

**POLITICAL DISCOURSE:
FUNCTIONAL-PRAGMATIC FEATURES
OF TRANSLATION OF EVALUATIVE LEXICAL UNITS**

Anzhelika Solodka¹
Tatiiana Moroz²

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-221-0-27>

Abstract. Political discourse is the implementation of the language of politics, the real embodiment in the language of all means of the national language that can be used in the context of political activity. *The purpose* of the article is to investigate the peculiarities of the reproduction of evaluative lexical units in the Ukrainian-English translation of texts that relate to political discourse. The research identifies structural-semantic and functional-pragmatic features of the implementation of evaluative vocabulary. This goal is realized by solving the following tasks: to determine the specifics of political discourse as a type of communication, its characteristics and functions; to consider the peculiarities of the functioning and specifics of the implementation of evaluative vocabulary in modern political discourse; to study the structural and semantic aspects of the reproduction of evaluative vocabulary in the translating the texts of political discourse, taking into account their typology; to identify the basic translation strategies that are implemented in the reproduction of evaluative units. *Methodology.* The study was based on the analyses of 300 evaluative lexical items from the texts of the Council of Europe summits, speeches and press conferences of politicians (2021) and their relevance in the translated texts. Thematically, the materials cover a wide range of both domestic and foreign policy issues. The research used qualitative and quantitative analyses. *Results* of the survey showed the pragmatic factors, identified as a result of the comparative analysis.

¹ Doctor of Science, Professor,
Head of the Department of German Philology and Translation,
V.O. Sukhomlynskyi National University of Mykolaiv, Ukraine

² PhD, Associate Professor,
Dean of Philological Faculty,
V.O. Sukhomlynskyi National University of Mykolaiv, Ukraine

They determine the translator's focus on the implementation of one of the selected strategies. These factors include: the affiliation of the original text to a particular type of discourse, the dependence of the evaluative characteristics of foreign text and the specifics of the functioning of evaluative vocabulary from the dominant functions of the political discourse; focus on the addressee of the translation, the presence of background knowledge and evaluative stereotypes, that allows to determine the potential response; the purpose of translation, which implies that the translator has certain attitudes. *Practical implications* of this research is in using theoretical research results when teaching courses in translation theory and practice, sociolinguistics, pragmalinguistics, as well as in translation practice and professional activities of specialists in political technology and PR management, semiotics of business communication.

Value/originality. The research developed the strategies of intensification and deintensification for evaluative units' translation. The focus on the intensification strategy is based on discrediting the object of evaluation; criticism of the opponent's actions; specification of the assessed situation; attracting attention; positive presentation. The basis of the deintensification strategy is the following attitude: diplomacy in criticism, political correctness in evaluation, correction of the linguistic image of the subject of evaluation, justification and support of the political course.

1. Introduction

The rapid development of political discourse in modern life of Ukraine, as well as the increasing of political translations in the Ukrainian and English linguistic communities cause the urgent need to describe the patterns and specifics of the text translation in communicative space.

Political discourse is a phenomenon that a person encounters on a daily basis. In foreign countries, this field of the research has occupied the mind of scientists for a long time – since the middle of the XX century. Interest arose in the United States (Bollinger, Davison, Leinbarger), Germany (Klemperer), Great Britain (France, Serio, Henri, Barth), and other countries.

It should be noted that the peculiarities of evaluative vocabulary reproduction in the Ukrainian-English translation, as one of the means of realizing the dominant function of political discourse, are not fully represented in current researches.

The aim of this research is to identify the peculiarities of the reproduction of evaluative lexical units in the Ukrainian-English translation of texts that relate to political discourse.

The research identifies structural-semantic and functional-pragmatic features of the implementation of evaluative vocabulary in the Ukrainian-English translation of political discourse. This goal is realized by solving the following tasks: 1) to determine the specifics of political discourse as a type of communication, its characteristics and functions; 2) to consider the peculiarities of the functioning and specifics of the implementation of evaluative vocabulary in modern political discourse; 3) to study the structural and semantic aspects of the reproduction of evaluative vocabulary in the translating the texts of political discourse, taking into account their typology; 4) identify the basic translation strategies that are implemented in the reproduction of evaluative vocabulary.

The study was based on 300 evaluative lexical items from the texts of the Council of Europe summits, speeches and press conferences of politicians (2021) and their relevance in the translated texts. Thematically, the materials cover a wide range of both domestic and foreign policy issues.

2. Features of political discourse

Discourse is a process associated with the creation of a linguistic work, a text that is the result of linguistic activity and it is characterized by a certain complete and fixed form [12; 31].

Discourse is seen as the unity and interaction of a text and a context (discourse = text + context). In this interpretation, the text means language forms, temporarily and artificially isolated from the context [32]. The context includes both linguistic and extralinguistic factors. Such an interpretation reveals the linguosocial conditionality of discourse.

Karaulov and Petrov emphasize the communicative nature of the discourse, which includes “extralinguistic factors necessary for understanding the text” [16]. Thus, discourse is perceived as “communication + text + context”.

Arutyunova gives the following definitions of discourse: 1) discourse is “a coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors” [1, p. 136]; 2) discourse – is “the text taken in the aspect of action. Language is seen as a purposeful

social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness “[1, p. 137].

This approach allows to consider discourse as a communicative event. Sociolinguistic approach to the study of discourse involves the analysis of the language of communication participants as representatives of a particular social group and analysis of the circumstances of communication in a broad socio-cultural context. Discourse is created in a certain communication situation, where participants have social roles and guidelines, have their own goals, according to which the discourse is organized [15].

