Translating the European House

Translating the European House:

Discourse, Ideology and Politics – Selected Papers by Christina Schäffner

Edited by

Stefan Baumgarten and Chantal Gagnon

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Translating the European House:
Discourse, Ideology and Politics – Selected Papers by Christina Schäffner

Edited by Stefan Baumgarten and Chantal Gagnon

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-9539-3
ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9539-2

Christina Schäffner

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Fonds de Recherche du Québec – Société et Culture, and by Bangor University in North Wales. The editors would also like to thank Adélie O. Coutu (Université de Montréal) for her help with editing and proofreading the book, as well as Professor Andrew Chesterman and Professor Paul Chilton for their valuable comments on an earlier script. Special thanks also go to the following publishing institutions and individuals, who have kindly granted permission to reprint each of the twelve essays: John Benjamins Publishing Company (Amsterdam/Netherlands), Vervuert Verlagsgesellschaft (Frankfurt/ Germany), Channel View Publications/Multilingual Matters (Bristol/UK), Taylor & Francis Group/Routledge (Abingdon/UK), Elsevier B.V. (Amsterdam/Netherlands), Ingrid Simonnæs (editor of SYNAPS Fagspråk, Kommunikasjon, Kulturkunnskap), Presses Sourbonne Nouvelle (Paris/France), Ashgate Publishing (Farnham/UK), Cambridge Scholars Publishing (Newcastle/UK).

TABULA GRATULATORIA

ADAB Beverly, Stoke-on-Trent, UK
AL-HARRASI Abdulla, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman
ASSIS ROSA Alexandra, Lisbon, Portugal
AUSTERMÜHL Frank, Birmingham, UK
AYYAD Ahmed, Jerusalem, Occupied Palestine
BAKER Mona, Manchester, UK
BASSNETT Susan, Warwick/Glasgow, UK
BAUMANN Klaus-Dieter, Leipzig, Germany
BAUMGARTEN Stefan, Bangor, Wales
BENNETT Karen, Lisbon, Portugal
BIEL Łucja, Warsaw, Poland
BOASE-BEIER Jean, Norwich, England
BREMS Elke, Leuven, Belgium
BRUMME Jenny, Barcelona, Spain
CAIMOTTO Maria Cristina, Turin, Italy
CASTRO Olga, Birmingham, UK
CHESTERMAN Andrew, Helsinki, Finland
CHILTON Paul, Lancaster and Warwick, UK
CORNELLA-DETRELL Jordi, Glasgow, UK
DAVIER Lucile, Geneva, Switzerland
DELABASTITA Dirk, Namur, Belgium
D'HULST Lieven, Kortrijk, Belgium
FIEDLER Sabine, Leipzig, Germany
FLYNN Peter, Ghent, Belgium
GAGNON Chantal, Montreal, Canada
GAMBIER Yves, Turku, Finland
GREMLER Claudia, Birmingham, UK
HALVERSON Sandra, Bergen, Norway
HERMANS Theo, Hemel Hempstead, UK
HERTING Beate, Leipzig, Germany
HOUSE Juliane, Hamburg, Germany
HUBSCHER-DAVIDSON Severine, Manchester, UK
JAKOBSEN Arnt Lykke, Copenhagen, Denmark
JÄÄSKELÄINEN Riitta, Savonlinna, Finland
JAWORSKA Sylvia, Reading, UK
JETTMAROVÁ Zuzana, Prague, Czech Republic
KOSKINEN Kaisa, Tampere, Finland
KRISHNAMURTHY Ramesh, Birmingham, UK
MACKEVIC Vlad, Birmingham, UK
MALMKJÆR, Kirsten, Leicester, UK

