



**IQTIDORLI TALABALAR, MAGISTRANTLAR, TAYANCH
DOKTORANTLAR VA DOKTORANTLARNING**

“TAFAKKUR VA TALQIN”

MAVZUSIDAGI

**RESPUBLIKA MIQYOSIDAGI
ILMIY-AMALIY ANJUMAN TO‘PLAMI
(II QISM)**

BUXORO 2022 yil, 23 may

**O‘ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY VA O‘RTA MAXSUS TA‘LIM
VAZIRLIGI**

**BUXORO DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI
MAGISTRATURA BO‘LIMI**

**IQTIDORLI TALABALAR, MAGISTRANTLAR, TAYANCH
DOKTORANTLAR VA DOKTORANTLARNING**

TAFAKKUR VA TALQIN

**mavzusida Respublika miqyosidagi
ilmiy-amaliy anjuman to‘lami
(II qism)**

Buxoro 2022-yil, 23-may

70230502 - Adabiyotshunoslik: rus adabiyoti	
<i>C.Файзуева</i>	<i>Художественное своеобразие творчества Л. Петрушевской.....629</i>
70230101 – Lingvistika: ingliz tili	
<i>N. T. Qo'chqorova</i>	<i>Ingliz va o'zbek tili matallarida somatizmning ifodalanishi636</i>
<i>N.T.Qo'chqorova</i>	<i>Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida somatizm semantikasiga doir ayrim mulohazalar640</i>
70230502 – Adabiyotshunoslik: ingliz adabiyoti	
<i>Z.R.Sobirova, U.A.Umarov</i>	<i>Analysis of gothic genre elements in the works of english children's literature.....645</i>
<i>M. R. Kilicheva, N. I. Ramazonova,</i>	<i>Mark Tvenning "Tom Soyerning sarguzashtlari" asarida yumor talqini.....651</i>
<i>Zoyirova Mokhidil</i>	<i>Literary analysis of flowers characterizing human being in english poetry.....655</i>
70230201 - Qiyosiy tilshunoslik va Lingvistik tarjimashunoslik	
<i>D.I.Bakhtiyorova</i>	<i>Interpretation of the protagonists in the novels by J.Steinbeck and writer's style.....659</i>
<i>Dilafruz Xodjayeva, G.M.Hoshimova</i>	<i>Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida ritorik so'roq gaplarning qiyosiy tahlili.....665</i>
<i>N.N.Salikhova N.A.Mahmudova</i>	<i>Occurrence of discursive markers in translation.....669</i>
<i>M.A.Olimova</i>	<i>Tarjima jarayonida adekvatlik va ekvivalentlikning yo'qolishi ...678</i>
<i>S.Muxammadova</i>	<i>Frazeologizmlar tarjimasiga doir muammolar680</i>
<i>N.X.Xakimova</i>	<i>Detektiv asarlar tarjimasida ijodkor uslubi.....685</i>
<i>N.Kasimova Sh.Safarova</i>	<i>Semantic, syntactic, pragmatic equivalence in terminology translation.....690</i>
<i>H.K.Pjzuev</i>	<i>Ўзбек халқ афсона ва ривоятларининг инглизча таржимасида сўз қўллаш билан боғлиқ мураккабликлар.....694</i>

SEMANTIC, SYNTACTIC, PRAGMATIC EQUIVALENCE IN TERMINOLOGY TRANSLATION

N.Kasimova,

*PhD, Associate Professor Head of the
Department of Translation Studies and Language Education at BukhSU*

Sh.Safarova

*Master's degree student in Comparative Linguistics
and Linguistic Translation at BukhSU
Department of Translation Studies and Linguodidactics*

Abstract. This chapter aims at comparing two main kinds of equivalence in translation: semantic equivalence and pragmatic equivalence. In contemporary translation theory, the concept of equivalence has played a central role in clarifying the relationship between an original (source text) and a translation (target text). The chapter also aims at understanding whether it is possible to reconcile semantic and pragmatic equivalence in translation and how it could be done in legal translation.

Key words: equivalence, terminology, translation, semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, extralinguistic, semiotics

Semantic deals with the relations of signs to what they mean, i.e. with denotations, meanings, names represented in the classical semantic triangle.

Syntactic considers ways of combining signs that ultimately lead to the generation of texts. Its subject is syntax and grammar of different sign systems¹⁰.

Pragmatic deals with the sign—person relationship (communicant or recipient)⁸.

Semiotics (the science investigating the general properties of sign systems) distinguishes the following types of relations: semantic (sign to object), syntactic (sign to sign) and pragmatic (sign to man).

