

LINGUISTIC-PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK CULTURAL REALIA IN LITERARY TEXTS AND INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR THEIR TRANSLATION

Akhmedova Mushtariy Farkhod kizi

PhD researcher at Jizzakh State Pedagogical University

Email: mushtariy.axmedova@jdpu.uz Phone: +998900294143

Annotation. This paper is dedicated to a comparative linguistic-pragmatic analysis of linguocultural realia found in English and Uzbek literary texts (fiction). The study aims to investigate the peculiarities of interpreting realia during translation, focusing on how these terms fulfill aesthetic and stylistic functions within a narrative. It examines the lexical and pragmatic problems arising from the translation of these elements, emphasizing strategies like transcription, descriptive translation, and contextual compensation required to preserve the local color and authentic cultural significance of the source text.

Key Words: cultural realia, literary translation, aesthetic function, comparative linguistics, translation strategies, local colour, non-equivalent lexicon, pragmatics.

LINGVISTIK-PRAGMATIK TAHLIL: INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK BADIY MATNLARIDAGI MADANIY REALIYALAR VA ULARNING TARJIMASIDA INNOVATSION YECHIMLAR

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqola ingliz va o'zbek badiiy matnlaridagi lingvokulturologik realiyalarning qiyosiy lingvistik-pragmatik tahliliga bag'ishlangan. Tadqiqot tarjima jarayonida realiyalarning interpretatsiya xususiyatlarini o'rganishga, xususan, bu terminlarning asar matnida estetik va stilistik funksiyalarni qanday bajarishiga e'tibor qaratadi. Unda manba matnning mahalliy rangini (local colour) va haqiqiy madaniy ahamiyatini saqlab qolish uchun zarur bo'lgan transkripsiya, tavsifiy tarjima hamda kontekstual kompensatsiya kabi



strategiyalarni ta'kidlab, ushbu elementlarni tarjima qilishda yuzaga keladigan leksik va pragmatik muammolar ko'rib chiqiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: madaniy realiyalar, badiiy tarjima, estetik funksiya, qiyosiy tilshunoslik, tarjima strategiyalari, mahalliy rang, noekvivalent leksika, pragmatika.

ЛИНГВИСТИКО-ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ АНГЛИЙСКИХ И УЗБЕКСКИХ КУЛЬТУРНЫХ РЕАЛИЙ В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННЫХ ТЕКСТАХ И ИННОВАЦИОННЫЕ РЕШЕНИЯ ИХ ПЕРЕВОДА

Аннотация. Данная статья посвящена сравнительному лингвистико-прагматическому анализу лингвокультурных реалий, встречающихся в английских и узбекских художественных текстах (прозе). Цель исследования — изучить особенности интерпретации реалий в процессе перевода, уделяя особое внимание тому, как эти термины выполняют эстетические и стилистические функции в повествовании. В работе рассматриваются лексические и прагматические проблемы, возникающие при переводе этих элементов. Особый акцент делается на стратегиях, таких как транскрипция, описательный перевод и контекстуальная компенсация, которые необходимы для сохранения местного колорита и подлинного культурного значения исходного текста.

Ключевые слова: культурные реалии, художественный перевод, эстетическая функция, сравнительная лингвистика, стратегии перевода, местный колорит, безэквивалентная лексика, прагматика.

INTRODUCTION

Literary translation is one of the most challenging branches of translation studies because it requires the translator to operate simultaneously on linguistic, cultural, and aesthetic levels. Unlike technical or informational texts, fiction is deeply embedded in its cultural environment, constructing identity, ideology, and atmosphere through its vocabulary. Among its most culturally charged units are **realia**—words or expressions that denote culturally specific objects, social structures, rituals, clothing items, architecture, ethnic customs, food, artifacts, and phenomena that have no exact equivalents in other languages.

In Uzbek literature, such examples include: *mahalla*, *choyxona*, *do'ppi*, *sumalak*, *Navro'z*, *oq yo'l*, *kallapo'sh*, and others.