Discourse includes both the dynamic process of language activity, inscribed in its social context, and its result (text). Thus, discourse is perceived as a linguistic phenomenon that is realized in the form of a text. The term “discourse” is used to denote a linguistic event that is created in a certain communicative situation and in a certain period of time. To adequately understand the discourse, it is necessary to take into account the whole set of linguistic and extralinguistic factors. Thus, the analysis of the text as a result of the discourse involves taking into account the situational and socio-cultural context, which includes the situation of communication, participants, their goals and objectives, as well as the relationship of discourse to a particular culture and its social parameters.

There are two types of discourse – personal (personality-oriented) and institutional (status-oriented) [14]. Discourse is defined as institutional if it is carried out in public institutions where communication is part of their organization. Institutional types of discourse include political, diplomatic, economic, scientific, and others [27].

Considering political discourse as a kind of institutional discourse, it is necessary to determine the scope and content of the concept of “political discourse”, the boundaries of this term, as well as the criteria for assigning a text (language act).

In Linguistics, the analysis of political discourse dates back to the early 90’s. As noted, the study of political discourse today addresses such issues as determining the mechanisms of generating and perceiving political texts, analysis of political metaphors as a “mirror” of the world of politics, the study of verbal and rhetorical strategies [28, p. 3–8].

Defining the boundaries of political discourse depends on understanding political communication. In a narrow sense, political discourse is limited

only by institutional forms of communication and “forms a set of all language acts, namely political discussions and even the rules of public policy ...” [5, p. 6].

Political activity is impossible without involving the language, which determines their relationships. With the help of language, representatives of politics and all those who come into contact with this area, communicate, inform, point out, and persuade. In political science, there is a tendency to consider language not as a reflection of political reality, but as a component of politics [28]. It must be acknowledged that political discourse is now recognized as the main way to take political action.

The decisive criterion for defining discourse as political is not only the connection of participants in communication in the political sphere or its content, but its objectives and goals [28, p. 15]. Thus, the space of political discourse includes not only the forms of communication directly related to the course of political processes, but also all types of communication, one way or another related to the sphere of politics.

Political discourse is the subject of the study of many sciences. Within the framework of linguistic research, Sheigal distinguishes between two approaches to the analysis of political discourse: descriptive and critical. Descriptive studies are based on the classical method of rhetorical analysis of public speeches presented in the works of Aristotle, Ciceron, Quintillian. In modern linguistics, one aspect of the descriptive approach is related to the study of language behavior of politicians: language tools, rhetorical techniques and manipulative strategies used by politicians to persuade (Baranov, Mikhalska, Parshin, Atkinson, Grieswelle, Holly) [28; 29].

Another area of analysis of political discourse is related to the study of the content of political texts and reveals the cognitive dispositions of individual politicians – value dominants, reasons for conflict or cooperation, the nature of causation in the relevant fragments of the world (Duka, Kostenko, Chilton, Iliyn).

A critical approach to linguistic research of political discourse is aimed at studying social inequality expressed in language or discourse, where language is perceived as a means of power and social control (N. Fairlough, R. Wodak, T. van Dijk) [18].

One of the new paradigms of studying political discourse is the cognitive approach, which allows to move from the description of units and structures

of discourse to modeling the structures of consciousness of participants in political communication. The relationship between language and ideology is also studied in the framework of cognitive analysis of language (Baranov, Karaulov, Lissan, Van Dijk, Fowler, Kress, Seidel). Political communication is always ideological, because communicators act in it as representatives of institutions and political groups [18; 28].

In scientific works on political discourse, close terms are used – “political discourse” [9; 14; 15; 28; 29], “language of politics” [5] and “political language” [7; 21]. As a rule, they are used as interchangeable concepts, but a number of researchers note their differences. Most often, political language is called “a special sign system designed specifically for political communication: to develop public consensus, adoption and justification of political and socio-political decisions” [5, p. 6]. The peculiarity of the language of politics is the accessibility of its understanding to almost all members of the language community [28, p. 20]. The specificity of this language is the use of national language in accordance with the functions performed by political discourse.

Political discourse, in contrast to the language of politics is formed by “a set of all linguistic acts of political discussions” [28, p. 16].

Political language is a set of manipulative means of language, it is a language used for manipulative purposes and goes beyond political communication. The language of politics is one of the professional subtexts. It creates a “system of professionally oriented signs”, characterized by special vocabulary, phraseology and paremiology [28, p. 14–21]. Thus, political discourse can be defined as the implementation of the language of politics, the real embodiment in the language of all means of the national language that can be used in the context of political activity [23].

An important function of political discourse is the informative function, which is responsible for impartial reporting on various political events. The importance of this function is that political discourse is “a mean of forming, functioning and transmitting political information” [19, p. 76]. According to Shegal, in addition to explicit information, messages may include implicit-connotative layer of information [28, p. 41].

It creates the preconditions for the allocation of the third function of political discourse – expressive. It should be noted that the prevalence of one or another function depends on the genre diversification of the space of political discourse.

Highlighting the system-forming features of political discourse – institutionality, specific informativeness, semantic uncertainty, fideism, esotericism, the special role of the media, remoteness, theatricality, dynamism, Sheigal emphasizes their gradual nature, which can be represented as a scale. Depending on the type of political discourse – totalitarian or democratic – the selected features occupy a certain place on the scale of totalitarianism / democracy [28].

3. The specifics of the implementation of evaluative vocabulary in modern political discourse

Evaluation is perceived as a factor that shapes the value picture of the world, because values are inherent in every culture. According to Sternin, values are social socio-psychological ideas and views that are shared and inherited by each new generation [40]. The value picture of the world of any society includes a certain set and hierarchy of values expressed in assessments [3].

It is noted that the assessment refers to the intentional aspect of language, where the reflection of the picture of the world in the mind of the speaker is complicated by a number of factors. This causes differences in the ways of its expression in different languages [9].

Sometimes evaluation and modality are combined into one concept or considered as related concepts. This approach is associated with the understanding of modality in the narrow and broad sense. In the narrow sense, modality is a grammatical (morphological) category, the main means of expression of which are verbs. Within this approach, modality is the “attitude of content to reality”, representing an objective-temporal category [4, p. 237].

