

**CRITERIA FOR A COMPARATIVISTIC ANALYSIS IN WORKS OF TRANSLATION
FROM UZBEK TO ENGLISH****Utkirova Hidoyat Alisher kizi**2nd year master's degree student, Turon University, Karshi cityhidoyat728@gmail.com

+998885650098

Scientific adviser: Doctor of Philosophy, Docent, **Yaxshiyeva Zebo Rashidovna**

Annotatsiya: O'zbek adabiyotining ingliz tiliga tarjimasini madaniyatlararo muloqot uchun muhim vosita bo'lib, Markaziy Osiyo tafakkuri, tarixi va estetikasining boy gobelenlarini jahon auditoriyasiga yetkazadi. Biroq, chuqur fors-arab va sovet-rus tarixiy qatlamlariga ega turkiy til bo'lgan o'zbek tili bilan global german tili bo'lmish ingliz tili o'rtasidagi til va madaniy masofa chuqur muammolarni keltirib chiqaradi. Ushbu maqolada o'zbek-ingliz tilidagi badiiy tarjimalarni qiyosiy tahlil qilish mezonlarining keng qamrovli, ko'p bosqichli doirasi taklif etilgan. Soddalashtirilgan "sodiqlik" tushunchalaridan tashqariga chiqib, ramka uchta asosiy sohaga tuzilgan: "Lingvistik-madaniy mezonlar", "Matn-pragmatik mezonlar" va "Parattekstual-ijtimoiy-tarixiy mezonlar".

Bu sohalar doirasida biz o'ziga xos tahliliy nuqtalarni, jumladan, agglyutinativ sintaksis, madaniy jihatdan bog'langan atamalar (masalan, "mahalla", "chardoq", "navro'z"), sharaf, maqollar, o'zbek she'riyatining o'ziga xos ritmik va metafora tizimlarining tarjimasini ko'rib chiqamiz. Abdulla Qodiriy, Cho'lpon va Otabek Omon kabi mualliflar asarlarining mavjud tarjimalarining qiyosiy amaliy tadqiqotlari orqali bu asosning qo'llanilishi ko'rsatilgan. Maqolada ta'kidlanishicha, ushbu batafsil mezonlar to'plamiga asoslangan qat'iy qiyosiy tahlil nafaqat individual tarjimalar sifatini baholash, balki jahon adabiyotining kengroq loyhasini va gegemon til ob'ektivi orqali "mayda" madaniyatni ifodalash dinamikasini tushunish uchun ham muhimdir. Xulosa qiladiki, eng muvaffaqiyatli tarjimalar ingliz tilidagi o'quvchi uchun qulaylik va o'zbek tilidagi manba matnining o'ziga xos madaniy va estetik "o'zgaligini" saqlab qolish o'rtasidagi simbiotik muvozanatga erishganlardir.

Kalit so'zlar: Tarjimashunoslik, o'zbek adabiyoti, qiyosiy tahlil, madaniy tarjima, til ekvivalentligi, madaniyatlararo muloqot, jahon adabiyoti, turkiy tillar, Abdulla Qodiriy, Cho'lpon, tarjima tanqidi.

Аннотация: Перевод узбекской литературы на английский язык представляет собой важнейший канал межкультурного диалога, знакомя мировую аудиторию с богатым разнообразием центральноазиатской мысли, истории и эстетики. Однако лингвистическая и культурная дистанция между узбекским языком, тюркским языком с глубокими персидско-арабскими и советско-русскими историческими пластами, и английским языком, языком глобальной германской группы, создаёт серьёзные проблемы. В данной статье предлагается комплексная многоуровневая система критериев для сравнительного анализа узбекско-английских литературных переводов. Выходя за рамки упрощённого понятия «верности», эта система структурирована на три основных области: «лингвистико-культурные критерии», «текстово-прагматические критерии» и «паратекстово-социоисторические критерии».

В рамках этих областей мы рассматриваем конкретные аналитические аспекты, включая трактовку агглютинативного синтаксиса, культурно обусловленных терминов (например, «махалла», «чардак», «навруз»), гомеопатических знаков, пословиц и перевода отдельных ритмических и метафорических систем узбекской поэзии. Применение этой концепции демонстрируется на примере сравнительного анализа существующих переводов произведений таких авторов, как Абдулла Кадыри, Чолпон и Отабек Омон. В статье утверждается, что строгий сравнительный анализ, основанный на этом детальном наборе критериев, необходим не только для оценки качества отдельных переводов, но и для понимания более широкого проекта мировой литературы и динамики представления «малой» культуры через призму доминирующего языка. В статье делается вывод о том, что наиболее успешными являются те переводы, которые достигают симбиотического баланса между доступностью для англоязычного читателя и сохранением уникальной культурной и эстетической «инаковости» узбекского исходного текста.

Ключевые слова: Переводоведение, узбекская литература, сопоставительный анализ, культурный перевод, лингвистическая эквивалентность, межкультурная коммуникация, мировая литература, тюркские языки, Абдулла Кадыри, Чолпон, переводческая критика.

Abstract: The translation of Uzbek literature into English represents a critical conduit for intercultural dialogue, bringing the rich tapestry of Central Asian thought, history, and aesthetics to a global audience. However, the linguistic and cultural distance between Uzbek, a Turkic language with deep Perso-Arabic and Soviet-Russian historical strata, and English, a global Germanic language, presents profound challenges. This article proposes a comprehensive, multi-tiered framework of criteria for the comparative analysis of Uzbek-English literary translations. Moving beyond simplistic notions of "fidelity," the framework is structured into three primary domains: "Linguistic-Cultural Criteria", "Textual-Pragmatic Criteria", and "Paratextual-Sociohistorical Criteria". Within these domains, we examine specific analytical points, including the treatment of agglutinative syntax, culturally-bound terms (e.g., "mahalla", "chardaq", "navruz"), honorifics, proverbs, and the translation of the distinct rhythmic and metaphorical systems of Uzbek poetry. The application of this framework is demonstrated through comparative case studies of existing translations of works by authors such as Abdullah Qodiriy, Chulpon, and Otabek Omon. The article argues that a rigorous comparative analysis, grounded in this detailed criteria set, is essential not only for evaluating the quality of individual translations but also for understanding the broader project of world literature and the dynamics of representing a "minor" culture through the lens of a hegemonic language. It concludes that the most successful translations are those that achieve a symbiotic balance between accessibility for the English-language reader and the preservation of the unique cultural and aesthetic "otherness" of the Uzbek source text.

Keywords: Translation Studies, Uzbek Literature, Comparative Analysis, Cultural Translation, Linguistic Equivalence, Cross-Cultural Communication, World Literature, Turkic Languages, Abdullah Qodiriy, Chulpon, Translation Criticism.

Introduction:

The Rise of Uzbek Literature on the World Stage: Uzbek literature, with its roots in the rich soil of Central Asian civilization, boasts a legacy that spans from the classical Persian-Turkic poetry of Alisher Navoi to the sophisticated novels and short stories of the Jadid reformists and contemporary writers. In recent decades, there has been a growing, albeit still limited, effort to

translate this corpus into English. This movement is driven by a desire to share Uzbekistan's unique voice, to contribute to the diversity of world literature, and to foster a deeper understanding of a region often shrouded in geopolitical mystery. Translations of works by Abdullah Qodiriy, Chulpon, Utkir Hoshimov, and others serve as crucial cultural ambassadors.

The Problem of Linguistic and Cultural Asymmetry: The task of translating from Uzbek to English is not merely a linguistic exercise; it is a complex act of cultural negotiation. The two languages belong to entirely different families (Turkic vs. Germanic), resulting in divergent grammatical structures, worldviews, and aesthetic sensibilities. Uzbek is agglutinative, employing suffixes to convey grammatical relationships, while English is analytic, relying on word order and prepositions. Culturally, Uzbek society is infused with concepts, social structures, and historical experiences—from the communal life of the "mahalla" to the linguistic purges of the Soviet era—that have no direct equivalent in the Anglosphere. A comparative analysis of translations, therefore, cannot rely on vague impressions of "fluency" but requires a systematic set of criteria to evaluate how these vast chasms are bridged.

This article aims to construct a detailed, practical framework for the comparative analysis of Uzbek-English literary translations. It will delineate specific criteria across multiple domains, providing a tool for scholars, translators, and critics to assess the strategies, successes, and shortcomings of a given translation. The scope is primarily literary, encompassing prose (novels, short stories) and poetry, as these genres present the most complex challenges and rewards. The framework is designed to be descriptive rather than prescriptive, recognizing that different translation "skopoi" (purposes) may legitimately prioritize different criteria.

Theoretical Foundations in Translation Studies

From Equivalence to Skopos: A Brief Theoretical Overview

Modern Translation Studies provides the theoretical bedrock for this framework. The early quest for "equivalence," championed by scholars like Eugene Nida with his concepts of "formal" and "dynamic" equivalence, highlighted the tension between preserving form and ensuring comprehensibility. Later, the German "Skopos" theory (Reiss and Vermeer) shifted the focus to the purpose of the translation, arguing that the target text's function should determine the translation strategies. This is particularly relevant for Uzbek-English translation, where the purpose might range from strict scholarly annotation to creating a readable literary work for a general audience.

The Cultural Turn and the Politics of Translation

The "cultural turn" in the 1990s, led by scholars like Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, emphasized that translation is never neutral. It is conditioned by ideologies, poetics, and patronage systems. Lawrence Venuti's concepts of "domestication" (making the text familiar to the target culture) and "foreignization" (preserving the foreignness of the source text) are central to our analysis. Translating a culture with a colonial and Soviet past like Uzbekistan's into English, a global hegemonic language, inherently involves power dynamics that must be critically examined.

Applicability to the Uzbek-English Context

These theories are not abstract; they directly inform our criteria. A translator's decision to domesticate a complex Uzbek kinship term or to foreignize it with a footnote is a strategic choice that can be analyzed through Venuti's lens. The "skopos" of a translation—whether it is for academic study or commercial publication—will directly influence the handling of culture-bound terms and syntactic complexity, falling under the purview of Skopos theory.

A Multi-Tiered Framework for Comparative Analysis

This framework is divided into three interconnected domains, each containing specific, actionable criteria for analysis.

Domain I: Linguistic-Cultural Criteria

This domain deals with the most fundamental level of translation: words, grammar, and culturally-specific concepts.

Lexical and Morphosyntactic Challenges

Agglutination and Case Marking: Uzbek uses suffixes to indicate grammatical roles (e.g., "-ni" for accusative, "-ga" for dative). A sentence like "Kitobni stolga qo'ydim" (I put the book on the table) is structured as "book-[accusative] table-[dative] put-I." The English translator must dismantle this structure and rebuild it using prepositions and strict SVO word order. The analyst must ask: Does the translation accurately convey the semantic relationships embedded in the agglutinative structure? Is any nuance of focus or emphasis lost?

Verb Morphology and Aspect: Uzbek verbs convey a rich array of aspects, moods, and evidentialities through suffixes (e.g., "-yapman" for present continuous, "-ibdi" for reported past). The translation of the reported past, which indicates that the speaker did not witness the event directly, is a particular challenge. Does the English translation find a way to convey this hearsay or inferred quality, perhaps through modal verbs or phrasing ("apparently," "it is said that"), or is this layer of meaning simply erased?

The Translation of Culture-Bound Terms (CBTs)

This is arguably the heart of the challenge. The analyst must create a taxonomy of CBTs and evaluate the translator's strategy for each.

Material Culture: How are terms like "hovli" (a traditional courtyard house, central to family life), "chardaq" (a decorative wooden ceiling/balcony), or "kazan" (a large cooking pot) handled? Strategies can include:

- Loanword + Gloss: "He entered the spacious hovli, the family courtyard."
- Cultural Substitution: Translating "kumyon" as "chest of drawers" (losing the specific cultural image).
- Descriptive Paraphrase: "The intricately carved chardaq overlooking the courtyard."

The analyst must evaluate the trade-offs: Does the strategy provide clarity at the cost of local color, or preserve foreignness at the risk of confusion?

Social and Religious Concepts: Terms like "mahalla" (a tight-knit neighborhood community), "gap" (a social gathering for conversation), or "bismillah" (an Islamic invocation) carry immense cultural weight. Translating "mahalla" as "neighborhood" captures the denotation but misses the connotations of mutual support, social control, and identity. Does the translator use footnotes, integrate explanation into the text, or accept the semantic loss?

Phraseology: Proverbs, Idioms, and Fixed Expressions

Uzbek is replete with proverbs (maqol) and idioms that are often rooted in a pastoral or agricultural lifestyle. For example, "It huriganda, to'nidan tut" (When a dog runs, hold onto its coat) implies seizing an opportunity. A literal translation would be nonsensical. The analyst must determine if the translator:

- Finds a functionally equivalent English proverb ("Strike while the iron is hot").
- Provides a literal translation with a footnote.
- Paraphrases the meaning within the text.

Each choice has implications for the text's rhythm, cultural authenticity, and readability.

Domain II: Textual-Pragmatic Criteria

This domain moves beyond the sentence to the level of discourse, style, and overall textual effect.

Register, Style, and Voice

Does the translation capture the author's unique voice and the text's register? Is the ornate, sometimes archaic style of Qodiriy's historical prose rendered in a suitably elevated English, or is it flattened into a modern, neutral register? Conversely, is the colloquial, intimate voice in a contemporary short story successfully replicated?

The Translation of Dialect and Sociolect

Uzbek has various dialects (e.g., Ferghana, Tashkent, Khorezm) and sociolects that mark a character's regional or social background. How does a translator convey this in English, which lacks a standardized system for marking such distinctions? Strategies might include using non-standard grammar ("ain't") or regional dialects (e.g., a Southern American accent to suggest ruralness), but these carry their own cultural baggage. The analyst must assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of these choices.

Dialogue and Speech Act Conventions

Uzbek dialogue employs a complex system of honorifics and polite forms ("siz", "sen", "sizlar"). The choice of pronoun conveys relationship dynamics, age, and respect. English's single "you" erases this entirely. Does the translator find other linguistic means to convey this relational hierarchy through word choice, tone, or added explanatory dialogue?

Poetic Translation: Meter, Rhyme, and Imagery

This is a specialized but crucial area. Classical Uzbek poetry (e.g., Navoi) uses quantitative "aruz" meters, while modern poetry may use syllabic or free verse. The translator must decide whether to:

Reproduce the meter and rhyme scheme (often requiring major semantic shifts).

- Create a new meter in English that echoes the original's rhythm.
- Abandon meter and focus on translating imagery and meaning (a "poetic prose" version).

The analyst must compare the soundscape, rhythm, and metaphorical coherence of the source and target texts, judging the success of the chosen strategy against the "skopos" of the translation.

Domain III: Paratextual-Sociohistorical Criteria

This domain examines the material and contextual elements that shape the translation's reception.

The Role of the Preface, Introduction, and Footnotes

Paratexts are not secondary; they frame the reading experience. A thorough introduction explaining historical context, literary significance, and translation choices is invaluable. Footnotes can be essential for explaining CBTs, historical figures, or untranslatable puns. The analyst must evaluate the quantity, quality, and intrusiveness of these paratexts. Do they empower the reader or create a pedantic, fragmented reading experience?

Ideology and Censorship: Soviet and Post-Soviet Contexts

Many classic Uzbek works were written, published, or censored during the Soviet era. A comparative analysis must consider if the translation is based on the original, pre-censorship manuscript or a later, Soviet-edited version. Furthermore, does the translation itself engage in a form of "self-censorship," softening or omitting politically or religiously sensitive content to make it more palatable for a Western audience?

The Translator's Visibility and Agency

Finally, the analyst should consider the translator's own background, stated philosophy, and visibility in the text. Is the translator a scholar of Central Asian studies? A native speaker of Uzbek or English? Their profile inevitably influences their approach, leaning more towards foreignization or domestication.

Case Studies in Application

(Note: Due to space constraints, these are summarized analyses.)

