TRANSLATING METHODS OF REALITIES
IN ENGLISH, RUSSIAN AND KYRGYZ CULTURE

©*Karabekova E.,* Osh State University, Osh, Kyrgyzstan
©*Abdykadyrova S.,* ORCID: 0000-0001-8141-5408, SPIN-code: 9760-7052,
Osh State University, Osh, Kyrgyzstan, sabdykadyrova@oshsu.kg

СПОСОБЫ ПЕРЕВОДА ЯЗЫКОВЫХ РЕАЛИЙ
АНГЛИЙСКОЙ, РУССКОЙ И КЫРГЫЗСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ

©*Карабекова Э. А.,* Ошский государственный университет, г. Ош, Кыргызстан
©*Абдыкадырова С. Р.,* ORCID: 0000-0001-8141-5408, SPIN-код: 9760-7052, Ошский
государственный университет, г. Ош, Кыргызстан, sabdykadyrova@oshsu.kg

Abstract. This article is devoted to the problem of translation of linguistic realities in English, Russian and Kyrgyz cultures. The article is an overview of the realities in the mentioned cultures. An attempt is made to find ways to overcome the linguo-ethnic barrier when translating concepts from the Kyrgyz language, reflecting the national character. The essence of this problem boils down to the fact that the main requirement of translation is to preserve the originality of the translated text and to study the cultural component of the text. It should be aimed at identifying the differences between the original and the translation, not only because of the linguistic form, but also because of the cultural one. The main purpose of the article is to analyze the elements of the linguistic specificity of translation of realities in English, Russian and Kyrgyz cultures. The subject of the research is ethnic elements — objective problems arising during translation, and methods of their solution, that is, the transfer of cultural realities during translation. The article examines the theory of cultural realities in the translation aspect and analyzes the main features and methods of translating words-realities. The selected realities are analyzed from the point of view of their translation methods to identify the most effective ones. To solve the set specific tasks, the following methods were used in the work: analysis, synthesis, classification and generalization of the data obtained. As a result of the study, material was obtained, the analysis of which made it possible to conclude that the choice of one way or another way to overcome the linguo-ethnic barrier depends on the situation of intercultural communication, as well as on the goals of the participants in the communication.

Аннотация. Настоящая статья посвящена проблеме перевода языковых реалий в английской, русской и кыргызской культурах. Статья представляет собой обзор реалий в упомянутых культурах. Сделана попытка найти способы преодоления лингвоэтнического барьера при переводе понятий из кыргызского языка, отражающих национальный характер. Сущность данной проблемы сводится к тому, что основным требованием перевода является сохранение оригинальности переводимого текста и изучение культурной составляющей текста. Оно должно быть направлено на выявление различий между оригиналом и переводом не только из-за языковой формы, но и из-за культурной. Основная цель статьи заключается в том, чтобы проанализировать элементы лингвистической специфики перевода реалий в английской, русской и кыргызской культурах. Предметом исследования являются этнические элементы — объективные проблемы, возникающие при переводе, и методы их решения, то

есть передача культурных реалий при переводе. В статье рассматривается теория культурных реалий в переводческом аспекте и анализируются основные особенности и способы перевода слов-реалий. Отобранные реалии проанализированы с точки зрения способов их перевода для выявления наиболее эффективных из них. Для решения поставленных конкретных задач в работе использовались следующие методы: анализ, синтез, классификация и обобщение полученных данных. В результате изучения был получен материал, анализ которого позволил заключить, что выбор того или иного способа преодоления лингвоэтнического барьера зависит от ситуации межкультурного общения, а также от целей участников коммуникации.

Introduction

At the present time, there is an intensive development of intercultural communication in different spheres of human life: in art, politics, science, economics, etc. That is why there is a need to develop the foundations of communication and mutual understanding, since the most important thing in a communication act is adequate mutual understanding of participants belonging to different ethnic groups, that is, their understanding of the way of life, mentality and national character of representatives of another ethnic culture. It is known that in such communication acts, many problems arise on the way to achieving this mutual understanding, in other words, linguo-ethnic barriers appear on the way of implementing the communicative attitude of the statement. In the process of intercultural communication, people are often separated by a linguo-ethnic barrier, that is, the lack of a common language, differences in cultures, national psychology, insufficient awareness of the current life of a foreign country, etc. Overcoming the linguo-ethnic barrier can be done in several ways.

