



PRAGMATIC SHIFTS IN THE TRANSLATION OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE AND THEIR CAUSES

Odina Islomova Orifjon qizi

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

PhD student (Theory and Practice of Translation)

Email: odinaislomova38@gmail.com

ORCID: 0009-0003-1275-6972

Abstract: This thesis provides an in-depth analysis of pragmatic shifts in the translation of political discourse and explores the underlying causes that motivate such shifts in English–Uzbek translation. Political discourse is characterized by ideological loading, persuasive intent, institutional framing, and context dependency, which makes pragmatic equivalence difficult to achieve through direct lexical or grammatical correspondence. The purpose of the study is to identify major types of pragmatic shifts and to explain their functional role in achieving translation adequacy. The research is based on a qualitative methodology that combines comparative textual analysis, discourse analysis, and pragmatic interpretation of political speeches, policy documents, and official statements. The findings reveal that pragmatic shifts are primarily caused by ideological asymmetry, cultural and communicative differences, institutional constraints, and audience-oriented adaptation. The study argues that pragmatic shifts should be interpreted as deliberate translation strategies rather than translation errors and that they contribute significantly to communicative effectiveness in political translation.

Key words: political discourse, pragmatic shift, political translation, ideology, translation adequacy.

Introduction. In the context of globalization, political discourse has become one of the most frequently translated types of texts. Political speeches, diplomatic statements, and policy documents are distributed across languages and cultures, requiring accurate and effective translation. However, political discourse is ideologically loaded and pragmatically complex, which makes direct linguistic equivalence difficult to achieve. As a result, translators often apply pragmatic shifts to preserve the communicative intention of the source text [3. 250 p.].

Unlike technical or purely informative texts, political discourse is inherently evaluative and persuasive. Meaning in political texts is often implicit and embedded in pragmatic cues such as modality, presupposition, metaphor, and ideological framing. As a result, literal or formally equivalent translation



may fail to convey the intended pragmatic force of the source text. This creates a need for pragmatic adaptation, which frequently manifests in the form of pragmatic shifts.

Pragmatic shifts refer to changes in the communicative force, evaluative orientation, or contextual meaning of a text that occur in translation. These shifts may involve modification of modality, explicitation or implicitation of meaning, mitigation or intensification of evaluation, and adaptation to institutional or cultural norms. In political translation, such shifts are often unavoidable due to differences between political systems, ideological traditions, and communicative conventions of the source and target cultures[2.245 p.].

The relevance of pragmatic shifts has been widely acknowledged in translation studies; however, their role in political discourse translation requires further systematic analysis, particularly in the context of English–Uzbek translation. This article aims to address this gap by examining the causes, types, and functions of pragmatic shifts in political translation and by demonstrating their contribution to translation adequacy.

Methodology. The research is based on a qualitative approach combining comparative textual analysis, discourse analysis, and pragmatic interpretation. The corpus includes English political speeches, policy documents, and official statements along with their Uzbek translations. The analysis focuses on identifying pragmatic shifts at lexical, syntactic, and discourse levels[6.173 p.].

Results. The study identifies several types of pragmatic shifts commonly used in political translation: explicitation, mitigation, intensification, ideological adaptation, and institutional normalization. The analysis shows that these shifts are mainly motivated by ideological differences, cultural and communicative norms, institutional requirements, and audience expectations.

Discussion. The findings demonstrate that pragmatic shifts function as purposeful translation strategies rather than translation errors. They help translators adapt political texts to the communicative and ideological context of the target culture. Therefore, pragmatic adaptation plays a crucial role in achieving translation adequacy and maintaining the persuasive impact of political discourse in English–Uzbek translation.

Conclusion. The study demonstrates that pragmatic shifts are an inherent and inevitable feature of political discourse translation. Due to ideological, cultural, and communicative differences between English and Uzbek political contexts, translators often need to modify the pragmatic force of the source text in order to achieve functional equivalence. The analysis confirms that such shifts—including explicitation, mitigation, intensification, ideological



adaptation, and institutional normalization—serve as purposeful strategies that help maintain the communicative effectiveness of political texts.

Furthermore, the findings indicate that pragmatic adaptation plays a crucial role in ensuring translation adequacy and preserving the persuasive and ideological impact of political discourse. Therefore, pragmatic shifts should not be viewed as distortions of meaning but rather as necessary mechanisms of intercultural and political mediation in translation. The results of this study may contribute to further research in political translation and support the development of more effective translation strategies in English–Uzbek political communication.

REFERENCES

1. Baker M. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. – London; New York: Routledge, 2018. – 332 p.
2. Chesterman A. *Memes of Translation*. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2016. – 245 p.
3. Hatim B., Mason I. *Discourse and the Translator*. – London: Longman, 1990. – 250 p.
4. Komissarov V. N. *Teoriya perevoda*. – Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 1991. – 253 p.
5. Newmark P. *A Textbook of Translation*. – New York; London: Prentice Hall, 1988. – 292 p.
7. Vermeer H. J. *Skopos and Commission in Translational Action*. – Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectoria Ab, 1989. – P. 173–187.