

## TRANSLATION CONCEPTS OF “THE LEIPZIG SCHOOL” SCHOLARS

**Azizbek Mukhamedov**  
Jizzakh State Pedagogical Institute  
**THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN**  
[azizbek-uzb@mail.ru](mailto:azizbek-uzb@mail.ru)

### ABSTRACT

The Leipzig school of translation holds a special place in the development of world translation science in the 60-70s of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the article, the author discusses the theoretical ideas and concepts of the Leipzig translators and scientists, the concept of "translation" introduced by German linguist Otto Kade, Albrecht Neubert's "communicative equivalence", "textual approach" to translation introduced by Katharina Reiss and one of the fundamental theories in translation studies, the Skopos. In this research also explores scholastic views and Gert Jager who made an important contribution to the development of a science of translation and investigated functional and communicative significance of a text and analyzed evolution of the concept of equivalence.

**Keywords:** Translation linguistics, literary translation, equivalence, pragmatic aspects of translation, text types, audio-medial text, the Skopos theory.

### INTRODUCTION

Ongoing reforms in the Republic of Uzbekistan cover all areas of social life, including organizational changes and modernization of the educational system, improving the quality of foreign languages teaching and learning, development of Translation studies as a discipline and training competent translators and interpreters. The issue of development and implementation of measures to address deliberate and purposeful training of translators and translation specialists, involvement of talented young people in scientific and scholarly procedures, organization and creation of conditions for realization of their inventive and intellectual potential is being gradually addressed as well.

The 20th century had played an important role in the development of theory of translation, Translation and Interpreting Studies. Pierre-Francois Caille, the founder and former president of the International Federation of Interpreters, named the 20th century as the Century of Translation. The rapid development of world science throughout the century, emergence and evolution of new genres and styles in literature and art, development of international relations have increased the demand and need for competent translators and learning more about the theory of translation and interpretation.

All of these scientific and practical realizations and accomplishments laid the groundwork for the rise and emergence of the science of translation studies as a discipline. Learning the formation stages of translation theory as a science, as well as the theoretical concepts of the European scholars and theorists and versatile analysis of all modern translation approaches and concepts has always been and is still of paramount importance.

## AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

The 60-70s of the XX century is a significant period in the development of the world translation science. During that time, theoretical views of the Leipzig scholars, representatives, located in southeastern Germany, played a crucial role in the development of the translation studies. The article aims to analyze the theoretical views and concepts of the Leipzig translators and scholars and identify the developmental principles of translation theory and practice of the period.

## RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

In the mid-1960s, a new turn in the debate about translation theory took place. It could be regarded as “protecting” a non-literary translation from an excessive claim that it can solve all problems of a literary translation. In this regard, scientific approaches, works and theoretical considerations of the Leipzig School scholars Otto Kade, Albrecht Neubert, and Gert Jager were more remarkable than Rudolf Walter Jumpelt’s “Translation of Scientific and Technical Literature” which was published in 1961 in Berlin.

The Leipzig School scholars had developed the theory of “Translation and translation linguistics” based on the notion that translation was an independent linguistic field and research area [1.77]. The objectives of translational linguistics included “a study of translation process as a linguistic phenomenon” and “the study of linguistic mechanisms underlying these processes”.

In 1963, Otto Kade introduced the concept of “translation” as a term that represents the general translation category. This category of translation included “Übersetzen” (“written translation”), and “Dolmetschen” (“interpretation, oral translation”). He also suggested the term “translat” to refer to the translation’s output, regardless of whether the word goes about “Übersetzen” or “Dolmetschen”.

Additionally, in written or oral forms, process of translation used the term “translator” to refer to and define the subject of translation activity. A Bulgarian translation scholar Alexander Lyudskanov once wrote that “it seems logical to introduce more general concept of higher abstraction to the science”. Like in many other languages, for German translations it is typical to have both “Übersetzen” and “Dolmetschen”, but in the Russian language, translating is equivalent to the term “translation” which was proposed by Otto Kade.

