
Comparative Analysis of Spiritual and Ideological Issues in Translation

Shirova Madina Bakhtiyorovna
Lecturer Karshi State University

Abstract: Different concepts of translation and its role in the dialogue of cultures, classification of translation according to culturally significant content, style and pragmatics, as well as a comparative analysis of spiritual and ideological issues in translation, the problem of translation within historical and cultural language will be displayed.

Keywords: translation, equivalence, adequacy, dialogue of cultures, intra-linguistic translation.

The status of translation as a part, if not the basis, of the dialogue of cultures is based on the fundamental properties of human communities - openness and mutual permeability, the tendency to compare one's own cultures with others, and the craving for their knowledge [2]. Translation is understood as crossing, overcoming linguistic, cultural, social boundaries by "transferring the contents and meanings created in one language and culture by means of another language and culture" [1]. Researchers consider the cultural aspect of translation in several planes:

- 1) as communication on the border of cultures, which has linguistic, communicative and cultural components;
- 2) as a means of familiarizing the recipient with the realities, characteristics and values of other cultures;
- 3) as a material embodiment of the dialogue of cultures: "In translation, two different cultures merge with each other, at the same time it appears as the fruit of the realization of the potential of two different languages and as a result of the expression of the creative energy of two different individuals on the basis of different languages. In other words, translation is a synthesis of two structures, where foreign and native languages are turned into an artistic quality" [3].

In modern Uzbek and foreign works of researchers devoted to the theory of translation, the concept of "translation" usually deciphered in different ways, depending on the methodological guidelines of the authors-researchers. On the one hand, translation is understood as "the process of converting a speech work in one language into a speech work in another language while maintaining an unchanged content plan, i.e. values" [2]. This process has the form of a "mental act" and consists "in the fact that a speech work (text or oral statement) that arose in one - source - language (FL) is recreated in another - translating - language (TL)". Translation as a process is inextricably linked with cognition and involves a number of interrelated operations, the main of which is interpretation in one form or another [1]. On the other hand, translation is "the result of this process, i.e. a new speech work (textile oral statement) in the target language. From the point of view of structural research methods, translation is "a transformation of the structure of a speech work, as a result of which, while maintaining the same content plan, the expression plan changes and one language is replaced

by another” [3]. When a denotation placed in the center of translation activity, translation becomes a process of “description using the language of translation of denotations described in the original language” [1].

In the phenomenon of translation, the essence of language as a sign system and the two-sided nature of the linguistic sign, which combines the content plane and the expression plane, are clearly manifested. In this regard, there are such fundamental translation problems as translatability and equivalence. At present, the question of translatability/untranslatability, i.e., the possibility of translation as such, has been removed: indeed, each language conceptualizes reality in its own way, and the boundaries of individual signs in different languages do not coincide. The search for equivalents for such linguistic units is one of the main difficulties of translation [5]. This difficulty, however, removed by the fact that the subject of translation is the text, and the object is meanings. Although the content of the translated original is directly related to the forms of the language in which it was created, the decisive role for translation is played by the fact that different languages contain units that differ in terms of expression, i.e. in form, but coinciding in terms of content, that is, in meaning [2]. It is on the transfer of the meaningful, semantic side of the text, and not on the exact recoding of individual linguistic signs that make it up, that the success or failure of translation as a process depends: “The main thing in any translation is the transfer of the semantic information of the text. All other types and characteristics of it, functional, stylistic (emotional), stylistic, socio-local, etc. cannot be transmitted without reproducing semantic information” [3]. It is also noted that the recoding of individual "untranslatable" elements is supported by the semantics of the surrounding words and constructions.

In translation studies, equivalence is understood as “the preservation of the relative equality of content, semantic, stylistic, and functional-communicative information contained in the original and translation” [3]. With complete equivalence, it is the identity of the semantic structures of the interacting languages that is revealed. The issue of semantic, stylistic, functional and aesthetic equivalence, as well as the equivalence of expressive means (rhymes, tropes, etc.) in different languages is debatable.

Theorists emphasize that the equivalence of the original and the translation is “first of all, a common understanding of the information contained in the text, including that which affects not only the mind, but also the feelings of the recipient and which not only explicitly expressed in the text, but also implicitly referred to the subtext. The equivalence of the translation also depends on the situation of the generation of the original text and its reproduction in the target language” [3].

A number of researchers consider its adequacy as a criterion for the quality of a translation, which be equated with equivalence or separated from it. In this case, adequacy seen as "the relative equivalence of the reconstruction of the semantic modality of the original text ... the reconstruction of the conceptual, subjective-evaluative specificity of the content and expression plans of the source text".The correct transmission of the original message while observing the norms of the target language, or as a stylistic and pragmatic correspondence between the translated and the original texts [1]. In the literary theory of translation, adequacy understood as the ability of a translation to convey all the intentions of the author (both thoughtful and unconscious) and all the resources of imagery, color, rhythm, etc. used by him [2]. In a number of interpretations (for example, in the model of K. Rice, G. Fermeer, A. D. Schweitzer), the criterion of adequacy is applicable to the translation process, and equivalence - to the result. A. Neubert proposes a distinction between two types of translation adequacy - semantic, understood as the transfer of the content of the original from compliance with the norms of the target language, and pragmatic, understood as taking into

account the pragmatic component of the statement [3].

There are many classifications of translation based on different criteria. So, R.K. Minyar-Beloruchev puts forward two classifications: the first is based on the operations carried out by the translator in the course of his work (written, simultaneous, from a sheet, sequential, paragraph-phrase, two-sided), the second - on the nature of the translated texts (fiction, scientific and technical, socio-political) [1]. Based on the ratio of the form and content of the original and the translation, L. L. Nelyubin and G. T. Khukhuni distinguish translation: word-for-word, providing for the lexical transfer of the meaning and content of the original, taking into account syntactic and stylistic parameters; literal, striving to preserve the semantic and formal components of the original; verbatim (objective), reproducing the semantic and structural characteristics of the original language; free (subjective), conveying the general content of the original, regardless of its linguistic embodiment [2]. R. O. Jakobson distinguished three types of translation based on the ways of interpreting a linguistic sign: intralinguistic (renaming) - interpretation of verbal signs using other signs of the same language, Interlingua (actual translation) - interpretation of verbal signs through some other language; intersemiotic (transmutation) - interpretation of verbal signs through non-verbal sign systems.

In the context of this study, intralinguistic and literary translations are of the greatest interest. The purpose of the second is "to generate a speech work in the translated language, which is capable of exerting the same artistic and speech impact on the reader as the work in the original language has" [2]. For this, according to R.K. Minyar-Beloruchev, "the translator must have a literary talent, or at least develop the ability to clothe his written speech in a literary form corresponding to the style of this or that author" [1]. At the same time, a number of modern researchers consider the writer's talent and the bright individuality of the translator to be an obstacle for the reader to understand the author and his work in the form in which they were created, which creates a well-known and irresolvable unambiguously antinomy of translation "in spirit" and "in letter".

Compared with other types of translation, literary translation has two notable features. Firstly, it generated by the original, depends on it, but at the same time, it has relative independence, since it becomes a fact of the translating language [2]. This is because fiction distinguished from other works of the bookish word by a special property, which can be called its semantic capacity. This property manifested in the writer's ability to say more than the direct meaning of words in their totality, to make the reader's thoughts, feelings, and imagination work. For this reason, not only the original and translation differ in the nature of comprehension, social significance and reputation, but also multilingual translations of the same literary source" [3].

Secondly, the very concept of content in fiction is much more complex than in a scientific work or business document; it covers not only the material-logical, not only the ideological-cognitive side of the statement, but also its emotional richness, its ability to influence not only the mind, but also the feelings of the reader. This ability is often in some stylistic shade of the word or in the form of the arrangement of words, or in the nature of their combination in meaning, or in what is called the "emotional halo" of the word.

In this regard, the translator is faced with the need to conduct a deep stylistic analysis of the material, which would allow revealing that its individual originality is [2]. In addition, when creating an adequate translation, it is important to take into account the totality of numerous extra linguistic factors that form a kind of "cultural context" of the source text.

Thus, the translator of a literary text needs to be proficient not only in the source and target languages, literary criticism and linguistic knowledge, but also in the skills of stylistic

analysis of the text, as well as to have, if possible, accurate ideas about the complex of extra linguistic factors that are important for understanding the text. The procedure for understanding and further interpreting the translated text has a personal and often subjective character, depending on the translator himself: "When translating, he consciously or unconsciously includes his own distributive understanding of the original and establishes a balance in the dialogue of two languages, cultures, ontologies. He becomes not only an interpreter, but also an analytical critic of the text.

