

INTERTEXTUAL MARKERS IN TRANSLATION

Kholibekova Omongul Kenjaboyevna*

*Basic Doctoral Student,

Navoi State Pedagogical Institute,

Navoi, UZBEKISTAN

Email id: o.kholibekova@gmail.com

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2022.00149.5

ABSTRACT

The article reflects an effort to scrutinize significant developments in the field of interfaces between intertextuality and translation, as well as to provide the general outline of approaches towards intertextuality research within the framework of translation studies. The research is topical as it is the first attempt at an overview of the overall strategies towards adapting intertextuality to translation analysis.

KEYWORDS: *intertextuality, intertextual irony, myth, implicit intertext, logopoeia, metatext, metacommunication, intertextual hybrid, topology of culture.*

INTRODUCTION

The beginning of the new millennium introduced significant changes in the scientific paradigm of translation studies, which led to a significant reformatting of established research strategies. In translation studies, the study of intersexuality is conducted by representatives of many schools and areas on different methodological bases. The new millennium has brought about tangible changes into the scholarly paradigm of translation studies, thus, re-forming traditional research strategies. Translation-focused investigation of intertextuality is carried out by representatives of different schools and trends. Summarizing and systematizing their work, we highlight a number of such areas: general philosophical (awareness of translation as an intertextual phenomenon and intertext as a model of translation); traditional (translation of quotations and explicit allusions); poststructural (reproduction of implicit intertext); polysystemic (appearance in the target text of translation contexts). [1]

METHODS

The phenomenon of intertextuality has been in the focus of translation analysis long before the coinage of the very term. Albrecht Neubert and Gregory Schreve ("Translation as Text", 1992) conceive of intertextuality from the angle of the proto-typical semantics. Intertextuality is perceived as the most important quality of the text along with intentionality, informativity, situationality, acceptability, cohesion and coherence. It is a model the reader compares with already existing samples abstracted from his/her experience. In other words, intertextuality is a set of the reader's textual expectations that should be heeded by a translator. Intertextuality has a structure of the prototype with the hard core (typical features of the genre, which the reader easily identifies) and blurred edges of the periphery where some features are shared by different genres or text-types.

Results

Each translation has double intertextuality: the original has intersexual links with texts of the source language (SL) and translation establishes intertextual links with the texts of the target language (TL). The translator should give preference to textual connections of the TL to meet the target reader's (TR's) expectations. In general, the translator is the mediator of intertextuality of the source text (ST) and the target text (TT), thus translation can be referred to as mediated intertextuality. This method is also called interpretative: the translator shows "where the treasures lie" making the target reader feel the flavor of the original. Intertextuality is so widely employed as a method of analyzing explicit references to other texts that it seems to have lost all connections with deconstruction that gave rise to it. Since each sign keeps traces of other signs, each discourse – traces of other discourses, each text – traces of other texts, all text are virtually intertexts. Some intertexts are explicit while others are so implicit that even the author himself may be unaware of them. In the philosophical sense the phenomenon of intertextuality entails:

1) the ability of any text to generate senses through the presence or copresence of other texts in it; 2) the shift of the authoritative right on true understanding of the text from the author to the reader; 3) the recognition of inner instability of the text and correspondingly, the possibility of multiple interpretations of textuality in general.

Analysis

Thus, the novelty of the research lies in the effort to highlight and generalize most widespread as well as marginal but perspective approaches towards intertextuality within the translation studies framework as well as to afford their practical interpretation. Derived from the Latin intertextio (intermingle while weaving) intertextuality is a term first introduced by French semiotician Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s. The scholar argues that a literary work is not simply the product of a single author, but of its relationship to other texts and to the structures of language itself. Thus, any writing is not absolutely creative because it always repeats something previously repeated. In the 1970s Anton Popovich ("Aspects of metatexts", 1967) elaborated a detailed typology of intertextual (his term is metatextual) links both at microstylistic and macrostylistic levels of the text. He employs the term met communication to describe all types of text interpretation – by translators, literary critics, scholars and readers. Metatexts are discriminated according to their corerelation with the prototext in different aspects: semantic, stylistic, axiological and in the aspect of reproducing the authors strategy. Pound's theory flashes out two approaches to comprehending intertextuality within the contemporary translation theory framework: 1) the word (Logos) accumulates explicit and implicit senses that require adequate translation; 2) secondary texts (metatexts) comprise all texts derivative of a prototext with various degrees of originality.

DISCUSSION

According to the axiological and stylistic criterion met texts can be: a) affirmative imitating the prototext and b) controversial. The translation studies research of intertextuality can cover a lot of problems as the translation itself can be viewed as an intertextual phenomenon. Peeter Torop draws a parallel between the translation activity and the author's strategy of integrating somebody

else's word into one's individual style [2, p. 169]. The secondary nature of both activities derives

from their relying on prototexts. As “each text is an intertext”, “a multidimensional space in which a variety of writing, none of them original, blend and clash” [4, p.146], the text we translate from can be regarded as an original only conventionally as its originality, according to Kristeva’s metaphor, consists of ‘the mosaic of quotations’ [10, p.66]. Torop discriminates between the terms intertextuality and intertextuality as broad and narrow understanding of intertextual links. Sometimes the translator makes the language of the original “to show through” the translated text and create intertextual hybrids.

George Steiner (“After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation”, 1992) regards intertextual elements in the broad cultural sense (not only words but also forms, themes and motifs) and refers to them as topologies of culture [3, p. 448]. Topologies are “manifold transformations and reordering of relations between an initial verbal event and its subsequent reappearances in other verbal or non-verbal forms”. Correspondingly, topologies are “invariants and constants underlying the manifold verbal, formal and the matic shapes and expressions in our culture” [3, p. 449]. Denisova singles out several functions of intertextemes due to the criteria of recognizability of the prototext and implicitness/explicitness of the intertext. The choice of the translation method depends on the fact what encyclopaedia (individual, national or universal) these intertextemes belong to. Main methods of translating intertextemes are 1) adaptation: to find a ST creative analogue; to refer to the translated versions of the intertextemes in the TL; and 2) foreignizing a) by means of commentary; literally and without the commentary where intertextuality is lost [2, p. 298]. The key demand to the translation is that it “should create the third cultural space and generate new senses in the target culture” [2, p. 263]. U. Eco advises a translator not to be afraid of radical transformations and substitute allusions that are unlikely to be known to the TR by absolutely different ones that can create similar pragmatic effect and evoke similar response. Ideal translation of an intertextual reference is the one where a translator reproduces no less but also no more of what the original hints at [4, p.255–269].

Galina Denisova (“In the World of Intertext: Language, Memory, Translation”, 2003) conceives of the intertext as a semiotic and pragmatic notion and defines it as any sign of the cited culture and any reproduction of phrases from the discourses available in the language [2, p. 77]. The phenomenon of translation is also viewed correspondingly: “Defined topologically a culture is a sequence of translations and transformations of constants”. G. Steiner substitutes the term intertextuality by his coinage interanimation: “The new beginning draws on precedent or canonical models so as to reduce the menacing emptiness which surrounds novelty” [3, p. 477]. This “transfer of souls” (interanimation) has exerted influence on a substantial portion of Western literature, plastic art and philosophy and can vary from the obvious repetition to implicit allusion and change almost beyond recognition.

Translation studies paradigm of intertextuality has been elaborated by P. Torop (“Total translation”, 1995). Total translation covers

- 1) Textual translation – translation of the whole text into the whole text;
- 2) Metatextual translation – translation of the whole text into the culture: commentaries, reviews, ads;
- 3) intertextual translation – the author translates into his text somebody else’s word or the whole complex of them;

4) extratextual translation—splits the text into codes rendered by other than verbal means (screen production)[6, p. 23–24]. For Marina Novikova (“Myths and Mission”, 2005) translation is the most obvious form of intercultural dialogue: “Translation has transformed all literary plots into international and wandering ones, all authors (together with their multilingual translators) have turned into “narrators” while all national languages and cultures got involved into a direct dialogue where interlocutors speak about the same though differently” [8, p. 47]. Intertexts are very individual, they appear “from the shadow of memory” that is an unconscious remembrance of something previously read which has become a part of your soul [10, p. 352]. In probing the notion of intertextuality as motivated translation strategy one can stress two disparate approaches: 1) different translators link themselves up to different codes, draw senses from different sources provided by the intertextual 2) target culture (TC) broadens the intertextual space of the text referring to the sources from the receiving system of the past and modern discourses. Each new translation through the penetration of new temporal and cultural layers transforms the original and its previous translations. The original together with its multiple translations of different languages and epochs constitute a common universe where texts indefinitely refer to each other and to themselves. Space of the original. On looking at the legacy of intertextuality the article flashes out key fields of its adoption by translation studies scholars:

1) philosophical interpretation of the ontology of translation as an intertextual phenomenon; 2) discourse model mapping the concept of intertextuality as prototypical signs of the ST recognized by SRs and those of the TT identified by TRs; 3) genre discrimination of metatexts according to types of their correlation with the prototext; thus translation is viewed as a fluctuation of primary and secondary elements in the structure of a translation that determines its genre; 4) traditional idea of intersexuality as the presence of explicit allusions and quotations in the structure of the ST (most widespread trend);

5) polysystemic approach aiming to single out translation intertextuality, i.e. literary and paraliterary references to the target culture in the text of translation; 6) poststructural studies whose object is the implicit intertext (myth world, intertextual irony) and its translation potential (perspective research trend).

CONCLUSION

The analysis of intertextuality and translation studies conflation raises one of the most topical theoretical problems – genre translation theory, now limited to some random ideas. The other perspective for further research is the systemic analysis of mechanism of implicit intertext actualization in translation.

REFERENCE:

1. Neubert A, Shreve G. Translation as Text. Kent; London: The Kent State Univ. Press; 1992. 197 p.
2. Steiner G. After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation. Oxford; New York: Oxford Univ. Press; 1992. 538 p.
3. Popovic A. Aspects of Metatext. Canadian Review of Comparative Literature. 1976. Autumn. pp. 225–235.

4. Franko I. *Moses and Other Poems*. New York; Atlanta; Los Angeles; Chicago: Vantage Press; 1987. 146 p.
5. Pound E. Guido's Relations. *The Translation Studies Reader*. In: Venuti L. (Ed). London; New York: Routledge; 2000. pp. 24–33.
6. Hatim B, Mason I. *Discourse and the Translator*. London; New York: Longman; 1990. 258 p.
7. Pound E. *Polite Essays*. London: Faber & Faber; 1937. 207 p.
8. Shakespeare W. *The Complete Works*. Oxford: The Shakespeare Head Press; 1999. 126p.
9. Kristeva J. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. In: Roudiez LS, Gora T. (Ed), New York; 136 p.
10. Steiner G. *After Babel. Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford; New York: Oxford Univ. Press; 1992. 538 p.