



Yana ARUSTAMYAN

PhD, assoc.prof.

Head of the department of Theory of translation
and comparative linguistics

National University of Uzbekistan

yana.arustamyan@yandex.ru

THE PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION OF ART TERMINOLOGY

Мақолада ихтисослашган тилнинг бир қисми деб ҳисоблаш мумкин бўлган санъатшунослик терминологиясини таржима қилиш муаммолари тадқиқ этилган. Унда атамани аниқлаш масалалари хусусида қисқача маълумот берилди. Муаллиф таржима жараёнида асосий муаммоларни юзага келтирадиган терминологик синонимия ва терминологик кўпмаънолилик ҳодисаларини мисоллар ёрдамида таҳлил этади.

Статья посвящена изучению проблем перевода терминологии искусствоведения как части специализированного языка. Приводится краткий обзор проблем определения термина. В данной работе проводится практический анализ явлений терминологической синонимии и терминологической многозначности, т.к. они вызывают основные трудности для перевода.

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.

Калит сўзлар: санъатшунослик терминологияси, атамалар таржимаси муаммолари, терминологик синонимия, терминологик кўпмаънолик.

Ключевые слова: искусствоведческая терминология, проблемы перевода терминов, терминологическая синонимия, терминологическая многозначность.

Key words: art terms, problems of term translation, term synonymy, term polysemy.

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 (7, p.79). Others define it as special nominative lexical unit (word or word combination) of a special language accepted for precise nomination of special concepts (8, p.22). And certainly there is widespread opinion that terms are monosemantic words devoid of expressiveness (10, p.49-51).

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” (2, p.15). 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) (4, p.104-116).

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 (9, p.19).

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: Russian word “рисовать” 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 word “коллаж” 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.

In other words, the avoidance of synonymy within a text and, in turn, in its translation, is seen as a communicative virtue. While it is certainly the case that a use of synonyms which is motivated purely by stylistic considerations such as the avoidance of repetition can be outweighed by considerations of clarity in certain

textual genres, text-based research has demonstrated that synonymy can be functional (3, p. 217–245).

It is well-known that variation in the form of synonymy is widespread in LSP writing practice. Furthermore, such intratextual variation is overlaid with intertextual variation in translation. Some researchers assert, for example, that “networks of lexical cohesion” are impossible to reproduce in translation “even in non-literary texts” (see, for ex. 6). There seem, then, to be potential tensions between the demands of lexical consistency and those of patterns of lexical cohesion across languages.

One way of studying this problem in special texts is to analyze lexical chains as an aspect of textual cohesion. By lexical chain is meant here “cohesive ties sharing the same referent”, lexically expressed (5, p.17). An onomasiological approach would view this as a chain of lexical designations (terms) of the same concept.

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. For example, the word “*mould*” may have up to 20 variants of translation: “I 1. плесень; плесенный грибок; 2. 1) плесневеть, покрываться плесенью; 2) покрываться плесенью, зарости паутиной, застояться без употребления II 1. 1) лекало, образец, трафарет, шаблон; 2) (литейная) форма, изложница, мульда; 3) матрица; 4) опалубка для бетона; 5) а) формочка (для пудинга, желе); б) приготовленный в формочке десерт; 6) характер”. Concerning art specificity we may notice that among this multitude of notions the term “*mould*” can be translated as “*лекало, образец, трафарет, шаблон, (литейная) форма, изложница, мульда, матрица*”. But this is still too many to be certain with the correct choice. At the same time each Russian term can also be translated by different variants: “*лекало* – profile of a line, cam, pattern, drawing curve, curve, face-mould, gauge, template; *образец* – agreement, design, form, instance, model, pattern, sample, specimen; *трафарет* – artwork, groove, stencil mask, mask, reticulation, screen, stencil; *матрица* – two-dimensional array, array, cast, mat, matrix, mold, mother, (напр. для прессования грампластинок) post-negative, (фонограммы) stamper, trellis”, etc.

Another example is the word “binder”. According to the grammar norm the ending -er should prompt us that this term is closely connected with profession or capacity of a person. Indeed, one of the meanings obtains this notion: “*переплётчик*”. But there is another meaning: связующее вещество (клей, цемент). Addressing to the art terms dictionary we may understand that this is “*A component of paint that creates uniform consistency or cohesion*”. So we may conclude that terminological word formation sometimes has its own regulations which influence on semantic content of a term.

