

THE EXPRESSION OF ATTITUDE IN TRANSLATION

Jeremy Munday
University of Leeds, UK

ABSTRACT

This paper applies appraisal theory to the study of translation and interpreting. It discusses earlier work on lexical expression of attitude in specific genres of advertising and public notices and in simultaneous interpreting. The question of graduation and intensification is central. A case study analysis of a speech from the European Parliament shows that graduation is more prone to variation, both upscaled and downscaled, in simultaneous interpreting than in written translation. This raises certain hypotheses about the relation between mode and evaluation and stage of text production and evaluation. The paper ends with a call for these to be tested in future interdisciplinary research.

KEY WORDS: appraisal theory, attitude, graduation, intensification, interpreting, translation

RESUMEN

Este artículo aplica la teoría de la valoración al análisis de la traducción y de la interpretación. Discute anteriores investigaciones sobre la expresión léxica de la actitud en la traducción de la publicidad y de los anuncios públicos, así como en la interpretación simultánea. Son aspectos centrales la graduación y la intensificación. El análisis de un discurso en el parlamento europeo demuestra que la graduación es más susceptible a la variación (tanto incrementada como reducida) en la interpretación simultánea que en la traducción escrita. Esto nos lleva a formular ciertas hipótesis sobre la relación entre el modo de comunicación y la evaluación y entre la etapa de producción de un texto y su evaluación. El artículo termina proponiendo a que estas hipótesis se pongan a prueba en futuras investigaciones interdisciplinarias.

PALABRAS CLAVE: actitud, graduación, intensificación, interpretación, teoría de la valoración, traducción.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper discusses the translation of lexical indicators of attitude. It thus sets out to apply elements of appraisal theory to a mode of communication in which the values expressed by the text producer are mediated through the words of a third party, the translator. The paper assumes a familiarity with the concept of evaluation (Hunston and Thompson) and appraisal theory (Martin and White). For this



reason only a cursory description of the theory is provided, followed by a summary of two types of translated text (advertising and public notices) which have been the major subject of research in translation studies to date. Subsequently the findings will be summarized of a more detailed study of various scenarios, including both written translation and spoken interpreting (Munday). The paper will then analyse an example of political interpreting from the European Parliament in order to begin to investigate how far the trends in the translation of attitude may be affected by the mode of communication. The goal of the paper is to raise awareness of the issue of evaluation in translation and hopefully to point to useful areas of future interdisciplinary work between appraisal theorists and translation theory specialists.

2. STUDIES OF ATTITUDE IN TRANSLATION

Hallidayan linguistics provided the theoretical underpinning for a number of key publications in the translation studies boom of the late twentieth century, amongst the most prominent of which were Hatim and Mason; House; Steiner and Yallop; Teich. These pursued and attempted to systematize the linguistic analysis of translation, incorporating concepts of discourse, genre and register but focusing mainly on the ideational and textual metafunctions (see also Mason and Serban; and Calzada Pérez) including cohesion and naming (Beaton). Subsequent developments in translation studies have tended to push a cultural studies or sociological agenda, which makes it all the more timely to introduce a new angle to linguistic analysis. One way of doing this is to focus on the interpersonal function and meaning of language, named by Halliday as the “intruder” function, which presents rich possibilities for the detailed analysis of the relationship between text producer, text receiver and the translator.

Within the field of interpersonal meaning, Martin and White, in their seminal *The Language of Evaluation*, describe three systems. These are:

- (1) tenor (negotiation of speech function)
- (2) solidarity (relation to the audience); and
- (3) appraisal.

Appraisal itself is divided into:

- (a) attitude (affect, judgement and appreciation)
- (b) graduation (intensifying or reducing the expression of attitude), and
- (c) engagement (opening up or closing down possible responses).

In this paper, for reasons of space, I shall limit myself to discussing the lexical expression of attitude, which is the central pillar of the appraisal system, and to graduation, which regulates its strength.

