

TRANSLATION ISSUES OF POLITICAL INTERVIEW

Elmurat M. ZIKHROLLAYEV¹, Aybarsha ISLAM²,
Bayan Kh. ISMAGULOVA¹, Dilfuza S. ROZIYEVA³

¹Department of Simultaneous Interpretation, Kazakh Ablai Khan
University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty,
Republic of Kazakhstan

²Pedagogical Faculty of Foreign Languages, Kazakh Ablai Khan
University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty,
Republic of Kazakhstan

³Department of Speech Practice of Foreign Philology, Kazakh Ablai
Khan University of International Relations and World Languages,
Almaty, Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract: *The discourse of politicians has its own specific terminology and functions. A political interview can be considered as a genre of political discourse and media discourse, since it combines the characteristics of both the language of politics and the language of the media. The participants in the political interview pursue the main goal – to convince the audience, to induce certain intentions in it and to encourage action. The paper investigates challenges and the translation aspects of political interview, the translation of figures of speech inherent to political discourse. The article examines efficient translation strategies and techniques for adequate translation of political interview. The article argues that the translation issues of political interviews have not yet seen sufficient attention within Translation Studies. The results revealed that the translator should make a translation decision taking into account the pragmatic intention of the interview participants in order to preserve the same communicative effect of the source language using appropriate and efficient translation strategies and techniques.*

Keywords: political discourse, political interview, translation strategies, translation techniques, communicative effect.

The processes of globalization have contributed to the politicization of society. In turn, the intensive spread of information technology and the expansion of media space lead to an increase of interest in political discourse. Both on national and international level, the 21st century has witnessed dramatic increase in the both the quantity and the importance of the discourse which disperses within the political sphere. To some extent the topicality of political discourse has been powered by different crises that have taken place at the global level for over last two decades: starting from global financial crisis, to volatility of regimes in the Middle East, the increase of influx of migrants to the European Union, the ongoing terrorist attacks around the world, the danger of nuclear proliferation and climate change issues.

Language as a social phenomenon is regarded as a political tool. Researchers point out the close relationship of these social phenomena. Bell¹ bases the definition of politics on three main concepts: power, influence and authority and he states that politics affects people's views, opinions and attitudes. Lasswell² also considers verbalization as a manifestation of power. This presupposes that language as an instrument of politics may be applied in all areas of human activities that are aimed at providing information and thus convincing and influencing an audience. All these arguments are based on a communicative-pragmatic approach that considers human activity as an extralinguistic context.

Political discourse is a special type of discourse that aims to conquer and maintain political power. In linguistics, political discourse is presented as a multidimensional and multifaceted phenomenon, as a complex of elements forming a single entity. Van Dijk³ defines political discourse as a discourse of politicians, implemented in the form of government documents, parliamentary debates, party programs, speeches of politicians. It is a politically restricted genre that has its own thesaurus and specific functions. Political discourse is an integral part of social relations, since it is formed by them and at the same time it forms social relations, being a complex unity of the linguistic form, knowledge and action. Thus, in the implementation of political discourse not only linguistic means are involved, but also extralinguistic factors that determine communication, as well as cognitive structures that determine the existence of the discourse itself⁴.

Political discourse is the subject of study of Political Linguistics, established in the middle of the 20th century by G. Orwell and V. Klemperer. There are such genres of political discourse as parliamentary debates, political speeches, interviews, the manifesto, the election platform speeches, political advertising, etc. In accordance with the object of our research, political interview is also considered as a specific genre of media. This is due to the fact that it belongs to both media and political discourse and incorporates the features of both the language of politics and the language of media. According

¹ D.V.J. Bell, *Power, influence and authority: an essay in political linguistics*, Oxford University Press, London, New York, 1975.

² H.D Lasswell, N Leites and Associates, *Language of Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics*, MIT Press, Massachusetts, 1968.

