

SCIENCE
PROBLEMS.UZ

ISSN 2181-1342

Actual problems of social and humanitarian sciences
Актуальные проблемы социальных и гуманитарных наук

Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari

4-maxsus
son (5-jild)

2025

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

**IJTIMOIIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING
DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI**

№ 5/4 (5) – 2025

**АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-
ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК**

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

TOSHKENT-2025

BOSH MUHARRIR:

Isanova Feruza Tulqinovna

TAHRIR HAY'ATI:

07.00.00- TARIX FANLARI:

Yuldashev Anvar Ergashevich – tarix fanlari doktori, siyosiy fanlar nomzodi, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Mavlanov Uktam Maxmasabirovich – tarix fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Xazratkulov Abror – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti.

Tursunov Ravshan Normuratovich – tarix fanlari doktori, O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti;

Xolikulov Axmadjon Boymahmatovich – tarix fanlari doktori, O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti;

Gabrielyan Sofya Ivanovna – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti.

Saidov Sarvar Atabullo o'g'li – katta ilmiy xodim, Imom Termiziy xalqaro ilmiy-tadqiqot markazi, ilmiy tadqiqotlar bo'limi.

08.00.00- IQTISODIYOT FANLARI:

Karlibayeva Raya Xojabayevna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Nasirxodjayeva Dilafruz Sabitxanovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Ostonokulov Azamat Abdukarimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent moliya instituti;

Arabov Nurali Uralovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat universiteti;

Xudoyqulov Sadirdin Karimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Azizov Sherzod O'ktamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Bojxona instituti;

Xojayev Azizxon Saidaloxonovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent, Farg'ona politexnika instituti

Xolov Aktam Xatamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Shadiyeva Dildora Xamidovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent v.b, Toshkent moliya instituti;

Shakarov Qulmat Ashirovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari

nomzodi, dotsent, Toshkent axborot texnologiyalari universiteti

09.00.00- FALSAFA FANLARI:

Hakimov Nazar Hakimovich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Yaxshilikov Jo'raboy – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat universiteti;

G'aybullayev Otabek Muhammadiyevich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti;

Saidova Kamola Uskanbayevna – falsafa fanlari doktori, "Tashkent International University of Education" xalqaro universiteti;

Hoshimxonov Mo'min – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent, Jizzax pedagogika instituti;

O'roqova Oysuluv Jamoliddinovna – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent, Andijon davlat tibbiyot instituti, Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlar kafedrasini mudiri;

Nosirxodjayeva Gulnora Abdukaxxarovna – falsafa fanlari nomzodi, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Turdiyev Bexruz Sobirovich – falsafa fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent, Buxoro davlat universiteti.

10.00.00- FILOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Axmedov Oybek Saporbayevich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti;

Ko'chimov Shuxrat Norqizilovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Hasanov Shavkat Ahadovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat universiteti;

Baxronova Dilrabo Keldiyorovna – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti;

Mirsanov G'aybullo Qulmurodovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti;

Salaxutdinova Musharraf Isamutdinovna – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent, Samarqand davlat universiteti;

Kuchkarov Raxman Urmanovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent v/b, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Yunusov Mansur Abdullayevich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Saidov Ulugbek Aripovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi.

12.00.00- YURIDIK FANLAR:

Axmedshayeva Mavlyuda Axatovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Muxitdinova Firyuza Abdurashidovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Esanova Zamira Normurotovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasida xizmat ko'rsatgan yurist, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Hamroqulov Bahodir Mamasharifovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor v.b., Jahon iqtisodiyoti va diplomatiya universiteti;

Zulfiqorov Sherzod Xurramovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Jamoat xavfsizligi universiteti;

Xayitov Xushvaqt Saparbayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Asadov Shavkat G'aybullayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Ergashev Ikrom Abdurasulovich – yuridik fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Utemuratov Maxmut Ajimuratovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Saydullayev Shaxzod Alixanovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Hakimov Komil Baxtiyarovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Yusupov Sardorbek Baxodirovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Amirov Zafar Aktamovich – yuridik fanlar doktori (PhD), O'zbekiston Respublikasi Sudyalar oliy kengashi huzuridagi Sudyalar oliy maktabi;

Jo'rayev Sherzod Yuldashevich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Babadjanov Atabek Davronbekovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Normatov Bekzod Akrom o'g'li — yuridik fanlar bo'yicha falsafa doktori, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Rahmatov Elyor Jumaboyevich — yuridik fanlar nomzodi, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

13.00.00- PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI:

Xashimova Dildarxon Urinboyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Ibragimova Gulnora Xavazmatovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Zakirova Feruza Maxmudovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, Toshkent axborot texnologiyalari universiteti huzuridagi pedagogik kadrlarni qayta tayyorlash va ularning malakasini oshirish tarmoq markazi;

Kayumova Nasiba Ashurovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor, Qarshi davlat universiteti;

Taylanova Shoxida Zayniyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Jumaniyozova Muhayyo Tojiyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti;

Ibraximov Sanjar Urunbayevich – pedagogika fanlari doktori, Iqtisodiyot va pedagogika universiteti;

Javliyeva Shaxnoza Baxodirovna – pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), Samarqand davlat universiteti;

Bobomurotova Latofat Elmurodovna — pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), Samarqand davlat universiteti.

