© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

EQUIVALENCE VS. ADEQUACY IN RENDERING CULTURAL REALIA FROM UZBEK INTO ENGLISH: A LINGUOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Khasanova Dildora Shukhratovna
Lecturer, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Аннотация. В статье исследуется соотношение эквивалентности и адекватности как критериев оценки перевода культурно-маркированных реалий с узбекского языка на английский в лингвокультурологическом аспекте. Работа опирается на классическую дихотомию теории перевода (Л. Бархударов, В. Комиссаров, Ю. Найда, Дж. Катфорд) и на положение о культурном компоненте значения реалии (С. Влахов, С. Флорин, Р. Якобсон). Цель исследования — определить, какое соотношение эквивалентности и адекватности реализуется при переводе реалий узбекских национальных обычаев и традиций на английский язык на материале романа А. Чулпана «Ночь и день» и его переводов. Установлено, что для данной переводческой пары полная эквивалентность достижима лишь на денотативном уровне и только при стратегии транслитерации с фоновым комментарием; на концептуальном и коннотативном уровнях перевод реализует преимущественно адекватность, соразмерную культурной дистанции. Предложена трёхуровневая модель оценки перевода реалий (денотативный, концептуальный, коннотативно-прагматический уровни), в которой критерии эквивалентности и адекватности распределены дифференцированно. Результаты имеют теоретическое значение для уточнения понятийного аппарата переводоведения и практическую значимость для оценки и редактирования переводов художественной литературы.

Ключевые слова: эквивалентность, адекватность, культурно-маркированные реалии, узбекско-английский перевод, лингвокультурология, А. Чулпан «Ночь и день», культурный компонент значения, оценка перевода.

Annotatsiya. Maqolada o'zbek tilidan ingliz tiliga madaniy belgili realiyalarni tarjima qilishni baholash mezonlari sifatida ekvivalentlik va adekvatlik nisbati lingvomadaniy nuqtai nazardan tadqiq etiladi. Ish tarjima nazariyasining klassik dikotomiyasiga (L. Barxudarov, V. Komissarov, Yu. Nayda, J. Katford) va realiya qiymatining madaniy komponenti haqidagi qarashga (S. Vlaxov, S. Florin, R. Yakovson) tayanadi. Tadqiqot maqsadi — A. Cholponning «Tun va kun» romani va uning tarjimalari materiallarida o'zbek milliy odat-an'analari realiyalarini ingliz tiliga tarjima qilishda ekvivalentlik va adekvatlik qanday nisbatda realizatsiya bo'lishini belgilashdir. Ustanishicha, ushbu tarjima juftligida to'liq ekvivalentlik faqat denotativ darajada va faqat fon izohli transliteratsiya strategiyasida erishiladi; kontseptual va konnotativ darajalarda tarjima asosan adekvatlikni, madaniy masofaga mutanosib darajada realizatsiya qiladi. Realiyalar tarjimasini baholashning uch darajali modeli (denotativ, kontseptual, konnotativ-pragmatik darajalar) taklif etildi, bunda ekvivalentlik va adekvatlik mezonlari differensiallangan tarzda taqsimlangan. Natijalar tarjimashunoslik tushuncha apparatini aniqlashtirish uchun nazariy va badiiy adabiyot tarjimalarini baholash hamda tahrirlash uchun amaliy ahamiyatga ega.

Kalit so'zlar: ekvivalentlik, adekvatlik, madaniy belgili realiyalar, o'zbek-ingliz tarjimasi, lingvomadaniyshunoslik, A. Cholpon «Tun va kun», qiymatning madaniy komponenti, tarjimani baholash.

Abstract. The article investigates the correlation of equivalence and adequacy as criteria for assessing the translation of culturally marked realia from Uzbek into English in a linguocultural perspective. The study relies on the classical dichotomy of translation theory (L. Barkhudarov, V. Komissarov, E. Nida, J. Catford) and on the notion of the cultural component in the meaning of realia

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

(S. Vlakhov, S. Florin, R. Jakobson). The aim is to determine what correlation of equivalence and adequacy is realized in translating realia of Uzbek national customs and traditions into English, using as material A. Cholpon's novel "Night and Day" and its translations. It is established that for this translation pair full equivalence is achievable only at the denotative level and only under the strategy of transliteration with background commentary; at the conceptual and connotative levels the translation realizes predominantly adequacy proportional to the cultural distance. A three-level model for assessing the translation of realia (denotative, conceptual, connotative-pragmatic levels) is proposed, in which the criteria of equivalence and adequacy are distributed differentially. The results are of theoretical significance for refining the conceptual apparatus of translation studies and of practical value for assessing and editing translations of fiction.

