



LITERARY TRANSLATION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE IN COMPARATIVE LITERATURE: ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS OF “GULSHANI RAZ”

Mannonova Feruzabonu Sherali kizi
Senior Teacher, Department of Integrated
Course of English Language № 3, English 3rd Faculty
feruzamannonova@gmail.com

Khallieva Gulnoz Iskandarovna
Professor, Doctor of Science in Philology, Head of Department of
World Literature, Uzbekistan State World Languages University
gulnoz7410@mail.ru

Leysan Shahin
Professor, Institution of Turkic Studies, University of Marmara
leysensahin@gmail.com

Abstract

The current article discusses the significance of literal translation in the sphere of comparative literature. Due to translation is included as one of the objects of the Comparative Literature, comparativists should study translations theory initially. The novelty of the article is to show distinguishing features and ways of comprehension literal texts in Sufi contexts written by Omar Khayyam and Makhmud Shabistari. Moreover, the research is based on analytical investigation of Gulshani Raz and its English translations by Robert Darr and commentaries by Lahiji.

Keywords: translation, translation models, literary understanding, rubaiyats, Gulshani Raz.

Introduction

Translation theory distinguishes between general and separate translation theory. General translation theory studies the laws that are common to a language and encompasses all types of translation. Separate translation theory studies only the linguistic aspects of translation from one language to another. Translation is a communicative process and, in this respect, has two features: 1. Intra-linguistic aspects - the style of the text, the linguistic features associated with the text; 2. Non-linguistic aspects - the degree of reflection of linguacultural features and cultural traditions in the original and in translation. It is known that ignorance of aspects other





than language (lack of a good understanding of other people's civilization) undermines translation. The essence of this theory is related to the translation between linguistically appropriate and incompatible.

Literature Review

There are the following models in translation theory: the transformational model; semantic-semiotic model; situational model; communicative model. The degree to which a language retains its state when a transformational model of translation is translated into another language. The semantic (semantic) - semiotic (character system) model of translation is the degree of preservation of the semantics of the original work [5].

A situational model of translation is one in which the translation takes into account certain circumstances (e.g., national-cultural). The communicative model of translation is a matter of taking into account the culture of that people in translation and adapting it to another language. There are 4 linguistic aspects of translation: 1. Lexical-semantic aspect; 2. Phraseological aspect; 3. Grammatical aspect; 4. Stylistic aspect. The lexical-semantic aspect is that in this translation we understand that the original spiritual content, the linguistic structure of the original is preserved as much as possible. Phraseological aspect is the problem of finding the equivalent of phraseological units in translation. An important problem in this area is the ability to translate cultural-national color in translation. The grammatical aspect is related to the grammatical laws of the original and the translation, sentence construction, conformity and inconsistency [3]. The stylistic aspect in translation is related to emotional dyeing, to what extent the writer's style is preserved and conveyed. For example, in the translation of Omar Khayyam's rubai, Shoislom Shomammedov kept the stylistic aspect to the maximum [4].

Translation is the object not only of linguistics, but also of literature, including comparative literature. Because the work itself and the translation serve as the basis for comparison. A researcher studying translation from the point of view of comparative literature must, of course, become acquainted with the theoretical literature on the subject, and understand exactly what he is comparing in the original work and in the translation. Literary scholar M. Topper's scientific work "Translation in the system of comparative literature" reveals very well the features of translation as an object of comparative studies. We know that translation essentially consists of processes such as communication (interaction) and reception (acceptance of translation). The same processes are peculiar to comparative literature, and in the process of comparing literary works of two different nationalities, of course, these





processes are analyzed. For example, Uzbek and foreign readers do not accept the novels of the same name “Qasos” by Nosir Zoxid and the American writer Victoria Schwab, it is a process of reception. Starting to compare both novels is a communication between two nations, two cultures, two writers. Hence, the very existence of the concepts of communication and reception alone provides a complete basis for the study of translation as an object of comparative literature. According to M. Topper, the methodology of comparative literature allows to compare different national literary samples in world literature, which increases the focus on translation studies [5].

In literary translation, the translator may, intentionally or unintentionally, combine his own individual personalities into the newly created piece of art, including the translator’s life experience, cultural background, aesthetic taste, and outlook on life, world and values [7].

According to Wang Lun Despite the long history of literary translation, it is not until 1970s that literary translation made its breakthrough in development. The remarkable contribution goes to the book *After Babel—Aspects of Language and Translation* written by the British Writer George Steiner. In this book, Steiner writes that we are doing the work of translation no matter what we have read or heard. Readers, actors, editors are all the translators of the written or spoken words; therefore Steiner put forward the notion that “understanding is also translation”. Although the theories about literary translation are not sound, its significance in comparative literature can never be overlooked [2].

For a rather long time, people have developed a bias towards literary translation, which is that translation is just to change the source language to the target language; therefore, translation is seen as a very easy job. If a person knows a little foreign language and is capable of using a foreign-language dictionary, he is surely to do literary translation [8].

