

UDC 81'25:808.5:378.147

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/89-2-35>

**Roksolana POVOROZNYUK,**

*orcid.org/0000-0003-3418-6651*

*Doctor of Science in Philology, Professor,*

*Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of Translation from English  
Educational-Scientific Institute of Philology of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
(Kyiv, Ukraine) r.povorozniuk@knu.ua*

## INTERPRETING AS RHETORIC: CORRELATING TRANSLATION STRATEGIES WITH PUBLIC SPEAKING TACTICS

*This study addresses a critical gap in interpreting studies by examining the inherent correlation between interpreting strategies and public speaking tactics, particularly in high-stakes public communicative contexts such as political discourse, international conferences, courtroom proceedings, and media appearances. Traditional approaches have predominantly focused on linguistic equivalence, information processing, and memory-related challenges, often overlooking the interpreter's crucial role as a rhetorical performer. This oversight is significant, as interpreters are not merely neutral linguistic conduits but active participants in communicative performance, tasked with reproducing not only the semantic content but also the persuasive force, emotional tone, and stylistic nuances of the source speech for a new audience. Drawing on classical rhetorical theory from Aristotle and Cicero to modern scholars like Perelman and Toulmin, the research explores categories of strategic audience engagement – ethos (credibility), pathos (emotional appeal), and logos (logical argumentation) – and their manifestation through devices such as repetition, emphasis, antithesis, and rhetorical questions. These rhetorical strategies are not mere embellishments; they are integral to shaping the message's interpretive trajectory and influencing audience reception. Simultaneously, the study analyzes established interpreting tactics (e.g., omission, addition/explicitation, compression, reformulation, intonation/prosody shifts) traditionally assessed for accuracy and completeness, extending their evaluative scope to include rhetorical impact. The analysis demonstrates significant functional parallels between rhetorical features and interpreting decisions. These correlations reveal that interpreting decisions are not solely linguistic or cognitive but are deeply shaped by the rhetorical architecture of the source text. The interpreter, therefore, functions as a rhetorical agent, actively co-constructing meaning and effect, especially in high-stakes scenarios where message reception hinges on delivery and framing. In light of these findings, the study advocates for a reconceptualization of interpreter training.*

**Key words:** interpreting, rhetoric, public speaking, translation strategies, rhetorical competence, interpreter training.

**Роксолана ПОВОРОЗНЮК,**

*orcid.org/0000-0003-3418-6651*

*доктор наук з філології, професор,*

*професор кафедри теорії та практики перекладу з англійської мови*

*Навчально-наукового інституту філології*

*Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка*

*(Київ, Україна) r.povorozniuk@knu.ua*

## УСНИЙ ПЕРЕКЛАД ЯК РИТОРИКА: КОРЕЛЯЦІЯ ПЕРЕКЛАДАЦЬКИХ СТРАТЕГІЙ З ТАКТИКАМИ ВИСЛОВЛЮВАННЯ УСНОГО ПЕРЕКЛАДАЧА

*Це дослідження висвітлює критичну прогалину в дослідженнях усного перекладу, а саме інгерентну кореляцію між стратегіями усного перекладу та риторичними тактиками, особливо у важливих публічних комунікативних контекстах, таких як політичний дискурс, міжнародні конференції, судові засідання та виступи в ЗМІ. Традиційні підходи переважно зосереджувалися на лінгвістичній еквівалентності, обробці інформації та проблемах, пов'язаних з пам'яттю перекладача, й часто не враховуючи вирішальну роль перекладача як публічного оратора. Цей недолік є суттєвим, оскільки перекладачі є не просто нейтральними лінгвістичними провідниками, а активними учасниками комунікативного виступу, завданням яких є відтворення не лише семантичного змісту, але й переконливої сили, емоційного тону та стилістичних відтінків значення оригінальної промови для нової аудиторії. Спираючись на класичну теорію риторики від Арістотеля та Цицерона до сучасних вчених, таких як Перельман і Тулмін, дослідження оприявлює категорії стратегічної взаємодії з аудиторією – етос (достовірність), пафос (емоційний заклик) та логос (логічну аргументацію) – та їх прояв за допомогою таких прийомів, як повтор, емпіза, антитеза та риторичні питання. Ці риторичні стратегії не просто прикрашають промову; вони є невід'ємною частиною формування інтерпретаційної траєкторії повідомлення та впливають на сприйняття промови аудиторією. Одночасно, дослідження аналізує усталені тактики усного перекладу*

