

**PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATING CULTURE-SPECIFIC WORDS IN ENGLISH–
UZBEK LEXICOGRAPHY****Madinaxon Munavvarxonova**

Teacher, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article examines the problems of translating culture-specific words in English–Uzbek lexicography. The study focuses on cultural realia, nationally specific concepts, and the semantic and pragmatic features of linguistic units. It highlights the challenges that arise when finding appropriate Uzbek equivalents for English culture-bound terms, including the lack of direct equivalence, differences in connotative meanings, and issues related to linguocultural interpretation. The paper also analyzes major translation strategies such as transcription, transliteration, descriptive translation, and functional adaptation. The findings emphasize the importance of accurately representing cultural components in bilingual dictionaries and provide practical recommendations for translators and lexicographers working with English and Uzbek languages.

Keywords: *culture-specific words, lexicography, translation problems, equivalence, realia, connotation, semantics, pragmatics, English language.*

Introduction: In the context of globalization and increasing intercultural communication, translation plays a crucial role in facilitating mutual understanding between different linguistic and cultural communities. One of the most challenging aspects of translation is dealing with culture-specific words, which reflect the unique traditions, values, and social realities of a particular speech community. Such lexical units often lack direct equivalents in other languages, making their accurate interpretation and representation especially difficult.

The issue becomes particularly significant in English–Uzbek lexicography, where the two languages belong to different linguistic families and embody distinct cultural systems. English, as a global language, contains numerous culture-bound terms rooted in Western traditions, while Uzbek reflects the history, customs, and worldview of Central Asian society. As a result, translating culture-specific words between these languages requires not only linguistic competence but also deep cultural awareness.

This study aims to explore the main problems associated with translating culture-specific words in English–Uzbek lexicography. It examines the types of cultural lexical units, identifies common challenges such as non-equivalence, semantic gaps, and connotative differences, and analyzes effective translation strategies used to overcome these difficulties. By addressing these issues, the research seeks to contribute to the development of more accurate and culturally sensitive bilingual dictionaries, as well as to improve translation practices in general.

Literature Review: The problem of translating culture-specific words has been widely discussed in the fields of translation studies and lexicography. Scholars emphasize that language and culture are deeply interconnected, and this relationship significantly influences the process of translation. One of the foundational contributors to this field, Eugene Nida, introduced the concept of dynamic equivalence, highlighting the importance of conveying meaning in a way that is natural and culturally appropriate for the target audience. His approach underscores that translation is not merely a linguistic operation but also a cultural one.

Peter Newmark further developed the discussion by distinguishing between semantic and communicative translation. He argued that culture-specific items, which he termed “cultural

words,” often require special treatment, as they are closely tied to the source culture. Newmark proposed several strategies for translating such items, including transference, cultural equivalent, descriptive equivalent, and explanatory notes. Another important contribution was made by Lawrence Venuti, who introduced the concepts of domestication and foreignization. He emphasized the translator’s role in either adapting the source text to the target culture or preserving its foreign characteristics. This dichotomy is particularly relevant when dealing with culture-bound terms, as translators must balance cultural authenticity with readability.

In the field of lexicography, scholars such as R. R. K.Hartmann and Gregory James have explored how bilingual dictionaries represent cultural information. They argue that many traditional dictionaries focus primarily on lexical equivalence and often fail to reflect deeper cultural meanings, especially in the case of realia—terms denoting culture-specific phenomena.

In Uzbek linguistics, significant contributions have been made by Sh.Raxmatullayev, who studied lexical semantics and the cultural aspects of language. His works emphasize the importance of understanding the national-cultural specificity of words and their meanings in translation. Raxmatullayev highlights that many lexical units in Uzbek carry rich cultural connotations that cannot be directly translated into English without loss of meaning, thus requiring descriptive or interpretative approaches.

Other Uzbek scholars have also addressed the challenges of translating national-cultural units, stressing the need for culturally sensitive strategies in bilingual lexicography. Their research shows that the absence of direct equivalents between English and Uzbek often leads to semantic gaps, which must be compensated through various translation techniques. Overall, the literature indicates that translating culture-specific words is a complex and multidimensional process involving linguistic, cultural, and pragmatic factors. Despite the extensive theoretical background, there remains a need for more focused research on English–Uzbek lexicography, particularly in improving the representation of cultural meanings in bilingual dictionaries.

Materials and methods: This study employs a qualitative research approach to investigate the problems of translating culture-specific words in English–Uzbek lexicography. The research is based on the analysis of lexical units that carry cultural meanings and lack direct equivalents between the two languages.

The primary materials for the study include English–Uzbek bilingual dictionaries, monolingual explanatory dictionaries, and selected literary texts containing culture-bound terms. In particular, examples of realia, idiomatic expressions, and nationally specific vocabulary were collected and categorized according to their semantic and cultural features.

