



DIFFERENCES IN TRANSLATING HUMAN GEOGRAPHICAL TERMS FROM ENGLISH TO THE UZBEK LANGUAGES

Khabibulloeva Gulchekhra Komiljonovna

English teacher of Denau Pedagogy and Entrepreneurship

Institute Department of Foreign language and literature lower courses

Introduction. Geographical terms are linguistic expressions that can be challenging to translate between two languages. "Human geography, a growingly globalized discipline, relies heavily on English as its lingua franca for disseminating core concepts and theories. This necessitates the translation of specialized terminology into diverse languages, such as Uzbek, for educational and research purposes. However, translating abstract and culturally-laden human geographical terms like 'sense of place,' 'cultural landscape,' or 'gentrification' is fraught with challenges. These terms are not mere labels but carry rich semantic fields and theoretical underpinnings often rooted in Anglophone contexts, making direct lexical substitution into a linguistically and culturally distant language like Uzbek problematic. Existing bilingual resources may offer simplistic equivalents, potentially leading to conceptual misinterpretations, hindering the development of robust indigenous geographical discourse, and limiting the effective application of geographical insights in local contexts. While translation studies address general complexities, the specific nuances of rendering core human geographical terminology between languages like English and Uzbek remain underexplored, highlighting a critical gap in understanding how geographical knowledge travels and transforms across linguistic divides.

This article investigates the translational challenges and nuances. Specifically, it aims to: identify common difficulties in translating selected key human geographical terms from English into Uzbek, and analyze how the conceptual depth of these terms may be altered or lost in translation. Through a comparative linguistic analysis of selected terms, drawing upon dictionaries, academic texts, and conceptual definitions, this study seeks to illuminate the complexities involved. Ultimately, this research contributes to a more critical engagement with the terminology that shapes our geographical understanding and offers insights for scholars and educators working at the interface of English and Uzbek, and potentially other similar linguistic pairings, thereby fostering more accurate and culturally attuned cross-linguistic communication within the discipline.

Methodology. The difficulties and subtleties of translating important human geography words from English into Uzbek were examined in this study using a qualitative, comparative analytical approach. The process comprised choosing important human geography concepts. A purposive sampling strategy was used to select a set of [State the number, e.g., six to eight] core human geographical terms for in-depth analysis. The criteria for selection included: Centrality to Human Geography: Terms widely recognized as foundational or critical within contemporary human geographical discourse.

Conceptual Complexity: Terms known for their abstract nature, rich theoretical underpinnings, and multiple layers of meaning (e.g., "sense of place," "cultural landscape," "gentrification," "sustainability," "territoriality," "globalization").

Potential for Translation Difficulty: Terms likely to lack direct one-to-one lexical equivalents

in Uzbek due to cultural, historical, or linguistic differences. Relevance to Uzbek Context (if applicable): Terms that are, or could be, relevant for discussing geographical phenomena in Uzbekistan.

Results. The comparative linguistic analysis of the selected key human geographical terms—"sense of place," "cultural landscape," "gentrification," "sustainability," "territoriality," and "globalization"—from English into Uzbek revealed distinct patterns of translation strategies, challenges, and conceptual shifts.

"Sense of Place":

English Conceptual Core (cf. Tuan, 1977): A subjective, affective, and experiential bond an individual or group forms with a specific location, imbuing it with meaning and attachment.

No single, established, direct lexical equivalent fully captures the multifaceted nature of "sense of place."

"Joy hissi" (feeling of place/space): This is a literal translation but often lacks the depth of emotional attachment and experiential meaning inherent in the English term. It can be interpreted as a mere perception of a place rather than a deep connection.

Emphasising "bog'liqlik" (attachment, connection) brings the phrase "Makonga bog'liqlik hissi" (feeling of attachment to space/place) closer, but it might not yet adequately capture the subjective, lived experience.

For example, "biror joyga nisbatan shaxsiy, hissiy munosabat va bog'liqlik tuyg'usi" (a personal, emotional attitude and feeling of connection towards a given area) requires periphrastic (descriptive) translations in order to communicate the entire meaning. Relying solely on straightforward translations frequently results in the loss or dilution of important conceptual nuance. Descriptive translations are longer and less useful as stand-alone terms, although being more correct.

"Cultural Landscape":

English Conceptual Core (cf. Sauer, 1925): The fashioning of a natural landscape by a cultural group; the visible imprint of human activity on the environment.

