

The Linguistic Worldview And Its Transformation In The Process Of Translation: A Comparative Analysis Of The Russian And Uzbek Languages

Kodirova Fazilat Yusuf kizi

Doctoral Student, Department of Linguistics, Karshi State University, Russian teacher of University of economy and pedagogy, Uzbekistan

Received: 18 October 2025; **Accepted:** 09 November 2025; **Published:** 12 December 2025

Abstract: The article examines the specific features of how the linguistic worldview is reflected in the Russian and Uzbek languages, as well as the ways in which it undergoes transformation in the process of translation. A comparative analysis shows that differences in national and cultural values, worldview, and the grammatical-lexical systems of the languages have a direct impact on the choice of translation strategies. Particular attention is given to substantive phrases, which are among the units most sensitive to shifts in semantic emphasis when transitioning from one language to another.

Keywords: Linguistic worldview, translation, Russian–Uzbek bilingualism, national and cultural differences, substantive phrases, comparative analysis.

Introduction: Modern linguistics views language not only as a means of communication but also as a reflection of national consciousness, a system of values, and a people's cultural representations. Each language forms its own linguistic worldview, in which distinctive ways of perceiving reality are encoded. In this context, translation is not merely a process of substituting linguistic units but also a means of cultural interconnection and mutual influence [1,25].

In the case of the Russian and Uzbek languages, this interaction is particularly noteworthy, as the two languages belong to different typological systems – Slavic and Turkic – which creates significant linguocultural distinctions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship between language, thought, and culture occupies one of the central positions in modern linguistics. The concept of the linguistic worldview emerged within the anthropocentric paradigm and has become an important tool for exploring the national and cultural specificity of languages. As early as the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt and Edward Sapir, it was emphasized that language does not merely denote

objects and phenomena but reflects a specific mode of perceiving and conceptualizing the world characteristic of each people.

In Russian linguistic scholarship, significant contributions to the development of this idea were made by E. M. Vereshchagin, V. G. Kostomarov, N. D. Arutyunova, Yu. D. Apresyan, N. Yu. Shvedova, and V. V. Vinogradov [5, 47]. These researchers noted that language functions not only as a means of communication but also as a repository of collective experience, cultural values, and an ethnic group's worldview. According to Yu. D. Apresyan, the linguistic worldview represents a set of naïve conceptualizations encoded in the lexico-semantic system of a language.

In Uzbek linguistics, the issue of the interaction between language and culture is also actively explored. Researchers such as A. Madvaliev, Sh. Safarov, N. Makhmudov, and I. Rasulov note that the Uzbek language possesses a unique system of concepts that reflects the traditions, worldview, and social norms of the people. In their view, translation is not limited to the mechanical transfer of meaning but represents a complex process of intercultural mediation, during which elements of national identity are either

preserved or transformed.

DISCUSSION AND RESULTS

The concept of the linguistic worldview (LWV) is one of the key notions in modern linguistics, cultural studies, and translation theory. It reflects the idea that language not only serves as a means of transmitting information but also constitutes a specific form of conceptualizing and modeling reality unique to a particular community.

The origins of this concept trace back to the works of Wilhelm von Humboldt, who argued that “language is the spirit of a people” and that through language, individuals perceive, interpret, and structure the world. According to Humboldt, every linguistic system forms its own way of perceiving reality – its “inner form of language,” which shapes the worldview of its speakers. This idea was later developed by representatives of the Neo-Humboldtian school – such as Weisgerber, Edward Sapir, and Benjamin Whorf – and, in Russian scholarship, by Yu. Stepanov, E. Vereshchagin, and others.

Research indicates that the structure of a language influences human cognitive processes: speakers of different languages may perceive the same reality in different ways. Language sets the boundaries of thought, shapes a system of concepts, categories, and value judgments, and thus determines a people’s worldview. Scholars emphasize that the LWV is a set of knowledge, representations, and evaluations embedded in the vocabulary, grammar, phraseology, and texts of a given language. It reflects not only objective reality but also the cultural and value-based orientations of the society.

In linguistics, two levels of the worldview are distinguished:

- The conceptual worldview, which is formed in a person’s consciousness as a result of cognition;
- The linguistic worldview, which expresses the conceptual one through the system of linguistic means.

It can be noted that the linguistic worldview is a verbalized model of the world, that is, a set of ways in which a person expresses and classifies phenomena of the surrounding reality through language. For example, in Russian, many concepts are associated with spiritual and emotional states (dusha – soul, sovest’ – conscience, sud’ba – fate), whereas in Uzbek culture, collective and socio-moral categories play a significant role (vafo – верность, iffat – честь, tarbiya – воспитание).

