BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

LINGUOCULTURAL CHALLENGES IN TRANSLATING HISTORICAL TERMS FROM ENGLISH INTO UZBEK

Makhliyo Khabibullaeva
Senior lecturer, Tashkent state university of oriental studies, Uzbekistan
Saida Panjiqizi Abramatova
Lecturer, Department of Foreign Languages
Uzbekistan University of Journalism and Mass Communications
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23492170

Abstract. This article examines the linguocultural challenges involved in translating historical terms from English into Uzbek, focusing on the relationship between lexical meaning, historical context, and cultural specificity. Particular attention is paid to terms denoting political institutions, social hierarchies, legal practices, and culturally specific titles. Through a qualitative comparative approach, the article explores how differences between English and Uzbek historical experiences complicate the selection of appropriate equivalents. It discusses the possibilities and limitations of borrowing, calquing, descriptive translation, functional equivalence, and explanatory notes. The analysis highlights the risk of anachronism and misleading cultural substitution when familiar Uzbek terms are used to represent historically distinct English concepts. The article argues that adequate translation requires attention to a term's institutional function, chronological setting, and cultural associations, alongside its dictionary meaning.

Keywords: historical terminology, English–Uzbek translation, linguocultural challenges, cultural specificity, lexical equivalence, historical context, translation strategies, anachronism.

Introduction: Historical terminology presents a particular challenge in translation because it conveys more than the names of past events, institutions, and social groups. Historical terms also encode culturally shaped understandings of authority, social status, legal relations, and collective identity. Their meanings are closely connected to the societies and periods in which they emerged. Consequently, translating historical terms from English into Uzbek requires both linguistic competence and an understanding of the historical and cultural contexts underlying their use.

The central difficulty lies in the uneven correspondence between the concepts expressed in the two languages. English historical terms such as thegn, shire, peerage, and workhouse refer to institutions or categories whose functions developed within particular historical circumstances. Although Uzbek may offer words with partially similar meanings, such similarities do not necessarily establish full equivalence. A familiar target-language term can facilitate comprehension while introducing associations absent from the source concept. Conversely, retaining an English term without explanation may preserve its cultural distinctiveness but make the translated text difficult to understand.

Equivalence in this context should therefore be considered in relation to a term's referent, institutional function, chronological setting, and cultural associations. A translation that communicates a general meaning may still obscure distinctions essential to historical interpretation. For example, rendering a historically specific rank through a broad designation of nobility may convey social prestige while failing to represent its legal privileges or position within a particular hierarchy. The translator must determine which features are necessary for readers to understand the term accurately in its immediate context.

A further challenge concerns the relationship between historical accuracy and accessibility. Borrowing, calquing, descriptive translation, functional equivalence, and explanatory notes offer different ways of addressing culturally specific meanings. However, their suitability depends on the purpose of the translation, the intended readership, and the role of the term within the text. Academic historical writing may require terminological precision and supplementary explanation, whereas a historical novel may require a more concise solution that also preserves narrative continuity. Translation choices must therefore be assessed within the communicative conditions of each text.

Against this background, the present article aims to examine the linguocultural challenges encountered in translating historical terms from English into Uzbek and to discuss strategies for preserving their historically significant meanings. Particular attention is given to culturally specific institutions, social categories, and titles, as well as the risks of anachronism, semantic generalization, and misleading cultural substitution. The discussion seeks to clarify how contextual analysis can support translation decisions that maintain historical specificity while ensuring intelligibility for Uzbek readers.

Materials and methods: This article adopts a qualitative comparative approach to examine the linguocultural difficulties involved in translating historical terms from English into Uzbek. The discussion combines semantic analysis, contextual interpretation, and the evaluation of translation strategies. The examples presented below are illustrative translation cases rather than findings from a systematically collected corpus. Accordingly, the analysis identifies potential translation problems without making claims about their frequency in published translations.

