construction was replaced by an active one. The passive construction in the object clause also undergone lexical transformation – verbal construction was substituted by substantive one: *по утверждению*.

So, we can point out that the category of voice has a much broader representation in the system of the English words that in the system of the Russian words, since in English not only transitive, but also intransitive objective verbs including prepositional ones can be used in the passive. Besides, polysemantic verbs taking not one but two objects, as a rule, can feature both of them in the position of the passive subject.

Still, not all the capable of taking an object are actually used in the passive. In particular, the passive form is alien to many polysemantic verbs of the statal subclass, such as *have, belong, cost, resemble, fail* etc. According with their relation to the passive voice all the verbs can be divided into two large sets: the set of passivised verbs and the set of non-passivised verbs. Considerations of both

form and function tend to interpret voice rather as a full-representative category, the same as person, number, tense and aspect.

3.2. Comparative analyse of usage of polysemantic verbs “to be” and “to have” in English and polysemantic verbs “быть” and “иметь” in Russian

English polysemantic verb *to be* corresponds to Russian polysemantic verb *быть*. In the main meaning “находиться” the Russian verb *быть* can be used only in the past and future tenses, in the present tense it is omitted.

Я был в комнате. Я буду в комнате. Я в комнате.

But in English sentence along with the presence in past and future tenses it is necessary to put the link-verb and in the present tense too.

I was in the room. I shall be in the room. I am in the room.

With the exception of presence in present tense of English polysemantic verb *to be* and the absence of it in present tense in Russian, other cases of usage of *to be* and *быть* here are coincide. But this is the only similarity of their usage in two languages. English polysemantic verb *to be* is much wider in its potential semantic possibilities rather than Russian *быть*. So, depending on a context polysemantic verb *to be* can take the meaning of “position in space”. For example:

The book is on the table. Книга лежит на столе.

The table is in the middle of the room. Стол стоит посреди комнаты.

The picture is on the wall. Картина висит на стене.

We would like to present the examples with some of the most important of its numerous meanings and the ways of translating them into Russian:

1) *to be* in the meaning of “to be present”:

She'll be here all the day. Она пробудет здесь целый день.

Tom was here for the holidays. Том приезжал сюда на каникулы.

2) *to be* in the meaning of “to occur”, “happen”:

It was only last year. Это случилось только в прошлом году.

3) *to be* in the meaning of “make”, “equal”:

Twice two is four. Дважды два – четыре.

4) *to be* in the meaning of “cost”:

How much is the hat? Сколько стоит эта шляпа?

5) *to be* in the meaning of “consist”:

The trouble was we did not know her address.

Беда состояла в том, что мы не знали ее адреса.

In forms of perfect tenses *to be* acquires the meaning of “to visit”:

I hear you have been to Switzerland this summer.

Я слышал, вы ездили в Швейцарию летом.

Has anyone been? Кто-нибудь заходил?

As we can see on the given examples, polysemantic verb *to be* acquires different meanings depending on a context. Translator has to be able to choose the most suitable variant while translating *to be* from English into Russian in a certain case. Moreover, there are a number of steady combinations with polysemantic verb *to be* in English, which requires from translator the knowledge of combinations of action verbs in Russian, in order to make correct translation of them. For example:

He was ill at ease. Он чувствовал себя неловко.

Are you in earnest? Вы говорите серьезно?

In these steady combinations *to be* loses its independent meaning saving only the link function. This happens in all compound nominal predicates, expressed by a verb combination “to be + noun / adjective / postpositive”

We would not like to remind again the simple combinations with *to be* like *he is a turner* or *the task is easy*, because they are not difficult to translate into Russian and there are a lot of grammar books devoted for describing them. But we would like to point out special combinations with *to be* which are extremely specific for English and rare for Russian and this is the reason why they present special interest for our research. The importance of postpositive in English is well known. With the help of postpositive and the most frequently used polysemantic

verbs such as *to do, to go, to come, to make, to put, to give, to take* we can form the verbs with new meanings.

If we add the postpositive to action verbs, the meaning of the verb in combination with postpositive can be saved equal to the meaning of added postpositive or new formed combination can take idiomatic meaning. But if we add postpositive to polysemantic verb *to be* the main semantic loading of combination takes the postpositive. For example:

Is Mr. Brown in? Мистер Браун дома?

No, he is out. Нет, он вышел.

Mr. Brown is away at present.

В настоящее время мистер Браун в отъезде.

I hear Mr. Brown is back. Я слышал мистер Браун вернулся.

The most of these postpositives are polysemantic. For example:

The train is off. Поезд ушел.

The meeting was off. Собрание не состоялось.

The lights were on. Свет был включен.

What is on at our cinema? Что идет в нашем кинотеатре?

The children are not up yet. Дети еще не встали.

Your time is up. Ваше время истекло.

There are a lot of steady combinations with postpositive of polysemantic verb *to be* in the English phraseological dictionary: *to be about to do something* – *собираться, намереваться сделать что-либо*; *to be up to something* – *затевать, замышлять что-либо*; *to be up to somebody* – *зависеть от кого-либо*; *to be for (some place)* – *отправляться, ехать куда-либо*.

The comparative analyse of polysemantic verb *to be* usage in English and *быть* in Russian showed us how wider it is used in English rather than in Russian.

This analyse helped us to reveal specific features of *to be*, the cases where we can use it and the ways of translating them into Russian.

Now, let's turn to the next polysemantic verb *to have* in English and *иметь* in Russian. We will again compare all cases of their usage in both languages and reveal similarities and differences between them.

The polysemantic verb *to have* in English is quite broad in its meaning rather than Russian verb *иметь*. As well as the polysemantic verb *to be* it contains potential possibility of an action. For example:

1) *Marry has a pencil in her hand.* (= *Marry is holding a pencil in her hand*).

Мэри держит в руке карандаш.

2) *The city has 100,000 inhabitants.*

Население города составляет 100 000 человек.

In the presence of a subject in such sentences, it is also possible to use the construction “there is”:

We haven't any coffee at home = There isn't any coffee at home.

However, the verb *to have* can be used not only with a noun designating a person (in the meaning to possess), but it also can be used in relation to subjects. In such cases its meaning is identical to the meaning of “there is” construction and in this way they are interchangeable. For example:

Some houses had quite wide grass round them. = There was quite wide grass round some houses.

Similar to the polysemantic verb *to be*, though more rare, polysemantic verb *to have* can also be used as a link-verb in a compound predicate. It can take place in such combinations with nouns like *to have lunch* – *обедать*, *to have a talk* – *поговорить*, *to have quarried* – *поссориться*, *to have a rest* – *отдыхать*, *to have a walk* – *прогуляться*, *to have a smoke* – *покурить*, *to have a good time* – *хорошо провести время* etc. In such cases the verb *to have* loses its main meaning and serves only to point out completed action.

If we look through these cases of polysemantic verbs usage more attentively and take into account their active presence in English, we can see the indication of systematic features of the English language. Indeed, English language speakers can merely say *to rest*, but they prefer to use complicated combination – *to have a rest*.

The essence consists that in any verb expressing specific action and reflecting a certain qualitative meaning of an action or a state, the quantitative meaning is already put into consideration.

The analytical tendency of English generates aspiration to separate formal expression of the general and concrete, quantitative and qualitative meanings of such actions. And then, naturally, the compound predicate with a verb *to have* comes to the place of a concrete verb.

There are some phraseological combinations with the verb *to have* in English, which can be expressed by an action verb in Russian:

1) *She has a perfect command of English.*

Она прекрасно владеет английским языком.

2) *I wish you to have a good time.*

Желаю вам хорошо провести время.

To have to do something expresses the idea that an action or routine is required of someone. We use *to have to do something* to speak about our responsibilities in life:

Jane has to get up early every day because of her work.

Жейн приходится рано вставать каждый день из-за работы.

This form can have the same meaning as “must”, but is generally preferred when speaking about responsibilities. “Must” is generally used to speak about strong personal obligation. (For example: *I must talk to Peter. It's important!*).

In conclusion we would like to point out that the verb *to have* in combinations with adjectives or nouns can give the meaning of corresponding verb and can be used instead of the verbal predicate:

1) *But if they were under the impression that they would get any information out of Jolyon he had a notion that they were mistaken.*

Но если им казалось, что им удастся выудить из Джозелиона какие-то сведения, то он считал, что они ошибаются.

2) *He had a longing to eat something.*

Ему страшно хотелось поест что-нибудь.

3.3. Conversion as a part of polysemy in the English and Russian languages

Most new words are not as new as we tend to think. They are just readjustments within the same language, like additions to existing items or recombination of elements. This is where the field of action of conversion may be placed, and that is why this type of morphological studies reveals interesting aspects in the diachronic evolution of the English language.

There are evident cases of conversion from one part of speech to another, unclear cases in which the grammatical category is not definitely shifted, secondary changes within the same word and marginal cases where the change has produced slight modifications.

Conversion is the reaction to syntactic constraint and the constancy in structure of English. This phenomenon first of all gives morphological freedom expressed in possibility to one word present different parts of speech and as a result to be polysemantic. It is enough to consult the English-Russian dictionary to be convinced of it: the same word can be noun, and a verb, and sometimes both an adjective, and an adverb. It means that originally the word acted as one of these parts of speech, but then due to conversion, gained also qualities of other parts of speech. For example: *blue* – 1) *adjective – the colour of the sky on a sunny day (синий, голубой)*; 2) *verb – to paint in a blue colour, become blue (окрашивать в синий цвет, синеть)*; 3) *noun – blue colour or material (синий цвет, голубой цвет)*. It is always easy to determine by a context, what part of speech is this or that word regarding to a firm word order in the English sentence.