MANZ Stefan, Birmingham, UK
MATEO Marta, Oviedo, Spain
MEDINA Raquel, Birmingham, UK
MEYLAERTS Reine, Leuven, Belgium
MILTON John, São Paulo, Brazil
MRGUDOVIC Nathalie, Birmingham, UK
MUNDAY Jeremy, Leeds, UK
NORD Christiane, Heidelberg, Germany
OLOHAN Maeve, Manchester, UK
PALOPOSKI Outi, Helsinki, Finland
POLEZZI Loredana, Cardiff, UK
PÖCHHACKER Franz, Vienna, Austria
RAMOS PINTO Sara, Leeds, UK
SALAETS Heidi, Antwerp, Belgium
SALAMA-CARR Myriam, Manchester, UK
SCHMITT Peter Axel, Leipzig, Germany
SHUTTLEWORTH Mark, London, UK
SNELL-HORNBY Mary, Vienna, Austria
STAFFORD Hélène, Birmingham, UK
STOLZE Radegundis, Darmstadt, Germany
STURGE Kate, Berlin, Germany
SUDLOW Brian, Birmingham, UK
TCACIUC Luciana Sabina Mihaela, Birmingham, UK
TIRKKONEN-CONDIT Sonja. Savonlinna, Finland
TYMOCZKO Maria, Northampton MA, USA
TESSEUR Wine, Reading, UK
VAN DOORSLAER Luc, Leuven/Antwerp, Belgium
WIELANDER Elisabeth, Birmingham, UK
WODAK Ruth, Vienna, Austria
WOLF Michaela, Graz, Austria

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Aims of this Book

This book contains a selection of articles on the theme of translation and politics, written by Christina Schäffner. Spanning a period of 16 years, the articles assembled here provide an overview of Christina Schäffner's outstanding academic achievements in the areas of translation studies and discourse analysis, and afford a valuable insight into her research, against the backdrop of European politics from the fall of the Berlin Wall to current debates on EU enlargement.

The metaphor of the 'European House' used in the book title reflects a shared intellectual stance and cross-European political project that has grown out of the experiences of two devastating world wars that involved levels of industrial killing, human suffering and deprivation on a scale unprecedented in human history. The early architects of a common European house endeavoured to put aside nationalist egoisms in order to create a multicultural European space, where political unilateralism and nationalist xenophobia might one day become a thing of the past. Today, this cosmopolitan vision is under severe threat from exclusionary politics and from a transnational elite that subordinates all social progress to the divisive dictates of international capital and its principles of market competition. Now, the dismantling of the European Union is seriously being contemplated, and the old Cold War divide is reappearing. Here in the UK, above all, loud voices are obliterating the vision of a co-operative integration across languages and cultures, leading some political commentators to conclude that "[c]riticism of the EU has been almost entirely dominated by a chauvinistic Euroscepticism that portrays all European politics through the absurd prism of outraged national identity and anti-competitive regulation" (Milne 2013, 98).

Is the concept of a common European house really starting to disappear? Whilst this remains a moot point, Christina Schäffner's work, which bears the hallmarks of a cosmopolitan and integrationist perspective, runs counter to a narrow-minded outlook on European affairs and to those vocal strands on the European right that seek to destroy a common

European vision. Christina Schäffner's scholarship moves beyond national and cultural boundaries, her work speaks to everyone for whom intercultural understanding, cross-cultural co-operation and peaceful diplomatic engagement are more than mere empty slogans. Hers is a Europe-focused and linguistically diverse perspective on discourse studies, in particular concerning the study of international political discourse.

Christina Schäffner has been at the forefront of research on translation and political discourse for the best part of 30 years. Originally from East Germany, and having begun her studies in applied linguistics in 1969, at what is now Leipzig University (then Karl Marx University), her research career took off in the early 1980s with comparative investigations of political vocabulary. In 1992, she came to Aston University in Birmingham in the UK, from where she has proactively contributed to the development and consolidation of the – still very young – disciplines of translation studies and discourse analysis. She has achieved this through numerous research publications, the establishment of scholarly networks, and through a willingness to support and facilitate the careers of students and young scholars.

