THEORITICAL ANALYSIING THE PROBLEM IN KORRESPONDING OF TOURISM TEXTS

Gavharoy Isroiljon kizi

Uzbekistan, Andizhan State Insitute of Foreign Languages

gavharoy7575@mail.ru

Annotation: This paper focuses on one particular parallel development in linguistics and translation studies, namely terms of the business tourism analysis of language use. Recent years have seen the compilation of translations, designed specifically to investigate the language and features of translation, usually by comparing translations with non-translations.

Key words: translation, target text, source text, linguistics, translator. (abbriviations: ST- source text; TT- target text; HC-high context; LC-low context)

Аннотация: Эта статья сосредотачивается на одном специфическом параллельном развитии в лингвистике и исследованиях перевода, а именно, термины делового анализа туризма языкового использования. Последние годы видели компиляцию переводов, разработанных определенно, чтобы исследовать язык и особенности перевода, обычно сравнивая переводы с не переводами.

Ключевые слова: перевод, целевой текст, исходный текст, лингвистика, переводчик.

Introduction. The general understanding of the world – which is socially and culturally produced – is always mediated by frames, i.e. cognitive models representing knowledge and beliefs related to frequently recurring situations (Fillmore 1985). Basically, the function of frames, filters and other mental models is that of setting priorities on certain elements to be perceived, and simplify or even bypass those considered less relevant, simply because of their being too far from one's accustomed world-view. A tension between the complexity of cultural systems and a general human tendency to reduce that complexity into manageable chunks appears to characterise a number of approaches to the study of tourism phenomena – including those focusing on intercultural communication. Drawing upon models developed within Neurolinguistic Programming (O'Connor 2001), Katan has distinguished amongst three "Universal Filters" to be used to mentally map reality, namely deletion, distortion and generalization. The first, 'deletion', is a simple non-perception of the Other. The second filter is

'distortion', which acts to fit what is perceived into the perceiver's world, relating (and hence distorting it) to other more familiar experience. The third filter is 'generalisation', which tends to gloss over or completely ignore individual contexts and forms the basis of stereotyping. (Katan 2016b: 64-5)

We have tried to define seems to be related to a specific combination of the language modalities illustrated by Katan. Strategies in no. 1 correspond to both pouvoir and vouloir functions (enabling and persuasive at the same time). The specific tourist genres mentioned in no. 2 bring together vouloir and savoir features (persuasive and informative) and, finally, the high presence of culture-specific elements combines savoir and vouloir aspects (informative and persuasive) of tourism discourse.

It seems particularly difficult to classify strategies or language functions into singular categories in the case of tourism discourse, as they appear not only to be related with each other, but also to overlap in a functional sense, one enhancing the other. For example, the high occurrence of culture-specific elements in tourist texts – in terms of information on the historical, artistic and cultural features of a certain tourist site – fulfils an informative and persuasive function (savoir and vouloir) at one and the same time: destination promotion is functionally realised by increasing tourists' knowledge.

Methods of the research. The purpose and tasks of the work determined the applied methodology. A comprehensive approach to the object of study led to the use of complementary methods of analysis. Logical-conceptual classification is obtained as a result of combining methods of induction and deduction /logical approach/. The selection of semantic areas and lexico-semantic groups is carried out using the logical-deductive method and the method of component analysis based on dictionary definitions. In addition, transformational, componential and analytical methods were used in the research. When considering the structure of TOURIST units, the method of identifying structural types at the word formation and morphological levels is used, since both of them are relevant in the study of the structure of the analyzed terms. In the process of studying TOURISM terms, the modeling method is used - one of the modern methods of knowledge, which allows highlighting the most important aspects of the studied object.