As practice shows, communication through the linguo-ethnic barrier is carried out in various ways, among which translation is only one of many. The simplest means of communication without a common language are non-verbal means of communication: gestures that can be natural (fixed in a particular people in the course of its historical development, for example, gestures of agreement, disagreement, indignation, admiration, etc.) or conventional (established by agreement, for example, the gestures of a street traffic controller, a sports judge); universal codes, for example, maritime bargaining code, formulas, pictograms - commonly understood symbols that designate an entrance, an exit, a dining room, a hairdresser, etc.

However, these types of communication do not provide an opportunity for full communication on various topics. Therefore, people divided by the linguo-ethnic barrier turn to the services of a language intermediary — a person who speaks the languages of both parties. The activity of a linguistic mediator is called linguistic mediation. Often the customer communicates his intention to the linguistic mediator (what he wants to achieve as a result of intercultural communication), and the linguistic mediator independently constructs the corresponding foreign language text, with which he addresses the foreign language participant in communication. If in the translation the translator receives the original text from the customer and then "transforms" it into a text in another language, then the language intermediary receives a communicative task of the type: "Ask about this and that", "Try to convince them of this and that's something". Turning to a

language intermediary, the customer is sure that the language intermediary, knowing better the situation, the culture of the country and the most appropriate ways of expressing intentions, will quickly achieve the desired result, having more freedom than in the case of translation [1].

Material and research methods

The difficulties arising in the process of communication between representatives of foreign-speaking countries have become the subject of research by many scientists, such as P. V. Veselov, Yu. M. Demin, M. V. Kirsanov, etc. In the process of developing key issues in the study of translation of realities, the theoretical basis was formed by the works of L. K. Latysheva, Markovina I. Yu., Savushkina L.V., Sdobnikova V.V. and others. In the works of these authors, the concept of the linguistic-ethnic barrier, its nature is very clearly defined, as well as a classification and characteristics of its components are given.

In our work, we stopped at the concept of "realities" and note that the translation of realities is rather arbitrary, since realities are usually untranslatable, but at the same time, in the context, they are still transmitted, since any lexical unit can be translated into another language, according to at least descriptively. Linguists define and classify realities in different ways. They are classified locally and divided into subgroups according to the classification of V. S. Vinogradov. as the most detailed. The universal classification was carried out by V. S. Vinogradov, relying on the development of S. Vlakhov and S. Florin [2], which is presented as follows: ethnographic and mythological realities, realities of the natural world, realities of state and administrative structure and social life (current and historical), everyday realities, onomastic realities.

Results and discussion

Realities are "the names of objects of material culture inherent only to certain nations and peoples, facts of history, state institutions, national and folklore heroes, mythological creatures, etc." [3]. For example, in English *dude ranch* — пансионат, Indian summer — бабье лето, in Russian *поликлиника* — health center, outpatient clinic, *субботник* — an unpaid/weekend/stint/volunteer effort, etc. Today, the problem of correctly translating realities is one of the most urgent, because the world is becoming more and more interconnected as a result of the exchange of goods and products, information, knowledge and cultural values. That is, we are talking about globalization — an inevitable phenomenon in the history of mankind. At the same time, each culture and subgroup provide its community members with rules for appropriate and inappropriate behavior. If you approach intercultural communication in terms of trying to learn the norms of all cultures and subgroups, this would certainly be an impossible task. It is impossible to learn all the rules governing appropriate and inappropriate behavior for every culture and subgroup you come into contact with. You will always do something wrong; you can offend someone, make someone laugh. Taking into account these common mistakes can help improve your intercultural skills while respecting the norms of another culture. Immersion in an authentic socio-cultural and linguistic environment has a huge didactic and methodological potential, which can and should be used in full by students to continue their linguistic and sociocultural education. It should be noted here that the socio-cultural, multicultural and communicative-cognitive approaches currently being implemented in the Kyrgyz system of general secondary and higher vocational education are focused on the systematic teaching of a foreign language and culture of the country of foreign students and students outside the cultural and linguistic environment.

