

CONTENTS

| | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>List of figures and tables</i> | <i>xi</i> |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | <i>xiii</i> |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| 1 Evaluation and translation | 11 |
| 1.0 Introduction | 11 |
| 1.1 Ideology and axiology | 12 |
| 1.2 Systemic functional linguistics and the value orientation of language | 13 |
| 1.2.1 Ideology and axiology in translation | 16 |
| 1.3 Appraisal theory and the concept of evaluation | 20 |
| 1.3.1 The system of appraisal | 22 |
| 1.3.1.1 <i>Direct, or 'inscribed', attitude</i> | 24 |
| 1.3.1.2 <i>Indirect, or invoked, attitude</i> | 27 |
| 1.3.1.3 <i>Evoked attitude</i> | 27 |
| 1.3.1.4 <i>Provoked attitude</i> | 29 |
| 1.3.2 Studies of attitude in translation | 31 |
| 1.3.3 Graduation and engagement | 33 |
| 1.4 Evaluation as an integrated complex | 34 |
| 1.5 Evaluation, textual voice and evidentiality | 35 |
| 1.6 Evaluation and reading positions | 37 |
| 1.7 Evaluation and 'critical points' in translator and interpreter decision-making | 40 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 2 | The interpretation of political speech | 42 |
| 2.0 | Introduction | 42 |
| 2.1 | The broadcast context | 42 |
| 2.2 | The expression of appraisal | 44 |
| 2.2.1 | Affect | 45 |
| 2.2.2 | Judgement | 48 |
| 2.2.3 | Appreciation | 54 |
| 2.2.4 | Provoked evaluation – lexical metaphors | 57 |
| 2.2.5 | Indirect evaluation and the question of translation | 62 |
| 2.2.6 | Graduation | 65 |
| 2.2.7 | Counter-expectancy indicators | 66 |
| 2.2.8 | Engagement | 67 |
| 2.3 | Deictic positioning | 68 |
| 2.3.1 | Translation of pronouns | 73 |
| 2.3.2 | Spatio-temporal deixis and identity | 74 |
| 2.3.3 | Reading position and voice of the interpreter | 76 |
| 2.4 | Conclusion | 78 |
| | Appendix 2.1 Transcript of Obama inaugural speech, 20 January 2009 | 80 |
| 3 | The view from the technical translators | 84 |
| 3.0 | Introduction | 84 |
| 3.1 | The perception of the professionals | 84 |
| 3.1.1 | Text-type and explicitation | 89 |
| 3.1.2 | The Chinese context | 90 |
| 3.2 | KudoZ™ | 92 |
| 3.3 | SENSE | 97 |
| 3.4 | Conclusion | 102 |
| 4 | The literary translator and reviser | 104 |
| 4.0 | Introduction | 104 |
| 4.1 | Revisions of a classical text – <i>Agricola</i> and <i>Germania</i> | 105 |
| 4.1.1 | The manuscript revised | 106 |
| 4.1.2 | Evaluative keys and reading position | 109 |
| 4.2 | Revision between author, translator and reader – Mario Vargas Llosa | 110 |
| 4.2.1 | Correspondence and queries | 111 |
| 4.2.2 | Indirect, associative evaluation | 112 |
| 4.2.3 | The reader–author relationship | 113 |
| 4.2.4 | Lexical alternatives in the essay genre | 118 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.3 The practice of self-revision – David Bellos' translation of Georges Perec | 121 |
| 4.3.1 The detail of self-revision | 122 |
| 4.3.2 Revision and evaluation at different stages | 128 |
| 4.4 Conclusion | 129 |
| 5 Translation variation and its link to attitude | 131 |
| 5.0 Introduction | 131 |
| 5.1 The texts: Borges and his translators | 132 |
| 5.1.1 Analysis of the Yates and Hurley translations of 'Emma Zunz' | 134 |
| 5.2 The experiment | 140 |
| 5.2.1 Invariance | 140 |
| 5.2.2 Linguistic variation in attitude and appraisal | 143 |
| 5.2.3 Attitude-rich words | 146 |
| 5.2.4 Genre differences | 148 |
| 5.3 Conclusion | 152 |
| Appendix 5.1 'Emma Zunz' extracts translated by Yates and Hurley | 153 |
| 6 Evaluation in translation – some concluding thoughts | 155 |
| 6.1 The results of the case studies | 155 |
| 6.2 Reading positions | 158 |
| 6.3 For the future | 159 |
| <i>Notes</i> | 161 |
| <i>Bibliography</i> | 173 |
| <i>Index</i> | 185 |