

Translation strategies of menacing speech act in political discourse from English into Russian

Shakhidam Khamrayeva

The 3rd year training, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages

Email: global@prescopus.com

Aybarsha Islam

Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, the Republic of Kazakhstan

Email: global@ores.su

Agnur Khalel

The 2nd year training, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages Almaty, the Republic of Kazakhstan

Email : russia@prescopus.com

Bulbul Matay

Kazakh State Women's Teacher Training University Almaty, the Republic of Kazakhstan

Email: info@ores.su

Abstract

The aim of the article is to investigate translation strategies of menacing speech act in political discourse from English into Russian via qualitative comparative analysis of other scholars' works in this field. As a result, in the translation of menacing speech acts in political discourse, we attempted to preserve the author's intention to convey his aggressive attitude towards the opponent. The diversity of the content of the political discourse allows us to conclude that not only a menacing speech act should be studied, but also other topics of the English-language political discourse and any other.

Key words: Menacing Speech, Translation Strategy, Discourse.

Estrategias de traducción de actos de habla amenazantes en el discurso político del inglés al ruso

Resumen

El objetivo del artículo es investigar las estrategias de traducción de actos de habla amenazantes en el discurso político del inglés al ruso a través del análisis cualitativo comparativo de los trabajos de otros académicos en este campo. Como resultado, en la traducción de actos de habla amenazantes en el discurso político, intentamos preservar la intención del autor de transmitir su actitud agresiva hacia el oponente. La diversidad del contenido del discurso político nos permite concluir que no solo se debe estudiar un acto de discurso amenazador, sino también otros temas del discurso político en idioma inglés y otros.

Palabras clave: Discurso amenazante, Estrategia de traducción, Discurso.

1. Introduction

Newmark (2008) believes that the goal of this strategy is to bring the text and the transmission of the speech statement in line with the norms of the target language. The subjective aspect of this strategy is that the translation is made comfortable for the reception. It should be noted that the classification proposed by Newmark (2008) about the translation strategy is generally accepted. He distinguishes the following types of translation strategies:

1. The strategy of literal translation (translation requires subsequent editing)
2. The strategy of word-by-word translation. It is applied, as usual, in a draft translation or for the transfer of a translation of the general meaning of a speech act or text);
3. The strategy of semantic translation. It assumes an accurate translation of the contents of the original);
4. The strategy of accurate translation. According to the scientist, this strategy as usual, is applicable only to translating technical texts, where an adequate transfer of the form is not required.);
5. The strategy of free translation (translation without preserving the style, form and content of the original text, with the preservation of the main idea, for example, as in the case of a foreign text);
6. Adaptation strategy. This form of free translation, which is used when translating literary texts);
7. The strategy of idiomatic translation. According to Newmark (2008), its suites with an oral translation, often in an informal setting);
8. The strategy of communicative translation.

In order to study the issues of strategies for translating speech acts of treats in political discourse, the unity of the communicative and cognitive-activity paradigm is of great importance. It is common knowledge that the basis of the communicative-activity paradigm lies in the psycholinguistic principles of the analysis of the translation process. Supporters of this area of the translation process consider it as the creation of some new, complete speech and power of thought as well. This approach involves paying special attention to the semantic side of the statement, where the main issues of translation are decided on the utterance level. And the cognitive-activity paradigm in the concept of translation strategies presupposes the study of translation, primarily, as a kind of human thought function aimed at understanding then translating the result of the understanding of the original individual knowledge into a translated text in another language. If with the development of sociology and philosophy, the concept of translation strategy is viewed as a form of social interactions between different actors, then this concept in political science is used as a discursive unit of interstate interactions that has a temporary character. Thus, the essence of the concept of translation strategy is due to a variety of different options in particular translation tactics.

Interpreter strategies, translation strategy, interpreter's behavior strategy in the process of translation. The strategy of translation of menacing speech acts in political discourse is understood as the main tasks of an interpreter in choosing a text for translation and developing an adequate method for its translation. From this point of view, the choice of an effective transfer strategy depends on objective and subjective factors. If objective factors are related to different types of text and types of communication, subjective factors include the translator's professional competence,

which, in addition to owning a foreign language, should be able to correctly interpret and understand every speech act. Subjective factors are also divided into a strategy of literal and free translation. The term translation strategy by linguistic scholars is often considered to indicate the methods and techniques used to achieve the goals formulated in the selection of translation strategies, general or particular trial and error strategies, the strategy of linearity and probabilistic forecasting.

