

TRANSLATION PROBLEMS OF DIPLOMATIC TERMS IN POLITICAL TEXTS

Almuratov Asqar Ravshan ugli
Termez State University

Abstract. This study manages the issues connected with the interpretation of political texts in the hypothetical structure expounded by the analysts working in the field of interpretation studies and thinks about the expressed idiosyncrasies of the exceptional language utilized for this text type. Thought of the hypothetical system is trailed by the examination of a particular text spoken then written in English and converted into Hungarian and Romanian. The ends are expected to feature the way that there are no plans for interpreting a political discourse, since interpretation isn't just a specialized process that utilizes interpretation systems and applies move activities, however additionally a question of getting social, verifiable and political circumstances also, their importance.

Keywords: interpretation techniques, political language, political discourse, variation, explicitation.

During the past quarter-century scholars have devoted a great deal of thinking, if not research, to the translation process as such. This part deals with the relationship between language and politics, translation and adaptation. It will present the difficulties of translating political texts and finally, it will discuss in detail one segment of this category of translation: the translation of political speeches. It will mainly underline the practical aspects of this kind of translation. This part consists of three chapters:

1. the general characterization of political language.
2. Translating and adapting political texts.

The problematic nature of translating political speeches. The general characterization of political language Political and diplomatic languages belong to the category of the special languages used in social sciences, and as such are closely linked to the history of political thought. Both – as technical languages – are in close contact with rhetoric, since these special languages can be considered the terminological core of many spoken genres. The scope and intent of political language are different from that of diplomatic language. While the latter is mainly used as the protocol language of official events and ceremonies, the former is adequate for carrying the utterances of historical genres as well (depicting historical events, personages and socially significant phenomena in the history of society, and presenting past representations of recent events whose social significance is recognized by contemporaries).

As such, political language is suitable for recording data and facts (e.g. highlighting important legal and territorial changes and political events in the world, wars, treaties, etc.). The terminology of political language is related to the special language of political philosophy, since this terminology aids the formulation of the most common questions regarding the relationship between the individual and society. However, it is also related to political theory since political terminology is used to formulate the descriptive theories of political phenomena, too (such as social criticism, the principles of justice, law, etc.). It would not have been possible to elaborate state theories without political language, and concepts such as “good government” or “right form of government” could not have been created. The description of political ideas (doctrines, ideologies, and political programs and policy objectives) is also an important domain for the manifestation of political language.

According to the foregoing ideas, political terminology can be considered a secondary discourse arising from the primary discourse, that is, a new discourse in which the primary discourse is alloyed with terminology (Sárosi 2011). Strongly related to the language of politics, the language of diplomacy is also an interesting segment of communication among different states.

This is actually the language of international relations, and its character is closely related to the function it performs in the international arena. Thus, diplomatic language is closely related to the nature of the most important diplomatic tasks. The political representations of different countries generally require the use of two or more languages and therefore the languages used on the scene of diplomacy are in permanent contact thus establishing, out of necessity, a kind of lingua franca of diplomacy. These scenes of diplomacy are: bilateral relations, relations with third countries and international organizations, international forums and non-political events with international impact. Regarding the political issues there is a continuous relationship between the diplomatic delegation and the competent authorities of the receiving state.

The language of these relationships may also take specific forms since, in many cases, the members of the diplomatic delegation do not speak the language of the host country at an appropriate level. In such cases a third language is involved in communication, or an interpreter is used, the latter representing a special form of diplomatic communication. Meetings between the senior leadership or a political delegation of the visiting country and that of the host country – as well as international diplomatic conferences and all the other similar events – require special diplomatic language use, as do the preparation of international agreements, negotiation and the conclusion of treaties. The specialized language of politics and thus of diplomacy in many respects depends on the international actions, habits and the bilaterally agreed solutions.

Problems Related to the Translation of Political Texts. The political texts as specific expressions of the political language. If we want to specify the nature of the terminology of political language, it is useful to examine what constitutes the core of political texts. The scope of a political text can be: persuasion, reasoning, deceit or even hustling, all of which require a specific language use. The purpose of a persuasive speech is to convince the audience to agree with an idea or opinion that the speaker puts forth. One can produce an effective persuasive speech if he/she structures the arguments as the solution to a problem. The first job of the speaker or writer is to convince the audience that a particular problem is important to them, and then they must be convinced by the text that the speaker or writer has the solution for addressing the problem. Persuasive speeches can come in many forms, such as sales pitches, debates and political proceedings.

Persuasive speeches may utilize emotional and/or logical appeals. Factors such as body language, the willingness of the audience, and the environment in which the speech is given, all affect the success of a persuasive speech. Persuasive texts, whether written or spoken, can be considered a process aimed at changing a person's (or a group's) attitude or behaviour. This is a long process. After a person is convinced regarding an issue, it is very difficult to change his/her opinion. This requires a lot of energy. Lacking this energy, persuasion will fail and instead of persuasion we will only talk about adaptation to the expectations, or possibly about superficial acceptance of the argument, that can be considered the initial phase of persuasion (Cialdini 2001). Successful persuasion requires the art of argumentation. A political argument is an instance of logical argument applied to politics.

