

ARTICLE

## Manipulating De/Legitimation in Translation of Political Discourse

Rasool Moradi-Joz<sup>1\*</sup> Elham Kavandi<sup>2</sup>

1. Translation Studies, Department of English Language and Literature, University of Zanjan, Zanjan, 45371, Iran

2. TEFL, Department of English Language and Literature, Farhangiyan University of Zanjan, Zanjan, 45371, Iran

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

*Article history:*

Received: 3 November 2018

Accepted: 7 December 2018

Published: 23 January 2019

*Keywords:*

Translation studies

Critical discourse analysis (CDA)

Political discourse analysis

Modality

De/legitimation

Manipulation

This study seeks to gain an insight into political speech subtitle, focusing on de/legitimation as a macro-linguistic discursive strategy reflecting micro-linguistic discursive strategies so as to exemplify as to how such a discursive representation could be mediated through translation as a socio-communicative action and translation studies as a growing interdisciplinary field of inquiry. To this end, a twofold theoretical framework at both macro-linguistic and micro-linguistic levels is employed – consisting of a quadruple categorization of legitimation developed by Van Leeuwen (2008)<sup>[38]</sup> on political discourse (PD) and Fairclough's (2003)<sup>[12]</sup> critical discourse analysis (CDA) model on linguistic modality – to analyze one of the political speeches delivered by the Iranian former president Mahmood Ahmadinejad and subtitled into English by MEMRITV (Middle East Media Research Institute TV). The results, confirming political discourse and its translation as a means of de/legitimation, indicate that although there are no overt manipulations regarding the discourse of de/legitimation in the target text (TT), the manipulation of micro-linguistic device of modality constitutes a degree of covert manipulation of de-legitimizing discourse, altering the author's (the source text enunciator's) commitment to truth. It is concluded that viewing translation of political discourse as a means of de/legitimation in the context of micro-linguistic aspects such as modality could probably open a fruitful avenue to discourse studies in general and translation studies in particular. However, to comparatively achieve more reliable and informative results, adopting eclectic approaches to the critical study of PD seems to be more promising.

### 1. Introduction

Critical discourse analysis (henceforth CDA) has led to a rather innovative way of conducting research in the fields of sociolinguistics, psychology, and social sciences. Emanating, in part, from its interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary nature, CDA has benefitted from different perspectives and fields of study. The linguistic theory that CDA and Critical Linguistics (CL) (subsumed by CDA) has traditionally drawn upon is Halliday's (1994)<sup>[19]</sup> Systemic-Functional Grammar,

which has to do with the function of language in the social structure (Fowler et al., 1979;<sup>[16]</sup> Fowler, 1991,<sup>[15]</sup> Kress & Hodge, 1979).<sup>[22]</sup>

In CDA, the approach is critical in the sense that it is both linguistically- and socially-oriented. It is not a mere description of language and the formal features of discourse but it aims at explaining the dialectic relationship among language, society, power, and ideology. In other words, CDA investigates the role of language in social contexts and the interrelations of power and

*\*Corresponding Author:*

Rasool Moradi-Joz, Lecturer,

Department of English Language and Literature, University of Zanjan, Zanjan, 45371, Iran;

Email: [moradijoz@gmail.com](mailto:moradijoz@gmail.com).

hegemony in society.

As Moradi-Joz et al. (2014)<sup>[24]</sup> contend, if CDA pertains to the discursive reproduction of the abuse of power (or the resistance against it) encoded within ideologically-laden terms, then translation may further enhance, mitigate or even avoid such domination by de-emphasizing the type of discourse structure that expresses or signals relationships of domination. Moreover, since ideological structures are typically polarized (between emphasizing OUR good things versus THEIR bad things), translations may further contribute to this strategy or downtone it.

Within the scope of de/legitimation, what has almost remained underexplored in translation studies, the study seeks to examine and uncover the ideological moves behind a speech fragment from Iranian former President Mahmood Ahmadinejad and its English subtitle. Once these de/legitimizing ideologies are discovered, it would be possible to see the interconnection between the linguistic behaviors and ideological motivations in both the ST and the TT.

According to Van Dijk (2003),<sup>[34]</sup> since CDA is not a specific direction of research, it does not have a unitary theoretical framework. Critical research on discourse, however, needs to satisfy a number of requirements in order to effectively realize its aims viz. dealing with political issues and discourse, resistance, legitimation, and dominance, and applying multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks. The need for applying eclectic approaches to critical study of political discourse is also emphasized by many researchers (see, e.g., Wodak's (2015)<sup>[42]</sup>; Van Leeuwen (2008),<sup>[38]</sup> Dunmire 2012,<sup>[7]</sup> Moradi-Joz et al. 2018a).<sup>[25]</sup>

All of these tenets, it seems, could directly feed into modern TS. By applying the methods of critical discourse analysis, one would be able to detect possible language manipulation in translations, news, speeches and so on within different aspects of language such as nominalization, topicalization, passivization, modality, etc.