Since its origins in the development of literacy in Australia (Iedema et al.), appraisal theory has to date been overwhelmingly applied to monolingual studies of specific genres such as newspaper discourse (Bednarek; White and Thomson) and

history textbooks (Coffin). Yet it would seem to provide a promising route to the study of evaluation in translation, the latter being intimately linked to translator subjectivity and motivation. Over the years, work in translation studies has undermined the concept of the translator as a transparent conduit of information between text producer and receiver. The translator acts as a visible or invisible “third man” through which the source text message passes and is inevitably modified both linguistically and conceptually. Anything else would be reminiscent of Borges’s narrator Pierre Menard who sets out to relive and recreate Cervantes’ creation of *Don Quixote* three hundred years after the event and succeeds in doing so only to find he has reproduced it word for word in the Spanish. However much the translator may strive to be unbiased, and however much the translator’s contract and code of ethics may stipulate that the target text must be faithful and accurate, the reality is more blurred. Inevitably, into the translation come the translator’s beliefs, background, values (or “ideology”) and idiosyncrasies and the effects of the Culture of Context, felt most keenly in conditions of political or religious censorship. This is seen in studies which adopt a range of theoretical frameworks (Cunico and Munday, eds.), including narrative theory (Baker), to analyse the role of the translator in the transmission of cultural values.

The general term “intervention” has recently been adopted in translation studies to study this intrusive role of the translator (see the papers in Munday, ed.) However, the technical resources of appraisal theory have been applied on few occasions and have been restricted to the analysis of attitude in very clearly delineated genres. Attitude is used by Zhang and Qian as a means of analysing culturally divergent values in advertising in Chinese and English. In such promotional texts the most obvious expression of attitude is by “direct inscription” (Martin and White 61), through evaluative epithets (Halliday 184) which seek to highlight the positive characteristics of a product. This is shown in Kaltenbacher’s study of monolingual tourist websites advertising Austria, Scotland and the United States, where the different cultures emphasize different qualities. In translation, when values are not shared between languages and cultures they need to be adapted to meet cultural expectations. One striking example given by Zhang and Qian is an advertisement for Boss perfume, translated from English into Chinese:

EXAMPLE 1 BOSS FOR MAN

Source text (ST): Launched in 1986, Boss is a distinctly **masculine** fragrance that combines citrus and tangy apple with woody tones of sandalwood.

Target text (TT)

这款香水的设计灵感源自于1986年同名的男装品牌。Boss成功表达男人的自信与品味,前味由香柠檬、柑橘、蜂蜜组成,中味含有胡荽、琥珀及苔藓,后味由檀香、皮革与雪松组合而成。气味清新而充满男人的简洁与自信。

(Literal translation: “The design inspiration of this perfume originates from 1986’s man suit of the same brand. Boss’s success lies in its expression of man’s confidence and taste. The top note comprises of bergamot, orange

and honey; the middle note consists of coriander, amber and moss and the base note includes sandalwood, further and cedar. The smell is fresh and full of man's uncomplicated style and confidence.”)

Here, the high degree of positive appreciation in the source text is expressed in the concept *masculine*. This is both context-specific as well as highly culture-specific and of course also functions in tandem with the visual image that shows *masculine* to be young, strong, raw, exciting, sexually attractive, and so on. The Chinese adapts the advertisement with a large degree of explicitation focused on many different qualities. Four of these are forms of judgement, specifically of capacity or tenacity: 成功 (“success”), 品味 (“taste”), 自信 (“confidence”, which occurs twice); and two of appreciation: 清新 (“fresh”—of the fragrance) and 簡潔 (“uncomplicated”—of the man). What is invoked by the word *masculine* in the English is directly inscribed in the Chinese and also culturally adapted. In translation theoretical terms, it is adapted or “localized” for the Chinese locale.

Further examples include Qian's analysis of bilingual public notices in Macau and Hong Kong. Analysis shows that the directness of the attitudinal expression varies between Chinese and English or Portuguese. So, in Example 2, designed to promote recycling and reduce waste, the Chinese operates more indirectly using declarative sentences and appreciation based on an appeal to communal values while the English of the translation uses concise and more direct imperatives.

