

BILDLEXEME IN DER POETISCHEN ÜBERSETZUNG IN PRAGMATISCHER ASPEKT

Iplina Antonina Alexandrowna

unabhängiger Forscher, Oberlehrer, Kavalier des Ordens "Dustlik", Namangan State University, Namangan, Usbekistan antipmoon@mail.ru

Anmerkung: In diesem Artikel betrachten und analysieren wir die Signalbildlexeme in poetischer Übersetzung unter dem Gesichtspunkt des pragmatischen Aspekts durch vergleichende Untersuchungsmethoden am Beispiel des Gedichts „Bulok“ des herausragenden usbekischen Nationaldichters Abdulla Aripov in drei Sprachen: Usbekisch, die Ursprungssprache, Russisch, die Übersetzungen von N.Grebnev und A.Fainberg, und Englisch, die Übersetzung unseres Autors. Es wurde versucht, die Signalbildlexeme des Originalgedichts und der Übersetzungen als Bildvorlagen durch die pragmatische Hauptbedeutung des dichterischen Werkes auf der Grundlage des außersprachlichen Prinzips zu vergleichen.

Schlüsselwörter: pragmatischer Aspekt, Signalbilder, Lexem, außersprachliches Prinzip, Bildmodelle.

IMAGE LEXEMES IN POETIC TRANSLATION IN PRAGMATIC ASPECT

Iplina Antonina Aleksandrovna

independent researcher, senior teacher, cavalier of the Order "Dustlik", Namangan State University, Namangan, Uzbekistan

antipmoon@mail.ru

Annotation: In this article, we consider and analyze the signal image lexemes in poetic translation from the point of view of the pragmatic aspect by comparative method of investigation on the example of the poem "Bulok" by the outstanding national Uzbek poet Abdulla Aripov in three languages: Uzbek, the language of the origin, Russian, the translations by N.Grebnev and A.Fainberg, and English, our author's translation. An attempt was made to compare the signal image lexemes of the original poem and translations as the image models through the main pragmatic meaning of the poetic work based on the extralinguistic principle.

Key words: pragmatic aspect, signal images, lexeme, extralinguistic principle, image models.

Historically, poetry in Central Asia, in particular in Uzbekistan, has been and remains the dominant literary genre, since not only lyrical works were written in poetic form, but also religious and moral instructions and chronicles. Consequently, the figures of poetic speech and imagery in Uzbek poems are multifaceted, picturesque, eloquent and deeply philosophical in their content. On the strength of this fact, it is necessary to pay special attention to the pragmatic aspects of the poetry

translation. Therefore, today it is especially important in translation studies when it comes to such language pairs as Asian and European languages, since the national identity of the cultures of the East and West differ significantly in ideological and linguogenetic identification.

“Different peoples have a specific "vision" of the world, and therefore reflect the reality around them in different ways in the language. According to this fact, reality itself may not completely coincide for different peoples” - a Russian linguist, O.N.Morozova [1], writes in her scientific work about the pragmatic factors of translation. In addition, another Russian linguist-translator L.K.Latyshev [2] believes that the translation activity of poetry is predetermined by the social norm, which determines the choice of translation strategy. The social norm varies, changing in the process of historical development, and reflects the requirements of society for a translator. One more researcher in this field, T.V.Antonova [3] argues that poetry translation is a speech activity, where language plays a key role in the translation process, while extralinguistic factors are secondary and complement linguistic factors in the process of translation activity.

Speaking about the Uzbek poetry of the 70-80s of the twentieth century, about the works of Abdulla Aripov, it should be noted that his works are in tune with the present of those years, and dedicated to the glorification of the “human-creator” and “worker”. The Uzbek researcher in literature, U.E.Turaeva [4] properly emphasizes the peculiarity of A.Aripov’s skill: “They (A.Aripov's poems) showed the artistic merits of the modern Uzbek language. Giving a beautiful artistic form to every word, every expression used by the poet in the usual and occasional meanings, as the fruits of beautiful philosophical thinking, demonstrates how skillfully the poet uses the richness of his native language. The poet A.Aripov sings of goodness as the eternal basis of being in his poems. He argues that where love ends, there humanity ends”.

