

SCIENTIFIC RELATION BETWEEN LINGUISTICS AND TRANSLATION
THEORY

Arabov Dilshod Norkozokovich
(teacher of SamSIFL)

Abstract: *This article explores the historical relationship between translation theory and linguistics, highlighting the challenges and complexities of their interwoven development. Despite translation theory's self-proclaimed status as a linguistic science, it has faced considerable skepticism and resistance from the field of linguistics itself. The article traces this tension back to the early 60s, where linguist J. Moonen pointed out the inherent contradiction between the theoretical assumptions of structural linguistics and the actual practice of translation. The asymmetry between language systems, which would theoretically make translation impossible, is refuted by the long history of successful translation practice.*

Key words: *linguistic science, translation, asymmetry, communicative linguistics, communicative model, study of translation*

Having declared itself as a linguistic science, translation theory hastened, first of all, to subordinate the literary approach to the linguistic one. A. V. Fedorov, having determined the status of translation theory as a branch of linguistic science, noted that "the study of translation in the literary is constantly faced with the need to consider linguistic phenomena, analyze and evaluate the linguistic means used by translators"[1]. At one time, linguistics attracted translation researchers with its greater harmony and rigor of theory and greater accuracy of methods compared to literary studies.

The relationship between translation theory and linguistics has been difficult from the very beginning. In the early 60s. last century, the French linguist, author of one of the first major works on the theory of translation, J. Moonen, noted that translation activity poses one very important problem for modern linguistic science: if we agree with the provisions widespread in linguistics about lexical, morphological and syntactic structures, then we will have to admit , that translation is impossible[2]. In fact, if the lexical, morphological and syntactic structures of languages overlap, they coincide only in minor parts. The "overlay" of these systems of different languages on top of each other demonstrates their obvious asymmetry, so translation is theoretically impossible. But this theoretical conclusion contradicts translation practice, the fruits of which have been enjoyed by human society for several millennia. One could say, Moonen continued, that the existence of translation is a scandal for modern linguistics[3].

Linguistic science, it seems, was in no hurry to recognize translation theory as its subsidiary branch. Structural and functional linguistics, which became widespread after the publication of the "Course of General Linguistics" by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, consistently ignored translation activities, excluding translation problems from the sphere of language and apparently assigning them a place somewhere in the marginal areas of speech. Moonen noted that no major theoretical work in general linguistics actually mentions translation.

It is characteristic that in the Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary of 1990, i.e. then, when thousands of works had already been written on the linguistic theory of translation, there was no room for separate articles either on the theory of translation or on translation itself. The only phenomenon that is directly related to translation and has the honor of being described in the dictionary is automatic translation, which, in its theoretical foundations, is closest to the structural and mathematical trends in linguistics[4]. Perhaps this disdain for translation theory reflects an idea formulated back in the early 50s. famous linguist A.A. Reformatzky, who argued that such a science cannot exist: "The practice of translation can use the services of many sciences, but cannot have its own science. This follows from the diversity of types and genres of translation"[5]. Once in the bosom of linguistics, translation theory has always strived to keep pace with this science, to "correspond" to the latest trends in the linguistic theory of a particular period. It is hardly possible to name at least one direction, one school, one theory in linguistics, which in one way or another would not be reflected in the science of translation.

In the 60s. under the influence of the ideas of structural linguistics, as well as in connection with the penetration of the ideas of cybernetics into linguistics, the concept of a linguistic model enters scientific use. Translation researchers, responding to the innovation, began to create a wide variety of translation models. And if in linguistics the term "model" begins to acquire the same content as the term "theory", then in the science of translation the terms "translation model" and "translation theory" become synonymous[6]. Each of these models was, as it were, a separate theory of translation, based on the principles and using methods of certain areas of linguistic science. Thus, generative grammar formed the basis of the transformational model of translation, semantic theories (the method of component analysis, generative semantics, etc.) gave rise to semantic models, communicative linguistics - the communicative model of translation, etc.

This situation was quite understandable and justified, given that the young theory of translation, which from the very beginning declared itself an applied branch of the science of language, could not help but rely on the data of fundamental linguistics. This often led to the fact that the authors of each subsequent model, if they did not completely deny the previous ones, then certainly noted their one-sidedness and inability to present the theoretical picture of translation as a whole. The very understanding of certain translation models was far from unambiguous. Thus, the "situational model" was interpreted by V.N. Komissarov as an analogue of the "denotative model", and A.D. Schweitzer - as an independent model, filled with completely different content.

The relationship between translation theory and linguistics has been fraught with tension and ambiguity from the outset. While translation theory sought to establish itself as a linguistic science, its very existence has been questioned by prominent linguists, who argued that translation, being diverse and context-dependent, could not be subject to a singular scientific framework.

Despite this skepticism, translation theory has consistently sought to align itself with advancements in linguistic theory. From structural and functional linguistics to generative grammar and communicative linguistics, each major trend in linguistics has been reflected

in the development of translation models and theories. This mirroring of linguistic progress, however, has often led to a proliferation of models, each claiming to offer a more complete picture of translation while simultaneously highlighting the limitations of its predecessors.

Ultimately, the intricate dance between translation theory and linguistics has yielded valuable insights into the complexities of translation. However, the ongoing debate about the nature and scope of translation theory within the broader field of linguistics underscores the challenges of defining and delimiting this complex and multifaceted field of study. While translation practice has been a constant in human history, the quest for a comprehensive and universally accepted theory of translation remains ongoing.

LITERATURE:

1. Федоров А.В. Введение в теорию перевода. С. 13.
2. Mounin G. Les problemes theoriques de la traduction. Paris, 1963. P. 8.
3. ughli Abdirasulov, B. A. (2023). Ethical Challenges in Translating Children's Literature. *Journal of Intellectual Property and Human Rights*, 2(12), 143-145.
4. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. М., 1990.
5. Реформатский А.А. Лингвистические вопросы перевода // *Иностранные языки в школе*. 1952. № 6. С. 12.
6. Daminov, N. K., & Nurullayeva, S. N. (2022). THE FEATURES OF INTERPRETING AND IT'S USE. *Вестник магистратуры*, (12-6 (135)), 155-157.
7. Asror, Y. (2023, March). THEORETICAL KNOWLEDGE IN THE LINGUOCULTURAL STUDY OF WORDS AND THE CONCEPT OF "LINGUOCULTURAL LITERACY". In *Конференция: Союз Науки и Образования* (Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 15-17).
8. Asror, Y. (2023, March). THE IMPORTANCE OF LINGUOCULTUROLOGY IN WRITTEN TRANSLATION. In *INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE "INNOVATIVE TRENDS IN SCIENCE, PRACTICE AND EDUCATION"* (Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 60-67).
9. ughli Abdirasulov, B. A. (2024). THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LINGUACULTUROLOGICAL ANALYSIS IN TRANSLATION. *GOLDEN BRAIN*, 2(1), 314-317.
10. Abdirasulov, B. A. O. G. L. (2022). NUMERATIV TURG'UN BIRIKMALARNING STILISTIK XUSUSIYATLARI. *Scientific progress*, 3(4), 275-280.