³ T.A. van Dijk, "Political discourse and Political Cognition", in P.A. Chilton, & Ch. Schaffner eds., *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2002, p. 203-237.

⁴ Barack Obama's interview by ITAR-TASS, 2009. Available at <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/realitycheck/the-press-office/interview-president-itar-tassrossiya-tv-7-2-09>; Can Donald Trump be understood? Planet Today, 2019. Available at <https://planet-today.ru/geopolitika/item/107415-mozhno-li-ponyat-donald-trampa>

to Blum-Kulka⁵, political interview is an interview in which the interviewees are members of the political elite – i.e. political decisionmakers who hold, or actively seek to hold widely publicised public offices. Political interview is a highly structured speech event which is characterized by a set of implicit norms which govern the verbal behavior of the interactants in relation to each other during the interview.

Sandová⁶ states that political interviews are a specific genre of political discourse in which, by using conventionalized ways, politicians reach the particular communicative intent of affecting and convincing the audience. Political interview differs from face-to-face conversation in that it is a planned and clearly structured discourse that takes place for the benefit of an audience⁷. In addition to this, it is a goal-oriented dialogue between the participants, the interviewer and the interviewee, both of whom have certain expectations of the outcome of the talk. They employ specific communicative strategies due to the contextual constraints and requirements that this type of communication poses in order to meet their expectations and the expectations of the other party⁸.

Mikhalskaya⁹ claims that political interview is a highly conventional (socially “conditional”) public speech genre with a rigid distribution of speech roles of direct participants, in which a journalist reveals or seeks to reveal the traits of a politician that are significant for society, including “dangerous” ones, while, the politician, answering the journalist’s questions seeks to convince the society of his “relevance”. In other words, participants of a political interview seek to convince the addressee and to prompt him to action.

Factors affecting the translation of political interviews

The most proactive participant in the interview is an *interviewer*, who plans questions, sets the course of the interview. An *interviewee* can completely obey the interviewer and follow his logic and the course of the interview, and but can also play a decisive role in the development of the dialogue. The information obtained during the interview process is intended not only for the interlocutors themselves, but also for informing the *audience*. The audience most often does not directly participate in the dialogue; however, this does not

⁵ S. Blum-Kulka, “The dynamics of political interviews”, in *Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 1983, vol. 3, no. 2, p. 131-153.

⁶ J.K. Sandová, *Speaker's involvement in political interviews*, Masarykova University, Brno, 2010.

⁷ A.B. Stenström, *Questions and Responses in English Conversation*, Lund University Press, Lund, 1984.

⁸ Z. Nedorostová, “Political Interview, A Study of the Genre Based on Textual Analysis of BBC HARDTalk Interviews”, 2007. Available at <https://theses.cz/id/dinpka/>

⁹ A.K. Mikhalskaya, “Field structure of political discourse.”, in *The method of analysis and description of the speech behavior of a politician in a political interview*, Moscow, Zhurnalistika, 2000, p. 28-70.

reduce its importance as a participant in the interview. The needs, interests, expectations of the audience are taken into account by both the interviewer and the interviewee. On the basis of this, they construct the interview.

The introductory part, the main part and the concluding part are distinguished in the structure of political interview. At the first stage, there are a greeting, an introduction to the topic of the interview, mutual expression of gratitude. This stage is completely formed by the interviewer. The second stage is the main part. It is important that the replies are monologic, since they perform the main semantic function in covering the actual topic. The questions asked by journalists are fewer in volume and the percentage of dialogue is high. Also, this stage is characterized by a frequent change and a wide range of communicative strategies, which are determined both by the personality of the politician and by sociocultural characteristics. The initiative in the main part of the interview can shift from the interviewer to the interviewee. Thus, in the context of the political interview, the roles that the participants in the dialogue should play are defined.