Methodology

In comparative literature, the knowledge of language is important, but it has no direct bearing on literary understanding. In many cases the study of translation becomes a comparative critical exercise of great value, even for readers who lack the original. Intelligent students of literature can benefit from a systematic comparison of six significant translations in Hindi of the Rubaiyats of Omar Khayyam. All these are retranslations of the English translation by Fitzgerald. One of Persian Rubaiyats translated by Fitzgerald is:





Dreaming when Dawn's left hand was in the sky

I heard a voice within the tavern cry

Awake my little ones, and fill the cup

Before life's liquor in its cup be dry.

Now 'my little ones' is the translation of Khayyam's 'A Rind Kharavati' which means 'Drunkards of the tavern' 'Drunkards of the tavern' is wrongly translated as 'My little ones' and this has raised different connotative meaning in the mind of various translators according to different cultural setups in which they live. Harivanshrai Bachchan translates it as 'Mere Sishuo nadan', Keshab Pd. Pathak as 'Mera Sishudal' and Maithisharan Gupta as 'O mere Bachhe' Sumitranandan Pant has a pedagogic attitude to this term and translates it as 'Madira ke Chhatra'. Bachchan does not stop at the filling of the cup and insists other to drink it even- 'Bujha lo pi-pi mandira bhukh'. Maithilisharan Gupta, being a Vaishnavite, slowly utters 'Patra Bharo na Vilamba Karo', as if afraid of drinking [1].

There is one more line in the Third Inquiry that makes use of letter play and whose translation will add to our understanding of Shabistari's teaching on identity. Literally, the line reads: Individuation is an imaginary dot on the 'ain. When your 'ain is purified, ghain becomes 'ain. This line uses the word 'ain three times. The word has several meanings but the two that concern us are 'individuality' and the seeing 'eye,' precisely the same resonance we find audibly in the words 'I' and 'eye.'

Lahiji writes, "Know that just as the difference between the letter 'ain and ghain is because of a dot, the difference between the 'contingent' and the 'Necessary' is because of individuation. Separate individuality is a mental construct which has no real existence. When the mystic's eye has become illuminated by the light of unveiling and witnessing, and the imaginary veil of contingent individual entities has cleared away from his vision, ghain which represents multiplicity and fictitious individuations, becomes 'ain, and the two letters become one. Duality no longer remains and the curtain of illusion lifts to reveal that there is only one Reality which manifested in the forms of the countless fictitious individualities, a Reality that had clothed itself in the vestments of 'I' and 'you'.' My translation reads, This separate I is like a speck in your eye; When your eye is cleared, forms reveal the Essence. Shabistari and Lahiji have already stressed that the illusory individuality which we know as our personal existence is, in fact, the very barrier that blinds us from the perception of True Reality. The Qur'an describes this as the heart's eye which blinded to what it real because of attachment to external forms. The eye of the heart refers to the spiritual organ of cognition which is said to be located within the physical heart [6].





The body is the soul itself but only at the station of the body. We must deny the fact that it has an independent persona that is connected to the spirit. This example has been explained in the commentary of *The Rose Garden of Mystery* in the following way: “The mystic is the one who sees within the external world, The Truth, in everything that it openly witnesses, The Truth is the Spirit and the entire world is like the body, It is manifest like the Sun in this Universe.” [3]

Coming to the symbols of the wave and the sea, The wave is the sea itself that has manifested itself in this form. The multiplicity and disparity in the forms of the waves and the foam [of the sea] do not cause the sea to multiply [6].

This example has also been presented in the form of the sun and its rays. In his commentary upon *The Rose Garden of Mystery*, Lahiji says the following regarding these two examples: “If you should happen to obtain two eyes that can see the Truth, You will see the Friend filling both of the worlds, We are drowned in the sea even though we are drops [from it], We are all the sun even though we are motes.” [3]

Conclusion. In short, “in order to create a translated text that accurately and completely reflects the spirit of the original, the translator must be both a talented master of artistic expression and a talented translator-scientist”.

References:

1. Al-Shirazi, Sadr ad-Din Muhammad, *al-Asfar al-Arba'ah* (Beirut: Dar al-Ihyah atTurath al-Arabi, 1981)
2. Bassnett, Susan. 1993. *Comparative Literature: A Critical introduction*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers.
3. Lahiji, Sheikh Muhammad, *Miftah al-Ijaz fi Sharh Gulshan-e Raz* (Tehran: Intisharat Sadi, 1374 AH Solar/1955 CE).
4. Henry Gifford. 1969. *Comparative literature*, London, Routledge and K. Paul.
5. Khallieva G., Khalikov B. *Comparative literature critical studies*. Tashkent. 2021
6. Robert Abdul Hayy Darr. *Found in Translation*. 2006.
7. WANG Ping. *Aesthetics of Literary Translation*[M]. Beijing: National Defense Industry Press,2009.
8. XIE Tian-zhen. *Comparative Literature and Translation Studies*[M]. Fudan University Press,2011.

