WEB OF SCIENTIST: INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH JOURNAL
ISSN: 2776-0979, Volume 3, Issue 1, Jan., 2022

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRAGMATIC ASPECT IN TRANSLATION

Xo'shbaqova Nasiba Nurqobil qizi
Master's Student at Termez State University

Abstract
This article deals with pragmatic aspect of translating from source language into target language when translators came across during translating. We also indicate what pragmatic is itself, then pragmatic aspect of translation and its importance are pointed out. Another peculiarity of this article is that it represents real examples of problems related to pragmatic aspect of translation. And, some relevant solutions are recommended for translators how to overcome the misunderstandings in interpreting so that their target readers can draw the appropriate inferences from the utterance of the communicator.

Keywords: pragmatics, pragmatic aspect, communicative intention, communicative effect, functional force, locution, illocution, perlocution, exegesis.

Introduction

Since the existence of translation as a linguistic phenomenon, there have been endless problems in translating from original language into another one. One of the problem in translating is related to pragmatics as the term pragmatic meaning of a word is not yet fully investigated. But some linguists point out that the pragmatic component of the word meaning, which is realized in various kinds of emotive and stylistic connotations, is individually-occasional or collectively used meanings (Komissarov,2002).

Translation, as a communicative act, involves interpretation made by the translator, which takes the context of the target text reader and his knowledge into consideration. The translator's interpretation is made in such a way which is deemed relevant to the target reader in the sense that the target reader can understand something from the utterance translated by the translator in accordance with relevance theory (Gutt, 2000, p. 116)

Methodology

First of all, we should understand what pragmatic is itself, indeed, before analyzing the importance of pragmatic aspect in translating literary texts.

Pragmatic is the relations of the sign and its users: Each utterance in a speech act is aimed at somebody. Combined together, words make up a syntactic scheme of the sentence. They refer to specific events, persons or objects, acquiring, thus, a sense. There are two types of language sign users: an addresser (author) and an addressee (receptor). When speaking, an addresser has a communicative intention, or purpose of the speech act. An utterance has a communicative effect on the receptor: it can inform a receptor of something, or cause some feelings, etc. A communicative effect is virtual. For example, an advertising text may persuade a receptor to buy something but the receptor may remain indifferent to the promotion. The potential effect of the utterance is its functional force. The communicative effect may override both literal sense and functional force and add further consequences depending on the situation. For example, Shut the door is imperative in a sense. Its communicative intention may be to carry the force of a request, but the communicative effect could be to annoy the receiver (H a t i m B, 1998).

Pragmatics of translation is a wide notion which covers not only pragmatic meaning of a word, but some problems connected with various levels of understanding by speech acts communicants of certain meanings or messages, depending on linguistic or paralinguistic factors (Wiezhbitska F, 1988), that is, background knowledge. A well-known linguist Komissarov points out that pragmatic aspect of translation should be considered from three points. One of them is conveying pragmatic meaning of words (Комиссаров В.Н, 1990).

In terms of linguistic pragmatics, developed by J. Austen, the three types of relations are locution (reference and the utterance sense), illocution (communicative intention and functional force), and perlocution (communicative effect) (A u s t i n J, 1962, 1986, 1985).

A translation should be primarily pragmatic because pragmatics and translation share common features. They are semiotic in nature, aiming at increasing understanding and facilitating communication. Semiotics is “the science that studies sign systems or structures, sign processes and sign functions” (Bassnett, 1991: 13). While pragmatics has been recognized by Morris (Morris, C.H,1938) as a division of semiotics (the relation of sign to user), translation is a kind of semiotic interpretation. Both pragmatics and translation are communicative, i.e. using sentences appropriately to achieve communication (G.H. Widdowson, 1979). In Gutt’s terms, translation is placed within the sphere of communication (Gutt,1991). Moreover, both pragmatics and translation utilize a functional view of language. Functionalism is a mode of explanation by reference to external factors. In pragmatics, “some linguistic feature is motivated by principles outside the scope of linguistic theory” (Levinson, 1983). In translation, a functional view should be adopted to compensate for the lack of a similar cultural convention in the TL (Bassnett, 1991, p. 22). Bell describes pragmatics

