UNDERSTANDING TRANSLATION UNITS AND SHIFTS

Azimjon Ahmedov
the teacher of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Nosirova Zarnigor G'ayratjon qizi
Otaqo'ziyeva Durdona Kamoliddin qizi
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages,
students of the 4th stage of English language and literature

Annotation: *Nowadays, globalization connected to all of kinds of community from nation background, culture, language, religion. Communication is needed as a tool of language, so in communicating one each other translation is important comprehension. This article discusses issues of understanding translation units and shifts.*

Key words: *units, shifts, language, translation, Catford, linguistic, text.*

Language is used as means of communication, by language we can talk to our friends, express our ideas, emotion our feelings. Language is also mirror of mind, thought our language we can understand what is in the brain of human being. It is true our language can show who we are and what we are now by how we use the language in communication an in order to express and to fulfill our basic needs for social interaction with other person.

Translation used to communicate a text from its original text into translated text in order to transfer the text's content. Translation is the process of re-contextualizing text in a different language. Translation, according to Catford, is the process of converting a text from a Source Language (SL) to an equivalent Target Language (TL). Meanwhile, translating, according to Nida and Taber, is the process of duplicating messages from Source Language (SL) as closely as feasible to Target Language (TL).

Translation is the process of transferring the meaning of a text from the source language into the target language. Basically, the text is reconstructed by translating the words from the source language into the target language and is arranged based on the structures of the sentence in the target language, therefore, the structures are suitable with the target language and certainly there will be no loss of meaning. Each language has its own characteristics or even distinction. Therefore, the translation from the source language into the target language cannot be exact equivalents as both languages are widely different in structure and cultural background. The understanding of the structure and the culture in both languages is required by the translator as it makes the translator capable of grasping the meaning in the text accurately and allows him to transfer the same meaning.

Units of translation depend on the text itself, i.e. to what point can I understand the meaning.

Both the word and the sentence, the period and the paragraph must be subject to analysis and interpretation in context; when it comes time to translate, we work with an organic semantic whole, the text, which is articulated through subunits of meaning. Therefore, the unit of translation is the entire text.

Newmark insists that the unit of translation, understood as a segment of the original text from which the translator can begin his or her reformulation in a different language, is part of a movable scale: "The word, the lexical unit, the collocation, the group, the clause and the sentence–rarely the paragraph, never the text".

This great linguist defends an intermediate posture between the restricted unit of Vinay and Darbelnet and the laxer unit of the speech analysis theorists, who consider that the unit of translation is the entire text.

"Unit of translation", by contrast, is a phrase that is normally used to make reference to the unit of analysis or interpretation and should perhaps be reserved to designate a segment of the dialectic process of the negotiation of the meaning of the source text and its placement in the target language.

The field of translation encompasses a wide range of situations, including not only formal papers but also literary works. Newmark claims that translating literature is the most challenging since it necessitates the preservation of aesthetics, taste, and meaning. Translators must be familiar with both translation and pragmatics, as well as the context of the text. Translators must take into account the form of language in both the Source Language (SL) and the Target Language (TL), as well as the text's equivalency. As a result, the translator must understand and overcome translation shift and translation equivalence.

Catford defined translation shift as a shift of translation from formal correspondence in process of changing text from Source Language into Target Language. Machali proposed translation shifts into two major types, obligatory shift and optional shift. Optional shift is a shift caused by the wisdom of the translator. In optional shift, the translator could choose more equivalent clauses. Meanwhile, obligatory shift is a shift that focus in grammar.

Moreover, Nida and Taber stated that common shift is modification that included specific and generic meaning. It can be differed into two types: meaning shift from general to specific meaning and meaning shift from specific to general meaning.

Catford also proposed translation shift into two major kinds, level or rank shift and category shift. Level or rank shift refers to language item that equivalent in a different level from source language into target language. Category shift refers to departure from formal correspondence in translation.

A shift is said to occur if in a given the target language a translation equivalent other than the formal correspondent occurs for a source language element'.

Translation shifts are small linguistic changes occurring in translation of the source language into the target language. Vinay and Darbelnet carried out a comparative stylistic analysis to describe translation shifts though the term 'shift' which was first used by Catford in his A Linguistic Theory of Translation.

Shifts is the departure from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL. Shifts in translation are known as those changes which occur or may occur in the process of translation. They results, most of the time, from the attempt to deal with the systemic differences between the source language and the target language The notion 'translation shifts' has been directly or indirectly investigated by every theorist who has ever mentioned linguistic translation in their studies, since the process of translation itself may be regarded as a transformation when a system of certain code is substituted with another by preserving identical communication function, reporting the same message and its functional dominance. However, the most prominent name in this field is Catford.

