

A STUDY ON THE TRANSLATION OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE FROM ENGLISH INTO RUSSIAN

Valeria ȘUTICOVA

CZU: 81`25:32=03.111=161

lerashuticova@gmail.com

The goal of this article is to shed light on the power of conceptual metaphors and to emphasise their importance for the political discourse and peculiarities of their translation. Although metaphors have traditionally been regarded as a stylistic device, they are deeply rooted in our conceptual system, influencing the way we perceive, think, and act in a range of situations. Conceptual metaphors used in the political discourse can influence and manipulate the consciousness of entire masses.

In cognitive linguistics metaphor is a central topic that has significantly shaped our understanding of how language and thought are interconnected. The foundational work in this field is primarily attributed to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson [1], who introduced the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) in their seminal book “*Metaphors We Live By*” (1980). According to CMT, metaphors are not just linguistic expressions but are rooted in our cognitive processes, influencing how we perceive, think, and act. Therefore, metaphor was studied as a mental operation that structures and explains the surrounding world based on our experiences, leading to the conceptual system being largely metaphorical. By examining metaphor from various perspectives, the study shed light on its pervasive nature and demonstrated its capacity to shape perceptions, evoke emotions, and enhance communication in a variety of contexts.

Concerning the discourse, it is defined as linguistic communication, and seen as a transaction between the speaker and hearer, and as an interpersonal activity whose form is determined by its social purpose. Discourse, as described by É. Benveniste [2] and T.A. van Dijk [3], pivots on communicative events, social interactions, and the speaker’s influence on the listener within contextual, pragmatic, and socio-cultural dimensions. It extends from the grammatical structure of language to the specific participants engaged in communication, reflecting the intricate relationship between language, speakers, and listeners. Additionally, as articulated by M. Foucault [4], discourse delves into the interplay between language and reality, unveiling how it shapes not just their intersection, but also the rules governing discursive practices. Therefore, discourse transcends mere linguistic exchange to encompass a dynamic process rich with social, cultural, and pragmatic implications, shaping our interactions, perceptions, and conceptualisations comprehensively.

Political discourse, in particular, is highlighted for its strong connection between language and power, with politicians using language to influence public conscious-

ness and impose their worldview. The analysis of political discourse by scholars like T.A. van Dijk [3] and P. Chilton [5] emphasizes the interplay between language, power, and politics, and the importance of addressing relevant political questions. Political discourse is characterised by features such as competitiveness, aggressiveness, ideological nature, and theatricality, which influence public perception and manipulate consciousness. Conceptual metaphors play a crucial role in political discourse, with examples like *"inflation as an adversary"* illustrating how metaphors shape public opinion and justify political actions. Overall, the linguistic strategies employed in political discourse aim to persuade the audience, evoke emotions, and defend policy decisions to achieve political agendas effectively.

Conceptual metaphor is an effective strategy in political communication that enables politicians to clarify complex ideas, evoke strong feelings and defend policy decisions. It is worth acknowledging that it is conceptual metaphors that play one of the most important roles in influencing public opinion and promoting political agendas, drawing on research findings and examples from political speeches. For instance, the following concepts: *nation – person* ("a nation exists to serve its citizens"), *politics – competition* ("a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before", "America will start winning again"), *politics – battle* ("We will fight for you"), *politics – building* ("rebuilding our country") can be found in Donald Trump's inaugural address. In the inaugural speeches of President Obama (2009 and 2013), similar concepts are encountered: *politics – war* ("We will defend our people"), *country – building* ("begin again the work of remaking America"), *country – person* ("America must choose"). Thus, both politicians seek to appeal to people's basic feelings and needs (the people – the audience) by presenting the country as one with human-like features, these tactics establish emotional connections and win support for his goals among the population. These metaphors have the dual purpose of eliciting a strong emotional response and simplifying complex political ideas, which in turn builds public opinion and contributes to the achievement of political goals, namely, at a minimum, securing voter support for taking office, which equates to gaining power.

