

Equivalence in the Particular Theory of Translation in the Example of English and Russian Languages

Ilkhomova Mohina

Student of the department of Translation theory and practice,
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

-----***-----

Abstract: This article addresses general linguistic issues related to the theory and practice of translation. During the translation process, the translator has to solve many linguistic issues related to phonetics, stylistics and grammar of the source language and the target language, about the features of the functional style to which the original belongs, with the problem of transferring content and the problem of achieving equivalence. The article reveals the concept of equivalence in translation theory, examines problems of translation semantics, and draws typological differences in the systems of English and Russian languages. The topic of work is relevant due to the fact that cross-linguistic issues are located in the area of intercultural communication. It is necessary not only to have knowledge in a certain subject area, but also to understand the differences in language systems in order to convey the informational part of the original with the least amount of effort.

Keywords: Translation, functional style, phonetics, transferring, language.

Translation is a complex process that requires the translator of certain knowledge to be able to identify linguistic and extralinguistic factors that influence its progress and results. During the translation process, the translator has to solve many linguistic issues related to phonetics, stylistics and grammar of the source language and the target language, about the features of the functional style to which the original belongs, with the problem of transferring content and the problem of achieving equivalence.

Despite the many linguistic problems of translation, there is no such thing as untranslatable in the translation process. A professional translator always achieves practical informational equivalence of the translation of the original, but in theoretical terms, equivalence has a number of differences. It can be said that any translation will never be absolutely identical to the text of the original. The degree of similarity with the original always depends on many factors: on the skill of the translator, on the differences between the languages and cultures being compared, the era of the original and the translation, the method of translation, the nature of the texts being translated, etc.

In a broad sense, equivalence is understood as something of equal value, equivalent to something. Equivalence in translation theory should be understood as the preservation of relative equality of content, semantic, stylistic and functional communication native information contained in the original and translation [1]. Equivalence in the original and translation is, first of all, the importance of understanding the information contained in the text, including that which affects not only the individual, but also the feelings of speech participants and which is not only explicitly expressed in the text, but also implicitly related to the subtext. This interpretation of equivalence reflects the completeness and versatility of this concept, associated with semantic, structural, functional, communicative, pragmatic, new ones, etc.

The main determining principle of equivalence is the communicative-functional feature, which is formed by the equality of the communicative effect produced on the users of original and translated texts. Ideally, the translator should not introduce into the text of the message an element of his own perception that is

different from the perception of the message by the recipient to whom it was sent. designed. In fact, the perception of the translator and any recipient cannot be the same due to a variety of personal, cultural and social reasons.

Viewing translation as a major type of interlingual communication reveals the leading role of the semantic aspect in the related functioning of two language systems, cos influencing the intralinguistic mechanism of translation. It is the semantic identification of common language texts that underlies their communicative equivalence.

Problems of semantics of translation constitute one of the main parts of linguistic issues.

Since the primary importance of maximum agreement between the original and the translation is obvious, 6 most researchers consider equivalence as an OS a new feature and constitutive condition of translation, distinguishing it from other methods of transmitting the content of a foreign language text.

They distinguish between potentially achievable equivalence, which is understood as the maximum similarity of the content of two multilingual texts, allowed by differences in the languages in which These texts and translation equivalence are given - the real semantic 6 texts of the original and translation, achieved by the translator in the translation process. The limit of translation equivalence is the maximum possible (linguistic) degree of preservation of the original content during translation, but in each individual translation the meaning The original copy is similar to the original to a different degree and in different ways approaches the maximum.

Differences in the systems involved in the creation of texts in each of these languages can, to varying degrees, limit the possibility of complete preservation of the original content in translation. Therefore, translation equivalence can be based on the preservation and loss of important elements of meaning contained in the original.

