ISSN:2308-5703
Impact factor:13.5 *International Multidisciplinary Online Journal* October, 2026

TRANSLATION TRANSFORMATIONS OF ONOMASTIC UNITS WITH NATIONAL AND CULTURAL COMPONENTS IN TOURISM DISCOURSE

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Senior Lecturer, Department of Theory and Practice of Translation
Nigora Tokhirovna Akhmedjonova
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23196624

Abstract: The article analyzes the translation features of onomastic units with national and cultural components used in tourism discourse. It examines such translation transformations as transliteration, transcription, calque translation, explicitation, and lexical substitution, as well as their role in conveying national and cultural meanings. Particular attention is paid to preserving national identity and ensuring communicative comprehensibility when translating onomastic units.

Keywords: tourism discourse, onomastics, onomastic unit, proper name, national and cultural component, linguoculturology, translation transformation, transliteration, transcription, calque translation, realia, cultural connotation.

The rapid development of globalization and international tourism has contributed to the expansion of communicative contacts between different peoples and cultures. The tourism sector is significant not only as an economic and social phenomenon but also as a linguocultural phenomenon. Tourist texts contain numerous linguistic units that reflect the historical and cultural heritage, geographical characteristics, customs, national values, and ethnic identity of a particular region. Among these units, onomastic units occupy a special place.

Onomastic units include proper names such as geographical names, personal names, names of historical sites, architectural monuments, religious sites and pilgrimage destinations, as well as names of organizations and institutions. In tourism discourse, toponyms and names of cultural sites are particularly common. For example, names such as Samarkand, Bukhara, Khiva, Registan, Shah-i-Zinda, Ichan Qala, and Ark Fortress not only designate particular sites but also embody historical and national-cultural information. Translating these units into another language is not merely a process of nominative substitution. The formally accurate rendering of a proper name does not always ensure that its cultural and semantic content will be fully understood by a foreign reader or tourist. From this perspective, the study of translation transformations of onomastic units with national and cultural components in tourism discourse represents one of the relevant issues in contemporary translation studies.

Tourism Discourse and Onomastic Units. In contemporary linguistics, the concept of discourse is generally interpreted as an integral form of language use associated with a particular communicative situation, socio-cultural environment, and speech activity. Tourism discourse, in turn, constitutes a communicative sphere designed to provide information about travel, tourist attractions, cultural heritage, historical sites, tourism services, travel routes, and destinations.

One of the principal characteristics of tourism discourse is its informative and persuasive nature. A tourist text should simultaneously provide information about an object, arouse the tourist's interest, and contribute to the formation of a particular cultural perception. Therefore, geographical and cultural names carry considerable communicative significance in such texts.

Onomastic units in tourism discourse can be divided into the following main groups:

1. **Toponyms** – names of countries, cities, villages, regions, rivers, mountains, and other geographical features, such as Samarkand, Bukhara, Zarafshan, and Hisor.
2. **Urbanonyms** – names of streets, squares, neighborhoods, and other urban objects.

3. **Names of spatial and cultural sites** – names of palaces, madrasas, mosques, mausoleums, fortresses, museums, and other historical sites, such as Registan Square, Ulugh Beg Madrasa, and Ark Fortress.

4. **Ethnonyms** – names of peoples, nations, tribes, and ethnic groups.

5. **Anthroponyms** – names of historical figures and representatives of culture.

6. **Religious and cultural onomastic units** – names of pilgrimage sites, mausoleums, and religious sites.

Some of these units are relatively easy to recognize in international communication, whereas others contain a strong national and cultural component. It is precisely the latter type that creates particular difficulties in translation.

National and Cultural Components in Onomastic Units. A national and cultural component refers to information concerning the history, lifestyle, traditions, worldview, and values of a particular people embedded in a linguistic unit. In onomastic units, such a component is often manifested through the etymology of a name, its historical origin, the function of the object, or associative meanings formed in the collective consciousness.

For example, the name Registan may be perceived by a foreign tourist simply as a geographical name. However, within the Uzbek cultural context, it has a broad range of associations related to the historical center of Samarkand, Oriental architecture, and the cultural heritage of the Timurid period. Similarly, the name Ichan Qala refers not only to the historic inner city of Khiva but also functions as a cultural symbol representing Uzbek traditions of urban planning and architecture.

Major Translation Transformations Used in Translating Onomastic Units. Various translation transformations are employed when translating onomastic units with national and cultural components. The choice of a particular transformation depends on the semantic characteristics of the unit, the norms of the target language, and the communicative purpose of the text.

Transliteration. Transliteration is a method of representing the characters of one writing system through corresponding graphic symbols of another writing system. In tourism texts, this method is used to preserve the national form of a proper name as much as possible.

For example:

- Samarqand → Samarkand;
- Buxoro → Bukhara;
- Xiva → Khiva.

This method enables foreign tourists to recognize the original name of a particular site. At the same time, transliteration does not directly reveal the meaning of the name. Therefore, when providing detailed information about culturally significant sites, it is advisable to combine transliteration with explanation.

Transcription. The primary purpose of transcription is to create a form of a proper name that approximates its pronunciation in another language. This method is particularly important in tourist audio guides, promotional materials, and oral communication. Transcription makes it possible to preserve the phonetic form of a national name relatively accurately. However, due to differences between the phonetic systems of the two languages, it is not always possible to reproduce the original pronunciation completely.

