

Modernization or Historization Translation Problems of Uzbek Classical Works (Part 2)

N.M. Urmonova

National University of Uzbekistan, Uzbekistan. PhD, Associate Professor

E-mail - m.forestiere@mail.ru.

ABSTRACT

The comparison of the translation of “The Code of Temur” into French, Uzbek, Russian with the original in Persian has been held for the first time. We defined the methods of archaization, modernization and neutralization of the historical-archaic lexics in translation, the principles of transliteration based on the context. The translation of historical names accomplished with historic-archaic lexics has been also studied. The adequacy of the translations, made in different epochs has been analyzed.

What is the necessary depth of historical stylization for each individual situation? What will be the solutions to the dilemma of “modernization or historization” and on what depended the choice of the era that the translator should focus on in historical stylization?

Keywords

Translation; literary heritage; Classical literary work, The historical spirit of epoch, Historical-archaic words.

Introduction

Ancient artifacts, written monuments and mainly enter the world literary process by translating. At the same time, translation can play an intermediary role, that is, serve as the initiator of subsequent translations. At the beginning of his speech for the 1996 «The Code of Temur», Academician B. Akhmedov noted that “... the Russian edition of the 1894 work is not a Persian original, but a French edition, usually translated from a translation.” But at the beginning of this word we read the following lines. “The Code of Temur” are written in the old Uzbek (Chigatai-Turkic) language, and its origin, unfortunately, has not been achieved. Nevertheless, the translation of Mir Abu Talib al-Turbati into Persian was preserved in the seventeenth century, [1] and has since been replaced by the original and is the basis for many translations of the world. There are many works in the world that have been preserved thanks to translations. Based on the foregoing, we can say that «The Code of Temur” is a rare work that is survived the translation.

Research-scientists of Temurids are conducting in more than 50 countries around the world. More than 900 papers in the European and more than a thousand in Oriental languages are published about Amir Temur. The archives and libraries of Venice, Spain, France, Great Britain have kept written records of the diplomatic correspondence of the outstanding statesman and his successors with many countries of the world.

“The Code of Temur” gained worldwide fame from the 15th century to the present. Manuscripts and copies are available in libraries in almost all countries of the world. Copying it is still continuing uninterruptedly. There are many handwritten copies of the “The Code of Temur” that have survived until this day, and they are slightly different. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate this critical source and create a critical text.

Literature Review

The concept of such “historical stylization” is not often found in the studies of translation theorists. They talk about the transfer of national and historical colour (A. Fedorov, G. Salyamov, N. Kamilov, S. Florin and others).

Historical stylization is a conscious, consistent and purposeful identification by the artist of a word of the characteristic features of the style inherent in a particular era, as well as the transfer of these features in translation [3].

Historical stylization is an inevitable technique in translation if the time of writing the original is significantly remote from the time of translation (for example, works such as Baburname, Code of Temur, Humayunname). Following V.S. Vinogradov [4] in this case, we will operate with the concept

of diachronic literary translation as opposed to synchronous literary translation performed in the era of the creation of the original, when the temporal level of the languages of the original and the translation are correlated and when the author and translator are contemporaries (for example, the historical novels of OybekNavoi, OdilYakubov "Treasury of Ulugbek" and PrimkulKadirov "Starry Nights" and many others). In the second case, the translator is forced to resort to historical stylization, if the author of the original consciously refers to this method. In this case, the translator may have to deal with both the works written in the era of significantly spaced from the translation time, and with the works written in the era of close contemporary interpreter.

However a considerable number of studies [6; 9; 14] were devoted to this problem. Researchers agree that when translating such texts, the translator can go in two ways: "approach the time of the original," that is, resort to historization, or modernize the text and thereby "remove the time of the original" [5]. Based on the fact that the original text was created for the modern reader by the modern language, most researchers conclude that the translation should be done by the modern translator in the language - "at least with such a selection of vocabulary and grammatical elements that, in certain cases, would allow observing necessary historical perspective" [6].

While preserving the artistic originality and historical authenticity of the original, the translator has the full right "to become equal with an age in describing the work", the right to read the original through the eyes of our contemporary, the right to a modern attitude to the image. At the same time, he should choose the basic and progressive that makes the classical work significant and relevant not only for its time, which justifies the appeal of the translator to it. [7]. When a translator translates a classical work with a deliberately archaized language, the archaic language becomes an element of the art form, acquiring a content that is strange to the author's intention. It is necessary to avoid and modernize the text.