Reflection and representation of the concept of translation strategy, as an integral unit of the cognitive-activity paradigm in the context of the study of menacing speech acts in political discourse, is of a special functional importance. It is about the existence of various forms and ways of interpreting the concept of translation strategies. The point is that at the present stage of development, the science of translation includes three research paradigms:

1. sub-institutional-transformational, 2. Communicative activity, 3. Cognitive-activity.

Translation studies very thoroughly consider the issues of translation strategies, so it is difficult to put forward a new concept. From this point of view, the strategy of transferring menacing speech acts in political discourse can be considered in the context of the unity of many of its species, which, in aggregate, can explain the general nature of the tactics of translation. The same approach, of course, does not mean that the strategy for translating menacing speech acts in political discourse is perfect. However, using different types of strategy, one can be guided by its principles to characterize the features of strategies for translating menacing speech acts in political discourse. Only such a combination of types of strategies, in our opinion, reveals the cognitive nature of the menacing speech acts, since the human factor acquires a special role in the cognitive and speech-thinking processes.

The cognitive-activity paradigm in the translation strategy is not simply related to the mental operations performed by the translator in the very process of conveying the utterance. For menacing speech acts in political discourse, such strategies are implemented in several stages, in particular, the stage of a common understanding of the meaning from which one can go to the stage of translating a particular utterance, which is the product of a new text or speech utterance. This stage consists of the selection of the text or speech act, the hierarchy (step) of the utterance, the sequence of words used and the set of actions. So, our research, as a single scientific text, can be determined as a holistic semiotic education and be the result of a cognitive-communicative activity paradigm. This naturally leads to the conceptualization of this issue, which includes the completeness of information that comes to the individual because of illocutionary acts. The peculiarity of this aspect is that the application of a holistic approach to the issues of the strategy of transferring menacing speech acts in political discourse can give a new possible strategy. At the heart of the proposed strategy of menacing speech acts are the logical interrelation principle of the basic units of the scientific text the basic words are usually explicative, associative, basic words, ready speech clichés and so on.

2. The identification of the problem

Various scholars have been engaged in the study of the question of a menacing speech act, but I would like to mention a few of them, in our opinion, which are the most striking works in this field. The following scholars have devoted many of their works to the study of the characteristics of a menacing speech act both in political discourse and in other interdisciplinary areas, such as

linguistics, philology and others. Political discourse is understood by us as a communicative act, in which the speaker acts through his speech activity on the recipient, if in his speech the speaker uses a manly cue. In his writings, Searle (1986) repeatedly mentioned that a menacing speech act can be either direct or indirect. A speaker's speech can be referred to as a direct speech act when he says the same thing as he has in mind, that is, explicit, in other words, an explicit intention. An indirect speech act describes the author that such cases of the offer, the indicators of the illocutionary force for one type of illocutionary act, can be pronounced to carry out, in addition, an illocutionary act of another type.

According to the majority of scholars, based on research on speech acts, speech acts of the menacing rhetoric of Searle (1986), the authors agreed that a variety of discursive tactics help to realize threats in the speech of the speech act, depending on the conflict situation. Armed conflict, hostility or an aggressively tuned addressee involuntarily allows himself to use certain threats in the political discourse. The subject matter, the use of the speech act of threat is diverse and unpredictable, it culminates from the deterioration of socio-cultural relations to the breaking of diplomatic, political, international ties. The implementation of a menacing speech act in the process of verbal communication, less often non-verbal communication in political discourse on the basis of the English language, more accurately is relied on an adequate translation from English into Russian, carrying out a translation analysis of the practical material of the study. Thus, we need to study in more detail the specifics of the voice speech practices in political discourse.

Epshtein (2010) proposes a definition to a menacing speech act as a communicative-pragmatic class of utterances with a semantic dominant threat. The author notes that in big politics and not only the threat, unfortunately, is a reality of human activity. According to the online version of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, the threat is... the intention to inflict physical, material or other harm to an individual or to the public interest, expressed verbally, in writing, by actions or in some other way. Epshtein (2010), in her works notes that the threat realized in a menacing speech act in political discourse is a tactical method of manipulating the enemy in the struggle for power, the author also recalls that politics involves not only struggle but also negotiations detailing the fulfillment of the requirements and realizing the intent of the threat in the speaker's speech.

