THE THEORY OF TRANSLATION

Aripova Kamola Yusupovna
Senior teacher of the department of foreign languages
International Islamic Academy of Uzbekistan
kamolakind@mail.ru

Abstract: *The issue of the relationship between language and culture has always dragged the scholars' attention. According to the American linguist E. Sepir (1993), language is closely connected with culture, which develops, expresses, and serves as a basis for the development of culture. It is known that language is in constant motion, it is an integral part of the history and culture of certain speakers, a mirror of the nation, the culture of the people. "Because any culture is manifested in language, it finds its material shell in language, and it develops and changes under the influence of the environment. The cultures of different nations differ from each other, first of all, in how they assimilate reality materially and spiritually."*

The need to study the national and cultural features of language units and the need to shed light on the relationship between language and culture led to the formation of linguaculturology as a separate field. In particular, the fields of linguaculturology and translation theory work together to develop the principles of translation of language units with national and cultural features.

Keywords: *Linguacultural, phraseologism, linguaculturema, realities, phraseological units, archetypes, paremiological, linguistic, comparative study, cultural realities, linguaculturologic algorithmization national-cultural feature lexical-semantic.*

imrconf.com

imrconf.com

Introduction

It is well known that the peoples of the world differ from each other in terms of their history, socioeconomic development, cultural development, and way of life. Every nation has its own dress culture, customs, traditions, and manners. The expression of such national and universal values in any work reflects the uniqueness of that nation. In this sense, "linguistic means that reflect the concepts, things, and events specific to a particular people, nation and ethnic group are the main means of determining the national character of a work of art." In the process of translation, these peculiarities, pictorial differences in different languages, and in some cases similarities, become clear.

The connection between language and culture and the reflection of national-cultural identity in the translation is crucial. The transmission of the worldview from one language to another, combined with cultural and spiritual features, depends on the quality and effectiveness of the translation. After all, when work in one language is translated into another, not only its meaning is expressed, but also the social origin, history, culture, and worldview of that people are promoted. In this regard, G. Salomov (1966) noted that "It is difficult to imagine how nations can establish friendly relations with each other, study and master each other's cultural riches without translation."

An analysis of the literature on this topic shows that, as units of language with national-cultural features, mainly reality and phraseology are recognized in them.

Studies give different descriptions of realities. For example, realities consist of words that express specific objects, concepts, and realities, moreover they relate to history, life, and the culture of a particular nation. They are unique to one language, have no alternatives in other languages, and also require the use of special methods in the translation process. Realities have entered the theory of translation as an independent unit and play an important role in translating the national and historical peculiarities of language. R.Fayzullaeva

(1972) also studies the problems of national color in translation on the example of German and Uzbek languages. Realities appear in the language of one nationality, reflect the way of life, history, and culture of the nation, and in another language, there is no clear alternative.

All the elements that make up a work of art, the spirit of the period, and the behavior and circumstances of the characters are shining examples of the national-cultural environment of that nation. M.Javburiev.(1991) also noted that each work of art has its own time and place, the specificity of time and place are inextricably linked with the image of the writer in his actions, he admits that his speech is manifested in his originality. So, these and other aspects reflect the spirit of the period and the historical landscape, historical-national features in the work.

Admittedly, another means of reflecting national-cultural identity is phraseological and pharmacological units. Phraseological units, which are the expression of the beauty and art of language, are not only means of expressing the imagery of language but also reflect the national culture, specific character, humor, sorrows, and concerns, as well as the mentality of the people. Therefore, in the literary text, phraseology is widely used to fully reveal the subtleties of the characters, to illustrate, exaggerate the description of events and situations.

In the semantic structure of the phraseology of each language, there are socio-historical events, moral and cultural norms, the spiritual world and religious ideas of the nation, national traditions, and customs. The effective and appropriate use of such units in the play ensures the popularization of the language of the work.

Significant work has been done in linguistics on the linguistic nature of phraseology (A.V. Kunin,(1984) V.V. Vinogradov,(1946) N.M .Shansky (1985), V.N.Telia (1996), V.A. Maslova (2001), etc.) In particular, V.A. Maslova “In the semantics of phraseological units, it reflects the long-term historical development of folk culture, summarizes cultural stereotypes,

imrconf.com

standards, and archetypes and transmits them from ancestors to generations. Phraseologisms are a mirror of the national language as an expression of the nation's unique spirituality and uniqueness."

Lexical and semantic features of phraseology have been studied by Uzbek linguists such as Sh.Rahmatullaev (1966), G.Salomov, B.Yuldashev, A.Mamatov. In this regard, it is worth noting the research of G. Salomov (1961) on the translation of phraseology. The scholar emphasizes the importance of preserving the national color in translation, emphasizing the expediency of giving phraseologies as much as possible with an alternative, variant, or synonym available in the language.