WEB OF SCIENTIST: INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH JOURNAL
ISSN: 2776-0979, Volume 3, Issue 1, Jan., 2022

in terms of situationality, intentionality and acceptability (Bell, 1991, p.209). Thus, the pragmatic approach (PA) can be said to apply these three important features into the appropriate use in a particular situation, intentionality to the intention of the producer, and acceptability to the effect of the TL text on the TL receptor.

It is worth pointing out that not all problems encountered during the translation process are translation-related. In fact, when the text is rendered from its source context to a different context, it is unequivocally affected by this change, which would also affect its meaning, even if there is no language change involved in this process (Gutt, 1998, p. 50). For instance, understanding classical Arabic poetry by an Arab person of twenty years old, may cause a problem due to difference in time period and context.

Significant mismatches with regard to contextual detail may lead to incorrect meaning alongside affecting the original text. The reason behind this dilemma resides in the principle of relevance which demands consistency with optimal relevance; such consistency is primarily founded on context (Gutt, 1998, p. 51). When the translator confronts problems emanating from secondary communication situations, he/she can find ways of surmounting them. These may lie in strategies of providing the target reader with additional contextual detail (Gutt, 1998, p. 52). Recent research has advocated the notion that translators who work between languages often have propensity for clarification, simplification and making implicit ideas in the source text explicit in the target text (Laviosa, 2002, p. 18; Blum-Kulka, 1986, p. 21; Baker, 2011, p. 223). This is arguably due to the notion that translators are usually viewed as partially accountable for the information offer of the receptor text, and any exotic details are indeed ascribed to them rather than to the original writers (Venuti, 1995).

Result and Discussion

In order to provide the certain aspects of relevance theory provided by scientists and its connection to translation, we give some examples for further clarification and discussion.

Example 1: English version (source language):

a) John: ‘Is Mike going to spend a long time there?’

b) Peter: ‘He is being interviewed by Frans at the moment’.

Uzbek translation (target language):

a) John: Mike u yerda ko’p vaqt qoladimi?

b) Peter: Undan hozir fransuzlar intervyu olishyapti.

It is clear that Peter has not given John a direct answer as to whether or not Mike will spend a long time there. He has replied, assuming that John knows of the nature of

Frans in interviewing people, that Mike is being currently interviewed by Frans. If John is aware of how Frans interviews people and that he is quick in his interview, he will be able to draw the right inference from the sentence uttered by Peter. On the contrary, if John is not familiar with how Frans interviews people and whether or not he spends a long time with them, John will encounter two contradicting possibilities. The first rests on the notion that Frans is quick in interviewing people and therefore, Peter's answer implies that Mike will not spend a long time there and will come back shortly. Conversely, the second lies in the concept that Frans takes a considerably long time in interviewing people, hence, Peter's reply implies that Mike will spend a long time there and will never show up soon.

It is evident that Peter's answer to John's query flouts the maxim of relevance propounded by Grice (Grice, 1975). Based on relevance theory, the communication will only take place if Peter assumes that John will assume the same with regard to Frans. In other words, Peter's utterance will be optimally relevant if John's assumption about Frans's nature in interviewing people is true. By contrast, if John's assumption about Frans's nature in interviewing people is different from the one held by Peter, the latter would be deemed to have miscommunicated in accordance with relevance theory. In this situation, the contextual details available to John, which form an important part of his assumption about the world, an assumption which represents the premise on which his interpretation of Peter's utterance is primarily grounded, would seem incomplete (Rafat Y. Alwazna, 2017, p.39-51).