There are two types of evaluation on formal grounds: absolute and comparative. In absolute evaluation structures, comparison is not directly expressed, but we always mean the evaluation stereotype or scale on which the evaluation is focused, and comparative evaluation is based on the comparison of one object with another [6, p. 15]. Despite this, it is recognized that the assessment is inseparable from the comparison, because the absolute feature also contains an implicit comparison [6, p. 15]. In the comparative assessment, its structure includes additional elements – the features that give comparisons, the motivation for comparison, etc. [26, p. 23]. Thus, the evaluation structure consists of many components, which reflects its

complex construction in the intentional world.

Thus, the basis of linguistic analysis of evaluation is the understanding of the subjective and objective aspects of the meanings of evaluation words and expressions.

In scientific works, the term “evaluation” is often correlated with the terms “emotionality”, “affectivity” and “expressiveness”. Thus, there is an obvious need to distinguish between these concepts.

The concepts of appreciation, emotionality and expressiveness are interrelated, but perform different functions. Expressiveness belongs mainly to stylistic categories, value and emotionality to lexical and grammatical. Evaluation and emotionality, being components of the statement, expand its informative volume, and expressiveness, without changing the original meaning, and strengthens it. According to Markelova, the difference between evaluative, expressive and emotional aspects is explained by the characteristics of the components of the speech act, its psychological (emotion), intellectual (evaluation), objective-situational (expression) aspects to varying degrees in the statement [22, p. 69].

It should be noted that assessment tools are found at all levels of language. The value of a language unit may be due to its lexical and semantic properties, functional and stylistic affiliation, its contextual use [8, p. 9].

There is a wide range of linguistic means of expression and evaluation, ranging from direct explicit to implicit methods. The most common in political discourse are lexical means of evaluation – words and phrases with evaluative meaning, as well as comparisons, metaphors, allusions and other figurative means.

It should be recognized that the most common lexical means of expressing evaluation in political discourse is the use of evaluative vocabulary. In this regard, there is a need to consider the value in terms of its position in the lexical and semantic structure of the word.

The evaluative component is a component of the semantic structure of the word. It may be due to the lexical and semantic properties of the lexical unit (LU), its belonging to a particular functional style and use in a particular context. This determines the position of evaluative meaning in the lexical and semantic structure of the word.

It should be noted that at the level of vocabulary there are three classes of LU, which differ in the position of evaluative value in their semantic structure.

1. Lexical units, the meaning of which contains an assessment, but does not indicate what exactly this assessment belongs to: good, bad, terrible or charm. In such exclusively evaluative lexical units, the evaluative component is part of the denotative meaning of the semantic structure of the word. The subject correlation of such units is established only in the context [22, p. 69].

2. Connotative value is inherent in neutral lexical units, which acquire value only in a certain context.

3. “Subject-evaluation” lexical units, in the meaning of which are combined subjectivity and value: *terrorism, politicization, cooperation, opportunist*. Such words express the attitude of the speaker to this phenomenon, which allows to distinguish them into a separate class of pragmas. Such lexical units represent pragmatic value [30, p. 20].

It can be concluded that the evaluative component in the semantic structure of the word can be part of the denotative component, and be a component of connotation. The correlation of the evaluative component with the denotative and connotative may vary depending on the type of evaluativeness represented by the lexical unit.

Thus, in two of the three types of evaluative lexical units considered, the evaluative component is part of the connotative (pragmatic) meaning.

There is an opinion that in some language signs it is possible to define a social microcomponent of value. According to Komlev, the existing social connotation for some linguistic signs can express the political worldview. Such connotations may be in units of socio-political vocabulary [17, p. 128–129].

Given the diversity of the concept of “evaluation” and the specifics of the position of the evaluative component in the semantic structure of the word, it seems appropriate to consider the main types of evaluation values, both in general and in terms of functioning valuable lexical items in political discourse.

The implementation of evaluation as a certain semantic category in the semantic structure of lexical meaning is multifaceted. It is due, as a rule, to what evaluation type it belongs. In the analysis of evaluation as a socially established and well-established in the semantics of language units of the subject (individuals, groups of persons, society) to the objects of reality. Different types of evaluation values are distinguished.

Given the basis of evaluation, evaluation values can be divided into three groups: sensory (hedonistic and psychological), sublimated (aesthetic and ethical, based on norms) and rationalist, which in turn are divided into utilitarian, normative and teleological evaluations [2, p. 13–15].

Of particular interest is the definition of emotional and rational values. Emotional evaluation in this case reflects a change in the emotional state of the interlocutor, and rational – confirmation or refutation of the addressee's opinion [6, p. 22].

It should be noted that all evaluative vocabulary can be divided into two main groups on the basis of “positive / negative evaluation”: negative evaluation (has a pejorative microcomponent in its structure) and positive evaluation [25].

Given the temporal properties of evaluation, all evaluation vocabulary can be divided into constant evaluation (where evaluation is constant) and chrono-valuation (evaluation can change in different periods of time). For chrono-valued vocabulary, the verbal environment (linguistic context) in which it is used is important [9, p. 84].

According to another typology, evaluative vocabulary is divided into emotional-evaluative and social-evaluative [20, p. 39]. In contrast to emotional vocabulary, the evaluative component reflects the emotional characteristics inherent as a biological and social individual, socio-evaluative vocabulary reflects the ideological, moral, social, and cultural relations of people [9, p. 84].

Emotional and evaluative vocabulary is stable over time, as the evaluations of centuries of activity experience expressed by it are experienced by language practice and enshrined in dictionary definitions. This determines the fact that socio-evaluative vocabulary is formed and functions only in the chronological framework of certain social relations. This kind of value can be layered on hitherto invaluable tokens and change with the change of social relations [10; 11].

