

The Formation of a Modern Translation Competence in Translator Training

Larysa Mosiyevykh

Abstract The chapter examines the new paradigm in the formation of translation competence—pragmatic competence within the political discourse. It analyses the pragmatic effects caused by specific translation solution; studies the processes by which information is transferred via translation to another culture; identifies the linguistic means of parainforming and metainforming in translation process. Pragmatic competence formation is closely connected with the linguistic competence skills, in order to precisely identify and select such lexical units as euphemisms and dysphemisms. The outcomes imply that in translation the political events are mainly euphemized, while the subjects of politics are dysphemized. Euphemisms may perform concealing and manipulative functions through the cognitive mechanism of abstraction. Euphemisms act as a tool for political participants to hide scandals, disguise the truth, and to guide public opinion when discussing social issues or events. Dysphemisms perform pejorative and discreditable functions through the cognitive mechanism of highlighting. Pragmatic competence formation reveals double pragmatic orientation. On the one hand, it is realized within inner lingual communication. On the other hand, translation is a concrete speech act that is pragmatically oriented to a certain recipient. Present linguistic research aims to point out textually where and in what ways source and target language political texts were not equivalent. The new concept of translation competence, based on the pragmatics, can help orient translator training in times of rapid technological, globalization, political changes.

Keywords Pragmatics · Pragmatics of translation · Pragmatic competence · Translation strategies

L. Mosiyevykh (✉)
Classical Private University, Zaporizhzhya, Ukraine
e-mail: loramos2008@yandex.ru

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017
E. Piechurska-Kuciel et al. (eds.), *At the Crossroads: Challenges of Foreign Language Learning*, Second Language Learning and Teaching,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-55155-5_11

189

1 Introduction

The object of the study is the translation process within the political discourse, namely within the verbalization of the Ukrainian-Russian conflict in mass media. The Ukrainian-Russian conflict is being examined within different dimensions but this is the first attempt to study its verbalization from the linguistic point of view.

The subject is the pragmatic competence formation in the Ukrainian-English (English-Ukrainian) translation. The empirical material is based on the both Ukrainian and English versions of the periodicals such as *The Day*, *The Guardian*, *BBC News*, etc. Political discourse has been described as “a complex form of human activity” (Chilton, 1997, p. 207), based on the recognition that politics cannot be conducted without language. It is generally acknowledged that the mass media plays an important role in disseminating politics and in mediating between politicians and the public, also in a critical sense (Ekström, 2001). Political discourse in the media is a complex phenomenon: it is institutional discourse, media discourse, mediated political discourse (Fetzer, 2007), and ideological discourse (Baker & Ellece 2011; Van Dijk, 2002, 2004).

Translation competence is defined as the knowledge and skills the translator must possess in order to carry out a translation, it encompasses TL (target language) knowledge, text-type knowledge, SL (source language) knowledge, subject area knowledge, contrastive knowledge, and decoding and encoding process skills summarized as “communicative competence including grammar, sociolinguistics and discourse” (Bell, 1997, p. 43), “knowledge of two languages, world and field knowledge, translation theories and methods” (Kautz, 2002, p. 20), “the ability to produce an acceptable text” (Király, 2000, p. 13), and “intra-lingual and interlingual translation” (Pym, 2003, p. 490). The pragmatic competence is “the ability to communicate your intended message with all its nuances in any socio-cultural context and to interpret the message of your interlocutor as it was intended” (Fraser, 2010, p. 1), and “knowledge of the sequential aspects of speech acts” (Barron, 2003, p. 10). Pragmatic competence formation is being developed within the communicative competence (the communicators’ ability to make a speech contact with a partner, not to insult his feelings, to avoid the categorical—explicit—statements).

The comparative method is used for revealing the pragmatic correspondences in the Ukrainian and English languages. The results prove that the pragmatics of political discourse translation differs in both languages. The English texts are distinguished by a great number of euphemisms which create some false reality due to the effect of blurring, ambiguity. This fact should be taken into consideration in the new paradigm of translation competence formation.

