

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2019 Issue: 09 Volume: 77

Published: 30.09.2019 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Toshtemir Amirkulovich Alimov
Karshi state university
Teacher of foreign languages faculty

GENDER AND TRANSLATION STUDIES IN PERSPECTIVE OF THE UZBEK LINGUISTICS

Abstract: *The article is concerned with the study of gender aspect in the process of translation. The study focuses on the investigation of the impact of gender on translation, in particular it is aimed to explore the distinctive features of translated work by male and female translators. Previous researches and studies in this area of investigation have been gathered and analyzed. It is concluded that a number of distinctive and similar features including cultural identity, ideology and lexical choices can be seen in the translation of different gender members.*

Key words: *gender and language, gender, translation, gender identity of the translator, text.*

Language: English

Citation: Alimov, T. A. (2019). Gender and translation studies in perspective of the Uzbek linguistics. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 09 (77), 357-360.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-09-77-64> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2019.09.77.64>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

Language is the most important way of the formation and existence of human knowledge about the world. The objective world of a person is reflected in the process of his/her activity and the results of his/her knowledge are recorded in the word. Thus, the linguistic picture of the world is the totality of all knowledge imprinted in a linguistic form. The linguistic picture of the world directly interacts with the cultural picture of the world related to the real world [9; p.17].

The concept of a linguistic personality and its structure is closely related to the concept of a picture of the world. Being one of the main components of the structure of a linguistic personality, the picture of the world is reflected on the verbal-semantic and cognitive levels, realized as special units of consciousness and objectified as specific sign forms.

The linguistic picture of the world is the totality of all the components of knowledge about the world expressed by the means of language. Consequently, all phenomena that find themselves at the structural levels of the language (words or syntactic constructions, texts) are considered to be units of the linguistic picture of the world.

Academician Yu. D. Apresyan outlined modern ideas about the linguistic picture of the world. The most important points of his ideas for our research can be represented as follows: “Each natural language reflects a certain way of perceiving and organizing the world. The values expressed do form a certain unified system of views, which is imposed as mandatory to all native speakers; the way of conceptualizing the reality is partly universal, partly nationally specific, so speakers of different languages can see the world a little differently, through the prism of their languages. The most important ideas for a given language are repeated in the meaning of many linguistic units and therefore are key to understand a particular picture of the world” [1; p.35].

One of the aspects of the further development of the problem of the linguistic picture of the world is the difference in the vision and description of the world by each person – man and woman – which is dealt with by a theory called gender.

The gender approach in science is based on the concept that it is not biological difference between men and women but the cultural and social significance that society prescribes to these differences. The foundation of gender studies was the identification of differences in roles, social status and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India)	= 3.117	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 0.829	PIHHI (Russia)	= 0.126	PIF (India)	= 1.940
GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.716	IBI (India)	= 4.260
JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 5.667	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

other aspects of the lives of men and women. The objectification of the male and female worldview (gender picture of the world) occurs in written and oral speech, in particular, in fiction.

With the help of gender theory, translations of works of fiction can be interpreted differently, where the views of the authors on gender relations are clearly and deeply embodied, from this point of view, differences in the translation of works of art are of interest due to the gender of the translator.

Theorists and practitioners of translation often have problems, such as, for example, literalism or the presence in the translation text of a pronounced position of the translator himself/herself. At the same time, a translation is considered successful if it does not contain factual errors, violations of lexicographic and syntactic norms, meets the goals of the message or pragmatics of the author, and preserves the emotional coloring of the source text.

However, in the theory and practice of translation, very little attention is paid to the category of "gender". By virtue of the anthropocentric approach adopted in science, it is important to consider the language not as a rigid and uncompromising system, but as a tool operated by a very real linguistic personality (in this case, the linguistic identity of the translator), over which certain factors dominate (gender, culture, stereotypes). Consideration of the category of "gender" in close connection with the problems of translation is necessary, since taking into account this actual phenomenon can make translations more accurate from the point of view of pragmatics of the source text.

Male versus Female

In the result of several studies and surveys, the significant similarities and differences between male and female have been discovered, not only in the area of mental abilities, but also their physical abilities and behavior have been investigated. Emily Wilson clarifies the differentiation of men and women by pointing out: "Two different people, from different demographic backgrounds with two different literary ears are going to produce completely different things, even while being as truthful as possible to the original. Gender is one of the things that impacts it".

Katharina A, Philips and William Menard did the survey on the investigation of general differentiation and similarities of male and female and concluded that:

- The men are significantly older and more likely to be single and living alone than women.
- Men are more likely to obsess about their genitals, body build and thinning hair/balding, excessively lift weights; and have a substance use disorders.
- Women are more likely to obsess about their skin, stomach, weight, breasts/chest, buttocks. Thighs,

legs, hips, toes, and excessive body/facial hair, and they are concerned with more body areas.