A particularly memorable example of Christina Schäffner's networking skills revolves around a series of recorded panel debates that were published in the unusual, yet highly efficient, format of edited proceedings. These feature positioning papers, key contributions, responses and a record of comments from the panel discussion (e.g. Schäffner and Holmes 1996, Schäffner 1999, 2004a). Later, in 2012, friends, colleagues and students put together a *Festschrift* in honour of Christina Schäffner's contribution to the academic world (Adab, Schmitt, and Shreve 2012). Now that she has retired, and has been awarded the title Emeritus Professor at Aston University, the time is ripe to present an anthology that brings together some of her best work, 'under one roof' so to speak. This is particularly important because to date, her writings have only been accessible in disparate publications in various parts of the world, some of which can be difficult to find.

Considering Christina Schäffner's wide range of writing on translation and political discourse, the collection presented in this book can, of course, contain only a selection of her works, but we hope to offer the reader a representative snapshot. The collection may thus function as a navigational tool, providing readers with an overview of key themes and developments. It is likely also to spark interest in, and prompt exploration of, other

aspects of Schäffner's research, lines of investigation that venture into diverse fields such as text linguistics, pragmatics, metaphor studies and translation didactics (for more details, please see the thematic index and the bibliography of her work at the end of this volume).

We sincerely hope that this anthology will strengthen the area of political discourse analysis in translation by providing a 'one-stop-shop' for articles written by its most prominent scholar. Over the last two decades or so, translation studies has made its mark by conceptualising translation as a form of cross-cultural communication that transcends asymmetrical relations of power, foregrounding issues such as (hegemonic) power, ideology, language contact and intercultural mediation. Yet only a handful of scholars truly relate questions of translation to practical politics (e.g. Hatim and Mason 1991, 1997, Gagnon 2006, Calzada Pérez 2007, Romagnuolo 2009, Baumgarten 2009). Thus, Christina Schäffner's research stands out because she has, consistently over the past 30 years, helped us to understand how political discourse at the international level presupposes translation.

In a rapidly globalising world, where the boundaries between domestic and international politics are increasingly blurred, it is imperative to tackle the social and diplomatic repercussions of mediated political discourse. Whilst readers will surely construct their own understandings and conclusions based on personal trajectories and ideological perspectives, each paper in this anthology can be read independently of any others. Besides having direct relevance to scholars and students in translation studies and (critical) discourse analysis, this collection will also be of interest to the general public and to researchers in other fields including (applied) linguistics, (intercultural) communication studies, political science or the sociology of globalisation. This anthology also lends itself to use in relevant higher education programmes around the world.

A Scholarly Life Between East and West

Christina Schäffner was born in 1950, in the small town of Schlotheim in the former German Democratic Republic. Being a contemporary witness to the effects of World War II on German society, and to an ideological divide that separated the country for more than 40 years, she has maintained a keen sense of historical awareness throughout a long academic career.

That career began in Leipzig, when it was part of the GDR, and ultimately led her to Aston University in Birmingham, in the UK. As a student and scholar in East Germany during the 1970s and 1980s, she witnessed the ideological battles of the Cold War and the eventual demise of totalitarian socialism. Christina Schäffner's work as a researcher began when she worked for the Institute of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics at Leipzig University and was inspired by the work of influential scholars such as Otto Kade (1968), Gert Jäger (1975) and Albrecht Neubert (1985), a group of people who nowadays are, perhaps somewhat misleadingly, referred to as the 'Leipzig School of Translation Studies'. At times, conducting research in East Germany was challenging, since only a fraction of the world's literature was readily available to scholars. In order to gain access to further material (which was deemed by the authorities to have been written by the imperialist class enemy), researchers needed special permission for library access by means of what was then referred to as a 'poisoned sheet' (*Giftschein*) (Schäffner 2004b, 306).

Translation studies as a discipline began to find its own contours and identity during the 1980s, thanks to the efforts of scholars such as José Lambert, Gideon Toury, Peter Newmark and James Holmes. The work of German scholars also found wide international resonance, for example the work of Hans Vermeer, Katharina Reiss, Christiane Nord, Paul Kussmaul, Albrecht Neubert, and that of Christina Schäffner herself. On one hand, Schäffner's work evolved in constant dialogue with linguistic paradigms such as text linguistics, pragmatics, critical discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics and metaphor theory. On the other hand, her work on translation took its initial inspirations from the so-called Leipzig School of Translation Studies, and later engaged with West German functionalism and descriptive systems- and norm-based approaches.

