

## THEORITICAL BASIS OF LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF REPETITION IN TRANSLATION

*Scientific supervisor: prof. Siddiqova Iroda Abduzuxurovna*

*National university of Uzbekistan*

***Muxamatjonova Diyora Rustam qizi***

*2<sup>st</sup> grade master's degree student of  
foreign languages and literature (English)*

*Toshkent region Chirchik state pedagogical institute*

+998990991877

[muxamatjonovdiyora@gmail.com](mailto:muxamatjonovdiyora@gmail.com)

### **Annotation**

Since the dawn of civilization, we, human beings, have been using language to translate our thoughts and ideas. We use a set of symbols or codes to communicate or transfer an idea or thought or a feeling to the person whom we address during an act of communication. Here too we have translation. In this sense, we translate every day. With the evolution of human society, we became more anxious to know about the thoughts and feelings of people in distant places. Hence we used two sets of symbols and codes to transfer the thoughts and ideas of people speaking a different language to our own language. This gave rise to translation as we see and use it today.

**Key words:** *word-for-word approach, metaphrase, paraphrase, imitation, techniques*

### **Introduction**

Literary translation is of huge importance. It helps to shape our understanding of the world around us in many ways. Reading Homer and Sophocles as part of a classical education in school helps to build an understanding of history, politics, philosophy and so much more. Meanwhile, reading contemporary translations

provides fascinating insights into life in other cultures and other countries. In a fast-paced world so rife with misunderstanding and confusion, such efforts to share knowledge and experiences across cultural boundaries should be applauded.

## **DISCUSSIONS AND RESULTS**

History has seen countless translators come and go. Many of their names we will never know, but some – King Alfred the Great and Geoffrey Chaucer, for example, who both translated Boethius from the original Latin – had the power and influence to ensure that their translation efforts were not lost to the sands of time.

As it is conspicuous, translation theory is much sparse in antiquity, and the theories that emerge at the time are unsystematic remarks, mainly situated in the discipline of rhetoric. In fact, the very pioneers of the field are luminary Roman commentators, such as Cicero, Quintilian, who deem translation as a pedagogical exercise whose debate on translation practice pertains to word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation. Cicero (first century B.C), in composing Latin versions of speeches by the Greek orators, writes: I did not translate as an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and the forms, or as one might say, the figures of thought, but in a language which conforms to our usage and in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word-for-word, but I expressed the general style and the force of language. Another period is brought about by St. Jerome (fourth century B.C) whose approach to translating the Septuagint Bible into Latin would affect later translations of the Scriptures He negates the word-for-word approach, for by closely following the form of the original, the sense of the original is masked and an absurd translation is created. In vindicating his own strategy, writes:

*Now, I not only admit but freely announce that in translating from the Greek- except in the case of the Holy Scripture, where even the syntax contains a mystery- I render not word-for-word, but sense-for-sense.* In the seventeenth century, influential theories emerge; the most obvious is that of John Dryden whose trichotomy on translation types (metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation) makes big strides. He as quoted in Venuti, negates metaphrase (word-for-word) for lacking fluency or easy readability and imitation as well, that adapt the foreign text so as to

serve the translator's own literary ambitions. Instead of he is in favour of paraphrase or translation with latitude, which seeks to render meanings.

During the 1900s to 1930s, in translation theory the crucial trends are rooted in German literary and philosophical traditions and hermeneutics. It is considered that language is not communicative, but constitutive in its representations of thought and reality. For translation, taking this into account, it is viewed as an interpretation which necessarily reconstitutes and transforms the foreign text. For scholars as Schleiermacher and Bolt, translation is a creative force in which specific translation strategies serve a variety of cultural and social functions, paving the way for the construction of nations, literatures and languages.

Another theorist who is more in line with the German interest is Ezra Pound. In Pound's view, the "autonomy of translation" takes two forms. A translated text might be interpretive, written next to the foreign poem and composed of linguistic peculiarities that direct the reader across the page to foreign textual features, or a translation can be original writing in which the TT literary standards are an impetus to rewriting the ST poem so as to seem a new poem. This second stance is in line with the translation of Khayyam by Fitzgerald. Pound's standards are modernist; he adopts the first so as to recover foreign poeties to advance these values in the TT. At the end of the 1930s, translation is viewed as a separate linguistic practice, a literary genre apart, with its own norms and ends Ortega, in his paper "The Misery and the Splendor of Translation" argues for the importance of the German translation tradition. By "Misery", Ortega means the impossibility of the task, for in the two intended languages, there are differences not only linguistically, but also culturally and mentally. On the other hand, what he means by "splendour" is the act of overcoming such differences and by so doing the TL reader is forced out of his/her linguistic habits and would move within the linguistic habits of the foreign author 1940-1950s In the 1940s to 1950s, the prevalent concept is "translatability". During this decade, the main issue to be tackled by linguists and literary critics is that whether the differences that separate the languages and culture can be brought back to friendship via translation or not.

