

Mykhailenko O. O., PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
Institute of Philology, Taras Shevchenko National University
of Kyiv

POLITICAL SPEECHES IN TRANSLATION: AN OUTSTANDING CHURCHILL

This paper deals with the problems related to the translation of a political speech as a genre of political discourse, with the aim to investigate the translation solutions used to achieve the pragmatic equivalence of the original and translation texts. The theoretical framework of the article has been equivalence-based translation studies by the prominent scholars in the field. The paper starts by outlining the oratory style features that should be a guide for the translator of political texts. Special research attention is paid to W. Churchill's oratory style, with the focus on the linguo-argumentative strategies that he used to persuade the audience. Consideration of the theoretical framework is followed by the contrastive analysis of the Ukrainian- and Russian-language translations of one of W. Churchill's most influential speeches – "Their Finest Hour". The paper highlights the translation solutions used by the Ukrainian and Russian translators in rendering W. Churchill's unique expressive style. The translation techniques in Ukrainian and Russian versions of the speech have been compared, with the view to trace the cross-linguistic variations in translation techniques and to determine whether the Ukrainian and Russian translators succeeded in conveying the strong emotional impact that W. Churchill's speech had on the audience. The paper concludes with summarising the appropriateness of the translation techniques in achieving the pragmatic equivalence of the original and translation texts. The research results prove that rendering political speeches is not just a matter of their faithful translation. It is a matter of understanding background cultural, historical and political situations, what influences the choice of translation solutions.

Key words: *political speech, political discourse, linguo-argumentative strategies, expressive means, stylistic devices, translation solutions, translation techniques.*

Introduction. Political speeches as a genre of political discourse very often rely on translation. Translating political speeches has received an increasing interest in recent years. Language is essential in conducting politics, and political translation – as an instrument of making information available beyond national borders — plays an important role in the development of political discourse [21, p. 120]. In a prototypical sense, this refers to texts discussing “political ideas, beliefs, and practices of a society or some part of it” or texts that are “crucial in constituting a political community or group” [21, p. 119].

Rendering the political speeches is a real challenge for the translator, whose task is not just to convey faithfully the meaning of the original text, but, before translating, to study the background political processes that determine the semantics and structure of the political text. It is important to translate a political speech in keeping with the current norms of political discourse, which is broadly defined as text and talk produced in regard to specific political issues (language in politics) or the actual language use of institutional political actors (language of politicians) [12].

Our research looks at the translation of a political speech as a genre of political discourse, with the aim to study the translation solutions used to achieve the equivalence of the original and translation texts. The research is based upon the original analysis of one of Winston Churchill’s landmark speeches — “Their Finest Hour” – and its Ukrainian- and Russian-language translations. We mainly focused on the translators’ techniques, on comparing their appropriateness for achieving the pragmatic equivalence of the original and its translations and finding an optimal balance of semantics and form in the source and target texts. Of special interest were the translation solutions in rendering W. Churchill’s expressive vocabulary and syntax, which are part of the author’s linguo-argumentative strategies. The research results prove that rendering political texts, in particular, political speeches is not just a matter of their faithful translation. It is a matter of thorough analysis of background political situations and processes determining the organization of political discourse, what influences the choice of translation solutions. With a view to the future development of this research area, we intend to suggest a number of guidelines to contribute to a more effective methodology for translating political speeches.

The oratory style features. Outlining the main characteristics of the oratory style, it is necessary to keep in mind that, in terms of language,

oratory is dual [1, p. 87]. On the one hand, oratory, as a type of written literary speech, retains the features of the written word: extended syntactic structures, commonly used phrases, syntactic parallelisms, lexical repetitions, etc. On the other hand, the language of public speeches that are mostly referred to the spoken word has many oral speech elements: short elliptic sentences, colloquial words, special turns of speech, etc.

In a public speech, especially important are syntactic stylistic devices — repetitions, inversion, antithesis, rhetorical questions, etc. They add expression and dynamism to the utterance. Colloquialisms in public speeches involve the audience in a quasi-dialogue with the orator, which keeps public attention and interest. Colloquialism brings simple phrases, deviation from rigorous grammar norms, use of conversation vocabulary and phraseology, a shift from the complex literary language [1, p. 88]. Recommended stylistic expressive devices include tropes, similes, hyperboles, allegories, euphemisms, idioms, quotations, winged words and others. All of these devices are stylistic signals that make a political speech a powerful instrument of political rhetoric in encouraging the audience for political action. And W. Churchill's speeches abound in them.

