

TRANSLATION UNITS

*Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages
Faculty of English language and literature,
foreign language and literature
(English language) 4th year student
Ergasheva Khusnida
Supervisor: Akhmedov Azimjon*

Annotation. Unit Of Translation - The smallest entity in a text that carries a discrete meaning. It varies all the time, ranging from individual words through phrases and sentences right up to entire paragraphs. This article

Key words: language pair, target language, condition, form of the translation, factual semantic information.

Аннотация. Единица перевода — наименьшая сущность в тексте, несущая дискретное значение. Он постоянно меняется: от отдельных слов, фраз и предложений до целых абзацев.

Ключевые слова: языковая пара, целевой язык, состояние, форма перевода, фактическая смысловая информация.

Annotatsiya. Tarjima birligi - matndagi diskret ma'noga ega bo'lgan eng kichik ob'ekt. U har doim o'zgarib turadi, ya'ni alohida so'zlardan tortib to iboralar va jummalargacha to'liq paragraflargacha.

Kalit so'zlar: til juftligi, maqsadli til, shart, tarjima shakli, faktik semantik ma'lumot.

The definitions of the translation unit below present it as a result of the step-by-step analysis of the text, each highlighting a new characteristic. For instance, I. I. Revzin and V. Yu. Rozentsveig note that the translation unit depends on "the language pair involved in the translation" and define it for machine translation as the minimal segment of the source text corresponding to a set of elementary meanings in the intermediary language, which can be matched with a segment in the target language (p. 117).

V. N. Komissarov views the translation unit as "the smallest unit of speech (i.e., the minimal segment of the text), the presence of which in the source text necessitates the appearance of a specific segment in the translation" (pp. 188-189).

Discussions about the content and size of the translation unit draw attention to its properties of conditionality, instability, and operationality. Variability is a necessary condition and form of the translation unit's existence.

Such diverse views on the translation unit are primarily due to the complexity of the translation process itself, the linear nature of the text, and the non-linear nature of the cultural, informational, and semantic spaces formed by the original and translated texts, as well as the contradiction between the impossibility of directly observing this process and the desire to describe it. A new scientific paradigm has moved the discussion of the translation unit into the cognitive field of linguistic research.

A. L. Semenov, V. I. Khairullin, and E. A. Ogneva propose the frame as the translation unit, convincingly arguing that translation as a communicative act is not a transformation of the original text into the translation but an exchange of culturally-conditioned pragmatic and factual semantic information contained within the frame.

The frame, as a key concept in cognitive linguistics, is seen both as a data structure representing a stereotypical situation and as a unit of knowledge organized around a concept, containing information about what is essential, typical, and possible for this concept within a specific culture (p. 119).

Thus, the frame, representing experiential cognitive knowledge, bridges the cognitive and linguistic domains in the process of verbalizing intentional meaning, linking semantic/propositional units/structures with corresponding frame components in the minds of language speakers.

The frame, a multi-component conceptual entity in its entirety, is a comprehensive representation, a set of standard knowledge about a subject or phenomenon. It can be called an objective translation unit because, first, the information processing in translation is cognitive in nature; second, due to the diversity of cognitive processes, the frame, with its non-linear, semantic, and informative load, represents an "information package" that conveys meaning and "forms the cognitive-communicative space, whose model in the original and translated texts differs in several parameters" (p. 16).

As the structural expression of a concept, the frame links the notions of "translation unit" and "concept." At the cognitive level, the frame as a research unit is a conceptual image-schema, extended in time and space; at the semantic level, this schema is filled with meanings and associative connections; at the lexical level, it is verbalized in specific lexical units linked by syntactic relationships, adhering to the norms of the translation language.

Translation is a linguistic-cognitive experiment where the cognitive spaces of the speaker and the recipient are compared, equated, and replaced in the communication process (p. 14). This comparison reveals intercultural and interlingual asymmetry, which, while technically complicating the translation process, significantly enhances understanding of the source language culture in cognitive and communicative terms. Through the frame-concept, the translation unit is connected as a mental phenomenon and its verbal representation, aiding a deeper pre-translation analysis of

the original text by providing knowledge about the world, situation, information type, context, realities; information about the author and characters, their emotions, attitudes, and value orientations, enabling an accurate assessment of the text's content, the communicative intent of the author, characters, and recipients, and making correct inferences based on semantic conclusions.

The text is seen as a hierarchical structure of frames reflecting the system of semantic relationships within the text. Since the translation text formally belongs to a different culture, it reveals an analogous but not identical hierarchy of frames. Situationally-driven translation strategies fill the structural elements of the frame, and "insufficient context specification leads to the introduction of explanatory details" (p. 13).