Currently, descriptive expressions such as “translator”, “oral translation” and “written translation” are also used in the Russian language. Although, previously, Russian translators were known as “dragomans - interpreters of the oriental languages, who were attached to ambassadors, councils and etc.” Vladimir Dal, a Russian writer and one of the greatest lexicographers, included the above descriptive terms in his “Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language”.

The difference between “Übersetzen” (written translation) and “Dolmetschen (interpretation, oral translation) was first shown by a German philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher and today, the visions and opinions of numerous modern scholars are based on his views and concepts. Although Friedrich Schleiermacher had written that the boundaries of these fields were not clear, they were intertwined, but nevertheless, “Dolmetschen” was believed to include, to some extent, all mechanical exercises: “The less the author’s personality is manifested in the original text (Urschrift), the more he or she becomes perceptive of the subject and the more subordinate to the space and order of time, and thereby translation turns into “Dolmetschen”. A translator of newspaper articles and roadside views usually deals with “Dolmetschen” [6.209]

Consequently, according to an interpretation of Friedrich Schleiermacher, “Dolmetschen”, although it had a meaning of oral translation, was mainly associated with the “translation of texts related to a service”. (“It’s as meaningless as it’s impossible to transfer “Dolmetschen’s” literary outputs by word of mouth’ he wrote).” Later, it was decided to separate “Übersetzen” (written translation) and “Dolmetschen” (oral translation) into two different concepts and the procedure was reflected in numerous dictionaries. Otto Kade’s aim was to give a high status to the non-literary translation. At the same time, the course-of-action was based on the view that, without considering the subject of “written translation” or “oral translation”, they could not be understood by relying solely on linguistic compliance or coherence.

It is noteworthy that Otto Kade did not use the phrase “Translationswissenschaft” (“Science of translation”). He realized that the linguistic approach to the problems of translation alone would not be sufficient. In 1970, Kade wrote: “The science of translation which is considered as a research area of “Linguo-semiotics” has not yet been able to provide the necessary scientific basis for practice. Due to the fact that it is still unable to answer the following questions: What is being translated? How and based on what information should a translation be made? There is no doubt that problems articulated in these questions are becoming more relevant in the context of the “information explosion”. [...] Translational science has not been able to answer these questions. As there are such factors which have nothing to do with linguistic influence in a language or bilingual communication it’s not possible to describe them from a linguistic and semiotic angle” [3.183]. Although, Otto Kade was doubtful about the idea of “translational linguistics” (so-called “science of translation”), it had been well supported and developed by a number of other scholars (and is still being developed).

In the “Translational linguistics” (also used by Alexander Lyudskanov, Bulgarian translator, semiotician), the concept of “code” which was borrowed from an information theory had a central place. In that context, translation activity was viewed as a “recoding”. The distinction between the “Parole” (speaking) and the “Langue” (language), which had been used since the times of a Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, had also a leading function.

The dual concept in linguistic practice implies: (a) the actualization of language means and (b) a stable language system which is not dependent on an individual. The task of linguistic approach in translation is to describe the inter-linguistic compliance on a systematic level. When this policy is applied to a specific translation process, it will be possible to look for compliance between the original and translation text. This compliance can be simplified and called “equivalence”. According to this concept, “general science of translation” develops a model of different types of equivalence. The science behind language and translation studies examines the relationships between two languages based on equivalence.

Naturally, a description of this kind is justified only when the essence of translated opinion (according to R.V. Jumpelt, “meaningful invariant”) is taken into account. In other words, the word is about texts and their form which does not have any other function than to express the meaning when translated.

