GALAXY INTERNATIONAL INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL (GIIRJ)
ISSN (E): 2347-6915
Vol. 9, Issue 12, Dec. (2021)

THE CONCEPT OF "EQUIVALENCE" IN TRANSLATION: TYPES, VIEWS, LEVELS

Makhliyo Atamirzayeva
Teacher, Department of French Andijan State University

ABSTRACT

The peculiarity of the translation is that, despite the necessary changes made to the original text, it is perceived as a full replacement of the original. In this case, the receptors perceiving the translated text will consider it to be completely identical to the original text. However, such an identity is only a theoretically achievable ideal of translation, which is impossible in translation practice.

INTRODUCTION

In this regard, back in the 19th century, the "theory of untranslability" was developed. This linguistic theory of Wilhelm von Humboldt is undoubtedly one of the most influential linguo-philosophical concepts of the 19th century. Then the main direction of linguistics was the study of the features of a language, the disclosure of all the unique features that distinguish it from other languages: a unique structure, features of the grammatical structure and vocabulary of each individual language. All this constitutes the originality of the language, its national characteristics. For these reasons, the assumption arose about the impossibility of transferring these features, both linguistic and linguistic and cultural, to another language. At the same time, it was believed that the translation should comprehensively reproduce the original and be completely identical to it, therefore, the translation, primarily of the literary text, turned out to be fundamentally impossible.

Translation appeared to be an impossible task, a process in which irreparable losses, both semantic and artistic, are inevitable. Two approaches were distinguished, both of which were recognized as unsatisfactory: to adhere to the original exactly, sacrificing the originality of the receiving language and literature (in fact, a literal translation), or to move away from the original text and reproduce the original text in the target language, focusing precisely on its features and linguocultural aspects (that is - free translation, adaptation). Based on this, it was proclaimed that translation, as an exact reproduction of the original, is impossible.

According to E. Sapir, there is “a generalizing, extra-linguistic art, accessible to transmission without prejudice by means of a foreign language, and a specifically linguistic art, essentially untranslatable” [Sapir 1993: 196]. Based on this quote, a translation, although not identical in all respects, is possible.

A. Meillet says about the same: “Any language expresses as much as is necessary for the society, the instrument of which it is ... With the help of any phonetics, any grammar, anything can be expressed” [Ortega y Gasset 1991: 529]. At the same time, this potential opportunity to express everything is not always practically realized in a particular language, which creates difficulties for a comprehensively complete translation.

However, the absence of absolute identity does not at all hinder the implementation of interlingual communication.

THE CONCEPT OF "EQUIVALENCE" IN TRANSLATION

Due to the fact that it is impossible to achieve absolute equality between the original and the translation, the term “equivalence” was introduced, denoting the generality of the content, i.e. semantic proximity of the original and the translation. P. M. Toper, noting the diversity of opinions about when and where the term "equivalent" entered the theory, writes: , and R. Jacobson suggested it for translation "human" in his article "On the linguistic aspects of translation" (1959) ". [Toper 2001: 176].

The term "equivalence of translation" has received different definitions in different sources. Here are some of them: The Social Science Dictionary gives this definition: «Equivalence of translation – commonality of content; semantic proximity of the original and the translation». [1]

"During an interlanguage transformation (as with any other type of transformation), losses are inevitable, that is, there is an incomplete transfer of the meanings expressed by the original text. Therefore, the translation text can never be the complete and absolute equivalent of the original text; the translator's task is to in order to make this equivalence as complete as possible, that is, to achieve the reduction of losses to a minimum, but to demand a "one hundred percent" coincidence of the meanings expressed in the original text and the translated text would be absolutely unrealistic ", - writes L.S. Barkhudarov in his book. and translation. [2]

V. Komissarov also asserts this definition: “The equivalence of individual words in the original and in translation presupposes the maximum possible similarity not only of the subject-logical, but also the connotative meaning of the correlated words, reflecting the nature of the speakers' perception of the information contained in the word. Its emotional, stylistic and imaginative components play the greatest role. In conveying the connotative aspect of the semantics of the original word, its emotional, stylistic and figurative components play the greatest role. "[3]

From these definitions, we deduce the key term for the concept of "equivalence" - this is equality, equality of meaning.

