

# ANALYSIS OF EPITHET IN “KUTADGU BILIG” (IN TRANSLATIONS)

Ibragimov Shekhrozbek To'lqinjon o'g'li<sup>1</sup>, Ibragimov Shekhrozbek Tulkinjon o'g'li<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology, Teacher, Department of Foreign Languages.

DOI: 10.47750/pnr.2022.13.S06.502

## Abstract

During the last century a great deal of work has been done in the study of the poem Yusuf Has Hajib's "Kutadgu Bilig", which was the first Turkic manuscript. In Uzbekistan, Professor Kayum Karimov did some research on translating this work in Uzbek and presented it in a language that is understandable to readers. On the other hand, this poem has been translated into several languages of the world, and much more has been done. However, there are some disadvantages in conveying its essence. These shortcomings can be seen in the fact that translations in different languages are lost in translation, with some artifacts being lost. This article compares the artistic content of the box knowledge with comparative analysis in foreign languages. Working on a scientific article, three versions were analyzed and studied. Their bytes were compared. As a result, every translation has some differences. But we can see the similarity between the translations, especially in translations by May and Ivanov. Because, separately, Walter May has translated this work from a Russian translation by Ivanov. Given that both of the above translations are translated in partnerships, we can see that they have some artwork in place. This is evident in the translation by Robert Denkoff. The main reason was that Denkoff translated this work in prose. Illustrated by specific bytes of the work, it provides a comprehensive comparison of the artistic tools used, including illustrations and epithets, in translations from four books to three different languages. Finally, it became clear that the shortcomings of some translators had a profound effect on the translation of the work without affecting the translation.

**Keywords:** Kutadgu bilig, stylistic devices, epithet.

## Introduction

Now let's look at the SD (stylistic device) called Epithet. It is an ancient Greek word that shows the quality. So in Uzbek literature, we call it as expressive modifier. Great linguist, Galperin believed that epithet displaying writer's and speaker's emotional attitude to the communication<sup>1</sup>. He also called it that epithet has a weaker but still forceful means. For example: “*yovvoyi shamol*”, “*yurakni yondiradigan kulgu*”, “*ochiq qo'l*”, “*egri yurak*” and “*shirin kulgu*”. In the above examples, adjectives are showing generally known meaning rather than giving exact one. Human can imagine “*yovvoyi hayvon*”, “*oddiy kulgu*”, “*katta qo'l*”, “*ishlayotgan yurak*” and others. There is a question why human can imagine those which I gave the latter as an example. Adjectives that are given to describe nouns do not give pointed inherent qualities to the nouns. Galperin divided epithet into groups in the following way:

### 1. Semantic

### 2. Structural

Semantic epithets are also divided into two parts

<sup>1</sup> Galperin I.R. Stylistics. Second edition. Revised – M.: Higher school. 1977 157-p

A. **Associated** (*qorong’u o’rmon, diqqat e’tibor, jimjit yarim tun*)

B. **Unassociated** (*qora tuproq, unsiz qum*)

Structural epithet is also divided in two parts.

A) **Composition** (O. S. Akhmanova gave some fact that “You know what I mean and all I have to do now is to point it out to you in this concise way”)<sup>2</sup>

B) **Distribution**

These ones are given exactly in the table.

1-table

<i>Semantic epithet</i>	<i>Associated</i>
	<i>Unassociated</i>
<i>Structural epithet</i>	<i>Composition</i>
	<i>Distribution</i>

Now, I’m going to look through some epithets of Kutadgu Bilig.

**Now let’s look at the couplet 51:**

*Uquşluğ biliglig tona alp yürak*

*Hazina tolulap aqutğu kerak.*

This couplet means that a leader should be a knowledgeable, intelligent, hardworking brave heart and fill the wealth of country. In the above example “*alp yürak*” is possibly taken as an epithet. As it is given “*alp*” is not usually inherent to “*yürak*”, but it the meaning of baraveness.

**Translation of W.May:**

*How boldly and wisely to manage his deeds*

*So treasure is endless, and serves all his needs!*

As it is seen or if we compare the translation of Arat and May, the epithet in the English translation is lost. In order to make it clear, I will give some explanation to two versions. In the original version there is a phrase “*alp yürak*” which representate the epithet, but in the English translation we can see the translation of “*alp*” as “*boldly*”, but we did not find the meaning of “*yürak*”. Maybe translator wanted to keep the pose of the rhytm or he wanted to give the meaning of the epithet with another words. But there is no change to the core meaning of the couplet. So it does not influence the detail which Yusuf Has Hajib wanted to share even though there is no the epithet in an English translatio.

**Translation of S.N. Ivanov:**

*Как смело и мудро вести все дела,*

<sup>2</sup> Akhmanova O. S. Lexical and Syntactical Collocations in contemporary English. “Zeitschrift fur Anglistik und Amerikanistik”, M., 1958, Heft I, 19-p

*Следя, чтоб казна неиссякшей была!*

Like May, Ivanov also translated at the same style, because May translated “Beneficent knowledge” from Ivanov’s translation. The word “*смело*” is the meaning of boldly and “*дела*” is the translation “*deeds*”, but we cannot say that there is also given the epithet. As we are seen in an English work there is no epithet in Russian one.

### **The couplet 343:**

*Bu qaç nan biriksa biragü üza*

*Anındın yırar ol iduq qut tez-a.*

In the original version, “*iduq qut*” is the example of the epithet because “*iduq*” is not really inherent to the word “*qut*” As we divided the epithet into parts in the above explanation, the epithet of this couplet is called semantic associated epithet. Yusuf Has Hajib was going to say that there is a bad situation if all deeds coincide with together.

### **Translation of R.Denkoff:**

*Now if a single individual unites all these traits in his person, then Fate will not favor him and Blessed Fortunate will turn away from him.*

In Denkoff’s translation we can see the epithet is kept in it. Like original version “*iduq qut*” is translated as “*blessed fortunate*”. In offline Macmillan English Dictionary “*blessed*” means “*holy*” showing being respected for living a very religious life. There is a little difference between two, but the core meaning is kept. “*Qut*” is given as “*fortunate*” meaning lucky. Anyway there is a stylistic device namely the epithet even though translator used different words.

### **Translation of W.May:**

*And all these bad qualities constitute woe.*

*The one who possesses them joy will not know!*

Unlike Denkoff, Walter May the epithet is not faced because we cannot find the translation of “*iduq qut*” or the paraphrase in the couplet. There is given a word “*joy*” but it does not mean fortunate. Though overall meaning is remained in the translation.

### **Translation of S.N. Ivanov:**

*А все эти свойства сойдутся – беда:*

*Владельцу их счастья не знать никогда!*

We can conclude that there is no epithet because May translated the work from Ivanov’s Russian translation

**The couplet 1707-1709:** in order to give the whole idea and be easily understandable to the reader here are given three couplets

*Qamuğqa yaraşar bu qut urşa yüz*

*Uquşluqqa artuq yaraşar keb uzç*

*Munar menzar emdi bu baytığ oqı*

*Oqıgıl uqa bar ay elgi aqı.*

*Biligsizga davlat yaraşsa kelip*

*Bilibgğa artuq yaraşar bilip.*

In the above examples wealth is the main topic. Writer wanted to compare a knowledgeable intelligent man with fool man who possessed wealth. In the second couplet there is a word “*elgi aqi*” meaning the word generous. Yusuf Has Hajib tried to refer to man who is generous with some suitable advice. “*Elgi aqi*” is the epithet here

#### **Translation of R.Denkoff:**

*Fortune indeed befits the man of intellect; as in the following verse:*

*Though Fortune favor fools once or twice,*

*She mainly favors **the wise**;*

*Though now and then on a fool she alight,*

*To the wise she fastens tight.*

#### **Translation of W.May:**

*In goodness, for men of all times, there's delight,*

*But only the wise ones have such blessed sight!”*

*There's a verse about this, so just read through its lines,*

*And learn them, and love them, recall them be times:*

*“A fool can be happy, if joy knocks his door,*

*But happiness suits **a wise man** so much more.*

#### **Translation of S.N. Ivanov:**

*Во благе отрада мужам всех времен,*

*А стоит его только тот, кто умен.*

*Об этом и стих есть, прочти его стоки,*

*Усвой его, муж, **сердолюбьем широкий**:*

*«И глупый хорош, если счастьем богат,*

*А умному счастье пригодно стократ.*

In Denkoff's translation, he used the word “*the wise*” as a translation of “*elgi aqi*”. It does not exactly mean as it is seen in the original version. There is a question why?. In dictionaries wise does not have the noun meaning, but everybody knows that “*wise*” is an adjective meaning “*a wise person is able to make good choices and decisions because they have a lot of experience*”. In that way we can use before the noun, but translator gave “*wise*” with a definite article “*the*” and turned the adjective into noun. In other word we cannot say that there is not the epithet in his translation.