These differences are manifested not only in vocabulary but also in syntactic structures, particularly in substantive phrases. For instance, the Russian phrase

tyazhyolaya sud’ba (“heavy fate - og’ir taqdir - тяжелая судьба”) expresses a person’s inner state and focuses on personal experience, whereas the Uzbek og’ir taqdir carries a more fatalistic nuance and is perceived as a given, predetermined from above.

The linguistic worldview is formed as a result of the interaction between a language system, culture, and the mentality of a people [1]. In this context, translation becomes not merely a linguistic act but a cultural-cognitive process that requires a deep understanding of both worldviews.

Therefore, it can be asserted that the linguistic worldview serves as the foundation that determines the direction and strategy of translation. Without taking its characteristics into account, it is impossible to achieve adequacy in conveying texts containing nationally specific elements – metaphors, proverbs, set expressions, and substantive phrases.

Practical research into the linguistic worldview in the process of translation between Russian and Uzbek requires a thorough analysis of the lexico-semantic and cultural-worldview features of both languages [8, 18]. Here, translation functions not simply as the substitution of one linguistic form for another, but as a complex process of understanding and reinterpreting concepts that reflect a national vision of the world.

When comparing the Russian and Uzbek linguistic worldviews, it becomes evident that differences manifest not only at the lexical level but also in the ways reality is categorized. For example, Russian actively employs abstract concepts that express a person’s inner state: qalb – душа (soul), vijdon – совесть (conscience), taqdir – судьба (fate), dovyurak – смелость (daring), sog`inch – тоска (melancholy). These words carry an emotional-evaluative component and form part of the national cultural code. In Uzbek, these concepts are often conveyed through word combinations or contextual constructions: ruh taskinligi (peace of mind), vijdon (conscience), taqdir (fate), dil izardobi (heartache), which reflect similar but not identical nuances of meaning. In translation, such differences require interpretation rather than literal equivalence to preserve the figurative and cultural content of the original.

Phraseological units deserve particular attention in translation practice, as they vividly convey elements of the national worldview. Russian expressions such as sidet’ slozha ruki (“sit idle”), vodit’ za nos (“lead by the nose”), delo v shlyape (“the matter is settled”) possess idiomatic meanings that cannot be translated word-for-word. In Uzbek, these expressions correspond to different images: qo’l qovushtirib o’tirish, burunidan yetaklash, ish bitdi these constructions demonstrate

how differences in figurative bases preserve the overall communicative function while simultaneously transforming the internal cultural image. Thus, the translator acts as a mediator between two mental worlds, creating a new textual space in which elements of both the source and target cultures are combined.

Semantic transformation is also observed in the translation of substantive phrases. For example, the Russian phrase *tyazhyoloye vremya* ("difficult time") can be rendered in Uzbek as *og'ir davr* or *og'ir kunlar*. Despite the formal similarity, the Uzbek version carries a more emotional and socially nuanced meaning, reflecting the collectivist nature of Uzbek culture. Similarly, the phrase *chistaya sovest'* ("clear conscience") has the Uzbek equivalent *pok vijdon*, but in Uzbek it is more frequently used in a religious and moral context.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the analysis demonstrates that the transformation of the linguistic worldview in translation is not merely the replacement of linguistic units but a process of cognitive and cultural interaction. The translator does not simply transfer meaning but interprets it within the framework of another system of world perception. Therefore, translation should be viewed as a form of cultural dialogue, where each word and expression carries nationally specific information that requires conscious interpretation. Practical research confirms that when translating between Russian and Uzbek, it is essential to consider not only lexico-grammatical differences but also the conceptual features that define the uniqueness of each linguistic worldview. Translation is effective when it conveys not only the content but also the cultural spirit of the source text, ensuring true equivalence at the level of meaning rather than just words.

REFERENCES

1. Apresyan, Yu. D. Selected Works. Vol. 2: Integral Description of Language and Systemic Lexicography. Moscow: Languages of Russian Culture, 1995.
2. Arutyunova, N. D. Logical Analysis of Language. Moscow: Nauka, 1990.
3. Vezhbitskaya, A. Understanding Cultures through Key Words. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2001.
4. Vereshchagin, E. M., Kostomarov, V. G. Language and Culture: Linguistic and Cultural Studies in Teaching Russian as a Foreign Language. Moscow: Russian Language, 1990.
5. Vinogradov, V. V. Russian Language: The Grammatical Theory of the Word. Moscow: Higher School, 1972.
6. Maslova, V. A. Linguoculturology. Moscow: Academia, 2001.
7. Sapir, E. Selected Works on Linguistics and Cultural Studies. Moscow: Progress, 1993.
8. Madvaliev, A. Til va tafakkur. Tashkent: Fan, 1995.
9. Safarov, Sh. Cognitive Approach in Linguistics. Tashkent: Universitet, 2006.
10. Khozhiev, A. Fundamentals of Language and Translation Theory. Tashkent: National University of Uzbekistan, 2018.