(вилучення, додавання/пояснення, компресію, переформулювання, зміни інтонації/просодії), які традиційно оцінюються на предмет точності та повноти, розширюючи їхню оціночну сферу й включаючи риторичний вплив. Аналіз демонструє значні функціональні паралелі між риторичними особливостями та перекладацькими рішеннями. Ці кореляції показують, що перекладацькі рішення є не лише філологічними чи когнітивними, а й формуються глибокою риторичною архітектурою вихідного тексту. Таким чином, перекладач функціонує як риторичний агент, активно співконструюючи значення та ефект промови, особливо у надважливих контекстах, де сприйняття повідомлення залежить від манери його виголошення та оформлення. У світлі цих висновків, дослідження наголошує на необхідності переосмислення підготовки усних перекладачів.

**Ключові слова:** усний переклад, риторика, публічні виступи, стратегії перекладу, риторична компетенція, підготовка перекладачів.

**Problem statement.** Interpreting in public communicative contexts – such as political discourse, international conferences, courtroom proceedings, and media appearances – demands from the interpreter not only linguistic and cognitive precision, but also a high degree of rhetorical competence. In such settings, the interpreter is not merely a neutral linguistic conduit but becomes an active participant in communicative performance, tasked with reproducing not only the content of the source speech, but also its persuasive force, emotional tone, and stylistic nuances for a new audience.

Traditional approaches to interpreting studies have primarily focused on linguistic equivalence, information processing, and memory-related challenges, often overlooking the interpreter's role as a rhetorical performer. Elements such as voice modulation, pacing, emphasis, gesture, and audience engagement – central to public speaking – remain underexplored in interpreting theory, despite their clear impact on the effectiveness of interpreted communication.

Simultaneously, rhetorical theory, from classical thinkers such as Aristotle and (Aristotle, 2007), Cicero (Cicero, 1942) to modern scholars like Perelman (Perelman, Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969) and Toulmin (Toulmin, 1958), has established categories of strategic audience engagement – ethos, pathos, and logos – that resonate with interpreting strategies and tactics such as modulation, amplification, omission, and reorganisation. These are not merely functional linguistic choices, but rather communicative moves that shape how a message is perceived by the audience.

This raises a critical question: How do interpreting strategies correlate with rhetorical strategies in public-speaking contexts? What specific public speaking skills should interpreters develop to successfully render not only the message but also the performative and persuasive intent of the original speaker?

This issue becomes particularly urgent in high-stakes domains such as political diplomacy, legal interpreting, and crisis communication, where interpreters serve as mediators of influence and meaning, and where rhetorical competence is integral to professional excellence. Addressing this intersection

between interpreting and rhetoric requires a transdisciplinary approach that combines insights from translation studies, rhetoric, communication science, and interpreter training pedagogy.

The specific **objectives of the study** are as follows: a) to define and categorise rhetorical strategies and tactics commonly used in public speeches (e.g., ethos, pathos, logos; repetition, emphasis, antithesis) and to examine their communicative functions; b) to analyse interpreting strategies and tactics (e.g., omission, addition, compression, reformulation, intonation shift) used in real-time interpretation of public addresses; c) to explore correlations and overlaps between rhetorical and interpreting strategies, with particular attention to how interpreters manage persuasive, emotional, and stylistic content under pressure and time constraints; d) to propose a competence-oriented model of interpreter training that integrates rhetorical awareness and public speaking techniques as core components of interpreter education.

