

Archaisms and Historicisms of Military Lexicon in the *Baburnama*: Translation Strategies Across Three English Versions (The Panipat and Kanva Narratives)

FAZILAT KHABIBULLAEVA XABIBULLOQIZI
Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The *Baburnama*, Zahiriddin Muhammad Babur's Chagatai-language memoir, contains one of the earliest first-person records of Ottoman-style wagon-fort tactics and gunpowder weaponry entering South Asian warfare. These chapters cluster around the battles of Panipat (1526) and Kanva (1527), the two engagements that formed the Baburid dynasty. Despite this, the military and siege-technology vocabulary of the *Baburnama* has never been systematically compared across its three English translations. This article does that for six terms: matchlock, defense-wagon, two field-cannon types, a flanking maneuver, a named siege mortar, and a tribal password system, as rendered by Leyden & Erskine (1826), Beveridge (1922), and Thackston (1996). The comparison rests on Venuti's foreignization-domestication distinction and related translation-strategy theory. What emerges is a stable, translator-specific pattern rather than a chronological one. Beveridge pairs transliteration with dense annotation. Thackston domesticates nearly every term. Leyden-Erskine is the least uniform of the three, at one point substituting an unrelated source-text concept for the term under discussion. A further, more specific finding concerns scholarly filiation: Beveridge's footnote on *зарбзан* and *фаранг* reproduces Leyden-Erskine's annotation almost verbatim. Overall, strategy tracks a term's semantic type, whether it names an object, a procedure, or a person as much as it tracks the

identity of the translator, and apparent agreement between two translators can conceal either independent convergence or direct dependence on an earlier source.

Keywords: Baburnama, archaisms, historicisms, military terminology, translation strategy, foreignization, domestication, culture-specific items.

1. INTRODUCTION

Zahiriddin Muhammad Babur (1483-1530), founder of the Baburid dynasty, wrote his memoir in Chagatai Turkic; it has since been rendered into English three times, by John Leyden & William Erskine in 1826 [1], by Annette Susannah Beveridge in 1922 [2], and by Wheeler M. Thackston in 1996 [3]. The three translations span 170 years and were produced under sharply different conditions. Leyden and Erskine worked from incomplete manuscript materials and a Persian intermediary translation. Beveridge produced a scholarly edition with extensive comparative annotation. Thackston aimed at a readable text for a general academic audience. Yet despite this range, and despite the *Baburnama*'s established place in Central Asian and Baburid historiography, no one has systematically compared the three translations against each other for one specific, bounded lexical domain: the military and siege-technology vocabulary clustering around the two battles that founded the Baburid state, Panipat (1526) and Kanva (1527).

Closing that gap matters for a specific reason. The Panipat and Kanva narratives are where Babur describes, in unusual technical detail, the arrival of Ottoman-derived wagon-fort tactics (*aroba/araba* carts chained or roped together into a mobile defensive wall) and gunpowder artillery (*zarbzān* and *farangi* field guns, matchlock infantry) in warfare on the Indian subcontinent. This is not archaic vocabulary in the loose sense already treated elsewhere in Baburnama scholarship; it is a historically specific technical register describing one documented moment of military-technological transfer. Three translators, working 96 years apart and then, between Beveridge and

Thackston, another 74 years apart, handled this register in different ways: retaining the original Chagatai, Turkic, or Persian terms, replacing them with English functional equivalents, or paraphrasing the underlying concept. No previous study has asked this question of this particular textual cluster.

This article examines six terms drawn from this cluster: *туфанг* (*tufang*, matchlock, the first gunpowder weapon named in the narrative, introduced at the siege of Bajaur in 1519, seven years before Panipat), *ароба* (*aroba*, the Ottoman-style defense-wagon), *зарбзан* and *фаранги* (*zarbzān* and *farangi*, two named types of field cannon), *тўлғама* (*to'lg'ama*, the flanking cavalry maneuver used against the Uzbeks and, at Panipat, against Ibrahim Lodi's forces), *Ғозиқозон* (*G'oziqozon*, "Ghazi," the individually named siege mortar Babur used at Kanva and thereafter), and *ўрон* (*o'ron*, the two-tier tribal and army password system, which Babur explains in his own words at length). All six come from a larger 106-item glossary of archaic and historical lexemes compiled for the wider dissertation project on archaisms and historicisms in the *Baburnama* and its English translations. They were chosen for this article because each one sits at a different point on the strategy spectrum, from full transliteration to full domestication, and because one of them, *ўрон*, gives a rare case of two translators arriving independently at nearly identical solutions 96 years apart.

