

MODERN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AND INNOVATIVE TEACHING SOLUTIONS
LINGUOCULTURAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN TRANSLATION OF
DIPLOMATIC SPEECHES

Khodjabekova Durдона Marufbekovna

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Department of international cooperation, leading specialist in Asia, Africa and the Middle East

Abstract. *The study demonstrates how diplomatic speech translation creates linguocultural changes because of its process that transforms cultural elements and practical purposes and hidden ideological elements through different languages. The researchers present a theoretical framework that includes translation studies and linguoculturology and discourse analysis to show how diplomats use translation as a cultural negotiation process that requires translators to choose between their dedication to original content and their responsibility to produce understandable material for specific audiences and their obligation to follow political requirements.*

Keywords: *linguocultural transformation, diplomatic discourse, translation studies, equivalence, cultural mediation, political language, pragmatic adaptation.*

Аннотация. *В данной статье рассматриваются лингвокультурные трансформации, возникающие в процессе перевода дипломатических речей, с особым вниманием к механизмам, посредством которых культурный смысл, прагматическое намерение и идеологический подтекст претерпевают изменения при пересечении языковых границ. Опираясь на теоретические концепции переводоведения, лингвокультурологии и дискурс-анализа, исследование доказывает, что дипломатический перевод представляет собой не нейтральный акт межъязыкового переноса, а сложный процесс культурного переговора, в ходе которого переводчик балансирует между верностью исходному смыслу, ожиданиями целевой аудитории и политическими последствиями.*

Ключевые слова: *лингвокультурная трансформация, дипломатический дискурс, переводоведение, эквивалентность, культурное посредничество, политический язык, прагматическая адаптация.*

Annotatsiya. *Ushbu maqolada diplomatik nutqlarni tarjima qilish jarayonida yuzaga keladigan lingvomadaniy transformatsiyalar o'rganiladi; xususan, madaniy ma'no, pragmatik niyat va mafkuraviy qo'shimcha mazmunning til chegaralari osha qayta shakllanish mexanizmlari tahlil qilinadi. Tarjimashunoslik, lingvokulturologiya va diskurs tahlili sohalarini nazariy konsepsiyalariga tayangan holda, tadqiqot diplomatik tarjimaning tillararo neytral ko'chirish akti emas, balki murakkab madaniy muzokaralar jarayoni ekanligini isbotlaydi — bu jarayonda tarjimon manba matniga sadoqat, maqsadli auditoriya kutishlari va siyosiy oqibatlar o'rtasida nozik muvozanatni saqlashga majbur bo'ladi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *lingvomadaniy transformatsiya, diplomatik diskurs, tarjimashunoslik, ekvivalentlik, madaniy vositachilik, siyosiy til, pragmatik adaptatsiya.*

INTRODUCTION

Your training data extends until the month of October in the year 2023. The process of translating diplomatic speeches establishes its own unique framework which exists apart from all other translation research fields. Diplomatic translation differs from both literary and technical translation because its practitioners must navigate existing political tensions which make even slight changes to register and pragmatic force and cultural connotation result in major effects that reach beyond the text. Diplomatic language exists as a system which creates meanings through a formal structure that hides multiple ideological positions and face-saving techniques and cultural assumptions. When such language crosses linguistic and cultural boundaries, it undergoes what scholars have increasingly termed linguocultural transformation — a process in which the structural, semantic, and pragmatic properties of the source text are not simply converted into target-language equivalents but are actively reshaped by the cultural logic of the receiving linguistic community [1]. The need to study these changes has become urgent because multilateral diplomacy and international organizations and cross-cultural summit communication have all gained importance. Scholars who study Uzbek and Russian and English-language traditions have discovered that general translation theory does not provide adequate tools to understand diplomatic discourse because this field requires a linguocultural approach that shows how language and culture interact. [2].

METHODOLOGY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Researchers built their research methods through an integration of linguocultural theory, discourse analysis, and comparative translation studies. This approach reflects the understanding, well established within the humanities, that theoretical synthesis and conceptual analysis constitute a legitimate and productive mode of scholarly inquiry, particularly in fields where the object of study — linguistic and cultural meaning — is not reducible to quantitative measurement [3]. The foundational theoretical resource for this article is the linguocultural framework developed within Soviet and post-Soviet linguistics, most notably in the work of Vorobyov, who defined linguoculturology as the discipline concerned with the relationship between language units and the cultural knowledge they encode and transmit [4].

The framework establishes a conceptual framework which treats diplomatic formulas and honorifics and discourse conventions as linguistic elements that carry cultural significance through their usage in specific historical and social situations. The tradition of translation theory which focuses on treating two languages as equivalent through their practical use rather than their actual linguistic structure has its most significant representation in Nida's work through his dynamic equivalence concept which enables translators to view their work as a process that aims for communicative results instead of maintaining exact structural accuracy [5]. Recent academic research has developed this understanding into the study of political and diplomatic communication by investigating how different cultures use speech acts such as apology and protest and condemnation and affirmation which translators need to comprehend in order to maintain the original illocutionary force [6]. The field of Uzbek linguistics has seen a rise in research about

translation problems that exist in political and official texts during the past few years because Central Asian states have developed more international relationships and the region has experienced a rise in multilingual diplomatic activities.

