

Split Equivalence Across Languages: The Case of English-Uzbek Railway Terminology

SEVARA BEKMURODOVA

Karshi State University, Karshi, Uzbekistan

JAKHONGIR BEKMURADOV

Karshi International Innovation University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This study investigates split equivalence in English-Uzbek railway terminology – situations where a single English term corresponds to multiple non-interchangeable Uzbek equivalents. Using a bilingual corpus compiled from technical manuals, station signage, official glossaries, and international term banks, the research identifies, classifies, and explains four recurring split patterns: functional, scale, technical vs. general, and borrowed vs. native distinctions. Analysis combines corpus-driven identification with contextual interpretation and expert validation. Findings reveal that functional splits (clarifying polysemy) are most common, followed by scale and register distinctions; Russian loanwords persist but are less frequent. The paper discusses safety and communication consequences for operations and proposes practical mitigation measures – standardized bilingual glossaries, contextual translator training, and staff workshops – to improve terminology management in Uzbekistan’s modernizing rail sector.

Keywords: Split equivalence, Railway terminology, English–Uzbek translation, technical lexicography, terminology standardization, Russian loanwords, corpus linguistics, operational safety

1. INTRODUCTION

Precise and standardized terminology is fundamental to the safe and efficient operation of railway (Bekmurodova & Bekmurodov 2025). In the global rail industry, English has become the lingua franca – it dominates international standards, technical documentation, and cross-border communication. International bodies like the UIC even maintain multilingual railway glossaries (such as RailLexic) built around English concepts. In contrast, Uzbek – the national language of Uzbekistan – is the primary medium for domestic railway discourse. Uzbek terminology reflects the country’s historical and institutional context, including legacies from the Soviet era. Uzbek scholars have begun to examine these dynamics. For example, Kurbanova (2024) takes a comparative approach to English and Uzbek railway terms, highlighting the linguistic, cultural, and sociolinguistic factors that shape each (Kurbanova 2024). She observes “the dominance of international terms” in modern Uzbek rail vocabulary while stressing “the necessity of developing national terminology systems” to align with global (Kurbanova 2025). Similarly, Bekmurodova & Bekmurodov (2025) argue that adopting standardized international definitions can markedly improve Uzbekistan’s railway efficiency and (Bekmurodova & Bekmurodov 2025). Together, these studies underscore how global English-based terminology and local Uzbek usage interact – sometimes harmoniously, sometimes contentiously – in the Uzbek railway domain.

1.1. *Importance of accurate terminology*

In railway operations, even minor terminological errors can have serious consequences (Fukuda 1990; Lövétei & Szabó 2016; Vanderhaegen et al. 1998). Miscommunication of technical terms – for example in signaling or instructions – can lead to operational delays, equipment conflicts, or safety hazards. As one analysis emphasizes, mastering railway language diversity is “safety-critical” because of “possible cases of miscommunication between operators” (Bade 2011; Sécurité Ferroviaire n.d.). In practical terms, a mistranslated signal instruction or procedural term could

cause a train to move incorrectly, endangering passengers and infrastructure. Conversely, consistent terminology improves training, maintenance, and incident response. In line with this, Bekmurodova et al. note that standardizing railway vocabulary “can boost Uzbekistan’s efficiency, safety, and training” by reducing (Bekmurodova & Bekmurodov 2025). In sum, the precision of cross-linguistic term mappings is not merely theoretical: it underpins reliable communication, regulatory compliance, and overall system safety.

1.2. *Problem statement*

A key challenge in English-Uzbek railway translation is the phenomenon of “split equivalence.” This occurs when a single English source term has multiple Uzbek counterparts, each covering a different nuance or sub-context. Such one-to-many correspondences arise from divergent semanti (Бакаев, 2021) structures and socio-historical influences in the two languages. For instance, many Uzbek rail terms entered the lexicon via Russian during the Soviet period, whereas others derive directly from English technical language or from newly coined Uzbek forms. The result is that an English term like “station,” “signal,” or “train control” may map to two (or more) Uzbek words depending on context. This asymmetry complicates translation and standardization: translators must choose among alternatives and ensure consistent usage. As Kurbanova (2025) points out, an effective translation process must “maintain the precise meaning of technical terms” while also aligning with international (Kurbanova 2025). When split equivalence is not carefully managed, clarity can break down in multilingual documentation or in communication among Uzbek- and English-speaking personnel.

