Basis of research of political terms of foreign scientists

Maftunabonu KHOLJURAEVA[1]

Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This article provides a brief theoretical overview of the key research on political discourse, with particular regard to metaphor use in political discourse, the role of equivocation, and rhetorical devices to invite audience applause. It first looks into the important elements of political discourse and how these elements impact the translation process. Second, the article looks at the translation techniques translator students use and whether or not these techniques are appropriate for translating political writings. Thirdly, the article seeks to demonstrate the translator students' errors in translation and the effect these errors have on conveying the intended meaning. Fourthly, the article clarifies the importance of pragmatically and semantically examining any translation output.

Xorijiy olimlarning siyosiy terminlar tadqiqotlari asoslari

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqola siyosiy nutqqa oid asosiy tadqiqotlarning qisqacha nazariy sharhini beradi, xususan, siyosiy nutqda metafora qo'llanilishi, ikkilanishning roli, tomoshabinlarni olqishlarga chorlovchi ritorik vositalar. Maqola birinchi navbatda siyosiy nutqning muhim elementlarini va bu elementlarning tarjima jarayoniga qanday ta'sir qilishini ko'rib chiqadi. Ikkinchidan, maqola tarjimon talabalari foydalanadigan tarjima usullari va bu usullar siyosiy asarlarni tarjima qilish uchun mos keladimi yoki yo'qligini ko'rib chiqadi. Uchinchidan, maqola tarjimon talabalarning tarjimadagi xatolarini va bu xatolarning mo'ljallangan ma'noni etkazishga ta'sirini ko'rsatishga harakat qiladi. To'rtinchidan, maqola har qanday tarjima natijasini pragmatik va semantik jihatdan tekshirishning muhimligini aniqlaydi.

[1] PhD Student, Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoi.
E-mail: maftunabonuholjuraeva@gmail.com

Основы исследования политических терминов зарубежных ученых

АННОТАЦИЯ

В этой статье представлен краткий теоретический обзор ключевых исследований политического дискурса, с особым вниманием к использованию метафор в политическом дискурсе, роли двусмысленности и риторическим приемам, вызывающим аплодисменты аудитории. Сначала рассматриваются важные элементы политического дискурса и то, как эти элементы влияют на процесс перевода. Во-вторых, в статье рассматриваются методы перевода, которые используют студенты-переводчики, и подходят ли эти методы для перевода политических произведений. В-третьих, в статье ставится задача продемонстрировать ошибки студентов-переводчиков при переводе и влияние этих ошибок на передачу задуманного смысла. В-четвертых, в статье разъясняется важность прагматического и семантического анализа любого результата перевода.

INTRODUCTION

The linguistic community has focused a lot of attention on the study of the connection between language and political conduct in recent decades (see, for example, Carver & Pikalo, Chilton, Fairclough, Wilson). For instance, metaphor, a type of linguistic form, can have three primary functions in political communication, according to Wilson. By simplifying complex political arguments into a metaphorical form, metaphors help us understand, act, and communicate about one type of experience in terms of another. They can also be employed to highlight specific objectives and arouse feelings. Wilson concluded by saying that politicians may contrive metaphors to reveal ridiculous pictures that they could then use to make fun of their rivals in politics. To put it another way, politicians can use metaphor to promote themselves favorably, shame their rivals, defend their own actions, and make specific political points. In particular, the employment of metaphors in political discourse, the function of equivocation, rhetorical tactics to elicit applause from the audience, and the use of personal pronouns are all discussed in this article's brief theoretical review of studies on political language in global politics. Several political communication studies (e.g., Beard, Chilton & Schaffner, De Landtsheer & Feldman, Feldman & De Landtsheer, Gastil) have focused on the political discourse.

The importance of metaphor in political discourse has been the subject of recent research (De Landtsheer, Lakoff & Johnson, Taran, Wilson); the deliberate use of equivocation (Bavelas, Black, Chovil, & Mullet, Bull); the ways in which politicians use rhetorical devices to elicit applause from the audience (Atkinson, Bull); and the use of pronouns (Bullet & Fetzer, Duszak, Fairclough, Gastil, Wilson). This piece aims to provide readers with an overview of political language research technique by looking at four different facets of political discourse research. Furthermore, I want to entice researchers by offering them the chance to apply these theoretical frameworks to their own studies.