## 2. CDA-Driven TS

CDA can bridge the gap between microstructures and macrostructures of a language by using power relations and ideology (for the most part, subconscious) to decide which part of the manifestation of reality in a text is made salient, insignificant, vague or even entirely omitted. Similarly, modern translation studies have increasingly taken into account the complexities of power relations and ideological management involved in the production of translations. The CDA of translated texts which should be performed along with its ST makes the work complicated and doubles the complexity.

The relationship between language and politics has

seen increasing interest within the last two decades especially in the linguistic (sub-) disciplines of Critical Linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis, and Political Discourse Analysis (see Fairclough and Wodak 1997,<sup>[11]</sup> Chilton 2004,<sup>[3]</sup> Chilton and Schäffner 1997),<sup>[4]</sup> and also in the neighboring disciplines of rhetoric, philosophy, and sociology (e.g. Habermas 1981,<sup>[17]</sup> Foucault 1971,<sup>[14]</sup> Bourdieu 1982)<sup>[1]</sup> (Schäffner 2007: 134–135).<sup>[29]</sup>

Within the domain of translation studies, however, as Schäffner (2004: 3)<sup>[28]</sup> argues: "Political Discourse Analysis has not yet paid sufficient attention to aspects of translation. Within the discipline of Translation Studies, aspects of politics have been considered more frequently." Political texts in translation have, it is to be mentioned, been the object of study for a number of scholars. To Puurtinen (1998<sup>[27]</sup> in Chesterman 2000: 178)<sup>[5]</sup> embedded (or unintentional, implicit, and or subconscious) ideological meanings are of interest in Translation Studies, "firstly because ideologies of societies and cultures are different, and secondly because the lexico-grammatical realization of ideology is likely to vary in different languages. However, very few CDA-oriented studies of translation have been carried out so far (Hatim & Mason 1997,<sup>[20]</sup> Knowles and Malmkjaer 1989)."<sup>[21]</sup>

Hatim and Mason (1997)[20 ] analyzed a translated political speech by the late Ayatollah Khomeini, which is characterized as a 'hybrid genre,' appearing to be part-political, part-religious sermon, and part-legal deontology. Their study reveals variation of tenor, cohesion, transitivity, and style-shifting.

Calzada Pérez (2001,<sup>[2]</sup> as in Schäffner 2007)<sup>[29]</sup> applied a three-level model to the analysis of translated speeches in the European Parliament (Spanish – English). Her analysis, carried out through surface description, illocutionary explanation and (socio-political) perlocutionary explanation, reveals a broad variety of translational shifts which were intended to help target texts to be more readable. Calzada Pérez's analysis combines descriptive translation studies, critical discourse analysis, and cultural studies.

Stage (2002)<sup>[30]</sup> compared three Danish versions of a speech by the former American president Bill Clinton which had been interpreted simultaneously, subtitled for television, and subsequently translated for Newspapers. Her study reveals potentials and constraints in these three different types of interlingual transfer.

In 2004, Ebru Diriker,<sup>[6]</sup> gaining the main insight of the work from her dissertation, published a perceptive book on conference interpreting in which she approached interpreters' presence and performance from two distinct perspectives including the de-contextual-

ized (meta-discursive) and contextualized (real life and performance) discourses. She made use of an eclectic approach of CDA encapsulating the models of (Fairclough 1992,<sup>[8]</sup> 1995,<sup>[9]</sup> 1997;<sup>[10]</sup> Van Dijk 1987,<sup>[31]</sup> 1990,<sup>[32]</sup> 1997;<sup>[33]</sup> Wodak 1996,<sup>[40]</sup> 1997)<sup>[41]</sup> and her extrapolations of this analytical framework, along with certain other theoretical concepts and views on 'discourse' and 'constitution of meaning' in language to explore the more immediate social and interactional contexts of two conference interpreters at a specific event, which was a two day colloquium on 'Martin Heidegger and Hanna Arendt: Metaphysics and Politics'. While delving into the macro-contexts (the de-contextualized discourses) was fulfilled through a number of meta-discursive elements such as the discourse of general reference books, the discourse of professional organizations, the discourse of Turkish academia and media, and so on, the analysis of micro-contexts (the contextualized and immediate discourses), following in the footsteps of Cicourel, was relied heavily on ethnographic material (field observation and interview) as well as the transcript recording of actual simultaneous interpreting performance. In the conclusion to her work, she hinted at the more manipulative nature of interpretations in the contextualized (immediate) discourse as compared to the de-contextualized one.

In a case study, Moradi-Joz et al. (2014)<sup>[24]</sup> examined ideological manipulation in the subtitle of a speech fragment by Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (President of the Islamic Republic of Iran). They applied a twofold theoretical framework based on the dichotomous categorization 'euphemism' versus 'derogation' developed by Kress and Hodge (1979)<sup>[22]</sup>, and on Van Dijk's (2004)<sup>[35]</sup> framework of CDA with some supplementary elements. Their findings suggested some degree of manipulation concerning some ideologically-loaded terms.

