



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *A model of appraisal: Spanish interpretations of President Trump's inaugural address 2017* .

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/122472/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Munday, J (2018) A model of appraisal: Spanish interpretations of President Trump's inaugural address 2017. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 26 (2). pp. 180-195. ISSN 0907-676X

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1388415>

(c) 2017, Taylor & Francis. This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice* on 25 October 2017., available online <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1388415>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

A model of Appraisal: Spanish interpretations of President Trump's inaugural address 2017

Jeremy Munday

School of Languages, Cultures and Societies, University of Leeds, UK

j.munday@leeds.ac.uk

Abstract

This article analyses President Trump's inaugural speech (2017) from the point of view of Appraisal theory (Martin & White, 2005). It compares the source text Appraisal profile with that of six Spanish target texts (five simultaneous interpretations and one written translation) in order to identify critical points of interpreter/translator intervention. The article replicates analysis of President Obama's 2009 inaugural (Munday, 2012), enabling further generalisation of the earlier findings and a refinement of methodology. This new study concurs with the earlier one in revealing that expressions of Attitude rarely shift; by contrast, shifts in Graduation are less frequent in Trump's speech, possibly because the reduced speed of delivery does not force the interpreter to so many omissions. More sensitive are shifts in Engagement, particularly counter-expectancy indicators and pronouns, which affect deictic positioning. The article concludes with a discussion of the methodology and the role played by speech mode, since problems described by interpreters are found more frequently in Trump's impromptu or unscripted speeches than in the more formal scripted inaugural.

Keywords: Appraisal theory; deictic positioning; interpreter positioning; presidential inaugural; President Trump

1. Introduction

In Evaluation in translation (Munday, 2012), one of the case studies employing Appraisal theory analysed in detail the 2009 inauguration speech of President Barack Obama in 2009. Three simultaneous interpretations from English into Spanish were analysed, along with translations into a range of languages. The high-profile event, with the controlled variable of

a stable¹ English source text input disseminated through international media, provided a wealth of data. Through the comparison of the target texts, which were produced simultaneously and independently, the analysis gave important insights into the working of simultaneous interpreters and the different characteristics of interpreting and translation of this speech. The goal was to identify what I call ‘critical points’ of decision making in the target texts following a hypothesis that variation is a potential indicator of translation problems, along the lines of the ‘rich points’ in the PACTE model (see Hurtado Albir, 2017, pp. 109-111). Unproblematic source text elements are likely to be interpreted/translated in the same way in different target texts, whereas variation requires extra cognitive effort since each interpreter or translator will have had to work to encode differently or will have drawn on a different repertoire of translation equivalents. The present article replicates and advances the Obama study by examining the inauguration speech of President Donald Trump in 2017. By comparing results on the same genre, it is hoped to explore how far the original findings may be dependent on the speaking style of the president or, conversely, may possibly be a general characteristic of interpreting in such contexts.

The present article is structured as follows: the Appraisal model is described (Section 2) and the methodology is explained (Section 3); findings of the Obama analysis are summarised (Section 4); Trump’s inauguration speech is presented, with source text analysis followed by the analysis of five simultaneous interpretations into Spanish and one translation (Section 5); the results of the Trump analysis will then be discussed in relation to the Obama analysis (Section 6) and conclusions drawn for future research and practice (Section 7).

2. The Appraisal-based theory model of analysis

Appraisal theory is part of Systemic Functional Linguistics, or SFL (Halliday, 1978; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014), which concentrates on the functional and communicative rather than formal aspects of language use. SFL is particularly suited for the close analysis of texts in context, since it links the realisation of different strands of discourse semantics to specific lexical and grammatical choices and to the broader sociocultural context. These strands are:

1. Ideational meaning, which covers experiential and logical meaning;

¹ ‘Stable’ in the sense that all the interpretations were made from the same audio/video source, even if subsequent transcriptions vary slightly from the official written version of the speech and those versions published in different newspapers. See Valdeón (2015) for a discussion of stable and unstable sources in news translation.

2. Interpersonal meaning, which articulates speaker-listener (or writer-reader) relations; and
3. Textual meaning, encompassing thematic structure, information structure and cohesion.

These three strands of meaning co-exist simultaneously in a text and sometimes overlap; for instance, naming or labelling (see Baker, 2006) of an entity (e.g. Malvinas versus Falkland Islands) is an ideational element with evaluative consequences that affect the interpersonal meaning. The most severe ideological shifts occur within ideational meaning, while censorship of various types may obliterate (or at least seriously manipulate) a text;² nonetheless, my main interest lies in the more subtle interpersonal meaning since it is here that the translator or interpreter may intervene surreptitiously and even unconsciously in the positioning of ST speaker and TT audience. Interpersonal meaning is expressed variously by the formality or informality of the language and by features such as evaluative epithets and modal expressions which indicate the speaker's attitude and commitment to a statement. Appraisal theory (most notably Martin & White, 2005) fills out the details of the interpersonal function of language and explores how feelings, values and identities, are constructed, shared or constrained. Its application to translation (e.g. Munday, 2012, 2015; Zhang & Pan, 2015) has been driven by its potential for investigating the evaluative input of the translator/interpreter as a third participant in the communication process.