EXAMPLE 2 ENVIRONMENTAL CAMPAIGN MACAU

ST: 減廢回收最環保 汙者自付齊贊好。

(Literal translation: “Reducing and recycling waste are most environmentally-friendly; making the polluters pay is praised by all”)

TT: Reduce waste. Make Polluters Pay.

Example 3, again from Qing, shows a similar trend in the Chinese, towards declarative sentences and an expression of appreciation based on the values of the community (“we do it for you”) and Judgement (“heart and soul”).

EXAMPLE 3 HONG KONG AIRPORT

ST: 即使看來微不足道，我們也為你用心做好。

(Literal translation: “Even if it seems trivial, we will still do it for you heart and soul.”)

TT: Service: it's all about the **little** things.

In this example, the English translation is more indirect and depends on the reader responding positively to the attention paid by the text producer to the small details, presumably thinking that this indicates that the important things are also managed with care. This more indirect expression of attitude, categorized variously as “invoked” or “evoked” attitude, is extremely important in appraisal theory and, as we shall see in the next section, may be central to the analysis of translated texts.

Sometimes these ideational meanings are highly charged with attitudinal value. The naming of politically and religiously sensitive concepts (e.g. Montreal or Montréal; the name of God) are extreme but by no means isolated examples (Mossop; Kim).

3. EVALUATION AND TRANSLATOR DECISION-MAKING

A more wide-ranging adoption of appraisal theory for the analysis of translation was carried out in Munday. The theory was applied in a series of case studies in different genres: multiple simultaneous interpretations of the 2009 inauguration speech of President Barack Obama, the analysis of queries on online translator forums, the revision of draft translations by literary translators and “legitimate variation” (Babych and Hartley) in multiple translations by trainee translators. The results were illuminating. Technical translators mainly focussed on subject-specific queries related to their technical field (what is a *pitch regulated upwind turbine with active yaw* in Romanian?) or arising from the lack of semantic correspondence between languages (e.g. the German word *Leistung* which has a myriad possible translations in English, such as *service, performance, output*). The evaluative language that caused problems tended to concern unknown terms of appreciation (e.g. *bleeding-edge technology, new-fangled features*). Where it is impossible to gain expert input or where the ambiguity of the ST cannot be resolved, the translator may select a more neutral TT rendering in order to control risk. In the lexical analysis of attitude in the study of 18 student translations of a literary text, critical points of evaluation seemed to be related to word class. Concrete nouns are less likely to carry attitude and are often relatively stable in translation. There was no variation in solid words such as *table, man, money* and very little in those abstract terms which have an obvious dictionary equivalent (e.g. *temor > fear*). On the other hand, there was great variation in the translation of ambiguous epithets, especially where the attitudinal charge was unclear. Thus, the epithet *decrecientes*, used to describe a neighbourhood viewed from a passing tram, was variously translated as the more neutral *diminishing, ever-decreasing* and the highly negative appreciation of *deprived* and *rundown*.

Of most interest for the application of appraisal theory were the results of the analysis of three broadcast Spanish simultaneous interpretations of Obama’s 2009 inaugural speech. Time and processing constraints imposed on the interpreter (see the discussion in the next section) dictate that some elements have to be omitted. Close analysis of the speech showed that these elements very often related to attitudinal expressions, especially evaluative epithets in noun-epithet combinations (e.g. *swift action, far-reaching network*) and adverbs or modal particles that act as modifiers (e.g. *badly weakened*). Little shift was found in the categorization of inscribed attitude but much more interesting was the translation of indirect invoked attitude. Examples included culture-specific historical references such as the battles of Concord, Gettysburg, Normandy and Khe Sahn, key moments in the history of the United States (War of Independence, the Civil War, the D-Day landings in the Second World War, the defensive battle in Vietnam) that index the courage and

spirit of the military in their fight to uphold the values of the people. These references contain complex associations, conveying what I term “evoked-associative” attitude, that may require explicitation if they are to successfully resonate with the TT audience. Even then, the target audience may be so removed from the event that achieving “equivalent effect” (Nida and Taber) may not be an option.