L.V. Savushkina considers translation to be a mental interpretive activity, a certain type of communication, carried out through two or more languages. In this regard, in order to achieve the

most positive effect, it is advisable to take into account the specifics of communication, which is directly related to the culture of interacting communities or individual representatives of different ethnic groups [4]. In our research, we must take into account the philosophical problems of the relationship between language and ethnography. Linguistic semantics as a form of knowledge refers to the non-linguistic semantics of objective reality. We proceed of the fundamental argument: the task — how the meaning manifests the content (meaning) — is only partially linguistic, and the task — how the language acts as a means of accumulation and transmission of knowledge — goes entirely to the field of semantics of reflection and is not actually linguistic. This means that the barriers created by the culture for communication are the barriers that arise due to the inconsistency of the communicative contextual knowledge of the participants in the communication. Communication success depends on the communicators having a common basic knowledge. They are defined as:

–knowledge known to all representatives of the linguistic community [5, p. 78];

–mutual knowledge of the realities of the speaker and the listener, which is the basis of linguistic communication [6, p. 84].

–a common fund that allows speakers of the same language to understand each other, mutual knowledge of realities [7, p. 48].

Traditionally, it is believed that background knowledge includes universal, regional, ethnic, local knowledge and knowledge of the microcollective — "comprehending a foreign language, a person assimilates a new world and its culture" [4].

The key concepts of our research, of course, are existing techniques and ways of conveying reality. V. N. Komissarov defines translation as a kind of linguistic mediation, in which a text is created in the translated language that is communicatively equivalent to the original [8, p. 9]. Translation of a foreign text is an act of intercultural communication, conditioned by the specifics of the translator's picture of the world and aimed at deciphering the meanings of the units that make up this text, with their subsequent recoding into units of the translation text. The originality of the national linguistic pictures of the world and the plurality of cultures are not an obstacle to the mutual understanding of peoples and are overcome during translation.

However, intercultural communication proceeds adequately and successfully only when communicants, who are carriers of different cultures and languages, realize the fact that each of them is "different" and each perceives alternately the "foreignness" of the partner. Acquaintance with the culture of other peoples is one of the most important social functions of translation.

Next, we will try to consider ways to overcome linguo-ethnic barriers when translating realities. The following methods of conveying realities are considered well-known — transcription, transliteration (for example: skyscraper — in Russian *"небоскреб"*). But the mechanical transmission of a non-equivalent word is not capable of sufficiently fully revealing the content of a new concept, which either will remain incomprehensible, or will only be very approximately clear from the context: *"И квасу мне принесешь"* — "And you'll bring me some kvass" (kvass traditional, refreshing drink of the Slavic peoples). *"Мамочка кофе просит* — Mamochka is asking for coffee" (affectionate address to mom in Russian). I had a ticket to Holiday on Ice, in translation — У меня был билет на «Холидей он айс» (1). Proper names are usually translated using transcription / transliteration, but since this name is unlikely to be understood by the Russian reader, the commentary given by the translator in the notes to the novel is simply necessary:

Nevertheless, despite the fact that the most accurate way of transmitting reality in a foreign language is borrowing (in transliteration or through transplantation), a number of other ways are used and fixed in the language of a foreign language description of culture. The most common

borrowing competitor is tracing paper. Calca replacing the constituent parts of a word (morpheme) of an inequivalent word or phrase with their literal correspondences in translation, otherwise the translation of a word or phrase in parts allows you to transfer reality while preserving the semantic content as accurately as possible, but not always without loss of color, for example: sweatshirt — *свитшот*, …just like the arms on the popular Disney watches — …*так же как стрелки на всем известных диснеевских часах.*

The use of a half-calico with the replacement of the national component is to create a new phraseological unit for the target language based on the material available in the source language. In this way, the proverb was introduced into the Russian language *"Москва не сразу строилась"* (*eng. "Rome was not built in a day"*). Another example is the translation of a Russian proverb *"копейка рубль бережет"* by the phrase "take care of the kopecks and the roubles will take care of themselves" based on English expression "take care of the pennies and the pounds will take care of themselves".

To analyze the translation and methods of translating ethnographic words-realities (concepts related to the life and culture of the people), we also considered some words from the Kyrgyz language translated into Russian: Алла — Аллах; Айыл — Аил; Жайлоо — Джайлоу (transcription); Кошок — Причитание; Ыйлоо — Плач; Күң — Выкуп; Устун— Дубина; Жар-жар-песня для невесты — this method of translation is not considered one of the most effective in relation to realities; when using this method when translating realities, their cognitive functionality and ethnocultural significance have been lost.

Let's give our examples of translating Kyrgyz realities into English, which look like this:

1) Алла — Allah-god — the most high;

2) Айыл — Aul — locate village;

3) Жайлоо— Jailau — highland pasture (summer pasture or camping cite for summer season);

4) Кошок — Не переведено;

5) Ыйлоо — Cry;

6) Жар — жар — Jar — a tale in verses, usually dealing with history (likewise a poetic story in recitative form);

7) Кун — Kun — compensation for a murder; a definite quantity of cattle was played for the compensation;

8) Устун — Ustun — a pole used as a weapon.