Perhaps, most often used examples of conversion are transition of nouns to verbs and verbs to nouns. Sometimes it is hard to say, what kind of part of speech originally it was — a noun or a verb. Such polysemantic pairs of words are real example of it: *step – to step, blow – to blow, roar – to roar, etc.* But in most cases

the initial word can be recognized. For example in such pairs of polysemantic words like face – to face, hand – to hand, pocket – to pocket, shoulder – to shoulder, eye – to eye the initial word was noun and derivative word is verb, because the main initial meaning of these words is value of subject.

It is also obvious that in such pairs of polysemantic words like *commission – доверенность, полномочие; комиссия, комитет – to commission – уполномочивать, поручать* и *station – место, местоположение – to station – помещать, размещать* the initial words according to formal indications – noun suffixes (-ssion, - tion) are nouns. Even complicated nouns and verbs with postpositives are easily given into conversion: *dog's ear – загнутый уголок страницы – to dog's ear – загибать уголки страниц; pull back – препятствие, помеха – to pull back – задерживать, удерживать; take off – взлет, старт, to take off – взлетать (о самолете).*

Word combinations like adjective + noun can also take conversion transforming into a verb. The majority of them are new comings and in most cases they can be occasional, that is why they cannot be fixed in the dictionary:

She exhilarated him by stiff-arming him into a corner.

Она растормошила его силой загнав в угол.

Substantivational adjectives in many respects caused by existence of such productive way of word formation, as conversion. In many cases it is difficult to determine is it occasional substantivation of adjective or is it a conversion. But for practical usage it is not important as in translation it into Russian in any case we give it as a subject: *I'm a subscriber to the Great Russian classics series, a monumental edition of all the Russian literary greats. Я подписался на серию “Великие классики русской литературы”, монументальное издание произведений всех великих русских писателей.*

Polysemantic adjectives can also transform into verbs but polysemantic verbs cannot transform into adjectives:

It was just an accident, why should it sour you against the world?

Это был всего несчастный случай. Зачем же из-за него злиться на весь

свет?

Moreover, even those adjectives in comparative and superlatives degrees can transform into verbs: *He wanted to better. Он хотел совершенствоваться.*

It would be desirable to note the usage of polysemantic adverbs *otherwise* and *so* in grammatical conversion of English and ways of translating them into Russian. The adverb *otherwise* can act as conjunction and carry out the functions of an adverbial modifier of object and attribute. Examples are given below:

1) *You must be careful. Otherwise I can't give a fillip for your life.*

Вы должны быть осторожны. Иначе (в противном случае, или) я и гроша медного не дам за вашу жизнь. (the role of conjunction).

2) *A few lads hung about old Thomas' fish shop, but otherwise the street was deserted. Несколько парней околачивались около рыбного магазина старика Томаса, но больше никого на улице не было (букв: "...но в прочих отношениях улица была пустынной"). (the role of condition).*

3) *The other two airline representatives on the committee had at first taken the view that the airport management was doing its best under exceptional conditions. Captain Demerest argued otherwise. Два других представителя авиационной компании в комитете сначала выразили мнение, что руководство аэропорта делает все возможное в исключительно трудных условиях. Капитан Димерет утверждал обратное. (direct object).*

4) *"Now", Mel said, "about sabotage – potential and otherwise" "А теперь, - сказала Мэл, - о саботаже, потенциальном и любом другом. (attribute).*

Polysemantic adverb *so* in conversion can take the functions of adverbial modifier of degree (before other adverb, adjective or pronoun), adverbial modifiers of manner, even it can perform as object, predicate and attribute. Here are the examples:

1) *You have read the testimony. You just said so. Вы же читали показания. Вы только что это сказали. (direct object).*

2) *I didn't explain my correction. I ought to have done so. Я не объяснил своей поправки. А мне бы следовало это сделать.* (direct object).

3) *"Well, are you going with me?" "I guess so". Ну, так вы идете со мной?- Думаю, что да.* (direct object).

4) *After the American-Spanish war of 1898 Puerto Rico became a colony of the USA and remained so till 1952. После испано-американской войны 1898 года Пуэрто-Рико стал колонией США и оставался ею до 1952 года.* (predicate).

5) *She is just the way the message said, only more so. Она как раз такая, как говорилось в радиোগрамме, только еще более такая.* (attribute).

There are many cases in which the process of conversion is evident. Nevertheless, conversion is not as simple as it may seem: the process is easily recognizable because both words are graphically identical; the direction of this process, though, is sometimes nearly impossible to determine. This is not very important for the speaker: he just needs a simple way to cover a gap in the language. The same pair of converted words can be placed into two different categories depending on the subjectivity of their meaning. Polysemantic nouns coming from verbs can express state of mind or state of sensation, like in the polysemantic nouns *experience, fear, feel or hope*. Polysemantic nouns can also name events or activities, such as the case of *attack, alert and laugh*. The object of the polysemantic verb from which the noun is derived can be observed in *visit* (with the sense of that which visits), *increase* (that which increases), *call* and *command*. In the fourth division the noun refers to the subject of the original verb. Examples of this kind are *contacts or judge*. Other nouns show the instrument of the primitive verb, like in *cover* (something to cover with) and *start*. Finally, a place of the verb can also be nominalised, like in *turn* (where to turn) or *rise*.

Polysemantic verbs converted from nouns have also many subclassifications. They can express the action of putting in or on the noun, such as *in pocket* (to put into the pocket), *film* and *practice*. These verbs can also have the meaning of "to provide with" or "to give", like *name* (to give a name to somebody), *shape* (to give

shape to something) or *fuel*. Another group of verbs has the meaning of to act as the noun with respect to something, as exemplified in *host* (to act as the host of a house). Other subclassification has the sense of making something into the original noun, like in *schedule* (to arrange into a schedule) and *rule*.

Closed-class categories can also undergo conversion. Although their frequency is much less common, the process is not ungrammatical. All morphologic categories have examples of this kind. Prepositions are probably the most productive ones. They can easily become adverbs, nouns and verbs. This is the case of *up* and *out*. Conversion to noun may as well occur in adverbs like in *outside* and *inside* conjunctions, as regarded in *if* and *but*. Conversion to verb is frequent in onomatopoeic expressions like *buzz*, *beep* or *woo*. Finally, phrase compounds can appear as adjectives, such as in *borrow-the-mower*, *down-to-earth*.

In the case of adjectives coming from nouns, the hints are quite easy: they can be considered as cases of conversion only when they can appear in predicative as well as in attributive form. If the denominal adjective can be used attributively, we can affirm conversion has happened. If it can only appear predicatively, it is merely a case of partial conversion. *Mahogany music box* can be used in an attributive way, *the music box is mahogany*. This implies *mahogany* is a denominal adjective. However, in the predicative phrase *antiques dealers* we cannot treat *antiques* as an adjective because the attributive form of this expression is ungrammatical (*dealers are antique). Another way to make sure we are in front of a case of conversion is to change a word for another similar one. For example, in *Dutch auction* we are sure the word *Dutch* is an adjective because it has the specific form of adjective. Therefore, in *South Jersey Auction* or *Texas Auction* we can affirm these are cases of denominal adjectives.

Adjectives can also shift into nouns, though it is not very frequent. It mainly happens in well-established patterns of adjective plus noun phrase. Nominalisation occurs when the noun is elided and the adjective is widely used as a synonym of an existing set pattern. This could be the case of a *Chinese favorite*. The adjective nature in cases of partial conversion is evident, though. They are nouns from the

point of view that they appear in the same syntactic position. Their grammatical nature, though, is a different one. These adjectives can still be changed to the comparative and superlative form (adjective nature). This can be exemplified in *worst* and *merrier*. However, these adjectives cannot behave as nouns: if their number or case is changed, they will produce ungrammatical sentences. This can be seen in the case of *more* in cases like **the mores we get*. If the *-s* for the plural is added to any of these items, we would get ungrammatical sentences. The case of *cutie*, though, could be argued. It seems to be much used and established within certain groups. This could have converted it into a lexicalised example of adjective to noun.

Up to this point conversion has only been considered as a shift from one grammatical category to another. However, these are not the only cases where it may happen. The notion of conversion may be extended to changes of secondary word class, within the same major word category [56; 129]. This process has no clear terminology; for example it is called “change of secondary word class” by Quirk [56; 130] and “conversion as a syntactic process by Bauer [13; 227]. Within the field of conversion, it has not been much studied because it is less evident than the classical conversion. Some scholars argue that these cases are products of syntactic processes, and so, they may not be considered as part of word-formation.

The noun category can undergo four different kinds of secondary conversion. First an uncountable noun can shift to a countable noun, like in the case of *supplies*. It can also happen the other way round, a countable noun can become an uncountable one by becoming abstract, such as in *cabaret*, *chief* and *touch*. A third case occurs when a proper noun is converted into a common noun, as can be seen in *diesel* (person's name), *Bordeaux* (usually related to high-quality French wines but not necessarily made in that particular city), *yo-yo* (trademark) or *Stradivarius* (famous maker of violins). Thus, this category can be rephrased as "a product of the proper noun". The fourth and final type happens when nouns shift from their static nature to a dynamic meaning when they follow the progressive of polysemantic verb *to be*. Examples of this kind are *student*, *president*. These cases

assume the meaning of "temporary role or activity". This fourth type is a product of the dynamic nature of the tense of the verb; it is not a characteristic of the noun by itself. This means that these nouns would return to their static nature by eliding the progressive form.

