Materiallar to’plami · Conference Proceedings

TIL, TARJIMA VA TA’LIM: GLOBAL KOMMUNIKATSIYA VA RAQAMLI INNOVATSIYALAR DAVRIDA YANGI YONDASHUVLAR

TARJIMANING ZAMONAVIY TENDENSIYALARI VA TEXNOLOGIYALARI

03 October 2026

UDK 81’25

Sivilizatsiyalarning o‘zaro o‘rganishi madaniy meros tarjimasi uchun axloqiy tamoyil sifatida: konseptual yondashuv

Xu Zhang*

”Silk Road” International University of Tourism and Cultural Heritage

✉ 535231128@qq.com

ANNOTATSIYA

Meros tarjimasi shunchaki lingvistik faoliyat emas, u madaniyatlararo muloqotda madaniy vakillik va tsivilizatsiyaviy o’zlikni shakllantiruvchi normativ amaliyotdir. Ushbu maqola «tsivilizatsiyalarning o’zaro o’rganishi» diplomatik falsafasini meros tarjimasining aniq axloqiy tamoyillariga aylantirish mumkinligini ta’kidlaydi. YuNESKOning Nara Autentlik hujjatiga (1994) tayanib, u «autentlik»ni terminologik izchillik va madaniy vakillikni boshqaruvchi yuksak norma sifatida belgilaydi. O’zaro o’rganish doirasidan uchta amaliy tamoyil kelib chiqadi: «o’z» va «boshqa»ning muvozanatli vakilligi, madaniy heterogenlikka hurmat va dialogik narrativ pozitsiya. Tashqi mezonlarni belgilash uchun YuNESKOning rasmiy diskursi va G’arb meros obyektlarini tarjima qilish strategiyalari ko’rib chiqiladi. Sintez yagona me’yoriy asosni — «O‘zaro ta’lim + Haqiqiylik»ni yuzaga keltirib, merosni tarjima qilish amaliyotini, ayniqsa, Xitoyning butun jahon madaniy merosi va uning xalqaro kommunikatsiyasi kontekstida yo‘naltirishga qodir. Maqola mavhum diplomatik konsepsiyalarni qanday qilib aniq, operatsion tamoyillarga aylantirish mumkinligini ko‘rsatib berish hamda meros tarjimasini neytral lingvistik uzatish emas, balki me’yoriy kelishuvlar maydoni sifatida joylashtirish orqali tarjima etikasiga hissa qo‘shadi.

Kalit so‘zlar

meros tarjimasi, tarjima etikasi, tsivilizatsiyalarning o’zaro o’rganishi, autentlik, Nara hujjati.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23278708

1. Introduction

Heritage translation plays a role in the international circulation of World Heritage nomination materials, site descriptions, museum interpretation, conservation documents, and public-facing cultural information. These texts do not simply convey dates and facts. They also select, organize, and explain the meanings attached to places, objects, practices, and historical experiences. Heritage scholarship has accordingly examined how heritage is interpreted and represented, rather than treating it as a self-evident collection of material objects (Smith, 2006). Translation studies, meanwhile, has drawn attention to the cultural and ideological dimensions of translation (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990). The intersection of these concerns makes heritage translation a useful site for considering the ethical implications of cross-cultural representation.

This paper explores civilizational mutual learning as a normative orientation for heritage translation. In official discourse associated with the Conference on Dialogue of Asian Civilizations, the idea emphasizes exchange, mutual learning, and dialogue across civilizations (Xi, 2019). The paper does not assume that a diplomatic concept automatically constitutes a translation theory. Instead, it asks what practical considerations can reasonably be developed from its emphasis on reciprocal understanding, when read alongside the Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS, 1994). The Nara Document is relevant because it cautions against applying fixed, universally valid criteria to all judgments of cultural heritage authenticity. However, it addresses the

evaluation of cultural properties, not translation ethics directly. Its implications for translation must therefore be argued rather than treated as an explicit rule contained in the document. On this basis, the paper proposes three ethical considerations: balanced representation, preservation of culturally significant differences, and dialogic mediation. It also revises the draft's earlier "zero-substitution" proposal into a more flexible principle of cultural-reference preservation.

The paper is conceptual, not empirical. UNESCO World Heritage Centre descriptions of Venice and Paris serve as limited illustrations; they are neither a representative corpus nor a comparison of source and translated texts. The proposed framework therefore requires testing against bilingual heritage materials.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Heritage representation and translation ethics

Heritage communication involves decisions about which features of a place or tradition to foreground, how to name them, and what background information readers need. Such choices can affect the way a community's past is understood by audiences unfamiliar with its historical or cultural context. Smith's (2006) account of heritage as a cultural and discursive process supports treating heritage descriptions as acts of interpretation, not merely as neutral inventories. Bassnett and Lefevere (1990) likewise situate translation within broader relations among language, culture, and power. These works provide a rationale for asking ethical questions about representation; they do not, by themselves, establish a specific set of rules for heritage translation. Aixelá's (1996) discussion of culture-specific items is relevant to the handling of culturally marked references. It offers a translation-studies basis for considering how such items may be retained, adapted, or explained. In this paper, that work supports attention to culturally significant references, but it is not taken to prove that one procedure—such as retaining every original term—is appropriate in every context.

