

## LANGUAGE WORLD PICTURE AND ITS REFLECTION ON TRANSLATION

A. M. Muminov

*Candidate of Philological Sciences, professor  
Uzbekistan State World Languages University  
Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

**Abstract.** The present article is devoted to the study of the reflection of language picture on translation. This work points out that a translator must overcome the cultural conflicts in finding equivalents of words or phrases. The most important problem which is studied in this article is how to find lexical equivalents for objects and events which are not known in the receptor language because background knowledge of the new culture often helps learners to understand better what is heard or read in the foreign language. In this investigation different ways of translation of Uzbek cultural words into English have been studied. It is pointed out that learning the semantic structure of words can reveal specific features of language world picture of the non-related languages in translation and the peculiarities of language world picture of these languages.

**Keywords:** semantic structure; reflection; language world picture; equivalence; worldview; cultural; similarity; receptor language; communication; influence.

One of the main tasks of the educational program is teaching foreign languages with the help of introducing foreign culture. Language world picture is the reflection of different cultures and mentality. It is the reflection of historical development of the people in the language. Language is the mirror which stands between people and the world picture. Therefore the educational system has the task to train the students to cultural, professional and individual communication with the representatives of other social structure, social traditions and language culture, because in translation from one language into another two cultures collided and influence the precise translation.

The problem of language world picture attracts interests of many linguists. Many linguists wrote about language world picture (Humboldt W [1], Sapir [7], Whorf, V. Maslova [4], V. N. Teliya, Ter-Minasova [8], Larin, Y.V. Apresyan, G. V. Kolshanskiy [2], O. A. Kornilov [3], Mildred L. Larson [10], G. A. Brutyan, S.A. Vasiliev, M. Black, D. Hime, Sh. Safarov, D. U. Ashurova, A. A. Abduazizov, I. Gafurov, Musayev K. and others). However reflection of world picture on translation of texts of non-related languages, particularly from English into Uzbek has not been adequately investigated yet.

Linguists underline that every language has unique picture of the world and a transla-

tor must arrange his or her translation in equivalence with its picture. Here we observe the specific perception of the world fixed in the language. Language gives knowledge about the world because the objective reality is fixed in the language, we see the conceptualization of the world in it, characteristics of the given culture.

W. Humboldt wrote that “different languages serve for nation as organs of their original thinking and perception” [1] National originality of language world picture is examined by the historical development of languages, culture, customs and traditions, the way of life. Moreover, according to W. von Humboldt, each language has some definite worldview. The people create their unique world which surrounds them in their own.

He says that the people understand world picture with the help of their language, they have knowledge about the world with the help of their language. Humboldt’s idea about language world picture can be used in translation too because word for word translation distorts the main content of the message. It is necessary to take into the consideration the way of usage of words and phrases by the people speaking the language. Really, people in their own way see the variety of the world, in their own way name the picture of the world.

The Sapir–Whorf hypothesis stated that “the way we think and view the world is determined by our language. Instances of cultural language differences are evidenced in that some languages have specific words for concepts whereas other languages use several words to represent a specific concept. For example, the Arabic language includes many specific words for designating a certain type of *horse* or *camel*. To make such distinctions in English, where specific words do not exist, adjectives would be used preceding the concept label, such as *quarter horse* or *dray horse*” [7].

Sapir-Whorf argued that language and mode of thinking are closely interconnected. If the world is the interaction between man and environment, world picture is a result of the processed information about the person and environment» [7]. The representatives of cognate linguistics also say that our conceptual system, reflected in the form of language picture of the world, depends on physical and cultural experience and connected with it. Language world picture doesn't comparable with other special world pictures (chemical, physical and etc.), it precedes them all and forms them, because a person can understand surrounded world. The translator can do his translation precisely only when he or she becomes aware of the world picture of the foreign language. Background knowledge of a translator about the culture of the people speaking the language often helps to do adequate translation. Therefore it is necessary for the future interpreters and translators to know the history, customs, traditions, culture, and way of life of the people who speak the language.

The world picture is found in the meanings of different words and word combinations. Learning the semantic structure of words we can find the specific features of language world picture of the non-related languages in translation and the peculiarities of language world picture of these languages are clearly seen. For example: in the connotative meaning of the words “*sun*” and “*moon*” express positive characteristics of people in different languages. The people who live in the North understand the meaning of the word as the source of life, joy. The people

express their joy, pleasure using the word “*sun*” (“*Моё солнышко – my sun*”) In the Southern countries the same connotation may be expressed by the word “*moon*”

There are a number of reasons why metaphors and similes are hard to understand and cannot be translated word for word. First of all the image used in the metaphor or simile may be unknown in the receptor language. For example, a simile based on *snow* would be meaningless to people who live in some parts of the country where snow is unknown but in English it is possible to use the word “*snow*” as a simile: *I washed my clothes white as snow*. In a language of the Southern countries it is accepted to say in this case: *I washed my clothes white as seashells or as bone*. In Uzbek: *Онноқ нахмадек қилиб кир ювдим – I washed my clothes white as cotton*. The sentence *he is a pig* does not include the point of similarity. In some cultures a reference to pigs would give the idea of dirty, but in other cultures it means *one who is a glutton* and in other culture it means *someone who doesn't listen to people*. In Uzbek it is used in the meaning of *fat* (*У семуз – means he is fat*). In English and Uzbek *green eyes* have negative connotation but in Russian it is used in positive connotation (голубые глаза – как море).