2 Pragmatics and Speech Acts

Proceeding from the definitions, pragmatic competence is based on the knowledge of pragmatics and speech acts. Pragmatics studies how language is used to express a meaning or attitude that may not be obvious from the actual words (MacMillan, 2008, p. 1162). Baker (2001) defines pragmatics as a branch of linguistics devoted to the study of meaning as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation. It follows that a pragmatic translation will convey both the connotative meaning and the interpersonal aspects of communication such as implicature, tone, register, etc. If an original text states a fact, instructs or apologizes for some kind of mischief, the translated passage is expected to perform the same actions in a manner similar to the original. The illocutionary function of the text determines text progression and defines its coherence. It also predetermines a certain sequence of speech acts (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985; Searle, 1992).

It is important to note that many speech acts are culture-specific. That is polite in one country can be impolite in another. The cross-cultural variation of speech acts can deal with responses, compliments, directness and indirectness, etc. The conversationalization of political discourse that has been found to hold for the Anglo-American context, may not necessarily be found in other cultural contexts, such as the German, Finnish or Swedish ones (Fetzer, 2007). For example, the same illocutionary functions are conveyed differently in English and Ukrainian. Compare the following: *Дідька лисого я погоджусь!* (a strong disagreement) versus *Agree my Aunt Fanny!* The Ukrainian affirmative sentence is rendered by an imperative sentence in English. Pragmatically speaking, the representative speech act in Ukrainian is translated into English with the help of a directive. Translators often have to deal with explicit and implicit meanings. They have to decide whether or to what extent the implied information needs to be made explicit in the target text.

Any speech act may challenge the speaker's image of himself, which turns communication into a face-threatening activity. The term *face* refers to a speaker's sense of linguistic and social identity. When a speaker enters into a social relationship, he is expected to acknowledge his public image, his sense of self—his *face*. When viewed from the standpoints of Brown and Levinson's theory, politeness becomes a redressive action a speaker has to perform in order to counter-balance the disruptive effect of face-threatening acts (FTA's). Every individual is protective of his self-image or *face*. At the same time, every speech event carries a potential threat to the speaker's sense of self. To avoid or limit the effects of those dangers, speakers employ specific linguistic strategies (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Another constituent of our self-image is the so-called *positive face*—an inherent desire to be loved and appreciated by others. Everybody wants to be accepted and liked by others and to be treated as a member of the group. Regardless of the language or culture, speakers are expected to respect each others' expectations regarding self-image. It is only natural for people to guard their own face, both positive and negative. Yet Brown and Levinson (1987) also argue that when people

communicate with each other, both orally and in writing, they tend to maintain one another's face by trying not to infringe on the other communicants' private territory. Being considerate involves taking other people's feelings into account and avoiding face threatening acts (FTA's). When a FTA cannot be avoided, the speaker can redress the threat with negative politeness that respects the hearer's negative face or with positive politeness that appeals to the hearer's positive face. As seen above, although speech acts can be understood outside cultural boundaries, there is a certain degree of cultural difference that affects the process of translation.

3 Pragmatics of Translation

The realm of pragmatics is extremely important for translation. Major strides have been made in research into the pragmatics of translation displayed by successful scholars, such as Chesterman (1997), Kautz (2002) and Barron (2003). It describes translation in its relation to the author and the context of the text. Semantically equivalent messages are not necessarily pragmatically equivalent. In some cases the source text pragmatics does not coincide with the pragmatics of the target text.

Pragmatics of translation is a broad concept which covers not only pragmatic meaning of a word, but also problems connected with various levels of understanding, depending on linguistic or paralinguistic factors (Wiezhbitska, 1988). Pragmatics of translation is the influence on the result of the translation process when a translator reproduces the pragmatic potential of the source text and makes a similar communicative effect in the target text. The pragmatic potential of the source text is defined by the communicative intention of its author.

Special attention should be drawn to the analysis of hedges as specific devices which can increase or decrease the illocutionary force of the text. Another important issue to consider is the perlocutionary effect of the source text and the target text. The relevance of the intention/effect duality is highlighted by Chilton and Schaffner (2002). For instance, the Ukrainian-English translations of the Donbass terrorist attacks seem to operate in the interest of the target culture and they substitute the word *terrorist* or *separatist* for *rebel*. In the context of cross-cultural variation of speech acts the English language demonstrates a willingness to resist the rhetorical effects associated with terrorists, bombing, etc., and hence to challenge attempts by other speakers to construe particular propositions as entirely unproblematic and universally agreed upon. Any text can evoke certain actions, feelings or thoughts in the reader. Therefore, a translator needs to decide what changes he may have to make so that the target text will appeal to the reader in the same way as the source text.