If this exchange is to be translated into Uzbek language: there will be two significant steps to be taken. The first concerns, if the translator has no knowledge about how Frans deals with his interviewees, he/she will face the two opposing situations indicated above, thus interpreting or misinterpreting Peter's answer correctly. The translator's interpretation of Peter's utterance will wholly be contingent upon the assumption he/she will make with regard to Frans's way in interviewing people. If the translator is well-versed in the way in which Frans deals with his interviewees, he/she will be in a good position to correctly interpret Peter's utterance, thus drawing the appropriate inferences (Rafat Y. Alwazna, 2017, p.39-51).

Even if the translator is capable of drawing the right inferences from Peter's utterance for he/she has the relevant contextual information about interpretation of Peter's utterance primarily hinges, he/she still cannot expect the target reader to have possessed the same relevant contextual detail as that obtained by the recipient of the source text. This is because, as other scientists (Hatim and Mason, 1990) point out, what is inferable for the source text reader may not be inferable for the target text reader due to cognitive and cultural differences. Therefore, as Hatim and Mason

(1990) contend, the translator needs to strike a balance between new, evoked and inferable entities such that the fusion of them scaffolds the hearer/reader to draw the right inferences intended by the speaker/writer (Rafat Y. Alwazna, 2017, p.39-51).
Hatim and Mason (1990) suggest two principles that the translator needs to follow to succeed in maintaining the balance concerned. The first is effectiveness, which rests upon the transfer of any relevant detail that can enable the target reader to draw the appropriate inferences, thus achieving the communication goals. The second is efficiency, which resides in performing the task in question with no unnecessary effort exerted. Based on the foregoing, certain exegesis is required to enable the target reader to draw the same inferences as that drawn by both the source text hearer/reader and the translator (Rafat Y. Alwazna, 2017, p.39-51) . The exegesis may read as 'Frans is quick in interviewing people') (Fransuzlar odamlardan intervyu olishda chaqqon) or 'Frans takes a considerably long time in holding interviews'), (Fransuzlar intervyu olishga juda ko'p vaqt sarflashadi) depending on the relevant contextual detail truly assumed by the translator.
Example 2: English version:
a) John: 'As today is Friday, what kind of drinks are you going to have tonight?'
b) Peter: 'I will see Frans tonight'.
Uzbek translation:
a) John: Bugun juma, kechki payt ichishga nima xohlaysan?
b) Peter: Men kechki payt Fransuzlar bilan ko'rishaman.
Again, Peter's answer to John's question is not direct; he has not specified to John the kind of drinks he may have tonight. However, Peter states that he will meet Frans tonight, thus flouting the maxims of relevance and leaving John with diverse possible situations if he does not possess the contextual detail relevant to Peter's utterance .
As indicated above, if John is aware that Frans does not drink, for instance, and that Peter will certainly do the same as a way of respecting Frans, John will therefore draw the appropriate inferences from Peter's utterance that he won't drink tonight. Conversely, if John lacks the relevant contextual information that constitutes a substantial part of his assumption that typifies the premise on which his interpretation of Peter's utterance is built, he will confront different possible situations. The first lies in the notion that Frans does not drink and that Peter will do the same as a way of respecting his guest. The second is that Frans enjoys drinking a particular type of drink, which is also likable by Peter and therefore, he will opt for this particular type of drink tonight (Rafat Y. Alwazna, 2017, p.39-51).
It is worth pointing out that whatever applies to John does also apply to the translator who is accountable for rendering the above exchange into Uzbek. Whether or not the

translator possesses the relevant contextual detail required for drawing the appropriate inferences from the utterance of the communicator, he/she still requires to explicate whatever he/she has inferred from the utterance in question to the target reader who can never be expected to draw the appropriate inferences. This is due to the fact that the translator is not cognizant of whether or not the target reader is conversant with the contextual detail required for a number of comprehending the utterance concerned. Hence, certain exegesis needs to be added in accordance with what the translator considers to be sufficient for the target reader to fully understand the utterance in question, utilizing the principles of both effectiveness and efficiency simultaneously. Another problem that may form a real obstacle to the target reader, particularly if he/she is not familiar with the Western culture is the word 'drink' stated in John's utterance. In Islamic culture, 'drink' may refer to any liquid which is legally permitted in Islam to be swallowed by Muslims. Consequently, all alcoholic drinks are clearly exempted from the circle of permitted drinks in Islam. (Rafat Y. Alwazna, 2017, p.39-51)

