Materiallar to’plami · Conference Proceedings

TIL, TARJIMA VA TA’LIM: GLOBAL KOMMUNIKATSIYA VA RAQAMLI INNOVATSIYALAR DAVRIDA YANGI YONDASHUVLAR

TARJIMANING ZAMONAVIY TENDENSIYALARI VA TEXNOLOGIYALARI

03 October 2026

UDK 159.9

Jorj Oruellning “1984” asarida emotsional nutqning roli

Dinora Sodikova*

✉ dinorasodikova1990@gmail.com

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada Jorj Oruellning “1984” romanida emotsional nutqning personajlar xarakterini ochib berish, ularning jamiyatga qarshiligini va mafkuraviy nazoratni aks ettirishdagi roli tahlil qilinadi. Tanlangan epizodlarning sinchkov tahlili takrorlar, qisqa jumlalar, ichki tuyg’ularini ifodalagan izhorlar va majburlash ta’siridagi iltijolarning asardagi emotsional rivojlanishni yozuvchi qay tarzda shakllantirganini yoritadi. Qahramonlar nutqidagi parchalarni Karim Bahriyevning o‘zbekcha tarjimasi bilan qiyoslash emotsional ta’sirchanlikni saqlashda voqeaviy kontekst va shaxslararo munosabatlarni hisobga olish zarurligini ko‘rsatadi.

Kalit so‘zlar

hissiy-emotsional nutq, Jorj Oruell, roman distopiya, ideologik boshqaruv, badiiy tarjima

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23278673

Introduction

In George Orwell’s 1984, political domination extends into the expression and interpretation of feeling. The Party demands visible enthusiasm, makes private affection dangerous, and seeks to redirect personal attachment towards Big Brother. Emotional speech therefore participates in the novel’s central conflict: the struggle over whether individuals can retain feelings and relationships that political authority has not prescribed. Winston’s anger, Julia’s declaration of love, Mrs Parsons’s anxious requests, and the cries produced under torture reveal different stages and forms of this struggle. Their significance emerges through their place in the narrative, the relationships between speakers, and the consequences of speaking.

This article argues that emotional speech performs three connected literary functions in 1984. It individualizes characters whose public identities are regulated by the Party; it makes the conflict between private attachment and collective obedience audible; and it marks the movement from resistance towards coerced submission. These functions make emotional speech especially relevant to literary translation. A translation may retain what an utterance states while altering the vulnerability, intimacy, hostility, or urgency through which a reader understands the character. The translation problem consequently concerns the reconstruction of a fictional voice within its narrative circumstances.

The discussion addresses two questions. How do selected emotionally charged utterances contribute to the novel’s characterization and development of political conflict? What does their literary function require a translator to preserve? The English novel provides the principal evidence, while one passage from Karim Bahriev’s Uzbek translation supplies a focused comparative example. The analysis distinguishes characters’ spoken words from their private writing and from the narrator’s representation of their feelings. This distinction matters because the novel can communicate emotion through each of these channels without making them interchangeable.

Material and Methods

Emotional speech is understood here as represented speech in which an attitude or feeling becomes important to the meaning of an interaction. An utterance can communicate emotion through an interjection, repetition, abruptness, or an apparently ordinary statement whose circumstances make it emotionally consequential. Jakobson's discussion of the emotive function connects expressive language with the speaker's attitude and recognizes that the impression of emotion may be sincere or performed [3: 65–66]. This distinction is useful for reading Orwell: outward enthusiasm does not necessarily establish inward loyalty, and a politically required expression may conceal a contrary feeling.

The novel has been analysed by a few number of Uzbek researchers earlier which made it acquainted to the Uzbek readers as well [4], [5].

The study uses qualitative close reading and contextual comparison. Eight focal episodes are considered: the Two Minutes Hate, Winston's diary inscription, Mrs. Parsons's request for help, Syme's account of Newspeak, Julia's written declaration, the lovers' repeated statement about death, Winston's betrayal in Room 101, and the closing representation of his attachment to Big Brother. The selection follows their contrasting emotional functions and their positions in the plot. It is a purposive sample, not a frequency study; it supports interpretations of these episodes rather than numerical claims about all dialogue in the novel.