The analytical material consists of selected English historical terms referring to social ranks, political institutions, administrative structures, and socioeconomic relations. Illustrative examples include knight, lord, Parliament, and serf. These terms were selected because their translation requires decisions about cultural specificity, semantic scope, and the relationship between historical and contemporary meanings.

The proposed Uzbek renderings are treated as context-dependent alternatives. They are evaluated according to their capacity to communicate the source concept while avoiding unsupported associations with Uzbek historical institutions. For a corpus-based extension of the study, each example would need to be documented through an identifiable source passage, its published Uzbek translation, and the relevant bibliographic details.

Comparative semantic analysis is used to compare the meaning components of an English term with those of its possible Uzbek equivalents. Particular attention is paid to social position, institutional function, and culturally specific associations. This method helps distinguish partial semantic similarity from equivalence appropriate to a particular passage.

Contextual analysis examines how the immediate passage and its historical setting influence a term's meaning. The same English word may function as a title, a form of address, or a general designation. Translation alternatives are therefore assessed within a specified use rather than through isolated dictionary correspondence.

Linguocultural analysis considers the cultural information activated by a translation choice. A target-language term may be understandable but introduce associations with a different historical tradition. This method identifies cases in which apparent familiarity may produce a misleading interpretation.

Translation-strategy analysis evaluates borrowing, descriptive translation, functional equivalence, and explanatory notes. The suitability of each strategy is considered in relation to the text's purpose and the reader's likely background knowledge.

The evaluation follows three criteria: semantic adequacy, or the preservation of essential meaning; historical appropriateness, or compatibility with the period and institution described; and reader accessibility, or the intelligibility of the translation.

English term and specified use	Possible Uzbek rendering	Translation problem	Analytical interpretation
Knight, used as a historical title	ritsar; where needed, ritsarlik unvoniga ega shaxs	Translating it simply as jangchi preserves a military association but removes the title or status component.	Borrowing may preserve the designation more precisely; a brief explanation can clarify its function for unfamiliar readers.
Lord, used as a title or form of address	lord; a contextual explanatory phrase where necessary	Replacing it automatically with bek may suggest an equivalence between historically distinct titles.	Retention is a useful starting point, but the precise referent must be established from the passage before an explanation is added.
Parliament, referring to a historical institution	parlament, accompanied by a period-specific explanation when relevant	A familiar modern equivalent may encourage readers to attribute contemporary institutional features to an earlier setting.	Lexical recognition alone does not ensure historical understanding; contextual explanation may be necessary.
Serf, referring to a dependent peasant	qaram dehqon; where supported by context, yerga biriktirilgan qaram dehqon	The broad rendering dehqon omits dependency, while qul risks replacing the source category with a different one.	Descriptive translation can communicate the relevant relationship more clearly, provided the description matches the source context.

The example of knight illustrates the difference between translating an activity and translating a status. The Uzbek word jangchi identifies someone involved in fighting, but it does not independently communicate a historically specific title. Consequently, its adequacy depends on whether the source passage emphasizes military action or social designation. Where the title itself matters, ritsar with an initial explanation provides a more informative solution.

The translation of lord demonstrates the problem of cultural substitution. Choosing bek may make the text immediately accessible, yet this choice can encourage readers to interpret the source title through a different institutional framework. The analytical task is therefore to establish the word's function in the passage before selecting a rendering. A title, an address form, and a reference to authority may require different Uzbek formulations.

The case of Parliament shows that a recognizable equivalent can still require historical clarification. Translating the word as parlament communicates the institutional name, but the surrounding text must establish its role in the period under discussion. Explanatory information is warranted when that role is essential to the author's argument and cannot be inferred from the passage.

Finally, serf demonstrates the value and limits of descriptive translation. The phrase qaram dehqon communicates both agricultural identity and dependency more explicitly than dehqon alone. However, a longer explanation should include only features supported by the specific historical context. Description improves precision when it clarifies the source concept; it reduces precision when it adds assumptions.

Together, these analytical procedures provide a framework for assessing translation alternatives through their meanings, contexts, and likely effects on readers. The approach supports reasoned translation choices while recognizing that the suitability of each equivalent must ultimately be demonstrated through an identifiable source passage.