Phraseological units and proverbs are all products of folklore, they express the way of life of peoples, nations, and peoples. For example, the Russian proverb "*The one who is afraid of wolves, never goes to the forest*" is equal to the Uzbek proverb *"The one who is afraid of sparrows, never plants millet"* although they are mutually alternative and balanced in content, they have national characteristics. The combination of millet in the first proverb indicates that the Uzbek people have long lived in agriculture, while the words wolf and forest in the second proverb indicate that the living conditions of the Russian people require hunting, which indicates the abundance of forests in the country. It is also possible to understand that such features of language units are described from the conclusions of A.Mamatov (1999): "Comparative study of cultural realities, lexical and phraseological units with national-cultural components in the native language and foreign language and intercultural, allows to enter the linguistic landscape of the world, to understand the general linguacultural aspects and to master the national-cultural features of language units"

As mentioned above, language units that reflect national-cultural characteristics are the subject of study of linguaculturology, while

imrconf.com

"linguaculturema" is a language unit that reflects concepts that are important for a particular culture.

V.V. Vorobev (2008), who first introduced the term "linguaculturema" into scientific circulation, defines it as follows: A.E.Mamatov (2015) explains the essence of linguaculturema as follows: "Linguoculturema reflects the linguistic and extralinguistic dialectical unity, which includes the concept and subject content. Dialectical communication in the process of understanding the object requires, on the one hand, the linguistic and non-linguistic components of linguaculture, their inequalities, differences, and on the other hand, their compatibility, and exact similarity. As an integral part of linguaculture, language informs not only about its "superficial" meaning but also about the fact that its "complete" meaning (meaning) is the basis (element, segment) of culture. This means that the absence of national-cultural concepts in one word or another may have pure linguistic features, while in linguaculture there are many non-linguistic factors related to the culture, mentality, and customs of the people, as well as linguistic aspects.

Linguaculture is also a set of forms of language symbols, the content and cultural meaning of which are reflected in this symbol. It has a much deeper meaning than the word and has a more complex structure than the original language units. "Linguaculturema", in addition to linguistic perceptions (forms of the meaning), incorporates extralinguistic states in constant motion, and cultural appearances (realities, lacunae).

Regarding the meaning of linguocultures, O. Yusupov (2011) says: "The semantics of linguaculturema includes words, phraseological units, phrases, sentences, speech clichés, complex syntactic units, texts, etc., reflecting a part of the culture." Thus, linguaculturema is a unit specific to a particular people, covering linguistic and non-linguistic factors, expressing the interdependence of language and culture, which can be manifested in all means of language. It

imrconf.com

can consist of a single word (wedding, soup), compound words (Uzbek dance, hospitality, tea party, etc.), or a whole paragraph or text.

Consequently, linguaculturema has its own complex structure, and each linguaculturema has primary (semantic) and secondary (non-linguistic) meanings. According to Vorobev's (2008) method of analysis, first, the semantic aspect of linguaculturema as a lexeme is determined (lexicographical analysis using dictionaries). In the next stage, based on the semantic analysis, the linguistic units (paremiological and phraseological units, realities, stylistic means, etc.) related to the non-linguistic aspect, which combine material-spiritual and national-cultural features, are studied. Explanatory, ethnographic, and encyclopedic dictionaries can be used in this process.

According to the teachings of linguist V.V. Vorobev (2008), linguacultures have the following qualities: the presence of connotative meanings (they can be several); linguaculturema may or may not be activated in the minds of learners; the activity of linguacultures depends on the activity of discourse.

Due to the fact that there are almost no monographs on the translation of linguacultures, we refer to IM Avdey's “Features of the translation of culturally marked vocabulary”, K.K. Karimova’s(2010)“On the issue of algorithmization of the process of translation by linguaculture”, E.B. Eliseev’s (2003) “Linguaculturema as a unit for decoding cultural meanings in the translation of a literary text”, and Vlasova P.S (2016)., Komarova A. V. “Linguaculturemes in the works of A. Voznesensky and their translations into French.

In the article of I.M. Avdei, linguacultures in the Italian translation of V. Erofeeva's work "Moscow - Petushki" are studied in two types: 1) national-cultural semantic linguacultures - proverbs, sayings, phraseological units, irreplaceable vocabulary, personal names, and toponyms. 2) socio-cultural linguacultures - clichés, slogans, and lexemes of the former Soviet-era

imrconf.com

(Sovietism). These linguacultures have been mainly translated by transliteration, transcription, contextual analog, and functional analog methods.