One of the most essential requirements, imposed on translation, is that the two texts (the original and its translation) should be semantically equivalent⁶. The goal of translation is to produce a text, bearing the same relation to the extralinguistic situation as the original. Semantic equivalence of messages does not necessarily imply the semantic identity of each linguistic sign. Semantically equivalent utterances include not only those, made up of the semantically identical signs, but also utterances comprising different sets of signs which in their totality add up to the same type of relationship to the extralinguistic world and denote the same extralinguistic situation (e.g. **Wet paint - Caution! Painted**). Semantic relations affect translation both in the initial stage of analysis and in producing the target-language text⁵.

As distinct from semantic relations, syntactic relations are important only at the stage of analysis since relations between linguistic signs are essential for their semantic interpretation (Karim hit Johnny and Johnny hit Karim). But although they may be occasionally preserved in translation, the translator does not set himself this goal¹³. Very often syntactically non-equivalent utterances prove to be semantically equivalent: **He was considered invincible - U yengilmas deb hisoblanadi**.

Another example: in the story of the American writer Harper Lee "To Kill a mockingbird" there is a quote: "**Mr. Raymond sat up against the tree-trunk**", uzbek translation "**Janob Raymond o'tirdi va eman daraxtiga suyandi**"²

Pragmatic relations are superimposed on semantic relations and play an equally important role in analyzing the original text and in producing an equivalent text in the target language⁹

Semantically equivalent messages do not necessarily mean the same thing to the source - and target-language receptors, and therefore are not necessarily pragmatically equivalent. The phrases "He made a fifteen-yard end run" and «**U o'n besh yardlik chetga chiqdi**» are semantically equivalent for they denote the same situation but the American reader, familiar with American football, will

extract far more information from it than his Uzbek counterpart who would neither understand the aim of the maneuver nor appreciate the football-player's performance. The pragmatic problems, involved in translation, arise from three types of pragmatic relations: 1) the relation of the source-language sender to the original message; 2) the relation of the target-language receptor to the target-language message and 3) the relation of the translator to both messages¹⁴.

Analyzing the source text, the translator poses the question: what is the sender's goal and what language means does he use for this? The understanding of the text is based on the awareness of its integrity with the obligatory consideration of the pragmatic rules of its construction. At the same time, it is important not only what is said, but also what is implied. Hence, there is a need for mandatory accounting of presuppositions, which should include not only what was said earlier, but also just the well-known, the speaker's "I", his social status, background knowledge, etc. In this regard, it is appropriate to recall the words of I.R.Galperin about the role of the subtext coexisting with the verbal expression, accompanying it and planned by the creator of the text². The position put forward by him on "content-subtext information" Galperin, I.R. "Text as an object of linguistic research". M.: Nauka, 1981¹⁵ as an organic part of the semantic content of the text is most directly related to translation. Based on what has been said above about the explicit and implicit components of the meaning of the text, about the role of pragmatic factors in its formation, R. Stolze makes an important conclusion for the theory of translation about the multiplicity and "super-totality" of the semantic content of the text¹.

At the same time, super-summarity means the irreducibility of the meaning of the text to the sum of the meanings of its constituents. However, it does not follow from this that, analyzing the source text as a super-sum total, one can to some extent neglect the semantic analysis of its constituents⁴. The fact is that recurrent semantic features that reveal the content of the text (semantically related lexemes) form isotopic planes of the text, in which the multidimensional structure

of its meaning is realized¹¹. It is as a result of the integration of individual elements in linguistic and non-linguistic contexts that the "increment of information" (Information super chess) is formed, which underlies the "super sum" of the meaning of the text. Taking into account the semantics of the text raises the question of taking into account the meanings of individual lexemes in a new way for the theory of translation. Their meaning is considered not as a fixed slice of a certain set of semantic features (as is the case in rigid models of structural semantics), but as a "flexible set of semes and pragmatic parameters, variable combinations of which are projected into the plane of the text" Along with the semantics of the text, the stylistics of the text is also essential for the theory of translation.

References:

1. Nafisa Farkhadovna Kasimova, & Masuma Umarovna Sharipova. (2022). Uzbek and English Philosophy and Phraseology About Happiness as a Value. Eurasian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 7, 47–49.
2. Haydarova, N. A. "Linguocultural analysis of English and Uzbek medical phraseological units describing physiological processes." European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability (2020): 15-16.
3. Kasimova, N. F. (2017). Communicative functions of the interrogative sentences in English. In *Приоритетные направления развития науки* (pp. 59-62).
4. Khaydarova Nodirabegim Ahtamjonovna. (2021). Significance of Phraseological Units application in Medical Discourse of English and Uzbek Language. Middle European Scientific Bulletin, 11. <https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.11.471>
5. Textual properties, communicative clues and the translator (Ernst-August Gutt)
6. Pragmatic errors in translating Kiswahili interjections: An example of Amezidi (Nahashon Akungah Nyangeri)