It should be emphasized that political discourse bears the national and cultural imprint of the era, acting as its representative. At the same time, political discourse belongs to the space of differentiated social interaction, helping to realize the political interests of some social groups and carries a certain burden. The mass addressee of political discourse not only belongs to a certain culture, but belongs to a certain ideology [33].

A number of researchers note that the specificity of vocabulary that operates in the field of politics is semantic uncertainty [21; 29]. The following features of the semantics of political vocabulary are considered as factors of semantic uncertainty: 1) breadth of meaning; 2) abstractness; 3) the complexity of the meaning due to the complexity of the denotation; 4) ambiguity, blurred semantic boundaries of words of gradual semantics; 5) interdisciplinary ambiguity; 6) relativity of designation; 7) ideological polysemy as a consequence of the emergence of group connotations that express the interpretation of political reality from the standpoint of a social group (political agent) [29]. All the above is a characteristic feature of socio-evaluative vocabulary and determines the specifics of its functioning in political discourse.

In conclusion, it should be noted that both emotionally evaluative and socially evaluative vocabulary, being one of the main features of political discourse, participate in the implementation of its informative function and the function of influence.

4. Specifics of functional-evaluative vocabulary's translation

Regular correspondences (single-level and multi-level language levels) are often used in the translation of functional-evaluative lexical units. When using one-level correspondence, both the polarity of the estimate (+) and the level of its intensity are preserved in the translation.

The comparative analysis revealed the use of other transformations, different from those used in the translation of pragmatic-evaluative vocabulary.

1. The use of transcription and transliteration is atypical in the translation of functional-vocabulary. This is confirmed by the lack of examples of translation using these transformations.

2. In some cases, the use of a calque was observed. An example of the use of this transformation in the translation of functional-evaluative vocabulary is the following text:

We are open to constructive work on the energy dialogue with the European Union / Ми відкриті до конструктивної роботи та в рамках діалогу з Євросоюзом [36].

The use a calque technique allows to reproduce the structure of evaluative phrases. It contributes to the achievement of structural-semantic

isomorphism, which preserves both the general value of the utterance and the value of lexical units that are part of the structure.

3. There are examples of the use of concretization, the replacement of a word or phrase of a foreign language with a broader subject-logical meaning of words and a phrase of the language of translation with a narrower meaning. However, their number is limited. Example:

As for the newly appointed ministers of Economic Development and Trade Minister, they are excellent specialists and are not new to the fields in which they are working / Щодо міністрів охорони торгівлі та економічного розвитку, то вони фахівці дуже хороші, вони не новачки в тих сферах, в яких працюють [35].

If there is an adjective with a general evaluative value – *хороший* – intensifier, which means a high level of positive assessment of the actions of newly appointed ministers. In translation, the intensity of evaluation is enhanced by replacing the structure “intensifier + adjective” with the affective adjective *excellent*, which not so much describes the state of affairs, as emphasizes the subjective position of the subject. The emotional aspect of meaning (focus on subjectivity) comes to the fore. Thus, the concretization serves to intensify the evaluative feature.

4. The use of generalization is also insignificant in the number of examples. The use of this transformation is usually due to the norms of the language of translation. An illustration of this is the following context:

Or, for example, immediately after the Baltic countries joined NATO jet fighters appeared in the sky. To resolve what problems? In the end there were only 4 or 5 planes, and a few flights. It was an irritation, nothing tore / Або, наприклад, відразу після вступу до НАТО прибалтійських країн в їхньому небі з'явилася бойова авіація. Для вирішення яких завдань? Адже прилетіли лише 4-5 літаків, це лише дратівливий фактор, нічого більше [35].

5. The modulation technique is also used in the translation of functional evaluation units. Example:

We both agreed that 2006 was a genuinely successful year for relations between our two countries / Ми були єдині в тому, що у 2019 відносини з Німеччиною склалися по-справжньому вдало [36].

In this example, the use of modulation allows to express the meaning of the original unit in a more natural way for the language of translation.

The use of vocabulary correspondences of a lexical unit – єдиний – united, integrated, common in this case would be inappropriate, as none of these correspondences has a meaning that would acquire the meaning of the analyzed lexical unit in this context.

The following example illustrates the replacement of a foreign language unit by a translation language unit, the value of which is logically derived from the value of the original unit:

People have been waiting for compensation, but despite numerous instructions to the Government they are still waiting to this day / І люди чекали на це до останнього часу. Досі це не зроблено. Тому, незважаючи на багаторазові доручення уряду, досі це не вдалося [35].

The use of modulation in this example makes it possible to imply an explicitly expressed negative assessment of government action. Correspondence still waiting for this day only implies that the reason for people's expectations is irrational actions of the government.

6. Antonymic translation is widely used in the reproduction of functionally evaluative units. An example of the use of this type of transformation is the following context:

First, regarding energy, as I said, it is our firm intention to build clear and transparent relations with all of our partners in this sector / Перше, що стосується енергетики, ми не збираємося ухилитися від налагодження ясних і зрозумілих відносин у сфері енергетики з усіма партнерами, зокрема й європейськими [35].

In this example, in the framework of the antonymous translation of a foreign language phrase with a negative particle, *ми не збираємося ухилитися*, is being replaced by the phrase of the language of translation *it is our firm intention*, which expresses the opposite opinion. This allows to emphasize in translation the seriousness of the intention to move to market principles in the price regulation of gas supply.

7. With the help of explication lexical units of the original are replaced by phrases that explicitly express their meaning:

So, I would not overplay the importance of personal relations. They have never been a hindrance, and indeed, they have helped by creating the necessary atmosphere / Тому я не став би гіпертрофувати тут особисті стосунки. Вони нам ніколи не заважали, але справді допомагали, бо створюють необхідну атмосферу [34].

