

TRANSLATION AND COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

Dumitru MELENCIUC

Universitatea de Stat din Moldova

Using translated fiction texts to carry out contrastive analysis of various philological categories requires the necessity to establish the quality of the text in the target language. A perfect translation means that the translator of the story is a good writer in his native language, preserving the spirit of the original. In case of morphology and syntax it is much more difficult, because the two systems diverge even in the related languages. In case of a literary text the task of confrontational linguistics is to go much deeper into language. We should draw a distinct line between intellectual information and the use of language as a poetic device, as a means by which to produce an esthetic impact. A translator should be a master of style. The translated information should be endowed with considerable artful merit. There are aspects of translation, which admit a purely linguistic approach in rendering lexical semantic, grammatical, lexical-grammatical, phonological and stylistic structures, involving two or more languages. It is necessary to take into consideration the linguistic and extra-linguistic reality in intra-lingual, inter-semiotic and inter-lingual translation.

Keywords: *semantic structure, intra-linguistic, inter-semiotic, inter-lingual, extra-linguistic, categorial meaning.*

TRADUCEREA ȘI LINGVISTICA COMPARATIVĂ

Traducerea necesită confruntarea nu doar a structurilor semantice ale unităților lexicale, ci și a categoriilor gramaticale, lexical-gramaticale, fonologice și stilistice din limbile respective. Cel care traduce trebuie să aibă în vedere că structurile semantice lexicale, categoriile gramaticale, lexical-gramaticale, fonologice și stilistice sunt în permanentă evoluție, ca și limba în ansamblu. În procesul traducerii translatorii trebuie să cunoască perfect limbile folosite în plan ontic și gnostic. Contribuția lor subiectivă este foarte importantă. Necesită a fi luată în considerație realitatea lingvistică și extralingvistică în traducerea intra-linguală, inter-semiotică și inter-linguală. Modificările intenționate ale textului pot fi motivate de cauze lingvistice și extralingvistice pentru a crea diverse imagini.

Cuvinte-cheie: *ontic, gnostic, intra-lingual, inter-lingual, inter-semiotic, extralingvistic.*

Translation, as part of comparative linguistics, should undertake a detailed analysis in case of fiction - texts on which the etic stage of contrastive linguistics is usually based. It amounts to retelling of the story by the natural user of the target language in one's own words. In case of a good translation the teller of the story is himself a good writer to be able to write well in his own language and has enough talent to catch the spirit of the original, to retell the story plausibly and approximate it to the original. As to morphology it is less satisfactory because here the two systems diverge even in cognate languages for the translator to be able to do justice to the structure of the original text. Creative work, as a most valuable asset, is an important part of the general cultural tradition of humanity in general. Fiction is different from what happens when people translate intellectual prose. In case of a literary text the task of confrontational linguistics is to go much deeper into language. We should draw a distinct line between “intellectual information” and the use of language as a poetic device, as a means by which to produce an esthetic impact. This division is well grounded and necessary in order to succeed. There are linguists, who are great masters of style. Their texts are not merely informative, but also endowed with considerable artful merit. There are many aspects of translation, which admit of purely linguistic approach, and involving two or more languages, it becomes part of the methods of comparative linguistics. R.Jakobson in his paper “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation” gives three kinds of translation: 1) Intralingual translation or rewording as an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language. 2) Interlingual translation or translation proper is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language. 3) Intersemiotic translation or transmutation is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of nonverbal sign systems. The second definition interests us mostly [E.Mednicova, p.3]. What is the role and place of affinity or lack of affinity between languages? Some languages, either because of genetic identity or because of certain sociolinguistic, historic and other circumstances are readily confronted, while others are not. There is much greater affinity between English, French and Romanian, than between English and Chinese. Let's take an example from by Oscar Wilde (The Picture of Dorian Gray): “The studio was filled with the rich odor of roses, and when the light summer wind stirred amidst the trees of the garden there came through the open door the heavy scent of the lilac or the more delicate perfume of the