If we continue with May's work he also used “*wise*” to give the meaning of “*elgi aqi*”. He used “*wise*” with an indefinite article “*a*” so as turn the adjective into noun. Like Dankoff May also did not keep the epithet in the work because “*a wise*” does not mean “*elgi aqi*”. I gave the explanation for this reason.

In Russian we can also find the same situation as May's translation.

#### **Last example for the epithet:**

*Erat körsa ötrü sewinçlig bolur*

*Yağı öğrı bolsa **sewüg can** berürç*

*İsig söz külar yüz bila bergü nan*

*Bu üç nan kişiga bolur edgü yan*

As it is seen in two couplets there are three epithet examples: “*sewüg can*”, “*İsig söz*” and “*külar yüz*”. All three adjectives which come before the noun are not inherent to the nouns. For example: “*sewüg*” is meant “lovely” if we translate into English, “*İsig*” is the translation of “warm” or “good”. This word is somehow inherent to the word “*söz*”. And the next one “*külar*” does not match to the word “*yüz*” in reality.

#### **Translation of R.Denkoff:**

*The troops will rejoice when they see you doing this, and willingly give up your souls when it is time to meet the enemy. Warm words, a cheerful face, a liberal hand: these three become a man well.*

Denkoff translated “*sewüg can*” as a “*your souls*” and it means that it shows the spiritual part of a person that most religions believe continues to exist after their body dies. It is related to the human body part religiously. “*Warm words*” is meant exactly as “*isig söz*”. In both English and Denkoff’s version “*warm words*” and “*isig söz*” is similar meaning. “*Külar yüz*” is translated as “*a cheerful face*” meaning that word in Uzbek language. “*Cheerful*” means making you feel happy because of being pleasant or enjoyable.

#### **Translation of W.May:**

*All warriors approve of the valour you show,*

*And to the last man they would die for you so.*

***Be kindly, and open, and spoil freely share,***

*These three things remember, and all will go fair*

Unlike Denkoff May did not give the epithet in the first couplet, but he gave it in the second. May gave the paraphrase of the original meaning version. Even though he gave the same meaning as original version, he used different words. So there is not the epithet because of paraphrase. In the second couplet May used some words in the first line of the couplet representing the epithet. “*Be kindly, and open, and spoil freely share*” is wholly epithet.

#### **Translation of S.N. Ivanov:**

*Одобрят все войны доблесть твою –*

*Все пасть за тебя будут рады в бою.*

***Будь ласков, приветлив и щедр на дары –***

*Три доблести эти добры и мудры.*

In Russian Ivanov’s translation is the same as Walter May. We can see similar situation. The word “*ласков*” means “gently” and “kindly” and “*приветлив*” as “friendly” or “cheerful”.

## **References**

- 1) Yoqubjon Is’hoqov. So’z san’ati so’zligi. – T.: Toshkent. Maktubot-Press. 2006. 126 p.
- 2) Юсуф Баласагунский. Благодатное знание. С.Н.Иванов. – Т.: Москва «Наука». 1983. 556 p.
- 3) Yusuf Has Hajib. “Wisdom of Royal Glory” Translation with an Introduction and Notes by Robert Denkoff. The University of Chicago Press, - Chicago: 1983. 283 p.
- 4) Yusuf Balasaguni. Beneficent Knowledge // Translated into English by Walter May. – Moscow-Bishkek: 1998. 510 p.
- 5) Yüsüf Has Hacib. Qutadğu bilig. Reşed Rahmeti Arat. – T.: Toshkent. 2010. 252 p.

- 6) Aida Kasieva. Stylistic devices in the “Kutadgu bilig” and the adequacy of their translation into English (on the material of English translation made by W.May). – T.: Kirgizistan. 2011. 957-976 p.
- 7) Margaret M. Lockhart. A description of similes from children’s fiction. A thesis submitted to the faculty of graduate studies and research. – T.: Edmonton. Alberta. 1972 242 p.
- 8) Galperin I.R. Stylistics. Second edition. Revised – M.: Higher school. 1977 330 p.
- 9) George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. Metaphors we live by. – T.: Chicago and London. The University of Chicago press. 1980. 252 p
- 10) John R. Searle. Expression and Meaning – T.: Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. 1981. 197 p.
- 11) Ernst Cassirer. Die Kraft der Metapher. Sprache und Mythe. – Leipzig – Berlin, 1925 145 p.
- 12) Akhmanova O. S. Lexical and Syntactical Collocations in contemporary English. “Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik”, M., 1958, Heft I, 157 p.