The poetic works of the national poet of Uzbekistan A.Aripov are far from simplicity in their artistic structure. They combine traditional and truly innovative beginnings in unique way, and are multi-layered in style. However, not all this “wealth of imagery” is adequately conveyed by translators. Consider the specific expression of the pragmatic aspects of A.Aripov's poem "Buloq" in Uzbek, the language of the origin, and poetic translations into Russian by N.Grebnev and A.Fainberg, and our author's translation into English (see table 1):

Table 1

<i>Original in Uzbek [5]</i>	<i>Our translation into English [6]:</i>
Кутлуғ бир саҳарда кўз очди булок, Йўл солди дарёлар сари адашиб. Унга раҳм этмоқчи одамлар шу чоқ Тоғу тошлар аро яқин йўл очиб. Одамлар, тегмангиз, майли тошсин у, Майлига, тоғни ҳам кўрсин йўлида. Кўйинг, ўз йўлини ўзи топсин у,	Breaking through the rocky stone, A spring went towards the river. People felt for it much sorrow And they paved a short way even. Do not touch it, let it flow Where stony hills are sited. Carving its way on a slope, Let it take delight in fighting.

Завқласин у ҳам кураш сўнгида.	
<i>Translation into Russian by N.Grebnev [7]:</i>	<i>Translation into Russian by A.Fainberg [8]:</i>
В горах родник родился в некий год И начал пробивать дорогу к рекам, Но человек не пожалел забот, Сочтя, что русло родниковых вод Сотворено должно быть человеком. Оставьте люди, пусть течёт он сам, Мешать ему подмогой не годиться. Пусть он, на радость и себе и нам, Найдёт дорогу к рекам и морям И сам борьбой нелёгкой насладится.	Ранней-ранней зарёю холодный и чистый Пробудился родник среди гор каменистых. Люди в горы пришли. Люди добрыми стали. Валуны раздвигали и камни дробили, Чтоб свободно струилась вода родника, Чтоб дорога его оказалась легка. Ах, оставьте его! Не лишайте исканий. Пусть он сам, пробиваясь, ворочает камни. Пусть он русло проложит к реке голубой. Дайте, люди, ему насладиться борьбой.

The main signal image lexemes of the original are *булок* (spring), *йўл* (road, way), *одамлар* (people), *тоғу тошлар* (mountain stones), *кураш* (struggle, fighting). Some of these image lexemes are repeated several times by the author of original poem text, apparently in order to focus the recipient's attention on the ideological meaning of the expressed thought, so the lexeme " *йўл*" (way) is used 3 times, " *тоғ*" (mountain) – 2 times, " *одамлар*" (people) – 2 times.

The next step, we examined whether these extralinguistic characteristics of the original lexemes were adequately interpreted by translators and whether they were able to convey the sociocultural aspects of the original poem in their translations. Thus, from the point of view of the pragmatic aspect, the following information is announced to the reader: in the image of "a spring", we must understand "a man", who must determine his own life path, passing through certain life difficulties (mountain stones), with which he must cope himself without the help of other people, who guide him along quite different path, in order to become a "river", that is, to achieve the goal and success in his life.

Comparing the aforesaid translations, we came to the conclusion that the translation into English and both translations into Russian to a certain extent correspond to the original poem text from the point of view of the pragmatic criterion, since they convey the qualitative and quantitative lexeme-models of the images of the original poem, which we expressed in the following comparative table of equivalence of lexemes (see table 2):

Table 2

Original poem	Our translation	N.Grebnev's translation	A.Fainberg's translation
кўз очди (1) ¹	break through (1) (замена образа)	родился (1)	пробудился (1)
булок (1)	a spring (1)	родник (1),	родник (1),

¹ In parentheses, we indicated the number of lexemes that were used in the text by the authors of the original text and translations.