3. Discussion and findings

In one of the analytical programs, the issue of which was devoted to the pre-election debate in the US presidents between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, the whole world was discussing the threat of D. Trump to Hillary Clinton, that if he becomes president, he will put her in jail. In mass media, he tried to sort out this difficult matter. During the pre-election debates, the ratings of TV channels rose sharply, and the whole world thereby saw the personal dislike of the two presidential candidates - Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. According to the press, the American political system has shaken and cracked. Donald Trump threatened to put Hillary Clinton in jail, appointing a special prosecutor who would investigate the case of the electronic correspondence of the former state secretary if he won the election. Scholars and political scholars theoretically suggested that it is possible that D. Trump will succeed in fulfilling the threat he promised. Under the legislation of the United States of America, the president has the right to propose the candidacies of Ministers in his office, including the Minister of Justice, who then must approve the Congress. Presumably, a trustee appointed by the president to the position of Minister of Justice

may in turn appoint a suitable special prosecutor who would reopen the e-mail case. It is common knowledge that the FBI has been investigating this case for quite some time but has not brought charges against Hillary Clinton. Hypothetically, we could assume that this is feasible, but if Barack Obama had given Presidential apologize to Mrs. Hillary in advance, it would not have been possible to put her in jail (Zykova, 2010).

The electronic version of the print edition of The New York Times provides a wide audience of scripts of statements by candidates for the presidency of the United States. In his pre-election speech, Donald Trump told Hillary Clinton, because you would be in jail. Below is a dialog, as if everything happened: In this passage from the debate in the presidents of the United States of America between Donald Trump and the state. Secretary Hillary Clinton, we clearly observe the rivalry, the clash of political interests, and the mutual personal dislike of two political figures. This pre-election race is a clear example of the fact that in political discourse such nuances as verbal attack against each other are possible, a violation not only of political ethics, but also of the general human values as a whole, the struggle for votes in the electorate, and this means a struggle for power in some measure.

The verbal act of threat we are investigating, in its essence, deviates from the norms of morality and any morality in general. The very same menacing speech act causes a desire to violate the norms of morality, and its use in such cases, largely depends on the principles and norms adopted in a particular society. The willfulness and freedom of the American people allow political persons to use such speech acts of threat in their official speeches. The pre-election race, in particular the debates, showed us how it is possible to violate the laws of ethics, with a verbal clash of two presidential candidates, for example, there is a trend of fearlessness, provocation, all kinds of accusations, and even threats, which Mr. D. Trump uses, the phrase Because you would be in jail, which in translation means *вам необходимо посадить в тюрьму*. In our research we mentioned an example of an explicitly expressed threat to the opponent. In the example given by us, a political person does not try to disguise or unclearly express his threat. Donald Trump is very clear, looking to his opponent in person, namely Hillary Clinton, threatens her with a prison, in case of successful elections in his favor. In our case, the aggression of a political person is not implicit, the politician does not seek approval or censure of the audience, based on his personal convictions he uses in his statements men's rhetoric, whereby he wanted to achieve a certain communicative goal.

As an example of the second debate between US presidential candidates, we observe that when using a speech act of threat, a certain reaction is expected on the idea of the opponent - this is either a fear for something, or fear, which later defines both behavior and even facial expression. From the fragment of the speech of the presidential candidates we notice that there are some nuances in the work of the translator. So, for example, each speaker was given two minutes to speak in the political debate, after the opponent had the right to respond to his partner. In this case, such a public exchange of views shows the viewer the whole picture of the electoral campaign of candidates. Each of the parties was to persuade the discussion to be correct, while using all methods to achieve the stated goal of the presidential contenders. We see that Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton used their rights when speaking. Each of the parties actively used a mass of rhetoric, facial expressions, and gestures.

Analyzing the television version of the debate live on the air with simultaneous translation, we had a legitimate question about the adequacy and equivalence of the official version of the translation. There was more than one interpreter working on translating this debate, because with a certain translation fragment, the interpreters changed each other, which is a natural process in simultaneous translation because of fast fatigue in the process of work. We assume that 4

interpreters took part in this discussion, replacing each other every 8 minutes. The spectator, observing the brilliant performance of the participants in the debate, rarely sees the mistakes made in the translation. Since the translation process is simultaneous, as in this case, the translator has almost no time to correct mistakes made during the work. Having examined the original scripts and the scripts for translating the first 30 minutes of the debate, we came to a definite opinion. It was in the first 30 minutes that the negative attitude of the candidates to each other was revealed, negative emotionality of the speech, personal dislike of the candidates, as well as the use of menacing speech acts were observed. From the first minutes it was clear that the candidates were not squeamish about anything. In their speeches, they worked on such data that it was difficult to believe in the reliability of the information provided. When analyzing the translation for past conventional reservations in translation, we noticed other more serious mistakes in the translation.

