European Journal of Innovation in Nonformal Education (EJINE)
Volume 5 | Issue 3 | Mar - 2025 ISSN: 2795-8612

Linguo-Pragmatic Analysis of Translation of Describing Rivers in the Text «Boburnoma»

Shuxrat Shergoziev
Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology "Uzbek and Foreign languages" department

A B S T R A C T
This article studies how different translators interpret and express the representation of rivers in Bobur's original Baburnama through a linguo-pragmatic analysis. By comparing the translations of Beveridge and Leyden-Erskine, the study looks at the linguistic and practical decisions each translator makes, and how these choices reflect their views on the rivers' cultural, historical, and emotional significance. While Leyden-Erskine adds a poetic and spiritual layer, emphasizing the rivers' symbolic and emotional depth, Beveridge focuses on presenting a clear, factual description based on geographical accuracy. The study also highlights how these contrasting approaches—literal versus interpretive translations, and domestication versus foreignization—shape how readers engage with the text and understand its meaning. The study shows how each translator tailors Bobur's depiction of rivers to suit the cultural context and expectations of their specific audiences, focusing on the practical aspects of translation. In its conclusion, the study highlights that translation is not just a linguistic task, but a cultural and pragmatic endeavor shaped by the translator's goals and the values of the time.

A R T I C L E I N F O
Article history:
Received 26 Jan 2025
Received in revised form
27 Feb 2025
Accepted 28 Mar 2025

Keywords: linguo-pragmatic, comparative approach, observation, linguistic analysis, geographical feature, vivid language, translation strategies, cultural and intellectual priorities, emotional or symbolic meaning, natural and agricultural resource.

Hosting by Innovatus Publishing Co. All rights reserved. © 2025

Introduction

Zahiriddin Muhammad Bobur's «Boburnoma» is a true gem in world literature and history. This autobiography is not just a personal story—it is a vivid journey through the natural beauty of Central Asia and India, with rivers playing a central role. In a certain sense, the events of the work are closely connected with his fateful adventures. Therefore, the reader who has read the book from cover to cover can clearly imagine Babur the teenager, Babur the young prince, Babur the lover, Babur the warrior all his life, the king and thinker, Babur the loving father with all his victories and defeats, virtues and vices. From the day, the author took the pen in hand to read "Vaqoe" ("Boburnoma"), only the truthful interpretation of events and opinions and information about the personality of people. "I have written real events. Because in this work it was considered necessary that, the truth of every word be written and every action be told exactly as it happened. That is why Babur, in assessing each person, tries to tell all his important qualities and character flaws. In this, he allows no exceptions, even if he is a father; he adheres to those two necessary measures. Not only to his father, but also to himself. Bobur paints detailed pictures of the Amu Darya and Syr Darya, the lifelines of his homeland, as well as India's sacred Ganges. He does not just describe their physical traits; he brings out their deeper cultural and symbolic meanings. Thanks to the translations by A. Beveridge in 1921 and Leyden-Erskine back in 1826, Boburnoma found its way to English-speaking readers. This study dives into how these translators approached Bobur's rich descriptions of rivers, focusing on their language choices and strategies. It looks at how well they captured Bobur's unique voice, his intentions, and the cultural depth he wove into his portrayal of these

essential waterways.

Methods

This study takes a qualitative comparative approach to explore how «Boburnoma» was translated by A. Beveridge and Leyden-Erskine. Here's how the process unfolded: Selecting Key Passages: First, specific parts of «Boburnoma» that describe the rivers of Central Asia and India were chosen from the original text. Side-by-Side Comparison: Then, the same sections from both Beveridge's and Leyden-Erskine's translations were placed side by side for a detailed comparison. Examining Language Choices: The focus here was on how each translator used language—looking closely at their word choices, sentence structures, and overall tone to see how they brought Bobur's descriptions to life. Exploring Cultural Context: Special attention was given to how well the cultural and symbolic significance of the rivers was conveyed in each translation. Understanding the Translators' Approach: Finally, the study considered what each translator might have been aiming for—how well they captured Bobur's voice and stayed true to his intent, all while adapting his work for English-speaking readers. This step-by-step approach helps uncover the subtle differences in how these two translators interpreted Bobur's work.

Results

1. Linguistic Analysis: There are several intriguing stylistic distinctions between Beveridge's and Leyden-Erskine's translations. A few crucial aspects to think about in order to delve deeper are: Word Selection: Do the two translators use distinct word types? Does one, for instance, use more formal or archaic language, while the other keeps things straightforward and up to date? Sentence Style: How do they build their sentences? Is one more straightforward and concise, or does one use more complex and intricate phrasing? Tone and Voice: Does one translation feel more formal or academic, while the other comes across as poetic or conversational? Cultural Nuances: How do they handle cultural or idiomatic expressions? Does one adapt them to fit a modern audience, or do they stick closely to the original context? Sticking to the Original: Is one translator more focused on staying true to the exact wording of the original, while the other takes more creative liberties to capture the spirit of the text? A. Beveridge: Beveridge's translation prioritizes clarity and accuracy, often sacrificing poetic and aesthetic elements for factual precision.

Example (Amu Darya): Original: *«Amudaryo ulug' daryodur. Suvining rangi loyqa va oqimi tezdir.»*

Beveridge: «*The Oxus is a great river. Its waters are turbid and its current swift.»*

Observation: Beveridge does a good job of keeping the factual details intact, like describing the "great river" and its "turbid waters." However, his translation doesn't quite capture the emotional depth of "*ulug' daryodur,"* which conveys a sense of grandeur and reverence. While his approach is clear and precise, it seems to lose some of the poetry and cultural richness of the original. This shows how tricky it can be to balance staying true to the words with bringing out the full spirit and feeling of the text. Leyden-Erskine: Leyden-Erskine's translation leans towards a more poetic and aesthetic rendering, often amplifying the descriptive elements.

Example (Amu Darya): Leyden-Erskine: *«The Amu is a mighty stream, with muddy waters and a rapid flow. »*

Observation: The phrase "mighty stream" perfectly captures the grandeur of the river and reflects Bobur's deep love for nature. It adds an emotional depth that mirrors his sense of wonder, bringing out the poetry and awe of the original text. This choice of words doesn't just describe the river's physical presence—it also conveys the symbolic meaning it holds for Bobur.

2. Pragmatic Analysis: Looking at the translations from a practical perspective, it is clear that each translator adjusted Bobur's descriptions to connect with their audience. They made specific choices to fit the cultural and linguistic expectations of their readers, which influenced how Bobur's imagery and tone were presented in each version. The cultural context behind Beveridge's and Leyden-Erskine's translations reveals how their different approaches were shaped by the audiences they aimed to reach. Beveridge's translation is straightforward and scholarly, catering to readers who valued accuracy and precision. His focus on historical and geographical details, with minimal embellishment, speaks to a more

academic audience that sought clear, factual content rather than literary flourish. This reflects the intellectual climate of his time, where translations were often used as research tools, not as storytelling devices. On the other hand, Leyden-Erskine's translation embraces a more creative and emotional approach. His poetic language appeals to the era's growing interest in exploration and romanticism, capturing the exotic and mysterious qualities of distant lands. His style speaks to a broader audience—one that was fascinated by adventure and the emotional depth of faraway places. This approach not only entertains but also taps into the cultural spirit of his time, when literature was often a means of transporting readers to other worlds, both physically and emotionally. These differences go beyond personal preference; they reflect the cultural and intellectual priorities of the eras in which each translator worked. Beveridge's more pragmatic tone mirrors a scientific, analytical worldview, while Leyden-Erskine's lyrical style connects with the romantic imagination of his readers. Together, they show how translation is not just about words—it is deeply influenced by the values, interests, and expectations of both the translator and the audience they are addressing.

Domestication vs. Foreignization: The debate between domestication and foreignization in translation is about finding the right balance between adapting a text for the target audience and preserving its original cultural and linguistic flavor. Beveridge's approach leans toward foreignization, as he keeps terms like "Oxus" and "Sir" as they are, without trying to make them more familiar or English-friendly. This choice prioritizes staying true to the original text's cultural and geographical authenticity. By leaving these names unchanged, Beveridge allows readers to experience the world as it was, offering a glimpse into the original setting. The rivers are more than just physical landmarks; they carry cultural and historical significance that might be lost if their names were altered to sound more familiar. This approach helps readers connect more deeply with the source culture and its unique context, rather than simplifying it for easy understanding. However, this method may pose challenges for readers who are not familiar with these terms or regions. While scholars may not mind, general readers could feel a bit disconnected or lost without some explanation. Foreignization, while honoring the original culture, can sometimes create a gap between the text and its audience. Ultimately, Beveridge's choice to favor foreignization over domestication reflects his goal to preserve the authenticity and integrity of the original text. It is a reminder that translation is a delicate balancing act—between staying faithful to the source and making the text accessible. This approach encourages readers to embrace the foreignness of the text; inviting them to explore a different cultural and geographical world rather than making the text feel too familiar or overly localized. Leyden-Erskine uses domestication, translating the rivers' grandeur into phrases like "mighty stream" to resonate with English literary sensibilities.

3. Central Asian Rivers: Amu Darya: The way Bobur describes the Amu Darya in his text, and how it is translated by Beveridge and Leyden-Erskine, shows how different translators can highlight different aspects of a place based on their intended audience and purpose. For Bobur, the Amu Darya is not just a vast river; it is a key player in the region's history and politics. He emphasizes its strategic importance, suggesting that the river was central to the power dynamics, trade routes, and territorial control in Central Asia. It is not just a geographical feature, but also a crucial element shaping the region's history. Beveridge's translation focuses on these practical aspects. He sticks to the facts—describing the size, location, and strategic importance of the river, giving readers a clear, straightforward understanding. His translation is aimed at those interested in the historical or geographical significance of the river. He does not try to add any emotional or cultural layers, keeping things academic and factual. Leyden-Erskine, however, takes a different approach. He emphasizes the river's grandeur and cultural importance. By focusing on its majesty, he taps into the romantic and poetic elements of the Amu Darya, inviting readers to appreciate not just its size, but its beauty and symbolic significance. This approach would resonate with a wider audience, from explorers to romantics, or anyone interested in the exotic and awe-inspiring qualities of distant places. Leyden-Erskine's translation seeks to stir emotion, using the river as a symbol of both natural beauty and historical depth. The differences between Beveridge and Leyden-Erskine reflect their broader translation goals. Beveridge's factual style appeals to readers who want a grounded, intellectual understanding of the river's geographical and strategic role. Leyden-Erskine, on the other hand, uses vivid language to evoke a sense of wonder, drawing readers into the cultural and emotional significance of the river. Both translations offer a different lens through which to view the Amu Darya—one as a historical and geographical landmark, the other as a powerful cultural and poetic symbol. In the

end, both translations deepen our understanding of the river, but in different ways. Beveridge appeals to the mind, while Leyden-Erskine speaks to the imagination and emotions. This shows that translation is more than just converting words—it is about choosing which aspects of the original text to highlight based on the audience's needs and the translator's goals. Bobur's portrayal of the Sir Darya emphasizes the river's clarity and its abundance, qualities that are essential for understanding its significance in the region. For Bobur, the Sir Darya is not just a river, but also a symbol of life and fertility—a powerful force that sustains both the land and the people. His description focuses on the river's purity and its productive nature, underscoring its role as a vital source of nourishment and vitality for the surrounding area. In Beveridge's translation, he stays true to Bobur's original vision, maintaining a clear and straightforward description of the river's clarity and life-giving qualities. Beveridge's approach is precise and factual, preserving the essence of the river as Bobur intended. This makes sense for readers who seek a more factual, geographical understanding of the river, as Beveridge keeps the language simple and avoids unnecessary flourishes. His translation emphasizes the Sir Darya's importance as a natural and agricultural resource, staying grounded in Bobur's original depiction. Leyden-Erskine, however, takes a different approach by adding a poetic and expansive touch to the description. He refers to the river's waters as "crystalline," turning the river from just a physical feature into something almost magical and majestic. Through this vivid language, Leyden-Erskine taps into the romantic ideals of his time, inviting readers to see the river not just as a geographical entity, but also as a symbol of beauty and grandeur. His translation aims to evoke a sense of awe, transforming the Sir Darya into a nearly mythical part of the landscape. The contrast between Beveridge and Leyden-Erskine reflects their different translation goals. Beveridge's focus on accuracy and clarity appeals to readers looking for a precise, factual representation of the river. Leyden-Erskine, by contrast, emphasizes the emotional and symbolic aspects of the river, allowing readers to engage with the Sir Darya in a more imaginative and personal way. Both approaches offer valuable insights—one grounded in the practical, the other in the aesthetic and emotional—demonstrating how the tone and language of a translation can shape the way we connect to a place.

4. Indian Rivers- *Ganges:* Bobur's description of the Ganges elevates the river to something much greater than just a geographical feature. For him, the Ganges is a symbol of sacredness and grandeur. It is a river that embodies both spiritual and cultural significance, revered deeply in Hindu tradition. Bobur's admiration is rooted in the Ganges' profound role in sustaining life and nurturing the soul. It is not merely a body of water, but a river carrying deep spiritual meaning, a sacred force that holds immense power and significance for those who honor it.

In Beveridge's translation, the emphasis shifts toward the more practical, geographical aspects of the Ganges. He describes its physical attributes—its size, its course, and the role it plays within the landscape—focusing on facts and details. Beveridge stays true to the literal aspects of Bobur's original text, offering a clearer understanding of the river in terms of its geography. While this translation is accurate and informative, it does not fully capture the reverence and spiritual awe that Bobur conveys in his description. Beveridge's approach is grounded in reality, offering readers a view of the Ganges as a physical force, but leaving out the deeper, emotional connection Bobur sees in it.

Leyden-Erskine, on the other hand, brings a more emotional and spiritual tone to his translation. He highlights the Ganges' sacredness and divine significance, portraying the river as more than just a physical presence. Leyden-Erskine's translation appeals to readers who are drawn to the mystical and spiritual side of the Ganges, inviting them to see it not just as a natural feature but also as a symbol of devotion and divine power. His focus is on the river's spiritual and cultural importance, bringing out its deep resonance with the millions who view it as sacred. Leyden-Erskine's version allows readers to feel the emotional weight of the Ganges, connecting them to its spiritual power. These two translations reflect the different priorities of their translators. Beveridge's emphasis on the Ganges' physical attributes will appeal to those who are interested in the river's geographical and factual details. His translation is rooted in a more analytical perspective. Leyden-Erskine's, in contrast, brings out the deeper, symbolic meaning of the river, inviting readers to explore its spiritual and cultural significance. His translation offers an emotional, almost poetic experience of the Ganges, focusing on its sacredness. Both approaches provide valuable insights. Beveridge's factual account helps us understand the Ganges as a natural feature within the landscape, while Leyden-Erskine's poetic rendering opens our eyes to the river's sacred grandeur.

This contrast shows how translation can serve different purposes: one providing clarity and precision, the other evoking emotion and cultural depth. Together, they allow us to appreciate the Ganges from two distinct but complementary angles—both as a physical entity in the world and as a symbol of deep spiritual power for those who revere it.

Example: - Original: «*Ganga buyuk va muborak daryodir. Hindular bu daryoni muqaddas deb bilurlar.*»

- Beveridge: «*The Ganges is a great and blessed river. The Hindus regard it as holy.*»
- Leyden-Erskine: "*The Ganges, revered as holy by the Hindus, is a majestic and hallowed river.*"
- *Yamuna:* Bobur's portrayal of the Yamuna beautifully weaves together vivid imagery of nature with the cultural context that surrounds it.

For Bobur, the river is not just a physical feature of the landscape; it holds deeper significance, resonating with both cultural and spiritual meaning. He sees the Yamuna as intertwined with the life of the people, a symbol of the region's vitality and history, making it much more than just water flowing through the land. Leyden-Erskine, in his translation, enhances Bobur's vision by adding a layer of poetic beauty. He elevates the river's description with rich, romantic language, turning the Yamuna into something even more majestic and awe-inspiring. His words go beyond the literal, evoking the emotional and spiritual weight that the river holds for the people who revere it. Leyden-Erskine's translation brings the river to life in a way that invites readers to experience its grandeur and cultural significance in a visceral, emotional way. On the other hand, Beveridge takes a more straightforward approach, staying true to the literal meaning of Bobur's text. His focus is on the physical aspects of the Yamuna, describing it in a clear, factual manner that emphasizes its natural characteristics and role in the landscape. While Beveridge's translation offers an accurate depiction of the river, it does not delve into the deeper emotional or symbolic meaning that the river holds in the original text. The two translations offer distinct experiences. Leyden-Erskine's rendition pulls readers into the beauty and mystique of the Yamuna, inviting them to appreciate its symbolic importance through lyrical language. Beveridge, meanwhile, provides a more grounded and analytical account, focusing on the river's physical presence and practical role in the environment. Together, these translations give us a fuller understanding of the Yamuna, one rooted in poetic imagination and the other in clear, factual representation.

Discussion

This review highlights how translation strategies can greatly influence how readers receive «Boburnoma. » Beveridge's translation is a solid choice for historians and geographers, as it stays true to the factual details, offering a clear and accurate representation of Bobur's work. However, this focus on precision can sometimes overshadow the more poetic aspects of Bobur's writing, leaving the reader with a more detached, almost clinical understanding of the text. In contrast, Leyden-Erskine brings out the emotional and aesthetic richness of Bobur's descriptions, infusing them with vibrant imagery that makes the narrative more accessible and engaging, particularly for general readers who might be drawn to the beauty and emotion of the text. The decisions each translator made in their approach to «Boburnoma» are deeply influenced by the cultural and historical contexts in which they were working. Beveridge, translating during the colonial period, adhered to the British academic tradition, focusing on thoroughness and precision. His goal was to produce a translation that would meet the expectations of a scholarly audience, one that valued factual accuracy and a clear, detailed account of history.

In contrast, Leyden-Erskine, translating earlier in the 19th century, was influenced by the romanticized fascination with the East that was common at the time. His translation reflects this cultural moment, emphasizing the exotic and mystical qualities of Bobur's narrative. By doing so, he aimed to captivate readers with the allure of the Orient, presenting Bobur's story as something not just historical but also awe-inspiring and rich with adventure. Both translators, in their own way, shaped Baburnama to fit the sensibilities and tastes of their respective audiences.

Each translation provides valuable insights into «Boburnoma», yet neither fully captures the richness and depth of Bobur's work. This highlights a central challenge in translating texts that are full of cultural and linguistic nuances: it is nearly impossible to preserve every layer of meaning and emotion from the original. Bobur's narrative, woven with historical, cultural, and emotional subtleties, resists being

completely conveyed through any one translation. While both translations add to our understanding of «Boburnoma», they also reveal the natural limitations and compromises that come with translating works that carry such profound cultural significance.

Conclusion

The study highlights how A. Beveridge and Leyden-Erskine adopt different linguistic and pragmatic strategies when translating Bobur's river descriptions. Beveridge's approach keeps the translation more reserved and factual, avoiding embellishment, while Leyden-Erskine focuses on the beauty and poetic aspects of the descriptions, bringing out their emotional and aesthetic appeal. Each approach has its own merits, but they cater to different audiences and serve distinct purposes.

Future research could explore other elements of Baburnama, such as Bobur's views on nature and architecture, which would further expand our understanding of how to accurately translate this work. Additionally, examining translations into other languages could provide valuable insights into the cross-cultural reception of Bobur's masterpiece, enhancing our appreciation of its global impact.

References:

1. Zahiriddin Muhammad Bobur. «Boburnoma» -Toshkent «Sharq» nashriyot-matbaa aksiyadorlik kompaniyasi bosh tahririyati. 2002
2. B.Sarimsaqov. O'zbek adabiyotida saj'. -Toshkent. «FAN»
3. Leyden J., W.Erskine. Memoirs of Zehired-din Muhammed Babur, Emperor of Hindustan.– Edinburg, 1826.
4. Beveridge A.S., the Bābur-nāma in English (Memoirs of Babur), Translated from the Original Turki Text of Zahiru"ddin Muhammad Babur Padshah Ghazi by Annette, Susannah Beveridge. 2 Vols, – London, 1922; Repr, in one Volume, – London, 1969; – New Delhi, 1970; – Lahore, 1975.
5. The Baburnama. Memoirs of Babur, Prince and Emperor, Translated, Edited, and, Annotated by Wheeler M., Thackston. – New York & Oxford, 1996. 1978
6. Salomov G'. Tarjima nazariyasiga kirish.-Toshkent.O'qituvchi,1978
7. Nematjonovich, M. R. (2022, January). WAYS TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF SMALL BUSINESS AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISES. In *European journal of Science Archives conferences series* (No. January).
8. Nematjonovich, M. R. (2022). THEORETICAL BASIS FOR ASSESSMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS AND PRIVATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INCREASING ITS EFFICIENCY. *Science and innovation*, *1*(A3), 154-157.
9. Khoshimova, D. (2019). The place of author's personal and interpersonal comparison means in translation of «Baburname». Sciences of Europe, (45-5 (45)), 46-48.
10. Khoshimova, D. (2019). THE PLACE OF AUTHOR'S PERSONAL AND INTERPERSONAL COMPARISON MEANS IN TRANSLATION OF" BABURNAME". Sciences of Europe, (45-5), 46-48.
11. Khoshimova, D. M. (2015). SCIENTIFIC TERMS AND COMPARATIVE STYLE IN" BABURNAME" BY ZM BABUR. Theoretical & Applied Science, (12), 55-57.
12. Khoshimova, D. M. (2023).TARJIMADA XARAKTER PSIXOLOGIYASINI AKS ETTIRUVCHI QIYOSIY VOSITALAR TARJIMALARI. Scientific journal of the Fergana State University, (1), 102-105.
13. Shuhrat Shergoziyev Sheraliyevich. (2023) «A Linguopragmatic Study of the Saj Translation Used to Describe the Nature of Ningnahar in the Text «Boburnoma»». Best journal of innovation in science, research and development. ISSN: 2835-3579 .Volume:2 Issue: 11|2023
14. Sherg'oziyev Shuhrat Sheraliyevich «Boburnoma» matnida foydalanilgan saj'i mutarrafning ingliz tilitarjimalarida aks ettirilishi.» FarDU ilmiy xabarlar 2023/2, Pp 1018-1021

15. Sherg‘oziyev Shuhrat Sheraliyevich (2022) «Boburnoma» matnidagi shaxslar tasvirida saj’i matavoziyning o‘rni va ularning inglizcha tarjimalarda aks etishi». FarDU. Ilmiy xabarlar. 2022/3, Pp403-405/
16. Shuhrat Shergoziyev (2022). Translation of Three Types of Saj’s in the Text "Boburnoma".Spanish Journal of innovation and Integrity. ISSN: 2792-8268. Volume: 09, August-2022. Pp.65-69.