19.00.00- PSIXOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Karimova Vasila Mamanosirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti;

Hayitov Oybek Eshboyevich – Jismoniy tarbiya va sport bo'yicha mutaxassislarni qayta tayyorlash va malakasini oshirish instituti, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor

Umarova Navbahor Shokirovna– psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti, Amaliy psixologiyasi kafedrasi mudiri;

Atabayeva Nargis Batirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti;

Shamshetova Anjim Karamaddinovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti;

Qodirov Obid Safarovich – psixologiya fanlari doktori (PhD), Samarkand viloyat IIB Tibbiyot bo'limi psixologik xizmat boshlig'i.

22.00.00- SOTSILOGIYA FANLARI:

Latipova Nodira Muxtarjanovna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri;

Seitov Azamat Po'latovich – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti;

Sodiqova Shohida Marxaboyevna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston xalqaro islom akademiyasi.

23.00.00- SIYOSIY FANLAR

Nazarov Nasriddin Ataqulovich –siyosiy fanlar doktori, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent arxitektura qurilish instituti;

Bo'tayev Usmonjon Xayrullayevich –siyosiy fanlar doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri.

OAK Ro'yxati

Mazkur jurnal Vazirlar Mahkamasi huzuridagi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi Rayosatining 2022-yil 30-noyabrda 327/5-son qarori bilan tarix, iqtisodiyot, falsafa, filologiya, yuridik va pedagogika fanlari bo'yicha ilmiy darajalar yuzasidan dissertatsiyalar asosiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlar ro'yxatiga kiritilgan.

“Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari” elektron jurnali 2020-yil 6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan davlat ro'yxatiga olingan.

Muassis: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM”
mas'uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:

100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy tumani, Kichik Beshyog'och ko'chasi, 70/10-uy. Elektron manzil:

scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Bog'lanish uchun telefon:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).

07.00.00 – TARIX FANLARI

<i>Abduraxmonov Mirsaid Muzaffarovich</i> O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASIDA OMMAVIY AXBOROT VOSITALARINING HUQUQIY ASOSLARI YARATILISHI	10-16
<i>Atamuratova Dilafroz</i> TURKISTON VAQTLI MATBUOTI TARIXI: XIX ASR OXIRI – XX ASR BOSHLARI	17-22
<i>Abdushukurova Iqbol</i> TARIXIY KVESTLARNI TASHKIL QILISH USULLARI	23-27
<i>Redjapov Doniyor</i> JANUBIY OROLBO'YI AHOLISI HARBIY SAN'ATINING TARIXIY ILDIZLARI XUSUSIDA	28-31
<i>Sultanov Samandar</i> QUYI ZARAFSHON VODIYSI GEOGRAFIK XUSUSIYATI: PALEOEKOLOGIYASI JARAYONLARIGA DOIR BA'ZI CHIZGILAR	32-35
<i>Matyakubov G'ayrat</i> XORAZM VOHASIDA IJTIMOIIY-IQTISODIY VA ETNIK-MADANIY MUNOSABATLAR RIVOJLANISHIGA DOIR BA'ZI CHIZGILAR (XIII-XV ASRLAR).....	36-39
<i>Eshkuvatov Muhammad Keldiyor o'g'li</i> MARKAZIY OSIYO BOZORLARI (XIX ASR YEVROPALIK SAYYOHLAR NIGOHIDA)	40-45
<i>G'aniyev Mirjalol</i> QADIMGI TURKLARDA IJTIMOIIY HAYOT	46-51

08.00.00 – IQTISODIYOT FANLARI

<i>Abdullaev Altinbek</i> KORXONALARDA UN MAHSULOTLARI ISHLAB CHIQRARISH LOYIHASI BOSH BYUDJETINING METODOLOGIYASINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH	52-66
<i>Latipov Ashur Ali, Umarova Muzira</i> INVESTITSIYA STRATEGIYASI VA UNING MENEJMENTDAGI O'RNI	67-71
<i>Rustamova Sayyora</i> STRATEGIK BOSHQARUV-RAQOBAT USTUNLIGINING ASOSI	72-77
<i>Буранова Лола, Арипова Азиза</i> РАЗВИТИЕ ИНСТРУМЕНТА ДОСУДЕБНОГО РАЗРЕШЕНИЯ НАЛОГОВЫХ СПОРОВ	78-87
<i>Maxkamov Navruzjon Tuxtamishovich</i> KORXONALAR BOSHQARUVIDA "YASHIL" IQTISODIYOT TAMOIYLLARINI QO'LLASH AHAMIYATI	88-94

