UNDERSTANDING TRANSLATION UNITS AND SHIFTS

Student: **Komilova Ozoda**
Supervisor: **Ahmedov Azimjon**

Introduction Translation is more than a mere linguistic activity; it is a complex cognitive and interpretive process that involves converting meaning across languages and cultures. Central to this process are two fundamental concepts: translation units and translation shifts. These concepts, introduced and developed in the mid-20th century by translation theorists such as Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) and Catford (1965), have been pivotal in understanding how translators manage equivalence and transform texts from one language into another. This paper aims to explore the theoretical underpinnings of translation units and shifts, their practical implications in translation studies, and how they contribute to achieving accuracy and naturalness in translated texts.

Defining Translation Units

A translation unit refers to the smallest segment of a source text that can be translated independently while preserving its meaning and context. Translation units are not fixed or solely linguistic; they may vary depending on the translator's perception, the type of text, and the translation strategy employed. Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) first described translation units in their comparative stylistics study of French and English, identifying units that ranged from words to entire sentences.

Modern translation scholars emphasize that translation units are often dynamic and context-dependent. According to Hatim and Munday (2004), translation units can be linguistic (words, phrases, clauses) or functional (segments of discourse that carry meaning, such as idioms or metaphors). This flexibility allows translators to shift focus from purely linguistic equivalence to communicative and pragmatic equivalence, which is crucial for conveying the intended message in the target language.

Understanding Translation Shifts

Translation shifts occur when there is a departure from formal correspondence between the source and target languages. Introduced by Catford (1965), shifts are classified into two major categories: level shifts and category shifts. Level shifts involve a change in grammatical level (e.g., from lexis to grammar), while category shifts involve structural changes, such as:

1. Structural shifts – changes in grammatical structure (e.g., active to passive voice).
2. Class shifts – changes in word class (e.g., noun to verb).
3. Unit shifts – changes in translation units (e.g., word to phrase).
4. Intra-system shifts – shifts within the same grammatical system (e.g., singular to plural).

These shifts are not errors but rather reflections of the translator's effort to produce a

grammatically and culturally acceptable version of the original text in the target language. Translation shifts often result from systemic differences between languages or the need to preserve stylistic or pragmatic meaning.

Relationship Between Units and Shifts

Translation units and shifts are interrelated. The identification of a translation unit often precedes a shift, especially when the translator determines that a direct equivalent is unavailable or inappropriate. For example, idiomatic expressions or culture-specific references often require shifts to maintain their intended effect. A translator who perceives a sentence as a unit might apply multiple shifts within that sentence to convey the correct meaning, tone, or style in the target language.

Baker (2018) suggests that translation shifts are the translator's tools for adapting a source text to a new linguistic and cultural environment. When a translator recognizes that a word-for-word translation would distort the meaning, they may shift the translation unit upward or downward, thereby facilitating a more accurate rendition of the text.

Practical Examples

Consider the English phrase "break the ice," which cannot be translated literally into many languages without losing its idiomatic meaning. In Uzbek, for instance, a literal translation like "muzni sindirish" would not convey the intended metaphor of initiating conversation or easing tension. The translator must recognize the phrase as a single unit and apply a semantic shift, replacing it with an equivalent phrase such as "muloqotni boshlash" (to start a conversation), which matches the function and context.

Similarly, a structural shift might occur when translating from English to Japanese, as Japanese often omits subjects that are implied, unlike English, which typically requires them. Thus, the translator must shift the structure while ensuring the message remains clear and natural in the target language.

Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications

Understanding translation units and shifts is essential not only for professional translators but also for students and educators in translation studies. These concepts help clarify why literal translations often fail and why contextual and functional equivalence should be prioritized. Moreover, identifying translation units and anticipating necessary shifts can enhance translator competence and reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation.

Pedagogically, these concepts can inform curriculum design by encouraging analytical thinking about how meaning is constructed and reconstructed across languages. Training in recognizing translation units and applying appropriate shifts can prepare translators to handle a wide variety of text types, from literary and legal texts to audiovisual and technical translations.

Conclusion

Translation units and shifts are foundational concepts in translation theory and practice. By recognizing the flexibility of translation units and the necessity of shifts, translators can navigate linguistic and cultural differences more effectively. These

concepts illuminate the decision-making process in translation and highlight the creative and interpretive skills involved in producing high-quality translations. As global communication continues to grow, a deeper understanding of translation units and shifts will remain vital in fostering cross-cultural understanding and linguistic diversity.

REFERENCES

1. Baker, M. (2018). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (3rd ed.). Routledge.

2. Catford, J. C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. Oxford University Press.

3. Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2004). Translation: An Advanced Resource Book. Routledge.

4. Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1958). Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais:

5. Méthode de traduction. Didier. (Translated by J.C. Sager & M.-J. Hamel, 1995, as Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation. John Benjamins).