Otto Kade wrote: “The quality of literary translation is determined by how a translator can exactly represent a quality or an idea of content of the text from one language into another. But, to be able to create a new text in a target language, translator should have a creative, literary and artistic potential and a talent to write. This is a requirement not only for translations of poetry but also for prose. The most prestigious translation of prose, outside of creation of

literary works, does not occur without the ability of literary translation or a potential for creative and intuitive processing of linguistic material.” [2.47]

For this reason, Otto Kade believed that the theory of translation, in a purely scientific and linguistic manner, was suitable only for “pragmatic texts”. Generally, texts of that type had an objective equivalent relationship between two languages. Hence, there was a need to differentiate between “literary translation” and “pragmatic translation” (texts which are related to documents, science, technology, law, commerce, advertising, etc.). If in a “pragmatic text” the form is subordinated to the content, in a “literary text” the form dialectically interacts with text content. Consequently, there cannot be a single theory of translation. It is desirable to work along the side of two independent scientific areas (or two separate branches of one scientific direction): for “pragmatic texts” - with linguistics, for “literary texts” - with literature and linguistics.

The development of the “textual genres” typology (“Textgattung”) was an attempt to overcome contradictions between a wide range of theoretical concepts and various practices. The practice had, as always, seriously opposed examining the process of translation in a single standardized system.

The renowned German linguist and translation theorist Albrecht Neubert advocated an idea of equivalence in translation based on the principle of preserving the pragmatics of the original text and language. Also, at the center of the scientist’s views and research were topics such as a communicative value of the text, types of translation and global significance of a text.

Albrecht Neubert’s “communicative equivalence” assumes that any translated text contains communicative nature. The communicative equivalence, consecutively, is related to a verbal interaction and a purpose of translation. The scholar innovatively presents four types of texts according to a pragmatic criteria.

The texts of the first type encompass scientific and technical literature, advertisements, announcements, texts with a high level of translatability targeting the needs of owners of the original and translation languages. The second text type includes an information for a foreign language audience which are usually local publications, laws, social and political literature and etc. The third type consists of literary translations for all types of audience. According to the scholar, quality of translated materials related to the literary texts depend on the genre they belong to. The fourth type of texts included foreign-language publications with a high level of pragmatic potential of translatability and texts containing political propaganda created for foreign audiences [8.21-23].

Differentiation of the purpose, function and specificity of translation, taking into account the text specificity, had given scholars and critics more scientific and effective ways to approach problems of translation.

One of the influential scholars who played a prominent role in the development of translation theory was a German scholar Gert Jager, who defined a functional significance of a text and determined the content of communicative significance of oral texts. The equivalency was a key concept in the author’s theory of translation. He defined the concept of equivalence from the point of a linguistic theory in translation and described the types of equivalence as functional and communicative. According to Jager, “it is an ideal case” when functional and communicative equivalences completely coincide Katharina Reiss, a German linguist,

translation scholar and one of the founders of the Skopos translation theory, first introduced the “textual approach” in translation. Her “Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik” (Translation Criticism: The Potentials and Limitations) book, published in 1971, is one of those works, in which an author usually presents the concept, expressing an attitude towards predecessors. In support of the universal theory of translation, the scholar wrote: “The theory that can be applied to the translation of all texts is still not worked out. But in the works published in the 1970s, many noteworthy points were presented on the subject. In this regard, authors and scholar like Otto Kade, Rudolf Walter Jumpelt, Eugene Nida, Rolf Kloepfer and Ralph-Rainer Wuthenow should be mentioned. It’s true that Kade focused mostly on "pragmatic" texts, Jumpelt reviewed scientific and technical texts, Nida focused on the Bible translation and Kloepfer was primarily interested in “literary texts” - prose and poetry, and Wuthenow learned and explored the uniqueness and complexity of “literary pearls”[5.15].

In her works, Katharina Reiss presented her opinions on a number of questions related to the theory of translation, classification and function of texts, equivalence and adequacy in translation. The scholar was concerned that the conclusions of different authors about various types of translation would be widely applied in the field by translators. K.Reiss criticized all existing translation classifications which were based on the types of texts and did not reflect any significant differences in applied methods of translation. Realizing that the type of original text was a determining factor in translation, K.Reiss developed her own classification for texts. The classification emphasized the importance of the language functions (Classification of language functions was first developed by the German linguist and psychologist Karl Ludwig Bühler). Katharina Reiss advanced her theory based on this classification and outlined three main text types.

