# The Role of Syntactic Strategies in the Representation of Persian Translators' Ideologies in Written Translated Social-Political Texts: A CDA Approach

**Dr. Ailin Firoozian Pooresfahani [1]**
*Assistant Professor of Linguistics, Damghan University, Damghan, Iran*

**Dr. Ferdows Aghagolzadeh**
*Professor of Linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran*

**Dr. Arsalan Golfam**
*Associate Professor of Linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran*

**Dr. Aliyeh Kord-e Zafaranlu Kambuziya**
*Associate Professor of Linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran*

## Extended Abstract

### 1. Introduction

Although it is believed that language is the sheer truth (Cook, 2003), this fact should not be ignored that language specifically the socio-political discourse is sometimes used to conceal the truth and conveys the purport the way that affects people and persuade them to accept the untruth. The translator who is responsible for transferring the content that in turn, includes meta-language elements such as culture, history, politics, authority, and different ideologies from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL) and by manipulating and altering the linguistic forms of source language, he affects the readers' schools of thoughts and feelings and finally lead them to a certain ideology (Mason, 2010; Penycook, 2004). therefore, it can be said that in a translation process, the translator can convey the source of language's content to the target language the way he likes by applying diverse strategies and techniques, consciously or unconsciously (Schäffner, 2007, 2009).

As far as the way a socio-political translator's choice of any of the linguistic forms considerably influences the reader's mind, the research aims to augment the precision of translations done by students of English translation from different social classes, to improve people's critical thinking, to find and analyze manipulative syntactic structures of socio-political texts, and to express translators' ideology or the dominant ideology of their society.

---

1 Corresponding Author: a.firoozian@du.ac.ir

## 2. Theoretical Framework

The framework of this paper is based on critical discourse analysis and socio-cognitive Van Dijk's approach (2004). His analytical method, suggest two levels of analysis: macro level and micro level. Macro-level is related to the analysis of meta-linguistic elements such as ideology. For investigating this level in this study, "ideological square" defined by Van Dijk (2004) will be used. The concept of this square based on polarization, designate the following dimensions:
1. Emphasizing *our* positive actions or properties
2. Mitigating *their* positive properties and actions
3. Emphasizing *their* negative properties and actions
4. Mitigating *our* negative properties and actions
Microstructure as another level is related to the analysis of the text in terms of linguistic forms. This research focuses on all syntactic strategies which might be applied by translators' in order to represent their ideologies.

## 3. Methodology

Among approximately 600 texts collected from different written English socio-political content that were translated to Persian language and were limited to national, international or regional issues related to subjects about Iran, 250 utterances were selected for analyzing. These excerpts had the most obvious syntactic manipulation done by Persian translators. They were taken from written news, interviews, resolutions and the like from different sources such as websites, press, and magazines. Searching all syntactic strategies and manipulations, the Persian translators' ideology were then challenged within CDA framework and Van Dijk's theoretical pattern (2004). After that, Van Dijk's ideological square was used to analyze how *Our* and *Their* actions and properties were polarized and how they were reflected in translation were examined. In the end, the frequency of the applied syntactic strategies was calculated.

## 4. Results and Discussion

In this part of the research according to Van Dijk's theoretical pattern (2004), the frequency and percentage of each syntactic manipulations including eight strategies (word order, passivization, topicalization, nominalization, addition, deletion, modality and tense shift) which were used to manipulate the syntactic structures of English (ST) in order to convey Persian translator's dominant or intended ideology, are excluded and analyzed.

## 5. Conclusion and Suggestions

The conclusions show that the syntactic strategies and manipulations do have a salient role in representing Persian translators' ideologies in English written translated socio-political texts through the polarization of *us* and *them*. In other words, the effectiveness of syntax, manipulations, and changes made on syntactic structures and the Van Dijk's theoretical pattern (2004) syntactic strategies could considerably echo the Persian translators' ideologies in translated socio-political

English discourses. Hence, studying these analyses clearly demonstrates that the major strategies or strategies used for emphasizing and mitigating actions in the content that Van Dijk explained in his ideological square has been significantly effective in justifying syntactic changes and the manipulations done by Persian translators. Also, comparing syntactic frequencies showed that the findings of the mostly applied strategies such as deletion and addition represent that among all such strategies, Persian translators pick the clearest and most direct way to express intended ideologies and hitherto, they have been trying to affect the meaning and the ideology of the target language indirectly. As far as the current research chose to study syntax among different discourse terms, studying other terms can show a more comprehensible picture of changes that represent the efforts translators have made to demonstrate beliefs, principles, personal and social culture through words, structures, and ideological meanings.

**Keywords:** Linguistics and translation studies, Critical discourse analysis, Ideology, Syntactic Structures and strategies, Socio-political texts

**References (In Persian)**

1. 8. Khosravi Nik, M., & Yarmohammadi, L. (2000) ساختــارهای گفتمانی و خبری [Ideological and discourse structures in ایـدئولوژیکی در گفتمان‌های روزنامه‌های ایران newspapers of Iran]. *Majmue Maghalate Panjomin Conference* (26-45). Tehran: Allameh Tabatabai University.

1. Aghagolzadeh, F. (2002). مقایسه و نقد رویکردهای تحلیل کلام و تحلیل کلام انتقادی در تولید و درک متن[Comparing and criticism of discourse analysis Approaches and critical discourse analysis in production and understanding] (Doctoral dissertation). Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran.

