

# Theoretical and Practical Aspects of Translation

**Khusanova Zukhra Almamatovna,**  
Uzbek state world languages university,  
Master's department,  
Tel.: +99897 1577511

**Abstract:** The study of the proper principles of translation is known as translation theory. Translation theory recognizes that various languages encode information in different ways, but enables translators to identify suitable ways of retaining meaning while employing the most appropriate forms of each language, based on a firm basis of understanding of how languages work. Principles for translating figurative language, coping with lexical incompatibilities, rhetorical inquiries, the use of cohesion markers, and a variety of other topics are all covered in translation theory.

**Keywords:** translation hypotheses, language of origin, language of destination, subject matter.

## Introduction

In essence, there are two opposing translation hypotheses. The primary goal in one is to convey the full force and meaning of every word and turn the phrase in the original, while the primary goal in the other is to produce a result that does not read like a translation at all, but rather moves with the same ease in its new attire as in its native rendering. Neither of these two approaches can ever be completely ignored in the hands of a professional translator.

Conventional wisdom suggests that translators should have three key needs in order to do their job well: they should be conversant with:

- the language of origin
- the language of destination
- the subject matter

Based on this premise, the translator determines the meaning of the forms in the source language and attempts to produce the same meaning in the target language by employing the target language's forms and structures. As a result, the form and code are expected to change, although the meaning and message are supposed to stay the same. 1984 (Larson)

Even when two translators work from the same source material and into the same target language, the results can be substantially different. A given text does not have a single proper translation. The following are some of the reasons for this variation:

- the **purpose** of the translation
- the **translation team** itself
- the target language **audience** for whom the translation is intended.

The end result is three translational philosophies that sit somewhere between literal and idiomatic translations on a continuum. **Literal** (word-for-word) translations are concerned with communicating the meaning of the source text using the receptor language's natural grammatical and lexical items, whereas **idiomatic** (thought-for-thought) translations are concerned with communicating the meaning of the source text using the receptor language's natural grammatical and lexical items. **Unduly free**, improperly free translations are those that add to the source text, paraphrase it, or change specific content for a specific effect, such as commentary.

Etienne Dolet, a French translator and humanist, made one of the earliest attempts to establish a set of major rules or principles to be referred to in literary translation when he formulated the following fundamental principles of translation ("La Maniere de Bien Traduire d'une Langue en Autre") in 1540, which are usually regarded as providing rules of thumb for the practicing translator:

- The translator should have a complete understanding of the author's intent and content.

- The translator should have a perfect understanding of the language from which he is translating as well as an equally good understanding of the language into which he is translating.
- When translating, the translator should use normal speech forms.
- The translator should create a whole overall impact with appropriate tone by choosing and ordering words.

Abraham Cowley, a seventeenth-century poet and translator, campaigned for translation freedom. He handled word-for-word translation as if it were two insane people conversing. John Dryden, a contemporary of his, defined three sorts of translation:

- **Meta-translation**, which includes 'word by word' and 'line by line' translation.
- **Translation** involving 'sense by sense'
- **Imitation** - deviating from the original text in terms of vocabulary and meaning as the translation thinks fit.

Sir Alexander Fraser Tytler, a Scottish jurist and historian, published his famous "Essay on the Principles of Translation" in 1791, in which he defines a good translation as "that, in which the merit of the original work is so completely transfused into another language, as to be distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country to which that language belongs, as it is by those who speak the original work's language."

Tytler goes on to provide certain principles for translators to follow as well as a criterion for measuring the efficiency of their translations. According to Tytler, the perfect translation should:

According to Tytler, the perfect translation should:

- keep the style's personality
- maintain the original text's simplicity and flow

Tytler's theories, particularly his open-mindedness on quality assessment and his ideas on linguistic and cultural components in translations, can inspire modern translators and researchers.

The literature on translation has begun to become more objective and methodical as modern language studies have flourished. To enhance existing theory, modern translation theory has evolved away from a strictly linguistic perspective and toward a methodology that incorporates non-linguistic disciplines, most notably Semiotics (the systematic study of signs, sign systems or structures, sign processes, and sign functions).

Linguist Eugene A. Nida proposed separating translation studies from linguistics in 1964, claiming that one can translate without knowing anything about linguistics, just as one can speak a given language fluently without being a student of language science.

However, understanding the linguistic and stylistic qualities of language variety can be quite useful in translation. With this information, one can look for the equivalent variation in the target language, learn its essential qualities, and remember them so that they can be reproduced as closely as possible in the translated version. According to Nida, a translator:

- analyzes the message of the text in question in the source language into its simplest and structurally clearest forms;
- transfers it at this simple level to the target language; and
- restructures it at this simple level to the target language that is most appropriate for the type of audience in mind.

Such a summary is unmistakably correct. It encourages translators to focus on the most important aspects of the translation and to reconstruct the form as needed to convey the idea. In a circumstance where communication is difficult, such an emphasis is especially beneficial, because it is preferable to transmit at least a minimal core information rather than generate a formal equivalent that does not operate at all.

Although the principle of dynamic equivalence has long existed and has been employed on rare occasions in previous translations, Eugene Nida was the first to give it that name and describe it as a systematic translation principle in the 1970s.