### 3. De/legitimation and Modality

This study follows a mainly CDA framework. CDA offers the tools to carry out an analysis, which could reveal how certain ideologies are reproduced and legitimized through discourse. Since CDA is not a specific direction of research, it does not have a unitary theoretical framework nor is it necessary to use all the methods or to use them in exactly the same way in specific research projects (Van Dijk 2003).<sup>[34]</sup> In this study, accordingly, as said, a twofold theoretical framework consisting of four major categories of legitimation developed by Van Leeuwen (2008)<sup>[38]</sup> on political speeches and Fairclough's (2003)<sup>[12]</sup> CDA framework on modality has been applied in the hope that the main objective of the study- finding the translation strategies used and illustrating the probable manipulations and

mistranslations- is achieved. Both of the methodologies are cited in the following.

#### 3.1 Van Leeuwen's Typology of De/Legitimation

Of particular importance in every political speech, operating within a sort of authority, is to fall back on an account of legitimacy so as to persuade and or convince the audience in hand. In other words, "Every system of authority attempts to establish and to cultivate the belief in its legitimacy," writes Weber (1977: 325).<sup>[39]</sup> Without doubt, language is the most important vehicle for these attempts (Van Leeuwen 2008: 105).<sup>[38]</sup> Berger and Luckmann have even argued that, in effect, all of language is legitimation (idem). Hence, in this study, four major categories of legitimation developed by Van Leeuwen (2008)<sup>[38]</sup> on political speeches have been applied.

Van Leeuwen's (2008)<sup>[38]</sup> CDA of linguistic legitimation, consisting of four categories is as in the following:

- 1) Authorization: legitimation by reference to the authority of tradition, custom, law, and/or persons in whom institutional authority of some kind is vested. Authority de/legitimation embraces custom (conformity and tradition), authority (personal and impersonal), and recommendation (expert and role model).
- 2) Moral evaluation: legitimation by (often very oblique) reference to value systems. It encapsulates evaluation, abstraction, and comparison (either positive or negative).
- 3) Rationalization: legitimation by reference to the goals and uses of institutionalized social action and to the knowledge that society has constructed to endow them with cognitive validity. This kind of de/legitimation consists of instrumental and theoretical de/legitimation.
- 4) Mythopoesis: legitimation conveyed through narratives whose outcomes reward legitimate actions and punish nonlegitimate actions. It includes moral and cautionary tale, single determination and over determination. Van Leeuwen further adds:

These forms of legitimation can occur separately or in combination. They can be used to legitimize, but also to delegitimize, to critique...they can occupy the largest part of specific instances of text and talk which may hardly refer to what it is that is being legitimized, or they can be thinly sprinkled across detailed descriptive or prescriptive accounts of the practices and institutions they legitimize (ibid: 106).

The rationale behind opting for such a model is in its compatibility with the socio-political, ideological and socio-cultural nature of the data. Furthermore, as said, "Every system of authority attempts to establish and to cultivate the belief in its legitimacy," writes Max Weber (1977: 325).<sup>[39]</sup> Undoubtedly, Language is the most important

vehicle for these attempts (Van Leeuwen 2008: 105).<sup>[38]</sup>

### 3.2 Fairclough's CDA Framework on Modality

In addition to the semantic framework of the study, put forward by Van Leeuwen (2008),<sup>[38]</sup> a syntactic framework dealing with modality, which is of particular importance in the traditional frameworks of CDA was found to be useful. The framework, to this end, is Fairclough's (2003)<sup>[12]</sup> CDA framework of modality. Conceptualizing modality, Fairclough (2003)<sup>[12]</sup> maintains, modality can be seen in terms of what authors commit themselves to, with respect to what is true and what is necessary (modality) and... The question of modality can be seen as the question of what people commit themselves to when they make statements, ask questions, make demands or offers (116-165).

To Fairclough (2003),<sup>[12]</sup> modality can demonstrate the issue of identification in texts. The rationale behind discussing modality within CDA framework is embedded in the "assumption that what people commit themselves to in texts is an important part of how they identify themselves, the texturing of identity", writes Fairclough (2003: 164).<sup>[12]</sup> Identification is able to be detected through modality. Examining the modals, one would be able to find texturing of identities thoroughly embedded in social relations and also to obtain information as to how reality has been represented. Thus, taking into consideration of modality, as a significant part of the representation of reality, would shed light on the CDA of the ST and the TT so as to see whether the TT has been manipulated.

Despite the fact that modality is a very complex aspect of meaning and that its realization in Persian and English is very complicated (since it embraces from the most straightforward forms of modals such as auxiliary modal verbs, modal adjectives and adverbs up to the most abstruse ones such as hedges, intonations, and tag questions) on the one hand and due to the need for a specific CDA framework of modality on the other hand, the study, following in the footsteps of Fairclough, tends to limit its scope to the CDA framework of modality put forward by Fairclough (2003),<sup>[12]</sup> even if it excludes much of its intricacy.

However, in the case of statements, epistemic modalized cases are seen here as intermediate between Assertion and Denial, which are typically realized as positive statements and negative statements. In the case of deontic modality, similarly, modality is seen as an intermediate between prescription (positive imperative clause) and proscription (negative imperative clause). "The rationale behind this is fairly obvious: in terms of commitment to the truth" (Fairclough 2003: 168).<sup>[12]</sup>

### 4. De/Legitimization in Translational Analysis

To apply CDA to the ST and the TT, three steps have been taken: first, the contexts of the situation has been clarified, second, having identified the terms hinting at de/legitimation and modality, the CDA framework of the study has been applied to them; a comparison and contrast between the problematic parts (the parts of the TT deviated from those of the ST as far as the theoretical framework of the study is concerned) of the translation in order to reveal probable deviations, omissions, addition and generally the strategies used in the TT has been the third step taken.

#### Persian Text (ST)

امروز به خیال خودشون بعضی ها می خواند جمع بشند در فلسطین اشغالی و جشن تولد بگیرند. تصور می کنن این موجب تقویت این رژیم مضمحل است. به عکسهمه دنیا می فهمد، نفس برقراری این مراسم نشان دهنده ضعف، نشان دهنده عقب افتادگی و نشان دهنده اضمحلال این رژیم و مناسبات است، و ال چرا جشن پنجاه سالگی نگرفتید، چرا جشن پنجاه و پنج سالگی نگرفتید، امروز چرا به این فکر افتادید. من می خوام به شما بگم که برایمرده جشن تولد برقرار کردن تاثیری به حال مرده نخواهد داشت. این مرده با انفس این آقایی که می خواند جمع بشند اونجا زنده نخواهد شد. یک عده تروریست و جنایتکار هستند که با طراحی آمده اند، با حمایت بیگانگان آمده اند و هیچ ریشه ای در خاک فلسطین ندارند و دیر یا زود به دست ملت فلسطین از صحنه فلسطین جارو خواهند ش

اعالم کردند، هم رژیم صهیونیستی، هم مسؤلن آمریکایی و بعضی از عناصر انگلیسی که ما می خوایم مقامات ایران و مسؤلین ایران رو ترور بکنیم. اجازه دادیم و خواستیم و طراحی کردیم برای ترور و انجام ترور در ایران. این رو اعالم کردند، در فاصله کوتاهی اون جنایت ناجوانمردانه در شیراز اتفاق افتاد. بدانید که دست قدرت الهی و دست قهر ملتها بسیار مقتدر است و گلوی شما را خواهد فشرد.

#### Literal Translation into English

Today some (a few) people are about to gather in occupied Palestine, in order to celebrate its anniversary. They fancy that by doing so, they are strengthening this disintegrating regime. On the contrary, the whole world understands that the very nature of holding these ceremonies is a sign of weakness, the backwardness, and the disintegration of this regime and its relationships. Otherwise, why didn't you celebrate this regime's 50th anniversary? Why didn't you celebrate this regime's 55th anniversary? Why have you come up with this idea today? Let me tell you, celebrating a dead man's birthday won't improve his condition one bit. This dead man will not be resurrected by all those people (guys) who are about to gather there. They are a group of terrorists and criminals, who came according to a plan, came with the support of the alien and who have not



any roots in Palestine soil and sooner or later they will be swept aside (out) by the

### People of Palestine.

The Zionist regime, American officials, and some British elements declared that "We want to assassinate senior Iranian officials and Iranian authorities. We authorized and wanted and planned the terror attacks and its performance in Iran." They announced this (and) a shorter while later, that cowardly crime was perpetrated in Shiraz. Be sure that the power hand of God and the wrath hand of the peoples are very mighty and will grab you by the throat.

### The Subtitled Translation of the Text (TT)

Today certain people are about to convene in occupied Palestine, in order to celebrate its anniversary. They believe that by doing so, they are strengthening this disintegrating regime. However, the whole world will come to understand that holding these ceremonies is a sign of weakness, the backwardness, and the disintegration of this regime. Otherwise, why didn't they celebrate this regime's 50th or 55th anniversary? Why did you come up with this idea now? Let me tell you, celebrating a dead man's birthday won't improve his condition one bit. This dead man will not be resurrected by all those people who are about to convene there. There is a group of terrorism and criminals who came according to a plan with the support of foreigners and who have not roots in Palestine. Sooner or later they will be driven out by the people of Palestine.

The Zionist regime, American officials, and some British elements have declared that they want to assassinate senior Iranian officials. They said that they authorized and planned these terror attacks in Iran. They stated this. A shorter while later, that cowardly crime was perpetrated in Shiraz. You can be sure that the hand of God and the wrath of the peoples will grab you by the throat.

### 4.1 Context of Situation

Exploring translation in context is an important objective in this study. Setting such an objective, however, is easier said than done, since defining and analyzing contexts relevant to specific action is not an easy task. This extract, as a part of Iranian former President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's press conference, is a reaction to the terrorist attack in Shiraz, an Iranian city, in 1385 (Iranian calendar year) which is alleged to have been planned and perpetrated by the Zionist regime, American officials and some British elements. However, the other theme of the speech would be regarded as in the following: the futile effort of the Zionist regime and some people with regard to deciding to celebrate its anniversary in that it is, as the speaker holds, like a dead man who is not able to be revitalized. On the

whole, both themes work as polarized reactions so that they firstly delegitimize 'Them' and then legitimize 'US', to use Van Dijk's (2004)<sup>[35]</sup> word. The speech subtitled into English by MEMRITV (Middle East Media Research Institute) is available on both [www.memritv.org](http://www.memritv.org) and [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com).

### 4.2 Analysis of De/Legitimation and Modality

As the main point of departure, de/legitimation going both to the decision of the Zionist regime and a few number of irrationals who are to hold its formation anniversary and to the Zionist regime, American officials and some British elements, who, allegedly, have planned and perpetrated Shiraz terror attack seems to be the most conspicuous illocutionary force resonating throughout the speech. Out of eight cases of de/legitimation bearing propositions found in the speech and illustrated in the following, only one of them moves to legitimate self ('Us') i.e. the rest delegitimize 'Them'.

[تصور می کنن این موجب تقویت این رژیم مضمحل است]

=*They fancy that by doing so, they are strengthening this disintegrating regime.*

As Van Leeuwen (2008)<sup>[38]</sup> maintains:

In some cases, moral value is simply asserted by troublesome words such as "good" and "bad", which freely travel among moral, aesthetic, and hedonistic domains and often combine with authority legitimation, as when President George W. Bush legitimizes aggressive policies by pronouncing his enemies an 'axis of evil' (p.111).

Accordingly, in the aforementioned phrase, the Zionist regime is morally evaluated as 'disintegrating regime' by the speaker.

Casting light on the statement: [دهنده عقب افتادگی و نشان دهنده اضمحلال این رژیم و مناسبات استتبه عکس همه دنیا می فهمد، نفس برقراری این مراسم نشان دهنده ضعف، ]=On the contrary, the whole world understand that the very nature of these ceremonies is the sign of weakness, the backwardness, and the disintegration of this regime and its relationship, it is made clear that regardless of the moral evaluation present in the statement to delegitimize the Zionist regime, there is an authority of conformity legitimation stemming from the speaker's assertion on behalf of others. In the case of conformity, the answer to the 'why' question is 'because that's what everybody else does' or 'because that's what most people do' (Van Leeuwen (2008).<sup>[38]</sup> The implicit message here is, 'everybody in the world understand it, and so should you'.

I would like (want) to tell = [من می خوام به شما بگم] you, is a case of personal authority legitimation namely the president asserts it because of his social status. As in this case, "Personal authority legitimation typically

takes the form of a "verbal process" clause (Halliday and Hasan,<sup>[18]</sup> 1985 as cited in Van Leeuwen 2008: 106).<sup>[38]</sup>

Delegitimation through instrumental rationalization is carried out, applying two phrases: [مردۀ جشن تولد برای ] = *celebrating a dead man's birthday won't improve his condition one bit*, and [این مردۀ با انفاس این آقاییونی که می خواند جمع بشند اونجا زنده ] = *This dead man will not be resurrected by all those people who are about to convene there*. To Van Leeuwen (2008),<sup>[38]</sup> "Like legitimations, purposes are constructed in discourse in order to explain why social practices exist, and why they take the forms they do." Similarly, in these metaphorical propositions, taken within the framework of delegitimation, the quotations can be rephrased as 'you should not both hold and take part in the celebration (the social practice) attributed to the Zionist regime in order to revitalize this dead man (because apart from its illegitimate nature, it is an activity of no use)'.

و ال چرا جشن پنجاه سالگی نگرفتید، چرا جشن پنجاه و پنج سالگی [ *Otherwise, why didn't you celebrate the 50th anniversary? Why didn't you celebrate the 55th anniversary? Why did you come up with this idea now?*: these supposedly penetrating question-like statements are applied to give dialogical sense to the speech which is, in effect, monologue and are three cases of delegitimation of the Zionist regime social action, celebrating of its anniversary, through resorting to the authority of tradition. According to Van Leeuwen (2008),<sup>[38]</sup> "Although the authority of tradition has been declining in many domains, it may still be invoked, particularly through key words like "tradition," "practice," "custom," "habit." Here, the implicit or explicit answer to the "why" question is "because this is what we always do" or because this is what we have always done" (108).

بدانید که دست قدرت الهی و دست قهر ملتها بسیار مقتدر است و گلوی [ *know that the hand of God and the wrath hand of the peoples are very powerful and will grab you by the throat*, is again a case of personal authority legitimation i.e. the president asserts it because of his social status. To put it in Van Leeuwen's (2008)<sup>[38]</sup> words "In the case of undiluted personal authority, legitimate authority is vested in people because of their status or role in a particular institution (106).

Save for one statement that indicates the speaker's power of prediction or futurology- [دست قدرت الهی و دست قهر ملتها بسیار مقتدر است و گلوی شما را خواهد فشرد بدانید]

*know that the hand of God and the wrath hand of the peoples are very powerful and will grab you by the throat*-almost all parts of the statements show the

speaker's positive commitment to the unmodalized truths.

Yet, modalities are appeared in three cases as follows:

The application of the verb [کنن تصور می] = they fancy which is a mental process clause modality and epistemic modality of low frequency kind which is considered to "give a subjective marking to the modality" (Fairclough I would like = ]2003:169).<sup>[12]</sup> [من می خواهم به شما بگم] (want) to tell you, is a deontic modality by which the speaker depicts his prescription as to the futile effort of making the anniversary ceremony for a dead man-the Zionist regime. Here 'would' is an objective modal auxiliary verb and indicates that the speaker as president identifies himself with a high social status. As Fairclough (1992)<sup>[8]</sup> maintains "The use of objective modality often implies some form of power" (159).

At the end, the use of the phrase [خواهد فشرد] = will grab, as an epistemic modality and presupposed and pre-sumed element points to the speaker's power of prediction in terms of insecurity, death and dire doom that will be the ramification of the Zionist regime, American officials and some British elements' performance. The brief CDA of Legitimation and Modality in the ST is shown in Table 1.

#### 4.3 A Comparison of Discursive Representation of De/Legitimization and Modality

In the case of the discourse of legitimation and de/legitimation, no outstanding deviation of the TT from the ST is observed whereas in terms of the modality two cases of mistranslations are found to be of particular importance in meaning negotiation.

One of these is the case when the speaker expresses that [است به عکس هم دنیا می فهمد، نفس برقراری این]

مراسم نشان دهنده ضعف، نشان دهنده عقب افتادگی و نشان دهنده [ *On the contrary the whole world understand that the very nature of these ceremonies is the sign of weakness, the backwardness, and the disintegration of this regime and its relationship*]. The distorted translation of the first phrase verb into 'will come to understand' that contains low epistemic modality lacking in the ST leads to a different functional equivalence for the TT readership. To put it in other words, the ST readership understands that the anniversary is futile whereas the one of the TT will understand.

Similarly, at the end, addition is applied in the case of a modal verb 'can' in the TT ('Know that' has been translated as 'you can be sure that'). The subtitle, it seems that, distorts the speaker's standpoint concerning his acknowledgement of the allegation (or in Fairclough's (2003)<sup>[12]</sup> terminology, prescription and positive commitment to the truth, which has been translated as a modalized statement)

Table 1. Analysis of De/Legitimation and Modality in the ST

Terms	Discourse of De/Legitimation (Why we/ you should/not do this (in this way?))		Modalization, Authors Commitment to the Truth	
1	تصور می کنند این موجب تقویت این { They fancy that by doing so, they are strengthening this disintegrating regime.	DELEGITIMATION, MORAL EVALUATION	MENTAL PROCESS CLAUSE MODALITY, LOW EPISTEMIC MODALITY FREQUENCY MODALITY, ASSERTION	
2	به عکس همه دنیا می فهمد، نفس برقراری { این مراسم نشان دهنده ضعف، نشان دهنده عقب افتادگی و نشان دهنده اضمحلال این رژیم و مناسبات است } = <i>on the contrary, the whole world un-derstand that the very nature of these ceremonies is the sign of weakness, the backwardness, and the disintegration of this regime and its relationship</i>	AUTHORITY OF CONFOR- MITY, PERSONAL AU- THORITY, MORAL EVALU- ATION	UNMODALIZED TRUTH, POSITIVE COMMITMENT TO THE TRUTH, ASSERTION	
3	و ال چرا جشن پنجاه سالگی نگرقتید چرا { جشن پنجاه و پنج سالگی نگرقتید امروز چرا } = <i>Otherwise, why didn't you celebrate the 50th anniversary? Why didn't you celebrate the 55th anniversary? Why did you come up with this idea now?</i>	DELEGITIMATION, AU- THORITY OF TRADITION	UNMODALIZED TRUTH, POSITIVE COMMITMENT TO THE TRUTH, ASSERTION, (DIALOGICAL RATHER THAN MONOLOGUE CHARACTER)	
4	من می خوام به شما بگم { to tell you	LEGITIMATION, PERSON- AL AUTHORITY	MODALITY, PRE- SCRIPTION, MEDION FREQUENCY MO- DALITY	DEONTIC
5	برای مرده جشن تولد برقرار کردن تاثیری { celebrating a dead man's birthday won't improve his condition one bit,	DELEGITIMATION, IN- STRUMENTAL RATIONAL- IZATION	COMMITMENT TO THE TRUTH, DENIAL	UNMODALIZED TRUTH, POSITIVE
6	این مرده با انفاس این آقایونی که می خواند { this dead man will not be resurrected by all those people who are about to convene there	DELEGITIMATION, IN- STRUMENTAL RATIONAL- IZATION		UNMODALIZED TRUTH, POSITIVE COMMITMENT TO THE TRUTH, DENIAL
7	بدانید که دست قدرت الهی و دست قهر { ملتها بسیار مقتدر است و گلوی شما را خواهد فشرد } = <i>know that the hand of God and the wrath hand of the peoples are very powerful and will grab you by the throat</i>	PERSONAL AUTHORITY		EPISTEMIC MODALITY, ASSERTION

