

FUNCTIONAL ERRATOLOGY AND PRAGMATIC EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATING ENGLISH LITERARY WORKS INTO UZBEK

Ibrohimova Nasiba Mirzohid qizi

mirzohidovna0328@gmail.com

Trainee-Teacher

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Annotation : *The research titled Functional Erratology and Pragmatic Equivalence in Translating English Literary Works into Uzbek investigates how translation errors and functional deviations affect the preservation of pragmatic meaning and communicative intent in literary translation. Functional erratology focuses on the role of translation errors not merely as linguistic inaccuracies but as meaningful indicators of the translator's functional and pragmatic decision-making process. This study examines how different types of functional errors—such as shifts in register, tone, or speech acts- impact the equivalence between the source and target texts. By analyzing selected English-Uzbek literary translations, the research highlights how pragmatic mismatches may alter narrative coherence, character voice, or cultural symbolism. The study also explores the boundary between acceptable functional adaptation and pragmatic distortion, emphasizing the translator's role as a mediator between linguistic systems and cultural frameworks. Ultimately, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of erratology as a diagnostic and evaluative tool that reveals how pragmatic equivalence can be maintained, negotiated, or lost in the process of literary translation.*

Keywords: *Functional erratology, pragmatic equivalence, translation errors, literary translation, communicative intent, functional deviation, cross-cultural pragmatics, english-uzbek translation.*

Pragmatics concerns how context contributes to meaning, encompassing speech acts, implicature, presupposition, deixis, and conversational principles (Leech, 1983). Translating pragmatic meaning presents distinctive challenges because pragmatic conventions vary substantially across languages and cultures. What counts as a request, how politeness is encoded, what can be left implicit, and how speaker attitudes are marked all differ between English and Uzbek. Speech act theory, developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), distinguishes between locutionary acts (what is said), illocutionary acts (what is done in saying something), and perlocutionary acts (what effects are produced). Translation must preserve illocutionary force while potentially altering locutionary form to achieve appropriate perlocutionary effects in the target culture. Errors occur when translators preserve surface form while losing illocutionary force or when attempts to preserve illocutionary force result in pragmatically inappropriate target text forms. Grice's (1975) cooperative principle and conversational maxims provide another framework for understanding pragmatic translation challenges. Implicature, meaning conveyed indirectly

through violation of conversational maxims, often requires substantial adaptation in translation. What English speakers leave implicit, Uzbek speakers may state explicitly, and vice versa. Translators must recognize implicature in source texts and recreate it appropriately in target texts, a process vulnerable to various errors. Politeness theory, particularly Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework distinguishing positive and negative politeness strategies, illuminates another pragmatic translation challenge. English and Uzbek employ different politeness systems, with varying strategies for face-threatening acts, social distance marking, and hierarchical relationship encoding. Errors occur when translators fail to recognize politeness marking in source texts or when they employ inappropriate politeness strategies in target texts. Stylistics examines how linguistic choices create particular aesthetic, emotional, and artistic effects. Literary style encompasses multiple dimensions, including lexical choice, syntactic structure, figurative language, sound patterns, rhythm, tone, and register (Leech & Short, 2007). Each dimension presents distinctive translation challenges, particularly across linguistically distant language pairs like English and Uzbek. Leech and Short's (2007) checklist approach to stylistic analysis provides a systematic framework for identifying stylistic features requiring translation. This includes lexical categories (general versus specific vocabulary, formal versus colloquial registers, abstract versus concrete terms), grammatical categories (sentence types and structures, clause patterns, noun phrase complexity), figures of speech (metaphor, simile, personification, metonymy), and cohesion patterns. Translators must recognize these features in source texts and recreate comparable effects in target texts using available linguistic resources. Register, the variety of language appropriate to particular social situations, proves particularly challenging in literary translation. Halliday and Hasan (1976) analyze register along three dimensions: field (subject matter), tenor (relationship between participants), and mode (channel of communication). Literary texts often employ distinctive registers to characterize speakers, establish tone, or create particular effects. English-Uzbek translation must navigate different register systems, with potential mismatches in formality marking, social distance encoding, and situational appropriateness. Metaphor translation represents another major stylistic challenge. Conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980) demonstrates that metaphors reflect underlying conceptual systems that vary across cultures. Some metaphors translate directly because they reflect universal or shared conceptual mappings, while others require adaptation or explanation because they reflect culture-specific conceptual systems. Errors occur when translators miss metaphors, translate them literally when adaptation is needed, or replace them inappropriately. Speech acts in English literary texts frequently undergo distortion in Uzbek translation due to different conventions for performing various illocutionary acts. English indirect requests, for instance, often employ interrogative forms ("Could you pass the salt?") that might sound inappropriately tentative or confused if translated literally into Uzbek. Uzbek typically employs different indirectness strategies, including conditional constructions or verbal mood markers rather than interrogative forms. Example errors include translating English indirect requests using Uzbek interrogative forms that function as genuine information