Crucially, also, graduation seemed subject to considerable shifting. Non-core words, especially verbs (e.g. *wield, harness*) often lost their intensity in interpreting. More explicit markers of force and focus, such as adverbs (*well understood*), were omitted far more than was expected, as were counter-expectancy indicators (*only the prosperous; never a given; even greater effort*). Overall in the interpretations of the Obama speech, intensification was lessened in more than a third of the cases in which it appeared in the source text and did not increase at all elsewhere. The question arises as to how far these trends are due to the mode of interpreting. In order to begin to explore this further, the remainder of the paper focuses on another example of the same mode, this time taken from a debate of the European Parliament.

4. EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT FARAGE SPEECH

On 24 February 2010 the European Parliament debate centred on the follow-up to the informal EU 20-20 European Council. Newly appointed President of the Council, Herman Van Rompuy, addressed the Parliament and spoke about his vision for his mandate. This prompted a furious reaction from the right-wing United Kingdom Independence Party MEP Nigel Farage. Notorious for his aggressive stance towards Europe, Farage launched a savage attack on Van Rompuy, and his State, Belgium (Example 4a).

EXAMPLE 4a FARAGE SPEECH ST

President of Europe – this long-awaited day. We were told that, when we had a President, we would see a giant **global** political figure: the man that would be the political leader for five hundred million people; the man that would represent **all** of us on the world stage; the man whose job was so important that **of course you’re** paid more than President Obama. Well, **I am afraid** what we got... was you. And I am sorry, but after that performance earlier that you gave ... and I do not want to be rude... but, **but... you know, really**, you have the charisma of a **damp** rag and the appearance of a **low-grade** bank clerk. The question that I want to ask **and that we are all going to ask** is: who ARE YOU? I’d never heard of you; nobody in Europe had ever heard of you. I would like to ask you, Mr President: who... voted for you? And what mechanism – [*he addresses other members protesting at his comments*] oh, I know democracy is not popular with you **lot – what mechanism do the peoples of Europe have to remove you?** Is this European democracy? Well, I... I sense, though, that you are competent

and **capable** and dangerous, and I have no doubt that it's your intention to be the **quiet** assassin of European democracy and of the European nation states. You appear to have a **loathing**... for the very concept of the **existence** of nation states; perhaps that it's because you come from Belgium, which **of course** is **pretty much** a **non-country**. (*Reactions*) **But since you took over, we've seen Greece reduced to nothing more than** a protectorate. Sir, you have no legitimacy in this job **at all**, and I can say with confidence ... that I can speak on behalf of the majority of the British people in saying... we don't know you, we don't want you, and the sooner you're put out to grass, the better.¹

The negative attitude in this intervention is very aggressively and forcefully expressed using a range of appraisal resources. These encompass direct inscription (*you are competent, capable and dangerous*), ideational meaning (*who are you?*), graduation and intensification (*a loathing for the very concept of ... nation states; whose job is so important*) and a large measure of sarcasm triggered by metaphor (*damp rag*) and counter-expectancy (*I'm afraid what we got was you*).

We shall compare this with the simultaneous interpreting into Spanish to give an idea of the types of changes that can occur. The result is quite dramatic. All those expressions highlighted in bold in Example 4a were omitted in the Spanish. These omissions may be classified as follows:

Loss of ideational information: *that we are all going to ask; what mechanism is there to remove you?; But since you took over, we've seen Greece reduced to little more than* (a protectorate); and the shift from the noun *a non-country* to the paraphrase *we see what that is for a country*

Loss of inscribed affect: *I am afraid*

Loss of inscribed judgement: *global, capable*

Loss of inscribed appreciation: *damp (rag), low-grade (bank clerk), quiet (assassin)*

Loss of expressions of graduation: *all of us, pretty much (a non-country), nothing more than (a protectorate), (no legitimacy) at all*

Loss of non-core intensification: *(you) lot, loathing, put out to grass*

Loss of counter-expectancy indicators: *Of course you're paid; you know, really; (I sense) though, (that you are competent); of course (is... a non-country)*

¹ Transcription by the author of the speech from the video recording. Jun. 20 2012 <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/wps-europarl-internet/frd/vod/player?language=en&menusearchfrom=by_mep&pageby=unit&idmep=4525&discussionId=0&page=0&category=0&format=wmv&askedDiscussionNumber=13>. The official transcript of the debate can be found on the European Parliament website. Jun. 26 2012 <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getVod.do?mode=chapter&language=EN&vodDateId=20100224-15:23:21-918>.



