INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC
INNOVATION RESEARCH CONFERENCE
Volume 03, Issue 05, 2026

LEXICAL-SEMANTIC AND LINGUOCULTURAL FEATURES OF HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: A COMPARATIVE TRANSLATION STUDY

Eshbobayeva Xolida Kaxramonovna

1st year Master's Degree Student, Faculty of Tourism,

Chirchik State Pedagogical University

eshbobaevaxolida@gmail.com

+998903514309

ABSTRACT

This article examines the lexical-semantic and linguocultural features of historical and archaeological terminology in English and Uzbek, with particular attention to the challenges of translating specialized vocabulary in museum descriptions, archaeological reports, historical documents, and cultural heritage texts. Historical and archaeological terms represent not only specialized concepts but also reflect the cultural, social, and historical experiences of particular communities. Therefore, their translation requires consideration of both linguistic meaning and extralinguistic context. The study employs comparative, descriptive, semantic, and contextual methods to identify similarities and differences in the formation, meaning, and translation of selected terminology in English and Uzbek. Particular attention is given to terminological equivalence, culture-specific vocabulary, semantic variation, borrowing, and descriptive translation. The analysis demonstrates that certain archaeological terms have relatively stable equivalents in both languages, whereas culturally specific historical concepts frequently require contextual explanation or adaptation. The article emphasizes the importance of maintaining terminological accuracy while preserving the historical and cultural information embedded in specialized texts. The findings may contribute to the development of English-Uzbek terminological dictionaries and improve the quality of museum and archaeological translation.

Keywords: historical terminology, archaeological terminology, lexical semantics, linguocultural features, translation equivalence, culture-specific terms, museum discourse, English-Uzbek translation, cultural heritage.

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье рассматриваются лексико-семантические и лингвокультурологические особенности исторической и археологической терминологии в английском и узбекском языках, а также основные трудности перевода специализированной лексики в музейных описаниях, археологических отчетах, исторических документах и текстах, посвященных культурному наследию. Исторические и археологические термины отражают не только специальные научные понятия, но и культурный, социальный и исторический опыт определенного народа. Исследование основано на сравнительном, описательном, семантическом и контекстуальном методах анализа. Особое внимание уделяется терминологической эквивалентности, культурно-специфической лексике, семантическим различиям, заимствованиям и описательному переводу. Анализ показывает, что некоторые археологические термины имеют устойчивые соответствия в обоих языках, тогда как перевод исторических понятий, связанных с национальной культурой и общественными институтами, часто требует дополнительного контекстуального пояснения. Полученные результаты могут способствовать совершенствованию англо-узбекских терминологических словарей и повышению качества перевода музейных и археологических текстов.

Ключевые слова: историческая терминология, археологическая терминология, лексическая семантика, лингвокультурологические особенности, переводческая эквивалентность, культурно-специфическая лексика, музейный дискурс, англо-узбекский перевод, культурное наследие.

ANNOTATSIYA

Mazkur maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillaridagi tarixiy hamda arxeologik terminlarning leksik-semantik va lingvomadaniy xususiyatlari, shuningdek, muzey tavsiflari, arxeologik hisobotlar, tarixiy hujjatlar va madaniy merosga oid matnlarda uchraydigan maxsus leksik birliklarni tarjima qilish muammolari tadqiq etiladi. Tarixiy va arxeologik terminlar nafaqat muayyan ilmiy tushunchalarni, balki xalqning tarixiy, ijtimoiy va madaniy tajribasini ham aks ettiradi. Tadqiqotda qiyosiy, tavsifiy, semantik va

kontekstual tahlil metodlaridan foydalaniladi. Terminologik ekvivalentlik, milliy-madaniy xususiyatga ega leksik birliklar, semantik farqlanish, o‘zlashma terminlar hamda tavsifiy tarjima masalalariga alohida e’tibor qaratiladi. Tahlil natijalari ayrim arxeologik terminlarning ikki tilda barqaror muqobillari mavjudligini, tarixiy va milliy-madaniy tushunchalarni ifodalovchi terminlar esa ko‘pincha qo‘shimcha izoh va kontekstual moslashtirishni talab qilishini ko‘rsatadi. Tadqiqot natijalari inglizcha-o‘zbekcha terminologik lug‘atlarni takomillashtirish va muzey hamda arxeologik matnlar tarjimasi sifatini oshirishga xizmat qilishi mumkin.

Kalit so‘zlar: tarixiy terminologiya, arxeologik terminologiya, leksik semantika, lingvomadaniy xususiyatlar, tarjima ekvivalentligi, milliy-madaniy leksika, muzey diskursi, inglizcha-o‘zbekcha tarjima, madaniy meros.

