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ABSTRACT

This Master’s Thesis “The Role of Critical Discourse Analysis in the Translation of Political Texts” is based on the integration of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in Translation Studies (TS). CDA has become an independent field within linguistics and it is continuously adapted to new phenomena, one of them being TS. The existing research in the respective field consists of a cluster of different approaches and does not provide an applicable framework that may be used as an auxiliary tool in the translation process for the analysis of source texts (ST) and target texts (TT). Thus, the main aim of this thesis is to create a set of CDA guidelines, combining the CDA framework by Norman Fairclough (1989) with the existing approaches of CDA within TS created by Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1990; 1997) and Christina Schäffner (1997; 2002; 2003; 2004), as well as to prove that CDA may be a useful tool in the determination of the social and situational context, power relations and ideological struggle during the translation process of political texts.

The main objectives of this thesis are: to work out a framework of CDA, apply the framework for the analysis of the ST and TT and to analyze the translators’ choices in the TT on the text-linguistic level. The methods applied in this thesis include critical review of the existing secondary literature on CDA within TS, creation of the CDA framework, application of the theoretical guidelines to the ST and TT, comparative analysis of the ST and TTs and data collection for the empirical part of this research. The data consist of a ST (in English) in the form of a political interview and TTs in the form of 10 translations (4 in Danish and 6 in Latvian). The results obtained in this research proved the fact that the application of CDA for the analysis of the ST and TT helps the translator to become aware of the genre conventions, social and situational context of the ST and TT, and outlines the formation of power and ideological relations on the text-linguistic level. This thesis consists of the theoretical and empirical part conveyed in 7 chapters, introduction and conclusion, list of abbreviations and 12 appendices.
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INTRODUCTION

The recent developments in Translation Studies (TS) have resulted in a variety of approaches that consider translation as an act of intercultural communication that is conditioned by the social context. The rise of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has influenced not only the branch of applied linguistics, but it has also found its way to Translation Studies. CDA sees language in a dialectic relationship with social reality, i.e. a communicative act (act of translation or interpretation) is affected by social reality and is used to sustain or change the social reality. According to CDA, the usage of text-linguistic elements reflects the text producer’s intentions and membership to a particular ideology which, in its turn, may create unequal power relations (class struggle, ideological struggle) between the participants of the communicative event. Thus, the main aim of CDA within TS is to disclose the underlying and often implicit ideological and power relations in spoken and written discourse. Since the approach is very new, it cannot be considered as an established theory but rather a cluster of approaches that have been initiated by the earlier research in functionalist and discourse analysis theories within TS.

The integration of CDA into TS has brought the concept of translation into another dimension. The act of translation is rooted in a particular social context and the translator’s interpretation (understanding) of the source text (ST) and the choices made in the production of the target text (TT) are based on the translator’s socio-cultural background, linguistic background and experience with other texts and discourses. This may result in the fact that translators embed their own world views and ideologies in translations either unconsciously or deliberately according to their own assumptions or the requirements stated in the translation brief. CDA has been mainly applied to political texts in one language and one culture with an aim to analyze the underlying power and ideological struggle created by the text producers. Political discourse originates from the historical and cultural development of a particular community and involves power and ideological struggle that is expressed through linguistic means. In TS, certain aspects of CDA have been applied to analyze the ideological motivations behind translators’ text-linguistic choices in the TT and the translator’s role in the interpretation process of the intended meaning of the ST and the production of a new TT. The existing research in the field of CDA within TS does not provide a solid framework for the analysis of the ST and TT, but rather a cluster of approaches requiring further research in the field.
The main aim of this Master’s Thesis is to develop a set of guidelines on the basis of Norman Fairclough’s (1989) tristratal CDA framework for the analysis of political texts and the existing CDA research within TS in order to prove the following hypothesis: **CDA is a helpful tool in the determination of the social and situational context, the underlying ideological and power relations during the translation process of political texts.** The core objectives of this thesis are:

a) to describe the CDA framework and its integration in TS;
b) to develop a CDA framework for the analysis of the ST and TT;
c) to apply the CDA framework in the analysis of the ST;
d) to detect power and ideological relations in the ST and to explain how these findings may help the translator in the production of the TT;

e) to apply the CDA framework in the analysis of TTs;
f) to analyze the translators’ text-linguistic choices in the TT;
g) to analyze whether the existing power and ideological relations in the ST have been successfully transferred in the TT.

The methods applied in this thesis include the discussion and critical review of the secondary literature in the field of CDA and TS, the creation and application of the CDA framework in the ST and TT analysis, the execution of the comparative analysis of the ST and TT and the collection of the data necessary for the practical analysis of the ST and TTs. The data used in this research are the ST in the form of a political BBC interview between a British journalist and the King of Swaziland Mswati III (originally a recorded radio interview). Furthermore, the data for the TT analysis are in the form of 10 translations (4 Danish and 6 Latvian) obtained from freelance and full-time translators on a voluntary basis. This thesis consists of 7 chapters that are divided into the theoretical part and the empirical part. Chapter 1 gives a short insight in the relations between politics and language, defines the political discourse and specifies the types of genre in the political discourse. Chapter 2 is devoted to a detailed description of the CDA framework, with an emphasis on Norman Fairclough’s CDA model. Chapter 3 describes political discourse within TS. Chapter 4 deals with the integration of the CDA framework in the translation process and provides an insight into the characteristics of the field of CDA. Chapter 5 defines the applied data and methodology in detail. Chapter 6 describes the application of CDA in the analysis of the ST. Finally, Chapter 7 provides a detailed description of the comparative analysis of the ST and the TTs - 10 translations in Danish and Latvian.
1. POLITICS AND LANGUAGE

Before considering how political discourse has been dealt with in Translation Studies (TS), it is necessary to establish a general understanding of the connection between politics and language. The theory and practice of political rhetoric go back to the ancient times (Fairclough 2001: 3). Aristotle was the first to recognize the importance of linguistic communication in the functioning of a social unit or state (Greek: polis). According to Chilton and Schäffner (2004:6), the only way to understand how politicians manage to influence society and are able to put their opinions through to a large audience on a local, national or even global level, is to analyze their text and talk. Political differences have always been constituted as differences in language, and political struggles have always been partly struggles over the dominant language. The modern perception of human endowment for language states that it has the function of indicating, namely to signify and communicate according to shared perceptions of a group. Hence the politics is the art and language is the medium (Joseph 2004: 347).

1.1. Role of Language

The recent development of linguistics has moved away from the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure’s theory of language as an autonomous system existing outside the society. The modern approach to linguistics is that language is the central means in which the social world is constructed (Muntigl 2002:49). Humans use language to share information with other individuals and to represent a state of affairs. Each individual belongs to a social group or community with its unique values and beliefs which are expressed through language as well. Thus, language is closely bound up in practice with culture and culture is in turn closely connected with the practice of politics in a particular society (Chilton, Schäffner 2002:8). Language and nations are myths that construct each other reciprocally rather than one constructing the other (Joseph 2004: 359). In other words, languages determine the physical and geographical borders between nations, social groups and even individuals. Language may be considered as a political act which reveals specific information about an individual (Joseph 2004: 348). It discloses the social hierarchy within the respective community and provides information on geographical or social origin, gender and even political orientation. This may be characterized by specific linguistic features: accent, idiolect, dialect, pitch, lexical and
syntactic choices. However, language itself is neutral and is neither political, nor social. It is only by convention possible to state that language itself can be used to restrict the way its users think and act. Different social practices, e.g. court proceedings, classroom situation, family dinner requires different ways of using language (formal vs. informal). These language forms become naturalized and humans are not always capable of resisting constraints of social conventions or political ideologies for the use of language - the ready-made moulds for thinking (Chilton 2004: 27). Thus, the main aspect of inquiry in the modern linguistic analysis of political discourse is how language affects social behavior and how social practices affect language.

1.2. Political Discourse

The fundamental patterns of political institutions arise out of words that people exert on behalf of their interests (Thompson 1987:24). Politics is war with words. At every stage politics comes up against the questions of language and these questions range from the choice of words to the choice of language: from fine detail of phrasing and wording to large-scale issues of national language policy (Chilton 2004:14). The linguistics-political dimension results in how those in power deploy language in order to achieve their aims either through power struggle or cooperation. Hence, the study of language and politics is aimed at understanding the role of linguistic communication in the functioning of social units, and how these social units shape language itself (Joseph 2004: 347). Political communication between the social units may be divided in two levels: micro and macro. The micro level concerns the conflicts of interest, struggle for dominance and efforts for co-operation between individuals, genders and social groups. However, the macro level includes the power struggle or cooperation between political institutions, social groups or individuals on state level (Chilton; Schäffner 2002:5).

The connection between language and politics was first brought to general attention in 1946, in an essay by George Orwell “Politics and the English language”:

*People dislike one thing and want to express solidarity with another, but they are not interested in the detail of what they are saying. You can shirk it by simply throwing your mind open and letting the ready-made phrases come crowding in. They will construct your sentences for you, even think your thoughts for you to a certain extent and at need they will perform the important service of partially concealing your meaning even from yourself. It is at this point that the special connection between politics and the debasement of language becomes clear.*
According to Orwell, the detachment of language from observable reality is what makes it possible for a political party to maintain orthodoxy among its followers, and in the most extreme cases, to enslave (Joseph 2004: 352). As Dr. Frank Luntz (2007: 49) states in his book “Words that Work”, people will not understand what is happening to them, and they cannot rebel against what they do not understand. This has been the main objective for political discourse analysts, i.e. to disclose the hidden power and ideological structures behind political discourse, which is all text and talk of the political arena.

Political discourse analysis is a rather new field in linguistics. Its main concerns are how politicians promote their authority and ideology in an implicit way, successfully employing linguistic means. Therefore, the political analysis has much to do with “credibility” and legitimization of one’s deeds according to the ideology one is supporting. Research in this field is mostly rooted in communication and linguistic theories, which are used to disclose the politicians’ intentions and analyze the effects of their speeches. One of the first to address the question of implied meaning and credibility of linguistic communication was Poul Grice. His Theory on Implicature has inspired many scholars in this field (Chilton 2004, van Dijk 1997a, 2001, Fairclough 1989, 1999). Grice proposed four conversation maxims: the maxim of quantity (give information as required), quality (be truthful), relation (be relevant) and manner (avoid obscurity). When a speaker follows all four maxims, there is no implicature. However, when the speaker “flouts” one of the maxims, the situation results in conversational implicature (implied pragmatic meaning) (Vine 2004:47). The usage of implicatures in the political language enables politicians to convey more than they say through intended meaning which is only recognizable to the hearer if he/she adopts a particular ideology or set of attitudes and values (Chilton 2004:37). Hence, the modern approach to political discourse is a critical study of signs of deception and authority in language of politicians. As a result, the following linguistic approaches evolved: Discourse Analysis (DA) and Critical Language Study (CLS) which in turn became Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (see Chapter 2).

1.3. Political Discourse Genres

Political discourse is generally associated with texts that discuss political ideas, beliefs and practices of a society and that are crucial in constituting a political community or group. Thus, political texts evolve from a variety of political genres: treaties, speeches, election campaigns, congress, political parties, parliamentary debates, editorials
and commentaries in newspapers, press conference with a politician or politician’s memoirs. Texts within these categories are divided into two sub-groups: a) internal political communication (politicians to politicians within policy making) and b) external political communication (politicians explain and justify political decisions to the public) (Trosborg 1997:128). The latter refers to the emergence of new public-sphere political genres, e.g. the political interview which is the result of the increasing role of mass media in politics (Schäffner 2004:118). The journalistic interview constitutes the data used in this thesis and thus needs a more detailed description of its characteristics.

Political interviews are considered to be the sub-genre of political discourse. Through political interviews, the politicians have an opportunity to perform political actions and make their party-political agendas public (Fetzer 2009:97). In political interviews, the political information is transmitted in question-and-answer formats, which usually allows the politicians to establish a dialogue with the public. In order to familiarize with the public, politicians often apply a mixed rhetorical style, i.e. the vernacular language of a lay person and the public language of politics (Fairclough 2001:8), also known as “public-colloquial” language (Fairclough 1989:180). This helps the politicians to become co-members of a private domain culture whose dominant values are ordinariness, informality, authenticity and sincerity. This shift in political discourse has been named as conversationalization (Fairclough 1999: 101) or politainment (Schäffner 2004:118), where the informal private domain discourses, such as conversation, are embedded in political discourse. The symbiosis of politics and entertainment constructs politicians as “real” individuals and personalities, which makes it easier to make their political beliefs and values more attractive. Political texts reflect each politician’s ideology which is the result of the historical and cultural evolution of politics in the society. Highly culture-bound political texts, for example speeches and statements made by politicians, refer to a wide range of cultural patterns of the society in question, including aspects of its economic, political and legal life (Trosborg 1997: 145). This means that the analysis of political texts is not merely an analysis of linguistic features embedded in texts, but instead a socio-cultural analysis of the underlying ideologies in written and spoken discourse. The next chapter will deal with a short description of the recent developments and theoretical approaches in political discourse analysis with an emphasis on the most widely used theoretical approach called Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).
2. CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

2.1. The Recent Developments in Discourse Analysis

In linguistics, the usage of the term “discourse” is rather ambiguous. Some language scholars (e.g. van Dijk 1997a, 1997b) refer to discourse as a one single conversation or several instances of text or talk within one field of activity. Others describe discourse as a philosophical or political movement, e.g. the discourse of racism, which is not limited to one single communicative interaction, but rather refers to a whole set of ideas or ideologies (Trosborg 1997:4). In this thesis, the term “discourse” will be used in the first sense, i.e. as a set of spoken and written events, which take place within one particular field of social action, e.g. political discourse. Additionally, it is necessary to clarify other instances of language use related to discourse, i.e. text, genre and orders of discourse. Any single instance of language use will be referred to as text. However, texts used in a particular situation for a particular purpose will be defined as genre and the term orders of discourse will be related to a network of social practices in its language aspect, i.e. the social organization of texts, genres and discourses (Fairclough 2003:24).

Since discourse is a form of language use, Discourse Analysis (DA) is the analytical framework which was created for studying actual text and talk in the communicative context. The early DA or the so-called Linguistic DA focused on the internal structure of texts, for instance, the linguistic devices that connect parts into wholes and grammatical cohesion and semantic principles through which words and sentences become recognizable as connected texts (Fitch 2005: 253). Due to the rise of Systemic-Functional Linguistics (Halliday 1978), the DA has become the core aspect of sociolinguistics and focuses on how personal and social processes are encoded in the ways sentences, utterances are formed and interconnected as components of larger text units. Halliday introduced a tristratal model (tenor, mode and field) consisting of phonology, lexico-grammar and semantics (Halliday 1978:262). Texts are no longer considered as a system of signs existing outside the social reality, but instead they are a process and a product which are produced and interpreted in a specific social context. Halliday’s tristratal model has now become the foundation of a variety of discourse analysis models. Texts are analyzed according to three inseparable elements: language use, communication and interaction (van Dijk 1997a:5) or description (text), interpretation (pragmatics) and explanation (the social and cultural context) (Fairclough 1999:180).
The modern DA is a trans-disciplinary approach, which incorporates both linguistic analysis (micro level) and social analysis (macro level). Discourses are considered as communicative events, which involve language use, communication of beliefs and interaction in social situations (van Dijk 1997:3). Since communication is a lot more than simply transferring a message from the sender to the receiver, discourse analysts frequently speak of interpretative work (Chilton; Schäffner 2002:9). Not all human utterances, whether textualized or verbalized, are only about “conveying” information in the ordinary sense of propositions about things, actors, actions and events. Even more important is the social information that is usually conveyed inexplicitly. The meaning of a text, written or spoken, is not contained in the text itself. Sense is made by readers or hearers, who link their knowledge and expectations stored in long-term and short-term memory to the processing of the language input, also called background knowledge or “Members Resources” (MR) (Fairclough 1989:11).

The modern DA covers a range of somewhat related but mostly contrasting kinds of work. DA does not have a strict framework and it is often considered as a general methodology, theory or merely critique allied to social constructionism or social power and oppression (Fitch 2005: 254). One of the major differences between the various approaches of DA lies in its methods of analysis. Some discourse analysts are linguists or applied linguists, where texts (textual and verbal) are analyzed in terms of their grammatical structures, others draw mainly on conversational analysis (CA) and speech act theory. Still, other kinds of DA rely on no particular procedure of detailed analysis, but rather look for patterns of language use that may be related to broader themes of social structure and ideological critique. This is another branch of DA, which is called Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and which combine linguistic analysis, ideological critique and cognitive psychology. CDA has now become one of the most widely used DA models in modern linguistics. Its aim is to uncover ideological and power relations and it has mainly been applied for the analysis of political discourse. Just like DA, CDA has no established theoretical framework, but rather a package of different focus areas. The next sub-chapters will be provide a general introduction to the field of CDA and will describe one of the CDA frameworks in detail.
2.2. The Field of Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA in all its forms understands itself to be strongly based in theory. CDA combines a variety of theories, ranging from micro-sociological theories to theories on society and power based Michael Foucault’s definition of power (Wodak; Cilla 2006:708). As it has been shortly mentioned in the preceding chapter, there are various fields of inquiry within CDA, thus the aim of the research is to provide a detailed description, explanation and critique of the textual strategies writers use to “naturalize” discourses, i.e. to make discourses appear common-sense and apolitical (van Dijk 1997a:2). There is no typical CDA method for collecting data and some authors do not even mention data collection methods. Others rely strongly on traditions based outside the sociolinguistic field, i.e. data collection is completed before the initial stage of the analysis (Wodak; Meyer 2001: 23). The raw material for the analysis within CDA is the naturally occurring text and talk in their original contexts.