The first type consists of informational texts, in other words, content-oriented texts, including scholarly press releases and reviews, reports, commercial correspondence, instructions for technical, electronic devices, patent descriptions, official documents, all types of educational and special literature, researches, reports, brochures and texts of humanitarian, natural and technical sciences [7. 125]. As an adequate way of translation, K.Reiss recommended a stylistically neutral ("prosaic") method of translation.

The second type of texts are expressive, form-oriented ones that activate verbal function of an information sender. Katharina Reiss included literary texts of different genres into this type. As for the method of adequate translation, the term “identified translation” of J.W. von Goethe was chosen. In this type of text translation, the main purpose is to convey an information to a recipient while preserving an aesthetic effect of the original text and language.

The third text types are motivational and call-to-action texts. Katharina Reiss concluded that translation was a departure from the original meaning of a text. Examples for such texts were texts which require clear actions from a receiver and included radio and television shows, plays, song lyrics, advertisements, propaganda, discussions and satires. While translating these types of texts, it was suggested that a translator should make an effort to achieve the same effect in the target, translation, language.

The scholar acknowledged that there was a fundamental difference between “pragmatic” and “literary” translations. In pragmatic translation, the language was primarily a means of communication; in literary, prose or poetry translation, the language was also a literary reconstruction of life, and a means of spreading aesthetic values.

Concurrently, the scholar, firstly, confronted an opinion that there was no problem with the “pragmatic translations” which did not need to be investigated deeply (and argued with a number of authors, including Friedrich Schleiermacher); Second, she believed that there were many more “types of texts” between “pragmatic” and “literary” texts. These types of texts created contrasting and particular problems, required different translation methods, and therefore abided by various laws. Katharina Reiss, who had critically analyzed the schemes proposed by some scholars’ “ancient attempt” to divide the translation into two parts, found them (including A.Fedorov's scheme) unsuccessful, presented her own system of classification. The basis of this classification system was the notion “text type” (“Texttyp”). It did not differ from the concept of “Textgattung” which was used by Rudolf Walter Jumpelt and Otto Kade. However, according to Katharina Reiss, the notion of a “genre of text” had failed because it resembled the concept of a “genre of work” in fiction, which “hindered the development of a typology of translation” [5.25].

Katharina Reiss believed that in each particular situation, the translation process was dictated by the type of text. A number of specific peculiarities played an important role in a translation process, for example, purpose of translation and characteristics of a target audience.

Katharina Reiss’s formulated rule had a following meaning: “If a critic expects meaningful invariance from the content-oriented translation, and seeks similarity and aesthetic effect from a form-oriented translation, searches analogy from the address-oriented translation, and in the case of audio-media texts, it is necessary to consider and evaluate the non-linguistic environment in the original text and a degree of participation of additional expressive devices in creating of a complete and mixed literary forms. [4. 202–228].

The Skopos theory of translation (from Greek “skopos” – “purpose”, which implies that any type of translation is an action, and therefore should have its own purpose and objective [9.1]) is one of the basic concepts in translation studies. It was developed in the 1970s, however, the name of the theory is related to Hans Vermeer, a German linguist who developed its basic principles in the 1980s. The theory first appeared in an article published in 1978 in German journal “Lebende Sprachen” (Living languages).

In this theory, emphasis is placed on the functions of an original text and a translated text in oral and written translations, the original text has a lower position than equivalence-based theories. Here, the original text has the status of a “source of information” and translator tailors the text and information for the needs of an audience.

From the foregoing, we can conclude that Katharina Reiss, based on Karl Ludwig Buhler's research on linguistics, classifies texts and main goal for the first group of texts’ meaning (mostly “pragmatic texts” and an interpreter is primarily concerned with facts and logic); for the second group, the main aim of the texts is a form (these are mainly literary texts, in which a translator concentrates primarily on aesthetic objectives); texts of the third group mainly aim to influence an audience (in this case, a dialogue or direct contact with a learner). Later, the fourth type of text was added to the list. The author named the type as an “audio-medial” and it included texts that are observed and grasped by the auditory perception (targeted an oral translation). The audio-medial texts are transmitted by radio and television, films, TV shows and etc.

