



INTEGRATION OF LANGUAGE AND CULTURE INTO THE TRANSLATION PROCESS

Irgasheva Feruza Bakhtiyorovna
*a lecturer of the department of
Translation Studies and Language Education
at Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan*

Received 22nd August 2020, Accepted 10th September 2020, Online 4th October 2020

Abstract— The presented article discusses the issue of integrating language, thinking and culture into the translation process within the framework of the anthropocentric paradigm. An overview analysis of the theoretical views of linguists-translators regarding the problem under study has been given as well.

Keywords: language, culture, thinking, translation, communication, asymmetry, coding, interpretation.

1. Introduction

In the science of translation, the issues of equivalence, adequacy, interlingual harmony, conditioned by the laws of symmetry and asymmetry in the plans of consistency, structure and functionality have always attracted great interest of linguists and translators. According to N.F. Kasimova, "... the linguistic sign, the asymmetry of the linguistic sign, the asymmetric dualism of the linguistic sign, the significance and value (and not the meaning) of the linguistic sign, the signified, the signifying are constantly one of the central objects of research not only for philosophers but also for linguists, translators, and psychologists "[3, 2]. From this point of view, when transforming linguistic signs within at least two languages, it is important to consider issues related to equivalence, that is, to deal with the relationship between the text in the target language and the text in the source language, which are characteristic of the translation, which does not address the fundamental question of theoretical requirements, possibilities, and limits of these relations.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the centuries-old dispute with translation, which has been discussed more intensely and controversially, there is hardly a question of theoretical and practical possibilities or impossibility to translate. The following theories show an

excellent position on the presented thesis. For example, W. von Humboldt believes that "... translation of everything is an attempt to solve an impossible task. Because every translator must always fail on one of the two cliffs, either due to understanding the language of his people too close to its original or due to the original having too much on features, towards his nation. The average value is not so difficult here, but absolutely impossible" [4]. According to M. Vandrushka, "... poetry is untranslatable; its sonority, rhythm, melody make it untranslatable, but that's not all. Poetry is untranslatable because it challenges us not only through language, to look not only at the language but at the language itself. Poetry is another great opportunity for language, an opportunity to turn an instrument into a work of art" [6]. O. Kade, in turn, asserts that "in relation to the semantic meaning and, therefore, the rational components of the information content of linguistic texts, in principle, there are no restrictions on translatability. All texts in the source language can be replaced by texts in the target language while maintaining rational information content during the translation process, while the success of communication will not be disturbed or even questioned. It also empirically confirms that the confirmation of translatability is justified by the proof that all the cognitive content of consciousness encoded in all languages and the result of the encoding (including recoding from another language) in principle -

although it overcomes dialectical contradictions - are decoded by potential addressees" [5].

Some theorists have argued, from the thesis of absolute translatability to the confirmation of translatability in the sub-domain of denotative meaning or "rational components", the content of information to deny translatability for the genre of the entire text and to characterize translation as a fundamentally impossible task. In the following sections - after fundamental reflections on the relationship between language, thought and reality - the theses of untranslatability (in connection with the linguistic principle of relativity, meaningful understanding of language and the theory of the word field), the relative translatability, and the principle of translatability are examined and critically discussed.

3. THE MAIN PART

With the question of the relationship between language, thought and reality, philosophers, psychologists, anthropologists, culturologists, ethnologists, linguists, and literary scholars have always been preoccupied with human behavior, and the answers fall out depending on the initial point of view. This, in particular, refers to the question of the role of language (individual language) in the cognitive process and in the interpretation of reality. For example, in German socio-pragmatics, in the presence of both forms of address in the language - you and you - children to parents, wife to husband, turn to you, which is observed in the following example:

"Beginnen werden wir mit dir", gähnte mein Frauchen am Morgen nach der Brautnacht, als wir noch in den Federn lagen. "Heute wirst du das Haus besorgen" [1, 114]. Sh.Imyaminova suggests the following Uzbek translation:

"Яхшиси эртага сиздан бошлай қолайлик!" деди хотиним. Ҳеч нарса дея олмадим. Чунки ким бошласа ҳам барибир эмасми? [1, 115].