CDA does not provide a well-defined method but rather a cluster of approaches with similar theoretical foundations and research questions, i.e. uncovering the relationship between language, society, power, ideology, values and opinions. Hence, CDA is continuously enriched with new approaches within the field of language and communication. The most significant research within CDA has been performed Teun van Dijk, who combines cognitive psychology and CDA to uncover how ideological structures are hidden in peoples memory (van Dijk 2001:26); Paul Chilton (2004:197), who combines cognitive and pragmatic aspects (using Habermasian “Validity Claims” and Grice’s “Cooperative Principle” theories) and focuses on credibility in political texts, and Ruth Wodak (1989:137) analyzes gender discrimination and how political groups/nations define their territory by means of language. Furthermore, Norman Fairclough focuses on social conflict and its linguistic manifestations in discourses of dominance, difference and resistance (Wodak; Meyer 2001: 22). The CDA trend has spread across other disciplines such as Translation Studies (see chapter 3) and has been applied in the work of Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1990; 1997) and Christina Schäffner (1997; 2002; 2003; 2004). The latter is one of the most recent approached to CDA and is the main focus area of this thesis. The integration of CDA will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. However, in order to be able to discuss how CDA is applied to translation, it is necessary to understand the nature of CDA framework and its theoretical realization. Thus, the next sub-chapter will be based on the discussion of Norman Fairclough’s CDA model.
2.3. **Critical Discourse Analysis by Norman Fairclough**

Fairclough’s model may be considered as the cornerstone of the entire field of CDA, because he was the first to create a theoretical framework, which provided guidelines for future CDA research. His model is based on the assumption that language is an irreducible part of social life. The dialectic relation between language and social reality is realized through social events (texts), social practices (orders of discourse) and social structures (languages) (Fairclough 2003:24). Fairclough’s model describes the process and the end-products of meaning-making, i.e. it is a description of a cognitive process on how people invest and interpret meanings in texts within a variety of social contexts. In sum, texts have causal effects upon and contribute to changes in people, actions, social relations and the material world (ibid. 8). In his research, Fairclough attempts to uncover ideological and power patterns in texts. Furthermore, he is the only CDA scholar who defines the relationship between power and language (social power and ideology) in his research (Fairclough 1989:46). Fairclough provides a tripartite framework for the analysis of text and discourse: 1) the linguistic *description* of the formal properties of the text; 2) the *interpretation* of the relationship between the discursive processes/interaction and the text, where text is the end product of a process of text production and as a resource in the process of text interpretation and lastly, 3) the *explanation* of the relationship between discourse and social and cultural reality.

2.3.1. **Description**

Description is the first stage of the CDA, which includes the analysis of the texture of texts (Fairclough 2003:158). According to Fairclough, close analysis of texts is a significant part of social scientific analysis of a whole range of social and cultural practices and processes. The first stage of the textual analysis is the examination of the linguistic analysis of the text on morphological and grammatical levels. According to Fairclough (Fairclough 1989:112), formal textual elements relate to the social world according to three types of value: *experiential, relational* and *expressive*. The experiential value is concerned with the text producer’s experience of the natural or social world (content, knowledge and beliefs). Relational value reflects the social relationships, which are enacted via text in discourse. Expressive value shows the producer’s evaluation of the reality (attitude towards
subjects and social identities). Any formal feature can simultaneously have two or three of these above-mentioned values.

2.3.1.1. Vocabulary

The analysis on the lexical level shows how ideological representations of the world are encoded in vocabulary (e.g. democratic vs. racist vocabulary). The main questions for the analysis of vocabulary are related to lexical aspects in the text, i.e. what values do words reflect, are there any ideological traces that words reflect, rewording and over-wording (high amount of wording shows preoccupation with some aspect of reality), are there some significant stylistic devices such as synonyms, hyponyms, antonyms and metaphors (related to particular ideologies), and are there euphemistic expressions and marked formal and informal words (ibid. 111). Great emphasis is laid on intertextuality, which is the presence of elements from other texts or discourses within a text (Fairclough 2003:47). Relational values show how the wording of a text depends on and establishes social relationships between participants. The vocabulary of a certain discourse type may represent the ideology of a particular social grouping, e.g. formality results in the use of highly formal vocabulary instead of less formal choices, the expression of politeness and the respect for status and position. Expressive values signal the attitude towards a certain aspect in the text. There are either negative or positive expressive values. Different ideologically contrastive schemes embody different expressive values in different discourse types, e.g. metaphors may have different ideological connotations (Fairclough 1989:112).

2.3.1.2. Grammar

The analysis of grammatical constructions include the research on the experiential values of the types of process and participants, i.e. agency, nominalizations, active and passive voice in sentences as well as grammatical aspects such as the role of connectors in the linking of sentences, coordination and subordination of complex sentences and textual means to refer inside and outside texts. The relational values refer to sentence modalities (declarative, grammatical question and imperative), relational modality, the usage of personal pronouns (we (in-group) and you (the others)). The expressive values are related to the exploration of the usage of expressive modality.
Experiential aspects of grammar include the ways in which grammatical forms of language encode happenings or relationships in the world, people or animals or things involved in those happenings or relationships, and their spatial and temporal circumstances and manner of occurrence (ibid. 125).

The choice of types of process and participants in the creation of a textual representation of an event is ideologically significant. In syntax the typical word order in English in declarative sentences is SVO (subject-verb-object). However, there may be variations between the elements in simple sentences that signify which elements bear the necessary information, i.e. (subject - verb), (subject-verb-complement) and any of these constructions can take an additional (adjunct) element in the sentence. There are also differences in which classes of words can operate within these elements: S and O can usually be nouns or nominalizations (noun phrase). Complements are either noun phrases and nominalizations or adverbs and a prepositional phrase. Adjuncts are usually adverbs or prepositional phrases. These three types of sentences most typically express three main types of process: actions (SVO), events (SV) and attributions (SVC) (ibid. 121).

*Action* involves two participants, an *agent* and a *patient*, and the agent acts upon the patient in some way. Agents are generally animate, but patients may sometimes be animate (*King Mswati III*) and sometimes inanimate (*many*). *Event* involves just one participant, which may be animate or inanimate. However, SV sentences are not always events. If they have animate participants, they may show a patient-less action or a non-directed action (ibid. 122). Events usually give an answer to what-happened question and non-directed actions answer to what-did-subject-do question. *Attribution* involves just one participant, but there is also an attribute after the verb, either a possessive attribute if the verb is a form of *have*, or a non-possessive attribute with other verbs (*be, feel, seem, look*) (ibid). Non-possessive attributes show up sometimes as adjectives (*Swaziland is poor*) and sometimes as nouns (*Swaziland is a disaster*). The ideological possibilities of the choice between process types are shown as an action with responsible agents, as an event or an attributed state. The attempts to foreground or hide agency may be ideological or they may be conscious hedging or deception. Obfuscation of agency is and can be often ideologically motivated. The agents can be either animate (they generally are) or they can also be inanimate nouns, abstract nouns or nominalizations (ibid. 124). Nominalizations are used when a sentence is deliberately reduced, i.e. the meaning in the sentence is obscured in order to reduce the traces of causality and responsibility. According to James Gee (1999:
nominalizations are like trash compactors: they take in a whole sentence’s worth information and compact it into a compound word or phrase. Once the compacted item is created, it is hard to tell what information exactly went into it (ibid.). Additionally, agentless passive sentences are used to hide the agent and leave the causality and agency unclear. All sentence types can be either positive or negative as well. Negation (experiential value) is the basic way to distinguish what is not the case in reality from what is the case. The latter is connected to intertextuality. Intertextuality signals the effect the text producer has wanted to create, when using a word from another discourse type having already a negative or positive connotation.

**Moods.** Relational values of the grammatical features of the text are most often addressed towards three grammatical features: moods of sentences, modality and pronouns. There are three major moods: declarative, grammatical question and imperative. These three moods position subjects differently. In the case of the declarative mood, the subject position of the speaker/writer is that of a giver of information and the addressee’s position is that of a receiver. In the case of the imperative, the speaker/writer is in the position of asking something of the addressee while the addressee is a compliant actor. In a grammatical question, the speaker/writer is asking some information from the addressee and the addressee is in the position of a provider of information. Systematic asymmetries in the distribution of modes between participants are important in terms of participant relations: asking for action or information is generally a position of power. However, giving of information is both the position of power and the position of powerless - to give if asked for. Text interpreters assign utterances such values on the basis of their formal features or on the basis of interpreter’s assumptions (Fairclough 1989:126).

**Modality.** The authority and power relations that apply to modal verbs in order to withhold permission or impose obligations are not made explicit. These are implicit authority claims and hidden power relations that make a matter of ideological interest (ibid: 127). If it is a matter of authority of one participant in relation to others, we have relational modality. The modality of the speaker/ writer’s evaluation of truth or probability of a representation of reality is expressive modality. There is an overlap between the modal auxiliaries that mark relational modality and those which mark expressive modality, e.g. “may” is associated with the meaning of possibility as well as permission and “must” is associated with certainty as well as obligation. Modalities express the commitment to the truth (ibid: 129).
Pronouns of power and solidarity. The usage of pronouns has a close association with the dimensions of power and solidarity (Brown; Gilman 1972: 252). The theory on pronouns of solidarity distinguishes two types of pronouns (T and V)\(^1\): pronouns of solidarity (familiar pronouns such as: you (singular)) and pronouns of power that in most of the European languages are attributed as honorifics. In English the T and V pronouns are replaced by the usage of the choice between different titles and modes of address (name or title + surname). The usage of the pronoun “we” refers to the making of an implicit authority claim that shows the power to speak for others in we-circle. The pronoun “we” also signals the ideology of the nationhood that represents the notion of a unified nation, e.g. we, the British. The pronoun “you” is frequently used in mass media communication in the case of simulated personal address to reduce the increasing impersonality. It may also used as an indefinite pronoun that implies a relationship of solidarity between the speaker and the people in general. Lastly, the relationship between pronouns we/us and them are most often used within the context of others, namely to stress that the pronoun them signals a reality that is alien and unwanted to we/us (ibid.)

2.3.1.3. Textual Structures

Textual structures are all formal features that establish cohesion between parts of text and contexts and constitute the particular order of how information should be perceived. For example, the structure of larger text structures is very important in order to create a sequence of information according to the importance of the information provided. For instance, the parts of the text that signal either causality or responsibility are structured in a way that makes them disappear from view and consciousness of the reader (Fairclough 1989:139), e.g.:

King: Monarchs in the world have assumed post at a specific timing. It is within the people to decide that it is now for the monarch to become the king. And especially because in the monarchy, there are a lot of advisers who advise him on issues. The Queen Mother is there, there is the Cabinet, there is the Parliament, and there are members of the Swazi National Concern. There are a lot of advisers who advise the King. So, the age is not so important.

This example is taken from a political interview which constitutes the data for this thesis (see Appendix 11). The example is an answer from the King of Swaziland

---

\(^1\) “French Tu or T” pronouns refer to 2nd person singular pronouns such as “you” and “French Vous or V” pronouns are used as honorifics, e.g. 2nd person plural or titles in English Sir/Madam, etc.
Mswati III, who attempts to answer a question regarding his becoming a king at the age of 18. The King places the general information first by comparing himself to other monarchs in the world. Then, he proceeds by diverting the responsibility to the people of Swaziland and only then he provides the information on the advisors and explains why his age has not been important. This is one of the ways how the causality and is hidden by providing vague information in the initial position and only then moving to the important information.

Other devices that determine the logical pattern of information acquisition are connectives, subordinate sentences, pronouns and articles. Connectives are cohesive features that help to establish a logical flow of events in texts, e.g. vocabulary links between sentences: repetition of words, or use of related words; connectors which mark various temporal, spatial and logical relationships between sentences; reference – words which refer back to an earlier sentence or, less often, forwards to a later one. Logical connectors cue ideological assumptions, showing causal and consequential relationships between things that are taken to be commonsensical, e.g. even though (what would be expected to happen, failed to happen). The presentation of information according to the level of importance can also be controlled in the coordination and subordination of sentences. For instance, the information given in the main clause is more informationally prominent than that given in sub-ordinate clauses. Usually, the content given in sub-ordinate clauses is presupposed, taken as already known for all participants. The means inside and outside the text are the grammatical devices that refer to a previously mentioned material introduced in the text making it possible to avoid repeating the whole text again, e.g. pronouns (he, she, it, this, that) and the definite article (the). The definite article is extensively used to refer to referents (persons and objects), which are not established textually, or even evident in the situational context of an interaction, but presupposed or known from the previous experience with texts or discourses (ibid: 132). The ability to understand the implied meaning present in texts is connected to the next stage in Fairclough’s CDA model – interpretation.
2.3.2. Interpretation

The term “interpretation” here is used in another sense than it is usually understood in Translation Studies. Interpretation deals with the understanding of meaning embedded in texts. The level of interpretation is concerned with participant’s text production and text interpretation (understanding). Texts are produced and interpreted against a background of common-sense assumptions. The interpretations are generated through the combination of what is in the text and what knowledge and beliefs the interpreter holds (ibid. 142), which according to Gee (1999:17) is the knowledge of language plus action, interaction, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools and places of events that are recognizable to people as a particular type of identity that may engage in a particular type of activity. Members’ Resources (MRs) are the background knowledge and the interpretative procedures that help to recognize the ideological constructions (ibid. 18). In table 2.2.2. the process of interpretation is illustrated, where the upper section shows the interpretation of context and the lower section shows the four levels of interpretation of a text (Fairclough, 1989:42):

**Table No. 2.2.2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretative procedures (MR)</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Interpreting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social orders</td>
<td></td>
<td>Situational context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactional history</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intertextual context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonology, grammar, vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surface of utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics, pragmatics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meaning of utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion, pragmatics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schemata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Text structure and „point“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interpretation of a text starts with the sound and mark interpretation into words, phrases and sentences based on person’s MRs, which is often referred to as their knowledge of particular language (phonology, grammar and vocabulary). Then interpreters, by drawing upon semantic aspects of their MRs, combine word meanings and grammatical information and work out implicit meanings, speech acts and utterances (the pragmatic level). The process of interpretation moves to a higher level of interpretation which establishes connections between parts of text (coherence and implicit assumptions of ideological character). The last level is the understanding of the global coherence of a text, where the different representations of patterns of different types of discourse are interpreted. In other words, at this stage the overall topic “the point” of a text is stored in the person’s long-term memory.

The next step is the interpretation of the context shown in the upper section of the table 2.2.2. Context is the mentally represented structure of those properties of the social situation that are relevant for the production or comprehension of discourse (van Dijk 2001:356). Participants arrive at interpretations of situational context partly on the basis of external cues: physical situation, properties of participants, and partly on the basis of aspects of MRs in terms of which they interpret these cues, i.e. the representations of societal and institutional social orders which allow them to ascribe situations to particular situation types. Here, intertextuality is an important aspect, because a given interpretation of a text is based on the previous knowledge of other discourses. Fairclough (1989:148) discerns four dimensions in the process of interpretation of situational context: a) type of activity, topic and purpose of the situation within a particular social order (what is going on); b) subject positions according to situation type, social identities within institutional settings (who is involved: speaker, addressee, hearer, over-hearer or spokesperson); c) type of relationship (power, social distance) in the particular situation and d) the role of language (mode: written or spoken and genre).

The entire process of interpretation takes place simultaneously in two stages. In the first stage the interpreter arrives at a determination of the institutional setting of the interaction on the basis of societal social order stored in his/her MRs (e.g. at the school). In the second stage the interpreter arrives at a determination of the situational setting (the situation type of the interaction, e.g. classroom) on the basis of the institutional social order in the first stage. Each institutional social order divides institutional space into many situation types (a class, meeting, etc.), and each actual situation is typified in terms of a
category from this typology (ibid. 150). The situation is not only typified in terms of the social order, but also in terms of a particular discourse type from the order of discourse. Situations may be differently interpreted if different participants are drawing different social orders as interpretative procedures. Such differences are relatively familiar cross-culturally, and they are likely to underlie cases of cross-cultural miscommunication or communication breakdown. However, they may occur within one culture between different ideological positions. Context is not always equally accessible to all participants as to the production and interpretation of the text. One should always establish what interpretations of situational context each of the participants are working with in order to see whether more powerful participants impose their interpretation on other participants.

Ideologies and power relations have a deep and pervasive influence upon discourse interpretation and production, for they are embedded in the interpretative procedure. Text interpreters operate with a certain context in mind, which influences the way in which linguistic features of texts are processed. This means that the values (experiential, relational, and expressive) of textual features depend on the interpreter’s assessment of the situational and social context (ibid. 151). Intertextuality and interdiscursivity belong to the interpreter’s MRs and which is acquired from the world of the existing texts and discourses (Fairclough 2003:39). Discourses and texts we enact in existed before each of us came on the scene, and most of them will exist long after we have left the scene (Gee 1999:18). Intertextuality and interdiscursivity is the ability to interpret the meaning of textual elements present in other texts and discourses. This knowledge helps the participants to establish a common ground in the act of communication and to trace presupposed information. Presuppositions are usually marked in texts with the usage of the definite article, subordinate clauses and pronouns, signaling that the information is already known and taken for granted. Presuppositions can be sincere or manipulative or they can have ideological functions, when what they assume has the character of “common sense in the service of power” (Fairclough 1989:154). The ability to interpret texts according to one’s own background knowledge may be shaped by the social context and ideologies, e.g. the way of thinking of a particular social movement. The next and last level of CDA framework explains how textual and interpretative procedures may be related to the social reality.
2.3.3. **Explanation**

The explanatory stage in CDA sees discourse as a part of processes of social struggle and power relations. It shows how discourses are determined by social structures and what reproductive effects discourses have on those structures, e.g. by sustaining them or changing them. These social determinations and effects are mediated by person’s MRs (Fairclough 1989:163). Explanation has two dimensions depending on whether the emphasis is upon processes of struggle or relations of power. First, discourses may be seen as parts of social struggle and the emphasis is on the effect of the discourse. Second, it is possible to show which power relationships determine discourses. These relationships are the outcome of struggles, and are established by those with power. Both social effects of discourse and social determinants of discourse are investigated at three levels of social organization: societal level, the institutional level and the situational level. Any discourse has determinants and effects at all three levels (ibid. 163). For example, a friendly conversation between a couple may be seen from three different perspectives: the situational, institutional and societal. From a situational point of view, the wife’s supportive understanding is interpreted as characteristic to women in a domestic relationship. In institutional and societal terms, women are obliged to obey the husband in a patriarchal society (ibid. 165). Not all discourses manifest conflict (social struggle) and do not necessarily take the form of overt struggle or conflict. The social struggle may be expressed implicitly as well. Even a discourse in which participants apparently arrive at the same interpretations of the situation, and draw upon the same MRs and discourse types, may be seen as an effect of power relations and as a contribution to social struggle.

