AL-FARABI KAZAKH NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
International Relations Department
Chair of Diplomatic Translation
**Translation business in the field of international and legal relations**
**Practice of Simultaneous Interpretation**
2021-2022 academic year spring semester

**Lecture**

**Module 3: Cognitive Aspects in Simultaneous Interpretation**

**Lecture 12: Stylistic tools in Simultaneous Interpretation of Political Discourse**


**Plan of the lecture**

1. Introduction

2. Linguistic features of speech in SI

3. Conclusion

4. References


**Aspects of the lecture**

1. Stylistic features of English political discourse

2. Peculiarities of public speech of political leaders

3. Classification of stylistic tools in political discourse

4. Dealing with difficulties


**Goals of the lecture**

1. Describe general stylistic features of political discourse of US leaders

2. Make pre-translation linguistic analysis of speech

3. Identify frequently used stylistic strategies in US political discourse

4. Make post translation analysis


**Basic concepts**

personal image of the author,  host factor, informational content, intentions, evaluation, tradition, emotions/expressiveness,  modality,  textuality,  socio-cultural content,  form of communication,  means of communication. and etc.


Regarding political discourse, Chilton  points out that there are two broad strands for the concept of politics: if one considers the definitions, implicit and explicit, found both in the traditional study of politics and in discourse studies of politics, there are two broad strands. In the one hand

politics is viewed as a struggle for power, between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it. On the other hand, politics is viewed as cooperation, as the practices and the institutions that a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, influence, liberty, and the like. The concept of political discourse is unanimously defined. Political discourse may overlap with other types of discourse, particularly religious discourse. Features of modern American political speeches Prime (2008, p. 1)) identified some of the common linguistic features of American political discourse, particularly speeches. According to Prime, "There are several readily recognizable techniques employed by all politicians, regardless of platform or ideology, when delivering speeches." Repetition is the first feature of American political speeches. Repetition is a widely used technique in political speeches. Politicians often repeat words or even phrases to emphasize certain points [1, page 14]. believes that "repetition can make a sentence or phrase "catchy," or more memorable, creating a rhythm for the words which can stick with the listener as much or more than the actual words spoken do."

The second feature of American political speeches is that they are generally delivered in the 36 first-person plural, rather than singular. Prime explains the effect of using the first-person plural on the audience as follows: A listener hearing "we" or "us" is free to interpret the usage as inclusive even if it is not. This inclusivity fosters a sense that the candidate is speaking for the listener as well as himself and presupposes the listener's agreement with the ideas espoused in a way that subtly brooks no argument [1, page 15]. The previous point is illustrated more than once in Obama's speech, *"Of course, recognizing our common humanity is only the beginning of our task. Words alone cannot meet the needs of our people.*

These needs will be met only if we act boldly in the years ahead; and if we understand that the challenges we face are shared, and our failure to meet them will hurt us all." Moreover, speakers use the third-person plural sometimes to generate sympathy from their audience. Prime explains how in certain cases, politicians use the first-person singular: politicians will utilize the first-person singular emphatically, often to highlight differences between their own respective political stances or character traits and those of opponents without specifically referring to those opponents [1, page 20]. The use of "I," especially when it marks a shift away from a trend of plural pronouns, indicates that the listener is to take what follows as something of individual importance to the speaker, perhaps even something unique."

The following example from Obama's speech, illustrates the previous point: *"We are taking concrete actions to change course. I have unequivocally prohibited the use of torture by the United States, and I have ordered the prison at Guantanamo Bay closed by early next year."*

Interpreting Political Discourse In the last decade, there has been an increasing interest in the subject of political discourse, especially with the development of ideological and rhetorical

criticism of political speeches. The development of technology and mass media made it possible for politicians to reach a large number of people, therefore exposing the public to a range of political messages in a variety of forms. However, research on the translation/interpreting of political texts remains scarce. In fact, Romagnuolo points out that "Currently, translation studies seems to be more concerned with the politics and the politicization of translation than with the translation of political texts" [2, page 3].  Similarly, little or no attention has been paid to investigating simultaneously interpreted political discourse in any of its forms. In her research on non-cognitive constraints and interpreter strategies in political interviews, Baker concludes that " although less common than court or community interpreting, 'political' interpreting as a genre deserves to be studied more closely in view of its importance in shaping cultural images and aiding or obstructing the cause of world peace" [3].

Translating and interpreting political discourse is of particular interest, not only because of its importance, but also because of the problems it poses theoretically and practically for translators and interpreters, plus of course the global effects of this discourse.  Cultural Issues in Interpreting Newmark defines culture as "the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression" [4]. Thus culture is a system of habits, beliefs, morals, law, religion, customs, and behavior. In the relation between language and culture, Faiq asserts that "language and culture represent the two sides of the same coin." In other words, language and culture are intertwined and can't be separated from one another [5, page 19].