Conclusion

It goes without saying that translating literary works is one of the functions of communicating cultures and notions with each others as literary works present the particular notion's culture. However, translating source language into target language is difficult also in terms of pragmatic, because the translator, as a text receiver, needs to be equipped with the appropriate contextual details that form a pivotal part of his assumption that typifies the premise upon which his interpretation of a particular utterance is essentially founded. On the other hand, the translator, as a text producer, should create a target text that is deemed relevant to the target reader, taking into account the context and knowledge of the target reader. The translator is required to produce a text act, thus fully comprehending the illocutionary forces and perlocutionary effects of the source text and trying to reproduce them in the target text. This what may indeed create differences among translators as the interpretation of a text's illocutionary forces and perlocutionary effects may largely differ from one translator to another.

As Hatim and Mason (1990) suggest two principles such as effectiveness and efficiency, that the translator needs to follow to succeed in maintaining the balance. Based on the foregoing, certain exegesis is required to enable the target reader to draw the same inferences as that drawn by both the source text hearer/reader and the translator.

Reference

1. A u s t i n J. How to do Things with Words. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962; Новое в зарубежной лингвистике: Теория речевых актов. – Вып. 17. – М.:, 1986; Новое взарубежной лингвистике: Лингвистическая прагматика. – Вып. 16. – М., 1985.
2. Bassnett 1991: 13, Translation studies, London ; New York : Routledge, 1991.
3. Baker, M. (2011). In other words: A coursebook on translation. 2nd ed. Oxon: Routledge. Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. U. (1981). Einfuhrung in die textlinguistik [An introduction to text linguistics]. Tubingen: Max Niemeyer.
4. Blum-Kulka, S. (1986). Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In J. House & S. BlumKulka (eds.), Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies (pp. 17-35). Tubingen: Gunter Narr.
5. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In L. Cole & J. L. Morgan (eds.), Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3: Speech acts (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
6. Gutt, E. (1991). Translation and relevance: Cognition and context. Oxford: Blackwell
7. Gutt, E. (1998). Pragmatic aspects of translation: Some relevance-theory observations. In L. Hickey (ed.), The pragmatics of translation (pp. 41-53). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
8. Gutt, E. (2000). Translation and relevance. 2nd ed. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
9. Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1990). Discourse and the translator. London: Longman.
10. H a t i m B. Pragmatics and Translation. // Routeledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London and New York: Routeledge, 1998).
11. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). – М.: Высшая школа, 1990. – 253 с.].
12. Komissarov, VN 2002 “Sovremennoye perevodovedeniye”, Uchebnoye posobiye, Moskva, 424 str.)
13. Laviosa, S. (2002). Corpus-Based translation studies: Theory, findings, applications.Amsterdam: Rodopi.
14. Levinson 1983: 40. Pragmatics-Cambridge University Press, 9 июн. 1983 г. - Всего страниц: 434..).

WEB OF SCIENTIST: INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH JOURNAL
ISSN: 2776-0979, Volume 3, Issue 1, Jan., 2022

15. Morris, C. H. (1938). Foundation of the theory of signs. In International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, Vol. 2, No. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.1938
16. Venuti, L. (1995). The translator's invisibility: A history of translation. London: Routledge.
17. Wiezhbitska F. Semantic Metalanguage for a Cross-Cultural Comparison of Speech Acts and Speech Genres. – N.Y., 1988.]
18. Widdowson G.H. 1979Explorations in Applied Linguistics, Oxford University Press, 1979 - Всего страниц: 273