This chapter (Chapter 2) has been devoted to the discussion of Norman Fairclough’s CDA framework, which involves 3 stages: description, interpretation and explanation. Each stage has been explained separately, but the reality is somewhat different. In a social encounter all three stages take place simultaneously. People interpret and produce texts on the basis of their MRs that are in turn shaped by social and ideological structures. People employ textual elements according to the ways they have interpreted (understood) the situational and social context and thus create certain participant relations in the communicative encounter, e.g. unequal power relations. The next chapter will discuss how all three stages of CDA have been integrated with the text production and interpretation in Translation Studies.
3. TRANSLATION AND POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Most of the research on politics and language has been based on the analysis of a single language and culture within the field of discourse analysis, mostly English and German (Ruth Wodak (1989), Poul Chilton (2002; 2004), Teun van Dijk (1997a, 1997b, 2001) and Norman Fairclough (1989; 2001; 2003; 2006)). The relationship between Translation Studies (TS) and political discourse has not been very widely discussed. Several research papers on the subject have dealt with translation of political texts applying different approaches, e.g. textual analysis (Anna Trosborg 1997; 2002) and most often Political Discourse Analysis or Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Christina Schäffner 1997; 2002; 2003; 2004; Hatim and Mason 1990; 1997). An element which is shared by most of the scholars when analyzing political discourse is that the broader societal and political framework in which such discourse is embedded has to be taken into consideration (Schäffner 1997:119). The current research in this field has been mainly based on the analysis of the mediatory role of the translator in translation process. It is assumed that translation is an act of intercultural communication, where the translator holds the knowledge of both the source text (ST) and the target text (TT) cultural, social and political contexts. The translator interprets the ST according to his/her cultural, social and political background which may be ideologically shaped. Hence, the analysis of the ST and the TT often deals with foregrounding the connections between linguistic, translational and ideological components in political texts (Valdeón 2007:100).

Political discourse is often of relevance not only for the specific culture of the text producer, but may be intended for a wider audience as well (Schäffner 2004:117). Due to globalization, politics have become internationalized, and it is through translation information is made available to addressees beyond national borders (ibid. 120). Today, translation is an integral part of the development of the political discourse. Christina Schäffner’s (1997; 2002, 2003; 2004) work on political discourse and translation has been one of the most inspirational in the field. She is one of the few scholars, who focus on the cultural, social and political aspects of text production in the source and target cultures, applying discourse analysis to translation. Comparing her past research with the most recent research articles, two interesting aspects are worth mentioning. First, her research deals mainly with translation strategies, which are used to transfer a culture-bound ST into another target language community with a limited knowledge to the ST culture. According to Schäffner (ibid. 127), political texts usually reflect culture-specific conditions of their
production. Their translations inform a target audience about a communicative act that had already been fulfilled in the ST community. In this case, the ST is addressed to either one or multiple target communities. Based on the general description of translation as mediated cross-cultural communication, the various factors that influence the TT (addressee, situation, function of TT in target language (TL) community, text type) are not of equal relevance in the ST. The functions of the ST and TT in their respective cultures determine the translation strategies, e.g. if the function of the ST was to persuade the source language (SL) audience, then the function of the target text in the TL culture will have only an informative function (ibid. 128). This perspective states that the TL audience does not have the same knowledge as the SL audience and thus the necessary changes have to be made in the TT by the translator. In other words, this perspective sees the ST as not having the same force and effect on the TT audience in comparison to ST audience.

Second, Schäffner states that the ST fulfills a specific function in a specific time and place and is addressed to an audience having specific knowledge of the subject in question. However, she also mentions that the knowledge of the target audience and the function of the TT in the TL community may be more or less the same or it may be different (ibid. 120). Here, the change from her viewpoint described in her previous research to her considerations about the target audience and the effect of the TT in the more recent research becomes evident. Political texts are now produced for an international audience, which means that the target audience is not the secondary audience, but the primary audience instead. Mass media is one of the reasons why political texts are addressed to an international audience and are equally relevant to multiple nations, e.g. political interviews or political speeches by international leaders or international treaties having the same legal force in a variety of communities, etc. The rise of the European Union has had a great influence on Translation Studies in the field of political discourse as well. Anna Trosborg’s (Trosborg 1997:146) research has been performed on the translation of political texts of the European Union, where she introduces a new term “hybrid texts”, referring to texts that are simultaneously produced in several language versions. These translations/texts have the same binding force and are intended for a multi-national target audience. This means that the function of the text has changed and the target audience of the TT does not necessarily have to differ from the ST audience.

As stated before in Chapter 1, there are different types of political texts which belong to a variety of political genres and thus are addressed to either one or the other
above-mentioned target audience. Target audience is only one of the elements which define the choice of a particular translation strategy. Other elements are the type of ST, ST producer, the purpose of the translation, target audience and the commissioner’s requirements. For instance, the translation strategies applied when translating a treaty will inevitably differ compared to the translation strategies employed in the translation of a political interview. Thus, the decision-making process on the choice of the appropriate translation strategy is in the hands of the translator. Taking into consideration the fact that political texts are saturated with historical, political and cultural elements, translators must bridge the gap between two different languages and cultures and must hopefully establish a contact and not conflict between the two cultures (Trosborg 1997:147). Schäffner (2004:125) provides a detailed description of the mistakes made in translations which have resulted in severe misunderstandings between political institutions on an international level. Therefore, the translator must have the knowledge of how to comply with cultural and political norms of the ST community as reflected in genre conventions and the cultural and political norms of the TT community (Trosborg 1997:147). This explains the fact that the recent translation theories regarding the translation of political texts involve the application of discourse analysis which requires a deeper understanding of not only the linguistic material of the ST, but the social and situational contexts on the particular communicative event as well. Therefore, the next chapter will deal with the recent changes in the translation approaches to political texts and will discuss the application of the most widely used approach in both discourse analysis and Translation Studies – Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).
4. TRANSLATION AND CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

4.1. Main Characteristics of the Field

The general attention to discourse analysis in 1970s found application in translation theory in the 1980s and 1990s (Pym 1992:227). The integration of discourse analysis in translation studies (TS) was initiated in the functionalist theories of translation (Munday 2001:73) which, involving text analysis of the ST, focused on the analysis of text type, language function, the effect of the translation and the participants of the translation event. The discourse analysis approach to TS applied Michael Halliday’s register analysis model, which was mainly used to analyze the pragmatic functions of linguistic elements in both ST and TT, e.g. the first theoretical frameworks were proposed by Mona Baker and Julian House (ibid. 90). In his model called Systemic Functional Grammar, Halliday considers language as communication and uses the theoretical framework to uncover what situational factors determine the usage of linguistic elements (Halliday 1978:32). Halliday states that language use varies according to situation, i.e. the meaning of linguistic elements is created in the given situation. Based on Halliday’s model, a new theoretical approach was created during 1990s as a separate branch of discourse analysis by Norman Fairclough called Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This framework is used to uncover the underlying ideological and power relations in the text. Fairclough introduced an additional approach to text analysis (to the existing “bottom-up” approach), namely the “top-down” approach, which explained not only how syntactic and lexical elements create meaning, but also how the social, political and the individuals’ background knowledge influences the choice of linguistic elements to create the different effects on the participants in a communicative situation.

As stated before in Chapter 3, CDA is a text-linguistic approach which mainly focuses on one language and one culture. However, in TS the CDA model has been applied not only on primary discourse (ST), but on the secondary discourse (TT) as well. As the entire field of linguistics developed away from the structuralist views on language as an independent system existing outside the social reality, TS developed in the same direction. Starting with the functionalist views on the communicative purpose of translation (Skopos Theory) with an emphasis on the participants and the effect of the TT and to the pragmatic approach to TS, which considers the communicative meaning of translation using such notions as presupposition and implicature based on Paul Grice’s Theory of Implicature and four conversation maxims, and moving towards translation
theories which see translation as a cultural, social and political act (e.g. Alvarez; Vidal 1996 or Bassnett and Lefevere 1998). CDA is used to analyze the source and target texts combining the three latter approaches, bringing translation theory to a completely new level. Most of the research which has been done within TS using CDA focuses on translation as a social action, answering questions such as: who is translating for whom, what is being translated, when is it being translated and what are the effects on the receiving culture (Chilton cited in Schäffner 2002:60). These questions have been mentioned before in this thesis, namely in the chapter on Fairclough’s CDA theoretical framework, which basically cover the questions asked during the analysis of texts at interpretation (understanding the situational context) and explanation (social and cultural context) stages. The attention is now on the different ways in which linguistic structures, lexical items and rhetorical devices all serve to reinforce the communicative purpose of a written message (Adab 2002:69).

CDA within TS has been mainly used to analyze political discourse due to the fact that the main aim of CDA is to uncover ideological and power structures in discourse, because power clashes in political discourse are the most frequent phenomena. The relation between TS and CDA has not been researched extensively. There are only a few scholars, mostly linguists with a special interest in TS, who have contributed to this study with a few published works, e.g. Christina Schäffner (1997; 2002; 2003; 2004), Jeremy Munday (2001; 2007), Maria Calzada Pérez (2002) and Robert Valdeón (2007). The most influential work is that of Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1990; 1997), who have published two books providing a very detailed insight into how the CDA model may be incorporated in translation theory. They have covered the power implications of the lexical choices made by translators and have also acknowledged the importance of the study of ideology in language within TS (Valdeón in Carr 2007:100). All the recent work within this field has been based on Hatim and Mason’s work combining it with the work of scholars in the field of CDA. The further discussion of CDA within TS will deal with the description of the most important aspects in the respective field. The description of the framework will be based on my own interpretation and summary of the existing research by all the above-mentioned scholars in the respective field and combining it with the tristratal CDA framework proposed by Norman Fairclough (1989).
4.2. Critical Discourse Analysis applied to Translation Studies

The research on CDA within TS is very new and thus there is no theoretical approach which serves as the backbone of this study. This leads to the fact that CDA is continuously adapted to new phenomena. In translation studies, CDA has an optional role and is mainly used as an auxiliary tool to the existing methodological approaches to provide a comprehensive reflection on language and culture (Valdeón 2007:100). Most of the scholars have chosen an existing CDA approach or some parts of the approach, for example the cognitive or ideological, and have described it from a translation point of view without creating a formal framework. There have been debates whether CDA should be applied to TS and whether a full linguistic analysis of the ST before translation is necessary (Schäffner 2002:53). Nonetheless, I have chosen to integrate all 3 dimensions of Norman Fairclough’s CDA model (text, pragmatics and social theory) and describe all three stages by focusing on how the CDA model in TS can provide an insight into both the linguistic and social elements of the text, allowing the translator to become aware of the possible social, cultural or linguistic clashes between the ST and the TT, especially when translating political texts. In other words, CDA may become a helpful tool in the determination of the translation strategy, the ST and the TT context, cultural and social differences between source and target language communities. It also helps to become aware of the cognitive process of translation and the participation of the translator in the interpretation (understanding) of the source text meaning which otherwise has not been explicitly described in TS.

Christina Schäffner (2004:136) states that it is the human communicative activity in the socio-cultural settings which is common in both CDA and TS, and that texts and discourses are the product of this activity. CDA may be used to analyze discourse, including translated discourse, in its three dimensions as texts, interaction or communication. These three CDA dimensions are also present in STs and TTs subsuming various components of the transformative of translation: “language, culture and the relationship between different peoples, different identities and even different points in time and space” (Valdeón 2007:100). Basil Hatim and Ian Mason’s (1990; 1997) analytic approach combines semiotic, pragmatic and communicative levels, which refer to the three dimensions mentioned first by Michael Halliday and then adopted by CDA scholars, who then added the fourth dimension, i.e. the power and ideological relations within discourse. Hatim and Mason’s framework, however, describes a variety of aspects instead of
providing a ready-to-use model. They combine translation dichotomies (dynamic vs. static translation), speech act theory, politeness theory, argumentation theory, discourse analysis and register analysis. Hatim and Mason consider translation as an act of communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries and investigate the underlying strategies behind the production and reception of texts, all texts: written and spoken, technical and non-technical (Hatim; Mason 1997:2). The latter corresponds to the main idea of CDA where both written and spoken discourses are used as the raw material for the analysis. Just like Fairclough (2003), Hatim and Mason consider the language user, in this case the translator, as the receiver and producer of the text. In other words, the translator is a communicator as well, whose act of communication is conditioned by another previous act and whose reception of that previous act is intensive, because the translator interacts closely with the source text, whether for the immediate response (simultaneous interpreting) or in a more reflective way (translation of literature) (ibid.). The unifying factor between CDA and Hatim and Mason’s work is that they both deal with the analysis of rhetorical structuring (intended meaning) and the effects of texts, which are interpreted taking into consideration the linguistic elements of texts, users and context in which they occur in (ibid. 14). The approach considers how the linguistic elements have been chosen to create a certain effect on language users and how the social context influences the choice of such linguistic elements.

Unlike discourse analysts, translators create a new act of communication on a previously existing one in a new target language environment by using their own background knowledge (linguistic, social and cultural) and negotiating the meaning between the ST producer and the TT reader (Hatim; Mason 1990:2). Translations are perceived as target texts in a new socio-cultural context, which are based on a source text which functioned in its original socio-cultural context (Schäffner 2004:138). Therefore, the CDA studies within TS mostly deal with questions around the translator’s role in the translation process: the mediat ory role of the translator. However, some aspects from TS have been adopted in the process of CDA integration into TS in order to specify the purpose of the translation, target audience design and the translation strategies. Hatim and Mason (1997:30) briefly describe their focus on the skopos of the translation (purpose) and two translation dichotomies: dynamic and static, which means that in dynamic translation, the translator is either creative and may suggest his/her original solutions to the translation or the translator must transfer the meaning as closely as possible to the ST, i.e. the literary
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A translation method. Christina Schäffner (2004) focuses on both the purpose of the translation and audience design from two angles, i.e. target audience with more or less the same knowledge of the ST subject and target audience which lacks knowledge about the ST issues. Hence, it is possible to state two main purposes in the translation:

\[a) \textit{the translator must convey information with certain changes in the TT}\]

(According to Valdéon (2007: 102) \textit{omissions, additions, permutations} and \textit{substitutions} may be included in the vocabulary of CDA as well, since they are connected to the editing and production processes of STs and TTs) (dynamic approach).

\[b) \textit{the translator conveys information in the TT with no significant changes according to word-for-word translation strategy (static approach)}.

To sum up, CDA may have a variety of “outputs”, which means that certain aspects of CDA may be incorporated into other disciplines of expertise. In TS, CDA is applied to both the ST and the TT, which are considered as the products of text production, i.e. the ST producer’s motivated choices in the ST language and culture and the translator’s motivated choices for the production of a new TT in a new language and culture. There are two possible translation strategies according to the text type and purpose of the translation: dynamic or static translation strategy.

It is rather complicated to describe all approaches of CDA in translation studies in detail both due to space restrictions and the amount of theoretical considerations. Furthermore, there are a number of various approaches where CDA has been applied to the analysis of either the ST or the TT, but they do not provide a clear explanation of how CDA is incorporated in TS. Therefore, I will attempt to provide a summary of the existing approaches by creating theoretical guidelines on the basis of Norman Fairclough’s (1989) CDA and power framework, which will explain how CDA may be implemented in the work of the translator. It would be rather complicated to create a model specifically designed for TS due to the fact that the approach is considered to be optional and is meant to serve as an additional tool towards a better understanding of the ST meaning and translation strategies used in the TT. In TS, it is a usual practice and a pre-condition in Translation Criticism (Reiss 2000:3) to create a specific model for the comparative analysis of both the ST and the TT in terms of the applied translation strategies and lexical choices. The same procedure may be attributed to the CDA implementation in TS as well. On the one hand, CDA may be used by the translator to analyze the lexical and
grammatical elements in the ST in order to provide a better understanding of the power relations and ideological clues in the ST. On the other hand, CDA may be used to analyze to spot the lexical, grammatical or ideological changes made in the TT by the translator. I will therefore try to sum up and describe the process of CDA integration in TS according to the three stages proposed by Norman Fairclough (1989), i.e. description (text-linguistic analysis), interpretation (pragmatic analysis) and explanation (social and cultural analysis). It is necessary to emphasize that the latter analytic stages must be perceived as functioning interchangeably and not independently, since they describe the cognitive process of text interpretation and production.

4.2.1. Description: Socio-Textual Perspective

The initial stage of CDA starts from word level and continues through semiotic and pragmatic levels to social and institutional level. The descriptive dimension or the text world (Hatim; Mason 1990:169) includes the analysis of lexis, grammatical structures, syntax, modality, pronouns, agency, text structures and dissemination of new/given information (see Table 4.1.1.). Linguistic elements are the raw material both for the translator in the translation process and for a translation critic when analyzing a completed TT. Initially, in translation, the “bottom-up” approach was adopted, when identifying discrepancies between the ST and the TT at a word or phrase level and only then relating them to the problem of contextual factors (ibid. 227). The modern approach considers that textual features are often linked to social and ideological contexts of text production and reception (Schäffner 2004:132). Hatim and Mason have adopted the view that the textual elements are chosen in accordance with certain communicative requirements, i.e. the translation brief and the effect necessary to create on the TT audience (Hatim; Mason 1997:16). This means that text users (writers, readers, translators) must process texts not only from word level, but interpret them taking into consideration the pragmatic, situational and social aspects. Table 4.1.1. shows my summary of the main textual elements which may carry certain ideological and power implications when used in a specific social context and which must be focused on during the analysis of the ST and the TT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text-Linguistic Elements</th>
<th>Rhetorical Purpose of the ST and TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td>The choice of lexis may be encoded with ideological connotations in ST and if translated disregarding its ideological loading, the TT may lose the ST text producer’s intended meaning (e.g. over-lexicalization).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Experiential values</strong> of types of process and participants:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Agency</strong>: animate (action process) and inanimate actors (event process) in sentences are related to the SVO position in sentence, which is also connected to ideological intentions of the ST or the TT text producer in order to stress the actor’s responsibility or hide it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Nominalizations</strong>: often used to reduce traces of causality and responsibility, when the active actor (subject) and verb is converted into one single noun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Active and passive voice</strong>: active voice has an active actor, but passive voice involves agentless passive sentences for hiding the real agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Relational/Expressive values</strong> of types of process and participants:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Sentence mood</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- declarative (speaker/writer provides information, recipient – receives information);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- interrogative or grammatical question (speaker/writer asks for information and the recipient provides the information);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- imperative (speaker/writer asks something of the recipient, who is the compliant actor);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Modality</strong>: modal verbs reflect power relations and status in order to withhold permission and impose obligation inexplicitly. Modal verb expressive values are related to the person’s evaluation of truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Pronouns</strong>: T and V pronouns express power and solidarity and reflect the power relations in both SL and TL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Solidarity pronouns (T): 2nd person singular (familiarity and in-group membership);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Honorifics (V): 2nd person plural (power relations), e.g. in English is replaced by the usage of titles and modes of address, in Danish the 2nd person plural “De” is used in rare occasions as when addressing the Queen, in Latvian 2nd person plural “Jūs” is a common practice when addressing strangers and persons of a higher position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>Pronouns “we/us“ or “you/others”</strong> are of main significance when considering exclusion or inclusion of members into a restricted group in the society (most commonly used in discourse of racism).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textual Structures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cohesion and coherence</strong> in texts contribute to how the presented information should be perceived:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Given and new information (the importance degree of information provided that signals the importance and causality);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Connectives establish a logical flow of information in the text;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vocabulary links between sentences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Connectors mark temporal, spatial and logical relations between sentences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- References relate back to earlier sentences or thoughts inside or outside texts (the usage pronouns and definite and indefinite articles to refer to known or unknown aspects);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sub-ordination and co-ordination of sentences indicates the information given in the main clause is more prominent than that given in the sub-ordinate clause.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.1.1., textual elements have certain functions with which they are related to the context of the communicative event. Hatim and Mason have adopted Michael Halliday’s three functions of meaning in register analysis: the ideational, interpersonal and textual, which correspond to Fairclough’s three values of meaning, i.e. experiential, relational and expressive (as mentioned in Chapter 1). However, Fairclough does not explicitly mention the fourth value, which is the textual value, which refers to the formal features of language per se. These values express the text producer’s (also translator’s) evaluation of the social world and the participants of the communicative event. Thus, TS/CDA scholars often speak about “motivatedness” (Hatim; Mason 1997:24 and Fairclough 2003:27), which is related to the fact that all choices on the textual, grammatical and syntactical level are deliberate and have an important role in the creation of the overall rhetorical purpose of the text. Translators must be able to spot the effect of the textual elements and relate them to the intended purpose of the ST in order to reach a certain degree of equivalence in the TT according to the needs of the target audience and purpose of the translation.