Since this is a piece of simultaneous interpreting, with the concomitant time constraints for the production of the target text, it is to be expected that there will be some omissions and possibly some false starts. The fact that Farage's diatribe is so forceful and face-threatening makes it even more difficult for the interpreter, compelled by his role to use the first-person singular pronoun for Farage's own opinion and the direct second-person pronoun for Van Rompuy. It is as if the interpreter himself is insulting the President of the European Council. The ideational omissions do result in some severe distortion of the details of the message, notably deleting reference to the mechanism to remove Van Rompuy and also any reference to Greece. These are not recoverable from the co-text or context. But there are far more frequent omissions of elements related to evaluation. As can be seen in the list above, these cover some direct inscriptions of attitude (*afraid, capable, low-grade*, etc) but also (and in fact more frequently) graduation and intensity, including counter-expectancy indicators "which indicate that attitudinal values are at stake" (Martin White 67). This pattern of graduation would seem to fit the trend of the earlier Obama inaugural analysis, but a finer-grained analysis of the full transcription of the Spanish interpreting (Example 4b) tells a slightly different story:

EXAMPLE 4b FARAGE SPEECH LITERAL TRANSLATION OF SPANISH INTERPRETING²

President of Europe. We have waited for so much time. They had told us that when we had a president we would see a giant political figure, the man who would be the political leader for 500 million ... citizens who would represent us on a world level, the man who... whose work would be so important that he was going to receive more salary than President Obama. Well, then, what us has... we got was you. And I am **really** sorry, but **well, it's that...** after your intervention of earlier and I don't want to be rude... but... **what do you [plural] want me to say?** You [sing] have the charisma of a rag and an appearance of a ... eh... clerk of a bank. And the question that I want to ... ask you... who are you, **who the devil are you?** I have never heard of you, no-one in Europe has ever heard **nor has the foggiest** you... **idea of who** you are ... I want to ask you ... who has voted for you? **And what mechanism? And what mechanism? Of course, I well** know that you [plural] don't like it but the democracy you [plural] who are shouting so much, what mechanism? What mechanism has chosen you [sing]? This is European democracy? Well, then... I say to you... that... not that... this is incompetent, dangerous and I am sure that [it] is your in... tention to be the assassin of European democracy and of the nation states of Europe... **And for... we have a... we want... eh eh... to be near the concept of nation state...** you it seems that you do not like this nation state much because maybe you come from Bel... because you come from Belgium and kno...

² A transcription of the Spanish itself is given in Appendix 1.

we see what that is as a country. (*Reactions*) You want to have a protectorate. You do not have legitimacy for this... to carry out this job and I can tell you certain in what I say and I speak furthermore in ... er... on behalf of the majority of British people: we do not know you, we do not want you and as soon...eh... the b.. the sooner you go, the better.³

The bold highlights in Example 4b are additions made by the interpreter. Two points should be made here. One is that most of these additions are to graduation: *really sorry; who the devil are you?; foggiest idea; I well know; shouting so much*. They thus partly compensate for the omissions in 4a. In addition, they suggest that interpersonal meaning, particularly intensification, is more susceptible to change in translation than is ideational meaning. In other words, the interpreter seems to focus on retaining or recreating the ideational function as much as possible, even if this sometimes collapses. He may similarly avoid changing an inscribed expression of attitude (so, *you have the charisma of a rag and the appearance of a clerk of a bank* remains!) but variation of graduation and intensification in its various forms does occur, both increasing and decreasing it.