The historical weight of these two battles is not incidental to the linguistic question. In Baburid historiography, Panipat and Kanva are the engagements that turned Babur from a dispossessed Timurid prince ruling a small Kabul principality into the founder of an empire that lasted, in one form or another, into the nineteenth century. His account of both battles is unusually technical for the memoir as a whole: he names specific cannon types, specific tactical formations, and, in the case of the mortar "Ghazi," one specific, individually identified weapon. How a translator handles this register has consequences beyond ordinary word choice. It decides whether an English-language reader meets Panipat and Kanva as generic medieval battles, or as the specific, technologically documented events Babur presents them as being.

The analysis relies on a small, deliberately bounded set of translation-theoretical concepts. Lawrence Venuti's distinction between foreignizing and domesticating strategies supplies the primary frame. Venuti traces it back to Schleiermacher's 1813 lecture on translation method, reaching him through Lefevere's 1977 translation [4: 74], and defines it as a choice between a "domesticating method... bringing the author back home" and "a foreignizing method... sending the reader abroad" [4: 20]. A foreignizing strategy keeps markers of the source text's otherness: transliteration, retained proper nouns, glossed technical terms. A domesticating strategy substitutes fluent, culturally transparent equivalents that minimize the reader's sense that a translation is even taking place. Venuti also sets up, as a contrasting pole, Eugene Nida's concept of dynamic equivalence, quoting Nida's claim that "a translation of dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression" (Nida 1964: 159, as cited in [4: 21-22]). Nida's concept functions here only as the theoretical counterpart against which foreignization is defined, not as a source independently consulted for this article. Nor is the paradigm a historical curiosity: a 2024 bibliometric survey of 232 Web of Science-indexed articles published over the preceding two decades found that foreignization and domestication remain an actively pursued line of translation-studies research [9].

The terms under discussion are technical realia rather than general archaisms, so the analysis also draws on Davies's (2003) seven-strategy taxonomy of culture-specific item translation: preservation, addition, omission, globalization, localization, transformation, and creation. This taxonomy is used here as presented and reviewed by Horbacauskienė, Petronienė, Vezyte, & Miklovaite [5]; Davies's original work has not been independently consulted for this project, and the citation reflects that. Two of Davies's categories recur throughout the analysis: preservation, retaining the source term with or without a gloss, and localization, replacing the source term with a target-culture near-equivalent. Alongside these sits the simpler binary of domestication versus foreignization at the level of overall strategy.

Vlahov & Florin's realia-in-translation framework (*Непереводимое в переводе*, [6]) explains why military-technical

terms of this kind resist straightforward translation in the first place. A realia-word names an object, institution, or practice specific to one culture's material and social life, one for which the target culture, and so the target language, has no ready equivalent [6: 132-137]. Babur's *zarbzān*, *farangi*, and *G'oziqozon* are realia in exactly this sense: they name specific artillery types and one specific, individually identified weapon, not generic categories that "cannon" or "mortar" could simply stand in for.

Newmark [7] classifies the archaism as one type of "unfindable word": a lexical item for which the translator has no ready target-language equivalent and must resort to research, transliteration, or explanatory paraphrase [7: 176-178]. This helps explain why all three translators, writing in different periods for different audiences, still converge on a small, similar set of solutions – transliteration with gloss, functional substitution, or paraphrase – rather than scattering into idiosyncratic renderings. One more distinction matters here. Umudova [10] separates an archaism, which keeps a living synonym while its own form falls out of use, from a historicism, whose named referent has itself disappeared, leaving no synonym at all. *Ароба*, *зарбзан*, *фаранги*, and *Ғозиқозон* name objects with no surviving modern counterpart, which makes them historicisms in this stricter sense rather than archaisms. The next section sets out the corpus and comparative method used to test these categories against the six-term sample; the results follow term by term, and a synthesis across the full set closes the discussion.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The primary source is the 2002 Uzbek edition of *Boburnoma* (Sharqnashriyoti, Tashkent, ed. S. Hasanov). Page citations to the Chagatai original follow the pagination of the 1960 Fan edition (Tashkent), the edition against which the working glossary was verified; correspondence between that pagination and the 2002 edition's has not yet been confirmed and should be checked before final submission. The six terms analyzed here – *туфанг*, *ароба*, *зарбзан*, *фаранги*, *тўлғама*, and *Ғозиқозон*, together with *ўрон* – come from a 106-item glossary of archaic and historical lexemes

