

Bobokulova Gulrux Sharipovna
Buhkara state University
Interfaculty department of foreign languages

Abstract: *The principal goal of the article is to substantiate the idea that a wider application of some forms of translators' activities does not necessarily entail development of new concepts and approaches to translation. To achieve this goal, the following tasks have been solved: the main approaches to translation specified in European Translation Studies and their provisions have been considered, new trends in translation including the wider use of information technologies and expansion of the areas in which new forms of translation/interpreting are used have been analyzed, definitions of localization as translators' activity together with substantiation of the distinction between localization and translation have been considered. Moreover, the article provides analysis of definitions of transcreation, transadaptation and transculturation viewed by some scholars as special strategies aimed at bridging the gap between cultures and adapting a text to recipients belonging to another culture.*

Keywords: *communicative-functional approach, information technologies, localization, internationalization, transcreation*

It should be clear that the only source of fresh ideas and concepts for translation studies is actual translation. The need to understand the fundamentals of translation and interpreting as practical activities, the fundamentals of the problems that translators must address, and the fundamentals of the many translation and interpreting methodologies led to the emergence of translation science. The relationship between Translation Studies and the practice of translation, on the other hand, appears to be more complex; it can be said that the two are interdependent. Translation Studies has an impact on this activity and provides some guidelines for locating the best solutions under the constantly shifting conditions of carrying out translating activity. Because of this, one of the main responsibilities of translation studies is to provide basic guidelines for instructing translators and interpreters who will be able to satisfy the demands of the translation industry. These are the guiding principles that define the caliber of any academic endeavor's final outcome, the caliber of a professional translator, and — eventually — the caliber of translation operations as a whole.

The environment in which translation efforts are carried out has evolved dramatically during the past few decades. Today's translators operate in a computerized, digital environment entwined with the Web; they employ a variety of information technologies including machine translation, TM systems, and other similar tools. The forms of translation/interpreting that were formerly on the fringe of the translator's profession or were entirely nonexistent (audiovisual translation, community interpreting, trans editing, transcreation, audio description, etc.) also began to receive more attention. These kinds of translation work are sometimes considered as fundamentally, completely, or even in



opposition to the so-called translation proper. According to Ives Gambier, the term "translation" "...is frequently replaced by or competes with other terms, which can in turn vary greatly depending on the specific sector of activity in which they are used." They display various professional realities and behaviors as well as various research trajectories" (Gambier, 2016: 56). It is undeniably true that scholars and translators are compelled to evaluate and grasp the theoretical underpinnings of these activities as new translators' activities have been pushed to the forefront of the profession or, at least, to the visual field. The endeavors provide new names, labels, and conclusions that, it would seem, are sure to add fresh ideas and concepts to translation studies.

But although being unquestionably fresh, these concepts do not further our understanding of the true nature of translation; rather, they muddy the definition and spread confusion around the word. Additionally, several remarks allude to the early stages of the development of Translation Studies rather than pointing us in a new, far more promising direction for the development of Translation Science, revealing a vulgarized view of translation and an oversimplified approach to its definition. The article's objective is to explore new definitions of translation and its role in the digital age and to expose myths that might eventually harm translation outcomes. According to Ives Gambier, two paradigms have emerged in translation studies. On the one hand, "the more traditional conceptualization of translation that has persisted for centuries through the paradigm of equivalence has evolved into one that is more oriented toward the public or audience, that is, the paradigm of the cultural turn" It is notable that this paradigm's orientation toward the general public or audience constitutes its essence. This truth is motivational. To summarize, Vilen Komissarov, one of the pioneers of Russian linguistic translation studies and creator of the equivalence levels theory, said that "a translator must realize precisely for whom and for what purpose (s)he is translating a text, what task the target text will perform, who will use the target text and in what way" (Komissarov, 2001: 357). I can only be sorry if supporters of linguistic translation studies have chosen to dismiss this assertion outright or have chosen to pay it no attention at all. To substantiate the claim, I may offer the following passage from an essay by Olga Petrova and Victor Lanchikov: "...it is not necessary to change any text (both ST and TT) each time in order to adapt it to the needs of each recipient" (Lanchikov, Petrova,)The statement demonstrates a clear inconsistency between a translation strategy that is recipient-focused and one that entirely disregards the requirements and expectations of the receiver. The statements made inside the paradigm typically referred to be linguistic, or text-oriented, as I prefer to call it, are comparable to the one given above. It implies that the linguistic approach to translation is riddled with inconsistencies, its benchmarks are imprecise, while it is also impossible to deny its more overt orientation toward the receiver. According to Ives Gambier, the second translation paradigm "reflects the platforms and mediums through which the activity of translation is currently carried out." In this way, the book's paradigm is replaced by the digital and web's (where the text that has to be translated becomes multimodal). The multiplicity of terminology used to describe what was formerly translation can be explained by this quickly evolving environment (Gambier, 2016: 888). There is no denying that, in terms of simply technological issues, the working conditions for a translator have drastically altered.

