Philology Matters / ISSN: 1994 – 4233 / E-ISSN: 2181–1237
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
2026 Vol. 1 No. M 2/1
LINGUISTICS
MAXSUS SON

Zarina Bobojonova – senior teacher

Uzbekistan State World Languages University (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)
E-mail: Zarinabobojonova83@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-8607-9695

INTERPRETATION OF UZBEK NATIONAL FOOD NAMES IN ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN: CULTURAL AND COMMUNICATIVE ADAPTATION

Annotation. This article examines how Uzbek national food names are translated into English and Russian from the perspective of cultural interpretation and communicative adaptation. The study looks at how these food names are presented in other languages and how understandable they are for different audiences. Using a qualitative descriptive approach, the research analyses common Uzbek dishes and explores how they are expressed across languages. The findings show that in some cases the original name is kept, in others it is briefly explained, and sometimes both approaches are used together. The article highlights the importance of preserving cultural meaning while making it clear and accessible for speakers of other languages.

Keywords: Uzbek cuisine, food names, translation, cultural interpretation, communicative adaptation, borrowing

Zarina Bobojonova – katta o‘qituvchi
O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti (Toshkent, O‘zbekiston)

O‘ZBEK MILLIY TAOMLARI NOMLARINING INGLIZ VA RUS TILLARIDA TALQINI: MADANIY VA KOMMUNIKATIV MOSLASHUV

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada o‘zbek milliy taom nomlarining ingliz va rus tillariga tarjima qilinishi madaniy talqin va kommunikativ moslashuv nuqtai nazaridan o‘rganiladi. Tadqiqot davomida o‘zbek taom nomlari boshqa tillarga o‘tganda ular qanday berilishi va qanchalik tushunarli bo‘lishi masalasi ko‘rib chiqiladi. Ish sifatli tavsifiy yondashuv asosida olib borilib, keng tarqalgan o‘zbek taomlari misolida ularning turli tillarda qanday ifodalanishi tahlil qilindi. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, tarjimada ba’zan taom nomi o‘z holicha qoldiriladi, ba’zan esa uning mazmuni qisqacha tushuntirib beriladi yoki ikki usul birgalikda qo‘llanadi. Maqolada samarali tarjima uchun madaniy mazmunni saqlagan holda uni boshqa til vakillari uchun tushunarli yetkazish muhimligi ta’kidlanadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: o‘zbek milliy taomlari, taom nomlari, tarjima, madaniy talqin, kommunikativ moslashuv, transliteratsiya

Зарина Бобожонова – старший преподаватель
Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков (Ташкент, Узбекистан)

ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ НАЗВАНИЙ УЗБЕКСКИХ НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫХ БЛЮД НА АНГЛИЙСКИЙ И РУССКИЙ ЯЗЫКИ: КУЛЬТУРНАЯ И КОММУНИКАТИВНАЯ АДАПТАЦИЯ

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматривается перевод названий узбекских национальных блюд на английский и русский языки с точки зрения культурной интерпретации и коммуникативной адаптации. В работе анализируется, как эти названия передаются в других языках и насколько они понятны для разных аудиторий. Исследование выполнено на основе качественного описательного подхода и включает анализ распространённых узбекских блюд, а также способов их передачи в разных языках. Результаты показывают, что в одних случаях оригинальное название сохраняется, в других даётся краткое объяснение, а иногда используются оба подхода одновременно. В статье подчёркивается важность сохранения культурного значения при обеспечении понятности для носителей других языков.

Ключевые слова: узбекская кухня, названия блюд, перевод, культурная интерпретация, коммуникативная адаптация, заимствование

INTRODUCTION

Food names are not just words. They reflect culture, history, and the way people live. When we look at traditional dishes in different languages, we can see that their names often carry meanings that go beyond simple translation. Because of this, translating food names is not always easy. In cross-cultural communication, especially in translation, food names act as cultural symbols. They show where a dish comes from and what it represents. For this reason, translating them requires not only linguistic accuracy but also cultural understanding.