**Analysis of the preceding studies.** This study draws on a multidisciplinary theoretical foundation that integrates concepts from interpreting theory, rhetorical studies, and public speaking pedagogy. The convergence of these domains provides a basis for analysing the interpreter's dual role as both a linguistic mediator and a rhetorical co-performer.

The foundation of interpreting theory is grounded in the work of scholars such as Daniel Gile (Gile, 1995: 135-142), who conceptualised interpreting as a constrained cognitive process involving coordination between listening, memory, production, and decision-making. Within this framework, interpreting strategies and tactics are defined as purposeful interventions employed by the interpreter to manage communicative flow, mitigate loss, and preserve meaning. These include: a) omission and compression (used to maintain pace or clarity); b) reformulation and generalisation (used to adapt culturally or stylistically marked content), c) intonation and prosody shifts (used to reproduce speaker intent) (Gile, 1995: 135-142; Pöchhacker, 2004: 113-120; Setton, Dawrant, 2016). These strategies are tradition-

ally assessed in terms of accuracy and completeness. However, this study extends the evaluative scope to include rhetorical impact.

Rhetorical theory, dating back to Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (Aristotle, 2007: 136-145), categorises persuasion into three modes: *ethos* (credibility), *pathos* (emotional appeal), and *logos* (logical argumentation). These modes manifest through stylistic and structural devices – repetition, contrast, metaphor, rhetorical questions – that signal intention and engage the audience (Perelman, Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969: 50-70).

In public speaking research, scholars such as Lucas (Lucas, 2015) and Beebe S. A., Beebe S. J. (Beebe S. A., Beebe S. J., 2017) stress the performative dimensions of rhetoric: delivery, tone, gesture, and pause serve as communicative tools that influence audience reception. These elements are particularly relevant to interpreters, who must adapt not only what is said but how it is said, maintaining persuasive force across languages and cultures.

The convergence between interpreting and rhetoric has recently been explored in the work of scholars such as Kalina (Kalina, 2005: 908) and Kurz (Kurz, 2010), who argue that interpreters act not only as language processors but also as rhetorical co-constructors. Their decisions – lexical, structural, tonal – can either preserve or dilute the speaker's persuasive intent.

In this view, interpreting is understood not only as a translational act but also as a rhetorical performance, where success is measured in terms of communicative effectiveness, not just semantic fidelity. The interpreter becomes a visible voice within the communicative triad: speaker – interpreter – audience.

While traditional interpreter training has prioritised linguistic and memory skills, more recent models have advocated for an expanded skill set that includes rhetorical and performative competence. Kalina (Kalina, 2015: 65) and Pöchhacker (Pöchhacker, 2022) suggest integrating public speaking, voice training, and non-verbal communication into interpreter curricula. Such skills enhance the interpreter's capacity to deliver messages that are not only accurate but also compelling and context-sensitive.

In line with this, the present study situates interpreter performance at the intersection of strategic decision-making and rhetorical embodiment, and seeks to model this relationship theoretically and pedagogically.

**Research objectives.** The overarching aim of this study is to investigate the interrelationship between interpreting strategies and rhetorical techniques in the context of public speaking. The research seeks to bridge the gap between the fields of translation studies

and rhetorical performance by identifying how interpreters can enhance the effectiveness of their delivery through alignment with the communicative goals of the speaker.

#### **Presentation of the main research material.**

The communicative power of public speaking – particularly in political, diplomatic, or ceremonial settings – rests on carefully structured rhetorical strategies aimed at persuasion, emphasis, and audience engagement. Drawing on classical rhetorical theory, most notably Aristotle's triadic framework of *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* (Aristotle, 2007: 136-145), one can observe that public speakers routinely construct authority, stir emotion, and appeal to reason through identifiable patterns and devices. *Ethos* is manifested in how speakers establish credibility, often through institutional affiliations, formal tone, and inclusive language ("we", "our") that aligns them with their audience. *Pathos* emerges through emotionally resonant language, evocative metaphors, narrative interludes, and heightened expressiveness. *Logos*, in turn, is realised through structured reasoning, statistical evidence, logical sequencing, and causality (enumeration, data presentation etc.).

