



***A CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATION STRATEGIES
FOR CONNOTATIVE ENGLISH EPONYMS IN UZBEK.***

Abdullaeva Gulkhayo Ulugbekovna

English teacher at Uzbekistan State World Languages University

gulhayo.abdullayeva.28@gmail.com

Connotative eponyms are a special class of proper nouns that have acquired metaphorical, evaluative, or symbolic meanings beyond their original reference. In English, these eponyms often derive from historical figures, literary characters, mythological heroes, or even contemporary personalities who have become widely recognized symbols of certain qualities or traits. For example, names such as Romeo connote a romantic lover, Scrooge denotes a miserly individual, and Einstein implies a person of exceptional intelligence. The connotative dimension of these eponyms presents significant challenges in translation, especially when the target language, in this case Uzbek, may not share the same cultural or literary background. The semantic richness and cultural specificity inherent in connotative eponyms require translators to make careful decisions regarding form, meaning, and function to ensure that the target text retains the intended evaluative, symbolic, or cultural nuances of the original term.

The primary problem addressed in this study is the difficulty of translating connotative eponyms from English into Uzbek without losing either their semantic meaning or cultural resonance. Unlike literal eponyms that simply name a disease, invention, or place, connotative eponyms carry associative meanings that depend on readers' familiarity with source culture, literature, or history. Therefore, translating these eponyms cannot be reduced to a straightforward substitution of words; it requires attention to both linguistic and cultural equivalence. Translators must decide whether to retain the original form, adapt its meaning descriptively, substitute a culturally analogous term, or



provide an explanatory translation to convey the intended connotation. These decisions are often influenced by the anticipated knowledge of the Uzbek readership and the translator's assessment of which strategy best preserves both meaning and stylistic effect.

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the translation strategies employed for connotative English eponyms into Uzbek, with a focus on analyzing patterns, evaluating effectiveness, and identifying recurring challenges. The study uses a corpus-based approach, drawing on authoritative online dictionaries, including the Oxford English Dictionary, Cambridge Dictionary, and Merriam-Webster, as well as other reputable sources to collect examples of connotative eponyms. By using dictionary-based sources rather than literary texts, the study ensures that the eponyms included in the corpus are widely recognized and consistently defined, which provides a more systematic and reproducible dataset.

The research questions guiding this study are: Which types of connotative eponyms occur in authoritative dictionary sources? What translation strategies are used in their Uzbek renderings? And how effectively do these strategies preserve the connotative meaning of the original? The corpus for this study includes approximately 40–50 eponyms extracted from dictionaries, each annotated with its English definition, connotative meaning, and Uzbek translation, along with the translation strategy applied. Although the dataset is relatively small, it is sufficient for a master's thesis because it allows for in-depth qualitative analysis alongside quantitative frequency counts, providing meaningful insights into translation patterns.

The theoretical framework for this study draws on multiple strands of linguistic and translation research. Eponyms, as defined by Blank (1997) and Nielsen (2013), are words derived from proper names, with literal eponyms referring to inventions, diseases, or scientific discoveries, and connotative eponyms functioning as metaphorical or evaluative symbols. Connotation, as



discussed by Leech (1981) and Cruse (1986), refers to the associative meanings of words that extend beyond their denotative or literal meaning. This includes evaluative, emotive, stylistic, and cultural dimensions. In the case of connotative eponyms, the connotation is often central to the word's communicative function, and losing it in translation can significantly alter the effect on the reader.

Translation studies provide a framework for understanding how these challenges can be addressed. Newmark (1988) and Nida and Taber (1969) identify several strategies that translators employ to deal with culturally or semantically challenging terms, including transliteration, descriptive translation, cultural substitution, functional equivalence, and explanatory expansion. Transliteration or borrowing involves retaining the original form of the eponym, which preserves the lexical identity but may obscure the connotative meaning for readers unfamiliar with the reference. Descriptive translation conveys the meaning through explicit description, which ensures comprehension but may reduce brevity and stylistic impact. Cultural substitution replaces the eponym with a term that evokes a similar connotation in the target culture. Functional equivalence seeks to convey the evaluative or functional meaning rather than the literal form. Finally, explanatory translation adds clarifying information to help the reader understand the reference.

Corpus-based methods provide a systematic means of investigating how these strategies are applied. According to Baker (1993) and Johansson and Hofland (1994), parallel corpora allow researchers to identify patterns of usage, frequency, and context in both source and target texts. In the present study, the corpus is composed of dictionary examples of connotative eponyms, along with their documented Uzbek translations from reputable sources. Each example is recorded in a table containing the English eponym, its connotative meaning, the Uzbek translation, and the translation strategy applied. This corpus allows for both quantitative analysis, such as frequency counts of strategy types, and



qualitative discussion, such as evaluation of whether the connotation is preserved, altered, or lost. Analysis of the corpus demonstrates that translation strategies vary depending on the type of eponym and its cultural or semantic load. Highly recognizable eponyms, such as Einstein or Newton, are typically transliterated or borrowed in Uzbek translations, reflecting the global recognition of these figures. Less universally known eponyms, or those with culturally specific connotations, such as Scrooge or Romeo, are often translated using descriptive equivalents, functional equivalents, or explanatory expansions. For example, the English eponym Scrooge, which denotes a miserly or stingy person, can be translated into Uzbek with a descriptive term that conveys the same evaluative meaning, ensuring that the connotation is accessible to readers who may not be familiar with the original literary reference. Similarly, Prince Charming may be translated either through borrowing or with an explanatory phrase such as “Ideal Shahzoda” to convey the connotative meaning.

Patterns observed in the corpus indicate that the choice of strategy is influenced primarily by three factors: the cultural familiarity of the eponym, the semantic richness of its connotation, and the intended audience. Transliteration is preferred when the eponym has global recognition and can be assumed to be understood, while descriptive translation is used when the connotation might otherwise be lost. Functional equivalents and cultural substitutions are applied in cases where the connotation can be preserved through culturally analogous concepts in Uzbek. Explanatory translation is sometimes necessary when the eponym carries layered literary, historical, or metaphorical meaning that cannot be fully conveyed by direct substitution.

The discussion of these findings underscores the complexity of translating connotative eponyms. Linguistic and cultural factors intersect, requiring translators to balance fidelity to the source text with accessibility and readability for the target audience. Corpus analysis offers a systematic



approach to identifying these strategies and evaluating their effectiveness, highlighting which approaches are most successful in preserving connotation in Uzbek. The study demonstrates that no single strategy is universally superior; instead, translators must select strategies based on the specific semantic, cultural, and contextual properties of each eponym.

In conclusion, this study has shown that connotative eponyms in English pose unique challenges for translation into Uzbek, requiring careful attention to both meaning and connotation. Translators employ a combination of strategies, including borrowing, descriptive translation, functional equivalents, and explanatory expansion, depending on the cultural familiarity and semantic load of the eponym. This research contributes to translation studies by providing empirical evidence of strategy use and by highlighting practical recommendations for translators working with connotative eponyms. Future research could expand the corpus to include additional eponyms, examine translations in media, or compare Uzbek translations with translations into other target languages to identify broader patterns and improve translation practice.

References

- Baker, M. (1993). *Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies*.
- Blank, A. (1997). *On Meaning and Naming: Generic and Specific*.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*.
- Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics: The Study of Meaning*.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*.
- Nielsen, S. (2013). *The Eponym in Language and Cognition*.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (n.d.). Online edition.
- Cambridge Dictionary. (n.d.). Online edition.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary. (n.d.). Online edition.