# LITERARY TRANSLATION AS A BASIS FOR DIALOGUE BETWEEN CULTURES

Bakyt Orazova[1], Liailia Mingazova[2], Zhansaya Zharylgapov[3]

### Abstract

*The new possibilities of global communication and the latest information technology bring the history of literary translation as a scientific discipline within the science of translation to a new level since it infinitely expands the possibilities of searching and comparing historically significant information necessary to build a coherent concept of the evolution of translation activity in the history of human civilization.*

*The problem of translation of fiction is one of the most important in both linguistics and literary criticism. Disputes about the methods, techniques and principles of translation, about the requirements for translations and the degree of their correspondence to a target text, about the originality of a translated text, as well as the problem of interlingual communication in general do not lose relevance in modern science.*

*It has been by time that for a correct and profound interpretation of a literary text, a translator must know well the information about the era described in the work and the time in which the author lived; philosophical and socio-historical prerequisites for the creation of the work to involve "out-of-text structures" [Lotman: 1970, p. 65].*

*In the paper the authors explore the peculiarities of translation of literary texts, consider different points of view on this issue and draw appropriate conclusions. Also, to reveal the specifics of fiction translation, in addition to the theory of proposition, the article deals with the theory of primary and secondary genres by M. M. Bakhtin [Bakhtin: 1986].*

*The authors hold the opinion that there are no good or bad translations of literary texts in general, no perfect, no canonical ones. No translation fully renders the text of the source material: each translator selects only the essentials in the original and subordinates the secondary and the tertiary to them. What they consider primary or minor is a matter of individual taste.*

*Keywords: artistic literary translation, content, variation, principle, proposition, poetry, M. M. Bakhtin, G. Steiner, Minnullin.*

[1] E.A. Buketov Karaganda University, Kazakhstan, orazova_bahyt@mail.ru

[2] Professor, Doctor of Philological sciences, Kazan Federal University, Tatarstan, leila69@inbox.ru

[3] E.A. Buketov Karaganda University, Kazakhstan, zharylgapov_zhan@mail.r

## Introduction

It is well known that in the process of cultural transfer the theoretical tools of translation have a strong influence to address the urgent issue of dialogue of cultures of peoples.

However, with all the productivity, as a rule, translators rarely keep in mind the specifics of the type of translation that lies at the heart of the analysis – literary and fiction. Even today, linguistically oriented modern translation studies rarely consider this specificity despite the fact that the problem was mentioned by F. Shleiermakher. In this connection it makes sense to refer to the work by the German philosopher, theologian, and preacher. In his lecture On Different Methods of Translation (1813), Shleiermakher writes about the contrast between two types of translation. The first type assumes that the translator seeks to reproduce the original text as accurately as possible, by means of another language, without resorting to simplification, adaptation, to other forms of facilitation of the reader's task to the detriment of the author's intention. According to the second type, the translator "leaves the reader alone, and then the writer has to step in," that is, from this point of view, the translation is a reader-friendly version of the text in which the complex elements associated with a source language and the people in which the original is created remain outside the translator's view [Shleiermakher: 2000, p.127-145]. Shleiermakher insists that those are completely different ways, and that one can follow only one of them, avoiding any combination. (Noteworthy that Shleiermakher's thought was borrowed from Goete. In the essay In Memory of Brother Wieland (February 1813, it had already been expressed four months before Shleiermakher's lecture [Goete: 1938, p.33].

In identifying the peculiarity of translation activity, we operate with the concept of "dialogue of cultures" that is determined in modern research as one of the dominant factors. The fundamental in the study is M. M. Bakhtin's theory about the dialogue of cultures as a form of existence of works in the big time, in the course of which the culture and literature of each nation, ethnic group becomes one of the participants in the dialogue with other cultures, as a result of which new meanings and forms are formed [Bakhtin: 1986].

