

LEXICAL PECULIARITIES OF TRANSLATION

Olha Hrabar

Lecturer,

National Technical University of Ukraine

'Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute'

The theory of translation reflects the most essential features of different phenomena. It considers only regular, i.e., typical, regularly recurring relationships between texts in the original language and the target language. But "irregular" correspondences are the most difficult issues for the practice of translation. The ability to find individual and single, "not predicted" by the theory correspondences is the creative nature of translation activity.

The translation process is often described with metaphors relating to space and movement. In some languages the terms referring to "source text" and "target text" are undoubtedly linked to the notion of "space". In Italian, for instance, "*testo d i partenza*" and "*testo d'arrivo*" (word for word, "starting text" and "arrival text") refer to the semantic field of running races. The same is true, for example, for the French "*texte de départ*" and "*texte d'arrivée*" (Osimo, 2019).

Translation is the process of transforming a linguistic work from one language to another while preserving the content, that is, the meaning. But we can talk about the preservation of the content only in a relative and not in an absolute sense. Losses cannot be avoided during interlanguage conversions. There is always an incomplete transfer of the meanings expressed in the original text. Therefore, the translated text can never be a complete and absolute equivalent of the original text. The task of the translator is to make this equivalence as complete as possible, that is, to reduce losses to a minimum. But to demand "one hundred percent" correspondence of the meanings expressed in the original text and in the translated text is absolutely unrealistic.

Thus, the translator's goal is to fully and accurately convey the content of the original through the means of another language, preserving its stylistic and expressive features. The integrity of the translation is understood as the unity of form and content on a new linguistic basis. If the criterion of translation accuracy is the identity of information presented in different languages, then only a translation that conveys this information by equivalent means can be called integral (full or adequate). In other words, unlike a retelling, a translation must convey not only what is expressed by the original, but also how it is expressed in it. As a rule, the linguistic theory of translation examines one of the sides of the language system: grammatical structure, vocabulary, stylistics of certain languages.

A colorless, devoid of lexical content grammatical structure has the same meaning for the translator as the metal frame for the future residents of the house.

Analyzing the text during translation, "the units of translation" (words, phrases, or parts of sentences) for which there are traditionally permanent, unchanging counterparts in a given language are singled out. However, in any text, such equivalent correspondences are a small minority. There are more such "units" for the translation of which it is necessary to use the most diverse means of one language or another, but this choice is far from arbitrary. Of course, it is not limited to the data of a bilingual dictionary. No dictionary can predict all the variety of contextual meanings realized in the language, just as it cannot cover all the variety of word combinations. Therefore, the theory of translation can establish only functional correspondences, taking into account the dependence of the transmission of certain semantic categories on the action of various factors.

What is the criterion of the correctness of the choice to achieve the adequacy of the translation? Since the criterion of adequacy can only be compliance with the part of reality described in the original, the equivalence of means is determined, if not by identity, then by the maximum approximation of the obtained result to the action of the original.

Even "penetration into reality", which is the basis of the so-called denotative theory of translation, cannot be a criterion of adequacy. There are quite possible cases when the translator is more fully and deeply familiar with the segment of reality described in the original than the author himself. But does the translator have the right to reproduce this reality not as it is reflected in the original? This approach distorts the very essence of the translation and replaces the author's vision of reality with the translator's vision.

Speaking of lexical phenomena, it should be noted that most words in the Ukrainian and English languages have multiple meanings. The different meanings of the word are related to each other and, as a rule, unite around a common, basic meaning. The semantics of a word is manifested in the context, depends on the lexical environment of the word. Therefore, to adequately convey the meaning, the words should not be considered in isolation, but in connection with other words, sometimes in a wider context.

The idea of translation as a simple substitution of words of one language with equivalent words from another language is wrong, since most words in the English and Ukrainian languages are polysemic, and the whole system of a polysemic word cannot coincide with the word system of another language.

References

Miram, G. (1998). *Translation algorithms: introduction to translation formalization*. TVIM INTER.

- Osimo, B. (2019). *Basic Notions of Translation Theory: Semiotics - Linguistics – Psychology*. Milan
- Sydoruk, H.I. (2016). *Basics of Translation Theory*. NUBiP