Verbs may undergo four different types of conversion. The first one happens when an intransitive verb is used transitively. This type has the meaning of "to cause to verb". Examples of this kind are *worked a computer*, *stop the manual recount* and *run the day-to-day operations*. Transitive verbs can also be used intransitively, that is the case of *closed*. This category has been previously converted from adjective to verb, and, afterwards, it has experienced a secondary conversion from transitive to intransitive verb. In this sense, the verb would change the meaning from "to make close" (transitive use) to "to become closed" (intransitive use). A third type involves intransitive nouns converted into copulas. Examples like *sat frozen*, *grew silent*, *were nailed shut* or *go global* are quite current in daily conversations for the economy of language. In the case of *sat frozen* the strongest meaning remains with the verb, while, in the other two examples, the resulting meaning of the adjective prevails over the verbal one. Finally, verbs also shift from a monotransitive nature to a complex transitive one. Verbs commonly used with a unique object—direct or indirect—shift their behavior and take more than one complement. In *won him the award*, the verb *win* takes an indirect object and a direct one, although it usually takes only one direct one. The verb *make* in *make it a cabaret* takes two different direct objects as well as the verb *find* in *find it very satisfying*.

The real examples of conversion as a part of polysemy provided indicate the high frequency of this process. It is quite a common phenomenon as in everyday English and in Russian. In addition, it is not a great source of problems for nonnative speakers and translators because the meaning of converted items is easily recognizable. However, nonnatives and translators are strongly advised to be taught conversion so that their passive knowledge of it can be turned into an active skill, with the subsequent lexical enlargement for their everyday communication.

Conclusion for chapter three

In this chapter of dissertation we discussed grammatical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian. Every language has a specific system which differs from that of any others. This is all the more so with respect to English, and Russian, whose grammatical systems are typologically and genetically heterogeneous.

In 3.1. we presented polysemantic words in passive voice construction and compared them in English and Russian. English passive voice is used more frequently due to the various types of construction it occurs in. Whereas Russian passive voice construction is formed only by transitive verbs requiring a direct object when used as an active voice structure. The category of voice differs radically from all other hitherto considered categories from the point of view of its referential qualities. Indeed, all the previously described categories reflect various characteristics of processes, both direct and oblique, as certain facts of reality existing irrespective of the speaker's perception. The property of the category of voice shows its immediate connection with syntax, which finds expression in direct transformational relational between the active and passive constructions.

In 3.2. we made comparative analyse of usage of polysemantic verbs *to be* and *to have* in English and their equivalents *быть* and *иметь* in Russian. After detailed consideration of all cases of the usage of these verbs in two languages we revealed their similarities and differences in English and Russian. As a result we have made conclusions about their grammatical difficulties in translation them from English into Russian. The conclusions are the following: English polysemantic verb *to be* is much wider in its potential semantic possibilities rather than Russian *быть*. Polysemantic verb *to be* acquires different meanings depending on a context. Translator has to be able to choose the most suitable variant while translating *to be* from English into Russian in a certain case. Moreover, there are a number of steady combinations with polysemantic verb *to be*

in English, which requires from translator the knowledge of combinations of action verbs in Russian, in order to make correct translation of them.

The polysemantic verb *to have* in English is quite broad in its meaning rather than Russian verb *иметь*. The verb *to have* can be used not only with a noun designating a person (in the meaning to possess), but it also can be used in relation to subjects. In such cases its meaning is identical to the meaning of “there is” construction and in this way they are interchangeable. If we look through these cases of polysemantic verbs usage more attentively and take into account their active presence in English, we can see the indication of systematic features of the English language.

In 3.3. we analyzed the grammatical phenomenon of conversion as a part of polysemy. Here we made an attempt to analyse in depth the behavior of one of these new word-formation methods and a part of polysemy: conversion. It is probably the most outstanding new method in the word-formation panorama. It is a curious and attractive subject because it has a wide field of action: all grammatical categories can undergo conversion to more than one word-form, it is compatible with other word-formation processes, and it has no demonstrated limitations. All these reasons make the scope of conversion nearly unlimited. From the aforesaid it is possible to draw a conclusion that conversion provides well known semantic freedom to the word, enriching it, allowing it to acquire new meanings regarding to its free movement in the sentence. So grammatical system has the impact on language lexicon, resulting to a polysemy of English and Russian.

Very frequently the structure of a Russian sentence absolutely differs from the one English. It has different word order, parts of the sentences and pretty often differs even the order of sentences. In some instances, parts of speech expressed in English are translated into Russian by the help of different parts of speech. You should remember that the compressed way of expression in the English can not be followed in Russian and we therefore have to “decompress” them so that to make the easy to perceive and understand. Nevertheless, some differences in usage of some specific features make us leave some elements unsaid while translating the

whole. And all these cases are explained by grammatical transformations we have just investigated.

Chapter four

Stylistic difficulties of translation of polysemantic words

4.1. The method of stylistic compensation in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian

In the previous chapters we carefully considered the lexical and grammatical difficulties that occur while translating polysemantic words from English into Russian. And now we would like to move to stylistic difficulties of translation of polysemantic words.

Stylistic means and devices present considerable and various problems for translation. They possess a distinct national character although at first sight they may appear to be identical. The translator must be fully aware of the function of a stylistic device and its effect, to be able to reproduce the same effect by other means, if necessary, thus minimizing the inevitable losses due to inherent divergences. A translator should not try to preserve the stylistic device given in the sentence, but reproduce its function in the target language. Thus, stylistic equivalence may be achieved by different means and not necessary by the same device. One of the methods that can help to achieve equal stylistic effect in target language as in a source language is a method of stylistic compensation in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian. This method allows saving some stylistic receptions used in the original text and to give to the text big brightness and expressiveness in translated version.

The principle of stylistic compensation requires, as K. I. Chukovskiy told, not to transfer a metaphor by metaphor, comparison by comparison, but we should give smile by smile and tear by tear. For the translator the form is less important than function of stylistic reception in the text. It means that he will get a certain freedom of actions: grammatical means of expressiveness can be replaced by lexical and vice versa. Translator can omit inexpressible in Russian stylistic effect

and then he can add it in the place where it is most suitable which corresponds to stylistic direction. By transferring stylistic figures of speech - comparisons, metaphors, etc. - the translator needs to regulate: is it expedient to keep the image which was in origin or in translation it should be replaced with another. Features of the Russian word usage, word compatibility can be the cause of such replacement.

The principal stylistic effect of the text is created, however, with the help of special stylistic devices as well as by the interworking of the meaning of polysemantic words in a particular context. The speaker may qualify every object he mentions in his own way thus giving his utterance a specific stylistic turn. Such stylistic phrasing gives much trouble to the translator since their meaning is often subjective and elusive. Some phrases become fixed through repeated use and they may have permanent equivalents in target language, for example, *true love* - *истинная любовь*, *dead silence* - *мертвая тишина*, *good old England* - *добрая старая Англия*. In most cases, however, the translator has to look for an occasional substitute, which often requires an in-depth study of the broad context. When for example, J. Galsworthy in his "Forsyte Saga" refers to Irene as "*that tender passive being, who would not stir for herself*", the translator is faced with the problem of rendering polysemantic word *passive* into Russian so that its substitute would fit the character of that lady and all the circumstances of her life described in the novel. A common occurrence in English text is the transferred qualifier syntactically joined to a word to which it does not belong logically. Thus the English speaker may mention *a corrupt alliance*, *a sleepless bed* or *a thoughtful pipe*. As often as not, such combinations will be thought of as too bizarre in Russian or alien to the type of the text and qualifier will have to be used with name of the object it refers to. *The sound of the solemn bells* will become *торжественное звучание колоколов* and *the smiling attention of the stranger* will be translated as *внимание улыбающегося незнакомца*.

Every polysemantic word is stylistically marked according to the layer of the vocabulary it belongs to. Stylistically words can be subdivided into literary and non-literary. The greater part of the literary layer of the Modern English

vocabulary is formed by polysemantic words of general use (i.e. words of general purpose) possessing no special stylistic reference and known as neutral words.

Neutral polysemantic words comprise common colloquial words and common literary words as well. Colloquial polysemantic words and some groups of literary words are expressive while neutral polysemantic words are not.

The stylistic function of the different strata of the English vocabulary depends not so much on the inner qualities of each of the groups as on their interaction when opposed to one another. For example:

“My dear Copperfield”, said Mr. Micawber, “this is luxurious”. This is a way of life which reminds of a period when I was myself in a state of celibacy, and Mrs. Micawber had yet not been solicited to plight her faith at the Hymeneal altar. (Ch. Dickens) Here Mr. Micawber’s speech is characterized by highly literary, pompous words and phrases.

“Мой дорогой Копперфильд”, - сказал мистер Микобер, - “Это роскошно”. Этот образ жизни напоминает мне о том времени, когда я сам был в состоянии безбрачия, а миссис Микобер еще не умоляли принести клятвы на алтаре Гименя.

If you don't keep your yap shut ... (J.Salinger)

Если ты не заткнешься...

Then he really let one go at me.

Тут он мне врезал по-настоящему.

The examples from Salinger are in marked contrast to the quotation from Dickens. The words are not colloquial, but slang words, i.e. emphatically non-literary. It would be an error to translate a neutral or a literary word by a colloquial one or a colloquial word by a literary one or to introduce a colloquial word in a literary context.