Each passage is examined through its speaker or narrative source, immediate situation, expressive features, and contribution to characterization or conflict. The comparison considers a local translation decision and does not claim to evaluate the Uzbek translation as a whole. References to readers' responses identify effects invited by the text, not responses measured through an empirical reception study.

The Two Minutes Hate presents emotional expression as a collective political activity. The crowd's hostility is directed towards an officially supplied enemy, while its subsequent relief and devotion attach themselves to Big Brother. Orwell describes a slow, rhythmical chant of "B-B!…B-B!" and associates it with overwhelming emotion and self-hypnosis [1: 18]. The abbreviated name contributes little propositional information. Its force lies in rhythm, repetition, and participation: those present enact membership of the same emotional community by producing the same sound.

This scene complicates any simple opposition between an emotional individual and an unemotional state. The Party depends on intense feeling. It organizes the objects of hatred and devotion and supplies occasions on which those feelings must become publicly legible. Emotional speech can therefore serve political conformity as effectively as personal resistance. The chant turns the leader's name into an object of attachment, while synchronized expression reduces the visibility of individual differences. Its literary role is to make ideological power bodily and communal rather than merely doctrinal.

Winston's private diary offers a contrasting use of repetition. His inscription "DOWN WITH BIG BROTHER" appears five times in succession [1: 19]. The capitals and repeated lines give written language the force of an unspoken shout. Unlike the collective chant, the inscription has no safe public audience. It exposes a feeling that the social environment requires him to conceal. The following panic prevents the moment from becoming a straightforward celebration of courage: resistance is shown as a precarious act performed by someone acutely conscious of danger [1: 19–20].

The relationship between these episodes shows why a formal feature cannot be assigned one fixed emotional value. Repetition supports submission in the chant and rebellion in the diary. What changes is its object, its audience, and the speaker's relation to authority. For a translator, preserving repetition is consequently only one part of preserving the episode. The contrast between collective vocal performance and solitary written defiance must also remain perceptible. The diary should not be treated as spoken dialogue, although its visual arrangement gives it a strongly vocal quality.

Mrs. Parsons's request introduces a quieter form of emotional speech. She begins, "Oh, comrade," and the narrator describes her delivery as "a dreary, whining sort of voice" [1: 21]. Her immediate purpose is practical: she needs assistance with a blocked kitchen sink. Yet the interjection, hesitant request, and description of her voice make the exchange part of her characterization. The ordinary domestic problem is presented through a person whose manner suggests exhaustion and diminished confidence. Emotional significance arises from the

combination of her words and the narrator's framing.

The address "comrade" belongs to the Party's prescribed social vocabulary, but it does not erase the speaker's vulnerability. An official expression of equality is spoken by a woman who appears dependent and intimidated. This mismatch connects public ideology with domestic experience. Her unfinished explanation also matters: the request trails off rather than reaching an assured conclusion. It should not automatically be classified as grammatical ellipsis. In literary terms, the interruption and incompleteness are evidence of the way her voice is represented within the scene.

Results and Discussion

The Uzbek version renders the opening as "Ой, ўртоқ" and describes her manner with "минғирлаган овозда" [2: 22]. The interjection and address retain an audible appeal and the recognizable form of ideological familiarity. The description of delivery also preserves a marked vocal quality. Nevertheless, the English phrase separately evokes dreariness and whining, whereas the compact Uzbek expression does not explicitly reproduce both components as separate descriptors. The comparison therefore suggests a condensation of the narrator's characterization of her voice, rather than the complete disappearance of emotion.

A further shift appears in the opening proposition. The English "I thought I heard you come in" [1: 21] refers to an auditory impression of Winston's arrival. The Uzbek "уйингиздасиз деб ўйлагандим" [2: 22] states that she thought he was at home. The translation retains the practical assumption that permits the request, but the specific auditory basis is no longer explicit. This difference should be described precisely: it alters a situational detail without, by itself, proving that the entire emotional effect has been lost. The scene still presents a tentative approach to a neighbour.