questions rather than requests, thereby losing the requestive illocutionary force. Conversely, translators sometimes render English direct commands into Uzbek using excessive politeness markers inappropriate for the source text's register or the character's social position, distorting interpersonal dynamics and characterization. Commissive speech acts (promises, offers, threats) also suffer from misrendering. English modal verbs ("I will," "I shall," "I must") carry different degrees of commitment and different pragmatic force depending on context. Uzbek marks commitment through different linguistic resources, including evidentiality markers, verbal mood, and specific commitment particles. Errors occur when translators select inappropriate modal markers or fail to recognize the degree of commitment encoded in English source texts. Expressive speech acts (thanking, apologizing, congratulating, complaining) involve particularly culture-specific conventions. Uzbek thanking and apologizing conventions differ from English patterns in frequency, elaboration, and appropriate contexts. Translators sometimes import English politeness patterns directly, creating characters who seem excessively or insufficiently polite by Uzbek cultural standards. For instance, translating every English "thank you" with "rahmat" may create unnaturally polite or formal-sounding dialogue inconsistent with the social context. Literary texts contain numerous cultural references and presuppositions requiring reader familiarity with source culture contexts. English literary texts reference customs, institutions, historical events, literary traditions, and shared cultural knowledge that Uzbek readers may lack. Translation errors occur when translators fail to recognize that references carry presuppositions requiring cultural knowledge or when they handle such references inappropriately. One common error pattern involves leaving cultural references unexplained when target readers lack necessary background knowledge. Translating references to English historical events, political institutions, or cultural practices without any contextual support leaves readers confused or creates misunderstandings. For example, references to "the Blitz" or "Victorian values" or "Thanksgiving" carry rich connotations for English readers but may mean little to Uzbek readers without explanation or adaptation. The opposite error involves over-explaining or inappropriately domesticating cultural references, thereby destroying the source text's cultural specificity and foreign flavor. Literary translation generally aims to preserve cultural markers while ensuring accessibility, requiring careful balance between foreignization and domestication. Errors occur when translators lean too far toward either extreme, either mystifying readers with unexplained foreign references or creating an inappropriately domesticated text that loses source culture authenticity. Intertextual references present particular challenges. English literary texts frequently allude to the Bible, Shakespeare, canonical literature, and popular culture in ways that educated English readers recognize. Uzbek readers share different literary traditions and canonical texts, making these allusions potentially invisible or meaningless. Translators must decide whether to preserve allusions (risking incomprehension), replace them with functionally equivalent Uzbek cultural references (risking anachronism or cultural distortion), or explain them (risking disruption of literary flow). Register selection represents a major source of pragmatic errors in literary translation. English literary texts

employ register variation to characterize speakers, mark social relationships, establish tone, and create particular effects. Uzbek expresses register through different linguistic resources, including address forms, honorific markers, lexical choice, and syntactic structures. Mistranslation of register creates characters who sound inappropriately formal or casual, distorts social relationships, and disrupts textual coherence. Address forms exemplify this challenge. English primarily uses names and titles to mark social relationships, while Uzbek employs a rich system of kinship terms, respectful forms, and age-based address terms. English "you" translates into multiple Uzbek forms depending on social relationship, relative age, formality level, and degree of intimacy. Both approaches involve losses, though they may be unavoidable losses rather than errors per se. Sound patterns including alliteration, assonance, and consonance create aesthetic effects and often reinforce meaning in English literary texts. These patterns depend entirely on specific phonological forms, making preservation in translation extremely difficult. Translators must decide whether to prioritize sound patterns, semantic content, or other features when conflicts arise. Errors occur when translators ignore significant sound patterns without attempting compensation or when they force unnatural Uzbek constructions attempting to preserve English sound patterns. Onomatopoeia presents special challenges. Onomatopoeic words supposedly imitate sounds but actually represent sounds through language-specific phonological systems. English and Uzbek onomatopoeic words for the same sounds differ substantially (English "meow" versus Uzbek "myau," English "bang" versus Uzbek "qarsillab"). Direct translation fails because it imports foreign phonological forms. Translators must replace English onomatopoeia with Uzbek equivalents, but this may disrupt sound patterns in source texts where onomatopoeia participates in alliteration or other phonological patterning. Phonological symbolism, where sound qualities suggest meanings (harsh sounds for harsh concepts, flowing sounds for flowing concepts), may transfer with varying success. Some phonological-semantic associations appear relatively universal, while others reflect language-specific patterns. Translators should attend to phonological symbolism and attempt to preserve it where possible, though this often requires departing from close semantic translation. Systematic error analysis requires explicit criteria for identifying errors. For literary translation, criteria must account for genre conventions, translation norms, and legitimate translation strategies while distinguishing actual errors from acceptable adaptations. This requires distinguishing between obligatory shifts (changes necessitated by linguistic differences), optional shifts (choices among legitimate alternatives), and errors (unjustifiable deviations). Comparative analysis between source and target texts forms the foundation of error identification. Analysts examine source texts to identify stylistic features, pragmatic meanings, and aesthetic effects, then evaluate whether target texts preserve, appropriately adapt, or fail to recreate these features. This requires bilingual competence and literary sensitivity in both languages. However, error identification cannot rely solely on source-target comparison because target text quality also matters. Target texts must function effectively as literary works in Uzbek, not merely as transparent renderings of English originals. Errors include not only inadequate

