

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

### International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2022 Issue: 10 Volume: 114

Published: 03.10.2022 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



**Kholiddin Abdulvakhobzoda Shomukhammadov**

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages  
teacher of English at the chair of "English teaching methodology"  
Uzbekistan

## ON THE PROBLEM OF TRANSLATABILITY: CULTURAL UNTRANSLATABILITY

**Abstract:** *The requirement for the translation text, which should have the same impact potential in relation to its addressees as the source text in relation to addressees in its linguistic and cultural community, is insufficient. The effectiveness of both texts can be ensured not only by translation, but also by other types of language mediation (retelling, etc.). At the same time, the content of the text in another language may differ from the content of the original. Therefore, another requirement is that the translated text should be as much as possible a semantic-structural analogue of the source text. There are contradictions between these requirements, since the principle of equivalence often requires a departure from linguistic parallels with the original. The reason for this is often the lack of sufficient information from the recipient of the translation about the ethnocultural and current event realities present in the source text. To eliminate such pre-information inconsistencies between native speakers of the source and translated languages and cultures, additional information is entered into the translation text, for example, in the form of translator's notes. However, in some cases, it is not possible to completely overcome the inequalities of pre-information knowledge, and therefore translation becomes possible only at the level of partial equivalence or is impossible at all, which means cultural untranslatability.*

**Key words:** *fundamental translatability, cultural untranslatability, translator's notes, equality of texts in translation, translation techniques, pre-information knowledge.*

**Language:** English

**Citation:** Shomukhammadov, Kh. A. (2022). On the problem of translatability: cultural untranslatability. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 10 (114), 19-23.

**Soi:** <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-10-114-4> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2022.10.114.4>

**Scopus ASCC:** 1203.

### Introduction

Since the concept of "translatability" is derived from the concept of "translation", let us clarify that translation is "a type of language mediation in which the content of the original foreign language text is transferred to another language by creating a communicatively equivalent text in that language" [Komissarov, 411]. In V. N. Komissarov's definition, the key attribute is "communicatively equivalent". What does it mean to be a communicatively equivalent text?

A text is a work of speech, and speech is a means, a tool. People speak / write in order to have a certain impact on the addressee with their speech: to change his level of awareness, emotional state, to encourage something, etc. Therefore, texts are communicatively equivalent, which (first of all) are equivalent in terms

of the potential impact on their addressees. "The purpose of language mediation is to create an opportunity to cause a certain communicative effect in the addressee, but not the call of the communicative effect itself" [Kade, 83]. If the effect turned out to be different from what the original author expected, the translator is not always to blame for this. The translator is responsible for the "disruption" of the communicative effect only if it occurred due to his incorrect translation.

However, the equivalence of the translated text to the original is not all that is required of the translation according to its conventional norm. "The conventional norm of translation is the requirements that a translation must meet in connection with the views generally accepted in this period on the role and tasks of translation activity" [Komissarov, 409]. In a

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

certain sense, an equivalent communicative effect can be provided not only by translation, but also in another way, for example, by replacing the original with a text in another language, the content of which has little in common with the content of the original. From translation practice, there is a case when a translator during a conversation, instead of translating jokes, replaced them with funny stories in the translated language. The translator justified such a replacement by saying that the purpose of communication in this situation is to move from official to informal, friendly communication. And local funny stories contribute more to creating a relaxed atmosphere than painstakingly translated jokes with their own cultural and linguistic specifics, in which it is not always possible to preserve the comic effect. In other words, the translator believed that by his substitutions he ensured the achievement of the goal of communication. It is obvious to us that the technique used has nothing to do with translation.

Sometimes other types of language mediation – retelling, abridged or selective translation, abstract, etc – are more effective than standard translation, but they cannot be passed off as it, since the authorship of the translated text is attributed to the creator of the original and, accordingly, the text of the translation can be quoted as the words of the author [Komissarov, 31]. In order to meet this requirement, the translation, among other things, must reproduce the semantic and structural parameters of the original as much as possible.

Contradictions periodically arise between this requirement for translation and the requirement of the equivalence of the impact of the source and translated texts, since the principle of equivalence often requires a departure from linguistic parallels with the original, for example: *Eng. Hold the line – Uzb. Go'shakni qo'ymang*. Such contradictions are resolved with the help of the optimal (best for each specific case) translation solution. It is impossible to describe a general algorithm for finding such a solution, since there are only variables in the scale of values that the translator is guided by.

For the same reason, not one, but several optimal, competing translation solutions are possible. In the absence of rules for finding the optimal translation option, an experience-based "inner feeling of satisfaction with the translation performed" becomes important, which to some extent helps to verify knowledge of translation theory, translation precedents.

