

e-ISSN 3060-5059

DOI: 10.67227



IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNAL

Scientific and Innovative Research in
Social and Humanitarian Studies

Vol. 3 • Issue 9

2026



Founded in 2024



publishscience.uz



publish_science_journal@mail.ru



PEER REVIEWED • OPEN ACCESS

O'ZBEKCHADAN INGLIZCHAGA BADIY TARJIMADA PERSONAJLARARO MA'NONI KATTA TIL MODELLARI YORDAMIDA SAQLASH: "O'TKAN KUNLAR"NING KONTEKSTUAL TAHLILI

Sharipova Fazilat Dilmurod qizi

Fan va texnologiyalar universiteti, dotsent.

e-mail: sharipovafazilat356@gmail.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-1101-7790>

Annotatsiya.

Maqolada "O'tkan kunlar" romanidagi o'n besh replika asosida o'zbek tilidan ingliz tiliga badiiy tarjimada shaxslararo ma'noni saqlash uchun zarur bo'lgan kontekst tahlil qilinadi. Qarindoshlikni ifodalovchi murojaat shakllari, bilvosita iltimoslar va yashirin munosabatlar ko'rib chiqiladi. Sun'iy intellekt yordamida yaratilgan namunaviy tarjimalar asosida kontekstni hujjatlashtirish tartibi taklif etiladi. Model samaradorligi eksperimental jihatdan o'lchanmagan.

Kalit so'zlar: katta til modellari, badiiy tarjima, kontekst, personaj nutqi, shaxslararo ma'no, murojaat shakllari, pragmatika, *O'tkan kunlar*.

СОХРАНЕНИЕ МЕЖЛИЧНОСТНЫХ СМЫСЛОВ В ХУДОЖЕСТВЕННОМ ПЕРЕВОДЕ С УЗБЕКСКОГО НА АНГЛИЙСКИЙ С ПОМОЩЬЮ БОЛЬШИХ ЯЗЫКОВЫХ МОДЕЛЕЙ: КОНТЕКСТУАЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ РОМАНА «МИНУВШИЕ ДНИ»

Шарипова Фазилят Дилмурод кизи

Университет науки и технологий, доцент.

Аннотация.

В статье на материале пятнадцати реплик из романа «Минувшие дни» анализируется контекст, необходимый для сохранения межличностного значения при художественном переводе с узбекского языка на английский. Рассматриваются формы обращения, выражающие родственные отношения, косвенные просьбы и имплицитные межличностные отношения. На основе образцов переводов, созданных с помощью искусственного интеллекта, предлагается порядок документирования контекста. Эффективность модели экспериментально не оценивалась.

Ключевые слова: большие языковые модели, художественный перевод, контекст, речь персонажа, межличностное значение, формы обращения, прагматика, «Минувшие дни».

PRESERVING INTERPERSONAL MEANING IN UZBEK-ENGLISH LITERARY TRANSLATION WITH LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS: A CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF O'TKAN KUNLAR

Sharipova Fazilat Dilmurod qizi

University of Science and Technology, Associate Professor.

Abstract.

Based on fifteen utterances from the novel *O'tkan kunlar* (*Bygone Days*), this article analyzes the contextual information required to preserve interpersonal meaning in literary translation from Uzbek into English. It examines kinship-based forms of address, indirect requests, and implicit interpersonal relationships. Drawing on sample translations generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence, the article proposes a procedure for documenting contextual information. The effectiveness of the model is not evaluated experimentally.

Keywords: large language models, literary translation, context, character speech, interpersonal meaning, forms of address, pragmatics, *O'tkan kunlar*.

Introduction A literary character's relationship with another character is not always recoverable from the dictionary meanings of a single utterance. An address form may express affection without naming a biological relative; a question may prepare a request; an apparently indifferent reply may conceal personal interest. Translating such expressions requires attention to the surrounding dialogue and to the narrator's description of conduct. For Uzbek-English translation, this problem becomes particularly visible where kinship terms, respectful address, and indirect requests occur together.

Abdulla Qodiriy's *O'tkan kunlar* provides a concentrated example. Otabek addresses Hasanali as *ota*, while Hasanali calls him *o'g'lim* and *begim*. The narrative subsequently identifies Hasanali's enslaved status and explains his longstanding attachment to Otabek's family [1; pp. 2–3]. A translation that presents only a father-son relationship would misrepresent the social arrangement. Conversely, one that preserves only hierarchy would obscure the affection through which the characters negotiate it. The relevant unit of meaning is therefore distributed across several turns and

the accompanying narration.

