

## TRANSLATION IN REGARD THE CULTURAL NUANCES OF THE LANGUAGE

**Bannopova Zulxumor Xatamovna,**

senior teacher, department functional lexicos of the filology faculty, of the  
Uzbekistan state world language university

**Ashurova Feruza**

senior teacher, Uzbekistan state world language university

**Abstract:** The following paragraph raises the question of the need to enhance the structural range and operational abilities of the modern dictionary (bi- or multilingual) to avoid laciness in the transmission of cultures and non-equivalent phrases into every other language. Without it the dictionary is incomplete and languages are unequal. The article offers with a number of alternatives of asymmetry reflection of the cultureless in the context of social and ethno-psychic reality of a native-speaking community. The specifics of lexicographical transmission is found in order to emphasize the want of in addition investigation of the linguistic map of the world. Linguistics of the recent years is a properly illustration of everyday traits in the modern humanitaristics: we witness an an increasing number of obvious inclination to interdisciplinarity and interparadigm in approaches to such complicated objects as a language, deep perception of it as an anthropological phenomenon in the immanent relationships with psychological and behavioural matrices, with ethno cultural origins of the linguistic picture of the world.

**Key words:** *linguistic and intellectual pix of the world, non-equivalence and lexical gaps, semantics and pragmatics of language signs, Classification of culturemes, In modern linguocultural research, linguocultural material through potential of some other language, lexicographers pursuits at a dictionary to end up as environment friendly and nonideological tool as possible, Equivalence (or its absence) is a marginal phenomenon, "Translation starts offevolved with setting up equivalence on the word level" the journey of cutting-edge lexicographers actually shows that in the method of compilation of any bilingual or extra lingual translation dictionary, the problems of conveying subculture specificity.*

### **1. Cultures' and non-equivalent lexis**

Therefore, linguoculturology is one of the most dynamically developing fields of linguistics and linguocultural studies which develops both standard (the relationship of culture and language, speech and language, comprehension of meaning-making rules) and new (conceptology and culture, linguistic and intellectual pics of the world, non-equivalence and lexical gaps, semantics and pragmatics of language signs) issues. Indeed, the potential to talk and think in a sure language largely defines a cultural identity. Individual appreciation of the world is linked with the linguistic group, which

we belong to. Since the speakers of one of a kind languages discover the world differently, it is impossible to learn a unique language without simultaneous examining its cultural context (Hall, 2002). The linguocultural works of recent years have amassed a lot of terminological principles which in one way or another reflect an vital cultural which means and attraction to the national, cultural specificity of meaning-making: cultural component, culture-related vocabulary, the national-authentic language, linguo-specific vocabulary, ethno-cultural vocabulary, lexical gaps, non-equivalent lexis, culture-carrying vocabulary, history knowledge, realia, culturemes, culturonym, linguocultural environment, the country wide specificity of verbal communication, lexical background, linguistic episteme, countrywide concept, country wide symbol, etc. The lookup of comparable phenomena is transferring divergently as nicely – both through potential of language clichés analysis and the study of phraseological units, stylistically marked vocabulary and identification of stereotypes of linguistic consciousness, as properly as examination the underlying phrase semantics.

## **2. Classification of culturemes**

The term “cultureme” itself used to be created outside the boundaries of linguistics, in the cultural theory of S. Lem, in which it describes, first of all, the minimal, indivisible units of culture: rituals, values, and stereotypes. In modern-day linguocultural lookup the term “cultureme” is a hotly debated subject and demonstrates a variety of procedures to its content. V. Gak considers cultureme “as a signal of tradition that additionally has a linguistic expression” (Gak, 1998). A. Vezhbtskaia regards cultureme as “an built-in interlevel unit, the shape of which is the cohesion of a sign and language meaning, while the content material – the unity of language that means and cultural value” (Vezhbtskaia, 1999). V. Vorob’ov singles out a linguistic cultureme along with a cultureme, given that “a cultureme” is considered to be an element of reality (an object or a situation), attributed to a specific culture, whilst “a linguistic cultureme” is the projection of the lifestyle factor into a language sign” (Vorob’ov, 1997). However, this strategy is linguistically restricted and ignores the immanent asymmetry of the which means and the implementation, as semantic load of cultureme is much higher than that of realia, because it appeals to culturally widespread information, it is extrapolated to other stages of the ethno-cultural photo of the world. Various languages vary from one any other in the way of organizing informative variations (perception and conceptualization of the world), and now not in separate cultureme, though it’s well worth noting that the countrywide specificity of cultureme content material most wholly reveals itself solely in contrast with the possible gadgets of implementation in some other language, interculturemes and intraculturemes disclose specifically in the asymmetry and lexical gaps. Therefore, the attempts to deliver the linguocultural cloth via means of some other language is constantly related with difficulties of reconstruction of all the linguistic focus and, in this way or another,