The requirements of equivalence in the translation of emotive prose differ considerably from these in other styles where form merely serves to convey the content of the utterance and do not fulfill any expressive and aesthetic function (publicist style in all its genres being to a certain extent an exception). In these

stylistic means and devices are merely used as their indispensable markers. But in the belles-lettres style form and content are inseparable whole; their common goal is to affect the reader emotionally, to appeal to his feelings and to stir his imagination, to arouse his sense of values both ethical and aesthetic. The approach to the problems of equivalence is broader and more flexible in this style. Losses may be greater here but so are the possibilities of compensation because the object in view is to produce as forceful a stylistic effect as that produced by the original. While in the translation of official, scientific and newspaper texts the losses are grammatical or lexical, in the translation of belles-lettres texts the losses are also stylistic affecting the expressive value of the translated text. This point may be illustrated by the following example taken from H.W.Morton's book "In Search of London", the style of which comes very close to imaginative prose. It is a picturesque and impressive description of the funeral of Henry V.

As the two miles of pompous grief passed through the streets of London, every citizen stood at his doorway holding a lighted taper.

В то время как торжественная похоронная процессия, растянувшаяся на две мили, двигалась по улицам Лондона, в дверях каждого дома стоял его хозяин с зажженной свечой в руках.

The striking metonymical transference of meaning *two miles of pompous grief* cannot be preserved in translation. The combination *две мили торжественной скорби* is against the norms of Russian valency. The loss in expressiveness is evident here but absolutely unavoidable.

Emotive prose abounds in images which are created by a variety of stylistic devices. A writer's imagery is always subjective, striking and original his images bear the imprint of his individuality. The choice of stylistic devices and the system of imagery determined by the writer's design and form one interdependent whole.

When she paid the coachman she took her money out of a hard steel purse in a very jail of a bag which hung upon her arm by a heavy chain, and shut up like a bite. I had never, at that time seen a metallic lady altogether as Miss Murdstone was.

Расплачиваясь с кучером, она достала деньги из твердого металлического кошелька, а кошелек она хранила, как в тюрьме, в сумке, которая висела у нее через плечо на тяжелой цепочке и защелкивалась, будто норовя укусить. Я никогда до тех пор не видел такой металлической леди, как мисс Мердстон.

Dickens uses many stylistic devices which are built around the same image *hard steel*: the translation is just as expressive and no losses have been incurred.

Sometimes in the attempt to preserve the writer's imagery at the same level of expressiveness, the translator "reshuffles" all its components as does Julia Zhukova in her excellent translation of the following extract from Faulkner's story.

They passed so, that semblance of a thrust and a hawk in terrific immobility in mid-air, this an apparition – like suddenness: a soft clatter of hooves in the sere needle and were gone, the man stooping, the woman leaning forward like a tableau of flight and pursuit on a lightning bolt.

Они появились неожиданно как духи, и так же неожиданно исчезли в мягком стуке копыт по сухим сосновым иглам, - две птицы, застывшие в быстром как ветер полете, коршун и его добыча.

These examples especially the latter prove that the conception of equivalence in the translation of emotive prose is flexible, broad and comprehensive. Equivalence in this case is functional, aimed at producing a similar effect in the target language, conveying the same degree of tension, and of emotive colouring in conformity with the author's design. Substitutions must be qualitatively equivalent. Losses which are inevitable in translation can nearly always be compensated for by a skilful use of substitutions because the same effect can be achieved by different stylistic devices.

Prichard's questions stung him to silent bottled up fury. (J.Hilton).

The causative verb + complex object structure is peculiar to the English language and there is no corresponding structure in Russian (*stung him to fury*). The semantics of the verb *to sting* can be regarded in the Russian translation at the expense of compactness.

Вопросы Причарда так его удивили, что он едва мог сдержать свою ярость, но промолчал.

The epithet *bottled-up (fury)* cannot be preserved in translation because of different collocability (*закупоренная ярость*). Hence a certain loss of imagery, but the referential meaning is rendered by the verb *одержать*.

Many stylistic devices are polysemantic: one and the same device may fulfill a variety of functions and produce diverse effects. These functions are sometimes not identical and do not coincide in English and in Russian. The same stylistic devices in two languages reveal complete concurrence, partial concurrence and no concurrence at all.

Alliteration is a case in point. Alliteration is primarily a euphonic device and euphonic function is practically identical in both languages. Alliteration appears to be one of the fundamental features of poetry. But alliteration in prose is more frequently used in English than in Russian and cannot always be preserved. For example, it is not preserved in the translation of the concluding paragraph of Galsworthy's "Indian Summer of a Forsyte" by M.Lorie.

Summer –summer – summer! The soundless footsteps on the grass.

Жарко – жарко – знойно! Бесшумные шаги по траве.

The second function of alliteration is a logical one. Alliteration serves as a link binding together different components of the text. It is used as a bound between the epithet and the qualified word. For example: *silent sea* (Oldridge); *dusty death* (Shakespeare).

Alliteration in its logical function is frequently used in all kinds of emotive prose. For example:

Nothing befalls him (the author) that he cannot transmute into a stanza, a song, or a story. (Somerset Maugham).

Alliteration here is deliberately used in the enumeration of different poetical and literary forms. The author's device and its function can, in this case, be easily rendered in translation:

Все, что происходит с писателем, может найти свое воплощение в песне, поэме или повести.

Alliteration is also not infrequently used in newspaper and publicist style.

At the end of the week the students, tutors and chairman meet to review the school. Everything is criticized, sometimes favorably, from the tutor to the tea, from the bedroom to the beer.

В конце недели студенты, преподаватели и председатель встречаются, чтобы обсудить все учебные дела. Все подвергается критике, иногда благожелательной – и преподаватели, и чай, и спальни и пиво.

In this case alliteration has not been preserved. While it is easily rendered in the preceding example and is not forced and sounds quite natural, here it would be rather affected (*преподаватели и пирожки, постели и пиво*). But the omission of alliteration is compensated by polysyndeton which imparts a certain rhythm to the sentence and makes it emphatic.

Alliteration is widely used in slogans, newspaper headlines and book titles where it fulfills an eye-catching function. For example:

We demand universal suffrage because it is our right... we believe it will give us bread, and beef and beer. (Dave Morgan).

Мы требуем всеобщего избирательного права, потому что это наше право... Мы убеждены, что это даст нам хлеб и мясо и пиво.

This brief outline of the most stylistic compensations in translation of polysemantic words of the language styles and their variants showed us that out of the number of features which are easily discernible in each of the styles, some should be considered primary and others secondary; some obligatory, others optional; some constant, others transitory. It appears the length of any language unit is a very important factor in information exchange, for the human brain can receive and transmit information only if the latter is punctuated by pauses.

4.2. The influence of polysemy in translating stylistically-marked language units from English into Russian

Stylistically-marked language units in different languages are, in the main similar but their functioning in each language, their specific weight and the frequency of their use are widely different. This fact accounts for the necessity of stylistic transformations – substitution and compensation. By means of lexical and grammatical transformations of polysemantic words the translator achieves an equivalent rendering of the lexical and grammatical meaning of a word or a form. The same principle is valid when rendering the stylistic meaning of the message that is, reproducing a similar effect in the target language text, arousing a similar response on the part of the target language reader as well was called forth by the source language text. The translator, however, is often compelled to achieve the intended effect by a different device.

Complicated translation problems are caused by source text containing substandard language units to produce a stylistic effect. The source text author may imitate his character's speech by means of dialectal or contaminated form. Source language territorial dialects cannot be reproducing in target text, nor can they be replaced by target language dialect form. It would be inappropriate if a black American or a London cockney spoke in the Russian translation in the dialect, say, of the Northern regions of the Russia. Fortunately, the English dialectal forms are mostly an indication of the speaker's low social or educational status, and they can be rendered into Russian by a judicious employment of low-colloquial elements, for example:

He do look quiet, don't 'e? D'e know'oo'e is, Sir?

Вид-то у него спокойный, правда? Часом не знаете, сэр, кто он будет?

Here the function of the grammatical and phonetical markers in the English sentence, which serve to show that the speaker is uneducated is fulfilled by the Russian colloquialisms *часом* and *кто он будет*.

Contaminated forms are used to imitate the speech of a foreigner. Sometimes, both source language and target language have developed accepted forms of representing the contaminated speech by persons of foreign origin.

The reversed epithet is translated by a Russian epithet which is equally colloquial and expressive. Although the semantic aspect is not preserved, the two epithets may be regarded as equivalents because they possess a common sense, namely “to knock down”. Sometimes the English and the Russian epithet which appear to be correlated because of their semantic likeness and because of possessing the same degree of triteness are far from being equivalents as they provoke different connotations, for example, *toothy* – *зубастый*:

To the puzzlement of the man speaking to her, she broke into a wide, toothy, unprovoked grin. (C.P.Snow).

К изумлению говорившего с ней человека она неожиданно широко улыбнулась, сверкнув зубами.

It should also be borne in mind that stylistic devices which seem to be identical may have different functional values in the source and target languages. In order to achieve a comparable effect another device with polysemantic word should be employed. Repetition may illustrate this point. For example, the five-fold repetitions of the word “stop” (*Stop! Stop! Stop! Stop! Stop!*) in Thomas Hardy’s story “Absent-mindedness in a Parish Choir” is compensated lexically by the introduction of conditional polysemantic words possessing the same degree of expressiveness:

Перестаньте! Сию минуту перестаньте! Да перестаньте же!

