HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

ADEQUACY IN TRANSLATION

Jasmina Yusufovna Masejonova

Student at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: This article examines the concept of adequacy in translation and its significance in achieving an accurate, natural, and communicatively effective target text. It focuses on the relationship between adequacy and equivalence and analyzes the linguistic, cultural, stylistic, and pragmatic factors that influence the translation process. Particular attention is given to the difficulties caused by polysemy, partial lexical equivalence, cultural realia, contextual meanings, and structural differences between source and target languages. The article also discusses the role of lexical, grammatical, and stylistic transformations as important strategies for achieving adequacy.

Keywords: adequacy, equivalence, lexical equivalence, pragmatic equivalence, cultural realia, translation transformations

1. Introduction

Adequacy in translation refers to the degree to which a target text fulfills the communicative purpose of the source text while following the linguistic, stylistic, and cultural norms of the target language. According to V. N. Komissarov, an adequate translation should achieve the communicative purpose of translation with the greatest possible degree of equivalence without violating the norms of the target language or the stylistic requirements of the particular type of text. Therefore, adequacy is closely related to equivalence, but the two concepts should not be treated as identical.

Equivalence primarily concerns the correspondence between the source and target texts at different linguistic levels, including lexical, grammatical, and semantic levels. Adequacy has a broader functional dimension because it also considers the communicative purpose, stylistic effect, cultural context, and expectations of the target audience. Consequently, a translation may contain formally equivalent linguistic elements but still fail to be adequate if the target reader misunderstands the intended meaning or cultural reference.

One of the main difficulties in achieving adequacy is the difference between languages. Languages organize reality in different ways and possess different grammatical structures, lexical systems, idiomatic expressions, and culturally specific concepts. A single source-language word may therefore correspond to several possible words in the target language, while a target-language word may cover only part of the semantic range of its source-language counterpart. For example, the English word cousin does not specify gender in the same way as many Uzbek kinship terms. Similarly, English distinguishes between hand and arm, while Uzbek organizes these concepts differently. Such differences demonstrate why contextual interpretation is essential in translation.
The problem becomes even more complicated in literary translation. A literary translator must understand the author's style, worldview, historical period, cultural environment, and psychological representation of characters. Literary translation therefore requires both linguistic competence and creative ability. The translator should preserve the artistic and emotional effect of the original without

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

producing an unnatural target text. Cultural realia also present considerable challenges. Terms referring to food, clothing, institutions, customs, traditions, and other culture-specific phenomena may not have direct equivalents in the target language. English terms such as *muffin*, *drugstore*, and *lobby* and Uzbek terms such as *somsa* and *tandoor* demonstrate how cultural concepts can require transliteration, transcription, description, explanation, or functional substitution.

2. Literature review

Adequacy and equivalence are among the central concepts in translation studies. Scholars have examined them from linguistic, communicative, functional, and cultural perspectives. V. N. Komissarov views adequacy as a combination of equivalence, target-language norms, and the communicative purpose of translation. E. A. Nida distinguishes between formal and dynamic equivalence, emphasizing that a translation should not only reflect the form of the original but also produce an appropriate effect on the target reader. R. O. Jakobson, in his discussion of interlingual translation, points out that complete correspondence between languages is often impossible, making functional choices necessary. Other scholars focus on the broader cultural and creative aspects of translation. G. Salomov emphasizes the importance of understanding the source text as a whole, while K. Chukovsky highlights the creative nature of literary translation. A. Lefevere draws attention to the relationship between translation, history, and culture. M. Yu. Brodsky also considers translation a complex process of transferring meaning between linguistic and cultural systems. These studies show that adequate translation depends not only on lexical and grammatical correspondence but also on context, culture, style, and communicative purpose. This is especially relevant to English–Uzbek translation, where differences in semantic structure, cultural realia, and linguistic conventions often require the translator to use appropriate transformations.

3. Methodology

The present study employs a qualitative comparative approach to examine adequacy in translation. The analysis is based on theoretical works in translation studies and selected examples illustrating linguistic and cultural differences between English and Uzbek. The study focuses on five major aspects of translation:

Lexical adequacy – the appropriate selection of target-language equivalents according to context.
Grammatical adequacy – the adaptation of source-language grammatical structures to the norms of the target language.
Semantic adequacy – the preservation of the intended meaning of the source text.
Stylistic adequacy – the reproduction of the stylistic characteristics and expressive effect of the original.
Pragmatic and cultural adequacy – the preservation of communicative intention and culturally significant information.

A ***contextual analysis*** was used to examine polysemous words and expressions whose meanings cannot be determined independently of their context. Examples involving English words such as *cover*, *thing*, *get*, *cousin*, *hand*, and *you* were considered to demonstrate problems of partial equivalence and semantic variation.

