



LINGUOCULTURAL REPRESENTATION IN THE TRANSLATION OF TOURISM DISCOURSE FROM ENGLISH INTO UZBEK

Noira Yakubova

Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy in Philological
Sciences (PhD). Journalism and Mass Communications

University of Uzbekistan Tashkent, Uzbekistan

E-mail: noira.yakubova@mail.ru

ORCID iD: 0000-0003-1696-4683

ARTICLE INFO:

Received: 06.10.2026

Revised: 07.10.2026

Accepted: 08.10.2026

KEY WORDS:

tourism discourse,
linguocultural
representation, cultural
translation, English–
Uzbek translation,
culture-bound
vocabulary, cultural
mediation, destination
image.

ABSTRACT

This article examines linguocultural representation in English–Uzbek tourism translation from a theoretical and functional perspective. Tourism discourse is treated as a form of intercultural communication in which historical, religious, social and symbolic meanings are reconstructed for a target audience. Drawing on approaches to tourism discourse, cultural translation and culture-bound vocabulary, the study identifies seven strategies for transferring culturally marked elements: direct/literal translation, borrowing and transliteration, explicitation, calque, modulation, metaphorical adaptation, and addition/omission. Particular attention is given to historical proper names, religious terminology, social institutions, realia and metaphorical destination descriptions. The analysis demonstrates that the effectiveness of tourism translation depends not only on semantic correspondence but also on cultural visibility, contextual accessibility, pragmatic function and destination-image preservation. The article proposes a functional model in which the translator first identifies the cultural element, determines its communicative and cultural status, selects an appropriate strategy, and verifies the result against the intended destination image.



INTRODUCTION. Tourism is not simply an economic activity or a form of physical mobility. It is also a complex communicative practice through which destinations, cultures, historical memories, traditions, lifestyles, and identities are represented to audiences who may not share the cultural background of the destination. Tourism texts consequently occupy an important position at the intersection of language, culture, translation, marketing, intercultural communication, and discourse studies.

The development of international tourism has substantially increased the demand for multilingual tourism communication. Destination websites, travel guides, brochures, museum descriptions, hotel materials, cultural heritage portals, itineraries, advertisements, and social-media publications are routinely produced in several languages. English occupies a particularly significant position because it functions as a global lingua franca of tourism and international communication. When information about Uzbekistan is presented to an English-speaking audience, translation becomes one of the principal mechanisms through which Uzbek cultural meanings are reconstructed for international visitors.

MAIN PART. Tourism discourse differs from many other specialized forms of discourse because its communicative purpose is rarely restricted to the transmission of objective information. Tourism texts are frequently expected to inform, attract, persuade, evoke emotions, construct expectations, and encourage the reader to develop a positive attitude toward a destination. Dann characterizes tourism discourse as a distinctive communicative system in which language is employed not only to provide information but also to construct an attractive representation of the destination (1, pp. 1–8). This persuasive dimension makes the translation of tourism materials especially sensitive to cultural and pragmatic differences.

A destination such as Uzbekistan contains a particularly dense network of linguocultural meanings. Concepts associated with the Silk Road, mahalla, madrasa, mosque, pilgrimage, hospitality, traditional crafts, national dress, historical dynasties, Islamic heritage, local gastronomy, bazaars, architectural monuments, and oral legends cannot always be reduced to straightforward dictionary equivalents. A culturally specific term may carry historical, social, emotional, and symbolic associations that are not automatically accessible to foreign readers.

The problem is therefore not simply whether an English expression has been translated accurately into Uzbek. The more complex question is how cultural meaning is represented through translation and what happens to that meaning when the source and target languages organize cultural experience differently. As Katan argues, translation requires attention to cultural frames and to the ways in which members of different communities conceptualize reality (2, pp. 45–68). Similarly, Newmark emphasizes the importance of culture-bound words and the need to select translation procedures according to the nature of the cultural reference (3, pp. 94–102). The Uzbek context is particularly relevant because Uzbekistan has increasingly promoted its cultural and historical heritage to international audiences. Samarkand, Bukhara, Khiva, Tashkent, the Fergana Valley, the Silk Road heritage, traditional crafts, national cuisine,



and local community traditions form important components of the country's tourism discourse. Official multilingual tourism communication therefore provides a valuable corpus for examining how culturally significant Uzbek concepts are represented across languages. Recent research has begun to address the linguistic and cultural features of Uzbek tourism discourse. Ziyotova's comparative study of English and Uzbek tourism discourse identifies differences in persuasive vocabulary, terminology, realia, grammatical organization, and cultural representation (4, pp. 176–192). The study is particularly relevant because it demonstrates that English tourism discourse tends to employ abundant evaluative and descriptive vocabulary, while Uzbek tourism materials may place greater emphasis on factual and culturally embedded information (4, pp. 184–190). However, the translation dimension of English–Uzbek tourism discourse remains comparatively underexplored. Existing studies often examine English and Uzbek tourism texts contrastively rather than analyzing specific English–Uzbek translation relationships. The present study addresses this gap by focusing on translation units in which cultural meaning is transferred from English tourism texts into Uzbek.

