

Date: 21st October-2025

**STYLISTIC ERRATOLOGY IN ENGLISH-UZBEK LITERARY TRANSLATION:
A PRAGMATIC AND AESTHETIC EVALUATION**

Ibrohimova Nasiba Mirzohid qizi

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Trainee- Teacher

mirzohidovna0328@gmail.com

Annotation: Stylistic erratology in literary translation represents a critical yet underexplored dimension of translation quality assessment, particularly for linguistically distant language pairs such as English and Uzbek. This article investigates stylistic errors in English-Uzbek literary translations through an integrated pragmatic and aesthetic evaluation framework, examining how translators navigate the complex interplay between linguistic constraints, cultural expectations, and artistic imperatives. Literary translation transcends mere semantic transfer, requiring preservation of authorial voice, recreation of aesthetic effects, maintenance of textual coherence, and adaptation of stylistic features to target language conventions while respecting source text integrity. Through systematic analysis of stylistic error patterns in published English-Uzbek translations, this research identifies recurrent problem areas including register leveling, metaphorical inconsistency, rhythmic deterioration, imagery loss, and tone distortion.

Keywords: Stylistic erratology, literary translation, English-Uzbek translation, aesthetic evaluation, pragmatic stylistics, translation quality assessment

Stylistic erratology, the systematic study of stylistic errors in translation, provides essential insights into the challenges of literary translation and the competencies required to address them effectively. Unlike semantic errors, which involve distortion of propositional content, stylistic errors concern inadequate preservation or recreation of aesthetic features, expressive qualities, and affective dimensions of literary texts. These errors may not render translations incomprehensible but diminish their literary quality, reduce aesthetic impact, and alter the artistic experience they offer readers. Stylistic erratology thus serves both evaluative purposes—assessing translation quality—and pedagogical purposes—identifying areas requiring attention in translator training. The English-Uzbek language pair presents particularly rich terrain for stylistic erratological investigation due to substantial linguistic distance, different literary traditions, and contrasting aesthetic conventions. English, a Germanic language with extensive lexical resources drawn from multiple sources, possesses distinctive stylistic features including flexible word order for emphasis, rich metaphorical traditions, and diverse register systems. Uzbek, a Turkic language with its own literary heritage influenced by Persian, Arabic, and Russian traditions, employs different stylistic resources including agglutinative morphology enabling expressive word formation, different metaphorical conventions, and distinct rhythm patterns. These differences create numerous challenges for translators

Date: 21stOctober-2025

attempting to preserve English stylistic features in Uzbek translation or vice versa. This article examines stylistic erratology in English-Uzbek literary translation through an integrated framework combining pragmatic and aesthetic evaluation. Pragmatic evaluation examines how stylistic choices function communicatively, considering register appropriateness, social meaning, and reader response. Aesthetic evaluation assesses literary quality, examining how effectively translations recreate source text artistic effects, maintain textual coherence, and function as literary works in the target language. This dual perspective recognizes that stylistic errors involve both pragmatic failures—inappropriate communicative effects—and aesthetic failures—diminished literary quality. The analysis proceeds through several stages. First, it establishes a theoretical framework for stylistic erratology, reviewing relevant concepts from stylistics, translation studies, and literary theory. Second, it examines major categories of stylistic errors in English-Uzbek literary translation, providing concrete examples and analyzing their causes and consequences. Third, it proposes methodological approaches for systematic stylistic error analysis. Finally, it discusses implications for translation practice, quality assessment, and translator training. Throughout, the article maintains focus on the specific challenges of the English-Uzbek language pair while drawing upon broader translation studies scholarship and stylistic theory. Stylistic errors in translation resist simple definition because they necessarily involve aesthetic judgments that vary across critical traditions, temporal periods, and individual readers. Unlike clear semantic errors where meaning is demonstrably distorted, stylistic errors concern more subjective dimensions including elegance, appropriateness, effectiveness, and literary quality. Nevertheless, certain principles provide foundations for identifying stylistic errors systematically. Leech and Short (2007) define style as the manner of expression in language, encompassing choices among alternative ways of saying things. Literary style involves purposeful exploitation of linguistic resources to create particular aesthetic effects, convey attitudes, establish voice, and generate meaning. Stylistic errors occur when translations fail to recognize stylistic features in source texts, inadequately recreate these features in target texts, or produce target texts with stylistic defects independent of source correspondence. Boase-Beier (2006) emphasizes that literary translation must attend to style because style constitutes meaning in literary texts rather than merely conveying it. The cognitive dimension of style—how stylistic choices guide reader processing and interpretation—means stylistic errors affect not only aesthetic experience but also meaning comprehension. A translation preserving propositional content while losing stylistic features may fundamentally alter textual meaning by changing how readers process and interpret the text. Parks (2007) distinguishes between micro-stylistic features (local choices affecting individual sentences or passages) and macro-stylistic features (patterns operating across entire texts). Stylistic errors may occur at either level. Micro-stylistic errors affect local passages, while macro-stylistic errors involve loss of consistency, pattern disruption, or failure to maintain voice across entire texts. Comprehensive stylistic evaluation must attend to both levels. The definition of stylistic error must also consider translation norms and purposes. What

