

TRANSLATION METHODS IN COMPARING ENGLISH AND UZBEK TOURISM TERMS

<https://doi.org/10.70728/phil.v05.i03.066>

Mukaddam Kurbanova

Abstract: This study examines translation methods used in English-Uzbek tourism terminology. Drawing on a corpus of 150 tourism terms and their Uzbek equivalents, it analyzes the distribution of five strategies: literal translation, transliteration, cultural substitution, functional equivalence, and omission/adaptation. The findings indicate that literal translation predominates, reflecting the standardized nature of global tourism discourse, while adaptive strategies highlight the importance of intercultural mediation. The study demonstrates that effective tourism translation requires a flexible and context-sensitive approach that balances semantic precision with cultural intelligibility, emphasizing the need for terminological standardization and professional translator training in Uzbekistan's developing tourism sector.

Keywords: tourism terminology, translation methods, English-Uzbek translation, literal translation, transliteration, cultural substitution, functional equivalence, omission/adaptation, cross-cultural communication

Introduction

Tourism terminology represents a specialized linguistic domain that demands precision due to cultural and conceptual differences between languages. English and Uzbek belong to different linguistic families and cultural traditions, which creates structural and pragmatic challenges in translation. Accurate translation in tourism ensures effective communication, promotes intercultural understanding, and enhances international cooperation (Newmark, 1988; Venuti, 1995).

This study aims to examine the translation methods applied in rendering English tourism terms into Uzbek, focusing on semantic preservation, cultural adaptation, and functional adequacy.

Methods

The research adopts a qualitative descriptive approach combined with comparative analysis. A corpus of 150 commonly used English tourism terms was compiled from tourism literature, international guides, and institutional materials. Their Uzbek equivalents were collected from official tourism publications, dictionaries, and professional sources.

The translation strategies were categorized according to Newmark's framework (1988), supported by Nida's (1964) equivalence theory and Venuti's (1995) domestication/foreignization model. The following five methods were identified:

1. Literal Translation
2. Transliteration
3. Cultural Substitution
4. Functional Equivalence
5. Omission/Adaptation

Each term was classified according to its predominant translation strategy.

1. Literal Translation (Word-for-word) - Translating terms exactly as they appear in the source language. Literal translation, also referred to as word-for-word translation, is a method in which the lexical items and grammatical structures of the source language (SL) are transferred directly into the target language (TL) with minimal modification. This approach seeks to preserve both semantic content and structural form as closely as possible. The translator reproduces the surface meaning of the original expression while maintaining terminological accuracy and structural parallelism.

According to Peter Newmark (1988), literal translation is often the initial stage of translation and becomes an appropriate final strategy when there is structural and conceptual equivalence between the two languages. In technical and terminological domains such as tourism, literal translation is highly productive due to the presence of standardized and internationally recognized vocabulary.

In the context of English-Uzbek tourism terminology, literal translation is typically employed when:

1. A direct lexical equivalent exists in Uzbek.
2. The concept is internationally institutionalized.
3. The semantic meaning is denotative rather than culture-bound.
4. The structural patterns of both languages allow parallel construction.

Tourism as a global industry relies heavily on shared terminology (e.g., airport, visa, reservation), many of which have already been integrated into Uzbek through direct equivalence or established borrowing. Therefore, literal translation ensures clarity, precision, and terminological stability.

Examples:

hotel - *mehmonxona*
 tour - *tur*
 excursion - *ekskursiya*
 reservation - *bron*
 airport - *aeroport*

passport - *pasport*
 visa - *viza*
 ticket - *bilet*
 tourism - *turizm*
 guide - *gid*

In these cases, the Uzbek equivalents preserve the denotative meaning and professional usage of the English terms without requiring semantic expansion or cultural modification.

Literal translation plays a crucial role in:

- Maintaining terminological consistency
- Supporting institutional communication
- Preserving legal and administrative precision
- Facilitating international tourism cooperation

Since tourism communication often involves contracts, official documentation, and service descriptions, semantic precision is essential. Literal translation helps prevent interpretative ambiguity and ensures professional reliability.

From a theoretical perspective, literal translation aligns with Eugene Nida's (1964) concept of *formal equivalence*, which emphasizes structural correspondence and fidelity to the original linguistic form. It also reflects the principles of semantic translation described by Newmark (1988), where meaning accuracy takes precedence over stylistic adaptation.

However, as Lawrence Venuti (1995) argues, excessive literalism may obscure cultural nuance if contextual sensitivity is ignored. Therefore, while literal translation is effective for neutral terminology, it may be insufficient for culturally embedded expressions.

In English-Uzbek tourism terminology, literal translation is one of the most frequently applied strategies due to the international standardization of tourism vocabulary. It ensures semantic accuracy and professional consistency. Nevertheless, its application must be context-sensitive, particularly when dealing with culturally nuanced terms.

