SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

# CULTURAL REFERENCES IN TRANSLATION

**Madiyorova Valida Kuvandik Kizi**
*PhD, Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

**Article DOI:** https://doi.org/10.36713/epra24449
**DOI No: 10.36713/epra24449**

**ABSTRACT**

*Archaic words (archaisms) reflect the daily life, ethnogenesis, gender relations, national-cultural customs, traditions, and values of a people, thus demonstrating specific linguocultural features. The use of archaisms in historical literary works not only forms an understanding of the social and political life and historical context of a given era in the reader's mind but also serves to develop and enhance the national, cultural, and ethnic worldview typical of a particular nation. Correct interpretation of such culturally bound and ethnographically significant archaisms enables an effective and expressive representation of a people's spirit, national color, culture, mentality, and worldview in translation. Achieving this, however, requires the combined application of translation studies, linguocultural studies, and linguistics, since without analyzing the national and cultural features of archaisms, it is impossible to achieve adequacy in translation.*

**KEY WORDS:** *Archaic Words, Linguocultural Translation, National Color, Cultural Adaptation, Equivalence, Translation Strategies, Functional Approach, Cultural Approach, Foreignization, Domestication.*

Archaic words (archaisms) reflect the daily life, ethnogenesis, gender relations, national and cultural customs, traditions, and values of a people, thereby revealing distinctive linguocultural features. The use of archaisms in historical literary works not only helps form the reader's understanding of the socio-political life and historical atmosphere of a particular period but also plays an important role in developing and enriching the national, cultural, and ethnic worldview specific to a given people and culture. Correct interpretation of such culturally and ethnographically marked archaisms enables the translator to effectively convey the spirit, national color, culture, mentality, and worldview of the people expressed through them in the target language. Achieving this goal requires the combined application of knowledge from translation studies, linguoculturology, and linguistics, since without analyzing the national and cultural features of archaisms, it is impossible to attain adequacy in translation.

The relationship between translation and culture is so strong that factors such as the translator's socio-cultural background, their awareness of both the source and target cultures, and even the nationality of the target reader inevitably influence the translation process. The ongoing debate regarding which culture to prioritize during translation—whether to focus on the reader's national-cultural background to ensure comprehension (the *functional approach to translation*), or to preserve the distinctive characteristics and national color of the source language (the *cultural approach to translation*)—remains unresolved. There is, indeed, a significant difference between "translating culture" and "translating into culture." In the first case, the translator's main task is to explain cultural differences and peculiarities through various textual and extratextual means. In the second, the translator strives to neutralize and simplify culturally unfamiliar expressions as much as possible for the reader. However, if the reader experiences "cultural shock" [1], the translation is considered unsuccessful.

In our view, it is essential to maintain a balance between both approaches when conveying the national characteristics of archaisms so that the translation remains accurate, comprehensible, and rich in national color. However, while this may seem simple in theory, it is a challenging task in practice due to the internal and external peculiarities of each language.

In the 1980s, the emergence of a new school in translation studies known as the *"cultural turn"* shifted attention from searching merely for linguistic equivalence to preserving the national color of the source text. In subsequent years, research in this field expanded significantly, and numerous scholars—including English linguists such as P. Newmark, G. Langer, M. Baker, R. Bell, L. Hickey, E. Gutt, R. Jakobson, and K. James; Russian scholars such as V. Komissarov, S. Vlakhov, S. Florin, A. Fyodorov, Y. Retzker, L. Nelyubin, and A. Semenov; as well as Uzbek scholars such as G. Salomov, Q. Musayev, J. Sharipov, R. Fayzullayeva, N. Komilov, O. Mo'minov, N. Qambarov, Sh. Sirojiddinov, U. Yo'ldoshev, and O. Fayzulloyev—have contributed to the study of linguocultural features in translation. These works widely employ such terms as *national-cultural essence, national peculiarity, national color, national-cultural*

SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.688| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 10 | Issue: 10 | October 2025 - Peer Reviewed Journal

*semantics, ethnosemantics, socio-cultural meaning, cultural component,* and others [2], which serve as key concepts in the linguocultural approach to translation.

In most studies addressing the reflection of linguocultural features in translation, the main focus is placed on linguocultural units, realia, and lacunae among other forms of national-cultural specificity. However, since not all archaisms can be classified as linguocultural units, lacunae, or realia, relying solely on this approach is not always effective. Some archaisms embody national and cultural meaning not in their entirety, but through subtle nuances of meaning. Therefore, it is necessary to prioritize national-cultural categories in linguocultural analysis of archaism translation, taking into account their deep connection with the national culture of the people.

Although many studies in global translation studies explore methods for rendering culturally marked vocabulary, our approach relies primarily on the works of P. Newmark [3], V. Ivir [4], and R. Leppihalme. P. Newmark proposed one of the most comprehensive classifications of translation methods for culturally specific vocabulary, including the following:

1. **Transference** (transliteration and transcription);
2. **Naturalization** (adapting the source-language term to the norms of the target language);
3. **Cultural equivalent** (using an equivalent term from the target culture);
4. **Functional equivalent** (using a neutral, non-culturally marked term);
5. **Descriptive equivalent** (explaining the ethnocultural term with several words);
6. **Componential analysis** (comparing source and target terms to explain similarities and differences in meaning);
7. **Use of synonyms**;
8. **Calque** (loan translation, often used for institutional names and compound words);
9. **Transposition** (changing grammatical form, such as from singular to plural, or from a verb to a noun, to fit target-language norms);
10. **Modulation** (restructuring meaning according to the target culture's perspective);
11. **Recognized translation** (using officially accepted institutional terms);
12. **Compensation** (expressing lost meaning elsewhere in the sentence);
13. **Paraphrase** (providing an expanded explanation, broader than descriptive equivalence);
14. **Couplets** (combining two or more translation procedures);
15. **Notes** (supplying additional information, usually in footnotes or parenthetical explanations).

In addition to these, V. Ivir proposed *cultural borrowing, lexical creation,* and *deliberate omission* [4], while R. Leppihalme argued that when source and target cultures are closely related, direct transference (transliteration) of ethnocultural vocabulary is most effective [5]. Other scholars favor calque and cultural adaptation, whereas proponents of functional translation theory advocate using hypernyms to help readers better grasp unfamiliar cultural concepts [6]. L. Venuti, in turn, distinguishes between the strategies of *foreignization* and *domestication* [7]. Furthermore, explicit paraphrasing and addition of contextual information within the text can effectively convey the national color of ethnocultural vocabulary, though in certain cases, omission may also serve as a practical strategy for achieving an adequate translation.

## REFERENCES

1. *Leppihalme R. Culture bumps. –Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters. –1997.*
2. *Yuldashev U.R. Linguistic and linguocultural features of the translation of satirical texts (on the example of Uzbek folk anecdotes translated into English). Philology.science.philology.doc. ...diss. – Tashkent, 2017. – 164 p.*
3. *Newmark P. Textbook of translation. – New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo: Prentice Hall, 1988. –P.98.*
4. *Ivir V. Procedures and strategies for the translation of culture. // Translation Across Cultures. –New Delhi: Bahri, 1987. pp.35-46.*
5. *Leppihalme R. Culture bumps. –Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters. –1997.*
6. *Nord C. Translation as a process of linguistic and cultural adaptation. //Teaching translation and interpreting. –Copenhagen: John Benjamins Publishinig Company, 1994, №2. – pp. 59-67.*
7. *Venuti L. Strategies of translation. // Encyclopedia of translation studies. –London and New York:Routledge, 1998. – pp. 240-244.*