The term "Madaniy landshaft" is a commonly used and recognised calque (loan translation). The terms "madaniy" (culture) and "landshaft" (landscape), which are also borrowed words, are translated directly.

In Uzbek academic circles, the phrase is widely used, especially in the fields of geography and architecture.

This is an example of a somewhat successful translation technique in which the combined concept resonates and the individual elements are translatable. Beyond just the term itself, however, the entire theoretical weight (e.g., culture as an agency, landscape as a historical record) may necessitate specific educational explication.

"Gentrification":

English Conceptual Core (cf. Smith, 1996): The process by which affluent individuals relocate, renovate, and repair homes and occasionally businesses in inner cities or other dilapidated areas that were once inhabited by the poor, frequently displacing the original residents and altering the district's social character.

"Jentrifikatsiya": This straightforward transliteration/loanword is occasionally employed in specialised academic discourse, but not all students or even the general public understand it. For example, "shaharning eski yoki kambag'alroq hududlarini boylar tomonidan egallanishi va obodonlashtirilishi natijasida avvalgi aholining siqib chiqarilishi" (the displacement of the former population as a result of the wealthy occupying and improving old or poorer urban

areas) is a descriptive translation, which is most frequently used and essential for clarity. Although the idea itself is evident in some Uzbek towns (like Tashkent), it might not have the same theoretical underpinnings or historical development as in many Western situations. This word draws attention to a serious lexical and conceptual gap. Although accurate, descriptive translations are verbose and lack the conciseness of a single term, which may impede complex theoretical discussion. Direct borrowing has a restricted reach.

"Sustainability":

Addressing current demands while preserving the capacity of future generations to address their own, including social, economic, and environmental aspects. Although "barqarorlik" is frequently used as a broad translation for "sustainability," it actually means "stability" or "steadfastness" and may not have the same developmental and intergenerational fairness connotations.

The phrase "Barqaror rivojlanish" (sustainable development) is widely used and understood, and it successfully conveys the idea of "sustainable development."

A more descriptive phrase such as "uzoq muddatli mavjud bo'la olishlik" (ability to exist long-term) may be required for complete clarification, or "barqarorlik" is sometimes used with contextual support for "sustainability" as a standalone noun referring to the state or characteristic.

The adjectival/phrasal form ("sustainable development" -> "barqaror rivojlanish") is well-translated. The core noun "sustainability" can be ambiguous if translated solely as "barqarorlik" without context.

"Territoriality":

The attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area.

"Hududiylik": A potential neologism derived from "hudud" (territory) + "-iylik" (a suffix forming abstract nouns). This is a concise option but its level of acceptance and understanding may vary.

"O'z hududiga egalik qilish/da'vo qilish hissi/xatti-harakati" (the feeling/action of possessing/claiming one's territory): A descriptive phrase.

The concept is often implicitly understood but may lack a single, universally accepted academic term.

This term demonstrates the potential for neologism creation based on existing Uzbek roots, but also the reliance on descriptive phrases in the absence of a widely standardized term.

"Globalization":

The process of interaction and integration among people, companies, and governments worldwide, leading to increased interconnectedness and interdependence.

"Globallashuv": A widely accepted and understood loanword, adapted to Uzbek phonology and morphology.

"Jahonshumullashuv": An alternative term, also meaning "becoming worldwide," sometimes used.

This is an example of successful assimilation of an international term, facilitated by its global relevance and frequent usage.

Discussion. Translating human geographical terms from English to Uzbek (such as "sense of place," "cultural landscape," "gentrification," "sustainability," "territoriality," and "globalisation") is a complex process that involves more than just lexical substitution; it

involves navigating linguistic differences, conceptual disparities, and the various stages of terminological development in Uzbek human geography. The results of this comparative analysis highlight the conceptual nuances and significant translational challenges described in the introduction.

Common Difficulties. The primary difficulty observed across several terms, particularly "sense of place" and "gentrification," is the lack of direct one-to-one lexical equivalents in Uzbek that fully capture the conceptual depth and culturally embedded meanings of the English originals. This often stems from the abstract nature of the concepts and their origination within Anglophone academic traditions (e.g., Tuan's phenomenology for "sense of place," socio-economic critiques for "gentrification"). Consequently, translators resort to periphrasis, which, while aiming for semantic accuracy, sacrifices conciseness and terminological utility. Another difficulty is the varying acceptance and understanding of loanwords; while "globallashuv" is well-integrated, "jentrifikatsiya" remains specialized.

