

EXPRESSING LEXICAL FEATURES IN TRANSLATION BASED ON THE OLD MAN AND SEA BY ERNEST HEMINGWAY

Sattorova Nafisa Isomidinovna

Department of Humanities,
Kattakurgan branch of Samarkand state university

Email: fine-2014@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

This article provides some information about translation analysis on lexical feature in English and Uzbek. The article also includes comparison of differences and similarities of lexical features both languages based on “The old man and sea” by Ernest Hemingway.

Key words: *Complete correspondences, partial correspondences, the absence of correspondences, terminological polysemy, realia, lexical transformations, lexical substitution, supplementation, omissions or dropping.*

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada o‘zbek va ingliz tilida tarjimadagi leksik xususiyatlar haqida ma’lumot keltirilgan. Maqolada, shuningdek, Ernest Xemingueyning “Chol va Dengiz” asaridagi leksik birliklarning O‘zbek va ingliz tillaridagi qiyosiy tahlili keltirilgan.

Kalit so‘zlar: *mutloq moslik, qisman moslik, moslikning yo‘qligi, realia, termin, vazifadoshlik.*

АННОТАЦИЯ

В данной статье представлены некоторые сведения об анализе перевода по лексическим признакам на английском и узбекском языках. В статье также проводится сравнение различий и сходства лексических признаков обоих языков на основе «Старик и море» Эрнеста Хемингуэя.

Ключевые слова: *Полные соответствия, частичные соответствия, отсутствие соответствий, терминологическая полисемия, реалии, лексические трансформации, лексическая замена, дополнение, пропуски или опущения.*

INTRODUCTION

“The Old Man and the Sea” by Ernest Hemingway, probes basic questions of life and death, and explores humankind’s relationship with nature. Free of the

sentimentality that often characterizes stories dealing with nature and animals, the story still carries emotional impact.

The small cast of characters in “The Old Man and the Sea” consists of Santiago, the old fisherman, and Manolin, the boy who has fished with him for years. Though the old man hits a run of bad luck, Manolin still wishes to fish with him. But Manolin’s parents demand that he fish with a more successful boat. Other important characters come to life in Santiago’s mind. Santiago speaks to and loves the flying fish, the dolphins, and the noble marlin. Santiago also speaks to the sharks, but he meets their malignancy with enmity. The sea is also a character, perhaps the major presence in the book.

Main Part

Lexical features of the work in translation

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.

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

Proper names and geographical denominations;

Scientific and technical terms / with the exception of terminological polysemy;

3. The months and days of the week, numerals.

In the following examples we can see complete lexical correspondence in the work between English and Uzbek language according to I. Gafurov’s translation:

He had gone eighty four days now without taking a fish – dengizga chiqqaniga mana sakson to‘r kun ham to‘ldi, ammo hali birorta ham baliq tutgani yo‘q;

Remember we are in September- Sentabr ekanligini unutma;

He ate them all through May to be strong in September and October for the truly big fish – Haqiqiy yirik baliqlar ko‘payadigan sentabr va oktabr oylarida bardam bo‘lish uchun butun may oyi shuni iste‘mol qilardi;

In these examples we can see complete lexical correspondence in translation expressing with names of months and numerals.

He always went down to help him carry either the coiled lines or the gaff and harpoon and the sail that was furled around the mast. – U cholning uskunalari changak, garpun va machtaga o‘ralgan yelkanlarni tashib olishga qirg‘oqqa kelardi.

In above mentioned example translator tried to pay his attention to terms of profession which was translated complete lexical correspondence. 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. 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 in synonymic order, the difference in lexical and stylistic meanings, and the ability of individual components of orders of synonyms to combine:

SL: When I was your age, I was before the mast on a square-rigged ship that ran to Africa

TL: Men bo‘lsam sening yoshingda yelkanli kemada yo‘nga bo‘lib Afrika qirg‘oqlariga suzib borgandim.

In the sentence the term „square-rigged ship“ does not have a one-to-one equivalent in Persian and the translator has to translate it into the nearest equivalent

3. Each word effects 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

SL: Keep warm old man

TL: Ehtiyot bo‘l qariya tag‘in shammollab qolma.

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: 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/.

- b. “adverbial verbs” with a composite structure, which have a semantic content, expressing action and nature at the same time.

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

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 Uzbek 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 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 equivalents

SL: Yet they (eyes) are still good

TL: Ular haliyam o‘tkir

SL: I am a strange old man

TL: Meni zuvalam o‘zi boshqacha uzilgan.

The following groups of words can be regarded as having no equivalents:

1. realiae of everyday life – words denoting objects, phenomena etc,
2. Proper names and geographical denominations
3. Addresses and greetings
4. The titles of journals, magazines and newspapers
5. Weights, linear measures and etc.

When dealing with realiae it is necessary to take special account of the pragmatic aspect of the translation because “the knowledge gained by experience” of the participants of the communicative act turns out to be different. As a result, much of which is easily understood by an Englishmen is incomprehensible to an Uzbek or Russian readers or experts 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 principle ways of translating words denoting specific realiae:

1. Transliteration complete or partial i.e., the direct use of word denoting realiae or its roots in the spelling or in combination with suffixes of the mother tongue

2. Creation of new single or complex word for denoting an object on the basis of elements and morphological relationships in the mother tongue

3. Use of a word denoting sometimes close to though not identical with realia of another language. It represents an approximate translation specified by the context, which is something on the verge of description.

