

UOT:811.

STYLISTIC PERSPECTIVE IN LITERARY TRANSLATION

Associate Professor of GSU Maharramova Sugura

sugraibrahim85@gmail.com

Annatasion: *This paper is intended to lay some grounds for aspects of literary translation both in theory and in practice. It provides definitions for basic terms and concepts of the major topics and issues pertaining to literary translation. Among the terms and concepts essential to the readers/students' background knowledge in this connection are: Literature, literary language vs. non-literary language; the literariness of literature, literary translation vs. non-literary translation, the literary translator and methods of literary translation. The paper ends with setting forth a creative literary stylistic method of translating literature. These points are scrupulously elaborated and updated to reflect the latest in the field.*

The ultimate objective of this paper is to provide a view of a number of means and requirements of a good literary translation today, and finally set forth a relatively creative approach to literary translation based on a literary stylistic method.

Keywords: literary translation, literature, literariness, stylistic, literary translator, translation method, creativity, literary

Açar sözlər: bədii tərcümə, ədəbiyyat, ədəbiyyatşünaslıq, üslub, bədii tərcüməçi, tərcümə metodu, yaradıcılıq, ədəbi

Ключевые слова: художественный перевод, литература, литературность, стилистика, литературный переводчик, метод перевода, творчество, литература

Going as far back as to Aristotle (in his famous work, *Poetics*) and Plato (and his widely known book, *The Republic*), the latter defined literature by making a distinction between two modes of speechrepresentation, *diegesis*, or “pure narrative” (the discourse of the narrator/poet) and *mimesis* (the directly imitated or enacted speech of the characters themselves, as in dramatic dialogue). The former, however, took literature to be mainly *mimesis*, which means that literature was mainly mimetic in its aim to present “the illusion of a representation of the real world”. In other words, literature can be described as an illusory reflection of real life, where words replace actions (see Wales, 1989, p. 300).

One or two further definitions of literature were based on conventionality, that is, a work is “recognized as a work of literature by generation after generation”, as Cohen claims. This definition is based neither on linguistic, semantic nor literary criteria, but on the criterion of traditions and conventions of recognizing what is literature and what is not. In fact, this is not a reliable criterion for it involves taste and changeability. Generations have a change of perspective and a difference in taste. Therefore, some generations might approve some works as literature, but other generations might not (see Schogt, 1988, pp. 82-83).

Other more recent, articulate and revolutionary definitions of literature include Fowler's who views it “as discourse, and thus, as communication rather than as object”, that is, to treat it as mediating relationships between language-users of speech, consciousness, ideology, social role and class. The literary text ceases to be an object and becomes “an action or process” (1981, p. 80). These days, many contemporary writers talk about literary *discourse*, rather than literary *text*, or literature, to imply a sense of interaction and communication inculcated in literature .

The key question now, as also Schogt declares, is “what features make a text literary?” (1988, p. 82). That is a question about what makes literature into literature, what Nash and Carter call “Literariness” (1983). In a paper entitled “Language and Literariness”, they carry out a practical survey, aiming at providing a clear vision and definition for the concept of literariness in language. It is done in the form of a comparison between literary and non-literary texts connected by the theme of the motor car. They extend their argument in a later work (1990, ch. 2) and apply the same line of argument to four texts, literary and non-literary, on the topic of Malaysia. They deny to language any imminent literary status as there is no “... single property intrinsic to language which can be called literary”. Yet, they do not dismiss the recurrence of properties of literariness in literary texts such as the plotting and elaboration of vocabulary; the imposition of a new thesaurus entry by blending or realigning registers; making moral judgments and discriminations; the possibility of reading at more than one level; polysemy; subtlety of procedure such as irony, and others. Throughout, they have come out with this style-based definition of literariness:

“Literariness in language... comes from the simultaneous operation and interrelation of effects at different levels of language system”. It is not “... a function of particular items or processes in lexicon and syntax. It is a property of texts and contexts”.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the previous account of Carter and Nash’s argument in both of their works (see *ibid.*):

- (1) There are elements of literariness in literary texts that can be identified.
- (2) The recognition of these elements is not a straightforward process, but it is implicit in the stylistic patterning of language, the effects produced and their interaction in texts.
- (3) The language of literary texts is multi-layered and, thus, the identification of literary properties should be sought for at its different levels, and not at one or two levels only.
- (4) Literariness is not an intrinsic property of a lexical item, a stylistic device, a special linguistic feature, but the product of the overlap of the different levels of the language of texts and the effects of that overlap.
- (5) Finally, the so-called properties of literariness are not present in literary texts only; other types of text can display few of them, however very occasionally, and not with such a degree of intensity and richness as in literary texts, and for different purposes. These properties are the point of departure between the literary and the non-literary, and the criteria in terms of which literary texts can be defined properly.

In continuation of the development of the list, I suggest further criteria which are also essential to the identification and definition of the notion of literariness in literature in particular: (a) *The possibility of reading literature at more than one level*: the multilayeredness of literature: this means a literary text does not deliver a denotative message, but a connotative message that lies beyond it.