2. Aghagolzdeh, F. (2004). تحلیل گفتمان انتقادی [Critical discourse analysis]. Tehran, Iran: Entesharate Elmi va Farhangi.

3. Attai, R. (2007). تحلیل گفتمان انتقادی واژگان دارای بار ایدئولوژیک در ترجمه رمان‌های قبل و بعد از انقلاب اسـلامی ایران [Critical discourse analysis of ideological words within translation of novels before and after Revolution] (Master's thesis), Islamic Azad University {Central Tehran Branch}, Tehran, Iran.

4. Attaran, A. (2007). بررسی ترجمه متون خبری در وبگاه‌های ایرانی بر اساس دیدگاه تحلیل گفتمان انتقادی[Investigating the translation of news in Tabnak Web: Critical discourse analysis] (Master's thesis). Allameh Tabatabai University, Tehran, Iran.

5. Farahzad, F. (2003). چــارچوبی نظری برای نقـد ترجمـه.[Theoretical framework for translation criticism]. *Translation Studie*s, *1* (3), 29- 38.

6. Farahzad, F. (2004). سیر تحول مطالعات ترجمه در پنجاه سال اخیر.[Changes in translation studies trend in last fifty years]. In F. Farahzad (Ed.), *Do Hamandishi Tarjome Shenasi* (pp. 9-24). Tehran, Iran: Alame Tabatabai University Press.

7.  Frahzad, F. (2008). نقد ترجمه از دیدگاه تحلیل گفتمان انتقادی [Translation criticism based on critical discourse analysis]. *Translation Studies*, *6* (24), 39-47.

8.  Pishghadam, R., Hashemi, M., & Hesami, Sh. (2011). Critical thinking and translation. *Language and Translation Studies, 4,* 15-33.

9.  Soltani, A. (2004). قدرت، گفتمان و زبان [Power, discourse and language] (Doctoral dissertation). Allameh Tabatabai University, Tehran, Iran.

### References (In English)

1.  Aslani, M., & Salmani, B. (2015). Ideology and translation: A critical discourse analysis approach towards the representation of political news in translation. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, *4*(3), 80- 88.

2.  Bloor, M., & Bloor, T. (2007). *The practice of critical discourse analysis*. London, England: Hodder Education.

3.  Cook, G. (2003). *Applied linguistics*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

4.  Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. London, England: Longman.

5.  Fairclough, N. (2013). Critical discourse analysis and critical policy studies. *Critical Policy Studies*, *7* (2), 177-197.

6.  Farahzad, F. (2008). Translation as an intertextual practice. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, *16*(3), 125- 131.

7.  Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London, England: Routledge.

8.  Keshavarz, M. H., & Alimadadi, L. (2011). Manipulation of ideology in translation of political texts: A critical discourse analysis perspective. *Journal of Language and Translation*, *2*(1), 1-12.

9.  Khajeh, Z., & Khanmohammad, H. (2012). Transmission of ideology through translation: A critical discourse analysis of Chomsky's *media control* and its Persian translations. *Applied Language Research*, *1*, 24-42.

10. Khanjan, A., Amouzadeh, M, Eslami., & Tavangar, M. (2013). Ideological aspects of translating news: Headlines from English to Persian. *META Journal*, *58*(1), 87-102.

11. Kua, S. H., & Nakamura, H. (2005). Translation or transformation? A case study of language and ideology in the Taiwanese press. *Discourse and Society*, *16*(3), 393-417.

12. Lande, I. (2010). *The role of critical discourse analysis in the translation of political text* (Unpublished master's thesis). Aarhus University, Denmark.

13. Li, J. (2013). *Translating Chinese political discourse: A functional cognitive approach to English translations of chinese political speeches* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Salford, Manchester, England.

14. Mahdiyan, M., Rahbar, M., & Hosseini Masoum, M. (2013). Applying critical discourse analysis in translation of political speeches and interviews. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, *2*(1), 35-47.

15. Mason, I. (2010). Discourse, ideology and translation. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Critical readings in translation studies* (pp. 83-95). London, England: Routledge.

16. Penycook, A. (2004). Critical applied linguistics. In A. Davies, *The handbook of applied linguistics* (784- 808). Oxford, England: Blackwell.

17. Schäffner, C. (2007). Politics and translation. In P. Kuhiwczak, & K. Littau (Eds.), *A Companion to translation studies* (pp. 134-147). Toronto, ON: Multilingual Matters LTD.
18. Schäffner, Ch. (2009). Political discourse and translation. In L. Wei, & V. Cook (Eds.), *Contemporary applied linguistics* (pp. 142-164). London, England: Continuum.
19. Schäffner, Ch., & Bassnett, S. (2010). *Political discourse media and translation*. Newcastle, England: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
20. Shojaei, A., & Laheghi, F. (2012). A critical discourse analysis of political ideology and control factors in news translation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(12), 2535-2540.
21. Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Discourse, power and access*. London, England: Routledge.
22. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In A. Bell, & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 21-63). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
23. Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannan, D. Schiffrin, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 583-588). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
24. Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction.* Barcelona, Spain: Pompeu Fabra University Press.
25. Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Discourse and manipulation*. London, England: Sage.
26. Van Dijk, T. A. (2012). Ideology and discourse. In M. Freeden, Tower Sargent, T., & Stears, M. (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political ideologies* (175-196). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
27. Van Leeuwen, T. (1993). Genre and field in critical discourse analysis: A synopsis analysis. *Discourse and Society*, *4*(2), 193-223.
28. Wodak, R. (1989). *Power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.