

The Concept of Equivalency in Translating Terminological Units of Uzbek and English Languages

Haydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamjon qizi

Teacher of translation studies and language education department, BSU, Uzbekistan

Safarova Shahnoza Luqmonovna

Bukhara State University, 2nd year master student in Comparative linguistics, linguistic translation studies

I. Introduction

The term "equivalence" appeared in the arsenal of translation scholars in the middle of the 20th century, at the height of the structural approach to linguistics. Equivalence implies that a relationship of equivalence can be established between the source text and the translation. The very concept of equivalence in one way or another rests on the possibility (or impossibility) of translating the text. Proponents of the untranslatability theory in the mid-1950s stated that if the translator does not receive an identical text as a result of the work, then the work of the translator is not satisfactory. V.N. Komissarov is sure that "translation does not imply the creation of an identical text, and the absence of identity cannot serve as proof of the impossibility of translation". If there is a translation, then there is a connection (equivalence) between the texts.

II. Literature review

Many spears have been broken about the nature of translational equivalence. The skopos theory by K. Rice interpreted the concept of equivalence as a functional "by-product" of translation. Her theory was a communicative approach to translation, i.e. translation is performed exclusively in the process of communication (Nord 2006). The source text has its own function, which must be preserved during translation. In doing so, the translation is described as a process that has the goal of preserving the function of the text while performing the translation. At the same time, the concepts of adequacy and equivalence of translation are distinguished. The adequacy of translation, according to K. Rice, refers to the process of translation, to the choice of the correct translation strategy. An adequate translation is a translation that fulfils the task assigned to it. Equivalence is interpreted as a functional correspondence of the translated text to the original text. That is, the concept of equivalence is interpreted as the similarity of the translated text to the original text. K. Rice states that a translation (mostly a literary one) needs to be checked only by comparing it with the original text. Vermeer believed that achieving equivalence is the main task of the translator.

G. Turi, being a historian-descriptivist, put forward his concept of translation, which is result-oriented. He interprets equivalence as follows: any translation is equivalent if it is really a translation, regardless of its quality or adequacy. Most likely, Turi was trying to free students from the need to follow the patterns of FL, which were imposed by the supporters of the skopos theory.

Soviet scientists also actively developed the concept of equivalence. V.N. Komissarov singled out three approaches: equivalence as identity, equivalence as a search for the correct version of the text,

equivalence as a process of maintaining the goal of communication, or, in other words, an empirical approach. The second approach of Komissarov was also highly developed by L.S. Barkhudarov. According to Barkhudarov, the translator should try to transfer the plan of expression from the source language (FL) to the translation. At the same time, the specialist notes, it is impossible to avoid semantic losses; therefore, equivalence cannot be absolute.

Another well-known linguist and translator A.D. Schweitzer developed his theory of equivalence, which he called the theory of semantic equivalence. Schweitzer distinguishes three types of equivalence - semantic, syntactic and pragmatic. Semantic equivalence means the preservation of the set of semas and the referential meaning (statements in different languages use different sets of semas characteristic of their languages when describing the same situation). The highest level of equivalence according to Schweitzer is pragmatic. This type of equivalence is achieved by preserving the communicative intention of the original. This type of classification is based on speech functions, which were first described by R. Jakobson

J. Nida defines translation as "the reproduction in the language of the recipient of the closest natural equivalent of the message in the original language, firstly, in terms of meaning and, secondly, in stylistic terms".

III. Analysis

Modern translation theory tends to interpret the concept of "equivalence" from a pragmatic point of view, equivalence should be achieved not by searching for static equivalent units in languages, but by transferring semantic significance within languages. Most units of different languages are non-equivalent because they are polysemic. The sign is formed around a special value axis. Robert and Pernier call it a minimal semantic feature (signification) and indicate the need to preserve it. The translation must reproduce a separate, complete message. Each communicative situation can be characterized by four parameters: the speaker, the object, the addressee and the vector (spatio-temporal conditions). The translator needs to consider this. Absolute equivalence, according to Robert, is an unattainable ideal. Equivalence should strive to fulfil the function of the original.