Let us consider a segment of Donald Trump's speech and its translation of the debate in the pre-election race. D. Trump: ...Certainly, I am not proud of it. But this is locker room talk. You know, when we have a world where you have ISIS chopping off heads, where you have – and, frankly, drawing people in steel cages, where you have wars and horrible, horrible sights all over, where you have so many bad things happening, this is like medieval times. We have not seen anything like this, the carnage all over the world. And they look, and they see. Can you imagine the people that are, frankly, doing so well against us with ISIS? And they look at our country and they see what is going on. Yes, I am very embarrassed by it. I hate it. But its locker room talked, and it is one of those things. I will knock the hell out of ISIS. We are going to defeat ISIS. ISIS happened a number of years ago in a vacuum that was left because of bad judgment. And I will tell you, I will take care of ISIS.

Translation:

D.Trump: «Я безусловно...нечем тут гордится. Но это говорилось за закрытыми дверьми. И сегодня, да, мы топим людей в каких-то стальных клетках, у нас ведется война во многих уголках, много столько всего происходит. Просто как какое-то средневековье. Столько крови льется по всему миру. А можно себе вот представить, что вот люди, которые столько как бы так хорошо удается им бороться против нас, возьмите ИГИЛ, мы...я например, мне стыдно за это. И вот этот, и мне стыдно за этот разговор, но мы победим ИГИЛ. Это происходило несколько лет назад, они... потому, что был вакуум они образовались, но я разберусь с ИГИЛ, Я буду заниматься важными вещами, гораздо важными вещами, большими вещами».

Proceeding from this section of the text, we hold the opinion that the simultaneous interpreter could not cope with the task, namely, adequately convey the meaning of the text. From this segment of the text translation, we clearly see that the translator does not comply with the norms of the translated language, moved away from the official business style, which is not the norm when translating political discourse of this level, pauses to select a correct equivalent of the word. In the sentence but this is locker room talk interpreter translate as«Но это говорилось за закрытыми дверьми». We see a mistake in translation in this sentence the wordдверьин plural form, would be дверями. Thus, interpreter should translate the sentence in the singular form«но это был разговор за закрытой дверью», or if you hold on to the official business style «разговор происходил за закрытой дверью»should be «разговор происходил за закрытыми дверями». In the next sentence...where you have ISIS chopping off heads, where you have – and, frankly, drawing people in steel cages... interpreter translate as «и сегодня, да, мы топим людей в каких-то стальных клетках».In my opinion, one of the key moments of this segment is the

phrase...where you have ISIS chopping off heads..., the interpreter uses translation strategy as compression.

We suggest translating it as «...где у вас ИГИЛ отрубает головы...» или же «...где ИГИЛ отрубает ваши головы...». Abbreviation ISIS in recent years, has become widespread, and often translators translate this abbreviation in a reduced form ИГИЛ. It is known that ISIS spelling out as Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, ИГИЛ же Исламское Государство Ирака и Сирии, although there are several options for writing the names of this organization in both languages, we decided on a well-known version. Continuing this proposal, we focus our attention on the translation «и сегодня, да, мы топим людей в каких-то стальных клетках». In the original, this translation sounds like this: where you have – and, frankly, drawing people in steel cages.... We do not agree with the translation of this phrase drawing people in a steel cage as «... да, мы топим людей в каких-то стальных клетках». In the Russian language we could not use the verb топить to the phrase стальная клетка. In my opinion, we need to use adaptation in translation in this case: «безусловно, там, где держат людей в стальной клетке...».

Let us to show an example of simultaneous translation of a part D. Trump's speech:

«Yes, I am very embarrassed by it. I hate it. / Мы... я, например, мне стыдно за это. But it is locker room talked, and it is one of those things. / и вот этот, мне стыдно за этот разговор. I will knock the hell out of ISIS. We are going to defeat ISIS. / мы победим ИГИЛ. ISIS happened a number of years ago in vacuum that was left because of bad judgment. / это происходило несколько лет назад, они...потому, что был вакуум они образовались. And I will tell you, I will take care of ISIS./ но я разберусь с ИГИЛ. Я буду заниматься важными вещами, гораздо важными вещами, большими вещами...». We consider the lack of translation of this segment to be obvious, the interpreter paused, as he needed time to pick up the desired equivalent to the next passage, making part of the translation, he resorted to the compression strategy, thereby omitting the phrase I hate it/ Мне ненавистно это, although we are deeply convinced that this phrase should be left in the translation to improve the quality of the translation itself, and to show the speaker's attitude to the organization in question. Similarly, with the following sentence, the simultaneous interpreter compresses it, probably to save time and catch up with the speaker, but unfortunately, the translator does not get it at the proper level, and the interpreter misses all the vivid expressive, sentimental cues that is possible, there will be a victory over ИГИЛ. Next, we observe a distortion in the translation. A perfect translation is not accurate and adequate. One cannot but agree with the lack of translation of the last sentence of this segment ...And will tell you, I will take care of ISIS in official translation it is sounds as«...но я разберусь с ИГИЛ. Я буду заниматься важными вещами, гораздо важными вещами, большими вещами».