INTRODUCTION

Language serves as an important instrument for preserving and transmitting historical knowledge, cultural values, and the collective experience of society. Within this process, historical and archaeological terminology occupies a significant position because specialized lexical units provide accurate descriptions of historical periods, archaeological discoveries, ancient objects, social institutions, and cultural practices. The translation of such terminology between English and Uzbek represents a complex linguistic process that requires not only knowledge of grammatical and lexical structures but also an understanding of the historical and cultural backgrounds of both languages.

Historical and archaeological texts differ from ordinary informational texts because their vocabulary frequently contains concepts associated with specific civilizations, political systems, social structures, material culture, and historical traditions. For example, terms such as artefact, stratigraphy, excavation, and burial mound refer to specialized archaeological concepts. However, expressions such as manor, feudal estate, khanate, and caravanserai may contain additional historical and cultural information that cannot always be conveyed through a simple lexical substitution. The theoretical foundation of terminology studies emphasizes the relationship between specialized concepts and the linguistic forms used to represent them. Cabré considers terminology an interdisciplinary field connected with linguistics, communication, knowledge organization, and specialized discourse [1]. This perspective is particularly relevant to historical and archaeological translation

because terminological meaning is determined not only by the word itself but also by the conceptual system in which it functions.

Translation studies also recognize the importance of cultural context. Newmark explains that culture-bound vocabulary frequently creates difficulties because the concepts represented by certain lexical units may be specific to the source-language community [2]. Similarly, Nida emphasizes the importance of communicating meaning in a way that is understandable to the target-language audience while maintaining the essential message of the original text [3]. In the context of English-Uzbek translation, these issues become especially important when dealing with historical institutions, traditional architecture, archaeological objects, and culturally significant expressions. English historical terminology often reflects European historical and social experiences, whereas Uzbek historical terminology incorporates concepts associated with Central Asian civilizations, Turkic traditions, Islamic heritage, and regional political structures. Museum discourse provides a particularly important context for investigating these differences. Museums do not simply display historical objects; they also interpret and communicate tangible and intangible cultural heritage to different audiences. According to the International Council of Museums, museums perform research, collection, conservation, interpretation, and exhibition functions in relation to cultural heritage [4]. Consequently, the translation of museum texts must ensure both terminological accuracy and cultural accessibility.

The relevance of the present research is determined by the growing importance of international cultural communication, museum cooperation, archaeological documentation, and the translation of historical heritage materials. Despite the development of translation studies and terminology research, the relationship between lexical meaning, cultural specificity, and terminological equivalence in English-Uzbek historical and archaeological discourse requires further systematic investigation.

METHODS

The research employs a qualitative comparative approach based on linguistic and translation-oriented analysis. The methodological framework combines comparative analysis, descriptive analysis, componential-semantic analysis, contextual interpretation, and translation analysis. The material for the analysis consists of selected examples of historical and archaeological terminology used in English-

language and Uzbek-language academic discourse, museum descriptions, archaeological reports, and cultural heritage-related texts. The examples are organized into several semantic groups, including archaeological processes, material remains, burial traditions, architectural structures, historical institutions, and social organization.

The comparative method is used to identify similarities and differences between English and Uzbek lexical units. It makes it possible to establish whether a particular term has a direct equivalent, a partial equivalent, or no established lexical equivalent in the target language. Componential-semantic analysis is applied to examine the constituent meanings of selected terms. This method is particularly useful when two lexical units appear equivalent but differ in their semantic scope, historical associations, or functional characteristics. Contextual analysis is used to investigate how the meaning of a term changes according to the type of text in which it appears. For example, the term excavation may refer to the general process of removing soil, whereas in an archaeological report it specifically denotes a systematic scientific investigation of archaeological deposits.

RESULTS

The comparative analysis reveals that historical and archaeological terminology in English and Uzbek demonstrates several important linguistic characteristics. These characteristics can be observed in the semantic organization of specialized vocabulary, the degree of terminological equivalence, the influence of cultural context, and the use of different translation strategies. Archaeological terminology is characterized by a relatively specialized semantic structure. Most terms refer to clearly identifiable objects, processes, scientific methods, or historical remains. Nevertheless, their meanings may differ depending on the academic context and the terminological traditions of each language. For example, the English term artefact is commonly translated into Uzbek as *artefakt or arxeologik topilma*. Both equivalents are understandable, but they are not always identical in semantic scope. *Artefakt* preserves the international scientific terminology, whereas *arxeologik topilma* provides a more accessible descriptive expression.

