

FEATURES OF THE NOMINATION OF ABBREVIATIONS IN THE SOCIO-POLITICAL TEXT AND THE ISSUES OF THEIR TRANSLATION

Zuparova Lobar Karimovna

lecturer, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

The deep fundamental differences that exist between different types of abbreviations require differentiated approach to abbreviated names that differ in the method of formation, composition, structure, degree of dependence of the abbreviation on the generating phrase, stylistic coloring, and the function of nomination (compare language and speech abbreviations) cf. BL (British Leyland), Dems (Democrats), CND (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament), Lady Di (Diana).

On the problem of abbreviations, there are many different opinions that eloquently attest to the complexity of the issue. Some researchers call any abbreviations words made in a new way. Other linguists see in abbreviated names incomplete verbal signs, which, in their opinion, it is advisable to consider either as “phonomorphological”, or as “stylistic variants” of complete designations. There is also a point of view on abbreviations as on a phenomenon that must be studied in diachronic terms, namely, as unstable linguistic facts that pass through the stages of literal development*. However, at the same time, it is difficult to establish the exact time from which the abbreviation can be assigned the status of the word.

According to E.S. Kubryakova, the semantic shift that takes place during the formation of an abbreviation occurs in the form of a transition from a motivated name to a demotivated one, the essence of which is that “the way of describing the designated item in these cases is different: the expanded several – word name gives an accurate idea of the details and characteristics of the designated item; the abbreviation is perceived rather as a conditional sign-a substitute for this name”.

Abbreviations are divided into autonomous and non-autonomous. Autonomous abbreviations evoke in the minds of native speakers not the corresponding few-word names, but rather the “pieces of reality” designated by them. There is no intermediate stage of intra-linguistic dependence between full symbols and their abbreviations.

Non-autonomous abbreviations in the text, usually of the initial type, are represented as nothing more than conditional substitutes for full names. In them, as E. S. Kubryakova rightly points out, the full and short versions of the notation differ by the measure of explicitness in the expression of individual components of the meaning: full-valued elements can be reduced beyond recognition, and the traces left by them vary from the initial syllables of the producing words to the initial letter abbreviations.

Here are some examples of abbreviations of data on human rights.

WHO-World Health Organization-Всемирная Организация Здравоохранения.

FAO-Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations-Организация ООН по вопросам питания и сельского хозяйства.

IMF-International Finance Corporation-Международная валютная корпорация.

IAEA-International Atomic Energy Agency-Международное Агентство по атомной энергии.

UPU-Universal Postal Union-Всеобщий почтовый союз.

Thus, the study of the varieties of abbreviations in some parameters shows a different degree of expression in them of the statutory features of the word. They are most obviously found in lexical abbreviations, which are quite independent autonomous nominative units capable of word production. (Euroshima, Nixonomics, Reaganomics)

The lowest degree of verbality is inherent in graphic abbreviations, which are characterized by non-autonomous nomination, dependence on the context, and minimal derivational potency. A number of varieties of abbreviations occupy an intermediate place, clearly revealing certain features of the word, but not so obviously showing other statutory properties. These are, in particular, compound words, telescopic formations, and truncations.

Differences in the semantic and grammatical structure of English and Russian languages cause in some cases the need for the division of English sentences. When translating specific constructions that do not correspond in Russian, you have to resort to internal division (replacing a simple sentence with a complex one) or external division (turning an expanded sentence into two or more sentences).

An example of internal partitioning is the translation of syntactic constructions of the type:

1) subject-infinitive turnover:

F. ex: The newly appointed Prime Minister is expected to get the vote of confidence he seeks.

F. ex: Ожидается, что вновь назначенный премьер- министр получит вотум доверия, которого он добивается.

2) gerundial turnover

F. ex: Vietnam thanked the Soviet Union for offering her a helping hand.

F. ex: Вьетнам выразил благодарность Советскому Союзу за то, что он протянул ему руку помощи.

3) independent participial turnover

F. ex: With war over, a new chance for Uganda.*

F. ex: С окончанием войны у Уганды появились новые перспективы.

We came to the conclusion that the socio-political terminology did not appear in one day, it is worth hundreds of years of hard work of diplomats-translators, who spent a lot of time on the coordination of certain controversial terms and semi-terms. And an attempt, for one reason or another, to deviate from established norms can unnecessarily strengthen the role of personal interpretation, create the illusion of a change in the position of the state, and lead the material to dissonance

After all, the field of socio-political relations that this terminology serves covers not only the internal problems of a given country, but also the field of external relations, and therefore is constantly in close contact with other languages.

REFERENCES:

1. Alimova K.T “The Role of Guide-Translator in the development of tourism Industry” Электрон // International Journal of Research e-ISSN: 2348-6848 p-ISSN: 2348-795X Volume 07 Issue 10 October 2021. – PP 564–571 <https://journals.pen2print.org/index.php/ijr/article/view/20325>
2. Breus E.V. fundamentals of the theory and practice of translation from Russian into English. M., 2002.
3. Vinogradov V.S. Translation: General and lexical issues: a tutorial. – 3rd ed. – M.: KDU, 2006.
4. Ter-Minasova S.G. War and peace of languages and cultures: issues of theory and the practice of interlingual and intercultural communication: textbook. manual-M.: AST: Astrel: The Guardian, 2007.
5. Akhmedova A. The problems of translating simile in Corpus-based translation studies // Berlin studies. – Germany. (Vol.2 Issue 1.6). 2022. – PP. 94–100.
6. The Guardian-electronic version (www.guardian.co.uk) 30.03.2002.
7. The Boston Globe-electronic version (www.boston.com) 23.04.2002.
8. Financial Times-electronic version (www.ft.com) 21.04.2002.