Generally speaking, pragmatic theories approach translation through the prism of the original author's communicative intention. Pragmatic studies may help scholars to understand how a translated text interprets the original in relation to the contextual conditions and the effect it has on the reader. If we return to the question of whether there is something in an original text that is carried over in its translation, a pragmatist might suggest that something does indeed survive the process. At the

very least, what is potentially done by the original text is retained in the target text, since the translation has the same capability. We say ‘at the very least’ because if an original text informs, entertains, demands payment or apologizes for some mistake, the translation is expected not only to perform the same actions, but to do it in a manner similar to the original. The pragmatics trend in linguistic studies covers the following issues:

1. Speech Acts and Illocutionary Function in Translation Methodology: Speech Act Theory; the task of conveying the illocutionary function; modifications of the illocutionary force; cross-cultural differences of Speech Acts;
2. Political correctness: politically correct terminology; politeness and translation, non-sexist language;
3. Relevance Theory and Translation: the inferential nature of communication; the notion of the context; interpretive and descriptive use of language; translation as an interpretive use of language; text typologies as guides to relevance.

According to Chesterman (1997), pragmatic translation strategies involve selecting information in the target text, which is governed by the translator’s knowledge of the prospective readership of the translation. These strategies are often the result of a translator’s global decisions concerning the appropriate way to translate the text as a whole. Therefore, pragmatic strategies are message oriented. As a rule, they incorporate syntactic and semantic strategies. In Chesterman’s approach, the following strategies are labeled as pragmatic:

- *Cultural filtering* may also be used to denote the process of adapting realia, or terms that are specific to the culture of the source language to the norms and expectations of the target language.
- *Change of explicitness*. Depending on the readers’ knowledge, certain details need to be made either more explicit or more implicit. The terms *explicitation* and *implication* are sometimes recognized as separate translation strategies.
- *Change of information*. Depending on the situation, some new, non-inferable information may have to be added to the target text. At the same time, the translator may have to omit superfluous, irrelevant information. *Addition* and *omission* are often recognized as separate translation strategies.
- *Interpersonal change*. This strategy deals with levels of formality. Sometimes the translator has to change a form of address in the target language or substitute a technical term with a more appropriate word.
- *Illocutionary change*. The logic of translation may make it necessary to replace a speech act in the source language with a different speech act.
- *Change of coherence*. The logical arrangement information of the target text may differ from that in the source text. The translator may have to resort to the strategies of *relocation*, or *dislocation* that deal with rearranging information at different levels.
- *Partial translation*. There are situations when the target text is only a summary of the information conveyed by the source text. The translator focuses on the gist rather than the details of the story.

- *Change of visibility.* The author of a story often makes himself visible to the readers through the use of footnotes or comments in brackets. However, the cultural norms of a target language may require a change in the ways the author's (translator's) presence is revealed in the text.
- *Other pragmatic changes.* The layout of the text may have to be modified due to a variety of reasons.

The consequences of pragmatic differences, unlike grammatical errors, are often interpreted on a social or personal level rather than a result of the language learning process. Without instruction, differences in pragmatics cause difficulties among learners regardless of their language proficiency. That is to say, a student of high grammatical or vocabulary proficiency might not necessarily show equivalent pragmatic skills. Translation problems dealing with the pragmatics of the text usually call for pragmatic strategies. So the students should be provided with opportunities to develop their pragmatic competence.

4 The Formation of Pragmatic Competence

Some scholars deny the perfect effectiveness of pragmatic competence formation (Kasper, 1997). They argue that since the deciding factor that underlies pragmatic ability is culture, and culture is a subconscious system, then it is difficult, not to say impossible, to make it teachable. They clearly state that when talking about the possibility of developing pragmatic competence in a second or foreign language, it is more appropriate to address the issue of how to arrange learning opportunities in such a way that they benefit the development of pragmatic competence.

In the present paper we emphasize the benefit of instruction in pragmatics because pragmatic competence is one of the vital components of communicative competence. The greater the distance between cultures, the greater the difference is in the realization of the pragmatic principles governing interpersonal interaction. And in these cases, more than others, instruction in pragmatics is necessary. To our mind the formation of pragmatic competence includes such aspects as translator's communicative intentions, the semantic representation of those intentions, the translation strategies.

