

**The Representation of Ideology in Translation of English Political Texts  
Regarding the Strategies of Style and Rhetoric: A Case of Critical  
Discourse Analysis**

**Ferdows Aghagolzadeh**

*Professor of linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran*

**Ailin Firoozian Pooresfahani<sup>1</sup>**

*Phd of Linguistics, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran*

*Received: 2 April 2016    Accepted: 20 September 2016*

**Extended Abstract**

**1. Introduction**

Without a doubt, people communicate their feelings and thoughts through discourse and texts. Every text is formed based on some metalinguistic variables including, culture, history, relations of power, politics, norms, and rules of the society. The author is supposed to organize a text considering all these mentioned variables and the translator is expected to take them into account while translating the same text (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). Hence, it can be inferred that the metalinguistic variables find their reflection in the language (the choice of words) both the author and translator employ and therefore, the trace of ideology can be found in all texts (Basnett, 2002; Schäffner, 2009). Moreover, the translator conveys his intended meaning to the reader by clever manipulation of words and structures (Tymoczko & Gentzler, 2002; Mason, 2010).

Considering all mentioned points and despite various ideological discourse structures proposed by Van Dijk (2004), Iranian researchers paid scant attention to the study of style and rhetoric as compared to other discourse structures introduced by Van Dijk (2004). Furthermore, regarding the reciprocal relationship between culture and language and the fact that Persian language is occupied with literary devices for long time, writers of different types of texts especially literary texts make use of these sources. Concerning the paucity of research in this realm, the chief purpose of this paper is to apply the Van Dijk (2004)'s model as the starting point for critical discourse analysis of Persian political translated texts to arrive at deeper understanding of how political translators use these two discourse structures and their strategies in order to impose their intended ideologies. In addition, we try

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author: a.firoozian @ modares.ac.ir

to uncover the ideological reasons of political translators in applying these two discourse structures.

## **2. Methodology**

To collect data, a corpus of 300 English paragraphs and their translated counterparts in Persian were accurately scrutinized sentence by sentence. All these paragraphs were related to the recently important political issues in Iran which were translated into Persian by translators. This corpus is taken from a comprehensive collection of newspapers, websites, theses, magazines, recorded deals, and so on. To achieve the aim of this study, all sentences in the 300 paragraphs were read meticulously and critically, concentrating on each phrase, clause, and sentence separately and in conjunction with the neighboring phrases, clauses, and sentences. They were searched for the strategies of style and rhetoric; the strategy of style includes lexicalization and rhetoric is composed of 7 strategies which are simile, number game, irony, repetition, hyperbole, dramatization, and metaphor. Subsequently, one example was given for each strategy.

## **3. Discussion**

The analysis of results exhibited that among 300 paragraphs taken into account, 50 instances of lexicalization were found; the reasons of applying such strategies were not the same throughout these paragraphs translated by different translators. The researchers cited three reasons behind making use of lexicalization which are as follows: 1) ideological lexicalization 2) stylistic lexicalization 3) complementary lexicalization (i.e., the translator resorts to the use of two strategies simultaneously, one of which is lexicalization, to express his ideology more effectively). The complementary lexicalization was classified into three groups: a) lexicalization and generalization b) lexicalization and euphemism c) lexicalization and nominalization. This finding is in line with the Ideological Square of Van Dijk (2004). Furthermore, the finding showed that the occurrences of the strategies of rhetoric were just equal to 7.

## **4. Conclusion**

The results indicated that the frequency of employing rhetoric strategies was much less than the use of the style strategy. This would mean that the translators enjoyed more tendency to apply lexicalization strategy than the rhetoric ones. As a matter of fact, rhetoric strategies may embrace literary devices, the abundance of which can be apparently seen in Persian language and culture. However, it was found that Persian translators showed less tendency to use rhetoric strategies to reflect their own ideology. This result may lend support to the fact that political texts are mostly written in direct and straight manner and as a result, translators would prefer to use lexicalization strategy more frequently than rhetoric strategies.

Every scientific enquiry opens new directions for further research. Future directions for research in this area would be to survey political discourses in other countries and compare their results with the results of current study. Since this study focused on written discourse, it is engrossing to conduct another study to deal with spoken discourse.

**Key words:** Linguistics and translation studies, Critical discourse analysis, Ideology, Style and rhetoric structures, Political texts.