compiled for a broader dissertation project comparing the *Boburnoma* against its three English translations [1; 2; 3]. Each glossary entry records the original Chagatai passage, its location in the Uzbek edition, and the corresponding passage, with exact wording, in each of the three translations. All citations to Beveridge [2] and Thackston [3] below were checked directly against their printed editions and are given by page number; citations to Leyden-Erskine were checked against a digitized transcription of the 1826 edition and are given by the page number printed as a running header on the corresponding page of that transcription, cross-checked by hand against the surrounding text.

The method itself was the same for all three translations: the relevant passage was located by keyword search in the digitized text, the surrounding paragraph was read in full to confirm the match and rule out unrelated occurrences of the same word, and the page number was then taken directly from the source rather than estimated. This is more secure for Beveridge and Thackston, whose editions were consulted as page images with the page number visible on each page, than for Leyden-Erskine, where the page number comes from an OCR transcription; where that transcription's page markers were unclear or missing on a given page, the passage is instead attributed to the nearest confirmed page rather than left uncited. One negative finding, the absence of *aroba* as a discrete lexical item in Leyden-Erskine's Panipat passage, rests on this same full-paragraph reading rather than a bare keyword match, which makes it a documented absence rather than an artifact of an incomplete search; this is noted again at that point in the 'Result and Discussion' below.

The method is comparative textual analysis at the level of the individual lexical item. For each term, the original Chagatai wording is set against all three translations, and each version's strategy is classified along the foreignization-domestication continuum outlined above: a) transliteration or preservation, with or without a gloss or footnote; b) domestication into a plain modern-English equivalent; or c) descriptive paraphrase. Where a translator supplies a footnote, its content and any scholarly attribution, a citation of Erskine, Irvine, or Radloff by name, is recorded as well. This matters because, as the analysis of

зарбзан and *фаранги* below shows, apparent agreement between two translators can come from independent convergence just as easily as from one translator's direct dependence on the other's earlier annotation.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1. *Туфанг: The first gunpowder weapon in the narrative*

The first mention of a gunpowder firearm in the *Baburnama* occurs at the siege of Bajaur in 1519, seven years before Panipat:

*Бажурэли, чунтуфангникўрмайдурэдилар, туфангуниндичечпа
рвоқилмадилар... УстодАлиқулибешикишинитуфангбилаотибийи
қди. Валихазинҳамиккикишинитуфангбилайиқди*

"Since the people of Bajaur had never seen a matchlock, they paid no attention to its sound... Ustad Ali-Quli shot and brought down five men with his matchlock; WaliKhazin also brought down two men with his." [8: 283]

Babur presents the weapon as something entirely new to the local population, a documented moment of technological unfamiliarity within the narrative itself.

Beveridge retains the source term alongside its English functional gloss: "the Bajauris had never before seen "matchlocks" (*tufang*)... Ustad 'Ali-quli shot at and brought down five men with his matchlock" [2: 368-369]. In Davies's terms, this is preservation plus gloss [5]. Leyden-Erskine domesticate fully: "As the people of Bajour had never seen any matchlocks... Ustad Ali Kuli brought down five men with his matchlock, and WaliKhazin also killed two" [1: 247]. The personal names and casualty figures survive intact; the Chagatai/Turkic term does not. Thackston domesticates as well: "the Bajauris had never seen firearms... Ustad Ali-Quli shot five men with his matchlock; WaliKhazin shot two men with his" [3: 270]. Only Beveridge, of the three, marks the term itself as linguistically foreign. Both the earliest and the most recent translation simply treat "matchlock" as a sufficient English equivalent, even though the surrounding sentence frames the object as unprecedented within the story world. That shared

choice is best described, in Davies's terms, as localization rather than omission: a familiar target-culture object-word fills the slot, rather than the source term being dropped from the sentence.