This translation causes us to doubt not only the adequacy of its transfer to the Russian language, but also the stylistics of the proposal. The speaker clearly gives us to understand his attitude towards this organization, using a speech in his speech that is very retaliatory. Thus, we draw attention to the fact that the speaker gives a promise in an implicit form to deal with the above-mentioned banned organization, which is in fact a threat. Based on the text of the speaker, we will try to give you an idea of the translation of this segment: «Несомненно, я не горжусь этим, но данный разговор проходил за закрытой дверью. В нашем мире где ИГИЛ отрубает головы, где открыто людей держат в стальной клетке, где ведется ужасная война во всех уголках земли, где происходят плохие события будто в каком-то средневековье. Мы не видели ничего подобного, резня по всему миру. Они смотрят и видят. Вы только представьте, что люди в открытую идут против нас...И они смотрят на нашу страну и видят, что происходит в ней. Да, я смущен этим. Презираю это. Повторюсь, разговор проходил за

закрытой дверью. Я отправлю ИГИЛ к чертям в преисподнюю. Мы собираемся уничтожить ИГИЛ. Вообще, ИГИЛ образовался несколько лет назад в вакууме из-за плохого правосудия. Скажу я вам вот, что: Я позабочусь об ИГИЛ» (Averbukh, 1985).

Thus, we tried to keep the speech in the intention and intention of the speaker, thereby emphasizing the negative attitude of the speaker to the organization. Let us note the fact that when analyzing the speech of two presidential candidates, one can notice how much the interpreter is competent and professional in his business. Earlier we talked about the fact that several interpreters were translating this debate. We believe that the gender aspect in translation is important and plays a huge role in the perception of the text by the recipient. It is known that the translation performed by a male translator differs from the translation of a female by a translator, and this can easily be seen in the translation of these debates. In my opinion, the stylistic design of the translation of the text depends on the cognitive features of the translator's gender. The gender aspect in the translation of the menacing speech acts in political discourse is no exception and in many respects the quality of the translation depends on it. Analyzing the simultaneous translation of the second debate, we note that the male interpreter, when translating the speech in political discourse at the peak of the emotional state of the speaker, unfortunately, translates with the least emotional coloring. Intentionally uses certain introductory words, translation transformations, compression strategies, thereby substantially reducing the text of the translation. As for the female translator, the situation here is fundamentally different from the previous one. When translating menacing speech acts in political discourse, the female translator actively uses metaphors, phraseological units, expressions, introductory constructions, where she enriches the lexical side of her translation. Differences in translations of linguistic scholars explain this not only by the cognitive characteristics of male and female gender but also by biological factors (Voskoboinik, 2004).

Consider the part of the speech from the Hillary Clinton's election company:

...We saw him after the first debate spend nearly a week denigrating a former Miss Universe in the harshest, most personal terms. So, yes, this is who Donald Trump is...

«... Как он целую неделю потратил, чтобы унижить бывшую Мисс Вселенную, используя при этом самые обидные слова. Личные оскорбления – это и есть Дональд Трамп...»

In this example, it is clearly visible that the translator, in this case female, in the transmission to the Russian language, tried to best convey the negative attitude of the addressee to the addressee. Nevertheless, we can observe that, at the context level, there is always a great semantics of the meanings of certain utterances.

The following example, which we propose to disassemble, is fragments of certain parts from the speech of Donald Trump in response to the speech of Hillary Clinton in the second debate:

- 1)...So you can say any way want to say it, but Bill Clinton was abusive to women. Hillary Clinton attacked those same women and attacked them viciously.../ «...Вы можете сказать все, что угодно, но Билл Клинтон относился к женщинам... приставал к женщинам и нападал на них...» (Vitrenko, 2008).