pink-flowering thorn". The Romanian translation: "*O aromă amețitoare de trandafiri plutea prin atelierul pictorului, iar atunci când în grădină se iscă o boare ușoară, ea aducea cu sine pe ușa deschisă un parfum îmbătător de liliac înflorit sau o mireasmă suavă de flori de gherghinari*". To actually bring out the analogies and differences the contrastive linguist must first retranslate the target-language text back into the source language. In our case, this is what the third text would look like: "*A stunning aroma of roses floated through the painter's studio and when in the garden arose a light breeze it brought with it through the open door, the intoxicating perfume of lilac in blossom or the sweet fragrance of the red flowers of hawthorn*". We shall have no difficulty in agreeing that the "information" contained in this extract is not only very simple but easily rendered in any other language. We can convey it into Russian: "*аромат роз врывался в студию всякий раз, когда в саду дул лёгкий ветерок и он через открытую дверь также нес с собой одурманивающий аромат цветущей сирени*": Or merely restating it as "*Somebody is sitting in a studio, the windows are open, there is a lovely garden outside, there are beautiful flowers there and the smell of these flowers is wafted into the studio by a light breeze, whenever there is a breeze to waft them into the studio*". Nothing could be simpler in so far as the factual information is concerned. But when we compare the 'retranslation' with the original text we find that the Romanian text does not precisely render the exceptional and individual stylistic features of Oscar Wilde's style. Syntactic, rhythmical, lexical and phonetic analysis - when all the words are carefully weighed, when the assonances and other phonetic arrangements, the functional perspective, etc. are carefully confronted, the immediate "etic" confrontation falls to the ground, where, in the target text is the skilful use of synonyms: "*odor*", '*scent*', "*perfume*!". "*The light summer wind*" is not a '*breeze*'; it is a '*summer wind*' and it does not simply "*arise*", '*appear*' or '*start*', but '*stirred amidst the trees*'. The translation of a short paragraph into different languages provides us with a large number of variations on the subject. The 'intellective' information will be rendered into all of them, we shall know that the scene opens in the studio of a painter and that it is summer because the scent of lilac was wafted into the room from the garden and the different flowers blooming in the garden all have a smell of their own. But it is not a translation of the text. It is an attempt to retell the story. Let us take the passage in its Russian translation: "*Густой аромат роз наполнял мастерскую художника, а когда в саду поднимался лёгкий ветерок, он, влетая в открытую дверь, приносил с собой то пьянящий запах сирени, то нежное благоухание алых цветов боярышника*". We find that in English "*the studio was filled with the rich odor of roses*" - a sentence which could quite well be translated as "*мастерская художника была наполнена...*" "*Густой аромат*" is doubtful as a word-combination. Besides the "*rich odor*" of roses cannot be '*thick*' or '*dense*'. '*Stirred amidst the trees*' - '*поднимался*'; thus when "*the light summer wind stirred amidst the trees of the garden*" is in Russian "*когда в саду поднимался лёгкий ветерок, он, влетая в открытую дверь*" - this of, course, has nothing to do with the English text. The whole thing is completely changed because the Russian text says the following "*the thick odor of roses filled the studio and when in the garden there rose a light summer wind, then floating through the open door it brought with it either the intoxicating smell of lilac or the tender (благоухание) perfume of the red flower of hawthorn*". Why "*the heavy scent of the lilac*" or "*the more delicate perfume of the pink-flowering thorn*" is changed in Russian into constructions with "*now... now*": "*приносил с собой то пьянящий запах сирени, то нежное благоухание алых цветов боярышника*". This separates the two scents, keeps them carefully apart by the orderly light wind. Still, the translation is quite good. An adequate translation of Oscar Wilde should make the reader believe that what he is reading is O. Wilde, something elegant and refined.

