



**International
Journal of Society, Culture & Language
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: www.ij scl.net
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

Translation of the Culture-Specific Items in Jumabayev's "Men Jastarğa Senemin" into English and Russian

Aygul E. Alpysbayeva^{1a}, Svetlana A. Ashymkhanova^{2a}

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received May 2021
Received in Revised form July 2021
Accepted August 2021
Available online August 2021

KEYWORDS:

Language
Poem
Reader
Transformation
Author

Abstract

This paper examines the translation of culture-specific items from Kazakh into English and Russian in the case of the poem "Men jastarğa senemin" ("I believe in youth") by Jumabayev. These three languages are quite different in relation to each other. It should be mentioned that Kazakhstan was one of the countries of the Soviet Union, so nowadays state organizations and local self-government bodies still officially use Russian as well as the Kazakh language. The current research is aimed to define the peculiarities of translating culture-specific items into well-known languages of the world through the comparative analysis based on Venuti's principles of foreignization and domestication and Davies's strategies for culture-specific items translation. Translation studies all over the world is experiencing a cultural revolution in all its senses as never before. And the translation of culture-specific items has been and still remains as one of the topical issues.

© 2021 IJSCL. All rights reserved.

¹ PhD Candidate, Email: alpysbayeva7460@tanu.pro (Corresponding Author)
Tel: +8-727-377-3333

² Professor, Email: svet-shymkhanova@uohk.com.cn

^a Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Republic of Kazakhstan

1. Introduction

Jumabayev (1995) is a great Kazakh poet whose work has been banned for many years. He was under Soviet government surveillance from the early 1920s because of his participation in the Alash national movement, which is named after the socio-political party that operated in the 19th century. In his poems, both nationalist and lyric themes, symbols, and imagery are combined (Kocaoğlu, 2018). After all, he became one of the victims of the Stalinist repression. His wife Zuleikha secretly kept his manuscripts for more than 20 years. Professor Margulan defined his role in Kazakh literature as follows: "Jumabayev has the same value for Kazakh people as Shakespeare has for the English and Pushkin has for the Russians" (Jumabayev, 2018).

Although it took quite a while, his good name and literary heritage were rehabilitated. The poet's creativity was recognized by other countries. They started translating his works as they were written by the poet of all mankind and the whole Turkic people. He was a poet who struggled for freedom and clearly realized that the future of society depends on the younger generation. He deeply believed in youth who would be able to fulfill his dream about the Kazakh nation being led out of the darkness. His famous poem "Men jastarğa senemin" ("I believe in youth") still remains relevant and in demand. This poem delights with a flurry of emotions, violent passion, and irrepressible energy. Jumabayev does not have a neutral state; he does not limit himself in the manifestation of feelings. At the same time, the poem is rich in history and culture. In this poem, the author created a culturally spiritual image of youth he would praise. Culture-specific items (CSIs) played an important role in creating this image.

The authors of this research aimed to analyze which role these significant items played in the translation into English and Russian. It is worth noting that the translation of Kazakh poetry into English was done for the first time by direct translation. Basically, the poems were translated by consecutive translations from the Russian language, which inevitably led to distortions. Kocaoğlu (2019, p. 41) commented on this rare case as follows: "I translated 20 poems of Jumabayev from Kazakh into English. Of course, I always resorted to the help

of my Kazakh friends regarding certain words and terms". Kocaoğlu (2019) has read many Kazakh novels and short stories when working on his dissertation. From a young age, he was interested in poems written by Kazakh poets. The Russian translation is Soloviyov (Soloviyov et al., 2010). Jumabayev's "Men Jastarğa Senemin" is a great example of the CSIs use in a literary work. The poem was translated into Russian and English. Therefore, the purpose of this article was to investigate the peculiarities of the CSIs in Jumabayev's "Men Jastarğa Senemin" translations.