Translation equivalence. Regarding political speeches and their equivalence in translation, it should be noted that it is necessary to find a balanced correlation between the two most important characteristics of source and target texts — completeness and accuracy of the meaning being rendered. And, on the other hand, it is important to reach the same pragmatic impact of the original text on its own reader and that of the translated text on its reader [15, p. 43]. Reaching absolute equivalence, in all its aspects — syntactic, semantic and pragmatic — is practically impossible and, sometimes, even unwelcome, as it can cause the imbalance of impact on the reader of the original and translated texts.

As stated in work [15, p. 43], equivalence-based translation theories, along with translation quality assessment procedures, have been proposed by many scholars in the field: J-P. Vinay & J. Darbelnet [23], E. Nida & Ch. Taber [17], J. Catford [7], J. House [11], W. Koller [14], P. Newmark [16], A. Pym [18], among others. Translation equivalence issues, in particular source- and target-oriented approaches to translation, and the issue of how theory can help in solving translation problems, have been widely discussed by many translation theorists [3; 4; 5; 6; 9; 13].

In achieving the equivalence of the source and target texts, a translator can use numerous translation techniques, or *translation solutions* [19].

They depend on a translator's expertise, particularly, on his/her ability to make necessary lexical and grammatical transformations in solving practical problems that arise in the process of translation.

So, in our study of W. Churchill's speech "Their Finest Hour" and its Ukrainian and Russian translations, we have analysed the translation solutions that were chosen to adequately render the speech in the target languages, focusing on the techniques of conveying the author's expressive means and stylistic devices. We also took a close look at the transformations that helped translate this speech in keeping with the current norms of political discourse.

Winston Churchill's linguo-argumentative strategies in "Their Finest Hour". Winston Churchill's political speeches have been widely analyzed in terms of language and style [22, 20, 10]. He is best remembered as the British prime minister whose speeches rallied a nation under a relentless Nazi onslaught in World War II. But few people know that Winston Churchill won the Nobel Prize in Literature — in part for his mastery of speechmaking [24].

Like many speeches, W. Churchill's ones are named for a memorable phrase he utters during the speech: "Blood, toil, tears and sweat", "we will fight on the beaches", "this was their finest hour", "never was so much owed by so many to so few." These phrases, all uttered in the summer of 1940, have almost become clichés, showing that W. Churchill was a master of what we now call the sound bite. They have taken on a life of their own outside the speeches in which they first occurred. Yet the power of oratory cannot be reduced to a string of memorable phrases. The sound bites were embedded in speeches and derived a lot of their original effect from their context [10].

As the researchers of W. Churchill's style note [10], his oratory was the main instrument used to maintain his shaky position in Parliament (as a newly elected Prime Minister), to solidify support in the nation, and to get the war fought. The style W. Churchill had developed changed little over the years and had not always worked. Romantic and verbose, he deployed a vocabulary that was old-fashioned even in 1940. Before the war, it had often seemed ridiculously inappropriate. In 1940, events suddenly rose to the dramatic level necessary for Churchillian prose to be worthy of them. Yet his sense of language was always very keen and his use of it precise.

The Prime Minister's speech in the House of Commons on the afternoon of 18 June 1940 has become one of his most famous. It gave the

Battle of Britain its name and it ends with the phrase which has become shorthand for the way in which Britain conducted its resistance to Hitler in 1940: “their finest hour” [10]. Probably unconsciously, it makes creative use of established rhetorical devices and has a classical pedigree. At times, W. Churchill’s exact meaning is obscure, but he employs formal linguistic tools which have moved and persuaded people since ancient times. Few if any of his listeners would themselves have been aware of this, but the effect was felt by them all the same [10].

W. Churchill used various oratory techniques that made “Their Finest Hour” incredibly impactful. He skilfully applied, first of all, the three kinds of persuasive appeal — logos, pathos and ethos [2, p. 43]. Logos — the appeal to reason — is one of the most prevalent. Appealing to people’s logical thinking makes them see why a certain point makes sense:

‘Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this Island or lose the war. If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands’.

