

го. В узбекском языке функционирование двухъядерных безглагольных предложений, как показало наше исследование, представляется нормой разговорной и литературной формы речи.

### *Литература*

1. Адмони В. Г. Завершённость конструкции как явление синтаксической формы // Вопросы языкознания. 1958. № 1. С. 111-117.
2. Бархударов Л. С., Штелинг Д. А. Грамматика английского языка. 3-е изд. М.: Высш. шк., 1965. 428 с.
3. Виноградов В. В. Некоторые задачи изучения синтаксиса простого предложения // Вопросы языкознания. 1954. № 1. С. 3-29.
4. Данеш Ф. Опыт теоретической интерпретации синтаксической омонимии // Вопросы языкознания. 1964. № 6. С. 3-16.
5. Мухин А. М. Структура предложений и их модели. Л.: Наука, Ленингр. отделение, 1968. 231 с.
6. Мухин А. М. О синтаксической и синтаксико-семантической классификации предложений // Материалы семинара по теоретическим проблемам синтаксиса. Ч. I. Пермь, 1975. С. 48-52.
7. Потебня А. А. Из записок по русской грамматике. Т. 1-2. М.: Учпедгиз, 1958. 536 с.
8. Почепцов Г. Г. Конструктивный анализ структуры предложения. Киев: Вища шк., 1971. 193 с.
9. Скребнев Ю. М. Общелингвистические проблемы описания синтаксиса разговорной речи: автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. Горький, 1971. 36 с.
10. Структурный синтаксис английского языка / под ред. проф. Л. Л. Иофик. Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1972. 176 с.
11. Шахматов А. А. Синтаксис русского языка. СПб.: Изд-во ЛКИ, 2007. 620 с.
12. Щерба Л. В. Избранные работы по языкознанию и фонетике. Т. I. 1-е изд. Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1958. 182 с.
13. Fries Ch. C. The Structure of English. N. Y.: Barnes and Noble, 1968. 298 p.

УДК 81

*D. Bekpulatova (Nukus, Uzbekistan)  
Karakalpak State University*

### **Lexical problems of translation**

The article studies lexical problems of translation. The principal types of lexical correspondences between two languages are complete, partial and absence of correspondences.

**Keywords:** translation, lexical problems, complete correspondence, partial correspondence, absence of correspondence

В статье исследуются лексические проблемы перевода. Основными типами лексических соответствий между двумя языками являются полное, частичное соответствие и отсутствие соответствий.

**Ключевые слова:** перевод, лексические проблемы, полное соответствие, частичное соответствие, отсутствие соответствий

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.

#### **I. Complete lexical 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.

#### **II. Partial lexical correspondences**

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

1. Most words in a language are polysemantic, and the system of word – meaning in one language does not occur with the same system in another language completely (compare the nouns “house” and “table” in English, Karakalpak and Russian). That’s why the selection of a word in the process of translating is determined by the context [5, с. 79].

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 synonymous is based on. Consequently, it is advisable to account for the

concurring meanings of members of the 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; жумыстан босатыў (әдебий тилде), куўыў (аўызеки тилде), столдың шети; айдың шети.

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 to 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 – қаймақ түскен ыссы сүт. – 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 human being), to sail (of a ship), to float (an inanimate object); in Karakalpak: жүзиў (адамлар ҳаққында), жүзиў (кеме ҳаққында), суў үстинде қалқып жүриў (предмет ҳаққында); in Russian плавать, плыть.

b) Words with “abroad” sense: verbs of state (to be), perception and brain-work (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 ысқырып, станциядан шығып кетти. – Дав свисток, поезд отошел от станции.

5. Most difficulties are encountered when translating the so called *pseudo-international words*, i.e. words which are similar in form 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 Karakalpak: пайыт, in Russian: момент, важность, значительность).

As a rule, the object of translation is not a list of separate lexical units but a coherent in which the SL words make up integral whole. Though each word in the language has its own meaning, the actual information it conveys in a text depends, to a great extent, on its contextual environment [5, с. 79, 22]. Generally speaking, the meaning of any word in the text cannot be understood and translated without due regard to the specific context in which it is actualized. Some words, however, are less sensitive to the contextual influence than others. There are words definite meanings

which are retained in most contexts and are relatively context-free. Context-free words are mainly found among proper and geographical names, titles of magazines and newspapers, names of various firms, organizations, ships, aircraft and the like, as well as among technical terms used by experts in all fields of human endeavour.

Context-free words have an important role to play in the translating process. They usually have permanent equivalents in TL which, in most cases, can be used in TT. The translator is thus provided reference points helping him to choose the appropriate translation variants [6, 7]. The permanent equivalents of context-free words are often formed by transcription (with possible elements of transliteration) or loan translations.

*Proper and geographical names* are transcribed with TL letters, e.g.: Smith – Смит, Brown – Браун, John Fitzgerald Kennedy – Джон Фитцджеральд Кеннеди; Cleveland – Кливленд, Rhode Island – Род-Айленд, Ontario – Онтарио; Downing Street – Даунинг-стрит, Foley Square – Фоли-сквер.

The same is true about *the titles of periodicals* and *the names of firms and corporations*, e.g.: Life – «Лайф», US News and World Report – «ЮС ньюс энд уорлд рипорт», General Motors Corporation – «Дженерал моторс корпорейшн», Harriman and Brothers – «Гарриман энд бразерс», Anaconda Mining Company – «Анаконда майнинг компани».

Transcription is also used to reproduce in TL the names of ships, aircraft, missiles and pieces of military equipment: Queen Elisabeth – «Куин Елизабет», Spitfire – «Спитфайр», Hawk – «Хок», Trident – «Трайидент», Honest John – «Онест Джон».