Another example is stratigraphy, which corresponds to *stratigrafiya* in Uzbek. This term refers to the study and interpretation of layered deposits and their chronological relationships. Its international character facilitates translation because the term has

a relatively stable conceptual meaning across archaeological discourse. The term excavation can be translated as *arxeologik qazishma* or *qazish ishlari*. The first expression identifies a specialized archaeological activity, while the second may have a broader meaning outside archaeology. Therefore, the choice of equivalent should depend on the communicative and scientific context. For instance, carbon dating requires a translation that communicates the scientific method rather than merely reproducing the structure of the English expression. The Uzbek phrase *radiokarbon usulida sanalash* conveys the essential scientific meaning more clearly.

Similarly, burial mound cannot always be translated exclusively as *qo‘rg‘on*. Although the two expressions may overlap in certain historical contexts, the English term refers specifically to an artificial mound associated with burial practices. Therefore, *qabr tepaligi* may be a more transparent equivalent when the archaeological context requires precise identification. Historical terminology is closely connected with the cultural and social organization of particular civilizations. Unlike many archaeological terms, historical expressions frequently contain meanings that reflect political institutions, traditional social relationships, religious practices, and forms of land ownership. The comparison of English and Uzbek historical terminology demonstrates that culturally specific concepts frequently lack complete lexical equivalents. For example, the English term manor historically refers to a landed estate associated with a particular system of landholding and social organization in medieval England. Translating it simply as *mulk* would not fully communicate its historical and institutional meaning. A more appropriate solution would be *o‘rta asrlardagi ingliz* manor *mulki* or manor *tipidagi feodal yer-mulki*, depending on the context.

Likewise, the term caravanserai can be translated into English as caravanserai or explained as a roadside inn for merchants and travellers. In Uzbek, *karvonsaroy* is an established cultural and historical term. Its meaning includes not only accommodation but also commercial, social, and architectural functions associated with historical trade routes. Another example is khanate, which corresponds to *xonlik* in Uzbek. Although the two terms have a close semantic relationship, their historical references depend on the particular political entity and historical period under discussion. The term guild, for example, refers to a historically organized association of craftsmen or merchants. Translating it as *uyushma* may communicate the general idea of an organization, but the historical meaning may require the additional expression *o‘rta asrlardagi hunarmandlar uyushmasi*. One of the most important

findings of the comparative analysis concerns the different levels of equivalence between English and Uzbek terminology. Terminological correspondence can be classified into three principal categories: complete equivalence, partial equivalence, and descriptive or explanatory equivalence.

Complete equivalence occurs when a specialized term has a well-established counterpart with a sufficiently similar conceptual meaning in the target language. Examples include monument-*yodgorlik* and stratigraphy-*stratigrafiya*. Partial equivalence occurs when the target-language expression communicates the general meaning of the source term but does not preserve all its historical or functional characteristics. For example, fortress and *qal'a* demonstrate a close correspondence, although their historical and architectural references may vary. Descriptive equivalence is required when the target language does not have a sufficiently precise lexical counterpart. In such cases, the translator uses a phrase that explains the concept and preserves its essential characteristics. The distinction between these types of equivalence is particularly significant in museum translation. A short exhibition label may require a concise equivalent, whereas a detailed catalogue entry can provide a longer historical explanation. Newmark's discussion of cultural vocabulary supports the importance of selecting translation procedures according to the semantic and cultural characteristics of individual lexical units [2]. Aixelá also emphasizes that culture-specific items require translation decisions that take account of the relationship between the source and target cultural systems [5].

Borrowing is particularly useful when an international scientific term has already entered Uzbek academic usage. Terms such as *stratigrafiya, artefakt, and arxeologiya* illustrate this tendency. Calquing can be applied when the structural components of a term can be reproduced meaningfully in Uzbek. However, the resulting expression must conform to the linguistic conventions of the target language. Descriptive translation is useful when a single lexical equivalent cannot communicate the full meaning of a historical concept. For example, grave goods can be translated as *dafn marosimi davomida qabrga joylashtirilgan buyumlar* when a detailed explanation is required. Functional equivalence is appropriate when the translator needs to communicate the role of an object or institution rather than reproduce its formal structure. This strategy is particularly useful for architectural and social terminology. Explanatory translation is important in museum descriptions because visitors may not

