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**INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays the English language has become the language of choice for conducting an international business. In addition, the English language has become prominent as the operational language of many law firms and multinational corporations. Thus, interest in studying English special terminology and special translating has recently grown up. In this context, the present course paper reviews general peculiarities of political terms and focuses on linguistic and political aspects of translating English political terminology. Politics plays very important role in a state`s development. It also defines the strategy in relations between countries. Our state is committed to get to the international level that`s why keeping contacts with other countries become more and more important. To understand and represent political interests properly, it`s necessary to have knowledge about translation of political literature, documents, speeches, and etc.

The **topicality** of the work is explained by a number of factors, but mostly by the absence of equivalent terms in the language of translation that emphasizes the necessity of studying this problem properly.

The **aim** of this work is to find out the peculiarities of translation of political terms. The following **tasks** should be completed:

- to review the sources concerning of political literature;

- to reveal the methods of translation of political literature;

- to investigate the ways of achieving equivalence in the process of translation of political terms.

The **object** of the course work is political discourse.

The **subject** of the course work is the peculiarities of English political terminology and its translational abilities,

**Methods** of research: componential analysis, distributional analysis, comparative analysis.

**Theoretical and practical value** of the work are conditioned by the necessity of study of political terminology from the point of view of its classification, as well as understanding its distributive abilities in functional aspect. The material of the work can be useful for the courses of Lexicology and Theory and Practice of translation.

**Methodological base** of the work is formed by the researches in the sphere of political literature and theory of translation by such authors as: M.Baker, C.Schäffner, M.Szabó, P. Newmark, E.Nida, and others.

**The structure of the work**. The course paper consists of the introduction, two chapters, conclusion, and the list of used literature. The introduction outlines the initial components of the work. The first chapter deals with factors presenting the importance of translation in political life. The second chapter analyses the words and word combination constituting political terminology. The conclusion summarizes the results of the work. The list of used literature include the sources used in the process of research.

**CHAPTER I.** **THE IMPORTANCE OF TRANSLATION**

**IN POLITICAL LIFE**

**1.1** **THE POLITICS OF TRANSLATION**

Translation studies is still a relatively young discipline, with roots in (applied) linguistics, comparative literature, and cultural studies. Linguistics-based theories, dominant in the 1950s and 1960s, which saw translation as meaning transfer between languages and cultures, did not explicitly study aspects of politics, ideology, and power. Since the mid-1980s, with the development of descriptive translation studies[[1]](#footnote-1) and, more importantly, with approaches inspired by cultural studies[[2]](#footnote-2), the complexity of the phenomenon of translation has been recognized. The focus is now on social, cultural and communicative practices, on the cultural and ideological significance of translating and of translations, on the external politics of translation, on the relationship between translation behaviour and socio-cultural factors, on social causation and human agency. This also means that questions such as the following are being asked: Who decides which texts get translated, and from and into which languages? Where are the translations produced? Which factors determine the translator’s behaviour? How are translations received? What is the status of translations, of translating, and of translators in the respective cultures and systems? Who chooses and trains translators? How many? For which language combinations? All these questions are related to politics: any decision to encourage, allow, promote, hinder or prevent to translate is a political decision. Translators perform their work in socio-political contexts and environments (cf. G.Toury’s concept of translation event as the social, historical, cultural, ideological, etc. context of situation in which the act of translation, i.e. the cognitive aspects of translation as a decision-making process, is embedded[[3]](#footnote-3)). Studying these contexts in addition to the actual products (i.e. source texts and target texts) allows for deeper insights into translation than focusing solely on the (linguistics features of the) products. In this respect, A.Lefevere’s concept of patronage[[4]](#footnote-4), which he developed in his investigation into the role of power and ideology behind the production of translations (or rewritings, in a wider sense), is of relevance, Patronage has:

(1) an ideological component, which refers to the fact that literature should not be allowed to get too far out of step with the other systems in a given society. This has consequences for the choice of topics and the form of presentation;

(2) an economic component, which refers to the fact that a patron assures the writer’s livelihood by providing payment and similar support;

(3) a status component, which relates to the writer’s position in society.

All three, interrelated, components are political in nature, in that they are linked to power relations in society. A.Lefevere himself analyzed German translations of the Anne Frank diaries that were produced after the end of World War II, and he argued that specific decisions for the German target text were made on the basis of ideological and commercial deliberations (economic constraints of patronage). For example, the original sentence’s reference to ‘no greater enmity in the world than between Germans and Jews’ had been modified to ‘there is no greater enmity in the world than between these Germans and the Jews’[[5]](#footnote-5). A.Lefevere sees the reasons for this modification in the publishers’ aim to avoid any possible offence to the German readership, i.e. a readership that had to come to terms with its involvement in the Nazi atrocities.

