

TRANSLATION AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS¹

Ch. Schäffner¹

¹ Aston University,
Aston Triangle, Birmingham, B4 7ET, UK
Submitted on May 27, 2019
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-2

This paper will illustrate how discourse analysis had been incorporated in Translation Studies. Discourse Analysis originated in Applied Linguistics and refers to the investigation of language in use. Depending on whether the term 'discourse' is understood in a narrower or a wider sense, discourse analysis aims at examining the structure and the function of language in various contexts and/or at revealing patterns of belief and habitual action, as well as social roles and power relations (Critical Discourse Analysis). Since translation can be characterised as an act of communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries, with source text and target text representing language in use, concepts and methods of discourse analysis have been found useful for Translation Studies. The paper will provide some examples of such research.

Keywords: *discourse, discourse analysis, genre conventions, translation quality, ideology.*

1. Introduction

Translation has often been characterised as an act of communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries. In this process, what is normally called a source text (ST) is transferred into a target text (TT). The most obvious difference between ST and TT is the language in which the two texts are written. However, the transfer process is also characterised by omissions, additions, structural changes and other shifts which a translator has made in respect of the translation's purpose (its *Skopos*, Vermeer 1996), the addressees of the TT, and other factors such as genre conventions or ideological considerations. Translators are faced with texts whose content and linguistic structure depend on the specific aim for which they have been produced, in short, they represent language in use. The investigation of language in use is the domain of Discourse Analysis, a sub-area of Applied Linguistics. In this paper, concepts and methods of discourse analysis will be introduced with a special focus on how they have been made useful for Translation Studies. The paper will start with definitions of discourse, followed by some examples to illustrate how methods of discourse analysis have been applied in translation research, and concluding with some implications for future research.

2. What is discourse?

The term 'discourse' is essentially linked to Applied Linguistics and refers to investigations of language in use, which can be both written and spoken interaction. Language in use is always socially situated, contextualised

© Schäffner Ch., 2019

¹ This paper builds on and expands the description in Schäffner (2013).



in time, space, and culture, and fulfilling specific communicative purposes. Whereas the traditional structural linguistics focused on language as a system, studying language in use thus also implies consideration of the concrete situation, the communicative partners, as well as the wider socio-cultural context.

As is frequently the case in the humanities, there is not one generally agreed definition of 'discourse'. As argued by van Dijk (1997: 1), the notion of discourse is "essentially fuzzy" despite the "ubiquitous presence of the term 'discourse' in the humanities, the social sciences and even in the mass media". This view is shared by Jaworski and Coupland (1999: 14) when they say that many academic disciplines "now see discourse as an important theoretical and empirical focus for them". The fuzziness of 'discourse' is reflected in diverse definitions and also in a variety of analytical methods. 'Discourse' has been defined in a wider or a narrower sense. In a narrower sense, the term has been used to describe oral communication, for example, teacher-student or doctor-patient interaction. In this sense, 'discourse' is set apart from the term 'text' which is reserved for written communication. In fact, 'discourse' and 'text' are sometimes used as synonyms, with both referring to anything beyond the sentence, which contributes to the fuzziness of both notions. In a wider sense, 'discourse' has been used as an umbrella term for both text and talk to signal commonalities beyond one individual text. Such common features can be related to text typologies and genres (e.g. common features of the genre of recipes), or to a specific author (e.g. the discourse of Barack Obama), or to a specific field (e.g. the discourse of education), or to a common topic or ideology (e.g. the discourse of feminism, the discourse of the far-right). In this last respect, discourse usually includes various genres. For example, the discourse of feminism can include academic publications, promotional leaflets, newspaper articles, letters. Moreover, it can include written documents, transcripts of oral talk, audio- or videotaped material, on-line communication, etc., thus integrating written and oral communication. In this view, which is also informed by sociolinguistics, texts are instances of discourse.

Other scholars build on the work by Foucault (e.g. 1972) for whom discourse is the way in which knowledge is organised, talked about and acted upon in different institutions. In this tradition, 'discourses' are defined as "conventional ways of talking that both create and are created by conventional ways of thinking. These linked ways of talking and thinking constitute ideologies (sets of interrelated ideas) and serve to circulate power in society" (Johnstone 2002: 3). In this broad sense, discourse analysis goes beyond the linguistic aspect and aims at revealing patterns of belief, patterns of habitual action, and social roles and power relations. Such aspects are also the focus of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA, e.g. Fairclough 1995) which sees discourse as a form of social practice. Fairclough and Fairclough (2012: 81) argue that within CDA, 'discourse' can also refer to "signification as an element of the social process" and they suggest to use the term 'semiosis' for this most general sense of 'discourse'. As a consequence, discourse analysis would also be "concerned with various 'semiotic modalities' of which language is only one (others are visual images and 'body language')" (ibid). In this view, 'discourse' is understood in a very broad view beyond 'language in use'.



3. How can discourse be analysed?

The notion of ‘discourse’ scholars adhere to as well as their specific research aims influence the way they go about analysing discourse. Jaworski and Coupland (1999:14) argue for a “broad and inclusive perspective on the concept of discourse”, adding that “discourse, however we define it, has focally to do with language use.” Discourse analysis is thus essentially an investigation of the structure and function(s) of text and discourse as they occur in context. Although van Dijk (2008: 2) argues that “discourse analysis is not a method but rather a domain of scholarly practice”, suggesting to speak of Discourse Studies rather than of Discourse Analysis, Discourse Analysis is more widely used and scholars frequently speak of methods of discourse analysis (e.g. Wood and Kroger 2000, Wetherell et al. 2001). Within this domain, a variety of methods have been used, depending on the aims of investigation. Titscher et al (2000), for example, compare twelve different methods of text and discourse analysis, among them content analysis, functional pragmatics, ethnomethodologically oriented methods, and CDA approaches. Principal traditions of discourse studies are also covered in *The Discourse Reader* (Jaworski and Coupland 1999), and the various methods and approaches are regularly illustrated in the journals *Discourse Studies* and *Discourse & Society*.

As Johnstone (2002: 8) says, “the basic question a discourse analyst asks is ‘Why is this text the way it is? Why is it no other way? Why these particular words in this particular order?’” Such questions focus both on structural and discursive characteristics of texts and on the social motivations and conditions. A CDA perspective, by extension, would add questions such as ‘What does the structure of an individual text reveal about the wider discourse? How do texts and discourse reflect social structures and power?’ etc.

Research which is interested more in the structure of texts as actual instances of discourse has made use of concepts (e.g. cohesion, coherence, speech act, rhetorical purpose) that have their origin in other sub-disciplines of Applied Linguistics, such as text linguistics, pragmatics, systemic functional linguistics, stylistics, rhetorics. CDA approaches which are committed to studying discourse as text and talk in and as social practices also draw on concepts (e.g. identity, power, ideology, hegemony) from disciplines such as sociology, critical theory, political studies, cultural studies).

Since texts are instances of discourse, methods of text linguistics and discourse analysis often overlap. Texts too are examples of language in use, and this understanding is clearly obvious in de Beaugrande and Dressler’s definition of text as a “communicative occurrence” (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3). They specify further that a text has to meet seven standards of textuality, and if “any of these standards is not considered to have been satisfied, the text will not be communicative” (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3). The seven standards (explained in de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3–13) are cohesion (“the ways in which the components of the surface text [...] are mutually connected within a sequence”), coherence (“the ways in which the components of the textual world [...] which underlie the surface text, are mutually accessible and relevant”), intentionality (“concerning the text pro-



ducer's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text instrumental in fulfilling the producer's intentions"), acceptability ("concerning the text receiver's attitude that the set of occurrences should constitute a cohesive and coherent text having some use or relevance for the receiver"), informativity ("the extent to which the occurrences of the presented text are expected vs. unexpected or known vs. unknown/certain"), situationality ("the factors which make a text relevant to a situation of occurrence"), and intertextuality ("the factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts"). Cohesion and coherence are text-centred notions, intentionality and acceptability are user-centred notions, but all seven standards are mutually related. Intertextuality can be seen as directly linked to discourse, and the knowledge of previously encountered texts can relate to an overarching theme (e.g. environmental protection) or to characteristic features of a text type, or genre (e.g. job offer, instruction for use).

Another large area of discourse analysis has been informed by Halliday's work on systemic functional linguistics (SFL, e.g. Halliday 1978), which is based on a view of language as social semiotic. Halliday's main interest is in investigating language as communication, studying how language is used to construe meaning as people interact in a specific situational and cultural context. Meaning is evident in the linguistic choices made by an author. The language used, and thus the features of a text, are derived from the features of the situation in which it is used (this is similar to the standard of situationality). Key concepts in this model are discourse, genre and register. Discourse is enacted by conventionalized genres of which texts are individual instantiations. Genres are understood as "the conventional text type that is associated with a specific communicative function" (Munday 2012a: 138). That is, they are defined through the overall communicative purpose of the interaction and are thus super-ordinate to register features. Register links the variables of the situational context to language variation and choice. It is described by three areas of contextual activity: what is actually taking place, the event and subject matter (field), who is taking part, the type of interpersonal role interactions (tenor), and the form of communication, e.g. written or spoken (mode). Field, tenor and mode collectively make up the register membership of a text, and they are related to three meta-functions, or discourse semantics: field to the ideational function, tenor to the interpersonal function, and mode to the textual function. The expression of content constitutes the ideational function, the way language is used to encode and (re)present our experience of the world (lexico-grammatically realized, for example, in specific terminology, nominalisation, transitivity). The role relationship between the communicative partners (status, level of formality) as influencing language choice constitutes the interpersonal function (realized for example in pronouns, modality). The textual function refers to the linguistic realisation of mode, and comprises aspects of textuality such as cohesion, thematic organisation, text types (e.g. expository, argumentative).

Since social practices construct power and ideologies, CDA approaches, as a "problem-oriented interdisciplinary research movement" (Fairclough et al. 2011: 357) have a special interest in revealing the discursive (re)produc-



tion of power and social inequality. In Fairclough's model of CDA, discourse analysis comprises "(a) interdiscursive analysis, and (b) language analysis" (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012: 85). Interdiscursive analysis identifies the genres, discourses and styles that are drawn upon. Genres are "semiotic ways of acting and interacting", discourses are "ways of representing aspects of the world", and styles are "ways of being, social identities, in their semiotic aspect" (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012: 82). In his analysis of the discourse of New Labour, Fairclough (2000) identified a hybrid discourse, and also a representation of the world as involving change. He noticed that in a speech by Tony Blair, 'change' is "metaphorically represented as a force of nature, [...] as an entity with causal powers" (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012: 87). This can be seen in the use of 'change' as a nominalization and in the subject position of sentences (e.g. 'change that sweeps the world'). This example reminds of the ideational function in SFL.

4. Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies

Translation as an act of communication across linguistic and cultural boundaries, as text-production for addressees in a new cultural context, typically involves two texts in two languages, which represent language in use and in context. Translation itself is a form of language in use. Based on this view, concepts and methods of discourse analysis have been found useful for Translation Studies. For translation purposes, scholars (predominantly those who work with linguistics-oriented approaches) have referred to concepts from discourse analysis as a toolkit for investigating textual structure and meaning. There is thus also a variety in the ways discourse analysis has been incorporated in Translation Studies. Only in a few publications is a systematic discourse analytical model presented in more detail (especially Hatim and Mason 1990, 1997, Trosborg 1997, 2002, House 1977, 1997, Munday 2012b). These models, despite minor differences, draw on Halliday's SFL and combine the concept of discourse with the concepts of register, genre, and text. Neubert and Shreve's textual model (1992) which builds on de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) can be given as another example. Other scholars have used concepts and methods of discourse analysis for identifying culture-specific genre conventions, for conducting a detailed pre-translational source text analysis, for comparing STs and TTs with a view of assessing their appropriateness and quality, and for uncovering attitudes and ideologies conveyed in translation. Some examples of such research will now be provided for illustration.

4.1. Translation-oriented discourse analytical models

Neubert and Shreve's approach (1992, also Neubert 1985) is explicitly built on the text linguistic model of de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) with its standards of textuality. They mainly speak of 'text' and hardly of 'discourse'. Translation is defined as a text-induced activity, more specifically as source text induced target text production (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 43). The text is treated as the unit of translation. They argue that translation in-



volves the displacement of texts (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 37), a retextualisation of the ST in a new environment. Both ST and TT need to meet the seven standards of textuality, and they give illustrative examples of how these standards can be made useful for translation, especially for ST analysis and assessing the appropriateness of the TT. Since STs and TTs are located in different contexts, translators need to apply various strategies to adjust the TT to its new situation. The situationality of a text in its L1 context and the corresponding translation in the L2 context can be shared (as in the case of users of instruction manuals) or displaced (as in the case of a political speech). The standard of intertextuality is presented as probably the “most important aspect of textuality for the translator” (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 117). They argue that translations having “double intertextuality”. Not only is there a relationship between ST and TT, but the “source text has intertextual relationships with other source-language texts. The translation will establish new relationships with existing L2 texts” (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 118). The translator is thus expected to produce “an L2 text approached by L2 users as if it were a naturally occurring instance of their communicative culture” (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 119). The authors also acknowledge that translation can be instrumental in introducing genres to a culture and can result in changes of genre conventions. Translation is thus characterized as “mediated intertextuality” (Neubert and Shreve 1992: 123).

The work by Hatim and Mason, Trosborg, House, and Munday is informed by SFL. For these scholars, the unit of discourse analysis is the text as an individual, concrete occurrence, and ‘discourse’ indicates a higher level which involves regular patterns in the use of language by social groups in areas of socio-cultural activity. Hatim and Mason (1990, 1997) presented an elaborate analytical framework for textual and contextual variables, essentially building on Halliday’s model but also incorporating standards of textuality, speech act theory, and politeness theory. Their main aim is to develop a unifying approach by which all the diverse forms, modes, and fields of translating and interpreting can be explained. They use ‘discourse’ in a wider sense as “modes of speaking and writing which involve social groups in adopting a particular attitude towards areas of sociocultural activity (e.g. racist discourse, bureaucratise, etc.)” (Hatim and Mason 1997: 216). An essential element of their model is register analysis, i.e. an analysis of field, tenor and mode through the realizations of ideational, interpersonal and textual functions in STs and TTs. The application of their discourse analytical model is illustrated with various examples, addressing, among others, cross-cultural differences in generic structures. As a case in point, they show differences in argumentative text types in English and Arabic. English texts are usually characterised by a pattern of counter-argumentation, in contrast to Arabic discourse which shows a preference for through-argumentation. A paragraph starting with ‘of course’ could thus lead to a different interpretation if it were translated literally. As they argue, “[t]he lexical token ‘of course’ is conventionally associated with text-initial concession in English but its token-for-token equivalent in these other languages [i.e. Eastern languages as Arabic and Farsi] often introduces not a concession to be countered but a case to be argued through” (Hatim and Mason 1997: 152). In their



1997 book, they illustrate the impact of factors of cultural asymmetry and ideology on translation. One telling example is an English translation of a Spanish text on ancient Mexicans. Analysing the discourse features of lexical choice, cohesion, transitivity and presupposition as an important component of intentionality, they note that as a result of the systematic shifts in the language used, the “different text world of the target text relays a different ideology” (Hatim and Mason 1997: 153). They argue that cumulatively, all the features analysed “relay discourses which point to two fundamentally opposed ideologies: destiny as personal commitment in the source text and history as passive observation in the target text” (Hatim and Mason 1997: 158, see also. Mason 2009).

Halliday’s SFL has also been used as a framework for training purposes and for translation quality assessment (e.g. by Trosborg and House), sometimes in combination with contrastive genre and text type analysis. Such research will now be illustrated.

4.2. Pre-translational source text analysis

Trosborg (2002) presents her approach, mainly based on Halliday’s register analysis and on Swales’ genre analysis (e.g. Swales 1990), as a model of pre-translational text analysis in a training context. For Swales, a “genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. [...] In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience.” (Swales 1990: 58). Trosborg’s model is very complex, covering extra-textual parameters (situational aspects, genre) and intra-textual parameters. All these parameters are presented in detail. She uses field, tenor and mode for a description of the speech situation, and the three meta-functions (ideational, interpersonal, textual function) to investigate how the text unfolds. On the basis of a concrete ST, she illustrates how these three functions are realized in features of the language used, such as lexical chains or metaphors for the ideational function, the level of formality or grammatical complexity for the interpersonal function, and cohesion or thematic progression for the textual function. Although her model is primarily based on SFL, she also incorporates speech act theory, semantic theory, text typology, frame semantics, etc. She argues that an “eclectic approach has been chosen, as the aim has been to bring in theoretical aspects that contribute to a deeper understanding of the text regardless of a strict adherence to one particular theory” (Trosborg 2002: 10). The didactic application is indeed her main aim, using the model to help students “to create a deep understanding of the source text (ST) by means of a detailed analysis of it. Understanding the text in full gives the translator a thorough overview and a possibility of maintaining or adapting the ST in a conscious way to meet the demands of the target text (TT) skopos when producing the TT” (Trosborg 2002: 9).

Didactic aims are also evident in other publications which illustrate how discourse analysis can be made useful for the teaching of translation (e.g. Kim 2007, Colina 1997). The comparative analysis of genres has been partic-



ularly prominent in this respect. Genres as conventionalised communicative events are culture-specific, and translators need to be aware of potential differences in the genre conventions. Colina (1997), for example, makes use of contrastive rhetoric in addition to concepts from text linguistics, genre analysis, and discourse analysis, to investigate differences in the recipe genre in English and Spanish. Characteristic features of English recipes are, among others, absence of prepositions in the list of ingredients, omission of definite articles (e.g. 'heat oil in a pan'), imperative as the most common mood to give instructions. Spanish recipes, in contrast, make use of prepositions and articles, and imperatives or the se-passive are the dominant tense and mood. Colina illustrates how familiarising the students with the genre conventions has resulted in fewer cases of direct transference of ST textual features into the TT. She argues that "a significant improvement in the work of students exposed to explicit instruction is indicative of the benefit of pedagogical intervention" (Colina 1997: 335).

4.3. Translation shifts analysis

In addition to research into genres and genre conventions, there are also investigations into more specific features of texts, often conducted in a descriptive way for reflecting on implications of cultural differences for translation. Such studies include the investigation of the functioning of speech acts (e.g. requests, apologies) or politeness phenomena across languages and cultures (e.g., House 1998), or of discourse markers (e.g. House 2015 on linking constructions), rhetorical devices, lexical repetition, etc. (e.g. the chapters in the edited volume by Trosborg 1997). Some such descriptive research was aimed at identifying patterns in actual translation practices, e.g. shifts in coherence and cohesion (Blum-Kulka 2004), or shifts in transitivity which can cause a shift in the ideational function of the text (Calzada Pérez 2001, Mason 2004). Calzada-Pérez (2001) analysed speeches presented in both Spanish and English in the European Parliament. For example, she identified cases where ST material processes were rendered in the TT as non-material processes, as illustrated in the following quote where the material process expressed by 'castigar' (literally: punish) is rendered as a mental process:

Spanish Source text: ... *en dos regiones especialmente castigadas con otras dos reestructuraciones ...*

English Target text: ... *in two regions that have already suffered particularly heavy from ...*

Calzada-Pérez also argues that the translations in her corpus often sound natural and do not normally stay close to the transitivity patterns in the TT.

Also focusing on transitivity shifts, Mason (2004) compared translations of speeches produced in the European Parliament and of articles in the UNESCO *Courier* (English, French, and Spanish). He identified examples of shifts of transitivity in both cases, and also noted that the translations of the speeches to the European Parliament "stay relatively close to the transitivity patterns observable in the source texts" (thus not confirming the findings by Calzada-Pérez) whereas "UNESCO *Courier* translators display greater lati-



tude" (Mason 2004: 475). Mason sees the political sensitivity of the speeches on the one hand and the ease of processing in the field of journalism on the other hand as the main reason for this difference. Such more or less subtle differences in the findings of research (here in respect of the European Parliament speeches) also indicate that more empirical research involving a variety of texts and genres, language pairs, and communicative settings are required to understand the complexity of language in use, i.e. discourse, in translation.

4.4. Translation quality assessment

One of the first publications to argue for the relevance of SFL for translation quality assessment is House (1977, with a revised model in 1997). She uses Halliday's register analysis with its categories of field, tenor and mode as well as his notion of genre for a comparative analysis of originals and translations. As a first step, a profile of the ST register is produced on the basis of a detailed analysis. This is followed by a description of the ST genre as realized by the register and a statement of function. The same process is carried out for the TT, and then the profiles of ST and TT are compared in order to identify mismatches or errors. On the basis of the profile comparison, a statement of quality is made for the translation which can then be categorised as overt or covert translation (for a summary of the model see also Munday 2012a:140–144). House views equivalence as "the fundamental criterion of translation quality" (House 1997: 31), and her original model was rather rigid in its invariance requirements. In her revised model, overt and covert translation are seen as a cline, and more attention is paid to the translation brief and socio-cultural constraints as influencing the translation strategy. In a covert translation, i.e. "a translation which enjoys the status of an original source text in the target culture" (House 1997: 69), equivalence needs to be achieved at the level of genre and the individual text function, which may require changes on the level of text and register to account for culture-specific discourse preferences.

4.5. Uncovering attitudes and ideologies conveyed in translation

Since every text is embedded in a discursive context, as well as in wider socio-historical, sociopolitical, ideological and institutional contexts, social aspects of discourse have recently seen more attention, also in translation research. As already illustrated above, Hatim and Mason (1997) address the impact of factors of ideology and agency on translation. In their recent work, they have extended this focus of their discourse analytic approach. For example, Hatim (2009: 37) argues that "situational appropriateness established by registers, together with textual well-formedness, generic integrity and a discourse perspective, may more helpfully be seen as layer upon layer of 'socio-textual practice'". Speaker's attitudes are conveyed in and through discourse, and texts thus become vehicles for the expression of ideology and power relations. Or, "[f]eatures of texts thus conspire with discursive practices and collectively act on society and culture" (Hatim 2009: 49). Textual



features concern ideational choices (e. g. in the linguistic system of transitivity, passivisation), interpersonal choices (e.g. in the linguistic systems of mood and modality), and in the way the text is structured through mode (e.g. suppressed agency).

Also in respect of agency, Munday (2012b) investigates the linguistic signs of a translator's intervention and evaluation shifts. His discourse analytical model is amended by the addition of appraisal theory (Martin and White 2005), which, as an extension of Halliday's work on the interpersonal meta-function, describes components of a speaker's attitude, the strength of that attitude (graduation), and speaker's engagement. Munday (2012b) focused on attitudinal meanings, whereas Munday (2015) "explores the potential for the use of engagement resources and graduation as a means of determining translator/interpreter positioning" (Munday 2015: 406). This is illustrated with the effect of shifts in reporting verbs in political documents. For example, rendering 'claim' in the English source text as 'afirmar (affirm)' in the Spanish translation means that the Spanish text "could be read either neutrally as a statement of fact or even positively as an affirmation of appropriate ethical behaviour" (Munday 2015: 414). Munday argues that such an approach can uncover values inserted into a text by the translator and identify those points in a text that have most evaluative potential. Appraisal theory has also been used for translation analysis by Rosa (2013) and Manfredi (2018) for analysing literary and news translation, respectively.

Some work in Translation Studies has been informed by CDA. For example, based in Fairclough's model of discourse combined with corpus linguistics, Baumgarten (2009) analysed various English translations of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. The work by Daghigh et al (2018) too is inspired by CDA. Specifically making "use of the linguistic tools of different CDA frameworks" (Daghigh et al 2018: 200) applied to a corpus of Persian translations of English opinion articles, they propose a typology of manipulative strategies and a typology of manipulation techniques which are related to the strategies. They argue that such a typology "could help researchers investigate the manipulations that translators perform to meet the socio-political expectations of the target community" (Daghigh et al 2018: 198).

5. Implications for future research

As this paper has tried to illustrate, discourse analysis in its variety has been used in translation research for several purposes. In particular, linguistics-oriented translation researchers have found it useful for investigating the structure and meaning of a text. In evaluating Hatim and Mason's work, Munday (2012a: 152) argues that they deal with a large number of concepts but that it "is not clear that their approach constitutes a model that can be 'applied' in the conventional sense of the word." He suggests that "[a]lternatively, the authors' proposals can be taken as a list of elements to be considered when examining translation." (Munday 2012a: 152). Both Translation Studies and discourse analysis have developed further in the last years, which also provides scope for exploring synergies. The evolution of



the use of discourse analysis in Translation Studies and current research is presented in a special issue of the journal *Target* (Munday and Zhang 2015). For future research, using discourse analysis and CDA for uncovering attitudes and ideologies conveyed in translation is a particularly promising area which also fits the growing interest in power, ideology and agency in Translation Studies. The analysis of a variety of texts as discourse, including multimodal texts, can also contribute to a critical reflection on the explanatory power of the concept of 'discourse' and the value of specific analytical methods. As Zhang and Pan (2015: 387) argue in respect of their own study, "the application of concepts from SFL in detailed text analysis and from CDA in the overall discussion may better reveal how different models of discourse analysis can supplement each other and be applied to translation studies." And finally, a combination of the more traditional linguistically oriented discourse analysis with sociological perspectives can provide deeper insights into the complexity of discourse and translation as language in use.

References

- Baumgarten, S., 2009. *Translating Hitler's "Mein Kampf"*. A corpus-aided discourse-analytical study. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr Müller.
- Beaugrande, R. de and Dressler, W., 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Blum-Kulka, S., 2004. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In: L. Venuti, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge. pp. 290–305.
- Calzada Pérez, M., 2001. A three-level methodology for descriptive-explanatory Translation Studies. *Target*, 13(2), pp. 203–239.
- Colina, S., 1997. Contrastive Rhetoric and Text-Typological Conventions in Translation Teaching. *Target*, 9(2), pp. 335–353.
- Daghigh, A.J., Sanatifar, M.S. and Awang, R., 2018. A taxonomy of manipulative operations in political discourse translation. A CDA approach. *Forum*, 16(2), pp. 197–220.
- Fairclough, N., 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N., 2000. *New Labour. New Language?* London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J. and Wodak, R., 2011. Critical Discourse Analysis. In: T. van Dijk, ed. *Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, London: Sage. pp. 357–378.
- Fairclough, I. and Fairclough, N., 2012. *Political Discourse Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M., 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on language* (tr. S.S. Smith). New York: Harper.
- Halliday, M. A. K., 1978. *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hatim, B., 2009. Translating text in context. In: J. Munday, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 36–53.
- Hatim, B. and Mason, I., 1990. *Discourse and the translator*. London/New York: Longman.
- Hatim B. and Mason, I., 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge.
- House, J., 1977. *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. Tübingen: Narr.
- House, J., 1997. *Translation Quality Assessment. A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Narr.
- House, J., 1998. Politeness and Translation. In: L. Hickey, ed. *The Pragmatics of Translation*, Clevedon: Avon. pp. 54–71.



- House, J., 2015. Global English, discourse and translation: Linking constructions in English and German popular science texts. *Target*, 27(3). pp. 370–386.
- Jaworski, A. and Coupland, N. eds., 1999. *The Discourse Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Johnstone, B., 2002. *Discourse Analysis*. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kim, M., 2007. Using Systemic Functional Text Analysis for Translator Education. An Illustration with a Focus on Textual Meaning. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 1(2). pp. 223–246.
- Manfredi, M., 2018. Investigating ideology in news features translated for two Italian media. *Across Languages and Cultures*, 19(2). pp. 185–203.
- Martin, J.R. and White, P.R.R., 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave.
- Mason, I., 2004. Text parameters in translation: transitivity and institutional cultures. In: L. Venuti, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*, New York and London: Routledge. pp. 470–481.
- Mason, I., 2009. Discourse, ideology and translation. In: M. Baker, ed. *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, London: Routledge. pp. 83–95.
- Munday, J., 2012a. *Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and applications*. 3rd edition. London and New York: Routledge.
- Munday, J., 2012b. *Evaluation in translation. Critical points of translator decision-making*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Munday, J., 2015. Engagement and graduation resources as markers of translator/interpreter positioning. *Target*, 27(3). pp. 406–421.
- Munday, J. and Zhang, M. eds., 2015. *Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies*. *Target*, 27(3).
- Neubert, A., 1985. *Text and Translation*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.
- Neubert, A. and Shreve, G.M., 1992. *Translation as Text*. Kent and London: Kent State University Press.
- Rosa, A.A., 2013. The power of voice in translated fiction. Or, following a linguistic track in translation studies. In: C. Way, S. Vandepitte, R. Meylaerts and M. Bartłomiejczyk, eds. *Tracks and Treks in Translation Studies*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 223–245.
- Schäffner, C., 2013. Discourse Analysis. In: Y. Gambier and L. van Doorslaer, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Vol. 4. pp. 47–22.
- Swales, J., 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E., 2000. *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Trosborg, A., 1997. Text typology: Register, genre and text type. In: A. Trosborg, ed. *Text typology and translation*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 3–23.
- Trosborg, A., ed., 1997. *Text typology and translation*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Trosborg, A., 2002. Discourse Analysis as Part of Translator Training. In: C. Schäffner, ed. *The role of discourse analysis for translation and translator training*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. pp. 9–52.
- van Dijk, T.A., 1997. The Study of Discourse. In: T.A. van Dijk, ed. *Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction*, London: Sage. Vol. 1: Discourse as Structure and Process. pp. 1–34.
- van Dijk, T.A., 2008. *Discourse and Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Vermeer, H.J., 1996. *A Skopos Theory of Translation (Some arguments for and against)*. Heidelberg: TEXTconTEXT.
- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S., Yates, S.J., 2001. *Discourse Theory and Practice. A Reader*. London: Sage.



Wood, L. and Kroger, R.O., 2000. *Doing Discourse Analysis. Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Zhang, M. and Pan, H., 2015. Institutional power in and behind discourse. A case study of SARS notices and their translations used in Macao. *Target*, 27(3). pp. 387–405.

The author

Dr Christina Schäffner, Aston University, Birmingham, UK.

E-mail: c.schaeffner@aston.ac.uk

To cite this article:

Schäffner, Ch. 2019, Translation and Discourse Analysis, *Slovo.ru: baltic accent*, Vol. 10, no. 3, p. 28–42. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-2.

ПЕРЕВОД И ДИСКУРС-АНАЛИЗ

К. Шеффнер

Астонский университет
В4 7ЕТ, Великобритания, Бирмингем,
Астон Трайангл
Поступила в редакцию 27.05.2019 г.
doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-2

Проанализировано использование методов дискурс-анализа в переводоведении. Дискурс-анализ зародился в прикладной лингвистике и традиционно применяется для выполнения широкого спектра лингвистических исследований. В зависимости от того, понимается ли термин 'дискурс' в узком или широком смысле, дискурс-анализ имеет целью изучение структуры и функции языка в различных контекстах его употребления и / или выявление закономерностей, убеждений, действий, а также социальных ролей и властных отношений (критический дискурс-анализ). Поскольку перевод можно трактовать как акт коммуникации, преодолевающей лингвистические и культурные границы, а исходный текст и текст перевода есть акт использования языка, то концепции и методы дискурс-анализа могут с успехом применяться в переводоведении. Даны примеры использования дискурс-анализа для проведения подобного рода исследований.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, дискурсивный анализ, характеристики жанра, качество перевода, идеология.

Список литературы

Baumgarten S. Translating Hitler's "Mein Kampf.". A corpus-aided discourse-analytical study. Saarbrücken : VDM Verlag Dr Müller, 2009.

Beaugrande R. de, Dressler W. Introduction to Text Linguistics. L. : Longman, 1981.

Blum-Kulka S. Shifts of cohesion and coherence in translation. In: L. Venuti, ed. *The Translation Studies Reader*. L. : Routledge, 2004. P. 290–305.

Calzada Pérez M. A three-level methodology for descriptive-explanatory Translation Studies // *Target*. 2001. Vol. 13, №2. P. 203–239.

Colina S. Contrastive Rhetoric and Text-Typological Conventions in Translation Teaching // *Target*. 1997. Vol. 9, №2. P. 335–353.

Daghigh A. J., Sanatifar M. S., Awang R. A taxonomy of manipulative operations in political discourse translation. A CDA approach // *Forum*. 2018. Vol. 16, №2. P. 197–220.



- Fairclough N.* Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. L. : Longman, 1995.
- Fairclough N.* New Labour. New Language? L. : Routledge, 2000.
- Fairclough N., Mulderrig J., Wodak R.* Critical Discourse Analysis // T. van Dijk (ed.). Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary introduction. L. : Sage, 2011. P. 357–378.
- Fairclough I., Fairclough N.* Political Discourse Analysis. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2012.
- Foucault M.* The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on language / transl. S.S. Smith. N. Y. : Harper, 1972.
- Halliday M.A.K.* Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. L. : Edward Arnold, 1978.
- Hatim B.* Translating text in context // Munday J. (ed.). The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies. Abingdon : Routledge, 2009. P. 36–53.
- Hatim B., Mason I.* Discourse and the translator. L. ; N. Y. : Longman, 1990.
- Hatim B., Mason I.* The Translator as Communicator. L. : Routledge, 1997.
- House J.* A Model for Translation Quality Assessment. Tübingen : Narr, 1977.
- House J.* Translation Quality Assessment. A Model Revisited. Tübingen : Narr, 1997.
- House J.* Politeness and Translation // Hickey L. (ed.). The Pragmatics of Translation. Clevedon : Avon, 1998. P. 54–71.
- House J.* Global English, discourse and translation: Linking constructions in English and German popular science texts // Target. 2015. Vol. 27, №3. P. 370–386.
- Jaworski A., Coupland N.* (eds.). The Discourse Reader. L. : Routledge, 1999.
- Johnstone B.* Discourse Analysis. Malden ; Oxford : Blackwell, 2002.
- Kim M.* Using Systemic Functional Text Analysis for Translator Education. An Illustration with a Focus on Textual Meaning // The Interpreter and Translator Trainer. 2007. Vol. 1, №2. P. 223–246.
- Manfredi M.* Investigating ideology in news features translated for two Italian media // Across Languages and Cultures. 2018. Vol. 19, №2. P. 185–203.
- Martin J.R., White P.R.R.* The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English. Basingstoke ; N. Y. : Palgrave, 2005.
- Mason I.* Text parameters in translation: transitivity and institutional cultures // Venuti L. (ed.). The Translation Studies Reader. N. Y. ; L. : Routledge, 2004. P. 470–481.
- Mason I.* Discourse, ideology and translation // Baker M. (ed.). Critical Readings in Translation Studies. L. : Routledge, 2009. P. 83–95.
- Munday J.* Introducing Translation Studies. Theories and applications. 3rd ed. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2012a.
- Munday J.* Evaluation in translation. Critical points of translator decision-making. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2012b.
- Munday J.* Engagement and graduation resources as markers of translator/interpreter positioning // Target. 2015. Vol. 27, №3. P. 406–421.
- Munday J., Zhang M.* (eds.). Discourse Analysis in Translation Studies // Target. 2015. Vol. 27, №3.
- Neubert A.* Text and Translation. Leipzig : Enzyklopädie, 1985.
- Neubert A., Shreve G.M.* Translation as Text. Kent ; L. : Kent State University Press, 1992.
- Rosa A.A.* The power of voice in translated fiction. Or, following a linguistic track in translation studies // Way C., Vandepitte S., Meylaerts R., Bartłomiejczyk M. (eds.). Tracks and Treks in Translation Studies. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2013. P. 223–245.
- Schäffner C.* Discourse Analysis // Gambier Y., Doorslaer L. van (eds.). Handbook of Translation Studies. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2013. Vol. 4. P. 47–22.
- Swales J.* Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1990.



Titscher S., Meyer M., Wodak R., Vetter E. Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis. L. : Sage, 2000.

Trosborg A. Text typology: Register, genre and text type // Trosborg A. (ed.). Text typology and translation. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1997. P. 3–23.

Trosborg A. (ed.). Text typology and translation. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 1997.

Trosborg A. Discourse Analysis as Part of Translator Training // Schäffner C. (ed.). The role of discourse analysis for translation and translator training. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters, 2002. P. 9–52.

van Dijk T.A. The Study of Discourse // van Dijk T.A. (ed.). Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction. L. : Sage, 1997. Vol. 1 : Discourse as Structure and Process. P. 1–34.

van Dijk T.A. Discourse and Power. Basingstoke : Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Vermeer H.J. A Skopos Theory of Translation (Some arguments for and against). Heidelberg : TEXTconTEXT, 1996.

Wetherell M., Taylor S., Yates S.J. Discourse Theory and Practice. A Reader. L. : Sage, 2001.

Wood L., Kroger R.O. Doing Discourse Analysis. Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text. Thousand Oaks : Sage, 2000.

Zhang M., Pan H. Institutional power in and behind discourse. A case study of SARS notices and their translations used in Macao // Target. 2015. Vol. 27, №3. P. 387–405.

Об авторе

Кристина Шеффнер, профессор, Университет Астон, Бирмингем, Великобритания.

E-mail: c.schaeffner@aston.ac.uk

Для цитирования:

Schäffner C. Translation and Discourse Analysis // Слово.ру: балтийский акцент. 2019. Т. 10, № 3. С. 28–42. doi: 10.5922/2225-5346-2019-3-2.