



**ADABIY ASARLARDAGI REALIYALARNI TARJIMA QILISH JARAYONIGA  
TA'SIR ETUVCHI OMILLAR**

**Nematova Surayyo**

*Qashqadaryo, Qarshi 29-maktab o'qituvchisi*

**FACTORS AFFECTING TRANSLATION OF REALIA IN LITERARY  
MASTERPIECES**

**Nematova Surayyo**

*Kashkadarya, Karshi 29th school teacher*

**Annotatsiya:** *Har bir xalqning adabiy asarlari shu millat madaniyatida ildiz otgan. Barcha madaniyatlarning o'ziga xosligi tufayli deyarli barcha xalqlar adabiyotida turli xil realiyalarni topish mumkin. Maqolaning maqsadi tarjima jarayonida realiyalar tasirini yoritib berishdan iborat Topilmalar shuni ko'rsatdiki, bir qancha omillar aralashmasi tarjimonlarga katta yordam beradi. Muammoni o'rganish uchun turli xil klassik badiiy matnlarga, shu jumladan boshqa til juftliklariga e'tibor qaratish orqali qo'shimcha tadqiqotlar talab etiladi.*

**Kalit so'zlar:** *realiya, tillar, tarjima, olimlar, madaniy atamalar, tarjima jarayoni.*

**Annotation:** *Literary works of each nation have their roots in that nation's culture. Because of the uniqueness of all cultures, various kinds of realia can be found in the literature of almost all nations. The article aimed to discover the impact of realia in translation process. The findings revealed that a mixture of several factors would provide a great help for translators. Further research is required to investigate the issue by focusing on various classical literary texts, including those of other language pairs.*

**Keywords:** *reality, languages, translation, scientists, cultural terms, , translation process.*

**INTRODUCTION.** Throughout the history, interlinguistic communication between people of different nationalities and, consequently, the enrichment of literature and culture have been made possible by translation. What makes communication a challenging task is the fact that almost all languages have their own idiosyncratic structure, and they are deeply rooted in their own specific cultures. As “textual elements which provide local and historical colour”, realia are commonly “confined to literary rather than technical translation”. Such textual elements are mainly the cultural terms (CTs) of the source language (SL) which “have no exact equivalents” in the target language (TL) and they majorly “convey national, local or historical colour”. Since translation is a process through which “a meaning in a specific” SL is “linguistically” and “semantically transformed into another language”, the responsibility of the translator is to discover “how to reconstruct the meaning” of the SL “and how to convey it” in the TL. In this process, the diversity between





## TANQIDIY NAZAR, TAHLILIIY TAFAKKUR VA INNOVATSION G'OYALAR



a source language (SL) and a target language (TL) and the variation in their cultures make the practice of translation a real challenge. Moreover, it is mainly through various types of translation that different nations can communicate their thoughts and share their knowledge. Therefore, culture significantly affects language and both (culture and language) greatly affect the act of translating. Meanwhile, the pivotal role of translation as a means to mediate “between local and foreign cultures” needs to be fully appreciated. Language, being “an expression of culture is the main subject of almost all discussions on translation; therefore, one of the most challenging problems a translator may encounter is realia. As Harvey (2000: 2) writes, they “refer to concepts, institutions and personnel which are specific to the SL culture”. Lexical gaps, or “semantic void”, refer to realia which are one product of such gaps. To fill in the gaps, there are some procedures translators can resort to. Such procedures can highly affect the type of equivalents selected for the SL terms. Harvey (2000: 2-6) has suggested the following four major techniques for translating CSIs: “functional equivalence”, employing a term in the TL whose “function” resembles that of the SL term; “formal equivalence” or “linguistic equivalence”, which refers to a “word-for-word” translation; “transcription” or “borrowing”, which transliterates the original term; and “descriptive” or “self-explanatory translation”, which employs general terms to transmit the meaning. Actually, there are various kinds of “equivalence and most of them do not imply ‘perfect’ equivalence”. The following are a number of translation procedures that Newmark (1988b: 82-91) has proposed: synonymy, descriptive equivalent, transference, through-translation, cultural equivalent, functional equivalent, naturalization, transpositions, modulation, paraphrase, componential analysis, and notes. Culture addresses all human needs (both psychological and physiological) and can generally be thought of as “a roadmap for living” and the source of national identity. Identity “has its roots in a nation’s culture” and while culture can be manifested through language, both language and culture are manifested in translated-texts. In other words, principally, it is via language that “cultural values and beliefs are transmitted from one member of a society to another and from one generation to the next” (Peccei, 1999: 102). Moreover, it is mainly through various types of translation that different nations can communicate their thoughts and share their knowledge. Therefore, culture significantly affects language and both (culture and language) greatly affect the act of translating. Meanwhile, the pivotal role of translation as a means to mediate “between local and foreign cultures” needs to be fully appreciated. Harvey has suggested the following four major techniques for translating CSIs: “functional equivalence”, employing a term in the TL whose “function” resembles that of the SL term; “formal equivalence” or “linguistic equivalence”, which refers to a “word-for-word” translation; “transcription” or “borrowing”, which transliterates the original term; and “descriptive” or “self-explanatory translation”, which employs general terms to transmit the meaning. Both Weston and Harvey have talked about “equivalence”. Actually, there are various kinds of “equivalence and most of them do not imply ‘perfect’ equivalence”. The following are a number of translation procedures that Newmark has proposed: synonymy, descriptive