**Table 2.** A Comparison Between the CDA of De/Legitimation and Modality

Terms		Discourse of Legitimation (Why we should do this (in this way?))	Modalization, Authors Commitment to the Truth
1	However, the whole world will come to understand that holding these ceremonies is a sign of weakness, the backwardness, and the disintegration of this regime.	INSTRUMENTAL RATIONALIZATION, PERSONAL AUTHORITY	PREDICTION, LOW EPISTEMIC MODALITY
2	You can be sure	CONFORMITY- CUSTOM AUTHORITY	DEONTIC MODALITY, MEDIAN MODALITY

and his presupposed assuredness from an undeniable danger lying in wait for the Zionist regime, American officials and some British elements. In Table 2, the CDA of the Problematic parts of the TT is portrayed.

### 5. Concluding Remarks

The analysis of a political discourse and its translation revealed that although there are no overt manipulations regarding the discourse of de/legitimation in the target text (TT), the manipulation of micro-linguistic device of modality constitutes a degree of covert manipulation of de-legitimizing discourse, altering the author's (the source text enunciator's) commitment to truth. Therefore, viewing translation of political discourse as a means of de/legitimation in the context of micro-linguistic aspects such as modality could probably open a fruitful avenue to discourse studies in general and translation studies in particular.

Indeed, manipulation is only observable in the case of modality (see Table 5.2). The speaker's self-presentation and identification differ in the TT from those in the ST because of manipulation in the modals. Hence, it can be indicated that the speaker's commitment to the truth is manipulated in the target text and that the findings, at least within the domain of modality, is in line with the literature (see section 2), what Diriker (2004)<sup>[2]</sup> found i.e. more manipulative nature of interpretation (as a form of translation) in the contextualized (immediate) discourse, and also with what Lefevere (1992: preface)<sup>[23]</sup> maintains: "translation is a rewriting of ST which definitely entails ideologically motivated manipulation."

Because of the manipulation observed, the persuasive effects of the ST cannot be the same as that of TT. In other words, the emphases and implications of the speech do not remain intact on the grounds that the modality manipulation in the TT (in two cases) leads to a different realization and identification of the speaker in the TT, all of which constituting a degree of manipulation in the reproduction of the discourse of de/legitimization.

A final question that should be addressed is which of the approaches to critical study of political discourse and its representation in cross-linguistic and cross-cul-

tural contexts would be more promising and appropriate. As Moradi-Joz et al. (2018a),<sup>[25]</sup> appraising Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012)<sup>[13]</sup> seminal argumentation-based model for political discourse analysis, contend, since different competing and even conflicting values, concerns, and beliefs underlie the discourses and narratives circulating across the world, the eclectic and multidisciplinary approaches of mainstream CDA are of potential to comparatively yield more adequate, informative, and promising results in analyzing political discourse. Of such seminal approaches to critical study of discourse, Wodak's (2015)<sup>[42]</sup> Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA), Van Dijk's (2004,<sup>[35]</sup> 2014)<sup>[36]</sup> sociocognitive theoretical framework, Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012)<sup>[13]</sup> argumentation-based model, and Van Leeuwen's (2008)<sup>[38]</sup> de/legitimation-based model, among others, could be availed of. This is in line with the Van Leeuwen (2005)<sup>[37]</sup> himself preference for the integrationist model of interdisciplinary in CDA, which could also do justice to critical study of translation, informed by "[p]ost-Nietzschean philosophy and conceptions of translation" (Moradi-Joz 2018b: 63).<sup>[26]</sup>

