



**LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL CHALLENGES IN INDIRECT
TRANSLATION FROM ENGLISH TO UZBEK VIA RUSSIAN: A CASE
STUDY OF 1984**

Dilshod Dilmurodovich Tog'aymurodov,
Denov Institute of Entrepreneurship and Pedagogy
Email: d.togaymuradov@dtpi.uz

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15183974>

Abstract. *This study examines the linguistic and cultural challenges encountered when translating from English to Uzbek through Russian as an intermediary language, using George Orwell's 1984 as a case study. The research highlights semantic shifts, loss of cultural references, and structural transformations that arise due to the influence of Russian on the Uzbek translation. By analyzing key terms such as Newspeak, Doublethink, and Thoughtcrime, as well as broader syntactic and ideological changes, this paper underscores the complexities of indirect translation. The findings emphasize the necessity of direct translations from English to Uzbek to preserve the original text's ideological and stylistic nuances. Additionally, the study advocates for improved translator training and methodologies to enhance cultural and linguistic fidelity in translation practices.*

Keywords: *Indirect translation, linguistic and cultural discrepancies, translation of 1984, English-Uzbek translation, influence of Russian, dystopian literature translation.*

Introduction

The process of translating from English to Uzbek through an intermediary language, such as Russian, presents unique linguistic and cultural challenges. These challenges become especially pronounced when dealing with dystopian literature, which is rich in political and philosophical terminology. This paper explores the linguistic and cultural implications of indirect translation using George Orwell's *1984* as a case study.

The field of translation studies has long debated the effects of indirect translation (Baker, 1992). Some scholars argue that this method introduces semantic ambiguities (Venuti, 2008). Translation theories emphasize that cultural realities and linguistic differences significantly impact translation quality (Nida, 1964).

Literature review

Indirect translation refers to translating a text not directly from the source language but through another intermediary language (Gambier & Van Doorslaer, 2010). This process often results in semantic shifts, loss of cultural references, or misinterpretations. The impact of indirect translation has been widely discussed in translation studies, particularly in relation to language pairs that do not share the same grammatical structures or cultural contexts (Munday, 2016).



XORIJY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

One of the primary concerns in indirect translation is the transformation of meaning through multiple interpretative layers. When a text is translated via an intermediary language, each translation phase introduces the potential for alterations in meaning, tone, and cultural references (Jakobson, 1959). As Catford (1965) suggests, linguistic differences between the languages involved in indirect translation create a significant challenge for translators who must navigate variations in syntax, morphology, and semantics.

Another key concept relevant to this study is the domestication and foreignization strategies discussed by Venuti (2008). In indirect translation, the intermediary language often exerts its influence, leading to shifts in domestication and foreignization patterns. Russian, for instance, may either add an additional layer of cultural adaptation or introduce linguistic elements that do not align with Uzbek linguistic norms.

The concept of equivalence in translation (Nida, 1964) is also crucial to understanding indirect translation. Dynamic equivalence, which focuses on conveying meaning rather than literal structure, often becomes problematic when translations pass through multiple languages (Togaymurodov, 2023). This issue is especially evident in *1984*, where Orwell's invented terminology carries specific ideological and cultural connotations that may be lost or altered in indirect translation.

Finally, Toury's (1995) descriptive translation studies emphasize that translations are not just linguistic transfers but cultural and historical artifacts. The socio-political context of the intermediary language—in this case, Russian—can shape the interpretation and adaptation of the original text, leading to ideological shifts in the target translation.

Analysis

Key terms in *1984*, such as *Newspeak*, *Doublethink*, and *Thoughtcrime*, undergo significant alterations in indirect translation. For instance, *Thoughtcrime* is directly translated from English as “fikr jinoyati” (thought crime). However, the Russian version “мыслепреступление” translates to “tafakkur jinoyati” (crime of thought) or “fikr suiqasd” (thought treason) in Uzbek. These variations alter the semantic depth of the concept.

Another crucial term is *Newspeak*, which refers to a deliberately simplified and ideologically controlled language. A direct translation from English would be “Yangi til” (New Language). In Russian, it appears as “Новояз,” which Uzbek translators might render as “Yangi nutq” (New Speech) or “Yangi tilda so‘zlash” (Speaking in a



XORIJIY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

New Language). However, these Uzbek versions fail to convey the term's ideological implications.

Cultural and ideological elements often get distorted in indirect translation. For example, *Big Brother* symbolizes oppressive surveillance and government control. The Russian translation, “Старший брат” (Older Brother), might be rendered in Uzbek as “Katta og‘a” or “Kattakon.” However, this translation does not fully capture the term's authoritarian connotations.

Similarly, *Telescreen*, a key concept in Orwell's dystopian world, represents an omnipresent surveillance device. A direct translation would be “teleekran.” The Russian version “телекран” retains the term's general meaning but does not emphasize its function as a government monitoring tool. In Uzbek, it might be translated as “televizor ekrani” (television screen), potentially stripping the term of its surveillance connotation.

When translated via Russian, the structure and grammatical nuances of the Russian language influence the final Uzbek version. For instance, syntactic structures in Russian tend to be more complex than in Uzbek, which could lead to unnatural sentence constructions. Additionally, some phrases and idiomatic expressions in Russian do not exist in Uzbek, forcing translators to either adapt them or omit key details.

A comparison between direct English-to-Uzbek translations and indirect translations via Russian reveals differences in meaning and emphasis. For example, *Room 101* in *1984* symbolizes a place where an individual faces their worst fears. In Russian, it is translated simply as “101-ая комната” (Room 101). This version lacks the symbolic weight of the English original. If translated from Russian, the Uzbek equivalent may fail to capture its deeper psychological significance.

Conclusion

The process of indirect translation significantly impacts the linguistic and cultural integrity of a text. As demonstrated through *1984*, semantic ambiguities, cultural misinterpretations, and structural influences from Russian shape the final Uzbek translation. The reliance on an intermediary language not only alters lexical choices but also modifies the ideological and stylistic essence of the original work.

To improve translation accuracy, it is essential to encourage direct translations from English to Uzbek, thereby reducing intermediary influences. Translators must be equipped with a strong cultural and linguistic understanding to navigate the complexities of both source and target languages. Additionally, translation



XORIJIY TILLARNI O'QITISHDA INNOVATSION YONDASHUVLAR NAZARIYANING AMALIYOTGA TATBIQI

mavzusidagi respublika ilmiy-amaliy anjumani

methodologies should prioritize maintaining the ideological intent of the original text while ensuring linguistic naturalness in the target language.

Future research could explore the broader implications of indirect translation in different literary genres, as well as the potential role of machine translation in mitigating linguistic distortions. A comparative study of direct and indirect translations across various texts could further illuminate patterns of meaning shifts and cultural adaptation strategies.

References:

1. Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge.
2. Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation Studies*. Routledge.
3. Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford University Press.
4. Dilshod Dilmurodovich Togaymurodov (2023). SIMILE: A COMPARATIVE STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF "1984" AND ITS UZBEK TRANSLATION. *Academic research in educational sciences*, 4 (3), 109-118.
5. Gambier, Y., & Van Doorslaer, L. (2010). *Handbook of Translation Studies*. John Benjamins.
6. Jakobson, R. (1959). *On Linguistic Aspects of Translation*. Harvard University Press.
7. Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Routledge.
8. Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating*. Brill.
9. Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. John Benjamins.
10. Venuti, L. (2008). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge.
11. Venuti, L. (2013). *Translation Changes Everything: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.