- Women also perform more repetitive and safety behavior and are more likely to camouflage.
- Women have significantly greater appearance dissatisfaction than men.
- Women worry more about their perceived defects in public than men.
- Women can be easily upset compared to men.
- Men and women do not significantly differ in terms of the delusionality of appearance beliefs.
- Men and women experience similarly lifetime suicidal ideation and have attempted suicide.
- Men have poorer current functioning and quality of life on all measures than women.
- Men are more likely to have a substance use disorders.
- Women are more likely to have an eating disorders [6; p.10-14].

Discussion

In recent years, a considerable volume of academic literature and researches in the field of translation are being focused on the subject *gender in translation*. The development of gender studies and translation studies has parallel to that of cultural studies, perhaps as a direct consequence of the growing awareness that when translation becomes entangled with gender, important cultural questions arise.

Integration of gender and translation studies have been prompted by the feminist scholars and translators who claimed on the visibility of the women translators. As to Venutti, the invisibility of the translator goes back to the following two factors: 1) economic factors that restrict the translators' visibility 2) assertion that the source text is to be the only original, i.e. the author is the only writer who ought to be visible.

We support Venutti's assumption that because of the ever changing essence of meaning, neither the (foreign) writer nor the translator may produce texts with one way interpretation, and that both source texts and target texts are subject to the taboos, the codes and the ideologies of their own social systems. Venutti's view towards translation as "a cultural political practice, constructing or critiquing ideology-stamped identities for foreign cultures, affirming or transgressing discursive values and institutional limits in the target-language culture" [12; p.19] is undoubtedly to be applied to the essence of the translation issues in the scope of social gender discourse, since it is an open and ever dynamic system.

The translation process is a research that involves choosing the right words and constructions from the available options. In making this choice, the translator uses his/her own linguistic and cognitive

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829	PIHH (Russia) = 0.126	PIF (India) = 1.940
GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.716	IBI (India) = 4.260
JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667	OAJI (USA) = 0.350

knowledge and takes into account the linguistic and cognitive knowledge of future readers, which are a reflection of the characteristics of their culture. The desire of the translator to convey the original source more fully, as well as to reflect its characteristic features, is met not only by the original, but also by the host culture and its language. Underestimation of the gender factor in the translation can lead to rejection of the text of the translation by the culture of the given language and its rejection by the native speakers.

Gender is considered to be one of the aspects of translation studies which has been under the discussion. Over the years, there have been many studies and surveys in order to investigate the influence of gender on translation. A number of scholars have explored the issue of gender in different ways: from the cultural, historical and theoretical point of view. According to the viewpoint of Chamberlain, “the issues relating to gender in the practice of translation are myriad, varying widely according to the type of text, being translated, the language involved, cultural practices and countless other factors” [2; p.82]. In addition, Von Flotow pointed out that “gender and translation can be investigated in historical studies, theoretical considerations, issues of identity, post-colonial questions and questions of cultural transfer” [13; p.15].

Dealing with the translation of gender identity terms Jose Santaemilia points that “A preliminary conclusion out of women’s and men’s translations seem to indicate that women as translators seem to show a tendency towards the softening – even desexualization – of sexual references but, when women’s status is at stake they rather tend towards dysphemism and moral censure [11; p.3].

Janet W. Rich- Edwards did a survey on methods to test sex/gender differences as effect modification or interaction, and discuss why some inferences from sex-stratified data should be viewed with caution [5; p.32]. Ved Prakash claimed: “Women tend to excel in empathy and interpersonal relationships and tend to minimize hostility and conflict, men perceive threat from intimacy while women sense threat from separation” [14; p.9]. Peter Van den Besselaar did a study on the change of performance differences during the career of men and women and explored that the productivity of male employers has grown faster than female employers [10; p.7]. Maccoby and Jacklin investigated psychological differences and similarities between men and women and concluded: “The sexes may be similar in their knowledge of aggressive responses but differ in their willingness to display or accept them due to negative socialization processes. Then it is possible that these tendencies may change over time as society changes” [8; p.11]. Eisenberg and Lennon discovered the existence of differences in empathy between men and women and claimed: “The

differences strongly favor women. When reflective crying and self report measures in lab settings were used, moderate differences favoring females were found” [3; p.101]. In addition to this, Hyde examined psychological variables of gender and concluded that compared to women, men could throw farther, were more physically aggressive.

Ambiguities also appear depending on the language in which the study is carried. For example, in the German language, along with the concept *gender* such concepts as *Geschlecht*, *das soziale Geschlecht* are used. Some confusion arises in the Russian language in the process of translation. Gender is also used as an euphemism for the Russian word *половой* and Uzbek *jinsiy*. French *le sexe* and English *sex* may be translated into Russian and Uzbek languages as *секс* (секс) and *пол* (jins).