### References

- [ 1 ] Bourdieu, Pierre. (1982). *Ce que parley veut dire*. Paris: Fayard.
- [ 2 ] Calzada Perez, Maria. (2001) A three-level methodology for descriptive-explanatory translation studies. *Target* 13 (2), 203-39.
- [ 3 ] Chilton, Paul. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- [ 4 ] Chilton, Paul. and Schaffner, C. (1997) *Discourse and politics*. In T. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (Vol. 2): *Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 206-30). London: Sage.
- [ 5 ] Chesterman, Andrew & Gambeir, Yves (eds.). (2000). *Translation in Context*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [ 6 ] Diriker, Ebru (2004). *Re/Decontextualizing Conference Interpreting: Interpreters in the Ivory Tower*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [ 7 ] Dunmire, Patricia L. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: Exploring the Language of Politics and the Politics*



- of Language. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 6(11): 73–5751.
- [ 8 ] Fairclough, Norman (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- [ 9 ] Fairclough, Norman. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London & New York: Longman.
- [10] Fairclough, Norman. (1997). Discourse across disciplines: Discourse analysis in researching social change. *AILAReview* 12, 3–17.
- [11] Fairclough, Norman. and Wodak, Ruth (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In *Discourse Studies A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, T. A. Van Dijk (ed), 258-84 [Discourse as Social Interaction 2] . London: Sage.
- [12] Fairclough, Norman. (2003). *Analyzing discourse*. London: Routledge.
- [13] Fairclough, Isabela, and Norman Fairclough. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [14] Foucault, M. (1971). *L'ordre du discours*. Paris: Gallimard.
- [15] Fowler, Roger (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- [16] Fowler, Roger, Hodge, Bob, Kress, Gunther. and Trew, Tony (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- [17] Habermas, J. (1981) *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- [18] Halliday, Michael, and Hasan, Ruquaya (1985). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- [19] Halliday, Michael (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*, 2nd edition, London: Edward Arnold.
- [20] Hatim, Bassil and Ian Mason (1997). *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
- [21] Knowles, Murray & Kirsten Malmkjær. (1989). *Translating Ideology. Language, Power and the World of the Tin Soldier*. *ELR Journal*, III, 205-42.
- [22] Kress, Gunther. & Hodge, Roger (1979). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge & Paul.
- [23] Lefevere, Andre (1992). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of literary fame*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [24] Moradi-Joz, R., Ketabi, S., Vahid, D, H. (2014). Ideological manipulation in subtitling: a case study of a speech fragment by Mahmoud Ahmadinejad (President of the Islamic Republic of Iran). *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 22(3), 404-418.
- [25] Moradi-Joz, R., Ketabi, S. & Tavakoli, M. (2018a). On conductive argumentation: President Trump's United Nations address on Iran in focus. *Journal of Language and Politics*, Published online 31 Oct, 2018, 1-24.
- [26] Moradi-Joz, R. & Pirnajmuddin, H. (2018b). Benjamin and Borges: Reflections on afterlife and translation. *Babel* 64(1), 63–80.
- [27] Puurtinen, Tiina. (1998). *Translating Linguistic Markers of Ideology*. In *Translation in Context*, Chesterman, A & Gambeir, Y (eds), 178-185, 2000. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- [28] Schäffner, Christina (2004). Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics* 3, 1, 117-150.
- [29] Schäffner, Christina (2007). *Politics and Translation*. In *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Kuhlwezak, P and Littau, K (eds.), 134-147 Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [30] Stage, Dorth (2002). Comparing types of interlingual Transfer. *Perspectives* 10, 2, 119-134.
- [31] Van Dijk, Teun A. (1987). *Communicating Racism: Ethnic Prejudice in Thought and Talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- [32] Van Dijk, Teun A. (1990). Issues in functional discourse analysis. In H. Pinkster (Ed.), *Liber Amicorum for Simon Dik*, 27-46. Dordrecht: Foris.
- [33] Van Dijk, Teun A. (1997). *Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction*. 2nd vol. London: Sage.
- [34] Van Dijk, Teun A. (2003). Introduction: What is critical discourse analysis? In: *The handbook of discourse analysis*, Schiffrin, D, Tannen, D. and Hamilton, E.H. (eds.), 352-371. Wiley-Blackwell.
- [35] Van Dijk, Teun A. (2004). *Politics Ideology and Discourse*. Retrieved from the web July 16, 2009. <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html>
- [36] Van Dijk, Teun A. (2014). *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [37] Van Leeuwen, Theo. (2005). Three Models of Interdisciplinarity." In *New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*, ed. by Ruth Wodak and Paul Chilton, 3–18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [38] Van Leeuwen, Theo. (2008). *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Oxford.
- [39] Weber, Max. (1977). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York: Free Press.
- [40] Wodak, Ruth. (1996). *Disorder of Discourse*. London and New York: Longman.
- [41] Wodak, Ruth. (1997). *Gender and Discourse*. London: Thousand Oaks, New Delhi.
- [42] Wodak, Ruth. (2015). *Critical Discourse Analysis: Discourse-Historical Approach*. In *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, First ed., ed. by Karen Tracy, Cornelia Ilie, and Todd Sandel. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.