## Research Methods

The history of literary translation as a special branch of the science of translation began to form almost simultaneously with the theoretical and didactic components of the science. Names in world history that have had a significant impact on the development of the history of translation: Roman orator Cicero (106 B.C. - 43 B.C.), German humanist Martin Luther (1483 -1546), French writer, philologist, and

printer Etienne Dolet (1509 - 1546), Illyrian church writer and theologian Jerome of Stridon (345 (347) - 419 (420)), French scholar of the history, theory, and didactics of translation Michel Ballard (1942– 2015), French and American literary critic, novelist, and literary scholar Steiner George (1929-2020), etc. The books by such scholars and luminaries allow us to trace changes in attitudes toward basic theoretical tenets of translation such as the plurality of translation methods and alternativity. These and other issues related to translation were subsequently fleshed out in the works by theorists such as Edmond Cary [Cary, 1956] and Theodore Savory [Savory, 1957], Georges Steiner [Steiner, 1975], Kopanev P. I. [Kopanev, 1972], Frederick Rener [Rener 1989], Nelyubin L. L., Khukhuni G. T. [Nelyubin, Khukhuni, 2006], Hansa Fermer [Fermer, 1992], etc. Thus, modern scholars constantly turn to the history of the translation experience.

Many theorists are therefore interested in the periodization of the history of literary translation. We find Steiner's periodization more compelling because he focuses not only on the phenomena of translation, but also on the evolution of theoretical perspectives on translation [Steiner, 1975].

Steiner distinguishes four periods in the history of translation. The first period begins with Cicero's reasoning. In this period translation practice serves as material for analysis and some findings. Steiner acknowledges that in this very broad historical period (the 18th century) many bright pages belong to the history of translation, but, despite this, the entire period is characterized by a strong empiricism.

Steiner refers the second period to the stage of theory and hermeneutic investigations. Steiner attributes its beginning to the names of Alexander Fraser Tytler and Friedrich Schleiermakher. This is the era of defining the essence of translation and constructing its philosophical and poetic theory. This is also the time when the historiography of translation is taking shape.

The third period begins in the 1940s with the first articles on the theory of machine translation. During this period, attempts are made to establish a correspondence between formal logic and models of language transformations. The period is marked by intensive scientific research in the field of translation.

Steiner associates the fourth period with the early 1960s. He defines the new direction as hermeneutic. At this time, translation theory goes beyond linguistics and becomes a focus of interdisciplinary research at the junction of anthropology, psychology, sociology and related disciplines such as ethnolinguistics and sociolinguistics.

It is necessary to clarify that this periodization is open to many objections.

## Main Body

It is well known that the main purpose of any literary text is to have an aesthetic impact, to create an artistic image. This aesthetic orientation distinguishes artistic speech from other acts of speech communication in which the aim is informativeness, meaningfulness of information. Literary texts are carriers of special aesthetic and emotional information. Therefore, we can even talk about the fusion of these two types of information – emotional and aesthetic information.

Literary translation is a special kind of speech activity in which a necessary element is the presence of an intermediary. The intermediary first acts as a recipient – a translator-interpreter who understands the fiction text, i.e., seeks to uncover the meaning, the idea behind the meanings of the words, the text, and then carries out its linguistic recoding. The scheme is as follows: through linguistic units from the author's consciousness to the translator's consciousness; from the translator's consciousness through linguistic signs to the addressee's consciousness. Thus, literary translation, like other types of translation, must always be preceded by important preparatory work: semantic, stylistic and literary analysis of the source text, comprehension of its meaning, style and imagery.

The quality of literary translation depends entirely on the initial goals of a translator. There are three main objectives in translating texts of fiction.

The first goal is to introduce readers to the work of a particular writer. That is, in this case, the task of the translator is to reveal in detail the creative manner and characteristics of an author's individual style.

With this aim in mind, the translator of a literary text should create for the reader the same picture, the same "atmosphere" and the same artistic impression that the reader of the original text is given. This requires the translator to take special care to ensure that the text is perceived as naturally as the original, to smooth out certain national and cultural differences, and not concentrate the reader's attention on unfamiliar realities. In this case, readers will be able to get a fairly complete picture of the writer's work, their individual writing style, but they will not get a complete picture of the mentality, life, culture that the writer of the fiction text represents.