Please place Table 1 around here

Domain of Appraisal	Category	Value	Illustrative realization
Attitude	Affect	Feelings and emotional reactions	Happy, sad
	Judgement	Of ethics, behaviour, capacity	Wrong, brave
	Appreciation	Of things, phenomena, reactions	Beautiful, authentic
Graduation	Force	Raise	Totally extinct

² For example, Obama's speech was interrupted on Chinese Central TV, while Trump's speech was not aired live at all in China and was given scant written news coverage (South China Morning Post, 21 January 2017).

		Lower	Slightly worried
	Focus	Sharpen Soften	A true champion Kind of blue
Engagement	Monogloss	Single-voiced	Categorical assertion
	Heterogloss	Contractive Expansive	Show, certainly Claim, nearly, possibly
			Pronoun use (T/V), terms of address, naming
			Counter-expectancy indicators (however, <i>even...</i>)

Table 1. Appraisal resources (adapted from Martin & White, 2005, p. 38 and Munday, 2012, p. 24).

Table 1 shows, in simplified fashion, the main resources of Appraisal. The domain of ‘Attitude’ is the principal resource, divided into three main categories or ‘values’: (i) ‘Affect’, which corresponds to an emotional response; (ii) ‘Judgement’, which is a comment on the ethics and normality of a specific behaviour; and (iii) ‘Appreciation’, which gives an aesthetic evaluation of the object or person. In Martin & White’s framework, each value is subdivided as follows:

- Affect encompasses the values of security, happiness, inclination and satisfaction
- Judgement covers normality, capacity, tenacity, veracity and propriety
- Appreciation is subdivided into reaction (impact and quality), composition (balance and harmony) or valuation (originality and worth).

Examples of this framework can be seen in Appendix I and will be discussed further below. Importantly, it should be noted that each value may be positive or negative and ‘inscribed’ (explicit) or ‘invoked’ (implicit), but also ‘upscaled’ or ‘downscaled’ through the use of non-core lexis and metaphor and the resources of Graduation (see Table 1): typically, Force modulates the intensity of Appraisal epithets (something may be said to be not just extinct but

totally extinct), whereas Focus makes a phenomenon clearer or fuzzier (Miles Davis's album *Kind of Blue* suggests that it is not a typical blue feeling). The third domain, Engagement, is crucial because it closely governs the way an argument is presented and the way it constrains or opens up the space for response: so, for example, categorical assertion is classified as monoglossic or single-voiced because it presents the argument as fact and leaves very little opportunity for challenge; other forms of presentation are heteroglossic or dialogic because they modulate a greater freedom of recipient response. Features of Engagement worthy of particular note are the choice of pronouns (T/V) for addressing and positioning the audience in relation to the speaker and counter-expectancy indicators (although, but, while, even...) which include modal particles and attitudinal adverbials (never, surely, etc.). These latter show 'intrusion'³ into a text; they indicate commitment to a value and align the readers with that axiological positioning (Martin & White, 2005, p. 120; Fairclough, 2003, p. 41) and will be important considerations in our discussion below.

3. Methodology and transcription

Appraisal theory provides a very detailed model for the recognition of lexical realisations of attitudinal insertion, in both source and target texts. In particular, it allows identification of those 'critical points' that 'generate the most interpreting and evaluative potential [...] that may be most revealing of the translator's value' (Munday, 2012, p. 41).

The earlier Appraisal-based analysis (Munday, 2012, pp. 42-83) was carried out on President Barack Obama's inauguration speech in 2009, which was 2395 words in length and lasted 18:35 minutes.⁴ Source text transcription was based on the published transcript but checked against the video recording of the speech. False starts, hesitations and other features of spoken language were indicated in the modified transcript. A similar process was followed for the target texts, only this time the transcriptions were made directly from the audio. A detailed Appraisal profile of the ST was produced and the lexical realisations in this profile were compared and categorised manually for shifts across the TTs. This was followed by a complete analysis of each TT independently to report any further the shifts that affected evaluation. The same methodology was followed for President Trump's 2017 inauguration speech of 1433 words, lasting 16:12 minutes.

³ Martin & White (2005, p. 67) use Halliday's term 'intrusion'. In translation studies, this is more commonly called 'intervention' (Munday, 2007).

⁴ See Peters (online). The speech can be viewed at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OFPwDe22CoY>

4. Critical points in the Obama speech

The analysis of Obama's speech revealed a number of key evaluative features in the source text: there was a strikingly high level of direct inscription, a large number of abstract nouns, and a propensity towards positive realisations of Judgement, particularly capacity (e.g. skill, vision), tenacity (enduring convictions, worked tirelessly) and propriety (generosity, co-operation). While there was little shift in attitude in the three simultaneous interpretations into Spanish that were analysed,⁵ variation in intensity of evaluation (Graduation) was certainly important. This occurred either through the omission of adverbials such as very or through the downscaling of non-core lexis (e.g. the verb toiled became simply the equivalent of 'worked') and metaphor (Munday, 2012, pp. 57-65). The treatment of invoked, or implicit, evaluation also differed noticeably between interpreters and between interpreting and translation. Examples included what I term 'associative' evaluation, where the culture-specific references to key battles in American history (Concord, Gettysburg, Normandy and Khe Sanh) or key cultural concepts such as the multi-ethnic patchwork of American society require explicitation or disambiguation by the translator/interpreter for a new target audience (p. 63).

5. Trump's inaugural speech

After his victory in the 2016 election campaign, Donald Trump was sworn in as 45th President of the United States at a ceremony in Washington, DC on 20 January 2017. Trump's inauguration speech was broadcast live on television across the world.⁶

A small-scale quantitative study by Schumacher & Eskenazi (2016) indicates that Trump's campaign speeches generally had a low REAP 'readability' (reading level) score, with vocabulary choice and syntax being less complex than his rivals' speeches, a point noted by Tsuruta, one of the Japanese interpreters (Osaki, 2017). Further computational analysis by Rice (2017) shows that Trump's speech was about average for lexical richness (calculated to be 32nd of 58 inaugurals since 1789, based on type-token ratio), but low for readability level (equivalent to 8th grade, 55th out of 58 inaugurals, calculated using the probability of occurrence of specific words and grammatical structures) and for sentence length (15 words

⁵ The interpretations were from CNN en español, Telemundo and the Peruvian Canal N.

⁶ Amongst many others, this can be viewed at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/inaugural-address>

per sentence, 58 out of 58).⁷ However, Rice suggests that this is a trend in inaugurals over the years, especially since 1925 and partly explained by the increased reach of the speeches, which for much of the earlier period were directed at a small group of politicians rather than the mass dissemination they receive today.

5.1 Appraisal profile

The Appraisal profile shown in Appendix I is highly useful in indicating the main themes and strands of evaluation in Trump's rhetoric. It can easily be seen that positive evaluation predominates and is distributed across the different categories of Attitude. The following are illustrative: safe neighbourhoods (+security), love (+happiness), a new national pride (+inclination), they fill their hearts with the same dreams (+satisfaction), a new vision (+normality), unstoppable (+capacity), the fight and spirit of America (+tenacity), honestly (+veracity), righteous people (+propriety), our wonderful nation (+reaction), two simple rules (+composition), great schools (+valuation). This is a somewhat different picture to the Obama profile, which showed the majority evaluation to be located in Judgement in comments of an ethical nature. What is also noticeable in Trump's speech is the concentration of negative evaluation in the categories of security and capacity: Trump highlights external and internal threats to the United States to justify his concentration on the struggling lives of 'forgotten' Americans and to claim his victory against the interests of the Washington 'establishment'. Often this is done by categorical assertion and straightforward inscription:

And the crime and the gangs and the drugs that have stolen too many lives.

The solutions he proposes are similarly active and categorical and sometimes are presented in parallel structures for emphasis:

We will bring back our jobs, we will bring back our borders, we will bring back our wealth and we will bring back our dreams.

⁷ The identification of sentence breaks is always problematic in a spoken text, but it seems that the analysis was based on the prepared written speech.

So, what happens to the Appraisal profile when rendered in Spanish? The following analysis examines how the evaluative language of the English source text (ST) was interpreted live in Spanish. We shall look at five different simultaneous interpretations:

1. The Spanish El País internacional, part of the PRISA media group (TT1)⁸
2. The Spanish Canal 24 horas, a broadcast channel run by Spanish state radio, television (TT2)⁹
3. Telemundo, a Spanish-language channel in the United States and part of NBCUniversal (TT3)¹⁰
4. Mexican cable news channel Excélsior, belonging to Grupo Imagen (TT4)¹¹
5. The news channel RT Spanish, part of the RT (formerly Russia Today) network, launched in 2009 and funded by the Russian state (TT5).¹²

Although other interpretations were available online, this corpus of five target texts was chosen as these were complete interpretations of the speech (others were extracts) on established news outlets employing professional interpreters (non-professional interpretations were discarded for the purpose of this analysis). The chosen target texts cover a range of varieties of Spanish and of modes of broadcast coverage: the interpretations in TT1 and TT2 are Peninsular Spanish, one by a privately owned and the other by a state-run broadcaster; TT3 and TT4 are US-Mexican Spanish and broadcast on commercial channels; while TT5 is an example of a peninsular Spanish interpreter working for a third-party foreign broadcaster that is known for following the Russian government line. These five complete interpretations of a single event were broadcast live and, as far as can be ascertained, were delivered without access to the script of the original speech.¹³ Five target texts in the same (or varieties of the same) language constitute an invaluable corpus for investigating key questions of variation in intervention in interpreting. In addition, the written translation published in the well reputed El País internacional (TT6)¹⁴ was also consulted in order to gauge how far some of the

⁸http://internacional.elpais.com/internacional/2017/01/20/actualidad/1484940369_431912.html

⁹ The interpreter, Daniel Sánchez Reinaldo, has posted the recording at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1mWzuBmB8QY>

¹⁰ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6sCTh8Gs1SE>

¹¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=miBDocLkOAA> . Interpreting begins at minute 0:36.

¹² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6rUJcKuMebg> . Interpreting begins at 2:02:39.

¹³ This is evident in the problems which all interpreters encountered with the phrase: buy American and hire American, where all interpreters initially mistook buy for its homonym by and translated it with the Spanish por or hecho por [made by].

¹⁴ ‘Discurso de investidura de Donald Trump, en español’, translated by María Luisa Rodríguez Tapia, 20 January 2017,

problems identified in interpreting were solved by a translator who, although working against the clock (the translation was published the same day) was less constrained by speed of delivery, cognitive overload and the need for omission.

As in the Obama speech, there is some omission of evaluation in the TTs: so, all interpreting TTs omit a translation of orderly in the phrase ‘Every four years we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power’, perhaps because of the difficulty of quickly finding an equivalent in Spanish (TT6, the written translation, gives ordenado), and three TTs omit the very marked epithet beautiful from ‘our young and beautiful students’. There are very few shifts of attitudinal category in the TTs. Those that do occur seem to be due to either mishearing (stir our souls understood as ‘stir ourselves’), imprecision (ravages becomes caos, ‘chaos’) or ambiguity: struggling families is interpreted either as negative capacity, that is, families who are in difficulty and barely coping (gente con dificultades, TT1), or as positive tenacity (‘fighting’), which is reflected by translations such as luchaban (TT2, TT3) and batallaban (TT4). Otherwise, it would be unusual for a category shifts to occur unless there were either manipulation of the text or a discordant value across cultures. The positive values of Affect, Judgement and Appreciation in the speech are likely to be shared by many citizens in the source-language and target-language communities: after all, who would not want ‘safe neighbourhoods’, ‘good jobs’, ‘great schools’, and so on? And who, among Trump’s supporters, would not look kindly on reinforcement of borders (including building the Mexican wall) in order to reduce immigration?

5.1.1 Invoked evaluation

Where the Trump and Obama speeches differ rhetorically is in the degree of invoked evaluation, notably through non-core vocabulary, metaphor and allusion. Obama’s speech was rich in metaphors related to meteorology, journeys, movement and personification, while also using historical references to create an image of the United States as it progressed through its history (Munday, 2012, pp. 58-62). These allusions are mostly absent in Trump’s speech except for a very few examples which do cause problems for most interpreters:

ST rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our nation.

http://internacional.elpais.com/internacional/2017/01/20/actualidad/1484940369_431912.htm
1.

The negative capacity of rusted-out factories refers to the rustbelt of the United States, running from the Great Lakes to the Midwest states, and conjures up images of de-industrialisation and economic decline since the 1980s. The simile scattered like tombstones reinforces the sense of decay. The various interpretations show great variety in this section.

Target texts	Literal translation of TT
TT1 fábricas cerradas	closed factories
TT2 fábricas cerradas...en todo...el paisaje de nuestra nación	closed factories...in all...the landscape of our nation
TT3 fábricas corroídas...dispersas por toda nuestra nación	corroded factories... dispersed like tombstones across all our nation
TT4 las fábricas dispersadas como si fueran tumbas en el paisaje de nuestra nación	factories dispersed as if they were tombs in the landscape of our nation
TT5 [omitted]	----
TT6 fábricas herrumbrosas y esparcidas como lápidas funerarias en el paisaje	factories rusty and scattered like tombstones in the landscape

As far as the evaluative language is concerned, only TT3 succeeds in rendering the image of rusted factories, whereas TT1 and TT2 generalise using the core adjective *cerradas* (closed). TT4 concentrates on the second part of the evaluation (the tombs) and TT5 omits the section altogether. The simile of the tombstones is omitted in TT1 and TT2, but rendered by TT3 and TT4. It would seem that interpreters are forced to resort to some form of simplification when faced with such a concentration of indirect evaluation. Curiously, even the written translation TT6, although producing a close version of the evaluation, for some reason omits the end of the sentence (of our nation). Could it be that in a written translation problems posed by evaluative language come to the fore and divert the translator's concentration away from what may be perceived as non-central circumstantial adjuncts?

The following example shows the problems caused for the interpreters by the non-core term *carnage*, which intensifies the negative security (*crime...gangs...drugs...*) presented earlier in the speech and offers a categorical statement of solution:

ST this American **carnage** stops right here and stops right now

Target texts	Literal translation of TT
TT1 esto acaba...aquí y ahora	this ends...here and now
TT2 todo esto acaba...justo aquí, y acaba...justo ahora	all this ends... right here, and ends... right now
TT3 esta masacre se acaba...aquí mismo, en este momento	this massacre ends... right here, in this moment
TT4 esta... situación estadounidense... esto se detiene en este momento. Esta carnicería se detiene ahora mismo	this... American situation... this stops in this moment. This carnage stops right now
TT5 Y...esto deja de existir, ahora... y...aquí	and... this stops existing, now... and... here
TT6 esta carnicería debe terminar ya	this carnage must finish right now

All interpreters pause to find a way to deal with the start of the sentence. TT1, TT2 and TT5 all decide on generalisation, and use the empty demonstrative esto [this]. TT4 provides a variant of this, using the general noun situación [situation] followed by esto [this] again before arriving at a more intensified non-core solution esta carnicería [this carnage]; only TT3 finds a solution immediately, selecting the synonym esta masacre [this massacre]. Comparison with written translation TT6 shows that the extra time available allows an appropriate solution for carnage [esta carnicería] that seems to have reduced the strength of the rest of the sentence, the emphatic source text declaration diminishing through the use of the modal debe [must] and the omission of the repetition that stresses the commitment - *right here and...right now*.

A final example will emphasise the problem of infused meaning in non-core words. Close to the end of speech, Trump appeals to his supporters in all parts of the United States using the following images of negative Appreciation:

ST And whether a child is born in **the urban sprawl** of Detroit or **the windswept plains** of Nebraska, [they look up at the same night sky.]

Target texts	Literal translation of TT
--------------	---------------------------

TT1 Si nace un niño en los...en Detroit...o en las llanuras de Nebraska	If a child is born in the... in Detroit... or in the plains of Nebraska
TT2 Y cuando nace un niño en Detroit...o en las llanuras de Nebraska	And when a child is born in Detroit... or in the plains of Nebraska
TT3 Y... si un chico nace...en...Detroit...o en las planicies de Nebraska...	If a child is born... in... Detroit... or in the plains of Nebraska
TT4 Y...ya sea que nazca un niño... en...la mancha urbana de Detroit o en las planicies de Nebraska	Whether a child is born... in... the urban area of Detroit or in the plains of Nebraska
TT5 Y no importa...si...un niño nace en Detroit o en Alaska	And it makes no difference...if... a child is born in Detroit or in Alaska
TT6 Un niño que nace en la gran urbe de Detroit y otro que nace en las llanuras barridas por el viento de Nebraska	A child who is born in the big city of Detroit and another who is born in the plains swept by the wind of Nebraska

Detroit (Michigan) and Nebraska represent the poles of urban and country life; both represent states that have experienced deprivation and which voted for Trump in the election. My interest here is the detail provided by the images of urban sprawl and windswept plains, examples that provoke or associate value dependent on the listeners' ability to capture the negativity of the two descriptions. Both are non-core terms that are difficult to interpret on the hoof. Understandably, the interpreters mostly resort to the core Detroit and plains of Nebraska, making the listener work harder to retrieve the negative evaluation. TT4's mancha urbana [urban area] is a fine attempt to render it (mancha literally means 'stain') while even the written translation, the only target text to translate windswept, fails to capture the negativity of urban sprawl.

5.1.2 Graduation

The second main trend that can be identified in Appendix I relates to Trump's very frequent use of explicit Force (part of Graduation) to intensify his statements, both positive and negative (e.g. decide the course of America for **many, many** years to come; **so much** unrealized potential). There are some 25 instances of positive Force and 12 of negative Force in the Trump ST; this total of 37 compares with 23 in the Obama speech, which was twice the length in words. Intensification through Force is therefore far more prevalent in Trump's

speech and, as we shall see below, may be characteristic of his speech style in general. However, the treatment of Force in the target texts varies. More than half the Obama examples were omitted in the target text interpretations studied in Munday (2012, p. 65) whereas the Trump speech shows additions and omissions: TT1 (two additions, eight omissions), TT2 (one addition, two omissions), TT3 (one addition, one omission), TT4 (two additions, no omissions), TT5 (two additions, 14 omissions), TT6 (no additions, three omissions). Apart from TT5, where the interpreter generally struggled with detail, and TT1, which showed some tendency to reduce Force and intensification in non-core lexis, the overall results show that there is no a priori need to sacrifice Graduation in interpreting. TT2, TT3 and TT4 show very low rates of omission, in fact lower than written translation TT6. They succeed in rendering Graduation as well as the more substantial core Attitude expressions. This is in stark contrast to the Obama findings.

There are several possible reasons for this, which merit further investigation. The speed of delivery must be a factor: Obama spoke at a rate of approximately 129 words per minute (2,395 words in 18:35 minutes) while Trump's rate was approximately 88 words per minute (1,433 words in 16:12 minutes). Another factor might be the awareness that Trump's signature rhetoric bases itself very much on high intensification and Force, as we shall see below. In such a context, a high rate of omission of such features would risk failure to interpret a significant element of the speech.

5.1.3 Engagement

Part of Engagement, counter-expectancy indicators 'alert readers that attitudinal values (positive/negative) are at stake' (Martin & White, 2005, p. 67). While these values may be retrieved from the ideational content, counter-expectancy indicators (such as only, even, but, however) reveal intervention from the speaker and flag the orientation of the evaluation or express some unusual or marked behaviour of the phenomena. They are therefore an important device for structuring discourse and guiding the reception of the arguments. Below is a list of the counter-expectancy indicators in the Trump speech:

not merely, no longer (x2), not even, only (x3), never (x3), however, but (x12), while (x5).

The first five items in the list are modal particles or attitudinal adverbials that indicate intervention from the speaker. These instances represent a similar scaled frequency to Obama's 22 in his longer text, of which seven were omitted in the interpreting (Munday,

2012, p.66). But there is also Trump's frequent use of conjunctions and occasional discourse markers to counter arguments that are set up in a contrast — compare President Obama's smaller total of seven but's with Trump's 12 plus five of the similar while. Typical of Trump is the following:

Today's ceremony, **however**, has very special meaning because today we are **not merely** transferring power from one administration to another, or from one party to another — **but** we are transferring power from Washington DC and giving it back to you, the people.

This key sentence occurs near the beginning of the speech after Trump has thanked the Obamas for their help during the transition of power. It marks a significant shift in tone and content, highlighted by the counter-expectancy marker *however* and the adverbial *not merely*, combined with the adversative conjunction *but* (in bold, above). The message, which continues throughout the speech, asserts contrast between the past where, according to Trump, a small élite flourished, and the change he will bring in the future by putting the common people and America first. In the example above, this stress is slightly reduced in interpreting: TT1 and TT5 omit *however* and TT2 and TT3 put no translation for *but*. Only TT4, and the written TT6, retains all three markers. Further examples of Engagement will be discussed in Sections 5.2 and 5.3.

5.2 Critical points in Trump's speech

One key concept in Trump's speech is related to naming. The term *America/American(s)* occurs 35 times — more than in any other previous inaugural (Rice, 2017) — and forms the bedrock of Trump's appeal. Examples include *fellow Americans.... We, the citizens of America... Buy American and hire American...* and the slogans *America First* and *Make America great again*. The problem in interpreting is that the Spanish term *América* usually refers to the whole continent, north and south. While interpreters of TT2, TT3 and TT4 use the more correct *Estados Unidos* [United States], TT1 and TT5, both Peninsular Spanish speakers, nevertheless use *América* which produces a strange disjunct geographically and politically.

In Trump's speech, opposed to 'America' and its citizens is what he calls 'a small group' of people in Washington, the establishment. In his view

The establishment protected itself but not the citizens of our country.

This use of establishment is defined by Merriam-Webster (2016, online) as ‘a group of social, economic, and political leaders who form a ruling class (as of a nation)’ or ‘a controlling group’.¹⁵ In English, alongside the similar term *élite* (itself originally a borrowing from French), it has been used by some politicians in recent years as a target in populist campaigns aimed at securing the support of ‘ordinary’ citizens. That this key concept is also a critical point in interpreting may be established by considering that the target texts present six different solutions:

los ricos (‘the rich’, TT1), el establishment (TT2), el sistema (‘the system’, TT3), el establecimiento (‘the establishment’, TT4), la clase alta (‘the upper-class’, TT5), el aparato (‘the apparatus’, TT6).

TT1 and TT5 opt for a translation based on an interpretation of wealth or class, whereas TT3 and TT6 offer a generalised solution, in TT6’s case one that seems to chime very much with a totalitarian political context. The other two interpreters eschew generalisation or interpretation and prefer narrower solutions: TT2 goes for an accepted borrowing¹⁶ and TT4 prefers an unusual calque or literal translation. Thus, we see how this critical point is shifted and clarified in different ways in the TTs. This affects the negative evaluation as illustrated through deictic positioning.

5.3 Deictic positioning

Adapted from Chilton (2004, p. 56), the concept of deictic positioning enables conceptual analysis of the speaker-hearer relationship. It is closely linked to Engagement and is plotted along three axes: modality/evaluation, time/space and identity (Munday, 2012, pp. 69-71; 2015). In a political speech of this type, the speaker occupies the ‘deictic centre’ (Verscheuren, 1999, p. 20) in the here-and-now, asserting moral rightness and identifying closely with the supporters. The deictic positioning of Trump in his speech is shown in Figure 1:

¹⁵ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/>

¹⁶ dle.rae.es

PLACE FIGURE 1 AROUND HERE

Figure 1. Deictic positioning in Trump inaugural ST

Expressions of Attitude of, particularly, Judgement, may be located along the modality/evaluation axis (1): thus, the negative realisations of Attitude described above, the examples of wrongs in society, crime, loss of jobs to other countries, the poverty of the common people, and so on. Along the space axis (2), Trump is at the centre with his team, addressing the ‘forgotten’ men and women who voted for him and who will be at the forefront of his policy, starting ‘right here and right now’. The more distant Other (axis 3) is constituted by the Washington establishment, foreign predator companies and radical Islamic terrorism, all of whom may be considered the moral opposite of ‘the people’ and the cause of the negativity on the modality axis. The key factor in interpreting is how Trump addresses his followers. Pronoun choice, especially for the second person, is crucial in establishing a relationship of closeness between Trump and the listeners. However, such relationships are problematic when translating into target languages that differentiate between formal and informal uses of the second person (T/V), as seen in the analysis of press conferences involving European heads of state (Schaeffner, 2015). Surprisingly often, the interpreting of these interpersonal features is unsystematic or inconsistent.

If we look at the Engagement resources deployed by Trump, we see how the pronoun you is used to refer to ‘you, the people’: we are giving [power] back to you, the people. In the target texts, it is the second person plural pronoun and related verb conjugation (when the pronoun is dropped) which is under investigation. This causes no problem with TT3 and TT4, since Mexican/US Spanish has the same form (*ustedes*) for both the formal and informal second person plural. In the other target texts, all produced by speakers or writers of Peninsular Spanish, which differentiates between the formal plural *ustedes* and the informal plural *vosotros/vosotras* and their related object and possessive pronouns, we see a different strategy: TT2 uses the informal plural throughout in a systematic strategy that locates the audience close to the deictic centre; TT5 and TT1 are unsystematic in their rendering. Below is a list of occurrences of you/your in the ST and their translation in TT1:¹⁷

1. we are giving it [power] back to you, the people devolviéndolo a **ustedes** el pueblo

¹⁷ Relevant ST pronouns are marked in italics; in the TT, formal pronouns and related conjugated verbs are indicated in **bold** and informal pronouns are underlined.

2. their victories have not been your victories	sus victorias no han sido las victorias de ustedes
3. their triumphs have not been your triumphs	sus triunfos no son los suyos
4. this moment is your moment, it belongs to you	este es el momento de ustedes , <u>os</u> pertenece
5. this is your day. This is your celebration	es su día...Es su celebración
... and this is your country	... es su país
6. everyone is listening to you now. You came by the tens of millions	todo el mundo escucha. <u>Habéis</u> venido en millones
7. I will fight for you ... I will never, ever let you down	Lucharé por <u>vosotros</u> ... nunca <u>os</u> dejaré caer
8. do not allow anyone to tell you...	no permitan que nadie les diga...
9. you will never be ignored again	ustedes nunca serán ignorados de nuevo
10. your voice, your hopes and your dreams	<u>vuestra</u> voz, <u>vuestras</u> esperanzas y <u>vuestros</u> sueños
11. your courage, and goodness and love	<u>vuestra</u> valentía.

The closeness relationship on the identity axis is negotiated constantly throughout the translated text: it goes from the formal addressing of the people (Examples 1-5), shifting to informal plural in 6-7, returning to formal (8-9) and back again to informal (10-11). The motives for these changes are unclear. Example 6 and, especially, 7 display strong +Affect and +tenacity as Trump stresses his loyalty to the people in a very emotional way. At the very least, this causes a blurring of the position along the identity axis.

6. Discussion

In Section 5.1.2 above, we stressed the importance of speed of delivery. The slower speed of the ST speech might be one of the factors that would explain the reduced omissions in Graduation and Attitude in the Trump TTs. The other important factor is the type of speech.

Trump claims to have written the speech himself, although others state that this inaugural address was written for the president by his senior adviser, Stephen Miller, and chief strategist Steve Bannon (Bender, 2017; Greenwood, 2017). Miller was the author of Trump's more formal campaign speeches, also delivered with the aid of a teleprompter, which marked a very different tone to the unscripted speeches and informal tweets for which Trump is renowned. The more sober, controlled scripts make Trump seem more conventionally presidential and they reassure financial markets (Fox, 2017). Unscripted delivery appears to intensify the main evaluative trends revealed in the inaugural. This can be illustrated by the following extract from Trump's unscripted victory speech of 9 November 2017:¹⁸

I've just received a call from Secretary Clinton. She congratulated us. It's about us. ... on our victory, and I [congratulated] her and her family on a **very, very** hard-fought campaign. I mean, she fought **very hard**. Hillary has worked **very long** and **very hard** over a **long** period of time, and we owe her a **major** debt of gratitude for her service to our country. I mean that **very** sincerely.

The cluster of **eight intensifiers**, part of Force, is not unusual for unscripted speech or for off-the-cuff comments made by Trump in other contexts. Another problematic feature of the impromptu speeches are points where there is a loss of grammatical or logical coherence, which for some interpreters makes him seem unpresidential. There is a tendency for Trump to mention individual words or names with no context. Japanese interpreter Miwako Hibi (Osaki, 2017) discusses the moment in the victory speech when Trump thanks Reince Priebus, then chairman of the Republican National committee, for his support during the campaign. Trump likens the campaign to the record of the brilliant racehorse Secretariat from the 1970s:

Let me tell you about Reince. [...] I know it, Reince is a superstar. I said, they can't call you a superstar, Reince, unless we win it. Like Secretariat. He would not have that bust at the track at Belmont.

¹⁸ Speech in English available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2016/11/09/politics/donald-trump-victory-speech/> .

Such indirect evaluation again depends on the listener's retrieval of the association behind the name of a horse so outstanding it is commemorated with a statue at Belmont race course but who is less well-known outside the United States. Even experienced interpreters indicate that this culture-specific item, with its associations to excellence and extraordinary capacity, was unknown to them; Hibi thought it referred to the role of Reince Priebus, while Sánchez Reinaldo mistook bust for bus and unusually produced a confused chunk of interpreting.¹⁹

7. Conclusion

The Appraisal-based model provides a very focused and intricate tool for identifying the power behind evaluative words and expressions, and how this fits into an act of communication including, in our case, translator/interpreter intervention. As BBC translator Olivier Weber reminds us (BBC World Service, 2017), in interpreting or translating the President of the United States 'every word counts'. The fine-grained lexical analysis presented in this article serves several important purposes: the Appraisal profile for the Trump source text enables main evaluative themes of the speech to be located and elaborated in some detail, for the speakers' evaluative strategies to be better understood and for the deictic positioning of speaker and audience to be ascertained; analysis of the shifts in the target texts enhances, and is enhanced by, the possibility of comparison with the earlier Obama study; specifically, the Trump analysis has shown that it is not inevitable that features of Force undergo a serious reduction in interpreting, although non-core lexis and allusion-laden images (less frequent in Trump than Obama) do tend to suffer a loss. As we continue to explore this field, important questions for future research into political speeches include the effect of speed of delivery and the roles played by speech mode and speaker signature.

References

- Baker, M. (2006). *Translation as conflict*. London: Routledge.
- BBC World Service. (2017). *Translating President Trump*. The Fifth Floor. 3 February 2017. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p04qx845>
- Bender, M. (2017). Donald Trump strikes nationalistic tone in inaugural speech. *The Wall Street Journal* 20 January 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/articles/donald-trump-strikes-nationalistic-tone-in-inaugural-speech-1484957527>

¹⁹ Daniel Sánchez Reinaldo's live interpreting for Canal 24 horas is posted at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qEgRjHeyD9Q>

- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing social discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Fox, M. (2017). Market likes ‘Teleprompter Trump’ way more than ‘Twitter Trump’, analyst says. CNBC 1 March 2017. Retrieved from <http://www.cnbc.com/2017/03/01/market-likes-teleprompter-trump-way-more-than-twitter-trump-analyst-says.html>
- Greenwood, M. (2017). Miller and Bannon wrote Trump address. The Hill 21 January 2017. Retrieved from <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/315464-bannon-miller-wrote-trumps-inauguration-address-report>
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Fourth edition. London: Routledge.
- Hurtado Albir, A. (Ed.) (2017). *Researching translation competence by PACTE group*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Martin, J.R. & White, P.R.R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave.
- Munday, J. (Ed.) (2007). *Translation as intervention*. London: Continuum.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Evaluation in translation: critical points of translator decision making*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Munday, J. (2015). Engagement and graduation resources as markers of translator/interpreter positioning. *Target* 27(3), 406-421. DOI: 10.1075/target.27.3.05mun
- Osaki, T. (2017). Japanese interpreters struggle to make sense of ‘Trumpese’. The Japan Times 17 February 2017. Retrieved from <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2017/02/17/national/japans-interpreters-struggle-to-make-sense-of-trump-speeches/#.WSAn2GjyuUn>
- Peters, G. (n.d.). *The American Presidency Project* [online]. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California (hosted), Gerhard Peters (database). Available from World Wide Web: http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/inaugurals_words.php.
- Rice, J. (2017). Does Trump really have the best words? A statistical analysis of Trump’s inaugural address. Retrieved from <http://www.litcharts.com/analytics/inaugural>
- Schaeffner, C. (2015). Speaker positioning in interpreter-mediated press conferences. *Target* 27(3), 422-439. DOI: 10.1075/target.27.3.06sch
- Schumacher, E. & Eskenazi, M. (2016). *A readability analysis of campaign speeches from the 2016 US Presidential campaign*. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Mellon Institute. <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1603/1603.05739.pdf>
- South China Morning Post (2017). Chinese media downplay Trump inauguration. 21 January 2017. Retrieved from <http://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy-defence/article/2064206/chinese-media-downplay-trump-inauguration-internet>

Valdeón, R. (2015). (Un)stable sources, translation and news production. *Target* 27(3), 440-453. DOI: 10.1075/target.27.3.07val

Verscheuren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

Zhang, M. & Pan, H. (2015). Institutional power in and behind discourse: a case study of SARS notices and their translations used in Macao. *Target* 27(3), 387-405. DOI: 10.1075/target.27.3.04zha

Appendix I

ST Appraisal profile for Trump's inaugural speech 2017

	+ (Positive)	- (Negative)
Affect		
Security	Orderly and peaceful transfer of power, great prosperity, safe neighbourhoods, your hopes and your dreams, safe	Trapped in poverty, wealth ripped from their homes; and the crime and the gangs and the drugs that have stolen too many lives, robbed our country, this American carnage, depletion of our military, the ravages of other countries, stealing our companies, radical Islamic terrorism
Happiness	Grateful, friendship, we all enjoy, <i>your...love</i>	Very sad depletion
Inclination	Good will, a new national pride, the same dreams, your hopes and your dreams	
Satisfaction	Good and pleasant, they fill their hearts with the same dreams	
Judgement		
Normality		

Capacity	<p>A new decree, a new vision, old <i>alliances... new ones, a new</i> national pride, old wisdom</p> <p>Great strength, unstoppable, <i>strong...wealthy, our country will</i> thrive and prosper</p>	<p>Struggling families, forgotten men and women, unrealized potential, deprived of all knowledge, very sad depletion, dissipated over the horizon, disrepair and decay,</p> <p>A small group</p>
Tenacity	<p>Crucial conviction, total allegiance, loyalty, united, solidarity, live together in unity, the heart and fight and spirit of America</p>	
Veracity	<p>Openly</p>	
Propriety	<p>Gracious, just and reasonable demands of righteous people and righteous public, the civilized world</p>	
Appreciation		
Reaction	<p>Magnificent, young and beautiful students, one glorious destiny, our wonderful nation, glorious freedoms</p>	
Composition	<p>Two simple rules</p>	
Valuation	<p>Very special meaning, historic movement, great schools, good</p>	<p>Empty talk, rusted-out factories</p>

	jobs, we will shine, great men and women, great American flag, make America great again	
Force	Great national effort, for all of our people, for many, many years to come, very special meaning, all across our land, that all changes, right here and right now, everyone gathered here today, all across America, what truly matters, in every city, in every foreign capital and every hall of power, every decision, great prosperity and strength, every breath, all across our wonderful nation, the right of all nations, for everyone to follow, eradicate completely, total allegiance, totally unstoppable, think big and dream even bigger, we all bleed, we all enjoy, to all Americans, in every city	For too long, little to celebrate, for too many, too many lives, so much unrealized potential, for many decades, deprived of all knowledge, very sad depletion, trillions and trillions of dollars, millions and millions of American workers, most importantly, constantly complaining
Focus		