

# Translation of Neologisms in Global Communication

*Abiyatova Muslima Maratovna*<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** This article examines the complex and multifaceted process of translating neologisms across linguistic and cultural boundaries, with a particular focus on English-Uzbek and English-Russian examples. This article examines the complex and multifaceted process of translating neologisms across linguistic and cultural boundaries, with a particular focus on English-Uzbek and English-Russian examples. The research identifies twelve major categories of neologisms, including old words with new meanings, new coinages, derived words, abbreviations, collocations, eponyms, phrasal words, transferred words, acronyms, and pseudo-neologisms, and examines the various translation strategies that can be used. It provides this issue by drawing on theoretical insights from translation studies as well as real-world examples. When deciding between transference, functional equivalents, and creative reformation, the essay emphasizes the significance of context, audience, and linguistic structure. In the end, it makes the case for an appropriate and knowledgeable method of translating neologisms that takes into consideration both cultural relevance and semantic integrity.

**Keywords:** neologisms, cross-cultural communication, translation strategies, Newmark's classification, abbreviations, derived words, collocations.

**Introduction.** In a time of rapid technological development and worldwide connection, language is changing at an unprecedented pace. The rise of neologisms newly created words or idioms that reflect innovative ideas, technologies, or changes in society attitudes is one of the most noticeable aspects of this progression. Neologisms address translators with a linguistic difficulty as well as a creative opportunity. Their translation is a culturally and practically sensitive undertaking rather than just a linguistic one. The difficulties of translating neologisms are examined in this article, with a focus on linguistic exchanges between English, Uzbek, and Russian. It seeks to clarify the essence of neologisms, categorize their primary forms, and offer guidance on efficient translation techniques. Because neologisms are useful for documenting cultural and technical changes, their study has attracted a lot of attention in linguistic and translation studies. Neologisms are dynamic and context-dependent, according to scholars like Peter Newmark and Jean Delisle, who also point out that translating them frequently calls for both originality and faithfulness to meaning. This article uses the twelve categories of neologisms identified by Newmark. These include, among other things, pseudo-neologisms, new coinages, and ancient terms with new meanings. According to Newmark, new approaches to managing lexical innovations in the target language are required due to the quick growth of vocabularies in many sectors, including science, technology, media, and social studies [9; 140 p].

The accepted frameworks that affect how translators deal with new lexical units have also been highlighted by Gideon Toury and Andrew Chesterman, who contend that cultural norms and expectations govern the acceptability of particular translations. In addition to offering contextualized strategies like transference, functional equivalence, paraphrase, and lexical invention, Mona Baker provides into detail about equivalency strategies for translating new terminology. Yoqubov and Sorokina are two examples of studies conducted in Uzbek and Russian translation contexts that indicate particular difficulties in translating Western neologisms into languages with dissimilar morphological and cultural systems. Their research offers empirical support for the modifications required to introduce new ideas while preserving authenticity and clarity. The practical analysis that follows in this study is based on these theoretical foundations.

<sup>1</sup> Student of the Faculty of English Philology and Translation Studies, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages  
muslimaabiyatova6@gmail.com



**Literature review and Methodology.** This study employs a descriptive-analytical approach to examine the translation of neologisms from English into Uzbek and Russian. The methodology consists of categorizing neologisms based on Newmark's (1988) framework and analyzing real-world examples drawn from media, academic literature, advertisements, and technical manuals. To begin, a neologism is defined as a newly coined lexical unit or an existing word that has acquired a novel meaning [9; 212 p]. Etymologically, the term 'neologism' derives from the Greek "*neos*" (new) and "*logos*" (word). Historically, neologisms have appeared whenever civilizations encounter new technologies, ideologies, or cultural practices. The Industrial Revolution, the rise of mass media, and the digital age have each contributed thousands of new terms to various languages.

This study traces such changes using examples like "*byte*", "*cyberspace*", "*crowdsourcing*" and their equivalents or lack thereof in Uzbek and Russian. By examining both direct translations and adapted neologisms, we assess how new lexical items enter and function within target cultures.

