

TRANSLATION ANALYSIS OF THE WORDS DENOTING "CHOOSE"

*Farmonov Bahodir Dustmurodivich*

*Teacher, researcher of the Department of foreign languages,  
Karshi engineering-economics institute*

**Abstract:** In this research work, we have analyzed the translation peculiarities, meaning possibilities and semantic features of the English verb "choose".

**Key words:** cross analysis, translation, verb, grammar, semantic field

The basic characteristics of translation can be observed in all translation events, different types of translation can be singled out depending on the predominant communicative function of the source text or the form of speech involved in the translation process. Thus we can distinguish between literary and informative translation, on the one hand and between written and oral translation, on the other hand.

In search of a necessary word a translator usually addresses to a synonymic group in Uzbek. The existence of synonyms gives an opportunity to find adequate equivalents in the course of translation.

An important part of the general theory of translation is the theory of equivalence aimed at studying semantic relationships between ST and TT. It has been noted that there is a presumption of semantic identity between the translation and its source text. At the same time it is easily demonstrable that there is, in fact, no such identity for even a cursory examination of any translation reveals inevitable losses, increments or changes of the information transmitted.

The general theory of translation describes the basic principles which hold good for each and every translation event. In each particular case, however, the translating process is influenced both by the common basic factors and by a number of specific variables which stem from the actual conditions and modes of the translator's work: the type of original texts he has to cope with, the form in which ST is presented to him and the form in which he is supposed to submit his translation, the specific requirements he may be called upon to meet in his work, etc.

Contemporary translation activities are characterized by a great variety of types, forms and levels of responsibility. The translator has to deal with works of the great authors of the past and of the leading authors of today, with intricacies of science fiction and the accepted stereotypes of detective stories. He must be able to cope with the elegance of expression of the best masters of literary style and with the tricks and formalistic experiments of modern avant-gardists. The translator has to preserve and fit into a different linguistic and social context a gamut of shades of meaning and stylistic nuances expressed in the original text by a great variety of language devices: neutral and emotional words, archaic words and new coinages, metaphors and similes,

foreign borrowings, dialectal, jargon and slang expressions, stilted phrases and obscenities, proverbs and quotations, illiterate or inaccurate speech, and so on and so forth.

An important feature of this and the subsequent type of equivalence is that they imply the retention of the linguistic meaning, i.e. the information fixed in the substantial or structural elements of language as their plane of content. We can say that here the translation conveys not only the “what for”, the “what about” and the ‘what’ of the original but also something of the “how-it-is-said in the original”. The meaning of language units is an important part of the overall contents of the text and the translator strives to preserve it in his translation as best he can.

Thus, the fourth type of equivalence presupposes retention in the translation of the four meaningful components of the original: the purport of communication, the identification of the situation, the method of its description, and the invariant meaning of the syntactic structures.

Every translation can be regarded as belonging to a certain type of equivalence. Since each subsequent type implies a higher degree of semantic similarity we can say that every translation is made at a certain level of equivalence. For instance:

*Arnold preferred such birds, literally he loved them*

*Арнолд бу каби қушчаларни жуда севарди, очигини айтганда бошқасига хуши йўқ эди.*

This example presents the word “prefer”, a synonym of “choose”. If you pay attention to translation sentence you can observe that Uzbek translation is antonymic one.

In this case the translation retains the two preceding informative complexes as well as the method of describing the situation. In other words, it contains the same general notions as the original. This means that the translation is a semantic paraphrase of the original, preserving its basic semes and allowing their free reshuffle in the sentence. Thus we are faced with a situation that can be explained in terms of the semantic theory. The common semes are easily discovered in the comparative analysis of the translations of this group. Consider the first of the examples cited. Both in the translation and in the original the situation is described as a “cause-effect” event with a different pattern of identical semes.

The translator makes his choice considering whether ST is highly technical or not, for a borrowed term is usually more familiar to specialists than to laymen. He has also to take into account the possible differences between the two forms in the way are used in TL. For example,

*The all peace-keepers opt for having peace in their countries.*

*Тинчликпарвар кишиларнинг ягона истаги бу ўз мамлакатларида тинчлик ҳукмронлик қилишидир.*

Translation of technical terms puts a premium on the translator's knowledge of the subject-matter of ST. He must take great pains to get familiar with the system of terms in the appropriate field and make good use of technical dictionaries and other books of reference.

**List of used literature:**

1. Швейцер Д., Теория перевода: статус, проблемы, аспекты". М., 1988., - 166 с
2. Baugh, Albert C. The Chronology of Loan-Words in English. *Modern Language Notes.L.*, 50: 90-93.
3. Bell, Roger, Translation and Translating. Longman., 1991., - 241 p.
4. Bosworth, Joseph - Toller, T. Northcote. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: University Press. 1976., - 176
5. Bradley, Henry. Treson in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. *Modern Language Review*. 1982., - 12 p.
6. Brunner, Karl. *Die englische Sprache*. vol. I. Halle: Niemeyer. 1989., - 34-37
7. Clark, Cecily. Peterborough Chronicle. Oxford: University Press. 1994., - 534 p.