



IJTIMOIIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI

DOI: 10.67227

ISSN 3060-5059



VOL.3 № 6

2026

TARJIMANING LINGVOMADANIY MUAMMOLARI: QIYOSIY-TIPOLOGIK VA TARJIMASHUNOSLIK YONDASHUVI

Togʻaymurodov Dilshod Dilmurodovich

Denov tadbirkorlik va pedagogika instituti

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada tarjima jarayonida yuzaga keladigan lingvomadaniy muammolar tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda Gʻarb va Sharq tarjimashunosligi maktablari namoyandalari asarlari qiyosiy oʻrganilgan. Ekvivalentsiz leksika, realiyalar, maqol va idiomalar tarjimasidagi murakkabliklar, shuningdek, "domestikatsiya" va "forenizatsiya" konsepsiyalari misollar yordamida yoritilgan. Tadqiqot natijalari tarjimada madaniy yoʻqotishlarni minimallashtirish boʻyicha amaliy tavsiyalar ishlab chiqishga xizmat qiladi.

Kalit soʻzlar: lingvomadaniyat, tarjima muammolari, realiya, ekvivalentsiz leksika, lakuna, domestikatsiya, forenizatsiya.

ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ПЕРЕВОДА: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО- ТИПОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ И ПЕРЕВОДОВЕДЧЕСКИЙ ПОДХОД

Тогаймуродов Дилшод Дилмуродович

Деновский институт предпринимательства и педагогики

Аннотация

В данной статье анализируются лингвокультурные проблемы, возникающие в процессе перевода. В исследовании сравнительно изучаются труды представителей западной и восточной переводоведческих школ. На примерах освещаются сложности перевода безэквивалентной лексики, реалий, пословиц и идиом, а также концепции "одомашнения" и "остранения". Результаты исследования служат разработке практических рекомендаций по минимизации культурных потерь при переводе.

Ключевые слова: лингвокультура, проблемы перевода, реалия, безэквивалентная лексика, лакуна, домистикация, форенизация.

LINGUOCULTURAL PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION: A COMPARATIVE-TYPOLOGICAL AND TRANSLATION STUDIES APPROACH

Togʻaymurodov Dilshod Dilmurodovich

Denov Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy

Abstract

This article analyzes linguocultural problems arising in translation. The research comparatively studies Western and Eastern translation theories. Complexities in translating non-equivalent vocabulary, realia, proverbs, and idioms, alongside "domestication" and "foreignization" concepts, are elucidated using examples. Results help develop practical recommendations for minimizing cultural translation losses.

Keywords: linguoculture, translation problems, realia, non-equivalent vocabulary, lacuna, domestication, foreignization.

In the current era of globalization, the importance of intercultural communication continues to grow. The exchange of information among different peoples and nations is primarily facilitated through translation. Translation is not merely a mechanical process of replacing words in one language with their equivalents in another; rather, it serves as a bridge between different cultures and worldviews. The renowned translation scholar Susan Bassnett states in her work *Translation Studies* [2]: "The translation process is not simply an interaction between languages, but a complex intertwining of the source and target cultures." This idea clearly demonstrates the true essence of translation and highlights one of its greatest challenges—linguocultural problems.

Language is a mirror of culture; the customs, traditions, history, socio-political life, lifestyle, and even geographical environment of every nation are reflected in its language. A concept that is ordinary and readily understandable to speakers of one language may be completely unfamiliar or incomprehensible to speakers of another. Gʻaybulla Salomov, one of the founders of Uzbek translation studies, emphasized the importance of preserving national identity in translation. In his work *Language and Translation*, he states

[11]: “The national color in the language of a work is its blood vessel. A work with a severed blood vessel cannot survive.” Indeed, the question of how to preserve the national spirit and cultural color of a literary work and convey it to readers of another language remains one of the most pressing issues in contemporary translation studies.

Linguocultural problems primarily involve the translation of concepts that exist in one language but have no direct equivalent or only partially correspond to meanings in the target language. These include the translation of realia, non-equivalent vocabulary, idioms, proverbs, folklore elements, and words that evoke culture-specific associations. In his work *A Textbook of Translation*, Peter Newmark defines culture as “the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression” [7]. According to Newmark, translators inevitably encounter difficulties when attempting to bridge the gaps between different cultures.

The main purpose of this article is to analyze the nature and types of linguocultural problems encountered in translation, using Uzbek, Russian, and English as examples, and to examine possible solutions to these problems as well as the role of the translator in this process, drawing upon the works of prominent translation scholars. To achieve this objective, the following research tasks have been identified:

1. To clarify the linguocultural characteristics of realia and non-equivalent vocabulary;
2. To analyze the difficulties involved in translating proverbs, sayings, and idioms, as well as the strategies used to overcome them;
3. To demonstrate how Lawrence Venuti’s concepts of “domestication” and “foreignization” are reflected in both Uzbek and international translation studies;
4. To compare the approaches of Eastern and Western schools of translation studies to the relationship between language and culture.

METHODS

This research is mainly theoretical and analytical in nature, and the comparative-typological, descriptive-analytical, and componential analysis methods of translation studies were used as its methodological basis. The fundamental works of selected and internationally recognized Uzbek, Russian, and English translation scholars served as the research materials.

