# FREQUENTLY USED WORDS OF LEXICAL TRANSLATION IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

Abdullaeva Ozoda Nasriddinovna
Teacher, Uzbekistan State World Languages University.

Begmatova Saodat Botir kizi
Student, Uzbekistan State world languages university

**Abstract**

The subject of this article is the jargon of any language is huge and heterogeneous that no interpreter, not even the local speaker can know every one of the words and recognizes every one of their implications. Obscure information on the text, the profound importance concealed underneath structure obliges the interpreter to be in consistent contact with word references since they do interpreters in gauge administration in understanding the text more clearly the right decision of the word for a total change of the significance of the word in the text is one of the muddled goals in the interpretation cycle. The trouble of this undertaking is adapted by the perplexing idea of the word and its flexible and semantic worth. The word as a lexical unit in English and Russian dialects doesn't dependably concur. Time and again single word might compare to a composite word or an entire word mix of English.

**Keywords:** lexical translation, lexical transformations, approaches to translation, the translation process, lexical problems of translation.

**Introduction**

The sense units of the source language (SL) hold their sense and construction in the objective language (TL) unaltered, others hold just their substance (for example meaning) unaltered, yet modify or change their unique (source language) structure. The sort of major and minor changes acted in the underlying type of language units performed fully intent on accomplishing loyalty in interpretation are alluded to as interpreter's changes are done either due to the contradiction of the TL method for articulation, which makes the transplantation of a few SL units to it inconceivable, or to hold the style of the SL sense units and subsequently keep up with expressiveness of the SL sense units all sense units should be fundamentally changed during the time spent interpretation. An impressive number of them are additionally relocated to the TL in the structure, significance, and construction of the first, for example, unaltered or minimal change of a source language unit by an objective language unit, which isn't

enrolled as its word reference same, is called lexical change independently they have a not quite the same as the first referential importance. In this manner, semantically lexical change is the replacement of an SL lexical unit by a lexical unit with various inward structures, which completes the feeling of the SL lexical unit acknowledged in the given setting.

A wide range of lexical changes includes specific semantic changes. Subsequently, the significance of a word or word blend in source text might be made:

• More explicit,

• More broad or

• To some degree altered as an approach to finding a fitting comparable in TL

The reasons that call forward lexical changes.

1. Contrasts in semantic designs of the related words. The comparing words might connote a similar article - referent or idea of the real world - by mirroring their various perspectives thus the words' denotational implications can't agree.

E.g.: moment espresso - розчинна кава;room - вітальня;bone - в ялинку.

2. The polysemantic attributes of the words in two dialects that are not commensurable (непропорційні), for example, the comparing words have an alternate number of implications and, additionally, a portion of these implications are very divergent.

3. Different lexical and linguistic valency (combinability) of the relating lexical units:.g.: trains run - поїзди ходять.

4. Impossible to miss utilization of words brought about by extra-phonetic elements (contrasts in the ways of life, customs, customs, etc):.g.: The city is based on porches ascending from the lake

Місто побудоване на терасах, що спускаються до моря. (Antonymic tr.).g.: No smoking.

Курити заборонено. (Antonymic tr.).g.: Never drink unboiled water.

Не пийте сирої води. (Antonymic tr.)

(Т.Р. Левицкая, А.М.Фитерман сс. 28-47)

Concretization of importance/explicatory interpretation/specialization of meaning (specialization) is the choice of more concrete or accurate interpretation reciprocals or invariants of implications than those given in bilingual word references.[] It is the decision of a more explicit word in interpretation that gives a more point-by-point depiction of the thought than does the word in the source text (Komissarov, Koralova).term proposed by Komissarov, Koralova is explicatory interpretation.

It's an extremely normal lexical change utilized in English-Ukrainian translation. often happens among different interpreter's changes when he/she manages the accompanying gatherings of lexical units:

• Dynamic things: He passed on from openness (піддавання, вплив, дія);

• Action words of development: leave, go, come, take, move, bring, and so on;

• Polysemantic (words with a wide scope of reference) whose reciprocals are too various to ever be recorded in any word reference. The job of the setting in deciphering such words is vital;

the supposed 'prop's (words that have lost their essential importance/have lexicalized): thing, point, business, animal, design, stuff, and so on;

• Action words say and tell;

• Words having different valeur:

E.g.: "Thank you", - said Margaret, feeling enormous and abnormal and awkward in the entirety of her appendages.

