



**TRANSLATIONAL FEATURES OF ECOTERMS:
METHODS AND CONTEXTUAL SPECIFICITY IN
ENGLISH, UZBEK, AND RUSSIAN**

Arifjanova Nilufar Mirsidikovna

nen02003@mail.ru

Katta o'qituvchi

O'zDJTU

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17978143>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 12th December 2025

Accepted: 17th December 2025

Online: 18th December 2025

KEYWORDS

Ecoterms, ecological terminology, translation methods, contextual specificity, equivalence, translation strategies, English-Uzbek-Russian translation, environmental discourse.

ABSTRACT

This article explores the translational features of ecological terms (ecoterms) with a focus on translation methods and contextual specificity in English, Uzbek, and Russian. Ecoterms constitute a dynamic layer of specialized vocabulary that reflects scientific knowledge, environmental policy, and socio-cultural attitudes toward nature. The study examines the main challenges in translating ecoterms, including contextual semantic variability, partial or complete non-equivalence across languages, and the selection of appropriate translation strategies. Using a comparative and descriptive approach, the article analyzes authentic examples from scientific, journalistic, and public discourse to illustrate the application of literal translation, calque, descriptive translation, adaptation, modulation, and compensation. Particular attention is given to the influence of communicative context, target audience, and translator competence on translation choices. The findings demonstrate that effective translation of ecoterms requires a flexible, context-sensitive approach that balances terminological accuracy with pragmatic adequacy in multilingual environmental communication.

Introduction

The domain of ecology is characterized by the rapid creation of new knowledge, which necessitates the continuous generation of new linguistic units that often do not make it into standard dictionaries. This environment requires translators to engage in **creative translational searches for equivalents**. While areas with standardized documentation, such as jurisprudence, rely on specialized dictionaries and stored text



fragments, the novelty inherent in ecological content means that translators must actively select methods and techniques, following established translation theorists.

This analysis supports the theory of translatability, which suggests that nationally specific vocabulary can be rendered using **partial equivalents**. The study specifically addresses the ways and techniques used to translate ecoterms from English into Uzbek, Russian, focusing on the interplay of translational and semantic transformations. A key preliminary consideration is the proposed distinction between *monosemy* and *polysemy* (as characteristics of language systems) and *monosemanticity* and *polysemanticity* (as properties of lexical semantics).

Methods

The methodology for analyzing the translation of ecoterms involves a combination of established approaches: the communicative, semantic, and transformational methods. To ensure a comprehensive and adequate translation, these methods are applied in conjunction with **comparative polyparadigmatic analysis** of the translation units in the source language (SL) and the target language (TL).

Given the dynamic nature of ecological terminology, translators are also encouraged to perform independent linguistic research, analyzing term usage in various sources, including official documents, journalism, and informal communications. Cross-linguistic comparison of internationalisms which are frequently used in ecological texts provides an additional source of information. The ultimate goal is to achieve an **adequate translation**, ensuring the communicative goals and objectives are fully met.

Results

Translational Transformations: Literal Transfer and Borrowing

Literal translation, borrowing, and calquing are frequently employed for ecoterms, particularly those that are already familiar to the Uzbek and Russian expert community in their primary English forms, generating numerous terminological internationalisms. These methods successfully convey the graphic form and often the morpho-morphemic structure, especially for ecoterms that are predominantly monosemic across the compared languages.

Examples of direct translation and calquing include:

Source Language (SL) Term	Uzbek Equivalent (TL)	Russian Equivalent (TL)	Technique
<i>emission</i>	Emissiya (chiqindi)	эмиссия (от выброс)	Literal/Calque
<i>stabilization</i>	barqarorlashtirish	стабилизация	Literal
<i>ecotoxicology</i>	ekotoksikologiya	экотоксикология	Literal
<i>green zone</i>	yashil zona	зеленая зона	Literal/Calque
<i>greenhouse effect</i>	issiqxona effekti	парниковый эффект	Literal/Calque

At the word level, **transliteration** according to traditional rules is common, although transcription is used less frequently, often due to concerns about the phonetic awkwardness.



Challenges arise when transferring cultural or historical elements, leading to **lacunae in the micro-terminological field**. For instance, specialized terms referring to the fauna and flora of tropical marine ecosystems require adjustment based on the target Russian audience (e.g., the community of divers), leading to the development of hundreds of equivalent hyponyms. In such contexts, while English names are often highly figurative (*Forktail rabbitfish*), the Uzbek and Russian equivalents are often calques from Latin (e.g., *Kumush sigan* - *Серебристый сиган* - *Siganus argenteus*) or descriptive metaphorical compounds (*zog'ora baliq*, *рыбы-понузгау*). For the identification of biological objects, it is recommended to supplement common English with the **Latin name in parentheses**.

Semantic Transformations: Secondary Nomination and Figurative Language. At the phrase level, some compound ecoterms are created through **secondary nomination**, representing a re-evaluation of European cultural realities. A notable example is the transference of the concept of struggle into ecoterms, such as *meeting the environmental challenge* - *ekologik muammoga duch kelish* - *перед экологическим вызовом*.

Another technique observed is **additional explication** (descriptive translation) when a direct equivalent is lacking or inadequate. For example, the English neologism *relocalization* (referring to local food/energy provision) must be conveyed in Uzbek and Russian using explication, such as *barcha zarur narsalarni joylarda ishlab chiqarishga qaytarish* - *возврат к производству всего необходимого на местах* (return to local production of everything necessary), as a literal translation is unacceptable.