The third stage summarizes the meeting, describes the prospects for a future meeting, contains a summary of the dialogue between the interviewee and the interviewer. Islam¹⁰, considering the translation of political discourse, states that “One of the main features of an interview is to know an interviewee’s opinion on the issues raised by asking questions. The interview does not always go in sequence of question and answer. The interviewer may express his/her controversial opinion and thus, ask precise, ambiguous or criticizing questions related to the subject of discussion. The interviewee may agree, object, or even refuse to answer”.

According to A. Fetzer and E. Weizman¹¹, the content and manner of talk in the political interview are determined by the following factors:

a) The topics and issues raised. These are sophisticated and often controversial.

b) The participants’ institutionalized roles and identities. The political interview as a type of an institutionalized communication presupposes a clear-cut division of labour and social roles that determine the allocation of speech acts utilized in this communication genre. The interviewer’s role, obligation and right is to extract information whereas the interviewee is obliged to provide relevant and informative data.

c) The broadcast and publication of the dialogue. These require adjustments related to public speaking style.

d) The audience that the interview is aimed at. Once members of an audience are involved in a political discourse, the language force is

¹⁰ A. Islam, *Simultaneous Interpretation in Political Discourse*, Bastau, Almaty, 2012, p. 120.

¹¹ A. Fetzer, E. Weizman, “Political discourse as mediated and public discourse”, in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 2006, vol. 38, p. 143-153.

characterized as “audience-dependent perlocutionary force, focusing on the effects of argumentation on various audiences”.

The use of language is largely reliant on the communicative situation. Thus, depending on different communicative situations the content of the conversation, syntax, lexis, tone of speakers’ voice is adjusted. Consequently, by taking into account the subject matter, the interview participants, the target audience and the communication channel it is possible to study the discourse of the political interview.

Political interview is characterized by being highly argumentative, persuasive, asymmetrical. Lavrinova¹² points out some other features of political interview such as polysubjectivity, special dialogicity, special addressing, two-subject character (both interlocutors act as the author of the text), the vector of addressing (from the author-interviewer to the interlocutor and from the interlocutor to the interviewer, on the one hand, and from both of them to the potential reader, on the other hand), informativeness, evaluativeness, institutionalism, spontaneity, authorship. In this research, we aim to define the importance of studying political interview from Translation Studies perspectives, to identify effective translation strategies and techniques, and to determine common translation errors.

In this globalized world, the translation/interpreting of political discourse has become an increasingly important field of scientific investigation that presents a number of challenges. These challenges imply the interdisciplinary character of the field, the sensitiveness of the subject matter involved, and the certain pragmatic constraints that relate to the translation/interpreting process of political discourse. Translation of political interview should adequately reflect the political and ideological views of world leaders conveyed in SL. Political interview translation does not allow free interpretation and is a sphere of increased speech responsibility. Political interview abounds in terminology, special vocabulary, ideologies, epithets, metaphors, abbreviations, political realia, specific grammatical constructions. Figures of speech, set expressions, clichés, appeals, slogans and quotes of prominent politicians are not uncommon in political interview.

A translator has to be aware of the specifics of political interview in both languages. The content of political interview includes all those factors present in the consciousness of the producer and recipient of the text that can influence the generation and perception of speech: other texts, political views of the author, political situation, etc. Linguistic aspects of political discourse have been studied following different perspectives. As part of the political discourse, the genre of political interview has also been researched by many

¹² N.I. Lavrinova, “Text-forming characteristics of a political interview”, in *Bulletin of the University of Pomerania, Series: Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2009, vol. 5, p. 68-71.

modern scholars. However, the translation issues of political interviews in political discourse are not sufficiently investigated.

Translation of political interview is evaluated by its adequacy. Adequate translation is the ratio of the source and the target texts, in which a certain goal is achieved. Adequacy is focused on translation as a process. Adequate translation presupposes the implementation of the semantic component and the pragmatic component of the source text. In the semantic component of the text, one can distinguish the content, which includes denotative and connotative meanings of words, and the contextual part, which is largely determined by pragmatic factors and, in turn, determine the final choice of translation correspondences, equivalents and techniques.