Russian	English
1. The language is inflected (inflection – case ending), complex grammatical relationships and shades of meaning are often “pressed” into one word.	1. The language is analytical, complex meanings are formed from a few words.
2. Many 6espersonal, indefinite personal constructions, recurrent and passive constructions.	2. Constructions with an explicitly expressed subject (subject) predominate, there are no reflexive verbs, and the passive is less common.
3. In book and official speech there is a predominance of the noun, especially the verbal, and the frequent accumulation of parent cases.	3. The verb predominates, especially in comparison with Russian. In conversation, the noun plays a greater role.
4. A lot of “negative” vocabulary, constructions “not” and double “not”; thought is often reflected from the opposite.	4. Affirmative sentences predominate, and negation and double negation are much less common than in Russian.
5. Russian text, as a rule, is longer than English. First of all, the words themselves are longer (“syllable value” of the Russian translation is on average	5. English text often consists of relatively short sentences; stylistically, a “good” tone is considered to be the use of short words and compressed

30-50% longer than the English original). Bo-secondly, Russian-New people express themselves more widely, in longer words.	constructions.
6. In Russian texts, especially official, scientific, journalistic, there is a lot of complex vocabulary, o6o6 words.	6. Concrete vocabulary predominates, meaning is more often implied than expressed directly.
7. Simple modality prevails (the relation of the statement to the action), the thought is expressed as a “given”.	7. Complex modality, expressing probability, assumption, doubt, prevails. The thought is expressed as belonging to someone specific.
8. The order of words in the Russian language carries a greater semantic load.	8. In the English language, the order of words is almost fixed, semantic shades are expressed by other means.
9. Many sentences begin not with the subject, but with another member of the sentence. New is often found at the end of a sentence.	9. Sentences, as a rule, begin with a subject. The new word appears at the beginning of the sentence.
10. There is a big difference between book (literary, official business) and conversational styles. Within the literary style there is a clear distinction between the so-called functional styles (scientific, journalistic, business, etc.)	10. The difference between literary and colloquial styles is much less than in the Russian language. Within the literary style there are no differences between functional styles.
11. The style of Russian oratorical speech is at the same time quite heavy and colorful. Rhetorical devices (parallelisms, long lists of adjectives, expressive means and expressions), various kinds of “lists” are widely used. The phrase “and so on” is very typical.	11. In English oratory, the style is more calm, neutral, emotions are conveyed more restrained, less repetitions, adjectives (especially expressive ones and epithets).

In order to make the text as fully equivalent as possible and convey the original text with the least loss during translation, the translator needs to understand the main differences between Russian and English languages. It is appropriate to give a summary of such differences [2]. Therefore, to achieve equivalence in the process of transmitting semantic information of the translated text, it is necessary to take into account differences not only in the grammatical system of the language in, but also in lexical and stylistic.

List of literature:

1. Komisarov B.N. Theory of translation (linguistic aspects) / В.Н. Комисаров. – М.: Higher School, 1990.
2. Chuzhakin A.P., Palazhchenko P.P. World of translation / A.P. Chuzhakin., P.P. Palazhchenko. – М., 2000.
3. Komisarov B.N. Linguistics of translation / В.Н. Комисаров. – М., 1996.
4. Эргашева, З. А. (2023). КАУЗАЛЛИК ВА СУБЪЕКТИВЛИК МУНОСАБАТЛАРИНИНГ ВОҚЕЛАНИШИ. *МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ ИСКУССТВО СЛОВА*, 6(1).

5. Ziyoda, E. (2023). PREDLOGLARNING O‘ZGARISHI VA DERIVATSIYASI XUSUSIDA. *International Journal of Contemporary Scientific and Technical Research*, 455-457.
6. Халимова, Ф. (2016). Эндрю моббснинг “ғазал. Таҳлил ва шаклнинг акс этиши” номли мақоласига доир мулоҳазалар. *Иностранная филология: язык, литература, образование*, 1(2), 59.
7. Халимова, Ф. Р. (2021). КОГНИТИВ ПОЭТИКА. *Academic research in educational sciences*, 2(12), 133-142.
8. Abdurasulovna, E. Z. (2023). REMARKS ON CAUSAL COMPLEX PREPOSITIONS. *SCIENCE AND INNOVATION IDEAS IN MODERN EDUCATION*, 1(6).

