



## Research Article

### STYLISTIC ASPECT OF TRANSLATION

**Submission Date:** November 30, 2022, **Accepted Date:** December 05, 2022,

**Published Date:** December 08, 2022

**Crossref doi:** <https://doi.org/10.37547/philological-crjps-03-12-02>

**Journal Website:**  
<https://masterjournals.com/index.php/crjps>

**Copyright:** Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

**M.T. Tajigalieva**

Lecturer Karakalpak State University, Uzbekistan

#### ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the stylistic aspect of translation from one language to another, the opinions of linguists, methods of translation of certain linguistic phenomena are given.

#### KEYWORDS

Activity, translation studies, stylistic device, analogous, synonym, subjective decision, function, metaphor, epithet.

#### INTRODUCTION

One of the most interesting aspects of translation theory is the problem of the transfer of stylistic techniques in the receiving language. This problem attracts the attention of linguists, but is insufficiently developed. The importance of studying the translation of figurative means is due to the need for an adequate transfer of figurative

information of a work of art in English, recreating the stylistic effect of the original in translation [2,43]. But first, let's define what a translation is.

#### THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Translation is a complex multi-faceted phenomenon, some aspects of which can be the



subject of research in different sciences. Within the framework of translation studies, psychological, literary, ethnographic and other aspects of translation activities are studied, as well as the history of translation activities in a particular country or countries. Depending on the subject of the study, "one can distinguish psychological translation studies (psychology of translation), literary translation studies (theory of artistic or literary translation), ethnographic translation studies, historical translation studies"[1,65], etc. The leading place in modern translation studies belongs to linguistic translation studies (linguistics of translation), which studies translation as a linguistic phenomenon. Certain types of translation studies complement each other, striving for a comprehensive description of translation activities.

A good translator uses the methods of transmitting some stylistic techniques used in the original in order to give the text greater brightness and expressiveness. The translator has the following choice: either try to copy the technique of the original, or, if this is not possible, create his own stylistic means in translation that has a similar emotional effect. This is the principle of stylistic compensation, about which K.I. Chukovsky said that it is not a metaphor that should be conveyed by metaphor, comparison by comparison, but a smile by a smile, a tear by a tear, etc. For a translator, it is not so much the form as the function of the stylistic device in the text that is important. This means a certain freedom of action: grammatical means of expression can be

conveyed lexically and vice versa; omitting stylistic phenomena that are not transferable into Russian, the translator will return the "debt" to the text by creating a different image in another place of the text - where it is most convenient - but of a similar stylistic orientation [5, 234],.

If a person is not used to thinking about translation issues, to know something about translators, if he has no experience comparing different translations or translation with the original, then he usually has a naive attitude to this matter, the translator and the translation are taken out of brackets, they just don't think about it. "I didn't like Updike's style: there are too many adverbial turns!" If something is wrong, the author is to blame, because there is simply no one else: whose book are we reading, after all? whose name is on the cover?

On the other hand, when a person understands the complexity and importance of the translator's work, is used to talking about it and comparing it, and has translated something himself, perhaps, then in a curious way he tends to the other extreme: the author disappears. If something is wrong in the translation, then it is the translator who is to blame, it is he who is responsible for the aesthetic and stylistic aspects of the text. "Look, what a horror, is that what they say in Russian?" — and there is not even a thought that perhaps they don't speak French, English or Chinese like that, and that maybe the author made this piece clumsy intentionally (or even — oh, horror! — unintentionally). There is no malicious intent in



this, just as there is none in the first version, when the translator is not noticed. The author just disappears somewhere in the background.