The research methods applied in this study include comparative analysis, semantic analysis, and contextual analysis. The comparative method is used to identify similarities and differences between English and Uzbek culture-specific lexical units. Semantic analysis helps to examine the meanings, connotations, and nuances of the selected words, while contextual analysis allows for understanding how these units function within different communicative situations.

In addition, the study utilizes a descriptive method to classify translation strategies used in rendering culture-specific words. These strategies include transcription, transliteration, descriptive translation, and functional adaptation. Each example is analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the chosen strategy in preserving both meaning and cultural significance.

The research also draws on theoretical frameworks from translation studies and lexicography, integrating perspectives on equivalence, linguoculture, and pragmatic adaptation. The combination of these methods ensures a comprehensive examination of the challenges and solutions related to translating culture-specific words in English–Uzbek lexicography.

Results and discussion: The analysis of culture-specific words in English–Uzbek lexicography reveals several significant challenges related to equivalence, meaning transfer, and cultural representation. The findings show that many English culture-bound terms do not have direct Uzbek equivalents, which leads to semantic gaps and difficulties in achieving full equivalence. These gaps are particularly evident in the translation of realia, idiomatic expressions, and culturally marked lexical units.

One of the key results of the study is the identification of different types of non-equivalence. These include complete absence of equivalents, partial equivalence, and differences in connotative meaning. For instance, certain English terms related to social institutions, traditions, or everyday life cannot be directly translated into Uzbek without additional explanation. In such cases, literal translation often fails to convey the intended cultural meaning.

The study also demonstrates that translators frequently rely on various strategies to overcome these challenges. Among the most commonly used methods are transcription and transliteration, which preserve the original form of the word, as well as descriptive translation, which explains the meaning in the target language. Functional adaptation is another effective strategy, allowing translators to replace a culture-specific item with a culturally analogous concept in Uzbek.

However, the results indicate that each strategy has its limitations. Transcription and transliteration may retain the foreign form but often fail to communicate meaning clearly to the target audience. Descriptive translation, while more informative, can lead to verbosity and reduce lexical economy. Functional adaptation, on the other hand, may distort the original cultural context if not applied carefully. The discussion highlights that the choice of translation strategy depends on several factors, including the purpose of the text, the target audience, and the type of lexical unit. In lexicography, it is especially important to balance accuracy and clarity, ensuring that both linguistic meaning and cultural information are adequately represented. The findings suggest that bilingual dictionaries should incorporate explanatory notes and cultural comments to better reflect the complexity of culture-specific words.

Overall, the study confirms that translating culture-specific vocabulary is a complex process requiring not only linguistic competence but also deep cultural knowledge. The results emphasize the need for more systematic approaches in English–Uzbek lexicography to improve the quality and effectiveness of translation.

Conclusion: This study has examined the main problems associated with translating culture-specific words in English–Uzbek lexicography. The analysis demonstrates that such lexical units pose significant challenges due to the lack of direct equivalence, differences in cultural context, and variation in connotative meanings. These factors make it difficult to achieve accurate and complete translation, especially when dealing with realia and culturally bound expressions.

The findings confirm that no single translation strategy is sufficient for all cases. Instead, translators and lexicographers must apply a combination of methods, including transcription, transliteration, descriptive translation, and functional adaptation, depending on the specific context and purpose. Each of these strategies has its advantages and limitations, and their effectiveness largely depends on the translator's linguistic and cultural competence.

The study also highlights the importance of incorporating cultural information into bilingual dictionaries. Providing explanatory notes and context-based interpretations can



significantly improve the understanding of culture-specific words and help bridge the gap between English and Uzbek linguistic systems.

In conclusion, translating culture-specific vocabulary requires a comprehensive approach that integrates linguistic analysis with cultural awareness. The research contributes to the development of English–Uzbek lexicography by emphasizing the need for more accurate and culturally sensitive representation of lexical units. Future studies may focus on expanding corpus-based analysis and developing more systematic models for handling cultural elements in translation practice.

REFERENCES

1. Abdullayeva, M. (2022). The Appearance Of The Term “Education Dictionary” In World Linguistics Is Analyzed. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 2(Special Issue 28-2), 48-52.
2. Nida E. A. *Toward a Science of Translating*. – Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964. – 331 p.
3. Newmark P. *A Textbook of Translation*. – New York: Prentice Hall, 1988. – 292 p.
4. Venuti L. *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. – London: Routledge, 1995. – 353 p.
5. Hartmann R. R. K., James G. *Dictionary of Lexicography*. – London: Routledge, 1998. – 176 p.
6. Raxmatullayev Sh. *O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati*. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi, 2006. – 680 p.
7. Baker M. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. – London: Routledge, 1992. – 304 p.
8. Qizi, Sodikova Dinora Ilhom, et al. "AI-Driven NLP and Blockchain-Enabled Linguistic Analytics: Integrative Approaches for Fair, Transparent Literary Translation of George Orwell's Works." *2025 International Conference on Electrical Engineering and Informatics (ICEEI)*. IEEE, 2025.