Here, W. Churchill uses logic rather than pure emotion to explain why fighting back is the only true course of action. He explains what Hitler aims to achieve and what he needs to do to reach that goal. This demystifying of the Nazi regime empowered the audience. Now they knew what the opposition’s plan truly was and could steel themselves for a counter-attack. In addition, W. Churchill presented some historical facts about the UK’s triumph over the Germans. He pointed out to the logistical issues standing in the way of a German ground invasion of Britain. All of this helped to rewire the people’s thinking patterns and give them a more optimistic approach [22].

Pathos — the appeal to emotion — is a cornerstone of every speech. It appeals to emotions that the orator wants to evoke in people in order to move them in a certain way. For W. Churchill, there were two emotions that he targeted: fear and hope. This might seem contradictory, as fear was probably the last thing the British needed in this situation. However, evoking fear can serve a useful purpose if it is done delicately. W. Churchill’s aim was to use fear to inspire the people into action rather than leaving them paralysed in the face of seemingly overwhelming odds. The following line perfectly conveys the balance that he struck [22]:

‘What General Weygand called the Battle of France is over. I expect that the Battle of Britain is about to begin’.

The fear triggered the fight-or-flight response in the listeners. This line, like many others, served the purpose of steering the nation in the direction of ‘fight’. It gave the people a reason to stand up to the Germans instead of waving the white flag [10].

Ethos — the persuasive appeal of one’s character — is mostly used when a speaker shows that they understand or share the audience’s ethos. It is an appeal to credibility. Since the people trusted W. Churchill, he had no trouble doing this. He used ethos to both give the people hope and let them see that he would hold himself accountable for the actions under his control. This is apparent in the part of the speech where W. Churchill talks about the British Navy:

‘Some people seem to forget that we have a Navy. We must remind them. For the last thirty years I have been concerned in discussions about the possibilities of overseas invasion, and I took the responsibility on behalf of the Admiralty, at the beginning of the last war, of allowing all regular troops to be sent out of the country’.

This gave the people more confidence in the outlook of the war and let them know they are in good hands. W. Churchill’s credibility was already high and the people took everything he said to heart.

W. Churchill’s speech was so much more than a pep talk — a talk intended to make someone feel more courageous or enthusiastic. The emotional component is one of many that made the speech legendary. Moreover, it is the blend of contrasting techniques that gave it such power. W. Churchill uses a formal tone throughout. It’s difficult to inject emotion into such a speech, which only adds to the complexity of W. Churchill’s technique. Blending ethos and pathos into his words achieved what his tone could not. At the same time, he informed, encouraged, and moved the people to come out of hiding and fight. Through the use of metaphors and analogies, he managed to add strong emotion to every vital part of the speech [10].

W. Churchill used a powerful ending. The ending of a story or speech is crucial especially when the goal is to invite the audience to take action. Here is the last sentence of W. Churchill’s speech:

‘Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, “This was their finest hour”’.

The ‘finest hour’ phrase and its packed power give the speech its perfect final punch. After using various techniques to appeal to the people’s reason and emotion, W. Churchill gives one last call to action that exudes courage and strength. It gave the people the things that they needed the most: encouragement and hope.

The comparative analysis of source and target texts. In our research, we compared the translation solutions in Ukrainian and Russian versions of this speech, with the focus on whether the Ukrainian and Russian translators succeeded in conveying the strong emotional impact W. Churchill’s speech had on the audience in 1940. Political speeches are particularly demanding for the translator, especially with regard to rendering the author’s language and style. The textual analysis has shown that for both the Ukrainian and Russian translators it was a real challenge to convey W. Churchill’s various oratory techniques, special expressive means and stylistic devices that were part of the author’s linguo-argumentative strategies.

The research corpus comprises W. Churchill’s original speech “Their Finest Hour” [27], the Ukrainian version translated by V. Horbatko in the book “Промови, що змінили світ” (“Speeches That Changed the World”) [25] and the Russian version translated by I. Matvienko in the book “Речи, которые изменили мир” (Speeches That Changed the World”) [26].

The analysis has shown that, in most cases, the translation solutions are well-grounded. They serve the purpose of achieving maximum possible equivalence of the source and target texts and could be used as translation models. However, there are some mistranslations, which, in our view, need corrections due to semantic and formal losses.