The pragmatic orientation, which plays an important role in the translation of political interview, involves certain transformations in the translation process. Translation strategies, techniques are necessary to make adequate translation. The adequacy of translation of political interview also depends on a translator's background knowledge of the target language culture. Possession of such knowledge related to national-specific realia, national peculiarities of political discourse and features of speech styles of particular politicians allows achieving necessary adequacy in the translation of political interview.

Islam¹³ claims about the importance of considering different factors from the interpreter perspectives: "the interpreter should take into account that the speaker delivers the speech in compliance with the aim of communicative situation with regard to the following specifications of the addressee as the social status, age, gender, occupation, mentality, ethnical culture and values the recipient audience follows...". Political interview should be adequately rendered taking into account pragmatic intention of its participants in order to cause the same communicative effect as in the source language using efficient translation strategies and techniques.

Producing an equivalent communicative effect is considered to be one the major requirements for a translator of political interview. P. Newmark¹⁴ stresses the importance of communicative translation that attempts to produce on its readers/audience an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers/listeners of the original. According to the scholar, the target text must emphasize the force rather than the content of the message and a translator should focus on producing an equivalent effect on the target readers/audience. Schweitzer¹⁵ also states that the reactions aroused by the two texts must

¹³ A. Islam, *Simultaneous Interpretation in Political Discourse*, Bastau, Almaty, 2012, p. 120.

¹⁴ P. Newmark, *About Translation*, Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, Beijing, 2006.

¹⁵ A.D. Schweitzer, *Translation Theory: Status, Problems, Aspects*, Nauka, Moscow, 1988, p. 215.

conform to the communicative intention of the ST Sender. Thus, the reproduction of such text is believed as adequate.

The corpus for the research work used for the analysis consists of interviews with political leaders. Russian reference corpus was also included in order to make a comparative analysis with the source texts. Findings of the research are chosen by the continuous sampling method and used in the present paper to illustrate the translators' translation decisions; implemented translation strategies, techniques; and translation errors while rendering political interviews into TL.

Features of translation of political discourse on the example of linguistic constructions

The translation of political interview has a number of functional and stylistic peculiarities that are directly dependent on the characteristics of political discourse itself. The most relevant general linguistic function of political interview is the function of influencing the addressee. Although one of the main functions of political interview is considered to be the information transfer, it is rarely quite neutral, that is, completely free from elements of influence on the addressee. In most cases, the information transfer is accompanied by an explicit or implicit expression of assessment, linguistic means prompting the audience to a certain reaction to the transmitted information. The theory of translation at the present stage of its development draws attention to the relationship of translation and sociolinguistic factors. The recipient invariably perceives the target text through the viewpoint of his national culture and, accordingly, some substantial aspects of the statement will be a priori not understood or misinterpreted. Hence, it is the task of a translator to make correct translation decision taking into account functional and stylistic peculiarities of political discourse, so to render the source text adequately preserving intended communicative effect¹⁶.

It should be noted that the political discourse, namely political interview, is characterized by expressiveness, emphasized by the abundance of stylistic means. The example below shows how the expressive means of language have been translated into TL:

Interviewer: Are you considering more military action?

Interviewee: I wouldn't say that. I can't say that at all. It would be inappropriate. But they would be making a big mistake if they enriched.

Interviewer: Are they calling your bluff on this or how do you see it?

¹⁶ Interview with Barack Obama. Full text ITAR-TASS, 2011. Available at <https://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=528104>; President Trump's interview with Meet the Press, NBC News, 2019. Available at <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/meet-the-press/president-trump-s-full-unedited-interview-meet-press-n1020731>

*Interviewee: Time will tell. Only time will tell*¹⁷.

Translation into Russian:

“Интервьюер: Вы рассматриваете возможность новых военных действий?”

Интервьюируемый: Я бы не сказал. Нет, я так не могу сказать. Это было бы неадекватно. Но они совершат большую ошибку, если займутся обогащением урана.