4.1 *Translator's Communicative Intentions*

The pragmatic potential includes the following parameters of conveying information: *parainforming* (which is beyond the direct information: associative hints, latent senses) and *metainforming* (motivated lie, deceit) (Gackowski, 2011, p. 43). Parainforming is a degree of reduced information. It occurs when the informer's purpose is distorted by the receiver's resonant change. It often involves

purpose-driven manipulation of the audience. The informing quality of parainforming is even worse than misinforming. While misinforming may be not intentional and very often is caused by the conditions of the communication channel, parainforming is the intentional plan to communicate a wrong frame in the setting of different purposes of parties (Targowski, 2016, p. 22). The opposite of it is metainforming which may complement each information.

Among the translator's communicative intentions within the verbalization of the Ukrainian-Russian conflict we should stress the following ones:

- to manipulate: e.g., the Ukrainian word *скинення* (English *subversion*) can be translated in political discourse as *regime change* because it is more delicate;
- to veil the unwanted truth: e.g.,

...Як відомо, 22 березня Донецький міський суд Ростовської області засудив українську льотчицю Надію Савченко до 22 років ув'язнення за сфабрикованими обвинуваченнями у вбивстві двох російських журналістів, які інформаційно супроводжували російське *вторгнення* і брехливо подавали інформацію про начебто злочини «українських карателів» / Our readers will probably recall that on March 22, the Donetsk City Court of Russia's Rostov region sentenced the Ukrainian pilot Nadia Savchenko to 22 years in prison on trumped up charges of murdering two Russian journalists who provided media support for the Russian *involvement* and spread false information about alleged crimes of "Ukrainian punitive troops" (The Day April 19, 2016).

The English word *involvement* neutralizes such semantic components as *army*, *force*, *control* in comparison with its Ukrainian correspondence *вторгнення* (English *invasion*—an occasion when one country's army goes into another country to take control of it by force (MacMillan dictionary, p. 797);

- to discredit some unfavorable event or personality: e.g., the stylistically neutral English word *war* can be translated into Ukrainian in a dysphemistic way as *різанина* (*bloodshed* in English).

Parainforming is mostly carried out through generalization, conceptual metaphor; metainforming—through specification. Euphemisms act as the linguistic means of the first process and dysphemisms may participate in the formation of metainforming.

4.2 The Semantic Representation of Pragmatics

The semantic representations of pragmatics are expressed through specific lexicalization, syntactic structures, as well as by rhetorical devices that are geared towards the emphasis or de-emphasis of underlying meanings. For instance, negative opinions about out-groups typically will be lexicalized by negative words. Conversely, positive lexicalization may be chosen to express positive self-images of the in-groups. Positive and negative effect in pragmatics of translation in political discourse is achieved mainly through the euphemisms and dysphemisms. A euphemism

is used as “an alternative to a dispreferred expression, in order to avoid possible loss of face: either one’s own or, by giving offense, that of the audience, or of some third party. In fact, many euphemisms are alternatives for expressions the speaker or writer would simply prefer not to use in executing a particular communicative intention on a given occasion” (Allan & Burridge, 1988, p. 1).

Whereas the term *euphemism* is well-known and has wide currency, *dysphemism* does not. A dysphemism is used for precisely the opposite reason that a euphemism is used: an expression with connotations that are offensive either about the denotatum or to the audience, or both, and it is substituted for a neutral or euphemistic expression for just that reason. Dysphemisms, then, are used in “talking about one’s opponents, things one wishes to show disapproval of, and things one wishes to be seen to downgrade, to obfuscate or offend” (Allan & Burridge, 1988, p. 11). The Russian military involvement in Syria is verbalized in the American mass media mainly by means of dysphemisms (*military Russian bombing*). On the contrary, the generalized euphemistic phrases *Russia’s air campaign* or *Russian military operation* are used in the Russian news. In the following example we can see a pair of synonyms where *terrorist* is a dysphemism, *rebel groups* is a euphemism:

...The then-UN special envoy Lakhdar Brahimi blamed the Syrian government’s refusal to discuss opposition demands and its insistence on a focus on fighting “terrorists” - a term Damascus uses to describe *rebel groups* (BBC News 9 October 2015).