Speaking about the peculiarities of translation of conceptual metaphors, various techniques can be used (most of them suggested by P. Newmark [6]) such as: **literal translation** ("*Our nation is at war against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred*" – «*Наша страна находится в состоянии войны против широкой сети насилия и ненависти*», "*Our history has been a constant struggle between the American ideal that we are all created equal and the harsh, ugly reality that racism, nativism, fear, and demonization have long torn us apart*" – «*Наша история была постоянной борьбой между американским идеалом – что все мы созданы равными – и суровой уродливой реальностью – что расизм, национализм и страх разрывают нас на части*»); **addition** ("*I will fight as hard for those who did not support me as for those who did*" – «*Я обещаю, что буду бороться за тех, кто не поддерживал меня так же, как за тех, кто поддерживал*», "*We will get our people off of welfare and back to work – rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor*"

– «Нашему народу больше не придётся получать социальные пособия: люди снова смогут работать и сумеют *возродить нашу страну собственными силами* – американскими руками и американским трудом»); **modulation** (“So let us mark this day with remembrance of who we are and *how far we have traveled*” – «Так давайте же отметим этот день, вспоминая тех, кто жил до нас, и *долгий путь, который мы проделали*»); **omission** (“Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and *begin again the work of remaking America*” – «Начиная с сегодняшнего дня, мы должны собраться и *начать перестраивать Америку*»); **transposition** (“We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort *to rebuild* our country and to restore its promise for all of our people” – «Мы, граждане Америки, сейчас объединились в едином общенациональном усилии *восстановления* нашей страны и возвращения надежды для всех наших сограждан»).

To stress the aforesaid, this study of conceptual metaphors in political discourse highlights their ubiquitous presence, nuanced functioning, and cultural significance. By unravelling the tangled relationship between language and politics, we gain a deeper understanding of the persuasive power of metaphor in shaping public discourse and collective identity.

References:

1. LAKOFF, G., JOHNSON, M. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003. 276 p. Also available: <https://www.textosenlinea.com.ar/libros/Lakoff%20y%20Johnson%20-%20Metaphors%20We%20Live%20By%20-%201980.pdf>
2. BENVENISTE, É. Subjectivity in language. Problems in general linguistics [online]. Florida: University of Miami Press. 1971, nr.1, pp. 223-230 [cited 15.03.2024]. Available: [https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/294097/mod_resource/content/1/Benveniste%20\(1\).pdf](https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/294097/mod_resource/content/1/Benveniste%20(1).pdf)
3. VANDIJK, T.A. *Discourse, knowledge, power and politics*. Critical discourse studies in context and cognition, edited by Christopher Hant [online]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing company. 2011, nr. 43, pp. 27-65 [cited 07.04.2024]. Available: <https://discourses.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2011-Discourse-knowledge-power-and-politics-article-in-Hart.pdf>
4. FOUCAULT, M. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans. Sheridan Smith, A. M. [online]. New York: Pantheon House, 1972, 245 p. [cited 16.02.2024]. Available: https://monoskop.org/images/9/90/Foucault_Michel_Archaeology_of_Knowledge.pdf
5. CHILTON, PAUL A. *Analysing political discourse: theory and practice* [online]. London: Routledge, 2004, 240 p. [cited 10.03. 2024]. Available: <https://voidnetwork.gr/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Analysing-political-discourse-Theory-and-Practice-by-Paul-Chilton.pdf>
6. NEWMARK, P. *A Textbook of Translation* [online]. London: Prentice Hall, 1988, 292 p. [cited 10.02.2024]. Available: [http://ilts.ir/Content/ilts.ir/Page/142/ContentImage/A%20Textbook%20of%20Translation%20by%20Peter%20Newmark%20\(1\).pdf](http://ilts.ir/Content/ilts.ir/Page/142/ContentImage/A%20Textbook%20of%20Translation%20by%20Peter%20Newmark%20(1).pdf)

Recommended by

Olesea BODEAN-VOZIAN, PhD, Associate Professor