According to Katharina Reiss, these types of texts were further subdivided into many more “types of texts.” For example, most importantly – texts with any content that included press

releases, reviews, reports, service correspondence, production instructions, patents, certificates, official documents, textbooks, special texts of natural, scientific, humanitarian, technical content, and so on [5.28].

Katharina Reiss introduced literary texts as one of the “most important – forms”, because, such texts have not only an informative content (what is being said) but the way of expression (how it is said) is of primary importance. However, these “text types” did not always obey the boundaries set by the author. For example, essays, feletons, entertainment, and even satirical poems might, by their true nature, remain within the context of “most essential meaningful” texts, even if the author claimed them to be works of art.

Literary translation is given a detailed definition in terms of “text types”. This text type includes prose (stories, stories, novels) as well as poetry (from advisory and didactic poems to lyrics). An author made remarks through a combination of so-called “literary translation” phenomenon. The reason for that is in Katharina Reiss’s concept, the term “literature” does not define belles-letters, but “a whole set of written thoughts in some language.” Thus, in her books, literary translation is described as the most sophisticated among other types, but in a classification scheme it occupies a relatively modest place among other “types”. Attempts to integrate all types of translation under one theory have made Katharina Reiss’s concept extremely complex and standardized. The concept had a significant impact on translation science (primarily because of its functional approach), but it also caused a lot of objections. The concept of Katharina Reiss was challenged by the fact that it was based primarily on strict rules and deduction.

According to the Skopos theory, the purpose of an original text is expressed in the converted text, and “sacredness” in the process of translation of the source text may be overlooked or ignored by a translator. The main disadvantage of the theory, according to some critics, is that the theory cannot be applied in translation of literary texts which are usually full of stylistic devices and expressive means.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Leipzig scholar, Otto Kade made a significant contribution to the development of linguistic theory of translation by investigating and discovering the effect of communicative approach in translation where communication usually occurs by using a system of linguistic features with grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic meanings. According to his conclusions, translation is mostly based on linguistic factors and theory of translation is part of applied linguistics.

Albrecht Neubert had used pragmatics as one of the most important aspects of translation theory and claimed that an adequate translation should preserve the pragmatics of the original. The purpose of the translation is to preserve the natural impact (pragmatic relationship), which may require changes in the message itself.

And among many translation concepts, works of Gert Jager are characterized by a linguistic interpretation of translation problems. The central place in this scholar’s research area was given to the main problem of translation studies - the problem of equivalence, which revealed the very essence of translation activity.

Katharina Reiss was among those European influential scholars and innovators who created a new paradigm of translation theory and one of the functionalist approaches where a translation

may turn out to be equivalent as a result of achieving the goal of the translation and then become adequate. The Skopos theory of translation puts an emphasis on the aim of the source and target texts over the sacredness of the original text and a translator, an independent text designer, can deviate from the original text as long as it all results in achieving the purpose of the source text in the target culture.

## LITERATURE

1. Gert Jäger. Translation und Translationslinguistik. Halle/Saale, 1975.
2. Kade O. Zufall und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung, Leipzig, 1968.
3. Kade O. Zum Verhältnis von "idealem Translator" als wissenschaftlicher Hilfskonstruktion und optimalem Sprachmittler als Ausbildungsziel // Neue Beiträge zu Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft. Leipzig, 1973.
4. Klassifikatsiya tekstov i metodi perevoda. (Voprosi teorii perevoda v zarubejnoj lingvistike. - M., 1978.
5. Reiss K. Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik, Munchen, 1971.
6. Schleiermacher F. Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzung//Schleiermacher F. Sammitche Ve-ke. Dritte Abteilung. Bd.2. Berlin, 1838.
7. Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriya 22. Teoriya perevoda. 2018. № 3
8. Neubert, Albrecht (1968). Pragmatische Aspekte der Übersetzung. Grundfragen der Übersetzungswissenschaft. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift Fremdsprachen II.
9. De Leon, C. M. (2008), Skopos and beyond: A critical study of functionalism, Target, 20(1).