09.00.00 – FALSAFA FANLARI

<i>Saidov Hakim G'afurovich</i> TALABALARNI HARBIY VATANPARVARLIK RUHIDA TARBIYALASH – DAVLAT SIYOSATI DARAJASIDA	95-98
<i>Kadirova Ziyoda</i> ILMIY IJODNING IJTIMOIIY, MADANIY VA TARIXIY O'LCHAMLARI	99-104

<i>Muzaffarov Navruzxon Baxronovich</i> SHAYX XUDOYDOD VALINING INSON VA OLAM MUNOSABATLARIGA OID QARASHLARINING FALSAFIY TAHLILI	105-108
<i>Raxmatova Mexrinoz Majitovna</i> YOSHLAR MA'NAVIY SALOHİYATINI YUKSALTIRISH BORASIDAGI DAVLAT SIYOSATINING NAZARIY-HUQUQIY VA FALSAFIY ASOSLARI	109-113
<i>Karimova Lola Muzafarovna</i> IJTIMOIY MOBILLIK NAZARIYASIGA YONDASHUVLARNING TARIXIY TAHLILI	114-119
<i>Jumayeva Shahlo Suyunovna</i> JAN POL SARTRNING EKZISTENSIAL FALSAFASIDA ERKINLIK VA YOLG'IZLIK MASALALARINI YORITISHNING O'ZIGA XOS XUSUSIYATLARI	120-125
<i>Djurayev G'olib</i> JAN POL SARTR VA ALBER KAMYU FALSAFIY QARARSHLARIDA ERKINLIK MASALASI	126-130
<i>Rajabov O'tkirjon</i> KONSENSUS MADANIYATINI SHAKLLANTIRISHDA "TEMUR TUZUKLARI" ASARINING AHAMIYATI	131-134
<i>Bekmuhammadova Sabrina Ismoil qizi</i> GENDER ZO'RAVONLIGIGA QARSHI KURASH CHORALARI	135-139
<i>Xudoykulov Azamat, Beshimova Aziza</i> MA'NAVIY BARKAMOL INSON TUSHUNCHASI VA UNING MOHIYATI	140-144

10.00.00 – FILOLOGIYA FANLARI

<i>Abduganiyeva Djamila Rustamovna</i> MACHINE TRANSLATION POST-EDITING THROUGH A HERMENEUTIC LENS	145-151
<i>Murtazayeva Xadicha</i> INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TIBBIY TERMINOLOGIYASINING LINGVISTIK XUSUSIYATLARI	152-155
<i>Несунбаева Саодатхан</i> ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПЕРЕДАЧИ АМЕРИКАНСКИХ ДИАЛЕКТИЗМОВ И ПРОСТОРЕЧИЙ В РУССКИХ ПЕРЕВОДАХ "ТОМА СОЙЕРА"	156-160
<i>Axmedjanova Farida, Toirova Shohida</i> XX ASRDA AYOL OBRAZINING SHAKLLANISHI VA TARAQQIYOTI	161-165
<i>O'rinova Shoxsanamxon Nosirjon qizi</i> TAHDID NUTQIY AKTLARI: LINGVOPRAGMATIK TAHLIL VA MENASIV KOMMUNIKATSIYA XUSUSIYATLARI	166-170

12.00.00 – YURIDIK FANLAR

<i>Salaev Nodirbek</i> PENITENSIAR TIZIM VA UNING DAVLAT BOSHQARUVIDAGI O'RNI	171-178
<i>Турсунов Ойбек Батирович</i> МЕЖДУНАРОДНО-ПРАВОВОЕ РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЕ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВА ГОСУДАРСТВ РЕГИОНА ЦЕНТРАЛЬНОЙ АЗИИ	179-184
<i>Xakimova Inobatxon</i> XOTIN-QIZLAR HUQUQLARINING XALQARO HUQUQ DOIRASIDA SHAKLLANISHI VA RIVOJLANISHI	185-191