Though euphemizing is now an accepted and established practice, it has acquired a dubious connotation in light of its tendency to deliberately disguise actual meanings of words in political discourse. Lutz, an English professor at Rutgers University, and a champion of rhetorical canons and the art of clear writing across numerous discourses, focuses his work on ethical considerations in using euphemisms, what he calls “the morality of rhetoric” (Lutz, 1996). He makes an immediate distinction between euphemisms proper and doublespeak: when a euphemism is used to deceive, it becomes doublespeak. The sole purpose of doublespeak is to make the unreasonable seem reasonable, the blamed seem blameless, the powerless seem powerful.

4.3 Translation Strategies

Within this paper we understand the notion *strategies* as the techniques that bridge pragmatic potential of source and target texts. They involve selecting information in the target text, which is governed by the translator’s knowledge of the prospective readership of the translation. The most typical translation strategies in the verbalization of the Ukrainian-Russian conflict in mass media are the following ones:

1. *Transliteration*. In the Ukrainian mass media the English term *annexation* (speaking about the illegal joining of Crimea) is mainly transliterated but not translated. We should take into account a fact that this word is a euphemism in

Ukrainian (it veils and softens the real information because it is a neologism of the Latin origin and is perceived by the Ukrainian speakers not in such a categorical way). But in English the word annexation is not a euphemism because it has been in usage for a long time: its meaning contains the negative seme (the smallest unit of a meaning) *force*—to take control of a country or region by force.

... Я декілька разів говорив і далі переконаний, що анексію Криму можна було попередити ще тоді, коли РФ розпочала величезні навчання біля кордонів України.

...I have said several times and I am still sure that we could have forestalled the *annexation* of Crimea as early as when Russia began a huge military exercise near the borders of Ukraine (BBC News, 4 November 2014).

The inevitable consequence of the war is an economic crisis which is verbalized with the euphemisms *downturn*, *recession*:

...The economy is struggling to recover from a *recession* and has been shaken by capital flight, as worried investors move their money abroad (BBC News, 1 May 2015).

...Економіка намагається оговтатися від *рецесії*, і був вражений втечею капіталу, як турбує інвесторів переміщати свої гроші за кордон.

The translators deliberately use the transliteration of the term *recession* (укр. *Рецесія*) to make an effect of a loan word. The loan words are one of the popular methods to euphemize because they shock less and seem to be more noble.

2. *Euphemistic substitutions*. The English word *displaced people* is mainly translated into Ukrainian as *біженці* (*refugees*). The source utterance is euphemistic because it has a latent sense which doesn't suggest military actions. The target utterance is not so polite:

...Число *біженців* в Україні та за її межами, в основному в Росії, наближається до 900,000.

...The number of *displaced people* inside Ukraine and beyond, mainly in Russia, is approaching 900.000 (BBC News, 21 November 2014).

The next example also indicates the euphemistic predominance in the English language:

...У Музеї імені Шевченка відкрилася виставка документальної фотографії, присвячена річниці Іловайської операції, тим, хто *загинув* там, і тим, хто вижив.

...Documentary photo exhibit, dedicated to the anniversary of the Ilovaisk operation, *the fallen* and the survivors, opens at Shevchenko Museum (The Day, 20 August, 2015).

The Ukrainian verb *зинути* (*to die*) is translated into English as the euphemism *fallen* (adj. *died*) (Holder, 2008, p. 174).

Sometimes the euphemistic substitutions help a translator to avoid labelling —“the practice of using a lexical item, term or phrase to identify a person, place, group, event or any other key element in a narrative” (Baker, 2006, p. 122). Such

names embody particular viewpoints, beliefs or political commitments of a community: e.g., the use of the lexical items of *terrorist* and *separatist* in the Ukrainian language (speaking about the rebel groups in Donbass frontline) and their English translation as *the rebel groups*.

3. *Conceptual metaphor*. One of the most sorrowful Ukrainian war episode called *Львайський котел* (*Ilovaisk pot*, i.e., *encirclement*) is translated into English as *Ilovaisk pocket*:

...*Львайський котел* — епізод війни на сході України в серпні минулого року, в ході якого розгорнулися запеклі бої між українськими Збройними силами та підрозділами МВС з одного боку, та збройними формуваннями невизнаної терористичної ДНР і російськими окупаційними силами — з другого.