The other obvious feature of Example 4b is the absence of cohesion, the abundance of false starts and self corrections, which suggest that the interpreter is struggling with how to deal with Farage's onslaught. How far these are features of spoken interpreting compared to written translation is moot, although the difference is far more than simply between spoken and written forms. It relates to characteristics of the process itself. To use the seminal definition given by Otto Kade, interpreting is "a form of Translation (in the wider sense) in which (a) the source language text is presented only once and thus cannot be reviewed or replayed, and (b) the target language text is produced under time pressure, with little chance for correction and revision" (Pöchhacker 133). A translator normally has more time to revise and correct, to compare ST and TT and to provide as complete a translation as possible.

In cases such as the Farage speech, it is possible to compare the interpreting with the official written translation that is produced after the event for formal publication and to stand as a record of events in the Parliament. This makes it possible to begin to test the hypothesis that variation in evaluation is more likely to be a property of interpreting. Example 4c shows this a literal gloss of the official Spanish translation (the actual Spanish is given in Appendix 2):

EXAMPLE 4c FARAGE SPEECH. LITERAL GLOSS OF OFFICIAL TRANSLATION INTO SPANISH

President of Europe, a very anticipated day. One said to us that when we had a President we would glimpse a gigantic world political figure: the man who would be the political leader of 500 million people; the man who

³ Transcription by the author. The recordings of the simultaneous interpreting of the debate are available on the URL indicated in Note 1.

would represent us all on the world scene; the man whose job would be so important that, of course, one would pay him more than President Obama. Well, I fear that what we got was you [sing]. And I am sorry, but after that intervention of yours earlier... I don't want to be rude, but, truthfully, you have the charisma of a cloth and the appearance of a low-level bank employee.

(Protests)

The question that I want to raise, and that all of us will ask ourselves is: who are you? Never had I heard of you; no-one in Europe had ever heard of you. Mr President, I would like to ask you, who voted for you?

(Strong protests)

And with what mechanism? —I know that democracy is not very popular with you [plural]—, what mechanism do Europeans have to remove you? Is this European democracy?

Nevertheless, I perceive that you are competent and capable and dangerous, and I have no doubt that it is your intention to murder in silence European democracy and the European nation states. You appear to have an aversion for the very concept of the existence of nation States; perhaps because you come from Belgium, which, of course, is to a large extent a non-country.

(Reactions)

But since you took control, we have seen Greece reduced to little more than a protectorate. Sir, you have no (stress) legitimacy for this post and I can affirm with confidence that I speak in the name of the majority of the British people in affirming: we do not know you, we do not want you and the sooner you disappear, the better.

Comparison of Example 4b and 4c shows that the shifts noted in 4b have almost all been resolved in the final translation. The ideational omissions and distortions have been corrected, the false starts removed so that the translation is a fully coherent piece of writing, and the omissions to attitude and graduation have to a large extent been filled in. While we cannot draw firm conclusions from this one example, at the very least it demonstrates that there is no a priori reason for distortion of evaluation in written translation, however sensitive the text. The translator has reproduced both the form and the force of Farage's attack without any of the modification or deletion that characterized the interpreting on the day.

5. SOME QUESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

So, what does this show us, beyond the fact that evaluation is different in translation and simultaneous interpreting? I would like to end with a few questions and recommendations for future studies of an interdisciplinary nature:

1. While much appraisal theory work is focused on producing taxonomies and profiles of evaluation in specific genres, translation studies is more centred on potential shifts in the transfer between languages and cultures. The Chinese examples in Section 2 indicate the effects this may have in cross-cultural communication. The Farage text analysed here will hopefully whet the appetites of appraisal theorists to consider the huge potential of how translation (in the widest sense) affects the expression of evaluation.
2. Graduation and intensification of various kinds occurred in the simultaneous interpreting of both the Obama inaugural and the Farage intervention. This is probably to be explained by time and processing constraints that force concentration on ideational content. It is an interesting finding, but of course far from conclusive. Nevertheless, I would suggest that variation in graduation is likely to be a strong characteristic of this mode of communication and would urge interpreting theorists to pursue this line of inquiry. I would also urge appraisal theorists to consider how far mode of communication may be a general determinant of graduation.
3. Also interesting is the possibility that graduation may be related to the stage of text production. So, Example 4c (the official written translation of the Farage speech) closely restored the evaluative properties of the ST. This chimes with findings in Munday, where examination of draft translations showed that graduation is increased at the revision stage, associated in literary translation certainly with an overriding concern for stylistic adjustment to produce a more natural TT.
4. This paper restricted itself to the lexical expression of attitude and graduation. I suggest that fruitful research can focus on the areas of engagement and reader response. The positioning of the translator or interpreter with regard to the other participants in communication is fundamental and is closely linked to the degree of explicitation added in translation in order to compensate for the TT audience's lack of detailed knowledge of the source context.