When the point of similarity is not stated it is often difficult to translate. For example: the sentence *He is an ox* has various meanings in different languages. In one language it is used in the meaning of the characteristics of an ox as *strong*. This makes it very difficult to translate it. In another culture it means unintelligent person. Like this *John is a rock* may mean differently in different cultures: *he is still, he can't talk, he is always there, he is very strong* or *He is sheep* has various meanings from one cultures to another: *long haired man, a drunkard, a person who doesn't answer back, one who just follows without thinking, a young fellow waiting for girls to follow him, one who is very calm*.

If the similarity is not made clear the translator must give careful consideration whenever a metaphor is found in the source text. In intercultural communication it is necessary to take into the consideration the peculiarities of national characteristic features of

the communicants, the specific emotional, national properties of their thoughts.

Though emotion is a universal semantic component, in every language it has cultural properties too. For example: there are more diminutive and caress, endear suffixes in Russian than in Uzbek and English. Foreexample: «Зёрнышко мое, дочушка! Приглушенно звенела мать. – Цветочек мой, не уходи, Танюшка! Глянь, моя красотишка, открой глазки. Опомнись же! Галушка мая черноглазая...за что же, господи?» (М. А. Шолохов «Тихий Дон», стр. 76).

In English: “My little one, my little daughter, she groaned, – my flower, don’t go away, Tanya. Look, my pretty one, open your little eyes, and come back, my dark-eyed darling! Why, oh lord?” (M. A. Sholokhov “The peaceful Don”, p.76).

In Uzbek: “менинг жаажжигинам, менинг қизгинам, деб у йиглади. Менинг гулим, кетма, Таня. Менга қара, гўзалим, жаажжи кўзингни оч, қайт менинг қора кузли қадрдоним! Нима учун, Э Худо!”

It is necessary to stress the fact that different languages have different concentrations of vocabulary depending on the culture, geographical location, and the worldview of the people. In the countries where agriculture is highly developed we find a great concentration of vocabulary that has to do with agriculture. Britain is an island surrounded by water therefore in English there are a lot of water, fish, and marine-related idioms. Such as *weak as water (fragile)*, *drink like a fish (booze)*, *to miss the boat (missed opportunities)*, *all at sea (a loss) etc.*

Another most difficult problem facing translators is how to find lexical equivalents for objects and events which are not known in the receptor language. They are called cultural words and phrases. If a word or a phrase is unknown in the receptor language the translator must find the ways of substitution without distorting the meaning of it.

Our investigation showed that Uzbek cultural words may be translated into English by the following ways:

1) by means of modification: У олча емоқда- he is eating a fruit called *olcha*; he is doingvoluntary and joint public work

called *khashar*; У сумалак емоқда- he is eating the main dish of the feast called *sumalyak*

2) by means of description of form or function: the *queen* of the UK came to India- *the woman who ruled the UK* came to India; *Келинсаломга кўпчилик келишди*- many quests came to the bride ‘s greeting called *kilinsalom*;

3) by means of descriptive translation: *Рамазон хаитда Ўзбекистонликлар ишга бормайдилар , дам оладилар*.-the people of Uzbekistan do not go to work and have a rest in *Ramadan-Khait which is a holiday of moral purification and spiritual revival*; *никоҳда келин ва куёв катнашди*- the bride and the bride-groom participated in *nikah which is a religious wedding ceremony*; *малакали ошпазюқори бахоланади, чунки 100 ва 200 одамга бита қозонда палов тайёрлаш осон эмас* – an experienced *oshpas* ( a man who prepares national meal) is appreciated because to prepare *pilav* ( a national dish) for 100-200 people in one *kasan* ( a national crockery which is used for preparing national meals) is not a simple work.

4) by means of comparison: Ўзбекистонда *мусичалар яшайди*- *Musichas, birds like doves*, live in Uzbekistan; *Мен гуммани пишираоламан*- *I can prepare gumma like patty in England.*

Thus, a translator must be not only a biolinguist but also a bio-cultural. Intercultural communication and translation are indivisible. Translation is the variety of intercultural and inter-language communication. It is necessary for an adequate translation to understand the difference between language and world language picture and be able to apply them in the process of translation.

### Bibliography

1. Гумбольдт В. Языки философия культуры. – М., 1985.
2. Колшанский Г. В. Объективная картина мира в познании и языке. – М. : Наука, 1990. – 103 с.
3. Корнилов О. А. Языковые картины мира как производные национальных менталитетов. – М., 2002.
4. Маслова В.А. Когнитивная лингвистика : учебное пособие. – Минск, 2004.
5. Попова З. Д., Стернин И. А. Очерки по когнитивной лингвистике. – Воронеж : Истоки, 2001.

6. Сукаленко Н. И. Отражение обыденного сознания в образной языковой картине мира. – Киев : Наукова думка, 1992. – 164 с.
7. Сепир Э. Коммуникация // Избранные труды по языкознанию и культурологии. – М., 1993.
8. Тер-Минасова С. Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. – М. : Издательство Московского Университета, 2008.
9. Anderson Crystal M. The Interpreter Trainer: Guidelines for Professional Development. L.McMire. – Maryland, 1984.
10. Mildred L. Larson. A Guide to Cross-language Equivalence. University Press America, 1984.
11. Paneth. Eva. The Interpreter's Task and Training. Universities Quarterly, 13, 1958.

© Muminov A. M., 2016