

Novikova O. V.

Oles Honchar Dnipro National University

PECULIARITIES OF POLITICAL SPEECHES TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH POLITICIANS INTO THE UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE

Public speaking is an important step in the work of every political figure. A successful politician must possess the skills of competent construction of speeches, as well as use knowledge in such fields as: linguistics, rhetoric, psychology, philosophy, etc. During the centuries within history of its development the art of oratory was used in various spheres of society: spiritual, ideological, socio-political. It was widely used in political activity. A public political speech in English is significantly different from a politician's speech in Ukrainian. The translation of political texts requires from the translator not only deep knowledge of the language, but also certain experience that forms professional skills. Various stylistic and linguistic means are used to influence the listener, and the translation necessarily reflects all the features of the speech.

Language and politics are closely related, first of all, this is directly reflected in the process of communication. Language is necessary in order to inform, to encourage action, to carry out legislative acts, etc. A distinctive feature of politics is its discursive focus, since political activity is speech-based in its specificity.

The modern world is a world of globalization in which states are in constant contact. To ensure it, a political discourse is needed, the purpose of which is to establish certain relations. Accordingly, the task of translating political discourse is to ensure maximum adequacy and equivalence.

The translator's primary task is to provide politicians and their audiences with an accurate translation. The most important thing is to convey the message to the addressee, without complicating the translation with different constructions. The translator faces a difficult task of conveying this or that opinion or statement of a politician so that the resulting text fully corresponds to the original in terms of meaning.

Key words: *discourse, political discourse, lexical and stylistic device, translation, political language, equivalent.*

Problem statement and relevance. Nowadays, languages are used not only as a tool of formation and expression of thoughts, but also as a way to hide it. In conditions of political struggle and negotiations in the world, the scholars are aware of the fact that political discourse is a linguistic and cultural problem. They pay much attention to the problem of persuasion and the strategies, which help to gain trust and faith of voters. There are several approaches, according to which, scholars study political discourse.

The problem of political discourse and political speeches was considered in the works of domestic and foreign scientists, such as A. M. Sharova [6], M. L. Makarov [2], K. F. Sedov [3], T. A. Dijk [9; 10], I. S. Shevchenko [7]. They made a significant contribution to the study of linguo-stylistic peculiarities, argumentation tools and their translation in the world, including translation of lexical, grammatical and stylistic tools in politicians' speeches.

The relevance of this study is caused by the importance of the development of a new perspective

of the theory and practice of translation, which combines the tools of preservation of argumentation and translation studies. We study political speeches and means of translation of their features. Difficulties in translation of political speeches are often associated with the boundaries between some types of political texts, which are not always clearly determined in scientific researches. From this perspective, it determines the relevance our topic. Translator should correctly and completely express by means of one language what has already been expressed by means of another language.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is to characterize the specific features of political speeches, identify the argumentation tools in the politicians' speeches and analyze the ways and peculiarities of their translation, which help translators to preserve the completeness of the content and transmit the argumentation tools into the translation of political texts from English into Ukrainian.

The presentation of the main material. Discourse is a purposeful social action and language,

which is closely connected to the life. Researchers also interpret discourse as a complex unity of language practice and extra-linguistic factors. To preserve the integrity of discourse research, the key factor is a generalized concept-code, which contains both verbal and nonverbal “signs” [8, p. 321]. Giving interpretations of political discourse in its entirety, we shouldn't limit it to purely linguistic moments, otherwise the essence and purpose of discourse will be unnoticed. Full understanding of political discourse implies knowledge of the background, various expectations of the author and the audience, hidden motives, plot schemes and favorite logical transitions that exist in a particular era.

The study of political discourse is at the intersection of different disciplines and is associated with the analysis of the form, objectives and content of discourse, which is used in certain (“political”) situations. In linguistics, the philosophical problem of the relationship between language and power is studied as a human factor in language and is implemented in practice in the form of discursive and argumentative strategies, which are developed for politicians by their advisers and image makers.