1.3. *Research Aim*

The present study aims to identify, classify, and analyze instances of split equivalence between English and Uzbek railway terminology. Specifically, we will collect examples where one English term corresponds to two or more semantically differentiated Uzbek translations. Each case will be examined for

underlying causes – whether linguistic (e.g. differences in grammar or semantics), cultural/historical (e.g. Russian influence, local conventions), or technical (e.g. shifting technology or standards). In doing so, we build on previous Uzbek research: for example, Kurbanova’s comparative work (Kurbanova 2024) and morphological analysis of railway (Kurbanova 2025), and Bekmurodova’s study of terminology (Bekmurodova & Bekmurodov, 2025). By systematically mapping these split equivalences, the study will clarify how English railway concepts are rendered in Uzbek. Ultimately, understanding these one-to-many mappings can inform better translation practices and support the development of more coherent, standardized terminology in the Uzbek railway sector.

1.4. *Research questions*

- What types of split-equivalence relationships occur between English and Uzbek railway terms?
- What linguistic, cultural, or historical factors contribute to these divergences?
- How can an improved understanding of split equivalence inform translation practice and terminology standardization in railway contexts?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. *Key concepts*

In translation theory, “split equivalence” (as defined by Baker 2018) describes when a single source term maps to multiple non-interchangeable target terms due to differences in semantic scope, register, or context (Baker 2018). This frequently arises in technical domains, where one English term may require several Uzbek words to capture its full meaning. For example, recent Uzbek research shows that achieving one-to-one equivalence can be difficult: Mirzaakhmedova (2025) observes that in English–Uzbek translation “full equivalence is often unattainable due to conceptual differences between the two languages,” forcing translators to use adaptation and (Mirzaakhmedova 2025). Similarly, To‘rayeva (2023) highlights that specialized terms

often differ sharply from common vocabulary – noting “morphological and semantic differences between terms and ordinary words” in Uzbek railway (To’rayeva 2023). These findings underscore how semantic divergence and polysemy complicate Uzbek technical translation. As Kurbanova (2021) notes in the educational context, Uzbek students face intense “terminology interference” when balancing English and Uzbek technical (Kurbanova Sharifovna 2021). In sum, Uzbek scholars confirm that linguistic and cultural divergences between English and Uzbek mean translators must carefully disambiguate concepts – often splitting a single English term into multiple Uzbek equivalents to maintain precision.

2.2. Prior studies

Much research on technical translation has documented these challenges in various language pairs. For instance, Hatim & Munday (2004) find split equivalence in English-Arabic, and similar issues appear in English-Chinese (e.g. alignments of technical terms) (Hatim & Munday, 2004). In domain-specific fields like law and medicine, Šarčević (1997) and Montalt & González-Davies (2007) also show that precise mapping of terminology depends heavily on context and field conventions (Šarčević 1997; Montalt & González-Davies 2007). In the Uzbek context, scholars have begun to address related issues. Kurbanova (2021) examines English-Uzbek railway education materials and points out a significant “problem of terminology interference,” calling for systematic standardization of railway (Kurbanova Sharifovna 2021). To’rayeva (2023) compares English and Uzbek rail terms, analyzing how they are formed and how they function, and likewise emphasizes lexicosemantic distinctions in (To’rayeva 2023). More recently, Kurbanova & Shavkatov (2024) analyze English-Uzbek railway terms with the explicit goal of “bridging linguistic gaps,” exploring structural and semantic dimensions of the terminology in both (Kurbanova & Shavkatov 2024). These Uzbek-led studies complement older translation theory by focusing on transportation-specific vocabulary. Together, they underscore that cross-cultural and contextual factors must guide any equivalent choice. (However,

most of these Uzbek works note the scarcity of prior comparative studies in this niche.)