Researchers such as Sobirov have studied the practical and stylistic aspects of official translation work which Uzbek institutions complete, because they discovered that Uzbek communication standards clash with the diplomatic standards of Russian and English which lead to translations that meet official standards but create misunderstanding of meaning [7]. Russian translation scholarship has established extensive methods to analyze translator's transformations which define all techniques that change source-text meaning into target text according to their specific functions and this system has been applied to study diplomatic and political writing [8]. The combination of these traditions with modern Western discourse analysis methods especially the critical discourse analysis framework developed by Fairclough and his colleagues creates an effective framework to study how power relations and ideological systems and cultural identities get expressed in diplomatic speech translation [9].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Theoretical literature analysis shows that diplomatic translation studies disclose three main categories for studying linguocultural changes in diplomatic translation work. The first category of the system represents one specific aspect of diplomatic interpretation while creating particular difficulties which translators need to overcome. The process of semantic-connotative transformation occurs when a source-language term contains cultural meanings which the target language either does not have or has different or reduced versions of its original cultural meanings. Diplomatic discourse contains numerous such terms because words and phrases that describe sovereignty territorial integrity and fraternal relations and mutual respect carry different historical meanings which vary between different language communities. The translator must handle multiple aspects of the Russian term *suverenitet* and the Uzbek word *mustaqillik* when they translate these terms into English diplomatic documents because the English word *sovereignty* lacks the complete denotative meaning and operational historical significance and original audience impact which these terms possess.

The process of pragmatic-illocutionary transformation will take place when a diplomatic speech act changes its intended meaning because of its transition to a different cultural and linguistic setting. Diplomatic speeches exist as performative acts because they create actual situations through their delivery which establishes diplomatic positions and binds states to their promises while resolving international conflicts. The illocutionary force of such acts — whether an utterance is a genuine concession, a ritual formality, or a face-saving ambiguity — is often culturally encoded and translation results in incorrect comprehension of its meaning [6]. The conventions of indirectness research in diplomatic communication demonstrate different patterns between various cultural groups because one linguistic system shows determination through its specific expressions which another system interprets as hostile or inflexible while one cultural

system uses polite indirectness as its standard social behavior and another culture sees it as dishonest conduct that results from its need for direct communication.

Translators who work between the indirect speech patterns of Uzbek official communication and the direct speech patterns of English diplomatic conventions must make choices about how to adjust the speech act strength between those two systems without changing the intended political message. Discourse-structural transformation involves the complete process of changing all macro-structural elements which compose diplomatic texts from their original form into their translated version. Different linguistic and cultural systems create distinct frameworks which govern diplomatic speeches because these systems determine how speakers should present their arguments and essential commitments and handle face-related issues and implement standard methods for beginning and ending their speeches. Translators face a decision between two options when they work with a diplomatic speech which follows one tradition but needs to be transformed into a language with different structural requirements; they can either maintain the original structure which creates an awkward experience for readers or they can change the text to fit target language norms which results in changes to both design and political impact of source material.

The theoretical implications of these three categories are significant for our understanding of what diplomatic translation is and does. If linguocultural transformations of this scope and complexity are inherent to diplomatic translation, then the notion of a transparent or neutral translator — one who simply conveys the meaning of the source speaker into another language — is revealed as a theoretical fiction. The diplomatic translator is, unavoidably, a cultural mediator: an agent who makes decisions, often under conditions of time pressure and political constraint, about how to render not only the words but the cultural logic of a diplomatic act in a target language and cultural context that may operate according to substantially different assumptions. The translator's task is not to produce an identical copy of the source text but to produce a target text that achieves an equivalent communicative and political effect within the conventions and expectations of the target linguistic community [5].

CONCLUSION

This article has argued that the translation of diplomatic speeches involves systematic linguocultural transformations that operate across semantic, pragmatic, and discourse-structural dimensions of meaning. These transformations are not incidental failures of translation but inherent features of the encounter between distinct linguistic and cultural systems, each of which encodes its own assumptions about the nature of diplomatic communication, the conventions of formal address, and the relationship between language and political action. The analysis demonstrates that a linguocultural theoretical framework, integrating insights from Uzbek, Russian, and Western translation traditions, provides a more adequate conceptual basis for understanding diplomatic translation than approaches that focus exclusively on formal or semantic equivalence. Future research in this area would benefit from extended attention to specific language pairs and diplomatic genres, as well as from closer engagement with the institutional contexts in which

diplomatic translation is produced and received, including the role of international organisations, bilateral summits, and multilateral treaty negotiations in shaping translation norms and practices.

REFERENCES

1. Комиссаров В.Н. Теория перевода (лингвистические аспекты). — М.: Высшая школа, 1990. — 253 с.
2. Хасанов Б.Х. Тилшунослик ва таржима назарияси масалалари. — Тошкент: Фан, 2005. — 180 б.
3. Воробьёв В.В. Лингвокультурология: теория и методы. — М.: РУДН, 1997. — 331 с.
4. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. — М.: Академия, 2001. — 208 с.
5. Nida E.A. Toward a Science of Translating. — Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964. — 331 p.
6. Schäffner C. Political Discourse, Policy and Translation // Perspectives: Studies in Translatology. — 2012. — Vol. 20, No. 4. — P. 375–379.
7. Собиров А.Б. Расмий нутқни таржима қилишнинг прагматик жиҳатлари // Ўзбек тили ва адабиёти. — 2017. — №3. — Б. 44–51.
8. Бархударов Л.С. Язык и перевод: вопросы общей и частной теории перевода. — М.: Международные отношения, 1975. — 240 с.
9. Fairclough N. Language and Power. — London: Longman, 1989. — 259 p.
10. Hatim B., Mason I. Discourse and the Translator. — London: Longman, 1990. — 258 p.