Fragment 1 is an example of faithful translation with apt lexical equivalents and few structural changes. Both translators also used clarifying additions (*володіннях* and *території*, respectively):

1. We do not yet know what will happen in France or whether the French resistance will be prolonged, both in France and in the French Empire overseas [27]. — Ми ще не знаємо, що трапляється

у Франції і чи триватиме французький опір як у самій Франції, так і в заморських **володіннях** цієї імперії [25, с. 115]. — Мы пока не знаем, что произойдет во Франции и продолжится ли сопротивление как в самой Франции, так и на **территории** Французской империи [26, с. 110].

Phrasal verbs are a vital, expressive part of the English language, and W. Churchill used them abundantly to add expression to his speeches. Phrasal verbs can be particularly challenging for the translator who can fail to convey their meanings with the same emotional colouring. So, in Fragment 2, the phrasal verb **to throw away** was rendered with a faithful Ukrainian equivalent, while its Russian counterpart lacks expression. In rendering the phrasal verb **to cast adrift**, the Russian translator chose an apt Russian idiom (**пустить на самотек**), whereas the Ukrainian translator used a more neutral description (**недбало поставитися**):

2. *The French Government will be **throwing away** great opportunities and **casting adrift** their future if they do not continue the war in accordance with their Treaty obligations, from which **we have not felt able** to release them [27]. — Французький уряд **змарнує** великі можливості і **недбало поставитися** до майбутнього власної країни, якщо не продовжуватиме війну відповідно до своїх союзницьких обов'язків, від яких ми **не визнали за можливе** його звільнити [25, с. 115]. — Правительство Франции **потеряет** прекрасные возможности и **пускает на самотек** свое будущее, если не станет продолжать войну в соответствии с обязательствами по договору, от которых **мы не можем** его освободить [26, с. 110].*

Fragment 2 also presents an interesting clarifying modulation in the Ukrainian version (**союзницькі (обов'язки)**), the Russian text here shows a word-for-word translation. An apt translation solution in rendering the phrase **we have not felt able** is a Ukrainian contextual replacement (**визнати за можливе**). The Russian equivalent (**мы не можем**) does not convey the meaning of this phrase in full.

However, along with successful translation solutions, there are fragments with mistranslations. So, Sentence 3 demonstrates the Russian translator's mistake in rendering grammar tenses — the Future Perfect Tense

(*will have read*) has been replaced with the Present Perfect Tense (*уже ознакомилась*). This is possibly due to the lack of attention to the grammar of the original text — a translator should be more scrupulous to the original:

3. *The House will have read the historic declaration in which, at the desire of many Frenchmen — and of our own hearts — we have proclaimed our willingness at the darkest hour in French history to conclude a union of common citizenship in this struggle* [27]. — *Палата громад невдовзі ознайомиться з історичною декларацією, в якій за бажанням багатьох французів і за бажанням наших власних сердець, ми в цю страшну годину французької історії виголосили своє прагнення утворити підчас цієї боротьби союз на основі спільного громадянства* [25, с. 115]. — *Палата уже ознакомилась с историческим заявлением, где, согласно желанию многих французов и наших собственных сердец, мы сообщаем о своей готовности в мрачайший час истории Франции образовать союз общего гражданства в этой борьбе* [26, с. 110].

In Sentence 4, the author's initial emphasis is preserved in both translations. Besides, the Russian sentence sounds more expressive due to the use of an emotionally stronger verb (*лишимся (чувства)*):

4. *However matters may go in France or with the French Government, or other French Governments, we in this Island and in the British Empire will never lose our sense of comradeship with the French people* [27]. — *Хоч якби не пішли справи у Франції чи у нинішнього французького уряду або наступних французьких урядів, ми на своєму острові і в Британській імперії ніколи не втратимо відчуття братерства з французьким народом* [25, с. 116]. — *Что бы ни происходило во Франции, с нынешним французским правительством или с другими французскими правительствами, мы на этом острове и в Британской империи никогда не лишимся чувства товарищества по отношению к французам* [26, с. 110].