Xorijiy lingvistika va lingvodidaktika – Зарубежная лингвистика
и лингводидактика – Foreign Linguistics and Linguodidactics
Issue – 2 № 3 (2024) / ISSN 2181-3701

Equivocation. According to several definitions, equivocation includes intentional use of imprecise language (Hamilton & Mineo), deliberate vagueness (Goss & Williams), strategic ambiguity (Eisenberg), and nonstraightforward communication (Bavelas, Black, Bryson & Mullett; Bavelas. In human communication, equivocation encompasses speech acts such "self-contradictions, inconsistencies, subject switches, tangentializations, incomplete sentences, misunderstandings, obscure style or mannerisms of speech...etc." according to Watzlawick, Beavin, Bavelas & Jackson. Through the groundbreaking research of Bavelas and her associates (Bavelas & Smith), a significant theory of equivocation has been created. Their approach examines equivocation in terms of the four dimensions of sender, content, recipient, and context. It is based on Haley's communication model. According to Bagellas "all messages that would (intuitively or otherwise) be called equivocal are ambiguous in at least one of these four elements" when measuring equivocation. Stated otherwise, in the event that any of the four components (Sender, Content, Receiver, and Context) lack clarity, this will lead to comprehension problems in interpersonal communication. In the meanwhile, they have framed the four dimensions in terms of the following queries in order to define ambiguity more precisely:

Sender: To what extent is the message the speaker's own opinion? Content: How clear is the message, in terms of what is being said? Receiver: To what extent is the message addressed to the other person? Context: To what extent is this a direct answer to the question? (Bavelas & Smith,)

Bavelas et al. have mostly used laboratory testing to verify their theories in their investigations on equivocation. Still, the research by Bull and his colleagues (Bull & Mayer, Bull, Elliott, Palmer, & Walker, Bull) has examined the application of equivocation in political interview settings and has broadened the application of equivocation theory beyond lab settings. Eight televised political interviews with Margaret Thatcher from the 1987 British General Election are analyzed by Bull and Mayer (then head of the Labour Opposition, 1983–1992) and Neil Kinnock (then Conservative Prime Minister, 1979–1990). According to the results, Neil Kinnock answered only 39% of the questions overall, and Margaret Thatcher only 37%. These findings bear striking resemblance to those of an earlier series of interviews with Margaret Thatcher and Neil Kinnock (Harris), which similarly revealed that both politicians directly responded to little more than 39% of the questions posed to them. As a result, the evidence described above strongly supports the popular view that politicians frequently do not answer questions in political interviews. In order to analyze the data further, Bull and his colleagues (Bull & Mayer, Bull) identified 35 different forms of equivocation in political communication.

A report by Bull is predicated on eighteen interviews from the British General Election of 1992. In political interviews, they emphasized the connection between equivocation and face, and they created a typology of face-threats in question formulation. Based on an analysis of face-threats in the questions, nineteen subcategories were identified and categorized into three main categories of face that politicians would defend: 1) their face, 2) the face of the party they represent, and 3) the face in terms of supporting others who are positively significant to them (e.g., the electorate, colleagues, and fellow party members) or refraining from supporting others who are negatively significant (e.g., political opponents). The information suggested that a politician's countenance significantly influenced whether or not they chose to respond to a query.

Xorijiy lingvistika va lingvodidaktika – Зарубежная лингвистика
и лингводидактика – Foreign Linguistics and Linguodidactics
Issue – 2 № 3 (2024) / ISSN 2181-3701

Bull et al. claim that the idea of threats to face can be seen as the fundamental justification for what Bavelas et al. refer to as an avoidance-avoidance conflict, in which every response to a question raises the possibility of unfavorable outcomes, but a response is still required. According to Bavelas et al. Conflicts between avoidance and avoidance are common in the setting of political interviews. They detailed numerous instances that resulted in politicians avoiding disagreements with each other. For instance, when requested, politicians can provide remarks on divisive topics with a split electorate, they frequently attempt to steer clear of straight answers in order to avoid upsetting either party of voters. Furthermore, politicians find frequently themselves forced to choose between providing a brief, insufficient response or a lengthy, convoluted, or evasive one when asked about complex subjects while under time constraints. The research discussed in this part focuses on the rhetorical strategies politicians use to get applause from the audience during speeches. Politicians know that it is useful to use rhetorical devices to elicit agreement from their audience by using audience reactions like clapping and booing. This is especially true when they are campaigning for office and want to gauge how popular their message is with the electorate. Applause can therefore be seen as a very obvious way for the audience to show their support for the speaker and the party they represent. In this regard, it would appear that a politician's reputation and career as a public figure are greatly influenced by the amount of applause they receive. Atkinson claims that there are two common rhetorical strategies used to elicit applause from the audience in three-part lists and contrasts are a staple of political speeches. Given that a three-part list that lists similar items can work to strengthen, highlight, or amplify a specific point in almost any kind of message, Atkinson argued that the three-part list in particular can serve as a clear signal to the audience of appropriate places to applaud. Contrast is another common rhetorical strategy employed to elicit applause. Because audience members must decide not only whether to applaud but also when to do so, Atkinson suggested that contrasts can serve to present a clear conclusion point for the message being conveyed. When a speech is given in a way that projects the right amount of applause, it will help the audience coordinate their actions and lessen the likelihood that they will expose themselves to shame and public disgrace through isolated applause. In addition, Atkinson noted that there are a few basic message types that are typically regarded as commendable when considering the role of speech content. These include positive references to specific individuals, positive references to "us," and negative references to "them." Atkinson noted that in one study, these three categories appeared in 95% of the applauding bursts at British political party conventions. Similarly, applause was linked to a relatively narrow spectrum of message kinds, according to Heritage and Greatbatch. They further contended that using the proper rhetorical devices seemed to significantly boost the likelihood that these message types would be met with applause.