Ecoterms in Political Discourse. When ecoterms enter political discourse, they are popularized and perform nominative, cognitive, pragmatic, and communicative functions. In this sphere, they often undergo functional-semantic transformations, acquiring **extended or figurative meanings**.

1. **Metaphor and Contextual Substitution:** Political discourse often employs metaphors requiring contextual substitution in translation. For instance, referring to a politician as *Green belt* necessitates an adequate conceptual shift in Uzbek/Russian, such as *ekologik harakat vakili* - *представитель экологического движения* (representative of the ecological movement named green belt), as a literal translation is impossible.

2. **Emotional and Expressive Functions:** Ecoterms used in political commentary frequently assume an enhanced **emotional-expressive function**. Ecoterms used in political commentary frequently acquire an enhanced "*emotional and expressive function*", extending beyond their primary terminological meaning. In English political discourse, ecological vocabulary is often employed metaphorically to convey evaluation, irony, or criticism. For example, the term "*recycling*" is used metaphorically in discussions of cabinet reshuffles or political appointments to describe the repeated return of the same political figures to positions of power. This usage involves a **metonymic transfer** that activates the semantic component of "*re-use*" or "*repetition*", often expressing public dissatisfaction or irony toward political stagnation (e.g., "The government once again resorted to political recycling rather than real reform"). Similarly, ecologically motivated metaphors such as *to bury a project* or *to put an environmental initiative to rest* are frequently employed to indicate the definitive termination of controversial infrastructure



or environmentally harmful projects (e.g., “The airport expansion plan was finally buried after years of public opposition”). When translating such expressions, the translator must ensure that both the *evaluative meaning* and the *emotional coloring* of the source text are preserved or appropriately neutralized in the target language, depending on genre and audience. In many cases, the irony or sarcasm embedded in the source-language metaphor requires *stylistic adaptation* in translation. Overly literal rendering may distort the pragmatic effect, while excessive neutralization may result in the loss of expressive force. Therefore, the translator’s task is to balance semantic accuracy with pragmatic and stylistic adequacy in the target text.

3. **Contextual Ambiguity** (e.g., *iconic, flagship, emblematic*)

Highly frequent evaluative adjectives in English ecological and political discourse, such as *iconic, flagship, or emblematic*, pose significant challenges in translation due to their semantic breadth and contextual ambiguity. These terms do not have a single fixed equivalent and may express symbolic value, representativeness, political importance, or public visibility depending on the communicative context. As a result, translators into Russian often face difficulties in selecting an adequate and stylistically appropriate equivalent.

In English source texts, such expressions are commonly rendered using a range of context-dependent substitutes, including *a prime example, a high-profile project, a landmark case, a symbolic initiative, a representative case, or a significant development*. For instance, the phrase *an iconic environmental project* may emphasize public recognition and symbolic status, whereas a *flagship sustainability initiative* foregrounds political visibility and institutional support.

In contemporary Uzbek and Russian ecological and political texts, translators frequently employ the word *shonli - знаковый* to convey the notion of relevance or prominence within a broader socio-political framework. Alternatively, more established equivalents such as *ramziy - символический* or *shonli - значимый* are used when the emphasis lies on symbolic meaning or measurable importance. The final choice of translation is determined by genre conventions, target audience expectations, and the intended evaluative force of the source expression, highlighting the crucial role of contextual interpretation in resolving translational ambiguity.

Discussion and Conclusion

The translation of ecoterms in varying contexts plays a crucial role not only in enriching the target language but also in developing its semantic processes, including resemantization, semantic transfers, and deamplification. Extralinguistic factors, such as the need for rapid communication during high-level meetings or congresses, often constrain the choice of translation methods.

A significant finding is the process of resemantization, where a neutral, generally used word or expression gains the status of an ecoterm within a specific environmental context, sometimes leading to the loss or deactualization of its initial meaning. This secondary nomination, especially when used in a figurative sense, lends the text greater emotional intensity and energy, often relying on metonymic or metaphorical transfer.



The primary translation methods identified for English ecoterms into Uzbek, Russian include **literal translation, calquing, descriptive translation, additional explication, and synonymic translation**. The translator must ultimately move away from strict literalism and focus on finding the most adequate unit accepted within the specific genre of the target text.

References:

1. Newmark, P. (1981). «Approaches to translation». Oxford: Pergamon Press.
2. Nida, E. A. (1991). «Language, culture, and translating». Shanghai: Foreign Languages Press.
3. Авдоница, М. Ю., Жабо, Н. И., Терехова, С. Ю., & Валеева, Н. Г. (2016). «Терминосистемы экологического дискурса в английском, французском и русском языках: полипарадигмальный подход к исследованию, переводу и обучению». Москва: РУДН.
4. Бархударов, Л. С. (1975). «Язык и перевод». Москва: Международные отношения.
5. Влахов, С., & Флорин, С. (2009). «Непереводимое в переводе». Москва: Р. Валент.
6. Комиссаров, В. Н. (2004). «Теория перевода». Москва: Высшая школа. (Оригинальная работа опубликована в 1980)
7. Муравьев, В. Л. (1969). «Перевод как проблема стилистики». Москва: Наука.
8. Рецкер, Я. И. (2004). «Теория перевода и переводческая практика». Москва: Р. Валент.
9. Терехова, С. Ю. (2014b). «Основы переводческой деятельности». Москва: Флинта.
10. Цатурова, И. А., & Каширина, О. А. (2008). «Теория и практика перевода». Москва: Академия.