2.3. *Research gap*

Despite these emerging studies, there remains a clear gap in the literature on English-Uzbek railway terminology. As Kurbanova & Shavkatov (2024) point out, “there is a paucity of research specifically focusing on the comparative analysis of railway terms in English and Uzbek (Kurbanova & Shavkatov 2024). In other words, no comprehensive corpus study has thoroughly catalogued where and why split equivalence occurs in authentic Uzbek rail texts. This gap is increasingly important to fill. Uzbekistan occupies a strategic geographic position in Central Asia (serving major North-South and East-West transit corridors) (Strategy of Development of JSC “Uzbekiston Temir Yullari” for 2015–2019, 2015), and its railway sector is undergoing rapid modernization. The national rail strategy explicitly highlights needs like “updating fixed assets,” expanding electrified lines, building new track, and raising train (Strategy of Development of JSC *Uzbekiston Temir Yullari* for 2015-2019, 2015). In this context, clear bilingual terminology is vital for safety, international cooperation, and integration with global standards. By analyzing split equivalence in real railway documents, the current study addresses this underexplored area and contributes to both translation studies and effective terminological management in Uzbekistan’s modernizing rail industry (Matlatipov et al. 2020).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. *Data collection*

A bilingual corpus of railway terminology was assembled from authoritative English and Uzbek sources. Sources include:

- Technical manuals, operational guidelines, and safety regulations published by O‘zbekiston Temir Yo‘llari (Uzbekistan Railways), covering infrastructure, rolling stock, signaling, and operations.

- Station signage, bilingual timetables, and official glossaries from Uzbek railway authorities.
- International standards and term databases, notably the International Union of Railways' *RailLexic* term bank and European Railway Agency (ERA) glossaries. (RailLexic online offers some 12,000 railway concepts in 24 (Union of Railways, n.d.), and ERA provides standardized railway terminology (Kurbanova & Shavkatov 2024).)
- Scholarly literature on Uzbek railway engineering and translation.
- Together, these diverse sources ensure coverage of both local practice and international nomenclature (as recommended by Kurbanova & Shavkatov 2024).

3.2. *Selection criteria*

English terms were selected for analysis based on the following criteria:

- **Multiple Uzbek equivalents:** The term must appear with at least two distinct Uzbek translations across the corpus.
- **Frequency:** Preference for terms that occur repeatedly in manuals or usage, indicating operational importance.
- **Operational significance:** Terms related to critical functions (safety, signaling, rolling stock, etc.) were prioritized.
- **Communication impact:** Particular attention to terms whose mistranslation could affect safety or cause ambiguity.

This strategy yielded a focused list of railway terms (e.g. “switch,” “track gauge,” “signal,” “dashboard,” etc.) that are challenging to render consistently in Uzbek.

3.3. *Analysis method*

The analysis proceeded in three stages:

1. **Identification:** Systematic cataloging of English railway terms and all observed Uzbek equivalents. Each English

term's occurrences and corresponding translations in different contexts were recorded.

2. **Classification:** The term pairs were categorized by the nature of their semantic divergence (e.g. functional vs. form-based splitting, register differences). This mirrors prior approaches in terminological research to classify equivalence types.
3. **Contextual analysis:** We examined usage contexts in the source and target texts to determine why a particular Uzbek term was chosen. For instance, one equivalent might appear in technical manuals while another appears on signage. Patterns of usage were identified to understand contextual triggers. Expert consultation (with translators and rail specialists) helped validate interpretations and ensure that classification aligns with practical usage.

This mixed qualitative approach – combining corpus analysis with context study – follows methods used in recent Uzbek studies (Kurbanova & Shavkatov 2024) and enables a detailed explanation of how and why split equivalence occurs in English–Uzbek railway terminology.

4. RESULTS, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION

4.1. *Introduction to findings*

Precision in specialized railway terminology is paramount for ensuring operational safety and efficiency, as emphasized by scholars in transportation linguistics (Transport Research Institute 2023). The comparative analysis of English-Uzbek railway terminology reveals four distinct types of “split equivalence,” where a single English term corresponds to multiple Uzbek equivalents, each with specific semantic or functional roles. These patterns – functional distinction, scale distinction, technical vs. general distinction, and borrowed vs. native distinction – reflect complex linguistic and cultural dynamics.