During the research, the literature was analyzed in the following directions:

1. **Works by representatives of the Uzbek translation studies school:** Works such as G. Salomov’s *Translation of Proverbs and Idioms*, *Translation Troubles*, *Language and Translation*, Q. Musayev’s *Fundamentals of Translation Theory*, A. Rustamiy’s *A Word About the Word*, and K. Jo‘rayev’s *The Art of Translation* served as a basis for analyzing issues related mainly to the culture and customs of Turkic peoples, their expression through language, and the translation of this culture into foreign languages.
2. **Works by representatives of the Western translation studies school:** Books by Mona Baker (*In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*), Peter Newmark (*A Textbook of Translation* and *Approaches to Translation*), Susan Bassnett (*Translation Studies*), and Gideon Toury (*Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*) were used to study issues such as a systematic approach to linguocultural problems, the debate between literal and free translation, and the filling of cultural gaps (*lacunae*). In particular, Lawrence Venuti’s *The Translator’s Invisibility* was considered in relation to modern Western views on domestication and foreignization in translation and writer/translator authority. Eugene Nida’s *Toward a Science of Translating* served as a methodological aid for understanding the principle of dynamic equivalence.
3. **Achievements of the Russian translation studies school:** A.V. Fedorov’s *Fundamentals of General Translation Theory* was adopted as the foundation of classical linguistic translation theory.

During the research process, the opinions of the aforementioned scholars regarding culture and its linguistic expression were first summarized. Then, specific examples—proverbs, idioms, and realia (mainly from Uzbek to English and vice versa)—were compared, and the lexical-semantic losses occurring in them and the methods of compensating for these losses were analyzed. The research relied on a step-by-step logical deduction principle, and the collected materials were systematized and fully reflected in the Results section.

RESULTS

The most debated and controversial issue in the theory and practice of translation studies is how to render concepts deeply rooted in the culture of one nation into the language of another. The analysis of the literature reviewed in this study shows that it is appropriate to divide linguocultural problems into three main groups and examine them accordingly.

Due to differences in lifestyle, geographical conditions, historical development, and religious

beliefs, many objects and phenomena existing in the language of one people may not exist at all in the life of another. Words denoting such concepts are referred to in translation studies as “realia” or “non-equivalent vocabulary.” Qudrat Musayev pays particular attention to realia in his work *Fundamentals of Translation Theory*, highlighting the difficulties involved in translating them from Uzbek into foreign languages [5]. For example, concepts related to Uzbek national clothing (“to'n”, “do'ppi”, “mahsi”), traditional dishes (“palov”, “sumalak”, “qazi”), and customs (“beshik to'yi”, “kelin salom”, “hashar”) cannot be translated directly into English or Russian with a single word. Since these concepts do not exist in the experience of those peoples, there are no corresponding lexical units to denote them (lacunae).

Russian scholar A.V. Fedorov states in his book *Fundamentals of General Translation Theory* that translators have several strategies available in such situations [3]. These include transliteration or transcription (rendering the pronunciation of a word), calque (literal translation), approximate translation (through functional analogy), and explanatory translation (providing additional explanation).

In her work *In Other Words*, Mona Baker refers to non-equivalent vocabulary as “culture-specific concepts” [1]. According to her, if a translator relies solely on transcription, the reader may not fully understand the text; however, if explanatory translation is used extensively, the literary quality of the text may be diminished, and there is a risk of transforming the work into a dry reference text. Therefore, translating the Uzbek word “hashar” simply as “voluntary mutual help” in English does not fully convey the social harmony and generosity embedded in the concept. Likewise, certain concepts from Western culture, such as “tips” or “Halloween,” may be borrowed into Uzbek, yet the socio-psychological associations underlying them often remain unfamiliar to local readers.

Phraseological units and folklore elements are among the most vivid manifestations of a nation's culture. In his works *Translation of Proverbs and Idioms* and *Translation Troubles*, G'aybulla Salomov extensively discusses the problems that arise when translating phraseological units into another language [10; 12]. The scholar emphasizes that translating the individual words that constitute proverbs and idioms is fundamentally incorrect. Instead, they should be rendered in the target language through the transmission of their overall meaning and underlying idea.

Peter Newmark calls the translation of idioms “the translator's biggest headache” in his work “Approaches to Translation” [6]. According to his analysis, idioms based on the same metaphor may convey different meanings in different languages, or conversely, idioms conveying the same meaning may be based on completely different symbols depending on the cultures of the two peoples. For example, translating the Uzbek idiom “tuya go'shti yegan” (literally “ate camel's meat”, meaning something that is long-awaited or severely delayed) into English literally would make no sense to an English reader and might result in a comical situation. To express this situation in English, phrases constructed from entirely different lexical units, such as “once in a blue moon”, might be used.