2. Theoretical Framework

CSIs were called cultural words by Newmark (2010), culture-specific concepts by Baker (1992), cultureme by Nord (1997), culture-specific references by Gambier, Shlesinger, and Stolze (2007), realia by Vlachov and Florin (1980), and culture-specific items by Davies (2003). The last term is the most common. There is no homogeneity on its definition as well. According to Nord (2001), CSI is a cultural phenomenon that is present in one culture but is not present (in the same way) in another culture. Aixela (1996, p. 56) notes that "many discussions of CSIs have avoided offering any definition of the concept implying that it is intuitively recognizable". Moreover, Aixela (1996) confirmed that CSIs could be recognized only with indication to a certain source text and,

in translation, a CSI does not exist as itself but as a result of a conflict arising from any linguistically represented reference in a source text which, when transferred to a target language, poses a translation problem due to the nonexistence or to the different meaning of the given item in the target language culture (whether determined by ideology, usage, frequency, etc.). (p. 58)

But Newmark (2010) considers that CSIs are seen as separate units like items in a glossary. Florin (1993) claims that translations of CSIs are not limited to language, expanding the idea that CSIs do not have the exact equivalents in other languages because they have been formed on a historical and local basis which is unique to every culture. Florin (1993) defines them as words and combinations of words that denote objects and concepts characteristic of the way

of life, the culture, and the social and historical development of one nation. Tymoczko (1999, p. 55) states a similar point, saying that “cultural elements in a literary work are metonymic evocations of the culture as a whole including its material culture, history, economy, law, customs, and values and so on”. Baker (1992, p. 41) implied that “the source-language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture”. He claimed that the culture-specific concept may be abstract or concrete and relates to a religious belief, a social custom, or a type of food. In comparison with Aixela (1996), Baker (1992) defines CSIs without relation to the context.

While discussing non-equivalence in translation, Baker (1992) placed CSIs in the section of the most common issues. Newmark (2010) has found that culture is an obstacle to translation and the achievement of an accurate and decent translation. Schäffner and Wiesemann (2001) have found CSIs as a problematic area in the process of translation and stated that usually CSIs were characterized as untranslatable. Also, Schäffner and Wiesemann (2001) stated that problems arise because the target readers are not always familiar with the source culture. Davies (2003) considered translators as mediators whose task is to make the various cultural manifestations accessible to the reader of the translated text. Various attempts to provide solutions for the translation of CSIs have been made. Considering all these attempts, Davies (2003) has defined two approaches: 1) when the distinction is made between two basic goals of the translator, i.e., preserving the characteristics of the source text or adapting it to the target audience, e.g., Venuti’s (1995) principles of domestication and foreignization; 2) when a list of alternative procedures for dealing with individual CSI is listed, e.g., translation procedures by Davies (2003) (preservation, addition, omission, globalization, localization, transformation, and creation). Davies (2003) believed that these procedures could be ranked on a scale according to their degree of adaptation. In this article, the authors conducted the analysis of the CSIs translation from both approaches, i.e., Venuti’s (1995) foreignization and domestication principles and translation procedures proposed by Davies (2003). Translation principles such as Venuti’s (1995) domestication and foreignization take an

important place in CSIs translation. As Davies (2003) noted,

discussion of the alternative treatments for CSIs often invoke the distinction between two basic goals of translation: preserving the characteristics of the source text as far as possible even where it has an exotic or strange effect and adapting it to produce a target text which seems normal, familiar and accessible to the target audience. (p. 69)

Davies (2003) noticed that these goals are usually seen as opposites. Schleirmacher (2016) distinguished the same translation principles but named them ‘naturalizing’ and ‘opposite alienating’. Hervey and Higgins (1992) used such terms as exoticism and cultural transplantation. As the De Pedro (2000) noted, none of the extremes is preferable in translation, and less radical alternatives are preferred. Discussing the translation of CSIs, Venuti (2001) introduced the terms ‘domestication’ and ‘foreignization’. According to Venuti (2001, p. 76), these two translation strategies can be defined as “deliberately domesticating in handling foreign text” and as “foreignizing motivated by an impulse to preserve linguistic and cultural differences by deviating from prevailing domestic values”.

