PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATING POLITICAL TEXTS FROM ENGLISH TO UZBEK LANGUAGE

Islomova Odina Orifjon kizi
Phd researcher at SamSIFL
E-mail:

Abstract: Translating political texts from English into Uzbek presents unique challenges that arise from linguistic, cultural, and ideological differences. Political discourse is characterized by nuanced terminology, persuasive rhetoric, and culturally specific references, which often complicate accurate and effective translation. This study examines the primary problems encountered in translating political texts, such as lexical gaps, cultural untranslatability, and the preservation of ideological intent. Using qualitative analysis of selected political speeches and documents, the research highlights strategies employed by translators to negotiate these difficulties and maintain the text's original impact. The findings underscore the importance of contextual awareness and interdisciplinary expertise in political translation.

Keywords: political translation, cross-cultural communication, linguistic challenges, ideological equivalence, English-Uzbek translation, discourse analysis.

Introduction. Political texts represent a highly specialized genre of discourse that requires careful handling in translation due to their complex nature. When translating from English to Uzbek, translators face significant problems linked to the linguistic structure of both languages as well as cultural and political contexts. Political texts are laden with ideological meaning, rhetorical devices, and culturally bound expressions, all of which challenge the translator's ability to produce an equivalent text that conveys both meaning and persuasive power. Moreover, the socio-political environment in which translations are read further complicates this process, as texts often serve not only to inform but to influence public opinion and policy. This article investigates the common difficulties encountered during the translation of political texts from English to Uzbek, focusing on lexical, cultural, and ideological barriers. The goal is to provide insights into effective translation practices that respect the source text's communicative intent while adapting it appropriately for Uzbek audiences.

Political texts are a distinct genre of discourse that play a central role in shaping public opinion, state policies, and international relations. These texts—ranging from presidential speeches and parliamentary debates to campaign slogans and diplomatic statements—are marked by their ideological orientation, persuasive intent, and reliance on culturally specific references. Translating such texts from English into Uzbek involves more than direct linguistic conversion; it requires the preservation of tone, purpose, and context while adapting to the cultural and political realities of the target audience. The challenge is particularly acute when English political discourse, which often reflects Western democratic traditions and institutional structures, must be rendered into Uzbek, a language with its own historical, political, and cultural context. The translator must navigate lexical gaps, culturally loaded metaphors, idiomatic expressions, and ideological nuance, all while maintaining fidelity to the original message and ensuring the translation remains appropriate for Uzbek readers. This article aims to explore the major linguistic and cultural problems encountered in translating political texts from English to Uzbek and to suggest strategies for overcoming these challenges in order to improve both the quality and clarity of political communication across languages.

Methods. This study uses a qualitative approach combining discourse analysis and comparative linguistics to identify translation problems specific to political texts. A corpus of English political speeches, press releases, and party manifestos alongside their Uzbek translations was collected from official sources spanning 2018 to 2024. The texts were analyzed for lexical equivalence, syntactic structures, idiomatic expressions, and cultural references. Problematic segments were identified and categorized according to common translation issues such as lexical gaps, ambiguity, and cultural untranslatability. Additionally, translator interviews were conducted to gain insight into the decision-making processes and strategies used to overcome these challenges.

Results. The analysis revealed several prominent problems in translating political texts from English to Uzbek. First, lexical gaps often arise when English political terms have no direct Uzbek equivalent, requiring translators to use neologisms, descriptive phrases, or loanwords. For example, terms like "checks and balances" or "filibuster" lack straightforward Uzbek counterparts and demand explanatory adaptation. Second, cultural references and idiomatic expressions embedded in political discourse pose significant challenges. English metaphors or allusions, such as "breaking the glass ceiling," do not always translate culturally and require creative substitution or omission. Third, preserving the ideological and persuasive intent of the source text is difficult because political language is often subtly manipulative or euphemistic. Translators must balance fidelity to the original message with the need to produce a culturally resonant text. The study also identified the frequent use of formal or neutral language in Uzbek translations to avoid political sensitivity, which may dilute the source text's rhetorical impact. Translator interviews confirmed that these challenges demand not only linguistic proficiency but also deep political and cultural knowledge.

This study adopts a qualitative methodology rooted in discourse and translation analysis to investigate the translation of political texts from English into Uzbek. A corpus of political texts—including official speeches, press releases, campaign messages, and political commentary—was collected from governmental and media websites between 2018 and 2024. These texts, along with their official or published Uzbek translations, were examined using comparative analysis. The focus was placed on identifying translation difficulties, strategies used by translators, and instances where ideological, lexical, or cultural mismatches occurred. Interviews with experienced political translators were also conducted to gain deeper insight into the choices and constraints they encounter in real-world translation tasks.

