

LEXICAL MEANS OF HISTORICAL STYLIZATION: ARCHAISMS AND HISTORICISMS.

Z.Aliyeva

Lecturer at the Bukhara State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract: The relevance of the work is due to the need to study historical vocabulary in the language of a work of art and analyze historical vocabulary, apply a practical approach to the problem of transferring lexical archaisms in translation within the framework of historical text stylization

Key words: archaisms, historicisms, epoch, stylization, classics

This work is devoted to the analysis of the transfer in translation of lexical means of historical stylization - archaisms, which are studied in comparative characteristics with historicisms.

As noted earlier, historical stylization is a stylistic device that allows solving certain artistic tasks: to recreate the historical flavor of works and form a speech portrait of a hero of historical prose who lived in a distant era. Accordingly, archaization is achieved through the use of stylistically marked elements that are part of the passive vocabulary, not used at the everyday level and in a neutral context, i.e. obsolete lexical units, which traditionally include archaisms and historicisms.

A. Akhmanova gives the following definition of archaism: “1. A word or expression that has gone out of everyday use and is therefore perceived as obsolete 2. Trope, consisting in the use of an old (ancient) word or expression for the purpose of historical stylization, giving speech an elevated stylistic coloring, achieving a comic effect” [3, p. 54]. This definition focuses on the role of archaism as a means of historical stylization, emphasizing that a word or expression is obsolete for a native speaker.

L. Nelyubin emphasizes that lexical archaism is “an outdated word that has a corresponding synonym in the modern language” [17, p. 22]. The presence of synonymous units of neutral vocabulary in the modern language is the most important distinguishing feature of archaisms. It is also important to note that the concept of archaism includes not only a word or expression, but also a lexical-semantic version of a word, those. obsolete meaning of the word functioning in the modern language [7].

Based on whether the whole word as a carrier of a certain meaning is obsolete or only its semantic meaning is obsolete, archaisms are divided into lexical archaisms and semantic archaisms [23]. Lexical archaisms include such units as a fisherman (fisherman), dolu (below), eloquent (pompous) - words that are outdated as sound complexes. Semantic archaisms include the words scoundrel (outdated meaning - unfit for military service), stomach (outdated meaning - life).

In this semantic classification, lexical archaisms are divided by N. Shanskiy into several subgroups [23]:

- proper lexical archaisms - archaisms, replaced by synonyms with a different non-derivative base: lyceum (archaism) - actor;
- lexical and derivational archaisms are archaisms that are replaced in the modern language by single-root words with the same non-derivative basis: to answer (archaism) - to answer;
- lexico-phonetic archaisms are archaisms that are replaced by single-root synonyms, the sound form of which is somewhat different: vran (archaism) - raven.

This classification seems to be significant for the analysis of units of obsolete vocabulary of the original work, however, in translation, the transfer, for example, of semantic archaisms of the source language by semantic archaisms of the target language is possible only in rare cases, due to objective differences in the development of language systems.

The most productive for translation purposes is the classification of archaisms according to the degree of their obsolescence and functioning in the modern language. I. Galperin identifies three main stages in the process of word obsolescence [5]:

- words that are at the first stage of the obsolescence process, when they become rarely used in everyday communication, gradually leaving their commonly used layer of vocabulary. In the terminology of I. Galperin - "obsolescent words";
- words that are completely obsolete, but recognizable by native speakers. The meanings of such words are still clear to modern man. I. Galperin denotes such obsolete words as "obsolete words";
- words that are completely obsolete in the modern language and are not recognizable by native speakers. Such words, according to I. Galperin, either completely disappeared from the language, or changed their external form so much that they were no longer recognized by speakers. The meanings of such words - "archaic proper" in the terminology of I. Galperin - are not clear to native speakers.

The boundaries between the described categories are quite blurred, in some cases it is very difficult to establish for sure at what stage a particular word is, whether it is still understandable to native speakers or is absolute archaism. However, a reference to this classification is necessary when translating deliberately archaic texts for the selection of lexical units when translating archaisms as a means of historical stylization. As noted earlier, one of the criteria for determining the depth of archaization of the text is the preservation of the clarity of the text for the recipient. The presence of archaisms, obligatory elements of conveying the historical color and speech characteristics of the characters, should not impede the perception of the text by readers. Archaisms should serve as a means of optimizing the understanding of the text, enliven the work, giving it credibility, and not become an obstacle for the reader that distracts from the content of the text.