In this regard, De Pedro (2000) noted that the tendency to foreignize the CSIs of the dominant culture leads to the fact that readers are becoming more familiar with a foreign culture and accept foreignization as a norm. Davies (2003) stated that the usage of a particular principle, i.e., domestication or foreignization, may be determined by various factors in different cultures and different periods. He provided several reasons that determine the choice of a particular principle, including the text type, the nature of the target audience, and the relationship between the source and target languages and cultures. Venuti (1995) argued that domestication, which includes target culture-oriented strategies, can be viewed as cultural imperialism. Therefore, in order to avoid it, he proposed foreignization as an alternative.

3. Methodology

To conduct the analysis of CSIs in “Men Jastarğa Senemin”, the authors investigated the

translation principles of CSIs (foreignization and domestication) and translation procedures for CSIs. Newmark (2010) suggested five strategies, such as transference, cultural equivalent, descriptive equivalent, componential analysis, and tronym. From his point of view, other translation procedures are marginal, e.g., literal translation, synonymy, modulation, paraphrase, and cultural footnotes. Schäffner and Wiesemann (2001) offered such translation strategies as loanword, calque, substitution, and explanation. The scholars added that the employment of a particular translation strategy is largely determined by an awareness of a kind of addressees' profile. Therefore, it is very important for the translator to define the target audience. When Kocaoğlu (2019) was asked about the target audience of his translations of Jumabayev's poems, he explained the two goals he had. He aimed to show the special literary thinking of Jumabayev in English. The second goal was to influence the audience whose native language is English. Yet, the measurement and evaluation of this issue are of concern to literary scholars. In other words, although it sounds vague, the addressee is an English-speaking audience. In general, it is difficult to define the target audience of a literary translation.

German linguist and translation teacher Neubert associated the problem of pragmatic adequacy (and thereby the problem of translatability) with four types of pragmatic relations that can exist in the original text. One of them is called 'fiction' since these pragmatic relations are created for the audience of the source text. They can also express universal human needs becoming part of the world literature (Gentzler, 2014; Komissarov, 1999). A Russian poet and translator, Goncharenko (2011), gave an excellent answer to this issue. In one of his articles, he raised questions about the reasons why the original poetic texts and the translated poetic texts exist. While the original texts ensure spiritual communication between the past and the future generations, the translated texts carry out the process of spiritual communication between people that have different languages and cultures.

Nevertheless, to meet target readers' expectations, translators usually use a combination of the four of the above-mentioned strategies, e.g., a loanword and explanation (Khoshsaligheh, 2018; Schäffner & Wiesemann,

2001). Davies (2003) suggested the following procedures to deal with CSIs: preservation, addition, omission, globalization, localization, transformation, and creation. Preservation occurs when a translator transfers the term directly into the target text with no further explanation. Davies's (2003, p. 70) second strategy is addition, when a translator "decides to keep the original item but supplements the text with any information he deems necessary". Davies (2003, p. 73) pointed out that "the translators have to know their target audience's background if they want to evaluate correctly what supplementary information should be included". The opposite strategy to addition is omission when translators decide to "omit a problematic CSI altogether so that no trace of it is found in the translation" (Davies, 2003, p. 73). Davies's (2003, p. 79) next strategy is globalization, "the process of replacing culture-specific references with the ones that are more neutral or general". An opposite strategy to globalization is localization, when translators "try to anchor a reference firmly in the culture of the target audience" (Davies, 2003, p. 85). Davies (2003) stated that this strategy also includes the phonological and grammatical adaptation of names and the use of gender endings.

