



HANDLING CONTEXT-FREE, CONTEXT-BOUND AND EQUIVALENT-LACKING LEXICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH-UZBEK TRANSLATION: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY

Damir Shermatov, Bachelor Student

Faculty of English Philology and Translation Studies (Ingliz Filologiyasi va

Tarjimashunoslik Fakulteti)

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Samarkand 140100, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This study explores the translation of context-free, context-bound, and equivalent-lacking lexical units in English-Uzbek translation practice. Although lexical units possess dictionary meanings, their communicative function is determined by contextual realization and semantic interaction within discourse. The article analyzes the structural and semantic characteristics of these three lexical categories and examines the strategies required for their adequate rendering into Uzbek. Context-free units, including proper names and technical terminology, generally have stable equivalents and are translated through transcription or loan translation. In contrast, context-bound lexical units require contextual interpretation due to polysemy, connotative variation, and pragmatic modification. Equivalent-lacking words, such as neologisms and culture-specific realia, demand creative strategies including descriptive translation, semantic transformation, and functional substitution. The findings demonstrate that successful translation depends on contextual awareness, terminological precision, and analytical flexibility. The study concludes that professional competence in English-Uzbek translation requires interpretative reconstruction of meaning rather than mechanical lexical substitution.

Nega

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada ingliz-o'zbek tarjima amaliyotida kontekstdan mustaqil, kontekstga bog'liq hamda ekvivalenti mavjud bo'lmagan



leksik birliklarning tarjima xususiyatlari o'rganiladi. Leksik birliklar lug'aviy ma'noga ega bo'lsa-da, ularning haqiqiy kommunikativ qiymati matn kontekstida yuzaga chiqadi. Maqolada ushbu uch toifadagi birliklarning semantik va strukturaviy xususiyatlari tahlil qilinib, ularni o'zbek tiliga adekvat tarjima qilish strategiyalari yoritiladi. Kontekstdan mustaqil birliklar, xususan, atoqli otlar va terminlar odatda barqaror ekvivalentlarga ega bo'lib, transkripsiya yoki kalkalash orqali tarjima qilinadi. Kontekstga bog'liq birliklar esa ko'p ma'nolilik va pragmatik o'zgarishlar tufayli chuqur kontekstual tahlilni talab qiladi. Ekvivalenti mavjud bo'lmagan birliklar, jumladan, neologizmlar va realiyalar, tavsifiy tarjima hamda semantik transformatsiyalar orqali ifodalanadi. Tadqiqot natijalari tarjimada kontekstual sezgirlik va tahliliy moslashuvchanlik muhim ekanligini ko'rsatadi.

Keywords: *English–Uzbek translation; context-free words; context-bound words; equivalent-lacking units; lexical semantics; transcription; semantic transformation; polysemy; translation competence; contextual meaning*

Introduction

Lexical meaning in translation is not static but dynamic. A word that appears clear in isolation may assume different semantic or pragmatic functions depending on the communicative environment in which it is used. In English–Uzbek translation, lexical challenges are intensified by structural, morphological, and cultural differences between the two languages. The translator must therefore move beyond dictionary definitions and evaluate how meaning is actualized in discourse.

Translation theory distinguishes three major lexical categories that influence translation strategy: context-free lexical units, context-bound lexical units, and equivalent-lacking words. Each category presents different levels of complexity. Context-free words generally retain stable meanings and offer predictable translation solutions. Context-bound words depend heavily on context and require interpretative analysis. Equivalent-lacking lexical items require creative transformation strategies because no regular equivalent exists in the target language.



This study aims to analyze these categories systematically and demonstrate how contextual interpretation determines translation adequacy in English–Uzbek practice.

Literature Review and Methodology

Scholars of translation theory emphasize that lexical equivalence is not always symmetrical across languages. Words operate within semantic fields shaped by cultural and institutional systems. Context-free words typically include proper names, geographical names, institutional titles, and technical terminology. These units are considered relatively stable because their referents remain constant across contexts.

However, the majority of vocabulary consists of polysemantic words whose meaning becomes clear only through contextual specification. Translation of such words requires semantic disambiguation. Furthermore, equivalent-lacking words arise due to differences in cultural experience, technological development, and linguistic structure.

The methodology of this study is qualitative and descriptive. English sentences containing representative lexical units are examined, translated into Uzbek, and analyzed. The evaluation focuses on semantic adequacy, contextual appropriateness, and communicative effectiveness.

Results

Context-Free Lexical Units

Context-free lexical units are relatively independent of contextual modification. Their referential meaning remains constant, and translation usually involves formal reproduction rather than semantic reinterpretation. These words function as stable reference points within the text.

For example, proper names such as:

“John Fitzgerald Kennedy”

“Jon Fitsjerald Kennedi”

“California”

“Kaliforniya”



Here, transcription ensures phonetic approximation while preserving identity. The translator does not interpret meaning but reproduces referential form. This process supports consistency and prevents distortion of internationally recognized names.

Institutional titles and political entities also belong to this category:

“The United States of America”	“Amerika Qo‘shma Shtatlari”
“The Federal Bureau of Investigation”	“Federal Tergov Byurosi”

In these cases, loan translation (calque) reproduces structural components while preserving institutional meaning. The translator follows established conventions rather than inventing new equivalents.