SL: He was an old man fished alone in a skiff in a the Gulf Stream.

TL: Chol qayiqda yolg'iz o'zi Golfstremda baliq ovlar edi.

SL: Perica gave it to me at the bodega" he explained

TL: menga buni pivo do'konida Periko berdi, tushuntirdi chol.

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:

1)lexical substitution

2) supplementation

3) omissions or dropping

1.In substitutions of lexical units words and stable word combinations are replaced by others

which are not their equivalents. More often 3 cases are met with:

A concrete definition – replacing a word with a broad sense by one of a narrower meaning:

Generalization- replacing a word's narrow meaning by one with a broad sense.

An integral transformation

SL: I know others better

TL: men undan ham zo'rlarini ko'rganman.

In the sample,I Gafurov has applied the expansion strategy by translating the sentence into „ Men undan ham zo'rlarini ko'rganman. This sentence belongs to the part of the story where the boy and the old man were talking about baseball and the boy asked: „who is the greatest manager, really, Luque or Mike Gonzalez?“ and the old man answered: „I think they are equal“ the boy said: „And the best fisherman is you“ then the old man answered: „No. I

know others better“. As it can be seen, the pronoun „others“ is translated into its antecedent which is “bundan ham“. Therefore, the translator has properly interpreted the pronoun into its antecedents.

2. Antonymous translation is a complex lexico – grammatical substitution of a positive construction for the negative one and vice – versa which is coupled with a replacement of a word by its antonym when translated.

SL: “why not”

TL: “hay mayli”

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 or another place to as to make up the semantic deficiency

SL: “between fishermen”

TL: “Baliqchi baliqchini siylamoqchi ekan”

2)Supplementations. A formal inexpressibility of semantic components is the reason most met with for using supplementation as a way of lexical transformation.

SL: ‘We’ve made some money”

TL: “Hozir biz biroz pul ishlab qo‘ydik”

I Gafurov has applied the addition strategy once in his translations. He has added “hozir” to the beginning of the Uzbek translation. In this part of the novel the boy told the old man “I could go with you again. We’ve made some money” and the old man answered “No. you’re with a lucky boat. Stay with them.” As it can be seen this addition may be helpful in improving the fluency of the sentence but it is not necessary and omission of this term does not change the meaning of the original sentence.

3)Omissions or dropping In the process of lexical transformation of omission generally words with a surplus meaning are omitted.

SL: “It was papa made me leave.”

TL: “Otam majbur qildi.”

SL: “Then leave a long time and take care of yourself”

TL: “Unday bo‘lsa dard ko‘rmagin, umring uzoq bo‘lsin.”

The foregoing sentences have one thing in common in translating which is the omission of one word or a part of the sentence. In the first sentence, „It was“ and „leave“ have been omitted in I Gafurov’s translation and the sentence has been rendered to “otam majbur qildi” .In the beginning of the story we read that the old man had gone eighty-four days without taking a fish and the boy’s parents had told the boy that the old man was Salao which was the worst form of unlucky and had sent the boy to another boat. In this part of the story the boy told the old man “I could go with you again. We’ve made some money” but the old man said “No, you’re with a lucky boat. Stay with them” and he added again “I know you did not leave me because you doubted” and the boy said: „It was papa made me leave. I am a boy and I must obey

him.“ As it can be seen omitting „It was“ has improved the translation and omission of „leave“ has been helpful to increase the intimacy of the sentence.

In the second sentence, I. Gafurov has omitted the word „and“ in his translation by rendering the sentence to “unday bo‘lsa umring uzoq bo‘lsin, dard ko‘rmagin” Since this omission does not damage the fluency of translation, it is not necessary.

Conclusion

Through the analysis made in this article, I found a close relationship between the style of the translation and the specific sociocultural environments of its production; for example, I discovered notable differences between I. Gafurov’s translation and the source text. As due to the fact that the translator tried to take into consideration Uzbek national colouring. This is revealed most markedly in Gafurov’s use of more conventional, formal and literary diction and a more conservative approach to rendering free direct thought, as well as his emphasis on the old man as undefeated hero. All in all, the translator’s decision-making process is a result of an amalgam of factors which cannot be fully assessed or predicted even by an integrated method of combining textual analysis and contextual exploration as I attempted in this research. Style in translation is “non-systematic,” “not scientific,” and “there is always an element of choice and poetic taste” involved.

References:

1. Khukovsky K. A High Art: the art of translation. USA: 1984. – 243 p.
2. Deyeva I.M. Lexico-Grammatical Difficulties of English. L.: 1976. – 278 p.
3. Graham J. Difference in Translation, Ithaca: 1985. – 340 p.
4. Holman M. Translation or Transliteration? Sofia: 1985. – 235 p.
5. Ilyish B. The Structure of Modern English. L.: Prosvesheniye, 1971. – 366 p.
6. Toury G. In Search of a Theory of Translation. Tel Aviv: 1980. – 289 p.
7. Wilss W. The Science of Translation. Tübingen: 1982. – 178 p.
8. Yakubov F.J. Siyosiy diskursda metaforalarning ishlatilishiga doir mulohazalar. Academic research in educational sciences, 2023. AREAS/Uz. Issue 2 S. 327-331.
9. “The old man and sea” by Ernest Heminguey
10. “Chol va dengiz” by Ibrohim G‘ofurov