Translation strategy that goes beyond globalization or localization is named transformation by Davies (2003). This strategy changes the content of the CSI used in the source language and may be defined as an alternation or distortion of the original. Davies (2003) noted that in certain cases, it is rather difficult to draw the line between globalization, localization, and transformation because it is not clear where the change of the content goes beyond the frames of localization and globalization. In other cases, it becomes difficult to realize where the explicitness goes beyond the addition and where the transformation could be considered. Davies (2003) stated that transformations do not always result in comprehensiveness and acceptability for the target reader. The translators may perceive and specify an allusion that was not meant in the source language. The last Davies's (2003) strategy is the creation of a CSI which is firmly or totally different from the source text or is not present in there. The techniques of preservation and addition fall under foreignization, whereas the techniques of

localization, transformation, and creation fall under domestication. Meanwhile, the techniques of omission and globalization fall in between foreignization and domestication as the CSI is either omitted or globalized in the target text. When Kocaoğlu was asked about the principle (preserving or adapting) he adhered to in the translation of CSIs, he replied that he “was always more worried about how to convey the artistic, literary skill of Jumabayev’s poetry rather than single words” (Kocaoğlu, 2018, p. 153). Such a purpose of a translator is bound with the purpose of poetic translation as a whole, that is, first of all, to convey aesthetic perception and imagery.

4. Results and Discussion

To perform the spiritual picture of the youth, the poet used stable expression *сүмпей маза жүректер*, which translates into English as *hearts as pure as milk*. This expression has a cultural connotation since, for nomadic Kazakh

people, animals and breast milk were sacred. There was a custom to sprinkle milk on the head of a snake that has climbed into the yurt (traditional nomadic house) so that it crawls away without causing any harm. Even then, this white drink obtained from cows, goats, sheep, horses, and camels was considered a symbol of abundance and health. Its color has made it a symbol of purity. In the Kazakh language, it is even replaced with the word *ақ* (*white*). Dairy dishes are called *ақмағам* (*white food*). On the spring holiday of the equinox, people wish each other *Ақмолболсын!* (*Let the white be a lot!*). There is a saying *сүттенәк, судантазаболу* (*to be whiter than milk and purer than water*) which means *to be innocent*. In Jumabayev’s poem, by saying *hearts as pure as milk*, the author means the pure, immaculate hearts of the youth. In Russian, unfortunately, this line was generally omitted, but it has been rendered as *fresh as milk* in English. Although, freshness and pureness are different notions (Table 1).

Table 1

Translation of CSIs ‘сүмпей маза жүректер’ into English and Russian

Original	Translation in English by Kocaoğlu	Translation in Russian by Soloviyov
Жұмсақ мінез жібектер, <i>Сүмпей маза жүректер</i>	The soft manner silks <i>The hearts as fresh as milk</i>	Omission of the whole stanza

It means that in English, the translator used the strategy of transformation, that is the change of the content of CSIs (pure, innocent hearts replaced by fresh hearts), while in Russian, the reason for the omission remains indefinite. In

the original, there are eight stanzas, while in the Russian translation, there are seven. The following lines include such CSI as *алаш* and the cultural toponym *Арқа* (Table 2).

Table 2

Translation of CSIs ‘алаш’, ‘Арқа’ into English and Russian

Original	Translation in English by Kocaoğlu	Translation in Russian by Soloviyov
Тау суындай гүрілдер, Айбынды алаш елім дер, Алтын Арқа жерім дер, Мен жастарға сенемін!	Babble like mountain water, Say my Majestic <i>Alash</i> nation, Say my <i>Golden backbone</i> , I believe in youth! <i>Alash is a national motto and ancient war cry of the Kazakhs.</i>	Водопады в тех поют, Что народ <i>Алаш</i> чтут, Золотой <i>Арқа</i> зовут, – Верю, верю в молодых!