Closely related to this is the desire of the translator (or, often, the translation editor) to “improve” the author's text, sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously. The author used the same adjective three times in a row; how bad it looks in translation, it must be replaced with synonyms! If you try to figure it out, such a replacement sometimes turns out to be justified. Maybe in the original language it is in this area that the synonymous row is poorer, and three identical adjectives in a row therefore do not look ugly [5, 89], but quite normal; in translation it is necessary to color. But maybe, on the contrary, the author sought to emphasize this word, or deliberately skimp on synonyms in this passage. Or: maybe, in the original language, these are repetitions of words that inevitably often occur for grammatical reasons (personal pronouns in English, for example); and in translation, you can and should do without such a tedious repetition. It is necessary to understand (and make some inevitably subjective decisions). But it often happens that the question of how it was in the original and how it can be perceived by the readers of the original and how it could have been intended by the author of the original simply does not pop up, it remains dissolved there, in the background. It is necessary to make it read well in translation; unfortunately, in practice this often means that it must be done smoothly. Hence, among other things (and not only from involuntarily borrowed grammatical and syntactic

cripples), a dull-smooth “translation language” arises.

But maybe it's impossible in any other way. After all, there is no escape from this black-and-white dilemma with which I started this entry; if the translation is rough, ugly, strange, not smooth, readers from the second category will consider it bad, and the translator is incompetent (and they will often be right, that's what else needs to be taken into account! in most cases, roughness and clumsiness will really be the result of poor command of the Russian language, insufficient translator skills). And the fate of the translation and the reputation of the translator depend mainly on the reaction and opinions of this category of readers.

And this choice is also quite natural in black and white. In front of the reader is a book, one object, a whole object. It is natural to perceive it as the result of the work of one person, or one something, one object that can serve as an addressee for emotions about the book - both positive and negative. Someone is responsible for this, someone did it. Depending on what the thought is used to clinging to, this “someone” will be the author or translator; and only for someone who takes this book and compares it with the original, it will be quite obvious that such an approach is unacceptable, there will be an obvious need to carefully consider both the author and the translator; and the original language, and the translation language. But, in the end, the translation is not done for such a person; he can read it in the original.



It turns out that translating, trying to convey the features of the author's text in everything (to the best of one's understanding and within the limits of what is possible, of course — and these limits can be oh so narrow) — does not work very well. The translation does not exist, does not make sense outside the community of readers who can read it, evaluate it, use it — but the expectations of this community of readers, the requirements of this community for the stylistics, phraseology, and vocabulary of the translation — these requirements inevitably force the translator to violate the author's intention again and again [6]. Translation of stylistic techniques (SP) bearing the figurative charge of the work often causes difficulties for translators due to the national peculiarities of stylistic systems of different languages. All linguists emphasize the need to preserve the image of the original in translation, rightly believing that, first of all, the translator should strive to reproduce the function of reception, and not the reception itself [7].

When transmitting stylistic figures of speech - comparisons, epithets, metaphors, proverbs, etc. - the translator needs to decide each time: it is advisable to preserve the underlying image or in translation it should be replaced by another. The reason for the replacement may be the peculiarities of Russian word usage, word compatibility, etc.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we can say that the stylistic aspect of translation is necessary for the translator, without it, there could not and cannot be a beautiful translation. It is the stylistic aspect of the language that is responsible not only for the translation from the original language into the target language, but also for the features and skill of the translator. After all, the translation of the original depends on how the translator is able to convey the meaning of stylistic units. A good translator uses the methods of transmitting some stylistic techniques used in the original in order to give the text greater brightness and expressiveness. The translator has the following choice: either try to copy the technique of the original, or, if this is not possible, create his own stylistic means in translation that has a similar emotional effect. In his understanding, the translator strives to "improve" the author's text by resorting to various techniques, and nevertheless it does not always work out. One of the many reasons may be the peculiarity of the original word usage. Another reason causing difficulties for the translator is the national peculiarities of stylistic systems of different languages.

## REFERENCES

1. Бархударов Л.С. Уровни языковой иерархии и перевод, М., 1975;
2. Бреева Л. В., Бутенко А. А., Лексико-стилистические трансформации при переводе, - М., 1999;



3. Виноградов В. В. Стилистика. Теория поэтической речи. М., 1963;
4. Влахов С. и Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. – М.: Междунар. Отношения, 1980;
5. Прозоров В. Г., Основы теории и практики перевода с английского языка на русский, - М., 1998;
6. <http://ar.sky.ru/friends/14.07.2004/9>
7. <http://belpaese2000.narod.ru/Trad/trasform01.htm>

