



PRAGMATIC REFRAMING AND LANGUAGE DOMINANCE IN ENGLISH-TO-RUSSIAN AND ENGLISH-TO-UZBEK NEWS TRANSLATION

Erkinjon Kamilovich Satibaldiyev

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

e.satibaldiyev@uzswlu.uz

Abstract

This paper examines how English-language news framing is pragmatically recast for Russian and Uzbek readers. Using three Reuters items in technology, finance, and climate reporting, it compares the headline and lead sentence with Russian and Uzbek renderings prepared for controlled analysis. The comparison tracks agency, compressed terminology, evaluative tone, and information density. Across the sample, Russian tends to preserve more of the compact analytical code typical of English-language news writing, while Uzbek more often expands shorthand and clarifies policy or financial terms at first mention. These shifts show how plurilingual mediation works under unequal language prestige: English supplies the first frame, Russian often negotiates through compression, and Uzbek more often negotiates through explicitation. Because the corpus is small, the pattern should be read cautiously.

Keywords: News translation, pragmatics, plurilingualism, language dominance, Russian, Uzbek.

Introduction

International news does not cross languages as a sealed package. Before a report reaches another readership, editors shorten, reshape, and sometimes redirect it. Studies of news translation describe this process through terms such as rewriting, transediting, and gatekeeping rather than through narrow sentence-by-sentence equivalence (Bielsa & Bassnett, 2009; Schäffner, 2012; Valdeón, 2022). This perspective becomes especially useful in a plurilingual setting, where languages do not enter the exchange with equal symbolic weight. English often provides the first



formulation of global technology, finance, and climate news. Russian and Uzbek then receive not only information, but also a ready-made angle.

The present paper focuses on that second stage. It asks how the same English-source media material is pragmatically reframed for Russian and Uzbek audiences, and what those reframings reveal about language dominance inside regional media circulation. Following Cenoz (2013), plurilingualism is treated here as a condition in which several languages participate in meaning-making, but not from symmetrical positions. Following Munday (2012), translator choice is approached as visible evaluation rather than mechanical transfer. The argument is modest. I do not claim that every Russian version will always be more compressed, or that every Uzbek version will always be more explicit. The claim is narrower: in the selected corpus, the strongest recurring shifts concern agency, terminology, and density.

Method and Material

The corpus contains three Reuters items from technology, finance, and climate reporting (Reuters, 2023, 2024a, 2024b). From each item, two units were selected: the headline and the lead sentence. These units were rendered into Russian and Uzbek for controlled comparison. The target versions are analytical translations prepared for this study, not quotations from a single newsroom. This limits claims about institutional style, but helps isolate the pressure created by the source text itself.

Four variables guided the comparison. First, I traced whether agency remained implicit or became attached to a named actor. Second, I examined how compressed terminology was managed, especially in finance and policy discourse. Third, I noted whether evaluative coloring was preserved, softened, or replaced. Fourth, I compared information density: whether the target line remained compact or expanded for intelligibility. Because the corpus is small, the method is qualitative and exploratory. It is designed to identify stable tendencies, not to generate statistical proof.

Analysis and Discussion

The technology item shows the first tendency with unusual clarity. The English headline, “ChatGPT comes to iPhone,” frames the event as arrival and keeps the sentence light, almost conversational (Reuters, 2024a). A Russian rendering such as “Apple внедряет ChatGPT в iPhone” shifts the focus from arrival to corporate action. An Uzbek rendering such as *Apple iPhone tizimiga ChatGPT funksiyasini



kiritmoqda* moves one step further and explains what exactly is entering the device. The English line sells novelty. The Russian line foregrounds integration. The Uzbek line gives the reader a slightly fuller interpretive key. This is not a lexical accident. It is a pragmatic recalibration of what the reader is expected to infer without assistance. The financial item creates a different kind of pressure. Reuters writes that the Fed was “seen nearly as likely to cut rates by 50 bps as 25 bps” (Reuters, 2024b). English financial journalism tolerates dense probability language and technical shorthand because its readers are trained to process it quickly. Russian business discourse can preserve much of that density with forms such as “вероятность снижения ставки на 50 б.п. почти сравнялась с 25 б.п.” Uzbek resists this compression more strongly. A natural version tends to expand both the measure and the evaluative frame: *stavkani 50 yoki 25 bazis punktga pasaytirish ehtimoli deyarli teng deb baholanmoqda*. The Uzbek line is longer, but the added length carries meaning that English hides inside a compact formula.