But is it justified to say that Translation Studies now has a fresh theoretical framework? Anthony Pym, who is more cautious about establishing new translation paradigms, seems to agree with Gambier's assessment. According to Pym (2011), new IT systems "are altering the very nature of the translator's cognitive activity, social relations, and professional standing" rather than simply being additional tools. I concur with neither I. Gambier nor I. Pym. I think it is unnatural and illogical to contrast the paradigm based on the usage of new media with the equivalency paradigm (linguistic approach). While the first "paradigm" actually reveals a particular attitude toward and perception of translation as a profession, as well as a specific understanding of the nature of translation and the essence of the tasks accomplished by a translator, the second "paradigm" only considers the tools that a translator uses to hasten and improve the effectiveness of the translation process. After all, a translator can approach translation in the same way whether or not they employ translation memory systems. Before brand-new IT ever became a thing, it already existed. On the other hand, different translators might employ various strategies while utilizing the same tools. The translation of the Bible was defended by Martin Luther and his opponents in the 16th century, and all of them wrote on paper or parchment with goose-quills. All translators in the 19th century shared the same tools, yet what a glaring contrast existed between the paradigms (approaches to translation) utilized by Russian translators Irinarch Vvedensky and Afanasy Fet! What has changed since then? If we discuss the relationship between translation methodologies and the tools employed, it is almost nonexistent. The functionalist approach might be seen as being in opposition to the equivalency paradigm (Prun, 2015: 57), which is exactly what Erich Prun discusses in his work on the history of European and American Translation Studies). Different labels can be used to describe this method, including functionalist approach in Europe and the US and communicative-functional approach in Russia. According to the communicative-functional perspective, translating is the activity that provides the possibility of the activity (productive, commercial, cognitive, and leisure) of translation users (also known as "consumers" of translation) and/or initiators (commissioners) of translation. This method holds that the structure of a communicative situation (a communication situation) include translating as an activity. A translator is expected to take into account the situation's unique characteristics, the translation's intended outcome, the needs and expectations of the parties involved in the communication process, as well as purely linguistic considerations like language differences, the type of text, and the ST's intended use. Refer to (Sdobnikov, 2016; 2017) for a more in-depth discussion of the communicative-functional method. It is interesting that there is no clear-cut distinction between the communicative-functional approach and the merely linguistic approach (equivalence paradigm). The latter, in my opinion, is a general translation philosophy, a way of thinking that translators utilize to foster an atmosphere where all sorts of translators' actions may be successful. Localization has recently grown in importance as a service in the translation industry. Many translation agencies make the claim that they do localization in addition to translation in an effort to draw in new customers. Although it might fall under a translator's purview, localization is sometimes presented as something wholly separate from "translation proper" (see, for instance, the website of Saint-Petersburg-based translation agency Linguacontact,

"Lokalizatsiya perevoda," Lingvakontakt). However, localization is defined as the adaptation of word and phrase meanings to the perception of the TT receivers, whereas translation proper is defined as reproducing the content of the ST and occasionally its formal aspects in the TT (Lokalizatsiya perevoda, Lingvakontakt). Since it is now widely accepted that translation and localization are two distinct processes, the draft standard for the translator's profession, which was originally going to be called "Translator," has been changed by a vote of the draft's developers to "Specialist in Translation/Interpreting and Localization." Let's examine the distinctions between translation and localization according to translation experts and managers of translation agencies. I'll begin by discussing how certain managers and translators define and evaluate localization. The Internet's information indicates that there are several steps to the translation process. The phrase "internationalization" (or, alternately, "globalization") refers to the process of adapting a text for a global audience. The objective is to eliminate any cultural quirks in order to create a text that might be readily translated into any language or locale. If regional differences cannot be eliminated from the outset, they must be localization stage was completed" (my translation. - V.S.) (Yazykovaya lokalizatsiya...). The outcome of internationalization is a "product that is localized in many languages and is based on the universal, internationalized variant without any reference to the ST; necessary changes are made in the text to adapt it to the tastes of the target audience and to the cultural and social situation in the specific location" (Internatsionalizatsiya i lokalizatsiya...) (Translation mine. - V.S.) The process of localization is thought of as the text's cultural adaption. According to an additional website, "localization entails adapting a source material to the cultural context of the nation into which the translation is done. In other words, one may say that localization is a form of adaptation" (Lokalizatsiya perevoda, Fridge; translation by V.S.). The way that adaptation is subtly separated from translation and portrayed as a separate action from translation makes these definitions intriguing. The same viewpoint is expressed on yet another website: "Localization and translation are frequently mixed together, yet they refer to two independent processes... Text conversion from one language to another is called translation. Localization is more involved than translation, which is one component of it. 2018's What Is Localization? It appears that localization is a process of text refining, completing, and "adaptation" to the target culture. Localization thereby gains a unique status of its own: Translation by me, V.S.: "Localization is often seen as translation at the highest level" (Yazykovaya lokalizatsiya...)

LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Gambier, I. (2016). "Perevod i perevodovedenie na perekrestke tsifrovoykh tekhnologii" [Translation and Translation Studies at the Crossroads of Digital Communications]. In Vestnik SPbSU. Philology. Asian Studies. Journalism, 4, 56–74.
2. Gambier, I. (2016). "Rapid and Radical Changes in Translation and Translation Studies". In International Journal of Communication, 10, 887–906.

3. Internatsionalizatsiya i lokalizatsiya v perevode [Internationalization and localization in translation]. In translation bureau "Express" ["Express" translation agency] Internationalization. Available at: <http://termin74.ru/articles/internationalization/>
4. Komissarov, V.N. (2001). Sovremennoe perevodovedenie [Modern Translation Studies]. Moscow, ETS
5. Бобокулова Г. Ш. Основные положения определения развития внимания //Молодой ученый. – 2016. – №. 9. – С. 1020-1022.
6. Бобокулова Г. Ш. Коммуникативность-один из важных путей повышения эффективности обучения иностранным языкам //Молодой ученый. – 2016. – №. 10. – С. 1174-1176.