LEXICAL AND SEMANTIC PROBLEMS IN TRANSLATION

Egamberdiyev Jasur
teacher of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages.
Yusupova Mohlaroy Avazbek's
daughter the 301- guide fellowship and translation theory student of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages.

Abstract: *This article presents the semantic and lexical problems in translation, and how to deal with them. It gives examples of such problems in translation and considers how to solve them. The chapter discusses the problem of a lack of equivalence in translation, which results in lexical gaps at the semantic field level. It also sheds light on the problem of improper vocabulary selection, assuming that there are equivalents to the source text words. Lexical ambiguity, which may result from the polysemous nature of a language or from it homonymic nature, is also discussed. In addition, there is discussion on synonymy and problems related to the translation of rhetorical devices.*

Key words: *problems in translation, lexical and semantic problems, morphological problems, solutions and examples.*

The study of the language is arguably the most hotly contested property in the academic realm. It becomes a tangle begetting multiple language discrepancies. That is why linguistics compares languages and explores their histories, in order to find and to account for its development and origins to give the answers to this or that language point.

Due to the semantic features of language the meanings of words, their ability to combine with other words, their usage, 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.

The principal types of lexical correspondences between two languages are as follows: 1) Complete correspondences; 2) Partial correspondences; 3) The absence of correspondences [1: 96].

Let's deal with them more exactly.

1) 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:

- proper names and geographical denominations:
- the months and days of the week, numerals.
- scientific and technical terms (with the exception of terminological polysemy).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 [2:5].

1. Most words in a language are polysemantic. That's why the selection of a word in the process of translating is determined by the context.

2. The specification of synonymous order. However, it is necessary to allow for the nature of the semantic signs which an order of synonyms is based on. Therefore, 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.

3. Each word affects the meaning of an 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 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.

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

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);

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).

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.

5. Most difficulties are encountered when translating the so called pseudo-international words. The regular correspondence of such words in spelling and sometimes in articulation 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. 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. It does not always coincide with their combinability in the Ukrainian or Russian languages on account of differences in their semantic structure [3:236]. Frequently one and the same adjective in English combines with a number of nouns, while in Ukrainian 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 Ukrainian and Russian equivalents.

A specific feature of the combinability of English nouns is that some of them can function as the subject of a sentence though they do not belong to a lexico-semantic category. The habitual use of a word, which is bound up with the history of the formation and development of its lexical system. This gave shape to clichés peculiar to each language, which are used for describing particular situations.

Semantic translation is the process of using semantic information to aid in the translation of data in one representation or data model to another representation or data model.[1] Semantic translation takes advantage of semantics that associate meaning with individual data elements in one dictionary to create an equivalent meaning in a second system.

An example of semantic translation is the conversion of XML data from one data model to a second data model using formal ontologies for each system such as the Web Ontology Language (OWL). This is frequently required by intelligent agents that wish to perform searches on remote computer systems that use different data models to store their data elements. The process of allowing a single user to search multiple systems with a single search request is also known as federated search.

Semantic translation should be differentiated from data mapping tools that do simple one-to-one translation of data from one system to another without actually associating meaning with each data element.Semantic translation requires that data elements in the source and destination systems have "semantic mappings" to a central registry or registries of data elements. The simplest mapping is of course where there is equivalence. There are three types of Semantic equivalence:

Class Equivalence - indicating that class or "concepts" are equivalent. For example: "Person" is the same as "Individual"Property Equivalence - indicating that two properties are equivalent. For example: "PersonGivenName" is the same as "FirstName"Instance Equivalence - indicating that two individual instances of objects are equivalent. For example: "Dan Smith" is the same person as "Daniel Smith"Semantic translation is very difficult if the terms in a particular data model do not have direct one-to-one mappings to data elements in a foreign data model. In that situation, an alternative approach must be used to find mappings from the original data to the foreign data elements. This problem can be alleviated by centralized metadata registries that use the ISO-11179 standards such as the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM).

Among the lexical problems offered are the absence of direct TL counterparts, the different function of the TL counterpart, words with opposite meanings, eponyms, acronyms, abbreviations and proper names. The syntactic problems include: tense, word order and syntactic ambiguity.Lexical and morphological problems are among the prominent problems in translation. These may include synonymy, polysemy and homonymy, lexical gaps, and collocations. Synonymy Synonymy, a lexical relationship term used to refer to the sameness of meaning (Lobner, 2002; Palmer, 1976/1981), has been identified as one of the troubles in translation from .

Arabic into English. Shunnaq (1992) states that translating cognitive synonyms2 is confusing due to the slight differences between these synonyms. Hence, a good criterion can be the intuition of a native Arabic speaker who is able to judge such differences better. For example, the slight difference between يغبط] yaghbit] and يحسد] yahsud] cannot be realized without having intuitive and deep knowledge of the differences between synonyms in Arabic. As a result, translators may use “envy” as an equivalent for both, though it is completely divergent from the real meaning because the first word, يغبط] yaghbit], has a positive implication, whereas the latter word, يحسد] yahsud], has a negative implication (Shehab, 2009).

Synonyms, in a religious context such as the Holy Qur’an, are a more intricate issue. The Holy Qur’an language is the most eloquent language among the different Arabic dialects. Translators sometimes render some words as synonyms, though they are not. Translating what look to be synonymous verbs is also problematic. Arberry3 considered حلفي] yahlif] and يقسم] yuqsim] as synonyms, and he translated them as “swear.” In Arabic, the two verbs have different implications. The verb يحلف] yahlif] is used in the Holy Qur’an to refer to hypocrites and disbelievers, which means breaking the oath; the verb يقسم] yuqsim] is utilized in the Holy Qur’an to refer to believers who fulfill their promises .

REFERENCES:

1. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-34332-3_4
2. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2158244015605880#:~:text=Those%20semantic%20problems%20can%20include,Synonymy
3. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259190951_Translation_Some_Lexical_and_Syntactic_Problems_Suggested_Solutions#:~:text=Among%20the%20lexical%20problems%20offered,word%20order%20and%20syntactic%20ambiguity.
4. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/the-problems-of-translation-of-lexical-and-lexicalsemantic-units-from-english-to-uzbek/viewer
5. http://www.vestnik-philology.mgu.od.ua/archive/v44/30.pdf
6. Curme G.O. English Grammar. – N.Y., 2003, p. 251
7. English Learner’s Digest. – 2004. - №3 (243), p.15
8. Ganshina M.A. English Grammar. – Moskow, 1994, p. 369
9. Jespersen O. Essetials of English Grammar. – Ldn., 1996. Koshevaya I.G. The Theory of English. P. 240
10. http://www.rusnauka.com/14_ENXXI_2009/Philologia/45914.doc.htm