The climate item demonstrates why metaphor and policy jargon often travel together. Reuters described the summit as “forced into overtime” while debates over a “fossil fuel phase-out” remained unresolved (Reuters, 2023). The sports metaphor works in English because it dramatizes diplomatic delay without much explanation. In Russian and Uzbek, literal transfer sounds strained. Both target versions therefore tend to neutralize the metaphor: negotiations run beyond schedule, or the summit extends longer than planned. The policy term also behaves unevenly. Russian can rely on a relatively established formula, *поэтапный отказ от ископаемого топлива*. Uzbek usually requires fuller unpacking, for example *qazilma yoqilg‘idan bosqichma-bosqich voz kechish*. Again, the difference is not stylistic decoration. It reflects different thresholds of acceptable opacity.

Across the three cases, one pattern repeats. Russian more readily keeps the compressed analytical rhythm associated with English-source news. Uzbek more often explicates institutional shorthand, abstract probability, or policy wording that would otherwise remain under-specified. This observation fits the view of news translation as transediting, where transfer already includes editorial reframing (Schäffner, 2012), and it also supports Valdeón’s (2022) argument that translation functions as a first-level gatekeeping mechanism. I still interpret the pattern cautiously. Some of the difference may come from genre convention, some from audience design, and some from the study’s own analytical choices.



Language dominance appears here not as an abstract slogan, but as a textual sequence. English produces the initial framing of the event. Russian often negotiates with that framing by preserving speed and compression. Uzbek more often negotiates by explanation, selective domestication, and reduced tolerance for opaque shorthand. In practical terms, this means that equivalence in media translation is less about lexical mirroring than about controlling what the target reader can process quickly without losing the point. The price of keeping English compactness too closely in Uzbek is not elegance; it is delayed comprehension.

Conclusion

This paper argued that pragmatic equivalence in English-to-Russian and English-to-Uzbek news translation is achieved through controlled divergence rather than strict formal similarity. In the small corpus examined here, Russian generally remained closer to the compressed code of the English source, whereas Uzbek more often expanded key terms and restored interpretive support. The result matters for the study of plurilingual media circulation because it shows how language dominance operates inside very small textual decisions: who becomes the actor, which term is shortened, and how much background the sentence assumes.

Two practical implications follow. Translators working for Uzbek readerships should treat Anglophone institutional shorthand with caution, especially in finance and climate reporting. Translators working for Russian readerships should be equally alert to the ideological effect of compactness, because dense lines can conceal a strong editorial angle behind a neutral surface. The limitation remains clear: three news items are enough to reveal a pattern, but not enough to close the argument. The next step should be a broader aligned corpus that compares published English, Russian, and Uzbek versions across multiple outlets and time periods.

References

1. Bielsa, E., & Bassnett, S. (2009). *Translation in global news*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203890011>
2. Cenoz, J. (2013). Defining multilingualism. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 33, 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719051300007X>
3. Munday, J. (2012). *Evaluation in translation: Critical points of translator decision-making*. Routledge.



4. Reuters. (2023, December 12). COP28 forced into overtime as fossil fuel phase-out divides nations. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/climate-energy/cop28-presidency-wants-historic-mention-fossil-fuels-text-up-nations-2023-12-12/>
5. Reuters. (2024a, June 10). Apple WWDC 2024: ChatGPT comes to iPhone. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/technology/ai-is-sole-focus-apples-annual-conference-2024-06-10/>
6. Reuters. (2024b, September 13). Fed seen nearly as likely to cut rates by 50 bps as 25 bps. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/markets/rates-bonds/fed-seen-nearly-likely-cut-rates-by-50-bps-25-bps-2024-09-13/>
7. Schäffner, C. (2012). Rethinking transediting. *Meta*, 57(4), 866-883. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1021222ar>
8. Valdeón, R. A. (2022). Gatekeeping, ideological affinity and journalistic translation. *Journalism*, 23(1), 117-133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884920917296>