However cultural difficulties are more problematic for them than linguistic difficulties. Newmark points out that "frequently where there is cultural focus, there is a translation problem due to the cultural 'gap' or 'distance' between the source and target languages." He further gives the following examples of the cultural objects that may cause difficulties for translators:

Amid classification offered by many scholars on political discourse, we have chosen to describe the general semantic-pragmatic categories of political discourse. These categories are as follows: 1) personal image of the author; 2) host factor; 3) informational content; 4) intentions; 5) evaluation; 6) tradition; 7) emotions/expressiveness; 8) modality; 9) textuality; 10) socio-cultural content; 11) form of communication; 12) means of communication. As for the main features of political discourse, Russian scholar V.Z. Demyankov defines the following features: 1) valuation and aggressiveness; 2) the ability to persuade the intent of the addressee; 3) protecting the views of political discourse, ie argumentation [7, p. 32-43]. Sheigal predominates four different types of political discourse: 1) agonism, competition; 2) aggressiveness; 3) ideological character; 4) theatricality [8, p. 198]. First of all let's define the characteristics of the competition.

*«The problem is not that all Republicans think the way this guy does. The problem is that they've been riding this tiger for a long time. They've been feeding their base all kinds of crazy for years, primarily for political expedience. They know better, a lot of these folks who ran, and they didn't say anything, and so they don't get credit for, at the very last minute, when finally the guy they nominated and they endorsed and they supported is caught on tape saying things that no decent person would even think, much less say, much less brag about, much less laugh about or joke about, much less act on. You can't wait until that finally happens and then say, 'That's too much, that's enough,' and think that somehow you are showing any kind of leadership... People like Ted's opponent, they stood by while this happened. And Donald Trump, as he's prone to do, he didn't build the building by himself, but he slapped his name on it and took credit for it. And that's what's happened in their party. All that bile, all the exaggeration, all the stuff that was not grounded in fact just kind of bubbled up, started surfacing. They know better, a lot of these folks who ran, and they didn't say anything. So they don't get credit.»*

This is an excerpt from the statement made by US President Barack Obama accused of inciting Republican Party for Presidential elections during the election campaign in Ohio in 2016. A candidate for the presidency supports Hillary Clinton, a member of his party, calling on the people to make the right choice for the mistakes made by their opponents and the shortcomings of their opponents. The use of the second or third-party prints is a clear indication of the agonistic nature of the presence of opposing parties and to indicate that the interests and the principles of the parties are separate. Let's consider speech of current US President D.Trump:

*«She really has no choice. But she doesn't want to. However, she's really been forced -- and she has been forced to say these words. She supports, and the reason is, she supports so much of what is wrong and what is wrong with this country. And what is going wrong with our country and our borders. She has no clue, in my opinion, what radical Islam is and she won't speak honestly about it if she does in fact know. She's in total denial, and her continuing reluctance to ever name the enemy broadcasts weakness across the entire world. True weakness.*

*I don't know if you know this, but just a few weeks before the San Bernardino, the slaughter, that's all it was, a slaughter, Hillary Clinton explained her refusal to say the words radical islam. She wants to take away Americans' guns and then admit the very people who want to slaughter us. She supports so much of what is wrong. She has no clue, in my opinion, what radical Islam is and she won't speak honestly about it if she does in fact know... So she says the solution is to ban guns. They tried that in France, which has among the toughest gun laws anywhere in the world, and 130 people were brutally murdered by Islamic terrorists in cold blood. Her plan is to disarm law abiding Americans, abolishing the Second Amendment and leaving only the bad guys and terrorists with guns. No good. Not going to happen, folks. No*

*good. Not going to happen. She wants to take away Americans' guns and then admit the very people who want to slaughter us... Let them, have all the fun they want...».*

Aggressiveness is the most important component of political discourse. In an English-language worded word, the word "aggression" refers to "violent or hostile feelings, behavior or attitude," that is, "anger or emotion".

**Follow-up questions**

1. Speak about illocutionary speech acts in political discourse
2. Make analysis of B.Obama speech, highlight stylistic features
3. Describe menace and menace speech acts in D.Trumps speech

**References**

1. Prime, K. Characteristic Linguistic Features of Modern American Political Speeches [Электронный ресурс]   Режим доступа: http://www.associatedcontent.com/article

2. Romagnuolo A. Political Discourse in Translation: A Corpusbased Perspective on Presidential Inaugurals // The Journal of American Translation and Interpretation.  2009. -  № 4(1). – p. 1-30

3. Baker, M. Non-cognitive constraints and interpreter strategies in political interviews // Translating sensitive texts: Linguistic aspects.  – 2000. - №7. – p.111-129

4. Newmark and Weaver W.The mathematical theory of communication.Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1949.- p 241

5. Faiq and Riccardi A. Language-specific Strategies in Simultaneous Interpreting // John Benjamins. – 1995. –  p. 750-756

7. Демьянков В.З. Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: История и современные исследования. – 2002. – № 3. – 32-43 с.

8. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса. - Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. - 368 с.