Topic

It turns out that the right strategy when translating "old" texts is the "golden mean" between modernization and historization, a mixture of the two types. This opinion is expressed by G. Salyamov in his article "Where is the "golden mean"? Translation of the classics: Modernization or stylization?", which aims to give a detailed answer to this question. The conclusion made by G. Salyamov says: the original work in the process of translation includes a living contemporary artistic consciousness ... with all its ancient charm. Not "modernized." And not "used" as a theme for variation [9]. "... The skillful use of archaic is not only harmful, but also simply necessary, indispensable, invaluable in the translation of old texts, because this is the most important means of artistic influence and an important arsenal of expression of content" [9].

Culture and languages of different nations are developing at different rates, which means that the language of, let us say, works of the XIV-XVI centuries, including the language of the works of Navoi and Babur, will not find an analogue in French literature of the XX centuries. Theorists of the translation see the way out of this situation in the fact that when translating texts written several centuries ago into other languages, the transmission of historical colour was carried out using language means characteristic of later periods [9].

At the same time, some scientists (A. Fedorov, G. Salyamov, N. Kamilov, N. Otazhonov, S. Florin, O. Semenova, M. Ladere, and others) make an important reservation: the translator should be guided by the constant phenomena of the language, that is, by the phenomena that have remained in the language for centuries. Orientation to the temporal in the language is an extremely undesirable method for stylization [11].

Another mistake in the use of archaisms, which translation theorists warn about, is the use of archaisms that have a national colouring. "The used archaisms of PY (translation language) should not ... be

specific to the target language as to exclude the possibility of their use in the translation of a foreign language message” [8].

Subtopic

Consider, as an example of such a situation, the translation of Oybek’s novel “Navoi” by M. Salier, P. Sletov (in Russian) and A. Orand (in French). The action of the novel is played out in parallel in two time plans - the modern era and the era of Navoi. Thus, the translators were faced with the following tasks: transferring the historical flavour of the Navoi era, and reconstructing the speech Uzus which was characteristic to this period of time.

The fact that translators deal with simultaneous translation imposes certain difficulties on the translation and gives it its own characteristics. If in a diachronic translation translator uses a neutral modern language, using archaisms of various eras, that is, resorting to “conditional historical stylization”, then when synchronously translating texts with the author’s historical stylization, the translator must transfer the stylistic contrast to the text of the translation, the translators successively and successfully solve the problem the transmission of the historical colour of the era using various linguistic means characteristic of the era being described, avoiding modernisms and obvious anachronisms and resorting to the best of archaic expressions and structures.

A diachronic translation of a text the author who intentionally uses historical stylization represents the third situation and differs from the synchronous translation described above with a similar authorial stylization method, in that the translator of old texts has tasks such as solving, and in addition, the task of transferring author's historical stylization.

Methods

Comparative-historical. When translating Uzbek classical works into French, the translator may encounter three possible situations in which there is a need for historical stylization: [2].

- a) the time of writing the original is significantly remote from the time of translation;
- b) the author of the original consciously resorts to the method of historical stylization and translation is performed in the era of writing the original;
- c) the author of the original deliberately resorts to historical stylization and the time of writing the original is significantly distant from the time of the translation.

Naturally, translation strategies are different in three different situations. Scientists began to study the translation strategies of historical stylization, caused by the need to convey the historical stylization carried out by the author, only recently, and there are relatively few studies devoted to this issue.

Methodology

The works of the best Uzbek and European translators allow us to judge which of the principles described by translation theorists are applied in practice and how successfully. Let us dwell on some translations of Uzbek, French and Russian translators in connection with the three named situations. At the same time, we draw attention to the statements of the translators about the reasons for their choice of a particular strategy.

The first of the situations is a diachronic translation, in which the author does not resort to historical stylization. Translations of the wonderful Uzbek translator S. Azimjanova, who introduced us the work of Gulbadanbegim, the daughter of the great Babur, Jean Louis Bakke Grammon, Sh. Minovarova, Kh. Karomatova, who introduced Uzbek, French and Russian readers to the works of Z.M.Babur, Amir Temur and many others, can serve as an example of how translations of works of distant eras should be

performed. These translations are written in general in modern language, and yet the reader feels the time distance that separates him from the time of writing the book. How does a translator achieve this? Firstly, by the lack of explicit modernisms, the installation of a constant in the language and the use of lexical anachronisms available to the reader. When translating the above-mentioned works, translators attach great importance to orientations on the Uzbek, French and Russian literary heritage. Secondly, the translator achieves a sense of temporal distance thanks to grammatical means of stylization. Thirdly, thanks to syntax, again archaic. The second situation, as we noted above, is characterized by the fact that the author of the original uses historical stylization as a technique, and the time of writing is slightly remote from the time of translation.