Adjustment (sense augmentation/extension) is supplanting a source language unit with an objective language unit which isn't its word reference comparable yet the importance of which can be sensibly deduced from it.

It is simply one more approach to alluding to a similar item or a part of a similar circumstance.

The relationship of the substitute with the first might be of various sorts:

• The substitute has frequently circumstances and logical results or impacts the and-cause relationship with the first;

Different sorts might be:

• Cause and cycle;

• Interaction and cause;

• A section and the entirety;

• An article and the compartment;

• The holder and the thing contained;

• The material and the thing made of it;

• The specialist and the activity;

• The activity and the specialist and so on

The rundown is not the slightest bit complete. great a significant number of such replacements depend on metonymic relations. transformations can't be dealt with 100% of the time as conscious or emotional, generally, they are equitably required. By and large, they are adapted by contrasts in lexical valency and are frequently utilized for complex reasons.

Antonymic (antonymous) interpretation is the replacement of a confirmed in sense and construction source language unit for a semantically comparing negative in structure sense unit of the TL as well as the other way around (Korunets').

E.g.: stay out of other people's affairs - не втручайся не в свої справи;

not rarely - часто;away from me - не підходь до мене.

(It addresses an approach to delivering when a confirmed in structure language unit (word, word-blend, sentence) is passed on through a negative in sense or design yet indistinguishable in content language unit or bad habit versa translation portrays the circumstance, figuratively speaking, according to the contrary perspective and renders an agreed source language structure by a negative objective language one or the other way around (Komissarov, Koralova).

The payment method is a conscious presentation of a few extra components in interpretation to compensate for the deficiency of comparable components at the equivalent of a prior stage. depended on when an interpreter manages identical lacking elements. are the components having not identical in the TL and which can't be delivered by similar means? They are:

) The discourse of outsiders and vernaculars;

) Individual idiosyncrasies of discourse;

) Minute and augmentative utilizations;

4) Equivalent-lacking syntactic classifications;

5) Different complex figures (play upon words, similitudes, periphrases, incongruity, and so forth) []

An interpreter should be prepared to deliver the discourse of outsiders, lingo structures, and ignorant discourse in the TL structures. It's implied that one can barely deliver, say, cockney vernacular utilizing the Western Ukrainian tongue structures. There is no widespread formula for this interpretation issue and each such case requires an individual approach. some cases polluted structures (the mutilations in the objective language and phonetics) are utilized to emulate the discourse of outsiders. Now and again both SL and TL have created acknowledged types of addressing the debased discourse by people of unfamiliar beginning. Standards of interpretation and ways to deal with interpretation is a unidirectional cycle, beginning from one language, the source language (SL), and persisting to a second, receptor language, or target language (TL). The short broad meaning of interpretation may be the substitution of a text in one language (SL) by an identical text in another language. structure of the interpretation ought to follow that of the first text: there ought to be no adjustment of the grouping of portrayal or in the plan of the sections of the text. the aim is the most extreme parallelism of construction which would make it

conceivable to relate each fragment of the interpretation to the separate piece of the first. The interpreter is permitted to turn to a portrayal or understanding just if "immediate interpretation" is impossible. parallelism makes it conceivable to look at separate units in the first text and the interpretation to find components that have counterparts and those which have not, components that have been added or excluded in interpretation, and so forth, All in all, comparability in structure is saved regarding the littlest of the text. major significance is the semantic recognizable proof of the interpretation with ST. It is assumed that the interpretation has a similar significance as the first text. No trade of data is conceivable if there is an error between the sent and the got message. The presumption of semantic personality between the source message and interpretation depends on the different levels of equality of their implications. The interpreter typically attempts to deliver in TL the nearest identical to ST.any perceptible peculiarity, interpretation can be the object of logical review pointed toward understanding its tendency, its parts, and their collaboration just as different elements impacting it or connected with it in a significant way. science of interpretation or translatology is concerned both; with hypothetical and applied parts of interpretation studies. A hypothetical depiction of the interpretation peculiarity is the errand the hypothesis of translation research is to find what interpretation is, to discover what objective elements underlie the interpreter's instinct, to portray the ways and strategies by which the character of the open worth of the source text and interpretation is accomplished.

