

PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION OF REALIAS

Nurmatova Munira Toshmamatovna

1st year Master student, Comparative linguistics, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

The translation of realia is partly great and important problem of transference of national and historical peculiarity which ascent to the very conception of theory of translation as independent discipline. Not setting our selves a target to give a historical survey we bring only some facts and names connected with the elaboration of this problem in translation.

To this sphere all theoreticians of translation, the supporters of non-translatability derived their arguments, the theoreticians-realists refuted them showing and proving the possibility of transference of coloring by deviation from the translation of "letters". I. Kashkin also wrote a lot about "the transference of national peculiarity" of original, "national spirit" and "national specifics", about "the traits of time and place", "preservation of stylistic peculiarity of original", transference of text in its "national cloth".

About realias as bearers of coloring, concrete elements of national peculiarity linguistics obviously spoke only at the beginning of 50th years. In L.N. Sobolev we find not only use of terms "realia" in its modern understanding but sufficiently expressed definition. Western authors, for (realia) instance, Peter Newmark (1981) has not a term for realia in our understanding. In his books we find "national institutional terms" that obviously correspond to our "social-political" realias, cultural terms for other majority significant realias; other groups not-called realias are scatters both here and there.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Most words in a language are polysemantic, and the system of word – meaning in one language does not concur with the same system in another language completely (compare the nouns “house” and “table” in English, Uzbek and Russian). That's why the selection of a word in the process of translating is determined by the context.

2. The specification of *synonymous order* which pertain the selection of words. However, it is necessary to allow for the nature of the semantic signs which an order of synonyms is based on. Consequently, it is advisable to account for the concurring meanings of members of synonymic orders, the difference in lexical and stylistic meanings, and the ability of individual components of orders of synonyms to combine: e. g. dismiss, discharge (bookish), sack, fire (colloquial); the edge of the table—the rim of the moon; ишдан бўшатмок (адабий тилда), ҳайдамок (оғзаки нутқда), столнинг чети (қирраси); ойнинг қирраси (чети).

3. Each word effects the meaning of an object it designates. Not unfrequently languages “select” different properties and signs to describe the same denotations. The way, each language creates its own “picture of the world”, 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 kind, as equivalence is not identical to having the same meaning (e. g. compare: Hot milk with skin on it – қаймоқ тутган иссиқ сут. – Горячее молоко с пенкой).

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

a) Words with a differentiated (undifferentiated) meaning: e. g – In English: to swim (of a human being), to sail (of a ship), to float (of an inanimate object); in Uzbek: сузмоқ (одамлар ҳақида), сузмоқ (кема ҳақида), сув юзида қалқиб юрмоқ (предмет тўғрисида); in Russian: плавать, плыть

b) Words with a «broad» sense: verbs of state (to be), perception and brainwork (to see, to understand), verbs of action and speech (to go, to say), partially desemantized words (thing, case).

c) Adverbial verbs* with a composite structure, which have a semantic content, expressing action and nature at the same time: e.g. The train whistled out of the station Поезд хуштак чалиб, станциядан жўнаб кетди. – Дав свисток, поезд отошёл

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

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

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

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

– The strike closed most of the schools in New-York.

– Иш ташлаш натижасида Нью-Йоркдаги мактабларнинг кўпчилиги ёпилди.

– В результате забастовки большинство школ Нью-Йорка было закрыто.

Of no less significance is the habitual use of a word, which is bound up with the history of the language and the formation and development of its lexical system. This gave shape to cliches peculiar to each language, which are used for describing particular situations (e. g. in English Wet paint; in Uzbek: Эҳтиёт бўлинг, бўялган! in Russian: ОСТОРОЖНО, ОКРАШЕНО!).

In order to attain equivalence, despite the difference in formal and semantic systems 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 deemed most suitable for describing all kinds of lexical transformations:

1. Lexical substitutions;
2. Supplementations;
3. Omissions (dropping).

1. **Lexical substitutions.** 1) In substitutions of lexical units words and stable word combinations are replaced by others which are not their equivalents. More often three cases are met with: a) a concrete definition –replacing a word with a broad sense by one of a narrower meaning (He is at school. –У мактабда ўқийди.–ОН УЧИТСЯ В ШКОЛЕ; He is in the army. – У армияда хизмат қиляпти; ОН СЛУЖИТ В АРМИИ; b) generalization –replacing a word with a narrow meaning by one with a broader sense: a navajo blanket–жун адёл, индейское одеяло; c) an integral transformation (How do you do! – Салом! – Здравствуйте!).