The example illustrates a useful principle for translation criticism. Emotional equivalence cannot be determined by counting matching interjections or adjectives in isolation. The analyst must consider whether the request remains hesitant, whether the voice remains socially and psychologically distinctive, and whether surrounding narration supplies comparable cues. A local reduction may coexist with preservation of the broader characterization. Equally, an apparently small lexical change can matter when it repeatedly alters the reader's access to a character's emotional condition.

Syme's discussion of Newspeak provides another significant emotional contrast. He exclaims, "It's a beautiful thing, the destruction of words" [1: 49]. The positive evaluation attaches aesthetic pleasure to linguistic reduction. In the surrounding passage, his animated appearance and almost dreamy expression reinforce his enthusiasm. The disturbing effect comes from the relationship between his pleasure and the activity he celebrates. A reader is invited to recognize an intellectual excitement directed towards restricting the resources of thought and expression.

Syme is therefore not characterized simply through the information he gives about Newspeak. His manner makes that information ethically and emotionally troubling. He can appreciate precision and verbal economy while supporting a project that narrows independent expression. The scene demonstrates that the Party's linguistic programme can attract willing intellectual investment. Emotional attachment to the programme helps explain how domination is reproduced by participants who experience their contribution as meaningful work.

For translation, the evaluative force of "beautiful" is central. A neutral rendering equivalent to useful or efficient would communicate approval but weaken the unsettling pleasure of the original. Likewise, an overtly sarcastic translation would attribute a critical distance that Syme does not display in this moment. The translator needs to preserve the character's enthusiasm and allow the narrative context to produce the reader's discomfort. Emotional speech thus helps maintain the distinction between a character's evaluation and the implications that the work makes available beyond that evaluation.

Julia's message "I LOVE YOU" is an instance of emotionally consequential writing rather than spoken dialogue [1: 99]. Its brevity contrasts with the danger of its transmission. The narrator describes Winston as stunned and shows that he reads the message again before destroying it. On the following page, the declaration is connected with a renewed desire to stay alive [1: 100]. The words do not merely report Julia's affection: their reception changes Winston's expectations and gives him a reason to imagine a different personal future.

The message establishes a private relationship in a world where communication is monitored. Its emotional force depends partly on the absence of elaborate rhetoric. An ordinary declaration becomes extraordinary because it is forbidden, risky, and unexpected. Expanding it into a florid romantic speech would change Julia's directness and could displace the importance of the clandestine situation. A translation should preserve the economy of the message while ensuring that its intimate relation between sender and recipient remains clear.

The lovers' differing attitudes emerge when Winston says, "We are the dead," and Julia replies, "We're not dead yet" [1: 124]. Winston treats anticipated punishment as already determining the present; Julia insists on the time and experience still available to them. Her answer is not merely a denial of his statement. The temporal qualification preserves a space for action and pleasure without guaranteeing safety. Their voices individualize two ways of living under the same threat: reflective fatalism and practical attachment to immediate life.

The phrase later returns at the moment of discovery. Winston and Julia both say "We are the dead," after which an unseen voice answers, "You are the dead" [1: 203]. The repetition becomes a structural link between anticipation and capture. The shift from "we" to "you" transfers the utterance from the lovers' self-description to the authority watching them. Private language is appropriated and returned as a threat. The effect depends on continuity of wording and the altered source of the voice, supported by the narrator's description of the lovers' physical terror.

This recurrence places a specific responsibility on the translator. Translating the same expression differently on each occasion may obscure its development across the novel, even when each local sentence is idiomatic. Consistency here preserves a narrative connection. The pronoun change is equally important because it identifies a new relation of power: the people who spoke about their own fate become the people whose fate another voice pronounces. Emotional force belongs to this sequence, not just to the isolated word "dead."

In Room 101, Winston's speech reveals the destruction of the attachment that previously sustained him. Confronted with the rats, he cries, "Do it to Julia! Do it to Julia! Not me! Julia!" [1: 261]. Imperatives, repeated names, and abrupt fragments compress his attention around the avoidance of immediate suffering. Julia's name no longer identifies the person whose safety and intimacy he values. It identifies the person to whom he wants the threatened violence transferred. The passage marks a reversal in the interpersonal direction of his emotional speech.