In many cases, traditional food names are not translated directly. For example, words like *sushi*, *pasta*, or *croissant* are used in English without change. This helps keep their original cultural identity. At the same time, some food names are explained in a descriptive way, such as “rice noodles” or “stuffed dumplings,” so that people can understand them more easily. These examples show two main approaches: keeping the original form or explaining the meaning.

Uzbek national cuisine is also rich in culture and tradition. Dishes such as *plov*, *somsa*, *lagman*, and *shurva* are not only food but also part of Uzbek daily life, celebrations, and history. When these names are translated into English and Russian, translators need to decide how to present them. Should they keep the original name, or should they explain it? This is where two important ideas come in: cultural interpretation and communicative adaptation. Cultural interpretation focuses on preserving the word's original meaning and identity. This is often done through transliteration or borrowing. Communicative adaptation, on the other hand, aims to make the meaning clear for the reader, even if it requires explanation or changes.

Both approaches are important, especially in areas like tourism, media, and international communication. This study looks at how Uzbek food names are translated into English and Russian, and how these strategies help or sometimes limit understanding. The goal is to better understand how language and culture work together in translation.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

Literature Review

The translation of culture-specific words, including food names, has been widely studied in translation research. Many scholars agree that such words are difficult to translate because they often do not have direct equivalents in other languages.

Newmark explains that culture-bound terms need special attention (Newmark, 1988). He suggests different ways to translate them, such as keeping the original word, describing it, or finding a similar concept in the target language. These methods are especially useful when dealing with traditional food names.

Venuti introduces two important ideas: domestication and foreignization (Venuti, 1995). Domestication means adapting the word to make it easier for the target audience to understand. Foreignization means keeping the original form to preserve cultural identity. For example, the word *plov* can be kept as it is, or it can be explained as “rice pilaf with meat and carrots.”

Nida focuses on the idea of dynamic equivalence (Nida, 1964). He argues that translation should create the same effect on the reader as the original text does. This is very important when translating food names, because they often carry emotional and cultural meaning, not just literal meaning.

More recent researchers, such as Molina and Albir and Pedersen, discuss different translation techniques like borrowing, calquing, and adaptation (Albir, 2002; Pedersen, 2011). These techniques help translators deal with words that are strongly connected to culture. All these theories provide a useful base for understanding how Uzbek food names can be translated into English and Russian. They show that translation is not just about words, but also about meaning, culture, and communication.

This study follows a qualitative descriptive research design, as it aims to analyse both the linguistic and cultural aspects of Uzbek national food names and their interpretations in English and Russian. A qualitative approach is appropriate here because the research focuses on meaning, cultural context, and translation strategies rather than numerical data.

The data for this study consist of a selected group of widely known Uzbek national dishes, including *plov, somsa, lagman, shurva, manti,* and *non*. These food names were chosen because they are commonly used in everyday communication as well as in tourism and international contexts. The data were collected from several reliable sources, such as bilingual dictionaries (Uzbek–English and Uzbek–Russian), restaurant menus, tourism materials, and online culinary platforms. These sources provide both original terms and their translated or adapted versions, which makes them suitable for comparative analysis.

In analysing the data, the study relies on well-established translation theories. In particular, Newmark's translation procedures, Venuti's concepts of domestication and foreignization, Nida's dynamic equivalence, and Molina and Albir's translation techniques are used as the main theoretical frameworks. These theories help to identify how each food name is translated and what strategies are applied in different contexts. Each selected food term is carefully examined by comparing its original Uzbek form with its English and Russian equivalents. The analysis focuses on identifying the translation strategy used, such as borrowing, descriptive translation, or adaptation. In addition, attention is given to how well the translation preserves the cultural meaning of the original term and how clearly it communicates the meaning to the target audience.

The research process is carried out step by step. First, the original Uzbek food name is identified. Then, their English and Russian versions are collected and compared. After that, the translation strategies are classified based on the theoretical models mentioned earlier. Finally, each example is evaluated in terms of cultural preservation and communicative effectiveness.