However, there are translation losses in the target texts. In Fragment 5 — *if* has not been conveyed in the Ukrainian version. What is

more, W. Churchill's colloquialism (*aye*) has been left unrendered by the Ukrainian translator. Besides, in our opinion, both translations could have benefitted if the original sentence had been partitioned:

5. *If we are now called upon to endure what they have been suffering, we shall emulate their courage, and if final victory rewards our toils they shall share the gains, aye, and freedom shall be restored to all* [27]. — *Нам тепер доведеться пережити ті страждання, які довелось пережити йому, ми будемо рівнятися на його мужність, а якщо наші труди увінчаються остаточною перемогою, то наші французькі брати неодмінно скористаються її плодами, і ми відновимо свободу для всіх нас* [25, с. 116]. — *Если нам теперь предстоит испытать то, что уже выпало на их долю, мы последуем примеру их храбрости, и, если наши усилия увенчаются победой, они разделят с нами ее плоды, да-да, и свобода будет восстановлена для всех* [26, с. 110].

As the translation analysis proves, expression and emotional colouring of the author's utterance has not been always rendered. The translators should have been more accurate with the original, to be able to render all expressive means that W. Churchill made a deliberate use of.

There are also semantic losses in translations. In Fragment 6, the Ukrainian version lacks an adjective in rendering the word combination *just demands*. There are omissions in the Russian version, though they have been compensated by the additional phrase *ни на шаг*, and the general expressiveness of the original sentence has been preserved:

6. *We abate nothing of our just demands; not one jot or tittle do we recede* [27]. — *Ми не відмовимося від жодної з наших вимог, не поступимося жодною йотою і жодним правом* [25, с. 116]. — *Мы не отступим ни на шаг от своих справедливых требований* [26, с. 110].

The translation solutions in Fragment 7 — the inner partitioning of the source sentence, modulations — made both translations even more expressive than the original:

7. *Czechs, Poles, Norwegians, Dutch, Belgians have joined their causes to our own. All these shall be restored [27].* — Чехи, поляки, норвежці, голландці і бельгійці — усі вони об'єдналися з нами у нашій спільній справі. І всі їхні права будуть відновлені [25, с. 116]. — Чехи, поляки, норвежці, голландці, бельгійці — все они теперь делают одно дело с нами. Независимость всех этих народов будет восстановлена [26, с. 110].

Fragment 8 generally demonstrates adequate word-for-word translation in both versions, though in the Ukrainian sentence there was an unmotivated replacement of W. Churchill's *I expect* with an impersonal equivalent *Схоже*, which can be considered controversial in rendering the author's intention — W. Churchill *did know* that the Battle of Britain was about to begin:

8. *What General Weygand called the Battle of France is over. I expect that the Battle of Britain is about to begin [27].* — Битва, яку генерал Вейган (французький головнокомандувач) назвав "битвою за Францію", скінчилася. Схоже, невдовзі почнеться битва за Британію [25, с. 116]. — То, что генерал Вейган назвал битвой за Францию, закончилось. Я ожидаю, что вот-вот начнется битва за Британию [26, с. 110].

9. *Upon this battle depends the survival of Christian civilization. Upon it depends our own British life, and the long continuity of our institutions and our Empire [27].* — Від цієї битви залежатиме доля християнської цивілізації. Від цієї битви залежатиме наше життя як британців, а також продовження тривалого існування наших суспільних інститутів і нашої імперії [25, с. 116]. — От исхода этой битвы зависит существование христианской цивилизации. От него зависит жизнь нас самих, британцев, и долготелние наших институтов и империи [26, с. 110].

In Fragment 9, W. Churchill's stylized technique — anaphora *upon this battle* has been preserved in both translations. Besides, the English noun *survival* has been rendered by generalized and more emotive equivalents — *доля* in Ukrainian and *существование* in Russian.

However, in our opinion, the Ukrainian translation of the phrase *the long continuity* is wordy (*продовження тривалого існування*), while its Russian version has a short, one-word stylistically coloured equivalent — *долготие*.

Sentence 10 gives an example of adequate word-for-word translation, with no major structural changes:

10. *Hitler knows that he will have to break us in this Island or lose the war* [27]. — *Гітлер знає, що йому доведеться розбити нас на цьому острові, інакше він програє війну* [25, с. 116]. — *Гитлер знает, что ему придется либо сломить нас на этом острове, либо проиграть войну* [26, с. 110].