Despite the fact that in the language of translation there is a dictionary correspondence of the lexical unit *зинепророчеству* – *exaggerate*, the translator considered it necessary to explain its meaning with the help of descriptive translation. This made the translation more neutral than the original, as the original expresses a slight irony created by the use of the lexical unit hypertrophied in this context.

A quantitative calculation was performed to identify the frequency of use of different types of transformations in translations of evaluative vocabulary.

The results for each of the considered types of transformations can be commented as follows:

1. When translating functional-evaluative vocabulary with the use of transformations, the calque technique is widely used. Its percentage among of other types of transformations is 28%. The use of this type of transformation ensures the preservation of the structure of the original statement, as well as the polarity and intensity of the assessment contained in the foreign language text.

2. The use of modulation in the translation of lexical units representing functional value (33%) is characterized by a high frequency. The application of modulation allows to implicate explicit assessment or to explicate it. By means of modulation the intensity of the initial estimation changes.

3. Antonymous translations were used for the reproduction of 30% of the analyzed units, which also indicates the high frequency of this type of transformation when translating lexical units of this type. Analysis of examples has shown that the use of antonymous translation in most cases serves to intensify the explicit assessment, as well as the explication of implicitness.

4. Cases of application of such transformation as explication, made 6% of quantity of lexical units which translation was carried out by means of such transformations. The need to use this technique is often due to the desire of the translator to make the translation more neutral and understandable to the listener / reader.

5. Quantitative data proved that the use of concretization and generalization are atypical in the translation of lexical units that represent functional value, and their use is usually due to the norms of the language of translation. The percentage of these transformations to other species under consideration is 2% and 1%, respectively.

6. Cases of functional-evaluative vocabulary's translation by means of transcription and transliteration were not found in the analyzed material.

Thus, the analysis of examples and quantitative calculation revealed that in the translation of functional-evaluative vocabulary in addition to regular correspondences are most often used techniques of calque, modulation and antonymous translation. Their use allows to maintain or change the intensity of the evaluation of the original lexical units.

5. Translation strategies and means of their implementation in the translation of the functional-evaluative vocabulary of political discourse

When reproducing the pragmatics of evaluation, the translator faces a number of strategic tasks:

1. The task of ensuring the relative relevance of the impact effect, which is correlated with the relationship "text-recipient". One of the tactical tasks that the translator solves in order to perform this task is to ensure the degree of closeness of the evaluative content appropriate to each case. In some cases, to achieve relative equality of the impact effect it is necessary to "soften" or "strengthen" emotional value, objectify or subjectivize the value of the translation against the original. This task is performed by achieving the maximum possible degree of closeness of the evaluative content" [13, p. 67].

2. The task of achieving proximity of evaluative content includes three aspects: reproduction of evaluative content (textual evaluation); reproduction of evaluative meaning (evaluation of expression); reproduction of the estimated values the expressive units.

The degree of possible similarity of the estimated content of the original and the translation at all the above levels is a relative concept, which depends on a number of factors. In order to most accurately determine the evaluative characteristics of lexical units in a particular text, it is necessary to take into account both the general situation of the foreign language and the language of translation, the pragmatic aspect of expression and the pragmatic characteristics of evaluative lexical units. The choice of translation strategy is influenced by a number of factors, both linguistic and extralinguistic.

The analysis of theoretical material allowed to determine the dominant functions of political discourse – informative and influential, the ratio of

which depends on the genre of the material. In this case, one of the key means of enhancing the effect on the recipient at the lexical level are evaluative lexical units.

Comparative analysis of the original and translated texts revealed the basic strategies of translation of evaluation vocabulary: 1) strategy of intensification of evaluation; 2) deintensification strategy; 3) the strategy of maintaining the intensity of the assessment in translation. In addition, the main methods of implementing each of these strategies were identified. These techniques include translation transformations according to the classification of Komissarov and other tools, the use of which ensures the implementation of the identified strategies [25].

6. Strategies for intensification and deintensification of evaluative vocabulary

Intensification of the evaluative lexical units in the Ukrainian-English translation can be achieved in different ways.

1. Intensification of the estimated meaning can be achieved with the help of explicit antonymous translation, which allows to specify in the translation the meaning of the original lexical unit.

2. Multi-vector modulation. Replacing the lexical unit of a foreign language with a lexical unit, the meaning of which is logically derived from the source language. The change of causal relationships between them is an effective means of intensifying the evaluative feature expressed by the original lexical unit.

3. Evaluative categorization. The basis of this technique is such a transformation as concretization, which allows to choose the correspondence with a narrower value compared to the unit of source language, which enhances the represented assessment.

4. Personification. In this case, the intensification of the value of the lexical unit and expression in general is achieved by changing the grammatical form of its evaluation. The use of the negative-evaluation verb to be imposed in the form of a passive state allows to soften the categoricalness of the evaluation and to avoid direct nomination of the object of evaluation. In the translated text, the impose correspondence is used by the translator in the form of the actual state, and the subject of the action which has received a negative estimation in statement is directly specified.

5. Means of intensification of evaluation can also include the method of de-euphemism, replacement in the translation of the lexical unit-euphemism by emotional-evaluation correspondence.

6. In some cases, the intensification of the evaluation is achieved by using in the translation of the evaluative explication, compliance with a more pronounced degree of evaluation.

The analysis of contexts showed that the strategy of intensification during the translation of evaluative lexical units is determined mainly by the purpose of translation and its adjustment by the following main guidelines (translation attitudes): setting to discredit the object of evaluation; attitude to criticizing actions of the opponent; attitude to the specification of the valuable situation; focus on attracting attention; attitude to a positive presentation of the country; setting for a positive presentation of the current foreign and domestic policy of the government.

As a result of comparative analysis of the original and translated texts, the following ways of deintensification of evaluative lexical units were identified.

1. The use of implicit antonym translation allows to neutralize the categorical assessment, which is realized by the original lexical unit and thus reduce its intensity.

