

THE PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF BORROWINGS

Zilola Shukhrat qizi Mahmudova

Master student of the Chirchik Pedagogical Institute, Tashkent region

Dj.Metyakubov

Scientific Supervisor: PhD

ABSTRACT

This article is dedicated to the pragmatic aspects of borrowings, semantic peculiarities and functions of loanwords. This article explores the notion of pragmatic borrowing, that is, incorporation of pragmatic and discourse features of a source language into a recipient language.

Keywords: pragmatic, semiotics, allowances, text relations, sociolinguistic factors.

INTRODUCTION

A subfield of linguistics developed in the late 1870s, pragmatics studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation which is usually a conversation. It distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act of verbal communication. One is the informative intent or the sentence meaning, and the other the communicative intent or speaker. The ability to comprehend and produce a communicative act is referred to as pragmatic competence which often includes one's knowledge about the social distance, social status between the speakers involved, the cultural knowledge such as politeness, and the linguistic knowledge explicit and implicit.

METHODOLOGY

The most recent focus in the study of pragmatic borrowing is how pragmatic functions are transferred cross-linguistically, through the notions such as functional stability, adaptation, narrowing, broadening and shift, quite similar to the study of semantic changes lexical borrowing.

Pragmatic aspects of translation.

Semiotics (the science investigating the general properties of sign systems) distinguishes the following types of relations: semantic (sign to object), syntactic (sign to sign) and pragmatic (sign to man).

Pragmatic relations are superimposed on semantic relations and play an equally important role in analyzing the original text and in producing an equivalent text in the target language. Semantically equivalent messages do not necessarily mean the same thing to the source- and target-language receptors, and therefore are not necessarily pragmatically equivalent. The phrase : "He made a fifteen-yard end run" and " Он сделал пятнадцатиярдовый рывок по краю" are semantically equivalent for they denote the same situation but the American reader, familiar with American football, will extract far more information from it than his Russian counterpart who would neither understand the aim of the maneuver nor appreciate the football-player's performance.

Thus, the pragmatic problems, involved in translation, arise from three types of pragmatic relations: the relations of the source-language sender to the original message, the relations of the target-language message and the relation of the translator to both messages. These relations can have various characters. They are individual, when the text is not more then only the source of information about some facts or events that do not present valuable interest for the receptor.

The effect of the pragmatic motivation of the original message

The I type of relations amounts to the sender's communicative intent or the pragmatic motivation of the original message. The translator, in other words, should be aware whether the message is a statement of fact, are quest, a command, an entreaty or a joke. Very often the speaker's communicative intent differs from what the message seems to say.

The effect of the receptor- to-the text relation

Prof. A. Neubert has proposed a classification of texts depending on their orientation towards different types of receptors: texts, intended for "domestic consumption" (local advertising, legislation, home news, etc.), texts, intended primarily for the source-language receptors but having also a universal human appeal (belles-lettres) and texts without any specific national addressee (scientific literature). Typically, in written translation the translator deals with texts, not intended for target-language audiences and therefore subject to pragmatic adaptations. Allowances are made for socio-cultural, psychological and other differences between source- and target-language receptors, particularly differences in their background knowledge. According to E. Nida, snow-white was translated into one of the African languages as "white as the feathers of a white heron". Pragmatic factors may affect the scope of semantic information, conveyed in translating. Differences in background knowledge call for addition or deletion of some information. Some cultural regalia may be translated by their functional analogues. Allowances should be made for the receptor's professional status and his familiarity with the subject. In texts, intended for specialists source culture regalia are more frequently rendered by transcription or transliteration while in texts for the laymen explanatory or descriptive translation is preferred.