Discussion and Results. Problems arise in fact in the translation of tourist texts. Tourism source texts (STs henceforward) are written for the benefit of Insiders, that is readers that share a similar world-view as the ST's author and have a privileged access to its contents **[Katan 2016b: 69].** Outsiders, on the other hand, do not have the same language competence of Insiders nor do they share the same cultural filter **[House 1997;4].** As a consequence, they will activate strategies to frame their perception or, more plausibly, they will rely on translators to help them access cultural difference. In a word, translators mediate texts not only from a lingua-cultural point of view, but they

also have to gauge the distance between the worldviews of Insiders (or original recipients of tourism texts) and Outsiders (recipients of translations). E.T. Hall has on text the whole process of gauging the distance between Insiders' and Outsiders' worldviews "contexting", which refers to "a decision concerning how much information the other person can be expected to possess on a given subject" **[Hall E.T.,1983: 81].**

Context is a fundamental notion not only in Linguistics and Translation Studies, but also and especially in Intercultural Studies. Hall's well-known distinction between High Context (HC) communication and Low Context (LC) communication is a case in point. In the first case, i.e. HC communication, the information must be inferred from the context surrounding the text, whereas in the second case, i.e. LC communication, the information necessary to decode the text is to be found within the text itself. So for example, meanings in HC cultures are not made explicit, and have to be interpreted within the context of specific situations or within the context of culture as a whole. On the contrary, messages are made explicit in LC cultures, and nothing is left to contextual   inference. This distinction separates HC cultures that are more context-oriented (i.e. the Mediterranean culture), from LC cultures that are more text-oriented (i.e. the Anglo-American culture) **[Katan , 2004:9].**

The process of mediation becomes extremely complex if translators want to go beyond the surface of meanings and relay messages incorporated into specific worldviews. This would be the task of 'mindful' translators, where 'mindful' is a term derived from social psychology and eventually employed for translating business tourism discourse **[Katan 2013, 2016:17].**

M*indful but silenced tourism translators?* Mindfulness has become an extremely popular concept in Tourism Studies. One of its first applications was proposed by Moscardo as early as 1996, when she cited a definition of people's on text in everyday situations as illustrated by social psychologist Ellen Langer. Langer claimed that people generally choose between a mindful and a mindless on text: Mindlessness is single-minded reliance on information without an active awareness of alternative perspectives or alternative uses to which the information could be put. When mindless, the individual relies on structures that have been appropriated from another source **[Langer, Hatem, Joss and Howell 1989: 140, quoted in Moscardo 1996: 380].**

Moscardo explains that there are two kinds of mindless 6ontextu: the first is when people find themselves in familiar or repetitive situations and respond with routine on text. The second is a sort of "premature cognitive commitment" **[Moscardo,1996: 381]:** in this case people can be mindless either in front of information they do not consider important, and take at face value, or when they accept fixed definitions or stereotypes.

However, people may decide to take the opposite path and choose mindfulness instead, which is described as: a state of mind that results from drawing novel distinctions, examining information from new perspectives, and being sensitive to context. When we are mindful we recognize that there is not a single optimal perspective, but many possible perspectives on the same situation. **[Langer 1993: 44]** Not surprisingly Katan has used the "mindful" concept in his description of a dynamic and intervening type of translation, particularly sensitive to the distance between STs' and TTs' worldviews **[Katan, 2014, 2016:13].** Moscardo applies the two terms to the specific context of tourism, describing tourists' on text, or rather, their response to the visit and interpretation of destination sites **[Moscardo,1996, 2014, 2017**]. She draws inspiration from the work of Tilden **[Tilden, 1977:23**], a pioneer of heritage interpretation. An American novelist and playwright, in the early 1940s Tilden began to write about national parks and published Interpreting Our Heritage in 1957. By "interpretation" Tilden refers to the activities carried out by guides or tourism interpreters illustrating national parks, museum exhibitions or tourist sites. Moscardo's own model of tourism interpretation develops Tilden's early work by introducing the notions of mindfulness and mindlessness: the result is an approach that brings together a series of concerns related to guides' interpretation and visitors' response.   From the perspective of a translation scholar interested in translation studies, it is immediately striking that the range of areas of language studies dealt with in general introductions to linguistics **[e.g.Biber, Conrad & Reppen 1998; McEnery & Wilson 2001; Kennedy 1998]** does not include translation. Tony McEnery and Andrew Wilson, for example, cover numerous topics within linguistics: lexical studies, grammar, semantics, pragmatics and discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, stylistics and text linguistics, historical linguistics, dialectology and variation studies and psycholinguistics. In addition, they deal with related fields: the teaching of languages and linguistics, cultural studies and social psychology. Teaching translation, but not translation studies, is covered in one paragraph in the language teaching section. The lack of attention to translation studies may be because the use of tourism terms in translation studies is relatively new, or perhaps because the exchange of knowledge between linguistics and translation studies has tended to be rather mono-directional. Often, the way in which they are used in parallel corpora indicates that translations are not seen as texts which exist and function in their own right in the target language system, nor as being subject to a range of constraints which differ from other text production situations. The way in which a work is translated in a particular instance will depend on a number of factors, including the form of the previous discourse and other contextual influences, including perhaps how much wine the translator had at lunch time **[Barlow 2000:110-111].** Few translators have the luxury of the leisurely lunch conjured