K.K. Karimova's(2010()) article analyzes the translations from Kazakh into Russian and English words denoting kinship names as linguaculturema. He also points out that, as a result of deep ignorance of the culture of the native speakers, the national-cultural parts of the text were either completely omitted or short or superficially translated on the basis of the following passage from M. Avezov's novel "The Way of Abay":

-Уай, ќатын, ќазан көтер мына ќонаќќа! – деп бұйрыќ етті.

Эй, хатын, ставь котел гостям! - приказал он.

“Khatin, prepare something for the guests!

In the translation of the lexeme *Khatin* in this passage, it is unreasonable to say that the transliteration method is used in both languages, even though the Russian and English lexemes denote the word, *jena*, *baba*, and *wife*. Also, in the second part of the sentence, the linguaculture of Kazan *көтер* (meaning “cooking for a guest”, “hanging a pot”) is artificially translated into Russian put the pot to the guests. After all, in Kazakhs, as in Uzbeks, the saying "Guest is a special God" is an example of the national color. The author of the article admits that the figurative translation of this sentence into English is much closer to the original than the Russian translation. In our opinion, the word ќonaќќa, which is expressed as a singular in the sentence *ќазан көтер мына ќонаќќа*, has been misinterpreted by translators into the plural.

E.B.Eliseeva's article provides a comparative analysis of the Russian-to-English translations of linguacultures such as *еда* (food), *образование* (education) and *традиции* (traditions) in Boris Akunin's novels. According to the author, the linguacultures reflected in the linguistic units denoting the concept of *еда* (food), in addition to expressing the daily diet of people, also represent important cultural values inherent in the Russian nation. Here is an excerpt from his analysis:

imrconf.com

Выпили вместе казенной, закусили солеными рыжиками, поговорили о том, о сем. They took a drop of vodka together, with pickled mushrooms, and had a chat about this and that.

In this case, E.B. Eliseeva (2003) makes a comparative analysis of lexemes *рыжики* and mushrooms, saying that in addition to the manifestation of linguaculturologic description in their semantic structure, there is also an additional meaning that reflects the Russian culture. For example, *рыжики* is a type of mushroom that is a fun pastime for Russians. Since the translator had no idea about this dish, he used the lexeme of mushrooms, which did not reflect the same national-cultural feature and was the common name of mushrooms. In general, it can be concluded from the content of this article that in the process of translation, the phenomena of meaning transfer are focused only on the denotative meaning, and the connotative component of its cultural features may not be covered.

It seems that the linguaculturological approach plays an important role in the theory and practice of translation, and the complexities of translating linguacultures and ways to solve them have not been sufficiently studied in the monographic plan on the basis of modern approaches.

Based on our observations, we propose the following step-by-step approach to the adequate representation of linguacultures in translation:

1. Comparative conceptual analysis of linguaculture before translation.

2. The correct choice and appropriate use of lexical-phraseological means of translation (equivalent, alternative and descriptive methods) in the translation of linguaculturalism.

3. Analysis of synonyms and antonyms in the translation of linguaculturems and their correct use.

4. Analysis and appropriate reflection of phraseological units and stylistic means in maintaining the emotional sensitivity and imagery of linguacultures in translation.

imrconf.com

5. Proper translation of linguacultures with a correct understanding of the linguistic landscape of the original language, taking into account the explicit and implicit data, as well as the modal attitude of the author.

Another linguaculturema is that when we take this happiness, the word happiness sounds different in every language and nations have always expressed their attitude toward this concept. Linguaculture of happiness is a universal concept, which reflects a number of national and cultural features in each language.

REFERENCE

1. Sepir E.(1993) Selected works on linguistics and culturology. - M .: Progress,- p. 223.
2. Safarov Sh.S.(2006) Cognitive linguistics. - Jizzax: Sangzor, - Б. 63.
3. Musaev Q.(2005) Fundamentals of translation theory. - Tashkent: Fan,- Б. 89.
4. Salomov G'.(1966) Language and translation. - Tashkent: Fan,- Б. 119.
5. Vlaxov S., Florin S.(1986) Непереводимое в переводе. - M .: Vysshaya shkola,- C. 47
6. James K.(2002) Cultural implications for translation. Translation Journal. http://www3.uji.es/~aferna/H44/Cultural-implications.htm .;
7. Serdihun B., Sivasish B.(2012) Language, Culture, and Translation of the Karbi: A Brief Study. / International Journal of Social Science and Humanity vol. 2, no.6 - India: - P. 562-564 .;
8. Ziaul H. Md. (2012)Translating Literary Prose: Problems and Solutions. / Inertational Journal of English Linguistics. Vol. 2, no 6. - Bulgaria: Canadian Center of Science and Education,- P. 109 .;
9. Adnan S.(2017) Translation of Cultural Terms: A Case study of a Novel Titled ‘For One More Day’ / Journal of Lanuage and translation. Vol. 7. - Australia: UTAS, - P. 53-62.

imrconf.com

10. Fayzullaeva R.(1972) К проблеме передачи национального колорита в художественном переводе- Tashkent, - С. 93.

11. Otajonov N.(1994) "Boburnoma" in the world literary process: comparative typological analysis: PhD. ... diss. - Tashkent, - Б. 55-56.

