



Intercultural Conflicts And Their Resolution Strategies: A Linguocultural Analysis Of Uzbek-Russian-English Culture-Specific Lexicon

**Kayumova Shakhlo
Komilovna**

1st year master's student in Russian Language and Literature
Asian International University
kayumovashahlo120@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper develops a linguocultural account of how culture-specific lexicon and conventionalized expressions generate intercultural conflicts in communication and translation, and how such conflicts can be systematically resolved. Building on contrastive Uzbek-Russian evidence, the study extends the analysis to English to show that *conflict of meanings* emerges not only from denotational mismatch but, more critically, from connotative polarity shifts, taboo asymmetries, register dissonance, and collocational incompatibilities that misguide recipients and destabilize pragmatic intent.

Keywords:

Intercultural conflict, linguocultural semantics, culture-specific lexicon, non-equivalence, connotation, pragmatics. domestication, foreignization, translation strategy.

Introduction. Language functions not merely as a neutral tool for transmitting information but as a repository of culturally shaped meanings and value judgments; therefore, intercultural interaction becomes vulnerable when culturally marked lexical units are transferred across languages without controlling for connotation and pragmatic force. In Uzbek-Russian communication, direct translation of culturally specific words often disorients recipients and produces a *conflict of meanings*, because what appears to be a straightforward lexical equivalent may reverse evaluation, activate taboo or stigma, or violate habitual collocations. This risk is conceptually anticipated by the view that equivalence must prioritize communicatively dominant meaning components rather than formal correspondence and by the understanding of *realia* as the most salient carriers of national color that resist purely formal transfer.

Methods. The study applies qualitative contrastive analysis to a set of culturally marked lexical items, pragmatic formulas, and phraseological units documented in Uzbek-Russian material, with an additional English mapping layer. The analytic procedure combines componential semantic analysis, pragmatic profiling, collocational diagnostics and risk assessment for intercultural conflict. The dataset includes animal lexemes with evaluative asymmetry, emotive interjections, collocational constraints, polysemous idioms, socio-historical semantics and metaphorically extended adjectives.

Results. The first cluster of results concerns lexemes whose denotation is shared across languages but whose connotative polarity is not. Uzbek *qo'chqor* can function as a positively evaluated symbol of strength and status (cf. the idiomatic praise *qo'chqorday o'g'il*), whereas the Russian everyday equivalent *баран* frequently carries a lowered, insulting shade; a literal

transfer therefore reverses evaluation and triggers interpersonal conflict. When English is added, the situation becomes triadic: *ram* is largely neutral (zoological), while *sheep* can be used as a negative metaphor (sheeple), and *goat* is ambiguous (insult and “G.O.A.T.” in modern slang). Hence, the translator or mediator must select the English rendering based on communicative intention (praise or insult or zoological reference), not on denotation alone. A

parallel taboo asymmetry arises with Uzbek *xo'roz* and Russian *nemyx*: although both denote the same animal, Russian usage may carry stable criminal-jargon stigma in certain settings, making literal transfer pragmatically risky. In English, *cock* is highly sensitive due to sexual slang, while *rooster* is the safe neutral option — so an English-target solution often requires lexical avoidance rather than direct equivalence.

Table 1. Connotative mismatch and conflict risk in Uzbek-Russian-English animal lexemes

Source unit (Uzbek)	Literal denotation	Risky literal counterpart (RU/EN)	Typical conflict trigger	Safer strategy (RU)	Safer strategy (EN)
qo'chqor	ram	RU: “баран”	polarity reversal: praise → insult	functional analogue (богатырский сын, крепкий парень) or borrowing + gloss	“strong lad / sturdy young man” (analogue), or “qo'chqor (honorific metaphor of strength)”
xo'roz	rooster	RU: петух (context-dependent stigma); EN: cock (taboo)	taboo/stigma activation; register clash	descriptive adjectives (“горделивый”, “задорный”)	“rooster” in neutral contexts; “swaggering / proud” in figurative speech

