

POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN TRANSLATION.**Mamatkulova Saida Shukurjonovna**

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

PhD, Associate professor

+998 99 907 88 07

Sarsenova Ulbosin Bazarbay Qizi

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Master's degree student

+998 99 555 26 29

Abstract: This paper explores the theoretical framework of political discourse and the intricate responsibilities associated with its translation. Drawing on historical perspectives from Aristotle to contemporary scholars like Teun van Dijk, A.N. Baranov, and E.G. Kazakevich, political discourse is analyzed as a multi-layered, structured system deeply intertwined with power dynamics, societal expectations, and language manipulation. The study highlights that political communication operates on both institutional (state) and individual levels, driven by five interconnected functions: persuasive, informative, suggestive, expressive, and communicative. Furthermore, the paper categorizes political genres into oral (e.g., agitational, parliamentary, and ceremonial oratory) and written forms (e.g., policy documents and manifestos), detailing their distinct stylistic markers. Within translation theory, the paper examines the critical distinction between equivalence and functional-communicative adequacy, as discussed by V.N. Komissarov, N.K. Garbovsky, and Eugene Nida. It concludes that achieving adequate political translation transcends simple word-for-word matching; it demands that the translator act as an active participant capable of decoding cultural and ideological "ciphers" to preserve the original persuasive strength, hidden manipulation, and political reality across linguistic and cultural boundaries.

Keywords: Political discourse, translation theory, functional-communicative adequacy, linguistic equivalence, political rhetoric, language manipulation, persuasive function, genres of political speech.

Today, political discourse has become a key topic across many academic fields, drawing interest from both linguists and translation theorists. The close link between language and political action is not new; it has existed throughout history. Aristotle highlighted this in his work *Politics*, where he connected political agency to language, saying that "man is by nature a political animal" (greek *zoon politikon*) because humans alone have the gift of speech. From my perspective, this ancient definition remains relevant today, as it demonstrates that politics fundamentally relies on communication. In contemporary contexts, a politician's influence is often assessed by their command of language.

Looking at political communication through the lens of discourse allows for a thorough analysis that connects language with real-world social situations. Studying political rhetoric is especially important because political thinking and actions are deeply rooted in language. In politics, words and actions influence each other: language helps explain and define events as political facts, while actions give meaning to those words. As a result, political discourse is seen

not just as a way to describe things, but as a key tool for planning, carrying out, and monitoring political actions. Moreover, the link between words and actions is the main challenge for translators. If a translator changes the words, they might also change the political fact itself. This highlights how much responsibility translators have in their work.

Scholars often describe political discourse as complex and made up of many different types of communication. For example, A. N. Baranov and E. G. Kazakevich define political discourse as all the speech acts that happen during political discussions, shaped by long-standing traditions and proven rules of public policy. This definition shows that political discourse is more than just a group of speeches. It is a structured system shaped by established norms and historical examples. By focusing on these “proven rules,” the authors explain how political communication keeps its authority and legitimacy in public policy. I think this structured system of “proven rules” works like a frame. It restricts what politicians can say and how they say it, making sure their words fit within what society expects.

Political discourse, in its broadest sense, refers to the communication produced by mass media and various social institutions in society. Christel de Landtsheer, in *Political Rhetoric of a United Europe*, explains that this view includes both formal institutions and informal ways people interact. In this approach, politics is analyzed on two levels. These two levels, the state and the personal, are always interacting. Politicians use mass media to reach voters directly, so studying manipulation strategies at both levels is a key focus of this research.

On a broad scale, politics involves actions aimed at distributing power and resources within countries or internationally. On a personal level, politics becomes an internal process, shaping how people understand political reality. This second level looks at how political identity influences personal and professional relationships, and shapes how people interpret literature and art. We believe this two-level structure is key to understanding manipulation. Power is spread out on a large scale, but it is at the individual level where language manipulation really takes hold and shapes what people believe.

