



DIFFERENT TYPES OF EQUIVALENCE IN BILINGUAL DICTIONARIES

Jumanova Orzigul Sa'dulla kizi

English teacher, Department of Foreign languages theory, ShSPI

Phone number: +998919641911

E-mail: jumanovaorzigul@gmail.com

Abstract *One of the main problem lexicographer has to deal with is a lack of equivalence or non-equivalence between languages which is the root cause of the difficulties for translators or users of the bilingual dictionaries. The main task of a bilingual dictionary is to give equivalents of source language lexical units in target language, as central work of compiling bilingual dictionary is to provide with translational equivalent. This article discusses typology of equivalence, the problems of correspondence of lexical units and their reasons with specific reference to English-Uzbek bilingual dictionaries. In the work some methods are also recommended which the lexicographers can follow in compiling a bilingual dictionary, and users would be able to disambiguate the recorded information successfully as result.*

Keywords: *equivalence, lack of equivalence, non-equivalence, zero equivalence, bilingual dictionaries*

РАЗНЫЕ ВИДЫ ЭКВИВАЛЕНТНОСТИ В ДВУЯЗЫЧНЫХ СЛОВАРЯХ

*Одна из основных проблем, с которой сталкивается лексикограф,
- это отсутствие эквивалентности или неэквивалентности между
языками, что является основной при59*/*

*- чиной трудностей для переводчиков или пользователей двуязычных
словарей. Основная задача двуязычного словаря - дать эквиваленты лексических
единиц исходного языка в целевом языке. В статье обсуждается типология
эквивалентности, проблемы соответствия лексических единиц и их причины со
специфической ссылкой на англо-узбекские двуязычные словари. В работе также
рекомендуются некоторые методы, которым лексикографы могут следовать
при составлении двуязычного словаря, и в результате пользователи смогут
успешно устранять неоднозначность записанной информации.*

Ключевые слова: *эквивалентность, отсутствие эквивалентности,
неэквивалентность, нулевая эквивалентность, двуязычные словари.*

IKKI TILLI LUG'ATLARDA UCHROVCHI EKVIVALENT TURLARI

Anotatsiya *Leksikograf bartaraf etishi kerak bo'lgan asosiy muammolaridan biri
bu ikki tilli lug'atlarning tarjimonlari yoki foydalanuvchilari uchun qiyinchiliklarning
asosiy sababi bo'lgan tillar o'rtasidagi ekvivalentlikning yo'qligi yoki ekvivalent*



emasligidir. Ikki tilli lug'atning asosiy vazifasi manba til leksik birliklarining ekvivalentlarini ikkinchi tilda berishdir. Ushbu maqolada ekvivalentlik tipologiyasi, leksik birliklarning mos kelishi muammolari va ularning sabablari inglizcha-o'zbekcha ikki tilli lug'atlarga alohida murojaat qilgan holda muhokama qilinadi. Ishda leksikograflar ikki tilli lug'atni tuzishda qo'llashi mumkin bo'lgan ba'zi metodlar tavsiya etiladi va buning natijasida foydalanuvchilar lug'atlarga kiritilgan ma'lumotlarni muvaffaqiyatli ravishda tahlil qilishlari mumkin.

Kalit so'zlar: *ekvivalentlik, ekvivalentlik yo'qligi, tengsizlik, nol ekvivalentlik, ikki tilli lug'atlar.*