The second cluster shows that intercultural conflicts often arise from pragmatic rather than lexical misalignment. The Uzbek emotive interjection *Voy, o'lay* is not a literal self-referential wish to die but a conventionalized emotive reaction expressing surprise or distress; literal translation (“пусть я умру”) is stylistically and pragmatically unacceptable and therefore misrepresents speaker intention. The Russian equivalents (“Боже мой!”, “Ой!”, “Господи!”) demonstrate that the correct solution is speech-act equivalence, with register calibration. In English, the closest functional range includes “Oh my God!”, “Oh dear!”, “Goodness!”, but future-oriented practice must also consider cultural sensitivity (religious contexts, institutional discourse), recommending graded

options (“Oh dear” as low-risk; “Oh my God” as high-frequency but potentially sensitive). Collocational incompatibility further demonstrates why literalism produces non-native or confusing outcomes: “nose of the ship” is a conventional collocation in Russian, but Uzbek does not accept *kemaning burni*; it requires *kemaning tumshug'i* (“beak of the ship”), and “глухая ночь” similarly requires Uzbek *jimjit/sokin tun* rather than literal *kar tun*. English again differs: the conventional nautical term is “bow,” so literal “nose” is marked or incorrect outside special stylistic uses. Finally, polysemous idioms such as “пускать петуха” produce high conflict risk because the recipient may select the wrong sense; adequate translation requires prior sense identification and then strategy choice.

Table 2. Pragmatic and collocational conflict zones with Uzbek-Russian-English solutions

Unit / pattern	Literal rendering (conflict-prone)	Why it conflicts	Adequate RU solution	Adequate EN solution
Voy, o'lay	пусть я умру	pragmatic failure: wrong speech act	“Боже мой!”, “Ой!”, “Господи!”	“Oh dear!”, “Goodness!”, “Oh my God!” (register-sensitive)
нос корабля	kemaning burni	collocational non-nativeness in Uzbek	нос корабля	bow (of a ship)
глухая ночь	kar tun	collocational mismatch: Uzbek prefers “quiet/still”	глухая ночь	dead of night / the still of the night
пускать петуха		polysemy: falsetto or arson	сорваться на фальцет or поджечь	to crack into falsetto / to set fire (to)

The third cluster isolates culturally conditioned semantic extensions that are likely to cause ethical or reputational conflict in intercultural settings. The phrase *чёрная кухарка*, when read through a modern lens, may be misinterpreted as racial labeling; however, in historical usage *чёрный* may indicate social status or *black* labor rather than skin color, requiring careful contextualization. English exhibits similar hazards: *black cook* is highly ambiguous and typically requires reformulation (“kitchen servant,” “servant cook,” or an explanatory note in historical translation). Uzbek metaphorical expressions such as *ichi qora* (“morally *black* inside”) convey envy/ill will; Russian can transfer the evaluative meaning (завистливый), but the imagery may partially fade. A comparable conflict mechanism

appears in adjectives whose figurative use does not match the physical source domain: Uzbek *sovuq* in figurative contexts can mean “unattractive” or “unpleasant”, not “cold” and phrases like *og'zi sovuq* do not denote temperature but a pattern of saying unpleasant things; literal translation produces semantic absurdity and social misreading. Conversely, *istarasi issiq* means “pleasant-looking, appealing” and literal “hot face” is distorting; Russian and English require functional, evaluative adjectives rather than temperature metaphors. Across all such cases, the findings converge on a single principle: stable resolution depends on functional analogues, descriptive translation, and controlled foreignization, not on formal correspondence.

Table 3. Strategy matrix for resolving intercultural conflict caused by culture-specific meaning

Conflict trigger	Typical error pattern	High-risk domains	Recommended strategy set	Minimal “safe” output
Polarity reversal	praise → insult (or vice versa)	interpersonal evaluation, literary characterization	functional analogue; modulation; glossed borrowing	neutral evaluative paraphrase (“strong / capable”)
Taboo/stigma shift	neutral animal term becomes slur	public speech, education, media	lexical avoidance; register shift;	neutral zoological term (“rooster”)

			descriptive rendering	
Collocational incompatibility	literal calque sounds unnatural	professional writing, translation exams	collocation substitution; idiomatic replacement	standard collocation ("bow," "still of the night")
Polysemy mismatch	wrong sense selected	idioms, figurative narration	sense disambiguation + split translation	descriptive clarification
Socio-historical ambiguity	modern ethical misreading	historical texts, archives	contextual comment; reformulation; cautious explicitation	de-ambiguous term role ("servant cook")

Discussion. First, the Uzbek-Russian-English triangulation indicates that intercultural conflict is best modeled as *pragmatic risk*, not as a purely lexical gap. Even when a dictionary provides an apparent equivalent, the communicative outcome depends on culturally stabilized evaluations and taboos. The *qo'chqor* case illustrates a future-relevant lesson for translation pedagogy and AI-assisted translation: systems that optimize only denotation will systematically fail on evaluation-laden metaphors because they cannot detect polarity reversal without pragmatic metadata. In human practice, the safest resolution path is to treat evaluative metaphors as *meaning bundles* (strength + praise + character framing) and to reconstruct them in the target language through functional analogues or explicitation, rather than to *name the animal* directly.

Second, the results show that pragmatic formulas and idioms require a *speech-act first* approach. *Voy, o'lay* demonstrates that the translator's task is to preserve emotive function and register rather than compositional semantics. This has direct implications for intercultural mediation beyond translation: in institutional or diplomatic communication, literalized interjections can be perceived as melodramatic, manipulative, or irrational; conversely, overly "flat" renderings can erase culturally meaningful emotional norms. A future-oriented resolution strategy is to standardize a graded repertoire of equivalents

in training and resources (e.g., low-, mid-, high-intensity options in English), linked to context labels (informal dialogue, formal statement, narrative voice).

Third, socio-historical semantics creates a distinctive class of conflicts where misunderstanding carries ethical weight. Expressions like *чёрная кухарка*, when transported without historical framing, can generate reputational harm or accusations of discrimination; therefore, translators and intercultural communicators must implement a precautionary protocol:

- verify historical meaning;
- predict modern recipient inference;
- choose reformulation or add explanatory framing.

Similarly, metaphor extensions such as *sovuq* and *istarasi issiq* show that "temperature words" do not map reliably across languages in figurative usage; future lexicographic and NLP resources should encode such figurative senses explicitly (sense inventories + typical collocations + recommended equivalents), reducing the likelihood of automatic or novice literalism.

Conclusion. The study demonstrates that intercultural conflicts frequently originate in linguocultural mismatches - especially in culture-specific lexicon, pragmatic formulas, idioms, and figurative adjectives - where literal translation triggers meaning reversal, taboo activation, collocational violations, or socio-historical misreadings. Extending Uzbek-

Russian evidence to English confirms that reliable conflict resolution requires a strategy-based framework: prioritize communicatively dominant meaning, diagnose connotation and register, and apply a controlled combination of functional analogy, descriptive rendering, and foreignization with glossing when cultural value must be preserved.

References

1. Влахов С., Флорин С.П. Непереводимое в переводе / С. Влахов, С. П. Флорин. — Москва: Международные отношения, 1980. — 183 с.
2. Sobirovich S. A. A PRAGMATICALLY ORIENTED APPROACH TO GENERATIVE LINGUISTICS //CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES. — 2024. — Т. 5. — №. 04. — С. 69-75.
3. Комиссаров В. Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). — Москва: Высшая школа, 1990. — 253 с.
4. Авезов С. КОРПУСНАЯ ЛИНГВИСТИКА: НОВЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К АНАЛИЗУ ЯЗЫКА И ИХ ПРИЛОЖЕНИЯ В ОБУЧЕНИИ ИНОСТРАННЫМ ЯЗЫКАМ //International Bulletin of Applied Science and Technology. — 2023. — Т. 3. — №. 7. — С. 177-181.
5. Beysenova A., Kadirova X. Mashg'ulotlarda o'zbek va rus tillaridagi turg'un birikmalarning lingvokulturologik qiyosiy tahlili //Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences. — 2023. — Т. 3. — №. 5. — С. 310-315.
6. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation. — London; New York: Routledge, 2017. — 353 p.
7. Авезов С. О КОРПУСНОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ, ТРУДНОСТЯХ ПЕРЕВОДА И ПРИНЦИПАХ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ПАРАЛЛЕЛЬНЫХ КОРПУСОВ ТЕКСТОВ //«УЗБЕКСКИЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫЕ ЗДАНИЯ ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКОЕ И ПРАКТИЧЕСКОЕ СОЗДАНИЕ ВОПРОСЫ" Международная научно-практическая конференция. — 2022. — Т. 1. — №. 1.
8. Nida E. A. Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating. — Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. — 331 p.
9. Nigmatova L., Avezov S. ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ МЕТОДОВ NLP В КОРПУСНЫХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯХ: ОСОБЕННОСТИ И ОГРАНИЧЕНИЯ //«УЗБЕКСКИЕ НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫЕ ЗДАНИЯ ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКОЕ И ПРАКТИЧЕСКОЕ СОЗДАНИЕ ВОПРОСЫ" Международная научно-практическая конференция. — 2023. — Т. 2. — №. 2.