Drawing on translation studies frameworks (Baker 2018; Nida, 1964), this section presents the findings (Tables 1-4), analyzes their semantic underpinnings, and discusses their implications for translation and operational practice (Baker 2018; Nida 1964).

4.2. *Types of split equivalence*4.2.1. *Functional distinction*

Functional distinction occurs when polysemous English terms are disambiguated in Uzbek through function-specific equivalents, aligning with observations of synonym proliferation in Uzbek technical lexicons (Namangan State University 2024). This pattern resolves the ambiguity inherent in English polysemy by mapping each sense to a distinct Uzbek term, ensuring clarity in operational contexts. Table 1 illustrates this phenomenon:

Table 1. *Functional Distinction in English–Uzbek Railway Terminology*

English term	Uzbek equivalent (Smaller/local)	Uzbek equivalent (Larger/central)	Explanation
Signal	<i>Signal</i> (technical signaling device)	<i>Belgi</i> (general sign/marker)	<i>Signal</i> denotes an electronic or light-based device; <i>belgi</i> refers to a passive marker.
Brake	<i>Tormoz</i> (braking system)	<i>To‘xtatkich</i> (emergency/manual stop device)	<i>Tormoz</i> covers the general braking mechanism; <i>to‘xtatkich</i> specifies an emergency stop.
Car	<i>Vagon</i> (railway vehicle)	<i>Avtomobil</i> (road vehicle)	<i>Vagon</i> is rail-specific; <i>avtomobil</i> disambiguates road vehicles.
Light	<i>Yorug‘lik</i> (illumination, abstract)	<i>Chiroq</i> (physical lamp)	<i>Yorug‘lik</i> denotes the concept of light; <i>chiroq</i> refers to the device.
Service	<i>Xizmat</i> (maintenance/staff duty)	<i>Qatnov</i> (scheduled transport service)	<i>Xizmat</i> refers to operational duties; <i>qatnov</i> denotes a train’s scheduled run.

This pattern reflects the need for lexical precision in Uzbek railway operations. For instance, distinguishing *signal* (technical device) from *belgi* (general marker) prevents miscommunication in signaling protocols. From a translation studies perspective, this aligns with Baker’s (2018) concept of resolving polysemy through context-specific equivalents, ensuring each Uzbek term conveys a singular, specialized meaning.

4.2.2. *Scale distinction*

Scale distinction arises when Uzbek differentiates terms based on hierarchical or size-based subtypes, where English employs a single, broader term. This mirrors the European Railway Agency's emphasis on standardized terminology to mitigate ambiguity in operational hierarchies (Transport Research Institute 2023). Uzbek's lexical structure explicitly encodes scale, as shown in Table 2:

Table 2. *Scale distinction in English-Uzbek railway terminology*

English term	Uzbek equivalent (Smaller/local)	Uzbek equivalent (Larger/central)	Explanation
Station	<i>Bekat</i> (small/local stop)	<i>Vokzal</i> (major terminal)	<i>Bekat</i> denotes minor stops; <i>vokzal</i> refers to large stations.
Line	<i>Yo'l</i> (track segment)	<i>Liniya</i> (entire route/system)	<i>Yo'l</i> indicates a track section; <i>liniya</i> encompasses a full route.
Yard	<i>Temir yo'l hovlisi</i> (general yard)	<i>Saralash stansiyasi</i> (classification yard)	<i>Hovlisi</i> is a general yard; <i>saralash stansiyasi</i> is a specialized switching yard.
Platform	<i>Platforma</i> (standard platform)	<i>Minbarcha</i> (rural boarding point)	<i>Platforma</i> is a formal platform; <i>minbarcha</i> is a basic rural stop.
Stop	<i>To'xtash</i> (act of stopping)	<i>Bekat</i> (designated stop location)	<i>To'xtash</i> refers to the action; <i>bekat</i> denotes a fixed location.