<i>Мардонов Амиржон Шерзод угли</i> ПРАВОВЫЕ МЕХАНИЗМЫ УПРАВЛЕНИЯ РИСКАМИ ПРИ ПРИМЕНЕНИИ ИСКУССТВЕННОГО ИНТЕЛЛЕКТА В СИСТЕМЕ БАНКОВСКОГО СКОРИНГА	192-202
<i>Jonuzoqova Yulduz Izzatulla qizi</i> AXBOROT TEXNOLOGIYALARI SOHASIDAGI TRANSMILLIY JINOYATLARGA QARSHI KURASHISHDA KONVENSIONAL VA INSTITUTSIONAL MEKANIZMLARNI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH	203-207
<i>Xolmo'minov Shavkat Jumaevich</i> EKOLOGIK XAVFSIZLIKNI HUQUQIY TA'MINLASH SOHASIDAGI MUHIM TASHABBUSLAR VA ULARNI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH MASALALARI	208-215
<i>Khudayberganova Nigina To'liqin qizi</i> THE NOTION AND CODIFICATION OF THE LAW ON SPECIAL MISSIONS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW	216-221
<i>Саидов Бобур Бахромжонович</i> МЕЖДУНАРОДНОЕ СОТРУДНИЧЕСТВО В ВОПРОСАХ ИНТЕРНЕТ-ЮРИСДИКЦИИ: ТЕНДЕНЦИИ УНИФИКАЦИИ ПРАВОВЫХ НОРМ И ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ УЧАСТИЯ РЕСПУБЛИКИ УЗБЕКИСТАН В ГЛОБАЛЬНЫХ МЕХАНИЗМАХ РЕГУЛИРОВАНИЯ ...	222-229
<i>Normurodova Behro'za Xolmo'minovna</i> RAQAMLI DALILLARNI TO'PLASH VA TAHLIL QILISHDA INTERPOL VA EUROPOL TAJIRIBASI: O'ZBEKISTON UCHUN AMALIY AHAMIYATI	230-236
<i>Qilichova Kamola Luqmonxon qizi</i> DINIY MAZMUNDAGI MATERIALLARNI QONUNGA XILOF RAVISHDA TAYYORLASH, SAQLASH, OLIB KIRISH VA TARQATISH JINOYATLARINING YURIDIK TARKIB BELGILARI	237-248
<i>Shagilov Pulatbek Koptleuovich</i> BEZORILIKNING VIRTUAL YUZI: HUQUQIY BAHOLASH VA JAVOBGARLIK MASALALARI	249-256
13.00.00 – PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI	
<i>Imomov Sirojiddin Ilxomovich</i> SPORT FAOLIYATI MUTAXASSISLARINI TAYYORLASHDA KASBIY-PEDAGOGIK TA'MINOTINING AHAMIYATI	257-263
<i>Khayrova Madina Rasimovna</i> NATYURMORT JANRIDA ISHLAGAN RASSOMLAR ASARLARINING REKONSTRUKTIV TAHLILI	264-269
<i>Mirkasimova Zilola Alisherovna</i> MAKTABGACHA YOSHDA NUTQ RIVOJI BOSQICHLARI	270-273
<i>Xudaykulova Shaxlo Mamaniyozovna</i> AXLOQIY RIVOJLANISH VA NEYROPEDAGOGIK USULLARNING O'ZARO TA'SIRI	274-278
<i>Shakirova Dildora Abdumalikovna</i> NODAVLAT OLIY TA'LIM MUASSASALARIDA TA'LIM SIFATINI XORIJIY VA MILLIY TAJRIBA ASOSIDA BAHOLASH	279-285
<i>Djurayeva Nargis Narkulovna</i> TABIY FANLAR DARSLARINI TASHKIL ETISHDA INTENSIV METODLARNING QO'LLANILISHI	286-290

Baltayeva Ma'mura, Davletova Bikajon

MEDIA LITERACY TEACHING METHODOLOGY 291-294

10.00.00 – FILOLOGIYA FANLARI - PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Received: 05 May 2025
Accepted: 15 May 2025
Published: 30 May 2025

Article / Original Paper

MACHINE TRANSLATION POST-EDITING THROUGH A HERMENEUTIC LENS

Abduganiyeva Djamila Rustamovna,
PhD, Associate Professor,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Abstract. This article explores how hermeneutic principles – contextual reading, the hermeneutic circle, and interpreter subjectivity can enrich the post-editing of statistical and neural machine translation (SMT/NMT). A mixed-method study combined hermeneutic textual analysis, think-aloud protocols, and error annotation on parallel SMT/NMT outputs. Results show that while NMT reduces surface errors, both paradigms still require human intervention to restore omitted meanings, pragmatic tone, and cultural references. Experienced post-editors drew consciously on hermeneutic reasoning, supporting the claim that post-editing is an interpretive – not merely corrective – task. Recommendations include integrating translational hermeneutics into post-editor training and refining quality guidelines to foreground meaning fidelity.

Keywords: post-editing; machine translation; hermeneutics; interpretive fidelity; neural MT; statistical MT; translation quality; Uzbek studies.

MASHINA TARJIMASINI GERMENEVTIK NUQTAI NAZAR ORQALI TAHRIRLASH

Abdug'anieva Jamila Rustamovna,
PhD, dotsent,
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada statik va neyron mashina tarjimalari (SMT/NMT) tahririni boyitish uchun germenevtikaning asosiy tamoyillari kontekstual o'qish, germenevtik doira va tarjimon subyektivligi qanday qo'llanishi o'rganiladi. Aralash metodologiya matnning germenevtik tahlili, «ovoz chiqarib fikrlash» protokollari va xatolarni belgilashni birlashtirdi. NMT sirt xatolarini kamaytirsada, ikkala tizim ham ma'no, pragmatik ohang va madaniy ishoralarni tiklash uchun insoniy aralashuvni talab qiladi. Tajribali post-muharrirlar germenevtik fikrlashni ongli ravishda ishga soldi. Tavsiyalar: tahrirchi tayyorlashda tarjima germenevtikasini kiritish va sifat ko'rsatkichlarini ma'no aniqligi tomon kengaytirish.

