STRATEGIES FOR RENDERING ENGLISH DIALECTAL IMPLICIT UNITS IN LITERARY TRANSLATION INTO UZBEK

Eraliyeva Istatoy Oblokul kizi
Teacher, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract. This article examines the translation strategies applied to English dialectal implicit units in the process of literary translation into Uzbek. Dialectal implicit units (also termed implicit nodes or knots) are fragments of discourse in which social, regional and cultural meaning is compressed and left unstated; their adequate transfer is one of the most difficult problems of English–Uzbek literary translation. The study draws on comparative analysis of excerpts from British fiction rendered into Uzbek and identifies a hierarchy of strategies — compensation, functional substitution, cultural adaptation, explicitation and footnoting — evaluated against criteria of adequacy and pragmatic equivalence. It is argued that no single strategy is universally optimal; the choice depends on the dominant pragmatic function of the unit in the source text and on the target reader's cultural competence.

Keywords: literary translation; dialect; implicit units; adequacy; pragmatic equivalence; English–Uzbek translation; compensation; explicitation.

Dialect in fiction is never a mere ornament. It is a compressed carrier of social identity, geographical belonging, education, irony and emotional attitude. When a British author makes a character speak in Cockney, Scots, Yorkshire or Afro-Caribbean English, the reader is expected to decode a whole social world from a handful of non-standard forms. These compressed clusters of unstated social meaning are what this study calls dialectal implicit units or implicit nodes: points in the text where the standard interpretation underdetermines the actual communicative content.

The transfer of such units into Uzbek, a language whose dialectal landscape and literary tradition of dialect writing differ profoundly from those of English raises the central question of this article: which strategies allow the Uzbek reader to recover, approximately and pragmatically, the social and expressive meaning encoded in the English dialectal node, and at what cost?

Following the tradition of implicit semantics (Bakhtin, Teliya, Sternin), an implicit unit is understood as a fragment of text whose full meaning exceeds its linguistic form and must be recovered through pragmatic inference, cultural knowledge or contextual cues. In dialectal discourse, implicitness operates at three levels: referential (local realities named in dialect words), indexical (the dialect itself indexes class, region and stance), and evaluative (dialect forms carry attitudes of solidarity, contempt, humour or intimacy). A translation that renders only the referential level silently loses the other two, and with them a layer of characterisation.

For the English–Uzbek pair, the asymmetry is acute. Uzbek possesses rich regional varieties, yet the modern Uzbek literary norm is strongly standardised, and the tradition of marking literary characters through dialect orthography is far weaker than in English. Consequently, a formally 'adequate' reproduction of dialect forms may produce, in Uzbek, not social colouring but mere oddity.

Four strategy groups dominate the corpus. First, functional substitution, in which an English dialectal node is rendered by a functionally analogous Uzbek device — colloquial syntax, expressive intonation particles, or regionally neutral but socially marked vocabulary. This strategy most consistently preserves pragmatic effect while sacrificing local colour. Second, compensation: where dialect cannot be preserved at a given point, the translator concentrates equivalent social meaning elsewhere in the utterance or scene. Third, explicitation by brief intratextual glosses, which secures comprehension but

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

risks flattening the implicitness that constitutes the unit's artistic value. Fourth, periphrastic footnoting, adequate for ethnographic detail yet disruptive in dialogue.

The findings suggest a hierarchy: for dialogue carrying strong social indexing, functional substitution and compensation are pragmatically superior; explicitation is acceptable for first occurrences of culturally dense nodes; footnotes are justified only for items whose referential content is plot-relevant. The hierarchy directly supports the dissertation's central claim: adequacy in dialectal translation is pragmatic adequacy, not formal similarity.

English dialectal implicit units resist direct transfer into Uzbek because the two literatures encode social identity differently. The translator's task is therefore not to imitate dialect forms but to reconstruct their pragmatic load. A strategy-based, function-oriented approach — grounded in compensation, substitution and controlled explicitation — offers a defensible model of adequacy for English–Uzbek literary translation and opens a productive field for further empirical study of reader reception.

References

1. Bakhtin M.M. Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. 177 p.
2. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988. 292 p.
3. Sternin I.A. Printsipy opisaniya implicitnogo soderzhaniya vyskazyvaniya // Voprosy yazykoznaniya. 1981. No. 4. P. 74–83.
4. Teliya V.N. Metafora kak model smysla i eyo ekspressivno-otsenochny funktsii // Metafora v yazyke i tekste. M.: Nauka, 1988. P. 3–32.
5. Vinay J.-P., Darbelnet J. Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995. 384 p.

© 2026 London International Monthly Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.