The most relevant for political discourse is the regulatory or as some scientists call it incentive function (particularly, such its manifestations as prohibition and inspiration). The specificity of the referential function of language, which is peculiar to political discourse, is the pronounced creativity of the language of politics, which allows us to talk about the merging of the referent and magical functions of language in political discourse.

Traditionally, the composition of speech is divided into three parts, but their names vary in different sources. According to Selivanova E. A. political speeches include:

- 1) introduction;
- 2) main part;
- 3) ending [4, p. 113].

These parts are called the functional structure components of the speech and the speaker does different tasks in each of them.

The process of translation, no matter how fast it is carried out in favorable or unfavorable conditions, is divided into two parts: to translate, you must first understand and clearly explore what you translate, analyze (if the original text causes difficulties), and after that critically evaluate it. Next, you should choose the appropriate means of expression in the target language. All translations of positive or negative attitudes require the selection of linguistic means of the lexical fund. If the translator works consciously,

not mechanically, then he or she is interested in a certain choice of language tools. The task of objective display of the original text facilitates the selection of appropriate means of translation [5, p. 18].

To our mind, it is important to start learning the analysis of political speeches in linguo-stylistic aspect with clarifying the essence of linguo-stylistics. It's basics could be find in the characteristics, which were given by S. I. Vinogradov [1, p. 49]. He says, that stylistics doesn't have one definition and subject, that's why calls it as linguo-stylistics and defines the following areas, which it covers: aesthetic functions of language, expressive means of language, synonymous ways of expressing thoughts, emotional coloration of speech, stylistic devices, stratification of the literary language into separate systems (styles of speech), individual manner of national language using which is represented by individual-artistic style of the writer.

We have chosen some political speeches of two ex-presidents of the USA, who made a significant impact on the history of the USA, George W. Bush (the 43rd U.S. President) and Barack Obama (the 44th U.S. President) and studied them from the linguo-stylistic point of view. Let's consider three main lexico-stylistic devices, which are quite frequently presented in their political speeches:

1. Colloquial vocabulary. A noticeable lexical and stylistic feature of all modern political speeches, not only Barack Obama's and George W. Bush's is the active usage of colloquial vocabulary. The current political situation is characterized by sharp clashes of political positions, frequent aggressive behavior and uncompromising expression of different points of view. It is not surprisingly, that in such situations we can find colloquial vocabulary very often. For instance, “*And one of the unique things I find now as I talk to representatives of governments from the region is they're all **pretty much** in agreement on that proposition – greater agreement if you will among the folks in the region that I can **recall on** most other propositions in recent years.*” [12] (George W. Bush) or “*My parents shared not only an **improbable** love, they shared an **abiding faith** in the possibilities of this nation.*” (Barack Obama) prove us, that even presidents see themselves at the same stage with common people [11].

2. Slang vocabulary and jargon. In modern political communication, slang vocabulary is extremely actively used, especially dating back to the speech practice of criminals and drug addicts. In recent years, politicians and journalists willingly use such jargon from the criminal sphere. For example,

“*A dumb war.*”, “*We can have an idea and start our own business without paying a bribe.*” “*Now they are having to compete with their own children for jobs that pay seven bucks an hour*”. The president talked about workers in Galesburg, Illinois and said, that there are so few well-paid jobs, which could give a great level of life. And such a slang word as “*Bucks*” shows the nothingness of such salary. “*A man, who butchers his own people to secure his own power.*” Barack Obama was talking about Saddam Hussein and his rude behavior and used expression, which brightly describe this negative character trait. Or one more example of slang vocabulary from the court vocabulary: “*They are prohibited from telling anyone about it and they’re even prohibited from challenging this automatic gag order in court*”.

From the functional point of view, it helps the speaker and his companion to build trusting relationship and become closer. It is noteworthy, that very often slang vocabulary is permeated with conceptual vectors of anxiety, danger, aggressiveness, unnaturalness of the current state of affairs, a sharp opposition of “our” and : “foreign”, which apparently meets the needs of modern political speech.