possess specialized historical knowledge. An unfamiliar term can be retained in its original or transliterated form and followed by a brief explanation.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that the translation of historical and archaeological terminology is a multidimensional process involving linguistic, historical, and cultural interpretation. Although terminology is often associated with precision and standardization, the analysis demonstrates that specialized lexical units may possess different degrees of semantic transparency and cultural specificity. One important issue is the relationship between terminological standardization and cultural preservation. International scientific terminology facilitates communication between researchers, archaeologists, historians, and museum specialists. Borrowed terms can therefore improve consistency and make specialized information accessible to international academic communities. However, excessive dependence on borrowed terminology may reduce the accessibility of museum texts for general audiences. This problem is particularly relevant to Uzbek museum discourse, where international scientific terminology frequently exists alongside traditional Uzbek expressions. For instance, the use of *artefakt* may be appropriate in a scientific report, whereas *arxeologik topilma* may be more accessible in a public exhibition description. The choice between these forms should be determined by the communicative purpose of the text. Another significant issue concerns historical equivalence. The existence of similar social or political institutions in two cultures does not necessarily mean that their names are interchangeable. A European medieval institution and a Central Asian historical institution may perform comparable functions while possessing different organizational structures and historical backgrounds. Therefore, the translator should avoid replacing a culture-specific term with a superficially similar concept from the target culture. Such substitution may create historical inaccuracies and distort the original meaning.

The findings also highlight the importance of contextual information in translating archaeological terminology. The meaning of a term may depend on the period, geographical location, archaeological culture, and type of material evidence being described. Consequently, terminology should be interpreted within the complete discourse rather than in isolation. Museum translation introduces an additional communicative dimension. A museum text is intended not only to inform but also to

interpret cultural heritage. Its language should therefore be accurate, accessible, and culturally sensitive. The ICOM definition of museums emphasizes the interpretation and communication of tangible and intangible heritage [4]. This perspective supports the need for translation strategies that preserve both scientific information and cultural significance.

The results are consistent with the broader principles of terminology and translation studies. Cabré's interdisciplinary approach demonstrates that terminology is connected with knowledge representation and specialized communication [1], while Nida's approach highlights the importance of transferring meaning in a form that can be understood by the target audience [3]. On the basis of the analysis, an effective English-Uzbek translation model for historical and archaeological terminology should involve three interconnected stages. First, the translator identifies the precise scientific or historical concept represented by the source term. Second, the translator examines its cultural and historical associations. Finally, an appropriate target-language equivalent or explanatory strategy is selected according to the communicative purpose of the text.

CONCLUSION

The study has examined the lexical-semantic and linguocultural features of historical and archaeological terminology in English and Uzbek, focusing on the challenges of translating specialized vocabulary in museum descriptions, archaeological reports, and historical texts. The analysis demonstrates that English and Uzbek historical and archaeological terminology share several conceptual and semantic similarities, particularly in the field of scientific archaeology. International terms such as stratigraphy and artefact facilitate cross-linguistic communication because their meanings are relatively stable in specialized discourse.

However, historical terminology frequently reflects culture-specific institutions, social structures, and traditional practices. Expressions such as manor, guild, caravanserai, and khanate demonstrate that direct lexical substitution may not always preserve the full historical meaning of the original concept. The findings establish that terminological equivalence should be evaluated not only according to lexical similarity but also according to conceptual accuracy, historical context, and cultural relevance. Borrowing, calquing, descriptive translation, functional equivalence, and explanatory additions represent useful strategies for overcoming translation difficulties. The study

also emphasizes that the requirements of scientific and museum translation are not identical. Academic texts generally prioritize terminological precision and consistency, whereas museum texts must combine accuracy with accessibility and cultural interpretation. Successful translation of historical and archaeological terminology requires an integrated approach that combines linguistic knowledge, terminological competence, historical understanding, and cultural awareness. The development of bilingual English-Uzbek terminology resources, contextual glossaries, and standardized museum translation practices may contribute to more accurate international communication and the preservation of cultural heritage. Further research may focus on the creation of a specialized English-Uzbek historical and archaeological terminology database based on authentic museum catalogues, archaeological reports, and historical documentation.

REFERENCES

1. Cabré M. T. Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications / ed. by J. C. Sager. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999. 34 p.

2. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall International, 1988. 22 p.

3. Nida E. A. Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. 31 p.

4. International Council of Museums (ICOM). Museum Definition [Electronic resource]. 2022.

5. Aixelá J. F. Culture-Specific Items in Translation // Translation, Power, Subversion / ed. by R. Álvarez, M. C.-Á. Vidal. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996. P. 52-78.

6. Dadaboyev H. O‘zbek terminologiyasi. – Toshkent: Yoshlar nashriyot uyi, 2019.

7. UNESCO. Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. Paris: UNESCO, 1972.