Introduction. As Zgusta says the main purpose of a bilingual dictionary is to coordinate with the lexical units of one language those lexical units of another language which are equivalent in their lexical meaning [1:294]. So lexicographers should create equivalent principles in bilingual translation. However, dictionary equivalent(s) are not the identical or do not exist in the TL or according to some other cases which are solved neither by a descriptive equivalent nor by a borrowings. The main issue talked over this article is the problem of equivalence and aim of this work is to investigate how to compensate for lack of equivalence as well as absent equivalents in the target language (TL), on the basis of Uzbek-English dictionary (hereafter referred to as EUD and UED). Because the most important function of a bilingual dictionary is to offer equivalents that can be balanced in translation from the SL into the TL. Different methods employed by the lexicographers while compiling a bilingual dictionary to provide acceptable solutions to translate lack of equivalence or non-equivalence are analyzed, such as borrowings (transliteration), translation loans, descriptive translation. Two symbols, # (implies no equivalence at the word level, but if the untranslatable SL lexical item is used in an example illustrating its use, be it a sentence or a truncated phrase, it can be rendered into the TL, which means that equivalence is reached at the level of the entire message) and 0 (complete absence of any equivalent) to mark absence of equivalents in English-Uzbek dictionaries as English-Slovene dictionaries (this symbols exist in these dictionaries) are invented[2].

Literature review: The most salient element of a lexicographic description, regardless of the type and scope of a dictionary and its intended users, is the semantic component. Bilingual lexicographers are therefore expected to find equivalents in the target language (TL) that correspond semantically to the source language (SL) lexical items not only in one particular context but more universally[3: 388], [4: 44]. Lexicographers, however, often come across cases when they fail to find suitable equivalents. This can happen with any lexical item; that is why the lexicographers must try to find and use means other than lexical equivalence[1: 323]. It should be stressed that carefully selected co-text or context provided in a mono- as well as in a bilingual dictionary in the form of illustrative examples plays a very important role, since examples disambiguate or specify the meaning of the lexical item in question[1: 337],



and “any semantic phenomenon, whether in the field of designation, connotation, or the range of application can be clarified by means of examples”[1: 340]. The relation between the SL lexical item and the TL lexical item is regarded as the equivalent relation[5:195-196]. There are generally three types of equivalent relations, which are variously referred to as absolute equivalence, partial equivalence and explanatory equivalence by Zgusta[1: 312-325]; full equivalence, partial equivalence and non-equivalence by Wiegand[6: 148]; as full equivalence (congruence), partial equivalence (divergence) and zero equivalence (surrogate equivalence) by Gouws[5: 196]; and multiple equivalence, zero equivalence and partial equivalence by Sipka[7: 51]. Adamska-Salaciak[8: 4], however, classified four varieties of equivalence: cognitive, translational, explanatory and functional. From above mentioned we can realize equivalence is the connection between two lexical units from two languages, and they share the same meaning. Every linguist gave their own classification and terms to call the degree of equivalence. There are mainly three types of equivalence and we prefer Wiegand’s classification full equivalence, partial equivalence and non-equivalence.

Research Methodology: Non-equivalence causes difficulty in communication so bilingual lexicographers should try to settle it. Svensen show direct borrowings, loan translation, new coinage, encyclopedic explanation as a way of to tackle the problem. In the article some methods have been recommended to solve the problem of non-equivalence in bilingual dictionaries:

By direct translation: (transcription or transliteration is mapping from one system of writing into another): mayor - mer, computer - kompyuter, disney - disney. But such borrowings are sometimes not understood by the general reader. It is often better to resort to interpreting translation to make the notion clear: mayor- shahar boshqaruvchisi yoki shahar hokimi.

By translation loans: House of Commons - Parlament Uyi, brain-sick - telba, brain-storming – boshqotirma (this also can be called as compounding new words from existing elements from the language).

By descriptive or interpreting translation (detailed explanation).

“The meaning of the respective lexical unit of the source language is describe by an explanation which is similar to the definition of a monolingual dictionary but is worded in the target language.” [1: 295]. landslide - siyosiy partiyalar orasida ovoz taqsimotining keskin o'zgarishi; wishful-thinking– orzu - havas, yaxshi niyat qilish, siz ishongan narsa amalga oshishini kutish.