doomed to struggle with the lexical gaps to overcome the natural asymmetry of languages. A. Bukhonkina suggests the classification of cultureme (Bukhonkina, 2002), based on the unique characteristics of their internal form and specificity of interlinguistic asymmetry; however, this approach is more applicable to the realia, considering the cultural magnitude and immanent signification is often ignored. So, the researcher singles out (as the examples Ukrainian and Polish cultureme were used, each taken from traditional ethno-culture and present day ones, with semantic layers, and shifts in the internal form) and in prevalent (the branch of non-verbal communication research that examines the cultural position of taste sensations, rituals and traditions, associated with food, delicacies as a reflection of countrywide mentality).

Linguocultural competence (N. Alefirenko), therefore, does no longer depend as an awful lot on the mastery of the language legal guidelines as it does on the extralinguistic records subject (the semiotic code), which hampers the transmission and perception of some other culture-bearer. A outstanding importance in the technique of intercultural interaction in the reception of culturemes, obviously, is given to lexicography as a field dealing with expert dedication to solving the issues of cross-linguistic asymmetry and overcoming the problem of lexical gaps. It need to be cited that modern lexicography additionally reflects modern-day tendencies of convergence of linguistics with different fields of humanitaristics. Consequently, linguocultural research is an essential and topical problem in the principle and practice of compiling dictionaries. Lexiografication of linguoculture (particularly, the intercultural one) includes each the common issues of linguistic material and the new ones, associated to the evolution of forms and methods to transmit semantic<sup>2.3</sup>. Reflecting subculture in lexicography

Given the lengthy history of compiling and functioning of dictionaries, simply recently, that is, extra or much less considering the 1950s, the efforts of some lexicographers have been targeted on the theoretical issue of this work. The work of lexicographers objectives at a dictionary to emerge as as environment friendly and no ideological device as possible. Nowadays, no one doubts that the so-called “corpus revolution” (Hanks, 2012; Krishnamurthy, 2002; Rundell, 1992) has helped to higher mirror how the language without a doubt functions inside a specific team of its users. For instance, it used to be stated that pre-corpus dictionaries normally contained rare meanings of some identical lexical gadgets (and their equivalent translation), however they lacked other necessary common units. Sometimes the words which are frequently used do no longer appear in the dictionary macrostructure; in different cases, the words are protected in the macrostructure, but their definition leaves a lot to be desired. Nowadays the size of frequency is part of the preferred of lexicographical work. But the keyword concordances and the frequency of factors have come to be not only an

quintessential resource for lexicographic documenting of the statistic content, but also increasingly more frequently on the web-sites of on-line dictionaries, the statistic content material of the headwords is complemented (or even replaced) by way of dynamically generated content, primarily based on corpus information. It is natural that the main task of the sufficient reflection of pragmatics which lexicography faces is an enough perception of a linguistic sign, overcoming ethno linguistic barrier, which is for sure primarily based on the asymmetry of ethno-mental cultureme. This potential dealing with two (or more) linguistic pictures of the world and with getting to know non-equivalent vocabulary. The trouble of equivalence lies in the area, in which an interdisciplinary consensus has been achieved: lexico-semantic structures of lexis of a precise language are peculiar, precise to this language and, therefore, they are in part unique. It potential that the lexical semantic structures of two (or more) languages are non-isomorphic. Non-isomorphy of lexis types the theoretical and found empirical circumstances, examination of which leads to concrete manifestations of the trouble of equivalence in exclusive disciplines. In this case, we are only fascinated in the metalexigraphic aspect of this issue. We agree with that the thought of equivalence in the lexicographical lookup need to not be developed anti-intuitively, away from its use in the frequent language sense, however need to be greater precise, and additionally must be extraordinary from the notion of equivalence in associated disciplines, especially if we refer to contrastive linguistics and translation theory. Equivalence (or its absence) is a marginal phenomenon, if lexicological studies are related to solely one language. For example, you can refer to the lexical synonyms within the limits of designator lexis. They are extensionally equivalent, which skill they have the same range of meanings. The thought of equivalence, on the other hand, plays a essential position in contrastive or confrontational lexicology. There are additionally quite a number lexicological manifestations of the problem of equivalence.