The second goal of a literary translation is to introduce readers to the nation, the subtleties of the mentality to which the author of the work belongs; to familiarize readers with the characteristics of the life, culture of other people, to convey the peculiarities of this culture, to expose them to cultural traditions, etc.

In this second task, the translator aims to remain as faithful as possible to the original text and to explain to the reader all the realities encountered when reading the text. The author of the translation will

try to capture all the features of the culture that the writer presents in the work. Such translations will be quite informative, in terms of getting to know the life, everyday life, of a "foreign" people, but will leave a very different impression on the reader than the original work did on its own reader. Moreover, as a result of setting a "second" goal, the translator will have to deviate significantly from the original text, and will fail to convey the author's individual style and his or her main idea, message.

The third goal is to introduce readers to the plot, characters and content of the book.

With the third objective, the translator will focus entirely on the story, on the content of the work of fiction. No longer will he/she try to find functional analogues of certain expressive means used by the author of the original, to reveal in detail the creative manner and characteristics of the author's individual style but he/she will neglect the national specificity and basic form of the fiction text. In certain cases, such translations can probably be justified. However, they can hardly be called artistic: such work is almost mechanical work which does not require a particularly deep knowledge of languages, and in the absence of gross errors, a good translation is little different from a bad one.

Accordingly, the goal will be to determine the translation fulfillment.

Whatever it was, the literary text realizes with its elements the propositions (contents) correlated with "objective" reality, which, grouped together with meanings, form the artistic world [Paducheva, 1985, pp.36-37]. It realizes a metaproposition of an aesthetic object and forms the content to be reconstructed in translation. At the same time, specific propositions and language constructions based on them turn out to be optional. In particular, in translation, these constructions may be different, modified to correspond semantically to the metaproposition, i.e., to the aesthetic object.

The "proposition-metaproposition" dichotomy can be defined more precisely on the basis of the means of differentiating fiction and nonfiction text – M. Bakhtin's theory of primary and secondary speech genres.

The theory of primary and secondary genres developed by M. Bakhtin, giving an explanation of the differences between fiction and non-fiction texts, details the tendency for variation in translation of a fiction text.

As Bakhtin writes, secondary (complex) speech genres in the process of formation "...absorb and process various primary (simple) genres developed in conditions of direct speech communication" [Bakhtin, 1986, p.430]. At the same time, the primary genres undergo a serious transformation, and "... lose their immediate relation to real reality

and to the real utterances of others. For example, rejoinders of everyday dialogue or letters in a novel, while retaining their form and everyday meaning only in the plane of the content of a novel, enter into real reality only through the novel as a whole, that is, as an event of literary and artistic life, not of everyday life" [Bakhtin, 1986, p.430]. But after being introduced into the work of fiction and having undergone the transformation described by M. Bakhtin, the primary genres begin to serve other purposes, realizing a different/other internationality.

Thus, once in the text of the secondary discursive genre, the primary genre no longer hypothetically fulfills the proposition of its realization in "everyday" terms but participates in the realization of the "metaproposition" that is the author's actual artistic picture of the world, his/her model. According to Bakhtin's description, this "metaproposition" must be reconstructed in the translation of a literary text. "It subordinates all levels of a literary and artistic work, including textual and, as mentioned above, extra-textual, and allows for the possibility of a situation in which, for the sake of preserving "metapropositional" authenticity, the translator has the right to break the rules of translation in opposition to "micropropositional" authenticity" [Galimullin: 2016, p.3941].

Therefore, the translation of a fiction text is not restricted to the transmission of the micropropositional content of the text, but also implements the principle according to which fiction texts become precisely fiction texts. Focusing on the metaproposition of the source text, the translator seeks to reconstruct it but by other linguistic means.

Continuing the thought, the transition to examples. In the practice of translating poetry.

The highest degree of translation is the translation poems. Translating poems, the translator should convey poet's idea, express the national characteristics of the work and often keep the meter. While translating a literary work, different cultures come into contact – the literature and the culture of the original work and the translator's national literature and culture, and the personalities – the author of the original work and the translator's personality, their worldview and various traditions.

It should be noted that the translator's task is even more difficult when the poetic text to be translated is not subject to poetic canons.