2. Transliteration - Adapting foreign words to the phonetic and orthographic system of the target language. Transliteration is a translation technique that involves transferring a lexical item from the source language (SL) into the target language (TL) by adapting its pronunciation and orthography to the phonetic and graphic system of the target language. Unlike literal translation, transliteration does not attempt to translate meaning; instead, it preserves the original lexical form while adjusting it to fit the structural norms of the receiving language.

According to Peter Newmark (1988), transliteration (often referred to as transference or borrowing) is commonly used for proper nouns, technical terms, and internationally recognized terminology. In tourism discourse, transliteration plays a significant role because the industry is highly globalized and many terms circulate internationally without semantic modification.

In English-Uzbek tourism terminology, transliteration is frequently applied when:

1. The term has no established Uzbek equivalent.
2. The concept is globally standardized.
3. The foreign term carries prestige or international recognition.
4. Translating the term semantically would reduce clarity or create ambiguity.

Examples:

lobby - <i>lobi</i>	minibar - <i>minibar</i>
concierge - <i>konsyerj</i>	spa - <i>spa</i>
shuttle - <i>shatl</i>	charter - <i>charter</i>
buffet - <i>bufet</i>	transfer - <i>transfer</i>

In these examples, the lexical form is preserved while its spelling is adapted to Uzbek phonological rules (e.g., *lobby* → *lobi*, *buffet* → *bufet*).

From a theoretical perspective, transliteration corresponds to what Lawrence Venuti (1995) describes as “foreignization,” where elements of the source language remain visible in the target text. Similarly, in translation theory, borrowing is recognized as a strategy that maintains lexical authenticity while integrating foreign elements into the target language system (Newmark, 1988).

In English-Uzbek tourism terminology, transliteration is widely used due to globalization and the international character of tourism discourse. While it supports terminological consistency, translators must balance foreign lexical preservation with clarity and accessibility for Uzbek-speaking audiences.

3. Cultural Substitution - Replacing a source culture-specific term with a target culture equivalent. Cultural substitution is a translation strategy in which a culture-specific term from the source language (SL) is replaced with a culturally equivalent or functionally similar term in the target language (TL). Unlike literal translation or transliteration, this method does not preserve the original lexical form; instead, it prioritizes cultural intelligibility and pragmatic relevance within the target context.

According to Peter Newmark (1988), cultural substitution involves replacing a source-language cultural word with a target-language cultural word that may not share identical denotative meaning but produces a similar effect on the reader. This strategy is particularly important in tourism discourse, where many terms are deeply embedded in specific social traditions, hospitality systems, and lifestyle practices.

In English-Uzbek tourism terminology, cultural substitution is frequently applied when:

1. The concept exists in both cultures but under different forms.
2. A literal translation would be culturally obscure.
3. The source term reflects a practice not directly present in Uzbek society.
4. The goal is to ensure reader comprehension and communicative efficiency.

Examples:

Bed and Breakfast - *mehmonxona*
bilan nonushta
 pub - *kafe-bar*
 guesthouse - *mehmon uyi*
 holiday camp - *dam olish*
oromgohi

theme park - *ko 'ngilochar bog'*
 food court - *umumiy ovqatlanish*
maydoni
 heritage site - *tarixiy yodgorlik*

In these examples, the Uzbek equivalents reflect culturally recognizable institutions rather than preserving the exact lexical form of the English terms.

For example, translating *pub* as *kafe-bar* captures the functional aspect but may omit certain socio-cultural connotations associated with British pub culture.

This strategy aligns with Eugene Nida's (1964) concept of *dynamic equivalence*, which emphasizes producing a similar response in the target audience rather than preserving the exact linguistic form. It also corresponds to what Lawrence Venuti (1995) calls *domestication*, where translation reduces foreignness to increase fluency and cultural familiarity.

In the comparison of English and Uzbek tourism terminology, cultural substitution plays a crucial role in bridging cultural gaps. It ensures that tourism-related concepts are accessible and meaningful within the Uzbek socio-cultural framework. Nevertheless, translators must carefully balance adaptation with semantic fidelity to avoid excessive cultural simplification.

4. Functional Equivalence - Conveying the intended function and meaning rather than the exact lexical form. Functional equivalence is a translation strategy that prioritizes the communicative purpose and pragmatic function of a term over its formal or lexical structure. Rather than translating words literally, this approach focuses on conveying the intended meaning, effect, and usage of the source language (SL) expression within the target language (TL) context.

The concept of functional equivalence is closely associated with Eugene Nida (1964), who introduced the notion of *dynamic equivalence*. Nida argues that translation should aim to produce an equivalent effect on the target audience, ensuring that the receptor of the translated text understands and responds to the message in substantially the same way as the original audience. In tourism discourse, where clarity and communicative efficiency are crucial, functional equivalence is particularly significant.