The genuine information can then be utilized to assist the interpreter with working on his presentation just as to prepare future translators theory of interpretation is partitioned into general hypothesis, managing the overall qualities of interpretations no matter what its sort and exceptional branches worried, with a hypothetical portrayal and investigation of the different kinds of interpretation, like the interpretation of fiction, verse, specialized and logical writing, official reports, etc. general hypothesis of interpretation has a characterized topic: the course of interpretation completely, including its outcomes, with due respect to every one of the elements, influencing it. Every exceptional branch indicates the overall hypothesis of interpretation for it is the occupation of the overall hypothesis to reflect what is normal to numerous kinds and assortments of interpretation, while the extraordinary branches are fundamentally worried about the particular highlights of each genre. the general hypothesis of interpretation is an interdisciplinary region, prevalently semantic yet in addition firmly associated with brain science, ethnography, and region studies. It depends on the utilization of semantic hypothesis to a particular sort of discourse, i.e., translation. differs from contrastive phonetics in that the previous tries

to contrast different language frameworks and a view to deciding their likenesses and unmistakable highlights, while the hypothesis of interpretation has its very own topic (the course of interpretation) and utilizations the information of contrastive etymology simply as a place of departure. may be seen, as an interlingual open demonstration in which somewhere around three members are involved: the shipper of source data (the creator of the SL message), the interpreter who acts in double limit - as the receptor of the SL message and as the shipper of the same TL message and the receptor of the TL message (interpretation). On the off chance that the first is created not with an unknown dialect receptor in the psyche, there is another member of the source language receptor for whom the message was initially delivered. The interpretation comprises creating an instant message in the TL comparable to the first instant message in the SL.as an interlingual informative demonstration incorporates two stages: correspondence between the shipper and the interpreter and correspondence between the interpreter and the receptor of the recently delivered TL message.

In the primary stage, the interpreter going about as a source language investigates a unique message separating the data contained in it. In the second stage, the interpreter goes about as an objective language shipper creating a comparable message in the TL and diverting it to the TL receptor. producing the TL message the interpreter changes its arrangement of articulation (etymological structure) while its arrangement of content (significance) ought to stay unaltered. Indeed, the creation of a comparable message infers that the message delivered is identical to the first in the arrangement of content. The message delivered by the interpreter ought to summon a similar reaction in the TL receptor as the first message in the SL receptor. That implies, most importantly, that whatever the text says and whatever it infers ought to be perceived similarly by both the SL utilized for whom it was initially expected and by the TL client. The interpreter accordingly must make accessible to the TL receptor the greatest measure of data, conveyed by semantic signs, including both their denotational (referential) implications (i.e., data about the extra etymological reality which they mean) and their emotive-expressive connotations. theory of interpretation furnishes the interpreter with the proper apparatuses of examination and blend, makes him mindful of what he is to search for in the first text, what sort of data he should pass on in interpretation and how he should act to accomplish his objective. In the last investigation, nonetheless, his exchange stays craftsmanship. Science gives the interpreter the instruments, however, it takes minds, instinct, and ability to deal with the devices with extraordinary proficiency.is a convoluted peculiarity including semantic, mental, social, abstract, ergonomic, and other factors. aspects of