To activate these modes, speakers employ a repertoire of rhetorical tactics. Repetition, for instance, serves to reinforce thematic content or mobilise emotional energy. Antithesis sharpens value contrasts ("*We must learn to live together as brothers or perish together as fools*" (King, 1986: 272); "*Ми повинні вчитися жити разом як брати, або загинемо разом як дурні*" (Діброва, 2023: 23)), while anaphora and parallelism introduce rhythm and memorability. Rhetorical questions, while not intended to elicit verbal response, function as devices of provocation or alignment, and enumerative structures ("*first..., second..., finally...*") enhance clarity by demarcating argument points. These techniques do not merely ornament discourse but shape its interpretive trajectory. The communicative functions of these devices are manifold: they enhance audience retention, build trust, channel emotion, and steer interpretation. For interpreters, such features become translation challenges requiring both linguistic fidelity and rhetorical awareness. For interpreters, this rhetorical density poses a multidimensional challenge, particularly when rendering such content spontaneously and under time constraints.

In the practice of simultaneous or consecutive interpreting, a range of strategies and tactics has been documented, aimed at ensuring real-time delivery without compromising communicative accuracy. Among the most frequently observed are omission, addition, compression, reformulation, and prosodic



modulation. Omission is often employed to bypass redundant or peripheral information in order to maintain synchronization with the speaker, especially when rapid delivery exceeds cognitive processing capacity. Addition, or more precisely, explicitation, is used to resolve ambiguity or compensate for culturally embedded references that would otherwise elude the target audience. Compression allows for the condensation of longer source structures into more efficient target-language formulations, whereas reformulation entails the restructuring of segments to preserve meaning when direct transfer is syntactically or culturally problematic. Prosodic modulation, encompassing tone, intonation, and pacing, is essential in mirroring the speaker's emotional contour and rhetorical intent.

These tactics are not applied mechanically; interpreters must make rapid decisions in response to cognitive load, pacing, and the rhetorical density of the speech. For example, if a speaker uses repetition for emotional impact (*"We will not yield. We will not falter. We will not fail"* (Churchill, 2008: 136); *«Ми не здамося. Не програємо»* (Європейська правда, 2025), the interpreter must judge whether to replicate all three clauses (to preserve pathos), condense (for timing), or restructure (for coherence in the target language).

The latter quotation was notably used by Volodymyr Zelenskyy (Європейська правда, 2025), in his addresses to international bodies and parliaments. He has not only echoed the spirit of Churchill's war-time defiance but has also made direct allusions to his speeches to emphasize the unbroken spirit, determination, and resilience of the Ukrainian people.

When juxtaposed with the rhetorical features of public speech, these interpreting strategies reveal clear functional parallels. Repetition in the source speech, when designed to heighten emotional appeal or solidarity, may be fully retained by the interpreter if time and processing capacity allow; alternatively, it may be condensed or stylised through intonational emphasis to preserve its effect. Logical structures in the source speech – particularly those guided by logos, such as cause-effect relations or numbered sequences – are often preserved through compression or segmentation, ensuring that the logical flow is not obscured by literal fidelity. Antithetical constructions, common in political oratory, are typically conveyed through reformulation strategies that foreground opposition through discourse markers in the target language. Similarly, elevated diction associated with ethos often prompts interpreters to adjust register and tone to maintain the speaker's perceived authority. Even rhetorical questions, which serve a performative rather than interrogative function, may require

modification, such as softening or contextual reformulation, to align with pragmatic norms in the target culture while retaining their persuasive force.

These correlations suggest that interpreting decisions are often shaped not only by linguistic and cognitive imperatives but also by the rhetorical architecture of the source text. The interpreter, far from being a neutral linguistic processor, becomes a rhetorical agent who co-constructs meaning and effect. This role becomes particularly salient in high-stakes scenarios – such as press conferences, diplomatic summits, or televised interviews – where the audience's reception depends not only on the content transmitted but on how that content is voiced, paced, and framed (Onyshchak H., Liutko N., Yarova A., Povoroznyuk R., Kolomiets I., Gontsa I., 2023).