11. *If we can stand up to him, all Europe may be free and the life of the world may move forward into broad, sunlit uplands* [27]. — *Якщо ми вистоймо проти нього, то вся Європа знову зможе стати вільною, а життя всього світу знову вийде на широкі й залиті сонцем верховини* [25, с. 116]. — *Если мы сумеем ему противостоять, вся Европа станет свободной, и жизнь всего мира снова потечет вперед, к просторным и светлым далям* [26, с. 111].

Sentence 11 illustrates W. Churchill's brilliant use of expressive means. The term *sunlit uplands* is probably an echo of a phrase from H. G. Wells's *The Discovery of the Future*, in which G. Wells refers to *the uplands of the future*. W. Churchill read G. Wells avidly, and the thought of describing fighter pilots as *the few* may also have been triggered by a passage in G. Wells's novel *The War in the Air*, where G. Wells observed that in air warfare the balance of military efficiency was shifting back "from the many to the few." W. Churchill kept a store of phrases in his encyclopedic memory like fragments of tunes in the mind of a composer, and at some point they would emerge in full form [10].

Author's expressive means must be rendered in translation as close as possible. And the emotional colouring of the original in Fragment 11 has been preserved in translation by a careful selection of stylistic equivalents of the highlighted phrases. Though modality (*may*) has not been rendered in the Russian translation.

12. *But if we fail, then the whole world, including the United States, including all that we have known and cared for, will sink into the abyss of a new Dark Age made more sinister, and perhaps more protracted, by the lights of perverted science [27].* — *Але якщо ми не вистоймо, то увесь світ, включно зі Сполученими Штатами, включно з усім, що ми знаємо і що цінуємо, зануриться в безодню нової доби мракобісся, яку світила викривленої й зіпсуті науки зроблять ще більш лиховісною і, можливо, ще більш тривалою [25, с. 116].* — *Но если мы надем, тогда весь мир, и в том числе Соединенные Штаты, и в том числе все, что нам знакомо и дорого, потонет в бездне нового мрачного средневековья, на этот раз еще более зловещего и долгого благодаря извращенной науке [26, с. 111].*

The meaning of the sentence in Fragment 12 is conveyed faithfully, though, in our opinion, the modulation (the phrases in bold) is too brave.

13. *Let us therefore brace ourselves to our duties, and so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, “This was **their finest hour**” [27].* — *Тож візьмемося за виконання своїх обов'язків і постаньмо так, щоб коли Британська імперія і її Співдружність проіснували ще тисячу років, люди й тоді казали: “Це був **їхній зоряний час**” [25, с. 116].* — *Так давайте же **соберемся с духом** и исполним свой долг так, чтобы, если Британской империи и ее Содружеству **суждено** просуществовать еще тысячу лет, люди и тогда сказали: “Это был **час их величайшей доблести**” [26, с. 111].*

In Fragment 13, the emphasis of W. Churchill's final phrase has been conveyed skilfully in both the Ukrainian and Russian translations, though the Russian version proved to be more expressive through the translator's use of emotive additions (*соберемся с духом, суждено просуществовать*).

Conclusions. Our analysis has shown that, in most cases, the choice of translation solutions was justified. In general, the translators reached their main goal — to render adequately the content of the speech, in keeping with the norms of the political discourse language. Our findings

prove that absolute equivalence is quite hard to achieve in translating political speeches. The translated texts demonstrate plenty of attractive translation solutions that serve the purpose of achieving maximum possible text equivalence. Both the Ukrainian and Russian translators have succeeded in recreating the spirit of the original text, conveying the main features of W. Churchill's individual style, rendering a wide range of expression. The translations generally produced identical impact on the source and target text readers and demonstrated high pragmatic equivalence. The minor translation mistakes did not mark down the meaning of W. Churchill's speech.

Thus, our research proves that it is essential for translators of political speeches to be knowledgeable about the basic norms of political discourse. To take a rational translation solution, the translator should be competent in using lexical, grammatical and stylistic translation transformations and bring the source text in accordance with the norms of the language of political discourse. The translator should be trained enough in the branch of knowledge the translation texts belong to, as the most important factors for delivering high quality translations are experience, expertise and continuous updating.