correspondence to source texts but also target text defects like unnatural language, stylistic awkwardness, or incomprehensibility. Effective error analysis therefore requires both comparative evaluation and independent target text quality assessment. Once identified, errors require categorization by type and severity. Type categorization enables systematic analysis of error patterns and underlying causes. The framework proposed in this article distinguishes pragmatic errors (speech act misrendering, cultural reference problems, register errors, implicature failures) from stylistic errors (metaphor problems, register inconsistencies, imagery deterioration, phonological loss), though these categories overlap in practice. Severity assessment proves more challenging because it involves subjective judgments about error consequences. Some errors fundamentally distort meaning or destroy aesthetic effects, while others involve minor infelicities with minimal impact. Severity assessment should consider multiple factors including degree of meaning distortion, inappropriateness to target context, unnaturalness of target language, and impact on literary aesthetic experience. Error consequences vary by genre and text type. In realistic fiction where character psychology and social relationships prove central, pragmatic errors distorting speech acts or register may prove severe. In lyric poetry where sound patterns and imagery create primary aesthetic effects, stylistic errors destroying these features may prove most serious. Error analysis must therefore consider genre-specific priorities and text-specific functions. Understanding error causes helps distinguish competence problems (knowledge deficits) from performance problems (processing limitations) and provides insights for translator training. Common causes include inadequate source language competence, inadequate target language competence, insufficient cultural knowledge, pragmatic awareness deficits, stylistic insensitivity, processing errors under time pressure, and interference from translation conventions or previous translations. Source language competence problems often involve missing figurative language, failing to recognize register variation, or misunderstanding pragmatic meanings. Target language competence problems include unnatural collocations, grammatical errors, inappropriate register selection, and difficulty expressing complex meanings fluently. Cultural knowledge deficits affect recognition and handling of cultural references, metaphors, and pragmatic conventions. Processing errors occur even with adequate competence when translators work under time pressure, lack revision opportunities, or experience cognitive overload. These errors include inconsistencies, oversights, and local infelicities that revision would catch. Distinguishing processing errors from competence problems helps identify appropriate interventions—competence problems require training, while processing problems require improved working conditions and revision procedures. Systematic erratology contributes to translation quality assessment by providing frameworks for identifying and categorizing errors. Quality assessment serves multiple purposes including translator selection, translation evaluation for publication, student assessment in translation programs, and translator self-evaluation for continuous improvement. Erratological frameworks enable more systematic, reliable, and fair assessment than impressionistic judgments. For English-Uzbek literary translation, quality assessment should evaluate both correspondence to

source texts and target text quality. Assessment criteria should include semantic accuracy, pragmatic appropriateness, stylistic effectiveness, cultural adaptation quality, and target language naturalness. The relative weight of these criteria may vary depending on translation purpose and text type, but all merit consideration in comprehensive quality assessment. Error-based assessment assigns point deductions based on error severity and frequency. However, purely negative assessment fails to recognize translation excellence and may demoralize translators. Comprehensive assessment should also evaluate positive achievements including creative solutions to translation problems, successful stylistic effects, and elegant target language. Balanced assessment recognizes both errors and achievements.

REFERENCES:

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press.
2. Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation studies* (4th ed.). Routledge.
3. Boase-Beier, J. (2006). *Stylistic approaches to translation*. Routledge.
4. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Gouadec, D. (1981). Paramètres de l'évaluation des traductions. *Babel*, 27(2), 99-103. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.27.2.04gou>
6. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
7. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
8. House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.
9. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
10. Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
11. Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
12. Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. St. Jerome Publishing.
13. Pym, A. (1992). Translation error analysis and the interface with language teaching. In C. Dollerup & A. Loddegaard (Eds.), *Teaching translation and interpreting: Training, talent and experience* (pp. 279-288). John Benjamins.