Comparative lexicology is regarded as a partial discipline with an emphasis on langue. Accordingly, the notion of equivalence in lexicology is concentrated on the language system, but, in general, is fantastically vague. The foundation of the designator lexis is polysomic grasp of the language signs. Therefore, the factors of the lexis can be various instances polysemantic. While correlating one thing of language A with every other element of language B, their denotative relationship is usually typical as a foundation for the comparison.

Thus, there appears equivalence, normally referred to as semantic equivalence, underneath the prerequisites that, firstly, the wide variety of sameness in language A equals the wide variety of sameness in language B (and they have the same meaning) and, secondly, their denotation (in pairs of sameness) is the same. It is necessary to be aware about various procedures to the definition of the equivalent and equivalence in translation studies. Equivalence of translation is described as the common content

material of the unique text and the translation. A. Ivanov regards an equivalent as “functional compliance in a target language, transmitting expression on the similar level (words, collocations) to all relevant factors inside the given context, or one of the versions of that means of the original unit in the supply language” (Ivanov, 2006).

A classical sentence from the textbook on translation research is as follows: “Translation starts with establishing equivalence on the phrase level” (Ivanov, 2006). Undoubtedly, the problems of translation commence at the stage of a separate phrase or collocations, when there seems non-equivalent lexis, i.e. lexical gadgets which do not have their equivalents in the goal language. We agree with that non-equivalent lexis (as a phenomenon both in translation research and lexicography) gives a vary of problems. In translation it is connected with what is usually referred to as “untranslatable”; as for lexicography, the problem is extra complicated, due to the fact a dictionary does now not furnish as many chances as a text does for distinct types of lexical transformations, with the help of which a nonequivalent thought can be identified. The time period itself is common for many authors, who understand it in a exclusive way: some authors regard non-equivalent lexis as a synonym of realia, the others see simply words, which due to cultural differences do no longer exist in the other language. S. Vlahov and S. Florin in their e book *The Untranslatable in Translation* supply the most complete description of sorts of lexical units, which can be considered as non-equivalent ones (Vlahov, Florin, 1980). It looks that non-equivalent lexis, as nicely as lexical gaps (composing a significant section of the countrywide specificity in any language) are the terms on the junction of various educational disciplines, which complicates the method to their definition inside the framework of lexicography. However, the trip of modern-day lexicographers clearly indicates that in the procedure of compilation of any bilingual or greater lingual translation dictionary, the issues of conveying lifestyle specificity, absent in another language, do now not lose their importance:

Translation in the system of intercultural conversation (recoding of linguocultural fabric by way of means a distinctive language system) and the software of various translation methods create a extraordinary linguistic and translation that means of a cultureme, primarily based on more than a few relationships of equivalence (Gusarov, 2002): signification (methods of transcription), semantisation (a method of descriptive translation), reference (a technique of removal of country wide cultural specificity, descriptive translation), syntagmatics (a approach of translation periphrasis) and performance (a technique of approximate translation, descriptive translation).