Whatever text we take, we will find a kind of "variation on the theme" in a different language. If it is creative work, it is a most valuable asset: it is an important part of the general cultural tradition of humanity in general. Philological science has no means of defining literary talent and telling us how the gift of finding "le mot juste" and bringing it together with other 'mots justes' and thus creating images and providing esthetic impacts is actually achieved, for all this is beyond the pale of the linguist. Translation of fiction is something that is different from what happens when people, translate "the English we use", "the English we speak with" or intellective prose. In this case "translation" is translation. What the translator is thinking of is transposing the source-text into the target one as exactly or as closely to the original as possible. In the case of a literary text, to say nothing of poetry, these are completely different things. The task of confrontational linguistics is to go much deeper into language than before. It cannot confine itself to some limited area and not think about the language as a whole with its different aspects, and how they interact.

We should distinguish between "intellective information" and the use of language as a poetic device, as a means by which to produce an esthetic impact. This division is well grounded and necessary, because without it translation from one language into another, both as a process and as an already existing text, becomes impossible. There are scientists, great masters of style, who write in a way which it would be difficult to classify merely as intellective information. Their texts are informative and also endowed with artistic merit. Let's take an extract from the writings of Emile Benveniste: "*Il est survenu au cours de ces dernières années dans les études portant sur le langage et les langues des changements considérables et dont la portée dépasse même l'horizon pourtant très vaste de la linguistique. Ces changements ne se comprennent pas d'emblée; ils se dérobent dans leur manifestation même; à la longue ils ont rendu beaucoup plus malaisé l'accès des travaux originaux, qui se hérissent d'une terminologie de plus en plus technique. C'est un fait: on éprouve grande difficulté à lire les études des linguistes, mais plus encore à comprendre leurs préoccupations. A quoi tendent-ils, et que font-ils de ce qui est le bien de tous les hommes et ne cesse d'attirer leur curiosité: le langage?*" [Benveniste E., 1966] The Russian translation: "*В течение последних лет исследования языка и языков претерпели значительные изменения, которые заставляют еще шире раздвинуть и без того очень широкие горизонты лингвистики. Сущность этих изменений нельзя понять с первого взгляда, они подспудны и проявляются, в конечном счете, во все большей труднодоступности оригинальных работ, которые все больше переполняются специальной терминологией. В самом деле, трудно читать сочинения лингвистов, но еще труднее понять, что они хотят. Какова их цель? Как относятся они к этому величайшему достоянию людей, постоянно вызывающему у человека неослабленный интерес – к языку?*" [Бенвенист Э., 1974] The English translation of the text is as follows: "*During the course of these last years, extensive changes, whose scope extends even beyond the already very broad horizon of linguistics, have taken place in studies dealing with language and languages. These changes may not be understood all at once - they elude one even as they appear. In the long run, they have made difficult the approach to new works, which bristle with an increasingly technical terminology. It is a fact that great difficulty is experienced in reading linguists and even more in comprehending their concerns, what are they aiming at and what are they doing with what is the property of all men and never ceases to attract their curiosity - language?*" [Benveniste E., 1971] "Il est survenu" - The author did not say, for instance, "*au cours de ces dernières années dans les études portant sur le langage... il est survenu*", or "*les études portant sur le langage au cours de ces dernières années on vu des changements.*" So here the foregrounding is very interesting and should be retained if possible. "*Il est survenu au cours de ces années* - in English it would be very easy to translate: *There have taken place in the course of these last years in the studies which bear on language and languages considerable changes, the importance of which goes beyond even the extremely wide horizon of linguistics?* It is easier to translate it into English and Romanian. A translator is always faced with great difficulties the moment the text ceases to be a simple transmission of intellective, preferably technical information. The moment the writer, even of a scientific text displays stylistic mastery, writes in a way which shows him to be a master of style, and can find pleasure and esthetic satisfaction in producing in his own language something that will be on a par with the original. What we are mainly interested in is not deciding whether the various departures from the original texts were justified. What we are talking about is that most of the time they did not result in equivalent texts being produced in the target languages and could not properly be used for confrontation and analytical comparison. Some languages, either because of genetic identity or certain sociolinguistic, historic and other circumstances are readily confronted, while others are not. It is easier to translate Benveniste's text from French into English and Romanian than into Chinese, because of the existing affinity between French, Romanian and English. Besides, E. Benveniste can write in very good English. If a writer is fluent in two or more languages then there must be a hidden interaction between these proficiencies, which facilitates transposition.

