TYPES OF EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION

Axmedova Mahliyo *- the teacher of*
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages
Qobuljonova Musharrafxon - *the student of*
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Anotation: Translation is a mental activity in which a meaning of given linguistic discourse is rendered from one language to another. It is the act of transferring the linguistic entities from one language in to their equivalents in to another language. Translation is an act through which the content of a text is transferred from the source language in to the target language. A translation equivalent is a corresponding word or expression in another language. The aim of researchers to develop automatic translation led them to concentrate on the equivalent effects that exist between words from different languages. This gave an impetus to research in equivalence in translation.

Key words: equivalence, translation, textual, correspondence, the

Equivalence is a crucial notion in any consideration of translation. In contemporary translation studies (TS), it is the relationship that binds any target text (TT) to the source text (ST) 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 (e.g., literary, technical, multimodal), this dependency relationship may adopt different modes to ensure the successful TT's delivery to its intended recipients. If a specific linguistic unit in one language carries the same intended meaning / message encoded in a specific linguistic medium in another, then these two units are considered to be equivalent. The domain of equivalents covers linguistic units such as morphemes, words, phrases, clauses, idioms and proverbs. So, finding equivalents is the most problematic stage of translation. It is worth mentioning, however, it is not meant that the translator should always find one-to-one categorically or structurally equivalent units in the two languages, that is, sometimes two different linguistic units in different languages carry the same function. For example, the verb "happened" in the English sentence "he happens to be happy" equals the adverb "etefaghan" (by chance) in the Persian sentence: "u etefaghan khosh hal ast". The translator, after finding out the meaning of an SL linguistic form, should ask himself / herself what the linguistic form is in another language—TL—for the same meaning to be encoded by. Koller (1995: 196-97). He includes five types of equivalence: (a) denotative equivalence, relating to the extralinguistic aspects of a text, (b) connotative equivalence, dealing with lexical solutions, (c) text-normative equivalence, concerning text-types, (d) pragmatic equivalence, engaging the recipient, and (e) formal equivalence, which would account

for the form and aesthetics of the text. Along the same classificatory line are Kade's (1973) degrees of (terminological and lexicographic) equivalence: total equivalence would be word-to-word correspondence, optional and approximative equivalence would account for partial, one-to-many equivalence, and zero equivalence would refer to the absence of term and concept in the target language.

1-Denotative equivalence :

The extralinguistic, 'real-world' referents to which the text relates.

Eg:. in the sentences 'The capital of Italy is Rome' and 'Die Hauptstadt von Italien ist Rom' , the words "Rome" & "Rom" have the same denotation, & are thus denotatively equivalent.

2- Connotative equivalence :

The connotations conveyed in the text, that is , the culturally normative feelings or associations evoked by a specific term or phrase, and by different levels of usage or styles, or social and geographical dialects.

For example: the connotations evoked by the term 'breakfast' in an English-speaking context may differ radically from the associations this term evokes in Islamic countries during Ramadan.

Different Types of Equivalence

The first kind of equivalence we might consider is of a linguistic kind , & here we can refer to two distinctions , mentioned in chapter 2:

1- Catford's distinction 2- Nida's distinction.

Catford's distinction: between "formal correspondence" and "textual equivalence".

"Formal correspondence" exists between items in the original & the translated texts whenever a category in the target language system occupies the same position as does the corresponding category in the source language.

-Sometimes this 'formal correspondence' will have 'textual equivalence'.

-But such formal correspondence is often not available, and then the translator has to engage in so-called " translation shifts" in word classes or structures.

-There is no direct correspondence in English.

- When we saw two things are "equivalent" we do not mean that they are "identical" but that they have certain things in common and function in similar ways.

-In the same way, "a translated text" will obviously bear very little linguistic resemblance to "the original", but can be equivalent, that is to say, equal in value, in that it conveys a similar message and fulfils a similar function.

-Equivalence in translation : cannot be taken to mean "identity" or "reversibility" because there can never be a one-to-one relationship between 'a source text' & 'one particular translation text'.

* Translation: is a process of replacing a text in one language (the source language) with a text in a different language (the target language).

References

https://www.aieti.eu/enti/equivalence_ENG/entry.html#:~:text=He%20includes%20five%20types%20of,(e)%20formal%20equivalence%2C%20which

https://www.translationdirectory.com/article31.htm

http://linguistics-elenapoparcea.blogspot.com/2012/11/the-equivalence-in-translation.html?m=1 .