Алаш is the name of the mythical ancestor of the Kazakhs who was taken to designate a social and political movement that later took shape in a party. One of the leaders of the party and the future autonomy Bukeikhanov in his articles, wrote that the word ‘*Alash*’ for centuries was the battle cry of the Kazakhs (Antonov, 2017). A similar explanation was given by the translator, as can be seen in Table 2. For the modern generation, the use of the

word ‘*Alash*’ can have a lot of meanings depending on the context, including the following meanings: the original unification of the people from Central Asia, the common motto of the Kazakh tribes, an alternative name for the ancient Kazakh people, *Alash* movement in the early 20th century, and *Alash* party in Kazakh Autonomy. Despite this, the translator gives the correct definition that is suitable for the context of the poem

understanding the intent of the poet, which is also very important. As Davies (2003, p. 93) noted while talking about shortcomings of addition, "there is a danger of burdening the reader with irrelevant details". So, in English, the translator used an addition outside the text (a short explanation in the form of a footnote) which goes beyond foreignization, while in Russian, there is preservation that also falls under foreignization.

Арқа is actually Сарыарқа which is a compound word сары (yellow) + арқа (back). Though, the poet often replaced the word сары (yellow) in this toponym with a determiner алтын (golden) to add imagery and expressiveness. But it does not particularly affect the meaning since сары is the color of gold, so, in one word, the author placed both the denotative and connotative meanings. That is, in the literal sense, this land is very rich in minerals, natural resources, nature itself is beautiful (mountains, hills, and fertile steppes, striking human consciousness with its endless expanse and beauty), and in a figurative sense, it is a very dear place to the nation and the poet's heart. This is where he was born, this is a sacred place in the minds of Kazakhs. Сарыарқа for the Kazakhs is the Promised Land. Distant ancestors, the creators of the nomadic civilization roamed on this land. It was them who managed to domesticate horses and create war chariots in ancient times. They were the founders of the unique nomadic culture and animalistic style in art. The historian Utemish-haji in his treatise *Tabakat-I Nasiri* wrote:

When he (Jochi, the eldest son of Genghis Khan, Khan of the Golden Horde) saw the Kypchak land Saryarka, he has found that there can be no land in the whole world more pleasant than this one, better air than this one, sweeter water than this one, wider meadows and pastures than these ones". (Boranbayev, 2017)

Also, Kazakhs address a close and dear, loving person as 'алтындай қымбаттым' (my darling as gold). But if Алтын Арқа can be said, it will not be a compound word such as Сарыарқа. In this case, алтын will be only a determiner for 'golden'.

Why did the ancestors of the present Kazakhs call this land Сарыарқа? In the scientific

literature, there is a direct translation into Russian 'Yellow Back'. 'Сары' is translated as yellow, golden, or reddish color, and Арқа is translated as 'back' or 'spine'. On the map of the country, it can be seen that this land stretches across Central Kazakhstan really resembles a spine in the middle of the back connecting the northern and southern parts. On the other hand, it can mean a crucial role of арқа (back and spine) in the anatomical structure of a human and their life, as well as this geographical place has the same importance for the Kazakh nation. Scientist-archaeologist and ethnologist Margulan stated that the translation of the name *Saryarka* as *Yellow Ridge* by the famous geologist Medoev "successfully conveys the geomorphological structure and relief of Central Kazakhstan" (Boranbayev, 2017). However, it cannot fully explain the sacred meaning of the name of this land.

So, in Russian, there is localization where Арқа was phonologically adapted and became Арка. Kazakh-specific consonant қ was replaced by к. Also, the word took the ending y (Аркаy). In English, there is transformation. In original, there is the word жерім after this toponym: Алтын Арқажерім that in English means my land. So, the interlinear translation is as follows: Say my land Golden backbone. Then it would serve as some kind of hint to the target reader that this is the name of the land or geographical name. Also, by capitalizing the word *Golden* instead of *backbone*, the translator changed the structure of the toponym. As the authors have mentioned above, *golden* is only a determiner but not a fixed geographic name. In the original, Арқа is capitalized (Table 2). Since the translator did not explain in any way what 'Golden backbone' means, it can be only guessed how the target readers would perceive this translation, with what they would associate it. In Russian, the translator capitalized Арка. There is also no explanation in the Russian translation as well, but it can be supposed that the translator did not find the need for it since this toponym is familiar to the Russian-speaking audience due to the long years of historical, political, economic, and social ties between the two nations. In the following stanza, the poet used the name of the mythical horse тұлпар and the religious concept иман (Table 3).