Having made these necessary preliminary remarks, we can proceed directly to the topic stated in the title, which has been addressed by well-known linguists and translation specialists at different times. This indicates its importance for the theory and practice of translation. The problems of translatability and untranslatability have been considered by many authors. Thus, Wilhelm Humboldt considered "Every

translation a hopeless attempt to solve an impossible task".

The last word in the discussion about translatability/untranslatability belongs to practice, which, as we know, is the criterion of truth. Successful practice of communication with translation on a global scale has convincingly proved that there is incomparably more translated than untranslatable. The fact that multilingual people around the world successfully communicate with each other at international meetings and conferences, coordinate their actions at meetings of specialists and diplomatic meetings, exchange cultural values, etc. allows us to talk about the overwhelming preponderance of translatability over non-translatability.

What is the nature of untranslatability? It is obvious that the addresser of the text orients it to a certain level of preliminary information (preinformation), which, according to the author, the addressee should have. An adequate sender will not talk to a small child in the same way as with an adult, or with a layman, as with a specialist, etc. An error in assessing the necessary preliminary knowledge of the addressee is fraught with disruption of communication. This applies to both monolingual and bilingual communication with translation, however, with the difference that in bilingual communication with translation, the factor of pre-information discrepancy manifests itself much more often due to the addressee's lack of information about ethnocultural and actual event realities that are explicitly or implicitly present in the source text.

In other words, in order to achieve the equivalence of the speech impact, the translator must not only transmit using a different language system and in accordance with a different language and speech norm, but also adapt the created text to a different ethno-cultural perception. Most often it succeeds, but not always.

An attempt to use translation in the absence of the necessary ethno-cultural prerequisites for its adequate perception by the speakers of the translation may lead to a conflict situation. A very illustrative example of this kind was given in an oral conversation by Doctor of Philology A.N.Kryukov. In the mid-1950s, one of the prominent Indonesian statesmen during a visit to the USSR, finishing his speech to the public in Moscow, said: "I'm done with this, since it's time for evening prayer soon and you, of course, are in a hurry." The audience took it as a joke and greeted the phrase with laughter. The speaker was puzzled and offended by this. A. N. Kryukov believes that in this case it would not be correct to translate. But what could the translator fill in his "untranslated" with? Perhaps some kind of routine phrase like: "And now let me say goodbye and wish you a good evening." However, such substitutions are prohibited because they do not comply with the translation norm.

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Especially if the person you are translating has a high official status. In fact, there was a deadlock here.

The elimination of "pre-informational obstacles" is part of the translator's task. To do this, various techniques are used, some of which we will demonstrate with examples:

1. *He suffers from Foehn disease – U fen kasalligiga chalingan. Alp tog'laridan quruq va iliq shamol esganda ko'pchilik fen kasalligiga chalinadi.*

Three translation techniques are used here: a) transliteration: Foehn - hair dryer, recreating the sound form of a foreign word using letters; b) calcification: Foehn disease - a common disease, translating a lexical unit into its component parts; c) descriptive translation: from which many suffer ... Using a combination of three techniques, non-verbal preinformation is transformed into verbal: if possible so to say, "passed from the heads of the carriers into the text of the translation."

2. *He behaves like a Hanswurst – U o'zini Hanswurtdek tutadi (Hatti-harakati).*

Hanswurst is a rude comic character of the German puppet theater, traditionally behaving obscenely, making obscene jokes. Comparing someone to this puppet character means extreme disapproval. Such a replacement of one cultural and historical reality with another can be qualified as an approximate translation or likening, the use of analogies: An Uzbek traveling artist is likened to a character of a German puppet theater.

However, the translator does not always manage to neutralize the information inequality between the media without going beyond the translated text, and it is necessary to place additional information for the media outside of it. This technique is called a translator's note and is of an auxiliary nature.

With the exception of the phrase we highlighted, all the replicas of the dialogue have been translated quite satisfactorily. However, the meaning of the allegorical conversation remained hidden for the Uzbek reader, since he does not know that tea in England at that time was considered a drink of high strata of society, and coffee was an ordinary, folk drink. To understand the meaning of the conversation, it is also necessary to take into account the context of the preceding part of the novel: Robert, in love with Patricia, was constantly tormented by the thought that he was not a match for her. She is the daughter of an officer, and he is a poor guy, in the recent past a simple front-line soldier. By the time of the conversation, all this is already a passed stage of their relationship, and they, drawing a line under the past, promise each other love and consent in a playful allegorical form.