Интервьюер: Они пытаются таким образом Вас спровоцировать, или Вы расцениваете это как-то иначе?

*Интервьюируемый: Время покажет. Это только время покажет*¹⁸.

However, such expressiveness is less characteristic to the Russian language, therefore, in translation one of the most commonly used technique is reducing expressiveness and rendering it by means of neutral lexis. Hence, “*Are they calling your bluff on this*”, the literal meaning “*заставить противника раскрыть карты*”, is translated into Russian as “*Они пытаются таким образом Вас спровоцировать*”. One more example is as following: “*It does look as if you’re getting drawn in rather than pulled out, especially with regard to the tankers. Are you concerned about Iran’s attacks?*”.

Translation into Russian: “*Вообще-то создается впечатление, что Вы скорее только глубже ввязываетесь в события на Ближнем Востоке, чем выводите оттуда войска, особенно это заметно по ситуации с танкерами. Вы обеспокоены нападением Ирана?*”.

“*You’re getting drawn in rather than pulled out*” is translated into Russian as “*Вы скорее только глубже ввязываетесь в события на Ближнем Востоке, чем выводите оттуда войска*” by means of neutral lexis using explicatory translation. The analysis shows that communicative translation is applied while rendering figurative stylistic means, which is certainly necessary for communicative effect. According to Charteris-Black¹⁷, metaphor in political discourse has previously been described to bear the following functions: supporting political positioning and ideology, creating a ‘myth’, increasing emotional effects, and establishing the speaker as a desirable candidate.

Metaphors are powerful persuasive tools in political discourse and politicians’ persona and agenda are shaped by metaphorical expressions. P. Newmark¹⁸ presented seven strategies to translate metaphors: 1) Reproducing the same image in the TL; 2) Replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image which does not clash with the TL culture; 3) Translation of metaphor by simile, retaining the image; 4) Translation of metaphor (or simile) by simile plus sense, or occasionally metaphor plus sense; 5) Conversion of metaphor to sense; 6) Deletion. If the metaphor is redundant or serves no practical purpose, there is a case for its deletion, together with its sense component; 7)

¹⁷ J. Charteris-Black, “Britain as a container: Immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign”, in *Discourse & Society*, 2006, vol. 17, no. 5, p. 563-581.

¹⁸ P. Newmark, *A Textbook of Translation*, Prentice Hall, London, New York, 1988.

Translation of metaphor by the same metaphor combined with sense. The addition of a gloss or an explanation by the translator is to ensure that the metaphor will be understood.

For example: “*We built an entire ocean... an entire ocean between us and Mexico. This ocean it is so big you can see it from the Moon. And we made the Mexicans pay for it. It's true*”.

Translation into Russian: “*Мы построили целый океан... целый океан между нами и Мексикой. Он такой большой, что его можно увидеть с Луны. И мы заставили мексиканцев заплатить за него. Это правда*”.

The analysis shows that the translator rendered the metaphorical expression “*We built an entire ocean... an entire ocean between us and Mexico*” as “*Мы построили целый океан... целый океан между нами и Мексикой*” using the strategy of reproducing the same image in the TL, i.e. literal translation, which we consider as inadequate translation. The metaphor “*ocean*” in Trump’s speech refers to the wall that he promised to erect on the border of the United States and Mexico at the expense of the Mexicans¹⁹.

Hence, the following translation implementing the strategy of translation of metaphor by simile, retaining the image is suggested: “*Мы построили такую огромную стену между нами и Мексикой, что ее можно увидеть с Луны*”.

Hereafter, we will analyze one more example of translation of a metaphorical expression: “*And others, I mean I could take you around to the back and I could show you many people, If you don’t—and some of them you wouldn’t know their names. Steve was—I always liked Steve, but Steve became very ineffective because he was such a lightning rod. And Steve, in the end I fired Steve*”.

