

LINGUOCULTURAL ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATION OF ART TERMINOLOGY (IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES)

Sayfiddinova Xurshida

Navoiy Davlat Pedagogika Instituti magistranti

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the research of the problems of art terminology translation as a part of specified language. The problems of term definition are briefly observed. Practical analysis of term synonymy and term polysemy phenomenon was revealed within present work considering to be the most difficult for translation. Moreover, linguocultural aspects of translation of art terminology were discussed.

Key words: art terminology, linguocultural analysis, term synonymy, term polysemy, transliteration.

The problems of term translation are widely discussed but they are still topical as any lexis layer tends to be changed in time as well as causes certain interlingual problems while translating. Besides, the word term has different interpretations. Some linguists consider it as a word or word combination for expressing notions and defining objects which possesses (thanks to having strict and exact definition) by precise semantic bounds being monosemantic within the limits of certain classification system. Others define it as special nominative lexical unit (word or word combination) of a special language accepted for precise nomination of special concepts. And certainly there is widespread opinion that terms are monosemantic words devoid of expressiveness.

However, from the perspective of Terminology Studies the usage of terms (as in text) was regarded as a preliminary step towards normalizing that use in a

terminological standard with a view to clarifying professional communication in order to avoid the intolerable confusion which, it was argued, would arise from free development of terminology. This claim rested on at least two assumptions: that there are clear differences in the ways that communication works in general language (LGP) and in special languages (LSPs); and that standardized terms (and in the case of translation, their equivalents) could be slotted consistently into texts in order to create the desired meaning. Subsequent research has challenged these assumptions on both philosophical grounds (e.g. maintaining that there is a constructed understanding of the world rather than an objective reality) and empirical grounds arising from the analysis of texts (and their translations).

Therefore, terminological system represents rather complex lexical layer. As practice sustains terminology of any sphere is always in state of permanent quantitative and qualitative alteration. Some terms become obsolete and go out of use; others are originated with either appearing new phenomena or defining the old ones by more precise definition. And it usually leads to the appearing of variability in terminological system.

This variability causes a number of problems referred to the process of translation: term synonymy and term polysemy.

Term synonymy can be illustrated by following examples: Uzbek word *chizmoq* can be translated at least by two variants to paint and to draw though here we should also define the process itself as to paint means to apply (a liquid) to a surface with a brush and to draw is defined as produce (a picture or diagram) by making lines and marks on paper with a pencil, pen. In other words, the differentiate factor is the tool which is used for this process. Another example is the Uzbek word *kollaj* which can be translated as assemblage or collage. The comparison of definitions also proves this synonymy: Assemblage a three dimensional composition made from a variety of traditionally non-artistic materials and objects; Collage a form of art in which various materials such as photographs and pieces of paper or fabric are arranged and stuck to

a backing. According to the definitions we can only infer that possibly the only difference between these two terms is the material assemblage is created of any (non-artistic) materials while collage is made with paper or fabric.

Sometimes term synonymy depends on term polysemy. The problems of polysemy in terminological sphere was widely discussed but nevertheless each time when translator comes across this phenomenon the only way is to define the best variant through the context.

Art terminology in English is characterized by existence of words of non-English origin (mostly of Italian, French or Latin, Greek). Such terms usually don't cause many problems with translation as they are often transcribed or transliterated. For example, **intaglio** [m'ta:ləu] (A printing process in which the image is incised or etched into a metal plate using a variety of techniques and tools.) In Uzbek language, **intaliya** - chuqurlashtirilgan tasvirli gemma, asosan, muhr vazifasini o'tagan.

cartouche [ka:'tu:ʃ] (Ornamental design resembling the curves of a rolled-up parchment scroll. It is found at the base of old master engravings containing inscriptions (title, dedication, date, signature, etc.)) In Uzbek language, **kartush** - "burchaklari o'ralgan o'ram shaklida bezakli chekka", arxitektura va bezak san'atida jingalak yoki "yarim ochilgan, ko'pincha qog'oz rulosing yirtilgan yoki tishli qirralari bilan hoshiyalangan [qalqon](#) shaklidagi naqsh, uning ustiga [gerb](#), gerb yoki yozuv joylashtirilishi mumkin.

To conclude, all these examples corroborate the idea that art terminology is a unique language layer which reflects cultural and historic inheritance of people, so its formation depended on many factors as well as different languages. That's why in the process of translation we shouldn't pay attention only to dictionary definitions. To choose the only possible variant it necessary to take into consideration the context itself and certainly the best way is to consult a specialist from art sphere.

REFERENCES:

5. Rogers M. Synonymy and equivalence in special-language texts. A Case Study in German and English Texts on Genetic Engineering //Text Typology and Translation. Amsterdam, 1997.
6. Rogers M. Translating Terms in Text: Holding on to Some Slippery Customers. // Word, Text, Translation. Clevedon, 1999.
7. Rogers M. Lexical chains in technical translation: A case study in indeterminacy. // Indeterminacy in LSP and Terminology: Studies in Honour of Heribert Picht. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2007.
8. Temmerman R. Towards New Ways of Terminology Description. The sociocognitive approach. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2000.