In light of these findings, there is a clear need for interpreter training models that go beyond traditional linguistic and memory-oriented curricula; reconceptualise interpreter training through the lens of competence-based education, one that explicitly incorporates rhetorical awareness and performance-oriented skill development. Traditional models of interpreter education have prioritised linguistic proficiency, memory enhancement, and fidelity to content, often at the expense of the broader communicative context in which interpretation takes place. However, as interpreting increasingly occurs in high-profile, public-facing environments – ranging from political addresses to media interviews and institutional ceremonies – the interpreter's role extends beyond linguistic mediation to include the co-construction of persuasive and performative discourse.

A competence-oriented model must therefore position rhetorical literacy as a core domain within interpreter education. This includes not only the ability to identify rhetorical strategies – such as ethos-building techniques, emotional appeals, and argumentative structuring – but also the capacity to reconstruct these strategies in the target language while preserving their pragmatic and stylistic effects. Introducing students to classical and contemporary rhetorical theory provides the necessary foundation for such literacy. Exposure to real-world speeches, both in source and target languages, enables future interpreters to internalise the discursive patterns and stylistic features that characterise effective public communication.

Equally critical is the development of voice and delivery skills. The physical act of interpretation – especially in consecutive and on-camera formats – requires not only verbal agility but vocal presence, breath control, modulation, and clarity of articulation. These paralinguistic features profoundly influence audience perception and the perceived authority of

the interpreted message. Voice training, therefore, should be embedded into interpreter curricula alongside traditional skills such as note-taking and terminology acquisition. Structured exercises focusing on pitch variation, pacing, and controlled emotional tone help interpreters manage not only content but affective resonance.

Furthermore, a competence-based framework must offer students opportunities to engage in simulated high-stakes interpreting scenarios. These simulations should involve interpreting authentic speeches with rich rhetorical structure and emotional nuance, such as inaugural addresses, courtroom statements, or commemorative eulogies. By rehearsing under semi-realistic conditions – with peer and instructor evaluation – students can refine their capacity to make real-time decisions that balance rhetorical fidelity, target audience expectations, and temporal limitations. Simulations also foster resilience and adaptability, traits essential for interpreters operating under pressure.

Another vital component is the integration of reflective practice. After each interpreting performance, students should engage in structured self-analysis, considering not only their accuracy and lexical choices but their ability to preserve the speaker's rhetorical intent and delivery style. Peer feedback and guided instructor commentary can further illuminate the relationship between strategic choice and rhetorical effect. This reflective loop transforms interpreting from a purely procedural task into a metacognitive, critically informed practice.

Finally, a competence-oriented model must bridge the gap between theory and practice through interdisciplinary collaboration. Interpreter trainers should draw on insights from fields such as rhetoric, theatre, and communication studies to develop modules that are both intellectually grounded and professionally applicable. Workshops with public speaking coaches, rhetorical analysts, or professional orators could enrich interpreter education by contextualising the performative dimensions of the profession.

In sum, a competence-oriented model of interpreter training should cultivate not only linguistic and cognitive agility but rhetorical responsiveness and performative sensitivity. It must prepare interpreters not merely to transmit meaning, but to embody and voice that meaning with precision, resonance, and contextual appropriateness. Only by recognising the interpreter as a co-performer in the rhetorical event can interpreter education rise to meet the demands of contemporary multilingual communication.

Therefore, interpreting cannot be fully understood or taught in isolation from rhetorical performance. As this analysis has demonstrated, rhetorical strategies

and interpreting tactics are not merely adjacent disciplines but interdependent dimensions of multilingual public discourse. Recognising this intersection not only enriches theoretical understanding but enhances pedagogical practices, ultimately preparing interpreters to perform their roles with both linguistic accuracy and rhetorical competence.