Date: 21stOctober-2025



constitutes an error under norms prioritizing source text fidelity may represent acceptable adaptation under norms prioritizing target text functionality. For English-Uzbek literary translation, contemporary norms generally favor balanced approaches preserving source text stylistic features where possible while ensuring target text literary effectiveness. Errors involve unjustifiable deviations from this balance, either through excessive literalism producing awkward target texts or through excessive adaptation losing source text specificity. Stylistic choices carry pragmatic meanings, affecting how readers perceive texts, relate to characters, and interpret messages. Register, for instance, signals social relationships, contextual formality, and speaker attitudes. Metaphor conveys not only semantic content but also invites particular cognitive processing and emotional responses. Sentence structure affects information flow, emphasis, and reader engagement. Stylistic erratology must therefore consider pragmatic dimensions of style, examining how stylistic features function communicatively. Halliday's (1978) functional grammar provides a framework for analyzing pragmatic dimensions of style through three metafunctions: ideational (representing experience), interpersonal (enacting social relationships), and textual (organizing information). Stylistic choices contribute to all three metafunctions. Lexical choices affect ideational meaning by presenting experience from particular perspectives. Register and tone affect interpersonal meaning by positioning readers relative to texts and establishing relationships. Information structure and cohesion affect textual meaning by organizing content for processing. Pragmatic stylistic errors occur when translations create inappropriate pragmatic effects through stylistic choices. For example, translating informal dialogue with formal register creates inappropriate social distance. Translating assertive statements with hedging modality creates inappropriately tentative tone. Translating foregrounded information with background positioning creates inappropriate emphasis patterns. These errors may not distort semantic content but fundamentally alter pragmatic meanings and reader responses. While literary translation has traditionally resisted automation, emerging technologies may offer support for stylistic aspects of translation without replacing human creativity and judgment. Computer-assisted translation tools might provide support including stylistic analysis of source texts highlighting features requiring attention, corpus-based suggestions for metaphor translation, register analysis tools, and consistency checking for recurring stylistic features. Machine translation systems, while inadequate for final literary translation, might generate initial drafts that human translators then revise extensively. This post-editing approach could enable translators to focus energy on creative problem-solving and stylistic refinement rather than basic semantic transfer. However, research is needed to determine whether post-editing machine-translated literature proves more efficient than translating from scratch and whether it yields comparable quality. Technology development for literary translation must account for literary translation's distinctive requirements including aesthetic quality, cultural sensitivity, and creative expression. Technology should augment rather than replace human translator expertise, providing tools that enhance efficiency and quality while respecting translation's fundamentally creative, interpretive nature. Cultural

