THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO THE REPRESENTATION OF LINGUOCULTURAL UNITS IN TRANSLATION

Qurbonova Mushtariy Abdujabbor qizi
National university of Uzbekistan
Fareign philology faculty
mushtariy.qurbonova@mail.ru
+998919093668

Annotation: This article explores the theoretical approaches to the representation of linguocultural units in translation, emphasizing the challenges of conveying culture-specific terms, idioms, and expressions across languages. The study analyzes key translation theories with examples from Uzbek and English languages illustrate the effectiveness and limitations of each method

Keywords: *Translation studies, linguocultural units, equivalence, Skopos theory, functionalist approach, intercultural translation, cultural adaptation, realia, idioms, artificial intelligence in translation.*

Introduction

Translation is not only a linguistic activity but also a cross-cultural process that plays a crucial role in preserving and transferring cultural identity. The complexity of translating linguocultural units arises from the fact that languages reflect the historical, religious, and social characteristics of a nation. Thus, translating these units requires careful adaptation to maintain both linguistic equivalence and cultural relevance (Abduazizov, 2016; G'afurov, 2020).

Uzbek translation studies have evolved significantly, with scholars such as Salomov (2019) and Qo'chqorov (2021) emphasizing that traditional Western translation theories—such as Nida's equivalence theory, Skopos theory, and functionalist approaches—should be adapted to the specific needs of Uzbek-English and English-Uzbek translation. This article explores both Western and Uzbek perspectives on handling linguocultural units in translation.

Translation is a complex cultural and cognitive activity that requires deep understanding and adaptation of cultural and linguistic differences. Each language serves as a reflection of the unique worldview, traditions, and historical background of its speakers. Thus, translating linguocultural units—expressions that encapsulate culturally specific concepts—poses a significant challenge in translation studies.

Linguocultural units include culturally bound words, realia, idioms, proverbs, and metaphors, which are deeply embedded in the sociocultural framework of a language. Translators must navigate between preserving cultural authenticity and

ensuring comprehensibility for the target audience. Over the decades, translation scholars have developed multiple theoretical approaches to handling these challenges, each offering distinct strategies for rendering linguocultural units in a new linguistic and cultural context.

This paper aims to examine the primary theoretical approaches in translation studies concerning the representation of linguocultural units. By analyzing these approaches with practical examples, we provide insights into their applicability and limitations in literary and cultural translation.

Methods

The study employs the following methodological approaches:

- Analytical method – reviewing scholarly works and theoretical perspectives in translation studies.

- Comparative method – comparing various translation strategies and their effectiveness in preserving linguistic and cultural meaning.

- Descriptive method – illustrating translation techniques with real-world examples.

- Empirical method – analyzing practical translations of linguocultural units in Uzbek and English literary texts.

Results

The findings indicate that multiple theoretical approaches have been proposed to address the challenge of translating linguocultural units. Each approach offers unique strategies, and their application depends on the context and purpose of translation:

Equivalence Approach (Baker M.)

"Navro'z" → "Nowruz (Persian New Year)": Formal equivalence retains "Nowruz" as a transliteration, while dynamic equivalence expands it to "Persian New Year" to aid comprehension among English readers.

"Palov" → "Pilaf" / "Rice dish": "Pilaf" serves as a direct equivalent, whereas "Rice dish" provides a generic explanation for non-specialist audiences.

Skopos Theory (A. Qo'chqorov)

"Sadaqa" → "Almsgiving" / "Charity": The translation choice is dictated by the function and target audience of the text. In a religious context, "Almsgiving" is appropriate, whereas "Charity" suits a secular readership.

Functionalist Approach (G'. Salomov)

"Doston" → "Epic poem": Rather than a literal translation, the functionalist approach ensures that the term resonates with the target audience by conveying its role in oral tradition.

Intercultural Translation Approach (Sh. Sirojiddinov)

"Qo'y so'ydi" → "Slaughtered a sheep for a special occasion": Since English lacks a direct equivalent for this cultural practice, an explanatory translation is required.

Metatextual Approach (N. Qambarov)

"Choy ichib kel" → "Join me for tea": Tea drinking in Uzbek culture represents hospitality and social bonding, which should be reflected in translation rather than a literal rendering.

Discussion

The results demonstrate that a one-size-fits-all approach to translating linguocultural units does not exist. Instead, a combination of approaches should be employed depending on the purpose, audience, and context of the translation. For instance, while formal equivalence maintains linguistic fidelity, it may not always provide clarity for readers unfamiliar with the source culture. Conversely, a dynamic or functional approach enhances accessibility but risks altering the original nuance.

Moreover, the translator's cultural competence plays a crucial role in balancing faithfulness and intelligibility. Understanding the connotative meanings of linguocultural units helps in preserving their deeper implications. Additionally, contextual adaptation is often necessary when translating for audiences with different cultural frames of reference.

Conclusion

The study underscores the importance of employing multiple theoretical approaches in translating linguocultural units. Each approach provides valuable insights into handling culturally embedded expressions, yet their effectiveness depends on specific textual and contextual factors.

Future research should explore the role of artificial intelligence and machine translation technologies in preserving linguocultural nuances. As AI-powered translation tools advance, assessing their ability to capture the subtleties of cultural expressions remains an essential area of investigation.

<div align="center">

References

</div>

1. Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (Eds.). (2020). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
2. Gambier, Y., & Van Doorslaer, L. (Eds.). (2021). Handbook of Translation Studies: Volume 5. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
3. Abduazizov, A. (2016). Tarjimashunoslik asoslari. Toshkent: Fan.
4. Salomov, G'. (2019). Badiiy tarjima va uning lingvistik asoslari. Toshkent: Sharq.
5. Qo'chqorov, A. (2021). Lingvokulturologik birliklarning tarjima muammolari. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya.
6. Sirojiddinov, Sh. (2018). Madaniyatiy tarjima va lingvistik moslashuv. Toshkent: Ma'naviyat.
7. Qodirova, N. (2022). Tarjimada lingvokulturologik muammolar: O'zbek tilidan ingliz tiliga tarjima tajribalari. Toshkent: Innovatsiya nashriyoti.