The article examines what contextual information is needed to preserve these relationships when preparing and reviewing translations with large language models (LLMs). It addresses three questions: which interpersonal meanings become clearer through co-text; what competing interpretations remain possible in English; and how contextual guidance can be documented without converting interpretation into invented fact. The contribution is a source-grounded analysis of fifteen short dialogue extracts and a practical distinction between textual evidence, interpretive inference, and translation instruction.

This is an exploratory qualitative study with AI-assisted candidate translations. It does not measure a causal effect of prompting, compare model brands, or report independently rated translation scores. Its results identify translation decisions and contextual dependencies within a small, traceable sample. A separate experimental design is proposed for testing whether supplying those contextual facts improves model performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

Karpinska and Iyyer compare sentence-level and paragraph-level literary translation using GPT-3.5 across eighteen language pairs. Their human evaluation finds advantages for paragraph-level translation while also identifying serious errors that require translator intervention [2; pp. 419–420]. Their language selection does not include Uzbek [2; p. 422]. The study supports investigating context as a translation resource, but its findings cannot establish the size or consistency of an effect for the Uzbek passages considered here.

Jiang and colleagues approach document-level translation through discourse annotations, including entities, terminology, coreference, and quotation. Their work demonstrates why maintaining relationships between expressions and speakers matters beyond sentence-level correctness [3; pp. 7853–7854]. For the present analysis, this motivates recording who speaks and who is addressed before discussing tone. The categories developed below are specific to the selected Uzbek material; they are not presented as a replication of Jiang and colleagues' annotation scheme.

Yim investigates prompting strategies for Korean–English literary translation where gender ambiguity is significant. Context-aware instructions and model versions influence outcomes, but more complex prompts do not consistently improve the reported quality metrics [4; p. 113]. This provides a relevant methodological parallel: additional guidance needs to preserve distinctions warranted by a text, and its usefulness must be tested. Gender reference in Korean and kinship address in Uzbek remain different linguistic problems.

Zhang, Zhao, and Eger examine literary translation evaluation using verified human translations, multiple translation systems, and different evaluator groups. They report that evaluation methods and evaluator expertise affect judgments, while model-based evaluation can struggle with distinctions between professional literary translation and more literal outputs [5; pp. 10961–10962]. Accordingly, the present article treats fluent candidate wording as material for discussion rather than evidence that a model has successfully reproduced literary effect. No automated score substitutes for an independent assessment.

The primary material is the publicly accessible, 220-page Ziyouz electronic text of *O'tkan kunlar* hosted by Allomalar. References to the novel use the page numbers printed in that electronic edition. Fifteen utterances or short utterance segments were selected purposively from pages 2–5, covering the first chapter and the opening of the second. They concern the visit by Rahmat and Homid to Otabek, Hasanali's participation, and the subsequent introduction to family acquaintances. These are fifteen extracts from connected scenes, not fifteen independent dialogues or a representative corpus of Uzbek literature.

Selection required an identifiable speaker and addressee and a translation decision involving address, interpersonal stance, or indirect communicative function. Source spellings are retained, while typographic apostrophes and line-break hyphenation are regularized. R01, R09, R13, and R15 are explicitly marked segments. Each record contains an identifier, page, source wording, participants, a candidate English rendering, and a contextual caution. Table 1 constitutes the complete sample used in this article; no unreported sample or numerical rating is implied.

The procedure begins with the surrounding passage, identifies observable evidence, and then examines what an English rendering preserves or changes. The working categories are referential relationship, social positioning, speech-act force, and stance. They may overlap and are not converted into frequency claims. Alternative translations in the discussion are analytical contrasts, deliberately written to expose a decision. They are not outputs from separately controlled, context-free and context-rich model conditions.

AI-use disclosure. An OpenAI ChatGPT assistant was used in preparing this manuscript, retrieving sources, drafting English prose, and generating the candidate translations and analytical contrasts on 24 September 2026. These examples were prepared within one context-aware conversation. A reproducible model snapshot and generation settings were not recorded, and no independent human rating or reader study was conducted. The linguistic judgments are provisional; the material must not be interpreted as a controlled evaluation of a particular model. Published human translations were not used as a reference standard.

DISCUSSION

The ota–o'g'lim exchange illustrates why address forms should be examined relationally. Otabek's inquiry about Hasanali's health precedes a request for tea, and Hasanali's response combines readiness to help with affectionate address. Later, Otabek waits until Hasanali has left before identifying his status to the visitors. The narration describes both long service and reciprocal trust [1; pp. 2–3]. These facts support an interpretation in which hierarchy and attachment coexist. Neither a purely familial nor a purely occupational description is sufficient.

For R02, "Are you well, Father?" retains the kinship metaphor but may suggest biological parenthood or religious address to an English reader. "Are you feeling better, Hasanali?" makes the referent clearer and connects the question to

his condition, yet replaces an affectionate address with a name. Table 1 retains *ota* as a possible compromise, which would require brief clarification elsewhere in a complete translation. None of these solutions preserves every feature automatically. A contextual note should explain the relationship to the model without forcing that explanation into the dialogue itself.

The corresponding answer, "Of course, my son," in R04 retains an affectionate paternal stance. However, its adequacy depends on the surrounding translation making clear who Hasanali is. R06 then introduces *begim*. "Certainly, sir" makes deference visible but reduces the local specificity of the address. "Certainly, my lord" would introduce a stronger English title and associations that need separate justification. The dialogue should therefore be assessed as a sequence: a plausible translation of one term can still create an inconsistent relationship when combined with adjacent choices.

R07 and R08 expose the consequences of making a relationship too explicit too early. Rahmat's question can be rendered as "How is this gentleman related to you, Bek?" but "What relation is this gentleman to you, Bek?" more strongly anticipates a family connection. Otabek's answer, "Our slave," then corrects that expectation. Replacing *qul* with "servant" would soften the status explicitly identified in the passage. Adding "although we love him like a father" to the answer would reveal information in a way that the source dialogue does not. Context should guide lexical choice while preserving the narrative order in which the relationship becomes known.

Indirect requests present a different problem. R03, "Ba'zi yumushlar buyursam....," leaves the formulation unfinished. A literal fragment about giving orders can preserve the hierarchical verb but sound abrupt in English. "If I might ask you to do something..." foregrounds a tentative request. The latter is a plausible functional choice because the preceding health inquiry and the following agreement establish a courteous exchange. Nevertheless, it somewhat softens the command-related wording. This trade-off should be recorded rather than described as a lossless equivalent.

R05 develops the request through thanks, an affectionate address, and a mitigated request form. "Make us some tea" transfers the task but removes much of its interpersonal preparation. "Thank you, *ota*. Then could you make us some tea?" preserves more of the turn's structure. Adding repeated "please" or an apology could make Otabek sound unusually deferential; deleting the address entirely could make him more distant. The target is the particular balance observable in the passage, not the maximum possible level of politeness.

Hospitality exchanges also depend on sequence. In R10, Rahmat rejects Otabek's explanation for staying at the *caravanserai* rather than visiting the family home. "That is still no excuse" can function as a reproach within an invitation, but it could sound hostile in isolation. In R12, Otabek's question about the necessity of trouble can be read as a conventional reluctance to burden a host. "Why go to all that trouble?" leaves room for a courteous reading; "There is no need to bother me" would change who is being inconvenienced. The invitation and response provide the evidence for this distinction [1; pp. 3–5].

R13 further shows that a conventional expression should not be classified by form alone. Rahmat says "Sog' bo'ling, bek aka" and immediately asks Otabek to specify the day of his visit. Treating the first segment as "Goodbye, Bek" would prematurely close an exchange that is continuing. "Thank you, Bek" fits its apparent appreciative function at that point, although it suppresses the wording of a wish for well-being. This is a contextual hypothesis grounded in turn position, not a claim that the Uzbek expression always means "thank you."

Stance can remain partly uncertain even when more text is available. R11 follows disagreement between Rahmat and Homid over marriage. Rahmat's "Sizga taraf yo'q, tog'a" can be rendered as "There's no arguing with you, Uncle." The wording suggests withdrawal from an unproductive argument, whereas "You are absolutely right, Uncle" turns the line into unqualified agreement. The surrounding debate supports the former interpretation, but it does not fix a single intensity of sarcasm. A model instruction should preserve the possibility of restrained irony without demanding ridicule or hostility.

R14 is more delicate. Before Otabek answers that the presence of additional guests makes no difference to him, the narrator describes a change in his appearance and his effort to conceal it [1; p. 5]. "It makes no difference to me" allows the contrast between speech and narration to remain. "I would be delighted if he came" replaces concealment with an explicit preference. This is an example where contextual understanding may require restraint: the translator can recognize possible concealed interest while preserving what the character actually says.

The same caution applies to R09. Its pauses and hesitation form part of Otabek's response about Marg'ilon. A polished sentence such as "I liked Margilan very much" would remove that hesitation. "What can I say... I did, on the whole... like Margilan" retains an uneven delivery without assigning a definite hidden motive. The passage supports uncertainty in expression; it does not authorize every explanation a model might infer from its prior familiarity with the novel.

Finally, R15 involves *amak* addressed to a family acquaintance in an introduction rather than an established biological uncle. Rendering it as "Uncle" may preserve a culturally marked relationship if the translation supplies sufficient contextual orientation. Using "sir" avoids a kinship inference but reduces the family-like warmth. Consistency does not require translating every occurrence of a kinship word identically. It requires checking the relationship and communicative purpose each time, including cases where the same English term would imply a different social connection.

RESULTS

The close reading produces an annotated set of fifteen contextual translation problems. Table 1 provides their source locations and candidate renderings. The English wording is newly generated for this article and remains provisional. Retained Uzbek address forms are deliberate options for analysis; their inclusion does not establish that

borrowing is the best strategy for a complete English translation.

Table 1. Source extracts and provisional English renderings

ID and page	Uzbek source	Participants, candidate translation, and caution
R01 · p. 2	Bizni kechirasiz, bek aka [segment]	Rahmat → Otabek. Forgive us, Bek. A courteous opening; retaining Bek loses the additional nuance of aka.
R02 · p. 2	Tuzukmisiz, ota?	Otabek → Hasanali. Are you feeling better, ota? The address expresses a paternal bond without biological kinship.
R03 · p. 2	Ba'zi yumushlar buyursam...	Otabek → Hasanali. If I might ask you to do something... Preserves hesitation but softens the command-related verb.
R04 · p. 2	Buyuringiz, o'g'lim.	Hasanali → Otabek. Of course, my son. Affectionate willingness; the relationship needs surrounding explanation.
R05 · p. 2	Rahmat, ota, bo'lmasa bizga choy qaynatib bersangiz-chi.	Otabek → Hasanali. Thank you, ota. Then could you make us some tea? Maintains thanks and a mitigated request.
R06 · p. 2	Xo'b, begim.	Hasanali → Otabek. Certainly, sir. Expresses deference but reduces the specificity of begim.
R07 · p. 2	Bu kishi kimingiz bo'ladir, bek aka?	Rahmat → Otabek. How is this gentleman related to you, Bek? May anticipate kinship; the next answer revises that expectation.
R08 · p. 2	Qulimiz.	Otabek → Rahmat. Our slave. Preserves the explicit status; servant would soften it.
R09 · p. 3	Nima desam ekan... Marg'ilonni har holda... xush ko'rdim [segment]	Otabek → Rahmat. What can I say... I did, on the whole... like Margilan. Retains hesitation without stating its cause.
R10 · p. 3	Har holda bu uzr emas.	Rahmat → Otabek. That is still no excuse. The hospitality exchange supports reproach without necessarily implying hostility.
R11 · p. 4	Sizga taraf yo'q, tog'a.	Rahmat → Homid. There's no arguing with you, Uncle. May convey ironic withdrawal; its intensity remains interpretive.
R12 · p. 5	Ovora bo'lmoqning nima zarurati bor?	Otabek → Rahmat. Why go to all that trouble? Reluctance to burden the host within an invitation exchange.
R13 · p. 5	Sog' bo'ling, bek aka [segment]	Rahmat → Otabek. Thank you, Bek. Appreciation within a continuing turn, rather than a farewell.

ID and page	Uzbek source	Participants, candidate translation, and caution
R14 · p. 5	Manim uchun farqsiz.	Otabek → Rahmat. It makes no difference to me. Keeps stated indifference; narration conveys the tension.
R15 · p. 5	Ota qadrdonlari bilan tanishdirg‘aningiz uchun rahmat, amak [segment]	Otabek → Ziyo shohichi. Thank you, Uncle, for introducing me to my father’s close friends. Uncle is respectful address here, not established biological kinship.

Source: Qodiriy [1; pp. 2–5]. Page numbers refer to the electronic edition. Segments are identified explicitly; dialogue dashes and terminal quotation punctuation are omitted. All English renderings are AI-assisted candidates prepared for this article, not independently rated translations.

Three findings arise from the selected material. First, factual relationships and interpersonal positioning must be recorded separately. Hasanali’s status and his paternal affection are compatible features, and a translation can lose either one. Second, a turn’s function can depend on adjacent turns: R03 prepares a request, while R13 acknowledges cooperation within an ongoing invitation. Third, contextual understanding does not always call for explicit wording. R14 benefits from retaining the distance between a character’s spoken indifference and the narrator’s account of his behavior.

These findings concern the textual sample and the choices made in the candidate renderings. They do not show that context caused an improvement in model output. The comparative contribution is the mapping from a specific source cue to a translation decision and its remaining risk. Table 2 turns that mapping into a proposed contextual record suitable for later controlled testing. It is a study-specific tool rather than a validated evaluation scale.

Table 2. Proposed record for contextual guidance

Record field	Example and evidential boundary
Textual fact	R02–R08: the narration identifies Hasanali’s status; the dialogue uses affectionate address. Record both.
Interpretive inference	R11: the preceding disagreement supports possible irony. Mark this as an interpretation rather than a stated emotion.
Translation instruction	Preserve the relationship and degree of indirectness. Keep explanatory notes outside the character’s speech.
Unresolved risk	Retaining ota requires reader orientation; replacing it may reduce warmth. Record the remaining trade-off.
Evidence location	Save edition, page, target span, surrounding passage, speaker, addressee, and the unchanged model response.

A future test can compare three conditions using the same target utterance: the utterance alone; the utterance with a fixed surrounding passage; and that same passage supplemented by a factual relationship note. Instructions, target span, and output requirements should otherwise remain constant. The note should state only information already available in the selected passage. If it introduces later plot knowledge, the comparison tests additional information as well as explicit guidance and must be described accordingly.

Each generation should use a fresh session or independent API request. The model identifier, date, complete prompt, generation settings where available, and unedited response should be retained. Several generations per condition would help distinguish persistent behavior from a single wording choice. Evaluation should conceal the generation condition from at least two qualified Uzbek–English readers and require a source-based explanation for each judgment. Reader inferences about kinship or attitude would require a separate reception task.

The current sample cannot support statistical generalization. It is purposive, drawn from the opening of one novel, and includes connected utterances whose interpretations are dependent. The English variants have not been compared with a verified published translation or independently rated. The model may also have encountered the novel during training, so even an isolated-sentence condition in a future study could contain implicit background knowledge. These limitations define what further evidence is needed before making performance claims.

CONCLUSION

Interpersonal meaning in the selected *O’tkan kunlar* passages depends on the relationship between dialogue, turn sequence, and narration. The analysis distinguishes affection from biological kinship, deferential language from complete social equality, and a character’s stated position from implications supplied by the narrator. These distinctions provide concrete guidance for preparing LLM-assisted Uzbek–English literary translations.

The proposed contribution is a traceable fifteen-item sample and a contextual record that separates evidence from interpretation. The candidate translations demonstrate choices that a translator would need to review, including the costs of retaining or replacing kinship address and the risk of making concealed attitudes explicit. Context is thus treated as a resource for constraining interpretation, not as a guarantee of translation quality. Whether supplying it improves model performance remains an empirical question for independently generated and assessed translations.

REFERENCES

1. Qodiriy A. *O'tkan kunlar*. – Elektron matn. – Ziyouz elektron kutubxonasi. – 220 b. – [Manba](#)
2. Karpinska M., Iyyer M. Large Language Models Effectively Leverage Document-Level Context for Literary Translation, but Critical Errors Persist // *Proceedings of the Eighth Conference on Machine Translation*. – Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. – P. 419–451. – DOI: [10.18653/v1/2023.wmt-1.41](#)
3. Jiang Y. E., Liu T., Ma S., Zhang D., Sachan M., Cotterell R. Discourse-Centric Evaluation of Document-Level Machine Translation with a New Densely Annotated Parallel Corpus of Novels // *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Vol. 1: Long Papers*. – Toronto: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. – P. 7853–7872. – DOI: [10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.435](#)
4. Yim J. Preserving Ambiguity: Prompt Sensitivity in Gender-Neutral Literary Translation by GPT Models // *Proceedings of the 39th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*. – Hanoi: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2025. – P. 113–125. – [Source](#)
5. Zhang R., Zhao W., Eger S. How Good Are LLMs for Literary Translation, Really? Literary Translation Evaluation with Humans and LLMs // *Proceedings of NAACL 2025: Human Language Technologies. Vol. 1: Long Papers*. – Albuquerque: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2025. – P. 10961–10988. – DOI: [10.18653/v1/2025.naacl-long.548](#)