**Conclusions.** This study set out to examine the intersection of rhetorical strategy and interpreting practice, with the aim of contributing to a more nuanced understanding of how interpreters mediate not only language but also the persuasive and stylistic dimensions of public discourse. Through an integrated analysis informed by rhetorical theory, interpreting studies, and pedagogical models, the research has arrived at several key conclusions, each corresponding to the objectives initially outlined:

a) Rhetorical strategies in public speaking – particularly those grounded in the classical triad of *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* – serve distinct and complementary communicative functions. These strategies are not ornamental but integral to the effectiveness of public communication, as they shape not only what is said but how it is received by an audience. Understanding these functions is essential for any interpreter tasked with faithfully rendering persuasive discourse.

b) The research has mapped a set of interpreting strategies and tactics commonly employed in real-time public address contexts. These include omission, addition (or explicitation), compression, reformulation, and prosodic modulation. Each strategy serves a functional role in balancing the cognitive demands of interpreting with the communicative imperatives of the speech event. Importantly, these tactics are not merely compensatory mechanisms; they are strategic choices that directly impact how the interpreter reconstructs rhetorical meaning under temporal and cognitive constraints.

c) There are multiple points of convergence between rhetorical and interpreting strategies. Interpreters are not passive conveyors of semantic content but active participants in the performance of discourse. Their task involves preserving not only logical structure and lexical accuracy, but also emotional tone, stylistic register, and persuasive force. The correlations outlined in this study demonstrate that interpreting decisions – such as whether to repeat, compress, or restructure an utterance – are frequently conditioned by the underlying rhetorical function of the original. This recognition repositions the interpreter as a rhetorical co-agent in the communicative event, particularly in high-stakes settings where the success of the message depends on its resonance, not merely its content.

d) The study has proposed a competence-oriented model of interpreter training that places rhetorical

awareness and public speaking proficiency at the core of professional development. This model advocates for the integration of rhetorical theory, voice training, simulated speech delivery, and reflective practice into interpreter education. Such an approach equips interpreters to navigate the dual demands of linguistic mediation and rhetorical performance, enabling them to operate effectively in environments where interpretive accuracy must be coupled with stylistic and affective fidelity.

Taken together, these findings argue for a reconceptualisation of the interpreter's role: not solely as

a translator of words, but as a mediator of discourse, a co-performer of meaning, and a rhetorical actor in multilingual communication. Future research should continue to explore this interdisciplinary intersection, with particular attention to empirical studies of interpreter performance in live rhetorical settings, as well as longitudinal studies of the pedagogical efficacy of rhetoric-integrated interpreter training. By foregrounding the rhetorical dimension of interpreting, scholars and educators alike can more fully prepare interpreters to meet the communicative demands of the 21st century.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aristotle. *Rhetoric* / trans. Kennedy G. A. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. 560 c.
2. Cicero M. T. *De Oratore* / trans. E. W. Sutton, H. Rackham. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942. 555 c.
3. Perelman C., Olbrechts-Tyteca L. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969. 310 c.
4. Toulmin S. *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958. 254 c.
5. Gile D. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995. 277 c.
6. Pöchhacker F. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge, 2004. 252 c.
7. Setton R., Dawrant A. *Conference Interpreting: A Complete Course*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2016. 470 c.
8. Lucas S. E. *The Art of Public Speaking*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2015. 576 c.
9. Beebe S. A., Beebe S. J. *Public Speaking Handbook*. Boston: Pearson, 2017. 656 c.
10. Kalina S. Interpreters as Rhetorical Agents. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*. 2005. Вип. 50. Ч. 4. С. 902–915.
11. Kurz I. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2010. 180 c.
12. Kalina S. Ethical challenges in different interpreting settings. *MonTI. Monografias de Traducción e Interpretación*. 2015. № 2. С. 63–86.
13. Pöchhacker F. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge, 2022. 281 c.
14. King M. L. *Remaining Awake Through a Great Revolution. A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King Jr.* / за ред. James M. Washington. San Francisco: HarperOne, 1986. С. 268–278.
15. Діброва А.С. Філософія гуманності та людяності. Збірник науково-практичного семінару «Подорож у світ філософії» (в рамках «Тижня філософії» до Всесвітнього дня філософії), м. Київ, 16 листопада 2023 р. Київ, 2023. С. 23–24. URL: [https://nubip.edu.ua/sites/default/files/u381/zbirnik\\_podorozh\\_u\\_svit\\_filosofiyi.pdf](https://nubip.edu.ua/sites/default/files/u381/zbirnik_podorozh_u_svit_filosofiyi.pdf) (дата звернення: 03.07.2025).
16. Churchill W. *Give Us the Tools. Churchill by Himself: The Definitive Collection of Quotations*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC, 2008. 416 c.
17. "Ми не здамося, не програємо": Зеленський виступив із зверненням до парламенту Британії. *Європейська правда*: веб-сайт. URL: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2022/03/8/7135534/> (дата звернення: 03.07.2025).
18. Onyshchak H., Liutko N., Yarova A., Povoroznyuk R., Kolomiets I., Gontsa I. Pragmatic Competence in Political Discourse Interpreting. *Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională*. 2023. Вип. 15. Ч. 3. С. 376–399. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/15.3/772>.