4.2.2. Interpretation: Semiotic and Pragmatic Evaluations

Texts are always interpreted and produced according to one’s linguistic, cultural and social background knowledge or the so-called Member’s Resources (MRs) (Fairclough 1990:142). Words and phrases do not carry meaning alone; it is the context and the text producer’s intentions that create the desired effect upon the receiver. Text producers (ST authors and translators) and receivers (translators and the TL audience) assign pragmatic values to textual elements (see Table 4.1.1) according to the type of activity, participants of the communicative event and the role of language. Translators/text receivers must be able to decode the intended meaning of the ST and TT producer in order to encode it in a new TL, which is addressed to an entirely new audience. In order to reach an appropriate degree of equivalence between the ST and the TT, the translator/text receiver needs to understand how texts and values imbued in textual elements create meaning in the particular context across cultural boundaries (Hatim; Mason 1990:105). The attitudinal meanings are assigned not only to words, but also to utterances and entire texts and usually are implicitly conveyed, so that the translator must not only be able to understand how the utterances are formed grammatically, but also what the text producer has inferred by arranging the textual elements in the specific order according to the
syntactic and grammatical constraints of the respective language (ibid. 60), e.g. the formation of speech acts, presuppositions (information provided in the text or outside text – a form of “common ground” (Fairclough 2003:55), argumentation patterns, politeness phenomena across cultures and construction of formality.

The knowledge the translator draws upon when analyzing the ST is based on his/her knowledge of other texts and discourses, which is most often known as intertextuality and interdiscursivity. Hatim and Mason include intertextuality under the semiotic dimension (Hatim; Mason 1990:168). This is related to the fact that the textual material is recognized in terms of signs, which are the conventionalized forms of expression of each language culture. Here, the translator’s socio-cultural and cross-cultural knowledge is necessary since signs in different cultures and contexts may not have the same meanings, e.g. the usage of the singular form of 2nd person pronoun in Latvian “tu” when addressing unfamiliar persons may seem impolite, however, in Danish, the usage of the particular form of address “du” in the same situational context is entirely acceptable. Intertextuality does not only refer to signs in the form of words, but it is connected to larger text units as well, such as texts, genres, styles, discourses and orders of discourse, where the latter is usually referred to as interdiscursivity.

The knowledge of different types of texts, genres, styles and discourses is necessary in order to ensure a successful communication in the given situational context. All above-mentioned categories may be perceived as signs, which stipulate certain linguistic and communicative constraints as well as participant relations in a particular situational context. Texts convey the rhetorical purpose (argument, narrating) (Hatim; Mason 1997:18), genres refer to a particular way of using language (news report, contract), styles (formal and informal) are connected to the way different identities and values are represented (Fairclough 2003:14), and discourses determine the way social values are included in texts (feminist discourse). The conventions for producing texts within particular genres and discourses are culture-bound and must be followed when translating a text into another language, e.g. there are specific conventions for translating a legal document into another language and these conventions are not necessarily equal in SL and TL. The same is true of the level of formality and word choice within a particular genre or discourse. Additionally, it is important to stress that all texts, genres and discourses enter into “interdiscursive relations” (Fairclough 2003:37), which means that they can be mixed, e.g. political interview belongs not only to the political discourse, but also to the public-
media discourse. The next sub-chapter will deal with the explanation of how the particular textual elements are influencing and are influenced by social and cultural aspects.

4.2.3. Explanation: Social Context

As mentioned before in Chapter 2, the explanatory stage of CDA relates textual elements to the social world. At this stage, it is possible to reveal what social, ideological, cultural and power-related aspects determine the choice of textual elements and the relationships between participants in both STs and TTs. Translators and text receivers interpret texts using their background knowledge (MRs), which is shaped by societal, social and institutional discourses (Fairclough 1989:163). Translators interpret STs in order to produce new TTs and translation critics interpret the translators’ motivated choices in TTs according to their MRs. It is a two-way process and each “reading” of a text is unique since people have different linguistic, social and cultural backgrounds and each will understand a text in his/her own way, e.g. two translators will always understand and translate one ST in slightly different ways. Naturally, it is also necessary to emphasize the importance of a translation brief and the purpose of the respective translation, because translators will make different choices according to different TT purposes and situational contexts. In table 4.1.3., I have created an overview on how the translation and text interpretation process may be analyzed according to the three stages of CDA:

**Table 4.1.3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST and TT text-linguistic level</th>
<th>Knowledge/experience of meaning relations in ST and TT</th>
<th>Cultural and social knowledge of SL and TL context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translator’s linguistic background</td>
<td>Interpretation: Pragmatic Dimension, Semiotic Dimension</td>
<td>Explanation: Communicative Dimension + Power, Ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interpretation:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text World</td>
<td>Intertextuality</td>
<td>Ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texture (Coherence)</td>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Speech Acts</td>
<td>Social context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Implicature</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Presupposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text structure (Cohesion)</td>
<td>Pragmatic Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field, Tenor and Mode</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In practice, the process (table 4.1.3.) is merely a cognitive one, which shows how the translator/text producer/text receiver produces and interprets a text being aware of the underlying cultural, ideological and power relations reflected in the motivated choices of textual elements. The textual material is chosen according to the type of situation and social context and thus the textual material helps to sustain the particular social context. At this stage, Fairclough (1989; 2003; 2007) speaks about texts as social events, language as a social structure and orders of discourse as social practices. Texts are produced with an intention to convey meaning and affect the social reality using language in a specific way according to the social practices, which are the social norms of each particular language community or social situation. This may be explained in terms of formality, which belongs under one of the types of power coined by Fairclough, namely power and access to discourse (1989:65). It is connected to the division of roles of powerless and powerful participants in a speech situation, which have different language resources at hand and where the powerless participants do not have the capability of understanding or using appropriate forms of language in a particular social situation. Another important aspect in the explanation stage is ideology. Ideology reflects the text producer’s cultural, political and social membership to a particular discourse, e.g. political movement, social class or group. Texts are produced and interpreted with a certain ideology in mind. This is often referred to as “mediation”, which is the most widely discussed topic within TS in relation to CDA.

Translators are considered as mediators between two languages and cultures. Translators interpret texts and produce texts according to the translation purpose and the needs of the particular audience. They edit texts and adapt texts according to the translation brief using their own linguistic and socio-cultural experience. All linguistic and textual choices are rooted in social practices. According to Christina Schäffner (2004), what may look like “mistranslation” or a “translation loss” at a first glance (or from a linguistic or text-specific point of view) will actually turn out to highlight the socio-political or ideological structures, processes, norms and constraints in which translations were produced or received. It is a controversial question whether all choices are motivated and rooted in a particular ideology, but it is certain that translators draw upon their own intertextual experience and explain texts according to their socio-cultural and linguistic knowledge. The next sub-chapter will deal with the discussion on the importance of ideology and power relations in translation studies.
4.3. Translation, Ideology and Power

The two main concerns of CDA are how powerful groups control the public discourse and what are the social consequences of such control and inequality. Power is not always exercised in obviously abusive acts of dominant members, but may be enacted in the taken-for-granted actions of everyday life (van Dijk 2001:354 - 355). Translation as an act of communication involves implicit power (ideology) which is realized through language. TS/CDA scholars in relation to ideology and power often speak of two aspects: the translation of ideology and the ideology of translating (Hatim; Mason 1997:143). The translator as a text producer operates between two socio-cultural environments and seeks to reproduce his/her interpretation of the ST in order to achieve the intended effects on TT readers (Hatim; Mason 1997:92). The following sub-chapter deals with the discussion of ideology and power and why it is important to be aware of these aspects in a translation situation.

4.3.1. Ideology and Types of Power

In CDA, there are two existing definitions of the term “ideology” and both are used interchangeably. The initial definition originated from the Napoleonic and Marxist traditions (Munday in Munday and Cunico 2007:195), where ideology was considered as the representation of aspects of the world which contributes to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation (Fairclough 2003:9). The most recent definition of ideology was created by Teun van Dijk (1997a:17) based on the tradition of cognitive psychology. This definition was adopted by Hatim and Mason (1990; 1997) as well, who define ideology as the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups and which is closely associated to the term “discourse”, as institutionalized modes of speaking and writing which give expression to particular attitudes towards areas of socio-cultural activity (Hatim and Mason 1997:144). In TS, ideology has been primarily linked to manipulation and power (Munday 2007b:195). In this thesis, both definitions of ideology are adopted due to the fact that ideology may be used not only to create unequal power relations, but also to consolidate solidarity among members of a particular social grouping (Fairclough 1989:84). Furthermore, ideology is not negative in its nature, because power and social struggle result only from the way ideology is portrayed and realized through language or physical force. Irrespective of the two latter definitions, it is clear that language users are active
subjects in discourse and are passively subjected to its authority (Hatim and Mason 1997:144). The translator acts in a social context and is part of the social context. It is in this sense that translating is, in itself, an ideological activity (ibid. 146).

CDA scholars state that ideologies are the result of differences in position, experience and interests between social groupings, which then enter into ideological conflict in terms of power. Usually, the ideological meaning systems become “naturalized” and are the common ways of operating in the social institutional discourses. Norman Fairclough (1989:46) is one of the few CDA scholars who have defined various types of ideological power. In the translation process, it is important to be able to detect these types of power in order to understand the ST producer’s motivations and ideological assumptions behind lexical and textual choices. There are five types of power: a) unequal encounter results from subordination and unequal social roles in the society where the dominant participant determines a particular type of discourse and uses the conventions of this particular discourse according to his/her needs; b) unequal encounter with cross-cultural differences, where powerless participants have different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The powerful participant is the “gate keeper”, who controls the access to information. This type of power is closely connected to institutionalized racisms and positive self-presentation and negative other-representation “rhetoric of othering” (Riggins 1997:1); c) hidden power is related to constraints of the produced text in terms of hiding the true agency, in order to favor certain interpretations and “wordings” of the events, while excluding others (indirect requests using elaborate politeness strategies and modal verbs: could); d) power behind discourse: the entire social discourse is held as hidden power, e.g. language standardization – correct language codification: Received Pronunciation in England and lastly, e) power and access to discourse is connected to the access to the order of discourse and its component discourse types (formality) (Fairclough 1989:66).

According to Hatim and Mason (1990:161), translators and other professionals looking at language in terms of some of these complex social relations cannot fail to be aware of how language is implicated whenever the ability to use certain genres, discourses, etc. becomes an instrument of power. Translators must be able to understand the ST producer’s intended meaning and spot the ideological implications in the ST when transferring the message in TL. Hence, new questions arise regarding the translator’s neutrality and his/her ideological position in the translation process.
4.3.2. Mediation

The main aim of the previous sub-chapter was to describe the aspects behind the translation of ideology as well as the different types of implicit power, which are connected to the analysis of STs. This sub-chapter will be devoted to the issues of the ideology of translation, mainly focusing on the notion of “mediation” and how it is connected to CDA and TS. In CDA, Fairclough refers to the term “mediation” in connection to mass media as the movement of meaning from one text to another, from one discourse to another and from one event to another, e.g. journalists transform the source materials according to their needs and text conventions (2003:30). The etymology of the word “translation” implies mediation in its literal sense due to the fact that the Latin word “translation” means “carrying across” materials or objects. The current meaning of translation (interlingual translation) was established only in 14th century by Bible translators (Tymocko 2003:189).

Translating has never been neutral and the question of the translator’s visibility and truthfulness has been of main concern to translation scholars for centuries. The ideology of translation resides not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator, and in its relevance to the receiving audiences (ibid.). Translator is considered to be the mediator between the ST culture and the TT culture, whose choices in the translation process are determined either by his/her world views or the ideology of a larger social institution, his/her background knowledge, the skopos (purpose) of the translation, target audience design, text type, genre and discourse textual and structural constraints as well as the translation brief, which are the prime determinants of the translator’s stance in the translation process. Political discourse is often mediated by translation, and political effects are caused by specific translation solutions, the processes by which information is transferred via translation as well as the structure and function of equally valid texts in both cultures (Schäffner 2004:121). In political discourse, the readers do not usually compare the translated document to the ST original as it is done by translation critics. As a consequence, the readers shape their perceptions based on the respective translation, which sometimes may be considered as a conscious act of deception, i.e. the translator has deliberately changed the ideological stance of the ST text in the TT. Thus, the reader becomes the powerless participant of the communicative act and is unable to access the information present in the SL discourse. Several TS/CDA scholars have dealt with the analysis of deception of the TT reader caused by politically and ideologically
motivated translation choices, e.g. Kuo and Nakamura (2005) have focused on the differences between translations of the same ST in two ideologically opposed newspapers in China. Furthermore, Rista-Dema (2008:1-23) focuses on the impact of register changes (the shift from informal to formal language) on the reader in translations of Albanian political memoirs into English and Valdeón (2007:99-117) analyzes the impact of the differences on the ideologically motivated lexical level in English and Spanish news articles. Hence, Valdeón talks about two types of mediation, which signify the text producer’s/translators ideological attitude, i.e. positive mediation and negative mediation.

The above-mentioned research papers are connected to the text producers or translators’ involvement in the reproduction of the ST meaning with minor or major lexical, generic or stylistic changes in the TT, which lead to ideological or power implications. Hatim and Mason (1990; 1997) have developed three types of mediation based on the translation scholar Venuti’s theory. Venuti’s theory concerns two translation strategies that are related to the translator’s conscious or unconscious choices of textual aspects, i.e. domestication and foreignizing. Domestication is the normalizing of foreign elements in the TT by adapting them to the dominant culture and thus, depriving them of the ST producer’s voice. This may be connected to a conscious translator’s strategy and to unconscious translator’s personal preferences rooted in the ideology of the dominant TT culture. Foreignizing is mostly observed when the TL is subordinate to the SL and elements of the SL are adopted in the TL, e.g. anglicisms in minority languages. These aspects in translation are undoubtedly related to Fairclough’s types of power of unequal encounter and unequal encounter with cross-cultural differences.

Based on these assumptions, Hatim and Mason (1997:143-164) have developed three types of mediation: minimal mediation, maximal mediation and partial mediation. Their theoretical considerations are mainly related to the analysis of translator’s lexical choices. Minimal mediation is most often related to minimal changes in the TT, e.g. mixing of genres and discourses in one culture may be confusing in another culture, over-lexicalization (foregrounding of lexical choices), which signals the text producer or translator’s obsession with a particular ideology, and style shifting or code-switching in the TT, e.g. the usage of two dialects or two rhetorical styles in one speech (to create distance or close relationships). Maximal mediation signals a radical departure from the ST in terms of intentionality, socio-cultural and socio-textual practices. However, the genre and discourse structure may remain unchanged due to the fact that the audience in both the ST
and the TT is the same, e.g. an international audience. Maximal mediation is often related to a complete shift of point of view and tends to change the agency in the TT, in order to make the agent either more active or passive, i.e. actions are turned into events (see sub-chapter 4.1.1.). Lastly, partial mediation is connected to discoursal shifts such as style-shifting, genre confusion and losing the ST characteristics.

The concept of mediation is an integral part of the third stage in Fairclough’s CDA framework – explanation, because it is closely connected to the creation of power struggle (unequal power relations) between the participants of the communicative event and the transfer of ideology from one language to another. The lexical and grammatical choices determine the effect of the ST and the TT and show the text producer’s attitude towards the subject of the ST or the TT. The term “mediation” may be understood as the translator’s intervention in the process of meaning making in the TL, which may have different levels, i.e. maximal, minimal, partial or positive and negative. The text producer’s (translator’s) attitudinal meaning is expressed by assigning particular values (experiential, relational and expressive) to the lexical and grammatical choices, which reflect the text producer’s belonging to a particular social class or ideological movement and his/her unique evaluation of the subject of the text. Furthermore, the text producer’s (translator’s) knowledge of other texts and discourses (intertextuality and interdiscursivity) may influence the choice of the lexical and grammatical elements as well, which helps to assign already presupposed negative or positive values to particular choices on the word level. However, it must be emphasized that not all translators’ uptake a specific ideological stance and not all lexical and grammatical choices may be explained in terms of power relations or social struggle between text producers and target readers.

The latter has been one of the major arguments among CDA/TS scholars and which is briefly described in the following sub-chapter. Nonetheless, there is no doubt that translators draw upon their own linguistic and socio-cultural background when interpreting (understanding) the ST and transferring the message in another TL, but not all choices may be characterized as politically motivated. On the contrary, it may also be connected to the translators’ awareness of what linguistic factors create the ideological and power relations in the ST and how the respective linguistic elements must be transferred in the TL in order to preserve an equivalent effect on the target readers. The CDA framework may be used both to analyze the ST and to analyze the translator’s motivated choices in the TT.
4.4. Critique of Critical Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies

CDA may be used to uncover the underlying ideological and power relations in STs and TTs, but not all translation strategies are meant to create unequal power relations or hide information from the reader. It is true that all lexical, grammatical and syntactical choices in a text are motivated and have a certain role in the creation of the overall rhetorical purpose of the text, but they are not always embedded in a particular world view or ideological stance. Jeremy Munday (2007b:199) states that translator’s choices are not always ideological, but they are influenced by the different language systems and the translators’ individual experience of language through education, the media and the local environment instead. However, each individual gains this experience in his/her own unique way and the translator’s linguistic perspective will still inevitably differ from the ST author’s perspective.