Table 3*Translation of CSIs 'тұлпар', 'иман' into English and Russian*

Original	Translation in English by Kocaoglu	Translation in Russian by Soloviyov
Қажу бар ма тұлпарға, Талу бар ма сұңқарға, Иман күшті оларда, Мен жастарға сенемін!...	Is there grass for the <i>stallion</i> Is there prey for the falcon <i>Faith</i> is strong in them I believe in youth!	Разве устает <i>тулпар</i> Или сокол, что не стар? <i>Святость</i> им – великий дар. – Верю, верю в молодых!

Тұлпар is a winged (or flying) horse in Turkic mythology which corresponds to Pegasus in ancient Greek mythology and Buraq in Islamic mythology. Since ancient times, nomadic people have depicted in great numbers their most loyal and faithful friends, horses. Giving them various mythological and fabulous properties, they considered them sacred animals. Images of horses were found on gold items of the Scythian-Sak (ancient tribes) times, on numerous drawings (petroglyphs) carved on rocks throughout Kazakhstan and beyond. Since the life of nomads is directly connected with horses, they have become characters of myths, fairy tales, legends, and epic poems, including the fantastic image of winged horses. The idea of magical winged creatures originated from ancient times. Let us look at the example from the Kazakh epic song «Кобланды-батыр»:

*У быстроногого Бурьла
Под ребрами крылья... (Baiġanin, 2012).*
Interlinear translation (by the authors):
*At the swift Buryl (name of the horse)
There are wings under the ribs...*

The Kazakhs naively believed that small wings invisible to the eyes were hidden under the shoulder blades of *тұлпар*. When they are born, in order to do no damage to these wings, it is necessary to take out the foal ripping open the belly of the mare. Of course, the mare would die, but this sacrifice would be for the sake of the incomparable speed of the horse. Future winged horses *тұлпар* should have been born, exactly as it was described in heroic poems about famous batyr (hero) and their horses. In Russian, *тұлпар* was phonologically adapted to *тулпар*. Kazakh-specific vowel *ұ* was

replaced by *у*. In English, it was globalized; the translator chose a more neutral and general word as a *stallion*. According to the Cambridge dictionary, “a stallion is an adult male horse that is used for breeding” (Cambridge dictionary, 2021). Such features of a stallion as speed, physique may have something common with the features of *тұлпар* but it is not enough to fulfill cultural and mythical context.

The next one is a religious term *иман*. The linguistic meaning of this word is *a confirmation of the truth*. That is, it is faith in something from the bottom of one’s heart and soul without a grain of doubt and hesitation, the confirmation of the truth or any decision that is told, recognition of it as correct, a belief that words of the transmitter are correct. The words *faith* and *иман* are synonyms. The religious meaning of the term *иман* is an unshakable belief in the correctness and truth of all revelations, religious foundations, and decisions sent down by Allah Almighty and transmitted by Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him!), confirmation of their truth and their recognition through understanding and acceptance. It has been translated into English as *faith* that is globalized. The same strategy was used in Russian. It has been rendered as *святость*, which means *holiness* and *saintliness*. The notion of faith exists in any kind of religion or even in the basics of any religion. Maybe it motivated the translators to choose this very translation strategy that falls under domestication. And in the following stanza, there is a two-fold use of the word *алаш* and the name of the sacred book in the religion of Islam *құран* (Table 4).