In English-Uzbek tourism terminology, functional equivalence is commonly applied when:

1. A direct lexical equivalent does not exist.
2. Literal translation would distort the practical meaning.
3. The term refers to an institutional or service-based function.
4. The emphasis is on communicative clarity rather than structural similarity.

Examples

sightseeing tour - <i>ko 'rgazmali</i>	travel insurance - <i>sayohat</i>
<i>sayohat</i>	<i>sug 'urtasi</i>
travel agency - <i>sayohat</i>	business trip - <i>xizmat safari</i>
<i>tashkilotchisi</i>	round trip - <i>borib-kelish sayohati</i>
package tour - <i>xizmatlar majmuasi</i>	travel package - <i>sayohat</i>
<i>asosidagi sayohat</i>	<i>xizmatlari to 'plami</i>
guided tour - <i>yo 'l-yo 'riq bilan</i>	city break - <i>qisqa muddatli shahar</i>
<i>sayohat</i>	<i>sayohati</i>

In these cases, the Uzbek translations focus on explaining the functional role of the service rather than reproducing the lexical structure of the English term.

From a theoretical perspective, functional equivalence reflects a communicative approach to translation, emphasizing message transmission over formal symmetry. It contrasts with formal equivalence (Nida, 1964) and aligns with communicative translation as described by Newmark (1988). Furthermore, it supports culturally adaptive translation practices while maintaining semantic accuracy.

In the comparative analysis of English and Uzbek tourism terminology, functional equivalence emerges as a highly effective strategy for preserving meaning and communicative intent. It allows translators to maintain pragmatic accuracy while adapting to the linguistic and cultural norms of Uzbek. However, careful balance is required to avoid excessive explanatory expansion or semantic reinterpretation.

5. Omission/Adaptation - Adjusting or omitting terms that have no direct equivalent in the target language. Omission and adaptation are translation strategies applied when a source language (SL) term has no direct lexical, cultural, or conceptual equivalent in the target language (TL). In such cases, the translator either modifies the term to fit the linguistic and cultural norms of the target audience (adaptation) or partially/fully omits elements that are redundant, culturally irrelevant, or pragmatically unnecessary (omission).

According to Peter Newmark (1988), adaptation is the "freest" form of translation, often used when the situation described in the source text does not exist in the target culture. Similarly, omission may occur when certain lexical items do not contribute essential semantic value within the communicative context. In tourism terminology, where many expressions are culture-bound or marketing-oriented, omission and adaptation are frequently necessary to preserve communicative effectiveness.

In English-Uzbek tourism terminology, omission/adaptation is typically applied when:

1. The concept does not exist in Uzbek socio-cultural reality.
2. A literal translation would create confusion or misunderstanding.
3. The source term contains culturally specific marketing elements.

4. The communicative goal prioritizes clarity over lexical fidelity.

Examples

all-inclusive - *barcha xizmatlar kiradi*

continental breakfast - *yengil nonushta*

boutique hotel - *kichik dizaynli mehmonxona*

city break - *qisqa muddatli shahar sayohati*

self-catering accommodation: - *o'z-o'ziga xizmat ko'rsatish turar joyi*

honeymoon package - *yangi turmush qurganlar uchun sayohat*

shore excursion - *qirg'oq bo'ylab sayohat*

backpacking trip - *mustaqil arzon sayohat*

In these cases, the Uzbek versions either expand the term descriptively or omit specific cultural components embedded in the English expression.

The strategy corresponds to Nida's (1964) principle of dynamic equivalence, emphasizing audience response over formal similarity. It also aligns with Venuti's (1995) domestication strategy, where foreign cultural elements are reshaped to fit the expectations of the target readership. From a communicative translation standpoint (Newmark, 1988), omission/adaptation prioritizes functional relevance rather than structural preservation.

In the comparison of English and Uzbek tourism terminology, omission and adaptation serve as flexible and culturally sensitive translation tools. While they ensure communicative effectiveness and accessibility, translators must apply them carefully to avoid excessive semantic loss. When balanced appropriately, these strategies contribute significantly to accurate and culturally coherent tourism translation.

Conclusion

The study confirms that translating tourism terminology between English and Uzbek requires a strategic and context-sensitive approach. No single method adequately addresses all semantic and cultural dimensions of tourism discourse. While literal translation remains dominant due to international standardization, adaptive strategies play a crucial role in ensuring cultural intelligibility and communicative effectiveness.

As Uzbekistan's tourism sector continues to expand, the demand for accurate and culturally coherent translation will increase. Therefore, systematic terminological standardization and professional translator training are essential for enhancing international tourism communication. Future research may expand the corpus, include additional languages, and examine the role of digital translation technologies in tourism terminology development.

References

1. Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. London: Prentice Hall.
2. Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
3. Venuti, L. (1995). The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. London: Routledge.
4. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary. (2015). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Oxford English for Tourism. (2013). Oxford: Oxford University Press.