E. Pym in one of the program articles points to the presence of natural and directional equivalence. Natural equivalence, as the name suggests, already exists in the language. Directional equivalence is achieved in the process of translation; it can be expressed through a direct connection between the source text and the translating text. At the same time, the translator is free to choose a translation strategy that corresponds to the pragmatics of the FL text. Natural equivalence is rare in the language. Such equivalence can be found in term systems, and the relationship of FL text and TL can be mapped as follows: FL text → concept → TL text (Pym 1995). Even a cursory analysis of the concept of "equivalence" in translation theory shows how different the approaches of specialists can be. However, all theories of equivalence agree on one thing - you need to translate the meaning, not the signs. All this is especially important when translating terms. At first glance, everything seems simple - the term of the term system of the FL has an equivalent term in the term system of the TL, the translator only needs to find this very equivalent. Therefore, many scientists talk about the impossibility of a direct translation of terms. In fact, it often turns out that the translator cannot establish the degree of equivalence of certain terms. So what is terminological equivalence? A.V. Achkasov points to the non-definition of the term "terminological equivalence". He also identifies the following approaches to terminological equivalence: logocentric and lexicocentric. The first approach considers terminological equivalence as a logical concept that conveys the same concept in different languages (the plan of expression of this concept will be the term). Such equivalence can be achieved only after the harmonization of the term systems of the two languages. The lexicocentric approach considers the term and its connection with the lexical substratum. A term, like any other lexical unit, has a set of lexical characteristics, thus terminological equivalence can be interpreted as one of the types of lexical

equivalence, which has already been mentioned above. Thus, the term, according to this approach, can have some synonymous equivalent series, since there are no completely monosemic lexical units.

IV. Discussion

As already mentioned above, the translation of terms is actually not a translation, but a process of searching for the correct lexical invariant, or in other words, as well as "the procedure for detecting an identical concept in the conceptual system of the receiving language and the lexical substrate assigned to this concept as its name". The main task that the translator faces when working with terms is to achieve the most adequate translation possible. V.M. Leichik identifies three conditions that contribute to the achievement of the adequacy of the translation of terms. These conditions are divided into general and particular. The former depend on the specifics of the term itself and the source and target language, while the latter depend on the genre of the text and the functioning of a separate term in it.

The first condition V.M. Leichik put forward was the correctness of the translation of terms. The scientist puts the following into this concept: each term must be translated; the translation of each term must fit into the terminological system functioning in the target language, and the specificity of the term that conveys a particular idea in the language of both the target and the original must be taken into account.

This condition causes certain difficulties for translation. The scope of the meaning of the term in the original language and in the target language may not coincide. From this paragraph follows the second condition for the adequacy of the translation: a comparison of the translated term with the term system. If both in the source language and in the target language there is an established term system, then the translated element should be part of the term system of the target language. For example, the phrase *ishchilar sinfi* in English must be translated as working class, and not, for example, class of workers or anything else. This is due to the fact that in the target language there are stable variants that help the recognition and unambiguity of the term.

If we have two harmonized term systems, then the systemic translation of terms is extremely simplified. A similar situation arises in the humanities around the world. An example is the phrase *inson huquqlari*, which are equivalent to the phrase *human rights*, even despite the formal divergence of the scientific base, the semantics of these phrases are absolutely equivalent. Another special case of this condition is the situation when the translator does not have an established terminological system in the target language or the original. This happens when science (or a field of knowledge) is either at the moment of active development or at the moment of systemic restructuring, which entails a paradigm shift, which means the replacement of systems of concepts and systems with a term under the influence of new discoveries and achievements of scientific and technological revolution. In this case, it is impossible to establish equivalent correspondences in the source and target languages.

The next general condition in the struggle for the adequacy of translation is the need to take into account the so-called "picture of the world", which differs in almost every language. A textbook example is the anatomical term *qo'l*, and the corresponding terms of the English language - *arm*, *hand*. In this case, the "English" picture of the world leaves its mark: in the mind of an English speaker, the terms *arm* and *hand* are opposed, and in Uzbek term *qo'l* has a very broad meaning, and the wrist is only a contextual specification. Another example is the adjectives *warm*, *hot*, which are not always differentiated in English, like the *warm-hot* pair.

V. Conclusion

The concept of "translational equivalence" is associated with the concepts of "translatability" and "untranslatability", a review of various theories of equivalence showed that equivalence can be of the following levels: lexical, contextual, pragmatic and situational equivalence. Terminological

equivalence, in turn, is responsible for the complete transfer of the meaning of individual units, and not the general meaning as a whole. The translation of a term is, first, the search for the necessary invariant; therefore, in order to meet the equivalence criteria, the translated term must be fixed in the TL terminology system. In the absence of a system invariant term in the TL, the translator is forced to resort to a number of methods for translating terms, in addition, it is necessary to take into account the logical-objective, terminological, normative and stylistic factors.

