THE EQUIVALENCE OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF TRANSLATION AND GENERAL TRANSFORMATION

Iskandarova Risolat Ravshanbekovna
postgraduate student, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

Have you read Dan Brown? Paolo Koelo? Haruki Murakami? In the original ?!

When we read the books discussed above, we mean translations, but we don't realize that this is their translation. A special effort is required to do this. This is because there is a perception in society that translation replaces the original in the host culture. Paradoxically, these texts are considered and accepted by the recipients as the same regardless of the true ratio of the translation and the original. The translator cannot ignore this phenomenon and tries to justify the expectations placed on him by the society and tries to present the text as close as possible to the original as its communicative and functional substitute / similarity according to its specific features.. As a result, it is assumed that there is an existence and some connection between the translated texts and the original. The existence of this relationship is simply the act of translating a text into free text, the placement of the original, which is that level of text.

Equivalence is the maximum generality of the content of bilingual texts signed by language difference. Under the content, in this case V.N. Komissarov understands the existence of any sentence 1) the purpose expressed by communication 2) a description of the situation through choice 3) some of its features, they are known at the surface level 4) syntactically organized and known 5) linguistic units represented by meaning, which consists of denotative, connotative, and internal language, respectively.

2) to determine the equivalence by demonstrating its specific types. That's it. equivalence with respect to a particular type of text is the preservation of those aspects of the original content that are recognized as invariant. (Giuliana Garzone, 2001) There are more than 5050 definitions, some of which are divided into "types" because the authors find it impossible to give a universal definition, distinguishing only one text feature to differ from others, which is not a theory, but practise.

3) Refusal to use this term. The reason for this is a very utilitarian, pragmatic approach to understanding the translation activity. The main functional principle is that the choice is dependent on the translation. It is well known that in order to define any scientific concept, it is very important to establish its connection with other concepts of the field of knowledge under consideration.

The concept of equivalence is a constant translation that is closely related to the concept. An invariant is often understood as a set of specific properties of the original that are stored in the translation. Naturally, researchers who define equivalence in different ways (forming the purpose of translation in different ways) include different features of the text in this collection. Moreover, in any case, the invariance of the translation ensures its equivalence.

It is important to be aware of the problems of semantic equivalence in translation, which determine the degree of similarity between ST ("Source translation – Asl nusxa matni") and "TM" ("Target translation – Tarjima matni"). If we compare TMs with STs, we can see the difference in the degree of semantic similarity between the two texts in

the translation process. Accordingly, many types of translation equivalents differ from each other. For example:

1) maybe there is some chemistry between us that doesn't mix – xarakteri bir-biriga to'g'ri kelmaydigan odamlar ham bo'ladi.

2) A rolling stone gathers no mass – kim uyida o'tiraolmasa uni mehribonlik kutmaydi.

3) That's a pretty thing to say – Uyalsang bo'lardi!

At the same time, we do not find any discrepancies between the original and its translation in terms of general meaning or structure. The absolute dissimilarity of linguistic units is explained by the fact that there is a clear logical similarity between the two texts, but in fact they lead to the conclusion that they are "about the same thing" because they describe a similar situation. It is clear that both statements have a common meaning. This general aspect of their content is important to ensure adequate content. In addition, it contains information that retains all the meaning of the original (the text being translated). From the examples we can see that the commonality of the original and its translation is the general content and figurative meaning of the text, that is, in a word, the translator must be able to embody the general conclusion or the semantic meaning of the text. In English, "what the original text is about", "what it says; It does not describe what is being said, but only what is being said. Examples of this type are described by the parallelism of lexical or structural units.

Translation transformations have a special place when considering the issue of achieving equivalence in simultaneous and written translation.

Translation is considered as a specific transformation and interlingual transformation. Therefore, the term "translation transformation" is widely used by many translators (Barkhudarov, 1975; Gak, 1975, 1978, 1988; Komissarov, 1973, 1990, 2002; Latishev, 1981 (a), (b), 19. 1986, 2001; Lvovskaua, 1985; Minuar- Beloruchev, 1980, 1996; Retsker, 1974; Schwautser, 1973, 1988, etc.), but the theory of translation still does not have a generally accepted interpretation. According to the rules of transformation, the remaining structures (transformations) are taken from the original structure, and vice versa, the latter is reduced to a phrase. For example, the phrase "child reads" creates transforms: "child reads", "child's reading", "child reads" and so on. The problem of determining the transformation of translation is solved in accordance with the initial principles of specific theory.

Let us now turn to a brief review of the most popular typologies of translation transformations. The ratios of these transformations are given in the

As can be seen from the table, there is no single classification system. Different authors highlight different types of changes. All authors have different ways of dividing transformations into species. Hence, V.N. Komissarov (1990: 172-186) translated all transformations into lexical, grammatical and complex lexical-grammatical, V.G. Gak (vak, 1992: 139–148) – into quality and quantity, L.S. Barkhudarov (Barkhudarov: 1915) distinguishes between substitutions, additions, and subtractions, and P. Newmark's classification (Newmark, 1988: 81-93) is based on direct descriptions of certain transformations without being divided into species.

In addition, there are similarities, as different translation methods are included in different typologies as transformations. The authors, who have proposed different interpretations, refer to the same translation technique. What V.N. Komissarov called transcription and transliteration, P. Newmark called substitutions. If V.N. Komissarov distinguishes one type – P. Newmark divides the trajectory into three: by translation,

by the sign of translation and by component analysis (observation of the lexical unit in parts).

Methods of concretization and generalization are available in the classifications of V.N. Komissarov, L.S. Barkhudarov and V.G. Gak. However, the latter author derives these two methods on the basis of an inclusive relationship and intersecting relations.

The technique defined as modulation by V.N. Komissarov and P. Newmark was developed by L.S. Barkhudarov. P. Newmark distinguishes between substitutions and transcriptions, considering the grammatical exchanges of a different order compared to the transformations classified by V.N. Komissarov, L.S. Barhudarov, V.G. Gak. These include: replacing a unit with a plural or changing the order of an adjective; when the grammatical structure of source translation does not have an equivalent in target translation; if literal translation is grammatically possible but does not conform to speech norms; replacing lexical space with grammatical structure. In V.G. Gak, the transformations associated with grammatical changes are not grouped together, but are in separate types.

The methods of addition and subtraction are listed in L.S. Barkhudarov's system of changes as the main types, in V.G. Gak's typology as small types of quantitative changes, in P. Newmark's classification as methods of expansion and contraction. V.N. Komissarov did not include these two methods in the general classification of transformations, but considered them as technical methods of translation, as well as a method of copying lexical units called substitutions in L.S. Barkhudarov's typology.

In practice, the translation changes described above are very rare in their pure form. In most cases, they are close and interconnected. Of course, as with any classification, the above typologies of translation transformations are conditional and do not cover all the methods actually used by the translator. The disadvantage of all classifications is that their authors do not indicate the relative frequency of individual changes listed in the different types of translation.

REFERENCES:
1. Barkhudarov L.S. Language and translation: Problems of general and special theory of translation. M.: Mejdunar. relation 1975.
2. Duan M. & Qin X. (2012). Collocation in English teaching and learning. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2 (9), – PP. 1890–1894.
3. Komissarov V.N. General theory of translation. Guide. M.: CheRo. 2000.
4. Komissarov V.N Theory of translation (linguistic aspects). M.: secondary school... 1990.
5. Newmark, Peter. Approaches to translation. Oxford. Pergamon press 1978.
6. В.Г. Гак Межъязыковая ассиметрия и прогнозирование переводческих трансформаций // Теория перевода и научные основы подготовки переводчиков. Материалы всесоюзной научной конференции. – 4.1. – М., 1975.