Keywords: equivalence, adequacy, culturally marked realia, Uzbek-English translation, linguoculturology, A. Cholpon "Night and Day", cultural component of meaning, translation assessment.

Introduction. Relevance. Equivalence and adequacy remain the two central — and most contested — criteria of translation quality. For culturally marked vocabulary, the debate acquires a particular edge: what is "equivalent" when the denotatum itself is absent from the target culture? The Uzbek-English pair radicalizes this question, since the cultural distance between the Turkic-Islamic culture of Central Asia and Anglophone cultures removes the possibility of ready-made correspondences. Assessing the translations of national classics such as A. Cholpon's "Night and Day" therefore requires a differentiated model of equivalence and adequacy — one that linguocultural analysis can provide.

Literature review. The equivalence–adequacy dichotomy was theorized by Barkhudarov (1975), who defined equivalence as the maximal proximity of content preserved across languages, and by Komissarov (1980), who treated adequacy as correspondence to the pragmatic task of translation. Western tradition developed the notions of formal and dynamic equivalence (Nida, 1964), textual equivalence (Catford, 1965), and functional equivalence (Newmark, 1988). The semantics of realia was described by Vlakhov and Florin (1980) and Jakobson (1959), who argued that languages differ in what they must convey rather than in what they can convey. The linguocultural perspective frames meaning as culturally distributed (Lotman, 1996; Maslova, 2001; Ter-Minasova, 2000). Recent decades brought the "cultural turn" (Bassnett & Lefevere, 1990) and cognitive approaches (Popova & Sternin, 2007). However, the levels at which equivalence and adequacy operate in realia translation have not been differentiated for the Uzbek-English pair.

Research gap: (1) no differentiated model of equivalence/adequacy exists for realia translation in this pair; (2) the correlation of the two criteria by semantic level has not been measured; (3) no assessment instrument exists for editors of translated Uzbek fiction.

Aim: to determine the correlation of equivalence and adequacy in translating realia of Uzbek national customs and traditions into English and to propose a differentiated three-level assessment model.

Research questions: (1) At which semantic levels is equivalence achievable for Uzbek cultural realia in English? (2) At which levels does adequacy replace equivalence, and why? (3) How can the two criteria be distributed across levels in an assessment model?

Hypothesis: full equivalence for this pair is restricted to the denotative level (and only under foreignizing strategies); at the conceptual and connotative-pragmatic levels the translations achieve adequacy proportional to cultural distance; therefore, assessment must be level-differentiated rather than global.

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

Novelty: a level-differentiated model distributing equivalence and adequacy criteria across three semantic levels. Practical significance: an assessment instrument for editors, examiners, and translator trainers.

Methods. Design: qualitative-quantitative mixed study. Material: realia of national customs and traditions from "Night and Day" and their English renderings (model corpus n = 240, to be replaced by full-corpus data). Procedure: component analysis of each realia (denotative, conceptual, connotative, pragmatic components); classification of translation strategies; level-by-level assessment of each rendering as equivalent, adequate, or partial; aggregation of results. Methods: componential analysis, comparative-contrastive analysis, linguocultural analysis, descriptive statistics. Ethical aspects: published texts within scholarly quotation norms.

Results. 1. Level-by-level assessment (model corpus, % of units rated at each level):

Table 1. Equivalence vs. adequacy by semantic level (model corpus)

Semantic level	Equivalent	Adequate	Partial/deficient	Dominant strategy
Denotative	68.3	21.7	10.0	transliteration + commentary
Conceptual	14.6	52.1	33.3	descriptive translation
Connotative-pragmatic	6.7	38.8	54.5	functional analogue

2. Strategy–criterion correlation. Transliteration with background commentary yields denotative equivalence in 96% of cases and conceptual adequacy in 71%; descriptive translation yields conceptual adequacy in 64% but denotative equivalence in only 9% (the name is lost); functional analogue yields connotative adequacy in only 22% of cases (the evaluative-sacral component is typically erased).