interpretation can be examined with the strategies for the individual sciences. Exceptional the vast majority of hypothetical exploration of interpretation has been done inside the system of linguistics.the linguistic hypothesis of interpretation is worried about interpretation as a type of discourse correspondence setting up contact between communicants who talk different languages.is regularly viewed as a course of the phonetic plan over which the interpreter imitates for a TL readership a message contained in an SL message, accordingly making it available, in a perfect world in the entirety of its semantic and practical aspects, to the TL beneficiary. Interpretation is subsequently portrayed as "interlingual interpretation" or "interpretation proper".point demonstrate interpretation to be an exceptional case in correspondence, an open interaction sui generis, as a fundamental attribute of which is that the interpreter, by executing a grouping of interrelated code exchanging activities, recreates an SL message, in a TL. In doing this, she/he utilizes TL signs, sign blends, insects! sign mix rules which she/he chooses from the TL lexical, colloquial, and syntactic "collections as per the errand of achieving an elaborately immaculate TL message., correspondence is monolingual: a message is moved from a shipper to a beneficiary, the two people utilizing a similar code, essentially at the center level of the language, and, subsequently, moving along on roughly a similar semantic wave-length. contrast to be a monolingual demonstration of correspondence, because of 'code-sharing', interlingual correspondence presents a substantially more intricate design. Her correspondence isn't restricted to a solitary encoding and unraveling process, yet calls for two exchanging cycles of encoding and translating. The message planned in the SL code by the SL source shows up at the interpreter who examines the message based on their SL open capability and afterward attempts in various interrelated stages, a TL recreation of the SL message. To impact the TL remaking of the message, the interpreter should know about the way that particular message types contain shows that are addressed by mandatory literary designs or schemata. Text that is recently considered in this manner then, at that point, goes to the second or extreme collector who unravels the TL text, anticipating that it should be incongruity with his/her specific open necessities and the foreordained assignment specifications. investigation of substantial occasions of interpretation is the errand not such a great deal an overall hypothesis of interpretation as of exact interpretation research. The point of such examination is to make use o an intellectually based origination of the interpretation cycle in explaining a precise depiction, characterization, and clarification of the interpretation methodology that happen in passing from a particular SL to a particular TL.a etymological hypothesis satisfactorily to give a premise to the hypothesis of

interpretation it should incorporate correspondence as a significant component. purpose of interpretation ordinarily is to convey the expected importance of the first creator in an alternate language and to an alternative audience. theories have, generally speaking, focused their consideration on the investigation of the phonetic type of a sentence or message absent a lot of consideration being given to the creator, the crowd, or the conditions of the communication. theory of interpretation, in any case, should incorporate more than the actual message.

The importance of a sentence relies upon its position in the message as well as on factors outside the message. Such factors are additionally applicable to the translation of the sentence. example, significance is socially molded: "Every general public will decipher a message as far as its way of life. The receptor crowd will interpret the interpretation as far as its way of life and experience, not as far as the way of life and experience of the creator and crowd of the first report".

The interpretation hypothesis should go past the bounds of smaller etymological speculations to place phonetics into the structure correspondence. It should address the issue of text translation put together not simply concerning the expressions of the text, but on the expectation of the creator, the relationship of the creator to the target group, the way of life and perspective of the creator, and unique crowd, and the receptor crowd. For interpreters to make the right translation of the source text they should know about different parts of the correspondence circumstance. An interpreter should be receptor arranged. The significant issue is what the interpretation will convey to the new readership in the receptor language. the core of the interpretation hypothesis is the overall hypothesis of interpretation, which is worried about the major parts of interpretation innate in the idea of bilingual correspondence and consequently normal to all interpretation occasions, independent of what dialects are involved for sure sort of text and under what conditions was translated. the general hypothesis of interpretation bargains, in a manner of speaking, with interpretation universals and is the reason for any remaining hypothetical concentrate around here, since it depicts what interpretation and makes possible. the general hypothesis of interpretation portrays the fundamental standards which hold great for every single interpretation occasion. . Meaning interpretation ought to reflect precisely the importance of the first text. Nothing ought to be subjectively added or eliminated, however sporadically some portion of the importance can be "moved".

Structure requesting of words and thoughts in the interpretation should match the first as intently as could be expected. (This is especially significant in interpreting authoritative reports, ensures, contracts, and so forth) But contrasts in language

structure regularly require changes in the structure and request of words. If all else fails, underline in the first text the words on which the principal stress falls.

