

**Kh.Y.Olimov - junior teacher,  
Kokand State pedagogical Institute**

## **LEXICOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF EQUIVALENT AND NON-EQUIVALENT CONCEPTS IN THE TRANSLATION PROCESS**

***Abstract:** This article is devoted to the lexicographic analysis of equivalent and non-equivalent concepts and the different theoretical views of scholars in the translation process.*

***Key words:** lexicon, lexicographic analysis, English language, interlingua asymmetry, language categories.*

In the lexicon of the English language, a large layer taken from the French language occupies a special place. The size and structure of these acquisitions continue to attract attention from the perspective of certain translation problems, the consideration of which is related to the categories of translation studies such as translation equivalence, the concept of equivalence, interlingua asymmetry, and language categories.

As part of our research, one of the tasks is to add some explanations to the traditional interpretation of translation in equivalence. In this regard, it is important to first of all define what we mean by the term "equivalence", as well as clearly distinguish the concepts of "equivalence" and "adequacy". For this purpose, we will consider the aspect of researchers on the equivalence problem in a brief translation of the main theoretical concept put forward by domestic and foreign.

However, researchers still do not agree on the meaning of the concept of "equivalence". If we try to single out the most important problem in translation theory, it should be called the problem of equivalence. The goal of translation theory, or at least one of its main goals, is to study the laws of transition from a text in one language to a text in another language with minimal loss of content. Any

comparison of two or more texts in different languages involves comparing the texts to determine how well the translated text represents the original text.

Of course, by text we do not mean text in the true sense of the word, but any sentence that can be framed in the form of text. J. Nida emphasized this concept (two plans) and distinguished its two types: formal equivalence (formal equivalence) and dynamic equivalence (dynamic equivalence) <sup>1</sup>. R. Jakobson defined equivalence in the translation as non-identical equivalence (equivalence in difference). <sup>2</sup> Most of the differences in terminology are observed in German translational linguistics: G. Jaeger used the term **Funktionale Aquivalenz** (Functional Equivalence). <sup>3</sup> R. Yumpelt, - **Gleichwertigkeit and Prinzip des aquivalenten Effekts** (principle of equivalent effect), O. Kade called it *Wahrung der Invarianz auf der Inhaltsebene* (sufficiency of invariant content). <sup>4</sup>

In addition to different types of equivalence, it has become traditional to allocate different levels of equivalence. For example, V.N. Komissarov's theory, from the point of view of the content of the text, a number of specific levels of equivalence can be distinguished: the level of linguistic signs, the level of pronunciation, the level of communication, the level of describing the situation, the level of the purpose of communication. <sup>5</sup> P. M. Toper rightly notes that "so much has been written about 'equivalence' that even a systematic bibliography of publications on the subject would be difficult." <sup>6</sup>

Turning to the concept of equivalence, it should be noted that there is a lack of clarity in the terminology used by translators and translation theorists, linguists

---

<sup>1</sup> Nida E., Taber Ch. R. The theory and practice of translation. - Leiden, 1969. - 126-137 pp.

<sup>2</sup> Jakobson R. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation / On translation / Ed. by R. Brower. - Cambridge, Mass., 1969. - P. 223-239.

<sup>3</sup> Jaeger G. Translation und Translationslinguistik - Halle (Saale), 1975. - P. 137.

<sup>4</sup> Kade O. Kommunikationswissenschaftliche Probleme der Translation // Zeitschrift fremdsprachen. Beihefte II. Leipzig, 1968. - S. 3-19.

<sup>5</sup> Комиссаров В. Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). — МВ Изд-во Высшая школа, 2000. - 117-137 с.

<sup>6</sup> Топер П. М. Перевод в системесравнительного литературоведения. — М.: «Наследие», 2000. - 117 с.

and linguists in relation to this concept. One of the first about non-equivalent vocabulary was G.V. Shatkov analyzed the methods of translating non-equivalent vocabulary into Norwegian in Soviet journalism.<sup>7</sup> In our opinion, the various opinions on this topic can be reduced to three main positions that regulate the nature of the relationship between the terms "non-equivalent vocabulary" and "reality":

- 1) non-equivalent vocabulary and realities are related to each other in whole and in part;
- 2) non-equivalent vocabulary and realities as synonymous concepts;
- 3) equivalence "in its purest form" - as words that cannot be translated into another language.