A ***comparative linguistic analysis*** was also applied to identify differences between English and Uzbek lexical and grammatical systems. Particular attention was given to culturally specific vocabulary, including realia, kinship terms, and expressions with no direct equivalents. The study additionally

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

examines translation strategies such as:
- concretization;
- generalization;
- semantic modification;
- transcription;
- transliteration;
- description;
- commentary;
- grammatical transformation;
- syntactic restructuring;
- stylistic substitution;
- functional adaptation

4. Results and discussion

- Adequacy and equivalence

The analysis demonstrates that adequacy and equivalence represent interconnected but distinct dimensions of translation quality. Equivalence establishes a relationship between the source and target texts, whereas adequacy evaluates whether the translation successfully fulfills its communicative purpose while respecting target-language norms. An adequate translation therefore requires an appropriate balance between closeness to the source text and naturalness in the target language. Excessive adherence to the source-language structure can result in unnatural or incomprehensible expressions, whereas excessive adaptation can lead to the loss of the author's style, cultural identity, or intended meaning. The translator's task is consequently not to reproduce every formal element of the source text but to preserve those elements that are significant for its meaning, function, and stylistic effect.

-The role of context in achieving adequacy

Context is one of the most important conditions of adequate translation. A lexical unit may have several meanings, and its appropriate translation cannot always be established from the dictionary definition alone.

For example, the English word *thing* is semantically broad and can refer to different objects, matters, circumstances, or issues depending on context. In some cases, the word may even be omitted in translation without changing the essential meaning of the sentence. This illustrates an important principle: adequacy does not necessarily require the translation of every individual source-language word. The same problem occurs with English verbs such as *get*, *make*, *have*, *be*, and *become*. These verbs have broad semantic ranges and may require completely different Uzbek equivalents depending on the surrounding words and situation. Phrasal verbs further increase the complexity because the meaning of the entire construction may differ significantly from the meaning of the individual verb.

- Partial equivalence and polysemy

The analysis identifies partial equivalence as one of the major obstacles to adequacy. Partial equivalents may arise when a word in one language has additional meanings that are absent from its apparent equivalent in another language. Another type occurs when the semantic fields of two words overlap only partially. A word may correspond to an equivalent in certain contexts while differing from it in other contexts. Such differences may result from historical, cultural, linguistic, and extralinguistic factors.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

A further complication arises when different languages conceptualize reality differently. The English words *hand* and *arm*, for example, distinguish between parts of the upper limb in a way that does not correspond exactly to the semantic organization of Uzbek. Consequently, translation requires the translator to determine the intended referent rather than simply select the closest dictionary equivalent. Kinship terminology provides another clear example. The English word *cousin* does not specify gender or the precise family relationship in the same way as many Uzbek kinship terms. Therefore, a sentence containing *cousin* may require additional contextual information before an adequate Uzbek translation can be produced. These examples demonstrate that lexical equivalence is often dependent on contextual and cultural interpretation.

- Extralinguistic information and pragmatic adequacy

Linguistic meaning alone is not always sufficient for adequate translation. The translator must often understand the speech situation, historical background, cultural practices, and social relationships represented in the source text. For example, the expression *two on the aisle* can be translated accurately only when the translator understands that the conversation concerns seating, such as at a theater or cinema box office. Without knowledge of the speech situation, the translator may choose an inappropriate equivalent. Similarly, references to fortune-telling traditions may require cultural knowledge. In C. P. Snow's *Time of Hope*, reference to reading tea leaves and cards reflects a cultural practice associated with fortune-telling. A literal translation may be formally accurate but communicatively inadequate for readers unfamiliar with the practice.

-Translation of cultural realia

Cultural realia are particularly challenging because they refer to objects, institutions, practices, foods, customs, or concepts associated with a particular culture.

Examples include English cultural terms such as *lobby*, *muffin*, and *drugstore*, as well as Uzbek terms such as *tandoor* and *somsa*. These units often lack direct equivalents in the target language.

Several strategies can be employed to achieve adequacy:

- **transcription or transliteration**, particularly when preserving the cultural identity of the term is important;
- **description**, when the target audience needs an explanation of the concept;
- **commentary or footnotes**, especially in literary and academic translation;
- **functional substitution**, when a culturally equivalent target-language expression exists;
- **mixed translation**, combining borrowing with explanation.

The appropriate strategy depends on the purpose of the translation and the expectations of the target audience. Realia that carry strong national colouring should often retain their cultural form, accompanied by explanation where necessary. However, excessive borrowing without clarification may prevent target readers from understanding the text.

-Lexical transformations

Lexical transformations are essential when direct lexical correspondence would produce an unnatural or misleading translation.

One important type is **concretization**, in which a broad source-language word is replaced by a more specific target-language expression. English frequently uses semantically broad verbs, whereas Uzbek may require a more precise description of the action. For instance, the appropriate Uzbek equivalent of an English verb may depend on whether the action means going, taking, understanding, changing, reaching, or another specific activity. The translator must therefore identify the contextual

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

meaning before selecting the target-language form. Another important principle is the preservation of **connotative meaning**. A word may have a neutral dictionary meaning but acquire positive or negative associations in a particular context. Adequate translation therefore requires attention to both denotative and connotative meaning.

The English pronoun *you* provides a further example. Depending on the social relationship, age, degree of formality, and communicative situation, its Uzbek equivalent may need to reflect differences in politeness and social distance. Consequently, grammatical equivalence alone is insufficient.