Another aspect, which is widely discussed among TS/CDA scholars, is the actual application of CDA framework in TS. CDA may not be regarded as a theoretical model, but rather a range of approaches with a common aim to uncover ideology and power. Some of the TS scholars have very negative views on the implementation of discourse analysis in TS, since it is merely text analysis with no relation to translation-specific problems. However, Christina Schäffner (2002:6) argues that the general aim of discourse analysis in TS is to identify specific textual features which are relevant for the process of translation and that it is only a translation-oriented analysis, and not text analysis on its own right. Other scholars, e.g. Anthony Pym (1992:227), suggest that discourse analysis is inappropriate to translation, because it cannot say whether a source text and a target text can or should belong to the same discourse and that most theories cannot describe the limits of any particular discourse across different languages.

There are a lot of pros and cons regarding the CDA implementation in TS and it is true that the usage of terminology is rather unclear and lacks solid theoretical foundation. It is probably due to all above-mentioned aspects why CDA approach to translation has not been included in any recent published literature on TS, but it is worth mentioning that it is a valuable asset for any translator to be able to reflect on the ST and the TT linguistic aspects in socio-cultural terms. This way the translators are able to understand the possible ideological and power relations in the ST and thus avoid problems when transferring the equivalent effect in the TT. Hence, CDA helps translators to become aware of the translation process and their own role in the choice of lexical elements.
5. DATA AND METHODOLOGY

5.1. Method

The main aim of the theoretical part of this thesis was to provide an insight into the complex world of CDA approaches and their application in TS. The theoretical foundation of this thesis has been based on a variety of secondary literature sources on CDA in TS, mainly the work of CDA/TS scholars such as Norman Fairclough (1989; 2003; 2007), Teun van Dijk (1997a, 1997b, 2001), Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1990; 1997), Christina Schäffner (1997; 2002; 2003; 2004), Robert S. Valdeón (2007), Jeremy Munday (2004; 2007) and many other scholars in the respective field. The latter theoretical approaches on CDA and CDA within TS do not provide standardized terminology or a general model which may be applied in the practical part of this thesis. Hence, I have pointed out the most important guidelines according to which it is possible to perform a translation-oriented analysis of political texts both in the form of STs and TTs. My approach is based on Norman Fairclough’s tristratal CDA framework, which is combined with Basil Hatim and Ian Mason, Christina Schäffner and other CDA/TS scholars’ considerations in relation to how translation/interpretation process and end-product analysis could benefit from the integration of discourse analysis. In this thesis, however, the emphasis is only on the analysis of the written translation.

CDA approach was initially created for the analysis of discourse within one language and one culture. The CDA integration in TS requires certain adjustments to the CDA approach, i.e. the data for the analysis must consist of both the ST and the TT due to the fact that the ST reflects the ST producer’s motivated choices that may contain implicit power and ideological aspects, whereas the TT reflects the translators’ translation strategies and lexical choices which may or may not be rooted in a particular ideology. The first part of the empirical analysis deals with the application of the CDA framework (introduced in Chapter 4) to the ST which is a political interview. The analysis is aimed at detecting power and ideological relations in the ST, explain how the power relations are formed by the choice of textual elements and how the awareness of these clues can help the translator during the ST interpretation (understanding) and the TT production processes. The second part of the empirical analysis is related to the analysis of translations of the respective ST (political interview) into Danish and Latvian. The main aim, using CDA/TS approach and terminology, is to see whether the translators have been successful in
transferring the ideological and power relations present in the ST in the TT and whether
the CDA framework may have been a helpful tool in the translation of the respective
political text. Furthermore, the analysis is aimed at spotting any ideological motivations
behind the translators’ textual choices, which reflect the translators’ individual
interpretation of the social context and their attitude towards the subject of the political
interview.

5.2. Data

The empirical part of this thesis is based on the analysis of a political
discourse genre, which is a political radio interview (recorded on September 29, 2006)
between BBC journalist Allan Little and King Mswati III of Swaziland. The radio
interview was transcribed and only the written text was used for analytic purposes. Due to
the extensive length of the interview (16 pages), it was not possible to perform the analysis
of the entire text. In order to create a ST, which would later be translated into both Danish
and Latvian, it was necessary to choose a certain part of the interview. Thus, the ST was
created by choosing the part of the interview, which deals with the discussion of the King’s
responsibility for his actions as well as his relationship with his citizens. This part of the
interview was the most suitable for both the ST analysis and later TT analysis since it
shows power relations between the two participants of the interview as well as their
ideological assumptions towards the latter topic.

The second part of the empirical analysis deals with the application of CDA
approach to TTs (in Danish and Latvian) in order to show how the CDA framework may
be used to analyze the translators’ motivated choices in the translations and determine
whether these choices are caused by the translator’s lack of linguistic competence,
experience, background knowledge or simply the inability to recognize the situational and
social context. The empirical data consists of 10 translations, 4 in Danish and 6 in Latvian,
which were translated by voluntary translators with at least 3 years of experience in written
translation. All translators work either as freelance or full-time translators and have a
considerable experience in the translation of political texts. It was a great challenge to find
voluntary translators for this research due to financial reasons and time restrictions due to
the length of the source text. All translators received the translation task including the
translation brief (specified in Chapter 7) in both Danish and Latvian, where the purpose of
the translation and the target audience were specified. The source text and all its
translations are enclosed as appendices at the end of this thesis.
6. TRANSLATION – ORIENTED SOURCE TEXT ANALYSIS

The application of CDA in TS is usually performed in two ways: a) the framework may be applied to the analysis of the ST and b) the framework may be applied to the analysis of the TT. In both cases the aim of the approach remains the same, i.e. to determine what ideological or power relations are reflected in lexical, grammatical and structural elements of the text, how they contribute to the overall rhetorical purpose of the text as well as whether the respective information can be useful to the translator during the translation process. This chapter deals with a translation-oriented analysis of the ST, which is a political interview between a British journalist Allan Little and King of Swaziland Mswati III (see Appendix 11), and which was broadcasted on September 29, 2006 on BBC radio program “Have your say!” . The political interview is transcribed and will be analyzed as written discourse. It has been adapted for translation purposes as a ST with an aim to be translated into Danish and Latvian (see Chapter 7). Due to time and length restrictions related to the production of the translation, only one particular topic has been chosen from the interview, i.e. clashes between two ideological movements and unequal power relations between the participants of the interview. The analysis will be based on the tristratal CDA (description, interpretation and explanation) and CDA within TS (terminology) approaches described in Chapter 4, and it involves the “bottom-up” (from word level) and “top-down” level (from social context level) approaches. All three levels: description, interpretation and explanation are an integral part of the overall perception of the text and thus, cannot be described separately.

6.1. Social Context

The rule of thumb when applying CDA for the analysis of texts is the determination of the social and situational contexts within which communication takes place and which determine the roles of the participants. There is no doubt that in order to produce a successful translation, translators must be able to understand the intended meaning of the ST producer. Hatim and Mason (1990:224) describe translators as “privilege readers” of the ST, because the translator reads in order to produce and decodes in order to re-encode. Every single text is interpreted on the basis of the Member’s Resources (MRs) of the translator, which hold the translator’s background knowledge of the particular topic and experience acquired from working with other textual and discursive material (called intertextuality and interdiscursivity). For a translator to be able to interpret
the situational and social context within which the communicative event takes place, it is necessary to have at least basic understanding of the topics present in the ST. Without the necessary background knowledge, the translator would not be able to uncover the underlying motivations behind the choice of linguistic or grammatical elements and their contribution to the creation of unequal power relationships, if any, between the participants of the communicative event.

As stated above, this political interview involves two participants – two source text producers: a British journalist and the King of Swaziland Mswati III. This information immediately signals a clash between two world views – the Western society (Great Britain/Europe/USA) and a Third World country in Southern Africa. The Kingdom of Swaziland is one of the last remaining absolute monarchies in the world and the head of state is King Mswati III. Swazi tribal traditions are still keenly celebrated in a wide range of rituals; one of them is giving unlimited power to their leader, the King. King Mswati III is now the last absolute monarch in the world. The official languages are English and siSwati (also known as Swazi language). Swaziland regained its independence from the British rule only in 1968 and is still the only African state which is ruled by its true successors from pre-colonial times. Class system and polygamy are among the most traditional customs in Swaziland, which are unacceptable to the democratic way of thinking in the Western part of the world. The King is the only head of state and political parties are banned in the country due to the fact that the King enjoys unlimited power with the support from the Queen Mother. The King has the power to single-handedly appoint the Prime Minister and the Parliament as well. The media is controlled by the government forbidding any distribution of negative information about the royal family. The economic situation in Swaziland is very poor due to a devastatingly low unemployment rate of 40%, inaccessible education, the highest HIV/AIDS infection rate in the world and extensive human trafficking. Still, the government shows indifference to the actual problems in the country and exercises corruption in all fields of economic activity.

The above-mentioned information on Swaziland is a brief summary of the facts already provided in the ST interview. However, it establishes a better understanding of the social context within which the political interview takes place. Both participants

2 Available online: BBC News, Swaziland country profile: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/country_profiles/1069035.stm

3 Available online: www.welcometoswaziland.com

4 Available online: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/wz.html
represent opposite world views, which create an ideological clash, i.e. the Western world’s dominance over the Third World countries, the opposite views on polygamy between the Western world and Swaziland (polygamy is charged with crime in the Western world), and the Western world’s disapproval of African tribal customs such as the political system: absolute monarchy, where the citizens are still obliged to trust all powers whatsoever to their only leader – the King.

6.2. Situational Context

The social context determines the situational context, i.e. the relationship between participants, power and distance aspects and language use in the communicative event. The translator must be aware of the type of genre and what constraints the respective genre imposes on the texture and structure of the text in both the ST and the TT. The interview is considered to be political due to following factors: a) the interlocutors represent opposite social groupings of the global society; b) the issues raised in the interview concern the ways of governing a country and c) the interviewee is a political statesman: the King of Swaziland Mswati III. Another important aspect is that the political interview is a mixed genre. The phenomenon, as mentioned in the preceding chapters of this thesis, is called “politantment” (Schäffner 2004:118) or “conversationalization” (Fairclough 1999: 101), which means that the interview combines both political issues and the private life matters of the interviewee. The latter is characteristic for the genre of media interview with an intention to attract the readers’ attention by both providing valuable information and entertainment. Furthermore, the genre imposes certain structural constraints such as the question-and-answer format which must be preserved in TL if the TT purpose requires it.

The identification of the genre helps to establish general understanding on how participant relations evolve throughout the communicative event. It is possible to interpret participant relations of this political interview in two ways. From the situational point of view, the genre - political interview automatically determines two explicit social roles: the interviewer and the interviewee. The journalist uptakes an explicit power-holder’s position because he controls the information flow by asking questions to the addressee. The interviewee-addressee relationship between interlocutors is characteristic to communicative events which involve an encounter between what Fairclough (1989:125) refers to as agent and patient. The agent (journalist) is the power holder of the encounter
whose interaction is determined by the ideology of the institution. However, the patient (the King) is both the powerless and the powerful participant due to the fact that the patient is obliged to provide information to the agent, but the agent needs this information in order to run the communicative event (the interview). From the institutional and societal point of view, the King is the symbol of power in every society across the world. Therefore, the King is both the powerless participant in front of the journalist who represents the dominant Western democracy, and the powerful participant due to his social status. This creates unequal power relations between the two interlocutors due to social status and ideological assumptions. The social status of the King imposes certain requirements on the journalist’s choice of language forms (politeness, forms of address, formality), which is necessary for the establishment of a working relationship with the King and to ensure the King’s will to collaborate and provide the necessary information for the interview. To sum up, there are two types of power exercised through the choice of textual elements in this interview: a) unequal power and b) unequal power due to cross-cultural differences (the ideological struggle between two world views: the Western society and the Third World country). The translator’s task is to reproduce the unequal power relations by spotting the respective power relations in the ST and then choosing the correct linguistic elements in the TL which would thus create an equivalent effect in the TL.

6.3. Text-Linguistic Analysis of Source Text

Textual elements are the translators’ raw material for the interpretation of the ST and the creation of an equivalent text in TL. According to CDA, the choice of textual elements reflects the text producer’s intentions and linguistic, social and political background. Translators must be aware of the fact that the social and situational context determines the vocabulary, syntax and the overall organization of the text of the political discourse in particular. The ideological struggle between two contrasting ideologies and unequal power relations due to social status are inflected in interlocutors’ linguistic choices: lexis, speech acts, texture and structure of texts. One of the most interesting and important aspects connected to the cross-cultural differences between the SL and the TL is the usage of politeness markers in the interview. Politeness determines the unequal power relations and social status and has a great impact on the development of social relationships between participants. Politeness may be expressed through speech acts (orders, requests,
suggestions and advice) and honorifics (T and V pronouns, i.e. 2nd person singular and plural). The role of politeness in the expression of power and distance has been researched by Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson (1987) within the framework of Politeness Theory. Hatim and Mason (1997:119-120) and Fairclough (1989:55) have extensively applied Brown and Levinson’s definition of “face” and positive and negative politeness in their research. Politeness Theory may be considered as a useful tool in understanding the patterns of the formation of politeness in different cultures and how politeness is employed to construct the social reality of unequal power relations. Hence, it is necessary to explain the general definitions and terms behind Politeness Theory before its application in the ST analysis.

6.3.1. Politeness Strategies

Politeness Theory is a socio-linguistic theory based on the analysis of speech acts in different languages. It investigates how asymmetries of rights and obligations between subjects (e.g. the King vs. journalist) may be embedded in asymmetrical rights to ask questions, to request information without trespassing distance and power relations between interlocutors. In this interview, the journalist is aware of the conventions of the degree of indirectness or directness for the expression of a speech act in line with his assumptions about the ways in which and degrees to which he should be polite to the King, avoid imposing on him and harming his public “face” (Fairclough 1989:157). Some speech acts are considered as “face-threatening acts”, which may harm the addressee’s public “face”. Both participants of the communicative event are willing to communicate and thus satisfy each other’s “face” by using different means of politeness. Politeness theory integrates four face-risk minimizing (redressive) actions: positive politeness, negative politeness, bald-on-record and off-record which are then followed by face-threatening acts (FTAs) (direct questions, reproach, etc.).

The most important types of politeness worth mentioning in this thesis are polite friendliness (positive politeness) and polite formality (negative politeness). Bald-on record is related to the usage of no politeness markers, clear agency and direct questions, whereas off-record strategy includes metaphor and irony, rhetorical questions, understatement, tautologies and hints and hedges as to what the speaker wants or means to communicate indirectly. Positive politeness is directed to the addressee’s positive face and his/her desires and wants. Negative politeness is a redressive action which is directed to the
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addressee’s negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded (Brown; Levinson 1987:129). The strategies for expressing positive politeness involve three broad mechanisms: a) claiming common ground; b) conveying the wish to cooperate by stressing in-group membership and c) fulfilling the addressee’s want for some wish or desire. Furthermore, negative politeness is expressed through conventional indirectness, hedges on illocutionary force, polite pessimism (about the success of requests) and the emphasis on addressee’s relative power (Brown; Levinson 1987:130). In Western cultures, negative politeness is the most conventionalized set of linguistic strategies for FTA redress. The outputs of negative politeness are all forms useful for social distancing just as positive politeness forms are used to reduce distance (ibid).

The expression of politeness forms may differ from one language to another, e.g. the usage of honorifics and address forms and the rules for creating positive and negative politeness. The translator’s task is to reproduce politeness forms which contribute to the creation of the equivalent level of formality in the TT according to the conventions of the TL. Thus, the translator must be able to interpret (understand) the politeness strategies and have a sound knowledge of the politeness forms in both SL and TL. In this interview, formality is one on the key aspects which explain the relationship between interlocutors. There are several instances of positive and negative politeness used by the journalist which are of main importance in a translation situation as well:

1. Allan: Your Majesty, a very warm welcome. What factors, do you think, have sustained yours, the last absolute monarchal Africa, when so many others have fallen?

Here, the journalist uses an opening sentence: honorifics + greeting, which is the common way of addressing a King in English and which signals the usage of the negative politeness strategy. In most European countries, there is an established system of honorifics, e.g. 2nd person singular and plural in Danish: du/Dem and titles: Deres Højhed, Deres Majestaet, Hans Majestaet, Hendes Majæstet; in Latvian jūs/Jūs and titles: Jūsu Augstība, Jūsu Majestāte and in English you/You, Mr/Ms/Mrs or titles Sir/Madam, Your Majesty, Your Highness. Another negative politeness marker is used in the question in a form of the so-called hedge5 “do you think”, which is used to acquire information regarding the

---

5 A hedge is a particle, word or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set; it says of that membership that it is partial, or true only in certain aspects, or that it is more true and complete than perhaps might be expected, e.g. tag questions, in fact/in a way, do you think roughly, I’ll just say, you know, I mean, etc. (Brown; Levinson 1987: 145).
addressee’s commitment to the truth. Hedges are cross-cultural phenomena as well and may be expressed using tag questions, adverbs and adjectives in both Danish and Latvian.

Another way of expressing politeness is using positive politeness markers in the form of textual elements which signal in-group membership or solidarity between interlocutors. The following example shows that politeness forms may be mixed. Here the negative politeness marker *Your Majesty* is used in combination with the verb “fascinate” + positive politeness hedge adverb “clearly” and then followed by a direct question (FTA):

8. Allan: *Your Majesty,* this is one of the things that clearly fascinate people all over the world and the majority of questions we have received were about polygamy and about your family and your own personal situation. *What is the value of polygamy in today’s world when the vast majority of the societies across the world are monogamous?*

The mixed politeness approach has been used to minimize the following face-threatening act (question: *What is the value...?*) by expressing admiration for the addressee’s personal characteristics, here it is related to Swazi unique cultural traditions. Politeness mitigates the following contradictory question that is used to uncover the King’s personal situation and compares two contradictory aspects: the ethnic African traditions with the “standard” practice of the rest of the world.