When we deal with cognate languages on the grammatical morphological level we cannot help asking: why is *perfectul simplu* in Romanian not used regularly, why is it replaced in speech and non-fiction texts by a stylistically more natural form - *perfectul compus*? It is not always easy to explain this difference only by stylistic factors. When we compare English original texts with their translations into French and Romanian we always find great similarity: *He entered the shop below; Il entra dans le magasin qui se trouvait au rez-de-chaussée; Intră în prăvălia de la parter. Soames followed another method; Soames adopta une autre méthode; Soames adoptă o altă metodă. He went on thinking; Il continua à songer; El continuă să chibzuiască.*

(Galsworthy) The examples show the positive result of this confrontation: *past indefinite* – *passé simple* – *perfectul simplu* are practically identical, both from the point of view of synchronic functional confrontation and the historical community of morphological systems. When confronting English, French and Romanian, we concentrate on the original identity and approach confrontation with preconceived ideas of potential correspondences already formed in advance. We should apply to Romanian what some specialists say of a comparatively low frequency of “*passé simple*” in French, the ousting of it by the form of *passé composé*. *Perfectul simplu* is also functionally limited and is replaced in speech by *perfectul compus*. There is every reason to believe that to try and explain this difference only by stylistic factors would not be easy. This will be possible only if the non-coincidences were confined to colloquial style. Thus, for example: *When did they go over? Când au emigrat? Quand ont-ils émigré?; Why, I did sew it with white, Tom! Neagră, Tom! Cu ață albă i-am cusut. Noir?, je les ai cousu avec du fil blanc. You were absolutely right; Ai avut perfectă dreptate; Tu a eu raison, Michel.* All these sentences belong to the colloquial style, where *passé composé* and *perfectul compus* are better suited, because these forms here do not express an anterior action to the present moment and the actions are not connected with the present moment and here they express actions completely identical with those expressed by past indefinite. [Melenciuc, p.127, 2003] The same relationship is found in scientific texts: *They recognized what was to become the basic principle of modern linguistics; Ei au recunoscut acest principiu, care avea să devină principiul fundamental al lingvisticii moderne; Ils ont reconnu ce principe qui allait devenir le principe fondamental de la linguistique moderne.* Past indefinite has been confronted with *passé simple* and *perfectul simplu* to illustrate historical continuity; with *passé composé* and *perfectul compus* it was confronted as an instance of divergence, which even today is not easy to account for. There are cases, when past indefinite corresponds to the form of *imperfectul* in Romanian, in spite of the fact, that an imperfect action expresses non-completion and duration of an action. It ought to be referred to past continuous, which has become so specifically durative, it is very often found to have a net semiotic connotation and past indefinite is increasingly used to denote not merely the point actions, but also those which require serious attention not only to the fact of its having taken place but also to the way it progressed - hence the tendency to equate in some contexts past indefinite with *imparfait* and *imperfectul*: *He represented for her the reality of things; El reprezenta pentru ea realitatea vieții; Il représentait pour elle la réalité de la vie. It reminded me too much; Dar ea mi-l reamintea; Mais elles me le rappelait. Plain people were in the ascendant; Oamenii mai simpli erau în ascensiune; “Les homes plus simples étaient in ascension; What he said about their development seemed quite sensible; Ce qu’il disait du développement de ces pays semblait plein de bon sens; Ceea ce spunea el despre dezvoltarea acestor țări părea plin de bun simț. [ibidem, p.128, 2003] If the lexical meaning of the verb is not punctual past indefinite and imperfect are quite comparable and can readily take each other’s place. It is essential to consider this question from the point of view of dual meaning of the English past indefinite. The *imperfectul* has a wider meaning in Romanian than the English continuous aspect forms may be explained by the fact that the latter appeared much later and its meaning is based not on aspectual opposition proper, but on a specific continuous aspect as a form which in most cases is metasemiotically loaded. Only a study of the collocational situations can account for cases when past indefinite is confronted with past anteriority forms in the confronted languages: *All through the house it was a wakeful night; Casa întreagă petrecuse o noapte de veghe; Toute la maison avait passé un nuit blanche. He was an actor on the English stage; Fusese actor pe scena engleză; Il avait été un comédien sur la scène anglaise. There were no mushrooms; Ciuperci nu se făcuseră; Les champignons n’avaient pas poussé. After Michael was returned for Parliament, Fleur had sent him Sir James Foggart’s book; Quand Michael fut élu dans le parlement, Fleur lui envoya le livre de Sir James Foggart; După ce Mihail fusese ales în parlament, Fleur îi trimisese cartea lui Sir James Foggart.* (Galsworthy) According to the context, then what has been said here in the past indefinite form is in the relationship of anteriority with the preceding and the subsequent situations. The category of anteriority and the content of precedence in the case of two events, following one another, are in a very complex relationship. The fact is that real anteriority may both, find expression, or remain unexpressed, in the way the appropriate forms are used. Everything depends on the purport of the utterance. Anteriority is closely connected, in the above given examples, with different predications of being. There are different ways of saying or expressing it but the less natural ones would be metasemiotically colored. The choice of this or that interpretation will depend on the idiomatic character of the language and*