...*The Ilovaisk Pocket* is an episode in the war in the east of Ukraine last August, which involved fierce fighting between Ukraine's Armed Forces and paramilitary units, on the one side, and the armed formations of the unrecognized terrorist organization DNR and Russian occupation forces, on the other (The Day, 20 August, 2015).

This bloody battle is associated with *pot* in the Ukrainian language and with the *pocket* in the English one. The source nomination as well as the target one is created by a conceptual metaphor but with the shift from *pot* onto *pocket*. Only one seme, *closed* is transferred into the concept *Pocket*, while the semes *hot* and *dangerous* (which describe carnage of war) disappear. Consequently the negative components of the concept *Pot* were replaced by more positive components of the concept *Pocket* leading to the positive pragmatic effect: This shift demonstrates the change of conceptual relevance of that terrible event for Ukrainian and English speakers. Metaphor facilitates perception and recognition in translation, as it reflects a metaphorical concept and therefore is immediately accessed. It is important to draw "links from metaphorical language to metaphorical thought" (Gibbs, 2002, p. 83). A metaphorical term reflects a figurative mode of thinking. The comprehension of a metaphorical term and its translation is a cognitive act, the same as its creation. The translation of metaphorical terms is an applied skill that needs to be acquired and developed. Since metaphors, especially innovative ones, may not trigger the same connotations with everyone, it would seem that they are another device to allow for varying interpretations.

There some examples of substitution of *weapon* by the euphemistic word *equipment*:

...На початку вересня у західних мас-медіа почали з'являться докази присутності російських військових на Донбасі. Про те, що Росія перекидає "зелених чоловічків" і бойову техніку на Донбас, заговорили і у США.

... In early September the Western media began to show evidence of the presence of Russian troops in the Donbass. The US is also saying that Russia is sending "little green men" and *equipment* to the Donbass (The Day, 17 September 2014).

The veiling effect is achieved due to the mechanism of abstraction. The generalized word *equipment* is diluted and thus softens the negative connotation of the

word *weapon*. In this example we can come across the translation transformation, so-called word-for-word translation: *зелені чоловічки* is translated as *little green men*. But it is a little bit strange and comical for an English recipient to hear such an expression which is similar to *aliens* for his imagination. It seems indispensable to give an additional explanation: *undercover Russian soldiers*. The negative pragmatic effect is achieved due to the attributes *little, green*, which discredits the Russian military men.

4. *Loan translation*. It is worth mentioning about the paradoxical case in translation of such Ukrainian war phenomenon as *cyborgs*. One newspaper headline was translated in the following way:

...Українські кіборги-захисники в донецькому аеропорту.

...Ukraine's *cyborg*-defenders at Donetsk airport (BBC News, 22 January 2015).

Ukrainian troops defending the Donetsk airport were called *cyborgs* for their toughness in repulsing constant attacks, they held out in the mangled metal ruins of Donetsk airport until the bitter end and for many they symbolized a new Ukrainian army. The nickname was first used online and has since become a media staple in Ukraine and stuck because to some the Donetsk airport defenders' exploits seemed superhuman. A paradox results from the usage of the English borrowing. For the Englishmen this word is associated with *cybernetic organisms*, or man-machines of science fiction. Some additional explanation should be added, for example *so-called* or *superheroes, tough, who have held on to the airport despite persistent rebel attack*.

5. *Descriptive translation*:

...She has faced down the so-called *Putinverstehers* – those who show such “understanding” for Putin's actions that they come close to excusing them (The Guardian, 22 October 2014).

...Вона розвінчала так званих *putinverstehers* – тих, хто виявляє таке розуміння для дій Путіна, що вони наблизилися до виправдання їх.

The pragmatic effect in the English language is achieved with the help of dysphemism of the German origin. The nomination *Putinverstehers* is derived from the components *Putin* and *verstehers* (Germ. *verstehen*—*to understand*) and has the meaning *a person who understands Putin*. It is transferred into Ukrainian with the help of combination of transliteration and descriptive translation. The German loanword is used to discredit the personality of the Russian President.

6. *Dysphemistic substitution*:

...У цьому плані варто згадати і нещодавній виступ *глашатая* путінського режиму Соловйова, який театралізовано перед публікою розповідав, як дуже швидко шляхом інформаційних і партизанських диверсій Росія «візьме» всю Україну. (The Day, 23 June 2015)

...In this regard, it is worth recalling a recent statement by the Putinist *loudmouth* Vladimir Solovyov, who theatrically described to his viewers how Russia would “take” all of Ukraine soon through information sabotage and guerrilla actions.