Other authors whose non-equivalent vocabulary boundaries are wider than the concept of "reality" include L.S. Barkhudarov included three sections of lexical units in the non-equivalent dictionary: 1) proper names, geographical names, names of institutions, organizations, newspapers, ships, etc.; 2) reality - words denoting objects, concepts and situations that do not exist in the practical experience of people who speak another language (objects of material and spiritual culture); 3) random spaces - vocabulary units of one of the languages that do not fit in the lexical structure of another language for certain reasons.<sup>8</sup>

Later S.I. Vlahov and S.P. Florin made significant corrections to the understanding of the term "non-equivalent vocabulary", focusing on the need to consider it in the context of this pair of languages. Because Y.I. If we follow Retzker's logic and define "equivalent" as the complete identity between two languages' corresponding units of content, the non-equivalent vocabulary turns out

---

<sup>7</sup> Шатков Г.В.Перевод русской безэквивалентной лексики на норвежский язык:автореф.дис....канд .филол.наук.-М. ,1952.-13с

<sup>8</sup> Бархударов Л.С.О понятии «адекватность реакции читателя на перевод»/ /Художественный перевод: Вопросы теории и практики.— Ереван:Изд-во Ереван,ун-та,1982.-С.94-95.

to be entirely "a huge group of words"<sup>9</sup>. Thus, the authors distinguish the concepts of "non-equivalent vocabulary" and "reality" in terms of the dependence of the first on the translation of the language and the independence of the second, the authors define the non-equivalent vocabulary as "lexical units that do not have translation equivalents in the translation of the language " are suggested to be considered. At the same time, realities are part of non-equivalent vocabulary as a set of independent words.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, N.A. Fenenko in his monograph "Truth and the Language of Truth": "It is impossible not to note the terminological inconsistency of the term reality, because it means both the phenomenon of reality (object) outside of language, its cultural equivalent (concept), and the means of naming this concept in language. (lexeme or phrase combination). For lack of a better one, we can talk about R-reality (French reality) and C-reality (French concept). culturel) and L-realia (French lexeme) left the term "realia" generic.<sup>11</sup>

In conclusion, our scientific work, A.V. Fedorova, A.D. We follow the view of Schweizer and other linguists that specific objects and events themselves should be considered true, not their respective determiners.

### References:

1. Nida E., Taber Ch. R. The theory and practice of translation. - Leiden, 1969. - 126-137 pp.
2. Jacobson R. On Linguistic Aspects of Translation/ /On translation/ Ed. by R. Brower. - Cambridge, Mass., 1969. - P. 223-239.
3. Jager G. Translation und Translations linguistic - Halle (Saale), 1975. - P. 137.

---

<sup>9</sup> Влахов С. И., Флорин С. П. Не переводимое в переводе. - М.: Изд-во Р. Валент, 2006. - 55-57с.

<sup>10</sup> Влахов С. И., Флорин С. П. Не переводимое в переводе. - М.: Изд-во Р. Валент, 2006. - 448с.

<sup>96</sup> Иванов А. О. Безэквивалентная лексика. - СПб.: Филологический факультет СПбГУ; Изд-во С-Петербурга, 2006. 81с.

<sup>11</sup> Фененко Н. А. Язык реалий и реалии языка / монография. - М., 1959-17с.

4. Kade O. Kommunikationswissenschaftliche Probleme der Translation // Zeitschrift fremdsprachen.- Beihefte II. Leipzig, 1968.- S. 3-19.
5. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты).— МВ Изд-во Высшая школа, 2000.- 117-137 с.
6. Топер П.М. Перевод в системесравнительного литературоведения.— М.: «Наследие», 2000.- 117 с.
7. Шатков Г.В. Перевод русской безэквивалентной лексики на норвежский язык: автореф. дис.... канд. филол. наук.- М., 1952.- 13 с.
8. Чернов Г.В. Вопросы перевода русской безэквивалентной лексики («Советских реалий») на английский язык: на материале переводов советской публицистики.- МВ Высшая школа, 1958.- 90-98 с.
9. Бархударов Л.С. О понятии «адекватность реакции читателя на перевод» // Художественный перевод: Вопросы теории и практики.— Ереван: Изд-во Ереван, ун-та, 1982.- С. 94-95.
10. Влахов С И., Флорин С П. Не переводимое в переводе.- М.: Изд-во Р. Валент, 2006.- 55-57 с.
11. Фененко Н.А. Язык реалий и реалии языка / монография.- М., 1959.- 17 с.
12. Влахов С И., Флорин С П. Не переводимое в переводе.- М.: Изд-во Р. Валент, 2006.- 448 с.
13. Иванов А.О. Безэквивалентная лексика.- СПб.: Филологический факультет СПбГУ; Изд-во С-Петербур. ун-та, 2006. 81 с.