



## SEMANTIC CORRELATIONS IN THE DISCURSIVE DYNAMICS OF TRANSLATION

Rasulova Dildora Atayarovna

Tashkent Textile and Light Industry Institute, English teacher of  
the department of Uzbek and foreign languages.

E.mail: dildorarslv@gmail.com

<https://www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10526525>

### ARTICLE INFO

Received: 11<sup>th</sup> January 2024

Accepted: 17<sup>th</sup> January 2024

Online: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2024

### KEY WORDS

*Comparative, discursive, coherence, cohesion, semantic correlation, perspective analysis, background of multiculturalism, linguistics, comparative typology, translation studies.*

### ABSTRACT

*The article deals with the major role of developing of semantic correlations in discursive dynamics of translation in English. The author concludes that the process of comparative linguistic researches and translation studies are considered an integral part of learning languages, as the language is the means of communication.*

**Introduction.** Comparative analysis in translation provides instructional strategies that will open doors to identify the elements under scientific investigation. Therefore, it will lead to deeper understanding of language elements in translation process and advances cognitive and emotional processing needed for language acquisition.

That is the reason why the semantic correlation in translation and discursive dynamic is more appropriate for implementation into the process of comparative linguistic researches and translation studies specialist. Study of the core of the comparative semantic correlation in translation and discursive dynamic, identifying the effective strategies and methods of semantic relationship in translation process and developing efficient ways of analyzing language structures and elements is topical nowadays. The objectives to achieve the purpose of the research problem development status: The rapid development in the second half of the 21st century of such interdisciplinary disciplines as semantics and discursive dynamics in translation largely predetermined the use of an integrated approach in the study of semantic correlation in translation.

**Literature review.** The study of semantics in translation process from the points of view of sociolinguistics, translation leads to the identification of such external factors of the formation of translation as semantic, lexical, phrase logical, cultural contacts. Linguists such as Van Dijk (1972), De Beaugrands (1980), Halliday and Hasan (1976) have made a significant impact in the field of discourse. The Prague School of linguistics, with their interest in the structuring of information in discourse, has been also influential. Its most important contribution has been to show the links between grammar and discourse. "Discourse: a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language larger than a sentence, often constituting a



coherent unit such as a sermon, argument, joke, or narrative" (Crystal 1992:25). According to Cook (1990) novels, as well as short conversations or groans might be equally rightfully named discourses. The term 'discourse' comes into force when we deal with the highest grammatical level of analysis in the rank scale, that is, paragraphs and texts, which are considered to be 'larger stretches of language higher than the sentence'.

The identification of the relationship between the content or purpose and the internal structure of a linguistic sign in functional linguistics and the use of developments on the theoretical foundations of semantic features led to the study of the functioning of semantic correlation in written translation reality. The result of such studies was a list of functions performed by discursive dynamics in translation.

**Research Methodology.** The comparative method, the component analysis method, the observation method, the contextual analysis method, the method of constructing a classification are used in this research work. One of the fundamental problems in written translation process is the question of the semantic features and semantic correlation in discourse.

The history of the question shows that the views on this problem have changed with the development of linguistic science. Fully knowing a word involves understanding its form and meaning, e.g., what part of speech it is, how its pronounced and spelt, all the meanings it can have. As words can get part of their meaning from context, and context helps to show the meaning of words, it is effective to translate words in context, e.g., through texts, stories or descriptions of events. We can use the relationships in meaning between words (synonyms, lexical sets, word families, etc.) and the ways in which they can be built (prefixes, suffixes, compounds) to me activities to help our students extend their knowledge of lexical sets and word families.

In order to attain equivalence, despite the difference in formal and semantic systems of two languages, the translators are obliged to do various linguistic transformations. It is aimed to ensure that the text imparts all the knowledge inferred in the original text, violating the rules of the language it is translated into. Lexical substitutions, supplementations, omissions(dropping) are considered as the most suitable for describing all kinds of lexical transformations. Translating a phraseological unit is not also an easy matter as it depends on several factors: different combinability of words, homonymy, synonymy, polysemy of phraseological units. Every language has a specific system which differs from that of any other. English and Russian belong to the Germanic and Slavonic groups respectively of the Indo- European family of languages; the Uzbek pertains to the Turkic group of the Altaic family.