the intention of the speaker. The real anteriority meaning may be grammatically expressed or it may be not. Other anteriority means (lexical, contextual or both) take over the function. It also depends on the intention of the speaker. For example: *There were no mushrooms; Les champignons n'avaient pas poussé; Ciuperci nu se făcuseră. All through the house it was a wakeful night; Toute la maison avait passé une nuit blanche; Casa întreagă petreectuse o noapte de veghe.* It is very important to take into consideration the fact that the category of anteriority is in close connection with various sociolinguistic situations. We can say in Russian: *Грибов не было от Грибов не выросло от Всю ночь никто не спал.* Let us consider the sentence *There were no mushrooms*, which was translated into French and Romanian as: *Ciuperci nu se făcuseră;* and *Les champignons n'avaient pas poussé.* If we approach this translation from the point of extralinguistic reality, then all the variants are identical. More than that, it would be much more natural to translate *There were no mushrooms* into Russian as *Не было грибов от Грибов не выросло.* Or: *Грибы есть в лесу? - Нет. - А в воскресенье были грибы? - Не было грибов.* There are various ways of expressing this idea, but a less natural of them gets a metasemiotic coloring. What has been said above is confirmed by examples, where the English past indefinite is confronted with present in Romanian and French: *Linguistics was worked out within the framework of comparative grammar; Lingvistica se elaborează în cadrul gramaticii comparative; La linguistique s'élabore dans le cadres de la grammaire comparée. Why is it that the English version does not say "Linguistics is worked out within the framework of comparative grammar?" [Ibidem, p.130, 2003]* In this case the English translator is not using present tense because simply he would not consider this as an idiomatically acceptable way of saying it or he considers the action as being true in all the times; present, future and past. It is also probable that in Romanian and French in such a case historical present may be used without expressing any connotation. In English historical present would invariably carry different semiotic overtones. For example: *It is not always to be recognized in the different stages, sometimes tentative, in which Saussure's thought was engaged. Il n'est pas toujours facile de la reconnaître dans les démarches diverses, parfois tâtonnantes, ou s'engage la reflexion de Saussure. Nu este întotdeauna ușor de a recunoaște la diferite etape, uneori tentative, unde se angajează gândirea lui Saussure.* In contrast with French and Romanian, in English present tense would be unacceptable, because it is fraught with emotional coloring and vivacity, which in this context would be out of place. In Russian, in such cases, present tense is also used: *A new phase developed at the beginning of nineteenth century with the discovery of Sanskrit. One phase nouvelle s'ouvre au début du XIXe siècle avec la découverte du sanscrit. O fază nouă se începe la începutul secolului XIX odată cu descoperirea limbii sanscrit. Новая фаза открывается в XIX веке в связи с открытием санскрита.* [Ibidem, p.137, 2003]

