UDC: 372.881.111.1

TRANSLATION AND POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Zamzagul Sagadiyeva
S_zamzi90@mail.ru
PhD student of the Department of Translation Theory and Practice
L.N.Gumilyov ENU, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan
Supervisor – S.Satenova

Nowadays indispensable significance of the international relations and global political situation has made “political discourse” an object of study. A number of academic fields and interdisciplinary researches focused on “political discourse” and “political discourse analysis”.

First of all we want to clarify the meaning of the notion “political discourse”. There is no single generally accepted interpretation of political discourse. Some scientists support the idea that political discourse unites "any speech, the content of which belongs to the sphere of politics".

Political discourse can be defined as a language of mass media or other institutions that is generally used in social and political spheres of communication. Such definition of political discourse is given by Christ’l de Landtsheer. We will rely on the definition given by Teun A. van Dijk from the University of Amsterdam in his article “What is Political Discourse Analysis?”.

According to his opinion political discourse is determined by authors (politicians). Majority of studies of political discourse includes texts and talks of professional politicians. So, we can make conclusion that political discourse is simply considered as a written or oral speech of politicians [1, 3].

This definition of the political discourse restricts and defines professional framework of the discourse. Political discourse is also an institutional form of discourse. It means that political discourse should take place in only institutional situations.

On the other hand politicians are not the only crucial participants of the political sphere. For the first time close relationships between people and politics was underlined by Aristotle. His famous description of human being as “political animals” is particularly true in a globalized world. From the interactional and translational point of view we have to take into account various recipients. The people, citizens and other groups or categories are also the vital part of political discourse. The intentionality is the main functional specificity of a political discourse. It has influential, informative and expressive functions.

The study of the phenomenon of political discourse is implemented in three aspects: sociolinguistic, pragmatic and cognitive, within which it reflects the whole complex of relationships between man and society, models cultural values in language groups, speakers' language strategies, forms social order and conceptual world view.

The latest research interest in political discourse founded a new tendency in modern linguistics - “political linguistics”. According to the E. Budaeva and A. Chudinov’s definition political linguistics is “an independent direction of the linguistics focused on the theory and practice of political discourse analysis” [2, 23].

In the works of different researchers were described and identified different genres and sub-genres of political discourse. It unites a broad category of texts and talks, including political (presidential) debates, electoral language, the language of diplomacy and international relations, the language of parliament, and etc.

T. Nikishin presents a classification of varieties of political discourse:

- institutional (in the framework of political communication only texts created by politicians are used, or for politicians);
- Mass media (texts created by journalists and distributed through the press, television, radio,

Internet);

- official business (texts intended for employees of the state apparatus);
- texts created by “ordinary citizens” who isn’t professional politicians or journalists (letters and appeals addressed to politicians or government agencies, letters to the media);
- “political detectives”, “political poetry” and political memoirs popular in recent years;
- political communication texts of scientific communication [3, 163].

Political discourse in linguistics in western scientific schools is represented by two directions: critical discourse analysis and descriptive analysis of political discourse. A critical analysis of the political discourse examines the means by which the authorities achieve a dominant position in society. Proponents of this trend see their goal in preventing all sorts of conflicts. Such a discourse analysis at the present stage of development of the study of political discourse can be considered the most common. Representatives of this school are particularly interested in negative images in the “alien” semantic field: for example, “alien” worldview, “alien” races, “alien” (or, more precisely, “alien”) culture.

Descriptive discourse analysis. Along with a critical analysis of political discourse, there is a different approach to it - the descriptive. Within the framework of this approach, its supporters seek not to criticize and evaluate, namely, to describe certain phenomena and scientifically substantiate their origin outside the field of their own assessment. Moreover, this desire is dictated not by civil passivity and the lack of own convictions, but by the principle of the scientific objectivity of the research.

As with the critical approach to political discourse analysis, in foreign political linguistics

there are quite a few different descriptions of political discourse, which are essentially different methods and approaches, united by a conceptual community.

International politics involve translation to a large extent. Agreements between countries are made available in several languages; interpreters participate in the most crucial political events facilitating the work of international institutions such as the European Union, the United Nations Organization, the League of Nations, etc; some governments put translations of significant documents on their websites. Translation and interpretation play critical role in international relations and diplomacy (for example, the signing of bilateral and multilateral agreements, delivering speeches during state visits, discussions and negotiations in UN and EU) and in national policy-making. International organizations, such as the United Nations and the European Union, have their own official languages and strict translation procedures. Their translation departments and interpreters are considered as a standard for comparison. As we know, the United Nations Organization has 6 working languages: English, French, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese. In contrast, the UN official languages are English and French. For the European Union, all national languages of the member states are considered to be official languages.

State visits and bilateral negotiations are impossible without translation. Translation of many texts and talks are usually available on government or embassy websites and official translation of a number of speeches of the Head of the state is provided and published. In this way, particular government publicizes its political directions and decisions to the global community. Political goals and arrangements of foreign countries are also revealed to home governments in translation. That is, translation/interpretation plays a role in both the export and import of political texts and talks. We also have to underline that translation in the field of politics is actually invisible and considered as an integral part of political activity. Translation and choice of texts for translation is also political decision.