**Results and Discussion.** The practical challenges of translating neologisms are diverse and depend heavily on the linguistic structure, cultural context, and intended audience of the target language. Based on Newmark's twelve categories, this section explores selected examples and offers solutions from English to Uzbek and Russian [2; 58 p].

1. **Old Words with New Senses:** The English word "*gay*" originally meant "happy" but has acquired a new sense referring to homosexuality. In Russian, it is often transliterated as "*гей*" (gey), while in Uzbek, it may be paraphrased to "*gomoseksual*". Similarly, "*mouse*" as a computer tool is translated as "*мышь*" (mysh) in Russian and "*sichqoncha*" in Uzbek, preserving the original metaphor.

2. **New Coinages:** It is a well known hypothesis that there is no such thing as a brand new word; if a word does not derive from various morphemes then it is more or less phonaesthetic or synacsthetic. All sounds or phonemes are phonaesthetic, have some kind of meaning. Nevertheless the etymology of many words, in particular dialect words, is not known and can hardly be related to meaningful sounds. Terms like "*blog*" and "*selfie*" entered the language abruptly. Russian uses "*блог*" and "*селфи*", while Uzbek translations include "*blog*" and "*selfi*". These are often transferred directly due to global media influence.

3. **Derived Words:** The great majority of neologisms are words derived by analogy from ancient Greek (increasingly) and Latin morphemes usually with suffixes such as *-ismo*, *-ismus*, *-ija*, etc., naturalised in the appropriate language. In some countries (e.g., pre-War Germany, Arabic-speaking countries) this process has been combatted and through-translation by way of the TL morphemes has been preferred (e.g., television - *Fernsehen*). However, now that this word-forming procedure is employed mainly to designate (non-cultural) scientific and technological rather than cultural institutional terms, the advance of these internationalisms is widespread. Normally, they have naturalised suffixes. Scientific neologisms like "*biotechnology*" and "*nanotechnology*" are translated into Russian as "*биотехнология*", "*нанотехнология*" and into Uzbek as "*biotexnologiya*", "*nanotexnologiya*". Their structure is preserved through morphological adaptation.

4. **Abbreviations:** Abbreviation, or shortening a word, is one of the most noticeable features of the English language, and it is used both in formal and informal registers. Based on the level of their usage, abbreviations can be divided into three groups:

- Graphical abbreviations, used only in writing, and, therefore, pronounced and translated in its full form. These abbreviations are widely employed in faxes: e.g., agst = against, f/b = feedback, ETA = expected date of arrival, ETD = expected date of departure, etc. However, though rarely, some of these abbreviations enter the common stock of vocabulary and, pronounced in a shortened way, they become new words of the language: asap = as soon as possible, AGAP = As Gorgeous As Possible.
- Phonetic abbreviations, or a non-standard way of writing some common words based on their pronunciation; typical of advertising. For example, u = you, thru = through. Of the same type is the word OK (all correct). Normally, in translation this type of abbreviation is lost.



- Lexical abbreviations, including initialisms, spoken as individual letters (*BBC, MP, USA*); acronyms, pronounced as single words (*NATO, UNESCO, AIDS*; *WAP = Wireless Application Protocol*); clippings, or parts of words which serve for the whole (*ad, phone, sci-fi = science fiction*; *m-commerce = mobile-commerce, business conducted over a mobile telephone system*; *e-bucks = electronic money*); blends, or words made out of the shortened forms of two other words (*brunch = breakfast + lunch, smog = smoke + fog, Eurovision = Europe + television*; *anetsitized = anesthetized + net + sit = numb from spending many consecutive hours on the Internet*) [11; 161 p].

**5. Collocations:** The significance of collocations can also be attributed to the challenges they pose in translation. Differences of collocation surface structure, misinterpreting the meaning of a source-language collocation, the tension between accuracy and acceptability of source language (SL) and target language (TL) collocations, and culture-specific collocations are but some issues that a translator may encounter [3; 65 p]. The presupposition that exact equivalence or synonymy in two languages, or in the same language, does not exist [7; 16 p]. Therefore, the role of a translator becomes harder to choose the most comparable expression which suits a certain context. From this perspective collocations may offer translators a significant tool to bridge the gap between source text (ST) and target text (TT). The difficulties of collocation have been stated by many translation scholars or linguists although there has not been an agreement on specific problem-laden categories. Collocations may be subdivided into two major categories: (1) free word combinations (2) fixed expressions and idioms [3; 67 p]. These may “consist of lexical items that enter mainly into high-frequency grammatical structures”; or may be concurrently grammatical and lexical in nature. Furthermore, Ghazala classifies collocations into 17 grammatical and lexical types. The BBI Combinatory Dictionary excludes free combinations, whereas the Oxford Dictionary of Current Idiomatic English includes such combinations as a category within a four-point scale of collocations (i.e., open collocations, restricted collocations, figurative idioms, and pure idioms). Collocations were also classified into 13 types in the Oxford Collocations Dictionary ranging between weak collocations through medium strength to the strongest and most restricted [1; 15 p]. New collocations like “acid rain” or “cold calling” pose unique issues. “*Acid rain*” is translated as “*кислотный дождь*” in Russian and “*kislotali yomg‘ir*” in Uzbek. “*Cold calling*” may be translated as “*холодные звонки*” or “*kutilmagan qo‘ng‘iroq*”.

**6. Phrasal Words:** English favors phrasal formations like “*sit-in*” (сидячая забастовка, o‘tirish noroziligi) or “*check-out*”. Their translation requires contextual understanding and sometimes expansion.

**7. Transferred Words:** Terms like “*kung fu*” or “*sari*” are usually transferred and explained. In Uzbek and Russian, they are often borrowed directly due to their cultural specificity.

**8. Acronyms:** Acronyms like UNESCO or OPEC are internationalisms and are used as-is in both Uzbek and Russian. However, others like NATO are sometimes localized (e.g., Североатлантический альянс). These examples demonstrate that translating neologisms demands a flexible approach that balances linguistic fidelity with cultural sensitivity. Strategies include direct transfer, calques, descriptive phrases, and creation of new equivalents, each applied based on context and audience literacy.

**Conclusion.** The translation of neologisms is still one of the most dynamic and complex areas of modern translation practice. As languages adapt to new realities, translators must not only bridge lexical gaps but also promote cultural understanding. This study demonstrated the validity of diverse techniques based on context and intent by studying various sorts of neologisms ranging from phrasal words to acronyms and providing Uzbek and Russian counterparts. While internationalisms provide some solutions, many neologisms necessitate descriptive or imaginative translations that consider both form and meaning. Finally, good translation of neologisms guarantees that new ideas are disseminated across linguistic boundaries without corruption or loss of context.



## References:

1. Al-Jaradi, M. (2015). *Translation of Collocation: Problems and Issues*. Sana'a University. (pp. 1–15).
2. Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge. (pp. 58–65).
3. Baker, M. (2011). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge. (pp. 58–67).
4. Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1986b). *The BBI Combinatory Dictionary of English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (pp. x–xxiv).
5. Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (pp. 63–76).
6. Delisle, J. (1999). *Translation Terminology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (pp. 35–49).
7. Enani, M. (1994). *Translation: Theory and Practice*. Cairo: GEBO. (pp. 15–16).
8. Ghazala, H. (2007). *Translation as Problems and Solutions* (2nd ed.). Syria: Dar Al-Kalem. (pp. 10–15).
9. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall. (pp. 140–212).
10. Oxford Collocations Dictionary. (2002). *Oxford Collocations Dictionary for Students of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (pp. ix–xii).
11. Proshina, Z. G. (2008). *Theory of Translation (English-Russian)*. Vladivostok: Far Eastern Federal University Press. (pp. 109–135).
12. Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (pp. 31–45).