However, at the same time, we suppose, that not every usage of jargon in political speech deserves undoubted condemnation. The usage of such words often gives opportunity to define of the phenomenon for which a stylistically neutral one-word definition has not yet been created. In addition, in some cases, the usage of jargon contributes to the achievement of expressiveness, helps to express an emotional attitude to the problem.

3. Composite words. At the beginning of the last century, experts noted the active use of compound words and abbreviations in political speeches. For example, “*Let’s fight to wean ourselves off Middle East oil, through an energy policy that doesn’t simply serve the interests of Exxon and Mobil*”. (Barack Obama). “*Middle East oil*” means Iran, Iraq and Saudi Arabia, which are the hugest oil producers in the Middle East. “*Exxon and Mobil*” is the name of the biggest American private oil company. Both compound words and abbreviations make the politician’s speech more clear and formal.

But we should not forget that these lexico-stylistic devices work only in the case, when they are not very frequent and they are only the “assistants”, which make successful accents in important places in the text or attract attention. In most cases speakers use neutral words, terms, book words, which indicate the purity of their speech, professionalisms, assonances (repetitions of identical vowel sounds), alliterations

(repetitions of identical consonants) and, of course, such pronouns as “we”, “our” and “us”. For instance, alliteration in one of the George W. Bush’s speech: “*Never tiring, never yielding, never finishing, we renew that purpose today, to make our country more just and generous, to affirm the dignity of our lives and every life.*” We see the repetitions of pairs of consonants **n** and **g**. It not only makes the speech more melodic, but, as we suppose, creates the sounds of working machines.

Next step, we should make in our article is to analyze the means of translation of lexico-stylistic devices, speech figures and tropes, which are often used in political speeches. Of course, it includes considering lexical translation transformations, which are very often used if there are non-standard words in the source language, such as terms, metaphors, proper names, or concepts that characterize the original culture, and so on.

We will present examples from the investigated speeches and our translation of lexico-stylistic devices, stylistic figures and tropes into Ukrainian.

1) Colloquial vocabulary

“*What I do oppose is a dumb war.*” «*Те, проти чого я виступаю – це тупа війна*». We chose a full equivalent, since this adjective contains a strong emotional component (useless and at the same time rude war), which is better to show with colloquial Ukrainian word «тупий».

One more example, “*He’s a bad guy.*” «*Він – погана людина*». We used generalization, because the main accent was made on human character traits, kindness, faithfulness, etc.

“*Our founders argued. They quarreled. Eventually they compromised.*” «*Наші засновники сперечалися. Їм було складно знайти спільну мову. Зрештою, вони все ж таки пішли на компроміс*». In the source language we can see two lexemes with the same meaning “*argue*” and “*quarrel*”. To our mind, although they have a clear difference in English (in the first case people put logical facts and in the second case – they don’t take care of moral values or the truth), their equivalents in Ukrainian don’t. «*Сперечатися*» and «*сваритися*» have the same meaning and are fully synonyms. That’s why we used translation transformation “addition” and developed it into «*складно знайти спільну мову*», because it shows their common problem they couldn’t solve together.

2) Slang vocabulary and jargon. If we talk about their translation, the most often used translation transformations are transcription, transliteration and calquing.

"I see those powers and principalities have **snuck back** in there." «Я бачу, що ці сили та князівства **прокралися туди**». We decided to use the word «**прокрастися**» to translate the phrasal verb "**sneak back**", because they have the closest meaning. Also we have added a conjunction «**що**», which wasn't present in the source sentence in order to preserve the same structure of compound sentence in Ukrainian.

"There were scandals that were in the years in making, **shook** the energy industry; it affected the telecommunications industry." «В роки створення були скандали, які **підірвали енергетичну і вплинули на телекомунікаційну галузь**». The first meaning of the word "**shake**", which is given by the dictionary – tremble or vibrate something, change the position from side to side. But according to the context, we substituted it with the word «**підірвати**», since we understood that this slang word has the meaning of "harm something, damage". We observe the change of the word-order (transposition), which was caused by the specifics of the Ukrainian language.