In this example, we observe a slight distortion in the translation...but Bill Clinton was abusive to the women we focus on the quality of translation «...но Билл Клинтон относился к женщинам... in this part of the translator paused, thus behind the speaker, then follows Hillary Clinton attacked those same women and attacked them viciously, While translating the same interpreter (male) misses key moments in the speech, thus causing a complete distortion of the text. In our opinion, it would be advisable to translate this passage as « Вы можете говорить, что угодно, но Билл Клинтон оскорбительно относился к женщинам. Да и, Хиллари Клинтон нападала на тех же самых женщин, нападала ожесточенно». The proposed version more clearly gives us the

opportunity to show the author's intense intention, his disgusting, contemptuous and unfair attitude to the situation at that time. ...Her client she represented got him off, and she is laughing on two separate occasions, laughing at the girl who was raped.../ «...ее клиент, она представляла его и он смеялся, дважды смеялся над этой девочкой, которую изнасиловали...» (Sorokin, 2003).

In the presented passage, unfortunately, when the translation is performed, the interpreter commits the error of transferring the pronoun of the feminine gender, replacing her in Russian with он. If we turn to a full printout of this text, which is presented above, then we will understand from the context that it is a matter of several cases of mistreatment of women, and translate the phrase on two separate occasions, laughing at the girl who was raped as «и он смеялся, дважды смеялся над этой девочкой, которую изнасиловали». From our point of view, it would be semantically correct to translate into Russian in this way «Лицо, которому она дала уйти от наказания, и она смеялась над двумя различными случаями, смеялась над девочкой, которая была изнасилована».

1. ... but what president Clinton did, he was impeached, he lost his license to practice law. He had to pay an \$850.000 fine to one of the women/ «...а что сделал президент Клинтон, он был подвергнут импичменту, он потерял лицензию занятием юриспруденцией, он был приговорен к штрафу за свои отношения к женщинам».
2. And I will tell you that when Hillary brings up a point like that and she talks about the words that I said 11 years ago, I think it is disgraceful, and I think she should be ashamed of herself, if you want to know the truth./ «И я вам должен сказать, что Клинтон... Хиллари Клинтон, поднимает эти вопросы вот слова, а я говорю 11 лет назад... Я считаю, что это конечно бессовестно, и ей должно быть стыдно!».

Analyzing these segments of the translation, no doubt, one should also consider the memory of the synchronizer interpreter, his ability to store a certain amount of information for a short time, in parallel to focus his attention on the transfer of a new segment of the speaker's speech. In the translation work, the interpreter adhered to the time interval, which is the norm for adequate simultaneous interpretation, but we see that the translation was poorly constructed, the grammatical sentences were incorrectly constructed in Russian, and the syntactic constructions in the sentence were broken during translation. Translating the interpreter paused to correct, thereby applying a trial and error strategy. Also, in the translation process, the compression strategy was applied, reducing and removing details to save time in general. But, unfortunately, the application of this strategy adversely affected the quality of the translation. In translation, we see that the translator does not observe and departs from the official business style. By intonation, we hear and understand how dramatic and slightly aggressive the translation of the last phrase was «я считаю, что это конечно бессовестно, и ей должно быть стыдно! ». Watching the speech of the speaker, we cannot say that he pronounced the offer with aggression. The speaker's speech was measured and smooth, but with elements of reproach for the opponent's address. A modal verb should be used in the meaning of probability, obligation or expresses advice. In our opinion, this passage should be translated into Russian as follows: «и я скажу Вам, что, когда Хиллари поднимает такие вопросы, как этот, оперируя словами, которые были произнесены мною 11 лет назад, на мой взгляд это позорно. Если вы хотите знать правду, ей должно быть стыдно за себя». Thus, we tried not to depart from the official business style, to observe a certain hostile intention of the addressee, expressing in the transfer some discontent towards the opponent. Let us analyze one more interesting example in our opinion. In a fragment of her speech, Hillary Clinton says: When I hear something like that, I am reminded of what my friend, Michelle Obama, advised us all: When they go low, you go high (Kharitonova, 2006).

Note that in one of her political speeches during the speech, Michelle Obama sounded the phrase when they go low, you go high, and instantly this expression becomes popular in the US. Prints, media, political figures, in short, all who are not indifferent to political discourse in general, quote Michelle Obama. Hillary Clinton, is no exception, she also quoted Michelle Obama in her election campaign. The transfer of this expression to the Russian language is no less unique, as is the original statement itself, consider the translation of this passage: «А когда это слышу... я вспоминаю, что мне однажды посоветовала мой большой друг, Мишель Обама «Когда нас бьют – мы летаем»».