In particular, Christina Schäffner's scholarly engagement with questions on the translation of political discourse, helped to raise the profile of the – still underdeveloped – study of translational phenomena in power politics. The overarching paradigm of Christina Schäffner's scholarship, as we the editors see it, lies in her commitment to discourse-analytical methods. Moreover, her research collaborations with Paul Chilton (e.g. 1997/2011, 2002a) represent a seminal contribution to the field of political discourse analysis. Most significantly, this mode of social and linguistic investigation, with its eye close to the manifold interdependencies across wider contexts, situations and textual minutiae, is firmly grounded in the everyday life of political experience and can therefore generate "a specific

kind of empirical evidence, a kind so obvious that it is ignored in political science and even in political philosophy" (Chilton and Schäffner 2002b, 4).

Our chapter entitled 'Political Discourse Analysis in a Multilingual World' evaluates Christina Schäffner's work within its wider historical and academic contexts. We aim to show the extent to which the above-quoted 'specific kind of empirical evidence' can contribute to a better understanding of political discourse and its translation (or recontextualisation) into other discursive domains and languages. We will, specifically, frame her scholarly oeuvre within its *discursive*, *textual* and *cross-cultural* dimensions, in an attempt to promote further research based on an academic legacy that continues to inspire students and scholars around the world.

Bangor and Montreal,
Stefan Baumgarten and Chantal Gagnon

The Louise Weiss building, seat of the European Parliament in Strasbourg. It evokes Pieter Bruegel's famous painting 'The Tower of Babel'

POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN A MULTILINGUAL WORLD

STEFAN BAUMGARTEN
AND CHANTAL GAGNON

This evaluative chapter considers the discursive, textual and translational dimensions of Christina Schäffner's scholarly work, with the intention to inspire and generate ideas for future research. This chapter emphasises three elements in particular, which are: 1) political discourse analysis, 2) modes of textual enquiry and 3) the translational significance of discourses in Europe, and we strive to acknowledge most of Schäffner's theoretical influences (which range from text linguistics, pragmatics and cognitive metaphor theory to political discourse analysis, e.g. Austin 1962, Searle 1969, Lakoff and Johnson 1980, de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, Chilton 2004).

Within the field of translation studies, Schäffner's work is indissolubly linked with early East German translation research (Neubert 1985), West German functionalism (Reiss and Vermeer 1984/2013) and descriptive translation studies (Toury 1995). Christina Schäffner considers her own approach to be primarily interdisciplinary, a mode of enquiry that aims "to break up narrowly conceived disciplinary boundaries and to elaborate, through the interpretation of examples, aspects that unite disciplines" (2004b, 311 – our translation). The exceptionally rich array of empirical examples in Schäffner's work, and her willingness to sustain constant dialogue across disciplinary boundaries, are particularly worthy of note.

The following discussion, comprising three subsections, will explore Christina Schäffner's work within the context of key historical milestones from around the 1980s onward, in particular those relevant to international security discourse as a feature of the Cold War period, German unification and the collapse of the Communist Eastern bloc, and European politics in relation to EU enlargement.

International Security and Peace: The Discursive Dimension

One of the major outcomes of World War II was the emergence of a bipolar world order, dominated by two new atomic superpowers. The stand-off between the United States and the Soviet Union, each armed to the teeth and with the metaphorical finger on the red button, loomed as a threatening shadow over the world. Underpinned by the grand ideological narratives of liberalism and communism, the Cold War period ended in the early 1990s with the political bankruptcy of the Soviet Union and its satellite states.