Technical terminology demonstrates similar stability:

“oxygen”	“kislород”
“legislation”	“qonunchilik”
“embassy”	“elchixona”

These terms function within specialized semantic systems. Because they are standardized, translation requires terminological accuracy rather than contextual reinterpretation.

However, even context-free units may produce errors when translators rely on formal similarity rather than semantic equivalence. For instance:

“decade” does not correspond to “dekada” but means “o‘n yil.”
“public school” in British usage not “ommaviy maktab.” refers to a private institution

These examples demonstrate that apparent stability does not eliminate the need for lexical awareness. Knowledge of semantic divergence prevents false equivalence. Thus, context-free units require terminological competence and awareness of interlingual asymmetry.

Context-Bound Lexical Units



Unlike context-free words, context-bound lexical units derive meaning from their environment. Most English words are polysemantic, meaning that they contain several potential meanings. The role of context is to eliminate irrelevant meanings and actualize one specific semantic variant.

Consider the sentence:

“Few Europeans speak Mandarin.” Here, “Mandarin” clearly refers to the Chinese language: “Kam sonli yevropaliklar mandarin tilida so‘zlashadi.”

However, in a different context:

“He served as a Mandarin in the imperial court.” Now “Mandarin” refers to a high-ranking official: “U imperator saroyida amaldor bo‘lib xizmat qilgan.”

The lexical form remains identical, yet contextual signals determine interpretation. The translator must analyze surrounding linguistic cues and background knowledge to avoid semantic confusion.

Context also modifies evaluative connotation. For example: “ambitious program” - “ulkan dastur” In this case, “ambitious” carries a positive connotation of scale and aspiration.

However: “ambitious politician” - “shuhratparast siyosatchi”

Here, the same adjective implies excessive personal desire. The translator must interpret pragmatic tone, not merely lexical meaning.

Another example illustrates contextual strengthening: “History has dealt with dictators before.” Literal translation would weaken the force of expression. Instead: “Tarix diktatorlar bilan allaqachon hisob-kitob qilgan.”

The semantic transformation intensifies meaning to match contextual implication. This demonstrates that contextual translation may involve lexical expansion or strengthening to preserve rhetorical effect. Thus, context-bound words demand interpretative analysis, sensitivity to connotation, and pragmatic awareness.

Equivalent-Lacking Lexical Units

Equivalent-lacking lexical units represent the highest level of translation complexity. These words have no permanent equivalents in the target language



because they refer to new concepts, culture-specific phenomena, or structural formations not present in the Uzbek linguistic system.

For example: “In many cities central streets have been pedestrianized.”

The English verb “pedestrianize” is formed through productive derivation. Uzbek morphology does not allow direct parallel formation. Therefore, descriptive translation is required:

“Ko‘chalar transport harakati uchun yopilib, faqat piyodalar uchun ajratildi.”

The translator reconstructs the underlying meaning rather than reproducing word formation.

Similarly, the lexical item: “know-how” has no single-word equivalent. Depending on context, it may be rendered as: “amaliy tajriba”, “maxsus texnologik bilim”

The translator selects the variant that reflects contextual intention.

Neologisms such as: “nuclearist”
require analytical decomposition:

“yadro qurollanish tarafdori”

Here, descriptive translation ensures clarity while preserving meaning. Equivalent-lacking words reveal structural differences between languages. They require creative transformation strategies such as borrowing, calque, semantic expansion, or functional substitution. Thus, this category tests the translator’s analytical reasoning and linguistic creativity.

Discussion

The findings demonstrate that lexical classification directly determines translation strategy. Context-free units rely primarily on terminological accuracy and convention. Context-bound units require contextual disambiguation and pragmatic interpretation. Equivalent-lacking units demand creative transformation and semantic reconstruction.

English–Uzbek translation particularly highlights lexical asymmetry due to differences in morphological productivity and institutional terminology. Therefore,



translation competence is not limited to bilingual knowledge; it requires interpretative skill, cultural understanding, and strategic flexibility. The translator must constantly evaluate whether a lexical unit requires reproduction, interpretation, or reconstruction.

Conclusion

This study confirms that translation of lexical units in English–Uzbek practice cannot rely on mechanical substitution. Context-free words require precision, context-bound words require interpretation, and equivalent-lacking units require creativity. Effective translation is a process of contextual meaning reconstruction. Professional competence involves semantic analysis, terminological awareness, and strategic adaptation. Mastery of these skills ensures communicative equivalence and lexical adequacy in translation practice.

REFERENCES

- Baker, M. (2018). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (Revised ed.). John Benjamins.
- Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as communicator*. Routledge.
- House, J. (2015). *Translation quality assessment: Past and present*. Routledge.
- Komissarov, V. N. (1991). *Theory of translation (Linguistic aspects)*. Higher School.
- Komissarov, V., & Korolova, A. (1990). *A manual of translation from English into Russian*. Higher School.
- Klaudy, K. (2003). *Languages in translation: Lectures on the theory, teaching and practice of translation*. Scholastica.
- Levy, J. (2011). *The art of translation*. John Benjamins.
- Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Brill.



Pym, A. (2010). *Exploring translation theories*. Routledge.

Toury, G. (2012). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. John Benjamins.

Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A methodology for translation*. John Benjamins.

Yusupov, O. (2017). *Translation theory and practice*. Tafakkur Publishing.