### **3. Reflecting subculture in lexicography**

Given the lengthy history of compiling and functioning of dictionaries, simply recently, that is, extra or much less considering the 1950s, the efforts of some

lexicographers have been targeted on the theoretical issue of this work. The work of lexicographers objectives at a dictionary to emerge as as environment friendly and no ideological device as possible. Nowadays, no one doubts that the so-called “corpus revolution” (Hanks, 2012; Krishnamurthy, 2002; Rundell, 1992) has helped to higher mirror how the language without a doubt functions inside a specific team of its users. For instance, it used to be stated that pre-corpus dictionaries normally contained rare meanings of some identical lexical gadgets (and their equivalent translation), however they lacked other necessary common units. Sometimes the words which are frequently used do no longer appear in the dictionary macrostructure; in different cases, the words are protected in the macrostructure, but their definition leaves a lot to be desired. Nowadays the size of frequency is part of the preferred of lexicographical work. But the keyword concordances and the frequency of factors have come to be not only an quintessential resource for lexicographic documenting of the statistic content, but also increasingly more frequently on the web-sites of on-line dictionaries, the statistic content material of the headwords is complemented (or even replaced) by way of dynamically generated content, primarily based on corpus information. It is natural that the main task of the sufficient reflection of pragmatics which lexicography faces is an enough perception of a linguistic sign, overcoming ethno linguistic barrier, which is for sure primarily based on the asymmetry of ethno-mental cultureme. This potential dealing with two (or more) linguistic pictures of the world and with getting to know non-equivalent vocabulary. The trouble of equivalence lies in the area, in which an interdisciplinary consensus has been achieved: lexico-semantic structures of lexis of a precise language are peculiar, precise to this language and, therefore, they are in part unique. It potential that the lexical semantic structures of two (or more) languages are non-isomorphic. Non-isomorphy of lexis types the theoretical and found empirical circumstances, examination of which leads to concrete manifestations of the trouble of equivalence in exclusive disciplines. In this case, we are only fascinated in the metalexigraphic aspect of this issue. We agree with that the thought of equivalence in the lexicographical lookup need to not be developed anti-intuitively, away from its use in the frequent language sense, however need to be greater precise, and additionally must be extraordinary from the notion of equivalence in associated disciplines, especially if we refer to contrastive linguistics and translation theory. Equivalence (or its absence) is a marginal phenomenon, iflexicological studies are related to solely one language. For example, you can refer to the lexical synonyms within the limits of designator lexis. They are extensionally equivalent, which skill they have the same range of meanings. The thought of equivalence, on the other hand, plays a essential position in contrastive or confrontational lexicology. There are additionally quite a number lexicological manifestations of the problem of equivalence.

Comparative lexicology is regarded as a partial discipline with an emphasis on language. Accordingly, the notion of equivalence in lexicology is concentrated on the language system, but, in general, is fantastically vague. The foundation of the designator lexis is polysomic grasp of the language signs. Therefore, the factors of the lexis can be various instances polysemantic. While correlating one thing of language A with every other element of language B, their denotative relationship is usually typical as a foundation for the comparison. Thus, there appears equivalence, normally referred to as semantic equivalence, underneath the prerequisites that, firstly, the wide variety of sameness in language A equals the wide variety of sameness in language B (and they have the same meaning) and, secondly, their denotation (in pairs of sameness) is the same. It is necessary to be aware about various procedures to the definition of the equivalent and equivalence in translation studies. Equivalence of translation is described as the common content material of the unique text and the translation. A. Ivanov regards an equivalent as “functional compliance in a target language, transmitting expression on the similar level (words, collocations) to all relevant factors inside the given context, or one of the versions of that means of the original unit in the supply language” (Ivanov, 2006).

A classical sentence from the textbook on translation research is as follows: “Translation starts with establishing equivalence on the phrase level” (Ivanov, 2006). Undoubtedly, the problems of translation commence at the stage of a separate phrase or collocations, when there seems non-equivalent lexis, i.e. lexical gadgets which do not have their equivalents in the goal language. We agree with that non-equivalent lexis (as a phenomenon both in translation research and lexicography) gives a variety of problems. In translation it is connected with what is usually referred to as “untranslatable”; as for lexicography, the problem is extra complicated, due to the fact a dictionary does not furnish as many chances as a text does for distinct types of lexical transformations, with the help of which a nonequivalent thought can be identified. The time period itself is common for many authors, who understand it in an exclusive way: some authors regard non-equivalent lexis as a synonym of realia, the others see simply words, which due to cultural differences do no longer exist in the other language. S. Vlahov and S. Florin in their e book *The Untranslatable in Translation* supply the most complete description of sorts of lexical units, which can be considered as non-equivalent ones (Vlahov, Florin, 1980). It looks that non-equivalent lexis, as nicely as lexical gaps (composing a significant section of the countrywide specificity in any language) are the terms on the junction of various educational disciplines, which complicates the method to their definition inside the framework of lexicography. However, the trip of modern-day lexicographers clearly indicates that in the procedure of compilation of any bilingual or greater lingual

translation dictionary, the issues of conveying lifestyle specificity, absent in another language, do now not lose their importance:

“...in each and every way of life there exist ideas or phenomena now not to be discovered some other place in the world. Such discrepancies between cultures, or cultural gaps, provide rise to lexical gaps in the vocabularies of the involved languages, manifesting themselves most vividly in the system of establishing interlingual equivalence. This, in turn, makes life challenging for both bilingual lexicographers and translators. Vocabulary gadgets denoting principles attribute of a specific culture are referred to through a quantity of names in the literature on the subject matter enumerate such labels as cultural or culture-bound words, culture-specific concepts, realia, culture-bound phenomena and phrases and culture-specific items. However, the proposed labels call for a sure disambiguation. As has been remarked, cultures pecificity is no longer as easy to pinpoint as it may additionally seem. There are these who argue that in reality very few if any vocabulary items are way of life independent: “As language is created and used in context, it is inevitable to be tinted with the coloration of cultural idiosyncrasies” (Podolej, 2009)

The process of translation is often hindered by structural, lexical and contextual constraints. Rhythmical, alliterative and onomatopoeic aspects have been hurdles at the lexical level. Cultural nuances of the language constitute the congenital merits of any literary work. They tend to resist translation and make translation unpoetic. Puns, equivocations and idioms constitute the lexical problems that literary translators encounter. Most of the lexical problems arise from the problems of equivalences. There are four types of equivalences: (1) one-to-one equivalence; (2) one-to-many equivalence; (3) many-to-one equivalence; and (4) one-to-none equivalence or null equivalence. The first type of equivalence is relatively unproblematic as a word in the Source language has only one equivalent in the Target language: for instance, the word amor (Latin) has love (English) as its equivalent. But it becomes problematic when the lexical gap between the two languages widens due to cultural, social and historical differences. The second type of equivalence is inherently problematic due to alternatives of equivalents offered: the word amor (Latin) offers three alternative meanings-erose, filia and agape- in Greek. Here the Source language covers a wide range of contextual meanings. When such words are translated, the translator has to choose the potent and vital meaning most appropriate to the context. For instance, when divine love is referred to, agape is the meaning appropriate to the context.

The third type is also problematic as the exactness or precision of meaning changes in translation. The fourth type leads to the problem of untranslatability. While translating idioms and proverbial expressions the translator confronts an obvious dilemma: whether he should transfer the items from the Source language and transcribe

them in the Target language. The transfer of the untranslatable words and their transcription in the target language provide a local colour to the translation. Thus, translation is a creative process at every level of which the translator makes a choice. The choice of the translator is political as well as aesthetic, though they are more or less synonymous. In the matter of equivalence, the translator's choice is not between alternative yet exact equivalents, but between equivalents more or less inexact. So the choice depends on the ideology of the translator and the aesthetic that he follows. As any literary text is a synthesis of politics and aesthetics of the writer, the translator's choice of equivalents depends on the requirements of his textual politics. All types of translation involve loss or gain off meaning. Translation also causes skewing of meaning while decoding and encoding ideas. This results from the choice of the nearest equivalent. In this regard, J.C. Catford remarks: "In translation, there is the substitution of TL meanings for SL meanings; no transference of TL meanings into SL. In transference, there is an implantation of SL meanings into the TL text. These two process must be clearly differentiated in any theory of translation" (1965:27).