Table 4*Translation of CSIs 'алаш', 'құран' into English and Russian*

Original	Translation in English by Kocaoglu	Translation in Russian by Soloviyov
<i>Алаш</i> айбынды ұраны, Қасметті <i>құраны</i> , <i>Алаштың</i> олар құрбаны, Мен жастарға сенемін!	<i>Alash</i> 23 – the Majestic warcry, The dignity of <i>Quran</i> , They sacrifice themselves to <i>Alash</i> , I believe in youth!	Если знамя их <i>Алаш</i> И <i>Коран</i> священен наш – С ними в жертву жизнь отдашь. – Верю, верю в молодых!

Concerning *алаш* in English, there is addition outside the text. The poet used this CSI three times in this poem, and in English, it was mentioned in the same amount, and there is one common explanation in the form of a footnote. In the Russian translation, there is a double use of preservation strategy, once CSI *алаш* was substituted by a pronoun. In the case of *құран*, the translators used a localization strategy in both languages. In Russian, Kazakh-specific letters *қ* and *ұ* were replaced by *к* and *о*: *Коран*. In English, *құран* phonologically adapted as *Quran*. But why isn't it capitalized in original? Since in the original, the author does not mean

sacred religious book Koran itself, but a derivative meaning of it which is *as sacred as Koran*. The interpretation of the first two lines (Table 4) should be like 'Alash is their (youth's) Majestic war cry, Alash is their sacred Koran'. So, Alash for them is as sacred as Koran. Overall, domestication has prevailed in the translations into both languages with a slight difference. In Russian, the translator has mostly employed localization in order to adopt CSIs phonologically and to make them more readable and acceptable for target readers (Table 5).

Table 5
The Frequency and Relation of Translation Strategies and Principles of CSIs

CSIs	English		Russian	
	Foreignization	Domestication	Foreignization	Domestication
Сүттей таза жүректер		+ (transformation)		+ (omission)
тұлпар		+ (globalization)		+ (localization)
иман		+ (globalization)		+ (globalization)
Арқа		+ (transformation)		+ (localization)
Алаш (3)	+++ (addition outside the text)		++ (preservation)	+ (localization)
Құран		+localization		+ (localization)
Total	3	5	2	6

The main reason for that is the fact that the Kazakh language has got nine specific consonants and vowels inherent only to it (despite the fact that both languages use the Cyrillic alphabet), which are very tricky to pronounce for Russian readers. In the English language, the translator had to make sacrifices in the relation of CSIs in order to compensate for other important aspects of poetic translation. For example, in the case of cultural toponym *Арқа*, the translator chose transformation (*Golden backbone*) instead of preservation which is commonly accepted in the translation of the toponyms but it provides consonance in rhyme: the previous line ends with *nation*, and this one ends with *backbone*. The same can be said regarding the mythical horse *tulpar*, which was rendered as *stallion* where the following line ends with *falcon*. In English, there is one case of addition outside the text concerning historical CSI *алаш*. While in Russian translation, this strategy is completely absent. Most probably, the translator relied on the background knowledge of the target readers. Regarding the two well-known religious CSIs, the translators employed localization and

globalization. In the case of religious CSI *иман*, both translators used globalization since the notion of *faith* in religion is universal.

5. Concluding Remarks

It can be concluded that there are three main reasons that impact the choice of translation strategies for CSIs. Firstly, it depends on the type of text. The authors analyzed a poetic text; thus, the translators sometimes had to make sacrifices for the benefit of artistic perception, shape, rhythm, and rhyme. The second reason is the target audience. In the case of Jumabayev's "Men Jastarğa Senemin", the Russian target readers are ready to understand the source text culture more than the English target readers. Thirdly, the relationship between the source and target languages plays an important role in the choice of translation strategies. Thus, Russian and English are quite different languages and belong to different language families in relation to Kazakh. Russian and Kazakh use the same alphabet, except for special letters that are used only in Kazakh. English is very popular in Kazakhstan, but the Kazakh language is hardly known for

English-speaking audiences. Nevertheless, the translation is possible in both cases. The authors hope that this study will lead to further studies on the level of perception of the target text by target readers since there is a need for a more detailed investigation.

