THE RELATION BETWEEN INTERTEXTUALITY AND TRANSLATION

Aziza Mirzaeva Shavkatovna

BSMI, teacher of English language department

ABSTRACT

This article examines scholars' approach and the relation between translation and intertextuality from two perspectives. The first is translation as intertextuality or as an intertextual practice, and the second is translation of intertextuality. Although scholars address different aspects of this relationship, such as the nature of meaning, and the status of the translator and of the target text, they converge on the notion that translation is an intertextual event.

Keywords: *Intertextuality, theory of intertextuality, the concept of intertextuality, translator, translation of intertextuality, interrelationships, intertextual practice, source text, target text.*

АННОТАЦИЯ

В этой статье рассматривается подход ученых и связь между переводом и интертекстуальностью с двух точек зрения. Первый — это перевод как интертекстуальность или интертекстуальная практика, а второй — перевод интертекстуальности. Хотя ученые обращаются к различным аспектам этих отношений, таким как природа значения, статус переводчика и целевого текста, они сходятся во мнении, что перевод является интертекстуальным событием.

Ключевые слова: *Интертекстуальность, теория интертекстуальности, концепция интертекстуальности, переводчик, перевод интертекстуальности, взаимосвязи, интертекстуальная практика, исходный текст, целевой текст.*

INTRODUCTION

Scholars address different aspects of the relationship, such as the nature of meaning, and the status of the translator and of the TT, they converge on the notion that translation is an intertextual event. They focus on two main points: the impact of the theory of intertextuality on translation theory and practice, and the translational approaches they propose for handling intertexts in ways that ensure that the foreign text's intertextual relations are communicated into the translated text.

To this end, Sakellariou (2015) speaks of the appropriation of the concept of intertextuality for translation-theoretic purposes which serves to disrupt established views of translation, and to redefine translation through a reconceptualization of the

relation between the ST (source text) and the TT (target text). From an intertextual view of texts, translation now is viewed as mediating between potentially compatible texts rather than incompatible linguistic systems. Such a conception of translation rejects the primacy of the 'original' over the translated text and dispels the idea of the translator as imitator (Also, Kershaw, 2014).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Similarly, Khanjan and Mirza (2008) stress the insights which intertextuality brings into translation theory and practice regarding the uncertainty or indeterminacy of meaning, in addition to the non-originality of the source text. Such view raises the translator's position and places him/he on equal footing with the author, considering the target text, as a form of writing, equal and not derivative to the source text.

Furthermore, from an intertextual perspective, some scholars view translation as a 'mediated intertextuality,' considering it a 'text-induced text production' (Neubert and Shreve, 1992). Others regard it 'an intertextual practice,' arguing that the relationship that links a 'prototext' (source text) and its 'metatext(s)' (target texts) is no more seen in terms of equivalence. Rather, it should be explained in terms of intertextuality, which views a prototext as related intra-lingually to all other texts, and interlingually to all its metatext(s), which are in turn interrelated (Farahzad, 2009). Hermans (2007, pp. 35-37) calls this latter type of interrelations 'translation-specific intertextuality,' which he divides into 'friendly filiations' in the case of accepted translational norms at a particular time, and 'hostile stand-offs' in the case of critical new translations, comprising a self-referential system of translated texts.

From these perspectives then, the impact of the theory of intertextuality on my translation of *O! My Prison Companions* is twofold. The first is that it allows it to be viewed, not in terms of equivalence or imitation, but in terms of being intertextually related to a prior text. That is, it will not have a derivative status to the source text, but the two will be perceived as two equal, original texts and the results of two forms of writing. And once this translation enters the literary system of the receiving culture, it will also have intertextual relations with other translated texts in that system. Additionally, and since intertextuality stresses the indeterminacy of meaning, other readings or interpretations of the ST will be provided by potential, future translations of the ST, to which my translation will also be intertextually related. Intertextuality places me, the translator, and my TT at equal footing with the author and his text. As for approaching intertexts or cultural references in translation, translation theorists and scholars propose a variety of strategies. Prioritizing one over the other depends

on the way they perceive translation (i.e., transfer or transformation) and the purpose or skopos7 (i.e., purpose) of the translation, in addition to the importance of the intertextual relationships in the source text, which are to be maintained in the target text. Such strategies, as explained by Mona Baker (1992, pp. 71-77), include literal translation, cultural substitution, elaboration and explication, and omission.