The distinction between translation and transference is essential to define linguistic untranslatability. J.C. Catford defines translation as a uni-directional process which involves "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)" (1965:20). It is primarily a linguistic act as it involves an operation performed on languages. Though the definition seems to be simple, it calls for comment on two terms, namely "textual material" and "equivalent." The use of the term "textual material" underlines the fact that in normal conditions of translation it is not the entirety of a SL text that is replaced by TL equivalents. At one or more levels of language there may be replacements by non-equivalent TL material there is replacement of SL grammar and lexis by equivalent TL grammar and lexis. There is also replacement of SL graphology by TL graphology. But, the TL graph logical form is in no way a translation equivalent of the SL graph logical form. Hence, the central problem of any translation practice is that of finding translation equivalents. Several theorists speak on the problems of equivalence in translation. Roman Jakobson, Eugene Nida and Anton Popovic have contributed to the theory of equivalence. In his essay "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" (1959), Roman Jakobson approaches the problem of equivalence as a linguistic problem: "Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics" (Brower, 1962: 239). He argues that the translator recodes and transmits the SL messages into TL messages and thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes. In Jakobson's discussion, the problem of equivalence focuses on the differences in the structure and terminology of languages rather than on the inability of one language to render a message written in another verbal language. He emphasizes that the problem of equivalence is related to the structure and syntax of the language. The conventional

terms such as literal, free and faithful translation became outdated with the publication of Eugene Nida's two major works *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964) and *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969), which he co-authored with Taber. Nida, who has applied a communication model for his theory of translation, distinguishes between Formal equivalence and Dynamic Equivalence. Nida explains: "Formal Equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content... One is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language" (1964:159). Formal equivalence or formal correspondence is thus oriented towards the SL structure. The most typical of this kind of translation is "gloss translation," with a close approximation to SL structure, often with footnotes, to gain close access to the language and customs of the source culture (Nida and Taber, 1969:24). In such a translation, a translator is concerned with such correspondences as poetry to poetry, sentence to sentence, and concept to concept. This kind of translation allows the reader to understand as much of the source language context as possible.

Dynamic or functional equivalence is based on what Nida calls "the principle of equivalent effect," where "the relation between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message" (1964:159). Here the message is tailored to the receptors' linguistic needs and cultural expectations, aiming at complete naturalness of expression. Nida defines the goal of dynamic equivalence as to seek "the closest equivalent to the source-language message" (1964:166; Nida and Taber 1969:12). This receptor oriented approach considers adaptations of grammar, lexicon, and cultural references essential to achieve naturalness, to minimize the foreignness of the SL setting. The emotive impact of the message is the same for the audience irrespective of the fact that whether they belong to the source culture or target culture. Yet another theory of equivalence is mentioned by Anton Popovic, who, in his *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation* (1976), identifies four types of equivalence- Linguistic equivalence, Paradigmatic equivalence, Stylistic or Translational equivalence and Textual or Syntagmatic equivalence. In linguistic equivalence there is homogeneity on the linguistic level of both SL and TL texts. It closely resembles word for word translation. Paradigmatic equivalence aims at equivalence of the elements of a paradigmatic expressive axis: elements of grammar which Popovic regards as a higher category than lexical equivalence. In stylistic equivalence, there is functional equivalence of elements both in the source text and the translation, aiming at an expressive identity with an invariant of identical meaning. When there is equivalence of the syntagmatic structuring of a text, an equivalence of form and shape exists and this is called textual equivalence. Translation is far more than replacement of lexical or grammatical items; the process also involves discarding the basic linguistic elements to achieve the

expressive identity. Koller describes five different types of equivalences. They are Denotative equivalence, Connotative equivalence, Text-normative equivalence, Pragmatic equivalence and Formal equivalence. The denotative equivalence is related to the equivalence of the extra linguistic content of the text. The connotative equivalence is related to the equivalence of the connotative dimensions of a text. The text – normative equivalence is related to text types, with different kinds of texts behaving in different ways. The pragmatic equivalence is quite similar to Nida's dynamic equivalence. It is oriented towards the receiver of the text or message. It is also called communicative equivalence. The formal equivalence is related to the form and aesthetic of the text.

Theorists like James Holmes think that the use of the term equivalence is perverse. Dionye Durisin argues that the translator of a literary text should not be concerned with establishing equivalence of natural language, but of artistic procedures. The procedures cannot be considered in isolation, but must be located within the specific cultural- temporal context within which they are used (Bassnett, 1991:28). Equivalence in translation should not be approached as a search for sameness, but as dialectic between signs and structures within and surrounding the Source language and the Target language text. As complete equivalence is not possible, there is always the question of loss and gain. Nida discusses in detail the difficulties encountered by the translator when faced with the terms or concepts in the Source language that do not exist in the Target language. This leads to the question of untranslatability. The complexity of languages makes one infer that literary art is untranslatable, both linguistically and culturally.