Tourism is a multidimensional communicative phenomenon. It combines informational, promotional, persuasive and identity-constructing functions. Tourism texts transform places into culturally meaningful destinations through evaluation, comparison, metaphor, historical narrative and direct engagement with potential visitors (1, pp. 1–8; 1, pp. 183–195). Uzbekistan provides a particularly dense linguocultural field for tourism discourse. Concepts associated with the Silk Road, mahalla, Islamic heritage, traditional crafts, architecture, historical dynasties and local community life cannot always be reduced to straightforward dictionary equivalents. Their meanings include historical, social, symbolic and emotional dimensions.

Tourism translation is therefore best approached as cultural mediation. The translator must negotiate between source-cultural visibility and target-reader accessibility. A destination description can remain factually accurate while losing its cultural resonance if culturally marked concepts are transferred mechanically. Conversely, excessive adaptation can obscure the distinctive identity of the source culture.

Linguoculturology examines the relationship between language and culture and is especially useful for translation units whose meanings depend on shared cultural knowledge. Culture-bound expressions may occur as proper names, historical terms, religious concepts, social institutions, traditional objects, culinary terms, rituals, geographical names, metaphors and evaluative expressions.

Newmark distinguishes ecological, material, social, organizational, traditional and conceptual cultural categories (3, pp. 95–102). House emphasizes the relationship between translation and communicative function (6, pp. 29–42), while Munday treats translation as a combination of linguistic, functional, cultural and contextual decisions (7, pp. 4–16). These approaches support a functional understanding of tourism translation in which cultural equivalence may be more important than formal equivalence.



The study identifies seven strategies: direct/literal translation; borrowing and transliteration; explicitation; calque; modulation; metaphorical adaptation; and addition/omission.

Direct translation is frequent for historical facts, geographical descriptions and dates. Borrowing and transliteration preserve proper names and realia. Explicitation makes culturally implicit information accessible. Calque reproduces structural components of transparent expressions. Modulation changes conceptual perspective while retaining communicative meaning. Metaphorical adaptation preserves the promotional and emotional function of imagery while allowing cultural adjustment. Addition and omission can support functional equivalence when the target audience requires additional information or when source material is redundant in the target context.

Historical tourism discourse combines factual narration with cultural memory. Bukhara, Samarkand and Khiva are represented through references to rulers, scholars, dynasties, religious heritage, legends and architectural monuments. Translation must preserve both informational accuracy and narrative function.

Religious references require similar care. Terms associated with Islamic scholarship, mosques, madrasas, sacred places and Sufism may carry meanings that are not fully recoverable through generic equivalents. The translator therefore has to balance terminological precision with accessibility.

Metaphors also contribute to destination image. Expressions presenting Samarkand as a pearl or garden, or Khiva as a living monument, are not merely decorative. They create evaluative and emotional representations of place. Lakoff and Johnson's account of metaphor as a conceptual mechanism is relevant here because metaphor structures the way a destination is imagined (8, pp. 3–6). The theoretical and textual evidence supports the view that tourism translation is an intercultural activity. Agorni describes tourism translation as negotiation between insiders and outsiders, while Petillo emphasizes the challenge of making culture-bound references accessible without eliminating destination identity.

The English–Uzbek case demonstrates that cultural authenticity and accessibility are not mutually exclusive. A local term can be retained while becoming understandable through contextual explanation. This is particularly evident in the representation of mahalla, architectural terms and historical proper names.

The most appropriate strategy therefore depends on the cultural density and communicative function of the individual unit. Proper names usually require preservation; culture-specific institutions may require explanation; metaphors may require adaptation; and historical facts often permit direct translation.

CONCLUSION. Linguocultural representation in English–Uzbek tourism translation is a process of negotiating cultural visibility, accessibility and communicative effect. The translation of Uzbek tourism discourse cannot be reduced to lexical substitution because historical names,



social institutions, religious concepts, metaphors and destination-image expressions carry meanings embedded in cultural experience.

A functional model of tourism translation should therefore begin with identification of the cultural element, classification of its cultural type, selection of an appropriate strategy, functional verification, and final assessment of destination-image preservation. Such an approach can support translators and editors working with multilingual tourism communication.

REFERENCES

1. Dann, G. M. S. *The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Wallingford: CAB International, 1996.
2. Katan, D. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. 2nd ed. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2004.
3. Newmark, P. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.
4. Ziyotova, R. U. "Lingua-Cultural Peculiarities of English and Uzbek Tourism Discourse." *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, 2025, Vol. 11, No. 3 (62), pp. 176–192.
5. Agorni, M. "Cultural Representation Through Translation: An Insider-Outsider Perspective on the Translation of Tourism Promotional Discourse." *Altre Modernità*, 2018, pp. 1–14.
6. House, J. *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. London: Routledge, 2015.
7. Munday, J. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 5th ed. London: Routledge, 2016.
8. Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.