The Dutch linguist Teun van Dijk offers a narrower view, describing political discourse as a specific type of language with its own vocabulary and clear boundaries. He argues that to study political discourse seriously, researchers need to connect its features to how political systems work and how people think about politics. This suggests that political discourse is more than just language; it is also a way of thinking. For our research, it is important to recognize that any effort to influence others must fit with how the audience already thinks to work well.

In this approach, the meaning and structure of political language depend on the interactive context created by the people involved. Participants shape this context using their knowledge, political views, and beliefs. Here, political discourse mainly refers to official forms like laws, party statements, inaugural speeches, and government announcements. These types of communication follow set rules and use familiar ways of speaking.

Political discourse aims to have an impact on its audience by serving several connected purposes:

- **Persuasive Function:** Using spoken or written arguments to change what people believe, which can lead them to act in certain ways or choose not to act.
- **Informative Function:** Sharing facts and explanations about political events with the audience.
- **Suggestive Function:** Subtly influencing people to accept certain ideas or goals, while making them feel they are deciding freely.
- **Expressive Function:** Showing the speaker’s emotions to create a similar emotional or intellectual reaction in the audience.

- Communicative Function: Making sure the message is clear and direct, so there is little confusion between the speaker and the audience.

The suggestive and persuasive functions are most important. These are the main ways language can be used to manipulate, as speakers often hide their real intentions behind information that appears objective. Politics relies heavily on language, and it can also be seen as its own unique way of communicating and using signs. The language used in politics is a core part of a society's political culture and acts as its main code for meaning. This language helps people understand the structures and ideas that shape every part of political life. As a result, the translator must figure out this cultural and political "cipher" and express it in another language while keeping the original power dynamics and manipulative intent.

Political language holds political society together. It keeps information moving and provides a set of signs that shape political conversations. According to resources like the Election Campaign Dictionary, political language is a complex system of tools used to share political information, encourage social action, and manage political activities. Political language uses both specialized terms and everyday words. These are combined in different ways to express ideas and interests. Politically, language brings together ethical, ideological, economic, and social aspects into one way of communicating.

Researchers in political communication classify types of political discourse using different systems, mainly based on how information is shared. Using this approach, political genres are divided into oral and written forms:

- Oral genres include speeches at rallies, reports in parliament, discussions between people, televised debates, and interviews.
- Written genres cover party manifestos, ideological pamphlets, analytical articles in the press, official correspondence, and specialized media kits.

The structure and style of spoken political discourse depend on the situation and the speaker's goals. Within this area, three main types of public speaking can be identified:

- Agitational Oratory includes pre-election speeches, candidate endorsements, and statements of support or opposition to certain policies. These speeches are expressive, persuasive, and easy to remember. They use simple slogans and everyday language, mixed with some formal elements, to connect with a wide audience.
- Parliamentary and Legislative Discourse covers discussions in legislative bodies about bills, procedures, and voting results. Unlike agitational speeches, this type of speech requires careful language, brevity, and the use of legal and economic terms. Another important difference from speeches at rallies is the inappropriateness of colloquial and slang language units. The persuasiveness of speeches of this kind is achieved through the use of emotionally charged literary vocabulary, logical completeness of speech, and expressive syntactic structure.
- Ceremonial and Epideictic Oratory includes formal announcements, welcome speeches, and official responses at state events. The language used should match the importance of the occasion and the status of those involved. As a result, these speeches use formal and literary words to create a sense of seriousness and respect.

At the same time, written genres such as policy documents and presidential speeches act as lasting records of political ideas. E.I. Sheigal notes that political communication centers on three main issues: how public resources are distributed, the legitimacy of decision-making bodies (like courts, legislatures, and executives), and how sanctions such as rewards and punishments are applied. Written political texts, especially those shared through mass media, are key in shaping and maintaining these important debates.

Written political texts often use specialized political terms and a formal, elevated style. Writers include words from Latin and French, especially in books and analytical works, to create a conservative and prestigious tone. These texts are also packed with information, so abbreviations and acronyms are common. Some of these are internationally recognized, while others depend on the context. Intertextuality is important too, as writers use exact citations, authoritative quotes, and, in digital formats, hyperlinks to support their sources and strengthen credibility.