Translation into Russian: “*И еще другие. Ну, я могу поводить вас по кабинетам, могу показать вам много людей. Если нет — а некоторых из них вы не узнаете по именам. Стив был... Стив всегда мне нравился, но он стал неэффективен, потому что он громоотвод. И в итоге я уволил Стива*”.

The rendering of the metaphorical expression “*a lightning rod*” (the person who is naturally blamed or criticized by people, although there are other people who are responsible) in the target text is performed by means of literal translation: “*громоотвод*”. Such translation weakens the communicative effect of the whole message because the sense of the sentence is not fully rendered in the target language. Therefore, the following translation using the strategy of replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image which does not clash with the TL culture is suggested, which could have the same communicative effect as in the ST: “*...Стив всегда мне нравился, но он стал неэффективен, потому что он был козлом отпущения*”. The metaphorical expression “*a lightning*

¹⁹ Donald Trump’s interview with the Wall Street Journal. *The Wall Street Journal*. 2018. Available at <https://www.wsj.com/articles/transcript-of-donald-trump-interview-with-the-wall-street-journal-1515715481>; Donald Trump’s interview with the TIME on 2020, 2019. Available at <https://time.com/5611476/donald-trump-transcript-time-interview/>

rod” is rendered by the standard TL image “*козёл отпущения*”, which describes a person who is blamed or punished for another’s faults or actions.

Translation of *political realia* is a rather complicated process, requiring a translator’s concentration and ingenuity to render it adequately. Hence, translators often face the problem of translating national political realia that do not have equivalents and correspondences in the target language. Such realia cannot be translated on a general basis, and special translation techniques must be applied to convey political realia in the target language. For example: “... *And you know, just so we understand. We need regulation, but we don’t need 19 different roadblocks getting to the same place and that’s what we had. And we have a long way to go, we’re cutting actually quite a bit of additional regulation. We’re looking at Dodd-Frank very strongly and I think we’ll have something on that*”.

Translation into Russian: “... *Знаете, мы именно так это поняли. Мы понимаем, что нам нужно регулирование, но нам не нужны 19 разных барьеров в одном месте, а у нас была именно такая ситуация. Нам еще предстоит очень многое сделать, мы сейчас в большом количестве сокращаем дополнительные нормы и правила. Мы внимательно изучаем закон Додда-Франка, и я думаю, мы что-то будем с ним делать*”.

The analysis demonstrates that translation technique of addition is used in rendering political realia “*We’re looking at Dodd-Frank very strongly*” – “*Мы внимательно изучаем закон Додда-Франка*”. We assume that adding the word “закон” in the given sentence does not allow us entirely to reveal the meaning of the mentioned realia, therefore, we suggest explicatory translation technique: “*Мы внимательно изучаем закон о реформировании Уолл-стрит и защите потребителей, и я думаю, мы что-то будем с ним делать*”.

The following is one more example of translation of political realia: “*START treaty, we all hope that you will find a decision through the end of this year, but what steps after that?*”.

Translation into Russian: “*Вы проложили курс “перезагрузки”. Кнопка “перезагрузки” уже сработала. А что дальше?*”.

The analysis shows that rendering of the political realia “*START treaty*” as “*курс перезагрузки*” is inadequate. “*START treaty*” is a nuclear arms reduction treaty between the United States and the Russian Federation with the formal name of Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. Good erudition and background knowledge play crucial role in translating political realia. Taking into consideration the use of the political realia “*START treaty*” for first time and the background knowledge of the audience the following translation using the decompression strategy will be efficient and adequate for full comprehension: “*Договор о мерах по дальнейшему сокращению и ограничению стратегических наступательных вооружений (или Договор СНВ), мы все надеемся, что вы найдете решение до конца этого года, но какие ваши дальнейшие действия?*”.