The emphatic effect of repetition in the following example is made up by the use of a synonymous pair and by the addition of an intensifier:

A policy of see no stagnation, hear no stagnation, speak no stagnation has had too long a run for our money.

Слишком долго мы расплачиваемся за политику полного игнорирования и замалчивания застоя в нашей экономике.

Another instance of influence of different meanings of polysemantic words is stylistic substitution in translation is well illustrated by K.Chukovsky's translation of the alliterative title of Oskar Wild's essay "Pen, Pencil and Poison" by a rhythmical arrangement of correlated words: "Кисть, перо и отравы". The same principle appears in another variant of translation: "Яд, перо и карандаш".

A translator should be fully aware of the degree of expressiveness of stylistic devices used in the text; according to it he can find out the most suitable polysemantic words for translating stylistically-marked language units. A line of distinction must be drawn between what is stylistically trite and what is stylistically original. It especially refers to lexical stylistic devices: deliberate mixing of words belonging to different layers of the vocabulary, metaphors, metonymies, epithets, similes, etc. Stylistic equivalence is a fundamental requirement.

Publicist and newspaper styles have different accepted norms in English and in Russian and in conformity with these norms certain stylistic modifications may be necessary. For instance, colloquial and even slang polysemantic words are frequently used in English newspaper style and therefore a typical modification in translating English newspaper texts into Russian is a switch from colloquial or neutral to literary. Such changes are due to a somewhat greater orientation of Russian newspaper style towards literary norms and standards:

You don't have to be a history buff to enjoy historic houses in Britain but it helps. Не нужно быть историком педантом, чтобы наслаждаться посещением исторических зданий, но это помогает.

The word "buff" is a highly colloquial, if not slangy word, meaning "a dull, slow-witted person" (Webster III). In the translation its stylistic reference is elevated and it is rendered by a literary word *педант*.

A certain toning down is sometimes necessary in the translation of such lexical stylistic devices used in newspaper articles as metaphors, metaphoric epithets and metonymies.

Metaphors are found in all emotively coloured styles of language but metaphors in the belles-lettres style (in imaginative prose) are usually original whereas original metaphors in newspaper style are rare, trite metaphors are, as a rule, given preference. The object pursued by editorials to bring the reader round to the paper's point of view, to suggest that paper's interpretation is the only correct one. Editorials appeal not only to the reader's mind but to his feelings as well. That accounts for an extensive use of various stylistic devices, metaphors in particular. But unlike metaphors in imaginative prose metaphors in editorials can be easily replaced if necessary. Such substitution may be caused by different usage, different valency or different target language norms:

The communists were the friends of peace in the foul weather of the cold war. Коммунисты были верными защитниками мира в мрачные дни холодной войны.

The collocation *скверная погода холодной войны* would violate the norm of Russian stylistic usage as would the combination *друзья мира*.

The Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 in South Africa, however, was only the opening wedge of suppression. (W.Pomeroy).

Закон о подавлении коммунизма в Южной Африке был принят в 1950 г. однако это было только началом репрессий.

Oil prices in 1973 soared into orbit.

В 1973 г. цены на нефть невероятно подскочили.

Toning down is resorted to in translating trite metonymies which are so extensively used in English.

Red carpet for the Oil Prince.

Britain is pushing the boat out this week for the first official visit by one of the world's most powerful man, Crown Prince and Prime Minister of Saudi Arabia and the most influential voice in world politics.

Пышная встреча нефтяного властелина.

Англия усиленно готовится к первому официальному визиту на этой неделе одного из самых могущественных людей в мире – наследного принца и премьер-министра Саудовской Аравии, человека, чей голос имеет решающее значение в международной политике.

The headline metonymy *red carpet* is replaced by the words expressing the notion which it stands for *пышная встреча*.

We should not forget that almost all stylistic devices are multi functional. It is like when polysemantic words in English and Russian languages do not coincide in their lexical-semantic variants and the same is when the function of identical stylistic device differs. Thus when comparing stylistic devices we can easily identify complete correspondence, partial correspondence and even sometimes absence of correspondence and their functions.

To illustration it we can compare *alliteration* in the English and Russian languages. The function of alliteration coincides in both languages – in this function alliteration is one of the basic devices of poetic speech. However the usage of alliteration for pleasant sounding in prose is more characteristic for the English language, than for Russian. The second function of alliteration is logical. Alliteration emphasizes close relationship between components of the statement. Especially brightly alliteration shows the unity of an epithet with an attributed word.

The third function of alliteration in English language – to attract attention of the reader – is widely used in the names of literary works, newspaper headings and often in articles. The use of alliteration is a convincing acknowledgement that various functions of stylistic devices in different languages do not always coincide in usage.

Stylistically-marked language units help to the author to achieve highly expressive and emotive effect in the given text. Thus, to translate them correctly, translator must pay attention to the words he gives in target text, in order to save the expressive effect of the source text. Here, as given examples show,

polysemantic words and the variety of their meanings can help him to achieve equal result as author presented to the readers in the source language text.

4.3. Handling the expressional effect of the original text with the help of polysemantic words

Individual style of the writer includes use of the certain speech styles of public language. Its unity gives in to a partition on elements already by way of the stylistic analysis (both the original, and translation in its parity with the original). The specific area within the limits of fiction is made with the poetry having the genres. Specificity of each of literary genres with characteristic for them speech styles is reflected in requirements to translation. The big role is played with conditions of expressional effect of that language on which translation is done. If while translating the structure of a phrase and a dictionary – material word meaning in dialogue of the novel or a drama too precisely corresponds to the original, very easily there is an impression of much more book painting of speech, than it actually takes place in the original. For the literature as for art as which material language serves, directly close communication between an artistic image and a language category on the basis of which it is under construction is characteristic special, frequently. Searches in translation of direct figurative conformity to the original frequently are impracticable or result in formalistic decisions. Polysemantic words possess a variety of different meanings, which can allow transferring the expressional effect of the text in accuracy.

Choosing the suitable meaning of polysemantic word in translation pursues the purpose of the translation of expression of idea of the original most adequate and natural to language. For example:

The troops shall not be used except for emergency.

In the Russian language, we can offer the following variant:

Войска должны использоваться лишь, в крайнем случае

This variant of translation, as against the original, contains denying (shall not be used), though the same idea is transferred, as other lexical elements (only in

the first case, except for in the second) play as though “a leveling role” depending on use or not uses of denying *not*.

Therefore antonymous here – only conditional: from the point of view of expression of the general idea any antonymous are not present. Appreciably such antonymous arises due to the various ways of expression of this or that action ratified in languages. It is easy to be convinced of it by the following comparisons: *Hang on, please!* - *Не кладите трубку!* *Keep off the grass!* - *Не ходите по газонам!* *Stay out of the sun!* - *На солнце лежать нельзя!* *Authorized personnel only.* - *Посторонним вход воспрещен.* *Keep clear of the door!* - *К двери не прислоняться!*

Researchers mark, that while translating on Russian antonymous frequently consists in replacement of a negative design affirmative.

She wasn't looking too happy.

Вид у нее был довольно несчастный.

I couldn't think of anybody to call up.

As a matter of fact, this reception is in this case necessary; if it is not used, translation will be not exact. Really, unless in Russian such phrase competently sounds: *Она не выглядела слишком счастливой* or *Я не мог думать о ком-либо, чтобы позвонить*. In Russian it is not correct, therefore on offered by the translator variants should affect feeling of language, knowledge of features of language of translation and, the most important, a context, the semantic maintenance of the original.

Practically, stylistic devices help to the author to achieve expressional effect of the text. In almost all languages stylistic devices are similar still though their functions in speech vary. Identical stylistic devices are used differently in languages; they perform different functions and have different value in stylistic system of their language what actually explains their necessity when transformations in translation occur. The stylistic changes are as necessary as grammatical or lexical ones. While applying some grammatical or lexical

transformation in translation the translator is guided by principle of rendering grammatical of lexical meaning. When rendering stylistic meaning of the source text a translator should be guided by the same principle – to recreate in translation the same impression that might be left by the original text. This can be achieved with the help of polysemantic words. A translator should not try to preserve the stylistic device given in the sentence, but reproduce its function in the target language.

We have already discussed functional translation of stylistic devices. But it is extremely important to distinguish in the translated text original and imagined alliterations so that to avoid unnecessary emphasizing and to keep stylistic equivalence which presents necessary component of adequate translation. There is a constant danger to smooth and de-color the original text or, on the contrary, to make translation brighter and stylistically colored. But sometimes a translator consciously applies some smoothing or neutralization in other words.

Repetition as you know is a more widespread stylistic device in the English language, than in Russian. In some cases repetition as the stylistic device should be necessarily kept in translation, but for the difference in combinability and various semantic structures of polysemantic words or words of wide meaning in English and Russian languages the translator has to change and replace some of elements.

The repetition is widely used with stylistic purposes in newspaper publicity. In these cases the translator is compelled to apply stylistic changes, make substitution or omission.

The triple repetition of *no stagnation* has been omitted in translation, though is partially compensated by the use of synonymic pair at a word (*stagnation*), but neutralization is evident in translation. The neutralization happened when translating the phraseological unit *to have (too long) a run for our money*.

Among stylistic devices used in political literature rather frequent there are synonymic and alliterated pairs. The use of such pairs is traditional for all styles of the English language including business style as well. When translating official documents such pairs are frequently by one polysemantic word. For example, the

just and equitable treatment of all nations from UN Charter is given in Russian as *справедливое отношение ко всем нациям*, for in Russian there is no absolute synonym for polysemantic word *just*.