Results and discussion: The qualitative examination of the illustrative examples suggests that equivalence in historical terminology is multidimensional. An Uzbek rendering may convey the general meaning of an English term while leaving its social, institutional, or cultural implications insufficiently expressed. The discussion therefore distinguishes between lexical correspondence and contextual adequacy. Since the examples are illustrative, the observations concern the selected translation choices and do not establish patterns across published English–Uzbek translations.

One problem identified in the examples is semantic generalization: a historically specific term is replaced by a broader Uzbek word. This strategy can make a passage easier to read, but it may remove distinctions necessary for understanding the source text. For instance, translating knight as jangchi communicates an association with military activity without necessarily preserving the status expressed by the original designation. Similarly, rendering serf simply as dehqon retains the agricultural component but omits dependency. These examples indicate that translation adequacy depends on which meaning components are significant in the passage. If social position explains a character's rights, obligations, or relationships, a general equivalent may weaken the historical interpretation. A more explicit rendering becomes necessary when the omitted feature contributes directly to the text's argument or narrative.

A second issue concerns the use of culturally familiar Uzbek designations for English historical concepts. Such substitutions may facilitate immediate comprehension, yet they can also introduce associations that the source term does not support. The proposed substitution of bek for lord, for example, requires particular caution. Familiarity alone does not demonstrate that the two designations express the same institutional position.

The central difficulty is that similarities in prestige or authority do not necessarily establish equivalence in historical function. A translator must consider the particular use of lord before choosing an Uzbek rendering. Where the source designation itself is important, retaining lord and explaining its contextual meaning may preserve more information than replacing it with a culturally familiar title.

This observation supports a distinction between an explanatory comparison and a translation equivalent. A comparison can help readers understand an unfamiliar concept, but it should not silently replace that concept with a different historical category. The example of Parliament illustrates a further difficulty: an established lexical equivalent may remain insufficient for historical interpretation. The rendering parlament is recognizable to Uzbek readers, but recognition does not guarantee an understanding of the institution's role in the period described.

The translation problem therefore extends beyond word selection. When the historical function of an institution is central to a passage, the surrounding wording or a brief note may need to clarify that function. Otherwise, readers may interpret the historical reference through their understanding of contemporary institutions. An important implication is that explanatory detail should address a demonstrable contextual need. Adding extensive background to every institutional term would

burden the translation, whereas omitting necessary clarification could obscure the source meaning. The translator's task is to identify which information is essential at the point where the term occurs.

The examples suggest that no single strategy provides an adequate solution for every historical term. Each strategy preserves some features while potentially weakening others.

Strategy	**Illustrative rendering**	**Main contribution**	**Potential limitation**
Borrowing	knight → ritsar	Preserves a distinct historical designation	May require explanation for unfamiliar readers
Descriptive translation	serf → qaram dehqon	Makes a relevant semantic feature explicit	Can become lengthy or introduce unsupported detail
Cultural substitution	lord → bek	Provides a familiar cultural reference	May imply an unjustified institutional equivalence
Established equivalent with clarification	Parliament → parlament, followed by contextual explanation	Combines recognizability with historical precision	Requires judgment about the amount of explanation needed

Borrowing is particularly useful when replacing a designation would erase its cultural identity. However, an unexplained borrowing may transfer the word without communicating its meaning. Descriptive translation addresses this limitation by expressing relevant features directly, although its accuracy depends on the evidence available in the source passage.

The rendering qaram dehqon for serf illustrates this balance. It is more informative than dehqon because it includes dependency. Nevertheless, any additional description must be justified by the specific context. Greater length does not automatically produce greater accuracy.

Taken together, the illustrative analyses suggest that historical terms should be evaluated through the relationship between designation, function, and context. Dictionary correspondence provides a starting point, but a defensible translation also requires identifying what the term contributes to the passage.