up here, but many translation scholars will be familiar with views of translation, held within neighbouring disciplines, which do not necessarily take account of advances and current concerns in translation theory and translation research.

However, with an increase in interaction between translation scholars and corpus linguists comes greater understanding of translation; Stag Johansson's acknowledgement of the difficulties inherent in using of texts and their translations for cross-linguistic study, while still viewing translation very much in terms of its 'equivalence' to a source text, also reflects some awareness of the contextual, contextual and extra textual influences on translators and translation, and an interest in studying features of translation: it is well-known that linguistic choices often differ depending upon the individual translator, or there may be outright mistakes in translation.

Here we will illustrate only the communicative aspects mentioned by Cohen, in order to point out elements that appear to be particularly relevant for present day translators and intercultural mediators, too. Such communicative aspects have been divided into four categories, which correspond to four activities, and namely:

1. *Selection*: guides should point out objects of interest to the tourist, that is "those which they deem worthy of their [visitors'] attention". In fact selection will structure the tourists' attention.

2. *Information*: the guide should provide visitors with correct and detailed information.

3. *Interpretation:* the guide should produce interpretation according to a principle of 'naturalisation': "In its general form, transcultural interpretation takes the form of translation of the strangeness of a foreign culture into a cultural idiom familiar to the visitors".

4. *Keying and Fabrication*: a distinction is made between "keying" – a sort of performance to present as authentic what is in fact a "staged" attraction – and "fabrication" – when it becomes apparent that the attractions illustrated by the guide have been made up. However, this distinction appears to be set up more in terms of degree than kind, although fabrication is given a definite moral bias, when Cohen illustrates it as "a type of activity which does not meet with general approval" .

Conclusion. These aspects of the tourist guide's role seem to be perfectly suitable for translators and intercultural mediators too – particularly for those working in the field of tourism. As a matter of fact, three of them match rather closely Katan's Greimas-derived definition of the tripartite function of tourism discourse, consisting respectively of vouloir (to desire), savoir (to know) and pouvoir (to be able). These three functions or language modalities represent the promotional (vouloir), informative (savoir) and performative (pouvoir) aspects of texts. Katan makes clear that it is up to the translator to decide which function should prevail in any single text.

REFERENCES

1.   Agorni M., 2012b, "Questions of mediation in the translation of tourist texts", Altre Modernità, [S.I.], pp. 1-11.

2.   Dann G., 1996, The language of tourism: A sociolinguistic perspective, CAB International, Wallingford, UK.

3.   Katan D., 2012, "Translating the tourist gaze: from 'heritage?' and culture to actual encounter", Pasos 10:4, pp. 83-95.

4.   Katan D., 2014, "Intercultural communication, mindful translation and squeezing 'culture' onto the screen", in Garzelli B. and Baldo M. (eds.), Subtitling and intercultural communication European languages and beyond, Edizioni ETS, Pisa, pp. 55-76.

5.   Moscardo G., 1996, "Mindful visitors: Heritage and tourism", Annals of Tourism Research 23:2, pp. 376-397.

6.   Cohen E., 1985, "The tourist guide: The origins, structure and dynamics of a role", Annals of Tourism Research 12, pp. 5-29.

7.   Manca E., 2012, "Translating the language of tourism across cultures: from functionally complete units of meaning to cultural equivalence", Textus 1, pp. 55-67.

8.   Milton J., 2009, "Translation studies and adaptation studies", in Pym A. and Perekrestenko A. (eds.), Translation Research Projects 2, Intercultural Studies Group, Tarragona, pp. 51-8.

9.   Snell-Hornby M., 1998, Translation Studies, John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia.

10.   Venuti L., 1995, The Translator's invisibility: a history of translation, London and New York, Routledge.