REFERENCES

1. *Brandes, M. P. & Provotorov, V. N. (2001). Predperevodcheskiy analiz teksta [Pre-translation text analysis]. Moskva: NVI-Tezaurus [in Russian].*
2. *Nekriach, T. & Dovganchina, R. (2015). Navchaiemosia vystupaty publichno [Make Your Way To Public Speaking]. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha [in English].*
3. *Baker, M. (2011). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge [in English].*
4. *Bassnett, S. (2002). Translation Studies. London: Routledge [in English].*
5. *Bayar, M. (2007). To Mean or Not to Mean. Damascus: Khatawat for Publishing and Distribution [in English].*
6. *Bell, R. (1993). Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice. London, New York: Longman [in English].*
7. *Catford, J. (1978). A Linguistic Theory of Translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press [in English].*
8. *Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (2002). Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins [in English].*

9. *Hatim, B. & Munday, J. (2005). Translation: An Advanced Resource Book. London: Routledge [in English].*

10. *His Speeches: How Churchill Did It?* Retrieved from <https://winston-churchill.org/publications/finest-hour/finest-hour-112/how-churchill-did-it> [in English].

11. *House, J. (1997). Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited. Tübingen: Narr [in English].*

12. *Kampf, Z. (2015). Political Discourse Analysis. The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction. K. Tracy, T. Sandel, C. Ilie (Eds.). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/5074479/Political_Discourse_Analysis [in English].*

13. *Kenny, D. (2001). Equivalence. Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. M. Baker (Ed.). London: Routledge [in English].*

14. *Koller, W. (1989). Equivalence in Translation Theory. Readings in Translation Theory. A. Chesterman (Ed.). Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab [in English].*

15. *Mykhailenko, O. (2018). Modern Popular Science Translations: The New Digital Age. Lingua Montenegrina. god. XI/2, br. 22. Retrieved from <http://www.fcjk.me/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/LM22.pdf> [in English].*

16. *Newmark, P. (1981). Approaches to Translation. Oxford: Pergamon Press [in English].*

17. *Nida, E. & Taber, Ch. (1982). The Theory and Practice of Translation. Leiden: Brill [in English].*

18. *Pym, A. (2014). Exploring Translation Theories. London: Routledge [in English].*

19. *Pym, A. (2018). A Typology of Translation Solutions. The Journal of Specialised Translation. Issue 30. Retrieved from https://www.jostrans.org/issue30/art_pym.pdf [in English].*

20. *Rhetorical Analysis of Winston Churchill's "Their Finest Hour". Retrieved from <https://alexandernealblog.wordpress.com/rhetorical-analysis-of-wintons-churchills-their-finest-hour> [in English].*

21. *Schäffner, C. (2004). Political Discourse Analysis from the Point of View of Translation Studies. Journal of Language and Politics, 3(1), 117–150 [in English].*

22. *Their Finest Hour: The Techniques That Churchill Used to Boost a Nation's Morale. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@speakersinstitutesm/their-finest-hour-the-techniques-that-churchill-used-to-boost-a-nations-morale-a8954f7154f0> [in English].*

23. *Vinay, J-P. & Darbelent, J.* (1958/1995). A Methodology for Translation (Juan C. Sager, M. J. Hamel, Trans). *The Translation Studies Reader*. L. Venuti (Ed.). London, New York: Routledge [in English].

24. *Vitale, T.* Winston Churchill's Way with Words. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2012/07/14/156720829/winston-churchills-way-with-words> [in English].

SOURCES

25. *Promovy shcho zminyly svit* (2017) [*Speeches that changed the world*]. (V. Horbatko, Trans.). Kyiv: KM-BUKS [in Ukrainian].

26. *Rechi kotoryie izmenili mir* (2014) [*Speeches that changed the world*]. (I. Matveyeva, Trans.). Moscow: Mann, Ivanov, Ferber [in Russian].

27. *Churchill, W.* Their Finest Hour. Retrieved from <https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1940-the-finest-hour/their-finest-hour> [in English].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 23.11.2020 р.

