

A STUDY OF CROSS-CULTURAL TRANSLATION

Shamsiyeva Marjona A'lam qizi

(shmarjona306@gmail.com)

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Translation Faculty

Department of English translation theory.

Master student on simultaneous interpretation

ABSTRACT

Language contact is the first kind of interaction to emerge across various cultures and countries; without it, effective communication is all but impossible. Thus, it is clear that translation may be extremely important for cross-cultural communication. To put it another way, it may be a helpful tool for bridging disparate cultures, languages, faiths, and points of view. In this essay, we examine the unavoidable role that translation plays in promoting cross-cultural communication as well as the extent to which translation might address the issue. Whorf's and Chomsky's theories have been used to study the latter, taking into account cultural variations and the translatability vs. untranslatability of cultural factors. Through mutual understanding and knowledge of many cultures, the world today will attain a better state of existence through language barrier surmounting, which is imperceptibly present in all forms of communication.

Keywords: *Translate, civilizations, cultural variances, and translateability.*

I. Introduction

We live in a world where information technology is constantly advancing. The language barrier is the only one that is imperceptibly present in all forms of communication. Modern men seek and need a universal language because they are aware of their inherent connection as human beings and are connected by trade, political alliances, and convenient travel. Thus yet, the ultimate answer to this dilemma has eluded us. Since a good discussion can only be conducted through a common language, these endeavors to create a common language were motivated by demands for a specific shared experience, a common understanding on which dialogue may build. Translation therefore continues to be the most practical means of achieving this goal. Stated differently, it seems that there is no other way to get over language inconsistencies but through translation. Men from all across the world may once again

become one people and establish themselves as the Bible states if they could comprehend one another via translation. Conversely, some academics contend that speakers' disparate cultural upbringings might enhance their mutual understanding. Chaudron, Erceau, and Tessier address the issue of collaboration amongst actors with disparate cultural origins by providing some philosophical and scientific milestones in their study. They refer to the people and artificial systems they may deal with as agents. Their method is a non-fiction step that demonstrates how cultural differences may be taken advantage of and turned into a chance for mutual knowledge advancement [2]. Regarding translation, it should be mentioned that, as a language activity, it has facilitated communication and improved cross-cultural interactions in the modern world. As a result, it may be thought of as a bridge that spans cultures to convey different knowledge facets and their intricacies in an effort to understand human civilizations.

II. Cultural differences among civilizations

Language inconsistencies and translation are only two examples of the many aspects that need to be properly taken into account for cross-cultural communication to be successful and produce desired outcomes. Naturally, communication between civilizations seems to be a common phenomena between many, if not all, of the civilizations that exist, or, to be more specific, between various cultures. We think that language contact, or communication across languages, might be the first type of interaction to emerge between civilizations, without which successful contact is very difficult. Thus, it is clear that translation may be an important part of cross-cultural communication and a helpful tool for bridging disparate cultures, beliefs, civilizations, etc. Translation is mostly done for target readers who come from cultures other than the author's own, as there are numerous cultural distinctions between the target and source languages. Translations must therefore be suitable and culturally competent. A person translating materials in another language that are political, economic, literary, or press texts and who still knows nothing about the people, customs, or even the political structure of that language group is essentially operating in the dark. Since the translator finds it difficult to comprehend and communicate the multitude of points and meanings found in the foreign writings, it is necessary to possess these sorts of information. The primary idea is that every book has some of these particular connotations and ideas specific to the language used. Take the German phrase "13 August did not have a historical significance," for example. The primary idea is that every book has some of these particular connotations and ideas specific to the language used. Take the German phrase "13 August did not have a historical perspective," which was published in a German newspaper and conceals a great deal of emotions and recollections. To be able to convey these historical and cultural events to a reader who