To achieve this, the impediments to translation are jotted down, to see whether they are surmountable or not, and translation methods are formulated. Ideas are formed by disciplinary trends and change to a great extent, ranging between the extremes of philosophical skepticism and practical optimism. The figure skeptical of translatability is Willard Quine. He develops the concepts of "radical translation," and "indeterminacy of translation". "Radical translation" describes the situation in which a linguist attempts to translate a completely unknown language, which is unrelated to his own, and is therefore forced to rely solely on the observed behavior of its speakers in relation to their environment. Any hypothesis of translation could be defended only by appeal to context: to seeing what other sentences a native would utter. But the same indeterminacy will appear there: any hypothesis can be defended if one adopts enough compensatory hypotheses regarding other parts of language. He Questions the empirical foundations of translation by pointing to a semantic "indeterminacy" that cannot be resolved even in the presence of an environmental "stimulus. Quine tells a story to illustrate this indeterminacy, in which an explorer is trying to puzzle out the meaning of the word "gavagai". He observes that the word is used in the presence of rabbits, but is unable to determine whether it means „undetached rabbit part“, or „fusion of all rabbits“, or 'temporal stage of a rabbit“, or 'the universal „rabbithood“..

The apparent division between cultural and linguistic approaches to translation that characterized much translation research until the 1980s is disappearing, partly because of shifts in linguistics that have seen that discipline take a more overtly cultural turn, partly because those who advocated an approach to translation rooted in cultural history have become less defensive about their position. In the early years when Translation Studies was establishing itself, its advocates positioned themselves against both linguists and literary scholars, arguing that linguists failed to take into account broader contextual dimensions and that literary scholars were obsessed with making pointless evaluative judgements. It was held to be important to move the study of translation out from under the umbrella of either comparative literature or applied linguistics, and fierce polemics

arguing for the autonomy of Translation Studies were common. Today, such an evangelical position seems quaintly outdated, and Translation Studies is more comfortable with itself, better able to engage in borrowing from and lending techniques and methods to other disciplines. The important work of translation scholars based in linguistics, such figures as *Mona Baker, Roger Bell, Basil Hatim, Ian Mason, Kirsten Malmkjaer, Katharina Reiss, Hans Vermeer and Wolfram Wilss*, to name but some of the better-known, has done a great deal to break down the boundaries between disciplines and to move translation studies on from a position of possible confrontation. Nor should we forget the enormous importance of such figures as *J.C. Catford, Michael Halliday, Peter Newmark and Eugene Nida* whose research into translation before Translation Studies started to evolve as a discipline in its own right laid the foundations for what was to follow.

Literary studies have also moved on from an early and more elitist view of translation. As *Peter France*, editor of the *Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* points out:

*Theorists and scholars have a far more complex agenda than deciding between the good and the bad; they are concerned, for instance, to tease out the different possibilities open to the translator, and the way these change according to the historical, social, and cultural context.*

## CONCLUSION

The history of translation studies and the resurgence and genesis of the approaches to this emerging discipline was marked by the first century (BCE) commentator Cicero and then St. Jerome whose word-for-word and sense-for-sense approaches to translation was a springboard for other approaches and trends to thrive. From 1950s, each decade was marked by a dominant concept such as translatability, equivalence etc. Whilst before the twentieth century translation was an element of language learning, the study of the field developed into an academic discipline only in the second half of the twentieth century, when this field achieved

a certain institutional authority and developed as a distinct discipline. As this discipline moved towards the present, the level of sophistication and inventiveness did in fact soared and new concepts, methods, and research projects were developed which interacted with this discipline. The brief review here, albeit incomplete, reflects the current fragmentation of the field into subspecialties, some empirically oriented, some hermeneutic and literary and some influenced by various forms of linguistics and cultural studies which have culminated in productive syntheses. In short, translation studies is now a field which brings together approaches from a wide language and cultural studies, that for its own use, modifies them and develops new models specific to its own requirements.

### **LIST OF USED LITERATURE**

1. Michael Cronin, *Across the Lines: travel, language, translation* (Cork: Cork University Press) 2000.
2. Peter France, *Translation Studies and Translation Criticism*, in Peter France ed. *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) 2000, p. 3.
3. Anuradha Dingwaney, *Introduction: Translating ‘Third World’ Cultures*, Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier, eds. *Between Languages and Cultures Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts* (Pittsburgh and London: University of Pittsburgh Press) 1995, p. 4.
4. Baker, M. (1998). *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London and New York: Routledge.
5. Benjamin, W. (1968). *The Task of the Translator*, in *Illuminations*, ed. H. Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn, New York: Schocken, pp. 69-82.
6. Dryden, J. (1680). „Metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation“. Extracts of „Preface to Ovid“s Epistles“ in R. Schulte and J. Biguenet (eds) (1992), pp. 17-31.
7. <https://www.k-international.com/blog/the-challenges-of-translating-literature/>
8. <https://literariness.org/2017/12/15/translation-studies/>