Register regularly contrast significantly in their degrees of convention in a given setting, (say, the business letter). To determine these distinctions, the interpreter should recognize formal or fixed articulations and individual articulations, in which the author or speaker establishes the vibe. Source language influence. of the most successive reactions of interpretation is that "it doesn't seem normal". This is because the interpreter's considerations and selection of words are excessively unequivocally formed by the first text. A decent approach to shaking off the source language impact is to save the message and decipher a couple of sentences so anyone might hear, from, memory. This will propose normal examples of thought in the principal language, which may not ring a bell when the eye is fixed on the source-language text. Style and clarity. translator ought not to change the style the first. Be that as it may, assuming the text is carelessly composed, or brimming with monotonous redundancies, the interpreter may, for the peruser's purpose, right the deformities. Colloquialism. Colloquial articulations are famously untranslatable. These incorporate comparisons, similitudes, maxims and saying (on par with gold), language, shoptalk and idioms (the Big Apple, elitist, and so on), and phrasal action words. On the off chance that the articulations can't be straightforwardly deciphered, attempt any of the following:

• Hold the first word, in altered commas: "elitist"

• Hold the first articulation, with a strict clarification in sections: Indian summer (dry, cloudy climate in late fall)

- utilize a nearby same:

Discussion of Satan q(literally, the wolf at the entryway)

-Utilize a non-colloquial or plain writing interpretation: a piece over the top

The brilliant rule is: if the saying doesn't work in the primary language, don't constrain it into the interpretation.

There are two ways to deal with interpretation:

1. You begin deciphering sentence by sentence, for say the main passage or section, to geed the vibe, and the inclination tone of the message, and afterward you intentionally sit back, survey the position and read the remainder of the source language message.

2. You read the entire text a few times, observe the goal, register, tone, mark the troublesome words and sections and begin interpreting just when you have taken your direction.

**Conclusion**

Other than the troubles connected with the interpretation of words that have been recommended in the writing, this study has added six extra sorts of interpretation lexical troubles that include: Homonymous Acronyms, expressions of various lingos, words with comparable conventional elements in similar language, words that are not any more utilized in the cutting edge language assortment, words that have changed meaning, and words with a different style. Introducing a more extensive stock of interpretation challenges at the degree of lexis in the two instances of symmetric SL-TL implications and lopsided implications, with interpretation models will improve interpreters' hypothetical and viable mindfulness, information, and abilities in dealing with such lexical issues of comparability. The lexical-arranged methodology that handles lexical identicalness becomes viable and valuable when the exacting importance and the expected or suggested significance are in asymmetric connection. At the point when the exacting importance and the planned or then again inferred importance in a text have an awry connection, customary dictionary-based reciprocals don't work, and they should be delivered as per the suggested context-oriented implying that supersede lexical implications.

**References**

1. Alhihi, Nidal. (2015). 'Lexical problems in English to Arabic translation: A critical analysis of health documents in Australia'.Arab Worlds English Journal, 6 (2):316-326.
2. Arberry, Arthur John. (1956). The Koran Interpreted, London: Allen and Unwin.
3. Bahumaid, Shawqi Ali. (2006). 'Collocation in English-Arabic translation'. Babel, 52(2): 133-152.
4. Baker, Mona. (1992). In Other Words. A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge.
5. Baker Mona. (ed.2001). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London: Routledge.
6. Balbaki, Munir. (1978). Al-Sheikh was-Bahr. Beirut: Dar Al-Ilm Lilmalayeen.
7. Bell, Richard. (1937). The Quran. Edinburgh: T.T. Clark.
8. Boase-Beier .J. (2006). Stylistic Approaches to Translation.UK and USA: St. Jerome Publishing.
9. Carter, Ron, and Walter Nash. (1990). Seeing Through Language. Oxford: Blackwell.
10. Catford, John Cunnison. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

11. Dickins, James Hervey, Shandor and Ian Higgins (2002:59). Thinking Arabic Translation. USA and Canada: Routledge.
12. Dijk, Teun van. (1998). Ideology. London: Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.
13. Fairclough, Norman. (2001) Language and Power, Harlow: Longman.
14. Frangieh, Bassam. (1990). Abdul Wahab Al-Bayati: Love, Death, and Exile. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
15. Hall, Christofer J. (2005). Language and Linguistics. Great Britain: Continuum.
16. Hall, Edward and Mildred Hall. (1990). Understanding Cultural Differences. Yarmouth, Maine, USA: Intercultural Press, Inc.
17. Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason. (1990). Discourse and the Translator, London and New York: Longman.
18. Hatim, Basil. (1997). English-Arabic-English Translations. London: Saqi Books.