Christina Schäffner's early publications appeared during the 1980s in the former German Democratic Republic. Published mostly in German, these works prefigured a life-long engagement with the study of political discourse, as they dealt largely with the semantics of political terminology (Schäffner 1985, 1986), while also investigating translation-related topics (Schäffner 1983, 1988). Schäffner's work emerged during the late Cold War period, so her thematic interests at the time and into the mid-1990s may be broadly located in the area of international security discourse and peace (Wenden and Schäffner 1995). Her research also significantly reflects the dramatically changing realities that followed German reunification and the redrawing of political boundaries (Schäffner 1990, 1992a). Indeed much of her theoretical writing on metaphors as cognitive and ideological phenomena (1994, 1996c, 1997c), work that remains of lasting interest to the international research community, has been inspired by these historical milestones. In the remainder of this subsection, we will flesh out the discursive dimension that underpins Christina Schäffner's distinctive approach to political discourse analysis.

The discursive dimension inherent in Schäffner's approach may be identified through a network of complex conceptual constellations, in particular through key notions such as *ideology*, *discourse* and *politics*. In critical discourse analysis, the concept of *ideology* tends to be approached from a cognitive perspective, as a set of socially shared cognitions. Leaning on van Dijk's influential conception, Schäffner (1996b, 2) describes ideologies as "socially shared belief systems of groups". As an analytical construct, ideology remains a widely contested term, and in the public imagination it continues to have largely negative connotations. Politicised conceptions of ideology do, in any case, tend to be avoided in empirically-grounded research.

Christina Schäffner's scholarship attained maturity at a time when essentialism was gradually but steadily being swept away by waves of postmodernist thought that dissolved binary social oppositions and illusions about the fixity of meaning. Out went Saussurian relational linguistics and Chomskian generative grammar; in came Derridean deconstruction and Foucauldian discourse theory. In the 1990s, shortly after the collapse of the Cold War world order, non-essentialist attitudes to the interpretation of text and talk were not yet as self-evident as they are held to be now, and only today can we legitimately speak of significant paradigmatic change across disciplines. While the scientific study of meaning still wields considerable influence in mainstream linguistics (e.g. Müller 2016), modern discourse theory presupposes an understanding of communicative behaviour as discursive action, a scholarly approach that tends to conform to the non-essentialist principle that meaning is socially constructed (cf. Berger and Luckmann 1991).

Discourse analysis is possibly the most influential interdiscipline that mediates across linguistics and other text-based disciplines, especially disciplines in the social sciences. Discourse analysis, the investigation of language as social interaction, constitutes a critical paradigm in the analysis of textual politics, mediating "between linguistic structures as evident in a text and the social, political, and historical contexts of text production and reception" (Schäffner 2003, 24). The notion of a 'critical' discourse analysis, moreover, highlights the engaged perspective of the researcher, who seeks to draw attention to those discursive practices that help us to develop an enhanced – hence, critical – awareness about ideological positions and power relations in unequal and often discriminatory social settings.

Specifically, Christina Schäffner's research can be regarded as a well-grounded empirical exercise in political discourse analysis, with a sustained focus on the strategic nature of political communication. For Norman Fairclough (1995, 74; 133), *discourse* can be fruitfully investigated along a three-dimensional matrix comprising "social practice, discoursal practice (text production, distribution and consumption), and text" whereby the "connection between text and social practice is seen as being mediated by discourse practice". In that light, Schäffner's work on the discourse of international relations provides valuable insights into ideological processes, institutional networks and sociotextual practices as they unfold, for instance, in global geopolitical strife, in the settings, situations and

conventions of public communication, and in the discursive and linguistic patterns of political text and talk. But what exactly is meant by 'political'?