In this example, it is clearly seen that in the first part of the sentence, the translator can withstand a short pause, applying the strategy of probabilistic forecasting and translating it first by the expression, which comes to the interpreter's mind. When we are beaten - we fly words from a song by Jahan Pollyeva, who was the head of the apparatus of the State Duma, was also an assistant to former Russian President Dmitry Medvedev. Biography D. Pollyeva impressive, she occupied at different times different positions in politics. Its main activity is the political sphere. We believe that the interpreter was well acquainted with the activities of D. Pollyeva, since she was in charge of a group of speechwriters for the president of the Russian Federation in 1997. Thus, the translator adapted the translation specifically for the Russian-speaking audience, while preserving the meaning and intent of the speaker (Volodina, 2015a; Volodina, 2015b).

Regarding the last part of the passage we propose, the case of deleted emails. Here, Mr. Trump needs to be given credit, in his speech he actively accused Hillary Clinton of the disappearance of these secret 33,000 e-mails, but the contents of deleted letters remained a mystery to the entire world community. Although Hillary Clinton admitted that it was a mistake on her part to use e-mail, even personal, Mrs. Clinton apologized to the American people, but Donald Trump did not stop it and he threatened the state secretary with a prison. Consider the following examples in sequence and in detail:

...But if I win I am going to instruct my attorney general to get a special prosecutor to look into your situation, because there has never been so many lies, so much deception / но если я выиграю, то я генеральному прокурору дам задание назначить прокурорское расследование против вас потому, что такое количество вранья, такое количество обмана, такого вообще никогда не было.

There has never been anything like this, and we are going to have a special prosecutor.

И прокурор, по специальным поручениям будет этим заниматься,

When I speak, I go out and speak, the people of this country are furious.

и я должен сказать страна, народ этой страны, разозлен,

In my opinion, the people that have been long-term workers at the FBI are furious/ и работники ФБР даже разозлены.

There has never been anything like this, where e-mails – and you get a subpoena, you get a subpoena, and after getting a subpoena, you delete 33 000 e-mails, and then you acid wash them or bleach them, as you would say, very expensive process./ Потому, что этого никогда не было с этими электронными письмами, вам прислали повестку и после повестки вы их взяли и удалили. 33 000 писем... и затем с кислотой вы их вытравили, очень дорогостоящий процесс, нужно на это рассмотреть.

So, we are going to get special prosecutor, and we are going to look into it, because you know what? / Потому, что знаете что?

People have been – their lives have been destroyed for doing one-fifth of what you have done. And it is disgrace. And honesty, you ought to be ashamed of yourself.../ Люди, жизни их были просто разрушены, за только 20 % из того, что сделали вы»

...Because you would be in jail. /...Потому, что Вы будете в тюрьме!».

So, we see that the translator allows certain mistakes in the translation, which we have noticed before. We agree that in the process of simultaneous interpretation, the interpreter solves several problems. The difficulties in simultaneous translation may be different: because of the narrow context, the tightness of time, poor audibility, or because of the speaker's specific pronunciation and so on. The probability that a simultaneous interpreter will make a mistake when translating exists always. The reasons for this can be different both objective and subjective. In this case, mistakes cannot be due to the translator's fatigue, since the segment of speech was the first 30 minutes, in our view the main reason is the insufficient language competence of the simultaneous interpreter. As for the position of Donald Trump, it is obvious to us. Having applied a speech in his speech, Mr. Trump gives us to understand that he pursues a certain communicative goal, and the purpose is to inspire fear of the addressee. Thus, it frightens and induces feelings of phobia to the recipient, by means of the implementation of certain negative actions in the future, which can cause the recipient any damage, loss, or deterioration of authority and life in general. To understand that this is a great speech act the context help us, the atmosphere, and the manner of communication. We offer our version of the translation to this segment of speech:

«Но, если я выиграю выборы, я поручу нашему генеральному прокурору назначить специального прокурора для изучения вашего дела, потому что никогда еще не было столько вранья, столько лжи... Никогда такого не было, и мы должны назначить специального прокурора для этого дела. Наш народ разозлен, я думаю, и сотрудники ФБР разозлены. После того, как вы получили повестку в суд Вы удалили 33 000 электронных писем, затем Вы вытравили их кислотой, и все вычистили, это очень дорогостоящий процесс. Мы назначим спецпрокурора, мы займемся этим делом. Только 20% из того, что Вы сделали разрушила жизни людей... Да, потому что Вы будете в тюрьме!».