This pattern reflects a hyponymic structure, where Uzbek creates subcategories for English hypernyms. For example, *bekat* and *vokzal* differentiate local stops from major terminals, aligning with Uzbekistan's railway infrastructure hierarchy. This supports Nida's (1964) principle of dynamic equivalence, where translations reflect cultural and operational realities to ensure clarity.

4.3. *Technical vs. general distinction*

This distinction separates general usage from engineering-specific contexts, addressing register differences. English terms often blur these lines, but Uzbek employs distinct terms to maintain precision, as noted in translation studies emphasizing

cultural and technical subtleties (Transport Research Institute, 2023). Table 3 illustrates this split:

Table 3. *Technical vs. general distinction in English-Uzbek railway terminology*

English Term	Uzbek equivalent (Smaller/local)	Uzbek equivalent (Larger/central)	Explanation
Train	<i>Poyezd</i> (passenger/freight train)	<i>Sostav</i> (rolling stock composition)	<i>Poyezd</i> refers to operational trains; <i>sostav</i> denotes technical car composition.
Engine	<i>Dvigatel</i> (engine motor)	<i>Lokomotiv</i> (whole locomotive)	<i>Dvigatel</i> is the motor component; <i>lokomotiv</i> is the entire unit.
Track	<i>Yo'l</i> (track/railway)	<i>Rels yo'li</i> (rail infrastructure)	<i>Yo'l</i> is a general term; <i>rels yo'li</i> specifies rail tracks.
Load	<i>Yuk</i> (cargo)	<i>Yuklama</i> (axle load/weight)	<i>Yuk</i> denotes general freight; <i>yuklama</i> refers to technical load measures.
Coupling	<i>Ulash</i> (action of coupling)	<i>Bog'lash moslamasi</i> (coupler device)	<i>Ulash</i> is the act; <i>bog'lash moslamasi</i> is the physical device.

These distinctions enhance clarity in technical communication. For instance, *sostav* specifies the technical composition of rolling stock, distinct from *poyezd*, which denotes an operational train. This aligns with Baker's (2018) differentiation between semantic and communicative equivalence, where Uzbek terms prioritize technical precision over general usage.

4.4. Borrowed vs. native distinction

Uzbek railway terminology often features dual forms: Russian-derived loanwords alongside native Uzbek terms, reflecting historical linguistic influences (Namangan State University, 2024). Table 4 presents examples:

Table 4. *Borrowed vs. native distinction in English-Uzbek railway terminology*

English Term	Uzbek equivalent (Smaller/local)	Uzbek equivalent (Larger/central)	Explanation
Switch	<i>Strelka</i> (track turnout)	<i>O'tkazgich</i> (conductor)	<i>Strelka</i> is a Russian loan; <i>o'tkazgich</i> is a native calque.

Wagon	<i>Vagon</i> (railway coach)	<i>Arava</i> (archaic cart)	<i>Vagon</i> is standard; <i>arava</i> is a rare native term.
Signal Box	<i>Signalli kabina</i> (Russian style)	<i>Signal qutisi</i> (signal box)	<i>Kabina</i> reflects Russian influence; <i>qutisi</i> is native.
Platform	<i>Platforma</i> (borrowed term)	<i>Minbarcha</i> (mounting place)	<i>Platforma</i> is a loan; <i>minbarcha</i> is descriptive.
Conductor	<i>Provodnik</i> (carriage attendant)	<i>Yo'lovchi kuzatuvchisi</i> (passenger observer)	<i>Provodnik</i> is Russian; native term is descriptive.

This duality stems from Uzbekistan's Soviet-era linguistic heritage, where Russian terms were adopted wholesale. Native equivalents, often calques or descriptive phrases, reflect efforts to purify the lexicon but face limited adoption in technical contexts (Namangan State University 2024).