Calque Translation. Calque translation involves rendering the components of an onomastic unit into the target language through literal or structurally corresponding translation. For example, when an object name contains generic naming components such as madrasa, mosque, fortress, square, or palace, their functional equivalents may be translated:

- Ulug‘bek madrasasi → Ulugbek Madrasa;
- Registon maydoni → Registan Square;

- Ark qal'asi → Ark Fortress.

In this case, the main national component of the name is preserved, while the type of the object is made comprehensible to the foreign recipient through translation.

Explicitation. Explicitation is one of the most effective methods of conveying a national and cultural component. In this case, the onomastic unit itself is not translated; instead, its meaning or historical and cultural significance is briefly explained.

For example:

Ichan Qala — the historic inner city of Khiva, surrounded by fortress walls.

This method is particularly effective for units whose national and cultural meanings do not have a direct equivalent in the target language. Through explicitation, the translator performs two important functions: first, the original name is preserved; second, its meaning is made comprehensible to the foreign tourist.

Lexical Substitution. In some cases, a component of an onomastic unit is replaced with a functional equivalent available in the target language. For example, the Uzbek component qal'a can be translated as fortress or citadel depending on the context, while maydon can be rendered as square and masjid as mosque. When selecting a lexical equivalent, the actual historical and functional characteristics of the site must be taken into consideration. For instance, translating qal'a as castle in every context may not be semantically accurate.

Specification. Specification involves rendering a general-meaning unit by means of a more specific unit in the target language. In tourism discourse, this transformation is used to indicate more precisely the functional or historical characteristics of an object.

For example, the Uzbek term ziyoratgoh can be translated, depending on the context, as shrine, pilgrimage site, or religious sanctuary. In this case, the translator takes into account the communicative function of the site.

Generalization. Generalization, by contrast, involves rendering a specific unit through a broader term. This method may be used when the target language does not have a complete functional equivalent of the original unit.

For example, if a localized concept contained in the name of a particular historical or cultural site is unfamiliar to the foreign recipient, it may be explained through a broader categorical term. However, generalization should not excessively reduce the national specificity of the original unit. This approach corresponds to the communicative characteristics of tourism discourse because a tourist text is intended not only to convey a name but also to shape the tourist's perception of a cultural site.

Linguocultural Significance of Translation Transformations. The main challenge in translating onomastic units lies in maintaining a balance between form and meaning. On the one hand, the translator should preserve the national name in its original form as far as possible. On the other hand, cultural information unfamiliar to the foreign recipient should be presented in an understandable form.

From this perspective, two major translation strategies can be distinguished in tourism discourse:

1. **The strategy of preserving cultural identity.**

In this strategy, the national form of the onomastic unit is retained. Transliteration and transcription constitute the principal means of implementing this strategy.

2. **The strategy of ensuring cultural comprehensibility.**

In this strategy, additional information is provided to the foreign recipient through explanation, calque translation, descriptive translation, or lexical substitution.

In practice, these strategies should not be regarded as mutually exclusive. On the contrary, their comprehensive application increases the communicative effectiveness of translation.

The Role of the Translator in Tourism Discourse. A translator of tourist texts is not merely a linguistic intermediary but also acts as a mediator who facilitates intercultural communication. One of the translator's primary tasks is to adequately recreate the national and cultural information contained in the source text in the target language. When translating the names of historical sites in particular, the translator should take the following factors into consideration:

- the historical origin of the name;
- the semantic characteristics of its constituent elements;
- the cultural and historical status of the site;
- the conventional variant existing in the target language;
- the established name used in international tourism communication;
- the level of cultural knowledge of the target audience;
- the genre and communicative purpose of the text.

For example, an academic historical text may require a detailed explanation, whereas concise and expressive naming may be prioritized in tourism advertising. In an audio-guide text, ease of pronunciation and rapid comprehension of meaning are particularly important. Onomastic units with national and cultural components in tourism discourse constitute important linguistic means of representing the historical, geographical, and cultural identity of a particular region. Such units are not merely nominative elements; they also embody additional meanings associated with the historical memory, cultural values, and national identity of a people.

The translation of these units into another language involves such transformations as transcription, transliteration, calque translation, lexical substitution, explicitation, specification, generalization, and combined translation. Each of these transformations performs a specific function in a particular communicative context.

The study demonstrates that the most appropriate approach to translating onomastic units in tourism discourse is not limited to achieving formal equivalence. Rather, it should be based on a comprehensive approach aimed at preserving the unity of nominative, semantic, and linguocultural components. In particular, combining transliteration or transcription with a brief explanation in the case of names containing a strong national and cultural component can enhance both the adequacy of translation and its effectiveness in intercultural communication.

Thus, the translation of onomastic units in tourism discourse is a complex process situated at the intersection of translation studies, onomastics, and linguoculturology. Its success depends on maintaining a balance between preserving the national identity of the original name and ensuring that its meaning is comprehensible to the foreign recipient.

REFERENCES:

1. Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод: Вопросы общей и частной теории перевода. – Москва: Международные отношения, 1975.
2. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). – Москва: Высшая школа, 1990.
3. Федоров А.В. Основы общей теории перевода. – Москва: Филология Три, 2002.
4. Влахов С., Флорин С. Непереводимое в переводе. – Москва: Р.Валент, 2006.
5. Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. Язык и культура: Лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного. – Москва: Русский язык, 1990.
6. Томахин Г.Д. Реалии-американизмы. – Москва: Высшая школа, 1988.
7. Newmark P. A Textbook of Translation. – New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.
8. Nord C. Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained. – Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 1997.

ISSN:2308-5703
Impact factor:13.5 *International Multidisciplinary Online Journal* October, 2026

9. Newmark, P. A Textbook of Translation. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.