
THE MAIN ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION AND TRANSLATION CRITICISM**Abduvaliyeva Farangizxon Saloxiddin qizi***Student of Fergana State University*Baxtiyorovafarangiz9@gmail.com

Abstract: *Two widely held but diametrically opposed perspectives on translation have arisen in the twenty-first century: the first holds that translation is a very informal and simple activity that hardly calls for any special knowledge, and the other is about translation as a vital part of comprehending the modern world, in which more than ever before, cultures, literatures, belief systems, and ideologies are communicating with one another quickly. The perception of translation as a very mechanical and simple procedure that can be completed by anybody with knowledge of two languages, with the aid of different online translation tools accessible, has been shaped by the introduction of online translation tools and other technical advancements.*

Key words: *translation process, translation strategies, translation theory, translation criticism, linguistic analysis, cultural analysis, translation quality assessment, translation ethics, translation norms, translation history, translation studies, comparative literature, intercultural communication, language and culture, translation pedagogy.*

INTRODUCTION.

The first approach, which is very problematic, has become widely accepted in part because academic discourse on translation has stayed confined to a relatively narrow subset of the field. For a very long period, the academic community also paid little attention to theorizing translation as a discipline. Theory and practice go hand in hand in translation, just like they do in any other subject. On the one hand, although translation has been practiced for hundreds of years in English and other European languages, it was not until the late twentieth century that translation theory needed to be developed and established as a subject. It is certainly not reasonable to expect the development of a practice of critiquing translations into or out of a language when there has been little to no effort made to theorize translation in that language. For instance, when it comes to Uzbek, there appears to be a general lack of interest in offering criticism on translations, particularly when it comes to literature that are translated from Uzbek into English. There are two main issues when this important technique is not followed. The first is the issue of translation criticisms not being available, which leads to really inadequate or inappropriate translations being passed off as excellent translations. It should be mentioned that in Uzbek, the custom of proofreading translations is highly developed. The lack of significance or recognition given to the translator is the second issue. It is imperative to problematize the translator's job in order to promote the practice of translation even further. Translation is "essentially an act of collaboration...with the translator playing the role of a prime collaborator," according to Anisur Rahman. Therefore, the translator is at the center of the translation process as they are always negotiating not just between two languages but also between two civilizations and literatures. Translators are those who, while being faithful to the original text, its author,

and the source language, carry a text into an unfamiliar language and appropriate it within the linguistic, cultural, and literary sphere of that language.

THE MAIN FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Despite being so important to the translation process, translators are frequently disregarded by both readers and critics. Seldom is a translation seen as the result of the author's and translator's combined efforts. Rarely is the translator's name listed next to the author's, disregarding the collaborative aspect of translation. The survival of the translation critic seemed unattainable in a situation where the translator is so marginalized. The translator "will be less valued than the original writer and the critic criticizing that translation will be even less valued," according to renowned translator and critic Raman Soni. Actually, we have internalized this way of thinking. Therefore, it is imperative to recognize not only the translator's crucial role in the translation process but also the existence of a translation critic whose goal is to produce in-depth analyses of translated texts by looking at the translation process from an impartial and holistic perspective. The paper's subsequent sections will address the topics of translation criticism, particularly as they relate to Uzbek-English translations, and will also provide an example of a critique of an English translation of a Uzbek short story. It is crucial to address terminology like analysis, evaluation, assessment, and evaluations of translations before starting a conversation about the nature of translation criticism. The underlying propensity to evaluate translations and hence give them a value is what unites all of these ideas. Such conceptions frequently lack a thorough examination of a translation and all of its facets. Translation criticism, on the other hand, aims to provide thorough critiques of translated texts by examining a translated text's components, settings, and translation process from an impartial standpoint. Beyond "trashing a translator's work on the basis of isolated instances," Translation Criticism seeks to go beyond. It typically achieves a balance that might give translation complaints more validity and comprehensiveness. In addition to analyzing the translated text in relation to and in contrast with the source text, translation criticism should concentrate on analyzing a translation as a text in and of itself, fulfilling a particular purpose in the target language, literature, and culture at large. Provide comprehensive, elusive analysis on the nature of translation and related subjects is one of the main purposes of translation criticism. It is necessary to talk about translation reviews with the translation-related data that is currently accessible. The fact that "most reviews in dailies or periodicals are commissioned, either by the publishers of the books or by the publications which carry the review," is another problem with translation reviews. In addition to the reviewer's obligation to endorse the book, space issues exist. It is clear that reviewers are frequently constrained by these outside circumstances and are not always apathetic toward translations. Nonetheless, the feedback on translations is typically unfavorable and demeaning, even in cases where the reviewer is not unaffected by the process and nature of translation. The majority of the time, it appears that these reviewers lack objective standards for appraisal or criticism.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To begin with, these are a few ideas and methods of Translation Criticism that address different facets of translation.