RESULTS

The analysis reveals that Uzbek national food names are translated into English and Russian using three main strategies: borrowing (transliteration), descriptive translation, and hybrid forms.

One of the most common approaches is borrowing, especially for culturally significant dishes. For example, *plov* is often retained as *plov* in both English and Russian, though in Russian it may also appear as *плов*. This strategy helps preserve cultural identity, but it may limit immediate understanding for those who are not familiar with the term. Another widely used strategy is descriptive translation, particularly in English contexts. For instance, *somsa* may be translated as "baked pastry with meat filling," and *lagman* as "hand-pulled noodle soup." This approach makes the meaning clearer, although some cultural depth may be lost. A further approach involves the use of hybrid forms, which combine both the original term and an explanation. Examples such as *plov (Uzbek rice pilaf)* or *manti (steamed dumplings)* include both the authentic name and a short description. This method appears to be the most effective in balancing cultural preservation with communicative clarity.

In Russian, due to historical and cultural proximity, many Uzbek food names are more widely recognised and therefore require less explanation compared to English.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study show that translating Uzbek national food names is not as simple as it may seem. It is not only about changing words from one language into another, but also about carrying cultural meaning from one context into another. These food names are closely linked to traditions, everyday life, and national identity, which makes their translation more challenging.

The frequent use of borrowing in the data shows that translators often try to keep the original form of the word. This idea is supported by Venuti, who explains that keeping original terms helps preserve cultural identity (Venuti, 1995). In this case, using words like *plov* or *manti* allows people from other cultures to become familiar with Uzbek traditions in a more authentic way.

At the same time, the results make it clear that using the original name alone is not always enough. For many readers, especially those who are not familiar with Uzbek cuisine, such words may not be easy to understand. This is where descriptive translation becomes useful. As Nida points out, translation should be clear and meaningful for the reader (Nida, 1964). Simple explanations like "rice pilaf" or "steamed dumplings" help people quickly understand what kind of food is being described. Another important point is the use of hybrid forms, where the original word is combined with a short explanation. This seems to be one of the most effective ways to translate food names. Newmark also supports this idea, suggesting that combining methods works well for culture-specific terms (Newmark, 1988). Examples like *plov (Uzbek rice pilaf)* show how it is possible to keep the original identity while also making the meaning clear.

The difference between English and Russian translations is also noticeable. Russian versions tend to keep the original names more often, while English translations usually include more explanation. This can be explained by cultural familiarity. As Pedersen notes, when people are already familiar with a culture, less explanation is needed. In contrast, when the culture is less known, more explanation becomes necessary (Pedersen, 2011).

These results show that translation is always about finding the right balance. If the translator only keeps the original word, the meaning may not be clear. But if everything is explained too much, the cultural value can be lost. That is why the best approach is to combine both clarity and cultural meaning.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that translating Uzbek national food names into English and Russian requires both cultural awareness and clear communication. The analysis confirmed that different translation strategies are used depending on the context and the target audience. Borrowing helps preserve the original cultural identity of the food, while descriptive translation makes the meaning easier to understand. Hybrid forms, which combine both approaches, provide a practical balance between keeping the original term and explaining it.

In conclusion, the findings highlight that effective translation of food names depends on balancing cultural meaning with clarity. In this way, Uzbek national dishes can be presented in other languages without losing their identity while still being understandable for a wider audience.

REFERENCES

1. Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
2. Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
3. Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Brill.
4. Molina, L., & Albir, A. H. (2002). Translation techniques revisited: A dynamic and functionalist approach. *Meta: Journal des traducers*, 47(4), 498–512. https://doi.org/10.7202/008033ar
5. Pedersen, J. (2011). *Subtitling norms for television: An exploration focusing on extralinguistic cultural references*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
6. Aixelá, J. F. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In R. Álvarez & M. C. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, power, subversion* (pp. 52–78). Multilingual Matters.
7. Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond* (Revised ed.). John Benjamins.
8. House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.