Catford is the first scholar to use this term in his 'A Linguistic Theory of Translation' (1965). He uses it to refer to those small linguistic changes that occur between the source language and the target language. He defines it as "a departure from formal correspondence in the process of going from the source language to the target language". Shifts within the Catford's framework occur at grammatical and lexical levels, and their investigation is therefore pursued within or beyond the boundaries of the sentence as an upper rank. He limits his theory of shifts to textual equivalence. In other words, he sees that shifts tend to occur when there is no formal correspondence between two linguistic codes. These shifts are seen as those utterances of translation which can be identified as textual equivalents between source text and target text utterances. Catford divides shifts into two categories, such as level shifts and category shifts.

Level Shifts. Shift of level is when a source language item at one linguistic level has a target language translation equivalent at a different level. It includes shifts from grammar to lexis and vice-versa. Catford (ibid) points out that, cases of shifts from grammar to lexis are quite frequent in translation between languages.

Category Shifts. Category shifts refer to unbounded and rank-bounded translation. The first being approximately normal or free translation in which source language and target language equivalents are up at whatever rank is appropriate. It is clear that category shift is unbounded, which might be normal of free translation, depends on what rank is appropriate. It includes structure shifts, class shifts, unit shifts, and intra-system shifts.

Structure Shifts. Languages exhibit a considerable amount of differences both in the realization of similar structures existing in these languages and in the type of structures existing in each language. Structures, where one element is typically obligatory while other elements are optional, an agreement between the head and its

modifiers, are usually observed in some languages, for instance. However, languages vary so widely in the restrictions they assign to this agreement. In the English nominal group, for instance, this agreement is observed between articles and nouns but overlooked between nouns and adjectives. This is a potential area of structural shifts in translation. Another type of dependency relations is that of the exclusion relation which is useful for defining some grammatical classes such as the verbs of state in English which do not agree with auxiliaries for the progressive aspect, and proper nouns which do not take the definite article 'the'.

Class Shifts. A class shift means the grouping of the constituents of a unit according to the way they operate in the structure of another unit next higher in rank. In other words, a class refers to any set of items having the same possibilities of operation in the structure of a particular unit. Class shift occurs when the translation equivalence of a source language item is a member of a different class from the original item. It is a change in world class. Catford defines class shifts following Halliday's definition "that grouping of members of a given unit which is defined by operation in the structure of the unit next above". Structure shifts entail class shifts. This is because of the "logical dependence of class on structure".

Intra-System Shifts. A system refers to the closed number of elements among which a choice must be made. In fact, the terms available in each system in one language can show fundamental differences from the terms of the same system in another language. This can be considered a major source of shifts at this level of language description. In other words, intra system shifts refer to those changes that occur internally within a system. The equivalence is said to occur at a non-corresponding term in the target language system. All languages have their systems of number, deixis, articles, etc. Intra-system shifts happen when a term is singular in the source text and its textual equivalent is plural, or vice versa (a change in number even though the languages have the same number system). It is worth noting here that the translator is compelled to be bound by the source language chosen by the writer; otherwise, her/his performance is destined to be erroneous.

Unit Shifts. The descriptive units of the grammar of any language are arranged into meaningful stretches or patterns. One single instance of these patterns is called unit. Unit shifts occur when translation equivalent of a source text unit at one rank is a unit at a different rank in the target language. It includes shifts from morpheme to a word, word to phrase, clause to sentence, and vice versa. For example: a phrase into a word.

There are some factors causing translation shifts to occur. Catford studied that there are two factors which affected the equivalence of translation shifts. They are linguistic and cultural factors. These two factors brought two equivalents. They are linguistic and cultural equivalents. This finding of Catford is very significant because it consists of both important approaches toward equivalence, namely, linguistic and

cultural approaches. He states that linguistic factors are those which exist at the levels of concrete form and abstract meaning of any chunk of language. In addition, cultural factors are those factors that cannot be seen at the level of form or meaning of language, however, they exist among the background of mind of speakers and writers of source language.

REFERENCES:

1. Catford, J.C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London: Oxford University Press. 1965.

2. Hatim, Basil and Munday, Jeremy. Translation: An Advanced Resource Book. London and New York: Routledge. 2004

3. Larson, M.L. Meaning Based Translation a Guide to Cross Language Equivalence. London: University Press of America, Inc. 1998

4. Baker, Mona, ed. (1998). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London and New York: Routledge.

5. Akbari, M. 2006. Structural Shifts in Translation of Children's Literature. Unpublished Master Thesis. Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Tehran.

6. Venuti, L. The Translation Studies Reader. London and New York: Routledge. 2000