Frames can take various forms. Linguistic studies identify terms like frame-script, frame-scenario, frame-situation, frame-schema, static and dynamic frames.

In our work, we provide examples of how analyzing the frame-script can help choose the appropriate translation strategy and describe the linguistic processes that create conditions for this choice.

A frame-script represents a typical structure of an event or situation, uniting its characteristic features. Actions specified in the script are verbalized in the original and translated texts depending on propositional content and presuppositional settings. The frame sets the boundaries applied to the "continuum of objective phenomena," prompting multiple interpretations that manifest in the variations of the original and translated text situations.

The transition to different translation options is facilitated by situational-semantic inference. G. V. Chernov defines situational inference as the extraction of meaning by comparing the perceived part of information (textual situation) with the factors of the situational context of the message (semantic situation) (Chernov, p. 94). This inference allows the non-linear representation of the frame's semantic components to be linearly ordered into linguistic formats of textual situations.

In both original and translated texts, only a part of the frame's essential components is fixed. This part does not become inherent since there is always a hidden cultural-cognitive background and its ontological implications behind the textual situation. The connections reflect the logic of interaction between the semantic and meaning components of propositions and presuppositions in line with the communicative intent of the entire textual content, which determines the direction of the inference. Each specific usage of a sentence satisfies some or all presuppositional conditions, specifying some or all non-exhaustive choices (p. 102).

In this pair, the stimulus is the correlate in the original text, and the reaction is the correlate in the translated text. Their combination represents a situation in development, changing the perspective of the proposition, leading to a rearrangement

of elements in the propositional structure of the translated text. The proposition "plenty of champagne" is a common judgment for both sentences and is initial in the correlate of the original text. The development of the semantic inference goes from the initial judgment to the process accompanying the initial judgment: "there was plenty of champagne, so it flowed like a river." The part before the comma is expressed by the correlate of the original text, and the part after the comma by the correlate of the translated text. The general propositional stance—judgment—is represented only in one member of the pair and is expressed by the existential verb "to be." It is replaced by a presuppositional stance forming the truth conditions for this proposition: that champagne flowed like a river is true if there is a lot of champagne. This introduces shifts in referential structures, adding a new element—"river"—in the fixed expression "flow like a river." This changes the evaluative framework of the statement: there was not just a lot of champagne, but very much. It not only states a fact but also evaluates it using an idiomatic expression. This pair also shows a mismatch in the pragmatic framework. The translator's analysis of situational factors suggests that the translation implicitly conveys information about the participants' behavior and the party's atmosphere—they were having fun. "There was plenty of champagne" is neutral information, from which the following implications are possible:

- a) no one drank it;
- b) everyone drank a lot and had fun.

The translation reflects the second inference.

In this case, the original text's proposition becomes one of the presuppositions of the translated text. The frame "too fresh grass" suggests the following semantic inferences:

- a) careful, it will stain your clothes;
- b) just grown;
- c) too fresh to crush;
- d) just rained;
- e) won't catch fire.

The situation where hunters track a lion, and one suggests setting the grass on fire to drive the lion out, favors the presupposition "won't catch fire." The translator identifies traits relevant to this situation, knowing not only the characteristics of social contexts, frames, and their components but also analyzing actions within these contexts.

References:

1. Garbovsky, N. K. Theory of translation / N. K. Garbovsky. – M.: Publishing house Mosk. Univ., 2004. – 544 p.
2. Dyck, T. Vann Language. Cognition. Communication / T. Dyck. – M.: Progress, 1989. – 312 p.

1. Komissarov, V. N. A word on translation (essays on linguistic teachings) / V. N. Komissarov. – M.: International Relations, 1973. – 215 p.
3. Minyar-Beloruhev R.K. General theory of translation and oral translation / R.K. Minyar-Beloruhev. – M.: Military Publishing House, 1980. – 237 p.
4. Popova, Z. D. Cognitive linguistics / Z. D. Popova, I. A. Sternin. – M. : AST: VostokZapad, 2007 – 134.(6) p. (Linguistics and intercultural communication.)
5. Revzin, I. I. Fundamentals of general and machine translation / I. I. Revzin, V. Yu. Rosenzweig. – M.: Higher school, 1964. – 243 p.
6. Sdobnikov, V.V. Translation theory / V.V. Sdobnikov, O.V. Petrova. – M.: AST VostokZapad, 2006. – 340 p.
7. Semenov, A. L. Fundamentals of the general theory of translation and translation activities / A. L. Semenov. – M.: Publishing center “Academy”. 2008. – 160 p.
8. Fillmore, Ch. Main problems of lexical semantics / Ch. Fillmore // New in foreign linguistics. – Vol. 12. – M.: Raduga, 1983. – P. 74–122.