THE PROBLEM OF EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATING COMPOUND SENTENCES FROM ENGLISH INTO UZBEK

Narzullayeva Iroda Narimon qizi
International Innovation University Department of Philology

Abstract. Translation equivalence is one of the central problems in translation studies, particularly when languages differ significantly in their grammatical structures, syntactic patterns, and means of expressing semantic relations. English and Uzbek demonstrate substantial structural differences that may create difficulties in translating compound sentences. This article examines the major problems of equivalence in translating English compound sentences into Uzbek. Particular attention is paid to coordination, conjunctions, word order, tense and aspect, semantic relations between coordinated clauses, lexical differences, and the influence of contextual factors. The study analyses how English compound sentences may require structural transformation, lexical adjustment, addition, omission, replacement, or restructuring when translated into Uzbek.

Keywords: translation, equivalence, compound sentence, English, Uzbek, syntax, translation transformation, coordination, semantic equivalence, communicative equivalence.

Introduction. Translation is a complex linguistic and communicative activity involving the transfer of meaning from a source language into a target language. One of the fundamental problems in translation studies is the achievement of equivalence between the source text and the target text. Equivalence does not necessarily mean that every grammatical or lexical element of the source language must have an identical counterpart in the target language. Rather, it involves preserving the essential meaning, communicative function, stylistic characteristics, and pragmatic effect of the original text.

The problem becomes particularly significant when translating sentences between languages with substantially different grammatical systems. English and Uzbek differ in their syntactic organization, word order, grammatical categories, conjunction systems, and methods of expressing semantic relations. English is predominantly an SVO language, whereas Uzbek generally follows an SOV pattern.

A compound sentence consists of two or more independent clauses that are coordinated with one another. In English, such clauses may be connected by coordinating conjunctions such as and, but, or, so, yet, and for. They may also be connected through punctuation or other discourse devices. For example:

The weather was cold, but we continued our journey.

The Uzbek translation may be:

Havo sovuq edi, lekin biz safarimizni davom ettirdik.

In this example, the structural relationship between the two clauses can be maintained relatively easily. However, not all compound sentences demonstrate such straightforward correspondence. Differences in conjunctions, word order, tense-aspect systems, lexicalization, information structure, and contextual meaning can make direct translation inappropriate.

For example:

He was tired, but he continued working.

may be translated as:

U charchagan edi, lekin ishlashda davom etdi.

The semantic relationship remains unchanged, but the grammatical realization is adapted to Uzbek norms.

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

Compound Sentences in English and Uzbek. Compound sentences represent an important syntactic category in both English and Uzbek. In English grammar, a compound sentence generally consists of two or more independent clauses connected by coordination.

For example:

1. The sun was shining, and the children were playing outside.
2. I wanted to call him, but I did not have his number.
3. You can stay here, or you can come with us.
4. She was tired, yet she continued working.

The semantic relationship between the clauses can involve addition, contrast, alternative, cause-result, or other logical relations.

The most common English coordinating conjunctions include:

✓and — addition;
✓but — contrast;
✓or — alternative;
✓so — result;
✓yet — contrast;
✓for — explanation or reason.

Uzbek also uses coordination to connect clauses:

✓va — and;
✓lekin, ammo, biroq — but;
✓yoki — or;
✓shuning uchun — therefore/so;
✓hamda — and/as well as.

For example:

The students finished the task, and the teacher checked their answers.

Talabalar topshiriqni tugatdilar va o‘qituvchi ularning javoblarini tekshirdi.

The two clauses maintain a similar syntactic and semantic relationship.

However, English and Uzbek differ in their basic word order. English generally follows:

Subject + Verb + Object

For example:

The student read the book.

Uzbek normally follows:

Subject + Object + Verb

Talaba kitobni o‘qidi.

When compound sentences are translated, the internal structure of each clause may therefore have to be reorganized:

The student read the book, and the teacher checked the answers.

→ Talaba kitobni o‘qidi va o‘qituvchi javoblarni tekshirdi.

Although the overall compound structure can remain unchanged, the word order inside each clause is transformed according to Uzbek grammatical norms.

Another important difference concerns the use of conjunctions. English so may express result:

It was raining, so we stayed at home.

Uzbek can express the same relationship with shuning uchun:

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

Yomg'ir yog'ayotgan edi, shuning uchun biz uyda qoldik.

