



LINGUISTIC FEATURES AND REPRESENTATIONS OF CHARACTERS IN “A FAREWELL TO ARMS”

Ibragimova Shaxnoza Xalilovna

PhD student at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: *This article explores the complex interplay between translation, context, and background knowledge, highlighting the challenges translators encounter due to linguistic and cultural differences. It draws on insights from scholars like A.V. Fedorov, A. Neubert, and G.D. Tomakhin, emphasizing the need to align translated texts with the literary norms of both source and target languages. It argues for the necessity of considering the reader's background knowledge to enhance comprehension and mitigate misunderstandings caused by socio-cultural disparities.*

Keywords: *linguistic units, Speech modifications, descriptive expressions, translation process, socio-cultural differences, pragmatic relations*

INTRODUCTION.

Ernest Hemingway's “A Farewell to Arms” is a literary masterpiece that, like many culturally rich texts, presents significant translation challenges. The accurate conveyance of its nuanced meaning is closely tied to the literary norms and stylistic requirements of the original text, as V.V. Vinogradov rightfully writes: “The language of any writer, no matter what elements it consists of, is always oriented towards being understood at the level of the literary ‘general’ language.” Based on this, the author distinguishes two contexts of a literary work: the context of literary and artistic speech forms, and the context of socio-linguistic systems that are distinguished within the written-literary and “Languages used by intellectuals”. According to our observations, context is “the linguistic environment of certain linguistic units,” which is realized in the form of a specific textual space, through “frames” stored in the individual's memory. Speech modifications exist due to the individual cognitive state of language users. This, in turn, leads to the problem of internal context, meaning a context limited within the scope of a sentence.

Studying the ambiguous use of names and descriptive expressions (descriptors) (the concept of “transparency” introduced by B. Russell implies that the object being referred to is either “visible” or “invisible” through the meaning of the expression) demonstrates this. For example, proper nouns or descriptive expressions manifest this: sometimes they refer to the same object, but replacing them affects the truth value of the sentence. The first is the act of communication in the source language, which creates the original text; the second is the act of creating the translated text in the target language; and the third is the communicative equivalence act that connects these two texts. Thus, two distinct texts are involved in the translation process, regardless of other methods: the source text and the resulting (target) text.

Since translation is a living communication process, it must take into account the levels of both language and culture. That is, it is important to analyze for whom the translation is intended, the reader's daily life, tastes, habits, and socio-cultural differences. When translating from the original text, the translator perceives hidden, unexpressed information (realia – historical events, names, etc.) through their background knowledge. It is precisely these factors that significantly influence the dependence of the translation language on the situation and context.

Yu.M. Lotman's rhetorical framework regarding “text within a text” is interesting. This, that is, the different coding of text parts, is formed on the basis of the structure created by the author and the content accepted by the reader. As Lotman notes, culture is regarded as a complex text and forms a hierarchy of “texts within texts.”

For example:



A nurse is like a doctor. It takes a long time to be. A V. A. D. is a short cut.

Сестра - это вроде доктора. Нужно долго учиться. А VAD кончают только краткосрочные курсы.
(Ye. Kalashnikov)

Hamshira – shifokorga o'xshaydi. Uzoq o'qish kerak. VAD'lar faqat qisqa kurslarni tugatishadi.
(I.Gafurov)

In these translations, the term “V.A.D.” was left untranslated in its original form, even though this phrase contains hidden cultural and historical information and requires explanation. In the second translation, this concept is explained in a reference (e.g., “Voluntary Aid Detachment - a voluntary women’s medical service corps during the war”). In the first case, due to the lack of explanation, the concepts of “nurse” and “voluntary nurse” become confused. During the First World War, these terms could have multiple meanings, so it is natural for the reader to ask: “Who was the main character?” In such cases, an explanatory note should be provided in the translation to clarify the contextual form. Thus, linguistic means and non-linguistic (cultural, historical) factors influence the context in translation, as the translator may not know them or may disregard them.

A.V. Fedorov emphasizes that the translation context “significantly covers and balances the formal inconsistencies in certain details. Correctly conveying the meaning of the translated text is closely related to the literary norms of the translation language and the stylistic requirements of the original text. The concept of context always implies an organic connection with the language system that is consistent with the style of the work being translated.” Due to the differences between the structures of different languages, contextual forms do not always correspond correctly. Therefore, it is always important to find the right way to translate each realia, and this is done through background knowledge. It is precisely the difference in the volume and content of background knowledge that constitutes the pragmatic aspect of translation.

As A. Neubert notes, the translation process involves not only conveying information, but also adapting it to the pragmatic relations of the receiving language system. This has a significant impact on the semantic content of the translation. As a result, a phenomenon called “pragmatic adaptation” occurs. This leads to some loss of meaning.

According to G.D. Tomakhin, the translator’s task is to “minimize” these losses. therefore, G.P. Nemets, V.V. Nalimov, and others view the introduction of additional information in translation as the translator’s “metalinguistic” function. Summarizing the above ideas, it can be said that it is necessary to take into account the reader’s background knowledge when translating contextual forms of language. This is because socio-cultural differences between the original and translated texts affect the individual cognitive state of the information recipient. This often leads to an incomplete understanding of the original text.

Taken into consideration, translating culturally-loaded terms requires translators to bridge linguistic and cultural gaps. By actively addressing gaps in readers’ background knowledge, translators minimize the loss of meaning and maximize comprehension. To be able to apply context, translators must recognize when and how meaning is shaped by culture.

References:

1. Hemingway E. A Farewell to Arms. M., 1969.
2. Neubert A. Text and Translation. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.1985
3. Tomakhin G.D. Translation as Intercultural Communication// Translation and Communication. M., 1997.
4. Lotman Yu. M. Text within a Text // Selected Articles, Vol. 1. Tallinn., 1992
5. Nemets G.P. Pragmatics of Metalanguage. Kiev, 1993.
6. Nalimov V.V. Probabilistic Model of Language. Moscow, 1979.
7. Russell, B. Descriptions. In New in Foreign Linguistics, Issue 13. Moscow, 1982.
8. Vinogradov, V. V. “Stylistics of the Russian Language”. Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences". Moscow, 1963