## TANQIDIY NAZAR, TAHLILIY TAFAKKUR VA INNOVATSION G'OYALAR



equivalent, transference, through-translation, cultural equivalent, functional equivalent, naturalization, transpositions, modulation, paraphrase, componential analysis, and notes. Considering the issue of “cultural loss in the English translation of Chinese poetry”, Yang (2010: 170) believes that “due to the differences between the Chinese culture and the English culture, the translator faces many difficulties in the translation of Chinese poetry”. He pointed out that “when translating poems, the translator must be sensitive to the cultural connotation of the original poem and well equipped with the necessary cultural background of the original poem, otherwise they cannot convey the beauty and subtlety” of the ST. Several scientists concentrated on cultural issues in the context of interpretation studies. They investigated “the most prevailing simultaneous interpretation strategies applied to culture-bound items by a number of professional simultaneous interpreters”. Their findings indicated that good interpretation depends on “interpreter’s understandings of the cultural elements” embedded in the SL “and the norms active either in” the SL or the TL. In the process of learning a language, we encounter realities all the time. Reading texts, listening to audio recordings on various topics, we encounter realities from different spheres of human activity. And the teacher's task is to help the student understand the semantic and cultural load of a particular reality, help with its translation, and, if necessary, explain the existing difference in the native and foreign languages, since many realities do not have equivalent equivalents. And this means that the main problem is not only understanding, but also translating realities.

The notion of realia and translation is very much based on the notion of equivalence. It specifically depends on the adopted definition of equivalence, though this very issue does not seem of much concern to modern scholars of realia, who jump straight away to examining realia without determining what they consider equivalent. The discussion of equivalence is, however, a fundamental issue in Translation Studies, and revolves around the question of whether there can ever be real equivalence. As Jakobson (1959/2000:114) says: “Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language.” The discussion divides those who believe that two words in different languages can have the same meaning versus those who believe that the meanings of two words in different languages will always be somewhat different, by virtue of belonging to different languages, which is also what proponents of the debate on linguistic relativity claim (Sapir 1929, Whorf 1956). According to this view, each language determines the way its speaker experiences the world so that speakers of different languages have different experiences of the same world. As a result, the words that speakers of different language use to describe their world are essentially different. In the words of Sapir: “No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached” (1929:209). This is related to the notion of translatability. If two words can have the same meaning (which linguistic relativity rejects), they are translatable; but even if two words





cannot have the exact same meaning, these meanings may be considered 'close enough' for the words to be considered translations of one another.

**Conclusion.** Thus, the question of how best to translate realia and non-equivalent vocabulary remains open. Therefore, when confronted with realia in the process of teaching a language, we try to explain this or that reality to the student as best as possible, to reveal the background information contained in it. In the 19th century, when all of The Gulistan's translators considered in the current study produced their works, there was no radio, television, the internet, social network, or any simple media for facilitating communication among people of all over the world. Therefore, the choices for translators to get themselves familiar with the source-text culture were very limited. They could travel to the country where the ST was originally written, to find some SL natives and get assistance from them (like what Anderson did), or to find some knowledgeable experts of the SL literature and seek help from them (as is done by Rehatsek). As the findings revealed, the mixed factor of the accessibility to 'the previous translations' and 'the SL experts' was more influential than the mere accessibility to the SL natives. Nowadays, accessibility to the previous translations and the SL experts can be attained via reading their books, majorly available in the internet. One main implication for the prospective translators of classical Persian literature would be that they do not necessarily need to consult with native speakers in order to deal properly with the realia embedded in such texts—studying the related books written by the SL experts, as well as reviewing and meticulously comparing previous translations, will be of great help. Rarely any translator can be found or expected to be more familiar with the source-culture than an expert native one. Therefore, it seems that a mixture of the three factors (consulting previous translations, as well as consulting an expert SL native) would be an optimal condition.

### **Bibliography:**

1. Yang, Liu, 2010: "Cultural loss in the English translation of Chinese poetry", *Babel* 56, 168-185. Zojer, Heidi, 2011: "Cultural references in subtitles: A measuring device for interculturality?", *Babel* 57, 394-413.
2. Fenenko N. A. - Language of realities and realities of language / N. A. Fenenko VSU. - Voronezh, 2001. - 140
3. Terestyényi, Enik'ó, 2011: "Translating culture-specific items in tourism brochures", *SKASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation* 52, 13-22.
4. Tobias, Shani, 2006: "Culture-specific items in Japanese-English literary translation: Comparing two translations of Kawabata's Izu no Odoriko", *Monash University Linguistics Papers* 5, 27-35.
5. Aijmer, K., Altenberg, B. and Johansson, M. (1996) *Languages In Contrast: Papers From A Symposium On Text-Based Cross-Linguistic Studies*, Lund, March 1994. Lund:





## TANQIDIY NAZAR, TAHLILY TAFAKKUR VA INNOVATSION G'OYALAR



Lund University Press Baker, M. (1992) *In Other Words: A Coursebook On Translation*. London:

6. Routledge Barlow, M. (2008) *Parallel Texts And Corpus-Based Contrastive Analysis*. In: De Los Ángeles Gómez González, M., Lachlan Mackenzie, J. and González Álvarez, E.M. (eds.) *Current Trends In Contrastive Linguistics: Functional And Cognitive Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 101-122