Analysis and results: These principal types of lexical correspondences between two languages are analyzed and reached some results below:

Full equivalence (complete lexical correspondence)

In full equivalence as Zgusta said the lexical meaning of the two lexical units be absolute identical in all components (designation, connotation, range of application) but absolute equivalents are quite rare [1: 312]. Complete lexical correspondence can



be observed between following lexical units of two language: a) Proper names and geographical denominations; America - Amerika; John - Jon; b) Scientific and technical terms: internet-internet, computer-kompyuter; c) The months and days of the week, numerals. June-Iyun, Monday-Dushanba, two-ikki; In the examples above, the two lexical items share the same meaning. They have designative functions, do not have connotative meaning, and perform a weak grammatical function. So they are full equivalences.

Partial equivalence (partial lexical correspondence)

The equivalent relation that is most common in bilingual dictionaries is partial equivalence, where the semantic component of the dictionary entry consists of several TL equivalents that cover the entire spectrum of meaning of the SL item [1:315]. In partial equivalence "polysemy structure of a source language lexical item does not correspond with that of the target language on the systemic level"[6:243]. Zgusta further contents that usually the lexical meaning of the unit in the TL is only partly identical with that of its counter part in SL. The term "partial equivalent" is more appropriate than the term

"equivalent"[1:296]. Moreover Al-Kasimi [9], Swanepoel [10], Baker and Kaplan [11], Adamska-Salaciak [12], Gouws [13] point out that a lack of equivalence between languages are basic issue of bilingual dictionaries. And we think that reasons of this are followings:

1. Most words in a language are polysemous, so meaning in one language does not concur with the same system in another language completely. If we compare the nouns "house", "table" and "lover" in English and Uzbek, they have different meaning:

table 1) stol; 2) ovqat, ovqat tayyorlash joyi; 3) jadval; 4) ro'yxat.

house 1) uy, palata; 2) uy-joy; 3) oila, ro'zg'or; 4) parlament;

lover 1) jazman; 2) sevdiganlar; 3) ishqiyoq, muxlis;

That is why the selection of a word in the process of translating is determined by the context.

2. The specification of synonymic order. It means concurring meanings of members in synonymic order, the difference between stylistic and denotative meanings:

dismiss, discharge (bookish) - ishdan bo'shatmoq (adabiy tilda);

sack, fire (colloquial) - ishdan haydamoq (og'zaki nutqda)

beautiful (used to describe female) - chiroyli, ko'rkli, zebo, barno, go'zal;

handsome (used to describe male) - kelishgan, barvasta;

Typical rules of combinability. Each language has got their own traditional way of combinability which do not concur with corresponding ones in another language. Mostly, adjectives cause considerable difficulties in the process of translation that is explained by the specific ability of English adjectives to combine. It does not always coincide with their combinability in Uzbek language on account of differences in their semantic structure and valence:



A bad headache - qattiq bosh og'rig'i;

A bad mistake – qo'pol xato;

A bad weather - yomon ob-havo;

A bad debt - munozarasiz bahs;

A bad accident - baxtsiz hodisa;

A bad wound -yomon yara;

A young child - yosh/kichkina bola; Young in a crime - tajribasiz jinoyatchi;

3. Identical conceptual meaning with different collocational meaning:

Have tea - bir piyola choy ichmoq;

Have meeting - uchrashmoq;

Have time - birga vaqt o'tqazmoq, ko'rishmoq;

All collocations have the same conceptual meaning as to meet or to spend time with somebody.

Non-equivalence (zero equivalence)

If there no equivalents in the target language for taken lexical units in source language, it means non-equivalence which is the most difficult problem for bilingual dictionary compilers. They may be divided into two groups. The first group consists of the so-called realia-words denoting things, objects, features of national life, customs, habits, etc., e.g. House of Commons, thane, coroner, teach-in, drive-in, cricket, etc. We can call this type of non-equivalence culture-bound words or cross-cultural differences between language. As Zgusta points out nearly all the problems of equivalence are caused by the anisomorphism of language [1: 296]. In other words, non-equivalence is caused "by the differences in the organization of designate in the individual languages and by other differences between languages" . [1: 294]. The second group embraces words, which for some linguistic reason have no equivalent in the target language: conservationist, readership, glimpse, non-designative words etc. These words can be called as functional or grammatical words. Atkins and Rundell show following grammatical words as problematic ones when trying to establish equivalence: some types of pronouns, auxiliary and modal verbs, prepositions, conjunctions, determiners (the definite and indefinite articles, numerals, negatives, predeterminers). Whereas, Zgusta enumerates other types of lexical units: functional words, interjections, onomatopoea, particles and similar lexical units.