**Analysis and results.** Discursive dynamic in translation is a vast subject area within linguistics, encompassing as it does the analysis of spoken and written language over and above concerns such as the structure of the clause or sentence. There is of course a lot more to look at. For example, I have mentioned the Halliday model of social action, looking at types of meaning in discourse and their relationship with the notion of *register*, the linguistic features of the text that reflect the social context in which it is produced. This chapter has also taken a selection of grammatical concepts and has attempted to show how discourse analysis has contributed to our understanding of the relationship between local choices within the clause



and sentence and the organization of the discourse as a whole. A discursive approach to grammar would suggest not only a greater emphasis on contexts larger than the sentence, but also a reassessment of priorities in terms such as word order, articles, ellipsis, tense and aspect and some of other categories are discussed here. A study of vocabulary in text is generated by the vocabulary relations that are found over clause and sentence boundaries, the role of certain words in organizing discourses and signaling their structure, and the relationship between these features of textuality and the register of the end product. Such an approach also offers an alternative motivation for the construction of word lists to supplement the traditional semantic-field orientation. Translating involves understanding sense of written text. To do this we need to understand the language of the text at word level, sentence level or whole text level. It is also important to connect the message of the text to our knowledge of the world. *E.g. The boy was surprised because the girl was much faster at running than he was. Qiz undan ko'ra tez yugurganidan bola hayratda edi.*) Generally speaking, girls do not run as fast as boys. Our knowledge of the world helps us understand why the boy was surprised. Connected text is referred to as discourse. Discourse is connected by grammar and vocabulary and/ or our knowledge of the world. Translating involves understanding these connections. *The boy was surprised because the girl was much faster at running than he was. But after he found out that her mother had won a medal for running at the Olympic Games, he understood. (Qiz undan ko'ra tez yugurganidan bola hayratda edi. Lekin qizning onasi Olimpia musobaqasida yugurish bo'yicha sovrin olganini bilgach hammasini tushundi.)* The second sentence gives us a possible reason why the girl was so good at running. But we can only understand that this is a reason if we know that Olympic runners are very good. This means we need to use our knowledge of the world to see the sense connection between these two sentences (**coherence**). The grammatical links between the sentences (**cohesion**) also help us see the connection between them. For example, in the second sentence 'he' refers to 'the boy' in the first sentence, and 'her' refers to 'the girl', and linking the sentences there is **the conjunction** 'after'. So, translating a written text involves understanding the language of each sentence and the relationship between sentences using our knowledge of language and our knowledge of the world.

**Conclusion/Recommendations.** In sum, a text can be coherent without cohesion. A text that is cohesive without coherence, however, is hardly a text: A man walked into a bar. Bars sell good beer. It's brewed mostly in Germany. Germany went to war with Britain...

In each case, we suggest, there is no clear and direct marking relationships, between the first and second sentences. Nonetheless, a normal reader will naturally assume that these sequences of sentences constitute a text and will translate the second sentence in the light of the first sentence. There are 'semantic relations' between the sentences, in the absence of any explicit assertion that there is such a relationship. It seems to be the case then that 'texture', in the sense of explicit realization of semantic relations, is not criteria to the identification and co- interpretation of texts.

### References:

1. Aznaurova E.S. Interpretation of literary text. Tashkent. O'qituvchi 1990



2. Brown G., Yuli G. Discourse Analysis. Cambridge University Press. 1985.
3. Halliday A. K. Language as social semiotic. – London, New York, Melbourne, Auckland, 1994. – 240 p.
4. Halliday A. K. (1985) An Introduction to Functional Grammar. 4758 p.
5. Langacker R.W. Concept, image, and symbol: The cognitive basis of grammar. – B.; N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990. – 395 p.
6. Michael Mccarthy. Discourse analysis for language Teachers.-Cambridge University Press 1991.