Alteration or Loss of Conceptual Depth. The analysis strongly suggests that conceptual depth is frequently altered or partially lost in translation. For "sense of place," the common Uzbek rendering "joy hissi" simplifies a rich, experiential, and affective concept into a more general "feeling of place," potentially stripping away the nuances of personal meaning-making and attachment central to Tuan's formulation. Similarly, while "madaniy landshaft" serves as a functional equivalent for "cultural landscape," the historical and theoretical layers embedded in Sauer's original work (e.g., culture as a superorganic agent transforming the "natural landscape") may not be inherently conveyed by the translated term alone and require substantial pedagogical scaffolding. The use of "barqarorlik" for "sustainability" can also lead to a loss of the specific connotations of inter-generational equity and ecological limits unless the broader "barqaror rivojlanish" is invoked or context is very clear.

Considerations for Contextually Sensitive Translation. The findings underscore the need for more contextually sensitive translation practices.

Beyond Literalism: Translators and educators must recognize that literal translation of complex terms is often inadequate. An understanding of the source term's theoretical underpinnings (as established by reviewing seminal texts like Tuan, Sauer, Smith) is crucial.

Strategic Use of Translation Methods: The choice between a loanwordneologism, calque, or descriptive phrase should be deliberate. For instance, while "madaniy landshaft" (calque) works well, "jentrifikatsiya" (loanword) has limited public intelligibility, making descriptive phrases more appropriate for wider audiences, even if cumbersome for specialists. The potential neologism "hududiylik" for "territoriality" warrants further discussion and potential standardization.

The Role of Elaboration: For many terms, the translated Uzbek term should be accompanied by explanations, especially in educational settings, to ensure the original conceptual richness is conveyed. This is vital for terms like "sense of place" or the deeper implications of "cultural landscape."

Collaborative Terminology Development: The inconsistencies and gaps highlight a need for collaborative efforts among Uzbek geographers, linguists, and translators to discuss, refine, and standardize key human geographical terms. This could involve developing glossaries that not only provide equivalents but also explain conceptual nuances.

References.



1. Temirova, M. (2024, February). THE CONCEPT OF" LINGUO-CULTUROLOGY" AND" LINGUO-MENTALITY" IN THE FIELD OF LINGUISTICS. In Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit (pp. 132-134).
2. Ergashevna, O. S. N. M. G. (2023). Analysis of Terms for Sewing in English and Uzbek. Internatioanl Interdisciplinary Research Journal, 3, 23.
3. Khushbakova, N. (2021). LINGUA-CULTURAL ASPECT OF LITERARY TRANSLATION. Экономика и социум, (5-1 (84)), 243-247.
4. Muradova Sevara Zoir qizi. (2025). LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH RIVER-NAMES OF TWO COUNTIES. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15179409> Sevara Murodova, [25.03.25 14:18]
5. Hafizov, S. B. (2024). Representative features of linguistic manipulation in the communicative situation. Social Science and Education, 1(2), 41-47.
6. Sobirjonova, M., & Hafizov, S. (2024). Linguistic and cultural characteristics of the concepts of "loneliness" and "alienation" in uzbek and english. *Talqin va tadqiqotlar*.
7. Mardanova, M. D., & Davlatova, S. M. (2024). The problem of stylistic classification of vocabulary. *Modern Science and Education: Achievements and Development Prospects*,(2), 10-13.
8. Sobirjonovna, S. M., & Murodullayevna, Q. M. (2023). Chet tillarni oqitish nazariyasi va uning maqsadi. *Journal of Universal Science Research*, 1(4), 150-158.
9. Safarova, A., & Khabibulloyeva, G. (2024, February). THE USAGE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL AND IDIOMATIC UNITS IN THE NOVEL" BETWEEN THE TWO DOORS" BY UTKIR KHOSHIMOV. In Conference Proceedings: Fostering Your Research Spirit (pp. 503-504).
10. Khabibulloeva, G. (2025). THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING GEOGRAPHY AT THE PRIMARY SCHOOLS. *TAMADDUN NURI JURNALI*, 1(64), 83-85.
11. Komiljonovna, K. G. (2025, February). THE USAGE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL AND IDIOMATIC UNITS IN THE NOVEL" THE WHITE SHIP" BY CHINGIZ AITMATOV. In *The Conference Hub* (pp. 30-33).