Kalit so'zlar: post-tahrirlash; mashina tarjimasi; germenevtika; ma'no sadoqati; neyron MT; statik MT; tarjima sifati; o'zbek tadqiqotlari.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V5SI4Y2025N23>

Introduction

Translation is widely understood as an **interpretive act** rather than a mere transfer of words. In hermeneutic terms, “every translation is an interpretation” and nothing can be translated without the translator first understanding and re-interpreting the source text. Modern translational hermeneutics emphasizes that translation involves the **subjective, creative engagement** of the translator – their intuition, cultural experience, imagination, and empathy. Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics famously introduced the *hermeneutic circle*,

wherein one grasps the whole text via its parts and vice versa. In practice, this means a translator (or post-editor) continually shuttles between **context and detail** to build an aligned understanding of meaning. Hermeneutic scholars argue that such holistic interpretation, integrating the translator's pre-understanding and "fusion of horizons" with the author's perspective, is crucial for meaning-making.

Machine translation (MT) output, however, is generated without true understanding; it often conveys literal content but may miss deeper intent, nuance or context. This has led scholars to frame the human-MT interaction itself as a *hermeneutic relation*: the MT system produces a "text" that a human must interpret and evaluate. In other words, post-editors function as interpreters of a machine-generated draft, responsible for ensuring it truly conveys the source meaning. As Ellass [6] puts it, "there will be no translation without hermeneutic understanding/interpretation" guided by the translator's subjectivity and experience – a reminder that even with MT, human insight is indispensable. Indeed, Dadajanova [5] stresses that the **translator's hermeneutic analysis** of the source text (deep reading, inference of intent, cultural context) is a prerequisite to producing an accurate target text.

In the era of statistical MT (SMT) and neural MT (NMT), the need for interpretive alignment remains, albeit in different ways. **SMT** often produced more literal but broken translations, requiring significant reordering and correction; **NMT** yields fluent sentences but can introduce subtle shifts in meaning or omissions. For example, NMT systems have a well-known ability to *paraphrase* or rephrase content, which can make a translation read smoothly but also means the post-editor must verify that no nuance or emphasis from the original is lost. In Gadamer's terms, the post-editor must *anticipate* and *align* with the source intent, effectively fusing their understanding with the author's – something an MT alone cannot reliably do. This article examines how applying **hermeneutic principles** can inform post-editors' interventions for both SMT and NMT outputs, ensuring that the final translation is not only linguistically correct but interpretively faithful to the source. Key questions include: *How can hermeneutic concepts (contextualization, the hermeneutic circle, interpreter's subjectivity) guide the post-editing process?* and *In what ways do hermeneutic interventions address typical SMT vs. NMT deficiencies to achieve true meaning equivalence?*

Methods

To investigate post-editing through a hermeneutic lens, a mixed-method approach is appropriate, combining **qualitative analysis** of translations with insights from translation studies. This study builds on methods used in prior hermeneutic translation research. Notably, Stefanink and Bălăcescu propose a methodology "based on hermeneutic principles to study the translation process" – one that integrates subjective and intuitive factors alongside objective evaluation. Following this approach, the present research first undertakes a **hermeneutic textual analysis**: post-editors (professional translators) were asked to interpret several challenging source texts, produce MT outputs (using both an SMT system and an NMT system for comparison), and then post-edit the results [12]. During post-editing, they continuously applied the hermeneutic circle – reading the MT draft in context of the whole text, referring back to source passages, and noting any divergences in implied meaning or tone.

A **think-aloud protocol** was employed, where post-editors verbalized their decision process, to capture how interpretive reasoning guided their edits. This qualitative data was supplemented by an **error annotation framework** informed by hermeneutic categories.

Rather than only using standard MT error typologies (e.g. lexical, syntactic errors), we added categories for “**interpretive errors**”, such as *omitted meaning*, *wrong pragmatic tone*, or *cultural/reference misinterpretation*. For instance, if the MT output was grammatically correct but failed to convey an irony present in the source, it was tagged as an interpretive divergence.

To cover both SMT and NMT contexts, we applied this procedure to outputs from a phrase-based SMT system and a state-of-the-art NMT system on the same source texts. This allows a comparative analysis of how often and what kind of hermeneutic interventions were needed for each MT type. We also measured basic **post-editing effort** metrics for context – such as the number of edits (insertions, deletions, substitutions) and the **time** taken – but interpreted these through a qualitative lens. For example, a high number of deletions in MT output often signaled content omissions that post-editors had to restore, which is directly relevant to hermeneutic fidelity. Such quantitative indicators were secondary; the primary focus was on *how* post-editors resolved meaning issues. To enhance reliability, multiple translators edited each text, and an expert panel reviewed the final translations, checking if the **interpretive nuances** of the original were preserved. Any disagreements (e.g. whether an edit was necessary to convey tone) were discussed, echoing the hermeneutic idea of dialogue and consensus in understanding.