The effect of the translator's angle of view

Another pragmatic factor, relevant to translation, is the socio-psychological and ideological orientation of the translator himself. As far back as K.I. Chukovsky wrote that "every translator translates himself, i.e. deliberately or inadvertently reflects his class affiliations. And in doing so he does not necessarily set himself the task to falsify the original". This view may be somewhat oversimplified but it is true that although ideally the translator should identify himself with the author, this is not always the case. What is more sometimes it is impossible. Any text is communicative and contains some message transmitted from the source-language sender to the target-language receptor or information which should be taken into consideration by the receptor. These relations have various characters. They have more rather intellectual character when the text for the receptor is not anything more than only a source of information about some facts or events and do not present for him the big interest. But the received information can render much deeper influence on the receptor: it can awake his feelings, cause the certain emotional reaction or to induce to some actions. Ability of the text to produce such communicative effect on the receptor, to cause pragmatic relations to information, in other words, to produce pragmatic influence on the receptor of the message, is called pragmatic aspect or pragmatic value of the text.

The pragmatic value of the text is the result of the source-language sender's choice of the original message's contents and the way of language expression. In conformity with the communicative intention the sender selects the language units, which possess necessary value as well as detail-logic, and connotative, organize them in the message so that it will be possible to establish between them necessary semantic connections for transition of the information. As a result the text has got the certain pragmatic potential, the ability to produce some communicative effect on the receptor. The pragmatic value is determined by the contents and the form of the original message and exists already irrespective of the text's creator. It can happen so, that the pragmatics of the text does not coincide completely with communicative intention of the sender ("has told not that wanted or how wanted"). The degree in which pragmatics of the text depends on the transmitted information and the way of its transition, it represents the objective essence accessible to perception and the analysis.

Pragmatic translation of individual genres

Pragmatic problems of translation are directly connected with genre of the original message and type of receptors for whom it intrudes. Translators of fiction are faced with essential difficulties in transmission of pragmatic potential of the original message. Fiction stories in any language are focused, first of all, to people for whom this language is native, but they have also universal value and are often translated to other languages. At the same time, very often they have descriptions of the facts and the events connected with history of the given people, various literary associations, customs, names of national dishes, subjects of clothes, etc. That demands amendments to pragmatic distinctions between SL and TL, to provide the adequate understanding of the text by the receptor of translation.

The necessity of pragmatic reorganization in translation of the scientific and technical materials focused on experts in the given field of knowledge and owning in all countries approximately the identical volume of the

background information are less. Such messages equally well understood by the scientists speaking in different languages, and explanatory should be given only concerning names of firms, the national units of measure, specific nomenclature names, etc.

Sociolinguistic factors of translation

The important role in the maintenance of pragmatic adequacy of translation belongs to sociolinguistic factors causing distinction in speech of separate groups of native speakers. In particular, additional difficulties for maintenance of full understanding of the transmitted message by the receptor of translation may arise in connection with the presence in the text of the original message of a) deviations from public norm of SL, b) the use of such substandard forms, as territorially-dialectic, socially-dialectic and contaminated, simulating the speech of the foreigner.

The elements of territorial dialects of SL which are found in the original message are not transmitted in translation. The use in the original message such dialectic forms can have double character. On the other hand, the text of the original can be written on any dialect of SL. In this case the dialect represents itself as means of the communication used by the sender, and translation from it will be done in the same way, as from any language (for what, naturally, the translator must have a necessary degree of possession of the given dialect). On the other hand, dialectic forms can be used in the text (mainly, in fiction) with the purpose of the language characteristic of certain characters, their identifications as inhabitant of the certain area where speak on given dialect of SL. In this case reproduction of dialectic features of SL gives nothing, because for the receptor of translation they do not carry out identifying function and will be just senseless. If in the English original the character speaks on the London dialect "chocny" adding a sound "h" to words where it is absent in a standard language, and omitting this sound there, where according to the norms of English language it should be pronounced.