2. One of the ways to reduce the intensity of the assessment and its categoricalness is multi-vector modulation. Deintensification of the evaluation occurs in the case of a change in the vector of relations in the direction of “consequence-cause”. The use of modulation in combination with antonymous translation softens the phrase.

3. Evaluative implication. Undoubted, examples illustrating the strategy of deintensification are parallel contexts in which the intensity of emotional evaluation of the lexical unit, due to its stylistic qualities, is reduced through the use of stylistically neutral correspondence.

4. Sometimes the desire or need to neutralize categorical, intense evaluation leads to more global transformations at the pragmatic level.

Based on the analyzed contexts, it becomes obvious that the deintensification strategy is based on the following translation guidelines: focus on diplomacy in criticism; focus on political correctness in the assessment; focus on the correction of the linguistic image of the subject of assessment; focus on justifying and supporting the political course.

Evaluative vocabulary is one of the most effective means of realizing the dominant function of political discourse. This fact necessitates the reproduction of the value of lexical units and its intensity in translation.

Adequate reproduction of the evaluative lexical unit and its intensity is achieved in the following ways.

1. The use of traditional correspondence, in other words, the reproduction in the translation of the structure and semantics of the foreign language pragma.

Pragmatic-evaluative lexical units are the core of political communication. They contain in their meaning a concise implicit judgment that expresses the assessment of the nominee denotation. As a result, the choice of the nominee of politically significant realities is one of the main means of linguistic influence.

During the reproduction of the pragma the translator seeks to achieve a possible level of structural and semantic similarity of the units of the original text and the translated text. The accuracy of the nomination of politically significant phenomena is a necessary condition for the adequacy of translation.

2. Explication of implicit meaning. In some cases, the translator has to explain the implicit evaluation contained in the meaning of the lexical unit, if he believes that the removal of this translation information may be possible.

The use of explication to reproduce evaluability is also necessary if the original lexical unit is not consistent in the language of translation [25].

3. Reproduction of evaluativeness and intensity in translation is possible due to semantic tracing, the use of vocabulary correspondences that represent an evaluation relatively equal in degree of intensity.

4. Concretization of the initial value is aimed at replacing the general adjective with private.

5. The preservation in the translation of connotative synonyms that neutralize positive evaluation contributes to the preservation of the evaluative meaning of the lexical unit and utterance in general.

6. Reproduction of metaphors and comparisons. Of particular interest is the translation of lexical units, the value of which is due to their functional and stylistic use as the basis of means of imagery – metaphors and comparisons. Such lexical units are one of the implicit- or explicit-

evaluation tools that have a powerful effect of influence, which necessitates their reproduction in translation.

7. Conclusions

This research determines the dependence of the degree of structural, semantic and communicative proximity of the estimated value of the units of the original text and its correspondences in translation from a number of pragmatic factors.

Evaluative lexical units were considered in terms of their functioning in a particular communicative situation, namely, in a situation of political communication. Such a perspective of the study of language units in the discursive approach involves taking into account the situational and socio-cultural context, which includes the situation of communication, participants, their goals and objectives, as well as belonging to a particular culture and social parameters.

In the course of the research the peculiarities of political discourse as an institutional type of communication were considered. The functional specificity of political discourse determines the use of evaluative vocabulary as one of the means of forming the influential effect of speech acts belonging to the specified communicative space.

The evaluative component in the semantic structure of the word is part of the denotative or connotative macrocomponents. The correlation of the evaluative component with the denotative or connotative, as well as the specificity of the denotation determine the type of evaluativeness represented by the lexical unit. Thus, evaluative lexical units form three classes: functional-evaluative, connotative-evaluative and pragmatic-evaluative.

The study of structural and semantic aspects of the translation of evaluative vocabulary revealed the dependence of the use of regular correspondences and various translation transformations in translation on the type of evaluation represented. As a result, it was found that the main criterion for evaluative degree of structural-semantic isomorphism of lexical units of the original text, representing pragmatic value, and their correspondences in the translated text, is to take into account the pragmatic situation, including social and ideological norms and stereotypes. Structural-semantic isomorphism determines the predominant use in the translation

of transcription / transliteration and calque techniques. At the same time, the correspondences created with the help of these transformations become regular due to the high frequency of their application.

The analysis of the translation peculiarities of functional-pragmatic vocabulary revealed a tendency to both preserve and change the intensity of the estimated value, which contributes to the predominant use of the following transformations: tracing of the original structure, modulation, antonymous translation.

Comparative analysis of connotative-lexical units and their correspondences revealed that the preservation of the value of this type in translation is possible by reproducing all relevant components of expression, and translation of lexical units that include the evaluative component of this type is mostly regular matches.

Thus, in translation, the evaluation of different types is updated by combining regular correspondences and different transformations that allow to maintain or modify the variant characteristics of the evaluation feature – intensity and affectivity. In this case, the structure and polarity of the estimate (+/-) are the invariant of the estimated value that ensures the communicative equivalence of the original and translated texts.

Equivalent reproduction of the pragmatic potential of the original text is not always the task of translation, therefore the relationship between the pragmatics of the original and the translation may be different, and the original pragmatic relationship may be subject to various modifications determined by the translation strategy.

Comparative analysis of pragmatic and lexical units of a foreign language and their correspondences in the language of translation revealed their main methods of translation, and the use of quantitative calculation – the ratio of different types of transformations used in translating lexical units of the analyzed type. As a result, it was found that in most cases there are relations of structural-semantic isomorphism between examples in a foreign language and their correspondences in the language of translation, which determines the predominant use of transcription / transliteration (43%) and calque (52%). A small percentage of the use of other types of transformations (explication – 3%, antonymous translation – 1%, concretization – 1%) indicates the atypicality of their use in the translation of pragmatics. When translating functional-evaluative vocabulary, both one-level and multi-

level correspondences are used, which have similar emotional-evaluative characteristics, that allows to preserve the intensity and polarity of the evaluativeness of the whole utterance.