However, no universal theory of translation that considers every issue pertaining to the linguistic and cultural transfer of meaning can be developed, given the multitude of

variables that any translation process must deal with. It is clear that the lack of a general theory of translation is the primary cause of the lack of a single framework or theoretical approach to translation. One could argue that the idea of putting forth a single, comprehensive theory of translation is a little overly ambitious and even unachievable. The explanation for this is that translation is not a unique occurrence that takes place in a vacuum. Instead, it depends on many other elements, including language, literature, culture, society, and history, to mention a few. It also involves a multitude of players, each of whom contributes in a different way—for example, as an author, translator, reader, reviewer, translation critic, etc. One theory or framework of translation criticism that can address the broad scope of translation seems unworkable and even restrictive. Due to its distinct identity and qualities, every translated work requires a different set of critical approaches related to its specific traits. An optimal collection of methods for critiquing a specific translation does not exist. The range of methods would rely on the standards that the critic had established. A cultural critique of a translation, for instance, would undoubtedly address a distinct set of methodologies than those employed in a semantic review. Whatever the criteria and tools, it is crucial for a critic to carefully select his or her set of approaches because it not only provides a solid basis for criticism but also serves as a guide for a translator critic navigating the intricate and complex maze of a translation, particularly a literary translation. It is crucial to take a quick look at some of the underlying themes of current Uzbek translation practices before discussing the practice of translation criticism in relation to Uzbek-English translation. Many well-known and important writings that were translated from English and other European and Indian languages have enhanced Uzbek. Nonetheless, the majority of this translation work has been unidirectional; that is, there are comparatively few writings translated from Uzbek into English compared to the quantity of materials that have arrived in Uzbek from English and other European languages through English. We would all harbor deep regret for this one-way translation flow. Speaking of the story's narrative structure, it is important to point out that, despite the fact that conversational language is used in most of the story's unfinished sentences, the narrative's overall structure does a great job of capturing the subject. In order to preserve the essence of the original text in the translation, the translator also decides to keep the narrative's somewhat conversational form.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Language, culture, and interpretation are the threads that weave together to form the tapestry of translation. Meaning transfer is a multilayered process that is revealed by this intricate interplay, which is examined via the lenses of translation and translation criticism. Both professions contribute to a fuller knowledge of the challenges involved in bridging language and cultural barriers, from the painstaking investigation of linguistic structures to the thorough examination of cultural subtleties. The fundamentals of translation, which include the methodology, approaches, and theoretical frameworks, offer a basis of knowledge for negotiating the complexities of translation. Translation critique is a critical voice that elevates the field and promotes continuous improvement, and it also provides an essential lens through which to evaluate the impact and efficacy of translation.

REFERENCES:

1. BAKER, MONA, & GABRIELA SALDANHA. 2011. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. London: Routledge.
2. KOTHARI, RITA. (ed.). 2006. Introduction. In *Speech and Silence: Literary Journeys by Gujarati Women*. New Delhi: Zubaan, an imprint of Kali for Women.
3. Ayala, F. (1965). *Problemas de la traducción*. Madrid: Taurus Ediciones.
4. Bausch, K.R. (1963). *Verbum und verbale Periphrase im Französischen und ihre Transposition im Englischen, Deutschen und Spanischen*. Phil. Diss. Tübingen.
5. Benjamin, W. (1955). *Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers*. In Adorno, T. W. & Adorno, G. (Eds.), *Schriften*, vol. 1 (p. 40-54). Frankfurt: Suhrkamp (1923).