Thus, in the translation of menacing speech acts in political discourse, we attempted to preserve the author's intention to convey his aggressive attitude towards the opponent, while focusing his attention on the threat, as a promise that the addressee will imprison the addressee. At the same time, Mr. Trump, in his speech, more than once mentioned that Ms. Hillary must be sent for jail. if you did that in the private sector, you would be put in jail, let alone after getting subpoena from the United Congress, this sentence should be translated as: «если Вы сделали это в частном порядке, вас нужно посадить в тюрьму, не говоря о том, что вы получили повестку от конгресса США», but interpreter decided to translated this way: «...и это после того, как Вы получили повестку... ее нужно посадить в тюрьму за то, что она после повестки...», as we see in the Russian version there not any continuation, because in the speech there were disputes, and the interpreter just lost the speaker, everyone knows the character of Mr. Trump, his temperament and propensity to his emotional speeches, shocking the world community distracted the translator from the translation process and the translation became incomplete, unfinished. The feeling of anger caused by emotional stress naturally affects the speech of the speaker, and at the cognitive level the addressee uses speech acts of threat. After speech acts, threats caused by emotions, aggression, the phobia as well to occurs the recipient. And through the phobia of the recipient, so the recipient is trying to gain absolute control and power over him.

4. Conclusion

The politicized society urges to study us menacing speech acts in political discourse as well. Particularly it should be noted that there are certain tendencies in the communicative intention of the new-time policy. The authors believe that the communicative intention of a person participating in a political discourse denotes the main, accurate goal of the speaker's statement. Often, statements that have a masculine nature can lead to conflict, moreover, to grow into a real threat or military confrontation. Therefore, from the theoretical and practical point of view, it is important to investigate this phenomenon, namely, menacing speech acts, verbal acts of threat in the interdisciplinary aspect. Aybarsha (2012) in her book, compiled in accordance with the Model curriculum for simultaneous interpreters and equipped with authentic texts and audio-video materials, special exercises focused on the formation of professional translation competencies. Working with this textbook, we can prepare highly qualified interpreters in the field of simultaneous interpretation in political discourse. At the exercises, we can observe what mistakes the students make when doing the interpretation, and in the future, they will work with their mistakes. Recommendations given by Aybarsha (2012), will help the simultaneous translator in his professional activities. And with such important and responsible activities as simultaneous interpretation in the political sphere, big mistakes will not be allowed.

We examined the main provisions of the theory of speech acts, namely, a menacing speech act in the general system of speech acts. In this section, we propose to consider a menacing speech act in the aspect of political discourse. The diversity of the content of the political discourse allows us to conclude that not only a menacing speech act should be studied, but also other topics of the English-language political discourse and any other.

References

- AVERBUKH, K. 1985. **To the definition of the basic concepts of terminology**. Theoretical problems of scientific and technical terminology. The practice of translation. pp. 3-7. Omsk. Russia.
- AYBARSHA, I. 2012. **Simultaneous interpretation in political discourse**, Almaty. Kazakhstan.
- EPSHTEIN, O. 2010. **Pragmalinguistic features of a menacing speech act in political discourse (on the materials of English language)**, dissertation, Samara. Russia.
- KHARITONOVA, E. 2006. **Conceptualization as a strategy for translating a scientific text: on the material of Russian and English languages: diss., Candidate, Phil., Sciences: special**. Comparative-historical, typological and comparative linguistics. Perm. Russia.
- NEWMARK, P. 2008. **Text book of translation Harward Pearson Education limited**. p. 302. Russia.

SEARLE, J. 1986. **Indirect speech acts**, *New in foreign linguistics*. M.: Progress, N° 17. pp. 195-241. Russia.

SOROKIN, Y. 2003. **Translation: the status of an interpreter and psycho-hermeneutic procedures**. ITDGK Gnosis, p. 247. Moscow: Russia.

VITRENKO, A. 2008. **On the translation strategy Issue, 536: Comparative linguistics and translation issues**, *Bulletin of Moscow State Linguistic University*, pp. 3-17. Moscow, Russia.

VOLODINA, T. 2015a. **The concept of translation strategy within the framework of the cognitive-activity paradigm (based on linguistic monographs)**. *Language and Culture from number*. pp. 23-24. Russia.

VOLODINA, T. 2015b. **The notion of translation strategy within the framework of the cognitive activity paradigm (based on linguistic monographs)**. *Language and Culture number*. p. 364. Russia. <http://www.ff.unipo.sk/jak/cislo23-24.html>).

VOSKOBOINIK, G. 2004. **Linguophilosophical foundations of the general cognitive theory of translation: diss.** kand. filol. nauk: specialty 10.02.20, comparatively-historical typological and comparative linguistics. Irkutsk: IGLU. Russia.

ZYKOVA, A. 2010. **Functional-speech aspect of phraseological units of literary origin in Russian and German: Diss.** philol. Sciences: specialty. Comparative-historical typological and comparative linguistics. Kazan, Russia.