2.2. Civilizational mutual learning as a normative orientation

In the official discourse cited here, civilizational mutual learning presents cultural exchange and dialogue as ways to foster mutual understanding (Xi, 2019). Applied cautiously to heritage translation, this orientation suggests that translated descriptions should neither present the source culture as inherently superior nor reduce its distinctive features to categories familiar to the target audience. It also encourages translators to anticipate how readers from another cultural background may interpret a term or historical reference. These are proposed implications for translation practice, not claims that the original policy discourse explicitly sets out translation procedures.

Three considerations follow from this interpretation. Balanced representation asks whether the text avoids both self-congratulatory claims and unnecessary self-erasure. Preservation of culturally significant differences asks whether the translation retains references that carry historical or cultural meaning. Dialogic mediation asks whether the text helps target readers understand those references without implying that the target culture's categories are universal. These considerations are related, but they are not interchangeable: representation concerns framing, preservation concerns the treatment of references, and mediation concerns reader-oriented explanation.

2.3. Authenticity and the limits of its application to translation

The Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS, 1994), particularly paragraph 11, recognizes that judgments about the values attributed to cultural properties may differ across cultures and that authenticity cannot be assessed solely through fixed criteria detached from cultural context. This position provides a reason to be cautious about translations that replace culturally specific concepts with apparently equivalent target-culture terms without explaining the difference.

At the same time, authenticity in heritage assessment and accuracy in translation are distinct concepts. A translation can accurately render a statement about a heritage property without itself determining whether the property is authentic. Conversely, retaining a culturally specific term does not guarantee that the surrounding translation is accurate. The present framework therefore treats the Nara Document as an important ethical point of reference, not as a "superordinate norm" that automatically governs every aspect of terminology or

translation quality. Terminology consistency remains important for accuracy and reader comprehension, while cultural-reference preservation addresses the risk of erasing meaningful distinctions.

3. Method and scope

This is a conceptual paper based on a focused reading of selected scholarship and public documents. The theoretical materials are Aixelá (1996), Bassnett and Lefevere (1990), Smith (2006), the Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS, 1994), and the cited official discourse on civilizational mutual learning (Xi, 2019). For illustration, the paper refers to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre's public descriptions of "Venice and its Lagoon" and "Paris, Banks of the Seine" (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, n.d.-a, n.d.-b).

The analytical procedure has three stages: (1) identify the concepts relevant to ethical representation in the selected theoretical sources; (2) formulate provisional translation considerations that are compatible with, but not directly prescribed by, those sources; and (3) read the two UNESCO descriptions for examples of how local historical and architectural information is framed for a broad audience. The illustrative reading focuses on the relationship between site-specific information and statements of wider significance. It does not use a coded corpus, quantify translation choices, or compare source-language texts with translated versions. The examples consequently serve to clarify the proposed framework, not to verify its effectiveness or characterize UNESCO discourse as a whole.

4. Illustrative examples

4.1. Balanced representation

The idea of balanced representation follows from the reciprocal orientation of civilizational mutual learning. For heritage translation, it means presenting a site's significance with support from the available historical and descriptive material, rather than adding unsupported praise or removing relevant context to fit an assumed target-audience expectation. This is a normative proposal for translators, not a claim that all existing heritage descriptions are unbalanced.

The UNESCO World Heritage Centre description of Venice and its Lagoon situates the site within a long history of maritime and commercial connections and describes Venice as a major link between East and West (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, n.d.-a). This wording offers an example of a site description connecting local history with interactions beyond the site. It does not, on its own, prove that the description achieves "balanced self/other representation": such a judgment would require a more explicit analytical rubric and attention to the full text and its context. The example instead illustrates one possible question for future analysis—how a description distributes attention between local historical agency and wider networks of exchange.

4.2. Preservation of culturally significant differences

The proposed cultural-reference preservation principle holds that a culturally meaningful reference should not be silently replaced by a target-culture equivalent if that substitution changes its historical or conceptual frame. This does not mean that every word must remain untranslated, nor that explanations and conversions should be prohibited. The relevant question is whether the translation preserves the original reference and makes any interpretive intervention transparent.

For example, a reference to the Yongle period of the Ming dynasty may be retained with its dates where these are supported by the source material. A traditional unit such as li or zhang may be retained and accompanied by an approximate metric conversion if readers need it. The conversion can aid comprehension, while the original term preserves the historical frame. The examples are hypothetical illustrations of the proposed principle; they are not presented as findings from the Venice or Paris descriptions. Similarly, personal names, titles, religious concepts, and craft terms should be handled according to their function and context rather than governed by a blanket ban on substitution.