Nida claims that "Language is fundamentally a code in operation, or, in other words, a code that functions for a certain goal or purposes, and it comprises of more than the meaning of symbols and combinations of symbols. As a result, we must consider the dynamic nature of

message delivery. This component is especially crucial for translation, because creating equivalent messages is a process that involves not only matching sections of utterances, but also duplicating the communication's overall dynamic aspect. Without both aspects, the results are unlikely to be considered similar in any sensible sense".

This idea of dynamic equivalent translation was established by linguists and translator educators to explain the distinctions between form and meaning, the disparities across languages, and the types of practices that contribute to sound translation. The notion of translating meaning over form was at the heart of the theory.

Thus, dynamic equivalence, or functional equivalent translation, aims to sufficiently and accurately express what the words and constructions in the source language conveyed to the original recipients in excellent target language grammar, style, and idiom.

A formal equivalent translation, on the other hand, attempts to translate from one language to another utilizing the donor language's grammatical and syntactical forms whenever possible.

One of the most important challenges of translation theory is to describe the translation process. V.N. Komissarov was a dynamic aspects of translation researcher who attempted to understand how the translator performs the transfer process from Source Text (ST) to Target Text (TT).

In terms of psychology, the translating process necessitates two mental processes: comprehension and verbalization. The translator must first comprehend the contents of ST, that is, reduce the knowledge contained therein to his own mental program, before developing this program into TT. The issue is that these mental processes are not easily visible, and we don't know much about the program or how the reduction and development activities are carried out. As a result, the translation process must be stated in a roundabout fashion. Translation theory accomplishes this goal by proposing a variety of translation models.

A model is a common depiction of the translating process that describes mental operations that can be used to translate the source text or a portion of it, regardless of whether these operations are actually done by the translator. It may explain the translating process in broad terms or by specifying a number of specific operations (or transformations) that can be used to accomplish the process in part. The scenario reflected in the ST contents or the meaningful components of the ST contents can be the focus of translation models.

The situational (or referential) model is based on the identity of the situations described in the original text and in the translation, while the semantic-transformational model assumes that basic notions and nuclear structures in different languages are similar. The dynamic characteristics of translation are thought to be explained by these postulates. In other words, it is assumed that the translator mentally travels from the original to some level of interlingua equivalency, and then to the translation text.

This intermediate level is extra linguistic in the situational model. It is the described reality, the realities of life, that the linguistic description represents. The process of translation apparently entails the translator moving beyond the original text to the context described therein. This is the initial step in the process, i.e. the situation's breakthrough. The translator's second task is to describe the scenario in the target language. As a result, the process moves from a text in one language to a text in another language via an extra linguistic circumstance. The translator first comprehends the original before saying "the same things" in TL. E. Nida took an alternative approach, suggesting that the translating process may be represented as a series of transformations. According to the transformational paradigm, there are a number of nuclear structures that are totally equivalent in any two languages. In relation to the other language, each language has a zone of equivalence.

It is assumed that the translator uses three transformational strokes to translate. He converts the original structures into nuclear structures in the first stage of analysis, i.e. he transforms within SL. He substitutes the SL nuclear structures with the equivalent TL nuclear structures in the second stage of translation. [5.-17]

He develops the latter into the final structures in the translation text in the third step of synthesis.

The translation of semantic units can be described in a similar way. The semantic model proposes the presence of "deep" semantic categories that are shared by both SL and TL. It's assumed that the translator lowers the original's semantic units to these basic semantic categories before expressing the appropriate conceptions using TL semantic units.

We can explain the discovered variants as the result of the translator employing one or more of these action models while explaining the translation process. This does not imply that the stages described by these models are followed in the translation process. They aren't just abstract schemes, though. We could teach translators how to use these models as practical tools if we train them. When a translator encounters a specific problem in ST, he or she should categorize it as situational, structural, or semantic, and then try to fix it using the proper approach.

### **Conclusion**

Another method of describing the translation process is to identify the various types of operations that are carried out by the translator. The process is considered as a series of manipulations with the original's form or content, with the result that the translator develops the text in the target language. By comparing the original and finished phrases, the type of operation can be determined. We should highlight one more specific approach that the translator may find useful when confronted with an apparently unsolvable translation challenge. It's known as the compensation technique, and it's defined as adding extra parts to a translation to compensate for the loss of equivalent items at the same or earlier stages. The compensating method is frequently employed to render the original's stylistic or emotional consequences.

### **References**

1. Ahmad, K. (2008) 'Being in Text and Text in Being: Notes on Representative Texts', in Anderman, G. and Rogers, M. (eds) *Incorporating Corpora. The Linguist and the Translator*. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters, pp. 60–94.
2. Anderman, G. and Rogers, M. (2005) *In and out of English: for Better, for Worse?* Clevedon/Tonawanda/Ontario: Multilingual Matters. *Incorporating Corpora. The Linguist and the Translator*. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
3. Arrojo, R. (1998) 'The Revision of the Traditional Gap between Theory and Practice and the Empowerment of Translation in Postmodern Times', *The Translator* 4: 1, 25–48.
4. Baker, M. (1993) 'Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies', in Baker, M., Francis, G. and Tognini-Bonelli, E. (eds) *Text and Technology*. In Honour of John Sinclair. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 233–50.
5. Baker, M. (ed.) (2010) *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*. London/ New York: Routledge.
6. Bandia, P. (2008) *Translation as Reparation. Writing and Translation in Postcolonial Africa*. Manchester: St Jerome. Barret, M. and Phillips, A. (eds) (1992) *Destablizing Theory. Contemporary Feminist Debates*. Cambridge: Polity Press.