Let us illustrate this with examples of Robert Minnullin's work. The main goal in the translation by R. Minnullin is to reveal the specificity, significance, originality of the author's poetic works. A few words about the poet himself.

He is a person who approved himself a talented translator and writer of interesting and meaningful poems for the last decades. According to the G.Nureeva, "... R. Minnullin is interested in his nation's life, traditions, and customs. But if the poet was not interested in other nations' heritage, he would create parochially. Robert understood that and also learned related nations' lives" [Nureeva, 2019, p.187].

Tatar reader knows R. Minnullin's translations of the Karakalpak, Turkmen, Mari, Chuvash, Georgian, Armenian, Kazakh, Udmurt, Lithuanian and other nations' poets' works. National poet translated the next writer's works with pleasure: Agniya Barto, Gennadiy Paushkin, Vladimir Roman, Anatliy Timirkaev, Raisa Sarbi, Vasiliy Davydov-Anatri, Ojars Vacietis, Leon Briedis, Grigore Vieru, Yuozas Nekroshus, Zholdas Saetnazarov, Mozaffar Alimbaev, Kayum Tanrekuliev, Agageldy Allanazarov, Silva Kaputikyan, Nodar Dumbadze and others.

It should also be noted, that R. Minnullin selects the works for translation carefully: they differ in ideological content and high morals, and they can observe the images and structure of the poem inherent in the poet's own creativity.

We'll continue our idea with the works by Agniya Barto, whose works the author loved to translate.

The translator is interested in his desire for stylistic experiments.

"A. Barto dramatically changes the idea in one poem ("Oh, the plank ends, / Now I will fall"), sometimes she brings pun to the fore ("When"
– "No time"); ("Lida, they say" – "made it up")), or, she refers to the unexpected expressive rhymes, which were often criticized. Images of children revealed in the satirical and humorous plans in A. Barto's poems". For example, the poem "Dad Got Angry":

I earned a D.

Because of the three-digit numbers.

My dad got angry,

But he didn't raise his voice.

My daddy would have been better off

Screaming and stomping his feet

Threw things on the floor

He'd smash a plate on the floor!

No, he doesn't speak for hours...

He won't say a word,

As if I were not Pavlik,

As if I were a stranger.

He doesn't answer me,

He doesn't notice me,
He's silent at dinnertime,
He's silent at tea...
He looks at me with indifference
He looks at me indifferently,
As if I were not Pavlik,
But a table or a bench!
And silence is a burden to me!
I'll go to bed in sorrow [Barto, 2001, p.101].


«Ətineң chykty achuy»
Alyp kajttym min «ikele» —
Andyj həl sezgə tanysh.
Ətineң chykty achuy,
Tik chygarmady tavysh.
Kychkyrsyn ide ul miңa,
Təlinkə vatsyn ide.
Achuynnan kөndəlekne
Idəngə atsyn ide.
Yuk, ul miңa karamyj da.
Imesh, anyң kүp eshe.
Min əjterseң Pavlik tүgel,
Nindider ber chit keshe.
Ul miңa җavap kajtarmyj
Hətta ashaganda da.
Yuri karyjm sөjləshterep —
Җavap birmi anda da.
Uza berni bulmagandaj,
 Karyj da өstən genə.
Min əjterseң Pavlik tүgel,
Uryndyk, өstəl genə.
Bik borchyj bu sөjləshməү,
Yukka tүgel bu dəshməү!
[Translation of the poem into Tatar. Minnullin 2007, p. 301].

It must be said that the Tatar translation retains Barto's inherent poetics, which, in our view, is one of the key indicators of a high-quality translation. Of course, some moments in the Tatar translation are not

particularly good, such as the translation of the quatrain at the end: the line "He looks at me with indifference, He looks at me indifferently" partially conveys Barto's meaning of the original line [Minnullin 2007, p.301]. Its semantic nuance, meaning, is fully expressed here, but an individual means of expression through the use of the metaphor "indifference" (stressing that nothing is needed) has been omitted by the translator due to the impossibility of including the whole gamut of meanings inherent in the Tatar word "looks down on me".

The translation of the lines "Screaming, stomping his feet,

Throwing things on the floor" is also in tune with the semantic meaning, but here, on the contrary, the translator allows himself to add elements that are not present in the original text, such as "severity" [Minnullin 2007, p.301].

Further, in the second eight-line verse, the lines "Because of the three digit numbers", "No, he's silent for hours... He won't utter a word", "I go to sleep with grief" were not translated, or partially translated. Apparently, the author does not consider such detail necessary, and indeed, these lines are not a great, significant find for the poet.

In the translation of the penultimate part, there was a certain disconnect and violation of parallelism in lines five through eight where subordinate clauses of time follow each other as homogeneous, for rhyme. "Even during meals... And there's no answer". In the translated text, "Silent at lunchtime, too, Silent at tea..." has been replaced by "while eating", which is completely absent in the original text [Minnullin 2007, p.301].

The disadvantage of this variant is that the second line and the fourth line in the second verse had to be reversed in order to translate it. However, we do not consider this rearrangement to be a gross translation error as they only list actions that are not directly related to each other. Consequently, having rearranged them, he has not disturbed the semantic or narrative structure of the text, but has made the orchestration of the poem more sonorous and enriched:

As if nothing had ever happened.

The look from above.

It's like I'm not Pavlik.

Just a chair, a table [Minnullin 2007, p.301].

Finally, in the last eight-line verse, the translator again resorts to additions (such as the word "I miss") that are only necessary to rhyme, but the translation of the last two lines, which are, if not the only key lines in the poem, the most climactic ones, is highly questionable. There is no possibility to be wrong with translation, because in poetry it's usually in the last lines, not the first ones, that the most important

idea is laid down. In our opinion, here translator R. Minnullin, preserving the rhythm and rhyme, was able not only to convey but also to accentuate this intensity, which is not very clearly encapsulated in the finale of the original poem. As a result, the poem has a psychological dimension that is missing in the original:

This silence is very disturbing.

Not for nothing is this silence! [Minnullin 2007, p.301].

Based on this, giving an assessment of the poem presented above, it can not be unambiguously said that this is a translated work. As our long-standing practice in the field of children's literature shows, language, imagery, rhythm and rhyme, the features of the structure of the poem for children are central to the national heritage of each nation and, as a result, it gives the opportunity to distinguish the people with different ethno-national thinking. And in this case we are confronted with the peculiarities inherent in Tatar children's literature and the work by R. Minnullin himself. In other words, the translation is dominated by the special style, nationality, and creativity of the poet.

In our opinion, this translation is more successful because it preserves the main idea of the poetic text.

Thus, we can say a poetic text translation is one of the most difficult types of translation, for it is relatively free. In other words, there can be no definitive translation here since each translator interprets and translates the poetic images into their own language in their own way. The impossibility of finding direct linguistic and, more importantly, metric correspondences leaves room for countless interpretations. So, as far as poetry is concerned, any successful translation can only be a partial representation of the source text. The more precisely the translator follows the original text, the more alien the translated text will appear to the reader. This method is, of course, vulnerable. It must be admitted that to reach a level of excellence by maintaining a sense of measure, without compromising oneself or the language, is the greatest challenge for the translator to overcome.

Let us return to Schleiermakher's idea of the plurality of translation methods: text can either be seen as a finished product, as a certain syntagmatically organized linear composition of signs. Either as a multi-dimensional process that involves its generation and interpretation. Accordingly, text and context will be analyzed as basic concepts and signs as context-dependent variables. Therefore, the semantics of the source text depends on the changing cultural and social context and is subject to constant transformations in a dynamic continuum of contexts and intertexts. The plurality and "indeterminacy" of translations is the identification and textual

representation of the semantic potential of the original text considered as a process.

If we assume that the semantics of a text is a dynamic, context-dependent, multidimensional structure, then the equivalent of translation is not a single text, but a set of representations of this structure taken as a whole, fixed in another language. Perhaps this is how Schleiermakher's paradoxical thesis should be understood.

Of course, the very ambiguity of these definitions reflects the variety of hypostases in which the original text can appear. In a somewhat simplified way – whether we understand the text as a sequence of syntactically related lexical units or as a coherent semantic and pragmatic structure. This plurality of approaches to translation, in turn, is based on a plurality of approaches to the text.

At the same time, the unofficial translations that exist at the moment may help gain insight into the poets' inner world and orientation, as well as increase the interest of translators and the general public in the work of the poets.

## Conclusion

Thus, although there is no consensus, a successful translation combines four basic elements. On the basis of the works of famous scientists - translators and linguists, we will try to highlight the main requirements that a literary translation must meet:

— accuracy: It is the translator's responsibility to convey the author's ideas to the reader as completely as possible. In doing so, not only the main ideas must be preserved, but also the nuances and shades of a statement. For the sake of completeness of the statement rendered a translator should not add anything on their own behalf, and should not complement and explain the information given by the author. This would be a distortion of the original text;

— conciseness: an interpreter should not be verbose, the ideas should be rendered as concise and succinct as possible;

— clarity: laconicism of language of a translation should never interfere with clarity of expression of ideas and ease of their understanding. A translator should avoid complicated and dubious explressions that complicate understanding;

— literariness: a translation should completely correspond to the norms of literary language.

A truly "successful" translation is one that exhaustively conveys the author's intent as a whole, captures all the shades of meaning of the original, and provides full formal and stylistic consistency with the source text.

## Summary

To summarize, we can say that the problem of translation of a literary text has long engaged the attention of theoretical researchers. The question of the possibility of "successful" translation is often subject to discussion, and a wide array of opinions are put forward, different definitions of the concept are given. A significant interest in this regard is caused by the translation of literary texts, due to the originality of style, figurativeness of language, the selection of lexical and stylistic means of expressing the author's thought.

Although more has been written about fiction translation than about any other type of translation, it cannot be said that the topic is exhausted. It is difficult to teach it, although in principle it is possible, but it is required the future translator to have an aptitude for working with words artistically, to have a solid cultural and general human background and to constantly broaden it.

Therefore, no matter how improved the technology of translation may be, no matter what new actants are included in the translation process, each translator again solves the problems that their "teachers" contemplated when they turned to translation.

## Bibliography

Lotman, J. 1970. Kunstilise teksti struktuur. Kazan.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1986. Literary-critical articles. Kazan.

Barto A. 2001. Poems. publishing house Roseman. Kazan.

Shleiermakher, F. 2000. On different methods of translation: Lecture, read on June 24, 1813. Vestnik MGU, Ser. 9: Filologiya (Bulletin of the MSU, Ser. 9: Philology), 2, p. 127-145.

Goete, J. W. 1813. Zu bruderlichem Andenken Wieland. Werke, Bd.36. Weimar, 1893, S.313-346.

Cary, E. 1956. La traduction dans le monde moderne. Michigan.

Savory, T. 1957. The Art of Translation. Michigan.

Steiner, G. 1975. Après Babel. Une poétique du dire et de la traduction. Traduit de l'anglais ar Lucienne Lotringer. Paris, 1978. P. 224 et alii; Steiner G After Babel. Oxford, 1975.

Frederick, Rehner. 1989. Interpretation: language and translation from Cicero to Titler.

Kopanev, P.I. 1972. Questions of the history and theory of artistic translation. Minsk.

Minnullin R.M. 2007. Works. In seven volumes. Vol.7: articles, travelogues, reviews, conversations. Kazan: Tatar. kit. publishing house.

Nelyubin L.L., Huhuni. 2006. G.T. The science of translation. Moscow.

Foat G. Galimullin, Alfiya F. Galimullina, Liailia I.Mingazova. Common roots, common spirituality: literary relationships of the tatar and azerbaijani literature in the context of the dialogue of cultures// The Social Sciences. Year: 2016 | Volume: 11 | Issue: 16 | Page No.: 3940-3945.

Paducheva E.V. 1985. Expression and its correlation with reality. Moscow. G.I.

Nureeva, L.I. Mingazova, A.T. Ibrayeva, K.G. Faridovna. 2019. Literary Drawing Room: Children's Poetry Translated by R. Minnullin //Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology. 10(4): 186-191.