This formulation is more defensible than an absolute "zero-substitution" rule. Some substitutions or adaptations may be necessary to communicate a reference accurately in the target language. What matters ethically is whether the procedure obscures a meaningful difference, introduces a misleading equivalence, or makes the translator's interpretive choice invisible. Aixelá's (1996) discussion of culture-specific items provides

a relevant conceptual point of departure for examining such decisions.

4.3. Dialogic mediation and target-reader comprehension

Dialogic mediation treats translation as communication between cultural frameworks, not as a one-way transfer in which the target reader is expected to share the source culture's background knowledge. A translator may therefore retain a culturally specific name or concept while adding a concise gloss, a date range, or contextual information. Such explanation should clarify rather than overwrite the source reference. The goal is neither to eliminate all unfamiliarity nor to leave readers without guidance, but to support informed interpretation while keeping cultural differences visible.

The UNESCO description of Paris, Banks of the Seine, presents a geographically specific urban landscape through its historical and architectural significance (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, n.d.-b). As with the Venice example, the description can be used to ask how a public-facing heritage text moves between local detail and wider significance. However, because the present study has not compared language versions or systematically coded textual features, it cannot establish that the Paris description employs a particular translation strategy or exemplifies dialogic mediation in a measurable sense.

4.4. What the illustrative cases can—and cannot—show

Taken together, the two descriptions provide limited examples of official heritage writing that connects site-specific histories with broader significance. They do not establish that UNESCO's discourse consistently follows the three proposed considerations, nor that it fails to articulate them. A claim about institutional practice would require a defined corpus, explicit selection criteria, and a reproducible analysis of texts and language versions. The present examples are therefore exploratory and are used to formulate research questions rather than to support general conclusions about UNESCO or about "Western heritage translation" as a category.

5. Proposed framework

The conceptual synthesis yields three interrelated considerations for heritage translation: First, balanced representation: avoid unsupported self-promotion, stereotyped depictions, and unnecessary erasure of relevant historical context. Represent claims in proportion to the evidence available in the source material. Second, preservation of culturally significant differences: retain the identity and cultural frame of significant references. Where a gloss, explanation, or conversion is useful, add it in a way that does not silently replace the original reference or imply a false equivalence. Third, dialogic mediation: consider what target readers may not know, and provide enough context to make unfamiliar references interpretable without reducing them to familiar but inaccurate categories.

These considerations should be used alongside, not instead of, ordinary standards of translation accuracy, source fidelity, terminological consistency, and evidence-based writing. They are best understood as a preliminary ethical framework, not a validated scoring system. A practical review of a heritage translation could ask: (a) Are claims supported by the source? (b) Have culturally significant references been retained or transparently explained? (c) Are adaptations and conversions accurate and clearly signaled? (d) Does the text avoid treating one cultural frame as universally self-explanatory? (e) Is the explanation sufficient for the intended audience without distorting the source meaning? These questions are proposed for future testing and should not be interpreted as an established assessment instrument.

For heritage communication concerning China or Uzbekistan, the framework offers questions for further study. Its practical value should be assessed using bilingual materials, consultation with heritage specialists, and attention to target readers; this paper does not conduct that assessment.

6. Conclusion

This paper has considered how civilizational mutual learning and the Nara Document on Authenticity may inform ethical reflection on heritage translation. The connection is an interpretation developed here: the Nara Document addresses heritage authenticity, not translation procedures.

The framework comprises balanced representation, preservation of culturally significant references, and dialogic mediation. It rejects an absolute "zero-substitution" rule: references should not be silently erased

or misleadingly recast, while explanation and appropriate conversion may aid comprehension. The Venice and Paris examples illustrate questions for analysis but do not validate the framework or support general conclusions about UNESCO practice.

A key limitation is the absence of a systematic bilingual corpus and reproducible textual analysis. Future research should specify texts and language versions, define units of analysis, and examine actual translation choices. Consultation with translators, heritage professionals, and relevant communities could also help assess the framework's practical value. It should therefore be treated as a proposal for further study, not an established standard.

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar

[1] Aixelá, J. F. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In R. Álvarez & M. C.-Á. Vidal (Eds.), Translation, power, subversion (pp. 52–78). Multilingual Matters.

[2] Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (Eds.). (1990). Translation, history and culture. Pinter Publishers.

[3] ICOMOS. (1994). The Nara document on authenticity. Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention. https://landscapes.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/1994-NARA-document-on-authenticity-International-Council-on-Monuments-and-Sites-1.pdf

[4] Smith, L. (2006). Uses of heritage. Routledge.

[5] UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (n.d.-a). Venice and its Lagoon. https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/394

[6] UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (n.d.-b). Paris, Banks of the Seine. https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/600

[7] Xi, J. (2019, May 15). Deepening exchanges and mutual learning among civilizations and building an Asian community with a shared future [Keynote speech]. Conference on Dialogue of Asian Civilizations, Beijing, China. http://www.npc.gov.cn/zgrdw/npc//xinwen/syxw/2019-05/15/content_2087219.htm