

The artistic and aesthetic significance of the translation of Ibroyim Yusupov's lyrics

Bekzod Sobirov

Assistant Teacher at the Department of Philology, Nukus Innovation Institute, Uzbekistan

Received: 12 December 2024; **Accepted:** 14 January 2025; **Published:** 16 February 2025

Abstract: This article provides a scholarly and theoretical basis for the assertion that conveying the psycho-emotional state in the translation of poetic texts is of critical importance, drawing on the works of Ibroyim Yusupov as an illustrative example. It also presents evidence that the translator's skill plays a pivotal role in literary translation and that accurately highlighting the national color in the target text is a mark of genuine artistic mastery.

Keywords: Translation, artistic mastery, literary connections, translator's skill, artistry, aesthetics, analysis, poetic perception, national color.

Introduction: Translating from languages that share close kinship in terms of vocabulary, lifestyle, and religious beliefs is in many respects more convenient than translating from languages of entirely different linguistic groups whose religion, customs, and traditions are very different. Nevertheless, there is a widespread but incorrect belief in Translation Studies that translation from closely related languages is more difficult than from distant ones. The main justification given is the existence of so-called "false equivalents": words that appear similar in form in both languages but differ substantially in meaning. Such words, when used incorrectly, can mislead the translator, slip into the translation, fail to fulfill their function in the target text, and—being used out of place—distort or alter the author's message. However, as the well-known translation scholar G'. Salomov put it, "When translating from closely related languages, instances of being misled by false equivalents generally stem from the translator's insufficient command of the source language" [1.133]. In our context, the field of literary translation from closely related languages has not evolved sufficiently, its rules and principles remain underdeveloped, and it receives relatively little oversight. As a result, individuals without proper mentorship often undertake translations "on their own terms," so to speak. It seems that, due to this neglect and lack of proper stewardship in Uzbek translation studies, professional translators have been sidelined in

this field, and it is largely occupied by random, unqualified individuals.

METHODOLOGY

In scholarly discourse, there is a phrase often referred to as "strangely well-known." It describes words, expressions, and concepts that are, in fact, incorrect but have become so widely adopted that they are treated as "correct." For instance, the Uzbek word *avliyo* (a plural form of *valiy*, meaning "saint") is sometimes further pluralized as *avliyolar*, or the word *axbor* (already a plural form of "information") is sometimes given the plural suffix *-ot*, and so on. We can observe similar phenomena in the shifts of certain word meanings. For example, *xoliq* means "Creator," while *maxluq* means "a created being." Historically, *maxluq* carried a positive connotation, but now it is used negatively or even as an insult. Likewise, today we use *dorilomon* in the sense of a peaceful, tranquil life, whereas in the past it denoted "the abode of peace," i.e., the afterlife [2.215].

RESULTS

An unwritten assumption seems to prevail that one does not need full proficiency in a closely related language to translate from it. This view may be exacerbated by the fact that Turkmen, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Azerbaijani, Tatar, Bashkir, and Karakalpak—languages closely related to Uzbek—are generally not formally taught anywhere (in higher education institutions, only

Turkish is usually offered among the Turkic languages). Other Turkic languages are taught primarily to native speakers in their respective schools, and Uzbek speakers do not usually receive such instruction. There are no standard textbooks, manuals, or dictionaries available in these languages for Uzbek learners. Thus, many translators who work with these languages often have connections to both cultures. For instance, N. Fozilov has ties to Kazakh heritage, Tursunboy Adashboyev to Kyrgyz, Muzaffar Ahmad to Karakalpak, and Abdulmo'min Jumayev to Turkmen, each having a cultural connection to the source language. Professional translators like Mirtemir are relatively rare in this field. If we look at the translators of Ibroyim Yusupov's works—Jumaniyoz Sharipov, Jumaniyoz Jabborov, Muzaffar Ahmad, Mirza Kenjabek, and Abdumo'min Jumayev—none are formally trained Karakalpak language specialists. Poet, writer, and translation scholar J. Sharipov benefited from growing up in Khorezm, where the local culture is somewhat closer to Karakalpak culture compared to other regions, and M. Ahmad, being a Karakalpak native, was already familiar with the language [3.84].

It is well-known that when translating from closely related languages, many words and phrases, lines, and even entire stanzas can be transferred into the translation almost unchanged. As the saying goes, "every benefit has its drawback," and indeed, there is a negative side to this convenience—it can discourage the translator from genuine creative effort and foster laziness. Two situations arise in this context. First, when translators notice that many words, sentences, lines, and stanzas have made their way into the translation unchanged, they may abuse this opportunity by preserving even the rest as is, simply adding footnotes for certain unfamiliar words. Consequently, the number of footnotes in the translation becomes excessive. For example, in one translation of Ibroyim Yusupov's poems, around 300 notes were given. "Naturally, having too many notes makes the translated work difficult to read" [5.48]. Yet it must be remembered that this is a translation, not the original. If we were to publish the poet's verses in the original Karakalpak, we would likely include as many or perhaps even more notes. Second, in our context, translation from closely related languages is often not regarded as a creative endeavor; rather, it is treated like a simple conversion from one language to another, merely swapping out any unclear words for more understandable ones. As a result, such translations are undertaken without significant preparation, leading to more errors than one might find in translations from more distant languages. The Russian translation scholar M. Rilskiy emphasized—aptly, it seems—that

translating from closely related languages can be more challenging than translating from distant languages. When working with distant languages, a translator usually undergoes rigorous preparation, scrutinizing every word and sentence in the original, extracting its essence, and carefully evaluating its shades of meaning. In translation from closely related languages, however, the translator may neglect this responsibility and become somewhat complacent. Consequently, they may be misled by words, phrases, and proverbs that appear similar on the surface (and thus seem understandable even without a dictionary), leading to numerous glaring errors that remain unnoticed. One might say there are three main reasons for mistakes in translation from sister languages:

1. Inadequate proficiency in the source language.
2. Being misled by similar but not identical words, idioms, or concepts.
3. Carelessness, lack of responsibility, and inattentiveness.

From ancient times, art has sought to explore the needs and interests of human beings. The gap between aspiration and reality shapes art's existential scope. Every literary interpretation, in turn, attempts to address the "mystery of existence" inherent in human nature, to the extent possible. More precisely, the boundaries of artistic expression and aesthetic choice demand this. In that sense, the system of literary thought exhibits both a complete and holistic philosophical reflection as well as the unified flow of emotion and reason, capturing images and expression in a concise and focused manner. Hence, the inclination to generalize human essence by harmonizing states of being and actions in an integrated manner signifies the breadth of lyrical perception. Within it, the spiritual tone of the depiction and the enlightenment of analysis merge into a single coherent meaning. When an author depicts the poetic impetus inspired by personal experience, the primary goal is to give the reader an opportunity to observe an emotional journey. This is where creative essence finds wholeness:

When Navoi and Berdakh wrote their epics,
When Babur departed his homeland,
When Mashrab's ghazals cried out,
Did they ultimately fulfill their cherished dreams?
[4.141].

CONCLUSION

A literary work is a unified system—systemic wholeness—composed of interconnected elements. It is not a monolith; rather, the relationships among its parts are so crucial that failing to understand them fully can lead to incomplete or distorted interpretation.

Each element is incorporated with an eye toward the entire work's demands, which means the whole is understood through its parts, and each part's meaning is fully revealed only within that whole. Thus, when reading a literary work, one must, first, view every element in relation to the others, and second, envision the work as a complete entity. In a long novel, for example, a seemingly minor element at the beginning may resonate with another at the end, forming a thematic connection that the author does not explicitly signal but that is essential to grasping the overall meaning. It is like touching two wires connected to a power source: only when these two elements come into contact in the mind of the reader does a "spark" occur, revealing a new facet of the text's significance. This is why reading is referred to as a creative process—merely linking disparate parts into a coherent whole is an act of creation. Different readers perceive a text differently partly because their ability to identify and connect these hidden relationships varies. There is another subtlety here: systemic wholeness demands the unity of the object (artistic reality) and the subject (the creator). Hence, a genuinely creative approach to the literary text is only achieved when the reader, during the reading process, mentally assumes the role of the author, immersing themselves in the unique artistic-spiritual experience present at the moment of creation. The text itself, as a model of the creative process, can facilitate this immersion. A commonly accepted rule for understanding a systematic whole is quite simple: the whole is understood through its parts, and the parts through the whole. Without visualizing how these components interrelate, and how they collectively shape a coherent entity, it is nearly impossible to grasp the deeper meanings of the text. Sometimes, neglecting just a single element can distort the overall meaning. After all, structure is the logical arrangement of meaning; without grasping that logic, capturing the intricacies of a literary work's content is very difficult.

Because human psychology is morally directed, the gradual philosophical development of humankind is connected to real-world necessities. In the process of artistic expression, interpretation and analysis not only take center stage but also integrate with one another. In other words, artistic and psychological essence, syntactic selection, and creative capacity complement each other. Accordingly, the criteria for evaluation stem from philosophical and artistic generalizations. In this framework, the method of analysis or validation becomes a measure that determines the value of the literary reality. The completeness of this expression reveals the socially and aesthetically charged depth of emotional perception. In other words, the poetic idea

converges with personal, social, and ethical interests.

REFERENCES

- Salomov G., Boboyev T. (1973). *Tarjima san'ati* [The Art of Translation]. Tashkent: Adabiyot va san'at.
- Isomiddinov Z. (1995). *Turkiy epos va tarjima masalalari* [Issues of Turkic Epos and Translation]. Tashkent: Universitet.
- Dilmanov I. (2007). *Folklor aloqalari va badiiy tarjima* [Folklore Connections and Literary Translation]. Nukus: Bilim.
- Yusupov I. (1994). *Sahro bulbuli* [The Desert Nightingale]. Tashkent: Adabiyot va san'at.
- Xolbekov M. (2016). *O'zbekistonda tarjima va tarjimashunoslik* [Translation and Translation Studies in Uzbekistan]. *Xorijiy filologiya* [Foreign Philology], №3, P.16.
- Salomov G'. (n.d.). *Tarjima nazariyasiga kirish* [Introduction to Translation Theory] (p. 95).
- Musayev Q. (2005). *Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari* [Foundations of Translation Theory] (pp. 27–28). Tashkent: Fan.