We find past perfect confronted with French *passé simple*, *passé composé* and even *imparfait*; and Romanian *perfectul simplu*, *perfectul compus* and *imperfectul* instead of *plus-que-parfait* and *plusquamperfectul*. Thus: 1. *I replied unwittingly, and not at first observing (so much had I been absorbed in reflection) the extraordinary manner in which the speaker had chimed in with my meditation; Comme j'étais plongé dans mes pensées, je n'ai pas même remarqué des le commencement que les paroles de Dupin ont coïncidé avec mes pensees; Îngândurat cum eram, la început nici nu mi-am dat seama că vorbele lui Dupin au coincis întocmai cu gândurile mele.* (E.Allan Poe) 2. *We cannot consider the silence of the grammars as an answer, since the question raised here had not yet been posed. Nous ne pouvons tenir pour une réponse le silence des grammaires, puisque la question soulevée n'a pas encore été posée. Noi nu putem considera tăcerea gramaticilor ca un răspuns, pentru că problema ridicată aici încă n-a fost pusă.* 3. *Why had the same expression not been employed in the intransitive perfect? Pourquoi la même tournure n'a-t-elle pas été employée au parfait intransitif? De ce aceeași expresie n-a fost folosită în perfectul intransitiv?* The grammatical anteriority used in the English sentences is not realized in the French and Romanian sentences, because a contextual anteriority was quite enough for the given situations. The confrontation of past perfect – *imparfait* – *imperfectul*: *For one hour at least we had maintained a profound silence; Il avait déjà un heur que nous gardions le plus complet silence; De o oră noi păstram amândoi cea mai deplină tăcere.* In this case the French and Romanian imperfect forms express anteriority lexically and contextually and the main grammatical meaning is that of durative action.. The confrontation of past perfect – *passé antérieur* – *perfectul compus*: *When the king had disappeared the princes and princesses grouped themselves around the queen. Aussitôt que le roi eut disparu, tout ce qu'il y avait dans la sale de princes et de princesses vint se grouper*

autour de la reine. Îndată ce regele dispăru prinții și prințesele din sală se grupară în jurul reginei. (Dumas) Past perfect in English and *passé antérieur* in French are very close in meaning, both expressing past anteriority. *Perfectul compus* in its turn expresses here a simple past action, anteriority being expressed contextually. Anteriority grammatical form is becoming now peripheral and even facultative. In situations of ordinary, everyday speech it is very easy to do without it as in Romanian colloquial speech, where pluscuamperfectul is regularly substituted by perfectul compus and sometimes by imperfect (for a durative anterior action). Thus, the category of taxis does not need to be expressed by elaborate morphological means. It would be faultlessly correct to say: "First I went to the University and then (later) I went to the library". The English present perfect action including the moment of speech is expressed by "*présent*" in French and "*prezentul*" in Romanian: *It has been been observed, indeed, that these are not equally subject to change; On observe, en effet, que ceux-ci ne sont pas également soumis au changement; Într-adevăr, se observă că acestea nu sunt supuse unor schimbări*". Thus, any inclusive anterior action to the present moment is usually expressed in Romanian and French by means of present tense forms. There is a tendency in English, especially in the American variant, sometimes to use a non-perfect form instead of past perfect in colloquial speech, anteriority in such cases is expressed lexically or contextually. This tendency is much more advanced in the Romanian language. In the spoken language people would regularly substitute pluscuamperfectul with perfectul compus (in the meaning of past indefinite), anteriority again is expressed lexically ("Când am venit, ea deja a plecat" instead of "când am venit, ea deja plecase").

