

THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN SIMULTANEOUS INTERPRETING

S.R. Babayeva

National university of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek Foreign philology faculty Translation theory and comparative linguistics department Simultaneous interpretation course Scientific advisor: Candidate of philological sciences Docent

Ermukhammadova Marjona Bobomurod kizi

1-course MD student

Annotation: *This article is devoted to the role of culture in interpreting process, especially in conference interpreting. The objective of this paper is to theoretically explore the significance of culture in terms of conference interpreting. It proposes a theoretical framework with which to analyze conference interpreting as a socially situated activity and interpreters as agents endowed with a specific quantity of resources and competences. This specific quantity of resources and competences are uniquely acquired in particular contexts of training and enacted with agency in the context of interpreting performances. The relevance of this study is determined by its focus on an important and insufficiently studied area of interaction between language and culture. According to observations, this study manifests itself in two aspects: the culture reflected in the language (a special national linguistic picture of the world), and the culture described by the language (representation of the facts of culture in the content of the text). Moreover, each of the aspects has its own specifics. In this article, there were used descriptive and experimental research methods. The practical implication of the results of this article is utilization them in international conferences, meetings and important events.*

Key words: *Culture, language, simultaneous interpreting, translation, interpreter, source language, target language, cultural values, process of translation*

The concept of culture at the turn of the century has acquired a new sound. If earlier the concept of so-called cultural values, works of art, literature, etc. prevailed, then in the modern world the importance of the concept of culture is increasing, in which a significant place is given to description and interpretation of national traditions of people, their way of life, specifics of behavior, thinking and perception of the surrounding world. In this regard, the priorities of linguistics have also changed: at the present stage of its development, more and more attention is paid to issues related to the national and cultural specifics of languages, with the national identity of the image of the world that has developed in the linguistic and cultural community. Translation scholars, recognizing the special importance that

culture has for translation, emphasize the role of translation as the most important means of intercultural communication.

Along with the unanimous recognition of the importance of the cultural aspect of translation, this multifactorial phenomenon has not been sufficiently detailed and described yet.

There are two fundamentally different strategies for conveying the cultural content of the source text. The first is that the culture of Foreign Language carriers adapts to the perception of Target Language carriers: cultural differences are softened, sharply specific is replaced by more general (generalization) or similar (adequate replacement). Another strategy is the opposite: the reader is transferred to the world of culture of native speakers of a foreign language: cultural differences are sometimes even emphasized (using a large number of transliterations). With both strategies, explicit and implicit explanations (notes) of the translator are used. The first strategy can be called strong adaptation, and the second - weak.

The choice of strong or weak cultural adaptation is determined by the place that cultural originality occupies in the system of literal values of the work. If the national flavor is one of its main advantages for the reader of the translation (for example, the fairy tale "A Thousand and One Nights"), then the strategy of weak adaptation is chosen. If the main thing is universal human problems, then preference, as a rule, is given to strong adaptation.

It is known that the process of translation is associated with certain losses of content. There are also cultural losses. There are especially many of them when translating folklore (for example, there are no adequate equivalents for such Russian cultural and national concepts as a canopy, a couch on a stove, etc.). The most striking and literally valuable details of culture are leveled (hut ~ house). In these cases, the question arises of the profitability of translation, the question of using a different type of linguistic mediation (retelling).

The thesis of L.K. Latishev confirmed that translation is not always the best way to overcome the linguistic-ethnic barrier. Thus, the solution of translation problems associated with linguacultural translation is conditioned by the art of choosing an adequate measure for preserving elements of a foreign language culture in translation and an acceptable measure for replacing them with functionally similar elements of one's own culture. If this measure is not observed, there are serious culturological errors in the translations that prevent the readers from adequate perception of the text of the translation.

Language is not just a property of culture, it is a precondition of culture, which allows us to consider it not as a passive reflection or mirror of culture, but as a partly autonomous entity. The fact that one and the same language can serve completely different ethnic groups testifies in favor of the independence of the language. In this regard, I recall the witty statement of Oscar Wilde, describing the situation with the English language in Great Britain and the USA. "England and the

USA are two great countries separated by one language." From the point of view of a person, neither language nor culture has priority, since a person assimilates culture along with the assimilation of the language, along with the texts [Teliya]. In addition, language helps us to see, notice and understand what we would not see and understand without it, it opens the world around us.

The cultural and linguistic pictures of the world are closely interconnected, are in a state of continuous interaction and go back to the real picture of the world, or rather, simply to the real world surrounding a person. The national cultural picture of the world is primary in relation to the linguistic one. It is fuller, richer and deeper than the corresponding language. However, it is the language that realizes, verbalizes the national picture of the world, stores it and passes it on from generation to generation. Language captures far from everything that is in the national vision of the world, but it is able to describe everything [Ter-Minasova 2000: 48].

Professor L.K. Latyshev, based on his experience in Germany, talked about how "cultural misunderstanding" often spoils personal relationships. Thus, the German families in which Russian students lived were offended by them due to the fact that the latter, having gone home, did not send them letters of thanks. The Russian students, in turn, had no idea about this, as they believed that they had already thanked the hospitable hosts enough with souvenirs and an expression of verbal gratitude upon departure. The German guests who came to Russia were, oddly enough, unpleasantly surprised by the breadth and generosity of the reception. Russian hospitality was perceived by them as eccentricity against the backdrop of complaints about a difficult life. It was hard for the Germans to imagine that the Russians arranged luxurious treats, literally emptying their pockets.

Reading foreign literature is inevitably accompanied by an acquaintance with a foreign, foreign culture, and a conflict¹ with it.

For example, Japanese readers, who first read L. Tolstoy's novel Resurrection in translation, "were not struck by the fact that Katyusha Maslova is a prostitute: this occupation in their country does not contain the shameful characteristic that it has in our country. It was striking that Katyusha loved Nekhlyudov and refused to marry him; loved and therefore left with another" [Prokopovich 1978].

REFERENCES:

1. **Латышев Л. К.** «Технология перевода» (2000);
2. **Телия В. Н.** «Фразеология в контексте культуры» (1999);
3. **Тер-Минасова С. Г.** «Язык и межкультурная коммуникация» (2000);
4. **Чернов Г.В.** «Теория и практика синхронного перевода» (2016)
5. <https://nhmtranslation.com/en/interpreters-and-culture/>

6. https://www.academia.edu/32937574/The_Role_of_Culture_in_Translation