Pragmatic influence on the receptor consists in granting to him the necessary information for realization of the certain activity of scientific or technical character. If the receptor of the message is capable to carry out the desirable experiment on its basis or to make ordered operations with the device or machine tool the communicative effect of the text can be considered to be achieved. The pragmatic problem of translation of the scientific and technical text consists in maintenance of the same opportunity to carry out necessary actions to the receptor of translation. If the receptor of translation can successfully use the text of translation as a manual to the certain actions, we can say that the transfer of pragmatic influence of the original message is achieved. And in this case the equality of influence of the original and translation must not be absolute. It can happen so, that in translation the necessary scientific and technical information is turned to have more precise and accessible form providing correct use of this information by experts, and, thus, translation carries out the basic pragmatic task even better, than the original.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, there is a fundamental difference between formal equivalence, on the one hand, and semantic and pragmatic equivalence, on the other. Formal equivalence may accompany semantic and pragmatic equivalence but it is by no means mandatory. Adequate translation may be defined therefore as that which is determined by semantic and pragmatic equivalence between the original and target-language text. Cases of formal equivalence without semantic or pragmatic equivalence are usually described as literal translation. Literal translating reproduces the linguistic form of the original regardless of semantic or pragmatic equivalence.

The English vocabulary enriches itself with the best linguistic elements during the whole evolution of the English language. Modern English vocabulary has been changing and enlarging over many centuries. In spite of the fact it has not lost its originality. And nowadays it has so many words and word combinations in the stock of words, which also have played an important role in the forming the vocabulary. Adoption of the vocabulary is the interaction in rapprochement the nation on the ground of economical, cultural, political, and scientific relations. The bright example of this is the French borrowings. But many of them were exposed by different morphological, phonetical and lexical modifications and they have lost its French character and that is why they do not apprehend as foreign words. The way that words passed through to get into the English language was multiple-stage.

REFERENCES

1. Cruse D.A. Lexical Semantics. — Cambridge, 1997
2. Galperin I.R., Cherkasskay E.B. Lexicology of the English language. — the Higher Education, Dropha, 1999
3. Arnold I.V. Lexicology of the Modern English language. — Moscow, 1989
4. Jespersen O. Growth and Structure of the English Language. —Leipzig,1938
5. Hopper P.H., Traugott E.C. Grammaticalization. — Cambridge, 1998
6. Hughes G. A History of English Words. Series: The Language Library. — Blackwell Publishers,1999
7. Hughes A., Trudgill P. English Accents and Dialects: an introduction to social and regional varieties of English in the British Isles. London,1996
8. Hudson R.A. Sociolinguistics. — Cambridge,1996
9. Labov W. Principles of Linguistic Change. Vol.1.- Oxford: Blackwell,1994
10. Langacker R.W. Language and its Structure. Some Fundamental Linguistic Concepts. — N.Y.,1968
11. Lyons J. Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. — Cambridge,1969
12. Leech G.H. Semantics. — London,1974
13. McCrum, Cran W., MacNeil R. The Story of English. — London, 1986
14. McMahon April M.S. Understanding Language Change. —Cambridge,1996
15. Mills C. American Grammar. Sound, Form, and Meaning. American Univ. Studies. — N.Y.,1990
16. Palmer F.R. Semantics. A New Outline. — M.,1982
17. Stubbs M. Words and Phrases. Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics. — Blackwell Publ., 2000
18. Ullman S. Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. — Oxford, 1962
19. Ullman S. The Principles of Semantics. — Glasgow,1959
20. Karpinsky A.E. The theory basis of interaction of the languages. — Alma-Ata, Gylym, 1990
21. Lerner K.B. Social nature of the language and the process of language interaction. — Tbilisi, Metsniereba, 1989
22. Arbekova T.I. Lexicology of the English language. — Moscow, 1977
23. Brunner K. The history of the English language. — Moscow, 1956
24. Gumboldt V. Selected words on the linguistics. — Moscow, Progress, 1984
25. Voinova E.A. Lexicology of the Modern English language.— Moscow,1991