The word *глауатай* is obsolete in Ukrainian, it has been the historical word since the times of Kyivska Rus and it means *the town/public crier, herald*. It gives some status shade, but it is translated into English as *loudmouth*, a quite modern informal lexeme, that refers to *someone who says a lot of stupid or offensive things to crowds of people*. As we can see, the trajectory of the meaning has changed in a derogative way. In the case of geopolitical conflicts we can observe the strategy *friend-or-foe identification* when some set of words with negative connotation is opted to name an unfavorable person, event, idea. The imposed stereotypes or labels effectively manipulate the public.

7. *Hyperbolization*. This strategy relates the translation of phraseological units:

...А в цей час триває активна робота Кремля із розхитування ситуації в нашій країні та розкручування низки політичних проєктів, які й мають взяти на себе роль кремлівського *шила в наших ребрах*.

...Meanwhile, the Kremlin is keeping up its efforts to destabilize our country and promote a number of political projects, which should take on the role of its *dagger in our ribs* (The Day, 23 June 2015).

The Ukrainian word *шило* (*awl*) is different from the English *dagger*. The translator used the equivalent English word but slightly hyperbolized in order to stress the contradictions between two countries and to demonize the image of Russia.

8. *Specification*. The mechanism of foregrounding is used in translation of the next sentences: “Недарма ж Путін «врятував» з України далеко не всіх!”/“It was not accidental that Putin did not “rescue” all his Ukrainian stooges” (The Day, 23 June 2015). The Ukrainian hypernym *yci* (*English all*) is specified through the dysphemism *stooges* and means “someone who is used by someone to do a difficult and unpleasant job” (MacMillan, 2008, p. 1473).

...А по-друге, в суспільстві виникатиме дедалі більше запитань, чи не прибрали Януковича, який зарвався і *заплутався*, з політичної арени Майданом ті, хто його зрештою і привів колись до влади.

...Secondly, the public will increasingly wonder whether Yanukovich, who had gone too far and *got entangled in his machinations*, was removed from the political arena via the Euromaidan by these very people who once effectively put him in office (The Day, 23 June 2015).

The English semantic equivalent of the Ukrainian verb *заплутався*—*to entangle in his machinations*—has a more negative coloring due to specification. A person can entangle himself in many things, but in this context the translator applied a sense development strategy specifying one of the features of Yanukovich’s activities.

As shown by the above examples the numerous translation strategies can influence the pragmatic equivalence achievement. Some strategies emphasize the contradictions between the conflict sides (specification, dysphemistic substitution, hyperbolization), while the other ones soften the straightforward rhetoric of a source text (euphemistic substitutions, transliteration, descriptive translation). In political discourse the cross-cultural variation of speech acts is revealed mainly through the aspect of directness (the Ukrainian language)/indirectness (the English language).

5 Conclusions

Based on the studies described in this paper, it can be concluded that pragmatic competence is an essential and indispensable part in the translation process, and that it depends on cross-cultural variation of speech acts due to contrasting sociocultural values, ideologies, systems of attitudes. The pragmatic aspect of translation involves a number of difficult problems. Translation process reveals double pragmatic orientation. On the one hand, it is realized within inner lingual communication. On the other hand, translation is a concrete speech act which is pragmatically oriented to a certain recipient. Pragmatic competence formation in translator training should follow the principles:

- In an adequate translation the communicative effect is close to that of the source text.
- At best the text's communicative effect coincides with the author's communicative intention.
- Two types of translation are caused by the above principle: communicative translation and semantic translation.

This study has shown that translation of political discourse can be used for political manipulation. Therefore, the analysis of any translated text must consider to contemporary social, cultural, political and ideological features as well as the textual realization and the context-based interpretation of such features. The source and target texts are not always equivalent in a political sense, and that target texts may be designed to realize partly different communication aims from those of the source text. Manipulation is achieved mainly through the specific lexical units. The English texts are distinguished by a great number of euphemisms which create some false reality due to the effect of blurring and ambiguity. These lexical units can influence the formation process of a great number of people's worldview. They can also deceive and neutralize one's critical mind.