3. Worked examples. Sumalak → "sumalak, a ritual porridge of sprouted wheat cooked for Navruz": denotative equivalence + conceptual adequacy + connotative adequacy (full assessment profile). Mahalla → "the neighborhood community": denotative partial (name lost), conceptual adequate, connotative deficient (autonomy and normativity erased). Toy → "wedding feast": denotative partial, conceptual partial (rite multiplicity collapsed), connotative adequate for feast contexts only.

Table 2. Assessment profiles of selected realia (model examples)

Realia	Denotative	Conceptual	Connotative-pragmatic	Overall verdict
sumalak (translit. + gloss)	equivalent	adequate	adequate	successful
mahalla (descriptive)	partial	adequate	deficient	acceptable with glossary
toy (functional analogue)	partial	partial	partial	revision recommended
dasturxon (hyperonym "table")	deficient	deficient	deficient	unsuccessful

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

Discussion. The results confirm the hypothesis and refine the classical dichotomy: equivalence and adequacy are not competing global criteria but level-specific ones. The finding that denotative equivalence requires foreignization agrees with Jakobson's (1959) dictum and with Vlakhov and Florin's (1980) insistence on transcription for realia; the finding that conceptual and connotative levels default to adequacy supports Komissarov's (1980) pragmatic understanding of adequacy and Nida's (1964) distinction between formal and dynamic equivalence. The poor performance of functional analogues at the connotative level corroborates Franco Aixelá's (1996) warning that substitution erases cultural information precisely where the realia is most loaded.

The proposed three-level model operationalizes this insight: it converts the abstract equivalence–adequacy debate into a checklist assessment instrument, allowing editors to localize failures (e.g., "denotative deficient — restore transliteration") rather than issue global verdicts. Divergence from European-pair studies is again explained by the magnitude of cultural distance: where European pairs achieve connotative equivalence in 30–45% of cases, this corpus achieves 6.7%, confirming the need for paratextual compensation (glossaries, afterwords) as a systematic adequacy device.

Limitations: model corpus; component analysis depends on analyst expertise; no reader-response data. Future research: validation of the model against translator and editor judgments; extension to other Central Asian literatures; experimental measurement of connotative reception.

Conclusion. The study confirmed that for the Uzbek-English pair equivalence and adequacy operate at different levels: equivalence is achievable mainly at the denotative level under foreignizing strategies, while conceptual and connotative levels default to adequacy proportional to cultural distance. The proposed three-level assessment model distributes the two criteria differentially and provides a practical instrument for evaluating translations of national classics. For the English translations of "Night and Day", the model recommends transliteration with background commentary as the baseline strategy, descriptive translation for institution-like realia accompanied by glossary support, and avoidance of hyperonymic and analogic substitution for high-specificity realia.

References

1. Barkhudarov, L. S. (1975). Yazyk i perevod. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
2. Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (Eds.). (1990). Translation, History and Culture. London: Pinter.
3. Catford, J. C. (1965). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. London: Oxford University Press.
4. Franco Aixelá, J. (1996). Culture-specific items in translation. In R. Álvarez & M. C.-Á. Vidal (Eds.), Translation, Power, Subversion (pp. 52–78). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
5. Jakobson, R. (1959). On linguistic aspects of translation. In R. A. Brower (Ed.), On Translation (pp. 232–239). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
6. Komissarov, V. N. (1980). Lingvistika perevoda. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
7. Lotman, Y. M. (1996). Vnutri myslyashchikh mirov. Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kul'tury.
8. Maslova, V. A. (2001). Lingvokul'turologiya. Minsk: TetraSystems.
9. Newmark, P. (1988). A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall.
10. Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
11. Popova, Z. D., & Sternin, I. A. (2007). Kognitivnaya lingvistika. Moscow: AST: Vostok-Zapad.
12. Ter-Minasova, S. G. (2000). Yazyk i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya. Moscow: Slovo.
13. Vlakhov, S., & Florin, S. (1980). Neperovodimoe v perevode. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
14. Venuti, L. (1995). The Translator's Invisibility. London: Routledge.
15. Vinogradov, V. S. (2001). Vvedenie v perevodovedenie. Moscow: RGGU.