From all this, you can see that:

1) Transliteration + explication translated the words: ыр, кун;

2) The words are translated by transcription + explication: устун, айыл, жайлоо;

ustun, ayil, jailoo;

3) Word is translated by transcription + addition + explication: алла;

4) Reality: кошок, жар-жар were not translated at all, explanations were given.

We draw conclusions: as you can see from the above translations, it is transliteration that many translators and translation scholars consider the best way to translate realities: "Transliteration is the best way of translation in cases where there is a need to convey a national or ethnographic coloration. However, you need to be careful with using one transliteration without supporting it with a description — the background knowledge of the reader is not so extensive as to decipher the cultural information. Don't leave transliteration in the past. If the language of origin of the proper name is unknown, it is most appropriate to use this particular technique. When the translator cannot guarantee the correct pronunciation, transliteration helps prevent spelling errors.

Conclusion

An analysis of the last two decades shows that the number of works indicating the growth of interest in the study of linguistic phenomena in the communicative act has increased significantly. Communication is the exchange of information between people through a common system of signs [5, p. 9]. Integration processes that covered most of humanity predetermined the intensification of communication, including in the intercultural sphere. At the same time, the density, intensity and duration of such relations, developing between representatives of different cultural communities, have significantly increased and continue to grow every year. The emergence of such a dialogue presupposes the need to reassess the connections between different socio-cultural communities and their own cultural identity based on the ideas of tolerance, adequate perception of cultural differences, which are prerequisites in these circumstances. Defining such, an approach will undoubtedly lead to effective relations and mutual understanding between cultures and their representatives. In such situations, the relevance of translation in the light of intercultural communication increases significantly.

Sources:

(1). Harris, T. The Silence of the Lambs. N.Y.: St. Martin's Press, 1991. 384 p.
(2). http://www.multitran.ru

References:

1. Karapetyan, O. V., & Myaskovskaya, T. V. (2012). Sopostavitel'noe lingvostranovedenie i fonovye znaniya kak osnovnoi predmet lingvostranovedeniya. *Al'manakh sovremennoi nauki i obrazovaniya: Gramota,* (4 (59)), 120-123. (in Russian).

2. Vlakhov, S., & Florin, S. (1980). Neperevodimoe v perevode. Moscow. (in Russian).

3. Tomakhin, G. D. (1988). Realii - amerikanizmy. Moscow. (in Russian).

4. Savushkina, L. V. (2013). Perevod kak problema mezhkul'turnoi kommunikatsii: authoref. Ph.D. diss. Saransk. (in Russian).

5. Sadokhin, A. P. (2005). Vvedenie v teoriyu mezhkul'turnoi kommunikatsii. Moscow. (in Russian).

6. Akhmanova, O. S. (1969). Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov: slovar'. Moscow. (in Russian).

7. Akhmanova, O. S., & Gyubbenet, I. V. 1977. Vertikal'nyi kontekst kak filologicheskaya problema. *Voprosy yazykoznaniya,* (3), 47. (in Russian).

8. Komissarov, V. N. (1990). Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty). Moscow. (in Russian).

Список литературы:

1. Карапетян О. В., Мясковская Т. В. Сопоставительное лингвострановедение и фоновые знания как основной предмет лингвострановедения // Альманах современной науки и образования: Грамота. 2012. №4 (59). С. 120-123.

2. Влахов С., Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. М.: Международные отношения, 1980. 343 с.

3. Томахин Г. Д. Реалии - американизмы. М.: Высш. шк., 1988. 239 с.

4. Савушкина Л. В. Перевод как проблема межкультурной коммуникации: автореф. дисс. ... канд. культурологии. Саранск, 2013. 21 с.

5. Садохин А. П. Введение в теорию межкультурной коммуникации. М.: Высш. шк., 2005. 309 с.

6. Ахманова О. С. Словарь лингвистических терминов: словарь. Москва: Советская энциклопедия. 1969. 607 с.

7. Ахманова О. С., Гюббенет И. В. Вертикальный контекст как филологическая проблема // Вопросы языкознания. 1977. №3. С. 47.

8. Комиссаров В. Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). М.: Высш. шк., 1990. 253 с.