Political texts and talks are the most challenging for translation. Translation of political concepts demands consideration of not only the context, but also the cultural characteristics of the countries of the source language and target language, as well as their history, political environment, understanding of the views of leaders on specific situations. On the other hand, political texts are replete with culturally significant lexical units, which reflect the general and specific features the functioning of national cultures. Therefore, the translation of lexical units of political discourse is a particular difficulty; the translator needs not only to identify culturally significant components of the speeches of politicians, but also to maximally adapt them for understanding of the addressee, focusing on the field of culture of the recipient.

Political texts are distinguished by the presence of specific phrases with strong emotional coloring. Translation of such combinations presents difficulties for the translator, due to the fact that such combinations are not always recorded in bilingual dictionaries. For an adequate translation, the translator must carefully analyze the context in which the phrase is used to determine what meaning it expresses. Explanatory dictionaries can also serve as an assistant to the translator in such cases.

Modern Translation Studies are concerned with the relationship between translation behaviour and sociocultural factors. The political discourse of the United States is distinguished by a high level of precedent. Famous Russian translator P. Palazhchenko says that there are three texts familiar to each citizen of the United States: the first paragraphs of the Declaration of Independence, National Anthem and Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Also majority of Americans are familiar with the text of the Bill of Rights. All politicians in their speeches usually mention these documents or use facts related with [4, 211].

In the book, Annotated Texts for Translation: English-German, also was said that political texts, including political speeches, tend to be quite cultural bound. They tend to possess many cultural-specific references as for example references to history, important places or persons. Moreover such references often come in the form of abbreviations of government institutions or other organizations of importance to the culture in question.

The translation of political discourse has a number of functional and stylistic features that

are directly dependent on the features of the political discourse itself. Of the common language functions, the most relevant for political discourse is impact function on the addressee. Translation theory at the present stage of its development draws attention to the relationship between translation and sociolinguistic factors. It is concluded that the recipient invariably perceives the text of the translation through the prism of their national culture and, accordingly, some substantive aspects of the statement will be a priori not understood or misinterpreted.

When working with texts containing political discourse, the translator must have an idea of the discourse analysis of such texts. It is these ideas that are of great importance in the case when it comes to the translation of political discourse. Since the 1950s, a number of different linguistic approaches for analysis of the quality of translation have been used. Some of them are: Scopos, Catford ,Vinay and Darbelnet. Skopos is a theoretical model that targets to the aim of the translation and figures out the translation methods and strategies for producing a functionally adequate result. According to Skopos theory, for the translator the most substantive is a way of translation, then function of the source text.

Regarding Catford's model we can underline translation shift. It is divided into two types: level and category shifts.

Published in 1995 Vinay and Darbelnet's model is amongst well known and often used approaches to the analysis of translation. It is focused on determining translation strategies and translation of stylistic devices.

The functional specificity of political discourse in relation to other types of discourse is manifested in its basic instrumental function — the struggle for power. One of the important features of media texts of almost all genres is a combination of elements of communication and impact. Although the main function of mass communication is considered to be the transfer of information, this transfer is quite rarely completely neutral, that is, absolutely free from the elements of influence on the audience. In most cases, the transfer of information is accompanied by a direct or veiled expression of assessment, linguistic means and speech techniques that induce the audience to a certain reaction to the transmitted information, means of drawing attention to the information or to the point view expressed in the message. The study of the functional and stylistic features of political discourse helps to translate while preserving the necessary communicative effect, which is, of course, the primary task of the translator.

Political discourse is a multifaceted linguistic phenomenon, knowledge of aspects of which is important in the work of a translator in order not only to relay one or another lexical and lexical-semantic meaning of the source text, enclosed by the author, but also to convey its true meaning.

Based on the studies described in this article, it can be concluded that the Translation Studies focused analysis of political discourse offers different approaches and methodologies. Political texts and talks are the most challenging for translation. Word choice, structure of the sentence, stylistic devices and social situation build a complicated, interdependent and vital construction. Ideologies, position, and feelings are expressed through language: politicians don't always mean what they said. In political discourse texts are similar to the iceberg and hide the vast of the intentions and statements.

Literature

1. Teun A. van Dijk What is Political Discourse Analysis? // Political Linguistics. – 1997. №2. P. 3. – URL http://discourses.org/OldArticles/What%20is%20Political%20Discourse%20Analysis
2. Будаев Э.В., Чудинов А.П. Методологические грани политической метафорологии / Э.В. Будаев, А.П. Чудинов // Политическая лингвистика. - Выпуск (1)21. - Екатеринбург, 2007. - С. 22-31
3. Палажченко П.Р. Мой несистематический словарь. – М. : Валент, 2002. – 289 с.

Никишина, Т.И. Функции политического дискурса как основные пути манипуляции политическим сознанием [Текст]: учебник / Т.И. Никишина. - Саранск, 2012. - 590 с