The rules of transcription have two minor exceptions. First, it is sometimes supplemented by elements of transliteration when SL letters are reproduced in TT instead of sounds. This technique is used with mute and double consonants between vowels or at the end of the word and with neutral vowels (Dorset – Дорсет, Bonners Ferry – Боннерс Ферри) as well as to preserve some elements of SL spelling so as to make the TL equivalent resemble some familiar pattern (the Hercules missile – ракета «Геркулес», Columbia – Колумбия). Second there are some traditional exceptions in rendering the names of historical personalities and geographical names, e.g.: Charles I – Карл I, James II – Яков II, Edinburgh – Эдинбург.

Some geographical names are made up of common nouns are translated word-for-word: the United States of America – Соединенные Штаты Америки, the United Kingdom – Соединенное Королевство, the Rocky Mountains – Скалистые горы. [1, с. 87].

If the name includes both a proper name and a common name, the former is transcribed while the latter is either translated or transcribed or both: the Atlantic Ocean – Атлантический Океан, Kansas City – Канзас-сити, New Hampshire – Нью-Хемпшир, Firth of Clyde – Залив Ферт-оф-Клайд.

*Names of political parties, trade unions and similar bodies* are usually translated word-for-word (with or without a change in the word-order): the Republican Party – республиканская партия, the United Automobile Workers Union – Объединенный профсоюз рабочих автомобильной промышленности, the Federal Bureau of Investigation – Федеральное бюро расследований.

*Terminological words* are also relatively context-free though the context often helps to identify the specific field to which the term belongs. In the sentence “These rifles are provided with a new type of foresight”, the context clearly shows that the meaning of “foresight” is that of military term and therefore all other meanings of the word can be disregarded [2, с. 55]. The context may also help to understand the meaning of the term in the text when it can denote more than one specific concept. For instance, in the US political terminology the term “state” can refer either to a national state or to one of the states within federal entity. The following context will enable the translator to make the correct choice: “Both the state and Federal authorities were accused of establishing a police state.” In the first case the term “state” is contrasted with “Federal” and will be translated as «штат», while in the second case it obviously means «государство».

As a rule, English technical terms (as well as political terms and terms in any other specific field) have their permanent equivalents in the respective Russian terminological systems: magnitude – величина, oxygen – кислород, surplus value – прибавочная стоимость, Embassy – посольство, legislation – законодательство.

Many Russian equivalents have been formed from the English terms by transcription or loan translations: computer – компьютер, electron – электрон, Congressman – конгрессмен, impeachment – импичмент, shadow cabinet – «теневой кабинет», nuclear deterrent – ядерное устрашение. Quite a few among them are international terms: theorem – теорема, television – телевидение, president – президент, declaration – декларация, diplomacy – дипломатия. In some cases there are parallel forms in Russian: one formed by transcription and the other, so to speak, native e.g.: резистор and сопротивление, бустер and ускоритель, индустрия and промышленность, тред-юнион and профсоюз, лидер and руководитель. [3, с. 98].

The translator makes his choice considering whether ST is highly technical or not, for a borrowed term is usually more familiar to specialists than to laymen. He has also to take into account the possible differences between the two forms in the way they are used in TL. For example, the Russian «индустрия» is restricted in usage and somewhat old-fashioned, «тред-юнион» always refers to British trade-unions and «лидер» gives the text a slightly foreign flavour [4, с. 67].

Dealing with context-free words the translator must be aware of two common causes of translation errors. First, English and Russian terms can be similar in form but different in meaning. A “decade” is not «декада», an “instrument” is not «инструмент», and a “department” in the United States is not «департамент». Such

words belong to the so-called false friends of the translator (see below). Second, the translator should not rely on the “inner form” of the English term to understand its meaning or to find a proper Russian equivalent for its often misleading. A “packing industry” is not «упаковочная» but «консервная промышленность», “conventional armaments” are not «условные» but «обычные вооружения» and a “public school” in Britain is not «публичная» or «общедоступная» but «частная школа».

Translation of technical terms puts a premium on the translator’s knowledge of the subject-matter of ST. He must take great pains to get familiar with the system of terms in the appropriate field and make good use of technical dictionaries and other books of reference.

### *References*

1. Арбекова Т. И. Лексикология английского языка. М., 1977.
2. Бархударов Л.С., Рецкер Я.И. Курс лекций по теории перевода. М., 1968.
3. Комиссаров В.Н. Лингвистика и перевод. М., 1980.
4. Мусаев К.М. Лексико-фразеологические вопросы перевода. Ташкент, 1978.
5. Muminov O.M. Lexicology of the English language. Tashkent, 2006.
6. Toury G. Descriptive translation studies and beyond. Amsterdam, 1995.
7. Ullman S. The principles of semantics. Glasgow, 1959.

УДК 81.112.2

*А. Б. Дадашева (Севастополь, Россия)  
Севастопольский государственный университет*

## **Трансформация значений кинематографических терминов в русском и французском языках**

В статье представлен сравнительный анализ лексики на тему кинематографа во французском и русском языках. Описывается эволюция семантики основных французских и русских слов, обозначающих предметы и понятия, относящиеся к сфере кинематографа. Исследуются как устаревшие, вышедшие из обращения термины, так и актуальные для современного языка понятия.

**Ключевые слова:** кино, кинематограф, термины, перевод, французский язык, русский язык, словообразование

Франция является родиной кинематографа, поэтому неудивительно, что именно французская теория кино имеет наиболее продолжительную историю. Большинство терминов, касающихся кинопроизводства и критики кинематографа, впервые появились на французском языке, и в дальнейшем другие языки