Metaphor is used in all emotionally – colored styles of speech and helps to handle the expressional effect of the text. However in style of fiction the metaphor always carries original character, whereas in political literature the original metaphor is used rather seldom and basically – copied metaphors. Nevertheless in advanced clauses of the English and American political literature, the purpose of which is to assure, to make people believe and to impress the reader, that is to force him to agree with the point of view given in the article, one can often see rather bright and colorful metaphors.

Sometimes the difficulty of translation of metaphor consists in translating some word combination or a phraseological unit, which does not have figurative equivalent in Russian.

We have already discussed the necessity of neutralization of means of expressiveness when translating English or American literature. Let us consider the problem of extended metaphor. The extended metaphor represents a chain of the logically connected figurative components. Sometimes such components of the extended metaphors pass through the whole clause. The below-mentioned example is taken from clause of the American observer James Reston:

The latest official explanation of the President's Indochina policy is that «he is backing out of the saloon with both guns firing», but there is a catch to this.

He insists that the guys in the white hats keep control of the saloon before he leaves town. He wants a non-communist bartender, and a non-communist sheriff, and a secure non-communist town before he rides away into the sunset of November, 1972.

In the final paragraph of the article the elements of one metaphor are partially repeated: but all this is a little more complicated than *«backing out of the saloon»*.

The images of this extended metaphor are taken from so-called “western” – of film about cowboys in “wild” West. In this case all elements of the developed (unwrapped) metaphor, perhaps, can be kept in translation.

Согласно последнему официальному объяснению политики президента в отношении Индокитая, “он хочет выбраться из бара, пятась к двери и отстреливаясь из двух пистолетов”. Но за этим кроется что-то еще.

Он хочет, чтобы парни в белых шапках следили за порядком в баре до тех пор, пока он не уедет из города. Он хочет, чтобы бармен не был коммунистом и чтобы шериф не был коммунистом и чтобы город заведомо не был в руках коммунистов. И только тогда он поскачет навстречу ноябрьским сумеркам 1972 года.

And at the end of clause – “но все это несколько сложнее, чем пятась к двери, выбраться из бара”.

However there are cases, when the preservation of all figurative components of the developed (unwrapped) metaphor is impossible, as well as preservation of both components of synonymic pair, for it would break the stylistic norms of Russian.

Being purely linguistic and stylistic device – metonymy is used more and more in literature, perhaps, even more than metaphor. Metonymy translation presents one of numerous problems for the use of metonymy significantly differs in English and Russian languages. Due to this fact the translator is often forced to go back to the primary meaning of a word that is to the meaning that was firstly created by metonymy.

It is a widespread case of metonymy usage – substitution of concrete notion by an abstract one, which can not always be preserved.

Concerning the translation of comparison as a stylistic device, the difficulties arise only if the words of English and Russian languages are various in the semantic structure. We have already considered in the chapter of lexical transformations the question of translation of such terms and now we would like to give the example of stylistic comparison:

Instant history, like instant coffee, can sometimes be remarkably palatable. At least it is in this memoir by a former White House aide who sees L.B.J. as «an extraordinarily gifted President who was the wrong man from the wrong place at the wrong time under the wrong circumstances».

Современная история, как и такой современный продукт, как растворимый кофе, иногда может быть необыкновенно приятна. По крайней мере, такой ее преподносит в своих мемуарах бывший помощник президента Джонсона, считающий его «исключительно одаренным президентом, который был неподходящим человеком, из неподходящего места (штат Техас), в неподходящее время, при неподходящих обстоятельствах».

In order to preserve this playing comparison, the interpreters were forced to apply additional words.

There is another kind of stylistic transformation – actualization – which involves transition of something simple into something unusual, strange. It reveals potential expressiveness put in the lexical morphologic and syntactic means of a language.

Now from everything that has been discussed above we can infer that the usage of some of stylistic devices in English is peculiar – and bears specific national character, therefore their direct translation in many instances is impossible. Moreover, the impression left by some of stylistic device maybe different in both languages. It can be explained not only by national features of stylistic means and devices of some of the language but by their multi functioning character also – that do not always coincide – as it was shown on the matter of alliteration. This is the main criteria causing the necessity of stylistic transformations that involve substitution and changes. Therefore we should warn the future translators and interpreters that it is not important to classify the device itself but the point is to be able to realize their ongoing effect and to identify the purpose of their application in the translation they are working on.

Conclusion for chapter four

In different communication situations the language users select words of different stylistic status. There are stylistically neutral words that are suitable for any situation, and there are literary (bookish) words and colloquial words which satisfy the demands of official, poetic messages and unofficial everyday communication respectively. Source language and target language words of similar semantics may have either identical or dissimilar stylistic status of the original text, by using the equivalents of the same style or, failing that, opting for stylistically neutral units.

The method of stylistic compensation in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian was discussed in 4.1. of this chapter. This principle of stylistic compensation requires, not transferring a metaphor by metaphor, comparison by comparison, but it requires giving smile by smile and tear by tear. For the translator the form is less important than function of stylistic reception in the text. It means that he will get a certain freedom of actions: grammatical means of expressiveness can be replaced by lexical and vice versa. Translator can omit inexpressible in Russian stylistic effect and then he can add it in the place where it is most suitable which corresponds to stylistic direction. By transferring stylistic figures of speech - comparisons, metaphors, etc. - the translator needs to regulate: is it expedient to keep the image which was in origin or in translation it should be replaced with another. Features of the Russian polysemantic word usage, word compatibility can be the cause of such replacement.

In 4.2. of this chapter we analyzed the influence of polysemy in translating stylistically-marked language units from English into Russian and the following conclusions were made: a translator should be fully aware of the degree of expressiveness of stylistic devices used in the text; according to it he can find out the most suitable polysemantic words for translating stylistically-marked language units. A line of distinction must be drawn between what is stylistically trite and

what is stylistically original. It especially refers to lexical stylistic devices: deliberate mixing of words belonging to different layers of the vocabulary, metaphors, metonymies, epithets, similes, etc. Stylistic equivalence is a fundamental requirement. We should not forget that almost all stylistic devices are multi functional. It is like when polysemantic words in English and Russian languages do not coincide in their lexical-semantic variants and the same is when the function of identical stylistic device differs. Thus when comparing stylistic devices we can easily identify complete correspondence, partial correspondence and even sometimes absence of correspondence and their functions.

The 4.3. of this chapter is devoted for handling the expressional effect of the original text with the help of polysemantic words. Specificity of each of literary genres with characteristic for them speech styles is reflected in requirements to translation. The big role is played with conditions of expressional effect of that language on which translation is done. If while translating the structure of a phrase and a dictionary – material word meaning in dialogue of the novel or a drama too precisely corresponds to the original, very easily there is an impression of much more book painting of speech, than it actually takes place in the original. For the literature as for art as which material language serves, directly close communication between an artistic image and a language category on the basis of which it is under construction is characteristic special, frequently. Practically, stylistic devices help to the author to achieve expressional effect of the text. In almost all languages stylistic devices are similar still though their functions in speech vary. Identical stylistic devices are used differently in languages; they perform different functions and have different value in stylistic system of their language what actually explains their necessity when transformations in translation occur. The stylistic changes are as necessary as grammatical or lexical ones. While applying some grammatical or lexical transformation in translation the translator is guided by principle of rendering grammatical or lexical meaning. When rendering stylistic meaning of the source text a translator should be guided by the same

principle – to recreate in translation the same impression that might be left by the original text. This can be achieved with the help of polysemantic words.

Conclusion

The present dissertation has investigated the problem of translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian. In this investigation, the aim was to assess detailed study of lexical, grammatical and stylistic difficulties of the translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian, differences in the shades of their meanings and the frequency of their usage in different types of the discourse. In this research work we tried to make new approaches to the analysis of translation difficulties of polysemantic words using the methods and procedures of analysis applied in translation theory.

In chapter one we studied theoretical basis of the research of polysemnatic words and revealed different opinions and approaches of English and Russian linguists according to the given problem. Both English and Russian linguists examined polysemy, and contrasted a range of current approaches, and highlighted many unresolved problems in the theoretical understanding of polysemy and the present computational challenges.

In chapter two of our dissertation we analyzed lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words. The analyse has shown that 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 three elementary types are seemed most suitable for describing all kinds of lexical transformations: lexical substitution, lexical compensation and metaphoric transformations. Then in this chapter we presented contextually bound polysemantic words and revealed the impact of the context in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian. Contextual meaning of polysemantic word in many instances depends on the character of semantic

context, on the semantics of the words combining with it. In a number of contexts, however, we find that both the lexical and grammatical aspects should be taken into consideration. The grammatical structure of the context although indicative of the difference between the meaning of the word in this structure and the meaning of the same word in a different grammatical structure may be insufficient to indicate in which of its individual meanings of the word in question is used.

One of the more significant findings to emerge from the study of lexical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words is that the difference in word semantic structures is of a linguistic nature. The meanings of the English language and Russian language polysemantic words do not coincide. Even one meaning in reference to different objects is verbalized by different words. Another contrast is manifested by the tendencies towards implicit and explicit expression.

The third chapter of present dissertation is devoted to grammatical difficulties of translation of polysemantic words. Here we analyzed three aspects of grammatical difficulties facing while translating polysemantic words from English into Russian: polysemantic words in passive voice construction and their comparison in English and Russian, comparative analysis of usage of polysemantic verbs “to be” and “to have” in English and polysemantic verbs “БЫТЬ” and “ИМЕТЬ” in Russian, conversion as a part of polysemy in the English and Russian languages. The first aspect mentioned above has shown that English passive voice is used more frequently due to the various types of construction it occurs in. Whereas Russian passive voice construction is formed only by transitive verbs requiring a direct object when used as an active voice structure. The property of the category of voice shows its immediate connection with syntax, which finds expression in direct transformational relations between the active and passive constructions.

