

LEXICAL TRANSFORMATIONS AND THEIR CORE TYPES IN TRANSLATION

Adizova Sarvinoz Tuygunjon qizi

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Berdiyeva Mashxura Arziqul qizi

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Zaripova Aziza Shaxobiddinova

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. In translation practice, lexical transformations serve as more than mere linguistic adjustments; they act as vital mechanisms for bridging structural and cultural gaps between languages. This paper examines the fundamental types of such transformations, specifically focusing on concretization, generalization, antonymic translation, and compensation. By analyzing these methods, we illustrate how translators maintain the necessary balance between semantic accuracy and stylistic naturalness when working with English and Uzbek texts.

Keywords: lexical transformation, concretization, generalization, antonymic translation, compensation, equivalence.

Introduction. It is widely accepted that translation is not a mechanical process of word-for-word substitution. Rather, it involves a complex layered transfer of meaning, tone, and the original intent of the author (2). Given that no two languages share identical semantic structures, translators are frequently forced to employ various transformation techniques to handle linguistic discrepancies (1). These lexical shifts are especially crucial when the target language lacks a direct equivalent for a specific source concept (3). Ultimately, the goal is to produce a text that resonates with the target audience while preserving the integrity of the source (4).

1. Concretization. Concretization is the process where a translator replaces a broad, generic term from the source text with a more specific, narrow equivalent in the target language (2). This is often a requirement when the target language's stylistic norms demand greater precision. For example, in the English phrase "He entered the building," the word "building" is neutral. However, depending on the context, an Uzbek translator might render it as "U maktab binosiga kirdi" (He entered the school building) to provide the clarity expected by the reader (2).

2. Generalization. Generalization acts as the logical opposite of concretization (1). Here, a specific unit is replaced by one with a wider semantic range (4). This is typically used to avoid awkward phrasing or when the specific detail is redundant in the target culture. Consider the English sentence "She wore a silk dress." In certain Uzbek contexts, the material might be secondary to the action, leading to the translation: "U ko'ylak kiygan edi" (She was wearing a dress) (4).

3. Antonymic Translation. Sometimes, achieving a natural flow requires a shift in perspective. Antonymic translation involves substituting an affirmative form with a negative one (or vice versa) while keeping the original meaning (2). This prevents the "robotic" feel of literal translation (1). The English double negative "He is not unkind" is often more effectively translated into Uzbek as "U mehribon" (He is kind), which sounds much more authentic in natural speech (2).

4. Compensation. Compensation is a deliberate strategy used when a specific nuance or stylistic element cannot be translated directly in its original position. To offset this "loss," the translator introduces the effect elsewhere in the text (1). This preserves the overall emotional impact and stylistic flavor of the work (4). If an English idiom cannot be matched exactly, the translator might use an Uzbek-specific idiomatic expression in the surrounding sentences to maintain the tone (1).

In our study, we have analyzed how lexical transformations function as the primary bridge between the distinct linguistic systems of English and Uzbek. Through our research, we have concluded that techniques such as concretization, generalization, and compensation

are not merely optional stylistic choices, but essential tools for any translator aiming for accuracy. By applying these methods, we were able to demonstrate that a translator can preserve the original meaning while ensuring the text feels natural to an Uzbek reader. Ultimately, our analysis highlights that mastering these transformations is what allows a translated work to transcend literal substitution and become a meaningful piece of cross-cultural communication.

REFERENCES:

1. Barkhudarov, L. S. (1975). Language and Translation: Issues in the General and Particular Theory of Translation. Moscow: International Relations.
2. Komissarov, V. N. (1990). Theory of Translation (Linguistic Aspects). Moscow: Higher School.
3. Musaev, Q. (2005). Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. Toshkent: Fan.
4. Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall.