

Hakimova, Sh. R. (2026). Travelogue: Linguistic Units Referring to Historical Heritage Sites in English and Uzbek Tourist Guidebooks. *The Delhi University Magazine. Series: The Humanities and the Social Sciences* 5: 35-43.

Travelogue: Linguistic Units Referring to Historical Heritage Sites in English and Uzbek Tourist Guidebooks

SHOHISTA R. HAKIMOVA¹

Gulistan State University

ABSTRACT

This article conceptualizes the travelogue as a distinct text type within linguocountry study and examines the dominance of linguistic units referring to historically significant heritage sites in English and Uzbek tourist guidebooks. From a philological perspective, tourism texts are not merely informational instruments but semiotic mechanisms of cultural mediation. They transform national history, symbolic geography, and collective memory into structured linguistic representations accessible to the foreign reader. The study proposes an operational model of “dominance” based on frequency, positional prominence, and multimodal anchoring. The analysis demonstrates that heritage-site units — toponyms, culture-bound realia, institutional names, historical anthroponyms, and evaluative descriptors — form the structural backbone of tourist discourse in both English and Uzbek contexts. At the same time, cross-cultural comparison reveals distinct strategies of cultural indexing: English guidebooks tend toward institutionalized heritage framing and standardized naming, while Uzbek-oriented materials intensify culturally saturated realia and explanatory expansion. The findings confirm that heritage-site lexical units function as primary carriers of cultural meaning in travelogue–guidebook hybrids and represent the central mechanism through which linguocountry study objectives are realized in tourism communication.

¹ PhD, Associate Professor, Department of the English Language and Literature, Gulistan State University, Republic of Uzbekistan. E-mail: shohista.hakimova.82@gmail.com

Keywords: travelogue; linguocountry study; tourism discourse; guidebook; heritage-site lexicon; toponyms; multimodality.

I. INTRODUCTION

The travelogue occupies a special position within the system of text typology because it combines narrative experience, documentary description, cultural interpretation, and publicistic commentary. In contemporary tourism communication, the travelogue increasingly overlaps with the guidebook, producing hybrid texts that simultaneously narrate and instruct, describe and persuade, interpret and promote. Within the framework of linguocountry study, such texts acquire a special methodological significance: they function as structured mediators of national culture.

Linguocountry study treats language as a carrier of cultural knowledge and views texts as instruments for introducing social institutions, historical processes, symbolic spaces, and value systems to the learner or foreign reader. The travelogue, particularly in its tourism-oriented form, performs precisely this task. It transforms geographical space into a culturally interpreted landscape and encodes historical memory into lexical units that become accessible and teachable.

A central observation motivates the present study: in tourist guidebooks and travelogue–guide hybrids, linguistic units referring to historical heritage sites dominate both quantitatively and structurally. These units are not neutral labels. They organize the text, define itinerary logic, structure evaluation, and anchor multimodal design. Heritage-site vocabulary — names of monuments, sacred complexes, architectural ensembles, museums, memorial landscapes — becomes the primary means by which national identity and cultural continuity are communicated.

The aim of this article is to conceptualize the travelogue as a distinct linguocountry study text type and identify the linguistic mechanisms that produce the

dominance of heritage-site units in English and Uzbek tourist guidebooks explaining how this dominance functions as a tool of cultural mediation.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on travel writing has consistently emphasized its hybrid and evolving character. Contemporary genre studies describe the travelogue as a flexible narrative form capable of integrating documentary realism, personal experience, and cultural commentary (Ozola, 2022). Within Uzbek philological scholarship, the travelogue has been examined as a culturally meaningful subtype of publicistic writing, often characterized by intertextual depth and cultural memory orientation (Usmonova, 2024; Abdullayeva, 2023).

Tourism discourse research provides additional analytical tools. Hannam and Knox (2005) argue that tourism texts construct destinations discursively rather than neutrally describing them. Guidebooks are therefore understood as persuasive informational genres in which promotion and explanation coexist. Rhetorical analyses of guidebooks demonstrate systematic deployment of ethos, pathos, and logos to build credibility and emotional engagement (Skendo, 2024). Appraisal-based approaches further show that evaluation and intensification are core linguistic mechanisms in tourism promotion (Jalilifar, 2019).

Multimodal scholarship has significantly expanded the understanding of tourism texts. Hiippala (2013) demonstrates that brochures and guidebooks integrate language, layout, photography, and maps into coherent semiotic systems. Francesconi (2011) similarly shows that images and writing collaboratively construct destination identity. These studies are crucial for defining “dominance” as a multimodal phenomenon rather than purely lexical frequency.

Contrastive linguocultural studies of tourism discourse emphasize the role of culture-bound vocabulary, translation strategies, and lexical lacunae in shaping destination representation (Goshkheteliani, 2022; Ziyotova, 2025). Uzbek dissertation research has highlighted the pragmatic and linguocultural features of tourism

communication, especially in relation to culturally marked lexicon and translation challenges (Buzrukova, year as published).

However, while tourism discourse has been widely studied, the specific dominance of heritage-site linguistic units as a structurally organizing principle within travelogue–guidebook hybrids has not been sufficiently theorized from a linguocountry study perspective. This article addresses that gap.

III. METHODS

The research adopts a qualitative philological discourse-analytic approach. Rather than focusing on a fixed statistical corpus, it proposes a systematic analytical model applicable to comparative corpus studies.

The unit of analysis is the heritage-site linguistic unit, including: toponyms (cities, squares, regions); monument and complex names; institutional names (museums, heritage bodies); culture-bound realia (e.g., madrasa, khanqah, abbey, cathedral); historical anthroponyms embedded in site names; chronotopic markers (period labels); evaluative descriptors associated with heritage.

Dominance is operationalized through three dimensions: frequency prominence – recurrence and lexical density; positional prominence – appearance in headings, captions, itinerary lists; and multimodal anchoring – integration into maps, images, typographic emphasis. A contrastive framework is applied to English- and Uzbek-oriented guidebooks to identify shared and culture-specific mechanisms of lexical dominance

IV. RESULTS

The analysis confirms that the travelogue, understood as a text type within linguocountry study, performs systematic cultural mediation through a lexically structured

representation of space. In tourism-oriented travelogues and guidebooks, linguistic units referring to historical heritage sites constitute the most stable and dominant lexical layer. These units organize the text architecturally and semantically, transforming geographical territory into culturally interpreted space.

In both English and Uzbek guidebooks, heritage-site units function as structural anchors. For example, an English guidebook entry may open with a heading such as **“Westminster Abbey”**, followed by a lead paragraph: *“One of London’s most iconic landmarks, Westminster Abbey has witnessed coronations and royal weddings for nearly a thousand years.”* The proper name appears in the heading, the opening sentence, and often again in the image caption: *“The Gothic façade of Westminster Abbey.”* Similarly, an Uzbek-oriented guidebook may structure a chapter around **“Registon maydoni”**, beginning with a formulation such as: *“Registon maydoni Samarqandning yuragi bo‘lib, Temuriylar davrining eng ulug‘ me‘moriy majmuasi hisoblanadi.”* The name is repeated in subheadings, image captions, and map labels, reinforcing its centrality.

These examples illustrate positional dominance. Heritage-site names occupy headings, boldface highlights, itinerary lists (“Top 10 Attractions”), and map legends. In an English context, a guidebook page may present: **“Tower of London – Highlights”**, followed by bullet points such as *Crown Jewels, White Tower, Medieval battlements*. In Uzbek materials, a similar layout appears as: **“Shohi Zinda majmuasi – Ko‘rish tavsiya etiladi”**, followed by descriptive segments emphasizing architectural features and historical figures. In both cases, the heritage unit structures reading progression and visitor movement.

Frequency dominance is also evident. Even when the discourse shifts toward practical guidance, historical reference reappears. An English guide may state: *“Several cafés are located near the historic Old Town walls.”* The adjective “historic” reconnects contemporary space to heritage. In Uzbek texts, one may read: *“Qadimiy shaharning tor ko‘chalari bo‘ylab sayr qilib, Bibi-Xonim masjidiga yetib borish mumkin.”* The adjective *qadimiy* (“ancient”) and the named mosque reintroduce historical framing into everyday orientation.

A clear contrast emerges in the handling of culturally dense realia. Uzbek-oriented materials frequently preserve original terminology, often accompanied by explanatory glosses. For instance: “*Ulug‘bek madrasasi (XV asr islomiy ta‘lim maskani)*” or “*Xonqoh – tasavvufiy majmua.*” In English-language materials about Uzbekistan, transliteration is often retained: “*Ulugh Beg Madrasa, a 15th-century Islamic school.*” The site name appears in its original form, followed by descriptive expansion. This repetition increases lexical prominence and enhances the linguocountry study function by combining naming and explanation.

By contrast, English heritage sites are frequently institutionalized through standardized nomenclature. For example: “*The British Museum houses one of the world’s most comprehensive collections of human history.*” The institutional name stands alone, rarely requiring glossing. Evaluation is embedded through phrases such as “*world-renowned,*” “*iconic,*” “*UNESCO-listed,*” or “*one of the finest examples of Gothic architecture.*” Uzbek guidebooks likewise intensify evaluation, but often through culturally resonant lexicon: “*betakror,*” “*muqaddas,*” “*bebaho meros,*” as in: “*Shohi Zinda – muqaddas qadamjo va bebaho me‘moriy meros.*”

Intertextual micro-narratives further reinforce dominance. An English guide may connect “*St Paul’s Cathedral*” to historical events: “*The cathedral survived the Blitz and became a symbol of national resilience.*” An Uzbek text may attach a legendary narrative to “*Shohi Zinda*”: “*Afsonaga ko‘ra, Qusam ibn Abbos shu yerda dafn etilgan.*” In both instances, the heritage-site name becomes inseparable from a condensed historical or legendary storyline, increasing mnemonic and symbolic weight.

Multimodal anchoring intensifies this effect. On a printed page, the photograph caption repeats the site name: “*The domes of Bibi-Xonim masjidi at sunset.*” The map marks the same location in bold type. The visitor encounters the name visually and verbally, creating cross-modal reinforcement. English guidebooks follow a similar pattern: “*Aerial view of the Tower Bridge.*” The repeated naming across image, caption, and map stabilizes cognitive recognition.

Translation practices amplify dominance in bilingual contexts. For example, a bilingual Uzbek–English brochure may present: “*Registon maydoni (Registan Square)*” / “*Temuriylar davrining buyuk yodgorligi – the grand architectural ensemble of the Timurid era.*” Here the heritage-site unit appears in Uzbek, then in English, then in descriptive expansion. Each repetition strengthens its structural prominence and pedagogical visibility.

Overall, the results demonstrate that heritage-site linguistic units dominate English and Uzbek tourist guidebooks because they operate simultaneously as lexical anchors, narrative centers, evaluative triggers, multimodal nodes, and translation focal points. Through repeated naming, evaluative intensification, and intertextual expansion, these units transform geographical locations into culturally saturated symbols. Their dominance is therefore not accidental but constitutive of tourism discourse and of the travelogue’s function within linguocountry study.

V. DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that the dominance of heritage-site units is a logical consequence of tourism discourse’s communicative goals. Tourism requires spatial orientation, cultural legitimacy, and emotional engagement. Heritage vocabulary fulfills all three. It provides stable cognitive anchors, legitimizes destinations through historical depth, and supports affective scripts of awe and reverence.

From a linguocountry study perspective, this dominance reflects the educational function of tourism texts. Heritage-site names act as condensed carriers of cultural information. They introduce dynasties, architectural traditions, religious practices, and historical events through compact lexical forms.

Cross-cultural differences highlight how linguistic choices reflect broader cultural models of heritage. English guidebooks frequently emphasize institutional management and visitor infrastructure, aligning with discourses of preservation and curatorship. Uzbek materials more often foreground culturally embedded naming traditions and religious-historical continuity, reinforcing national identity through lexical saturation.

The travelogue–guidebook hybrid therefore represents an especially productive object for linguocountry study. It combines narrative immediacy with structured explanation, allowing heritage-site vocabulary to function as both experiential symbol and pedagogical instrument.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that the travelogue, conceptualized within linguocountry study, constitutes a distinct text type characterized by cultural mediation through language. In contemporary tourism discourse, particularly in English and Uzbek guidebooks, linguistic units referring to historical heritage sites occupy a dominant position. This dominance is manifested through frequency, positional prominence, multimodal reinforcement, evaluative framing, intertextual embedding, and translation expansion.

Heritage-site vocabulary forms the structural and semantic core of tourism texts. It organizes itineraries, anchors multimodal design, constructs authenticity, and transmits cultural memory. While English and Uzbek guidebooks share core structural patterns, they differ in strategies of cultural indexing and explanatory density.

Future research may apply corpus-based quantitative analysis to validate the dominance model proposed here and further explore translation pragmatics in bilingual tourism materials. The findings underscore the importance of integrating discourse analysis, multimodality, and linguocountry study in the philological examination of tourism communication.

REFERENCES

- Abdullayeva, M. (2023). Linguocultural analysis and review of the work of the poet Hayrati “Sayohatnoma”. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377253732_LINGUOCULTURAL_A

[ANALYSIS AND REVIEW OF THE WORK OF THE POET HAYRATI S
AYOKHATNOMA](#)

- Buzrukova, M. M. (2024). *Turistik diskursning lingvomadaniy xususiyatlari va tarjima pragmatikasi*. DSc thesis. Bukhara: Bukhara State University.
- Francesconi, S. (2011). Images and writing in tourist brochures: A multimodal analysis. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 9(4), 341–357.
- Goshkheteliani, I. (2022). Lingua-cultural peculiarities of tourism discourse. *International Journal of Multilingual Education*. URL: <https://sjani.ge/index.php/ijml/article/view/6546>
- Hannam, K., & Knox, D. (2005). Discourse analysis in tourism research: A critical perspective. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 30(2), 23–30.
- Hiippala, T. (2013). The structure of multimodal documents: An empirical approach to modelling tourist brochures. University of Helsinki. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266738024_The_Structure_of_Multimodal_Documents_An_Empirical_Approach
- Jalilifar, A. (2019). Tourism Discourse Revisited: An Analysis of Evaluative Strategies in Tourist Brochures from a Systemic Functional Linguistics Perspective. *Journal of English Studies*, 17, 211-232. URL: <https://www.semanticscholar.org/reader/e836e687f77caf48efbcd5e62b9cfc2d2180be82>
- Ozola, D. (2022). Typology of the genre of travelogue in Latvian and American literature. Doctoral dissertation. URL: <https://du.lv/en/doctoral-thesis/diana-ozola-typology-of-the-genre-of-travelogue-in-latvian-and-american-literature-at-the-turn-of-the-20th-and-the-21st-centuries/>
- Skendo, I. (2024). Using pathos, logos and ethos in tourist guidebooks. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 11(1).
- Usmonova, U. (2024). A Publicist Discourse as a Conceptual Linguistic Unit Forming the Base of the Text. *Philology Matters*. URL: <https://uzjournals.edu.uz/philolm/vol2019/iss1/44/>
- Ziyotova, R. (2025). Lingua-cultural peculiarities of English and Uzbek tourism discourse. *O'zbekistonda xorijiy tillar*, 12(2), 158–174.