As you can see from the above examples, the German pronoun *dir* when translated is adapted to the Uzbek linguistic culture using the form *siz*-. Since in Uzbek sociocultural thinking it is unacceptable to address the husband to you, the translator approaches this problem absolutely correctly, which, in turn, ensures the adequacy and harmony of the translation. The linguocultural worldview of the Uzbek reader is also taken into account here since the original text is recreated for the speakers of another language, thinking, and culture. This translation example is a vivid illustration of the manifestation of cross-language translation asymmetry while maintaining the original functionality.

In the process of interacting with the "world", people acquire ways to see this "world": templates or models for interpreting reality. You learn to look and judge things like marriage, death, and work in a certain way. Language plays an important role in the development and consolidation of these ways of seeing: with the help of language, a person communicates about reality or its interpretations. To the extent that interpretations of reality are culturally determined, i.e. historically and socially conditioned, the ways of speaking about these interpretations of reality are also historically and socially conditioned. Interpretations of reality are reflected in language and at the same time transmitted through language.

If the language and the communicative context are in mutual conditional relationships, as shown above, then absolute translatability is ensured, despite the linguistic difference, if the communicative relationship between the source and target languages is identical. Thus, it can be assumed that in a multilingual city in which residents grow up bilingual, there is ideally a communication link that leads to both. Languages convey the same interpretations of reality.

Another extreme case is when the communication relationship between the source and target languages has nothing in common (older ethnological or artistic descriptions of "wild indigenous tribes" sometimes give the impression that such disparate cultures exist or have existed). In this case, we can talk about the absolute untranslatability of the source and target languages.

Partial translatability is ensured when the communication relationship between the source language and the target language overlaps: language uses that relate to the area of overlap are translated with this approach, the relationship between language, communicative background and translation translatability depends on the distance between the communication relationship between the source and target language, with which the distance between languages or their use correlates. The translator needs to make a choice in favor of an equivalent element [2, 3].

4. CONCLUSION

Summarizing the above mentioned information, we can conclude that the dynamic nature of the relationship between language - thinking - culture - the concept of reality is of particular importance in translation. The heterogeneity, diversity, asymmetry of the language in terms of form and content ensure its communicativeness. The slightest violation of the semantic, pragmatic boundaries of a linguistic sign of one language can lead to inadequacy and inconsistency in the translation as a whole. Therefore, the translator needs to

make a choice in favor of an equivalent element corresponding to an element of the source discourse.

REFERENCES:

1. Имяминова Ш.С. Олмон насридан намуналар. – Тошкент: Мумтоз сўз, 2012. – Б. 154-155.
2. Касимова, Н. Ф. (2011). Асимметрия при переводе интеррогативов с вопросительным словом what (на материале английского, русского и узбекского языков). Вестник Челябинского государственного университета, (11), 70-73. [article/n/asimetriya-pri-perevode-interrogativov-s-voprositelnym-slovom-what-na-materiale-angliyskogo-russkogo-i-uzbekskogo-yazykov](#)
3. Косимова Н.Ф. (2015). ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИЕ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИИ В ПЕРЕВОДЕ КАК ПРОЯВЛЕНИЕ МЕЖЪЯЗЫКОВОЙ АСИММЕТРИИ. World science, 3 (4 (4)), 54-57
4. Humboldt, W. Einleitung zu „Agamemnon“. In: Störig, H.J. (Hrsg.) – München, 1973.
5. Kade, O. Zum Verhältnis von Translation und Transformation. In: Studien zur Übersetzungswissenschaft, – Leipzig, 1971.
6. Wandruszka, M.: Sprachen – vergleichbar und unvergleichlich. – München, 1969.