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

3) Compensation is used when certain elements in the original text cannot be expressed in terms of the language it is translated into. In cases of this kind the same information is communicated by other means or in another place so as to make up the semantic deficiency. (... He was ashamed of his parents..., because they said “he

don't" and "she don't"... – (*Селинджер*) – У ўз ота-онасидан уяларди, чунки улар сўзларни нотўғри талаффуз қилардилар... Он стеснялся своих родителей, потому что они говорили «хочут» и «хочете» (перевод Р. Райт – Ковалевой)

2. Supplementations. A formal inexpressibility of semantic components is the reason most met with for using supplementations as a way of lexical transformation. A formal inexpressibility of certain semantic components is especially of English word combinations N + N and Adj. 4- N: Pay claim – Иш хакини ошириш талаби. – Требование повысить заработную плату; Logical computer. – Логик операцияларни бажарувчи ҳисоблаш машинаси – компьютер.

3. Omissions (dropping). In the process of lexical transformation of omission generally words with a surplus meaning are omitted (e. g. components of typically English pair – synonyms, possessive pronouns and exact measures) in order to give a more concrete expression. To raise one's eyebrows – Ялт этиб карамок – поднять брови (в знак изумления).

Realia are words denoting objects, phenomena and so on, which are typical of a people. In order to render correctly the designation of objects referred to in the original and image associated with them it is necessary to know the tenor of life epoch and specific features of the country depicted in the original work.

The following groups of words can be regarded as having no equivalents: realiae of everyday life – words denoting objects, phenomena etc. which typical of a people (cab, fire – place); 2) proper names and geographies! denominations; 3) addresses and greetings; 4) the titles of journals, magazines and newspapers; 5) weights, linear measures etc.

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

Below are three principal ways of translating words denoting specific realias:

1) transliteration (complete or partial), i. e, the direct use of a word denoting realiae or its root in the spelling or in combination with suffixes of the mother tongue (cab, дўппи, садал, изба);

2) creation of new single or complex word for denoting an object on the basis of elements and morphological relationship in the mother tongue (skyscraper – осмонўпар, небо-скрѐб);

3) use of a word denoting something close to (though not identical with) realiae of another language. It represents an approximate translation specified by the context, which is sometimes on the verge of description. (Pedlar – тарқатувчи – торговец – разносчик).

Translating a phraseological unit is not an easy matter as it depends on several factors: different combinability of words, homonymy, and synonymy, polysemy of phraseological units and presence of falsely identical units, which makes it necessary to take into account of the context. Besides, a large number of phraseological units have a stylistic-expressive component in meaning, which usually has a specific

national feature. The afore-cited determines the necessity to get acquainted with the main principles of the general theory of phraseology.

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

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

REFERENCES:

1. Mirziyoyev Sh.M. O‘zbekiston Respublikasi prezidenti Sh.Mirziyoyevning mamlakatimizni 2016 yilda ijtimoiy –iqtisodiy rivojlantirishning asosiy yakunlari va 2017-yilga mo‘ljallangan iqtisodiy dasturning eng muhim ustuvor yo‘nalishlariga bag‘ishlangan Vazirlar Mahkamasining kengaytirilgan majlisidagi ma‘ruzasi
2. Karimov I.A. Yuksak manaviyat – yengilmas kuch. – Toshkent: Ma‘naviyat, 2008. – B. 8–7.
3. Newmark P. Approaches to translation. – M., 1981.
4. Mc Mordie W. English idioms and how to use them. – L., 1956.
5. Yuldasheva Ch. In original and translation. – T., 1989.
6. Chomsky N. Language and mind., 1972.
7. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and translation. – M., 1975.
8. Vereshagin E.M., Kostomarov A.V. Lingua-country study theory of word. – M., 1973.
9. Rossels V.M. Realia. – New-York, 1971.
10. Tomakhin G.D. Realias – Americanisms. 1988.
11. Fyodorov A.V. The basis of general theory of translation. – M., 1971.