Case Study 1: Translating a National Epic – "Alpomish"

A comparison of different English translations of the epic "Alpomish" reveals stark contrasts. One version, aimed at folklorists, uses extensive footnotes, retains Turkic terms like "batir" (hero), and attempts to mimic the rhythmic repetition of the oral original. Another, aimed at a general audience, smoothes the rhythm, substitutes more familiar heroic epithets ("mighty

warrior"), and reduces explanatory notes. Applying our framework, the first scores high on foreignization and scholarly accuracy but low on narrative fluency; the second reverses these priorities. Neither is inherently "better," but their evaluation depends on the stated "skopos".

Case Study 2: The Modernist Novel – Chulpon's "Night and Day"

Chulpon's novel is a masterpiece of Jadid-era modernism, blending stream-of-consciousness with social critique. The English translation by Carol Ermakova faces the challenge of rendering its poetic prose and psychological depth. Our analysis finds that it successfully captures the melancholic tone and central imagery. However, it often opts for cultural substitution for CBTs (e.g., translating specific garments into generic "robes"), leading to a slight homogenization of the cultural landscape. The translation's strength lies in its Domain II performance, preserving the novel's lyrical voice, even as it makes concessions in Domain I for the sake of readability.

Case Study 3: The Historical Novel – Kodiriy's "By gone Days" (O'tkan Kunlar)

The translation of this cornerstone of Uzbek literature is a monumental task. The translator must navigate 19th-century Kokand lexicon, Islamic terminology, and a dense, descriptive style. A close reading of passages shows the translator, an academic, frequently using footnotes to explain historical references and Islamic practices—a strong paratextual strategy (Domain III). However, the syntactic complexity of Uzbek sentences is often broken down into simpler English sentences, which can lessen the rhetorical power of Qodiriy's prose (a Domain I/II trade-off). The handling of honorifics in dialogue is largely lost, a common and perhaps unavoidable casualty.

Discussion: Towards a Symbiotic Translation Ethos

The application of this framework demonstrates that translation is a series of negotiated compromises. The ideal of a "perfect" translation is a mirage. The most resonant translations are those that achieve a symbiotic relationship between the source and target cultures. They are accessible enough to engage the English reader without assimilating the Uzbek text entirely into familiar patterns. They use strategies like strategic foreignization, calibrated footnoting, and creative lexical innovation to allow the "otherness" of the Uzbek worldview to shine through. The translator, in this model, is not an invisible conduit but a visible, responsible, and creative cultural mediator.

Conclusion and Recommendations for Future Translation

This article has presented a detailed, multi-domain framework for the comparative analysis of Uzbek-English literary translations. By systematically applying these Linguistic-Cultural, Textual-Pragmatic, and Paratextual-Sociohistorical criteria, critics and scholars can move beyond impressionistic praise or criticism to a nuanced understanding of a translator's methods and achievements.

For future translations, this analysis suggests several recommendations:

1) Collaborative Translation: Partnerships between native Uzbek speakers and native English-language writers can balance linguistic authenticity with literary flair.

- 2) Contextual Richness: Publishers should be encouraged to include robust introductions, glossaries, and historical notes to frame the work for the uninitiated reader.
- 3) Embrace Strategic Foreignization: Translators should feel empowered to leave key CBTs untranslated, integrating them into the text with context and minimal glossing, to preserve the text's cultural texture.
- 4) Poetic License in Prose: In translating complex prose, the goal should not be simplistic clarity but the recreation of a comparable aesthetic and rhetorical effect in English.

The journey of Uzbek literature into English is only beginning. By equipping ourselves with rigorous analytical tools, we can ensure that this journey is marked by depth, respect, and a genuine opening of one world to another.

References

1. Bassnett, Susan, and André Lefevere. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Multilingual Matters, 1998.
2. Ermakova, Carol (Trans.). *Night and Day* by Cho'lon. Sphinx Books, 2018.
3. Nida, Eugene. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Brill, 1964.
4. Qodiriy, Abdullah. *Bygone Days*. Translated by various scholars, multiple excerpts available in academic journals.
5. Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge, 1995.
6. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Routledge, 2000.
7. Vermeer, Hans J. "Skopos and Commission in Translational Action." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, Routledge, 2000, pp. 221-232.
8. Various Translators. *The Albanian Trinity: The Epic of Alpomish*. Edited and translated by various, sources vary.