

Equivalence and its types in translation

Linora Alijon kizi Shermuhammedova

Supervisor: Mukadas Ikromovna Murodova

Kattakurgan branch of Samarkand State University

Abstract: Equivalence is a crucial notion in any consideration of translation. In contemporary translation studies, it is the relationship that binds any target text to the source text it derives from, and that accounts for both texts being purportedly “the same” in different languages. Depending on the theoretical outlook and the text’s specificity involved, this dependency relationship may adopt different modes to insure the successful target text’s delivery to its intended recipients. Equivalence implies variability and consequently several types of equivalence can be distinguished. Equivalence has been and still is one of the most challenging and controversial issues among scholars, who have taken one of three views: equivalence as a defining condition for translation as a conceptual tool useful for describing translation, or as an impediment for advancement in translation studies. Some linguists define translation in terms of equivalent relations while others reject the theoretical notion of equivalence, claiming it is either irrelevant or damaging (Gentler 1993) translation studies. Yet others scientists are a middle position.

Keywords: equivalence, linguistics, public services, dual society, translation studies, target text, technological idiosyncrasies

INTRODUCTION

The content, the structure of the sentence and the semantic components are similar. Each element of the [SL] text has a corresponding one in the [TL] text. But such cases of complete similarity are rather rare. There are ample reasons to claim that no translation model is possible without some implicit or explicit recognition of the relationship between the translation text and its source text. Such omission would question the very existence of translation in all its forms and manifestations. The European Owl may be equal to Iranian *hod-hod* (hoopoe) symbolically:

Coal in English may equal *ziera* (raisins) in Persian and Newcastle in English may equal Kerman (a city in Iran), hence:

Taking coal to Newcastle = *ziera ba Kerman bordan*

Shoulder in English may equal *gradan* (neck) in Persian:

The blame rests on my shoulders. = *Masuliat bar gardan man ast.*

Bedsheet in English may equal *barf* (snow) in Persian: as white as bedsheet = *ba sefidie barf.*

Inch in English may equal "vajab"(span) in Persian (Safarzadeh)They knew every inch of the field. = A nha ba mazra (farm) vajab ba vajab ashnaie dashtand.

Gold in English may equal aieneh (mirror): heart of gold = aieneh delan.

She has dressed up to nines. = Haft ghalam araiesh kardah ast.

None-corresponding elements may be lexical, grammatical or stylistically. Equivalence of the second type is usually achieved by means of various transformation: substitution or replacements [both lexical and grammatical] , additions and omissions, paraphrasing and compensation. Although a considerable degree of equivalence has been achieved a number of transformations certain losses have been incurred, namely, compactness and vividness. They are accounted for by existing discrepancies in colla ability. In practice, equivalence underlines every effort to distinguish translation from non-translation. Research into translation universals has proven that translated language-the third code-shows features that set it apart from original, non-translated language. Since both textual practices use the same resources, these are essential to discriminate translations from non translations.

AIM AND OBJECTIVES

In translation, the ability to use words is in the first place, because words can mean more than one meaning. This is an indication of the fact that there is a mutual difference between the words and they are definitely divided into several types. I think it can be compared to a bird. because a bird cannot fly on one wing, it is understood that both meanings of the word have their proper place, and both of them have a support function.

Of course, everyone has a different opinion on the equality or difference between the theory of translation, and of course everyone has different views. For example, when Amon Mominov says that translation is complicated and should be approached seriously. And V.Demidov has no states that it is possible to create communication without barriers. The translation by S.Marshak may be regarded as excellent. The text as the unity is reproduced most fully and this conception of unity justifies the change in the order of the lines within the stanza. No desire on the part of the translator to preserve in his translation the lexical, grammatical or stylistic peculiarities of the original text can justify any departure from the norms of the [TL]. The aim of the translator is to improve the structure of the translation and to create convenient methods for the authors. They can create content without any obstacles.

CONCLUSION

Thus, from a telegrammatic recollection of the basic structure of the speech the interpreter is able to flesh out the information so as to provide a complete version of the original, they do this by mobilizing all possible means at their disposal. They use the basic structure as a starting point. It is also true that if the speaker does not divide his own speech up rigorously it may be difficult to identify points to number so clearly; and if one reproduces such a cut and dried structure in the interpretation, where it was

absent in the original, one risk distorting the speaker's message. To sum up, the interpreter must pick up the half dozen or so ideas that make up the backbone of the speech and lay sufficient emphasis on them in the interpretation; verbal redundancies should be cut down to a minimum; digress cons comparisons and compression may be kept in the translation but should have the right relative weight in the overall context of the speech. The first key to understand a speech is the identification of the main ideas; the second is an analysis of links between those ideas. A speech is not just a sequence of juxtaposed sentences

The sentence are related to one another in particular way and it is this relationship that determines the over all meaning of the speech.

References

1. Omon Muminov. A guide to simultaneous translation.
2. D.V.Demidov. Theoretical English Grammar.
3. Ibraimov, X., & Urakov, S. (2023). TECHNOLOGY FOR ASSESSMENT OF THE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY OF PROFESSORS-TEACHERS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS ON THE BASE OF INDICATORS OF STUDENTS'SATISFACTION. Science and innovation, 2(B12), 896-904.
4. Bahriddinovna, T. B. (2017). The Quintessential Categories of the Author's time and Literary Time. Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research, 5(03), 13-21.
5. Lynne Cameron and Penny Mckay >Oxford.