

THE CONCEPT OF TRANSLATION

Rashidov Sanjar

*Jizzakh State Pedagogical University, Jizzakh,
Uzbekistan*

Annotation: *This article is interpreted on the basis of the issues of general linguistic description of the concept of translation. It expresses such features as the transfer of phrases, sentences, words in transformation of meaning on the logical basis of phrases.*

Keywords: *concept, tendency, mechanism, collision, general principles, intersection, linguoculturological, heuristic, lingua-culturology, national cultures.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In translation studies, a concept of translation has been widely debated. An analysis of the ways in which the term “concept” is used allowed to assume that our tendency to use terms borrowed from foreign languages is rooted in a certain mechanism of how thinking works.

The usage of the term "concept" in a scientific and philosophical literature also led us to another important problem, the essence of which is following: the use of foreign terms in a particular scientific community can lead to the fact that these terms begin to be associated with meanings that, in "Native" for them, these terms, the environment was not contacted with them. This collision most often occurs as a result of the mechanism mentioned above. We will also talk about how the term “concept” took root and how it began to be understood as it is understood today in philosophy and science.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

At the intersection of linguistics and cultural studies, a linguoculturological understanding of the concept arose. Acting as a basic heuristic unit of lingua-culturology, the concept, among other things, allows you to refer to the understanding of ethnic and national cultures, subcultures, etc. In this regard, a "layer model" of the concept is used, in which different layers of the concept are a condensate of the cultural life of different eras.

In modern Western philosophical and scientific literature, the analogue of our term the “concept”. The “notion” synonymous with it is used much less frequently, and more likely in the sense of an idea, a representation, than a proper logical concept. Translation theory covers such activities as written translation, oral translation or interpreting. The French Philosopher E. Dolet was one of the first who formed a translation theory to impart scientific support into this activity in the XVI century.

According to him, “the real translation has to face a particular criterion that is about a perfect understanding of the original text’ content and the author’s intentions, mastery of languages, which are included in the translation process, unsuitableness of literal translation, preservation of the authentic atmosphere of the original, preserving the style of the original text”²⁰. Later, Savory made “a list of requirements for the various authors’ translations.

Outlining of some of his statements will be enough to get his point of view on translation process”.

Russian-American linguist and literary theorist Roman Jakobson shared “an idea that the translation theory plays an essential role in other sciences, particularly indifferent branches of linguistics. He offered to define different types of translation: intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic, in which one system of signs transforms into another. He supposed every transformation which carries the original meaning to be an adequate translation. This idea of Jakobson is closely correlated with the role of translation in logic”.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

French linguist and translator Georges Mounin paid more attention to the discourse’s semantic structures and claimed to iron their differences. They arrive as differences in semantics impose so many restrictions in translation, for instance, make it impossible to deliver the original meaningfully. It is also acceptable to note the merits of such scientists as Revzin and Rozentsveig to the linguistic translation theory. In “The Fundamental so Human and Machine Translation they pointed out that the theory of translation should be not a prescriptive (i.e. the one that a priori formulates translation demands), but a descriptive – the one to describe the objective reality. It is the description that produces standards and regulatory guidelines of translation. They also highlighted the use of the deductive approach, which extends the use of general linguistic concepts in translation process”.

4. CONCLUSION

The issues stated above are just several fragments of the huge linguistic mosaics of translation theory problematic field. On the assumption of asserted, it is possible to point out two major inferences. These inferences will be the requirements basis for defining the term translation and for comparing other definitions with the worked out one later. Translation should keep the meaning of the original and target texts. In other words, the problem of invariance should be taking into account while crossing the boundaries of two languages. Secondly, the target text should be theoretically equivalent to the original one. The logical sequence and inter-originating of these two principles can be clearly observed”. In their “Dictionary of Translation Studies” Shuttleworth and Cowie define translation unit as “[a] term used to refer to the linguistic level at which source text is remodified in target language”. There is a degree of structural relatedness between target and source languages may influence the size of translation units. It is likely that translation between unrelated languages will involve larger units than translation between closely related languages.

REFERENCES:

1. Tymoczko, Maria. 2006. *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome. P. – 7.
2. Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Hermeneutics and Criticism and other Writings*. [German original 1838. Translated and edited by Andrew Bowie]. Cambridge: University Press. 1998. P. – 80.

3. Steiner, George (1975): *After Babel. Aspectsof Language and Translation*. [New edition 1992]. London: Oxford University Press. P. 296-300
4. *The Art of Translation: Kornei Chukovsky's a High Art.*– March 1, 1984 . P. – 28.
5. Fedorov A.V. *Fundamentals of the general theory of translation (Linguistic problems)*–4th Ed, Revised and add –M: Higherschool, 1983. P.-303
6. Komissarov, v. N., *Theory of translation (linguistic aspects)*, Moscow, 1990 (in Russian). P.-6.
7. Jakobson, R., *On linguistic aspectsof translations*, in R. Brower (ed.), *On Translation*, OUP, New York, 1959, pp. 232–239.
8. Revzin, I. I., and V. U. Rozentsveig, “*The Fundamentals of Human and Machine Translation*”, Moscow, 1964 (in Russian). P. – 65.
9. V.N. Komissarov. “*Linguistics of Translation M.: International relations*, 1980.P.-167.
10. Shuttle Worth, Mark and Moira Cowie (2007).*Dictionary of Translation*