		родниковые воды (1)	родниковая вода (1)
йўл (3)	way (2)	дорога (2), русло (1)	дорога (1), русло (1)
дарёлар (1)	river (1)	реки (2), моря (1)	река (1)
рахм этмокчи (1)	felt sorrow (1)	не пожалел забот (1)	стали добрыми (1)
одамлар (2)	people (1)	человек (2), люди (1)	люди (3)
тоғ (1), тоғу тошлар (1)	rocky stone (1), stony hills (1), slope (1)	горы (1)	горы (1), горы каменистые (1), валуны (1), камни (2)
майли (2)	let it (1)	пусть (2)	пусть (2), дайте (1)
тегмангиз, кўйинг (2)	do not touch (1)	оставьте, не мешайте (2)	оставьте, не лишайте (2)
ўз (2)	-	сам (2), себе (1)	сам (1)
топсин (1)	carve (1)	найдёт (1)	пробиваясь (1), проложит (1)
завқласин (1)	take delight (1)	насладиться (1), радость (1)	насладиться (1)
кураш (1)	fighting (1)	борьба (1)	борьба (1)

As we can see from the data obtained, translators allow some deviations from the exact reproduction of the original poem in order to preserve the central role of the main image lexeme-models in a pragmatic aspect. So, in the original text, we observe the following interrelated textual concepts and associations, such as:

1) in the original text: *булок – тоғу тошлар* (a spring – mountain stones), in N.Grebnev's translation: *родник – горы* (a spring – mountains), in A.Fainberg's translation: *родник – горы каменистые* (a spring – stony mountains), in our interpreted text: *a spring – stony hills*;

2) in the original text: *одамлар – раҳм* (people – compassion), in N.Grebnev's translation: *человек – забота* (a man – care), in A.Fainberg's translation: *люди – доброта* (people – kindness), in our interpreted text: *people – sorrow*;

3) in the original text: *ўз йўлини – кураш* (its own way – struggle), in N.Grebnev's translation: *дорога к рекам – своя борьба* (the road to the rivers – its own struggle), in A.Fainberg's translation: *русло – борьба* (riverbed – struggle), in our interpreted text: *way – fighting*.

Based on the data obtained, we can conclude that from the point of view of pragmatic correspondence, the translators adequately identified the signal figurative models of lexemes in their translations into Russian and English, through which the author of the original text wanted to convey the basic worldly wisdom to the readers. A.Aripov gives his exhortation to the recipients through poetic lines that each person must go through his own “stony path” in order to experience later the pleasure and delight from the “hard struggle”. This statement is clearly expressed in the third model of image lexemes: “its own way – struggle” (*ўз йўлини – кураш*).

Thus, the translator of Uzbek poetry needs to understand and to feel the figurative image world of the poet, the principles of his thinking, the system of his details, epithets and metaphors. In fact, the translating problems of Uzbek poetry is to preserve the best in the great tradition and at the same time to see and to convey new vocabulary by means of the target language by introducing a new series of words-

concepts and figurative lexemes into aruz and other traditional forms of versification from the point of view of the pragmatic aspect in poetry translation.

References:

1. Morozova O.N. Lingvisticheskiye i ekstralingvisticheskiye aspekty perevoda. // Voprosy teorii i praktiki. – 2015.– № 3 (45).– Part 3. – Pp. 129-131.
2. Latyshev L.K., Semenov A.L. Perevod: Teoriya, praktika i metodika prepodavaniya.– M.: Akademiya, 2005.– 192 p.
3. Antonova T.V. Vliyaniye ekstralingvisticheskikh faktorov na perevod leksiki s natsional'no-kul'turnym komponentom // Litera. – 2017. – № 4. – Pp. 46-52. URL: https://nbpublish.com/library_read_article.php?id=21735
4. Turayeva E.U. K voprosu izucheniya idiolekta tvortsa (na primere poezii A. Aripova). // Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.– 2012.– № 5 (259). Issue. 63.– Pp. 158-160.
5. Oripov A. Bulok. Tanlangan asarlar, part 1.– Tashkent, 2000.– Pp. 39.
6. Iplina A. A spring of water. URL: <https://stihi.ru/2022/03/23/3192>
7. Grebnev N. Rodnik. Veter moyego kraya. – Moskva, 1988.– Pp. 34.
8. Faynberg A. Rodnik. Udivleniye. Stikhotvoreniya. – Tashkent, 1985. – Pp. 71.