is from a different culture and speaks a different language, a professional translator may and must be aware of them [5]. Apart from imparting broad knowledge of a source language in whatever format, it is imperative to take into account the historical, cultural, political, economical, and other relevant aspects and requirements of that particular linguistic group. The reader may become more curious about the source linguistic group as a result, and a strong sense of connection to the nation where the source language is spoken may develop. When translating text from one language to another, one must consider that the target audience is someone whose cultural and historical background is different from that of the language being translated. Therefore, s/he should make an effort to locate words, phrases, and expressions in his/her home tongue that, to the greatest extent feasible, can translate the concepts of the foreign text. Immethodical importation of foreign terms into the native language is a severe issue that arises when an inexperienced translator translates a foreign text into the native language. Since none of these translators have had the necessary training in either their native tongue or translation methodologies, they just translate from what they understand from the foreign originals without acknowledging or even comprehending the cultures that lie beyond (Mosavi miangah, T. 2000). Wiersema draws attention to this issue by stating that there will be some cultural distortion in every translation. There is currently a way to include additional foreign terms in the target text, but the translator will have to justify their decisions (Wiersema, N. 2004). Thus, it follows that there is a mutually reinforcing relationship between translation and cultural knowledge of the target languages. That is to say, a competent translator who is conversant in the cultures and histories of the two languages being translated transmits a thorough understanding of the people and the nation to which the languages belong and offers his or her audience more than just translation. Nobody is as good at doing this work as a translator. Conversely, translating an original work from a foreign language that takes into account and reflects all of its different facets into the native tongue can help the speakers of the two languages get to know one another better by allowing the reader to see both languages' points of view without any bias. That is not to say that human identity is entirely shaped by culture. However, we think that the cultural traditions of the people might influence how they perceive effective communication. Studying various cultures may help one understand them and have conversations with them; this is made possible by the translation or distribution of primary information from other cultures. Every culture and every civilization has a particular mode of reasoning and thought by which human beings demonstrate themselves and their universe. This human deed can mostly be manifested in the form of language. And translation, in turn, culminates in a common language by which different cultures and civilizations can reach to a better understanding of each other.

III. Translatability vs. untranslatability

A basic question about the nature and number of links between humans, language, mind, and reality has existed for a very long time. Since so many academics have studied the issue, it stands to reason that the answers they came up with differ from person to person and from generation to generation. From the perspective of our topic, translation in this case, we need to respond to the following query: What role does language play in understanding and perceiving the actual world? We can conclude that speakers of one language may have different concepts of the real world than speakers of the other language if we take Whorf's (Whorf, 1956) theory, which was discussed in the previous section, into consideration. According to Whorf, language is not an independent corpus but rather a relation between man and reality. Thus no two languages are structurally identical to one another. The majority of those who reject this theory—also referred to as "linguistic relativity"—are structuralism adherents. According to Whorf's hypothesis, languages cannot be understood in their natural form unless two mutual speakers' conceptions of the real world are as similar as possible. However, proponents of a universal grammar like Noam Chomsky (1972) have maintained that all languages have a same underlying structure, with the surface structure being the only source of variation. This theory is predicated on the idea that language serves simply as a tool for our explanation of the outside world. The differences in language structures are only surface-level phenomena; at their core, they are all the same. If individuals put in enough time and effort, he thinks that people from different languages and cultures can converse with one another [3]. The second hypothesis has been consistently validated by literary and philosophical schools and provides a resoundingly favorable solution to the topic of translatability. A translation from one language into another is an art form whose foundation is the oneness of idea and reality, according to this hypothesis, which holds that language is a tool that man uses to represent his thoughts. A reality or idea within the context of one sort of speech can be communicated to another, according to the two theories that have been discussed. That is, because language and cognition are mutually related, everything that can be said in one language may also be expressed in another. Naturally, it should not be overlooked that a language may not always include all of the tools required to represent a certain type of content. The degree to which speakers of a given language have advanced in the social sciences, literature, theology, economics, philosophy, and other subjects directly influences that language's vocabulary. For example, in the sphere of the most contemporary natural sciences (medical, chemistry, etc.), Uzbek language naturally lacks such possibilities present in English language. Conversely, the history of Iranian mysticism may not be adequately expressed in the English language in terms of vocabulary. These shortcomings and inadequacies, therefore, cannot serve

as a primary obstacle to cross-cultural understanding. Linguistic and cultural untranslatability are the two categories into which Catford (1965) separates untranslatability. According to his definition, there are two types of untranslatable situations: those in which translation fails or those in which untranslatability arises because it is not feasible to include situationally important functional aspects into the target language text's contextual meaning. In general, there are two types of circumstances when this occurs. Those in which language barriers exist and those in which cultural barriers do. Some of the functionally significant characteristics of linguistic untranslatability are really formal characteristics of the source language. The text or item is (relatively) untranslatable if there are no technically matching characteristics in the target language. Because the linguistic content of the source and target languages differs, linguistic untranslatability is unable to discover an equivalent in the target language [1]. Because Uzbek and English differ in terms of spelling, phonology, and semantics, these graphical parallels are unique to the Uzbek language and cannot be translated accurately into another language, such as English. If an adequate translation is to be provided, it is necessary to explain this situation of linguistic untranslatability from the literary, poetic, phonetic, orthographic, and semantic points of view. Once more, a translator's duty in this situation is to be conversant with the various facets of the language's culture to which the translated work belongs (Mosavi miangah, T. 2004).