### 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. Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
3. Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T.A. Van Dijk (Ed.). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
4. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
5. Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. United Kingdom: Longman.
6. Farahani, E.D. (2011). *A critical discourse analysis of LA times and Tehran Times on the representation of Iran's nuclear program implications* (Master's thesis). University of Arak, Iran.
7. Hemmati, A. (2012). *Comprehension of 'self' and 'the other' in Obama's speeches through the representation of social actor* (Master's thesis). Ferdowsi University, Mashhad, Iran.
8. Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis*. UK: Blackwell.
9. 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.
10. Keshavarz, M. H., & Zonoozi, L. (2011). "Manipulation of ideology in translation of political texts: A critical discourse analysis perspective". *Journal of Language and Translation*, 2(1), 1-12.
11. 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.
12. Khanjan, A., Amouzadeh, M., Eslami, A. & Tavangar, M. (2013). "Ideological aspects of translating news: Headlines from English to Persian". *Erudit*, 58(1), 87-102.
13. Longman, P. (2014). *Longman of contemporary English*. England: Longman.

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 and New York: Routledge.
16. Richardson, J. (2007). *Analyzing newspaper: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. China: Macmillan.
17. Schäffner, Ch. (2009). Political discourse and translation. In L. Wei & V. Cook (Eds.), *Contemporary applied linguistics* (pp. 142-164). London and New York: Continuum.
18. 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.
19. Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.
20. Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Discourse and manipulation*. London: Sage.
21. Van Dijk, T.A. (2012). Ideology and discourse. In M. Freedon, L. Tower Sargent, & M. Stears (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political ideologies* (pp. 175-196). London: Oxford University Press.
22. Van Leeuwen, T. (1993). Genre and field in critical discourse analysis: A synopsis analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2), 193-223.
23. Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In G. R. Caldas Coulthard (Eds.), *Text and practice* (pp. 45-69). London: Routledge.
24. Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice*. London: Oxford University Press.
25. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

#### References (In Persian)

1. Aghagolzadeh, F. & Dehghan, M. (2013). "Tahlile Baznamaie Shivehae Baznamaie Gozineshe Khabar bar Mabnae Ruykarde Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadi" (The Analysis of News Selection Representative Methods from CDA Perspective). *Language Related Research*. 5(4). 1-16.
2. Aghagolzadeh, F. & kheirabadi, R. (2014). *Be Suye Eraeye Olguye Tolide Khabar dar Charchube Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadi (The Linguistic Model of News Production and Processing: A Critical Discourse Analysis)*. Tehran: Nashre Elmi.
3. Aghagolzadeh, F. (2002). *Moghayese va Naghde Ruykardhaye Tahlile Kalam va Tahlile Kalame Enteghadi dar Tolid va Darke Matn (The Comparison of Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis in Production and Comprehension of a Text)* (Ph.D Thesis). Tarbiat Modares University: Tehran.

4. Aghagolzadeh, F. (2004). "Raveshshenasie Tahghigh dar Tahlile Kalame Enteghadi" (The Research Methodology in Critical Discourse Analysis). In A. Kazemi. *Sixth Conferences on Linguistics* (22-37). Tehran: Allameh Tabataba'i University.
5. Aghagolzadeh, F. (2006). *Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadi (Critical Discourse Analysis)*. Tehran: Elmi va Farhangi Publication.
6. Aghagolzadeh, F. (2010). *Tahlile Goftemane Radio bar Paye Nazariyeha va Rahbordhae Zabanshenasi (Radio Discourse Analysis Based on Linguistic Theory and Strategies)*. Tehran: Tarhe Ayandeh.
7. Aghagolzadeh, F. (2011). "Asibshenasie Tahghighate Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadi dar Iran" (Pathology of critical discourse analysis studies in Iran). In F. Aghagolzadeh. *The First Conferences of Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics* (11-22). Tehran: Nevis Parsi.
8. Aghagolzadeh, F. (2012). "Moadelyabi, Estelahshenasi va Vazhegane Paye dar Tahlile Gofteman va Karbordshenasie Zaban" (Equivalence, terminology, and basic vocabulary in discourse analysis and pragmatics). *Second Conference of Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics* (13-30). Tehran: Nevis Parsi.
9. Attai, R. (2007). *Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadie Vazhegane Daraye Bar Idolozhik dar Tarjomeye Romanhae Ghabl va Bad az Enghelabe Eslamie Iran (Critical Discourse Analysis of Ideological Words in the Translation of Novels before and after Revolution)* (MA Thesis). Azad University: Tehran. Iran.
10. Attaran, A. (2007). *Barasie Tarjomeye Motune Khabari dar Vebgahhaye Irani bar Asase Didgahe Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadi: Motaleeye Moredie Vebgahe Tabnak (Investigating the Translation of News in Tabnak Web: Critical Discourse Analysis)* (MA Thesis). Allameh Tabataba'i University: Tehran. Iran.
11. Azad, A. (2008). *Tajziye va Tahlile Khabar 20:30 dar Charchube Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadi (The Analysis of 20:30 Newsbroadcasting within the Framework of Critical Discourse Analysis)* (MA Thesis). Azad University: Tehran. Iran.
12. Dekhoda, A. & et al. (1994). *Dekhoda Dictionary*. Tehran: Tehran University. Iran.
13. Eris, A. & Hashemi, M.R. (2014). "Barasie Tarjomeye Akhbare Siyasi ba Ruykarde Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadi" (The investigation of translated political news: Critical Discourse Analysis). In F. Aghagolzadeh. *Third Conference of Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics* (65-78). Tehran: Nevis Parsi. Iran.
14. Eris, A. (2013). *Barasie Tarjomeye Akhbare Siyasi ba Ruykarde Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadi bar Asase Modele Se Vajhi (The Translation of Political News Based on Three Dimensional Model: Critical Discourse Analysis approach)* (MA Thesis). Ferdowsi University: Mashhad. Iran.

15. Haghshenash, A. M., et al. (2001). *Hezareh English-Persian Dictionary*. Tehran: Farhange Moaser. Iran.
16. Kheirabadi, R. (2011). *Engareye Zabanshenakhtie Tolid va Pardazeshe Khabar: Critical Discourse Analysis (The Linguistic Model of News Production and Processing: A Critical Discourse Analysis) (Ph.D. Thesis)*, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran. Iran.
17. Khosravi Nik, M. & Yarmohammadi, L. (2000). "Sakhtarhae Goftemani va Idolozhiki dar Goftemanhae Khabarie Ruznamehae Iran" (Ideological and discourse structures in Iranian Newspapers). In F. Farahzad. *Fifth Conference of Iran linguistics* (26-45). Tehran. Allameh Tabataba'i University. Iran.
18. Kusha, M. & Shams, M. (2005). "Masaleye Hasteiye Iran dar Khabarhae Beritania: Barasie Naghadane" (Iran nuclear issue in Britain news: Critical investigation). *Applied Linguistics Journal*. 8(2). 107-141.
19. Mohammadpour, F. (2012). "Barasie Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadie Matbuate Iran va Engilisizaban ba Mozue Bazdid az Tasisate Hasteiye Keshvare Iran" (The investigation of Iranian and English press related to nuclear installation in Iran). In A. Kupal and et al. *The first national conference on language and Linguistics* (355-366). Tehran: Nevis Parsi. Iran.
20. Shirvan, Z. (2009). *Tahlile Goftemane Enteghadie Parei az Motune Matbuatie Siasie Moaser (Critical Discourse Analysis of Some Political Texts)* (MA Thesis). Ferdowsi University: Mashhad. Iran.
21. Soltani, A. (2004). *Ghodrat, Gofteman va Zaban (Power, Discourse and Language)* (Ph.D Thesis), Allameh Tabataba'i University: Tehran. Iran.
22. Soltani, A. (2008). *Ghodrat, Gofteman va Zaban: Sazo Karhae Jaryane Ghodrat dar Jomhuri Eslamie Iran (Power, Discourse and Language in Iran)*. Tehran: Nashre ney.
23. Yarmohammadi, L. & Seyf, L. (2004). "Baznamaiye kargozarane Ejtemai dar Monazeate Felestin va Esrail az Tarighe Sakhtarhae Goftemanmadare Jameshenakhti-Manai" (Representation of social actors in Palestine and Israel Conflicts through socio-semantic discursive structures). In F. Farahzad. *Sixth Conferences on Linguistics* (421-434). Tehran: Allameh Tabataba'i University. Iran.
24. Yarmohammadi, L. (2004). *Goftemanshenasie Rayej va Enteghadi (Common and Critical Discourse Analysis)*. Tehran: Hermes. Iran.
25. Yarmohammadi, L. (2006). *Ertebatat az Manzare Goftemanshenasie Enteghadi (Communications: Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective)*. Tehran: Hermes. Iran.