When translating functional-evaluative vocabulary, both one-level and multi-level correspondences are used, which have similar emotional-evaluative characteristics, which allows to preserve the intensity and polarity of the evaluativeness of the whole utterance.

The comparative analysis revealed other examples of transformations used, different from the set of transformations used in the translation of pragmatic-evaluative vocabulary. Of the total amount of functional-evaluation units translated by transformations, approximately equal number were lexical units reproduced in translation by tracing the original structure (28%), modulation (33%), antonymous translation (30%). The use of these types of transformations in the translation of functional-evaluative vocabulary allows to maintain or change the intensity of the value of the original lexical unit. Cases of explication were 6%. The use of this type of transformation is due to the desire to make the text of the translation neutral and understandable to the recipients of the translation. Quantitative data confirm the thesis that the use of concretization (2%), generalization (1%) and transcription / transliteration (0%) is not typical for reproduction in the translation of functional-evaluative lexical units.

The translation of lexical units, the value of which is contextually determined, is not particularly difficult. To reproduce them, as a rule, regular correspondences are used, and the preservation of their connotative value contributes to the reproduction of all relevant elements of expression. When reproducing connotative-evaluative lexical units in translation, there is a tendency to de-intensify evaluation and reduce their categoricalness.

As a result of comparative analysis of language material, the main directions of modifications of lexical units' estimated value in the Ukrainian-English translation related to political discourse were revealed. These modifications implement the following main translation strategies: the intensification strategy, the deintensification strategy, the strategy of maintaining the original intensity of the assessment. The possibility of modifying the estimated value within these strategies provides a gradation of the evaluation scale. Achieving these strategies is possible through the use of a number of translation techniques. Thus, when focusing on the

strategy of intensification, the following techniques are used: explicit antonym translation, multi-vector modulation in the direction of “cause-effect”, evaluative categorization, personification, de-euphemism, evaluative explication. The implementation of the deintensification strategy is achieved through the following transformations: implicative antonymous translation, multi-vector modulation in the direction of “consequence-cause”, evaluative implication, changes in the evaluation structure. Preservation of the initial level of intensity and categoricalness of the estimated value is achieved through the use of traditional correspondences, methods of explication, semantic tracing, concretization, reproduction of connotative synonyms.

The pragmatic factors identified as a result of the comparative analysis determine the translator’s focus on the implementation of one of the selected strategies. These factors include 1) the affiliation of the original text to a particular type of discourse, the dependence of the evaluative characteristics of foreign text and the specifics of the functioning of evaluative vocabulary from the dominant functions of the political discourse; 2) focus on the addressee of the translation, the presence of background knowledge and evaluative stereotypes, which allows to determine its potential response; 3) the purpose of translation, which implies that the translator has certain attitudes.

The focus on the intensification strategy is based on the following translation attitudes: discrediting the object of evaluation; criticism of the opponent’s actions; specification of the assessed situation; attracting attention; positive presentation.

The basis of the deintensification strategy is the following attitudes: diplomacy in criticism, political correctness in evaluation, correction of the linguistic image of the subject of evaluation, justification and support of the political course.

Particular interest for the study of the evaluative vocabulary reproduction are lexical units, the evaluability of which is due to their use as the basis of means of imagery – metaphors, comparisons, and allusions, detailed analysis of which was not part of this research. In this regard, it is promising to consider the specifics of the translation of such lexical items as a means of updating the evaluative content of utterances in a foreign language.

References:

1. Arutyunova N. D. (1990) *Pragmatika. Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar* [Pragmatics. Linguistic encyclopedic dictionary] / ed. V. N. Yartseva. Moskva: Sov. Encyclopedia. (in Russian)
2. Arutyunova N. D. (1988) *Tipy yazykovykh znacheniy: otsenka. sobytiye. Fakt* [Types of linguistic meanings: assessment, event, fact]. Moskva. (in Russian)
3. Arutyunova N. D. (1999) *Yazyk i mir cheloveka* [The language and the world of man]. Moskva. (in Russian)
4. Ahmanova O. S. (1966) *Slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov* [Dictionary of linguistic terms]. Moskva. (in Russian)
5. Baranov A. N, Kazakevich E. G. (1991). *Parlamentskiye debaty: traditsii i novatorstvo* [Parliamentary debate: traditions and innovation]. Moskva. (in Russian)
6. Volf E. M. (1985) *Funktsionalnaya semantika otsenki* [Functional semantics of evaluation]. Moskva: Nauka. (in Russian)
7. Vorobyeva O. I. (2000). *Politicheskaya leksika. Ee funktsii v sovremennoy ustnoy i pismennoy rechi* (Political vocabulary. Its functions in modern oral and written speech). Arkhangelsk. (in Russian)
8. Geliyeva A. V. (2005). *Otsenochnyye strategii v yazyke britanskoy kachestvennoy i massovoy pressy* [Evaluation strategies in the language of the British qualitative and mass press]: avtoref. diss. ... kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.19. Moskva. (in Russian)
9. Golovanevskiy L. L. (2002) Otsenochnost i eye otrazheniye v politicheskom i leksicograficheskom diskursakh [Valuability and its reflection in political and lexicographical discourses]. *Filologicheskiye nauki*, no. 3, pp. 78–87. (in Russian)
10. Golovanevskiy L. L. (1987) Sotsialnaya i ideologicheskaya differentsiatsiya i otsenochnost obshchestvenno-politicheskoy leksiki russkogo yazyka [Social and ideological differentiation and evaluation of the socio-political vocabulary of the Russian language]. *Voprosy yazykoznavaniya*, no.4, pp. 35–42. (in Russian)
11. Gromovenko V. (2015) Doslidzhennya politichnogo diskursu v lingvistitsi [Research of political discourse in linguistics]. *Naukovi zapiski Vinnitskogo derzhavnogo pedagogichnogo universitetu imeni Mikhayla Kotsyubinskogo. Seriya: Filologiya (movoznavstvo)*, no. 21, pp. 238–242. (in Ukrainian)
12. Dymarskiy M. Y. (1998) Tekst – diskurs – khudozhestvennyy tekst. Tekst kak obyekt mnogoaspektynogo issledovaniya [Text – discourse – artistic text. The text as an object of multifaceted research]. *Sb. statey nauchno-metodicheskogo seminaru «Textus» / pod red. d-ra filol. nauk K. E. Shtayn. SPb.-Stavropol: SGU*, no. 3.4.1, pp. 18–27. (in Russian)
13. Efimenko A. M. (1989) O peredache pragmatiki otsenki v publitsisticheskoy perevode. Kommunikativnyy invariant perevoda v tekstakh razlichnykh zhanrov [On the transfer of the pragmatics of evaluation in journalistic translation. Communicative invariant of translation in texts of various genres]. *Sb. nauch. tr.*, no. 343, pp. 64–74. (in Russian)
14. Karasik V. I. (2000) O tipakh diskursa. Yazykovaya lichnost: institutsionalnyy i personalnyy diskurs [About types of discourse. Linguistic personality: institutional and personal discourse]. *Sb. nauch. tr. Volgograd: Peremena*, pp. 5–20. (in Russian)