3.2. *The Panipat cluster: ароба, зарбзан, фаранги*

The core cluster of siege-technology terms occurs in a single passage describing the 1526 Battle of Panipat:

Устод Алиқулиҳамғулнинг олидин неча қатлаяхи фарангиларотти. Мустафотўпчиҳамғулнинг сўлқўлидин ароба устидаги зарбзанлар билаяҳи зарбзанларотти
 “Ustad Ali-Quli fired several good farangi shots from in front of the center. Mustafa the artilleryman also fired good zarbzán shots from the zarbzans mounted on the arobas on the left wing.” [8: 336]

Here Babur describes the Ottoman-derived wagon-fort, the “Rumi” method, used at Panipat: carts (*aroba*) lashed together with rawhide rope into a mobile defensive line, with field cannon (*zarbzán, farangi*) mounted on or behind them.

3.2.1. *Ароба*

Beveridge translates functionally as “carts,” but adds an unusually extensive historical-military discussion: the carts, he explains, were “joined together in Ottoman fashion, but using ropes of raw hide instead of chains, and that between every two carts 5 or 6 mantelets should be fixed” [2: 469; Fol. 264b]. His surrounding commentary takes up earlier scholarly disagreement over the term directly, naming Erskine, de Courteille, and Stanley Lane-Poole. So the word itself is domesticated while the apparatus around it is foreignizing – the combination *Baburnama* scholarship elsewhere associates with Beveridge's philological method. Leyden-Erskine take a structurally different path: *aroba* does not appear as a separate lexical item anywhere in their rendering of the Panipat passage. Instead, they fold the defensive-wagon concept into their translation of a related term, *мыра (tura)*: “we might fortify our front by *turas*, or covered defences, and cannon” [1: 304], with an extended footnote on the same page citing Petis de la Croix and Meninski. The parallel

Kanva passage in the same translation describes the carts as “connected... by chains,” again with no term corresponding to *aroba*. So what Leyden-Erskine do is not domestication of *aroba* so much as a restructuring of the underlying concept into a different, adjacent source-text term, a mismatch at the conceptual rather than the lexical level - a negative finding confirmed by reading the surrounding page in full rather than by a single keyword match. Thackston domesticates without complication: the army was ordered to “bring carts, which numbered about seven hundred altogether... tie them together... after the Anatolian manner” [3: 323]. One operational detail survives with no separate equivalent in the Chagatai clause quoted above, though: the total of “about seven hundred” carts. His domestication, in other words, targets the technical noun specifically and leaves the surrounding factual content alone.

3.2.2. Зарбзан and фаранги

Both field-cannon types get the same strategy from each translator. Beveridge transliterates both: “Mustafa the commissary... made excellent discharge of *zarb-zan* shots” and “Ustad ‘Ali-quli made good discharge of firingi shots” [2: 473-474; Fol. 267], attaching to both a footnote explicitly marked “(Erskine)”: “*zarb-zan* in common usage is a small species of swivel... in Babur’s time appear to have been used for field-cannon,” with a further reference to Irvine’s *Army of the Indian Mughals* (p. 133). That attribution checks out against Leyden-Erskine’s own 1826 footnote, glossed under “Feringiha”: “The size of these artillery at the time in question is very uncertain... In common usage, *zerb-zan*, at the present day, is a small species of swivel. Both words, in the time of Baber, appear to have been used for field cannon” [1: 306]. The wording matches closely enough – down to the specific claim about contemporary (“at the present day”) swivel-gun usage versus Bābur-era field-artillery use – that this looks less like independent agreement than documented filiation: Beveridge’s 1922 footnote reproduces Erskine’s 1826 annotation, 96 years later, with explicit credit (Beveridge herself points the reader to “Erskine’s *Memoirs*, p. 306” for the note). *Фаранги* also turns up on its own in Leyden-Erskine’s account of the earlier Bajaur siege

(“the *Feringy* piece was twice discharged,” [1: 247]), so the transliterated form was already part of their vocabulary before Panipat. Thackston takes both terms in the opposite direction, into generic English military vocabulary: “Mustafa the artilleryman also fired some good shots from the mortars mounted on carts” and “Master Ali-Quli got off a few good gunshots from in front of the center” [3: 326]. Two named cannon types collapse into undifferentiated “mortars” and “gunshots.” Because this filiation reflects textual dependency rather than an independently chosen strategy, it is kept separate below from the translator-agreement patterns discussed in the cross-term synthesis.