Euphemism is the ideal way to manipulate people because they hide the real essence of the matter due to the creation of a neutral or positive connotation. With the help of political euphemisms, the level of negative valuation becomes smaller, hence one can speak about the complete change of pragmatic focus. The high level

of euphemistic frequency in English texts demonstrates the pragmatic intention to depict the negative objects of politics as neutral or sometimes even positive. The culture surrounding the English language is characterized by tolerance and this is why English places heavy restrictions on the use of direct speech acts, the use of imperative, and the use of straightforward words. On the contrary, in Ukrainian, the themes in regard to politics are introduced in a dysphemistic way. Ukrainian people are more emotional, impatient and straightforward. Pragmatic competence helps to intensify or soften cross-cultural communicative acts through the following translation strategies: euphemistic and dysphemistic substitutions, generalization, specification, loan translation, metaphorization.

In sum, it is necessary to stress the importance of the translator's background knowledge that includes a profound knowledge of history, culture, mode of life of the country as well as his linguistic background.

References

- Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (1988). Euphemism, dysphemism cross-varietal synonymy. *La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics, 1*, 1–16. <http://arrow.latrobe.edu>. Accessed October 25, 2016.
- Baker, M. (2001). The pragmatics of cross-cultural contact and some false dichotomies in translation studies. In M. Olochan (Ed.), *CTIS occasional papers* (pp. 7–20). UMIST: Manchester: Centre for Translation & Intercultural Studies.
- Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict. A narrative account*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Baker, P., & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key terms in discourse analysis*. New York: Continuum.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.
- Bell, R. (1997). *Translation and translating: Theory and practice*. London, New York: Longman.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chesterman, A. (1997). Ethnics of translation. In M. Snell-Hornby (Ed.), *Translation as intercultural communication: Selected papers from the EST Congress, Prague 1995* (pp. 147–164). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chilton, P. (1997). Discourse and politics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction (Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction, 2)* (pp. 206–230). London: Sage.
- Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (2002). Introduction: themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse. In P. Chilton & C. Schaffner (Eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytical approaches to political discourse* (pp. 1–41). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ekström, M. (2001). Politicians interviewed on television news. *Discourse and Society, 12*(5), 563–584.
- Fetzer, A. (2007). *Political discourse in the media: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of hedging. In G. Kaltenböck, W. Mihatsch, & S. Schneider (Eds.), *New approaches to hedging* (pp. 15–34). Emerald: Bingley.
- Gackowski, Z. (2011). *Informing for operations: Framework, model, and the first principles*. Santa Rosa, California: Informing Science Press.
- Gibbs, R. W. (2002). Psycholinguistic comments on metaphor identification. *Language and Literature, 11*(1), 78–84.
- Holder, R. W. (2008). *Dictionary of euphemisms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kautz, U. (2002). *Handbuch Didaktik des Übersetzens und Dolmetschens*. München: Goethe Institut.
- Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* (NetWork #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. <http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/NetWorks/NW6/>. Accessed October 25, 2016.
- Kiraly, D. (2000). *A social constructivist approach to translator education. Empowerment from theory to practice*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Lutz, W. (1996). *The new doublespeak*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- MacMillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* (2008). MacMillan Publishers Limited.
- Pym, A. (2003). Redefining translation competence in an electronic age: In defence of a minimalist approach. *Meta*, 48(4), 481–497.
- Searle, J. R. (1992). Conversation. In H. Parret & J. Verschueren (Eds.), (*On*) *Searle on conversation* (pp. 7–29). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Targowski, A. (2016). *Informing and civilization*. Santa Rosa, California: Informing Science Press.
- Van Dijk, T. (2002). Political discourse and ideology. In C. U. Lorda & M. Ribas (Eds.), *Anàlisi del discurs politic* (pp. 15–34). Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Van Dijk, T. (2004). Discourse, knowledge and ideology. In M. Pütz, J. Neff, & T. A. van Dijk (Eds.), *Communicating ideologies. Multidisciplinary perspectives on language, discourse and social practice* (pp. 5–38). Frankfurt: Lang.
- Wiezhbitska, F. (1988). Semantic metalanguage for a cross-cultural comparison of speech acts and speech genres. *Language in Society*, 14, 491–514.

References of Illustrated Material

BBC News [Electronic resource]: <http://www.bbc.com>

The Guardian [Electronic resource]: <http://www.theguardian.com/international>

The Day [Electronic resource]: <http://www.day.kiev.ua/en>