



METHODOLOGY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF MEANING IN TRANSLATION OF UZBEK LITERATURE

Hojaliyev I

Fergana State University, Faculty of Philology, Department of Linguistics, Associate Professor

A'zamova Gulasal Sodiq qizi

Teacher of Fergana State University, Faculty of Foreign Languages

Article history:	Abstract:
Received: 24 th August 2021	This article fully reveals and analyzes the adequacy of style and meaning in the translation of examples of Uzbek literature. Comments were made on the adequacy of the translation.
Accepted: 20 th September 2021	
Published: 11 th November 2021	
Keywords: Translation, Language, Style, Meaning, Adequacy, Identity, Equivalence.	

Translation is the art of recreating a work in another language. The translator must experience these feelings in his own mind, just as the artist felt in the process of creation, as much as he felt the hardships of creation from the heart. Only then will the translated work be translated into another language as in the original. At the same time, it is important to take into account the lexical-semantic, syntactic differences between the languages of different systems, the content and spirit of the translated work. At the same time, the success of a translation is determined by how close the rewritten (translated) text is to the original. Of these all in translation require special attention not only to the content but also to the syntactic structure of the text. This is because the completeness of information requires not only semantic, but also syntactic harmony of texts in different systems of languages. In some cases, in order to convey the content of the text, translators do not hesitate to divide compound sentences into several simple sentences, which does not correspond to the syntactic structure of the original sentence, the specific flow of thought, dynamics, intonation features of speech. This becomes an obstacle to the musicality of the text, to the reading with enthusiasm

Any work of art appears in the hearths of national culture, reflecting national problems, the peculiarities of the nation to which the author belongs, and, at the same time, the problems known and known to all mankind. As we move from one nation to another, literature becomes richer and serves as a bridge for people to learn more about each other. In this process, the preservation and delivery of national diversity is one of the most difficult issues of artistic translation. Because works of art, which are very important and popular due to translation, find their readers in other countries who speak different languages and increase their level of knowledge, enriching them with life experiences. At the heart of this is the clear and accurate expression of national identity and diversity in translation. Not only the units of language construction, its semantic and syntactic patterns play an important role in preserving national identity in translation, but also the ability to convey in the text the dialects, extralinguistic, paralinguistic means of the language in which the work is created. Literary translation differs from the translation of scientific and technical texts in these respects.

The relativity of the concepts of equivalence, equality, and adequacy of translation is interpreted differently in theoretical sources: in some literatures these concepts are considered synonymous, while in other sources they are interpreted as having different meanings. Therefore, the question of whether these terms should be used interchangeably among linguists and translators has caused a great deal of controversy.

Literary translators' views on adequacy differ from those of linguists-translators. Literary critics and writers such as K. Chukovsky, I. Kashkin, G. Gachechiladze, V. Rossels, O. Kundzich consider translation as a literary process. They believe that the compliance of language rules is an element of artistic support. According to this approach, adequacy is determined by the relevance of the translation to the original art.

Literary critics do not approve of linguists' strict adherence to language conformity and attempts to create a normative system of translation that denies variations as well as a creative approach. V. Vinogradov believes that poetic translation should be adequate only to the original. In his view, artistic translation has its own creator, creator, source of language and style. The best poetic translation is the translation that corresponds to the original. The degree of compatibility should be assessed not only by the linguistic conformity of the texts but also by the artistic adequacy. According to S. Goncharenko, this is determined by the stylistic aspect of the original and the nature of the poetic text reflected in the translation. Artistic adequacy must keep the poetic character of the two languages, the language of the original and the language of translation, in balance. It can be seen that linguists and literary scholars approach the concept of equivalence and adequacy mainly from their specializations [1]. This explains their limited views. For example, those who are limited by equivalence think that "text is a system," while those who are adequate

think that "text is a living organism." A general look at such debates shows that there is a one-sidedness in the approaches of both views. In our view, there is an opportunity to come to a common denominator on the issue of adequacy. It should be noted that translation analysis and critique serve as methodological guidelines in translation. It is known from the history of literature that as a result of revealing shortcomings in the analysis of the translation of a work, translators re-translated that work and created excellent translation options. But the school of translation analysis and criticism has not yet been formed at the level of demand.

While the responsibility of achieving adequacy through the correct selection of language units requires the translator to think deeply about each expression, medium, this is not a significant issue in the work of some translators. Even simple words that are not difficult to understand in the original are sometimes interpreted differently due to the carelessness of translators, so that each linguistic element that makes up a work of art, whether the main or auxiliary means of language, is used to express a specific content and methodological task. The omission, or the inability to find a logically sound means appropriate to their content and style in the language of translation, impedes the occurrence of adequacy, while the words themselves do not logically adhere to the spoken situations in which they are used.

Sometimes it is necessary to refer to stable word combinations that are not given in the dictionary as the meanings of the same units in order to adequately interpret in translation the semantic signs of lexical units of free meaning that appear in the process of oral speech. The figurativeness or expressiveness of emotion required for the expression of a particular methodological purpose of such stable linguistic means is usually polished, and they are often used only for the vivid expression of thought. For example, in English, the lexical equivalent of the verb "to sacrifice", the word "pojertvovat" in the Russian-Uzbek dictionary means "to donate", "to sacrifice", "to sacrifice", and the Russian word "verit" means "to believe", "In the following examples, the translators do not refer to any of these lexical equivalents. Those who chose the phrase "to look": I sacrificed everything for something that never came.

Replacing lexical units that are unique to live speech and do not perform a methodological function with phraseological units whose imagery is obvious in translation leads to an inappropriate additional methodological function of the expression. For example, at a time when there is an opportunity to express the rain in English, Russian, Uzbek using artistic (figurative) and figurative (phraseological) means of speech, the violation of the norm reflected in the translation leads to inadequate interpretation of the author's image.

P. The verb "to beat" was chosen for the image of thought mentioned in Abraham's novel *The Wreath in the Tomb*. In Russian and Uzbek, the words "lit" and "put" are contextually appropriate: the metaphorical movement of the bases is polished, and it is self-evident that only words expressing a certain way of life are translated into the languages of peoples who do not have such concepts. Thus in translation the national color of the author's text is adequately interpreted. For example, the components of the Uzbek way of life, such as tahman, khurjun, pilaf, ketmon, paranji, supa, are translated into English and Russian languages without linguistic units. gives the opportunity.

So, being able to give a creative style in translation and, at the same time, maintain the adequacy of meaning is one of the most important problems waiting to be solved. Achieving this requires an approach to translation as a literary process, as well as an adherence to the dialectic of inter-systemic relations between languages. That is, it is necessary not only to prioritize the language system in which the text is translated, but also to give dialects in the translated language, syntactic structure of sentences, find and use synonyms of phrases, ensure text integrity and intonation integrity, pay attention to extralinguistic, paralinguistic means. Because if the sign of translation as a literary process is its soul, its linguistic side is the body of the work. Just as a body without a soul is dead, so a soul without a body cannot exist.

REFERENCES:

1. Salomov G. Literary tradition and artistic translation. - Tashkent: Fan, 1980.
2. Retsker Ya. I. Translation theory and translation practice. - IMO, 1974.
3. Aznaurova E. S. Essays on stylistic slova. - Tashkent: Fan, 1973.