### REFERENCES

1. Aristotle (2007). *Rhetoric* / trans. Kennedy G. A. New York: Oxford University Press. 560 p.
2. Cicero M. T. (1942). *De Oratore* / trans. E. W. Sutton, H. Rackham. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 555 p.
3. Perelman C., Olbrechts-Tyteca L. (1969) *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 310 p.
4. Toulmin S. (1958) *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 254 p.
5. Gile D (1995). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 277 p.
6. Pöchhacker F. (2004) *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge. 252 p.
7. Setton R., Dawrant A. (2016) *Conference Interpreting: A Complete Course*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 470 p.
8. Lucas S. E. (2015) *The Art of Public Speaking*. New York: McGraw-Hill. 576 p.
9. Beebe S. A., Beebe S. J. (2017) *Public Speaking Handbook*. Boston: Pearson. 656 p.
10. Kalina S. (2005) Interpreters as Rhetorical Agents. *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*. 50 (4). P. 902–915.

11. Kurz I. (2010) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing. 180 p.
12. Kalina S. (2015) Ethical challenges in different interpreting settings. *MonTI. Monografías de Traducción e Interpretación*. № 2. P. 63–86.
13. Pöchhacker F. (2022) *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge. 281 p.
14. King M. L. (1986) *Remaining Awake Through a Great Revolution. A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King Jr.* / Ed. James M. Washington. San Francisco: HarperOne. P. 268–278.
15. Dibrova A.S. (2023) *Filosofia humannosti ta liudianosti*. [Philosophy of humanity and humanism]. *Zbirnyk naukovopraktychnoho seminaru «Podorozh u svit filosofii» (v ramkakh «Tyzhnia filosofii» do Vsesvitnoho dnia filosofii)*. Kyiv, 16 November 2023. Kyiv. P. 23–24. URL: [https://nubip.edu.ua/sites/default/files/u381/zbirnik\\_podorozh\\_u\\_svit\\_filosofiyi.pdf](https://nubip.edu.ua/sites/default/files/u381/zbirnik_podorozh_u_svit_filosofiyi.pdf) (date of access: 03.07.2025) [in Ukrainian].
16. Churchill W. (2008) *Give Us the Tools. Churchill by Himself: The Definitive Collection of Quotations*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing PLC. 416 p.
17. "My ne zdamosia, ne prohraiemo": Zelenskyi vystupyv iz zvernenniam do parlamentu Brytanii ["We will not give up, we will not lose": Zelensky addressed the British Parliament]. *Yevropeiska pravda: website*. URL: <https://www.eurointegration.com.ua/news/2022/03/8/7135534/> (date of access: 03.07.2025) [in Ukrainian].
18. Onyshchak H., Liutko N., Yarova A., Povoroznyuk R., Kolomiiets I., Gontsa I. (2023). Pragmatic Competence in Political Discourse Interpreting. *Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională*. 2023. 15 (3). P. 376–399. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/15.3/772>.