When translating a political interview, it is common for a translator to deal with set expressions, which are difficult to translate. One of these expressions is called *idioms*. This indivisible phrase is inherent in any language, the meaning of which is not revealed from the meaning of its constituent components. Idioms reflect the uniqueness of the people's way of life, accumulate in themselves the totality of the culture and mentality of the people, a unique way of their creative thinking, and create their linguistic view of the world. According to Baker²⁰, a translator may use the following translation strategies while rendering idiomatic expressions: 1) using an idiom of similar meaning and form; 2) using an idiom of similar meaning but dissimilar form; 3) paraphrase the idiom; 4) translation by omission. We will consider the following examples of translations of idioms in the framework of political interview:

“Interviewer: You think North Korea is trying to drive a wedge between the two countries, between you and President Moon?”

Interviewee: I'll let you know in—within the next 12 months, OK, Mike?”.

Translation into Russian:

“Интервьюер: не кажется ли вам, что Северная Корея пытается вбить клин между двумя странами, между вами и президентом Муном?”

Интервьюируемый: Я дам вам знать, Майк, в течение следующих 12 месяцев. Согласны?”.

The analysis of the example above shows the full correspondence of the idiomatic expression in the ST and the TT. In English, the idiomatic expression “*drive a wedge*” with the meaning “to damage the good relationship that two people or groups of people have” has the idiomatic equivalent in Russian as “*вбить клин*”, which is an adequate translation. The translator has used the translation strategy of using an idiom of similar meaning and form.

The following is another example of translation of the idiomatic expression in the political interview: “*But I'll tell you, you know, when you talk about driving a wedge, we also have a thing called trade. And South Korea—brilliantly makes—we have a trade deficit with South Korea of \$31 billion a year. That's a pretty strong bargaining chip to me.*”

Translation into Russian: “*Скажу вам так. Вы ведете речь о клиньях, но у нас еще есть такая вещь как торговля. А у нас с Южной Кореей отрицательное торговое сальдо, составляющее 31 миллиард долларов в год. Для меня это серьезный козырь на переговорах”.*

The idiomatic expression “*bargaining chip*” with the meaning “something that can be used to gain an advantage when trying to make a deal or an agreement” has been translated into Russian using the translation strategy of using an idiom of similar meaning but dissimilar form – “*козырь на переговорах*”, which is adequately translated. We could suggest the following rendering of the

²⁰ M. Baker, *In Other Words – A Coursebook on Translation*, New York, Routledge, London, 1992.

given idiom using strategy of translation the idiom by omission, i.e. using neutral lexis: “*Для меня это серьезное преимущество на переговорах*”, but we assume that it will not convey the addresser’s communicative and pragmatic intention.

Translation of such figure of speech in political interview as *hyperbole* also poses challenges for a translator. Hyperbole is defined as a stylistic and rhetorical device based on an exaggeration of existing information about an event, an action, or an exaggeration of an attribute of an object or person. The presence of a hyperbola is indicated by the presence in the phrase of a particular word or group of words that carry the meaning of exaggeration, aimed at enhancing, emphasizing properties, expressed quantitatively or figuratively. Hyperboles are used not only to enhance the emotional tone of the statement, but also to express humor, sympathy, solidarity, antipathy and other emotions, while they also perform an evaluative and persuasive function. Due to the mentioned features it is frequently used by politicians.

In the examples below, the translation of hyperboles in political interview is analyzed:

“*Look, there's no doubt that it did not work. And, one of the challenges that I've had throughout this heartbreaking situation inside of Syria is, is that-- you'll have people insist that, you know, all you have to do is send in a few-- you know, truckloads full of arms and people are ready to fight. ..*”

Translation into Russian: “*Смотрите, нет сомнений, что это не сработало. И знаете, одна из проблем, с которой столкнулся во всей этой душераздирающей ситуации в Сирии, состоит вот в чем. Есть люди — знаете, которые настаивают, что надо просто отправить туда несколько грузовиков с оружием и людьми, готовыми воевать...”*

The analysis shows that the hyperbole “*heartbreaking situation*” that means extremely sad situation was translated as “*душераздирающей ситуацией*”, which we assume as adequate translation. The translator could find the equivalent hyperbole “*душераздирающей ситуацией*” and enhance the emotional tone of the statement in the TL and preserve the hyperbole’s evaluative function, i.e., the translator was able to produce the corresponding communicative effect on the target audience.