15. Karasik V. I. (2004) *Yazyk sotsialnogo statusa* [The language of social status]. Moskva: ITDGG «Gnozis». (in Russian)
16. Komissarov V.N. (1980) *Lingvistika perevoda* [Linguistics of translation]. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya. (in Russian)
17. Komlev N. G. (2006) *Komponenty soderzhatelnoy struktury slova* [Components of the content structure of the word]. Moskva: Komkniga. (in Russian)
18. Kondratenko N. V. (2016) *Politichniy diskurs: sutnist. tipologiya. spetsifika funktsionuvannya* [Political discourse: essence, typology, specifics of functioning]. Odesa: Astroprint. (in Ukrainian)
19. Korneyko T. G. (2013) Osnovnyye podkhody k izucheniyu politicheskogo yazyka v sovremennykh politiko-lingvisticheskikh issledovaniyakh [Basic approaches to the study of political language in modern political-linguistic research]. *Vestnik MNU. Ser. 12. Politicheskiye nauki*, no. 5, pp. 74–85. (in Russian)
20. Krysin L. P. (2018). Sotsialnaya markirovannost yazykovykh edinit [Social labeling of language units]. *Voprosy yazykoznavaniya*, no. 4, pp. 26–42. (in Russian)
21. Kryuchkova T. B. (2019) *Osobennosti formirovaniya obshchestvenno-politicheskoy leksiki i terminologii* [Features of the formation of socio-political vocabulary and terminology]. Moskva: Nauka. (in Russian)
22. Markelova T. V. (2015) Semantika i pragmatika sredstv vyrazheniya otsenki v russkom yazyke. *Filologicheskiye nauki*, no. 3, pp. 67–79. (in Russian)
23. Nariychuk M. (2013) Ukrainski politichni realii v anglomovnomu politichnomu diskursi [Ukrainian political realities in English-language political discourse]. *Naukoviy visnik Skhidnoevropeyskogo natsionalnogo universitetu imeni Lesi Ukrainki*, 19. (in Ukrainian)
24. Sternin I. A. (2016) *Leksicheskaya lakunarnost i spetsifika natsionalnogo myshleniya* [Lexical lacunarity and specifics of national thinking]. Retrieved from: <http://www.kcn.ru> (in Russian)
25. Sternin I. A. (1979) *Problemy analiza struktury znacheniya slova* [Problems of word structure analysis]. Voronezh. (in Russian)
26. Teliya N. (1986). *Konnotativnyy aspekt semantiki nominativnykh edinit* [Connotative aspect of semantics of nominative units]. Moskva: Nauka. (in Russian)
27. Shevchenko I. (2005) *Problemi tipologii diskursu. Diskurs yak kognitivno-komunikativniy fenomen* [Problems of discourse typology. Discourse as a cognitive-communicative phenomenon]. Kharkiv: Konstanta. (in Ukrainian)
28. Sheygal E. I. (2017a) *Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa: monografiya* [Semiotics of political discourse: a monograph]. Iyaz RAN. Volgograd: Peremena. (in Russian)
29. Sheygal E. I. (2017b) Smyslovaya neopredelennost kak faktor politicheskogo diskursa [Semantic uncertainty as a factor of political discourse]. *Materialy rabochego soveshchaniya-seminara / pod red. Yu. A. Sorokina i V. N. Bazyleva*. Moskva: Dialog-MGU, pp. 111–116. (in Russian)
30. Epshteyn M. H. (1991) Ideologiya i yazyk (Postroyeniye modeli i osmysleniye diskursa) [Ideology and language (model building and understanding of discourse)]. *Voprosy yazykoznavaniya*, no. 6, pp. 19–33. (in Russian)
31. Brown G., Yule G. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge.

32. Cook G. (1992) *The Discourse of Advertising*. London, New York.
33. Dijk T.A. van. (2004) *Ideological Discourse Analysis*. Retrived from: <http://www.discourses.org/Teun.html>
34. Foreign Affairs Council, 22 February 2021. Retrieved from: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/meetings/fac/2021/02/22/>
35. Panel Discussion: Geospatial Infrastructure for Europe. Retrived from: <https://www.esri.com/en-us/about/events/gis-euro-union/save-date?date=2021-12-02>
36. Panel Discussion: Sustainability: Reunion, Recovery and Reinvention. EU-US summit, Brussels, 15 June 2021. Retrieved from: <https://www.esri.com/en-us/about/events/gis-euro-union/save-date?date=2021-12-02>