IV. Text formats

Texts may be classified into several categories based on its subject matter. For example, there are texts on law, religion, technology, literature, and newspapers. Each type of text has unique characteristics. When a translator is familiar with these qualities, they can make the right decisions when translating. Translators ought to be aware that not all texts should be translated in the same way; that is, not every text type can be translated using the same approach. Literary literature that heavily rely on speech style to communicate meaning, for example, must be translated with this in mind rather than just the core idea and meaning [5) Literary text translation is an impossible task for someone lacking creative ability and compositional skills. As the lyric branch of a literary work builds its foundation with elements like rhyme, rhythm, and imagery, this endeavor will get harder. Literature, it is true, reflects the social cultures and traditions of a country; therefore, in order to ensure mutual comprehension while translating these sorts of materials, one must become knowledgeable about the customs and cultures of the target language. Furthermore, literary writings are difficult to translate with a little vocabulary due to their complex language and wide range of subject matter, particularly if they are large volumes. Thus, having a large vocabulary is also necessary for translating literary materials. Generally speaking, different text

kinds would call for distinct translation techniques because of their unique textual characteristics.

V. Conclusion

Since it is practically difficult to create a global language that would serve as a lingua franca and enable easy communication between all people, translation is still the only viable solution to linguistic communication issues. A translator's expertise with the historical and cultural context of the nation or society to which the source language belongs may greatly aid in the process of mutual understanding across various languages and cultures. Put another way, there is a reciprocal relationship between translation and cultural knowledge of the target languages. We think it is quite conceivable for civilizations to have a good discussion, even though the languages engaged will have different cultural characteristics. Anything that can be said in one language can be spoken in another if we take the time and make the necessary efforts to act as an effective mediator and deliver the messages as effectively as we can (depending on the kind of text).

REFERENCES

1. Catford, C. J. (1965). *Linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.
2. Chaudron, L., Erceau, J. and Tessier, C. (1998). Cultural differences? An opportunity for a mutual knowledge enhancement. *Proceeding of PRICAT 98, Pacific Rim Int. conf. On Artificial Intelligence, Singapore*.
3. Chomsky, Noam (1972). *Language and mind*, enl. ed New York.
4. Dries, Debackere bvba (2003). *Cross-cultural and cross-language communication - learning and management*. Belgium.
5. Haddadi, Mahmud (1996). *Translation principles*. (in Persian) Pejman Press, Tehran.
6. Kurilecz, Margaret (1969). *Man and his world*. Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York.
7. Mosavi miangah, T. (2000). Lexical borrowing likely to be found in any language. From the standpoint of Persian. In *proceeding of international conference on world culture through dialogue among religions and civilizations, 3-5 October 2000, Omsk, Russia*.
8. Mosavi miangah, T. (2004). The role of translation in dialogue among civilizations. In *proceeding of 1st International Conference on the Role of Language in the Dialogue among Civilizations, April 24th and 25th 2004, University of Isfahan, Iran*.

9. Okamoto, M., Isbister, K., Nakanishi, H. and Ishida, T. (2002). Supporting cross-cultural communication with a large-screen system. *New Generation Computing*, 20 (2), Ohmsha, Ltd, and Springer-Verlag.
10. Sapir, Edward (1949). *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture and personality*. Ed. by David G. Mandelbaum. Berkeley.
11. Tehranian, Majid (2002). *Dialogue of civilizations for global citizenship*. University of Hawaii at Monoa. U.S.A.
12. Tokitsu Budo, K. (1998). *Beyond cultural barriers*. Conference given at the first "Paris Taikai". <http://www.TOKITSU.com/eng/nl.htm>.
13. Whorf, Benjamin Lee (1956). *Language, thought and reality: selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Ed. by John B. Carroll. Cambridge, MA.
14. Wiersema, N. (2004). *Globalization and translation. A discussion of the effect of globalization on today's translation*. *Translation Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1.