A practical implication is the value of a consistent first-mention explanation. Where a term is unfamiliar and recurs throughout a text, the translator can introduce a concise explanation at its first occurrence and subsequently use the selected designation consistently. However, consistency must follow meaning: if the source word performs different functions in different passages, its Uzbek rendering may require adjustment. The discussion thus supports a context-sensitive understanding of equivalence. An adequate translation preserves the historically relevant features of a term while giving Uzbek readers sufficient information to interpret it. These observations provide a basis for further corpus-based investigation, in which the proposed alternatives could be assessed against documented source passages and published translations.

Conclusion: The analysis of the selected illustrative examples suggests that translating historical terms from English into Uzbek requires attention to semantic meaning, cultural specificity, and historical context. Lexical similarity alone does not ensure an adequate translation, particularly when terms designate culturally distinct titles, institutions, or social relationships. Generalization may obscure essential features, while cultural substitution may introduce associations unsupported by the source text.

The discussion indicates that borrowing, descriptive translation, and contextual explanation offer complementary solutions. Their suitability depends on the function of the term, the purpose of

the text, and the intended readership. A historically appropriate rendering should preserve the features necessary for interpretation while remaining accessible to Uzbek readers. Terminological consistency is also essential, provided that it accommodates differences in contextual meaning.

These observations support a context-sensitive approach to equivalence rather than the automatic selection of fixed word-for-word correspondences. Since the present discussion is based on illustrative cases, its conclusions do not establish the prevalence of particular problems in published translations. Further research using a documented parallel corpus would enable a more systematic evaluation of translation choices and contribute to the development of an English–Uzbek glossary of historical terminology.

References

1. Abdullayeva, M. R. (2022). TRANSLATION PROBLEMS OF VERB PHRASEOLOGISMS EXPRESSING NATIONAL COLOR. Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences, 2(Special Issue 25), 347-352.
2. Abramatova, S. (2025). A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LEXICAL GAPS IN UZBEK-ENGLISH LITERARY TEXTS. SPECIAL FOR TEACHERS, 1(1).
3. Baker, M. (2018). In other words: A coursebook on translation (3rd ed.). Routledge.
4. Katan, D., & Taibi, M. (2021). Translating cultures: An introduction for translators, interpreters and mediators (3rd ed.). Routledge.
5. Rundle, C. (Ed.). (2022). The Routledge handbook of translation history. Routledge.
6. Xodjayeva, D. K. (2026). THE ISSUE OF PRESERVING SPEECH GENRE IN ENGLISH–UZBEK LITERARY TRANSLATION. BG pulse journal, 2(5), 1919-1923.
7. Абдуллаева, М. (2024). НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-КУЛЬТУРНЫЕ ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПЕРЕВОДА ПРОЗЫ (на примере прямых переводов с английского языка конца XX-начала XXI века). Предпринимательства и педагогика, 3(4), 3-10.
8. Makhliyo Khabibullaeva. Literary Translation: From the Magic of The Words to The Bridge of The Cultures. (2025). International Journal Of Literature And Languages, 5(04), 75-78. https://doi.org/10.37547/ijll/Volume05Issue04-19
9. Khamrabaeva, S., & Bahrombekova, M. LINGUISTIC EXPRESSION OF GENDER IMAGES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES (BASED ON THE TRANSLATIONS OF JANE AUSTEN'S PRIDE AND PREJUDICE).
10. Khabibullaeva, M. E. (2020). Modern learning system in education. International Journal of Engineering Science and Computing (IJESC), 10(4), 103–108.
11. Khabibullaeva, M. E., & Shermatova, M. (2022). Distance studying in higher educational establishments. In Proceedings of the VI Forum of Young Orientalists (pp. 87–90). Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies.
12. Makhliyo, E. K., & Dilfuza, Z. S. (2026). LINGUISTIC ISSUES IN PRESERVING NATIONAL SPIRIT AND HISTORICAL COLOR IN THE TRANSLATION OF HISTORICAL WORKS. International Journal of Political Sciences and Economics, 5(5), 47–51. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20058316