One more example of translation of hyperbole is as following: “*I’m not wildly optimistic at this point that his orientation changes, partly because the one thing that’s been very successful for Mr. Putin is his politics...*”

Translation into Russian: “*На данный момент я не питаю особого оптимизма по поводу вероятности того, что г-н Путин изменит свою позицию, отчасти из-за одного вопроса, где он в политике очень преуспел...*”

The analysis demonstrates that the sentence segment with the hyperbole “*I’m not wildly optimistic at this point...*” has been rendered into the TL as “*На данный момент я не питаю особого оптимизма...*”. The translator has reduced the emotional tone of the statement by using nonfigurative expression “*особый*

оптимизм” and he/she could not retain the equivalent communicative effect as in the SL. To produce the corresponding communicative effect of the sentence with the hyperbole on the target audience, the following translation using the same figurative meaning in the TL is suggested: “*На данный момент я не крайне оптимистичен по поводу вероятности того, что г-н Путин изменит свою позицию, отчасти из-за одного вопроса, где он в политике очень преуспел*”.

Political interview should be rendered into the target language precisely and adequately keeping the communicative and pragmatic intention of the source language. The translator of political interview has a major task of preserving the most relevant general linguistic function for political discourse – the function of influencing the addressee using appropriate translation techniques and strategies. Moreover, the translator in rendering political interview may face challenges in translating explicit or implicit expressions of assessment, stylistic devices and figures of speech.

Conclusions

Political discourse is defined a discourse of politicians, which has its own thesaurus and specific functions. Political interview can be regarded as a genre of both political discourse and media discourse since it combines the characteristics of both the language of politics and the language of the media. Participants of political interview has a primary goal of convincing the recipient, the audience; arouse certain intentions in him; and encourage him to act. Argumentativeness, persuasiveness, asymmetry, polysubjectivity, special dialogicity, special addressing, two-subject character, informativeness, evaluativeness, institutionalism, spontaneity, authorship are inherent features of political interview.

The analysis of a number of political interviews and their translations demonstrates that the translator should make a translation decision taking into account pragmatic intention of its participants in order to preserve the same communicative effect of the source language. The adequate translation of political interview implies retaining its one of the most important general linguistic functions – the function of influencing the addressee by implementing appropriate translation techniques and strategies. Oratory skills of a politician play a dominant role in achieving his/her goal – gaining and retaining power. Political interview is distinguished with expressiveness, emotionality and figurative character. Thus, translation of political interview is hindered by challenges of rendering explicit or implicit expressions of assessment, stylistic devices and expressive means: set expressions, idioms, metaphors, political realia, hyperboles, etc.

A translator has to use efficient translation strategies and techniques, such as the technique of reducing expressiveness and rendering it by means of neutral lexis; and the strategy of communicative translation for rendering

figurative stylistic means to preserve communicative effect. Strategies of reproducing the same image in the TL, replacing the image in the SL with a standard TL image, translation of metaphor by simile, retaining the image, translation of metaphor (or simile) by simile plus sense, conversion of metaphor to sense, deletion, translation of metaphor by the same metaphor combined with sense are used to render metaphorical expressions effectively into TL. The following translation strategies are used to convey idioms: using an idiom of similar meaning and form; using an idiom of similar meaning but dissimilar form; paraphrasing the idiom; translating by omission. Equivalent hyperboles with the same figurative meaning in the TL are efficient to preserve the emotional tone of the statement in the TL and communicative effect of the SL. Translation issues of political interview have not been studied sufficiently and require the use of an integrated translation approach.