



Translation Issues Of Craftsmanship Realia In English And Uzbek

Ilyos Nuraliyev

Doctoral Candidate at Denau Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy,
Uzbekistan

Abstract

Craftsmanship realia—culture-bound terms denoting artifacts, tools, materials, techniques, and social roles within craft traditions—pose persistent challenges in translation between English and Uzbek. This article examines typical problem areas such as partial equivalence, semantic lacunae, polysemy, and connotative load, and evaluates strategies including borrowing with transliteration, calque, descriptive translation, cultural substitution, and hybrid solutions with annotations. Using illustrative pairs like *ganchkorlik* (gypsum carving), *kandakorlik* (metal chasing), *suzani* (embroidered textile), *do'ppi* (skullcap), and *adras/atlas* (ikat silks) vis-à-vis English craft lexemes such as joinery, bespoke, apprentice/journeyman/master, and smithing, the study argues that optimal rendering depends on genre, readership design, and documentary vs. instrumental translation skopos. A principled decision matrix grounded in equivalence theory and terminology management is proposed to balance intelligibility with cultural visibility. The findings indicate that consistent metadata (glossaries, term notes) and paratextual aids enhance transfer accuracy without erasing local color.

Keywords

realia, craftsmanship, Uzbek, English, translation strategies, domestication, foreignization, terminology, *suzani*, *ganchkorlik*.

Introduction

Realia terms encode condensed ethnocultural knowledge and social memory. In craftsmanship domains, they name historically situated techniques, guild roles, decorative repertoires, and materials that rarely map one-to-one across languages. Uzbek craft vocabulary—*ganchkorlik*, *kandakorlik*, *koshin*, *suzani*, *do'ppi*, *adras/atlas*, *Chust pichog'i*—indexes specific practices and regional identities. English craft lexis spans pre-industrial guild terminology and contemporary maker discourse, producing asymmetrical equivalences such as journeyman vs. *usta shogirdi* or bespoke tailoring vs. *tikuvchilikning buyurtma uslubi*. Because these lexemes act as cultural carriers, translation must negotiate precision, readability, and the ethics of cultural representation. Prior scholarship on culture-specific items and translation visibility provides a theoretical backdrop for addressing these tensions.

The study aims to identify recurrent translation issues in rendering craftsmanship realia between English and Uzbek and to articulate decision criteria for selecting strategies that preserve terminological exactitude while ensuring accessibility for target readers in scholarly, museum, journalistic, and educational contexts.

The material base comprises representative Uzbek craft terms drawn from textile, wood, metal, and decorative arts alongside English craft nomenclature from guild history and contemporary

craft discourse. Examples include *suzani*, *adras/atlas*, *ganch*, *kandakorlik*, *do'ppi*, *koshin*, and social roles like *usta* and *shogird*; on the English side, *apprentice*, *journeyman*, *master*, *joinery*, *smithing*, and *bespoke*. The method combines contrastive lexical analysis with functionalist translation frameworks. Strategy evaluation follows established taxonomies—*borrowing*, *calque*, *descriptive paraphrase*, and *cultural substitution*—tested against text types: museum labels, academic articles, policy reports, tourism copy, and literary nonfiction. Criteria include denotative accuracy, pragmatic adequacy, discoursal coherence, and terminological consistency. Where necessary, controlled language techniques and glossary design principles are invoked to manage repeated realia.

The first recurrent issue is referential density. Terms like *ganchkorlik* denote both material (gypsum/plaster) and technique (ornamental carving and stucco relief) with spiritual and architectural connotations. A simple plaster carving under-represents the tradition's stylistic canon and workshop lineage. Borrowing with a brief explicitation—*ganchkorlik* (ornamental gypsum carving)—proved optimal in academic and museum genres because it preserves the ethnonym while clarifying function. In journalistic texts aimed at non-specialists, the shorter paraphrase ornamental plasterwork maintained fluency but risked cultural flattening; the trade-off becomes acceptable when supported by a captioned image or hyperlink to a glossary. The second issue is category mismatch. *Adras* and *atlas* are both ikat-patterned silks but vary in weave and sheen. English readers may recognize *ikat* as a global textile term; however, *satin* is misleading for *atlas* because it implies a weave class rather than a culturally specific fabric category. The most stable solution is a hybrid: *atlas* (Uzbek satin-weave ikat silk) and *adras* (semi-silk ikat) on first mention, followed by *atlas/adras* thereafter. This respects local terminology and supplies a technical anchor point.