Speaking of "false friends" in translating grammatical morphological forms we can mention the category of mood and modal words in general. The Romanian *condiționalul* and *optativul* categorical forms of mood are homonymous forms. Their categorical meanings can be expressed in Romanian by some other forms, which are polyfunctional and formally belong to different moods. The sentence *If I had had time I would have come to help you yesterday* corresponds to - *Dacă aveam timp, veneam să te ajut ieri; (imperfectul modal in both cases); Dacă aș fi avut timp aș fi venit să te ajut ieri; (optativ, condițional); Să fi avut timp, aș fi venit (veneam) să te ajut ieri* (conjunctivul in the secondary clause). In English all of them correspond to the forms of Conditional and Subjunctive II. The English Infinitive also has several equivalents in Romanian: the infinitive, supinul and conjunctivul! The translator should be aware of what they have in common and in what functional styles they are preferred. Thus, in case of *conjunctivul*, the criterion in singling it out as a separate "mood" in Romanian textbooks serves the verbal form with the particle "să". The research demonstrates that this grammatical form is polyfunctional and can be used in function of infinitive and some mood categorical forms: 1) Subjunctive I (or Old Subjunctive) - *Long live democracy! Să trăiască democrația! I insist that he come. Eu insist ca el să vină*". *It is necessary that he be (come) here in time. E necesar ca el să vină aici la timp.* 2) Subjunctive II - *If I were you. Să fii în locul dumatăle... If I had had time yesterday... Să fi avut timp ieri...* 3) It substitutes the infinitive in Romanian: *They promised to help him. Ei au promis să-l ajute. To believe me capable of something like that! Să mă creadă capabil de așa ceva!* 4) It is used in combinations like: *Let's sit and talk. Sa ședem și să vorbim. He will come in time. El va veni în timp.* 5) After modal verbs: *Even a child could understand. Și un copil putea să înțeleagă.* 6) Future tense: *What shall I do? Ce să fac? El are să vină la timp (colloquial);* 7) To express supposition, including the meanings of suppositional mood: *Might he have been here? Să fi fost el aici? Could I have lost it on my way home? Să-l fi pierdut în drum spre casă? I insist (order) that he should be present. Eu insist (ordon) ca el să fie prezent. It is necessary that he should be here. E necesar ca el să fie aici.* [Ibidem, p.11-15, 2008] Another example of polyfunctional polysemy and homonymy is the lexeme **should**. 1. Should+infinitive in the secondary clause of the type (*it is recommended (suggested, etc.) that...*, in object clauses after modally charged verbs like *to recommend, to suggest, to demand*; in subject clauses, etc. *Should* in this case is used in the suppositional mood (which is synonymous to subjunctive I in the second meaning): *The best thing the commission can do is to recommend that the Geneva conference should begin again with renewed energy.* 2. The conditional clause with *should + infinitive*: *Should the U.N. fail to produce an early settlement, are we then to wash our hands of the whole matter?* 3. Future in the past, 1st person: *I promised that I should come home in time.* 4. The modal *should* in various meanings. Obligation: *He said that she should be there.* Emotional emphatic function; attitude towards the event, etc.: *It is strange that he should be there.* [Ibidem, p.68-74, 2008] While translating from one language into another we have to remember the connotation and denotation of the given words or expressions, their grammatical contents, the importance of prosody in the realization of their lexical, lexical-

grammatical and grammatical categorial meanings. Important is the rendering of modality (phonological, lexical, grammatical, stylistic and prosodic) both in the spoken and written language, etc. Translation is a science, skill and an art.

References:

1. Akhmanova O., Melenciuc D. The Principles of Linguistic Confrontation. - Moscow: MSU, 1977.
2. Benveniste E. Problèmes de linguistique générale. - Paris, 1966.
3. Benveniste E. Problems in General Linguistics. - University of Miami Press, Florida, 1971.
4. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. - Москва, 1974.
5. Mednicova E. Translation as an Aspect of Foreign Language Studies. - Moscow: MSU, 1976.
6. Melenciuc D. Comparativistics. - Chișinău: CEP USM, 2003.
7. Melenciuc D. Comparative Grammar. Suport de curs (masterat). - Chișinău: CEP USM. 2008.

Prezentat la 06.08.2012