Non-journalistic political texts, like official reports and executive summaries, often use plain or even dull language filled with common phrases and general statements. Writers achieve this abstract style by choosing words with broad meanings. To make their writing more persuasive and less neutral, they use various advanced grammar and sentence structures. These include exclamations, rhetorical questions, inverted word order, parallel sentence structures, and repeating similar sentence parts to strengthen their arguments.

In modern translation studies, adequacy and equivalence are key concepts used to evaluate translation quality. Western linguistic traditions often mix these terms because of their similar origins, but Russian translation theory, especially in the work of V. N. Komissarov, clearly separates them and sees them as related but different ideas.

In this framework, equivalence means matching meaning at the level of specific words or phrases. Adequacy, on the other hand, is a broader idea that focuses on how well the translation works in practice, making sure the source and target texts communicate effectively. While some level of equivalence is needed for adequacy, a perfect word-for-word match does not always lead to a good translation. In some cases, being too exact can actually get in the way of clear communication.

According to N. K. Garbovsky, the idea of adequacy comes from cognitive theory, where it means accurately reflecting reality in our thoughts and judgments. In translation, adequacy means meeting the expectations of those involved in communication and carefully keeping the author's intended message. So, a translation is considered adequate not because it matches the original word for word, but because the translator successfully achieves the intended purpose.

An important part of this study is functional-communicative adequacy, which means accurately reproducing the main purpose of the original text. This purpose comes from the author's intent and aims to create a certain effect, while also fitting the cultural and genre rules of the original. This level of accuracy is especially important in texts with strict genre rules, like political or official documents. This approach matches Eugene Nida's main standards for translation quality: effective communication, clear delivery of the author's intent, and getting a similar reaction from the new audience.

In summary, adequacy and equivalence are the two main foundations for successful political translation. Equivalence ensures the languages align, but functional-communicative adequacy is the key standard for judging political translations. In political communication, where language is closely linked to power and shaping public opinion, simply swapping words is not enough.

Our analysis shows that achieving adequacy in political translation is complex and involves more than just matching meanings. Translators need to fully understand the author's intent and the effect the message is meant to have on the original audience. In this field, a translation is adequate if it keeps the ideological impact and persuasive strength of the original. If a translator matches the words but misses the hidden messages or the power of a political slogan, the translation is not adequate in practice.

The views of scholars like V.N. Komissarov, Y. Nida, and N.K. Garbovsky highlight an important move from strict rules to a more functional approach in translation studies. This shift is crucial for this dissertation. It lets us see the translator as an active participant who must work

within the set forms of political speech and also adapt to the culture and beliefs of the target audience. Keeping the “suggestive” and “expressive” functions is not just about style; it is necessary to preserve the political facts from the original text.

In conclusion, the theoretical framework in this chapter gives us the tools needed for the next analysis. By setting the boundaries of political discourse and defining what makes a translation adequate, we are ready to study how language is used to influence. The following chapters will use this foundation to look at how power and manipulation are carried over between languages and cultures, making sure the core of political agency stays the same in translation.

REFERENCES

1. Aristotle. Politics. (Classical reference to language and political animal / zoon politikon).
2. Baranov, A. N., & Kazakevich, E. G. (Definitions on political discourse as speech acts and proven rules of public policy).
3. De Landtsheer, C. Political Rhetoric of a United Europe. (Mass media, state, and personal levels of political communication).
4. Garbovsky, N. K. (Theory of adequacy in translation and cognitive reflection of reality).
5. Komissarov, V. N. (Russian translation theory; distinction between equivalence and adequacy).
6. Nida, E. (Standards for translation quality: effective communication and dynamic/functional equivalence).
7. Sheigal, E. I. (Structure of political communication: resources, legitimacy, and sanctions).
8. Van Dijk, T. (Narrow view of political discourse, cognitive and institutional approach to political language).
9. Election Campaign Dictionary. (Lexical systems and terminology tools in political language).