WORKS CITED

- BABYCH, B., and A. HARTLEY. "Modelling Legitimate Translation Variation for Automatic Evaluation of MT Quality." *Proceedings of LREC 2004*. Jun. 15 2012 <<http://www.mt-archive.info/LREC-2004-Babych-2.pdf>>.
- BAKER, Mona. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.
- BEATON, M. "Interpreted Ideologies in Institutional Discourse: The Case of the European Parliament." *The Translator* 13.2 (2007): 271-296.
- BEDNAREK, M. *Evaluation in Media Discourse: Analysis of a Newspaper Corpus*. London: Continuum, 2006.
- CALZADA PÉREZ, M. *Transitivity in Translating: The Interdependence of Texture and Context*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007.



- COFFIN, C. *Historical Discourse: The Language of Time, Cause and Evaluation*. London: Continuum, 2006.
- CUNICO, S., and J. Munday, eds. *Translation as Ideology*. Special issue of *The Translator* 13.2 (2007).
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold, 1994.
- HATIM, B., and I. MASON. *Discourse and the Translator*. Harlow: Longman, 1990.
- . *The Translator as Communicator*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- HOUSE, J. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1997.
- HUNSTON, S., and G. THOMPSON, eds. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- IEDEMA, R., S. FEEZ, and Peter R.R. WHITE. *Media Literacy*. Sydney: Disadvantaged Schools Program, NSW Department of School Education, 1994.
- KADE, O. *Zufall, und Gesetzmäßigkeit in der Übersetzung*. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1968.
- KALTENBACHER, M. "Exploring Culture Related Linguistic Differences in Tourist Board Websites: The Emotive and The Factual." *System and Corpus: Exploring Connections*. Ed. G. Thompson and S. Hunston. London: Equinox, 2006. 269-292.
- KIM, S. *Strange Names of God: The Missionary Translation of The Divine Name and the Chinese Responses to Matteo Ricci's "Shangti" in Late Ming China, 1583-1644*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2004.
- MARTIN, J.R., and Peter R.R. WHITE. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave, 2005.
- MASON, I., and A. SERBAN. "Deixis as an Interactive Feature in Literary Translations from Romanian into English." *Target* 15.2 (2003): 269-294.
- MOSSOP, B. "The Translator's Intervention through Voice Selection." *Translation as Intervention*. Ed. J. Munday. London: Continuum, 2007. 18-37.
- MUNDAY, J. *Evaluation in Translation: Critical Points in Translator Decision-Making*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2012.
- . ed. *Translation as Intervention*. London: Continuum, 2007.
- NIDA, E., and C. TABER. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969.
- PÖCHHACKER, F. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- QIAN, H. "Investigating 'Unfaithful' Translation via the Appraisal Theory: A Case Study of Translations of Public Notices." Paper presented at FIT 5th Asian Translators' Forum, Bogor, Indonesia, April 11-12, 2007.
- STEINER, E., and C. YALLOP, eds. *Exploring Translation and Multilingual Text Production: Beyond Content*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001.
- TEICH, E. *Cross-Linguistic Variation in System and Text: A Methodology for the Investigation of Translations and Comparable Texts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003.
- WHITE, Peter R.R., and E. THOMSON. "Analysing Journalistic Discourse." *Communicating Conflict: Multilingual Case Studies of the News Media*. Ed. E. Thomson and Peter R.R. White. London: Continuum, 2008. 1-23.
- ZHANG, M., and H. QIAN. "Investigating 'Unfaithful' Translations via the Appraisal Theory: A Case Study of the Translation of Six Advertisements." Paper delivered at the 3rd IATIS Conference, Melbourne, 2009.