A formal one-to-one correspondence between conjunctions is therefore not always possible.

The Problem of Structural Equivalence. One of the main problems in translating English compound sentences into Uzbek is the difference in syntactic organization. Structural equivalence refers to the preservation of the grammatical and syntactic relationships of the source sentence in the target language.

Consider the following sentence:

The students completed the assignment, and the teacher collected their papers.

A structurally close Uzbek translation is:

Talabalar topshiriqni bajardilar va o'qituvchi ularning ishlarini yig'ib oldi.

Here, both the compound structure and the coordination relation are maintained.

However, English and Uzbek do not always permit direct structural correspondence. English frequently places elements before or after the main clause in ways that may sound unnatural if transferred directly into Uzbek.

For example:

He opened the door, and he saw his friend standing outside.

A natural Uzbek translation is:

U eshikni ochdi va tashqarida do'stining turganini ko'rdi.

The English independent clause he saw his friend standing outside becomes a construction in which the complement is expressed through the Uzbek -ning ... -ganini structure. Thus, formal equivalence is reduced, while semantic equivalence is preserved.

Another issue concerns **subject repetition**. English frequently repeats the subject in coordinated clauses:

John went to the library, and John borrowed several books.

Uzbek may avoid unnecessary repetition:

Jon kutubxonaga bordi va bir nechta kitob oldi.

The second subject is omitted because it can be understood from the context.

Conversely, Uzbek may sometimes require an explicit subject where English allows a different structural interpretation. Therefore, translators need to consider the information structure of the sentence rather than mechanically reproduce its formal elements.

Structural transformation is also required when English conjunctions do not have a direct Uzbek equivalent. For example:

He was poor, yet he was happy.

Possible Uzbek rendering:

U kambag'al edi, biroq baxtli edi.

The conjunction yet cannot simply be translated by any English-like structural equivalent; the Uzbek conjunction biroq appropriately expresses the contrastive relation.

Consequently, structural equivalence in English–Uzbek translation should be understood as **functional structural correspondence**, rather than absolute formal identity.

Translation Transformations and Equivalence. Achieving equivalence in the translation of compound sentences often requires the use of translation transformations. A translator may modify the structure of the source sentence while preserving its meaning and communicative function.

One common transformation is **restructuring**.

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

For example:

He was very tired, but he continued to work.

→ U juda charchagan bo‘lsa-da, ishlashda davom etdi.

The English compound sentence can be rendered in Uzbek through a concessive subordinate construction. The sentence changes from coordination to subordination, but the contrastive relationship remains.

Another transformation is **addition**. Certain elements may need to be added to clarify a logical relationship in Uzbek:

It was raining, so they stayed at home.

→ Yomg‘ir yog‘ayotgan edi, shuning uchun ular uyda qolishdi.

The expression shuning uchun explicitly marks the result relationship.

Omission can also contribute to naturalness. English often repeats subjects or other elements that can be omitted in Uzbek:

Mary entered the room, and Mary sat near the window.

→ Meri xonaga kirdi va deraza yoniga o‘tirdi.

The second occurrence of Mary is omitted because it is contextually recoverable.

Another transformation is **replacement**. An English conjunction may be replaced by a structurally or semantically more appropriate Uzbek expression.

He wanted to leave, yet he stayed.

→ U ketmoqchi edi, biroq qolib ketdi.

Here, yet is replaced by biroq.

Sentence splitting can also be used when an English compound sentence is too complex for a natural Uzbek translation:

The meeting ended late, and everyone was tired, so we decided to go home.

A possible Uzbek translation is:

Yig‘ilish kech tugadi. Hamma charchagan edi, shuning uchun uyga qaytishga qaror qildik.

The original compound structure is transformed into shorter sentences. This may improve clarity while preserving the main information.

Conversely, **sentence integration** may sometimes be appropriate when several short English clauses can be naturally combined in Uzbek.

These examples demonstrate that equivalence is not synonymous with formal similarity. Translation transformations are legitimate when they allow the translator to preserve the semantic and communicative content of the source sentence.

Literatures:

1. Baker, M. (2018). In other words: A coursebook on translation (3rd ed.). Routledge.
2. House, J. (2015). Translation quality assessment: Past and present. Routledge.
3. Swan, M. (2016). Practical English usage (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
4. Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation. John Benjamins.
5. Yule, G. (2020). The study of language (7th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

© Ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.