The concept of *politics* seems to be most obviously grounded in our daily lives and struggles. If the Greek philosopher Aristotle referred to humans as "political animals" (Chilton and Schäffner 1997/2011, 303; see also Chilton 2004), this points us to the crucial – yet easily forgotten – role that people themselves play in the negotiation of political values. After all, "what is considered 'political' depends on the participants in the communicative context" (Schäffner 2004d, 119), so political discourse analysis places particular emphasis on the identities and ideological positionings of social actors within institutional hierarchies and networks of power. Pierre Bourdieu's (1982/1991, 190 – emphasis original) notion of politics complements this way of thinking, specifically in the way he describes the "political field" as regulating behaviour in terms of competition, population control and the demand to remain committed to what has been said:

> The political field is … the site of a competition for power which is carried out by means of a competition for the control of non-professionals or, more precisely, for the monopoly of the right to speak and act in the name of some or all of the non-professionals. […] In politics, 'to say is to do' … Political speech … commits its author completely because it constitutes a commitment to action which is truly political only if it is the commitment of an agent or group of agents who are *politically responsible* …

In her discourse-analytical and linguistic investigations of political text and talk, Schäffner mainly scrutinises the discursive behaviour of 'politically responsible' agents. In the modern era particularly, politicians rely on the media to 'mediate' their message. Here the notion of *recontextualisation* serves as a useful analytical construct to shed light on the ideological, discursive and political dimensions of international power politics (cf. also Medina 2010, 164-167, on concepts of 'discursive responsibility' and 'intercontextuality'). But why focus on this notion? According to Blackledge (2005, 121), "recontextualisation always involves transformation, and that transformation is dependent on the goals, values and interests of the context into which the discursive practice is being recontextualised".

Recontextualisation drives the ideological, political and textual transformations occurring in discourse, and recontextualising practices are specifically effective in the communicative power-play between the media

and political institutions. This view is echoed in Christina Schäffner's (2012d, 113) research on the media, given that "processes of recontextualisation have been investigated in critical discourse analysis, and there is plenty of evidence that mass media are not neutral reporters, but that they actively construct and shape representations of politics as a result of the way they select and structure their discourse". In the following, and building on Schäffner's ideas and empirical data (2008), we would like to put forward the notion of 'cross-cultural recontextualisation' with reference to a long interview granted by Russian President Vladimir Putin to the international press in June 2007. By reinterpreting Christina Schäffner's ideas and favoured concepts, we propose here a discursive dimension that occurs in the form of a 'recontextualised recontextualisation'.

An analysis of any stretch of text or talk by default implies recontextualisation, and an analysis of media discourse adds further layers of complexity. A political interview takes place at a specific location and time, and the event is immediately 'cognitively' recontextualised by the individuals present, just as it is later recontextualised, in a more obvious manner, by media and press representatives in the form of written, radio or televised communications. There are numerous *ideological* viewpoints involved, all of which flow into the language, tone and style of the resulting press reports, articles, radio talks, news channel summaries, and so on. Ideologies are manifest in a free-floating web of *discursive* (i.e. thematic, attitudinal and linguistically-inflected) constellations that are habitually invoked by *political* actors, for instance the tendency by Russian politicians to either ignore or condemn the expression of gay rights in their country (e.g. Luhn 2014), or Western politicians' habitual refusal to acknowledge that unelected and undemocratic institutions such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund impose economic policies upon poor countries, policies which threaten the world's geopolitical stability (Harvey 2005, 87-119).

When analysing discourse, however, contextualisation comes before *re*contextualisation. Vladimir Putin's interview with international press representatives was recorded on 1 June 2007 in Putin's private residence, with simultaneous interpretation provided. This was a high-profile and in-depth interview lasting many hours, including a dinner with the Russian President. Here we have a complex situation that involves the meeting of political actors carrying significant 'discursive responsibilities' – these could be towards their electorate and country or their employers in the media and their readership. The hallmarks of such a high-profile event,

furthermore, constitute a confluence of diverse ideological viewpoints and socioculturally inflected discourse dynamics. A summative description of the interview's cross-cultural recontextualisation via an extract from *Spiegel International*, the English-language version of the German magazine *Der Spiegel*, will serve as a lucid exposition of Christina Schäffner's approach to political discourse analysis.