References

- Aixela, J. F. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In R. Alvarez, & M. C.-A. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, power, subversion* (pp. 52–78). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Antonov, S. (2017). *100 years of autonomy "Alash". Everything you need to know about the first Kazakh republic*. Retrieved from <https://informburo.kz/stati/100-let-avtonomii-alah-vsyo-cto-nuzhno-znat-o-pervoy-kazahskoy-respublike.html>
- Baiġanin, N. (2012). *Alpamysbatyr, Qoblandybatyr*. Almaty: Kazygurt.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A course book on translation*. London: Routledge.
- Boranbayev, N. (2017). Saryarka is a sacred place in the minds of Kazakhs. Retrieved from <https://kokshetau.asia/interesnoe-mobile/16365-saryarka-sakralnoe-mesto-v-soznanii-kazahov>
- Cambridge dictionary. (2021). Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/stallion>
- Davies, E. E. (2003). A goblin or a dirty nose? The treatment of culture-specific references in translations of Harry Potter book. *Translator*, 9(1), 65–100.
- De Pedro, R. (2000). Cultural misrepresentation. In O. Clasee (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of literary translation into English* (pp. 321–322). Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Florin, S. (1993). Realia in translation. In P. Zlateva (Ed.), *Translation as social action: Russian and Bulgarian perspectives* (pp. 122–128). London: Routledge.
- Gambier, Y., Shlesinger, M., & Stolze, R. (2007). *Doubts and directions in translation studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gentzler, E. (2014). Translation studies: Pre-discipline, discipline, interdiscipline, and post-discipline. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 2(2), 13–24.
- Goncharenko, S. (2011). *Poetic translation and translation of poetry: Constants and variability*. Retrieved from http://samlib.ru/w/wagapow_a_s/poetic-transl.shtml
- Hervey, S., & Higgins, I. (1992). *Thinking translation: A course in translation method, French to English*. London: Routledge.
- Jumabayev, M. (1995). *Poems*. Almaty: Sanat.
- Jumabayev, M. (2018). *Spiritual revival: Eternal giants of the country*. Retrieved from <http://presidentlibrary.kz/ru/news/proekt-ruhani-zhangyru-mngilik-el-alyptary-magzhan-zhumabaev>
- Khoshsaligheh, M. (2018). Seeking source discourse ideology by English and Persian translators: A comparative think-aloud protocol study. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 6(1), 31–46.
- Kocaoğlu, T. (2018). *Poet of flame, liberty and love*. Astana: Nauka.
- Komissarov, V. N. (1999). *General theory of translation: Problems of translation studies in the coverage of foreign scientists*. Moscow: CheRo.
- Newmark, P. (2010). Translation and culture. In B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, & M. Thelen (Eds.), *Meaning in translation* (pp. 171–182). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Nord, C. (1997). *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Nord, C. (2001). Text analysis in translation. In Ch. Schäffner, & U. Wiesemann (Eds.), *Annotated texts for translation: English-German, functionalist approaches illustrated* (pp. 24–25). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Schäffner, Ch., & Wiesemann, U. (2001). *Annotated texts for translation: English German. Functionalist approaches illustrated*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Schleirmacher, F. (2016). On the different methods of translating. In J. Munday (Ed.), *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (pp. 28–30). London: Routledge.
- Soloviyov, A., Kanapyanov, B., & Bakbergenov, K. (2010). *Jumabayev M.*

- Prophet. Poems and stories.* Almaty: Audarma.
- Tymoczko, M. (1999). *Translation in a postcolonial context.* Manchester: St Jerome.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation.* London: Routledge.
- Venuti, L. (2001). Strategies of translation. In M. Baker, & K. Malmkjaer (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 283–288). London: Routledge.
- Vlakhov, S., & Florin, S. (1980). *Untranslated in translation.* Moscow: Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya.