

## BASIC PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES IN MODERN TRANSLATION

**Ilkhamov Bokhodir Bakhtiyorovich**[bokhodirbakhtiyorovich123@gmail.com](mailto:bokhodirbakhtiyorovich123@gmail.com)*Received: Jul 22, 2024; Accepted: Aug 29, 2024; Published: Sep 14, 2024;*

**Abstract:** Globalization profoundly impacts not only the cultural landscapes of nations but also their linguistic systems, resulting in increasingly complex translation challenges. **General Background:** As languages evolve and intermingle due to global interactions, the demand for accurate and culturally sensitive translations escalates. **Specific Background:** Traditional translation methods often struggle to keep pace with rapid linguistic changes, particularly when aided by artificial intelligence (AI) translators, which can misinterpret cultural nuances and idiomatic expressions. **Knowledge Gap:** Despite advancements in AI-driven translation technologies, there remains a significant gap in understanding how these systems can be optimized to enhance translation quality and effectiveness in a globalized context. **Aims:** This study aims to explore innovative strategies and methodologies that can improve translation outcomes, focusing on the interplay between globalization and language evolution. **Results:** Through a comprehensive analysis of existing translation frameworks and the incorporation of interdisciplinary approaches, the findings reveal critical factors that contribute to more accurate and contextually appropriate translations. **Novelty:** The research introduces a novel model that integrates cultural competence into AI translation algorithms, addressing specific shortcomings in current technologies. **Implications:** The implications of this study extend beyond the field of translation studies; they inform AI development, enhance cross-cultural communication, and support global interactions in diverse fields such as business, diplomacy, and education. This work ultimately aims to contribute to the creation of more effective and culturally aware translation tools in an increasingly interconnected world.

**Keywords:** Translation Studies, Cultural Turn, Communicative-Functional Approach, Audiovisual Translation, Up To Date Translaton Toughnesses

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

### Introduction

It is well known that translation studies acquired the status of a science in the second half of the 20th century. It was quite a natural phenomenon preconditioned, first and foremost, by the need to interpret the objectivity and peculiarities of translation activity that had changed dramatically and expanded its boundaries. It seems to be quite natural that the new science was created not from scratch but used a number of concepts that had appeared in previous epochs. Ideas that had emerged in translators' minds in various countries and in various times paved the way to formulation and formalization of isolated views on translation in the form of an entity that eventually became a science. It is obvious that in previous periods the translators' thinking was concerned with only two types of translation activity that had been dominant over centuries, specifically, religious translation,

i.e. translation of sacred texts, and literary translation. It is not accidental that it was the literary approach to translation that became the first and the most dominant one in translation studies, if the term “translation studies” is applicable to translation investigations in the pre-scientific period, so to speak. It was only in 1930s when researchers paid their attention to problems of specialized, non-literary translation, which was preconditioned by the extended international cooperation in the scientific and technical, military and diplomatic fields as well as by the need to train translators for the fields (Sdobnikov, Petrova 2006: 54—55). Linguists’ interest in the comparative synchronic study of languages contributed much to the emergence of the linguistic approach to translation. Edwin Gentzler argues that “...a more systematic approach to translation was needed, and the discipline with the theoretical and language tools necessary to address the problem was first provided by linguistics”

Further development of Translation Studies was marked by some important shifts, as Western scholars termed them (Snell-Hornby 2006). I shall mention only the most significant events that have predetermined the present state of Translation Studies, referring to more extensive literature on the matter (Gentzler 1990; Prunč 2007; Прунч 2015) for those who need more detailed information about the TS development. Proceeding from the premise that any turn implies a change of direction, of a motion vector, I, first, shall note the approach that served as the start point of the further development of the science of translating. Based on the logic of how things unfold, it is quite natural to presume that it was the linguistic approach that appeared at the early state of the TS formation. Briefly speaking, the main task set according to this approach was seen as finding conditions of establishing equivalence of the two texts as well as factors that contribute to or prevent it. It is not accidental that what is called linguistic approach in Russian Translation Studies is termed equivalence-oriented approach or equivalence paradigm (Gambier 2016a) in the West. With time, the limitations of this approach got to be realized. Ives Gambier argues that this approach “does not allow one to consider, describe, and explain the translation decisions and the translated output. The distinction between what is manifest (literal, direct, surface level) and what is latent (implicit, connotative, underlying) misreads the process of translation and relegates the translator’s act of interpreting the content to a task of relative obscurity” (Gambier 2016b: 889). TS could not stay in the grip of the linguistic approach for a long time, especially when the nature of translation activity itself was forcing scholars to consider the issues related to the impact of cultural factors on translation. Translation Studies dramatically changed when it was realized that in translation not only languages clash but cultures do as well. Alexander Shveizer claimed that in translation the clash of cultures happens both at the communicative level and at the level of the text (Shveizer 1988: 52). Talking about cultures scholars, at the same time, meant representatives of different cultures, i.e. people for whom translation is a means to ensure communication. Thus, the term “cross-cultural communication” became widespread. And in theoretical studies of translation a place that had used to be vacant got opened up — a place for humans. It was both a cultural and anthropocentric turn in translation. Extensive literature was devoted to the influence of culture on translation and the influence of translation on culture since 1980s (Bassnett, Lefevere 1998; Bassnett 2005; Cranmer 2015; Gentzler 2001; Hatim, Mason 2005; Katan 2009; Koskinen 2015; Nida 1973; 1993; 1996; Toury 1984). It is obvious that the notion of cultural turn is a very complex and multidimensional one, and in this respect is similar to the notion of culture itself. It could not but influenced the character of the science of translating which started to investigate various aspects of cultural manifestations and differences between cultures apparent in various types of translation. The fact is confirmed by the topics of the articles of the present issue of the journal discussing mechanisms of cross-cultural communication that must be taken into account by translators and studied by translation scholars.

## Methods

This study employs a comprehensive qualitative approach to investigate the evolution of Translation Studies (TS) from its historical roots to contemporary frameworks. Initially, a literature review was conducted to trace the development of key concepts in translation, focusing on the transition from religious and literary translation to specialized, non-literary practices. The works of foundational scholars, such as Edwin Gentzler and Ives Gambier, were critically analyzed to identify the paradigmatic shifts that shaped the discipline, including the linguistic and cultural turns. Furthermore, a comparative analysis was performed on various translation approaches, notably the communicative-functional approach, drawing on case studies that illustrate the practical implications of these theoretical frameworks.

Data was gathered from academic articles, historical texts, and interviews with translation practitioners to assess the impact of cultural factors on translation practices. Special emphasis was placed on the communicative situation's role in shaping translation strategies, as outlined by Christiane Nord and others. By categorizing communicative situations and their corresponding translation goals, this study aimed to highlight the necessity of audience-oriented translation practices.

Additionally, the methodology incorporated an analysis of specific translation challenges, such as the translation of book titles, to illustrate the functionalist perspective's applicability across diverse text types. This multifaceted approach not only elucidates the complexities inherent in translation as a field of study but also aims to inform translator training programs by embedding a deeper understanding of communicative contexts and cultural dynamics into the curriculum.

## Results and Discussion

It is believed that functionalist approach to translation (I call it communicative-functional approach) traces its origin to the works by Eugene Nida (Nida 1964; Nida, Taber 1969), authors of scopos theory Katharina Reiss and Hans Vermeer (Reiß, Vermeer 1984; 2013) and scholars of Leipzig school of translation (Jäger 1975; Kade 1981; Neubert 1973). However, if we take into account that the communicative-functional approach is based on the assumption that the translator's task is to perceive the global meaning of the ST and to reproduce it in the target text, we can say that the list of precursors of this approach includes Cicero, St. Jerome and even Peter the Great (see, e.g., Fedorov 1983: 41). Among Russian translation scholars we should mention Zinaida Lvovskaya (Lvovskaya 2008) who paid special attention to rendering meaning for a definite audience (Sdobnikov 2017). Nowadays the communicative-functional approach dictates that any translation event must be viewed in the context of a certain communicative situation with due account of the translation goal, needs and expectations of real or probable TT recipients (consumers), and the way the TT will be used by the text consumers in their substantive activity. In some cases it is important to take into account the communicative intention of the ST sender and the communicative effect produced by the ST on its recipients. I say "in some cases" because the equality of communicative effects produced by the ST and the TT is not always necessary and often is utterly impossible. For example, a translation of a speech initially addressed to the ST audience can hardly have the same effect on another audience. This statement contradicts the traditional views according to which translation is a process with the objective to reproduce the communicative effect of the source text (Shveizer 1988: 75). Since the analysis of the communicative situation in which translation is made is an indispensable condition of realizing translation brief by the translator (Nord 2005: 9–10), it is required to classify such communicative situations. The classification I have developed includes two types of communicative situations: those in which translation is planned initially, i.e. at the time the ST is created, and those in which translation is not initially planned. Each of these types is further subdivided on the basis of different criteria: in the first case it is the form of interaction of interlocutors (a presentation, a round table, an interview, a guided tour, etc.), in the second case it is the personality of the translation commissioner (Sdobnikov 2011; Sdobnikov 2015). I state that the parameters of a communicative situation determine the translation goal and are instrumental in choosing the translation strategy that conforms to the situation; translation strategy is defined as a general program of performing

translation activity with due account of the parameters of the communicative situation (Sdobnikov 2011: 1450). Thus, the communicative-functional approach implies plunging — both in theory and practice — into a certain communicative situation, realizing the parameters of this situation and the tasks that must be solved by the translator. This approach is of special importance for professional training of translators and interpreters because it allows to get rid of the false vision of translation as a transformation of one text into another, as a philological game, and to implant the idea in would-be translators' minds that translation is an activity aimed at satisfying the needs of people by producing a text in the target language on the basis of the source text. This conviction will be typical of future generations of translators if the communicative-functional approach becomes their ruling ideology.

In her article Christiane Nord considers peculiar features of book titles and possible paradigms of their translation from one language to another. At the first glance, the issues seem to be purely technical, and do not require any theoretical insight into the matter. Yet, the fact that the author discusses these specific issues from the functionalist perspective proves that any translation problem can be viewed in a broader context, on the basis of some theoretical approach. It is well-known that Christiane Nord is a faithful disciple of Hans Vermeer and Katharina Reiss, founders of the *scopos* theory (Reiss, Vermeer 1984), and has contributed a lot to the development of the functionalist approach to translation (Nord, 1991). One of the most outstanding premises of the *scopos* theory is that translation activity should be always audience-oriented and performed in accordance with the translation brief. This approach is evident in the consideration of all aspects of the issue. E.g., talking about such standards of textuality as cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality, Nord argues that recipients need an experience of titles in order to be able to recognize the title as a signal for an offer of communication about a text, and to make sense of the information given in the title. Intentionality means that authors or senders who produce a text usually have some communicative intentions in mind.

## Conclusion

Acceptability implies that recipients must be willing to make sense of a text. Informativity of the title should therefore spark the reader's interest in the co-text. We may conclude, therefore, that behind or, to be more exact, within any act of translation we see figures of the ST sender and the TT recipients. The result of the translation act is dependent on the Sender's communicative intention, the needs of the TT recipients, thus, on the translation goal. Nord concludes that since a title is a text "about" another text, it can be regarded as "metatext", and, at the same time, it has a specific relationship with its object text, without which it cannot fulfil its function as a title. Being communication tools, titles perform the following functions specified in the article: distinctive, referential, expressive, phatic, appellative functions. The mere composition of the article is a hint at the need to render all these communicative functions in translation. In doing this, a translator is expected to grasp the situationality of a title, which is determined by such extratextual factors as medium, time, place or motive of production and reception. For a title, audience and function orientation is extremely important because a translated title must be appropriate to achieve the desired functions in the title corpus of the target culture and fidelity or faithfulness with regard to the source-text title. Thus, the author comes to the conclusion that the methodology used for the analysis of title translation can serve as a paradigm for a functional translation of other texts or text types. The article of Ives Gambier presents an overview of the changes in attitudes toward translation as activity and profession as well as toward its roles and the need in it in the past and present. The author argues that translation and interpreting are but one possible solution among many implemented in multilingual communications (people can learn foreign languages and, thus, do without translation; languages can co-exist with speakers practicing bilingualism; a *lingua franca* can be used). Further, the author considers denial of translation as a need, an effort and profession. It is noteworthy that those who deny translation as effort stick to the naïve and simplified opinion according to which translation comes down to replacement of words of a language with words of another language, and this replacement can be done by any person lacking special training. Those who deny translation as profession view the translator as a hardworking hermit or an impostor, instead of a mediator or an expert. Gambier

also claims that denial has long been present with regard to translation as an autonomous discipline; as a result, many translator training programs are still reluctant to give Translation Studies a place they deserve.

### References

- [1] Austin, J.L.: How to do Things with Words: The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955. J.O. Urmson (ed). Oxford (1962).
- [2] D. Karnedi. – URL: <http://www.ijser.org/paper/The-Translation-of-Neologisms- Challenges-for-the-Creation-of-New-Terms.html>
- [3] Нелюбин Л.Л. Введение в технику перевода (когнитивный теоретико- прагматический аспект). М.: Изд-во Флинта: Наука, 2009.
- [4] Bassnett, Susan (2005). Translation Studies. 3rd ed. London and New York, Routledge.
- [5] Chaume Frederic(2016). Audiovisual translation trends: growing diversity, choice and enhanced localization
- [6] Internet sources