Finally, the last important politeness strategy used in this interview is acknowledgement. The journalist tries to gain common ground with the King by expressing understanding of the King’s assumptions and only then uses the coordinating conjunction “but” to express a mild disagreement (FTA):

10. Allan: *I accept that the unfamiliar is often shocking at first, but what I am asking you is, why is polygamy so valued by the Swazis? What does it bring to Swazi society?*

This emphasizes the journalist’s wish to gain approval by lessening the imposition and to preserve neutral relationship with the King. Positive politeness is the way of satisfying some of the speaker’s wants to be approved and admired in order to establish successful cooperation. Even though positive politeness is rarely used in the Western political discourse, in this interview positive politeness is used as a redress before bald-on-record strategies to preserve a neutral and polite atmosphere. For example, in case of disagreement the journalist tries not only to apologize but also acknowledge the possible truthfulness of the King’s previously uttered statement as if pretending to share some
understanding of the aspects uttered by the King. This is mostly applied when the journalist tries to reformulate the question in order to receive a satisfactory answer.

In political discourse, especially in the respective political interview, politeness is one of the ways to convey one’s intentions and gain information without making an explicit imposition upon the addressee’s face. The journalist uses positive and negative politeness strategies to prepare the King for the upcoming face-threatening acts and maintain the King’s wish to collaborate. Politeness is one of the ways of expressing formality and is one of the expressions of power, which determines the way language is used (constraint on contents) and the way participants establish relationships with each other (constraints on subject positions and social roles). In a translation situation, the translators must be able to transfer the respective level of formality through politeness forms in the TL by following certain politeness formation and formality rules, i.e. using honorifics (T and V), forms of address, hedges, etc. However, politeness reflects only one side of the power struggle in an unequal encounter. The underlying ideological struggle is achieved by specific linguistic and grammatical means which carry intertextual meaning on their own. It is important for translators to be aware of the ideological patterns hidden in the choice of lexis and understand their contribution to the overall meaning of the text.

6.3.2. Vocabulary and Grammatical Structures

Politeness strategies are the visible part of unequal power relations between the participants of the communicative event. In a formal encounter as this political interview, the usage of politeness is an integral part of the basic communicative requirements between two participants holding unequal power status. Nevertheless, ideological struggle and power relations may be exercised implicitly through lexis and grammatical structures. The CDA research within TS has been mainly based on the analysis of lexical and grammatical structures and their role in the translation process. Intertextuality and interdiscursivity are closely connected with the analysis of lexis, because language users recognize the meaning on the basis of their background knowledge and experience dealing with other texts and discourses. Thus, the translator must be able to detect the underlying ideological patterns and possible positive or negative connotations of lexical elements in the ST in order to establish equivalence between the ST and the TT by choosing appropriate textual elements on word level as well.
As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the ideological struggle in this political interview is between two world views: the Western democratic community and the African tribal community. The journalist inexplicitly represents and defends the opinion expressed by the Western democracy. This position and the genre of the text allow the journalist to acquire an implicit power-holder’s position and become what Fairclough (1989) defines as a “gatekeeper” of a cross-cultural encounter. The gatekeeper phenomenon results in the fact that the journalist belongs to the dominant culture of the Western society and, even though Swaziland gained its independence from the British rule in 1968, the Western society imposes its ways of life through political negotiations. However, it may be interpreted differently taking into consideration the poor life conditions in Swaziland, violations of human rights of the Swazi people and the highest HIV/AIDS infection rate in the world. The Swazis do not know other life conditions than the existing ones because of the oppressive political regime in the country, lack of knowledge, access to education and information.

The formal politeness pattern is preserved throughout the interview, but the stance of the journalist is implicitly conveyed through the wording of his utterances. There are two ideologically opposite semantic fields in the vocabulary which characterize the power struggle between the two participants. First, the journalist uses lexical elements with strong negative expressive values which signify disapproval by the entire Western community towards the political regime in the country. This is introduced at the opening passage of the interview, where the journalist introduces the audience to the actual situation in Swaziland as if trying to determine the formation of attitudinal meaning towards the country in question:

1. Allan: Today’s interview is in the world’s last remaining absolute monarchies, but the power of the King of Swaziland has not gone unchallenged. This landlocked kingdom bordered by South Africa and Mozambique suffers from chronic poverty and food shortages. It has the highest incidence of HIV infection in the world. King Mswati III was crowned 20 years ago at the age of 18. The King, called Ingwenyama (the Lion), has many wives and lives in a considerable luxury compared to his subjects. Swaziland has been described as an island of dictatorship in a sea of democracy. Opposition political parties are banned; royalists argue that democracy creates division and that a monarch is a strong unifying force.

The marked words in the first passage describe the critical situation in the country and the role of the King. The adjective phrase “world’s last remaining” signifies that Swaziland is the last absolute monarchy in the world. However, the coordination conjunction “but” +
the predicate “has not gone unchallenged” signal the fact that Swaziland has received harsh critique from the Western world in relation to its existing political system. It is possible to determine two opposite ideological lexicons in the text, which are rooted in the democratic ideology against the existing political rule in Swaziland, e.g. constitutional monarchy, republic, elected parliamentary or presidential systems, monogamy and positive democratization. The words which characterize the existing political rule in Swaziland are as follows: absolute monarchy, dictatorship, chronic poverty, food shortages, HIV infection and polygamy, etc. The journalist assigns negative and positive expressive values to lexical elements, which characterize the democratic traditions of the Western world and its fight against dictatorship and injustice. Additionally, the journalist chooses dysphemisms6 to strengthen the negative attitude towards Swaziland and Swazi traditions, e.g. many wives as a dysphemism towards the peculiarities of the Swazi traditions of polygamy. The metaphor as an island of dictatorship in a sea of democracy clearly underlines the opposite ideological patterns present in the interview and signifies the fact that Swaziland is seen as the only country left in the world with a political regime that does not match the international democratic criteria. It is of major importance that the translators pay attention to the two opposite lexicons and transfer the same meaning and effect in TL. This metaphor must not be ignored in TL and should be translated directly. However, in translations metaphors are often transferred in the TL by neutralizing them and thus losing the ST producer’s intended meaning. This is mostly referred to metaphors which are culture-bound and do not have a cultural equivalent in the TL. Translators must pay attention to the ideological struggle observed in the usage of agency in journalist’s utterances. The journalist uses direct questions and statements, using the 2nd person pronouns and clear agency in sentences, e.g.:

6. Allan: When you look at the changes that have taken place over the last ten to fifteen years in South Africa and Mozambique, your two direct neighbors, that amounts to very positive democratization and it is well known that South Africa in particular, would like to see you advance towards a more constitutional monarchy. Do you have those talks with South African authorities?

Having the above-mentioned characteristics of the journalist’s discourse in mind, it is not possible to ignore the King’s attempts to create another image of Swaziland. An interesting aspect is the King’s vocabulary, when he describes the democratic traditions of Swaziland.

6 Dysphemism: “making something sound worse” (Available from: http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/cumming/ling50/euphemism%2Bdysphemism.htm)
Both Hatim and Mason (1997) and Fairclough (1989) refer to this phenomenon as *over-lexicalization*. It means that an excessive usage of synonyms and contextual synonyms signals the speaker’s obsession with a certain ideology in order hide the actual information. The King employs vocabulary that contradicts to the journalist’s evaluation of the existing situation in the country:

3. **King:** The King of Swaziland is *the king by the people*. All that the king does whenever he rules the country, there is always *the process of consulting the people* and every decision he makes is a result of the *contribution of the people*. So, that makes the monarchy always *in touch with the people*.

The King’s choice of words reflects a very democratic political governing system in the country. Cohesion in the King’s answers is created using the recurrence of nouns: *people* and *Swazis*, and parallel structures. From the CDA perspective, the nouns “people” and “Swazis” are used to emphasize the fact that people in Swaziland determine the internal affairs and that the King has no power whatsoever without his people. This leads to the next aspects which are repeated throughout the King’s answers, i.e. unclear agency. The King uses 3rd person singular/plural nouns and pronouns to refer to his area of responsibility, thus trying to alienate from his duties:

5. **King:** Different countries have got their systems and it is *within the people to decide what they want*. And the people of this country have decided that the system they are living in, is a system which *they are comfortable* with and a system they understand well and they want to support.

13. **King:** A king is *a king by the people*. The king is *always with the people*. *He* must be identical to the people of the country who *he* lives with.

The abundance of parallel structures (*the people decide, the practice of consulting the people*) and usage of unclear agency in the form of 3rd person singular nouns and pronouns all contribute to hiding the responsibility. In case the pattern is broken in TL during the translation process, the meaning will be lost and the ideological ST producer’s motivations will not be conveyed adequately. The usage of pronouns in the King’s utterances is related to the spatial dimension of the text and references inside and outside texts which reflect the characteristics of the *rhetoric of othering*. This reflects how the King positions himself (the centre of *Self*) when talking about Swazi people and his duties. The social distance is not only between the King and the journalist; it is also present between the King and his nation:

11. **King:** *I have to ask a lot of the Swazis what it brings to them*, because they are the ones who really have decided that this is what they want.
This example shows how the King transfers his duties to his people and thus hides his responsibility in front of the journalist in a very diplomatic way. The only instance where the King uses the in-group marker the pronoun “we”, is where the journalist compares Swaziland to its neighbors, who have successfully introduced democratic systems in their countries:

7. King: We are Swazis and if we are Swazis everything is done by the Swazis. The Swazis are the ones who live here and they are the ones who will always be here in this country. They are the ones who will want to see what suits them. So, if the Swazis have decided that this is what they want, and since the Swazis have decided that this is what they want, we will go according to how the Swazis want to see things.

This is one of the best examples of parallel structures as well as the recurrence of the noun “the Swazis” in the interview, which reflects the King’s ideological stance. However, there is a slight difference in the usage of the in-group pronoun “we” used together with the pronoun “they”, which shows that the King not only tries to show that he is one of the Swazi people, but also belongs to another social group, namely the government (the Swazis have decided that this is what they want, we will go according to how the Swazis want to see things).

Ideological struggle and power relations are present in the rhetorical styles of the participants of the interview. The King employs a slightly more colloquial English and informal rhetorical style in comparison to the journalist. This may be related to the fact that the King’s mother tongue is siSwati language, even though English is the second official language and the King has been brought up and educated in Great Britain. Language differences (idiolects, dialects or accents) are usually related to the unequal power relations with cross-cultural differences, where the representative of another culture is considered the powerless participant. In this interview, the King’s language style has not been changed, i.e. corrected to more advanced English due to the fact that it shows the King’s origin and the characteristics of the dialect of South African English. For a translator, the translation of such language varieties is a great challenge and it is not always possible to transfer the same effect in the TL. On the contrary, in this interview the King’s English is merely more informal than the journalist’s and would not create any problems to transfer this particular effect in TL.
The analysis of the ST gives a short insight into the problems related to the translation of political texts which convey power and ideological struggles between participants belonging to two opposite social institutions, i.e. the Western democratic world and the absolute monarchy in Swaziland. In this interview, the ideological struggle is conveyed inexplicitly through the usage of negative and positive politeness, semantic fields of the vocabulary, passive and active agency, wording and grammatical structures. Two types of power may be observed in this interview: unequal encounter and unequal encounter with cross-cultural differences. The first is related to the social distance between the King and the journalist, and the latter signifies the journalist’s power having the role of the host of the interview (determined by the genre of political interview) and as the representative of the Western dominant culture, which makes the King the powerless participant of the interview. However, in order to defend his public face and hide the real situation in Swaziland, the King manipulates with the vocabulary and grammatical structures that are rooted in democratic ideology, and provides vague information.

This ST analysis provides only the author’s personal interpretation of the text. Other interpretations may have different considerations regarding power and ideological relations in the respective text. Nonetheless, the ST analysis was performed with an aim to outline certain linguistic and grammatical aspects which are considered important during the translation process. The ST analysis helps the translators to establish a better understanding of the cross-cultural differences in the formation of politeness strategies, the creation of a particular formality level between the interlocutors and helps to spot the ideological and power struggle in the textual material. It is not necessary for a translator to perform a full ST linguistic analysis prior each translation task, but it is important to have an understanding of the social and situational contexts and how they contribute to the creation of unequal power relations between the participants of the communicative event. The analysis provides the translators with guidelines for the understanding of the intended meaning in the ST and raises their awareness regarding their textual choices in the TT. Hence, the following chapter deals with the analysis of the TTs in Danish and Latvian.
7. TRANSLATION-ORIENTED TARGET TEXT ANALYSIS

The previous chapter dealt with a short description of the main aspects of power and ideology in the political interview and how the application of CDA to the ST may help translators to establish a better understanding of the social and situational context, participant relations and the role of the textual elements in the creation of power and ideological struggle in the text. This chapter provides a detailed insight into the CDA-related analysis of 10 translations of the respective political interview, 4 in Danish and 6 in Latvian. The main aim of this chapter is to compare the ST to TTs and analyze translators’ motivated choices of textual elements on the linguistic micro-level, the experiential, expressive or ideational values assigned to these elements as well as how their choices have contributed to the recreation of the rhetorical purpose and unequal power relations in the TT. Furthermore, the results of this analysis are expected to show whether the translators’ ability or inability to determine the social and situational context as well as ideological and power relations has had an impact on the quality of the translation and whether the awareness of the CDA framework had helped during the translation process.

The initial aim of the TT analysis was not only to focus on the translators’ text-level choices and errors, but to see whether there are any ideological differences between the representatives of both language cultures as well. However, this perspective towards TTs turned out to be inappropriate in this situation because Danish and Latvian ideological stances are embedded in democratic traditions. The results of the analysis would have been different if representatives from two more radically different cultures were chosen to perform the translation of the same ST. Hence, since every translator is considered to be an intercultural mediator, the analysis of TTs will be aimed at each translator’s individual interpretation (understanding) of the ST and context, and their choices on the textual, pragmatic and semantic levels, which may or may not reflect each translator’s specific linguistic, cultural and ideological characteristics. Prior the actual translation process, all translators received a translation brief which determined the translators’ orientation and choice of translation strategies:

*Please, provide a translation into Danish/Latvian of a political interview between a British journalist and King Mswati III of Swaziland. The translation was commissioned by a right-wing political magazine in Denmark/Latvia and the text is addressed to a target audience having a good understanding of the international political affairs.*
The translation brief provides information on the discourse, genre, purpose, target audience and the translation strategy to be employed in the translation of the ST. The type of genre places the translation within political discourse and remains unchanged since the question-and-answer format is a widely used layout for political interviews in political magazines both in Denmark and Latvia. The original purpose of the interview is both to inform and entertain the target audience having somewhat the same level of knowledge in international political affairs. This leads to the determination of the translation strategy of the text. In their research Hatim and Mason (1997:31) mention two types of translation strategies—dynamic and static. According to Hatim and Mason (ibid. 27), texts belonging to the static type display maximal cohesion and coherence. The intertextuality is not frequent and ST producer’s intentionality is opaque. On the contrary, the dynamic type of text has elaborate cohesion, problematic coherence, saturated intertextuality and obscure ST producer’s intentionality. These two types of texts partially correspond to two general dichotomies in translation studies: ST-oriented translation and TT-oriented translation or “free” or “literal” translation. In this analysis the terms “dynamic” and “static” will be applied, where “dynamic” describes a more free and creative approach to translation (oriented towards the effect of the TT) and “static” requires a fairly literal translation which is relatively close to the ST. This interview requires a dynamic approach due to the fact that the text contains elaborate sentence structures, linguistic choices which portray power and ideological struggle, stylistic devices (metaphors) and politeness structures.

Within CDA framework, translation is considered to be a communicative act which involves the production of a new target text in a new target culture. During this process of intercultural mediation, translators make minor or major changes to TTs. Thus, the following terms will be used to describe the changes made in the translation process: omission (the deletion of a textual element in the TT), addition (textual elements added in TT), substitution (SL element replaced with another more TL specific element) and adaptation (a ST element adapted to TL context) (Valdeón in Carr 2007:103). Furthermore, the linguistic choices made in the target texts will be described using concepts of the CDA framework within TS. The examples in both Danish and Latvian will be supported by a formal translation in English shown in square brackets. In order to be able to comment on the translators’ choices, a brief description of the linguistic and cultural differences between English, Danish and Latvian will be provided in the following sub-chapter.
7.1. **Linguistic and Cultural Perspective: Danish, English and Latvian**

The data used for the analysis are constituted by translations in Danish and Latvian. Thus, it is important to give a short insight into the differences among all three languages applied in this thesis. Danish (North Germanic) and English (West Germanic) both belong to the Germanic language group under the Indo-European language family (IE) and share some of the main morphological and grammatical features. Latvian is very different from English and Danish, and therefore needs a more detailed description since not everyone is familiar with the origins and characteristics of the Latvian language. Latvian (*latviešu valoda*) is an Indo-European language as well, which together with Lithuanian and the extinct Old Prussian constitutes the Baltic language group. The recent linguistic theories include Latvian in the so-called Balto-Slavic language group since some theorists consider that Latvian is more closely related to the Slavic branch than to any other Indo-European linguistic sub-division (Mathiassen 1997:19 and Young 2006:673). However, according to Mathiassen (ibid.) the similarities between Latvian and Slavic languages should not be exaggerated, because there is no whatsoever understanding between the representatives of these languages. There is a considerable critique regarding this language division among Latvian scholars due to the fact that the theoretical basis for this conclusion is rather unclear and mainly based on the analysis of the lexicon of the Latvian language which has been enriched throughout the history due to the considerable impact of the Russian language during the oppressive political regime.

Latvian with some 1.5 million speakers is the official language of the Republic of Latvia (Young 2006:725). Throughout its history, Latvian language has been mainly enriched by German, which has been the basis for the Latvian grammar. Due to the attractive geographical location of Latvia, the Baltic tribes have never had an independent state: first, Germans, Poles and Swedes (from 1200 – to 1700), and then again Germans and Russians (during both World Wars). The Republic of Latvia was founded in 1918, but soon after lost its independence once again to the Soviet Union. The Soviet occupation has been the most devastating for Latvia and the Latvian language, because thousands of Latvians were deported to Siberia and lost their lives there. Latvia regained its independence in 1991 and since then has been one of the fastest growing democratic (parliamentary system) economies in Europe as a member of the UN, NATO and the EU. Throughout the history, Latvians have succeeded in preserving their culture and language and the Northern European mentality.
Latvian has a phono-morphological spelling system (Latvian graphemes correspond almost perfectly to phonemes) and is considered to be one of the most perfect Latin-based spelling systems in the world. Latvian is a synthetic (inflectional) language, i.e. number, gender and case are inflected in the word. Latvian nouns have the masculine and feminine gender, each with three declension patterns. There are five cases, which are distinguished morphologically: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative and locative, in both singular and plural. Adjectives, definite and indefinite forms, agree with the noun in number, gender and case. The Latvian verb distinguishes present, past and future tenses, and has a system of relative tenses formed with “būt” (to be) and the past active participle. The verb has three conjugational types, each with a number of subtypes. Latvian lexicon has been strongly influenced by the German language and Baltic Finnic languages (extinct Livonian, Estonian and Finnish), and later a great number of borrowings appeared from Russian and English. The Latvian sentence structure is very complex and not fixed, but the most general word order in a simple sentence is SVO.

On the contrary, Danish and English are isolating languages, i.e. grammatical relationships are expressed through word order (SVO and VS), prepositions and auxiliary verbs. English and Danish have a relatively fixed word order, but in Danish the verb may also take the first position which is called inversion VS. The distinction is between the word order in the main clause and subordinate clauses. Danish nouns are inflected for number, gender and case. However, English nouns are inflected for number and case (genitive), but do not have a grammatical gender. There are two numbers (singular and plural) in Danish, two genders (common and neuter) and two cases (unmarked case and genitive), indefinite article *en* and neuter *et*. Danish verbs have four verb conjugations, no person or number distinction and thus no agreement with the subject. Personal pronouns show case distinction (nominative vs. oblique) as well as person and number distinction. Some possessive pronouns inflect adjectives and some just have one form in all uses. English determiners are similar to the general IE languages with a distinction between a definite “the” and indefinite article “a/an”. There are three types of verbs in English: regular and irregular with an inflected third-person singular present, and past tense and modal verbs (invariable, lack nonfinite and past forms).

---

7.2. Translation-oriented Target Text Analysis

Each translation is unique, because it reflects the translator’s interpretation of the ST and the production patterns of the TT based on the translator’s language skills, socio-cultural background knowledge, interpretation of situational and social context and the choice of textual elements, which all contribute to the creation of the overall rhetorical purpose of the TT. The translation process is a mediatory process, where translators use their socio-cultural and linguistic skills to produce a new independently functioning text in the TL. However, sometimes the lack of time, experience, language skills and inadequate input in the processes of interpretation of the ST and production of the TT may result in mismatches and even communication breakdown. In the previous chapter (Chapter 6) the analysis of the ST showed a number of aspects which may be important in the translation process of the respective political interview, i.e. the detection of lexical and grammatical elements which contribute to the creation of power and ideological struggle between the interlocutors, genre characteristics and background knowledge. This chapter provides a comparative analysis of both the ST and the TT, with an aim to understand how translators’ motivated choices of textual elements in the TT reproduce the ideological and power struggle present in the ST.

7.2.1. Politeness Strategies

In the previous chapter, it was stated that politeness forms are used to create unequal power relations in the form of formality between two interlocutors based on the differences in their social statuses: the King vs. the journalist. According to Levinson and Brown (1987), there are four types of politeness, from which the most common is positive and negative politeness, which is expressed using specific linguistic means, e.g. honorifics, hedges, etc. The basic rules for the formation of positive and negative politeness coincide in all three languages, i.e. the most frequent type of politeness in Danish, English and Latvian is negative politeness, which is formed using face-threat minimizing acts to avoid trespassing the addressee’s negative “face wants” for freedom of action and attitude unhindered. However, there is a difference in the usage of honorifics between Danish, English and Latvian. In Danish, the 2nd person plural pronoun “De” is used rarely and often only to address the Queen or a person of an honorable status. In English the 2nd person pronoun plural and singular forms “you” are not distinct in writing. Hence, the status and
the politeness are expressed using other forms of address (Sir/Madam, etc). Furthermore, in Latvian, honorifics are used much more often in comparison to Danish and English, because it is the standard form of address whenever turning to unfamiliar persons irrespective of their age, profession or social status. In writing the polite forms are always written with a capital letter: the 2nd person plural pronoun “Jūs” and 2nd person singular “Tu”. In Latvian and Danish translations, there are some instances where inappropriate and inconsistent usage of honorifics hinders the credibility of the translation and the transfer of the level of formality in the TT:

*Example in Danish (Appendix 7):* Når De ser tilbage på de ændringer, der er sket de sidste 10-15 år i Sydafrika og Mozambique, Jeres to nærmeste naboer, så er det meget positive demokratiseringer, og det er velkendt, at især Sydafrika gerne så Jer gå hen imod et mere konstitutionelt monarki. Har du haft sådanne samtaler med de sydafrikanske myndigheder?

*Formal translation from Danish* [When you (2nd person plural, polite form) look back at the changes that have taken place during the last 10-15 years in South Africa and Mozambique, your (2nd person plural, not polite form) two closest neighbors, there are very positive democratizations, and it is known that, especially South Africa, would like to see you (2nd person plural, not polite form) move towards a more constitutional monarchy. Do you (2nd person singular) have these kinds of talks with the South African authorities?]

This example shows inconsistencies in the usage of pronouns, which signals the fact that the translator has not been able to identify the addressee to whom these questions are addressed. First, the translator starts with using the polite form of the 2nd person plural pronoun “De” to address the King and then moves on using the 2nd person plural form “Jer/Jeres”, which addresses the entire nation of Swaziland. In the ST, the journalist uses the 2nd person pronoun “you” consistently and it is not possible to understand whether the first instance of “you” is addressed to the King or functions as an impersonal pronoun and is not directed to any addressee in particular. Further in the text the genitive “your” and the second instance “you” the 2nd person plural or singular “you” is used to either address only the King or the nation. The translator may freely decide which pronoun established coherence in the respective context. However, in the last question, the translator uses the 2nd person singular “du”, which does not match the formality requirements in the text. Additionally, the same translator has used the polite form of the 2nd person plural pronoun
“De” in the translation together with the form of address “Hr. Majæstet”, as an equivalent form of “Your Majesty” in English:

*Example in Danish (Appendix 7):* Hr. Majæstet, jeg byder Dem varmt velkommen. Hvilke faktorer, mener De, har opretholdt Deres absolutte monarkiske Afrika, når så mange andre har fejlet?

*Formal translation from Danish* [Mr. Majesty, a very warm welcome. What factors, do you (2nd person plural, polite form) think, have sustained yours (genitive 2nd person plural, polite form) monarchal Africa, while so many others have failed?]

The address form “Hr. Majæstet” does not match the formality criteria in Danish and is not an appropriate address form. The translator has not bothered to find the correct equivalent in the Danish language “Hans Majæstet” or “Deres Majæstet” (formal translation: His Majesty and Your Majesty). This is merely a spelling mistake where the translator has not looked up the standard form of address in Danish. Another example in Danish shows how the translator has failed to transfer the politeness forms in the TT:

*Example in Danish (Appendix 8):* En varm velkomst, Deres (genitive 2nd person plural, polite form) majestæt ... hvilke faktorer har efter din (genitive 2nd person singular, not polite form) mening været afgørende for at dit (genitive 2nd person singular), det sidste absolute monarki i Afrika, består, når så mange andre er faldet?

*Formal translation from Danish* [A very warm welcome, Your majesty...what factors, do you (2nd person singular,) think, have been decisive in the fact that your (genitive 2nd person singular) last absolute monarchy in Africa remains, when so many others have fallen?]

This example shows that the translator has not been attentive enough to determine the situational context and the unequal status between the interlocutors. The translator has failed to apply the Danish spelling rules in relation to capitalization of “Deres majæstet/Deres Majæstet” (Your Majesty). There are similar grammatical mistakes in Latvian TTs as well, which are connected to spelling errors and inadequate determination of the situational context, which violates the formality rules in Latvian:

*Example in Latvian (Appendix 1):* Jūsu Augstība, sveicinām jūs... Kādi faktori, jūsuprāt, ir palīdzējuši pastāvēt jūsu monarhijai Āfrikā, kamēr tik daudzas citas sistēmas ir kritušas?

*Formal translation from Latvian* [Your Majesty, we greet you... What factors, do you (2nd person plural, not polite form) think, have helped to
sustain your (2nd person plural, not polite form) monarchy in Africa, while many other systems have fallen?]

**Example in Latvian (Appendix 2):** Esiet sveicināts, Jūsu majestāte! Kādi faktori, jūsuprāt, ir palīdzējuši jums saglabāt pēdējo absolūto monarhisko valsti Āfrikā laikā, kad tik daudzas monarhijas ir kritušas?

**Formal translation from Latvian** [A warm welcome, Your majesty! What factors, do you (2nd person plural, not polite form) think, have helped to sustain your (2nd person plural, not polite form) monarchy in Africa, during the times when so many other monarchies have fallen?]

The usage of politeness forms in the translations is inconsistent. Both in Danish and Latvian, the translators use politeness forms randomly without following simple spelling rules, i.e. in Latvian and Danish the 2nd person plural polite form and the polite form of address Jūsu Majestāte/Deres Majæstet (Your Majesty) must be written with capital letters throughout the entire text. This way it is ensured that the formality is preserved in the TT as well. Furthermore, greetings belong to the expression of politeness as well. The next example shows how the translator’s choice of an inappropriate form of greeting in the respective context changes the level of formality:

**Example in Latvian (Appendix 3):** Labdien, Jūsu Majestāte...Kādi faktori, jūsuprāt, ir ietekmējuši to, ka Jūsu absolūtā monarhija ir pēdējā, kas ir saglabājusies Āfrikā?

**Formal translation from Latvian** [Hello/Good afternoon, Your Majesty… What factors, do you (2nd person plural, polite form) think, have influenced the fact that yours (2nd person plural, polite form) absolute monarchy remains as the last one in Africa?]

The form of greeting used in the Latvian version is rather neutral and does not apply to the rules for expressing social distance in Latvian. The greeting “Labdien!/Hello/Good afternoon” is usually used in a more informal context and not when addressing the King. Another problem in the translation of greetings is that the level of formality may be exaggerated by choosing highly formal forms of address, which is the case in one of the Latvian translations (Appendix 5):

**Example in Latvian (Appendix 5):** Jūsu Majestāte, man ir liels gods ar jums tikties. Kādi faktori, jūsuprāt, šauj pastāvēt Jūsu absolūtajai monarhijai, kas ir pēdējā Āfrikā palikusi, kad tik daudzas ir kritušas?

**Formal translation from Latvian** [Your Majesty, it is great honor for me to meet you. What factors, do you (2nd person plural, polite form) think,
have influences the fact that yours (2nd person plural, polite form) absolute monarchy remains as the last one in Africa?

As stated earlier in this chapter, there are two existing types of politeness (positive and negative), which are also present both in Danish and Latvian. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness is a cross-cultural phenomena and the construction of politeness according to such variables as power and social distance is similar in many cultures. Thus, it is possible to conclude that in English, Latvian and Danish it is mainly negative politeness which is used to address persons holding a higher social status. Additionally, most Danish and Latvian translators have successfully managed to transfer politeness forms such as hedges and acknowledgement into TL:

**Example in Latvian (Appendix 5):** *Es saprotu, ka nezināmais sākumā bieži liekas šokējošs, bet es vēlos noskaidrot:* kāpēc svazilendieši poligāmijai piešķir tik lielu vērtību? Ko tas dod Svazilendas sabiedrībai?

**Formal translation from Latvian** [I understand that the unknown may seem shocking at first, but I would like to know why is polygamy so valued by the Swazis is? What does it bring to Swazi society?]

**Example in Danish (Appendix 9):** *Jeg accepterer, at det ukendte ofte virker chokerende ved første øjekast, men det, jeg spørger Dem om, er: Hvorfor er polygami så højt værdsat hos Swazi-folket? Hvad tilfører det Swazi-samfundet?

**Formal translation from Danish** [I accept that the unknown may often seem shocking at the first glance, but what I am asking you is: why is polygamy so highly valued by the Swazi people? What does it bring to Swazi society?]

However, the translation of politeness may be unsuccessful if the positive politeness hedge is replaced with an adverb with a negative connotation and the positive politeness becomes a bald-on record strategy (positive politeness + face threatening act) in TL:

**Example in Latvian (Appendix 4):** *Jūsu majestāte, šī tēma nodarbina cilvēkus visā pasaulē, visvairāk jautājumu esam saprēmuši par poligāmiju, jūsu ģimeni un privāto dzīvi. Kāda ir poligāmijas vērtība mūsdienu pasaulē, kad vairākums sabiedrību ir monogāmas?*

**Formal translation from Latvian** [Your Majesty, this is **one of the things** that preoccupy the people’s minds all over the world….]

The translator has failed to recognize the positive politeness strategy used to minimize the impact of the direct question regarding the King’s personal situation and has transferred a
direct reproach in the TL. Politeness is one of the most basic forms of expressing unequal power relations, and it is important for a translator to transfer the same type of politeness in TL (hedges and honorifics). 4 out of 10 translations have followed the Danish and Latvian spelling rules and have successfully transferred the formality level in both languages. The translators’ inability to transfer the politeness forms in TL may be related to the lack of time, inattentiveness or simply negligence of the context, which results in the fact that the power relations between participants are depicted unclearly and do not have the same effect in the TL.

7.2.2. Vocabulary and Grammatical Structures

Text producers assign values (experiential, relational and expressive) to their lexical and grammatical choices, which express their interpretation of the ST producer’s intended meaning as well as their attitude towards the topic or participants in question. According to CDA, the text producers’ choices are always motivated and the particular linguistic elements have a specific effect on the reader. The vocabulary in this political interview consists of two opposite semantic fields: the Western democratic ideology opposed to the Swazi tribal customs. In CDA framework within TS, it is considered that the translators’ choices reflect their own unique interpretation of the two respective ideological stances as well as the translators’ or text producers’ personal ideological and cultural background. The following examples from both Danish and Latvian translations will show how translators have managed to translate the ST producers’ intentions into TL and whether the translators’ linguistic and grammatical choices transfer the desired effect in TL. Some of the most problematic areas in TTs are connected with the translation of the opening passage of this political interview and the transfer of the exact word meaning in TL. 5 out of 10 translators have managed to transfer the correct meaning of the word “landlocked” (surrounded by land) in the TL:

Example in Latvian (Appendix 1): Šī karaliste, kas robežojas ar Dienvidāfriku un Mozambiku, cieš no hroniskas nabadžības un pārtikas trūkuma.

Formal translation from Latvian [This kingdom which is bordered by South Africa and Mozambique suffers from chronic poverty and food shortages.]

In this example the translator has deliberately omitted the word “landlocked”, which automatically fails to convey the geographical information of the country. In other
translations the translators have misunderstood the meaning of the word and have failed to transfer the correct meaning in the TL:

Example in Danish (Appendix 9): Dette lukkede kongerige, der grænser op til Sydafrika og Mozambique, lever i evig fattigdom og mangel på mad.

**Formal translation from Danish** [This closed kingdom which borders with South Africa and Mozambique lives in constant poverty and food shortages.]

Example in Latvian (Appendix 3): Slēgtā karaliste, kurai ir robeža ar Dienvidāfrikas Republiku un Mozambiku, cieš no hroniskas nabadzības un bada.

**Formal translation from Latvian** [The closed kingdom, which borders with South Africa and Mozambique, suffers from chronic poverty and famine.]

Here the translators may not have looked up the English word “landlocked” in the dictionary and have chosen a word which describes the political regime of absolute monarchy instead, i.e. “locked” from the outside world. In the Latvian translation, two aspects of the translator’s personal attitude (expressive values) towards the subject of the interview must be underlined: the choice of the words “locked” and “famine” signifies the translator’s background knowledge regarding the situation in Africa. This may be attributed to the translator’s individual interpretation of the ST context. Translators act as intercultural mediators and the TT readers receive their interpretation of the text as an end-product. If the translator fails to interpret the context, the readers are not able to retrieve the information actually conveyed in the ST. However, there are some very creative examples in both Danish and Latvian which convey the correct meaning of the word “landlocked” by paraphrasing the word. Thus, the translators have explained the word (referred to as adaptation or substitution in TS) instead:

Example in Danish (Appendix 10): Dette kongerige, som er omgivet af land, og som grænser op til Sydafrika og Mozambique, lider under kronisk fattigdom og fødevaremangel.

**Formal translation from Danish** [This kingdom, which is surrounded by land and which is bordered by South Africa and Mozambique, suffers from chronic poverty and food shortages.]

Example in Latvian (Appendix 6): Šī karalīvalsts, kam nav jūras robežas un kas robežojas ar Dienvidāfrikas un Mozambiku, cieš no hroniskas nabadzības un pārtikas trākuma.
Formal translation from Latvian [This kingdom, which does not have any coastline and which is bordered by South Africa and Mozambique, suffers from chronic poverty and food shortages.]

The latter indicates that the translator’s background knowledge of the social context is very important in the process of translating political texts. The translator as mediator conveys culture-specific information from the SL to TL and must be able to provide explanation of specific cultural terms which are only found in SL or find the equivalent expressions in the TL to match the exact wording in SL. If the translator is not able to retrieve the information in SL and fails to choose the correct TL equivalent, it may cause an unreliable translation. The following example may be connected to the translators’ lack of background knowledge:

Example in Danish (Appendix 7): Dagens interview foregår i et af verdens sidste absolute monarkier, men kongen af Swazilands magt er blevet udsat for prøvelser.

Formal translation from Danish [Today’s interview takes place in one of the world’s last absolute monarchies, but the power of the King of Swaziland has been challenged.]

Example in Latvian (Appendix 4): Šodienas intervija notiek vienā no pasaules nedaudzājām absolūtājām monarhijām, tomēr Svazilandes karalē varai bijuši arī izaičinājumi.

Formal translation from Latvian [Today’s interview takes place in one of the few absolute monarchies in the world, however, the power of the King of Swaziland has had challenges as well.]

Only 2 out of 10 translators have made the same mistake which conveys dubious information to the target readers. It is not possible to explain why both translators have chosen to translate the English sentence “in the world’s last absolute monarchies” into “one of the last remaining absolute monarchies”, but it may be attributed to the fact that the translators have failed to establish basic background knowledge about the respective subject matter. Additionally, the choice of inappropriate terms in the TL and the confusion of the SL terms may lead to misunderstandings:

Example in Danish (Appendix 7): Ikke desto mindre er lignende styrer over hele Afrika blevet erstattet gennem årene og årterne af republikker, af valgte præsidenter eller præsidentstyrer. Findes der et lignende pres for at få sådan et system her?

Formal translation from Danish [Nonetheless, similar systems throughout the entire Africa have been replaced over the years and decades by republics,
elected presidents or presidential systems. Is there a similar pressure for this kind of system here?