The conceptual position of the author in the choice of terminology is also important. Thus, representatives of biodeterminism, insisting on physiologically and mentally differentiation of cognitive differences and language ability of men and women, use the traditional designation of *sex*. Yet, the term *gender* can not be dropped because it proved itself first of all from a conceptual point of view, most clearly demonstrating cultural rather than natural modeling of sex. However, positive and fast acceptance of combinations in the Russian and Uzbek languages as *gender identity* (*гендерная идентичность*, *gender o'xshashlik*), *gender harassment* (*гендерное домогательство*, *jinsiy tajovuz*), *gender roles* (*гендерные роли*, *gender rollar*), *gender discrimination* (*гендерная дискриминация*, *gender kamsitish*), *gender relations* (*гендерные отношения*, *gender munosabatar*), *gender inequality* (*гендерное неравенство*, *gender tengsizlik*) shows timely response to social processes acting within the scope of GM discourse.

Regarding the full acceptance of the term *gender* by Uzbek discourse G.Ergasheva claims that there are still gaps [4]. We would not enunciate that the term is completely new for Uzbek social sciences, but we may still expect the scientific controversy in its use. However the nature of gender as “self-regulating” process induces the society to response to the problems of gender mainstreaming as quick as possible.

Although many surveys and researches have been explored about the impact of gender on translation, the aspects of differences and similarities of the translated material by male and female translators and general gender problems which translators could come across are not yet clear enough.

The relevance of the article is dictated by the need to establish the influence of the personality of the translator, namely, his/her gender affiliation on the choice of language means when translating works of art from one language to another. The category of gender is considered in the work through a

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 3.117
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 0.829
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHHI (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 8.716
SJIF (Morocco) = 5.667

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

comparative analysis of translations made by men and women from English into Russian and Uzbek languages. The “gender” issue takes one of the leading places in linguistic research, however, practically no studies have been done in translation studies, in particular in the Uzbek linguistics: the issues related to the influence of the gender of the translator on the pragmatics of translation, on the preservation of the style and pragmatic attitudes of the original, etc. At the same time, the data obtained in the work indicate that gender studies in translation studies contribute both to the further development of the theory of translation and to greater accuracy of translations from one language to another.

According to the research of Ju.Kulikova devoted to the influence of the personality of the translator on the translation of literary works:

1. The socially and culturally conditioned phenomenon of “gender” is of key importance in translation studies when considering the problem of preserving the pragmatic potential of the text.

2. Differences in the use of imaginative means in male and female languages are manifested in the

original translated works in the sense that female prose is very diverse in the use of tropes, as well as at the morphological, lexical and syntactic levels.

3. A male translator, encountering a text with typical female vocabulary and style, translates it under the influence of his gender status, which is manifested in a certain decrease in the author’s connotation, emotional coloring of the work and violation of the pragmatics of the author [7].

Conclusion

One may assume that the following tasks should be identified based on the aim of the study.

1. To consider the category of “gender” as a linguistic phenomenon due to sociolinguistic and cultural factors, as well as modern principles of analysis of this phenomenon in linguistics.

2. To develop criteria for a comparative analysis of translations made by male and female translators.

3. To identify and analyze the characteristics of the translation of the work of art, taking into account the gender of the translator.

References:

1. Apresyan, Y. D. (1996). *Ideas and methods of modern structural linguistics*. Moscow: Prosvesheniye. Retrieved 2019, from <https://www.booksite.ru/fulltext/apresyn/index.htm>
2. Chamberlain, L. (1998). *Gender Metaphorics in Translation*. London: Routledge.
3. Eisenberg, M., & Lennon, R. (1994). *Sex Differences in Empathy and Related Capacities*. (p.101). Psychological Bulletin.
4. Ergasheva, G. (2018). *Linguistic and extra-linguistic factors in the formation of gender terminology in the system of different languages*. Dissertation of Doctor of Science on Philological Sciences. Tashkent.
5. Janet, W., & Rich, E. (2018). *Sex and Gender Differences Research Design for Basic, Clinical and Population Studies*. Essentials for Investigators.
6. Philips, K. A., & Menard, W. (2006). Gender Similarities and Differences in 200 Individuals with Body Dysmorphic Disorder. *Compr Psychiatry*, 47(2).
7. Kulikova, J. S. (2011). *The influence of the personality of the translator on the translation of works of art: gender aspect: on the material of Russian, English and German*. Chelyabinsk.
8. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Women’s Place*. New York: Harper and Row.
9. Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Linguoculturology: Textbook*. Moscow: Publishing Center “Academy”.
10. Van den Basselaar, P. & Sadstrom, U. (1985). *Gender Differences in Research Performance and its impact on Careers: a longitudinal case study*.
11. Santaemilia, J. (2005). *Gender, sex and translation*. The manipulation of identities. Manchester, UK.
12. Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator’s Invisibility. A History of Translation*. Routledge. London and New York.
13. Von Flotow, L. (2001). *Gender in Translation: The issues of Go on*. University of Ottawa.
14. Prakash, V., & Flores, R. C. (1985). *A Study of Psychological Gender Differences*.