Based on these theses, we can conclude that when using archaisms in translation, it is necessary to focus on the archaisms of the first two groups, which carry a shade of obsolescence, but at the same time are understandable to a reader who has an average stock of background knowledge. The translator must color the text, reproduce the spirit of the past era, choosing archaisms that will fit into the general outline of the text as naturally as possible. The use of archaisms of the third group is highly undesirable, since it will force the reader to refer to the dictionary, which will deprive the work of its aesthetic function.

This point of view is confirmed by O. Akhmanova, who notes that obsolete words that are still known to native speakers, despite the fact that they are not used in everyday communication (that is, the words of the first two groups according to the classification of I. Galperin) are still part of the dictionary composition of the language. They have not disappeared completely, but have received a special stylistic quality, having expressive properties. Words that are completely unknown to native speakers are no longer part of the language [2]. Thus, stylistic categories are only archaisms known to the speaker, which are used to stylize the text.

Considering the reasons for the appearance of archaisms, it should be noted that the obsolescence of such words is due to intralinguistic factors, the development of the language as a system. The general mechanism of archaization implies the initial equal existence of synonyms, the relationship between which changes due to the expansion of the sphere of use of one variant and, conversely, the narrowing of the sphere of use of the second synonym. There is a stylistic differentiation of synonyms. A word with a narrower scope of use gradually becomes part of the passive vocabulary of speakers, remains on the periphery of the language and then completely falls out of use.

Thus, we can single out the following reasons for the transition of commonly used words into the category of archaisms:

- the desire of the language to free itself from excessive synonymy [24];
- change in the scope of the meaning of the word [13].

Linguists also refer to the reasons for the emergence of archaisms more particular cases associated, for example, with getting rid of borrowed synonymous words or the desire for orderliness of the terminological base, in which there are often duplicate terms.

Extralinguistic reality is practically not involved in the process of the emergence of archaisms. Exceptions may be synonyms that carry an ideological connotation; the reduction in the use of such words is associated with a change in the political system.

Considering the functions of archaisms, first of all, it is necessary to clarify that archaisms are not always stylistic means. N. Shanskiy subdivides archaisms into archaisms of time and archaisms of stylistic use. In old texts created in a bygone historical era and describing events contemporary to this era, archaisms will be part of the vocabulary of the language modern at that time period. They will look archaic only for readers of subsequent eras due to changes in the language system. Such archaisms do not carry a stylistic load and are not a means of historical stylization, which is why they are called archaisms of time.

However, appearing in historical prose, archaisms become the most important lexical means of archaization of the text - archaisms of stylistic use. The main function of archaisms is associated with the creation of a realistic background for works describing the events of bygone eras, as well as with the reproduction of the characteristic linguistic features of the era when creating a speech portrait of speakers. I. Galperin notes that with the help of archaisms, the reader is transported to another era and perceives archaic speech as a natural style of communication [5].

The stylistic function of archaisms is not limited only to the reconstruction of historical color in works of art. Archaisms are used to create a solemn style of narration, to give speech an elevated tone. O. Akhmanova notes that archaisms closely merge with other varieties of sublime vocabulary [2]. Such archaisms can serve to increase the intensity of speech, adding to it a certain pathos. Also, archaisms, which give speech an exalted character, serve as a speech characteristic of the hero, reflecting his character, mindset and, one might say, serve as an indicator of the speaker's education.

Another function of the stylistic function of archaisms is the creation of a comic effect, used for the purposes of satire and irony. The intentional use of obsolete words against the background of neutral vocabulary enhances the communicative effect, creates a sharp contrast that helps to realize the author's intention.

Summarizing all of the above, we can conclude that the category of archaisms is a complex phenomenon. A thorough analysis of the archaisms and archaisms of the target language used in the original text is necessary to select effective translation strategies that convey the theme and idea of the text, realizing the communicative task.

Archaisms as a lexical category are opposed to historicisms, which reveal a number of similar and different characteristics. The similarities and differences between these categories are also reflected in the translation, which is confirmed by the analysis of the translation presented in the second chapter of this work.

Historicism is “a word that has emerged from living word usage due to the fact that the object it designates is already unknown to speakers as a real part of their everyday experience” [3, p. 179].

Historicism can also be one of the meanings of a polysemic word. An example is the word label, which in modern reality means a label. In the past, the label was “a letter, a written decree of the Khan of the Golden Horde” [9, p. 1101].

As you can see, archaisms and historicisms are words that have gone out of living use, which are part of the passive vocabulary, but the reasons for the decrease in the frequency of their use are completely different. The transition of lexical units that exist in the language into the category of historicisms is due to extralinguistic reality: changes in the socio-political system, customs, material culture of the language community, which is associated with technological progress and the development of society as a whole. Historicisms, according to I. Galperin, do not disappear from the language, but are historical terms that serve as the only designations for realities related to certain stages of the development of society [5].

Unlike archaisms, historicisms do not have synonyms in the modern language, since the objects they designate are not part of modern reality [28]. However, historicisms can return to living use if the objects they designate return to use again. In addition, sometimes historicisms remain in the active dictionary as part of phraseological units, for example, beat the buckets.

Another difference between archaisms and historicisms is that historicisms belong exclusively to the lexical layer of the language, while archaisms can be grammatical.

Thematic division into groups of archaisms seems to be very difficult, since archaisms cover all areas of human activity. Historicisms are easily subdivided into thematic groups. Summarizing the data of various classifications proposed by I. Arnold [1], L.Nekrasova [6], the following groups can be distinguished:

- objects of material culture, words associated with the peculiarities of the way of life, including items of clothing, transport, food and drinks;
- professions, occupations, positions, ranks, social status of a person;
- military equipment, elements of military operations;
- social institutions, public institutions;
- illness;
- religious concepts;
- units of measurement, monetary measures;
- social realities.

Analysis of the above thematic groups allows us to conclude that often historicisms denote cultural-specific realities, especially in the areas of the general way of life and social and social phenomena, and refer to the layer of non-equivalent vocabulary, which is defined as "lexical units (words and set phrases) , which have neither full nor partial equivalents among the lexical units of another language" [7, p. 24]. That is why the translation of historicisms is a particular difficulty, consisting in a combination of the technique of transferring non-equivalent vocabulary and techniques that can reflect the belonging of the designated object or phenomenon to a bygone historical era.

The similarities of historicisms and archaisms are determined by the commonality of functions. Historicisms, like archaisms, may not have a stylistic function, but be a means of nominalizing objects and phenomena of the past, as, for example, in a scientific style [5]. However, in historical prose, historicisms also serve to recreate the historical flavor of the work and are an integral part of the characters' speech. Historicisms carry the amount of information necessary to make communication logical. Historicisms have a clearer temporal attachment in the minds of native speakers, so they draw the depicted period as vividly as possible, restoring the objective reality of the era.

Thus, we can conclude that historicisms are, along with archaisms, the most important means of historical stylization. With the help of historicisms, the abstractness of the past is eliminated, a specific look is given to a certain historical era, it becomes more material due to the reconstruction of the situation.

The differences between historicisms and archaisms cause different strategies for their translation. The impossibility of replacing historicisms with synonyms, their frequent assignment to the layer of non-equivalent vocabulary, is the key issue that the translator needs to solve in order to preserve the historical stylization of the text.

List of sources used

1. Arnold I.V. Lexicology of modern English [Text]: textbook. settlement / I.V. Arnold. - 2nd ed., trans. - M.: FLINTA: Nauka, 2012. - 376 p.
2. Akhmanova O.S. Essays on General and Russian Lexicology [Text] / O.S. Akhmanov. – M.: Uchpedgiz, 1957. – 295 p.
3. Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms [Text] / O.S. Akhmanov. - M.: Editorial URSS, 2007. - 567 p.
4. Vinokur T.G. Characteristics of the structure of the dialogue in the evaluation of a dramatic work [Text] // The language and style of the writer in the literary-critical analysis of a work of art. - 1977. - S. 130-197.
5. Galperin I.R. Stylistics of the English language [Text] / I.R. Galperin. - M.: Higher school, 1981. - 295 p.
6. Gorbachevich K.S. Changing the norms of the Russian literary language [Text] / K.S. Gorbachevich. - L. : Education, 1971. - 270 p.
7. Edneralova N.G. Outdated vocabulary of the Russian language of the newest period and its perception by the linguistic consciousness of modern schoolchildren [Text]: dis. for the competition scientist step. cand. philol. Sciences: 10.02.01. / Edneralova N.G.; Voronezh. state un-t. - Voronezh: publishing house of the Voronezh state. un-ta, 2003. - 242 p.8. Efimov A.I. Stylistics of artistic speech [Text] / A.I. Efimov. - M.: MGU, 1957. - 520 p.
9. Efremova T.F. New dictionary of the Russian language. Explanatory educational [Text]: [in 2 volumes] / T.F. Efremov. – M.: Rus. lang. 2000. - 1209 p.
10. Kashkin I.A. For a contemporary reader: Articles and research [Text] / I.A. Kashkin. – M.: Sov. writer, 1977. - S. 321-370.
11. Lanchikov V.K. Historical Stylization in Simultaneous Literary Translation [Text] // Vestnik MSLU. - 2002. - Issue. 463: Translation and discourse. - S. 115-122.