3) Composite words and their translation require a great base of knowledge about both language realities, because linking two or more words together is the highest degree of translator's skills.

"All that is needed is a **signoff** from a local **FBI** agent." «Все, що потрібно – це отримати **дозвіл** від місцевого агента **ФБР**», "I want to thank the Director of the **FBI** and the Director of the **CIA** for waging an incredibly important part on the **two-front** war – one overseas, and a front here at home." «Я хочу подякувати директору **ФБР** і директору **ЦРУ** за те, що вони відіграли неймовірно важливу роль у війні **на два фронти** – один за кордоном, а інший у нас вдома», "The decisions that have been made have led us to this **crossroads** – a moment of great peril, Mr. President." «Рішення, які були прийняті, привели нас до цього **роздоріжжя** – моменту великої небезпеки, пане Президенте». It's important that translators be aware of terms such as **FBI**, **CIA**, **two-front**, **crossroads**, because translation could be impossible without knowing this factual material: **FBI** – Federal Bureau of Investigation, **CIA** – Central Intelligence Agency, **two-front** – war, where soldiers defend two sides, **crossroad** – two or more roads come together. If the first two abbreviations require only knowing factual material and we don't use any transformations, the translation of "**two-front**" required the change of grammatical form and "**signoff**" – concretization, because in this case "**a sign**" means a written permission.

4) Antithesis

"Dr. King inspired with words **not of anger, but of an urgency**." «Мартін Лютер Кінг надихнув **не гнівними, а переконливими словами про необхідність**». The politician used antithesis to show the contrast between the power of anger and indication of necessity. People are more likely to do the things they really need, the task is to prove the necessity. We preserved antithesis, but changed the word-order a little bit. Besides, we changed grammatical forms "**of anger**" (pronoun) – «**гнівними**» (adjective), "**of an urgency**" (possessive case) – «**про необхідність**» (common case).

5) Ellipsis

"Materialism alone will not fulfill the possibilities of your existence. **You have to fill with something else**." «Сам по собі матеріалізм не сповнить можливостей вашого існування. **Їх треба наповнити чимось іншим**». We decided to add a pronoun «**їх**» in the Ukrainian variant, because otherwise it could lose its sense and be incomprehensible. This is an example of addition transformation, there is no ellipsis in target language anymore.

6) Parceling

"**Take off your bedroom slippers. Put on your marching shoes. Go do some politics. Change this country!**" «**Зніміть кімнатні капці. Взуйте берці. Ідіть в політику. Змініть цю країну!**» This is a bright example of the agitation or incitement. This is the so-called suggestion of the idea that all people should unite into one whole and start changes from themselves. We see, that word-order and parceling are preserved in the target language. We omitted the verb "do" in the third sentence and added the participle «**в**» because of the specific features of Ukrainian (we say «**йти в політику**»). We found an interesting equivalent for the notion "**marching shoes**". In Ukraine we call them «**берці**». This is a kind of direct translation, where we found a famous analogue.

Conclusions. We analyzed the political speeches in linguo-stylistic aspect on the base of Barack Obama's and George W. Bush's speeches and found various lexico-stylistic devices, which emphasize the language of a political leader and have a direct impact on the image of politicians. It turned out that the main ones are: extensive usage of colloquial and slang vocabulary and composite words. We discovered the following stylistic figures: antithesis, ellipsis, parceling. The investigation of different lexico-stylistic devices in the translation of political speeches of American politicians is not exhaustive

and requires further study by structural, grammatical and morphological analysis. The practical value is that the materials and results of the study can be useful for the development of theoretical courses

in political advertising, public relations, political management and marketing, political journalism. They can find application on the interdisciplinary level: in sociology, ethnosociology, ethnopsychology.