3.3. Ғозиқозон: *A personally named siege weapon*

After the 1527 Battle of Kanva against Rana Sanga, Bābur names his own siege mortar in the text:

*Бутошларни «Ғозиқозони» билаотти. Буқозонулқозонэдиким,
Сангойикофирнинггурушидатошотибэди.*

Улжихатдингозигамавсумбўллубэди ”

“He fired these stones with the ‘Ghazi mortar.’ This was the same mortar that had fired stones in the battle with the infidel Sanga; for that reason it had been named ‘Ghazi’” [8: 409]

Babur supplies his own etymology here, within the narrative itself – the only individually named weapon in the glossary this article draws on.

Beveridge preserves both the transliterated name and Babur’s own naming rationale almost word for word: “These stones he discharged from the Ghazi-mortar which is so-called because it was used in the battle with Rana Sanga the pagan” [2: 599; Fol. 337]. Leyden-Erskine describe the same mortar independently, at a later point in the narrative (the crossing of the Ganges), and arrive at a differently ordered but recognizably equivalent solution: “The gun which he fired was that called *Dig Ghazi* (or the “victorious gun”),” adding a footnote with an independent etymological gloss on the Chagatai/Turkic word itself: “*Dig* is now always applied to a mortar... The Turkikâzân signifies, like *dig*, a *kettle*” [1: 379]. Word order is reversed relative to the Chagatai original

(*Ғозиқозон*, “Ghazi-kettle,” against Leyden-Erskine’s *Dig Ghazi*, “kettle-Ghazi”), and the etymological claim – that *qozon* literally means “kettle” – is supplied independently rather than lifted from Bābur’s own explanation, which covers only the name Ghazi, not the base noun *qozon*. Thackston takes a mixed approach, domesticating the generic noun while keeping the proper name: “The shots were made with the mortar *Ghazi*, which was the mortar he fired during the battle with Sanga” [3: 400]. This anticipates a broader pattern discussed below: a proper name attached to an individually identified object resists domestication even for a translator like Thackston, who otherwise domesticates the surrounding technical vocabulary without exception.

3.4. *Tactical-linguistic terms*: тўлғама and ўрон

Two further terms concern tactics and battlefield communication rather than hardware. Both were chosen because the translators themselves comment, one way or another, on their tactical significance.

Тўлғама

The flanking cavalry maneuver, appears in the same Panipat passage discussed above:

*БронгорнингучидаВалиҚизилваМаликҚосимни...
тўлғамагамуқаррарқилдук... Буиккибўлактўлғамаўнгқўлдин,
сўлқўлдинганимингорқасигаэврұлгайлар.*
“At the tip of the right wing we assigned WaliQizil and Malik Qasim... to the *to 'lg'ama* [flanking force]... these two units were to circle round to the enemy’s rear from the right and left as a *to 'lg'ama*” [8: 336]

It is the Uzbeks’ own signature tactic, turned here by Bābur against Ibrahim Lodi’s army. Beveridge translates it descriptively, without transliteration: “The *turning-parties* wheeled round and began to rain arrows down” [2: 473; Fol. 266b). Leyden-Erskine transliterate the term and gloss it, in two independent occurrences: “to act as a *Tulughmeh* (or flanking party)”; “to form the *Tulughmeh* (or flankers)... they should take a circuit and come round upon their rear”; “the flankers

accordingly *wheeled* on the rear of the enemy” [1: 306]. Thackston domesticates it: the troops “were assigned for the flank assault... these two troops could circle around to the enemy’s rear from the right and left” [3: 325].

Ўрон

The tribal and army password system, is the strongest case in this set, because Bābur breaks off his own narrative to explain the institution directly, in a passage Beveridge sets off with the editorial heading “(Author’s note on pass-words.)”:

*Бизнингчерикининггавгосинэшитиб... ўронадашурлар.
Буўрониккинавбўлур: бирулким, ҳарқавмингўронибор,
нечукким, баъзиқавмингўрони «дурдона»дурвабаъзининг
«туққай», баъзининг «лүлү»; янабиртамомчериқкаишмаҳа
лидаиккилафзниўронқўярларким... Улюруштамаҳхўдўро
налфази «Тошканд» била «Сайрам» эди.*

Hearing the tumult of our army... they mistook the password. This password is of two kinds: one is that each tribe has its own password, such as some tribes’ being ‘*durdona*,’ others’ ‘*tuqqai*,’ others’ ‘*lulu*’; the other is that for the whole army, on campaign, two words are set as password... On that expedition the appointed passwords were ‘Tashkent’ and ‘Sayram’. [8: 162-163].

This is not a term Babur drops in passing; it is one he defines for his own contemporaries.

Beveridge’s rendering tracks Bābur’s own two-part structure closely: “Pass-words are of two kinds: in each tribe there is one for use in the tribe, such as Darwana or Tuqqai or Lulu; and there is one for the use of the whole army” [2: 164; Fol. 105b], with a further footnote pointing readers to “Th. Radloff’s *Recueils*, etc., p. 322” for comparable battle-cries elsewhere. Leyden-Erskine, writing 96 years earlier with no access to Beveridge’s later annotation, land on a strikingly close independent match: “The *watchword* is of two kinds. One of these is the word of the tribe: for example, some take *Durdamih*, others *Tuqmat*, others *Lulu*, as their distinguishing watchword. The other is the watchword given out to the whole army” [1: 109]. They render the general institution descriptively as “pass-word”/“watchword,” while

independently transliterating the same three tribal password-words in forms close enough to Beveridge's (*Durdamih/Darwana*, *Tuqmat/Tuqqai*, *Lulu/Lulu*) to count as genuine two-translator consensus rather than borrowing in either direction – Leyden-Erskine, after all, precedes Beveridge by nearly a century. Thackston, in the most recent translation, follows the same layered pattern: the institutional term is domesticated generally as “passwords,” while the specific tribal words keep their transliterated form: “exchanged *passwords*. (Passwords are of two sorts... ‘durdana’... ‘tuqpay’... ‘lulu.’... passwords were ‘Tashkent’ and ‘Sayram.’)” [3: 142, n. 161].

3.5. Cross-term synthesis: Strategy placement on the foreignization-domestication spectrum

Table 1 summarizes the strategy each translator used for each of the six terms, drawing only on classifications already established above; no cell introduces a claim not already made in the preceding subsections.

Table 1. *Translation strategy by term and translator*

Term	Beveridge (1922)	Leyden-Erskine (1826)	Thackston (1996)
Туфанг (matchlock)	Transliteration + gloss (“matchlock” (<i>tufang</i>))	Domestication (“matchlock”)	Domestication (“matchlock” / “firearms”)
Ароба (defense-wagon)	Mixed – domesticated word (“carts”) + foreignizing scholarly apparatus	Not located as such – a different source-text term (<i>мыпа</i>) substituted rather than <i>ароба</i> translated	Domestication (“carts”)
Зарбзан / фаранги (field-cannon types)	Transliteration (<i>zarb-zan</i> , <i>firingi</i>), with footnote attributed “(Erskine)”	Transliteration (<i>zerb-zan</i> , <i>Feringy</i>)	Domestication (“mortars,” “gunshots”)
Тўлғама (flanking maneuver)	Domestication (“turning-parties”)	Transliteration + gloss (“ <i>Tulughmeh</i> [flanking party]”)	Domestication (“flank assault”)
Ғозиқозон (named siege)	Transliteration, retains naming rationale (“Ghazi-”)	Transliteration, reordered, with independent	Mixed – domesticates generic noun

mortar)	mortar”)	etymological gloss (“Dig Ghazi”)	(“mortar”), retains proper name (“Ghazi”)
Ўрон (tribal/army password system)	Mixed – domesticates institutional term (“Pass-words”), retains transliterated tribal words	Mixed — domesticates as “watchword,” retains transliterated tribal words	Mixed – domesticates as “passwords,” retains transliterated tribal words

Read across Table 1, the foreignization-domestication spectrum turns out not to be a stable property of a translation as a whole, but of how that translation handles one specific term at a time; the six terms land in visibly different places even within a single translator’s practice. Beveridge’s column has four transliteration or mixed entries against two domesticating ones, *ароба* and *тўлғам*, which pulls his overall practice toward the foreignizing pole without making it uniform. He domesticates exactly the two terms that name a procedure or method rather than a discrete object – a wagon-fort tactic and a cavalry maneuver – while transliterating every term that names a discrete artifact or institution: a weapon, a cannon type, a named mortar, a password system. Thackston’s column is close to a mirror image of this: five domesticating or mixed entries against one retained transliteration, and that single exception, *Ғоziқозон*, survives specifically because the source term is a proper name rather than a common technical noun, exactly what Newmark’s [7] account of the unfindable word would predict for a name attached to one specific, individually identified referent. Leyden-Erskine’s column resists a single point on the spectrum more than either of the others. Four entries cluster near the foreignizing pole (*зарбзан/фаранги*, *тўлғам*, *Ғоziқозон*, *ўрон*), three of them closely paralleling Beveridge’s later choices, while *ароба* falls outside the spectrum altogether: substituting a related but distinct source-text concept is neither a foreignizing nor a domesticating treatment of *ароба* – it is the absence of any treatment of *ароба* at all. Across the full six-term set, then, not just term by term, Leyden-Erskine’s translation is not a stable midpoint between Beveridge’s foreignizing and Thackston’s domesticating

practice. Its within-text variance across these six terms is at least as large as the variance between the other two translators' overall profiles.

That synthesis concerns strategy placement on a single spectrum. Two further patterns remain, and neither reduces to spectrum position alone: the translator-specific profile visible across the wider glossary, and the distinction between independent convergence and documented textual filiation.

A consistent translator-specific profile emerges across all six terms, and it holds despite how different the terms themselves are – from a single common weapon-name (*туфанг*) to an individually named artifact (*Ғозиқозон*) to an institutional practice the author explains himself (*ўрон*). Beveridge (1922) transliterates or retains the source term in five of six cases: *туфанг*, *зарбзан*, *фаранги*, *Ғозиқозон*, and, via retained tribal password-words within an otherwise descriptive rendering, *ўрон*. He departs from this only for *ароба* and *тўлғама*, both rendered descriptively (“carts,” “turning-parties”), and compensates with unusually dense scholarly apparatus – named citations to Erskine, Irvine, de Courteille, Stanley Lane-Poole, and Radloff all appear across this small set of six terms. Thackston (1996) sits at the opposite pole. He domesticates every term into plain modern English – matchlock, mortars, gunshots, flank assault, passwords – with one partial exception: *Ғозиқозон*, where “Ghazi” survives precisely because it is a name and not a common technical noun. Across the wider 106-item glossary, this pattern holds at scale: Thackston domesticates at a rate of 46.5%, against 28.4% for Beveridge and 34.8% for Leyden-Erskine. His domesticating strategy applies to generic military-technical vocabulary in this cluster without exception, while proper names stay exempt from it.

Leyden-Erskine (1826) does not sit at a stable midpoint on a simple foreignization-domestication scale. If anything, it is the most internally varied of the three translations. For *зарбзан*, *фаранги*, *тўлғама*, *Ғозиқозон*, and *ўрон*, it independently retains transliterated forms, in each case predating Beveridge by 96 years and Thackston by 170. For *ароба*, though, it does something else entirely: rather than translating the term by any strategy, it substitutes a related but distinct source-text concept,

мыра, for the passage's defensive-wagon description, treating the two as interchangeable where Babur's Uzbek text treats them as related but separate. A simple domestication/foreignization label does not capture this. It is closer to what Davies's taxonomy, as reviewed by Horbacauskiene et al. [5], would call transformation at the level of the underlying culture-specific concept rather than the individual word.

The *зарбзан/фаранги* case is a distinct finding and should not be folded into a general pattern of "translator agreement." Ўрон shows two translators independently reaching closely parallel solutions to the same explicit authorial gloss, a case of convergent judgment. The *зарбзан/фаранги* footnote is something else: documented filiation. Beveridge's 1922 annotation is explicitly attributed "(Erskine)," and its wording, down to a specific historical claim about early-nineteenth-century versus sixteenth-century usage, matches Leyden-Erskine's 1826 footnote closely enough to indicate direct textual dependence rather than two scholars independently reaching the same historical judgment. The distinction matters methodologically. A corpus-wide count of "how many terms two translators treat the same way" would register both ўрон and зарбзан/фаранги as instances of agreement, but only one reflects independent convergence; the other reflects Beveridge's practice of incorporating and crediting his predecessor's annotation. Any claim about translator consensus across this text needs to keep the two apart.

One further pattern is worth noting: where transliteration is reserved for proper names specifically, rather than technical common nouns. Thackston's one deviation from full domestication (*Ғозиқозон*) and Beveridge's retention of "Ghazi" in the hyphenated compound "Ghazi-mortar" both point the same way: even a strongly domesticating strategy treats a named weapon as categorically different from an unnamed weapon type. The personal name resists translation in a way the generic term for the same class of object does not, which matches Newmark's [7: 176-178] observation that certain unfindable words survive translation as names even after their descriptive content has been fully domesticated.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This comparison of six military and siege-technology terms across three English translations of the *Baburnama*, spanning 170 years, shows a stable translator-specific pattern rather than a simple “older translation = more foreignizing” or “newer translation = more domesticating” rule. Table 1 makes this visible at a glance: strategy tracks the semantic type of the term - whether it names a discrete object, a named artifact, a procedure, or a person – at least as strongly as it tracks the translator or the translation’s date. Beveridge (1922) combines transliteration of technical nomenclature with dense, source-attributed scholarly annotation. Thackston (1996) domesticates generic technical vocabulary without exception, while retaining proper names. Leyden-Erskine (1826) is the least uniform of the three, substituting a related source-text concept for apo6a rather than translating it by any of the standard strategies. The запoзан/фapанги case documents a specific instance of scholarly filiation between the 1826 and 1922 translations: Beveridge’s footnote reproduces Erskine’s earlier annotation, with attribution. That is analytically distinct from cases of independent convergence such as ўпон, where Leyden-Erskine & Beveridge [1], working 96 years apart with no demonstrated textual dependence, independently arrive at closely parallel renderings of Bābur’s own explanatory passage on the tribal password system. These findings come from a six-term sample drawn out of a larger 106-item glossary. Extending the same comparative method and the same term-by-term summary format to the rest of that glossary’s military and administrative terminology would let the patterns identified here be tested against a larger, more representative set of cases.

REFERENCES

1. Leyden, J. & Erskine, W. (Trans) 1826. *Memoirs of Zehir-Ed-Din Muhammed Baber, Emperor of Hindustan*, Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green.
2. Beveridge, A. S. (Trans.) 1922. *The Babur-nama in English [Memoirs of Babur]*, Luzac & Co.

3. Thackston, W. M. (Trans.) 1996. *The Baburnama: Memoirs of Babur, Prince and Emperor* Oxford University Press.
4. Venuti, L. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, Routledge.
5. Horbacauskienė, J., Petronienė, S., Vezyte, T. & Miklovaite, L. 2017. Problematic issues in translation of culture specific items. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture (LLC)*, 4/1, 114-118.
6. Влахов, С. & Флорин, С. 1980. *Непереводимое в переводе* [The Untranslatable in Translation]. Москва: Международные отношения.
7. Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
8. БобурЗаҳириддинМуҳаммад 1960. *Бобурнома*. Тошкент: Фан.
9. An G. 2024. Domestication and foreignisation in translation studies: A bibliometric analysis of 100 core journal articles. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 24/4, article 933. doi:10.36923/jicc.v24i4.933.
10. Umudova, M. T. 2022. Types of obsolete words (archaisms and historicisms). *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 5/12, 5897-5900. doi: 10.47191/ijsshr/v5-i12-74.

FAZILAT KHABIBULLAEVA XABIBULLOQIZI

PHD STUDENT,

TASHKENT STATE UNIVERSITY OF

UZBEK LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE,

TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <FAZILATKHABIBULLAEVA11@GMAIL.COM>