To reveal to the Uzbek reader of the novel the "secret" meaning of the conversation of two lovers, you can use a technique called a translator's note (in parentheses or as a footnote), for example: In the times described, tea was considered in England to be a drink of the high strata of society, and coffee was a drink of

the common people - note. translator. Due to the fact that the note is a complete statement of a large volume, it is better to arrange it in the form of a footnote.

The translator's notes have two significant drawbacks. The first is that they put the addressee of the original and the translation in unequal conditions in terms of the perception of the message. If the addressee of the source text deals with one text, then the recipient of it in translation deals with two texts - the translation itself and the note, which is a separate text. Switching from one text to another and back violates the reader's integrity of perception, which is especially important when reading fiction, the most important purpose of which is to evoke emotional and aesthetic experiences in the reader (the emotional and aesthetic function of a literary work of art). And more generally, this contradicts the socially determined purpose of translation activity: to create translated texts, to the maximum extent possible (in these linguistic and extralinguistic conditions) equivalent to the source texts both in their speech effects and in semantic and structural means of its implementation, which includes the possibility of equivalent perception.

The use of translator's notes not only puts native speakers in unequal conditions of perception of the message, but also (especially if there are a lot of notes) turns the translated text into another product of language mediation – something like a retelling adapted for the native speaker, with the only difference that the additional information necessary for adaptation is placed in separate portions outside the main text. The use of the translator's comment in interpretation is also associated with technical difficulties. So, sometimes the translator has to ask the speaker for permission to make a comment that requires a pause in translation.

From what has been said, it is clear that the use of translator's notes is something like "walking on the edge of translatability", and the result obtained with the help of such notes can be considered, using the term of A.D.Schweitzer, translatability "at the level of partial equivalence" [Schweitzer, 107].

If there was a need to translate the song about the black cat into English, the translator would face a deadlock. It is obvious that neither the translator's notes nor other methods of compensating for the inequality of prerequisites necessary for an equivalent reaction of native speakers of two languages to the content of the song are applicable here, since humor is not conveyed either by comments or by adding content to the translation text or, conversely, omitting it.

In addition to cultural untranslatability, there are two other types of untranslatability that we are not able to characterize within the limited scope of this article. This is the untranslatability of wordplay and the inability to recreate in translation the dialectal features of the author's speech or his characters.

## Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317  
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582  
GIF (Australia) = 0.564  
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912  
ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939  
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771  
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630  
PIF (India) = 1.940  
IBI (India) = 4.260  
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Compared to cultural untranslatability, both of these factors manifest themselves in bilingual communication with translation much less frequently.

Let's summarize the above. On the one hand, translation in practice has proven its effectiveness on a global scale as a means of successful communication between people who do not speak a common language. On the other hand, in some cases translation is either not possible at all, or is possible only at the level of partial equivalence. This is due to the insurmountable (with the help of "legitimate" means of translation) inequality of the media's pre-information knowledge (cultural untranslatability). In some cases, cultural untranslatability may be partially compensated by the translator's notes.

The above is a statement of a general nature, unrelated to the peculiarities of texts and their types. The scale of the translated and untranslatable significantly depends on the type (genre) of the source text. Each text has its own ratio of translatable and untranslatable, or, if I may say so, has its own coefficient of translatability. Texts of various types are characterized by different translatability coefficients. Thus, the probability of cultural untranslatability in the translation of special texts is significantly lower than in the translation of folklore or fiction, since special knowledge (preinformation), conceptual thesauruses and relevant topics of special

branches are international. Multilingual specialists are united by a common range of interests, topical issues, a common (albeit multilingual) conceptual apparatus.

It is wrong to consider untranslatability as one of the "working" difficulties of translation - such as trivial lexical and grammatical difficulties. It is not due to natural differences in languages, but there is a "generic" flaw in translation as one of the ways to ensure communication between people with different languages and cultures, as a result of the socially conditioned "claim" of translation to do it at a level comparable to natural, monolingual communication, on the one hand, and the inability to fully compare with her, with the other.

The concept of translatability / untranslatability is an important section of translation theory, the knowledge of which has not only purely scientific, but also applied value. In particular, when preparing translators, theoretical knowledge will help the teacher to use more evidential, and, consequently, more convincing arguments when discussing and evaluating translation options. Consideration of cultural untranslatability allows us to concretize the idea of what is possible and impossible in translation, translatable and untranslatable, their relationship. This has a certain theoretical value and can be useful for translation teachers and their students - future translators.