This is similar to the criterion of polysemy above, and emphasizes yet more strongly the possibility of multiple and multilayered reading and interpretation of literature any time anywhere in terms of variable and different criteria of social, political, cultural and ideological conventions and backgrounds. Or else, the text cannot be described as really literary. (See also Carter & Nash, 1990 for further discussion).

(b) *Symbolism*: a genuine literary work of art is symbolic, representing a real word behind it imaginative world. It is supposed to stand for another thing in human life, what Weinreich terms “enhanced semanticity”, or “hypersemanticization”, i.e. independent symbolic values of a literary text [9,66-67].

(c) *The involvement of human feelings, sentiments and emotions*: any literary text inevitably involves human feelings and emotive reactions, which is essential to the readers' actions, reactions and interpretations. It is called by Anani (1997) and Landers (2001) "*tone*" (see below). This can be decisive especially for a literary translator who is supposed to get engaged with the feelings and sentiments instigated by the SL Text to be able to enliven its world more emotionally than mentally. This will be an essential factor in his construction of literary translation in the Target Language, or he/she may run the risk of failure to do that.

It is hoped now that Schogt's question of what makes literature into literature is now answered, and not as he said twenty four years ago that the question "remains unanswered" (1988, p. 84). In sum, the foregoing argument about literature, literary language and literariness has led to these criteria, with the ultimate objective of putting them to use in practice at translating literature. These criteria are in other words what the literary translator would take as his/her prime target at constructing meaning in the TL. (More on this and other details relative to the literary translator and literary translation is due now). [7,187]

Like any professional, the literary translator has to command certain capabilities and qualifications. I must insist that inasmuch as we do not have an ideal, or perfect translation, literary or other, there is *no ideal or perfect translator*, literary or other. Therefore, we have to come down to earth, be realistic and lower our expectations regarding the translator's potentials. Some of these potentials are shared by all types of translators; others are unique to literary translators only. The following list suggests a number of qualifications to be commanded by all types of translators in general including the literary translator, followed by another list especially for the latter's faculties and proficiencies. [4,175]

(1) Due respect for the profession with a view to faithfulness and moral commitment to translating texts from one language into another. No deliberate additions, alterations, deletions or obliterations are exercised on the original unless justified on solid social, religious, cultural, moral, ideological or other grounds.

(2) Accuracy of rendering in the sense that everything in a text should be included or taken into account in translation, but not necessarily translated verbatim.

(3) Mastery of the two languages concerned in the translation, the SL and the TL, regarding the basics of their grammars (word order, major sentence and clause types, parsing, tenses, etc.), vocabularies (word combinations/collocations, technical terms of different fields and types, main figures of rhetoric, etc.), sound features (alliteration, assonance, consonance, rhyme, rhythm, and preferably a general idea about scansion, meter and foot).

(4) Competence in *tone*. Landers defines tone as "the overall feeling conveyed by an utterance, a passage, or an entire work, including both conscious and unconscious resonance" (2001, p. 69). That is why he regards it as one of the essential capabilities of the translator (ibid.: 8). Further, Anani assigns a whole

chapter for "tone" in literary translation, defining it in terms of an attitude of irony, humor, seriousness, overstatement, understatement, etc. of the SLT author, which are prone to change from one age to another, and one language to another.

(5) Good knowledge of the different types of style of both languages: grammatical, lexical and phonological features of style, in addition to the stylistic scales of formality (i.e. frozen formal, classical, formal/standard, informal, colloquial, slang, etc.). They can be sometimes essential to meaning in the various types of text.

(6) Good command of the differences between the conventions of the two languages involved, regarding the use, or non-use of formal/standard, old or modern, or colloquial, or mixed in both languages, or either language. In the case of English and Arabic, for example, while the conventions of English allow for a large use and borrowing from colloquial dialects,

written Arabic conventions do not, and are still resistant to colloquialisms of all types. Written Arabic is standard only, but it is usually Modern Arabic described as MSA (Modern Standard Arabic), and occasionally old Arabic, or CA (Classical Arabic). Old English, on the other hand, has disappeared from today's formal/standard written dialect. It might be the case that, as Landers suggests, "the half-life of a translation... is from 30-40 years; every 30 years (or 40 or 50...) the translation loses half its vitality, its freshness, to communicate to the reader in a contemporary voice" (2001, p. 10).

(7) Good knowledge of the SL culture, not necessarily to the same extent of the translator's knowledge of his/her native culture, for, unlike bilingualism, biculturalism is far-fetched.

(8) Good awareness of the world around us, and the knowledge shared by all humans about the latest changes and developments with respect to science and technology, cultures, social, political, religious, moral and ideological values and attitudes.