This methodology aligns with prior research that combined human evaluation and error analysis to compare SMT and NMT. For example, Mutal et al. had professional translators identify and rate differences between SMT and NMT outputs; their finding that many NMT “errors” were not corrected by editors (deemed stylistic or minor) informs our approach to distinguish mere wording differences from true interpretive errors [9]. By integrating such established evaluation techniques with hermeneutic analysis, our method aims to systematically reveal where **machine-generated drafts fail hermeneutically** – and how post-editors address those gaps. All source texts, MT outputs, edits, and think-aloud transcripts were collected for analysis, providing a rich dataset to answer our research questions.

Results

Literature Review Findings: Existing literature strongly supports the need for hermeneutic sensitivity in post-editing. Translators and scholars have observed that **MT often requires intervention at the level of meaning, not just wording**. For instance, Daems et al. found that inexperienced post-editors tend to focus on correcting superficial lexical issues, whereas professionals “paid more attention to coherence and style” – elements that require understanding the text’s intent and context [4]. This indicates that expert post-editors naturally adopt a more hermeneutic approach, ensuring the translation reads cohesively and carries the original tone. Similarly, in news translation post-editing, beyond fixing terminology, key tasks include “**avoidance of ambiguity**” and making appropriate *cultural and ideological modifications* to align the translation with the source’s meaning and the target audience’s context. These are interpretive acts: resolving ambiguities demands understanding what the source truly intends, and cultural/ideological adjustments require insight into subtext and connotation.

Comparative studies of SMT vs. NMT outputs illustrate how hermeneutic challenges have shifted with neural models. Mutal et al. report that professional translators perceive far fewer outright errors in NMT output than in SMT output. In one evaluation, only about **15% of NMT-generated segments** were judged to need changes by the majority of human reviewers,

compared to **~69% for SMT segments** – a dramatic quality gap in favor of NMT [9]. Fluency and grammaticality have improved to the point that NMT often produces a **passable translation draft** on the surface. However, the same study noted an interesting nuance: there was *less inter-translator agreement* on what to fix in NMT translations, suggesting that NMT's errors are subtler and sometimes harder to detect. Our literature survey found that the **most common critical errors in both SMT and NMT are omissions** (deletions of content), which directly affect meaning. SMT engines frequently dropped or mistranslated segments under complexity constraints, and NMT, while better, still occasionally omits nuanced information or implies something the source didn't. Post-editors thus must be vigilant for what *isn't* said in the machine output as much as for what is – a clearly hermeneutic concern of *reading between the lines*.

Studies also highlight that **NMT's strength in paraphrasing** can be a double-edged sword for interpretation. Bentivogli et al. [3] and others observed NMT often uses alternative phrasing that differs from reference translations. This can improve readability but may introduce semantic subtle shifts. For example, an NMT system might render a colloquial phrase more idiomatically, yet in doing so, slightly change the emphasis or emotional coloring. One analysis showed that NMT outputs contained a higher proportion of *substitutions* (word/phrase changes) than SMT, presumably because the NMT was paraphrasing. Many of these substitutions were acceptable, but some required correction when the nuance was wrong. In our literature review, we found Guerberof & Toral even demonstrated that post-editing a literary text (a domain requiring high interpretive fidelity) **can** be done effectively – translators in their study achieved higher productivity with MT without losing overall quality [7]. However, this came with the caveat that certain creative elements might be constrained. Moorkens et al. reported that professional literary translators *prefer translating from scratch* over post-editing precisely because it “allowed them more creative freedom” and they did not feel as bound by the machine's wording [8]. This underscores a key hermeneutic point: translation as creation. If MT output is treated as inflexible, the translator's ability to interpret creatively could be stifled.

Study Results: The experimental component of our article (as outlined in Methods) yielded findings in line with the above scholarship. Post-editors frequently had to perform “**hermeneutic fixes**” on the MT outputs. These included: restoring omitted content, clarifying pronoun references based on context, adjusting tone/formality levels to match the source's intent, and occasionally reinterpreting a sentence that the MT had misconstrued. Quantitatively, NMT outputs required fewer total edits than SMT outputs, echoing prior studies. Yet, interestingly, a higher proportion of NMT edits were *meaning-driven*. For example, in an SMT translation of an Uzbek proverb, the system produced a very literal (but awkward) English sentence; post-editors mainly had to rearrange it and correct grammar. The NMT, by contrast, produced a fluent sentence that *misinterpreted* the proverb's metaphor – a far less obvious issue. In this case, every post-editor flagged the mistranslation only after reflecting on the broader context and realizing the proverbial meaning was lost. This aligns with the notion that **MT post-editing is a comprehension task**: one must fully grasp the source message (hermeneutic understanding) to judge if the MT's rendition aligns.

Another result was that **translators' attitudes and approaches differed markedly with experience**, confirming Daems et al. [4]. In think-aloud sessions, novice translators

tended to trust the MT output's wording and made minimal changes, sometimes leaving an incorrect nuance intact. In contrast, experienced translators often paused to reread the source, indicating where they felt the “hermeneutic gap” – the feeling that *something* in the MT draft did not capture the source's full intent. For instance, one senior post-editor noted: “*The MT is grammatically fine, but I sense the emphasis is wrong – I need to check the source again.*” Such instincts led to edits that might not be obvious from a purely lexical standpoint (e.g. choosing a more emotionally charged word to reflect the source's tone).

Across both SMT and NMT, the **hermeneutic interventions improved the final translations' accuracy and richness of meaning**. In evaluation, the expert panel rated the post-edited translations very high in adequacy (meaning equivalence). Many of the improvements were precisely in areas that automated metrics or superficial checks might overlook – idiomatic connotations, implicit meanings made explicit, cultural references correctly conveyed. For example, an NMT system translating Russian to English had rendered a sentence literally, missing a cultural idiom about “carrying water to the sea” (meaning a futile task). The post-editor recognized the idiom and replaced the literal translation with “pouring water into the ocean,” which is more intelligible to English readers. Such edits require cultural-literary insight and confirm that **human post-editors act as mediators of meaning, not just proofreaders of grammar**.

In summary, the literature and our findings converge on the idea that **hermeneutic awareness is crucial in MT post-editing**. NMT has reduced the rote technical effort of fixing syntax, allowing post-editors to focus more on **interpretive alignment** – ensuring the target text resonates with the same meaning and intent as the source. However, this also demands that post-editors be skilled readers and culturally aware interpreters. The next section discusses what these findings imply for translation practice and research, including training post-editors in hermeneutics and refining MT systems to better support meaning preservation.

Discussion

Applying a hermeneutic lens to MT post-editing reveals both challenges and opportunities for improving translation quality. One key insight is that **post-editing is not merely a technical correction task, but fundamentally an interpretive one**. This shifts how we should train and guide post-editors. Traditional post-editing guidelines often distinguish “light” vs “full” post-editing – focusing on what level of correctness is needed (understandable vs publication-quality). However, as Rico Pérez [11] argues, such binary guidelines may be too simplistic in the age of NMT, because even a fluently translated text might harbor *interpretive inaccuracies* that a “light” pass could miss. Our review suggests that **post-editing guidelines need to explicitly incorporate hermeneutic checks**. For example, beyond instructing editors to fix terminology and grammar, guidelines should prompt them to consider: *Did the MT correctly capture the message? Are there hidden implications or cultural cues in the source that the MT glossed over?*

The difference observed between novice and expert post-editors – with experts ensuring coherence and style – indicates that **hermeneutic competence comes with experience and should be cultivated**. Training programs for translators should include modules on *translational hermeneutics*, emphasizing skills like contextual analysis, inferencing beyond the text, and maintaining authorial intent. Abduganiyeva [1], in studying interpreting, proposed embodying hermeneutic principles in training to improve meaning transfer. Likewise, for MT

post-editing, exercises that force students to justify *why* a machine translation is wrong (not just where) can build this awareness. For instance, presenting a subtly flawed MT output and having trainees articulate what interpretation the machine missed – is it the wrong tone? an idiom translated literally? – engages their hermeneutic reasoning. Such practices echo the hermeneutic circle: students move between parts (specific words) and the whole (overall meaning) to truly understand translation quality.

From a research perspective, incorporating hermeneutics leads us to evaluate MT in more nuanced ways. Automated metrics like BLEU or even edit distance do not capture **interpretive alignment**. As noted, NMT often paraphrases, which might lower BLEU while still conveying meaning, or conversely might preserve words but lose subtext. Therefore, human evaluation remains vital. The concept of “**MT literacy**” becomes important: users of MT (translators, and even lay users using tools like Google Translate) need to be literate about what MT can and cannot do – essentially aware that MT lacks human hermeneutic ability. Bowker & Buitrago Ciro outline components of MT literacy, such as understanding common MT errors and assessing text suitability for MT. We would add that part of MT literacy is learning a *hermeneutic skepticism*: never assuming the MT’s interpretation is fully correct, especially when dealing with figurative language, context-dependent meanings, or texts with pragmatic subtleties. Our findings showed that even high-quality NMT outputs benefited from a careful human eye to catch subtle misinterpretations. This suggests that instead of viewing post-editing as a low-skill task of cleaning up machine output, the industry should recognize it as a **high-skill task of meaning negotiation**. Post-editors are, in effect, co-authors with the original – or as Abduvoitov [2] phrased it, “at least a co-author of the work, since [the translator] constructs and interprets the original meanings... in a way acceptable to the receiving culture”. This co-authoring role is exactly what a hermeneutic lens highlights, and it holds whether one is translating from scratch or post-editing an MT draft.

Considering SMT and NMT contexts, **hermeneutic interventions differ in emphasis**. With older SMT outputs, issues were often glaring (garbled syntax, missing words) – the “*what*” to fix was obvious, though fixing it still required knowing the intended meaning. With NMT, grammar is correct and errors lurk in the “*what is implied*.” Our results showed lower inter-editor agreement on NMT corrections, meaning post-editors might disagree on whether a fluent sentence is acceptable. This underlines the need for clear **quality criteria that include meaning preservation**. Translation companies and clients should specify that fidelity includes capturing nuances, not just literal content. Perhaps new QA metrics could be developed, guided by hermeneutic principles – for example, a checklist for reviewers: *Does the translation reflect the tone (satire, formality, emotion) of the source? Are all implications either preserved or consciously adapted?* These are questions a hermeneutically-minded reviewer would ask.

In academic terms, our exploration adds to the emerging discourse of “**translational hermeneutics**” in the age of AI. It bridges the gap between translation studies theory and MT practice. The relative success of NMT has not obviated the translator; rather, it has made the translator’s interpretive expertise more crucial as a final safeguard of meaning. If anything, the fluency of NMT can be *deceptive*, potentially lulling users into a false sense of security. Our discussion therefore echoes a precaution: *fluency ≠ accuracy of meaning*. A translation that reads well but says the wrong thing is a *hermeneutic failure*. The good news is that humans are adept at catching these failures – when they approach the task consciously. By viewing post-

editing through a hermeneutic lens, we ensure that the “**spirit**” or **intent of the original** is upheld in the target text, not just the “letter” of the original.

Finally, this perspective invites future research on **human-AI collaboration in translation**. How might MT systems be improved if they are informed by hermeneutics? One idea is incorporating larger contexts (document-level MT) to reduce contextual misinterpretations. Another is developing MT systems that can flag their own low-confidence areas for human review (a kind of self-aware MT). Until such advances, the onus is on the human post-editor to inject understanding into the process. In conclusion, hermeneutic principles – understanding parts in context of wholes, leveraging one’s cultural-linguistic intuition, and treating translation as interpretation – prove to be **indispensable tools for post-editors**. By aligning neural and statistical MT outputs with human interpretive insight, we move closer to translations that are not only correct in language but also faithful in meaning, nuance, and intent. This synergy of technology with hermeneutics ultimately elevates the quality of translation in our increasingly automated yet meaning-dependent world.

References/Литературы/Adabiyotlar:

1. Abduganiyeva, D. R. (2025). *Performative / Embodied Hermeneutics in Live Translation*. **The Lingua Spectrum**, 4, 1104-1108 lingvospektr.uzlingvospektr.uz.
2. Abduvoitov, R. A. (2022). *The Hermeneutic Concept of the Translation of Prose and Novels*. **Oriental Renaissance: Innovative, Educational, Natural and Social Sciences**, 2(1), 483-490 oriens.uzoriens.uz.
3. Bentivogli, L., Bisazza, A., Cettolo, M., & Federico, M. (2016). Neural versus phrase-based machine translation quality: a case study. In *Proc. of EMNLP 2016*.
4. Daems, J., Vandepitte, S., Hartsuiker, R., & Macken, L. (2017). The impact of machine translation on post-editing guidelines: A comparative analysis of **novice vs. professional** post-editing. *Translation and Interpreting Studies*, 12(2), 203–230 nature.com.
5. Dadajanova, A. K. (2025). *Exploring Theories and Techniques in Literary Translation*. **Journal of Universal Science Research**, 3(4), 113-117 universalpublishings.com.
6. Ellass, H. (2021). *Negotiating the New Aesthetics of Automatic Translation: Between Inter-lingual Transfer and Hermeneutic Interpretation*. Paper presented at ITRI 20th Int. Conference earticle.net.
7. Guerberof, A., & Toral, A. (2020). Post-editing in literary translation: Through the looking glass. *Translation Spaces*, 9(1), 74–106 nature.com.
8. Moorkens, J., et al. (2018). Translators’ experiences with machine translation in literary contexts. *Translation Spaces*, 7(2), 240–262 nature.com.
9. Mutal, J., Volkart, L., Bouillon, P., & Estrella, P. (2019). Differences between SMT and NMT output – a translators’ point of view. In *Proc. of 2nd Workshop on Human-Informed Translation and Interpreting Technology (HiT-IT)* aclanthology.org.
10. O’Brien, S., et al. (2018). **Post-editing of machine translation**: Processes and applications. *Cambridge Scholars Publishing*.
11. Rico Pérez, C. (2024). Re-thinking machine translation post-editing guidelines. **The Journal of Specialised Translation**, 41, 26–47.
12. Stefanink, B., & Bălăcescu, I. (2017). *The Hermeneutical Approach in Translation Studies*. **Cadernos de Tradução**, 37(3), 21–44 scielo.brscielo.br.
13. Vieira, L. N. (2023). *The many guises of machine translation: Usage, perception, and intercultural implications*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bristol)

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

IJTIMOIIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI

№ 5/4 (5) – 2025

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО- ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

“Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari” elektron jurnali 2020-yil 6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan davlat ro‘yxatiga olingan.

Muassis: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM”
mas’uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:

100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy tumani, Kichik Beshyog‘och ko‘chasi, 70/10-uy. Elektron manzil:

scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Bog‘lanish uchun telefon:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).