## References:

1. Barhudarov, L. S. (1975). *Iazyk i perevod (voprosy obshchei i chastnoi teorii perevoda) [Language and Translation the questions of general and special theory of translation]*. (p.240). Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.
2. Cvilling, M. Ya. (2009). *O perevode i perevodchikax. Sbornik nauchnyh statei [On Translation and Translators. The Collection of Scholarly Articles]*. (p.288). Moscow: Vostochnaia kniga.
3. Evteev, S. V. (2016). *Nemetskii iazyk : praktika perevoda : ucheb. posobie : urovni B 2-C 1 [The German Language: The Practice of Translation: A Manual: Levels B2–C 1]*. pod red. M. A. Chigashevoi (ed. M. A. Chigasheva); Mosk. gos. in-t mezhdunar. otnoshenii (un-t) Min-va inostr. del ros. federatsii. kaf. nemetskogo iazyka. (p.289). Moscow: MGIMO - Universitet.
4. Evteev, S. V., & Latyshev, L. K. (2017). *Perevod i iazykovoe posrednichestvo [Translation and Language Intermediation]*. *Filologicheskie nauki v MGIMO: Zhurnal*. No. 3 (11), gl. red. V. A. Iovenko (*Philology at MGIMO, Journal 3* (11), pp. 80–86, ed. V. A. Iovenko). Moscow, MGIMO -Universitet.
5. Fedorov, A. V. (1983). *Osnovy obshchei teorii perevoda (lingvisticheskie problemy) [The Principles of General Theory of Translation (Linguistic Issues)]*. 4- e izd., pererab. i dop (4 ed.). (p.303). Moscow: Vysshaia shkola.
6. Kade, O. (1978). *Problema perevoda v svete teorii komunikatsii [The Problem of Translation in the Light of the Theory of Communication]*. *Voprosy teorii perevoda v zarubezhnoi lingvistike*. (pp.69-90). Moscow: Mezhdunar. otnosheniia.
7. Katford, D. K. (2004). *Lingvisticheskaia teoriia perevoda: ob odnom aspekte prikladnoi lingvistiki*: per. s angl. [Linguistic Theory of Translation: On One Aspect of Applied Linguistics: Trans. from English]. (p.208). Moscow: Editorial URSS.
8. Koller, W. (1983). *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft [Introduction to Translation Science]*. (p.291). Heidelberg, 2. durchges. u. erg. Auflage. (In German).

**Impact Factor:**

**ISRA (India) = 6.317**  
**ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582**  
**GIF (Australia) = 0.564**  
**JIF = 1.500**

**SIS (USA) = 0.912**  
**PIHII (Russia) = 3.939**  
**ESJI (KZ) = 8.771**  
**SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184**

**ICV (Poland) = 6.630**  
**PIF (India) = 1.940**  
**IBI (India) = 4.260**  
**OAJI (USA) = 0.350**

---

9. Komissarov, V. N. (1980). *Lingvistika perevoda* [Linguistics of Translation]. (p.167). Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.
10. Komissarov, V. N. (2002). *Sovremennoe perevodovedenie: ucheb. posobie* [Modern Theory of Translation: A Manual]. (p.424). Moscow: ETS.
11. Latyshev, L. K. (2007). *Tehnologiya perevoda: uchebnoe posobie dlia vuzov* [Technology of Translation: A Manual for University Students]. 3- e izd., stereotip. (p.320). Moscow: Izdatelskii centr "Akademiiia".
12. Ozhegov, S. I. (2017). *Tolkovy slovar russkogo iazyka: ok. 100 000 slov, terminov i frazeologicheskikh vyrazhenii* [Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language: About 100 000 Words, Terms and Phraseological Expressions]. pod red. Prof. L. I. Skvortsova (ed. L. I. Skvortsov). 27-e izd., ispr. (p.736). Moscow: Izdatelstvo AST, Mir i Obrazovanie.
13. Remark, E. M. (2017). *Tri tovarishcha* [Three Friends: A Novel]. Per. s nem. I. Shraibera. (p.478). Moscow: Izdatelstvo AST.
14. Shveitser, A. D. (1988). *Teoriia perevoda: status, problemy, aspekty* [Theory of Translation: Status, Problems and Aspects]. (p.215). Moscow: Nauka.
15. Ter-Minasova, S. G. (2008). *Iazyk i mezhkulturaia kommunikatsiia*. 3-e izdanie [Language and Intercultural Communication. 3-ed.]. (p.350). Moscow: Izd-vo MGU.
16. Yusupov, O., & Nasrullaev, J. (2020). Linguo-social and cultural features of learning English. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, 82(02), 408-412. doi: 10.15863/tas.2020.02.82.65