According to earlier research, pronouns can be used to communicate a variety of information about a speaker's motivation, social standing, opinions, and more. Pronominal selection in Indo-European languages, including German, French, Italian, and Spanish, is influenced by the perceived role relationship between the speaker and the addressee, according to the seminal work of Brown and Gilman. By utilizing power and solidarity semantics to examine pronominal usage in Indo-European languages, Brown and Gilman contended that the power dynamics and solidarity of a relationship can be

Xorijiy lingvistika va lingvodidaktika – Зарубежная лингвистика
и лингводидактика – Foreign Linguistics and Linguodidactics
Issue – 2 № 3 (2024) / ISSN 2181-3701

shaped or validated through the exchange of pronouns. A non-reciprocal use denotes social distance and an unequal power connection, with the dominant speaker employing the informal pronoun. Conversely, a reciprocal use of address forms shows relative equality and solidarity. In this context, personal pronouns are crucial for negotiating social position during interactions. Put differently, personal pronouns can serve not just as personal deictic devices in discourse, but also as social deictic devices. Furthermore, Helmbrecht suggests that the language establishment of social groups is directly linked to the use of the first-person plural pronoun we. Using this pronoun, speakers publicly distinguish between the social categories of their listeners. They also disclose that they belong to various groups at the same time. This standard use of the pronoun "we" offers a powerful method for creating and reaffirming social identities. R. Lakoff made the case that politicians' choice of pronouns affects them subconsciously and does not arouse suspicion the way nouns do, even when their meanings and functions have been purposefully altered. In her analysis of the late US President Ronald Reagan's use of the first-person plural pronoun "we" in a television speech announcing his intention to seek a second term in office in 1984, Lakoff contended that Reagan frequently used the word "we" in a way that left the American people wondering if they were being referred to or not. Furthermore, Lakoff showed how Reagan's use of the pronoun "we" could have a dichotomous or connective effect on the American people. This is because Reagan uses hearer-inclusive we to establish solidarity with the hearer and hearer-exclusive we to denote his role as the President of the United States and his administration.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the studies presented in this article contribute to our understanding of how politicians use language in the political exchange of ideas. For example, the above has demonstrated that politicians frequently vacillate when faced with uncomfortable questions; they employ rhetorical strategies, like contrasts and three-part lists, to elicit applause from the audience to convey their increased popularity, sense of group identity, or solidarity with the speaker and the party in political speeches; and they purposefully use personal pronouns to indicate their motivation, attitudes, and social status. Additionally, the research included in this article has shed information about the usage of metaphor in political correspondence, specifically referring to the metaphors' functions in political contexts in addition to the role metaphor plays in persuasion in politics. For instance, Lakoff & Johnson demonstrated how specific domains can be highlighted using metaphor while stifling others. Put differently, metaphor helps the public understand complex message comprehension, but it can also be employed to misrepresent reality and deceive others. At the same time, from a cognitive perspective, metaphor additionally serves as a heuristic for examining intended new laws and conditions. Consequently, the Bush has been demonstrated that administration used a variety of analogies to support military action in Gulf War action

REFERENCES:

1. Atkinson, J.M. (1983) 'Two devices for generating audience approval: A comparative study of public discourse and text'. In K. Ehlich and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Connectedness in Sentence, Text and Discourse*. Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg Paper in Linguistics, pp.199-236.

2. Atkinson, J.M. (1984a) *Our Master's Voices*. London: Methuen.

Xorijiy lingvistika va lingvodidaktika – Зарубежная лингвистика
и лингводидактика – Foreign Linguistics and Linguodidactics
Issue – 2 № 3 (2024) / ISSN 2181-3701

3. Atkinson, J.M. (1984b) 'Public speaking and audience responses: Some techniques for inviting applause'. In J.M. Atkinson and J.C. Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,pp.370-409.

4. Bavelas, J.B., Black, A., Bryson, L. & Mullett, J. (1988) 'Political equivocation: A situational explanation'. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 7, 137-145.

5. Bavelas, J.B., Black, A., Chovil, N. & Mullett, J. (1990) *Equivocal Communication*. Newbury Park: Sage.