Ben-Ari’s (1992) study into the translation of children’s literature from German into Hebrew revealed similar features. She illustrates that, owing to changed attitudes towards Germany after the Holocaust and World War II, references to Germany and German culture in the source texts were either omitted or changed in a systematic way in the Hebrew target texts, thus revealing both the ideologically motivated concerns of the translators and the publishers as well as the political power of publishers and governments. Methodologically, Ben-Ari’s analysis is linked to polysystem theory[[6]](#footnote-6) and norms[[7]](#footnote-7), with the aim of discovering regularities in translators’ behaviour and, ultimately, translational norms. Although A.Lefevere developed the concept of patronage first of all for literary translation, it can equally be applied to all kinds of translation. Studies into the history of translation have brought to light a number of issues about power relations that are linked to patronage. For instance, the history of Bible translations is full of examples of material support for translators. Martin Luther finding refuge at the Wartburg castle and gaining the support of a German duke who allowed him to translate the Bible into German, is just one example that shows how a person in power acted as a patron. King James’s role for the translation of the Bible into English is another example.[[8]](#footnote-8) Without any form of patronage, other translators were burnt at the stake for falsifying the word of God. Institutions, associations and government bodies that provide funding for publications can act as patrons. For example, the German institution Inter Nationes provides half the cost of some translations, and the French Ministry of Culture supports, assists and encourages the translation of French texts. There is a long tradition of governments and authorities being interested in promoting knowledge of their culture abroad, or in enhancing it by ensuring the import of ideas. S.Faiq illustrates this with reference to medieval Arab translators. He shows that translation was made “part of government policy with its own budget and institutions”, and that the Arab rulers had “recognized the importance of translation for spreading their new faith and strengthening their new state”.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The opposite of promoting translation is hindering it, and this links to the issue of censorship. Censorship, too, can be considered with reference to A.Lefevere’s concept of patronage, since it is perceived as ideological control by powerful institutions or individuals. That is, institutions have the authority to exercise explicit censorship, preventing translations from being published at all, or only in a specific form. The translation studies literature, including quite a number of case studies of explicit censorship.

**1.2 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.[[10]](#footnote-10) 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.[[11]](#footnote-11)

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.

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.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Persuasive texts, whether written or spoken, can be considered a process aimed at changing a person’s (or a group’s) attitude or behavior. 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.[[13]](#footnote-13)

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.[[14]](#footnote-14)

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 .[[15]](#footnote-15) 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.[[16]](#footnote-16) 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*.[[17]](#footnote-17) 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 pre-formed 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 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. This theory describes political language as a category of human behavior, 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. Here, the focus is not on the man acting with the aim of linguistic tools, but on the linguistically mediated interpretations, reports. Politics is a discursive process. The process consists of actors in the political system who take up problems/issues, which are dealt with in other subsystems such as economy, and frame it as a political problem. In doing so, a political debate is launched in which the political problem, or to be more precise, solutions for the political problem are discussed. Those who are concerned with politics treat reality in the same way they treat symbols. People generally treat real things in the same way as they treat the referring concepts that have already been interpreted or commented somehow.

**1.3 EQUIVALENCE IN POLITICAL TRANSLATION**

Mistranslations (translation mistakes) occur more often than not in translation, and are considered to be unwelcome shifts that should be avoided. Mistranslations are the transformation of certain source text values or properties, which ought to remain unaltered.[[18]](#footnote-18) They are the semantic changes in the target text, which are totally irrelevant to the purpose of translation and are often the result of misinterpretation.[[19]](#footnote-19) Cases of mistranslation can be abundantly seen in everyday life (road signs, film subtitles, advertising billboards, etc.). The degree to which they need to be taken seriously and how they need to be treated depends on the purpose and sensitivity of the original text/talk as well as the consequences they may bring about. Political text/talk is an advanced type of text/talk with high political sensitivity; it has a strong policy orientation focusing on imparting a country’s political views to the world.[[20]](#footnote-20) As a result, political translation has a very low tolerance towards mistakes, even minor ones, because the results could be catastrophic and affect international relationships if a political message were wrongly translated.

Mistranslation is a widely seen phenomenon in politics. More often, this has happened in the translation of top political authorities’ texts and talks and has caused diplomatic disputes between nations. For example, mistranslating a recent speech from Iran’s president, Rouhani, raised a controversy. The controversy concerned both CNN and the Wall Street Journal whose translations of a recent political speech (which involved adding the word 'holocaust' when it was not stated by the President) led to different interpretations (Empowerlingua website 2013).[[21]](#footnote-21) As discussed by R.Holland, in 2006, CNN was banned from reporting in Iran after broadcasting a news conference by the ex-president Ahmadinejad, in which his assertion (in Farsi) that Iran had “… a right to use nuclear technology” was translated into English as “… a right to use nuclear weapons.” In another more critical case, which came to be known as the *Rumor of the Century*, mistranslating part of the Iranian ex-president’s speech in an international conference led the country to one of its most contentious problems of the last two decades.[[22]](#footnote-22)

It proves the fact that political translation is a vital bridge in international relations and one of the most complicated, advanced, sensitive and highly demanding translation activities, as it concerns national interests and foreign relations. M.Yang remarks that political translation “plays an essential role in trans-language, cross-border, and inter-cultural international exchanges and cooperation.” He has put forward the idea of “Political Equivalence” in translation as the vital principle for diplomatic translation. He explains that while in Nida’s theory (1964), attention is on equivalence of meaning and style, in his concept of Political Equivalence there is an emphasis on the equivalence of political connotations (accuracy, faithfulness, acceptability and dynamicity).[[23]](#footnote-23) By being dynamic, he means the translator must keep a balanced relationship between the SL/speaker and the TL/audience in achieving political equivalence hence being a "wirewalker." In his theory of political equivalence, M.Yang formulates four principles to achieve political equivalence, and for each he refers back to real cases where misquotes, misinterpretations and mistranslations have sparked political events. The four principles are as follows:

1) fully understanding the political context of the speaker and accurately communicating the connotation of time in the diplomatic source language. For this, he claims that the meanings of words and their connotations change with time and environment and explains that even the same idiom or literary illusions may have different meanings within different contexts or in a specific political environment.

2) conveying political meanings to the recipients in popular language form by highly integrating the policy information availability of the translation version with the effect of the original version.

3) working towards dynamic, rather than formal, political equivalence.

4) paying attention to balancing the SL and the TL, the context of the source language and the context of the audience, and the speaker and the audience, without bias to either side (what he calls “dual identification”).[[24]](#footnote-24)

M.Yang also refers to some tactics and methods to achieve political equivalence in political translation as follows: First, he states that the translator should do discourse analysis in translation and analysis the political meanings by “reading between the lines.” Second, political translation methods should not be confined to linguistic forms. Here, he refers to the translation of idioms, allusions, myths and fables in political contexts and states that the translator must distinguish between their cultural connotations and political orientations and adopt a “mixed translation method.” Third, the translator must be familiar with disparities in historical cultures, national customs, feelings and ideologies between the languages he is translating. Fourth, the translator must have a good command of foreign policy and ensure “political correctness.” Lastly, he refers to the special use of grammatical phenomena and rules. M.Yang advocates ‘Approximate Equivalence’ rather than ‘Perfect Equivalence’ as the latter is not easily achievable. Accordingly, he rejects ‘Absolute Literal’ (Foreignisation) and ‘Absolute Free’ (Domestication) methods in political translation as orientation toward each (speaker or audience) will raise problems.[[25]](#footnote-25)

J.Munday has a more or less similar view of equivalence when he applies 'appraisal theory' in translation and particularly in political discourse translation. He believes that the ST and its translation do not necessarily have the same 'value' and require different 'evaluation' and different 'readings'. In other words, what is 'critical' in the ST is not necessarily so in its translation and vice versa.[[26]](#footnote-26)

Intertextual references are among the cases in translation, which may potentially cause non-equivalence; they can be a recurring problematic area in translation. This difficulty becomes even more complicated in political translation. Intertextual references in political translation, in general and political speeches in particular, are an under-researched area within the field of translation studies. [[27]](#footnote-27)

The interpretation and re-texting of a discourse in the form of an equivalent discourse written in another language will be possible only if the translator analyses the linguistic signs according to the extra-linguistic aspects. To produce a translation the translator will need a minimal knowledge of both political systems. Using the methods of comparative political study is important not only to understand how the respective political systems work, but also to place the text correctly in the receptive culture. The comparison is a theoretical method which helps to understand the power and the limits of the political actions in the two different political systems, and it also points out the convergent and divergent aspects of the two political systems During the process of comparative study the translator gains thematic knowledge that becomes active and useful only in the very moment of translation. Regarding political translations the most difficult issue is the translation of political realia.

As a translation technique, adaptation can be defined as a technical and objective method. The best-known definition is that of Vinay and Darbelnet, who list adaptation as a separate translation procedure: “adaptation is a procedure which can be used whenever the context referred to in the original text does not exist in the culture of the target text, thereby necessitating some form of re-creation.”[[28]](#footnote-28) This widely accepted definition views adaptation as a procedure employed to achieve an equivalence of situations wherever cultural mismatches are encountered.

Eugene Nida has noted that “language is a part of culture, and in fact, it is the most complex set of habits that any culture exhibits. Language reflects the culture, provides access to the culture, and in many respects constitutes a model of the culture.”[[29]](#footnote-29) In order to render culture specific elements and to reflect a certain model of culture, translators may use the following techniques:

– omission: the elimination or reduction of part of the text;

– expansion: making explicit information that is implicit in the original, either in the main body or in footnotes or a glossary;

– exoticism: the substitution of stretches of slang, dialect, nonsense words, etc. in the original text by rough equivalents in the target language (sometimes marked by italics or underlining);

– updating: the replacement of outdated or obscure information by modern equivalents;

– situational equivalence: the insertion of a more familiar context than the one used in the original;

– creation: a more global replacement of the original text with a text that preserves only the essential message/ideas/functions of the original.

**CHAPTER II. PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION OF POLITICAL LITERATURE**

**2.1 PROBLEMS OF CHOICE OF CONNOTATION FOR POLYSEMANTIC WORDS**

Political literature like any other scientific kind of literature has language items and characteristic to them that requires the translator to be precise and sharp. Most books on general politics are characterized by the passion of expression, polemic style and the specific feature is in blending the elements of scientific speech on the one hand and with different emotionally colored means of expression on the other hand.

The translation of political literature can be considered in two ways: as a field of linguistic activity and as a separate field in science.

As a field of linguistic activity translation of political literature represents one of the types of special translation possessing as objects of its activity different materials of political character.

The political translation comes out into a special field of study due to its specific features of written and verbal speech on political topics, which is specified by its essential character and the knowledge of this science. Sometimes these features are so diverse that in order to understand them one should have a special knowledge without which it would be very hard to clearly perceive the inner sense on politics or a translated piece.

Therefore, the study of specific features of written and verbal speech acquires great importance to translators (interpreters). To the features mention above belong the following:

1. maximal filling the political literature with special political terms, and in verbal speech (among the politicians) - filling it with words of political jargon - slang.
2. presence of special idiomatic expressions and phraseological units in verbal and written speech that are rarely used in colloquial speech and general literature.[[30]](#footnote-30)

As an example, we may bring the following idioms:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **English** | **Russian** | **Uzbek** |
| blitzkrieg | молниеносная война | yashin tezligidagi urush |
| Comprehensive Program of Disarmament | Всеобъемлющая программа разоружения | Disarmament kompleks dasturi |
| principal powers | крупные державы | asosiy vakolatlari |
| status quo | статус кво | maqomi quid |
| limited war | локальная война | mahalliy urush |

and many others***.*** Here, it is necessary to mark, if the quantity of political idioms is limited, then the amount of "politically" related phraseological idioms is vast in English, Russian, and Uzbek languages.

1. the presence of some stylistic deflection from general literary norms is sometimes very great.
   1. Wide usage of elliptic constructions, especially in periodically publishing materials, propaganda and other kinds of politically important printing media.
   2. Preciseness and beauty of self-expression which is achieved by the usage of elliptic constructions along with wide usage of passive constructions and an often substitution of subordinate clauses by absolute constructions and verbal participle phrases.
   3. The presence of official writing style, mostly in documents of official provisions that cover administrative and political questions.
   4. Strictly regulated use of verbal forms and word phrases in special chapters of political literature and political documents.

As it was told before, while translating a political character, like doing any other special translation a great importance is given to translation of special terms.

In philological literature there are many definitions of the concept of term, but the essence of majority comes to the following:

*Term is a word or a combination of words, which define a notion (subject, a phenomenon, property, relation or a process) that is characteristic for the given field of science, technology, art or a sphere of social life.[[31]](#footnote-31)*

Terms differ from the words of general usage by definite semantic limitations and specific meanings they define. It is very difficult to overestimate the general and scientific meaning of terms since the concrete knowledge demands definite expression and a term does not only fix the concept by its notion (name) but specifies it diverging it from adjacent components.

For better functioning, terms must express systematization of notions, express their essence or at least be semantically neutral and at the same time be unambiguous and precise.[[32]](#footnote-32)

The phenomenon of a separate field of science and the terms that fix them should be systemized that offers gender availability around which group notions are formed. Thus an English term ***representative*** which presents a group notion and forms a group of notions that belong to this group:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **English** | **Russian** | **Uzbek** |
| representative forum | представительный форум | (vakillar) forum |
| business world representative | представитель делового мира | biznes dunyoning vakili |
| representative to the talks | представитель на переговорах | muzokaralarda vakili |
| representative to the public | представитель общественности | jamoatchilik a'zosi |
| representative of political circles | представитель политических кругов | siyosiy doiralar vakili |
| representative to NATO | представитель НАТО | NATO vakili |
| representative of various strata or the population | представитель различных слоёв населения | aholining turli qatlamlarini vakili |

The capability of a term to express a systematic state of notions and easily merge with new phrases that represent new group notions that consequently appear along with the development of a definite field of science or knowledge maybe called its *systematic capability.[[33]](#footnote-33)*

The systematic capability of notions helps us to clarify the relation of notions, raise their semantic definiteness and ease their understanding and remembering. In terms, formed on the base of mother tongue we may differ *direct* meaning and *terminological* meaning.

The direct meaning of a term is formed through the elements of the language used for their formation; the terminological meaning defines the concept of notion expressed by the term.

The terms, direct and terminological meaning of which correspond to each other, correctly orientate and underline the so-called their interrelation. These terms are able to express the essence of notions.

The terms, which direct and terminological meaning does not correspond to each other belong to semantically neutral group of terms.

And at last, the terms whose direct and terminological meaning contradict each other, should be admitted as completely unsatisfactory because they distort the genuine relations among the notions, disorientate the hearer and do not possess any semantic definiteness.[[34]](#footnote-34)

Unambiguousness of a term also influences its clear semantic features but since we do not have any researches in this field this concept cannot always be applied. Therefore, up to 10% of English and American political terms do not possess even a relative semantic definiteness, i. e. definiteness in some political concerns. This situation may be explained by the fact that the terms according to their nature are firstly simple words, and consequently, they develop according to general laws of linguistics. The result of this is the appearance terminological homonyms that hinder the normal functioning of political terms in a language.[[35]](#footnote-35)

The definiteness of a term requires preciseness of an expressed idea. It also raises the semantic definiteness of the term averting its misusage according to it form.

Not all the terms, of course, possess the above-mentioned qualities, but the translator/interpreter of political material should take them into consideration while forming new terms and solving the question of preference to one of the available term-synonyms.

The correct translation of political literature is a laborious work despite the terms’ considerable possession of definite semantic clearness and independence in usage.

While speaking of difficulties of translation, we imply as a matter of the first importance, the translation of political literature in general, which either do not yet have any equivalents in the translating language or have several similar notion for the term in question or at least have one equivalent but of doubtful adequacy. There are lots of word phrases and idiom and terms of this kind and their number is growing with development of technology and interrelation of people and especially with the development of Political sciences.

To achieve the highly qualified level of translation, first of all, it is necessary to group political literature and the terms used in there, according to their field of application and some principles of translation for each group. Thus, all the political terms and idioms existing in politics can be divided into three groups:

1. terms - defining the notions of a foreign reality but identical to the reality of Russian or Uzbek languages language ***march – марш – марш / қадам ташлаш***
2. terms - defining the notions of a foreign reality absent in the Russian one but possessing generally accepted term-equivalents ***National Guard – Национальная Гвардия – Milliy Qorovul, Territorial Army – Территориальная Армия – Hududiy Armiya.***
3. terms - defining the notions of a foreign reality that are not available in the Russian or Uzbek languages and not having generally accepted term-equivalents: ***alert hanger – ангар вылета по тревоге –*** ***hangar ketishi signal . [[36]](#footnote-36)***

The adequacy of translation of the first group is achieved by the use of terms implementing corresponding notions in Russian or Uzbek languages.

At the same time, it is very important for the notion expressed by the notion of another language to correspond in meaning rendered in Russian or Uzbek languages only by its main, essential attributes.

The translation of an English term ***poll*** into Russian *опросы населения (голосование)* is possible only for the correspondence of their principal meaning though the organization and methods of polling are quite different in both countries.

An adequate translation of the second group is comprised in the selection of generally accepted Russian or Uzbek terminological equivalents.

Even terms, not fully meeting the above mentioned requirements due to the terminological meaning fixed for it through the linguistic activity will adequately fit into these rules.

However, there are a number of examples that illustrate the absence of some political concepts, which are reflected onto the absence of special words in the language of translation. In these case they are usually rendered either by transcribing or descriptively, or with the help of calque.

For example:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Term** | **Definition** | **Translation into Russian** | **Translation into Uzbek** |
| junta | A clique, faction or cabal, often military, taking power after an overthrow of the government. From the latin ‘juncta’ for join. | хунта | хунта |
| limited war | A war, often not formally declared, fought to obtain specific political / territorial objectives, rather than to obtain the unconditional surrender of the enemy. | локальная война | mahalliy urush |
| cumulative voting | A type of block voting but where the voter can choose, from the list of (for example) ten candidates running for four seats, his preferred four, or just two or even one. In such decisions, the selected candidates would get one quarter of a vote each, or half a vote, or where only one candidate received the vote, the whole vote. | система выборов, когда избиратель имеет право подать столько голосов, сколько выставлено кандидатов (эти голоса могут быть отданы избирателем одному кандидату или распределены между несколькими по его желанию) | jami ovoz berish (общее голосование) |
| adversarial system | The system of law, as exists in the Anglo-American world, where an issue is argued in court by two opposing sides, the prosecutor or plaintiff, and the defence. Opposite to the Inquisitorial system where a judge or panel of judges call evidence and interrogate witnesses, as exists in many European countries. | - | - |
| androcracy | A state or society ruled by men where moral authority and control of property may also be exclusively in the hands of males. | - | - |

An adequate translation of the words of the third group may be achieved by the means of creation of a new terms, which will have to completely merge into the existing system of political terms underlying the systematization of available notions, reflect the essence of the notion it expresses or at least not to contradict it and possess an unambiguousness within its field of application.

Thus, to achieve the adequate translation of political text, it is necessary to pay serious attention to the words used there, which are usually called terms. However, in political discourse terms can be considered as both special words used only in this very sphere and common notions obtaining certain connotations in the context that should be represented in the translation as well. Besides, the process of rendering must submit general principles in achieving an adequate translation including translation of political literature and the essential features of translation of political terms.

**2.2 THE DIFFICULTY OF TRANSLATION OF SET PHRASES AND IDIOMS IN POLITICAL TEXTS**

As far as idioms and phraseological units are concerned in translation, the first difficulty that a translator comes across is being able to recognize that s/he is dealing with an idiomatic expression. This is not always so obvious. There are various types of idioms, some more easily recognizable than others. Those which are easily recognizable include expressions which violate truth conditions, such as *It's raining cats and dogs, throw caution to the winds, storm in a tea cup, jump down someone's throat,* and *food for thought.* They also include expressions which seem ill-formed because they do not follow the grammatical rules of the language, for example *trip the light fantastic, blow someone to kingdom come, put paid to, the powers that be, by and large,* and *the world and his friend.* Expressions which start with *like (*simile-like structures) also tend to suggest that they should not be interpreted literally. These include idioms such as *like a bat out of hell* and *like water off a duck's back.* Generally speaking, the more difficult an expression is to understand and the less sense it makes in a given context, the more likely a translator will recognize it as an idiom. Because they do not make sense if interpreted literally, the highlighted expressions in the following text are easy to recognize as idioms (assuming one is not already familiar with them):

*This can only be done, I believe, by a full and frank airing of* ***the*** *issues. I urge you all to* ***speak your minds*** *and not to* ***pull any punches.***

Provided a translator has access to good reference works and monolingual dictionaries of idioms, or, better still, is able to consult native speakers of the language, opaque idioms which do not make sense for one reason or another can actually be a blessing in disguise. The very fact that s/he cannot make sense of an expression in a particular context will alert the translator to the presence of an idiom of some sort.

There are two cases in which an idiom can be easily misinterpreted if one is not already familiar with it:

(a) Some idioms are 'misleading'; they seem transparent because they offer a reasonable literal interpretation and their idiomatic meanings are not necessarily signaled in the surrounding text. A large number of idioms in English, and probably all languages, have both a literal and an idiomatic meaning, for example *go out with (*'have a romantic relationship with someone') and *take someone for a ride (*'deceive or cheat someone in some way'). Such idioms lend themselves easily to manipulation by speakers and writers who will sometimes play on both their literal and idiomatic meanings. In this case, a translator who is not familiar with the idiom in question may easily accept the literal interpretation and miss the play on idiom.

(b) An idiom in the source language may have a very close counter part in the target language which looks similar on the surface but has a totally or partially different meaning. For example, the idiomatic question *Has the cat had/got your tongue?* is used in English to urge someone to answer a question or contribute to a conversation, particularly when their failure to do so becomes annoying.

Apart from being alert to the way speakers and writers manipulate certain features of idioms and to the possible confusion which could arise from similarities in form between source and target expressions, a translator must also consider the collocational environment which surrounds any expression whose meaning is not readily accessible. Idiomatic and fixed expressions have individual collocational patterns. They form collocations with other items in the text as single units and enter into lexical sets, which are different from those of their individual words. Take, for instance, the idiom *to have cold feet. Cold* as a separate item may collocate with words like *weather, winter, feel,* or *country. Feet* on its own will perhaps collocate with *socks, chilblain, smelly,* etc. However, *having cold feet,* in its idiomatic use, has nothing necessarily to do with *winter, feet,* or *chilblains* and will therefore generally be used with a different set of collocates.

The ability to distinguish senses by collocation is an invaluable asset to a translator working from a foreign language. It is often subsumed under the general umbrella of 'relying on the context to disambiguate meanings', which, among other things, means using our knowledge of collocational patterns to decode the meaning of a word or a stretch of language. Using our knowledge of collocational patterns may not always tell us what an idiom means but it could easily help us in many cases to recognize an idiom, particularly one, which has a literal as well as a non-literal meaning.

Once an idiom or fixed expression has been recognized and interpreted correctly, the next step is to decide how to translate it into the target language. The difficulties involved in translating an idiom are totally different from those involved in interpreting it. Here, the question is not whether a given idiom is transparent, opaque, or misleading. An opaque expression may be easier to translate than a transparent one. The main difficulties involved in translating idioms and fixed expressions may be summarized as follows:

(a) An idiom or fixed expression may have no equivalent in the target language. The way a language chooses to express, or not express, various meanings cannot be predicted and only occasionally matches the way another language chooses to express the same meanings. One language may express a given meaning by means of a single word, another may express it by means of a transparent fixed expression, a third may express it by means of an idiom, and so on. It is therefore unrealistic to expect to find equivalent idioms and expressions in the target language as a matter of course.

Like single words, idioms and fixed expressions may be culture-specific. Formulae such as *Merry Christmas* and *say when* which relate to specific social or religious occasions provide good examples.

B.Basnett-McGuire explains that the expression *say when”*is… directly linked to English social behavioral patterns' and suggests that 'the translator putting the phrase into Russian has to contend with the problem of the non-existence of a similar convention in either culture”. Less problematic, but to some extent also culture-specific, are the sort of fixed formulae that are used in formal correspondence, such as *Yours faithfully* and *Yours sincerely* in English. These, for instance, have no equivalents in Arabic formal correspondence. The same mismatch occurs in relation to French and several other languages but in Russian we have similar expression *Ваш верный!* [[37]](#footnote-37)

Idioms and fixed expressions which contain culture-specific items are not necessarily untranslatable. It is not the specific items an expression contains but rather the meaning it conveys and its association with culture-specific contexts which can make it untranslatable or difficult to translate. For example, the English expression ***to carry coals to Newcastle,***though culture-specific in the sense that it contains a reference to Newcastle coal and uses it as a measure of abundance, is nevertheless closely paralleled in Russian by ***в Тулу со своим самоваром***. Both expressions convey the same meaning, namely: to supply something to someone who already has plenty of it.

1. An idiom may be used in the source text in both its literal and idiomatic senses at the same time. Unless the target-language idiom corresponds to the source-language idiom both in form and in meaning, the play on idiom cannot be successfully reproduced in the target text.
2. An idiom or fixed expression may have a similar counterpart in the target language, but its context of use may be different; the two expressions may have different connotations, for instance, or they may not be pragmatically transferable. An idiom may be used in the source text in both its literal and idiomatic senses at the same time. Unless the target-language idiom corresponds to the source-language idiom both in form and in meaning, the play on idiom cannot be successfully reproduced in the target text.

Using idioms in English and American politics is very much a matter of style. Languages such as Arabic and Chinese which make a sharp distinction between written and spoken discourse and where the written mode is associated with a high level of formality tend, on the whole, to avoid using idioms in written texts. L.Albrecth discusses the difference in rhetorical effect of using idioms in general and of using specific types of idiom in the source and target languages and quite rightly conclude that: “Translation is an exacting art. Idiom more than any other feature of language demands that the translator be not only accurate but highly sensitive to the rhetorical nuances of the language”*.[[38]](#footnote-38)*

Thus, it can be concluded that set phrases and idioms present a special problem in translational process on the whole, and in translation of political texts, in particular, as in some cases it is impossible to understand the meaning of the phrase having analyzed its components – it is necessary to find out the meaning of the phrase on the whole.

**2.3 POLITICAL METAPHORS AND TRANSLATION**

Politics is the art and profession of persuasion. It aims at, in the final stage, manipulation of the public opinion for a chance to govern a country, ideally through a democratic election system. Politics operates through language, that is, oral and written texts, produced in the field of politics.

A political metaphor is a lexeme or a phrase with political content and connotations. What makes a lexeme political is its use with reference to politics either as part of a political text or in a political context. Political metaphors pose constraints in translation especially in situations such as translation of political texts where a lexical choice goes through conscious or sub-conscious ideological transfer. As C.Schäffner points out, there are strategies commonly used in translating metaphors such as translating a metaphor into metaphor or sense, or delete all together. The studies commenting on the translations of metaphors are either normative (how to translate metaphors) or descriptive in their approaches (how metaphors are dealt with in actual translations).[[39]](#footnote-39)

The potential of conflict involved in the transfer of lexis in addressive texts such as those in the media and politics based on the contextual aspects of the source lexeme is a topic already dealt with in TS from the contextual and discursive points of view. These viewpoints of analysis give TS researchers the opportunity to analyze the contexts of utterances with both senders (speakers and translators/interpreters) and receivers of messages (source and target) taken into account along with the aspects of source and target contexts and situations.

For instance, the use of white and black with reference to their original context of use in the US are attributed to the white race (basically, the immigrants of Anglo-Saxon origin and other European immigrants of the continent) and the black race (immigrants of African origin). In a politically correct language, it is always possible to use African-Americans or black community just as any other ethnic community, without any emphasis on the skin colour. In daily use, white race and whiteness is suggestively more advantageous in terms of life standards and privileges although there is supposed to be no discrimination of this sort in today’s world as a consequence of all the declarations of human rights and equalities. The word *zenci* (Arabic), *zengi* (Persian) (*negro*, meaning Ethiopian at that time; non-literally barbarian and strange) referring to the people of Zanzibar (“Zengibar”/ “Zencibar”). The word *negro* was used in a negative sense in the 19th century in the Western world until it gained a positive meaning owing to thinkers such as Léopold Sédar Senghor (Senegal), Aimé Césaire (Martinique) and Léon Damas (French Guiana) in the 1930s through the concept of /*négritude*/..[[40]](#footnote-40) K.Allan and K.Burridge discuss in length “political correctness” (PC) and the impact of “-ist dysphemisms” in language use as a possible reason for taboo and censoring through euphemisms, because “politically correct” is “ideologically sound” and safe.

Yet, the authors continue to say that “…PC language is no more a threat to freedom of speech than other types of verbal taboo…”.[[41]](#footnote-41) Politically correct language is a result of social conventions such as the need of being accepted in the society through being polite, inoffensive and inclusive and is mainly displayed through euphemistic strategies, which may easily lead to verbal taboos and blocking of free and open linguistic expressions.

Nigger, as one of the examples of analysis taken by the authors under the category of “racist dysphemisms,” is introduced as racist terms are not intrinsically dysphemistic, and can be used without prejudice; for instance ‘blacks’ is not necessarily any more dysphemistic than ‘whites’…. Practically all these racist terms can be used without irony in orthophemistic illocutionary acts….[[42]](#footnote-42)

Following an interesting background information about the first occurrence of nigger as a dictionary entry, the authors refer to the coinage of adjective niggardly from nigger as a politically incorrect neologism which, in 1999, was used by an employee in Washington D.C. Mayoral Office as “being niggardly with funds” to refer to cutbacks as a euphemism of the negative effect of cutback interestingly enough.[[43]](#footnote-43) They also share the results of a survey by BBC, Advertising and Broadcasting Standards Authorities and Independent Television Companies about the swear words on TV programming which is “words of racial abuse are the severest of all taboo words and the reasons for verbal euphemisms/plays nigger being at the top of the severity scale out of 84 swear words in TV programming at 53% by comparison to other swear words such as *paki* or *Jew*”.[[44]](#footnote-44)

K.Allan and K.Burridge discuss the need and use of politically correct words in all aspects of our lives under a wide variety of euphemistic representations, at times in acronymic forms, from using resale store for second-hand/consignment store; RIF (reduction in force)/downsizing/rightsizing for firing staff; partner for spouse; underdeveloped (1940s), less developed/ lesser developed (1950s), developing (1960s), emerging (more recent) or Third World for poor countries; HIPL for highly indebted poor countries; LD/learning difficulty for mental handicap; hearing impaired for deaf.[[45]](#footnote-45) As for the specific euphemisms developed for black or nigger basically in the US over the years since the tabooing of white and black in the 19th century, Allan and Burridge’s following examples are worth mentioning: *leg for dark meat*; *breast for white meat*; *coffee without milk for black coffee*; *Darlie Toothpaste for Darkie Toothpaste*.[[46]](#footnote-46) A relatively recent example of the use of negro/nigger as a denigrating word in English has been given in the United Kingdom on Channel 4, where the reality show Big Brother House has become the target of a racist remark against the black (African-American) participant of the program.[[47]](#footnote-47)

In this way we may conclude that politically correct language deals with many problems assuming not only linguistic aspects, but also cultural ones. Therefore, in the process of translation it is very important to consider all the connotation and national peculiarities concerning such kind of problems in the process of rendering of political expressions.

**CONCLUSION**

Contemporary language of politics makes several requirements relating to political terms that should be taken into consideration in the process of translating. The political term should meet the following important requirements:

a) satisfy the rules and norms of a corresponding language,

b) be systematic,

c) correspond to a certain definition oriented to a certain concept,

d) be relatively independent of the context,

e) be precise,

f) be as concise as possible,

g) aim at one-to-one correspondence (within the certain terminological system),

h) be expressively neutral,

i) be euphonic.

The language of politics as a special sublanguage has its own content and a set of specific characteristics, which vary depending on a language system. However, irrespective of a language, the major part of its distinctive features and peculiarities are explained by the influence of historical, cultural, social and political factors on the language community.

The English political language is characterized by a specific set of terms. First of all, it comprises numerous borrowed words and phrases (ex. *casus belli, cause célèbre, civis Romanus sum, dystopia*, etc.), which still has no equivalents in Russian and Uzbek languages. Thus, the present content of the English language of politics is due to the influence of different languages and that has a historical explanation.

Thus, to achieve the adequate translation of political text, it is necessary to pay serious attention to the words used there, which are usually called terms. However, in political discourse terms can be considered as both special words used only in this very sphere and common notions obtaining certain connotations in the context that should be represented in the translation as well. Besides, the process of rendering must submit general principles in achieving an adequate translation including translation of political literature and the essential features of translation of political terms.

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.
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