

## PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION OF LEXICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH

*Jumanazarov Samandar Urinovich*

*Teacher of the Department of Foreign Languages,  
Karshi Engineering Economics Institute*

**Abstract:** This article describes the translation features of lexical units in the English language. The article presents theoretical ideas in this regard and proves them with examples.

**Keywords:** translation; lexical units; semantic, polysemantic; grammatical form.

Apart from the previously mentioned aspects, it is relevant to emphasize the necessity for sound linguistic knowledge of both the SL (source language) and the TL (target language), an essential condition, yet not the only one, to begin swimming up the streams of professional translation. However, neither knowing languages nor being efficiently bilingual is enough to become a translator. For more than twenty years, translation theorists have been pointing this out, and yet many people believe and claim that knowing two or more languages is identical to knowing how to translate properly. Delisle states it clearly that linguistic competence is a necessary condition, but not yet sufficient for the professional practice of translation.

In addition to reading comprehension ability, the knowledge of specialized subjects derived from specialized training and a wide cultural background, and the global vision of cross-cultural and interlingual communication, it is a must to learn how to handle the strategic and tactical tools for a good translating performance. Hence the importance of a didactic translation approach: A methodology that allows the development of an effective and efficient transfer process from one language to another. As is widely known by those committed to the field, translation as a formal professional activity with a theoretical background is relatively new.

Classifications of translation types obviously depend on what criteria you use. The proposal outlined below is more complex than any of these, but, as we shall see, can be simplified. The proposal is distinguished first between four sets of variables, A-D:

- A) Equivalence variables (having to do with the relation between source text and target text)
- B) Target-language variables (having to do with the style of the target text)
- C) Translator variables
- D) Special situational variables

These variables are ways in which translations can vary, parameters along which clients and translators can make choices. We will now look at each set in turn, outlining

the main variables in each case. There may well be other variables that might be included in a more refined analysis, but he suggested that these are the main ones. (The rest of this section, together with the following one on default values, is taken almost verbatim from Chesterman 1998: 205-209.)<sup>1</sup>

A) Equivalence variables

A1) Function: same or different? — Is the main function of the target text intended to be “the same” as that of the source text, or not? If not, what? (Different function leads to an adaptation of some kind.)

A2) Content: all, selected, reduced or added, or some combination of these? — Does the translation represent all the source content, or select particular parts of it (keyword translation) or reduce the content overall (summary translation, gist translation; subtitling), or add some elements such as explanations (exegetic translation)?

A3) Form: what are the formal equivalence priorities, what formal elements of the source text are preserved? — The main ones are text-type (“same” or different? Different genre, e.g. verse to prose, sonnet to lyric?); text structure; sentence divisions (full-stops preserved; a common interpretation of what is meant by literal translation); word/morpheme structure (gloss translation, linguistic translation); other (e.g. sounds — phonemic translation, transliteration, transcription; or lip-movements — dubbing).

A4) Style: evidently intended to be “same” or different? — If different, in what way (another sense of adaptation)?

A5) Source-text revision for error correction: evident or not (implicit or explicit)? Minimal or major? — Has the translator “edited” the source text during translation, corrected factual errors, improved awkward style and communication quality, or is the source reproduced without corrections or improvements? This is the “cleaning-up transediting” mentioned by Stetting (1989).

A6) Status: is the status of the target text, with respect to the status of the source text, autonomous, equal, parallel or derived? (Sager 1993: 180.) — This status is autonomous if the source text had only provisional status, such as a draft letter or notes; equal if both texts are functionally and legally equal, such as legislation in bilingual countries, official EU texts; parallel if the translation appears alongside the source text and is functionally parallel to it, e.g. in multilingual product descriptions (incidental translation); derived in other cases. To these status categories we might add one that we could call subordinate,

---

<sup>1</sup> Feleppa, R. J., “Convention, Translation and Understanding”, Albany, 1988. p. 131

referring to cases where the source text is co-present, as in gloss or interlinear translation, but the target text is not functionally parallel. Yet another aspect of status, occurring together with any of the above-mentioned ones, is whether the source text actually used in the translation is the original text (direct translation) or some intermediary version in a third language (indirect translation); in the latter case, the status of the target text might be said to be once-removed (or even twice-removed, etc.).

An important feature of this and the subsequent type of equivalence is that they imply the retention of the linguistic meaning, i.e. the information fixed in the substantial or structural elements of language as their plane of content. We can say that here the translation conveys not only the “what for”, the “what about” and the ‘what’ of the original but also something of the “how-it-is-said in the original”.

#### **LIST OF USED LITERATURE:**

1. Feleppa, R. J., *Convention, Translation and Understanding*. Albany., 1988., - 133 p.
2. Newmark, Peter, *A textbook of translation.*, Prentice Hall., 1988., - 102 p.
3. Farmonov Bahodir Dustmurodivich. (2023). GRAMMATICAL STANDARDS AND TRANSLATION. *World Scientific Research Journal*, 16(2), 41–43.
4. Farmonov Bahodir Dustmurodivich. (2023). SEMANTIC RELATIONS OF THE SYNONYMS OF “CHOOSE”. *ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ НАУКА И ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ ИДЕИ В МИРЕ*, 24(2), 9–11