The results reveal several prominent problems encountered during political translation. First**,** lexical untranslatability is frequent due to the absence of direct Uzbek equivalents for complex or context-specific English political terms. Phrases like "checks and balances," "partisan gridlock," or "executive privilege" carry institutional meanings deeply embedded in the political culture of English-speaking countries. Translators often resort to explanation, paraphrasing, or neologisms—sometimes at the cost of brevity and clarity. Second, cultural references and idioms in English political texts often pose serious challenges. For instance, metaphorical expressions such as "draining the swamp" or "red lines" do not have cultural resonance in Uzbek and are either replaced with functionally similar idioms or omitted entirely. This process often leads to a dilution of rhetorical force or political symbolism.

Another observed challenge is the transfer of ideological and emotional tone**.** Political texts are inherently persuasive and ideologically charged, employing rhetorical devices, euphemisms, and emotional appeals to influence audiences. When translating into Uzbek, there is a tendency—sometimes due to editorial guidelines or sociopolitical sensitivity—to neutralize emotionally charged or ideologically divisive language. This results in a more formal, less dynamic tone that may fail to convey the original intent. For example, while the English source may use populist or provocative language, the Uzbek translation might adopt a neutral bureaucratic register, reducing the text's communicative effectiveness.

The discussion of these findings suggests that political translation requires more than linguistic fluency. Translators must act as cultural and ideological negotiators**,** adapting messages for local

audiences while retaining the core meanings and strategic aims of the original text. This balancing act raises ethical concerns, particularly regarding the potential manipulation of meaning or the erasure of politically sensitive content. The political context of Uzbekistan, where media and discourse are more regulated than in some Western contexts, also plays a significant role in shaping translation practices. As a result, even when a literal translation is possible, the political climate may necessitate cautious rewording to avoid controversy or misinterpretation.

In conclusion, the main part of this study shows that the translation of political texts is not a purely linguistic process but a complex act influenced by cultural, institutional, and ideological factors. Translators need specialized training in political science and cross-cultural communication in order to make informed decisions. Understanding these challenges can contribute to better translation quality and help foster clearer international political communication.

Discussion. The findings suggest that translating political texts is a complex task that transcends linguistic conversion. The absence of direct lexical equivalents and culturally bound expressions necessitates adaptive strategies that include paraphrasing, localization, or the use of footnotes. Moreover, the ideological nature of political discourse means that translators often act as mediators between source and target cultures, negotiating meaning in ways that influence audience perception. This mediation role highlights the ethical dimension of political translation, where fidelity to the original must be weighed against potential political consequences in the target context. The tendency to neutralize rhetoric in Uzbek translations reflects broader socio-political constraints and risks limiting the text's effectiveness. Therefore, translators must be not only language experts but also cultural and political analysts to maintain the text's communicative power while respecting local sensitivities. These insights emphasize the need for interdisciplinary training and collaboration in political translation projects.

Conclusion. Translating political texts from English to Uzbek involves navigating linguistic gaps, cultural differences, and ideological complexities. The problems identified—lexical untranslatability, cultural incongruence, and the challenge of preserving ideological intent—underscore the importance of contextual knowledge and adaptive translation strategies. Political translators must carefully balance fidelity with cultural resonance to produce texts that effectively communicate the original message without alienating the target audience. Future research could explore the impact of digital media on political translation practices and examine translation issues in other language pairs within the region to build a broader understanding of cross-cultural political communication.

Translating political texts from English into Uzbek presents multifaceted challenges stemming from linguistic, cultural, and ideological differences. The absence of direct lexical equivalents, culturally specific references, and the need to preserve the original text's persuasive and ideological intent complicate the translation process. Translators must navigate these difficulties by employing adaptive strategies such as paraphrasing, localization, and sometimes neutralization of rhetoric, balancing fidelity to the source with the cultural expectations of the target audience. Moreover, the role of the translator extends beyond linguistic conversion to that of a cultural mediator, requiring deep understanding of both political contexts. Addressing these challenges is essential for producing translations that retain the communicative power and political significance of the original texts. Future research should consider the influence of digital media on political translation and investigate best practices for translator training in politically sensitive contexts.

References:

1. Baker, M. (2020). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (3rd ed.). Routledge.
2. Chesterman, A. (2021). Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
3. Hatim, B., & Munday, J. (2020). Translation: An Advanced Resource Book (3rd ed.). Routledge.

4.   House, J. (2022). Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present. Routledge.

5.   Katan, D. (2020). Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators (2nd ed.). Routledge.

6.   Munday, J. (2021). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications (5th ed.). Routledge.