In English literature, realia appear as *Thanksgiving*, *goblet*, *primrose*, *barrow*, *tea-time*, *moors*, *gin alley*, *crumpets*, *Eton*, *Oxford Union*, and more.

These units **encode cultural memory**, mark geographical identity, and serve as anchors of the fictional universe. Consequently, their translation is not a mere lexical operation; it is a complex process of **cultural mediation**.

The relevance of studying realia translation between English and Uzbek stems from:

1. Increasing intercultural literary circulation

Uzbek classics are now being translated into English and vice versa at a growing rate.

2. Non-equivalence as a linguistic problem

Many Uzbek cultural concepts have no lexical equal in English (*mahalla*, *osh*, *suyunchi*, *kuyovnaykar*), while English literary tradition contains culturally loaded items difficult to localize into Uzbek (*tea-time*, *boarding school culture*, *pub*, *Sunday roast*).

3. Pragmatic expectations of readers

The target audience must perceive the same stylistic effect, emotional tone, and cultural imagery that the original reader experienced.

4. The need for innovative strategies

Traditional approaches—footnotes, literal translation, calque—often fail to fully convey cultural nuance in modern publishing, where readability and narrative flow are prioritized.

The aim of this study is to conduct a comparative linguistic-pragmatic analysis of English and Uzbek realia and propose innovative translation solutions.

Research objectives:

1. Identify types and functions of realia in both languages.
2. Analyze pragmatic factors that influence translation choices.

3. Evaluate existing strategies and their limitations.
4. Propose innovative, context-sensitive translation techniques suitable for literary texts.

THEORETICAL BASIS AND AESTHETIC FUNCTION OF REALIA IN FICTION

The concept of *realia* occupies a central position in modern translation studies, especially within comparative linguistics and linguocultural research. Vlakhov & Florin (1986) provide one of the foundational definitions, stating that realia are “objects of material culture, social life, and historical tradition which reflect national characteristics and have no direct equivalents in another language” [10, 47]. Their seminal work emphasizes that realia function simultaneously as linguistic units and as cultural symbols, forming a bridge between language and ethnos. Contemporary scholars such as Baker (2018) further extend this understanding by highlighting the pragmatic and symbolic dimensions of realia, noting that such units transmit national values, worldview, emotional associations, and identity markers embedded in discourse [2, 112].

The field of cultural linguistics (Ashurova & Galieva, 2019) also underscores the semiotic and conceptual relevance of realia, treating them as carriers of “collective cultural memory” that activate associative frames within the minds of native readers [1, 54]. In fictional texts, realia do not function merely as referential items but operate as stylistic and meaning-generating devices that shape the narrative’s cultural ecology.

Classification and Cultural Encoding of Realia

Scholars have proposed numerous classifications of realia, but most converge on several universal categories that encapsulate the culturally unique components of human life. Based on Vlakhov & Florin (1986), Newmark (1988), and Baker (2018), realia in English and Uzbek fiction may be grouped into the following major categories:

1. Ethnographic Realia

These include objects, practices, and traditions tied to everyday life:

- **Food:** *plov, norin, crumpet, shepherd's pie.*
- **Clothing:** *do 'ppi, chapan, bonnet, petticoat.*
- **Household items:** *tandir, sandali, mantelpiece, hearth rug.*

Ethnographic realia typically serve to depict the visual and sensory world of the text. Newmark (1988) classifies such items as “culture-specific referents that resist straightforward lexical transfer” [4, 94].

2. Social-Political Realia

These units refer to institutions, administrative structures, and societal roles:

- Uzbek: *mahalla, hokimiyat, mirzaboshi.*
- English: *parliament, county, peerage, borough.*

According to Vermeer's Skopos Theory, such units gain communicative significance depending on the translator's purpose and intended readership [8, 178].

3. Geographical Realia

Geographical terms evoke spatial authenticity:

- Uzbek: *Chimgan, Qashqadaryo, Karakalpakstan.*
- English: *the Midlands, Yorkshire moors, Thames marshes.*

Toury (1995) argues that geographical realia contribute to “cultural anchoring,” situating the narrative within a recognizable socio-spatial context [7, 69].

4. Historical Realia

These refer to culturally embedded historical periods, titles, and social systems:

- Uzbek: *amirlik, Sovet davri, mang 'itlar sulolasi.*
- English: *Victorian era, Regency period, Industrial Revolution.*

Baker (2018) notes that historical realia often require strategic compensation techniques in translation to preserve temporal atmosphere [2, 143].

5. Folkloric or Mental-Cultural Realia

These encode national psychology, rituals, and culturally coded behaviors:

- Uzbek: *suyunchi, odobsizlik, kelin salom, sanduk.*
- English: *wassailing, Maypole dance, Thanksgiving customs.*

Cultural linguists (Ashurova & Galieva, 2019) emphasize that these units carry connotative meanings inseparable from the nation's symbolic worldview [1, 81].

Each category reflects a different layer of cultural knowledge. As Venuti (1995) notes, *realia* “mark the text as culturally situated,” often becoming focal points of tension between foreignization and domestication in translation [9, 70].

Aesthetic Function of *Realia* in Fiction

Realia are key components in constructing the novel's “local colour.” They create atmospheric authenticity by embedding culturally specific material into the fictional world. For instance:

- Dickens's use of *tea-time*, *shires*, *lorry*, *forge* evokes Britishness with precision, grounding the narrative in Victorian England [3, 42].
- Qodiriy's usage of *tandir*, *arava*, *ko'hma Toshkent*, *jarchi* constructs a vivid image of early 20th-century Central Asian life [1, 63].

As Newmark (1988) asserts, *realia* in literary texts serve not only referential but also expressive and aesthetic functions, contributing to tone, symbolism, and imagery [4, 97].

In fiction that represents distant epochs or imaginative worlds, *realia* help build socio-cultural and temporal authenticity:

- Dickens's *Great Expectations* uses terms like *marsh country*, *blacksmith's hut*, *forge* to reconstruct the 19th-century rural-industrial landscape [2, 211].
- Qodiriy's *Mehrobdan Chayon* includes terms such as *yuzboshi*, *arava yo'li*, *qozixonalar*, reflecting historical governance and social customs in Turkestan [1, 102].

According to Skopos theorists, such *realia* must be translated “with functional transparency,” ensuring the target reader senses the same historical distance as the source reader [8, 184].

Realia reveal social class, education, background, and worldview:

- Dickens's aristocratic characters refer to *manors*, *estates*, *governesses*.

- Qodiriy's characters invoke *yuzboshi*, *bozor*, *madrasa*, indicating hierarchical structure and local social institutions.

Bassnett (1980) notes that realia embedded in dialogue function as “identity markers” that shape character voices [3, 55].

Realia also evoke culturally specific emotions—nostalgia, respect, disdain, or humour.

For example:

- *Choyxona* in Uzbek culture implies hospitality, maleness, and traditional social bonding—not merely a “tea house.”
- *Pub* carries connotations of informality, community, and British social ritual that lack direct counterparts in Uzbek.

Failure to transmit these emotional overtones leads to a loss of pragmatic effect, thereby flattening the narrative.

PROBLEMS OF NON-EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATING REALIA

The translation of realia remains one of the most challenging areas in literary translation due to multi-level non-equivalence. Vlakhov & Florin (1986) identify three key types of non-equivalence that directly affect the translation process [10, 62]:

1. Linguistic Non-Equivalence

Occurs when:

- A lexical unit exists in one language but not in another (*osh*, *ariq*, *suyunchi*).
- The semantic range mismatches (*cousin* ≠ *amakivachcha* / *tog‘avachcha*).
- Grammar or word-formation systems prevent direct mapping.

Newmark (1988) emphasizes that such gaps require “pragmatic adaptation rather than literal substitution” [4, 121].

2. Cultural Non-Equivalence

Arises when the cultural concept itself does not exist in the target culture:

- Uzbek *mahalla* has no exact English institutional equivalent.
- English *boarding school*, *pub*, *shire* lack Uzbek analogues.

Toury (1995) notes that translators must “negotiate cultural asymmetry” and recreate communicative relevance rather than seek one-to-one parallels [7, 71].

3. Pragmatic Non-Equivalence

This level concerns emotional connotations and cultural associations:

- *Choyxona* evokes traditional masculinity, hospitality, and social cohesion.
- English *Thanksgiving* carries religious, historical, and familial sentiments that cannot be transplanted literally.

Baker (2018) and Venuti (1995) both argue that pragmatic failures often cause the most significant stylistic and interpretive losses, because the narrative’s emotional texture becomes diluted [2, 149; 9, 102].

According to Skopos Theory, the translator’s goal is not to preserve linguistic form but to reproduce function and pragmatic impact in the target culture [8, 186].

INNOVATIVE TRANSLATION STRATEGIES FOR CULTURAL REALIA

Traditional strategies—footnotes, calques, literal translation—remain useful but insufficient for contemporary fiction translation. Modern readers expect smooth, immersive prose without excessive academic commentary. Thus, innovative hybrid strategies are essential.

Contextual Amplification (Integrated Micro-Explanation)

This strategy subtly inserts a brief explanation within the narrative flow to clarify culturally unfamiliar realia.

Example (Uzbek → English)

“Ular mahallaga yig ‘ildilar.’”

→ “They gathered at the **mahalla**, the traditional neighborhood council, to discuss the issue.”

Example (English → Uzbek)

“He drank hot cider at Christmas.”

→ “U Rojdestvo kuni ichiladigan **issiq sidir** ichimligidan ichdi.”

Advantages:

- No disruption of narrative flow
- Ensures comprehension
- Preserves cultural term + adds clarity

Hybrid Strategy: Transcription + One-Time Explanation

At first appearance: several words of explanation

Later appearances: only the original term

This helps “train” the reader to understand repeated realia without overloading text.

Strategic Functional Analogy

When the realia is minor, analogy may be used: not identical meaning, but identical **function**.

Example (English → Uzbek):

“Sunday roast” → “yakshanbalik oilaviy tushlik marosimi”

Example (Uzbek → English):

“Suyunchi berdi” → “She offered a traditional gift for good news.”

Archaism and Stylistic Compensation

For historical texts, culturally marked archaisms in the target language can mimic the temporal “feel” of source realia.

Example:

“Mirzaboshi” → “chief scribe” (archaic tone)

“Manor house” → “zodagonlar qarorgohi” (historically colored)

Cultural Framing Through Additive Context

This method uses broader context or narrative cues to frame realia without direct explanation.

Example:

Instead of explaining *tandir*, the text may show characters baking bread, allowing readers to infer meaning through scene dynamics.

CONCLUSION

The study demonstrates that translating English and Uzbek cultural realia requires deep linguistic awareness and cultural sensitivity. Realia are not mere lexical items; they are aesthetic devices and cultural markers that construct the world of the narrative. Therefore, their translation must balance:

- **accuracy**
- **artistic value**
- **reader comprehension**
- **cultural authenticity**

Innovative strategies such as contextual amplification, hybrid transcription, functional analogy, and stylistic compensation significantly enhance translation quality and preserve local colour.

REFERENCES

1. Ashurova, D. U., & Galieva, M. R. (2019). *Cultural Linguistics*. Uzbekistan State World Languages University.
2. Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
3. Bassnett, S. (1980). *Translation Studies*. Routledge.
4. Florin, S. (1993). “Realia in Translation.” *Journal of Translation Studies*, 5(2), 123–128.
5. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
6. Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Brill.
7. Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins.
8. Vermeer, H. J. (1989). “Skopos and Commission in Translational Action.” In *Readings in Translation Theory*.
9. Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator’s Invisibility*. Routledge.
10. Vlakhov, S., & Florin, S. (1986). *Neperevodimoye v perevode*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola.