A DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF PERSIAN TRANSLATION OF PASSIVE VOICE IN POLITICAL SPEECHES ACCORDING TO CATFORD'S CATEGORIES

Zahra Khan

Islamic Azad University of Bandar Abbas, IRI

ABSTRACT: *Drawing upon the framework of Catford's Shifts, this study is a DA investigation into the translation of passive voice in English speeches of the US politicians during the year 2013. Having carried out a detailed discourse analysis on a corpus of 29 speeches, the number of frequencies and percentages of the instances were computed. The findings show that in translating passive structures in political speeches, translators use structural shifts with high frequency; however, class shifts were used when the translator was not able to create the same effect or emphasize a particular message, while intra-system, unit and level shifts were not used at all. Having been applied Catford's translation notion mostly on literary or some psychology texts in previous studies, this research has contributed to the theory in the genre of political texts.*

KEYWORDS: Discourse Analysis, Political Discourse Analysis, Political Speeches, Passive Voice, Persian Translation, Catford's Categories

INTRODUCTION

DA in this inquiry mainly focuses on uncovering any significant deviation in translation done by translators, by taking into account whether the intended message has been transferred to the audience of TT.

Within different ideological frameworks the meanings of words may become transformed or reinterpreted. In political discourse language is used to manipulate thought. Orwell (1946) suggests "political speech is the defense of indefensible." Population may not see the truth or horror in front of them as politicians hide the negative. As this is done via using passive voice, the use of words, sentences and structures, gain more importance than usual i.e. politicians would not use passive sentences unless, they want to emphasize an object, de-emphasize an unknown subject/actor, hide the blame or obscure responsibility to convey the intended purpose. "Passive voice" is one of the structures which among different grammarians and linguists have been a cause of dispute. When translating a political text from English, where these structures are used more often, it becomes more challenging.

The frequency of these structures can be one of the basic differences between English and Persian and the failure to pay attention to them makes the translated texts seem odd and unusual in Persian. Persian language uses more active sentences, therefore, one of the major problems for translators is transferring intended message of political texts from English in which passive is more frequent in conveying a special message. Hence, translators would naturally encounter such translation problems as to how to emphasize an object in passive voice, how to hide the responsibility and how to convey the message so that there would be no loss of message, intonation and particular intention.

In doing so, Catford's translation shifts has been used as a framework for the analysis. In this regard, the questions addressed in this research are: (1)What strategies among those of Catford's are used in translating passive voice in political speeches? (2)What is the frequency of each strategy in translating passive voice in political speeches according to Catford's categories? (3)What does the application of translation strategies for passive sentences indicate? In answering the mentioned questions, this study tries to show how different orientations in the Persian translations of English texts can contribute to the interpretations of that text. The main goal here is to shed light on the sources of manipulation in Persian translations via translators. However, as the areas to be analyzed and discussed are widely vast, this research has significantly been devoted to a thorough analysis of passive voice in translation of speeches made by different politicians.

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING

The practice of translating is long established since the beginning of civilization to date. Translation is the meaning of a text which is rendered into another language as it is intended by the author of the text. (Newmark, 1988, p.5). Regarding translation, an important distinction is made between formal correspondence and textual correspondence by Catford (1965) as cited in Munday (2008). Equivalence tied to a particular ST-TT known as textual and a system-based concept between a pair of sentences is defined as formal equivalence. Translation shifts occur when these concepts diverge. To put it in Catford's (1965) words, "TRANSLATION SHIFTS are thus departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL." The translation shifts are classified into level shifts and the category shifts (cited in Munday, 2008, p.60). A source language item at one linguistic level with its translation equivalent at a different level, in other words, shift from grammar to lexis and the other way round is called **Level Shift**. On the other hand, **Category Shifts** are divided into four types; namely: structure, class, unit and intra-system shifts. **Structural shifts** are the shifts in grammatical structure and the most common type of shift. For instance, when a passive structure in English is translated into an active sentence in Persian. By **class shifts,** the shift from one part of speech to another is concerned. That is, adjective in English is translated as noun is Persian. **Rank** refers to "clause, group, word, and morpheme, which are the "hierarchical linguistic units of sentence," and the **unit shift** is said to occur when changes in rank occur. For example, a word in SL is translated into a phrase in TL. Finally, **intra-system shifts** are defined as, **"**when the SL and TL have corresponding systems and translation involves non-corresponding elements." (Munday, 2008, p.61).

Translation is one of the most critical jobs in modern society. As international diplomacy is the most important of all external affairs, it is important that those ideas are translated properly when expressed; else they can result in major catastrophes.

Discourse analysis gained significance in translation studies in the 1990s. Discourse analysis studies the meaning, social and power relations communicated through languages. When people talk about language they are focusing on it as an abstract system, i.e. people use a set of rules, generalized system to share their feelings, express and exchange opinions, ideas, information and actions. This knowledge is based on what they already know about language. But discourse is not focusing on language as an abstract system rather, focusing on both the origin of this knowledge and the result of it. Put it differently, discourse is what people participate in and make generalizations and application of that knowledge they already know

while making discourse (Johnstone, 2008). In van Dijk's (2000) terms "power, dominance, hegemony, ideology, class, gender, race, discrimination, interests, reproduction, institutions, social structure and social order" are typical vocabulary of scholars in DA. "Discourse refers to expressing oneself using words". To know, value and experience the world, to assert power and knowledge, discourses are used. Discourses are used to build power and knowledge, to regulate and normalize, to develop new knowledge and power relations and for hegemony (McGregor, 2003).

Johnstone believes that "power comes with social status, in other words, it "can be seen as something one subgroup or one person "has" and others do not." In the same line, van Dijk states, social power is defined in terms of control. That is, groups have power because they are able to control the acts and minds of other groups. He states, the resources used to exercise power differentiate power into various types: namely, force is the coercive power of the military and of violent men, money is the power of the rich, likewise, knowledge, information or authority can be compelling and forceful power of parents, professors or journalists. In a particular historical, social and political condition, our words have meaning. It means we should be conscious about underlying meaning of the words and never again speak, or read/hear others' words. Because of the reason that, "our words are politicized": they "carry power which reflects the interests of those who speak (McGregor, 2003).

This study has considered investigating how political discourse has been dealt with in Translation studies (TS). As per Chilton and Schaffner (2004, p.6) by analyzing the text and talk of politicians, we are able to understand their influence on society and their ability to put their opinions through to a large audience on a local, national or even global level.

Seminal work on political discourse as compare to linguistics, pragmatics, and discourse studies has been done by Chilton (1985) outside the more theoretical mainstream. The examples include his debate on the language of the nuclear arms and also work on nukespeak. He claims that in the political language of nuclear weapons, negative connotations are subverted from linguistic point of view. Similarly, Fairclough (1989) criticizes that political discourse is a "form of social practice with a malign social purpose." In support to his criticism an illustration of this malign social purpose are works on "Nukespeak" in political discourse. Montgomery (1992) has clearly mentioned that language used for nuclear weapons is "obscurantist and "euphemistic." He elaborates that within different ideological frameworks similar words and phrases are reinterpreted. The concept of "representation" links directly to this process. In representing what we can know, believe and think, language is used in different ways. This issue is referred to as representation. It has two views: the Universalist and the Relativist. According to the universalist view, language and thought are seen as independent of each other. To express our system of thought language is used while this system is independent of language. On the other hand, according to the relativist, language and thought are seen as inextricably intertwined. The language makes our understanding of the world possible, particularly within a political context in which you need to manipulate, in order to make others do what you want and believe. Transformation is general principle here. As Pĕcheux (1982) claims: "based on who uses them, the meanings of words become transformed." The interaction of the words and the words in one formation are interpreted differently within another.

In translation, due to complicated and subtle ideas, structure and message of the texts behind the word choice, political texts seem more challenging. In order to find out the ideologies, attitudes and feelings expressed through language, through the thoughts and emotions of the

speaker about an event or phenomenon, speeches are analyzed. Not being stated clearly and explicitly of the intentions, studying remarks and comments of the politicians becomes more substantial.

According to Bassnett and Schäffner (2010, p.22), in the field of politics, translation is an integral part of political activity, often invisible, though. As a bridge between various discourses, translation makes the information available to addressees beyond national borders. It is the consequence of globalization, that political texts are required to be translated. The reactions to the statements between countries are as they are provided in translation. As in some cases the reality is concealed, in some others magnified by the orator. The original text is produced in accordance with the norms and values of that society i.e. in particular socio-cultural situation, in the same line, the socio-cultural background, linguistic background and experience of the translator is not ineffective on the product of translation. Hence, translation is a mediating intercultural activity, the audience, situation, function of the text in TL community and text types are factors which possibly may affect the practice.

Edelman (1977, p.123) believes that, in exchanging values in social life and transforming power into right and obedience into duty, a key role is of the language. It can be seen as creating both power and becoming an area where power can be applied. Language, therefore, creates and shares the products of the institutions and organizations which are social values and beliefs. In the same way, Wareing (2004) states that the choice of words affects the perception of people of the others and of themselves; hence, on our attitudes, words have a strong influence.

DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY

To accomplish the objectives of this research a collection of English political speeches given by the president Barack Obama, Secretary John Kerry, and ambassadors such as Dicarlo and Power and the like has been compiled along with their Persian translations from the website "IIPDIGITAL" which is managed by the US Department of State. The speeches under study are the ones given by politicians in 2013, and the important reason of selecting mostly speeches by politicians from the United States is the difference in accent; that is, the discourse of American accent and that of British English is not the same. In this regard, the researcher was restricted to pick American accent for the unavailability of sources in British accent and their Persian equivalents. The rationale behind choosing aforementioned website for the selection of materials was the availability of speeches with their translations in Persian. To meet the demands of this study, Catford's shifts have been used as a framework for conducting discourse analysis on Persian translation of political speeches. This is a corpus-based research which has made it descriptive in nature. The sampling technique used in this qualitative research is Purposeful Sampling and the method used to gather the data is document analysis in which translations already conducted by translators have been studied. Each speech and its translation was read and numbered sentence by sentence. Passive voice structures and their translations were found and specified by underlining and italicizing. Moreover, there were phrases or sentences which were not translated or missing in their Persian versions. They are highlighted to be distinguished. Then the passive voice structures in each speech were compared with their Persian equivalents according to Catford's Categories. While comparing the source and target texts deviations, mistranslations or any violations in following the framework were analyzed. The role of political speeches in affecting knowledge, beliefs, values, social identities and social relations appears to be partly a matter of how language is used. In this regard, analysis

of language used by politicians can be considered as a significant attempt to highlight the nature of political power. The language of politics includes particular ways of representing the world, particular constructions of social identities and relations. The focus is, then, upon how events, situations and people are represented by politicians.

ANALYSIS

The comparative data and the areas of similarity and difference between the two languages identify in which categories the translators had deviations. The comparison of passive voice in the source language and their counterparts in the target language manifests that the translations had some degrees of deviation from the original texts. These changes, or rather say manipulations were obvious throughout the translated texts. Based on the fact that discourse reveals the attitudes of language users in different texts, the translations involved different types of changes in discourse. In some places, translators showed intention towards transforming the social pattern of the original text while in some other tend to remain loyal to the original discourse. By taking about 29 political speeches and their translations in which there are 212 examples for discussion there are lots of points which can be mentioned. As an illustration, what the speaker or writer puts first will influence the interpretation of everything that follows. The way the speaker places the information within a sentence and their order is of great significance. And if the translator changes the placement of a particular structure; in other words, subject or the object, the words or phrases that come first or last instantaneously might have an effect on the comprehension of the listener. Here some instances have been extracted both from the original source language and its translation where the order of the information is changed by the translator and clearly indicate the deviation from the original meaning in the intonation of the speaker.

S.T: *We've been blamed by supporters of Morsi*. (John Kerry, "Annual Trafficking in Persons Report Release", sentence 37)

TT: *هواداران مُرسی ما را سرزنش کرده اند.*

ST: *We've been blamed by the other side*, as if we are supporters of Morsi. (John Kerry, "Annual Trafficking in Persons Report Release", sentence 38)

TT: *طرف مقابل نیز ما را چنانکه گفتی هوادار مرسی بوده ایم مورد ملامت قرار داده است.*

In both extracts, although passive has been translated into passive, in the original text the stress of the speaker's intention is on "we" while in its translation by placing *هواداران مُرسی* or in the second one *طرف مقابل* at the beginning of the sentence, the stress the speaker wanted to put on "we" has been ignored. By placing "we" at the beginning, the speaker intended to show their innocence; that "we have been blamed."In other words: it is we who have been blamed.

S.T: I reiterated to President Rouhani what I said in New York -- while there will surely be important obstacles to moving forward, and *success is by no means guaranteed*, I believe we can reach a comprehensive solution. (President Obama, "Iran", sentence 5)

TT:در این گفتگو، من به پرزیدنت روحانی بر آنچه در نیویورک بیان داشتم تاکید کردم – اگر چه مطمئنا موانع مهمی در پیش رو خواهد بود، و *به هیچ وجه تضمینی برای دست یافتن به موفقیت وجود ندارد*، من معتقدم که ما می توانیم به راه حلی جامع دست یابیم.

Here again, the linguistic manipulation diverts the people's attention from the real attention president Obama wanted to show that what is of vital matter for him to be stressed out is "success" which cannot be guaranteed and due to lack of notice to this issue by the translator simply caused the idea not to be transferred thoroughly and reliably to the target listener. Furthermore, in its translation the stress is on "*تضمین* " i.e. there is no guarantee that success will be achieved while in the original it is vice versa.

Moreover, we have instances where the translator, on one hand, have ignored the emphasis on a particular word; on the other, when the same structure has been repeated by the speaker in the source text s/he has faithfully and carefully transferred the idea in the target text with clearly the same effect. For example:

S.T: *It's rooted* in our respect of Egypt as a nation, an ancient center of civilization, and a cornerstone for peace in the Middle East. (President Obama, "The Situation in Egypt", sentence 5)

TT:این مناسبات در احترام ما برای مصر به عنوان یک کشور، یک کانون باستانی تمدن، و یکی از ستونهای صلح در خاورمیانه *ریشه دارد.*

S.T: *It's also rooted* in our ties to the Egyptian people, forged through a longstanding partnership. (President Obama, "The Situation in Egypt", sentence 6)

TT: *ریشه ی* این رابطه را همچنین باید در پیوندهای ما با مردم مصر، که از طریق یک مشارکت دیرینه شکل گرفته است، *جستجو کرد.*

In the latter extract as mentioned before the same emphasis has been carefully observed by the translator; while, in the former one, the translator placed the word ریشه دارد to the end part of the sentence. Here the question arises that when there are two sentences with the same words and structures why there is a prominent difference in their translations? It can be whether due to the politics hidden underlying the texts or it may be because of the ignorance of the translator. It is noteworthy to mention that although in the phrase: ریشه ی این رابطه the stress has been considered, the structure has been changed; that is, verb "rooted" is translated as noun "ریشه." By doing so, class shifts are used by the translator.

S.T: *A gender-sensitive approach is needed* when considering measures to address the safety of journalists. (Ambassador, "Protecting Journalists", sentence 25)

TT:هنگام در نظر گرفتن اقدامات برای رسیدگی به موضوع ایمنی روزنامه نگاران، اتخاذ *یک رویکرد حساس نسبت به موضوع جنسیت مورد نیاز است.*

In the above sample, the translator changed the place of " *A gender-sensitive approach*" to the ending of the sentence which leads to another interpretation.

There are lots of other examples where the translator has used class shifts, in some instances s/he noticed the emphasis while in some other ignored. Like:

ST: And *backed by the President*, you drove the effort with persistence, patience, and creativity. (Kerry, "Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations", sentence 43)

TT: و شما *با پشتیبانی رئیس جمهوری*، این تلاش را با پافشاری، بردباری، و خلاقیت پیش برده اید.

Here, on one hand, the phrase "backed by the President" has been put at the beginning of the sentence. That is to show that the "support of president" precedes "you" while, in its translation "you (شما)" has been presented first in the sentence, indicating the lack of notice by the translator. On the other hand, the stress on the word "پشتیبانی (back)" in the phrase "backed by the president (با پشتیبانی رئیس (جمهوری)" has been considered; however, by doing so, the translator has used class shifts. Similarly, we have:

ST: And so this gives us an opportunity not only to present the evidence to all of the leading members of Congress and their various foreign policy committees as to why we have high confidence that *chemical weapons were used* and that Assad used them. (Obama, "Situation in Syria", sentence 7)

TT: و بنابر این، این کار به ما فرصت می دهد که در عین ارائهٔ مدارکی به همهٔ اعضای رهبری کنگره و کمیته های گوناگون سیاست خارجی آنها دایر بر این که چرا ما *به استفاده از سلاح های شیمیایی توسط رژیم اسد* اطمینان کافی داریم.

In the original extract the speaker is emphasizing the idea by breaking it into two parts; first, "chemical weapons" were used of course i.e. chemical weapons is of importance; second, the emphasis is repeated by stressing out who used them that is Assad. Moreover, the latter part has been said in its active form for more clarity.

Whereas, in the target text, the translator has simply put the two ideas in one sentence by saying that "we have confidence that chemical weapons were used by Assad regime." Although the sentence is syntactically and semantically correct and complete, it lacks the effect and influence of the source text. In order to transfer the same influence of the phrases the speaker has used, the translator could have said:

"ما اطمینان کافی داریم که سلاح های شیمیایی مورد استفاده قرار گرفتند و اسد از آنها استفاده کرد"

Here, the emphasis is conveyed precisely like the original text. That is, the assurance that "we know" and that we have confidence; second, the fact that chemical weapons were used. Finally, Assad was the person in charge who used them. It is also worth mentioning, that in the extracted samples there are sentences which were not translated at all. The translator has not given attention and simply ignored. It might be as if s/he is using his/her strategy to hide something and not to reveal some facts. Moreover, there are instances where a part of the sentence is missed out. For instance,

ST: But we certainly don't see a resolution in the Human Rights Council, which is part of routine business, as in any way undermining or detracting from the goal of bringing the two parties together in Geneva II — the purpose there being a peaceful resolution — a peaceful negotiated resolution — to this conflict, which would be the best and perhaps only way to end the human rights abuses that *we* are witnessing and *are horrified by in Syria.* (Ambassador, "Syria, Sudan", sentence 55)

TT: ولی ما به هیچوجه طرح یک قطعنامه را در شورای حقوق بشر که بخشی از کار معمولی آن است، از نظر آوردن دو طرف به ژنو II تضعیف کننده و نفی کننده نمی دانیم-هدف رسیدن به یک راه حل مسالمت آمیز- مذاکرات برای رسیدن به راه حل مسالمت آمیز-برای این جنگ است که بهترین راه و تنها راه برای پایان دادن به نقض حقوق بشر است که ما در سوریه شاهد آن هستیم.

In this extract the passive phrase is not translated. May be the strategy of the translator was to deduce the frightening image dominating in Syria. However, there is another example worth noting:

ST: At least twice in this agreement, *it is mentioned* that nothing *is agreed* until everything *is agreed*, and that is specific as to the final agreement. (Kerry, "First-Step Agreement with Iran on Its Nuclear Program", sentence 112)

TT: در این موافقتنامه حداقل برای دو بار _ذکر شده است_ که درباره هیچ چیز _موافقتی صورت نمی گیرد_ و این موضوع به طوردقیق در موافقتنامه نهایی ذکر خواهد شد.

In this example, it might relate to the politics of the two countries; anyway, by not translating "until everything is agreed" the translator has ruined the message generally. To put it in other words, the speaker states that "in the agreement it is mentioned that unless everything is agreed, nothing will be agreed" while in translation by omitting the main part of the message, the translator has manipulated the text and deviated the real interpretation. In the studied samples, there were sentences where the speaker, in order to emphasize, has repeated a word or phrase, thus by repetition wanted to show the importance of a particular message. For example:

ST: *I am convinced* from my conversations today with a number of foreign ministers, including the Foreign Minister of Egypt, *I am convinced* that that path is, in fact, still open and it is possible though *it has been made much, much harder, much more complicated, by the events of today*. (Kerry, "Egypt", sentence 26)

TT: من درنتیجهٔ گفتگوهای امروزم با شماری از وزیران امور خارجه، شامل وزیر امور خارجهٔ مص، _متقاعد شده ام_ که آن مسیر هنوز باز و دست یافتنی است، هرچند که در اثر رویدادهای امروز به مراتب _دشوارتر و پیچیده تر شده است_.

Here, the speaker is emphasizing that "he is convinced" and by repeating it twice, he is showing that being convinced is of much importance to him i.e. once he is convinced from the conversation; second, he is convinced that path is open; whereas, in the translation it is mentioned that he is convinced from the conversation that path is open. Although the two concepts are almost the same, there is a prominent difference. Difference is in the emphasis the speaker is highlighting with the help of repetition and is ignorantly not paid attention to by the translator. Additionally in some cases, although the structural shifts has been used, the translator changed the passive voice into active, like in the following example:

ST: We urge the Iranian Government to release Mr. Hekmati and Mr. Abedini and to help us locate Mr. Levinson so that they may *be reunited* with their families as safely and as soon as possible. (Kerry, "U.S. Citizens Detained or Missing in Iran", sentence 12)

TT: ما از دولت ایران می خواهیم تا آقای حکمتی و آقای عابدینی را آزاد سازد و به ما در یافتن آقای لوینسون کمک کند تا آنها بتوانند به سلامت و هر چه زودتر _به خانواده های خود بازگردند_.

Here, by translating the passive voice into active, the load the passive carries has been ignored. That is, by mentioning "that they may be reunited with their families" the speaker is showing

that they must be returned and don't have the authority to go back by themselves while in translation this concept has been changed.

Last but not least, the number of structural shifts employed in translation in which passive voice has been translated into passive is much larger than the aforementioned points. That is, the translator has at most cases, transferred the message by trying not to manipulate or change the structure or meaning. Hence, the passive structures have been rendered safely without any deviation.

FINDINGS

After obtaining all the sentences with passive voice in English speeches, analyzing and comparing them with their translations, the data were organized in a systematic form. At first, the strategies of Catford's model and their usage by translators have been shown efficiently in table 1.

Table 1: List of Strategies of Catford's Model used in Translating Passive Voice in Political Speeches

List of Strategies	Strategies used by Translators
Structural Shifts	✓
Class Shifts	✓
Unit Shifts	
Intra-System Shifts	
Level Shifts	

Table 1 demonstrates that among all the strategies of Catford only two strategies that is, structural shifts and class shifts were used while translating passive voice in political speeches, it means translators tend to use mentioned shifts comparatively frequently. Equally important matter to be point out is that there are sentences that translators did not translate whether consciously or unconsciously

To deal with the second question, related to the frequency of each strategy while rendering passive voice in Persian language table 2 gives explanation in detail.

Table 2: The overall percentage of Catford's Strategies and their frequencies used in translating passive voice in political speeches

Number	Speech By	No. of Examples	Structural Shifts		Class Shifts	Unit Shifts	Intra-System Shifts	Level Shifts	Not Translated
			Passive to Passive	Passive to Active					
1	US President Barack Obama	85	67		7	0	0	0	11
			64	3					
2	Secretary of State, John Kerry	59	53		3	0	0	0	3
			49	4					
3	Ambassadors	68	60		6	0	0	0	2
			56	4					
	Total	212	180		16	0	0	0	16
			169	11					
	Percentage		84.9%		7.5%	0%	0%	0%	7.5%
			79.7%	5.1%					

Table 2 indicates that after the analysis of speeches, two hundred and twelve examples of passive voice were found, among which one hundred and eighty samples were translated using structural shifts i.e. the structural shifts enjoyed the highest frequency with high percentage of 84.9. Then the second most frequent case was class shifts with the frequency of 16 and percentage of 7.5. In the same way, there were 16 samples which were not translated at all (Percentage of 7.5.) However, there were distinct cases in which the translator has translated the passive voice into passive, but changed parts of the speech and by doing so, used class shifts. For instance:

ST: *It's also rooted* in our ties to the Egyptian people, forged through a longstanding partnership. (President Obama, "The Situation in Egypt", sentence 6)

TT: ریشه ی این رابطه را همچنین باید در پیوندهای ما با مردم مصر، که از طریق یک مشارکت دیرینه شکل گرفته است، جستجو کرد.

Here, the translator has considered the emphasis on the "root" (ریشه) by not changing the voice; however, the verb has been changed to noun. Similarly, the following example indicates the same deviation:

ST: As others have noted, Resolution 1738 reminds us that *journalists operating in armed conflict are protected* under international humanitarian law. (Ambassador, "Protecting Journalists", sentence 17)

TT: _همانگونه که دیگران نیز خاطر نشان کرده اند، قطعنامهٔ 1738 به ما یاد آوری می کند که روزنامه نگاران فعال در جریان جنگهای مسلحانه_تحت محافظت قانون بشر دوستانه ی بین المللی_قرار دارند._

Here, again the translator translated the passive voice into passive in Persian; however, "protected" is verb in ST while in TT it has been changed to a noun phrase.

Moreover, the following extract is an example among many cases in which a word or phrase has not been translated. For example,

ST: That poses a serious national security threat to the United States and to the region, and as a consequence, _Assad and Syria needs to be held accountable_. (President Obama, "Situation in Syria", sentence 4)

TT: این امر یک تهدید جدی برای امنیت ملی ایالات متحده و برای منطقه به شمار می رود، و در نتیجه_سوریه باید پاسخگو قرار داده شود._

In the mentioned sample, such an important word like "Assad" has been missed out by the translator whether by or without purpose.

Significantly, unit, intra-system and level shifts were not used at all.

DISCUSSION

Application of DA for the analysis of ST and TT helps the translator to become aware of the social and situational context of the ST and TT and outlines the formation of power relations on the text-linguistic level. Various text types require different techniques and strategies for translation in order to be efficient in conveying the intended message of the source text into the target text.

Political texts may appear more challenging for translations. In the first place, although for the translators they may seem as like the other text types, the ideas hidden in the selection of words, structure and particularly message of these texts are complicated and subtle. Politicians usually do not state their intentions and objectives clearly and explicitly. For this reason, their remarks and comments become more essential. As it is the language through which attitudes and feelings are expressed, with the analysis of speeches, the speaker's thoughts and emotions about or towards an event or phenomenon can be figured out. The discourse analysis of twenty-nine political speeches in which there were two-hundred and twelve sentences with passive voice, revealed that politicians use passive voice when they want to condemn somebody or something to threatening actions against the world or to attribute good deeds and actions to somebody or something. While attempting to convey the speaker's objectives, translators have translated English passive structures into passive in Persian with a high percentage of 79.7. On the contrary, the percentage of passive sentences rendered as active voice was 5.1. By the same token, the percentage of sentences in which noun was translated as verb or vice versa (class shifts) was 7.5. It indicates that translators have sought to remain loyal in most places while attempting to render from English to Persian, although there are cases in which passive sentences were translated as passives, but it was done with lack of emphasis on a particular part or simply by missing out a rather significant part, name or object which was addressed mainly by the speaker. Equally important matter to be mentioned is that translators mostly have not paid attention carefully to some aspects by or without intention. As an illustration, in the

following instance the translator has rendered the message but ignored some very significant and critical points; in other words, first of all, the clause: "chemical weapons were used" is a passive structure, then the next clause "Assad used them" is said in active voice by the speaker; while in the translation the two clauses were put as one sentence. On the other hand, "were used" is structurally mentioned in passive form while in the translated version it is rendered as a noun phrase "استفاده". Finally, the translation does not convey the similar influence as the speaker wanted to convey:

ST: And so this gives us an opportunity not only to present the evidence to all of the leading members of Congress and their various foreign policy committees as to why we have high confidence that *chemical weapons were used* and that Assad used them. (Obama, "Situation in Syria", sentence 7)

TT: و بنابر این، این کار به ما فرصت می دهد که در عین ارائهٔ مدارکی به همهٔ اعضای رهبری کنگره و کمیته های گوناگون سیاست خارجی آنها دایر بر این که چرا ما به *استفاده از سلاح های شیمیایی توسط رژیم اسد* اطمینان کافی داریم.

A better option for the above sample could have been the following structure:

"ما اطمینان کافی داریم که سلاح های شیمیایی مورد استفاده قرار گرفتند و اسد از آنها استفاده کرد"

Here, the message is transferred word by word with the same influence and effect as the speaker wanted to convey. Although, the two translations seem similar at first sight, there is a prominent difference.

This was an example among many others. The main difference between a political text (written or spoken) and the other type of texts such as scientific, literary and others is mainly the passive voice structures then the obscurities and ambiguities lying within the words. Therefore, the real challenge for the translator is how to deal with them and finally how to transfer the same load of meaning without decreasing the influence and impact hidden behind the words.

CONCLUSION

This research has attempted to delineate a discourse of passive voice in political speeches by analyzing translations with reference to Catford's Shifts. The dicourse analysis of passive structures and their translations obviously reveal that the structure, the underlying meaning, the points to be prominent, the matters to be stressed out in the process of translating passive structures into Persian language requires translators to automatically tend to use structural shifts and class shifts.

Based on results, it is clearly obvious that in the process of translating passive voice in political speeches, structural shifts were used with the highest frequency. By structural shifts, it means both structures i.e. passive sentences which were translated as passive in Persian and passive sentences which were translated as active in Persian. Nevertheless, the number of passive structures translated as passive in Persian is much higher than the number of passive structures translated as active in Persian. It indicates that translators in most cases have kept the passive voice. However, class shifts were used where the translator was not able to show the emphasis

or particular intention lying in the passive structure; therefore, s/he used class shifts. Moreover, surprisingly other shifts like intra-system, unit and level shifts were not applied by translators at all. To put it differently, Catford's Shifts have been applied mostly on literary and some psychology texts. While, in the field of politics, a work was conducted by Hijjo & Huiling (2014) from China, in which Catford's translation framework were applied on Chinese translation of English BBC political news in which they concluded that Catford's notions on translation Shifts can be applied only on the sentence level of English-Chinese translation of BBC political news while for the greater contexts such as passage or discourse, the theory cannot provide appropriate guidance.

On the other hand, in this research the researcher has applied Catford's translation theories on Persian translation of passive structures in English political speeches in which it is concluded that only two category shifts i.e. structural and class shifts were used by the translators. Thus, the application of translation strategies represents that, mostly translators, in order to create the same effect on the target language use structural shifts and when unable to transfer the same load, use class shifts to create the same emphasis in the target text. Therefore, by applying Catford's strategies on passive Persian translation of English political speeches, translators make the target text more accessible to the target reader and by doing so, this research, on the whole has contributed to Catford's translation Shifts theory.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy to mention that there were sentences or mainly the special parts of sentences where the translator has neither used structural shifts nor applied other category shifts and level shifts; in fact, s/he has not taken the burden of translating; hence, s/he had left out the sentence containing passive or simply missed out the particular part.

Finally, it seems worth emphasizing that in addition to the strategies of Catford that translators use to interpret an original text, translators sometimes do not translate a particular word, phrase or sentence and ignore it by not translating. This may be allocated to the fact that to detect the power in political texts, translators either lack knowledge of a set of guidelines or simply avoid translating for specific reasons which regard the politics of the two countries. Thus, not translating a particular message can be eventually called as the strategy of manipulation in translation.

REFERENCES

Bassnet, S. & Schäffner, C. (eds). (2010). *Political Discourse, Media and Translation.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Newcastle upon Tyne.

Chilton, P. & Schäffner, C. (2002). *Politics as Text and Talk.* John Benjamins Publishing Company, Armsterdam/Philadelphia.

Chilton, P. (1985). *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate: Nukespeak today.* London: Francis Pinter.

DiCarlo, R. A. (2003, July 16). Iran (ايران) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/07/20130716278714.html#axzz2fmUukJnm

DiCarlo, R. A. (2003, July 160. Iran [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/textrans/2013/07/20130716278700.html#axzz2fmUukJnm

DiCarlo, R. A. (2003, July 17). Hemayat Az Rozname Negaran (حمایت از روزنامه نگاران) [Transcipt]. Retrieved December from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/07/20130717278917.html#axzz2fmUukJnm

DiCarlo, R. A. (2003, July 17). Protecting Journalists [Transcipt]. Retrieved December from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/07/20130717278905.html#axzz2fmUukJnm

DiCarlo, R.A. (2003, July 18). Nelson Mandela International Day [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/07/20130718278932.html#axzz2fmUukJnm

DiCarlo, R.A. (2003, July 18). Ruze Beinolmelaliye Nelson Mandela (روز بین المللی نلسون ماندلا) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/07/20130718278943.html#axzz2fmUukJnm

Edelman, M. J. (1977). *Political Language: words that succeed and policies that fail.* New York: Academic Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power.* London: Longman.

Hijjo, N.F.M. & Huiling, L. (2014). The Necessity of Translation Shifts in Current English-Chinese Translation on BBC Political News. *British Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 12(1),* 14-36.

Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis.* (2nd ed.). USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Kerry, J. (2013, July 19). Goftegohaye Solhe Khavarmiyane (گفتگو های صلح خاورمیانه) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/07/20130719279237.html#axzz2fmUukJnm

Kerry, J. (2013, July 19). Middle East Peace Negotiations [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/07/20130719279235.html#axzz2fmUukJnm

Kerry, J. (2013, August 14). Egypt [Transcipt]. Retrieved December from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/08/20130814280957.html#axzz2fdUdO3pi

Kerry, J. (2013, August 14). Mesr (مصر) [Transcipt]. Retrieved December from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/08/20130814280964.html#axzz2fdUdO3pi

Kerry, J. (2013, August 18). Afghanistan's Independence Day [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/08/20130819281265.html#axzz2fdUdO3pi

Kerry, J. (2013, August 18). Ruze Esteghlale Afghanistan (روز استقلال افغانستان) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/perian/texttrans/2013/08/20130819281269.html#axzz2fdUdO3pi

Kerry, J. (2013, August 28). Shahrvandane Amrikai Dar Bazdasht Ya Mafqud Shode Dar Iran (شهروندان امریکایی در بازداشت یا مفقود شده در ایران) [Transcipt]. Retrieved December from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/08/20130828281903.html#axzz2fPfTdtA9

Kerry, J. (2013, August 28). U.S. Citizens Detained or Missing in Iran [Transcipt]. Retrieved December from

http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/08/20130828281901.html#axz
z2fPfTdtA9

Kerry, J. (2013, December 11). First-Step Agreement with Iran on Its Nuclear Program
[Transcript]. Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/12/20131211288737.html

Kerry, J. (2013, December 11). Tavafoghe Game Nokhost Ba Iran Bar Sare Barnameye
Hasteiye An Keshvar   (توافق گام نخست با ایران بر سر برنامه هسته ای آن کشور) [Transcript].
Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/12/20131211288767.html#azz
2o6JjHDbr

Kerry, J. (2013, July 29). Goftegohaye Solhe Esraili-felestin (گفتگوهای صلح اسرائیلی-فلسطین)
[Transcript]. Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/07/20130729279649.html#axz
z2fdUdO3pi

Kerry, J. (2013, July 29). Israeli-Palestinian Negotiations [Transcript]. Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/07/20130729279643.html#axz
z2fdUdO3pi

Kerry, J. (2013, June 19). Annual Trafficking in Persons Report Release [Transcript].
Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/06/20130619276890.html#axz
z2fmUukJnm

Kerry, J. (2013, June 19). Enteshare Gozareshe Salaneye Qachaqe Ensan (انتشار گزارش سالانه
ی قاچاق انسان) [Transcript]. Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/06/20130619276892.html#axz
z2fmUukJnm

Kerry, J. (2013, September 3). Jalase Estema Sana Dar Bare Bohrane Suriye (جلسه استماع سنا
در باره بحران سوریه) [Transcript]. Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130904282170.html#axz
z2fPfTdtA9

Kerry, J. (2013, September 3). Senate Hearing on Syrian Crisis [Transcript]. Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130903282166.html#axz
z2fPfTdtA9

Kerry, J. (2013, September 6). After P-5+1 Meeting with Iran [Transcript]. Retrieved
from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130927283652.html#axz
z2grjoyAQJ

Kerry, J. (2013, September 6). Kaheshe Chashmgire Kharide Nafte Khame Iran (کاهش
چشمگیر خرید نفت خام ایران) [Transcript]. Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130906282375.html#axz
z2fPfTdtA9

Kerry, J. (2013, September 6). Pas Az Didar Gorohe 5+1 Ba Iran (پس از دیدار گروه 5+1 با ایران)
[Transcript]. Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130927283659.html#axz
z2grjoyAQJ

Kerry, J. (2013, September 6). Significant Reductions of Iranian Crude Oil Purchases
[Transcript]. Retrieved from
http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130906282362.html#axz
z2fPfTdtA9

McGregor, S. (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis-A Primer.*Retrieved December 5, 2010, from http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/15-1/mcgregorcda.html/

Montgomery, M. (1992). *An Introduction to Language and Society.* London: Macmillan.

Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies Theories and Application.* USA: Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation.* London: Prentice Hall International.

Obama, B. (2013, August 15). Situation in Egypt [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/08/20130815281173.html#axzz2fdUdO3pi

Obama, B. (2013, August 15). Vazee'at Dar Mesr (وضعیت در مصر) [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/08/20130815281182.html#axzz2fdUdO3pi

Obama, B. (2013, December 10). Maraseme Yadbude Nelson Mandela (مراسم یادبود نلسون ماندلا) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/12/20131210288697.html#axzz2o6JjHDbr

Obama, B. (2013, December 10). Memorial Service for Nelson Mandela [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/12/20131210288692.html#axzz2o6JjHDbr

Obama, B. (2013, December 2). Ruze Jahanie Aids (روز جهانی ایدز) [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/12/20131202288206.html#axzz2o6JjHDbr

Obama, B. (2013, December 2). World AIDS Day [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/12/20131202288202.html#axzz2o6JjHDbr

Obama, B. (2013, September 10). Dalile Ahamiate Suriye (دلیل اهمیت سوریه) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130911282577.html#axzz2f5hlFLAB

Obama, B. (2013, September 10). Why Syria Matters [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130911282574.html#axzz2f5hlFLAB

Obama, B. (2013, September 11). Maraseme Bargozariye Salruze 11 Septamber Dar Banaye Yadbude Pentagon (مراسم برگزاری سالروز 11 سپتامبر در بنای یادبود پنتاگون) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130912282677.html#axzz2f5hlFLAB

Obama, B. (2013, September 11). September 11 Observance Ceremony at Pentagon Memorial [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130911282617.html#axzz2f5hlFLAB

Obama, B. (2013, September 14). Barnameye Iyalate Mottahede-Rusiye Baraye Selah hae Shimiyaee Suriye (برنامه ایالات متحده-روسیه برای سلاح های شیمیایی سوریه) [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130916282939.html#axzz2f5hlFLAB

Obama, B. (2013, September 14). Peigiriye Rah hale Siasi Dar Suriye (پیگیری راه حل سیاسی در سوریه) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130916282898.html#axz z2fdUdO3pi

Obama, B. (2013, September 14). Pursuing Diplomatic Solution in Syria [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130913282880.html#axz z2fdUdO3pi

Obama, B. (2013, September 14). U.S.-Russian Plan for Syrian Chemical Weapons [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130914282883.html#axz z2f5hlFLAB

Obama, B. (2013, September 27). Iran (ایران) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130928283751.html#axz z2grjoyAQJ

Obama, B. (2013, September 27). Iran [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130927283741.html#axz z2grjoyAQJ

Obama, B. (2013, September 3). Situation in Syria [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130903282116.html#axz z2fPfTdtA9

Obama, B. (2013, September 3). Vazee'at Dar Suriye (وضعیت در سوریه) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130903282116.html#axz z2fPfTdtA9

Obama, B. (2013, September 7). Need for Limited Military Action in Syria [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130907282390.html#axz z2f5hlFLAB

Obama, B. (2013, September 7). Zarurate Eqdame Nezamie Mahdud Alaihe Surie (ضرورت اقدام نظامی علیه سوریه) [Transcipt]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130908282397.html#axz z2f5hlFLAB

Orwell, G. (1946). *Politics and English Language.* Retrieved January 12, 2011, from www.worldpolicy.newschool.edu/globalrights/europe/Orwell-Politics%26English.html.

Pěcheux, M. (1982). *Language Semantics and Ideology.* London: Macmillan. *Power, S.* (2003, August 19). World Humanitarian Day [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/08/20130819281287.html#axz z2fdUdO3pi

Power, S. (2003, August 19). Ruze Jahaniye Ensan Dosti (روز جهانی انسان دوستی) [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/08/20130819281323.html#axz z2fdUdO3pi

Power, S. (2003, December 11). Human Rights Day 2013 [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/12/20131211288738.html#axz z2o6JjHDbr

Power, S. (2003, December 11). Ruze Hoqoqe Bashar 2013 (2013 روز حقوق بشر) [Transcript]. Retrieved from

http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/12/20131211288764.html#axz z2o6JjHDbr

Power, S. (2003, November 21). Aghaze Peikare Agahi Resani Tavalode Raha Az Aids/HIV (آغاز پیکار آگاهی رسانی تولد رها از ایدز/اچ آی وی) [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/11/20131121287634.html#axz z2o6JjHDbr

Power, S. (2003, November 21). Launch of "Born Free" of HIV/AIDS Campaign [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/11/20131121287614.html#axz z2o6JjHDbr

Power, S. (2003, October 22). Darbareye Khavarmiyane (درباره ی خاورمیانه) [Transcript]. Retrieved December from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/10/20131022285006.html#axz z2jYPBeduY

Power, S. (2003, October 22). Debate on the Middle East [Transcript]. Retrieved December from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/10/20131022285002.html#axz z2jYPBeduY

Power, S. (2003, Sepember 5). Suriye Va Rusiye (سوریه و روسیه) [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130905282298.html#axz z2fPfTdtA9

Power, S. (2003, Sepember 5). Syria, Russia [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130905282293.html#axz z2fPfTdtA9

Power, S. (2003, September 5). Iran (ایران) [Transcript]. Retrieved December from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/09/20130905282297.html#axz z2fPfTdtA9

Power, S. (2003, September 5). Iran [Transcript]. Retrieved December from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/09/20130905282289.html#axz z2fPfTdtA9

Rice, *S. E.* (2003, May 29). Suriye va Sudan (سوریه و سودان) [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/persian/texttrans/2013/05/20130529148142.html#axz z2fmUukJnm

Rice, *S. E.* (2003, May 29). Syria, Sudan [Transcript]. Retrieved from http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2013/05/20130529148124.html#axz z2fmUukJnm

Van Dijk, T. (2000). *Critical Discourse Analysis.* Retrieved January 12, 2011, from www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Critical%20discourse%20analysis.pdf.

Wareing, S. (2004). 'What is Language and What does It Do?', in Thomas, L.(ed). *Language, Society and Power.* New York: Routledge