If the fact of the existence of a literary translation and the ability of the texts created because of it to be stylistically, aesthetically and pragmatically equivalent to the original is currently, practically not disputed then intralinguistic (intralinguistic) translation has a less definite status and not too extensive bibliography. The real prerequisites for its selection are the historical variability of languages at all levels and the resulting difficulties in understanding "ancient" texts by "modern" speakers, as well as the heterogeneity of the language community in social, cultural, geographical, ethnic and other respects. Our use of words denoting the moments of creation and perception of texts in quotation marks is because the real value of this time distance can vary significantly, since it influenced by many extra linguistic factors (changes in the language norm, language construction, changes in cultural paradigms, etc.).). The existing skepticism regarding the term "intralingua translation" obviously connected with "the traditional use of the term "translation" in relation to interlingua communication, as well as with the popular point of view that the process of text transformation within one language is not complex and mostly affects only its individual elements" [1].

In the literature, there are two possible ways of translating texts of remote eras into modern languages: the first is that the translated text is "lightened", simplified, and thus more "similar" to a modern literary work, the second is based on an attempt to penetrate the structure thoughts of the author of the original text, without sacrificing its originality. The translator makes sure not to lose sight of the features of the dictionary and word usage of the era of the emergence of a literary monument, but adapts it to modern aesthetic requirements [4].

The statement that in intralingual translation "the translator belongs to the same cultural and linguistic community as the author of the text" seems to be extremely controversial, because it is the emergence of a cultural distance between the authors. Translator and reader that determines the need for pragmatic adaptation of the translated text and its difficulties, such as the need to "reproduce the specifics of the worldview, the picture of the world, morality, all those features of everyday life that are reflected in the original text" [2]. The search for a balance between the attitude towards the modern reader with his usual aesthetic, ideological and other ideas and the pragmatics of the author is a fundamental difficulty of intralinguistic diachronic translation, and the possibility of adequate understanding and interpretation of content created within a different culture is a fundamental problem of translation in general.

Translation is currently recognized as a means, form, and material embodiment of intercultural communication. Serving the implementation of a number of the most important functions of human communication, it arose already in the early stages of history and went through a complex and contradictory path of development from purely practical activities. That implement various pragmatic tasks to a complex of scientific theories based on a sign concept of language and comprehending at a high level both the possibility of translation in general, and its forms, types, types and specific techniques. The linguistic theory of translation considers equivalence as a system of mutual correspondences between the signs of the source and target languages to be one of the central problems. The literary theory of

translation pays special attention to the adequacy of the translation as the correspondence of the translated text to the ideological, aesthetic, stylistic tasks that the author set for him, and to the formal means that he used to achieve them.

A special case of translation is intralingual translation, which occurs due to the internal heterogeneity of languages in a synchronous plan (the active functioning of territorial and social dialects, regional and national forms), as well as their historical variability, leading to a mismatch between their modern and earlier forms at all levels of the language structure. . An additional impetus and, at the same time, complexity of intralinguistic translation is given by the discrepancy between the sociocultural characteristics of the language community at the time of the creation of the text and its translation. The fundamental problem of both inter- and intra-linguistic translation is finding a balance between the pragmatics and expressive system of the author and the receptive abilities of the reader of the translated text, as well as the possibility and limits of understanding the foreign cultural meaning.

References

1. Avtonomova N. S. Knowledge and translation. Experiences in the philosophy of language. Calarado: Linguistic Encyclopedia, 2018.
2. Barkhudarov L. S. Language and translation (questions of general and private theory of translation). Moscow: International relations, 2020.
3. Sidorenko S.I. To the question of the status and typology of intralingual translation // Language and culture in the era of globalization. Sat. scientific works on materials of the first intern. Scientific conf.: in 3 vols. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg State University of Economics. 2021. Vol. 2. P. 194-202.
4. Toper P. M. Translation in the system of comparative literature. Poland: Heritage, 2021.
5. Yakobson R. O. On the linguistic aspects of translation // Questions of the theory of translation in foreign linguistics. M.: MIR, 2017