Date: 21stOctober-2025



dimensions of pragmatic style prove particularly important for English-Uzbek translation. Different cultures have different conventions for expressing emotions, marking politeness, conveying directness or indirectness, and establishing authority. English literary style may employ irony, understatement, or emotional restraint reflecting Anglo-American cultural values. Direct translation into Uzbek may create texts that seem cold, confusing, or culturally inappropriate. Conversely, Uzbek stylistic conventions may employ different strategies for emphasis, emotional expression, or relationship marking that seem inappropriate if used for translating English texts. Literary style serves aesthetic functions, creating beauty, generating artistic effects, and contributing to literary value. Aesthetic stylistic features include imagery creating vivid sensory experiences, metaphor generating conceptual insights, rhythm producing musical effects, repetition creating emphasis and coherence, and deviation from norms attracting attention and creating defamiliarization. Aesthetic stylistic errors diminish these artistic dimensions, reducing literary quality and impoverishing reader experience. Russian Formalist concepts of foregrounding and defamiliarization illuminate aesthetic functions of style (Shklovsky, 1917). Literary language deviates from ordinary language norms to make familiar experiences seem fresh, attract attention to linguistic form, and slow down reading for contemplation. Stylistic features including unusual metaphors, syntactic inversions, sound patterns, and lexical innovations serve defamiliarizing functions. Translations losing these deviations through normalization fail to recreate aesthetic effects central to literary experience. Jakobson's (1960) poetic function of language, where messages focus on their own form, characterizes literary discourse. Patterns of equivalence—sound repetition, parallel structures, symmetrical arrangements—create aesthetic effects and generate additional layers of meaning. Translation must attend to these patterns, attempting to preserve or recreate them where possible. Stylistic errors include destroying source text patterns without compensation or introducing inappropriate patterns creating unintended effects. Aesthetic evaluation also considers target text literary quality independently of source correspondence. Translations may accurately reflect source text features while producing aesthetically deficient target texts through awkward constructions, unnatural collocations, or failed attempts at creativity. Comprehensive stylistic evaluation therefore requires both comparative analysis (source-target correspondence) and independent aesthetic assessment (target text quality). For English-Uzbek literary translation, aesthetic considerations include respecting literary traditions in both languages while producing translations that function effectively as literary works in Uzbek. This requires knowledge of Uzbek literary aesthetics, stylistic conventions, and reader expectations alongside understanding of English source texts. Translators must judge when to preserve English aesthetic features, when to adapt them to Uzbek conventions, and when to employ creative solutions transcending conventions in both languages. This article proposes an integrated framework combining pragmatic and aesthetic evaluation of stylistic features. Stylistic choices simultaneously carry pragmatic meanings and create aesthetic effects, making separation artificial. Register choices, for instance, pragmatically mark social relationships while

Date: 21stOctober-2025

aesthetically contributing to characterization and tone. Metaphors pragmatically structure understanding while aesthetically creating imagery and emotional resonance. Rhythm pragmatically affects information processing while aesthetically creating musical effects. Integrated evaluation examines how stylistic features function both pragmatically and aesthetically, assessing whether translations preserve or appropriately adapt these functions. Stylistic errors may involve pragmatic failure (inappropriate communicative effects), aesthetic failure (diminished literary quality), or both. The most serious errors affect both dimensions, creating pragmatically inappropriate texts that also lack aesthetic value. This framework recognizes that pragmatic and aesthetic priorities sometimes conflict, requiring translators to make difficult choices. Preserving source text aesthetic features may create pragmatically inappropriate target texts, while ensuring pragmatic appropriateness may sacrifice aesthetic qualities. Effective literary translation navigates these tensions through creative solutions that honor both dimensions. Stylistic errors often result from inadequate attempts to balance pragmatic and aesthetic demands, either prioritizing one dimension exclusively or failing to recognize conflicts requiring resolution.

REFERENCES:

- Boase-Beier, J. (2006). *Stylistic approaches to translation*. Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.
- Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), *On translation* (pp. 232-239). Harvard University Press.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350-377). MIT Press.
- Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. St. Jerome Publishing.
- Parks, T. (2007). *Translating style: A literary approach to translation—A translation approach to literature* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- 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.
- Shklovsky, V. (1917/1965). Art as technique. In L. T. Lemon & M. J. Reis (Eds.), *Russian formalist criticism: Four essays* (pp. 3-24). University of Nebraska Press.

