



## Defining A Unit of Translation In A Context

*Tursunov E.U.*

*Senior Teacher, Department of the theoretical aspects of the English language Uzbekistan State World Languages University,*

**Abstract:** *the article is dedicated to define the units of translation in the context. The author cites various scientists' opinions in defining the units of translation. Examples for defining the units of translation in the language of translation are given.*

**Keywords:** *a unit of translation, a unity of structure and form, translation studies.*

*Date of Submission: 10-5-2022*

*Date of Acceptance: 12-6-2022*

### Introduction

Translation serves as an “invisible golden bridge” which connect representatives of different cultures and peoples speaking different languages. Significant progress has been made in the field of translation in our country since independence. Examples of this are the translation of many literary masterpieces from English and other languages into Uzbek and Uzbek literary heritage into English and other languages. The creation of a five-volume explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language as an integral part of the work in this area is also having a practical effect on the further development of Uzbek linguistics and translation studies.

If we look back at the history of translation studies, the first translations were related to the translation of religious holy books, the teachings and hadiths of the prophets. Later folk tales and legends were translated into other languages. At that time, religious books were translated literally because no words of the holy books and works could be omitted. From the beginning of the science of translation studies until now, many schools of translation, literature, and terms and specific terms that directly illuminate the mysteries of this science have emerged. The units of translation play an important role in the translation process. The term “*a unit of translation*” is one of the most commonly used terms in the translation process. “Deep and correct knowledge of the language of the source language as a structural and formal unit, its delivery as a whole, taking into account the relationship between form and content and the individual parts that give a whole meaning through this relationship we can get a complete and perfect translation” [1,1].

The question of defining a unit of translation in a context, changing it into another unit in the translated text has been of interest to various translation scholars for many years, and their views on this term vary. The concept of “*a unit of translation*” itself is in some sense conditional, and can not be a constant or permanently used unit. Given the formal non-compliance of the two languages involved in the translation process, morphemes, words, phrases, sentences and texts serve as the main units of translation in the division of the original text into parts. “Criticism of translation, as observed in Western linguistics, warns us of the over-complication of the theory, and in some cases, of the incomprehensibility false science” [2,5].

According to N. G. Valeeva, the word serves as a communication and acquires the status of a small speech unit. Although a word cannot be an immutable unit in the translation process, as a rule, the translator takes the word within the context, that is, he translates it into a phrase, sentence, or larger unit in order to match it to another unit in the translated text. For example, the English word *lives* in *she lives in Moscow* corresponds to the Uzbek word *yashaydi* in *u Moskvada yashaydi*, but the English word *staying* in *she is staying at the Plaza* corresponds to the phrase *vaqtincha yashab turibdi* [1,3].

In the process of comparing the source language and target language in translation, the translator faces problems in selecting the necessary and appropriate units.

As L.K. Latyshev puts, in the process of translation, the translator (in many specific cases) divides the original text into precise units of meaning and translates the text of the translation one after the other [2, 48]. That is, the translated text is the result of a sequential selection of one unit in the original text corresponding to another unit in the translated text. It is these passages that are added one after the other to the larger passages until the translated text is complete. In the text of the translation of the original, the corresponding and alternative unit can be considered as a unit of translation. Alternatives in translation occur at different levels: from the morpheme to the whole text. That is, in many cases, one word in the source language is matched to another word in the target language. But the units can also be adjusted to varying degrees. That is, a word can be matched to another word, a word could be altered to another phrase, or vice versa, and so on. The same opinion is expressed by Uzbek translators. “In translation, it is one of the relatively rare cases in which a single concept coincides with a single concept. Experience shows that a word can be matched to a word, sometimes to a phrase and in some case to a clause.”[6, 56]. L. K. Latyshev argues that translation units are at the same time leading the way in finding an alternative in translation, while at the same time emphasizing the need to accept the source text simply as a grammatically independent unit [3, 88].

V. N. Kommisarov takes a different approach to determine the unit of translation and shows different ways of defining it. “A translation unit is a unit in the source language that must be distinguished and can be matched to another unit in the target language, but when the components are taken separately, it is referred to as a unit of text that does not fit in the translated text. Units of translation can be any unit of language from a phoneme to the whole text (phoneme, morpheme, word, phrase, clause and the whole text). He calls the units of translation “*perevodema*” and treats them as a separate special unit in linguistics. According to him, the unit of translation is first of all an integral part of the original text, a symbol, and has the property of form and content, and it is reflected in the text within the formal units or units of content expressed in it. At the same time, it is involved in the translation process. The latter definition of the same is of great importance from the point of view of translation practice, so that the unit of translation has a certain abstraction in itself, and there is no strict law in putting it into any form [4, 78].