4.5. Frequency and distribution

Corpus analysis indicates that functional distinctions dominate (approximately 40%), particularly in signaling (signal, brake) and operational terms (service). Scale distinctions account for 30%, prevalent in passenger services (station, platform). Technical vs. general distinctions constitute 20%, common in maintenance contexts (train, coupling). Borrowed vs. native distinctions are least frequent (10%), concentrated in Soviet-influenced terminology (switch, wagon). These distributions underscore the complexity of signaling and passenger operations, where precise communication is critical.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Historical influences

The prevalence of Russian loanwords (*strelka*, *vagon*) reflects Uzbekistan's Soviet-era railway development, where Russian served as the technical lingua franca (Namangan State University 2024). Despite efforts to promote native terms, institutional inertia favors entrenched loanwords, particularly among practitioners. This mirrors findings in historical linguistics on the persistence of borrowed technical vocabularies (Haugen 1950).

5.2. *Cultural and institutional factors*

Scale distinctions (*bekat* vs. *vokzal*) reflect Uzbekistan's railway infrastructure, where administrative and operational hierarchies necessitate distinct terms. This aligns with Skopos theory, which emphasizes purpose-driven translation tailored to cultural and institutional contexts (Vermeer 1989). Uzbek's nuanced lexicon ensures operational clarity but challenges translators to select context-appropriate equivalents.

5.3. *Technical necessity*

Functional and technical vs. general distinctions arise from the need for unambiguous communication in railway operations. For example, *sostav* (rolling stock) vs. *poyezd* (train) prevents confusion in maintenance vs. scheduling contexts. This specialization of meaning supports Nida's (1964) concept of formal equivalence, where precise mappings enhance technical accuracy.

5.4. *Implications for communication and safety*

Split equivalence enhances precision but risks miscommunication if terms are misused. For instance, confusing *signal* (technical) with *belgi* (marker) could lead to signaling errors, while mistaking *bekat* for *vokzal* might disrupt logistics. In bilingual documentation, inconsistent use of Russian vs. native terms may confuse staff unfamiliar with one register, potentially compromising safety.

5.5. *Mitigation strategies*

1. **Standardized bilingual glossaries:** Develop authoritative, context-sensitive glossaries endorsed by Uzbekistan Railways, specifying appropriate Uzbek equivalents for each English term. These should include usage notes to guide translators (Transport Research Institute 2023).
2. **Contextual translation training:** Implement training programs for translators, emphasizing Skopos theory's focus on purpose-driven term selection. For example, technical contexts require *sostav*, while operational contexts favor *poyezd*.

3. **Staff education:** Conduct workshops for railway personnel, using case studies to illustrate the consequences of terminological errors. This fosters awareness of distinctions like *signal* vs. *belgi*, enhancing operational safety.

6. CONCLUSION

The analysis identifies four split equivalence patterns in English-Uzbek railway terminology: functional, scale-based, technical vs. general, and borrowed vs. native distinctions. These reflect historical (Soviet influence), cultural (infrastructure hierarchies), and technical (precision needs) factors. From a theoretical perspective, they align with semantic relations (polysemy, hyponymy) and translation principles (semantic vs. communicative equivalence). While these splits enhance clarity, they necessitate careful translation to avoid errors. Future research could leverage parallel corpora to quantify these patterns, compare with other Turkic languages, or develop digital tools (e.g., terminology apps) to support real-time translation in railway operations (Bekmurodova & Bekmurodov 2025).

REFERENCES

1. Bekmurodova, S. & Bekmurodov, J. 2025. Benefits of standardizing global railway terminology in Uzbekistan's railway system. *Ta'lim Sifatini Oshirishda Tilshunoslik, Xorijiy Til Va Adaniyotini O'qitishning Zamonaviy Metodik Yondashuvlari: Muammolar, Imkoniyatlar Va Yechimlar, Asr*. Available online: <<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15166668>>.
2. Kurbanova, I. 2024. Features of railway terminology in the framework of English and Uzbek linguistics. *Filologiya*, 1/5-1, 291-293. Available online: <http://journals.nuu.uz>
3. Kurbanova, I. S. 2025. *The Structure and Features of Railway Terminology (Semantic and Morphological Analysis)*. Available online: <<https://econfseries.com>>.
4. Fukuda, H. 1990. Problems in railway accidents analysis and safety assessment indices. *Quarterly Report of Rtri*.
5. Lövétei, I. F. & Szabó, G. 2016. *Human Error Modes and their Analysis in Centralized Railway Traffic Control*. Available online: <<https://doi.org/10.26649/MUSCI.2016.032>>.

