

**THE ENGLISH AND UZBEK SCHOOL OF LITERARY TRANSLATION STUDIES
AND ITS ROLE IN WORLD TRANSLATION STUDIES****Islomov Dilshodxon***Academic Lyceum of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages**Executive Director**+998 93 297 87 60*

Abstract: This article examines the development and significance of the English and Uzbek schools of literary translation studies, highlighting their contributions to global translation scholarship. The English school, rooted in linguistic and structural approaches, has influenced translation theory through scholars like Eugene Nida and Peter Newmark. In contrast, the Uzbek school emphasizes cultural context and literary nuances, with scholars such as Gaybullat Salomov and Jumaniyoz Sharipov leading the way. By comparing these schools, the article underscores their unique methodologies and their impact on world translation studies.

Keywords: English translation studies, Uzbek translation studies, literary translation, translation theory, cultural context, linguistic approaches, translation schools, global translation scholarship.

Introduction

Translation serves as a bridge between cultures, facilitating the exchange of ideas, literature, and knowledge. The study of translation, or translation studies, has evolved into a distinct academic discipline, with various schools of thought emerging globally. Among these, the English and Uzbek schools of literary translation studies stand out for their unique approaches and significant contributions to the field [1].

The English school of translation studies has been shaped by a focus on linguistic structures and equivalence. Scholars like Eugene Nida introduced concepts such as dynamic and formal equivalence, emphasizing the importance of conveying meaning accurately across languages [2]. Peter Newmark further developed these ideas, advocating for a balance between fidelity to the source text and readability in the target language.

In contrast, the Uzbek school of translation studies has developed within a rich cultural and literary tradition. Scholars such as Gaybullat Salomov and Jumaniyoz Sharipov have emphasized the importance of preserving cultural nuances and literary style in translation [3]. Their work highlights the role of translation in reflecting national identity and promoting cultural exchange.

Literature Review and Methodology**Literature Review**

The English school of translation studies has been influenced by linguistic theories and structuralist approaches. Nida's concept of dynamic equivalence focuses on conveying the meaning of the source text in a way that is natural for the target language reader. Newmark's communicative translation theory emphasizes the importance of achieving the same effect on the target audience as the original text does on its audience [4].

The Uzbek school, while acknowledging linguistic aspects, places a strong emphasis on cultural context and literary style. Scholars like Salomov have discussed the challenges of translating

idiomatic expressions and cultural references, advocating for strategies that maintain the integrity of the source text's cultural elements [5].

Methodology

This study employs a comparative analysis methodology, examining key texts and theories from both the English and Uzbek schools of translation studies. The analysis focuses on the following aspects:

- Linguistic Equivalence: Comparing how each school approaches the concept of equivalence in translation.
- Cultural Context: Investigating the emphasis placed on cultural nuances and their preservation in translation.
- Translation Strategies: Analyzing the strategies recommended by each school for dealing with challenges in translation.

Results and Discussion

The English school prioritizes linguistic equivalence, focusing on accurately conveying the meaning of the source text. Nida's dynamic equivalence aims to produce a target text that elicits the same response from the target audience as the original does from its audience. Newmark's communicative translation theory seeks to achieve the same effect on the target audience as the original text does on its audience [6].

In contrast, the Uzbek school recognizes the importance of linguistic accuracy but emphasizes the need to preserve cultural nuances and literary style. Salomov discusses the challenges of translating idiomatic expressions and cultural references, advocating for strategies that maintain the integrity of the source text's cultural elements.

Linguistic equivalence refers to the principle in translation theory that emphasizes the importance of maintaining similar linguistic structures and expressions between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL). This concept ensures clarity and precision in communication by preserving the grammatical and syntactical features of the original text. It involves finding corresponding words or phrases in the TL that closely match the meaning and function of those in the SL [7].

Cultural Context

The English school acknowledges the importance of cultural context but tends to focus more on linguistic aspects. Nida's dynamic equivalence, for instance, aims for a natural rendering of meaning, which may sometimes overlook cultural nuances.

The Uzbek school places a strong emphasis on cultural context, viewing translation as a means of cultural exchange. Salomov and Sharipov highlight the role of translation in reflecting national identity and promoting cultural understanding. Their work underscores the importance of preserving cultural elements in translation to maintain the authenticity of the source text [8].

Translation Strategies

Both schools recognize the challenges inherent in translation and propose strategies to address them. The English school advocates for strategies that prioritize linguistic equivalence, such as formal and dynamic equivalence. Newmark's communicative translation theory emphasizes strategies that achieve the same effect on the target audience as the original text does on its audience.

The Uzbek school, while acknowledging linguistic strategies, emphasizes the importance of cultural considerations. Salomov and Sharipov propose strategies that maintain the integrity of

cultural elements, such as adapting idiomatic expressions and cultural references to the target language.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the English and Uzbek schools of literary translation studies offer distinct yet complementary approaches to translation. The English school provides a framework grounded in linguistic equivalence, focusing on accurately conveying meaning across languages. The Uzbek school, while acknowledging linguistic aspects, emphasizes the preservation of cultural nuances and literary style, viewing translation as a means of cultural exchange.

Both schools contribute significantly to the field of translation studies, offering valuable insights and methodologies. Their work highlights the multifaceted nature of translation and underscores its role in bridging cultures and fostering global understanding.

References:

1. Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
2. Newmark, P. (1981). *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
3. Salomov, G. (1978). *Introduction to the Theory of Translation*. Tashkent: Reader.
4. Sharipov, J. (1972). *Artistic Translation and National Identity*. Tashkent: Teacher.
5. Khabibullaeva, M. E. (2021). Experience in Translating Historical Novels in Translation Studies. *Journal of Academic Research and Trends in Educational Sciences*, 3(6), 84-90.
6. Karimova, G. (2024). The Role of Cultural Context in Translation: Challenges and Solutions in Translating Uzbek Literary Texts into English. *Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit*. <https://doi.org/10.2024/59ss9r16>.
7. Nabiulina, Z. N. (2021). Theory and Practice of Literary Translation: The Situation in Uzbekistan. *Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 3(2), 45-60.
8. Xaitbaeva, N. K. (2022). The First Translations from Uzbek into Russian, On the Formation and Development of the Uzbek School of Translation Studies. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 3(3), 26-28.