Political arguments are used by academics, media, candidates for political office and government officials. They may also be used by citizens in everyday interactions to comment on and understand political events. Political arguments are very often circular, repeating the same facts as premises under perhaps slightly different guises. Argumentation should be distinguished from propaganda, in that propaganda has little or no structure or rationality. A specific type of argument is the argument based on probability, which relies on an observation, experience or finding that the majority deems acceptable and true. Probably the most important arguments are those that rely on evidence: facts, statistical data, research results, summary reports, or reference to prestige (Zemplén – Kutrovátz 2012).

If persuasion based on argument does not achieve success, then deceit, misguidance and hustling follow. This means that in order to achieve their aim, the speakers present false data, show bogus statistics and make promises that cannot be kept due to objective circumstances. Politics is saturated with speeches: citizens and politicians speak, journalists and political analysts give speeches and, last but not least, political scientists speak as well (Cacioppo and Petty 1986). Regarding political texts

it can be stated that subsequent readings create new interpretations resulting in the same text gaining new meaning and significance, yet, the most important question remains: what is the texts' meaning? What are they saying to us? To effectively answer this question, one must have a thorough knowledge of political jargon. The discourse of the political sciences appears as professional language. Nevertheless, political speech cannot be considered in isolation from different yet strongly connected political discourses.

The problems related to the linguistic aspects of politics appear the moment when a preliminary idea is formulated about the role of language in politics, and when language becomes a relevant issue from the perspective of political scopes as well. Political terminology has the following functions: – expressive function, meaning that it expresses aims that are rooted in the real sphere of politics; – objective function, meaning that it has an objective reason to influence people's thinking, feelings, and thus their actions; – symbolic function, meaning that thoughts and feelings are expressed by political symbols. According to the symbolic approach, if someone is talking about symbolic politics, then (s)he refers to an individual area of politics that is genuine and separate from real and actual political issues. In habitual language use, symbolic politics means a publicly displayed deception or surrogate action that is used to detract from actual political reality. In this sense symbolic politics is considered to be a surrogate for politics. Symbolic politics differs from substantial policy.

As a policy of signs (terms and slogans, badges, banners and pictures, gestures, ritual acts, and political staging), symbolic politics evolves in a semantic field. Substantial policy, by contrast, consists of a revisable succession of political decisions (e.g., legislation, contracts, taxes, etc.). Symbolic politics and substantial policy can be related to each other. On the one hand, symbolic politics can have an impact on substantial policy, while substantial policy can be communicated, implemented, or averted by symbolic politics (Sarcinelli 1998). If we try to define political jargon from the perspective of language policy, we notice that this conception of language directs attention to the concept of fighting (Szabó 2003).

Assumptions: – politics is primarily a linguistic arena, largely because the political struggles take place in the public space defined by the mass media; – the benefits that are obtainable in this struggle – for example, linking the positive concepts with one's own political group and the negative ones with the opponents – can be directly converted into political gains; – the ground for further political battles will be the preformed political space in which the winners of the symbolic political struggle will be favoured. When approached from the perspective of the rhetoric, the analysis of the structure, tropes, symbols and metaphors used in the political speeches will Problems Related to the Translation of Political Texts 167 become essential. This is so because, presumably, in these political speeches the political objectives and means of

the speaker are expressed – mainly for manipulative intent – and because the ultimate objective of political speech is of course a rhetorical one, i.e. manipulation. The analysis of political speeches, from the perspective of communication theory, comes to a particular prominence parallel to the professionalization of politics.

In political communication, we are broadly interested in the relationship between politics and citizens, and the communication modes that connect these groups to each other. To conclude with, this article describes political language as a category of human behaviour, that is equal with other political actions and that has become – due to the development of communication technologies and mass media – perhaps the most important form of political action. The language use has an entirely instrumental nature, the language itself being both the instrument and object of the actions.

The basic question is how other political actions can be reinforced through the effectiveness of communication. Later, the idea has become prevalent that all political actions are interesting as they play a role in communication.

As a result, it is obvious that the analysis of political communication refers not only to linguistic tools or matters of content but to strategies used to attain a position of power. Proponents of the discursive approach analyze the political language because through this they wish to understand how the political actors shape the world around them.

REFERENCES

1. Zuparova, S., Shegay, A., & Orazova, F. (2020). Approaches to Learning English as the Source of All. *European Journal of Research and Reflection in Educational Sciences*, 8(5).
2. Zuparova, S., Shegay, A. (2021). Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages. *Eastern European Scientific Journal*, 1(7), 141-143.
3. Djurayeva, Y., Ayatov, R., & Shegay, A. (2020). Current Problems and Resolutions of Teaching English Grammar. *Academic research in educational sciences*, 1(3).
4. BAKHRITDINOVICH, R. K. The Approach of Paremiias in Parallel Corpora. *JournalNX*, 6(05), 216-222.
5. Ruziev, K. B. (2020). Proverbs and corpus linguistics. *Актуальные проблемы гуманитарных и естественных наук*, (6), 64-67.
6. Ruziyev, K. (2021). Paremiological units and their differences. *InterConf*.
7. Ruziyev, K. (2021). Etymology of the word and term paremia. *InterConf*.
8. RUZIYEV, X. B., & SIDIKOVA, S. A. K. (2019). Translation problems of proverbs and some special tip for translating from english into uzbek. *Наука среди нас*, (5), 100-105.