References

1. Boase-Beier, J. (2006). *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*. Manchester, UK & Kinderhook, USA: St. Jerome Publishing.
2. Brumfit, C., & Carter, A. (Eds.). (1986). *Literature and Language Teaching*. OUP.
3. Carter, R. A. (1979). *Towards a Theory of Discourse Stylistics: A Study of Some Applications of Linguistic Theory to the Analysis of poetry with Particular Reference to W. H. Auden* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). University of Birmingham.
4. Carter, R., & Simpson, P. (Eds.). (1989). *Language, Discourse and Literature: An Introductory Reader in Discourse Stylistics*. London: Unwin Hyman.
5. Carter, A., & Nash, W. (1983). Language and literariness. *Prose Studies*, 62, 123-141.
6. Fowler, R. (1998/1996). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Ghazala, H. (1987). *Literary Stylistics: Pedagogical Perspectives in an EFL Context*. Thesis: University of Nottingham, UK.
8. Ghazala, H. (2008/2012). *Translation as Problems and Solutions: A Textbook for University Students and Trainee Translators*. Beirut: Dar El-Ilm Lil-Malayin.
9. Schogt, G. (1988). *Linguistics, Literary Analysis, and Literary Translation*. Toronto & London: University of Toronto Press.
10. Schulte, R., & Biguenet, J. (1992). *Theories of Translation: an Anthology of Essays From Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
11. Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. London & New York: Routledge.

BƏDİİ TƏRCÜMƏDƏ STİLİSTİK PERSPEKTİV

Məhərrəmovə Suqurə

Xülasə

Bu məqalə bədii tərcümə tələbələri və oxucularının daha konkret argumentlərə və təbiiqlərə başlamazdan əvvəl xəbərdar olmaları üçün zəruri olan ilkin təriflər və təfərrüatları təqdim etmişdir. Ədəbiyyatın müxtəlif tərifləri verilir. Sonra üslub baxımından ədəbi dillə qeyri-ədəbi dil arasında qütbləşmə aşkar edilsə də, qaçılmaz və ədəbi tərcüməçilər üçün faydalı hesab edilmişdir. Ədəbiyyatı ədəbiyyata çevirən xüsusiyyətlərə, yəni ədəbiyyatda ədəbiyyatın xüsusiyyətlərinə görə ədəbi tərcümə edirlər: semantik sıxlıq, leksik və sintaktik işlənmə, orta asılılıq, təkrar qeydiyyat, çoxmənalılıq, birdən çox ədəbiyyat oxumaq imkanı.

səviyyəsi, iştirakı insan hissləri və s.. Bu xüsusiyyətlərin əsas əhəmiyyətinin ədəbi tərcüməçilər üçün ölçüyəgəlməz olduğu iddia edilmişdir.

Qaldırılan son nöqtə bu sahədə tərcümənin əsas üsullarını həll etdi. Yekun nöqtə və nəhayət, bu məqalənin qarşıya qoyduğu son məqsəd ədəbiyyatın tərcüməsi üçün ədəbi üsluba əsaslanan tərcümə metodunun təklifi olmuşdur: “yaradıcı bədii üslubi tərcümə üsulu”. İddia edilmişdir ki, bu üsul tərcümənin tələbkar tələbinə cavab verə bilər yaradıcılığı və onun mənbəyini, üslubunu ayıraraq ədəbiyyatın ədəbi əsasını təmsil etmək. Ümid etmək olar ki, bu metod daha yaradıcı, həqiqətə əsaslanan, vicdanlı və təsirli tərcümə üçün yeni trampolin olacaq və indi ədəbiyyatın yaxşı bədii tərcüməsi üçün zəruri tələblərə cavab verə bilər

СТИЛИСТИЧЕСКИЙ АСПЕКТ В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОМ ПЕРЕВОДЕ

Магerrамова Сугура

Резюме

В этой статье представлены первоначальные определения и детали, которые необходимо знать изучающим и читателям художественного перевода, прежде чем приступать к более конкретным аргументам и применениям. Приводятся различные определения литературы. Тогда поляризация между литературным языком и нелитературным языком с точки зрения стиля была признана, но оказалась неизбежной и полезной для литературных переводчиков. Они переводят литературно с точки зрения особенностей, которые делают литературу литературой, то есть таких особенностей литературности в литературе, как: смысловая плотность, лексическая и синтаксическая разработанность, зависимость от среды, перерегистрация, многозначность, возможность чтения литературы более чем на одном уровне, участие человеческие чувства и т. д. Утверждалось, что решающее значение этих особенностей неизмеримо для литературных переводчиков.

Предпоследний поднятый вопрос касается основных методов перевода в этой области. Завершающим моментом и, в конечном счете, конечной целью, преследуемой данной статьей, было предложение литературно-стилевого метода перевода литературы: «творческого литературно-стилистического метода перевода». Утверждалось, что этот метод может удовлетворить строгие требования перевода.

литературу, выделяя творчество и его источник, стиль, чтобы представить ядро литературности литературы. Есть надежда, что этот метод станет новым трамплином для более творческого, правдивого, скрупулезного и впечатляющего перевода, который может удовлетворить необходимые требования для хорошего художественного перевода литературы в настоящее время.

Рəyçi: dos. Zahirə Əliyeva

Daxil olduğu tarix: 01.10.2024