Conclusion or Recommendation. This article discusses the types of equivalence, wheares, contrastive differences between the SL and TL, as well as features typical of either the SL or the TL results in different types of equivalence, analyzes the causes of non-equivalence and recommends some methods to deal with the problem of non-equivalence in bilingual English-Uzbek dictionaries. Equivalence principle is very important in bilingual translation. If there are clear principles lexicographers can do their jobs more effectively and with greater confidence. So conclusions is that, if equivalence cannot be achieved by providing a dictionary equivalent, the problem can be resolved by including examples of use which should be selected very carefully by



the lexicographers to enable the users to become familiar with different contexts in which the word is used. Our recommendation is that if there is non-equivalence, compilers should mark it with # or 0 according to type above mentioned, than they may give explanatory translation with illustrative examples as “bridge bilinguals”

REFERENCE:

1. Zgusta, Ladislav. Manual of Lexicography. Prague: Academia / The Hague/ Paris: Mouton. - 1971
2. Alenka Virbinc and Marjeta Vrbinc. Approaches to the Treatment of Zero Equivalence in a Bilingual Dictionary. Lexicos. – 2017. – 27. P.522 - 539
3. Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. Examining Equivalence. International Journal of Lexicography. – 2010. - 23(4): P. 387 - 409.
4. Atkins, Beryl T. Theoretical Lexicography and its Relation to Dictionary-Making. Dictionaries. - 1992/1993. – 14. P. 4 - 43.
5. Gouws, Rufus H. Equivalent Relations, Context and Cotext in Bilingual Dictionaries. Hermes, Journal of Linguistics. – 200. – 28. –P. 195-209.
6. Wiegand, Herbert Ernst. Equivalence in Bilingual Lexicography: Criticism and Suggestions. Lexiko. - 2002. -12. P. 239-255.
7. Sipka, Danko. Lexical Conflict: Theory and Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 2015. P. 51
8. Adamska-Sałaciak, Arleta. 2011. Between designer drugs and afterburners: A Lexicographic-Semantic Study of Equivalence. Lexikos- 2011. – 21. P. 1-22.
9. Al-Kasimi, A.M. Linguistics and Bilingual Dictionaries. Leyden: E.J.Brill. - 1983.
10. Swanepoel, P.H. Only Study Guide for LEKPER – Q. Pretoria: University of South Africa. - 1989
11. Baker, M. and R. Kaplan. 1994. Translated! A New Breed of Bilingual Dictionaries. Babel 40(1). P. 1-11.
12. Adamska-Sałaciak, A. Meaning and the Bilingual Dictionary. The Case of English and Polish. - 2006.
13. Gouws, R.H. Bilingual Dictionaries and Communicative Equivalence for a Multilingual Society. Lexikos. – 1996. - P. 14-31.
14. Atkins, Beryl T. Sue and Michael Rundell. The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography. Oxford/ New York: Oxford University Press. – 2008. P 164-165.
15. Svendsen, Bo. A Handbook of Lexicography: The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 2009. P. 261,274-275
16. Sanayev Mirsanjar. Nazar Eshonqul asarlari uslubiyati. “Ilm-fan va ta’limda innovatsion yondashuvlar, muammolar, taklif va yechimlar” ko’p tarmoqli 8-sonli Respublika ilmiy-onlayn konferensiyasi. 110-114



17. Shavkat Butayev and Abbas Iriskulov. English-Uzbek, Uzbek-English dictionary of 70000 words and expressions. Toshkent. Fan – 2009.

18. Zamirjon Butayev. English-Uzbek, Uzbek-English dictionary dictionary of 24000 words. Toshkent. Yangi nashr nashriyoti - 2020 15th ed.