The translator has failed to find a corresponding political term in the TL and instead of transferring the SL sentence “by republics, by elected parliamentary or presidential systems” the translator has translated “elected presidents or presidential systems”, which conveys very different information to the target readers and does not emphasize the types of democratic political systems according to the ST producer’s (journalist’s) intentions. The same problem occurs in one of the Latvian translations as well, which is connected to a wrong choice of a noun and which results in an entirely different message in the TL:

Example in Latvian (Appendix 6): Jūsu Majestāte, esiet sveicināts šisdienas raidījumā! Kādi faktori, jūsuprāt, noteikuši to, ka esat pēdējais Afrikas absolūtais monarhs, lai gan daudzi citi ir krituši?

Formal translation from Latvian [Your Majesty, welcome to our today’s program! What factors, do you think, have determined the fact that you are the last absolute monarch in Africa, even though so many others have fallen/have been killed?]

The translator has chosen a term “krituši” (the verb contains information on gender (masculine) and number in Latvian: they are fallen), which in Latvian has a very different connotation and meaning. It is true that the term carries figurative meaning and is usually used in a different discourse (mostly referred to wartime, e.g. regarding the death of soldiers). However, it is possible to use the term together with abstract nouns in Latvian, e.g. system or power. This example indicates that the translator has failed to establish the correct genre of the political interview as well by not reading the translation brief properly, e.g. the translator has added “Your Majesty, welcome to our today’s program!” in the greeting, which is not required in the translation brief as the translation has been commissioned by a political magazine.

One of the most important elements in the analysis of ST vocabulary was the metaphor “an island of dictatorship in the sea of democracy”, which sums up the core concepts of the Western ideology represented by the journalist in this political interview. Almost all translators have preserved the metaphor in their translations and have successfully transferred the meaning in the TL (as shown in tables No. 7.2.2.A (Danish) and table No. 7.2.2.B (Latvian)):
Most of the translators have translated the metaphor directly employing a word-for-word strategy, which in this case is an appropriate solution (Appendices 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9). The word “sea” in both Danish and Latvian is widely used to denote an abundance of objects and is often found in a number of colloquial metaphorical expressions, e.g. “et hav af mennesker” (a sea of people) or “cilvēku jūra” (a sea of people). However, there are both some creative and some problematic solutions to the translation of the respective metaphor. One of the problematic examples is the translation in Danish (Appendix 7), where the translator has not transferred the original meaning of the metaphor “en diktatorø i et demokratisk farvand” (an island of dictators in democratic waters). There are some successful examples where the translator has emphasized the ST producer’s words (Appendix 10) “en dikatorisk ø i et ocean af demokrati” (an island of dictatorship in an ocean of democracy), where the choice of the word “ocean” strengthens the effect of the metaphor in the TL. In one of the Latvian translations (Appendix 4), the translator has used the diminutive form of the noun “sala” (an island) – “saliņa” (a small island), which

Table No. 7.2.2.A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Danish</th>
<th>Formal translation in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>“en diktatorø i et demokratisk farvand”</td>
<td>An island of dictators in democratic waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>“en dikatorisk ø i et hav af demokrati”</td>
<td>An island of dictatorship in a sea of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>“en diktaturo i et hav af demokrati”</td>
<td>An island of dictatorship in a sea of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>”en dikatorisk ø i et ocean af demokrati”</td>
<td>An island of dictatorship in an ocean of democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table No. 7.2.2.B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Latvian</th>
<th>Formal translation in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“diktatūras sala demokrātijas jūrā”</td>
<td>An island of dictatorship in a sea of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“diktatūras sala demokrātijas jūrā”</td>
<td>An island of dictatorship in a sea of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“diktatūras sala demokrātijas jūrā”</td>
<td>An island of dictatorship in a sea of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“diktatūras saliņa demokrātijas jūrā”</td>
<td>A small island of dictatorship in a sea of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>“diktatūras sala demokrātijas jūrā”</td>
<td>An island of dictatorship in a sea of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>”diktatoriska režīma sala demokrātijas jūrā”</td>
<td>An island of a dictatorial regime in the sea of democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
matches the social context and underlines the fact that Swaziland is the only country left in the sea of democratic political systems in the world.

As described in the previous chapter (Chapter 6), belonging to a particular ideology may be expressed through over-lexicalization. In this interview the King uses nouns “the King”, “the people”, “the Swazis” and the 3rd person singular pronoun “he”, which function as contextual synonyms in this text; it helps to divert the responsibility for his actions to the people of Swaziland (active agent). The translators have successfully preserved the pattern in both Danish and Latvian, which conveys the ST producer’s (the King’s) wish to hide agency:

**ST version:** King: The King of Swaziland is the king by the people. All that the king does whenever he rules the country, there is always the process of consulting the people and every decision he makes is a result of the contribution of the people. So, that makes the monarchy always in touch with the people.

**Example in Latvian (Appendix 3):** Svazilandes karalis ir tautas karalis. It visā, ko karalis dara, ir jāņem vērā tautas viedoklis, un katrā lēmumā, ko tas pienem, ir tautas ieguldījums. Tādējādi monarhija nekad nezaudē kontaktu ar tautu.

**Formal translation from Latvian** [The King of Swaziland is the king of people. All that the king does is in concert with the people and every decision the king makes is the people’s contribution. Thus, the monarchy does not lose the contact with the people.]

**Example in Danish (Appendix 10):** Kongen af Swaziland er en konge af folket. Det eneste kongen gør, når han leder landet, er altid at gennemgå processen, hvor der rådføres med folket og hver eneste beslutning han träffer er et resultat af et bidrag fra folket. Så det gør, at monarkiet altid er i kontakt med folket.

**Formal translation from Danish** [The King of Swaziland is the king of people. All that the king does whenever he rules the country, there is always the process of consulting the people and every decision he makes is a result of the contribution of the people. Thus, the monarchy is always in touch with the people.]

In both language versions the translators have preserved the parallel structures and chosen to use only one noun, e.g. the Danish “folket” (the people) and the Latvian “tauta” (the people). Other translators have chosen to vary the term by using contextual synonyms to establish a natural flow of language such as “pilsoņi” (the citizens on the country, Appendix 1), „nācija” (nation, Appendix 2), „cilvēki” (people/human beings in general - very neutral term in Latvian, Appendix 4). Additionally, none of the translators has
changed the agency (active or passive subjects). This may be attributed to the fact that both languages, Danish and Latvian, are mainly SVO languages, where the subject usually is the active member in the sentence and takes the initial position. However, some of the translators have attempted to add an active subject in the places where the passive is used in English ST (Is there pressure here for that kind of system?):

*Example in Latvian (Appendix 4):* Tomēr lidzīgas sistēmas Āfrikā gadu desmitu laikā ir aizstājušas republikas, parlamentāras vai prezidentālas sistēmas. Vai šāda veida sistēma izjūt spiedienu?

*Formal translation from Latvian* [Nonetheless, similar systems across Africa through decades have been replaced by republics, parliamentary and presidential systems. Does this kind of system experience pressure?]

Here the translator has attempted to turn the passive ST sentence (with a dummy subject “there”) into an active one in Latvian, but unfortunately, the choice of the noun “system” as an active subject does not convey the exact meaning of the ST. Furthermore, some translators have added an extra subject in the translation, e.g.:

*Example in Latvian (Appendix 3):* Vai Jūs tādēļ neizjūtat spiedienu?

*Formal translation from Latvian* [Don’t you (2nd person plural, polite form) feel pressure because of this?]

*Example in Danish (Appendix 8):* Presser folket ikke på for at skifte til et lignende system?

*Formal translation from Danish* [Are people not making pressure to change to a similar system?]

The translators have changed the passive agency to an active one either due to the fact that the translators have not been content with the passive sentence structure in the TL or they have simply replaced the adverb “here” with an active subject “the people” in the Danish version, and the subject “you” as to refer to the King in the Latvian version. Both solutions are more direct than the passive structure in the SL, but they are both acceptable solutions if the aim is to make the TL version sound more natural.

The above-mentioned TT analysis in both Danish and Latvian revealed a number of problems related to the translation of political texts. Even though the text type required a fairly dynamic translation, most of the translators have used the static strategy to translation and have applied a very literal approach. Hence, most of the translations reflect the SL structures (both in Danish and Latvian), which hinders the level of perception of the TT. It may be related to the phenomenon of “foreignizing”, i.e. the usage of borrowing
from the English language and grammatical structures, but may also be related to the lack of time and accuracy during the fulfillment of the translation task. There are a great number of linguistic, grammatical and semiotic inaccuracies in the translations, which signify the fact that the translators have not been able to get fully acquainted with the translation brief and the situational and social contexts of the ST and TTs. Thus, the credibility of the translation suffers. According to Hatim and Mason (1997:176), the texture and structure are at risk when the context is misinterpreted. It seems that most of the translators have been able to understand the ideological and power struggle between the two participants (the journalist and the King), but have not been able to determine what textual means are used to create the respective power struggle in the ST and have not been able to transfer the same effect in the TL. There are, however, a number of very good solutions where translators have applied translation strategies to explain or substitute a SL term with a more natural equivalent term in the TL in order to make the TT more accessible to the target reader.

Both the ST and TT analysis provides a very short insight into the problems and solutions present in the TTs, but it is a good foundation for further research in the respective field of the CDA framework within TS. The translation quality has suffered not only due to the fact that the translations were done on a voluntary basis, but also to the fact that the translators did not have a ready-made framework at hand, which would provide them with tools for the analysis of the ST and certain guidelines which are necessary in the translation of culture-bound political texts. Most of the translators failed to pay attention to the situational and social contexts, background information, linguistic choices, semantic and pragmatic relations in the text and thus created fairly literal translations causing some misunderstandings in the TL. These findings prove the fact that the translation brief alone is not enough to provide the translators with the valuable information regarding the underlying power and ideological struggles in political texts and thus leads to the conclusion that CDA framework may become a useful tool, which would help the translators to perform a critical analysis of the ST at the initial stage of the translation process. Furthermore, the implementation of the CDA framework in translator training would provide the future translators with an analytic tool which helps them to establish a step-by-step procedure for the analysis of the ST and the production of the TT, which would raise their awareness of the importance of the role of language in the socio-cultural context as well as the impact of their own textual choices in the translation process.
CONCLUSIONS

The main aim of this thesis was to prove the hypothesis that CDA is a helpful tool in the translation process of political texts. The CDA integration in translation is a very new field within TS and has not been researched extensively. The existing research – contains a variety of approaches and considerations and does not provide an applicable model for translation-oriented analysis of both STs and TTs within political discourse. Thus, this thesis deals with the integration of Norman Fairclough’s CDA model into the translation process of political texts, i.e. in this thesis the material for the analysis was a political interview. The integration of the CDA model in the translation process was based on the earlier considerations within TS by such CDA/TS scholars as Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1990; 1997), Christina Schäffner (1997; 2002; 2003; 2004), Robert S. Valdeón (2007), etc. The framework created in this thesis may be considered as an optional supplementary tool or a set of guidelines for the ST and TT analysis during the process of translation of highly culture-bound political texts which display significant power and ideological struggle between the interlocutors of the communicative act.

In this thesis the modern approach to TS prevails, which considers translation as a communicative act between the SL and TL cultures and which involves the interpretation of the text producer’s intended meaning in the ST, the production of a new communicative act in the TL and the interpretation (understanding) of the end-product of the translation process – the TT. According to CDA, the act of text interpretation and production takes place within a particular socio-cultural context and thus, language is influenced by the social context and is used to sustain or change the social context and participant relationships as well. Hence, the act of translation takes place in a particular socio-cultural setting and it is determined by the purpose of the translation, the commissioner’s request, the target audience, the type of genre and translator’s socio-cultural, as well as linguistic background knowledge and experience. Every act of text interpretation or text production takes place on the basis of the Member’s Resources (MRs) of the translator, which constitute the translator’s individual interpretation of the ST, ability to determine the social and situational context of the communicative act and to understand the ST producer’s intended meaning. The translator’s interpretation of the ST is then used to create a new TT in another culture according to the lexical and grammatical constraints of the TL. In CDA and TS every text is considered to contain the text producer’s intentions to create a certain rhetorical purpose which may or may not be explicit. The term
“mediation” may be attributed to both CDA and TS, which means that text producers, ST producers and TT producers’ beliefs and values are embedded in the text production and may reflect their individual attitudinal meaning towards the subject of the text. CDA alone and within TS is used to uncover the attitudinal meaning, which typically creates power and ideological struggle in texts between the interlocutors (target audience, readers or participants of an interview). The CDA framework described in this thesis is based on three stages of analysis defined by Norman Fairclough (1989), i.e. description (text-linguistic analysis), interpretation (assigning pragmatic values to textual features) and explanation (the social and situational context in terms of power and ideological struggle). During the communicative event or the translation process, all three stages co-occur simultaneously and cannot be viewed separately. For instance, in the translation process, the translator draws upon his/her linguistic background knowledge and interprets (understands) the ST intended meaning according to the social and situational context within which the communicative event takes place in. Furthermore, the translator’s interpretation of the ST may be shaped by an ideological membership, e.g. right-wing or left-wing ideology. In the production of the TT, the translator may adopt a neutral stance and reproduce the text with no ideological implications in the TL. However, the translator may embed his/her ideological stance in the choice of certain linguistic and grammatical patterns, which then create a different meaning in the TL and which creates the target reader’s assumptions of the TT, not allowing the target reader to access the original ST meaning.

The CDA framework may be applied to TS in three ways: a) as an auxiliary tool for critical analysis of the ST prior to the translation process, b) for the analysis of the translator’s role in the creation of power and ideological struggle in the TT and c) for the analysis of the translator’s choices in the recreation of the power and ideological struggle in the TT. Approaches b) and c) require a comparative analysis of the ST and the TT. In this thesis, the CDA framework is applied for the analysis of the ST (a) and the analysis of the translators’ textual choices in the reproduction of power and ideological relations in the TT (c). The application of the CDA framework to the ST and the TT may be summed up in the following way:

a. the interpretation (understanding) of the ST or the TT on a descriptive level;

b. the establishment of the type of genre;

c. the establishment of the social and situational context;
d. the text-linguistic analysis of the lexis, grammatical and textual structures;

e. the explanation of the textual material in terms of the intended meaning, power and ideological implications, social relations between interlocutors;

(the following is related to the TT production)

f. the establishment of the TT purpose and target audience;

g. the establishment of the TT genre;

h. the establishment of the social and situational context for the TT;

i. the application of text-linguistic material in the TL according to TL lexical and grammatical constraints;

j. the reproduction of power and ideological struggle, intended meaning and relations between interlocutors in the TT.

The above-mentioned guidelines were applied to the analysis of the ST – a political interview between the BBC journalist Allan Little and the King of Swaziland Mswati III. The ST analysis revealed two types of power in the ST: unequal power relations and unequal power relations with cross-cultural differences. First, it was concluded that the type of genre determines the roles of participants, i.e. the interviewer and the interviewee, where the journalist is in the position of the powerful participant who is entitled to determine the flow of the interview by asking questions. However, due to the social status, the King is the powerful participant and thus may choose to collaborate with the journalist or not, and determines the level of formality between the two participants. Additionally, the unequal power relations with cross-cultural differences reflect different social roles between the participants: the journalist implicitly represents the democratic Western society, whereas the King represents the last absolute monarchy in the world. Both types of power are exercised through textual means. In order to establish an appropriate level of formality and ensure collaboration, the journalist uses politeness forms (positive and negative) in the form of honorifics and specific forms of address (titles). Furthermore, the ideological struggle between two world views takes place through the usage of lexis and grammatical structures, e.g. vocabulary and stylistic devices (metaphor, parallel structures) belonging to the democratic ideology, animate and inanimate agency and over-lexicalization. The ST analysis establishes a general overview of the text-linguistic level of the ST and helps the translators to become aware of the social and situational context of the ST, the formation of power and ideological relations in the text.
and the ST producers’ intended meaning. Furthermore, the ST analysis prepares the translators for the translation process by helping them to anticipate the possible cross-cultural differences between the SL and TL.

The TT analysis was based on 10 translations (4 in Danish and 6 Latvian). Prior to the translation task, all voluntary translators received a translation brief including the specification of the translation purpose, TT genre and the target audience. The main aim of the TT analysis was to analyze the translators’ choices on the text-linguistic level and how their choices have contributed to the re-creation of the power and ideological struggle between the ST producers (the journalist and the King). It was not possible to analyze the translators’ ideological motivations behind the production of the TT due to the fact that the translation brief specified the adoption of the right-wing ideology and all translators’ ideological and political belonging was rooted in democratic traditions. In order to be able to analyze the differences between translators’ ideological assumptions, it was necessary to choose either two different translation briefs, specifying different purposes and target audiences or choosing translators from radically different cultures.

The aim of the TT analysis was to assess the translators’ ability to interpret the social and situational context of the ST and the TT and to reproduce the power and ideological struggle present in the TT on the basis of their choices on the text-linguistic level. The results of the TT analysis revealed that only a few translators had successfully managed to convey the power and ideological struggle in the TL by following the TL rules for the creation of the corresponding formality level and politeness, as well as following the specifications mentioned in the translation brief. The most common text-level errors may be related to inadequate interpretation of the social and situational contexts (lack of background knowledge - intertextual and interdiscursive knowledge), as well as the ST producer’s intended meaning (mistranslation of lexical choices) and inability to detect and recreate the ideological and power relations in the TT (inconsistent usage of politeness markers and forms of address). The text-level errors may be attributed to the fact that the translations were performed on a voluntary basis; also, the translators’ lack of time and commitment to the fulfillment of the translation may have been one of the major drawbacks which have affected the quality of the translations.

The results of the TT analysis show that most translators have not been able or have failed to pay attention to the power and ideological struggle in the respective political text and have not transferred the same effect in the TL. This may be allocated to
the fact that they have not had access to or knowledge of a set of guidelines for the
detection of power and ideological phenomena in political texts. The CDA framework
gives an insight into the three stages of the cognitive process of meaning-making during
text interpretation and production, which raises the translators’ awareness to their personal
linguistic choices, ideological and cultural standpoint and background knowledge. The
CDA framework provides a clear-cut explanation of how power and ideological relations
are created on the text-linguistic level and which lexical and grammatical choices may be
used to recreate the same effect in the TL. Furthermore, the CDA framework may become
a useful tool for the professional training of the future translators due to the fact that it
establishes a set of guidelines which specify certain steps in the translation process such as
the importance of the social and situational context, genre conventions in both SL and TL,
cross-cultural differences of pragmatic phenomena (politeness, formality), intertextuality
and interdiscursivity, the existing ideological and power relations in the ST and the TT, as
well as the impact of translators’ lexical and grammatical choices on the overall rhetorical
purpose of the TT.
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