Bibliography:

1. Виноградов С. И. Слово в парламентском: функции и культурный контекст. Культура парламентской речи. М. : Наука, 1994. С. 46-57.
2. Макаров М. Л. Основы теории дискурса : монография. Москва : ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2003. 280 с.
3. Седов К. Ф. Дискурс и личность : Эволюция коммуникативной компетенции. Москва : Лабиринт, 2004. 320 с.
4. Селиванова Е. А. Основы лингвистической теории текста и коммуникации : монографическое учебн. пособие. Киев : ЦУЛ, Фитосоциоцентр, 2002. 336 с.
5. Фесенко Т. А. Концептуальные основы перевода. Тамбов : ТГУ, 2001. 124 с.
6. Шарова А. М. Лінгвістичний вимір політичної інформації: становлення політичної лінгвістики. Миколаїв : ЧДУ ім. Петра Могили, 2009 № 97. URL: http://www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Npchdu/Politology/2009_97/index.html
7. Шевченко І. С. Когнітивно-комунікативна парадигма і аналіз дискурсу. Харків : Константа, 2005. С. 9–20.
8. Шейгал Е. Семиотика политического дискурса : дис. док. филол. наук : 10.02.01. Волгоград, ВГПУ, 2000. 431 с.
9. Dijk T. A. van. Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. New York : Academic Press, Inc., 1983. 389 p.
10. Dijk T. A. van. What is political discourse analysis? Amsterdam, 1997. URL: <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/What%20is%20Political%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>.
11. Barack Obama. Ebenezer Baptist Church Address, delivered 20 January 2008, Ebenezer Baptist Church, Atlanta. URL: <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamaebenezerbaptist.htm>
12. George W. Bush. Address to Citadel Cadets, delivered 11 December 2001, Charleston, South Carolina. URL: <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/gwbushcitadelcadets.htm>

Новікова О. В. ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ ПОЛІТИЧНИХ ПРОМОВ АНГЛОМОВНИХ ПОЛІТИКІВ УКРАЇНСЬКОЮ МОВОЮ

Публічне виступ є важливим кроком у роботі кожного політичного діяча. Успішний політик має володіти навичками грамотної побудови виступів, а також використовувати знання у таких галузях, як: лінгвістика, риторика, психологія, філософія та ін. Протягом багатотисячолітньої історії свого розвитку ораторське мистецтво використовували у різних сферах життя суспільства: духовній, ідеологічній, соціально-політичній. Широке застосування воно знаходило в політичній діяльності. Публічний політичний виступ англійською мовою значно відрізняється від промови політика українською мовою. Переклад політичних текстів вимагає від перекладача не тільки глибоких знань мови, але також певного досвіду, який формує професійні навички. Для впливу на слухача використовують різні стилістичні та мовні засоби, у перекладі обов'язково відбито всі особливості промови.

Мова і політика тісно взаємопов'язані, насамперед, це відбито безпосередньо у процесі комунікації. Мова необхідна для того, щоб поінформувати, спонукати до дії, проводити законодавчі акти та ін. Відмінною рисою політики є її дискурсивна спрямованість, оскільки політична діяльність за своєю специфікою – мовленнєва.

Сучасний світ – це світ глобалізації, у якому держави перебувають у постійному контакті. Для його забезпечення необхідний політичний дискурс, метою якого є встановлення тих чи тих відносин. Відповідно, завданням перекладу політичного дискурсу є забезпечення максимальної адекватності та еквівалентності.

Першочергове завдання перекладача – надати політикам та їхній аудиторії точний переклад. Найважливіше – донести повідомлення до адресата, без ускладнення перекладу різними конструкціями. Перед перекладачем стоїть непросте завдання передати ту чи ту думку, чи висловлювання політика для того, щоб отриманий текст повністю відповідав оригіналу у смислового плану.

Ключові слова: дискурс, політичний дискурс, лексико-стилістичний засіб, переклад, політична мова, еквівалент.