A third problem centers on social roles and training pathways. The English triad *apprentice–journeyman–master* carries European guild historiography and mobility rights; Uzbek *shogird–usta* encodes dyadic mentorship within workshop lineages and city quarters. Literal substitution creates anachronism. A functional equivalence works better: *shogird* as apprentice with note, *usta* as master craftsman, and, where necessary, a footnote clarifying the absence of an exact journeyman stage in certain Uzbek contexts. This approach aligns with documentary *skopos* in ethnography while remaining transparent for general readers.

Polysemy and connotation also affect choices. *Kandakorlik* indicates non-ferrous metal chasing, repoussé, and engraving traditions with ornamental repertoires specific to Bukhara and Khiva. Rendering it simply as metalwork sacrifices technique specificity. Descriptive translation—metal chasing and engraving (*kandakorlik*)—preserves method and signals regional style when coupled with a modifier like *Bukharan*. For portable artifacts such as *suzani*, widespread museum usage has normalized borrowing; the unmarked *suzani* functions as a loanword, and added paraphrase is necessary only at first occurrence or in pedagogical texts.

Genre proves decisive across cases. Museum labels and academic prose benefit from borrowing plus micro-definition on first mention and consistent reuse thereafter. Tourism and marketing copy favor fluent paraphrase with selective retention of distinctive ethnonyms to support place branding. Literary translation typically opts for foreignization to preserve texture, relying on paratext (glossaries, endnotes) rather than in-line explanations to maintain narrative flow. In all genres, a controlled glossary mitigates variability—e.g., choosing either *suzani* embroidery or *suzani* (embroidered textile) as the canonical pairing and repeating it.

Finally, visual anchoring improves comprehension. When an English paraphrase lacks cultural density, pairing the Uzbek loan with imagery or a figure reference restores indexicality. For digital contexts, hover-notes or tooltips can replace footnotes without interrupting reading. Across the evaluated corpus, strategy performance correlated with two variables: the audience's presumed craft literacy and the text's tolerance for paratext. Where tolerance was low, compact descriptive translations outperformed pure borrowings; where tolerance was high, borrowings with definitional first mentions best preserved cultural specificity.

Translating craftsmanship realia between English and Uzbek requires a calibrated balance between cultural visibility and reader accessibility. No single strategy suffices; rather, a dynamic repertoire—borrowing with transliteration, disciplined descriptive translation, and selective calque—should be chosen according to genre and readership. Implementing consistent glossaries, first-mention definitions, and paratextual aids enables translators to maintain terminological precision while conveying the sociocultural depth embedded in craft lexemes. The proposed decision criteria support stable practice across academic, museum, educational, and media settings, preserving Uzbek artisanal heritage in translation without sacrificing communicative clarity.

References

1. Vinay J.-P., Darbelnet J. *Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Paris: Didier, 1958. 331 p.
2. Nida E. A. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: Brill, 1964. 331 p.
3. Newmark P. *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988. 292 p.
4. Baker M. In *Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd ed. London; New York: Routledge, 2018. 370 p.
5. Venuti L. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 2nd ed. London; New York: Routledge, 2008. 353 p.
6. Aixelá J. F. Culture-Specific Items in Translation // Álvarez R., Vidal M. C.-A. (eds.). *Translation, Power, Subversion*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996. P. 52–78.
7. Leppihalme R. *Culture Bumps: An Empirical Approach to the Translation of Allusions*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997. 236 p.
8. Fedorov A. V. *Osnovy obshchey teorii perevoda*. 5-e izd. Moskva: Filologiya tri, 2002. 416 s.
9. Komissarov V. N. *Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty)*. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, 1990. 253 s.
10. Cabré M. T. *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. 248 p.