DISCUSSION AND RESULT

Lowrance Venuti (2009) views translation as a unique case of intertextuality which is central to the production and the reception of the target text. He argues that translating foreign intertexts with any completeness and precision is almost impossible because relaying the words and phrases that make up foreign intertextual relations, while it achieves semantic equivalence, does not maintain those relations, nor does it capture the cultural significance of the foreign intertext. Therefore, the intertextual context is lost in the translating process. To compensate, translators usually employ paratextual devices, such as introductory essays or annotations. He adds that, while this can be useful in maintaining the foreign intertextual relations and capturing their significance, it makes the translator's work more of a commentary than of translation and restricts its audience to academic settings, consequently losing the impact the ST had on its readers. Therefore, Venuti insists that translation is a transformative process which decontextualizes and re-contextualizes the ST. In the process, another receiving intertextual context is created in the translation as translators replace the foreign intertexts with analogous, but ultimately different, intertextual relations that are specific to the translating language and culture (which I believe runs counter to his proposed foreignization strategy). Such a translation, viewed as not instrumental, but hermeneutic, provides one particular interpretation of the ST. This interpretation is communicated by employing a category of translation strategies that mediates between the source language and culture and the target language and culture. It consists of 'interpretants' that can be formal (which include the concept of equivalence), or thematic (which include codes such as ideas or beliefs). Creating receiving intertexts, therefore, makes translation readable with comprehension. It also increases linguistic and cultural differences between the ST and the TT and opens the latter to interpretive possibilities. In the same vein, Hatim and Mason (1990) adopt a semiotic functional approach to translating intertexts. They distinguish two types of intertextuality: active when it activates a belief system beyond the text itself, and passive when it only serves the basic requirements of the text's internal coherence. To them, intertextuality is "not some static property of

texts," rather it is "best viewed in terms of semiotic system of signification" and it is not random, but functional: intertexts are brought into a text for a reason. In translation, translators first encounter 'intertextual signals' which trigger the process of intertextual search and semiotic processing. As to which aspect of the intertext should the translator prioritize: form, content, or both, they answer that normally, intentionality is prioritized over content.

Other scholars call for employing translation strategies that respect intercultural differences. Schaffner (2012) views translation as 'intercultural intertextuality.' She analyses translations of political speeches between English and German to highlight translation strategies employed by translators for handling intercultural references in those speeches. She concludes that, while intertextuality refers to the plurality of voices on which authors draw in their cultures, translation adds an intertextual (intercultural) dimension to this plurality. Similarly, and because of their sensitivity in political discourses, Sanatifar (2015) calls for more attention to the translation of intertextual references. Being socio-culturally constructed, such references pose potential difficulties to translators and may give rise to mistranslation, which may in turn lead to negative political or diplomatic consequences. He concludes by suggesting some concrete guidelines for a more efficient and effective translation of such references, such as literal translation which he deems safer and which excludes a translator's mis-interpretations that might be imposed on the audience.

Similarly, Kharabsheh (2017) proposes two translation strategies for translating a specific type of intertexts. He discusses Quran-related intertextuality in news headlines as an enriching communicative act, both monolingually and interlingually, and therefore represents semantic and conceptual complexities. Quranic references can pose semantic difficulty to the Arabic reader with their classical Arabic lexicon. Further, their conceptual density stems from the multiple Quranic contexts they invoke. Such references pose considerable challenges to translators with an added intercultural dimension. Echoing Venuti, he agrees that achieving lexicographical equivalence alone fails to establish intertextual relations of the foreign text in the translated text. He therefore suggests two strategies for dealing with those references: the gist-paratextual (i.e., using paratextual devices such as footnotes) and the gist-exegetical (inserting intext parenthetical explanations). He concludes that it's the Skopos (i.e., the purpose) of the translation that is central as to which strategy to operationalize.

In a different vein, Alawi (2010) stresses training for enhancing efficiency in translating intertexts. To produce better translations, he calls for incorporating more

**Oriental Renaissance: Innovative,
educational, natural and social sciences
Scientific Journal Impact Factor
Advanced Sciences Index Factor**

**VOLUME 2 | ISSUE 5/2
ISSN 2181-1784
SJIF 2022: 5.947
ASI Factor = 1.7**

training courses that introduce translation and intertextuality practices in translation programs at Arab universities alongside translation theory courses. He emphasizes the citationality and double-voicing of intertexts, and the importance of their recognition by the translator and the target reader. He examines intertextuality in relation to literary translation between Arabic and English and discusses allusion as an intertextual figure, citing examples from poetry to show how an allusion acquires a new meaning every time it travels from one sign system to another. Such recurrence creates textual patterns with which translators should acquaint themselves in both the SL and the TL to produce a more efficient and timely translation. That is, to engage with the translation process with the assumption that "every stretch of language is likely to recur".

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.

This article subscribes to the notion of intertextuality as a precondition for understanding texts and as a linguistic mechanism whereby a text makes reference, explicitly or implicitly, to a previous text(s), henceforth triggering meanings and implications expressed by such a text(s) which are added to the meaning expressed in the hypertext or transformed by it. I draw on Kristeva's (1986) 'vertical intertextuality' (integrated prior texts in new texts), Fairclough's 'manifest intertextuality' (explicitly demarcated intertexts) (Momani et al., 2010), Derrida's 'iterability' and 'citationality' (repetition of a text in a new text or context), Bakhtin's 'reaccentuation' or 'double-voicing' (reusing a text in a new context that gives it a new meaning), and Kristeva's 'absorption' (referring to a text's absorption of another text). I argue that translating intertexts, such as Quranic references, Classical and contemporary Arabic poetry, proverbs, and other cultural references, pose a considerable difficulty to translators. While their intertextual relations are accessible by and familiar to most Arabic readers, they remain inaccessible to the English target readers who will not get their implications. Therefore, they require employing translation strategies that, in addition to achieving semantic equivalence, ensure that the intertextual relations in the source text are captured and relayed into the target text. In dealing with them in translation, there are three options: (a) produce a semantic equivalence only, (b) provide analogous intertexts specific to the target culture, or (c) employ paratextual devices. I chose semantic equivalence combined with paratextual devices. I mainly opted for footnotes (marked with Arabic numerals) rather than endnotes (marked with Roman numerals) and bracketed explanations because footnotes are not interruptive like endnotes, nor expansive like bracketed