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:lɪəu] (A printing process in which the image is incised

or etched into a metal plate using a variety of techniques and tools.) – 1. 1) а) *инталия*,
глубоковырезанное изображение на отшлифованном камне или металле; б)
гемма с углублённым изображением; 2) (= *intaglio printing*) глубокая печать; 2.
вырезать, гравировать; *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.).) –
картуш
(лепное украшение в виде щита с завитками или полуразвёрнутого свитка).

But there are some examples when such terms may have established
equivalent in the language of translation: *niello* [ni'eləu] (the incrustation of an
engraved silver or gold plate with a metallic black enamel (from Latin: “*nigged*”).
A niello print is an impression taken from such a plate before the enamel has been
poured into the furrows, or an impression taken from a sulphur cast of such a plate)
– 1) а) *чернь* (на металле); б) *изделие чернью*; 2) *чернение*,
работачернью по серебру; *gouge* [gaudʒ] (a tool used for cutting wood and
linoleum, specifically to clear away larger spaces of the block. Curved gouges may
be obtained as well as flat ones. V-shaped gouges are used for cutting deep, angular
furrows. A gouge used in linocutting resembles a pen and is attached to a pear-shaped
handle.) – *полукруглоедоло или листамеска*. Or can be translated in both ways,
like: *patina* ['pætɪnə] (A surface formation on an object, e.g. corrosion, oxidation,
discoloration, which may be either natural in origin, or artificially applied (for
aesthetic reasons) by the artist or craftsman.) – 1) *патина* (плёнка разных
оттенков, образующаяся на бронзе, меди, латуни при окислении металла); 2)
налёт, след, отпечаток; 3) *дискос*.

Another problem which may appear in the process of term translation is
multicomponent terms. They generally can be divided into terms with parataxis
(when attributive or relative components are combined with defining elements) and
terms formed with the help of prepositions. The first type of term formation is more
usual in art sphere. For example, *lithographic mezzotint* (a method which is akin to
mezzotint in metal engraving although it does not attain quite the same quality.
Various methods of working the stone exist of which the aim is to create the white
areas by scraping away parts of a specially prepared black background) can be
translated by “*литографский меццо-тинто*” or, using descriptive translation,
“глубокая печать на камне”. The last variant is not very appropriate considering
semantic combinatory as it is impossible to imagine the process of “printing” on
stone. Another example is *sugar-lift process* (a method of defining drawn areas on
an intaglio plate. The necessary area is painted directly onto the metal surface with
Indian ink in which sugar has been dissolved. This is covered with a stopping-out
varnish and, when the latter has dried, submerged in water which causes the sugar
mixture to swell, removing the varnish and exposing the metal at the parts where the
drawing has been made). This word combination cannot be found in the dictionary,
so the translator has to render it either descriptively or by calquing.

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

1. Clarke M., Clarke D. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Art Terms (2 ed.). – Oxford University Press, 2010.
2. Felber H. Terminology Manual. – Paris: General Information Programme & UNISIST, UNESCO, Infoterm.
3. 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.
4. Rogers M. Translating Terms in Text: Holding on to Some Slippery Customers. // Word, Text, Translation. – Clevedon, 1999.
5. 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.
6. Temmerman R. Towards New Ways of Terminology Description. The sociocognitive approach. – Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2000.
7. Глушко М.М. Функциональный стиль общественного языка и методы его исследования. – М., 1974.
8. Гринев С.В. Введение в терминоведение. – М., 1993.
9. Динес Л.А. Вариантность терминологических единиц в частноотраслевой терминосистеме. // Лингвистические проблемы формирования и развития отраслевых терминосистем. – Саратов, 1997.
10. Реформатский А.А. Что такое термин и терминология? // Вопросы терминологии. – М., 1961.
11. <http://www.masterworksfineart.com/education/art-dictionary/?kmas=1&kmca=Education&kmag=Art+Dictionary&kmkw=art+terms+dictionary&kmmt=b&gclid=COB6kau56b0CFcHDcgodnzYA0Q>
12. <http://www.rexart.com/glossary.html>