KINDS OF EQUIVALENCE

It should be noted that an equivalent translation requires the preservation of such characteristic parameters as semantic, structural, functional, communicative, pragmatic, genre and others. Depending on the text itself, as well as the conditions and methods of translation, the degree of their actual implementation will change [Vinogradov 2001]. Dinda Gorley, considering this issue, noted that “the picture is even more complicated due to the numerous definitions used with this term, which is often used not just for descriptive purposes (that is, neutrally), but as an a priori requirement that the text must meet to be considered an adequate translation. The variety of types of equivalence proposed in works on translation theory is simply amazing: in addition to the term "translation equivalence", perhaps the most general term, one can also find such as "functional equivalence", "stylistic equivalence", "formal equivalence", "textual equivalence "," communicative equivalence "," linguistic equivalence "," pragmatic equivalence "," semantic equivalence "," dynamic equivalence "," ontological equivalence ", etc." [Gorlee 1994: 170].

To understand the concept of translation equivalence, it is necessary to comprehensively consider various approaches to understanding the structure of equivalence.

To understand the concept of translation equivalence, it is necessary to comprehensively consider various approaches to understanding the structure of equivalence.

V.N. Komissarov in his book "Theory of Translation (Linguistic Aspects)" [Komissarov 1990] formulated the theory of levels of equivalence, according to which, in the process of translation, equivalence relations are established between the corresponding levels of the original and the translation. V.N.Komissarov identified five content levels in terms of the content of the original and translation:

1. The level of the purpose of communication;
2. The level of description of the situation;
3. The level of utterance;
4. The level of the message;
5. The level of language signs.

According to Komissarov's theory, the equivalence of translation consists in the maximum identity of all levels of content of the original and translated texts.

The units of the original and the translation can be equivalent to each other at all five levels or only at some of them. Potentially, both in the original language and in the target language there are full equivalents, overlapping equivalent units, or contextually equivalent statements. At the same time, their correct assessment, selection, selection and use depend on the skill of the translator, on his knowledge, skills and creativity, on the ability to take into account and compare the entire complex set of linguistic and extralinguistic factors. In the process of translation, each translator solves a difficult task: it is necessary not only to find and select the required equivalent unit, but also to use it correctly, creating communicatively equivalent statements in two languages.

Komissarov also distinguishes between two types of equivalence. The first is a potentially achievable equivalence, which is understood as the maximum commonality of the content of two multilingual texts, taking into account the systemic differences of the languages in which these texts were created; you can call this equivalence ideal or theoretical. The second is translation, practical, equivalence, which is the real semantic proximity of the original and translation texts, achieved by the translator in the process of translation. Accordingly, in the process of translation, the translator proceeds from a specific text, bringing the translation closer to the original in various ways, achieving varying degrees of preservation and proximity of the content, while striving and as close as possible to potentially achievable equivalence.

V. N. Komissarov's classification is just one of the approaches to identifying types of equivalence. V.G. Gak also developed a level approach to the concept of equivalence, highlighting three levels and the corresponding translation models:

1) Formal equivalent: similar linguistic forms express a common meaning in two languages, the difference in means of expression is due only to the structural difference of language systems (presence / absence article, formation of temporary forms, etc.);

2) Semantic equivalent: the same meanings in two languages are expressed in different ways (comparable to the level of description of the situation in V. N. Komissarov);

3) Situational equivalent: even the elementary meanings expressed by linguistic forms are different, but the statement describes the same situation. Differences in particular values are leveled out in a specific context.

A different approach is proposed by Eugene Nida, an American linguist and doctor of theology, distinguishing two types of equivalence: formal and dynamic [Nida 1964a].

1) Formal equivalence is focused primarily on the structure of the source text and on the most accurate reproduction of the content plan. In this regard, translations of this type are often replete with footnotes, with the help of which the maximum approximation to the structure of the original text is achieved.

2) Dynamic equivalence is based on the principle of equivalent effect. The structure fades into the background. The main thing is to keep the relationship between the receptor and the output text identical to the relationship between the receptor and the similar text. Nida considers the main goal of dynamic equivalence to be the search for the closest natural equivalent to a message in the original language [Nida, Taber 1969].

However, when considering this classification, the already mentioned problematic question arises: is it possible to achieve the same effect produced by the text on receptors belonging to different cultures, mentalities, literary traditions and historical eras? Nevertheless, despite the unresolved issue of this issue, Naida's theory had a significant impact on many scientists.

These include the German scientist Werner Kohler, who developed the theory of Eugene Nida and identified five types of equivalence [Köller 1979a]:

1) Denotative equivalence is associated with the equivalence of the extralinguistic content of the text.

2) Connotative equivalence, also called "stylistic", is associated with the choice of lexical units. In particular, this concerns the choice between words with synonymous lexical meaning.

3) Textually, normative equivalence is responsible for compliance with the norm in relation to a certain type of text, since texts of various types (scientific, journalistic, legal, etc.) have their own translation characteristics.