explanations, when used economically. Still, I resorted to endnotes when the explanation is long and not so immediately critical to the novelistic context, and less frequently to bracketed explanations when the explanation is very short. Each, however, has its own shortcoming. Semantic equivalence risk losing the intertextual relations embedded in the intertexts, analogous intertexts risk depriving the target reader of the opportunity of exposure to a foreign culture, and paratextual devices relegate those relations to a place outside the text. Since this is an instrumental and communicative translation, and because writers usually rely on readers' recognition of intertextual relations for the construction of meaning, I opt for the third, (following Appiah's 'Thick Translation', (2012), but not going as far as Nabokov (2012) and his skyscraper notes), being the least compromising, to ensure the target reader's recognition of those relations and to capture their cultural significance. Therefore, translating these intertexts requires, in addition to achieving a certain level of semantic equivalence based on linguistic acceptability in the target language, compensating for the intertextual relations of the source text, which are otherwise lost.

REFERENCES

1.   Allen, R. (1995). The Arabic novel: An historical and critical introduction. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

2.   Alawi, N. (2010). Intertextuality and Literary Translation between Arabic and English. *An-Najah Univ. J. of Res.*. Retrieved October 10, 2017.

3.   Bastin, G. L., Echeverri, A., & Campo, A. (2010). Translation and the emancipation of Hispanic America. In M. Tymoczko (Ed.), Translation,

Resistance, Activism (pp. 42-64). Boston: U. of Massachusetts P.

4.   Baker, M. (2010). Narratives of terrorism and security: 'accurate' translations, suspicious frames. Critical Studies on Terrorism,3(3), 347-364.

5.   Kristeva, J., & Moi, T. (1986). The Kristeva reader. New York: Columbia University Press.

6.   Kershaw, A. (2014). Intertextuality and Translation in Three Recent French Holocaust Novels. *Translation and Literature*, 23, 185-196. Retrieved December 14, 2017, from www.eupublishing.com/tal.Khanjan and Mirza

7.   Farahzad, F. (2009). Translation as an Intertextual Practice. *Perspectives: Studies Translatology*, 16(3-4), 125-131.Hermans (2007, pp. 35-37)

8.   Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. New York: Longman.Schaffner (2012)

9. Nabokov, V. (2004). Problems in Translation: Onegin in English. In L. Venuti (Ed.), Translation Studies Reader. New York: Routledge.

10. Mirzaeva , A. S. (2022). Intra-linguistic and extra-linguistic factors related to the language and vocabulary of the basic concepts of renaissance english philosophy .Eurasian Journal of Social Sciences, Philosophy and Culture, 1(5), 9–17. извлечено от https://www.in-academy.uz/index.php/ejsspc/article/view/51.

11. Mirzaeva Aziza Shavkatovna. (2022). Enlightenment-moral, philosophical, linguistic views of modern creators. journal of new century innovations, 3(1), 200–208. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6467831.

12. Мирзаева Азиза Шавкатовна. (2022). Просветительско-нравственные, философские, лингвистические воззрения современных творцов. Journal of new century innovations, 3(1), 190–199. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6467821.

13. Habibova, M. N. (2021). JORJINA HOUELLNING "QUEEN OF THE DESERT" BIOGRAFIK ASARIDA GERTRUDA BELL TIMSOLI TASVIRI. *Academic research in educational sciences*, *2*(2).

14. Habibova, M. N. (2021). The theme feminism in the epistolary novels in modern times. ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science, 11 (103), 1101-1105. Soi: http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-11-103-124 Doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.11.103.124

15. Manzila Nuriddinovna Habibova. (2022). The history of the russian epistolary novel in eighteenth century. eurasian journal of social sciences, philosophy and culture, 2(3), 135–139. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6378797

16. Manzila Nuriddinovna Habibova. (2022). Evaluative observation on d.h. lawrence's epistolary achievement. eurasian journal of academic research, 2(4), 489–494. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6516999

17. Manzila Nuriddinovna Habibova. (2022). THEORIES OF INTERTEXTUALITY AND THE BASIC FRAMEWORK OF KRISTEVA'S FORMULATION OF HER THEORY OF INTERTEXTUALITY. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6590540

18. Habibova, M. N. (2022). A BIOGRAPHY IS A SPECIALIZED FORM OF HISTORY AND BASIC TYPES OF BIOGRAPHIES. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, *2*(5), 495-503.