The outburst has a precise narrative function. Its intensity does not establish moral resistance; terror makes Winston demand the betrayal of someone he loves. The Party's intervention succeeds at the level of attachment as well as verbal behaviour. Earlier, expression could preserve a private relation against public coercion. Here, speech performs the repudiation of that relation. The scene also explains why emotional intensity alone cannot be used as a measure of a character's autonomy: a highly emotional utterance can register the collapse of self-command.

The sentence "He loved Big Brother" closes the novel's account of Winston [1: 271]. It is a narratorial statement, not a declaration Winston addresses to another character. Its restrained form is essential to its effect. After the violence and verbal fragmentation of the interrogation, the simple declarative sentence presents the outcome as settled. The emotional vocabulary appears familiar, but the object of love has changed. Read alongside Julia's earlier message and the public chant, the ending completes a progression in which personal attachment is first awakened, then broken, and finally redirected towards political authority.

Adding emotional explanation to this closing sentence would risk weakening its severity. The sentence depends on what the reader remembers of the preceding narrative. A translation that supplies explicit horror, regret, or commentary would interpret the event on the reader's behalf and could disturb the tension between Winston's apparent acceptance and the reader's recognition of what has been destroyed. Preserving emotional force sometimes requires restraint: the absence of an exclamation can carry as much narrative weight as a scream.

Conclusion

The selected episodes demonstrate that emotional speech in 1984 is a means of constructing character and tracing political power through intimate experience. Similar forms acquire different functions in different

situations. Repetition can organize collective obedience, register private rebellion, or enact desperate betrayal. A simple declaration can restore the desire to live, while a similarly economical sentence can represent the extinction of independent attachment. These contrasts make emotional expression inseparable from who speaks, to whom, under what pressure, and at which point in the narrative.

The Uzbek comparison shows why translation analysis should connect local wording with these literary functions. Bahriev’s rendering of Mrs Parsons’s request retains an emotional appeal and a marked voice while condensing some descriptive information and modifying a situational detail. This finding is limited to the examined passage. It does not justify a general verdict about the translation, nor does it establish a measurable loss of reader response. It does, however, show how a careful comparison can distinguish preserved characterization from particular semantic and expressive shifts.

For literary translation, the central task is to reconstruct the relation between verbal form, emotional position, and narrative development. Interjections, repetitions, interruptions, terms of address, and speech descriptions matter because they help readers recognize dependence, intimacy, ideological enthusiasm, or terror. Recurring utterances also require attention across scenes. In Orwell’s novel, emotional speech reveals both the persistence of personal attachment and its vulnerability to organized coercion. Preserving that double role allows a translation to sustain the psychological and ethical conflict on which the novel’s disturbing conclusion depends.

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar

[1] Orwell, G. Nineteen Eighty-Four. Project Gutenberg of Australia eBook No. 0100021, 2001, 284 pp. First published 1949.

[2] Оруэлл, Ж. 1984. / таржимон Карим Баҳриев. Иккинчи нашр. Тошкент: NIHOL, 2020. 296 б.

[3] Jakobson, R. Linguistics and Poetics. In: Language in Literature / ed. K. Pomorska and S. Rudy. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1987. Pp. 61–94. Originally published 1960.

[4] Abdullayeva, M., Sodiqova, D. Jorj Oruell asarlarida til va emotsiya. // «Ta’lim sifatini oshirishda tilshunoslik, xorijiy til va adaniyotini o‘qitishning zamonaviy metodik yondashuvlari: muammolar, imkoniyatlar va yechimlar» (ASR), Tashkent, Uzbekistan. — 2025. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15167644

[5] Qurbonova Sh. Jorj Oruell va Murod Muhammad Do‘st asarlarida jamiyat konsepsiyasi va ko‘pqatlamli tasvir. Filol.fan.d-ri. diss. avtoref. – Buxoro:2023. – 48 b.