12. Sobirov M.(2002) Problems of restoring the author's style and art in the English translations of "Boburnoma". (Based on a comparative analysis of Leiden-Erskin, Beverij, and Texton translations): Philol. fan. nomz. ... diss. avtoref. - Tashkent, - P.13.

13. Javbo'riev M.(1991) National character and color of the historical period in literary translation: PhD ... diss. - Tashkent, - Б. 129.

14. Kunin A.V. (1984)Anglo-Russian phraseological dictionary.- M .: Russian language,- 944 p

15. Vinogradov V.V. (1946) Основные понятия Русской // Труды юбилейной научной сессии Ленинград гос. Section of philological sciences. - L .:- p. 62-63 .

16. Shanskiy N.M.(1985) Фразеология современного русского языка. - M .: high school,- 160 p .;

17. Teliya V.N.(1996) Русская фразеология: семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты – M.: Языки русской культуры,- 288 p .;

18. Maslova V.A.(2001) Linguoculturology. - M .: Akademiya,- p. 82.

19. Rahmatullaev Sh.(1966) Some issues of Uzbek phraseology. - Tashkent: Fan,- 262 p.

20. Salomov G'. (1961) Concerning the translation of proverbs, sayings, and idioms from Russian into Uzbek. - Tashkent: Fan,- 161 p.

21. Yuldashev B.(1993) Functional and methodological features of phraseological units in modern Uzbek literary language: Philol. fan. d-ri. ... diss. - Tashkent:- 297 p.

imrconf.com

22. Mamatov A.E.(1999) Problems of formation of Uzbek phraseology: Philol. fan. d-ri. ... diss. avtoref.-Tashkent,- 56 p.

23. Salomov G.(1983)Fundamentals of translation theory. - Tashkent: Teacher,- 232 p.

24. Mamatov A.E.(2011) . Слова с национально-культурным компонентом значения как источник формирования языковой личности студентов // Xorijiy filologiya. - № 2 (39) - Samarkand, - Б. 6.

25. Vorobev V.V.(2008) Linguoculturology: monograph - M .: RUDN,- p. 45.

26. Mamatov A.E.(2015) Linguocultural studies: lingvokulturema and logoepistema // Foreign philology. № 1 (54) - Samarkand, - Б. 13.

27. Yusupov O'.Q.(2011) New directions in linguistics and some terms used in them // Philological issues. - T.oshkent, - №2. - B.15.

28. Avdey I.M.(2009) «Problems of translation of lingvokulturem in the context of intercultural communication» // Yazyk i kultura. - Minsk, - p. 254-256.

29. Karimova K.K.(2010) К вопросу об алгоритмизации процесса перевода лингвокультурем //: Вестник ПГУ. – Павлодар, №1 - С. 65-72.

30. Eliseeva E.B.(2003) Лингвокультурема как единица декодирования культурных смыслов при преводе художественного текста. – Тамбов: Грамота, - № 3 (21): v 2-x ch. Ch. II. - С. 67-70.

31. Vlasova P. S., Komarova A. V.(2016) Лингвокультуремы в произведениях А. Вознесенского и их переводах на французский язык // Молодой ученый. - № 13.2. - S. 19-21.

32. Karimova K.K. .(2010) The work is shown. - S. 69.

33. See Skeat W.W.(2007)Concise Dictionary of English Etymology. - N.Y .: Wordsworth Editions,- 648 p.

34. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English.(2009) - Harlow: Pearson Edu.,- P. 797.

imrconf.com

35. Rahmatullaev Sh. (2009)Etymological dictionary of the Uzbek language (Persian, Tajik units and their derivatives).-Tashkent: University, - P.24.

36. Annotated dictionary of the Uzbek language. 2 volumes.(1981) - M .: Russkiy yazyk,T. 1. - 632 b., T. 2. - B.85.

37. See Skeat W.W.(2007)Concise Dictionary of English Etymology. - N.Y .: Wordsworth Editions, - 648 p.

38. See: Rahmatullaev Sh. (2003) Etymological dictionary of the Uzbek language (Arabic words and their derivatives). - Tashkent: Universitet, - 599 p.

39. See: Uzbek folk proverbs. (2003) - Tashkent: Sharq, - 512 p.

40. See:The Concise Dictionary of Proverbs. (2003) - Oxford: Oxford University Press, - 354 p.

imrconf.com