Data Analysis

THE COMPARISON OF THE TRANSLATION OF “THE CODE OF TEMUR”

“The Code of Temur” is a valuable resource in the study of life and the socio-political activities of the state and the state system of Amir Temur (09.04.1336-18.02.1405). This work was also referred to as “TuzukiTemurius”, “MalfusotiTemurius” and “Real Temur”. This famous work contains valuable information about the biography, life, state and army of Hazrat Amir Temur, as well as the history of the Chigataiulus for more than fifty years (1342-1405).

It is well known that “TuzukotiTemuriy” consists of two “articles”, the first “article” is the plans and plans of Amir Temur to create and strengthen his state, the formation of a well-armed army. It also outlines the arrangement of troops in battle.

The second part of the work, which consists of thirteen chapters, contains the advice and actions that Hazrat Amir Temur created to create a powerful state, form an army and defeat the enemy.

“The Code of Temur” has been translated and published in several languages around the world, including Persian, English, French, Russian, Urdu [15]. The French translation of “The Code of Temur” by L. Langle, based on the old Persian translation of Abu Talib al-Husseini, is a continuation of Franco-Uzbek relations [16] that began many centuries ago. This translation, containing only the Tuzukot part of the work, was published in Paris in 1787.

The work was translated into Russian in 1892 by teachers of the Tashkent Women's Gymnasium under the guidance of A.F. Pronevsky, A.G. Zayonchakovskaya, S.A. Pyatnitskaya (first part) and students of the male gymnasium D. Roitman and V. Stepanov. This translation is based on the French translation of L. Langle [17] and was first published in Russian in the Russian Orthodox Journal, edited by N. Ostroumov. In 1894, a separate book was published in Kazan [8]. Currently, there are issues (facsimiles) of it edited by I. Muminov in 1968 and edited by R. Azimova. The reason we give information about these publications is because they were translated from French, not the original. This allowed us to compare the existing Russian translation with the French translation and determine how close it is to the original.

In honor of the 660th anniversary of the birth of Amir Temur in 1996, the publishing house Literature and Art of GafurGulyam published Uzbek, English and French translations of “The Code of Temur” [1]. This edition contains a new edition of the French translation of L. Langle (1787) by the Uzbek scientist Yu. Muratova, supplemented with comments.

Achieving excellence in translating classical pieces is a daunting task. Therefore, such works are translated many times over time. From translation to translation, readers' comments and the spirit of that period are compared with the existing manuscript and fossil records, with the necessary changes and improvements. Work on the translation of great works, such as Temptation of Temur and approaching the original, is an ongoing process.

We published the publication “The Code of Temur” in 1991 and 1996 in the Uzbek [1] language by A. Saguni and H. Karomatov.

L. Langle translated by “Les Institutes de Temour” (1787, 1996) [1] and Russian N. Ostroumov (1894), as well as copy No. 9658, published in 1307 (Melody 1889/1890), published by the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Uzbekistan. First of all, let's talk about the translation of the French work. The first French translation of “The Code of Temur” was made two centuries ago. The book contains two articles, and the Tuzukot article is the second in the Uzbek translation, the first in the translation of L. Langle. As we have already mentioned, L. Langle translated both articles (27 in total) in the Tuzukot section.

Results

Reflections made in a comparative study of the first French translation of the work (L. Langle. 1887, 1996) and Russian (N. Ostroumov, 1894, 1992), on which this translation was based.

Edition of N. Ostroumov: 1. Interpretations are given in an intermediate language, in French, and do not contain spelling errors. (41, 42, 44, 45, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 63, 73). Here are some of them: “Haraun-le JustecinquièmeKhalifeA'bbasside, a contemporary of de Charlemagne, a calm messenger to Ahbossade, mortenl'an de JC809” (1894. 41) or “Que son père avait établi dans la Transoxiane” Instead “Que son père avait et abli dons la Transopiaone” (1894. 42) with spelling errors. This (and many other) comments were discarded by the editors in the new French and Russian editions of the work.

2. Some interpretations of both French and Russian are presented at the end of the page, and the translation is artificially expanded (51, 64, 65, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 81, 83, 86, 88) ., Page 89).

3. The French edition of 1887 left some historical and historical vocabulary, as it was in the English translation of the work, and the same thing was repeated in the Russian edition of 1894.

4. Historical words (French princes, monks, pros, officials, magistrates, judges, postmasters, officers, ministers, soldiers, field commanders, general, police). This also survived in the new issue of 1992.

5. One of the negative aspects of the Russian translation in 1992 and the new edition of the French translation in 1996 is the lack of references to sources explained by L. Langle.

6. Editorial comments have been excluded from publications that, in the opinion of the editors, are incompatible with the spirit of the present.

7. Unfortunately, the comment in the 1894 Russian edition “Balkh, Dzhigun and Oksus Compile information about one and the same river ji”, unfortunately, is not fully reflected in the next edition (“Balkh-In the Middle Ages, the Amu Darya also had such a name” (44.1992)). This was repeated several times by the editors.

8. The positive aspect of the new 1992 edition is that some of the shortcomings made by N. Ostroumov during the reflection of the spirit of the period were corrected: “According to a sketch of a dragonfly with small diamonds and socks and cloves with diamonds” (37). “Blind gullibility prompts him to blame a kind of treason; Chubin's female blanket and chain (jewelry). Bahram wears on (jewelry) on his neck and (chain) on his feet, covered with a veil, calls heads, emirs and soldiers and in such form opens public audience ”(37). NizamAlkulk (42 years) - NizamAlmulk (93 years) and others; b) the order of the army of A. Temur in the new edition of 1992 (57); About 14 divisions of 40,000 cavalry (61) are additionally listed; c) Some of the famous names mentioned in the first edition have been commented on and commented on in subsequent editions. For example, Kurdish (66) is a 1992 issue of the Kurdish Dynasty that ruled Gur and Hirat. Sinuddin Muhammad (Died against 1245).

Discussions

The historical flavour of the era is in no way created by the use of outdated words obscure or generally incomprehensible to the modern reader, but by the skillful use of all available means of stylization. That is why the French translation of “The Code of Temur”, made by L. Langle, does not seem entirely

successful. The translator failed to comply with the stylization measures, saturating the translation with archaisms, almost unknown to the French-speaking reading public which, of course, can be found in the dictionary (sometimes only in many volumes!) Marked “obsolete” or “dialectic,” but they are completely unfamiliar to the modern reader, but will the reader of a work of art look into the dictionary every minute? Although the translation of L. Langle is the most accurate and complete among the available French translations of the work from the point of view that the translator painstakingly transfers the archaisms and historicisms of the original with French counterparts, other incomplete French translations of the work convey the style and spirit of the work much more accurately. Therefore, although the first translation is undoubtedly of particular value to the scholars of this work, other French translations of the Code of Temur are preferable for the ordinary French-speaking reader. This probably suggests that in solving the dilemma of “modernization or historization”, as well as questions about the depth of historical stylization, it is necessary to proceed who the translation will be oriented to, that is, who will read it.

Conclusion

A comparative analysis shows that the accuracy of the translation of ancient works is achieved, first of all, by preserving its scientific and historical source. However, translators did not always comply with these requirements. Differences in translations can be seen not only in style, but also in their scientific accuracy and level.

In the translation of L. Langle we see a tendency to give the Temples of Temur its originality. L. Langle's translation and the language and style of Russian translation based on it are simplified for the reader of his time. Translators studied scientific works, historical and linguistic information, dictionaries and translations of "Temur Conspiracies" in different languages and creatively used them in their work. Although the translations of L. Langle and N. Ostroumov found flaws, they are of particular importance and serve the interests of preserving the national heritage of our people in other countries.

The differences observed in translations are reflected not only in style, but also in their scientific accuracy and level.

- a) The translation of the publication by L. Langle and N.Ostroumov can be considered as a work for mass publication.
- b) The translation of classical works must include the period during which the translator lived and the translation was made. Because translation is a product of its time. The translation of L. Langle was made two centuries ago, and the publication of N. Ostroumov a century ago, and when preparing their new edition, the history of the transition period and, therefore, the interpretation of historical and archaic words should now be taken into account. Naturally, many of the words used by L.Langle and N.Ostroumov in translation are outdated and outdated.
- c) Analysis of the translations of L.Langle and N.Ostroumov “The Code of Temur” should not lead to the conclusion that these translations are invalid. These translations also have their own meaning. Thanks to them, our written monuments have become the spiritual wealth of foreign readers.
- d) The scientific and creative work of L.Langle and N.Ostroumov on the promotion of “The Code of Temur” deserves respect, but requires analysis and editing.

