

Tetiana Semyhinivska
Kyiv, Ukraine

Political Discourse in the Translation

The article focuses on the linguo-cultural and pragmatic peculiarities of the political discourse, scholars' and translators' views on the translation transformations and their role in rendering the source text by employing the language resources of the target language. Of special interest was an analysis of the sample sentences and their translations involving the use of lexical and grammatical transformations; an attempt was made to study the frequency of such transformations while rendering the samples into the Ukrainian language.

Key words: political discourse, translation transformations, linguo-cultural and pragmatic peculiarities, language resources, professional language.

Despite the fact that professional text and this line research of terminology is up-and-coming, the first theoretical basis of this phenomenon appeared only in the 20th century. Professional text in linguistics was singled out in a separate area of general linguistics, the object of which is the text.

Professional language as a special language that serves a particular field or area of knowledge differs from the general one owing to its terminological system. Many linguists have attempted to classify professional language, such as A.I. Movchun, L.M. Muharyamova, O.D. Petrenko but a comprehensive and consistent professional text classification was developed by R. Gläser [1, p. 33-57].

Political activity has always played a key role in the society. At present political discourse has become an instrument of various political circles. Its creation involves huge amounts of money and effort. The growing importance of issues of cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis, which provides high-quality coverage of various aspects of oral and textual communication, as well as the orientation of modern linguistic research into the study of various types of discourse from the communicative and pragmatic point of view, determine the relevance of the versatile coverage of issues of political discourse, one of which is the harmonization of a single terminology apparatus. Political texts are socially conditioned. A special language used in the writing of political texts requires constant study and description, in order to develop a kind of model of political text, a certain constant.

The debates whether the political discourse is the subject of scientific activity field of political scientists or linguists are still on. By answering this question, we study political discourse in terms of linguistics and political science. Political science focuses on the thinking of politicians and their propensity to manipulate the consciousness of the electorate while linguistics is interested in linguistic behavior of politicians, mechanisms of creating political texts of various illusory strategies. As a result, a new branch of research in this field arose – political linguistics. This concept is found in the works by L.M. Mukharayamov, L.P. Nahorny and others. According to the latter, political linguistics is a subdiscipline that explores the language of politics and linguistic politics. Researchers argue if political-and-linguistic relations form the subject of political linguistics. It is believed that linguists are the first ones to distinguish political discourse in the field of scientific research. It is they who, with the help of a new term, “a critical analysis of discourse”, have made it into a political plane [5, p. 54].

Ways of rendering political discourse are almost indistinguishable from text translation methods used in literature. Transformations are the main method of professional text translation. In modern linguistics there is no single classification of types of translation transformations. In most classifications there are two groups of transformations, lexical and grammatical, but V.N. Komissarov [2] provides also lexical and grammatical (complex) transformations. In the proposed research examples of such lexical transformations are analyzed: translation transcription and transliteration, addition, omission, loan translation, lexical-semantic replacement (concretization and generalization of the word). Let us consider some examples:

The transformation of addition may be used with the aim of underlying the importance of the issue or its urgent solution, casting doubt on the political system of government:

Perceived corruption is increasing now [4, p. 3]. – ***Рівень корупційності збройних сил зростає з кожним днем*** [3, p. 3].

The translation is done at the sentence level, but some phrases are translated with the addition of words or even phrases that are relevant in meaning. It ran about the corruption in the armed forces in this section, therefore, the word combination *збройні сили* was added in order to clarify the area under study. Thus, the translator drew the public’s attention to the importance of the issue that has emerged, namely the areas where corruption is flourishing the most. *Now* was substituted by *з кожним днем*. Such a transformation can be considered as a substitution, concretization or addition. The translator stressed that the situation worsened not only over time, but every day, and drew the audience attention to the speed of the

deployment of events, forcing them to think about their actions, or vice versa, inactivity.

*But the **results collectively achieved** so far in the fields of defense reform, stabilization of **conflict-prone regions** and the extension of international corporation bear witness to the **promise** encapsulated in this worthy compendium [4, p. 5]. – Проте, досягнуті **на сьогоднішній день спільними зусиллями результати** у сферах оборонної реформи, стабілізації ситуації у регіонах, де існують умови для виникнення конфліктів, а також розширення міжнародної співпраці свідчать про великі перспективи та можливості, відображені у цьому дуже корисному збірнику [3, p. 5].*

It is noticeable that the translator responsibly fulfilled his/her job, finding direct correspondences for some difficult political terms, but the transformation of adding and descriptive interpretation (explication) were used at least three times. These transformations were taken in order to achieve a communicative effect and impact on the reader (pragmatic aspect), the aim of which was to convince the audience. The phrase *results collectively achieved* was translated into Ukrainian by adding the word combination *на сьогоднішній день*, however the English version does not point to a specific time period. Such information was checked, and judging from the previous context it is clear that the translator did not fabricate the circumstances of time, specified in Ukrainian translation, but convinced of the veracity of the information, added to the reader. The transformation of descriptive translation was also used here, but it refers to the lexical and grammatical (complex) transformations.

***Populist slogans** also often indicate corruption [4, p. 6]. – Корупційні дії можуть ховатися і під завісою **популістських гасел** [3, p. 6].*

The term “populism” and the derived noun “populist” emerged in 1981 in America, because of the establishment of bourgeois Farmers Party. Over the time, the term began to be used in other countries. Direct correspondence for this term has never been found; therefore translators began to use the transformation of transliteration.

*Direct costs of corruption (**Rossiiskaya Gazeta**) [4, p. 34]. – Прямі втрати від корупції (**Російська газета**) [3, p. 36].*

The name of the newspaper was also transliterated, because it is a well-known fact that we do not usually translate proper names.

Grammatical transformations are caused by different reasons – generally, by grammatical and lexical nature, although grammatical factors, in other words, differences in the structure of the two languages play the main role here.

***Defence** is not immune to the scourage of corruption [4, p. 3]. – Не застрахований від прокляття корупції й **військовий сектор** [3, p. 3].*

Translators often use permutation because of differences in the communication sentence division in Ukrainian and English. It is clear that English has predominantly direct word order, while a Ukrainian sentence can start with an object, but it will look and sound just right and grammatically correct for the Ukrainian readers. There is one more important thing: “theme” and “rheme”. Each translator, especially professional, knows that in order to draw the reader’s attention to the main and important information in the sentence, “rheme” should be put at the end. Thus, a translator places the subject, in other words “rheme” in the end, using permutation transformation to emphasize the most important information.

References

1. Gläser R. Linguistic Features and Genre Profiles of Scientific English. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang. 1995. P. 33-57.
2. Комиссаров В.Н. Современное переводоведение. М.: Изд-во «ЭТС», 2001. 421 с.
3. Збірник прикладів (компендіум) позитивного досвіду. «Виховання доброчесності та боротьбі з корупцією в оборонному секторі». Женева-Київ, 2010. 383 с.
4. A Compendium of Best Practices. “Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence”. Geneva, 2010. 331 p.
5. Мухарямов Н.М., Мухарямова Л.М. Политическая лингвистика как научная дисциплина. *Политическая наука*. 2002. С. 45-67.