-Grammatical transformations

Structural differences between languages frequently require grammatical transformations. A sentence structure that is natural in English may sound unnatural if reproduced directly in Uzbek. Translators may therefore change word order, grammatical categories, sentence structure, or verbal forms while preserving the source text's communicative content. Such transformations are not signs of inaccurate translation. On the contrary, they can be necessary for achieving adequacy because the target text must conform to the grammatical and stylistic norms of the target language.

The fundamental principle is that *formal modification is acceptable when it helps preserve meaning, function, and authorial intention*.

-Stylistic adequacy in literary translation

Literary translation presents particularly demanding challenges because literary works contain imagery, metaphors, idioms, rhythm, characterization, and individual authorial style. A translator may sometimes need to replace an image, modify word order, transform a figure of speech, or select a different stylistic device in order to reproduce the effect of the original. The translator must therefore understand the author's personality, historical period, cultural environment, and artistic objectives. Knowledge of the author's biography and the circumstances in which the work was produced can significantly contribute to adequate interpretation. The translation of major literary works into Uzbek illustrates this principle. The preparation undertaken by translators of works such as Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Fyodor Dostoevsky's novels, and Gabriel García Márquez's *The Autumn of the Patriarch* demonstrates the importance of understanding not only the language but also the historical, cultural, and artistic environment of the source text. In this context, Nikolai Lyubimov's notion of the **"translator-writer"** is particularly relevant. A literary translator assumes a creative responsibility similar to that of the original writer because the translated work becomes the target reader's primary representation of the author's artistic world.

-The translator's competence

The findings indicate that linguistic competence alone cannot guarantee adequacy. A competent translator needs:

- advanced knowledge of both source and target languages;
- strong contextual interpretation skills;
- knowledge of cultural and historical backgrounds;
- awareness of stylistic differences;
- knowledge of translation strategies and transformations;
- pragmatic competence;
- creativity and sensitivity to literary language.

Before translating a literary work, the translator should therefore study the author's biography, historical period, cultural environment, characters, artistic devices, terminology, and stylistic features.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

This preparatory stage can be understood as a form of creative research. Just as writers collect information before producing a literary work, translators may need to construct their own background knowledge and reference materials before beginning translation.

-Major sources of inadequacy

The analysis allows four major sources of translation inadequacy to be identified:

1. **Structural differences between languages** — differences in grammar, syntax, word order, and lexical organization.
2. **Semantic differences** — differences in the meanings and semantic ranges of words.
3. **Linguistic and stylistic differences** — differences in idioms, metaphors, figures of speech, and conventional expressions.
4. **Cultural and historical differences** — differences in background knowledge, traditions, social practices, and historical references.

These factors may interact with one another. A lexical problem may simultaneously be a cultural and pragmatic problem, while a grammatical transformation may also influence stylistic effect.

Consequently, translation adequacy should be evaluated holistically rather than through isolated words or sentences.

5. CONCLUSION

Adequacy is a multidimensional criterion of translation quality that extends beyond lexical and grammatical correspondence. An adequate translation should preserve the essential meaning, communicative purpose, stylistic characteristics, and relevant cultural information of the source text while conforming to the linguistic and stylistic norms of the target language. The analysis demonstrates that equivalence and adequacy are closely interconnected. Equivalence establishes correspondence between source and target texts, whereas adequacy additionally requires the translation to function appropriately within the target linguistic and cultural environment.

REFERENCES:

1. Brodsky, M. Yu. (2012). *Ustnyy perevod: Istoriya i sovremennost* [Interpreting: History and Modernity]. Yekaterinburg: AMB.
2. Jakobson, R. O. (1978). On linguistic aspects of translation. In V. N. Komissarov (Ed.), *Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubezhnoy lingvistike* [Questions of Translation Theory in Foreign Linguistics] (pp. 16–24). Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya.
3. Nida, E. A. (1978). Toward a science of translating: Principles of correspondence. In V. N. Komissarov (Ed.), *Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubezhnoy lingvistike* (pp. 91–137). Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya.
4. Kozhina, M. N., Duskaeva, L. R., & Salimovskiy, V. A. (2008). *Stilistika russkogo yazyka* [Stylistics of the Russian Language]. Moscow: FLINTA; Nauka.
5. Wagner, K. R. (2020). Legal text: Adequacy and equivalence of translation. *Uchenye Zapiski Kazanskogo Filiala Rossiyskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta Pravosudiya, 16*, 312–316.
6. Salomov, G. (1983). *Fundamentals of Translation Theory*. Tashkent: Teacher.
7. Salomov, G. (1990). *Introduction to Translation Theory*. Tashkent.
8. Musaev, K. (2005). *Fundamentals of Translation Theory*. Tashkent.
9. Chukovsky, K. (1989). *The High Art of Translation*. Moscow.
10. Lefevere, A. (2001). *Translation/History/Culture*. Australia.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

11. Shapira, I. (1977). *Some Problems of Translation and Translated Literature*. Tashkent.
12. Esenboev. (1986). *The Art of Translation*. Tashkent.
13. Mirabdullayeva, Z. O., & Bakhodirova, D. A. (2020). Problems of adequacy and equivalency in translation. pp. 385–390.