Limitations and Future Studies

It is well known that commentary plays an important role in distinguishing between the time of ancient monuments and the time in which we live, as well as the differences between the lives of two different peoples and the accuracy of translation in historical and archaic vocabulary unknown to the reader.

Received 05 March 2021; Accepted 01 April 2021.

Explanatory notes in “The Code of Temur”, some of the information contained in it, names, geographical names and other historical and archaic words that need to be interpreted are mainly contained in the Uzbek and Russian translations of the work and in the translation of the page of L. Langle. In addition to various explanations, interpretations in translations can be divided into several groups depending on the nature and meaning of the commenting word. Temur translators interpreted and commented on the names of translators of military, religious, historical figures and geographical names, national expressions representing various aspects of public life. The farther we go from the time of creation, the more difficult it is to understand the text, and, of course, the number of footnotes increases. Below we can reproduce their numbers.

Translations of “The Code of Temur”.	firstpart	second part
French translation by L. Langle	92	133
Russian edition of N. Ostroumov	126	124

Achieving excellence in translating classical pieces is a daunting task. Work on the translation of great works, such as “The Code of Temur”, and convergence with the original is an ongoing process. Such works will continue to be translated over and over.

References

1. “*The Code of Temur*”. (1996). Tashkent. Publishing house of literature and art named after Gafur Gulam. p. –344. this book the french translation L. Langle. p. 249-343.
2. Gack, V,G. (1988). *Russian in comparison with French*. 2nd edition. Moskow. High School. p. 48.
3. Troitsky, V,Yu. (1964). *Stylization*. Moskow. Education. Word and image. Digest of articles. Compiler Kozhevnikova V,V. p. 164-194.
4. Vinogradov V,S. (1997). *Temporal (temporary) stylization as a translation technique*. Moskow. Philological Sciences. №6. p. 54-59.
5. Popovich, A. (1980). *Problems of literary translation*. Moskow. High School. 199 p.
6. Fedorov, A,V. (1968). *Fundamentals of the general theory of translation*. Moskow. Higher School. 396 p. Him: (1963). *About some features of the translation of ancient Russian literary monuments into the modern language*. Leningrad. Leningrad University. Problems of theory and history of the language: Collection. p. 308-314. Him.(1983). *Fundamentals of the general theory of translation*. Moskow. Higher School. p. 291. Also, *Three principles of translation of ancient monuments and classical literature*. p. 143-151. (1971). *About the translation from the language of the ancient period into the same language in the modern state*. Moskow. Higher School. In the book. Essays on the general and accompanying stylistics. p. 151-166.
7. Kashkin, I. (1977). *For the contemporary reader*. Moskow. SP. Articles and studies. p. 321-370.
8. Komissarov, V, N. (1973). *A word about translation*. Moskow. International Relations, 215 p.
9. Salyamov, G. (1986). *Where is the “golden mean”? Classics translation: Modernization or stylization?*. Moskow. Izvestia. Literary translation: Problems and judgments. p. 442-461; Ibid: Movchan, P., Leonovich, V. *Is it necessary to translate from Old Russian?* p. 333-359; Kaybulloyl as-Salom., Otajonov, N. and others. (2000). *Three translation and three discoveries*. Tashkent. Herald of NUUZ. Collection. №2. p. 48-53. Komilov, N. (1973). *Style in classical translation*. Tashkent. Art of translation. 180 p.
10. Hohel, B. (1988). *Time and space in translation*. Moskow. Rainbow. Poetics of translation. p. 152-171.
11. Vinokur, G, O. (1991). *On the language of a historical novel*. Moskow. High School. On the language of fiction. p. 407-429.

Received 05 March 2021; Accepted 01 April 2021.

12. Andres, A. (1964-1965). *Distance of Time and Translation*. Moskow. Mastery of Translation.collection. p. 127.
13. Lederer, M. (1994). *L'étrangeté de la langue étrangère*.p. 81-83. *Fidélité et liberté*.p. 83-86. Paris. Hachette. In the book. La traduction aujourd'hui.
14. Semenova, O, N. (1962). *Archaic vocabulary in the novel by A. Tolstoy "Peter I" and methods of its translation into Estonian*. Leningrad. Leningrad State University. Collection. Theory and criticism of translation. p. 59.