### **Conclusion.**

Crawford distinguishes two types of untranslatability, linguistic and cultural. Linguistic untranslatability occurs when there is no lexical or syntactic substitute in language for the Source language item. This is the result of the differences between the Source language and the Target language. Cultural untranslatability is due to the absence in the target culture of a relevant situational feature for the Source language text. Translation is not an isolated endeavour; it is a part of an ongoing process of intercultural transfer: a transfer across linguistic and cultural boundaries. The translator has to present the aspects of social culture that is unfamiliar to the receiving audience. They consists of elements of the material culture like food, dress and tools, factors of social structures like customs and law, features of the natural world like weather, flora and fauna, and social functions like festivals, rituals and ceremonies. Such elements of the source culture have no equivalents in the receptor language. The translator may transfer the source culture item untranslated into the Target language; he may transcribe the item in the Target language and provide an explanatory footnote for the readers of the receptor culture. Popovic also distinguishes two types of untranslatability

without making a separation between the linguistic and the cultural. The first is defined as the problem of connotation: A situation in which the linguistic elements of the original cannot be replaced adequately in structural, linear, functional or semantic terms in consequence of a lack of denotation or connotation. (Gentzler, 1993: 85) The source culture item eludes translation due to the failure of target culture items to denote it in the target language. The second type goes beyond the purely linguistic; it reflects the inadequacy of language itself: A situation where the relation of expressing the meaning, i.e., the relation between the creative subject and its linguistic expression in the original does not find an adequate linguistic expression in translation. (Gentzler, 1993:85-86)The creative subject finds appropriate expression in the source language, but it fails to find appropriate expression in the target language. Since language is a modeling system within a culture, cultural untranslatability is inevitably implied in any process of translation. The types of untranslatability Catford and Popovic define correspond to each other.

Linguistic untranslatability arises mainly due to the problem of suggestive meaning. A word attains different shades of meaning through its context, etymology, appropriation, time and place, association, contrast, gender, and collocation. While English does not distinguish between the words used for greeting someone face to face or when answering the telephone, French, German and the Italian all do make that distinction. The Italian pronto is used as telephonic greeting like the German hallo. The Italian ciao is used equally on arrival and departure, and not to the specific context of arrival or initial encounter. Moreover, German and French use as forms of greeting brief rhetorical questions, whereas in English rhetorical questions like How are you? or How do you do? are used only in formal situation . So, the translator, who is faced with the task of translating hello into any language, should first extract a core of meaning which is applicable to his translation of the word hello. Jakobson has described this as interlingual transposition, while Ludskanov, in his A Semiotic Approach to the Theory of Translation, calls it Semiotic transformation. It is the replacement of the signs encoding a message by signs of another code, preserving invariant information with respect to a given system of reference. In the case of hello the invariant is the notion of greeting.

### References

1. H o l m e s J. S. The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. 3d International Congress of Applied Linguistics: Abstracts. Copenhagen, 1972; H o l m e s J. S. The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, Department of General Studies, 1975.
2. К о м и с с а р о в В. Н. Слово о переводе. – М., 1973; Ш в е й ц е р А. Д. Перевод и лингвистика. – М., 1973; Ф е д о р о в А. В. Введение в теорию перевода. – М. 1958.

3. Newmark P. Approaches to Translation. – New York a.o.: Prentice Hall, 1988. – P. 19.
4. Catford J.C. A Linguistic Theory of Translation. – London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
5. Миньяр – Белоручев Р. К. Теория и методы перевода. – М.: Московский лицей, 1996. – С.29.
6. Nida E., Taber C. Theory and Practice of Translating. – Leiden: Brill, 1969.
7. Benjamin W. Illuminations. – New York, 1955. - P.75.
8. Encyclopedia Britannica. Version 1997. CD-ROM.
9. Бархударов Л. С. Язык и перевод. – М.: Международные отношения, 1975; Ревзин И. И., Розенцвейг В. Ю. Основы общего и машинного перевода. – М.: Высшая школа, 1964. –С.64.
10. Кузьмин Ю. Г. К вопросу о предмете и месте теории перевода. // Вопросы теории и практики научно-технического перевода. P, 19