In such instances, the principle of “dynamic equivalence” introduced by Eugene Nida comes in handy [8]. Nida suggests evaluating the translation based on “the receptor's response”. That is, whatever emotion or impression was evoked in the reader of the source text should also be evoked in the reader of the translated text. If the Uzbek proverb “It hurar, karvon o'tar” is translated literally as “The dogs bark, but the caravan goes on,” but this is perceived by the English reader merely as a description of a landscape, then the translation has not achieved its goal. Therefore, as G. Salomov pointed out, folk wisdom specific to one culture should, whenever possible, be rendered through an absolute equivalent or an analogous proverb in the target language.

Another pressing linguocultural issue in translation studies is deciding which culture to lean toward more: the source or the target language culture. In this regard, Lawrence Venuti introduces two main terms in his book “The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation”: “domestication” and “foreignization” [14].

Venuti notes that traditionally, English and Western translation studies in general have always strived for “domestication”. That is, a work must be translated so smoothly and fluently that the reader feels as if they are reading a work written in their native language rather than reading a translation. Venuti calls this the “translator's invisibility” and condemns such practices. According to his objection, completely adapting the work to the taste of local readers erodes the source culture and destroys its national identity (an ethnocentric approach). As an alternative, he promotes the “foreignization” approach. In this method, the translator deliberately retains certain awkwardness and cultural foreignness in the text, guiding the reader toward the author and the culture of the original work.

These approaches are also reflected in Uzbek translation studies. In his work “The Art of Translation”, Komiljon Jo'rayev expresses views that partially align with Venuti's foreignization principle,

acting as a proponent of preserving the national color of a work [4]. In the same vein, Alibek Rustamiy discusses the value of the word, its cultural and historical layers, and the negative consequences of carelessly replacing words in his book "A Word About the Word" [9]. When translating foreign works into Uzbek, there are sometimes cases in which characters use purely Uzbek and Islamic interjections such as "voydod", "obbo", or "la ilaha illalloh". This is the strongest manifestation of "domestication", which damages the psychology of the foreign character and completely "Uzbekizes" the cultural atmosphere of the work. As a result, an image of a "foreigner wearing a chapan (traditional robe)" emerges rather than that of a European figure. Susan Bassnett evaluates this as depriving the reader of intercultural communication and confining the work within the grip of a single culture [2].

DISCUSSION

The analysis of the obtained results shows that there is no single, universal rule for solving linguocultural problems. When comparing the approaches of the Western and Eastern schools of translation studies, their similarities and differences become apparent. Peter Newmark's theory of communicative and semantic translation is, in some sense, in harmony with G'aybulla Salomov's views on "equivalent translation". Both scholars assert that the text type (pragmatic or literary) determines the translation strategy. However, Venuti's principle of "foreignization" is relatively new and controversial for the Uzbek school of translation studies, as Uzbek readers have long been accustomed to reading assimilated translations adapted to national tastes (e.g., translations by Abdulla Qahhor and Mirzakalon Ismoilily).

The cultural role of the translator as an interlingual mediator is invaluable. As Gideon Toury stated, the translator is a person at the "crossroads of cultures", uniting not only two languages but also two cultures [13]. If the translator ignores the cultural layer or translates it incorrectly during the translation process, it leads to the formation of a false impression in the reader about the author and the nation to which they belong. To prevent this, the translator is required to judiciously use all available linguistic resources in the target language – compensation, explanation, annotation, and the search for an alternative variant.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, linguocultural problems in translation represent one of the main and most complex barriers to translating literary works from one language into another. The conducted research confirms that:

1. When translating realia and non-equivalent vocabulary, the translator should approach each word individually and apply explanatory or transcription methods based on the overall spirit of the text.
2. Translating phraseological units such as proverbs, sayings, and idioms not literally, but on the basis of the "dynamic equivalence" principle while fully preserving their meaning, ensures the success of the translation.
3. It is necessary to find a golden mean between the "domestication" and "foreignization" approaches in translation. Over-localizing a work destroys its nationality, while excessive foreignization makes it difficult for the reader to perceive the text.

Although linguocultural problems inevitably lead to certain losses in translation, properly chosen translation strategies and the high skill of the translator allow these losses to be minimized. The results of this research can serve as a guide for specialists engaged in translation practice and for young translators.

REFERENCES

1. Baker M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. – London; New York: Routledge, 1992.
2. Bassnett S. Translation Studies. 3rd ed. – London; New York: Routledge, 2002.
3. Fedorov A.V. Osnovy obshchey teorii perevoda. – Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, 1983.
4. Jo'rayev K. Tarjima san'ati. – Toshkent: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti, 1982.
5. Musayev Q. Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. – Toshkent: Fan, 2005.
6. Newmark P. Approaches to Translation. – Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981.
7. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. – New York: Prentice-Hall International, 1988.
8. Nida E.A. Toward a Science of Translating. – Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964.
9. Rustamiy A. So'z haqida so'z. – Toshkent: Yosh gvardiya, 1987.
10. Salomov G'. Maqol va idiomalar tarjimasi. – Toshkent: Fan, 1961.
11. Salomov G'. Til va tarjima. – Toshkent: Fan, 1966.
12. Salomov G'. Tarjima tashvishlari. – Toshkent: G'afur G'ulom nomidagi adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti, 1985.
13. Toury G. Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1995.
14. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. – London; New York: Routledge, 1995.