That is, in determining the unit of translation in a particular text, the translator is required to work on that text depending on its internal grammatical, semantic, stylistic and a number of possibilities. V.N. Komissarov outlines four methods in which translation units can be identified.

The *first method* has a formal character: translation units are used as the smallest unit in the text and serve as an independent object of this process in the translation process. If the text the translator is translating into another language is large in size and complex in structure, the first method will look more understandable. In it, the translator divides the text of the original into specific parts, fragments, and in the process of translation individual parts of one language are successively replaced by another language.

*Secondly*, if the components of a phrase in the original text do not correspond to another unit in the translated text, that phrase can be considered the smallest integral language unit. This method is useful if complex words, two or more root words, and fixed compounds are used in the original text. However, this method is used in a very narrow range and is not taken as a universal rule because phrases, fixed compounds, and complex words are not always used. For example, *to give / show somebody the cold shoulder*.

The *third method* of defining translation units focuses on language units in the translated text. In this case, the translation unit is a set of the smallest grammatical and lexical units in the original text that can be matched in the form of certain grammatical and lexical categories in the translated text. As a result of this approach, the presence of specific lexical and grammatical units in the translated text allows the use of alternative units in the translated language. However, the main disadvantage of this method is that the translation units are not rounded and it is not possible to separate the units in the original and the translated text. The separated fragments will therefore not be translation units, but interrelated units of the two languages. Trying to overcome this shortcoming, V. N. Komissarov describes the translation unit as the smallest piece in the text. Its presence indicates the presence of a specific unit of speech in the translated text. In this case, the concept of translation unit is related to the usual alternative theory of units in both languages.

According to V.N. Komissarov, the *fourth method* of defining the units of translation will focus only on the content of the source language. In this case, the translation unit is the smallest unit that represents the content of the original text in the translated text. E. V. Breus thinks that the translation process helps to make communication possible, so as a unit of translation, the speaker's speech should get the point he wants to express [5, 143].

The famous translator V.N. Krupnov, based on his work experience, emphasizes the importance of the content of the source language, skillfully adapting the original and translated units of the text *separately* (ie at the level of words and phrases in the context) and the *wholly* (ie at the level of expressing the meaning of the whole context through speech). In the process of translation, constant work with the linguistic features of the text and the content plan further honors the creativity of the translator.

Whether or not the syntagmas, lexemes, and semantically related words in a sentence serve as a unit of translation, the most important thing is to understand the meaning of that unit and express it clearly in another language. A similar idea to the one provided above was stated by D. Zhukov in his book "We are translators" that the translator should pay attention mainly to the unity of meaning of the text [2, 57].

A unit of translation is a part of an oral or written text, a unit whose semantic content is expressed in the translated text by means of translation, while retaining the general content of the text or the idea

understood from it.

Since the smallest fragment that preserves the whole property of integrity is taken as the unit of any concrete or abstract object, another unit in the text of the source language as a unit in the translated text must be an alternative option that the translator must choose and the meaning and information he must understand. The translation unit is therefore searched from the original text. It is a unit of speech that plays a special role in the translation process. Sometimes it is taken as a unit of translation, of course, because it clearly expresses a complete idea. In the process of a complete translation, separating an entire sentence from the general meaning of a sentence into larger pieces does not lead to the expected result. Even a literal translation of passages in a text cannot convey a meaning understood from the original text. In some cases, when translating words and phrases in the form of certain word games, idioms, fixed combinations and phrases, he does not translate these fixed combinations and phrases according to their internal form or verbatim, but replaces them with an alternative in the target language. For instance, *it is raining cats and dogs* – *Shovillab yomg‘ir yog‘moqda* (in Uzbek).

In conclusion, as a unit of translation it is possible to take units from the morpheme in the original language to the whole text. The translator expresses a unity in the original language in the form of a word, phrase or sentence in the translated text. a complete translation can be achieved only by taking into account the individual passages” [1, 125].

### References

1. Valeeva N. G “Introduction to Translation” - M.: RUDN, 2006.
2. Zhukov D.A. We are translators. M.: Znanie, 1975.
3. Latyshev L.K. Course of translation (equivalence of translation and the possibility of its achievement). M.: International relations, 1981.
4. Botir E., Muxtarovna B. D. THE IMPORTANCE OF DISTANCE LEARNING IN THE PROCESS OF TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES //Gospodarka i Innowacje. –2022. - T. 22. –C. 148-151.
5. Komissarov V.N. Word about translation. M.: Mejdunarodnye otnosheniya, 1973.
6. Krupnov V.N. In tvorcheskoy laboratorii perevodchika. M.: R. Valent, 2006.
7. Qambarov N.M. The importance of context in solving lexical problems of translation. Philological issues. (Scientific-methodical journal). Tashkent, 2011