4) Pragmatic (communicative) equivalence is similar to the type of dynamic equivalence identified by Nayda. It focuses on the receptor of the message and the effect of the text on it.

5) Formal equivalence, despite the coincidence of the name with a similar term by Eugene Nida, has a different meaning in this classification. It is connected with the preservation of such formal features of the original as puns, puns, and the author's design of the characters' speech.

This theory is good for studying the translation result, as it looks at it from different angles and shows its versatility. However, the absence of a single criterion, grounds for such a division does not allow attributing this classification to strictly scientific. In this regard, the varieties of equivalence identified by V. Koller intersect with each other.

Another German scientist, a representative of the Leipzig School, Otto Kade presented a system consisting of four clearly delineated types of equivalence.

1) Full equivalence is a rarely achievable equivalence of absolutely identical terms, which is possible only when using terms in narrow areas.

2) Optional equivalence appears when there is a one-to-many ratio: so the English word anxiety corresponds to the Russian variants of anxiety, anxiety, fear, fear, concern, apprehension, longing desire.
3) Textually, normative equivalence is responsible for compliance with the norm in relation to a certain type of text, since texts of various types (scientific, journalistic, legal, etc.) have their own translation characteristics.
4) Pragmatic (communicative) equivalence is similar to the type of dynamic equivalence identified by Nayda. It focuses on the receptor of the message and the effect of the text on it.
5) Formal equivalence, despite the coincidence of the name with a similar term by Eugene Nida, has a different meaning in this classification. It is connected with the preservation of such formal features of the original as puns, puns, and the author's design of the characters' speech.
This theory is good for studying the translation result, as it looks at it from different angles and shows its versatility. However, the absence of a single criterion, grounds for such a division does not allow attributing this classification to strictly scientific. In this regard, the varieties of equivalence identified by V. Koller intersect with each other.
Another German scientist, a representative of the Leipzig School, Otto Kade presented a system consisting of four clearly delineated types of equivalence.
1) Full equivalence is a rarely achievable equivalence of absolutely identical terms, which is possible only when using terms in narrow areas.
2) Optional equivalence appears when there is a one-to-many ratio: so the English word anxiety corresponds to the Russian variants of anxiety, anxiety, fear, fear, concern, apprehension, longing desire.
3) Approximate equivalence is a one-to-one ratio. This type corresponds to the ratio of the English adjective blue and the Russian blue / blue.
4) Zero equivalence occurs when translation of culturally oriented words is required, such as English wicket or Russian balalaika.
Otto Kade was the first to introduce the concept of "potential equivalents", from which the translator selects the "optimal equivalent" in a specific situation. The disadvantages of this theory include the atomistic linguistic approach, since equivalence is considered only at the level of individual words [Kade 1968].

CONCLUSION

The article considered only some of the main approaches to understanding the structure of the category of equivalence. Analysis of the material shows that this category is heterogeneous, it can be divided into different types, types, levels. The use of this or that approach in practice will be determined by the specific goals and objectives of the translator.
But you can briefly define the meaning of the concept as follows: Equivalence characterizes the identity of the translated texts and the original at the semantic, communicative, linguistic or structural levels, depending on the goals for which the translation activity is carried out.
Scientists R. Jacobson, J. Naida, W. Koller consider equivalence as or as levels lying in the same plane. A.D.Shveitser, V.N.Komissarov represent the concept as a hierarchy.

The author of the thesis "Adequacy and Equivalence as Fundamental Criteria for Assessing the Quality of a Translation" V.V. Moshkovich believes that equivalence is a hierarchical concept that estimates the approximation of the real semantic proximity of the translation to the original to the potentially achievable and maximum possible. At the same time, each of the levels has its own characteristics and translation at one or another level of equivalence is used depending on the similarity or difference of language systems and ways of expressing information.

The concept of equivalence is associated with the content closeness of the original and the translation, and also reflects the correspondence of the syntactic structure of sentences.

REFERENCES

1. http://www.glossary.ru/cgi-bin/gl_find.cgi?ph=%FD%EA%E2%E8%E2%E0%EB%E5%ED%F2%ED%EE%F1%F2%FC&action.x=29&action.y=7

2. Бархударов Л. С. Язык и перевод (Вопросы общей и частной теории перевода). М., "Междунар. отношения", 1975

3. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты): Учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. - М.: Высш. шк., 1990. - 253 с.

4. Мошкович В.В. «Адекватность и эквивалентность как основополагающие критерии оценки качества перевода»/ диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. – Челябинск, 2013.