After detailed consideration of all cases of the usage of polysemantic verbs “to be” and “to have” and polysemantic verbs “БЫТЬ” and “ИМЕТЬ” in two languages we revealed their similarities and differences. They are following: English polysemantic verb *to be* is much wider in its potential semantic

possibilities rather than Russian *быть*. Polysemantic verb *to be* acquires different meanings depending on a context. Translator has to be able to choose the most suitable variant while translating *to be* from English into Russian in a certain case. Moreover, there are a number of steady combinations with polysemantic verb *to be* in English, which requires from translator the knowledge of combinations of action verbs in Russian, in order to make correct translation of them. The polysemantic verb *to have* in English is quite broad in its meaning rather than Russian verb *иметь*. The verb *to have* can be used not only with a noun designating a person (in the meaning to possess), but it also can be used in relation to subjects. In such cases its meaning is identical to the meaning of “there is” construction and in this way they are interchangeable. If we look through these cases of polysemantic verbs usage more attentively and take into account their active presence in English, we can see the indication of systematic features of the English language. In this chapter we also made an attempt to analyse in depth the behavior of one of these new word-formation methods and a part of polysemy: conversion. It is probably the most outstanding new method in the word-formation panorama. It is a curious and attractive subject because it has a wide field of action: all grammatical categories can undergo conversion to more than one word-form, it is compatible with other word-formation processes, and it has no demonstrated limitations. All these reasons make the scope of conversion nearly unlimited. From the aforesaid it is possible to draw a conclusion that conversion provides well known semantic freedom to the word, enriching it, allowing it to acquire new meanings regarding to its free movement in the sentence. So grammatical system has the impact on language lexicon, resulting to a polysemy in English and Russian.

The fourth chapter of this dissertation presents stylistic difficulties of translation of polysemantic words. The first aspect considered in this chapter is the method of stylistic compensation in translation of polysemantic words from English into Russian. This principle of stylistic compensation requires, not transferring a metaphor by metaphor, comparison by comparison, but it requires giving smile by smile and tear by tear. In the second question of this chapter we

analyzed the influence of polysemy in translating stylistically-marked language units from English into Russian and the following conclusions were made: a translator should be fully aware of the degree of expressiveness of stylistic devices used in the text; according to it he can find out the most suitable polysemantic words for translating stylistically-marked language units. A line of distinction must be drawn between what is stylistically trite and what is stylistically original. It especially refers to lexical stylistic devices: deliberate mixing of words belonging to different layers of the vocabulary, metaphors, metonymies, epithets, similes, etc. Handling the expressional effect of the original text with the help of polysemantic words was also presented in this chapter. Specificity of each of literary genres with characteristic for them speech styles is reflected in requirements to translation. The big role is played with conditions of expressional effect of that language on which translation is done. For the literature as for art as which material language serves, directly close communication between an artistic image and a language category on the basis of which it is under construction is characteristic special, frequently. Practically, stylistic devices help to the author to achieve expressional effect of the text. The stylistic changes are as necessary as grammatical or lexical ones. While applying some grammatical or lexical transformation in translation the translator is guided by principle of rendering grammatical or lexical meaning. When rendering stylistic meaning of the source text a translator should be guided by the same principle – to recreate in translation the same impression that might be left by the original text. This can be achieved with the help of polysemantic words.

Thus, the research conducted by us showed availability and expediency of translation methods offered in this research work. This research work will serve as a base for future studies and can be used in preparing new manuals for the theory of translation study courses and can serve as the basis for further scientific investigations in this sphere. As a result of the research and approbation of offered methods of translation, the general aim and tasks were realized and the problem was fully inspected and the reliability of a hypothesis of the thesis was checked.

Used Literature

Standard and Legal Documents:

1. Ўзбекистон Республикаси олий ва ўрта махсус таълим вазирининг “Магистратура тўғрисидаги низом” 2012 йил 29 октябрдаги 418-сонли буйруғи.
2. Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти И.А. Каримовнинг 2012 йил 10 декабрдаги “Чет тилларни ўрганиш тизимини янада такомиллаштириш чора тadbирлари тўғрисида” ги ПҚ № 1875 – сонли қарори.

Works of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan:

3. Каримов И.А. Ўзбекистон мустақилликка эришиш остоғасида. – Т.: Ўзбекистон, - 2012 – 436б.
4. Каримов И.А. Гармонично развитое поколение - основа прогресса Узбекистана. – Т.: Узбекистан, - 1998 – 117с.
5. Karimov I.A. Uzbekistan on the threshold of the twenty-first century. – Т.: Uzbekistan, - 1997 – 235р.

Scientific Literature:

6. Аполлова М.А. Specific English (Грамматические трудности перевода). – М.: Международные отношения, - 1977 – 135с.
7. Апресян Ю.Д. Лексическая семантика. – М.: Просвещение, - 1992 – 583с.
8. Атрушина Г.Б., Афанасьева О.В., Морозова Н.Н. Лексикология английского языка: учебное пособие для студентов. – М.: Дрофа, - 1999 – 384с.
9. Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1975 – 512с.

10. Бархударов Л.С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1966 – 321с.
11. Бархударов Л.С., Штелинг Д.А. Грамматика английского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1973 – 326с.
12. Блох М.Я. Вопросы изучения грамматического строя языка. - М.: Просвещение, - 1976 – 312с.
13. Бреус Е.В. Основы теории и практики перевода с русского на английский: Учебное пособие. – М.: УРАО, - 2000 – 208с.
14. Ванников Ю.В. О едином комплексе переводческих дисциплин. Вопросы теории и техники перевода. - М.: МГУ, - 1970 – 325с.
15. Виноградов В.В. Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1947 – 312с.
16. Виссон Л. Русские проблемы в английской речи: слова и фразы в контексте двух культур. – М.: Прогресс, - 2003 – 522с.
17. Воронцова Г.Я. Очерки по грамматике английского языка. - М.: Дрофа, - 1960 – 220с.
18. Гальперин И.Р. Очерки по стилистике английского языка. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1958 – 245с.
19. Гальперин И.Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1981 – 279с.
20. Галь Н.И. Слово живое и мертвое: из опыта переводчика и редактора. – М.: Книга, - 1975 – 113с.
21. Гачев Г.Д. Ментальности народов мира. - М.: Дрофа, - 2008 – 421с.
22. Гинзбург Р.С. Курс современной английской лексикологии. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1983 – 321с.
23. Гутнер М. Д. Пособие по переводу с английского языка на русский. – М.: Дрофа, - 1982 – 467с.
24. Дмитриева Л.Ф., Кунцевич С.Е. Курс перевода с английского языка на русский. – М.: Наука, - 2005 – 534с.

25. Дольгова О.В. Семиотика неправильной речи. - М.: Просвещение, - 1980 – 272с.
26. Дубенец Э.М. Современный английский язык. Лексикология. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1985 – 327с.
27. Елисеева В.В. Лексикология английского языка: учебное пособие. – М.: Педагогика, - 1975 – 238с.
28. Жегadlo В.Я. Иванова И.Я. Иофик Л.Л. Современный английский язык. - М.: Титул, - 1956 – 376с.
29. Иванова И.Я. Вид и время в современном английском языке. - Л.: Народное образование, - 1961 – 296с.
30. Иванова И.Я., Бурланова В.В. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1981 – 327с.
31. Казакова Т.А. Практические основы перевода. Переводоведение. – М.: Владос, - 2000 – 533с.
32. Казакова Т.А. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). - М.: Владос, - 2002 – 422с.
33. Кожина М.Н. Стилистика русского языка. – М.: Титул, - 1996 – 266с.
34. Комиссаров В.Н. Лингвистика перевода и переводоведения. - М.: Просвещение, - 1980 – 523с.
35. Комиссаров В.Н. Лингвистические основы научно-технического перевода: пособие по научно-техническому переводу. - М.: Просвещение, - 1980 – 300с.
36. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1990 – 315с.
37. Комиссаров В.Н., Рецкер Я.И., Тархов В.И. Пособие по переводу с английского языка на русский. – Часть II: Грамматические и жанрово стилистические основы перевода. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1965 – 570с.
38. Крупнов В.Н. Курс перевода. Английский язык: общественно-политическая лексика. – М.: Международные отношения, - 1979 – 312с.
39. Латышев Л.К. Курс перевода (эквивалентность перевода и способы ее

- достижения). - М.: Наука, - 1981 – 512с.
40. Левицкая Т.Р., Фитерман А.М. Теория и практика перевода с английского языка на русский. – М.: Дрофа, - 1963 – 280с.
41. Леонтьев А.А., Аврорин В.А. Язык, речь, речевая деятельность. – Л.: Академия, - 1969 – 180с.
42. Медникова Э.М. Значение слова и методы его описания. – М.: Просвещение, - 1974 – 432с.
43. Минаев Л.В. Слово в языке и речи. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1986 – 213с.
44. Миньяр-Белоручев Р.К. Общая теория перевода и устный перевод. - М.: Наука, - 1980 – 211с.
45. Мордвилко А.П. Как скорее усвоить значение английских слов. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1968 – 370с.
46. Морозова Н.Н. Лексикология английского языка: Учебное пособие для студентов. – М.: Дрофа, - 1999 – 125с.
47. Пешковский А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. – М.: Радуга, - 1956 – 165с.
48. Плоткин В.Я. Грамматические системы современного английского языка. - К.: Издательство Калининградского Университета, - 1975 – 252с.
49. Погепцев Г.Г. Конструктивный анализ структуры предложения. – М.: Просвещение, - 1971 – 400с.
50. Попович А.Н. Проблемы художественного перевода. – М.: Высшая школа, - 1990 – 213с.
51. Приходько В.К. Выразительные средства языка: учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений. – М.: Академия, - 2008 – 345с.
52. Ревзин И.И., Розенцвейг В.Ю. Основы общего и машинного перевода. – М.: Филолог, - 1964 – 230с.
53. Рецкер Я.И. Теория перевода и переводческая практика. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1974 – 212с.
54. Слюсарева Я.А. Проблемы функционального синтаксиса современного английского языка. - М.: Школа, - 1981 – 357с.

55. Смиринцкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка. - М.: Филолог, - 1980 – 252с.
56. Смиринцкий А.И. Морфология английского языка. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1959 – 315с.
57. Сулейманова О.А., Беклемешева Н.Н., Карданова К.С., Лягушкина Н.В., Яременко В.И. Грамматические аспекты перевода. – М.: Академия, - 2009- 512с.
58. Сулейманова О.А., Беклемешева Н.Н., Карданова К.С., Лягушкина Н.В., Яременко В.И. Стилистические аспекты перевода. – М.: Академия, - 2009 – 430с.
59. Трусцева О.Н. Английский язык: особенности номинации. – Л.: Наука, - 1986 – 250с.
60. Федоров А.В. Основы общей теории перевода. - М.: Высшая школа, - 1983 – 260с.
61. Чернов Г.В. Основы синхронного перевода. - М.: Филолог, - 1987-200с.
62. Черняховская Л.А. Перевод и смысловая структура. - М.: Международные отношения, - 1976 – 263с.
63. Чужакин А.И., Палажченко П.М. Мир перевода или вечный поиск взаимопонимания. – М.: Валент, - 1997 – 200с.
64. Шаховский В.И. К проблеме трансляции коннотативных компонентов переводимой единицы содержания текста оригинала. – М.: Международные отношения, - 1980 – 167с.
65. Швейцер А.Д. Перевод и лингвистика. (Газетно-информационный и военно-публицистический перевод.) - М.: Воениздат, - 1973 – 170с.
66. Швейцер А.Д. Теория перевода. - М.: Наука, - 1988 – 340с.
67. Ширяев А.Ф. Синхронный перевод. - М.: филолог, - 1979 – 217с.
68. Alan Duff. Translation. – London: Oxford University press, - 1972 – 234p.
69. Arnold I.V. The English Word. - М.: High School, - 1979 – 302p.
70. Biber J. Introduction to Functional Grammar. – New York:

- Harper, - 1994 – 268p.
71. Catford I.C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. – New York: Harper and Row, - 1975 – 312p.
 72. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. – London: Cambridge University Press, - 1995 – 530p.
 73. Fillmore Ch. The Acquisition of Complex Sentences. - New York: Harper,- 2004 – 186p.
 74. Frederick Fuller. Translation Handbook. – Chicago: Chicago Press, - 2002 – 212p.
 75. Ginzburg R.S., Khidekel S.S., Knyazeva G.Y., Sankin A.A. A Course in Modern English Lexicology. – M.: High School, - 1966 – 312p.
 76. Givon T. Typological Studies in Language. – London: Harlow, - 1990-220p.
 77. Hatch, Evelyn and Brown, Cheryl. Vocabulary, Semantics and Language Education. – Boston: Boston Press, - 1990 – 232p.
 78. Hatim B., Mason I. Translator as Communicator. – London: Routledge, - 1997 – 117p.
 79. Johansson S. Studies in Corpus Linguistics. – New York: Florence, - 1996 - 163p.
 80. Kashcheyeva M.A., Potapova I.A. Practical Lexicology. - L.: Lviv University Press, - 1974 – 235p.
 81. Landendoen S. Approaches to Linguistics. – Philadelphia: Philadelphia University Press, - 2008 – 215p.
 82. Lehrer Adrienne. Structures of Lexicon and Transfer of Meaning. – Washington D.C.: Department of foreign service institute, - 1978-234p.
 83. Levitskaya T.R, Fiterman A.M. The Problem of Translation on the Material of the Contemporary English Language. - M.: High School, - 1974- 321p.
 84. Lyons John. Semantics. – London: Cambridge Press, - 1979 – 200p.
 85. Meints K. Studies in English Language. - New York:

- Croom Helm, - 2005 – 348p.
86. Minayeva L.V. English Lexicology and Lexicography. - M.: High school, - 2003 – 224p.
87. Nida.E. Towards a Science of Translation. – Nashville: Abingdon Press, - 1964 – 448p.
88. Oksefjell S. Corpora and Cross-Linguistic Research. - Netherlands: Atlanta, - 1997 – 320p.
89. Palmer F.R. Semantics. A New Outline. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, - 1976 – 312p.
90. Pei Mario. The Story of the English Language. – Philadelphia: Philadelphia & New York Press, - 1992 – 295p.
91. Quirk R. Reference Grammar for Students of English. – M.: High School, – 1982 - 313p.
92. Reynolds R. Introduction to Functional Grammar. – New York: New bury house publishers, - 1994 – 265p.
93. Ravin Y., Leacock C. Polysemy: Theoretical and Computational Approaches. – London: Oxford University Press, - 2000 – 105p.
94. Roberts J. Typological Studies in English. New York: Pinter, - 1998 – 531p.
95. Shread J.A. The Words We Use. – London: Cambridge Press, - 2001 – 344p.
96. Shveytser A.D. Translation and Linguistics. – M.: High School, - 1973 – 518p.
97. Soloshenko A.M. Lecture Notes on English Lexicology. - L.: Lviv University Press, - 1998 – 226p.
98. Thompson R. Referred Grammar. – Chicago: Chicago Press, - 2008 – 239p.
99. Ulman S. Words and Their Use. – New York: New York Publisher House, - 1997 – 211p.
100. Yang Z. Functional Grammar. - Harlow: Longman, - 1995 – 220p.
101. Wyngaerd G. Syntax and Semantics. – Philadelphia: Philadelphia Press, - 2008 – 315p.

Belles-lettres Literature:

102. Bernard Shaw – Pygmalion. – New York: Dover Publications, - 1994 – 200p.
103. John Galsworthy - The Forsyte Saga. – London: Headline Book Publishing, - 2000 – 704p.
104. Joseph Heller - Catch-22. – New York: Simon & Schuster, - 2008 – 544p.
105. Mark Twain - The Adventures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn. – London: Penguin Classics, - 2002 – 327p.
106. William Shakespeare - Midsummer Night's Dream. – Moscow: Higher School Publishing House, - 1973 – 280p.

Dictionaries:

107. Ахманова О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. – М.: Просвещение, - 1996 – 607с.
108. Мюллер В.К. Англо-русский словарь. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, - 1965 – 904с.
109. Ожегов С.И. Словарь русского языка. – М.: Русский язык, - 1986 – 795с.
110. ABBYY Lingvo 6.0 English-Russian, Russian-English Dictionary, Copyright. 1989-1999 (BIT Software).
111. Collins English Dictionary and Thesaurus, Version 1.0 HarperCollins Publishers, 1992.
112. Pocket Oxford English Dictionary. – Oxford: Oxford University Press,-2005.

Internet Sources:

113. www.linguistlist.org
114. www.lingsoft.com
115. www.languagesdirectory.com
116. www.linguistic.ru
117. www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linguistics

118. www.allbooks.com
 119. www.multi-lingual-atlas.com
 120. www.translateweb.org

Appendix

Appendix 1

Statistical investigation of the functional aspect of the common polysemantic words in discourse

N	The Verb	Number of occurrences in a million words of text	The number in percentage
1	To be	39.175	3,9 %
2	To have	12.458	1,25%
3	To do	4.367	0,43%
4	To say	2.765	0,27%
5	To make	2.312	0,23%
6	To go	1.844	0,18%
7	To take	1.575	0,16%
8	To come	1.561	0,15%
9	To see	1.513	0,15%
10	To get	1.486	0,15%

Appendix 2

**The quantity of meanings of the most frequently used
polysemantic verbs in English (Oxford English Dictionary 2008)**

N	The Verb	Meanings	Lexico-semantic variants
1	To make	41	105
2	To do	12	45
3	To come	51	96
4	To get	72	145
5	To go	35	129

Aspects of analyzing polysemy in semantics

The distinction between polysemy and homonymy

A. Smirnitsky, I. V. Arnold, R. S. Ginsburg, G. Dunbar, R. Geeraerts



Analysis of theoretical developments

G. Y. Knyazeva, A. Ivanov, A. Muminov, L. Croft, R. Sandra



The development of the radial categories model of word meaning

A. Nikitin, Y. Apresyan, I. Novikov, J. Lakoff



The principled polysemy approach

J. Evans, E. Mednikova, A. Ufimtseva, A. Smirnitsky



The polysemy of spatial particles

G. Brugman, J. Lakoff, Herskovits



The psycholinguistics of polysemy

Sandra and Rice, I. V. Arnold

Corpus linguistics and cognitive lexical semantics

S. Gries, W. Chafe



The frame semantic approach to lexical semantics

J. Fillmore, J. Palmer



The role of context in polysemy

J. Cruse, D. Croft