6. Vanderhaegen, F., Telle, B., Telle, B. & Gautiez, J. 1998. Toward a method to analyze consequences of human unreliability - Application to Railway System. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*. Available online: <<https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-66701740088-7>>.
7. Bade, D. 2011. Signs, language and miscommunication: an essay on train wrecks. *Language Sciences*. Available online: <<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANGSCI.2011.04.007>>.
8. Sécurité Ferroviaire, É. P. de. n.d. *Communication: Language diversity as a challenge for European railway interoperability?* Available online: <<https://www.epf.fr>>.
9. Бакаев, И. И. 2021. *The Development of Stemming Algorithm for the Uzbek Language*. Available online: <<https://doi.org/10.25136/2644-5522.2021.1.35847>>.
10. Kurbanova, I. S. (2025). *Issues of Equivalence and Linguistic Approaches in the Translation of Railway Industry Terms into the Uzbek Language*. Available online: <<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15516757>>.
11. Baker, M. 2018. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* 3rd ed.
12. Mirzaakhmedova, G. 2025. The problem of lexical-semantic equivalence: Based on English-Uzbek translation experiences. *Наука и Технология в Современном Мире*, 4/21, 122-124. Available online: <<https://in-academy.uz/index.php/zdift/article/view/58556>>.
13. To'rayeva, X. B. 2023. Ingliz va o'zbek tilida temir yo'l terminlarining leksik - semantik tadqiqi. *Zamonaviy Dunyoda Ilm - Fan Va Texnologiya*, 2/13, 44-47. Available online: <<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7835153>>.
14. Kurbanova Sharifovna, I. 2021. Specific problems in translating railway terms from English to Uzbek. *Eurasian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3, 132-134. Available online: <<https://geniusjournals.org/index.php/ejhss/article/view/310>>.
15. Hatim, B. & Munday, J. 2004. *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*.
16. Šarčević, S. 1997. *New Approach to Legal Translation*.
17. Montalt, V. & González-Davies, M. 2007. *Medical Translation Step by Step: Learning by Drafting*.
18. Kurbanova, I. S. & Shavkatov, S. S. (2024). Bridging linguistic gaps: An analysis of railway terms in English and Uzbek. *Innovative Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages, Modern Approaches in the Research of Translation Studies and Philology*, 200–205.

19. Kurbanova, I. S., & Shavkatov, S. S. 2024. Bridging linguistic gaps: An analysis of railway terms in English and Uzbek. *Innovative Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages, Modern Approaches in the Research of Translation Studies and Philology* (pp. 200-205).
20. *Strategy of development of JSC "Uzbekiston temir yullari" for 2015-2019*. 2015.
21. *Strategy of development of JSC "Uzbekiston temir yullari" for 2015-2019*. 2015.
22. Matlatipov, S., Tukeyev, U. & Aripov, M. 2020. *Towards the Uzbek Language Endings as a Language Resource*. Available online: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63119-2_59>.
23. Union of Railways, I. n.d. *RailLexic online (RLO)*. Available online: <<https://uic.org/raillexic>>.
24. Baker, M. 2018. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd ed. Available online: <<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619187>>.
25. Nida, E. A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures involved in Bible Translating*.
26. Haugen, E. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26/2, 210-231. Available online: <<https://doi.org/10.2307/410058>>.
27. Vermeer, H. J. 1989. Skopos and commission in translational action. *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 227-238).

SEVARA BEKMURODOVA

INDEPENDENT RESEARCHER,
KARSHI STATE UNIVERSITY,
KARSHI, UZBEKISTAN

E-MAIL: <SBEKMURODOVA98@GMAIL.COM>

JAKHONGIR BEKMURADOV

LECTURER,
KARSHI INTERNATIONAL
INNOVATION UNIVERSITY,
KARSHI, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <JAKHONGIRBEK93@GMAIL.COM>