References

1. Nafisa, K. . (2022). On Anglophone Borrowings in the Contemporary Russian Media. *Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT*, 2(5), 158–163. Retrieved from <https://literature.academicjournal.io/index.php/literature/article/view/367>
2. Xaydarova, L. (2022). «GLOBAL VALUE OF HEALTH AND ITS PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION IN THE FORM OF ACTUAL DAILY PRACTICES. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 8(8). извлечено от http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/5779.
3. Fayziyeva, Aziza. "LINGUISTIC AND CONCEPTUAL PICTURES OF THE WORLD." ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz) 10, no. 10 (2022).
4. Shakhnoza, T. . (2022). Expression of Averbial Sentence in Uzbek and French. *Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT*, 2(5), 133–138.
5. CONTINUITY AND DISCRETENESS OF SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING OD Zokirovna - THEORY AND ANALYTICAL ASPECTS OF RECENT RESEARCH International scientific-online conference,2022.Vol 1,issue 2.Pages 729-733
6. Xafizovna, R. N. . (2022). Discourse Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Literary Work: Speech Acts and Politeness Strategies. *Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity*, 5, 123-133. Retrieved from <http://sjii.indexedresearch.org/index.php/sjii/article/view/100>
7. Rabiyeve, M. . (2022). Difficulties of Differentiating Euphemisms and Dysphemisms. *Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT*, 2(5), 127–132. Retrieved from <https://literature.academicjournal.io/index.php/literature/article/view/362>
8. Olimovna, Narzullayeva Firuza. "Analysis of Phraseological Units with the Somatic Component." *Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT* 2.5 (2022): 218-225.
9. Nasriddinova, S. Z. (2022, April). CLASSIFICATION OF SYNTACTIC RELATIONS IN COMPOUND SENTENCES. In *International Conference on Research Identity, Value and Ethics* (pp. 121-123).
10. Haydarova, N. (2022). Dialogue As An Essential Element of Interdiscursivity. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 22(22). извлечено от http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/7994
11. Salixova, N. N. (2019). PECULIAR FEATURES OF TEACHING READING. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (11), 705-708.
12. Irgasheva, F. (2022). Представление лингвокультур в переводе и их структурных компонентов (на примере немецкого и узбекского языков). ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 8(8). извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/4070

13. Mehmonova, Y. (2022). ДЕНОМИНАТИВНЫЕ И КОГНИТИВНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 14(14). извлечено от http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/6820
14. Shakirov, R. (2021). ЭТИМОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ДУБЛЕТЫ В СИСТЕМЕ ФРАНЦУЗСКИХ ГЛАГОЛОВ И ИХ ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 1(1). извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/2344
15. Babayev, M. (2021). ИЗУЧЕНИЕ ЛОШАДЕЙ С НЕМЕЦКИМ СУФФИКСОМ В ПРОЦЕССЕ ОБУЧЕНИЯ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 6(6). извлечено от http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/3576
16. Kizi, M.M.I. 2021. Numbers and similarities in their use in English and Uzbek Folklore. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*. 12, (May 2021), 175-177.
17. Radjabov, R. (2022). ЛЕКСИКА ВИНОГРАДАРСТВА НА ФРАНЦУЗСКОМ И УЗБЕКСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ И НАУЧНЫЕ ВЗГЛЯДЫ УЧЕНЫХ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 8(8). извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/6033
18. Shakhnoza, T. (2022). Learning the Polysemy of the French Noun "Souris" and the Verb "Battre". *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 3(6), 75-79.
19. Tuyboeva, S. . . (2022). LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF SIMPLE SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION IN UZBEK AND FRENCH . *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 2(3), 184–187.
20. Djalolov, F. (2021). МАКТАБ ТАЪЛИМИДА ПАСТ ЎЗЛАШТИРИШ САБАБЛАРИ ВА ТЎЛИҚ ЎЗЛАШТИРИШ ТУРЛАРИ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz)*, 1(1). извлечено от https://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/2872
21. Safoyeva, S. (2021). ЛИНГВИСТИКА ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПУБЛИЧНОГО СТИЛЯ. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz)*, 5(5).
22. Islomov D. S. THE ART OF TAVZE (ALLITERATION) IN THE PHONETIC STYLE OF THE UZBEK LANGUAGE IMPORTANCE (IN THE EXAMPLE OF POETIC WORKS) //International Virtual Conference on Language and Literature Proceeding. – 2022. – Т. 1. – №. 1.
23. Izomovich, Rasulov Zubaydullo, and Ubaydullayeva Dilafruz Fazliddinovna. "Implications from syntax for teaching a second language." *Integration of Pragmalinguistics, Functional Translation Studies and Language Teaching Processes* (2022): 320-323.
24. To'rayeva, F. S. (2022). Modality and Modal Verbs in German. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 8, 39-42.