*Михайленко О. О., к. філол. н., доц.,
Інститут філології, КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка*

ПОЛІТИЧНІ ПРОМОВИ У ПЕРЕКЛАДІ: ВИДАТНИЙ ЧЕРЧИЛЛЬ

Статтю присвячено порівняльному аналізу політичної промови В. Черчилля "Their Finest Hour" в українському та російському перекладах, із метою дослідження перекладацьких рішень для досягнення прагматичної еквівалентності текстів оригіналу та перекладів. Особливу увагу приділено відтворенню в перекладах мовних засобів експресії як частини лінгвоаргументативних стратегій В. Черчилля.

Ключові слова: політична промова, політичний дискурс, лінгвоаргументативні стратегії, стилістичні засоби, прагматична еквівалентність, перекладацьке рішення.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Брандес, М. П., Провоторов В. И.* Предпереводческий анализ текста. Москва: НВИ-ТЕЗАУРУС, 2001. 224 с.

2. *Некряч, Т., Довганчина, Р.* Навчаймося виступати публічно = Make your way to public speaking: навч. посібник. Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2015. 280 с.

3. *Baker, M.* In *Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge, 2011. 332 p.
4. *Bassnett, S.* *Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, 2002. 176 p.
5. *Bayar, M.* *To Mean or Not to Mean*. Damascus: Khatawat for Publishing and Distribution, 2007. 223 p.
6. *Bell, R.* *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*. London, New York: Longman, 1993. 298 p.
7. *Catford, J.* *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978. 103 p.
8. *Chilton, P., Schäffner, C.* *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002. 246 p.
9. *Hatim, B., Munday, J.* *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge, 2005. 400 p.
10. *His Speeches: How Churchill Did It?* URL: <https://winstonchurchill.org/publications/finest-hour/finest-hour-112/how-churchill-did-it>.
11. *House, J.* *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Narr, 1997. 160 p.
12. *Kampf, Z.* *Political Discourse Analysis*. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction* / K. Tracy, T. Sandel, C. Ilie (Eds.) URL: https://www.academia.edu/5074479/Political_Discourse_Analysis.
13. *Kenny, D.* *Equivalence*. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* / M. Baker (Ed.). London: Routledge, 2001. P. 77–80.
14. *Koller, W.* *Equivalence in Translation Theory*. *Readings in Translation Theory* / A. Chesterman (Ed.). Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab, 1989. P. 99–104.
15. *Mykhailenko, O.* *Modern Popular Science Translations: The New Digital Age*. *Lingua Montenegrina*. god. XI/2, br. 22, 2018. P. 39–57.
16. *Newmark, P.* *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981. 200 p.
17. *Nida, E., Taber, Ch.* *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1982. 218 p.
18. *Pym, A.* *Exploring Translation Theories*. New-York: Routledge, 2014. 255 p.
19. *Pym, A.* *A Typology of Translation Solutions*. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*. Issue 30, 2018. URL: https://www.jostrans.org/issue30/art_pym.pdf.
20. *Rhetorical Analysis of Winston Churchill's "Their Finest Hour"*. URL: <https://alexandernealblog.wordpress.com/rhetorical-analysis-of-wintons-churchills-their-finest-hour>.

21. *Schäffner, C.* Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*. 3(1), 2004. P.117–150.

22. *Their Finest Hour: The Techniques That Churchill Used to Boost a Nation's Morale.* URL: <https://medium.com/@speakersinstitutesm/their-finest-hour-the-techniques-that-churchill-used-to-boost-a-nations-morale-a8954f7154f0>.

23. *Vinay, J-P., Darbelent, J.* A Methodology for Translation / Trans. by Juan C. Sager, M. J. Hamel. *The Translation Studies Reader* / L. Venuti (Ed.). London, New York: Routledge, 1958/1995. P. 84–93.

24. *Vitale, T.* Winston Churchill's Way with Words. URL: <https://www.npr.org/2012/07/14/156720829/winston-churchills-way-with-words>.

ДЖЕРЕЛА ІЛЮСТРАТИВНОГО МАТЕРІАЛУ

25. *Промови, що змінили світ* / пер. з англ. В. Горбатько. Київ: КМ-БУКС, 2017. 328 с.

26. *Речи, которые изменили мир* / пер. с англ. И. Матвеевой. Москва: Манн, Иванов и Фербер, 2014. 256 с.

27. *Churchill, W.* Their Finest Hour. URL: <https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1940-the-finest-hour/their-finest-hour>.