APPENDIX

1. FARAGE SPEECH. TRANSCRIPTION OF SPANISH INTERPRETING

Presidente de Europa. Hemos esperado tantísimo tiempo. Nos habían dicho que cuando tuviéramos un presidente veríamos una figura gigante política, el hombre que sería el líder político para 500 millones de ... ciudadanos que nos representaría a nivel mundial, el hombre que... cuyo trabajo sería tan importante que iba a recibir más salario que el presidente Obama. Bueno, pues, lo que nos ha.. hemos recibido es usted. Y lo siento de verdad, pero bueno, es que... después de su intervención de antes y no quiero ser mal educado... pero... ¿qué quieren que les diga? Tiene usted el carisma de un trapo y una apariencia de un ...eh.. contable de un banco. Y la pregunta que le quiero .. hacer a usted... ¿quién es usted ¿quién demonios es usted? yo no he oído en mi vida de usted, nadie en Europea ha oído jamás ni tiene ni pajolera ust... idea de quién es usted ... Le quiero preguntar a usted ¿quién le ha votado a usted? ¿y qué mecanismo? ¿y qué mecanismo? Claro, ya sé que no les gusta pero la democracia ustedes que gritan tanto ¿qué mecanismo? ¿qué mecanismo le ha elegido a usted? ¿Esta es la democracia europea? Bueno, pues... le digo .. que ... no que ... esto es incompetente, peligroso y estoy seguro de es su in...tención de ser el asesino de la democracia europea y de los estados nación de Europa... Y por... nosotros tenemos un.. queremos ... eh eh...estar cerca del concepto de estado nación... usted parece ser que no le gusta mucho este estado nación porque a lo mejor viene de Bél... porque viene usted de Bélgica y sab... vemos lo que es esto como país.

(Reacciones)

Usted quiere tener un protectorado. Usted no tiene legitimidad para est...para llevar a cabo este trabajo y le puedo decir seguro de lo que digo y hablo además en...er.. por la mayoría de los británicos: no le conocemos, no le queremos y cuanto ...eh... m.. antes se vaya, mejor.

2. FARAGE SPEECH. OFFICIAL TRANSLATION INTO SPANISH

Presidente de Europa, un día muy esperado. Se nos dijo que cuando tuviéramos un Presidente vislumbraríamos una figura política mundial gigantesca: el hombre que sería el líder político de 500 millones de personas; el hombre que nos representaría a todos en la escena mundial; el hombre cuyo trabajo sería tan importante que, desde luego, se le pagaría más que al Presidente Obama. Bien, me temo que lo que conseguimos fue usted. Y lo lamento, pero tras esa actuación suya de antes... No quiero ser grosero, pero, de veras, tiene usted el carisma de una bayeta y la apariencia de un empleado bancario de bajo nivel.

(Protestas)

La pregunta que quiero plantear, y que todos nos vamos a hacer, es: ¿Quién es usted? Nunca había oído hablar de usted; nadie en Europa había oído nunca hablar de usted. Señor Presidente, me gustaría preguntarle, ¿quién votó por usted?

(Fuertes protestas)

¿Y con qué mecanismo —sé que la democracia no es muy popular para ustedes—, con qué mecanismo cuentan los europeos para destituirle? ¿Es esto la democracia europea?



No obstante, percibo que usted es competente y capaz y peligroso, y no me cabe duda de que su intención es asesinar en silencio la democracia europea y los Estados nación europeos. Parece tener aversión al concepto mismo de la existencia de los Estados-nación; tal vez porque usted viene de Bélgica, que, desde luego, en gran medida es un no-país.

(Reacciones)

Pero desde que asumió el control, hemos visto a Grecia reducida a poco más que un protectorado. Señor, no tiene usted ninguna legitimidad para este puesto y puedo afirmar con confianza que hablo en nombre de la mayoría de los británicos al afirmar: no lo conocemos, no lo queremos y cuanto antes desaparezca, mejor.