Line	***Spiegel International***
1	**Question:** What exactly do you want?
5	**Putin:** What are we striving for? *We want to be heard*. We do not exclude (the possibility) that our American partners might rethink their decision. I think that everyone possesses common sense. But if this does not happen, we cannot be held responsible for our reciprocal steps. Because it is not us who have initiated the arms race that is pending in Europe. We want everyone to understand that we will not assume any responsibility for that. Nor will we allow ourselves to be blamed if we now improve our strategic
10	nuclear weapons system. This system of missile defence creates the illusion of being protected, but it increases the possibility of unleashing a nuclear conflict. So there is a violation, an imbalance of strategic equilibrium in the world, and in order to provide for the balance we will need to establish systems that would be able to penetrate the missile defence system.
15	**Question:** *Why are the Americans so obstinate about* putting these plans into practice, if it is so clear that they are unnecessary?
20	**Putin:** Possibly this is to push us to make reciprocal steps in order to avoid further closeness of Russia and Europe. I am not stipulating that, but I cannot exclude this possibility. But if it is so, then it is another mistake again.

This stretch of text constitutes a prime example of cross-cultural recontextualisation. Let us break this down with reference to the analytical dimensions of discourse, ideology, and politics.

First, *discursive interaction* is historically and spatiotemporally grounded. Discourses, however, are never stable or fixed, they constitute an integral link to argumentation patterns and modes of rhetorical composition. Discourses are thematic nodes in an (endless) universe of possible themes, all of which may be strategically applied, foregrounded

or backgrounded, by actors in the geopolitical arena. So, what would the effects of reading this piece of text be upon an average reader? The extract may be broadly associated with international security discourse. Participants in this discourse seem to strive for peaceful and amicable solutions in the international arms race – and yet the issue at stake has its roots in the Cold War. A perceptive reader, of course, will sense the underlying competition over geopolitical, economic and cultural resources, interests and values, as well as the arduous negotiations over discursive responsibilities and stakes in power – e.g. "we want to be heard" (line 3), "Why are the Americans so obstinate about … " (line 16). Discourses also echo the psychosocial attitudes of political actors, for example here Putin, one of the most powerful people on the planet, conveys a self-assured voice.

Second, a text-sensitive analysis of discourse needs to take into account the wider dimensions of *ideology*. Here, for instance, one could establish that Putin comes from a specific political tradition and responds to a set of specific (historical) narratives (cf. Baker 2006). Most notable, however, is the existence of an assertive 'us vs. them' dialectics, which appears both threatening and unforgiving, creating the impression of an almost unbridgeable clash of interests across seemingly fixed ideological boundaries. This rhetorical move, ultimately, evokes an underlying essentialist (and thus relatively inflexible) view of social relations that assigns stable identities to political actors. This brings to mind Samuel P. Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations* (1996), which took an essentialist and antagonistic stance that did great harm to intercultural understanding.

Thirdly, the actors involved in the delivery and dissemination of Putin's words, just as those positioned in the wider geopolitical arena, are fulfilling very specific roles as *political* agents in a field of discursive and ideological struggle. They are, to use Bourdieu's formulation, 'politically responsible' in the sense that they are answerable to a host of diverse groups and actors in the political field and beyond.

Arguably, a well-informed reader would make out some of the discursive themes, ideological affiliations and political responsibilities arising from the interview in *Spiegel International*. This reader's knowledge should include an understanding of the newspaper's own political stance, and yet numerous recontextualisation processes remain invisible to the average reader, processes and strategies that include

translation and that are closely scrutinised by cross-cultural discourse analysis:

> The processes involved from conducting the actual interview to the final text as published in the mass media are highly complex and involve a number of transformations. As a result of these transformations, readers of the respective newspapers get a different impression of the topics discussed in the interview and of the way in which Putin expressed his views. Deletions, rearrangements of information, substitutions and paraphrasing are typical examples of transformations that text producers (i.e. journalists, revisers, editors) make use of in the recontextualisation processes. (Schäffner 2008, 3)

Political discourse analysis also needs to incorporate institutional and genre analysis, just as it must account for intertextual relationships. The notion of 'political text' may cover genres as diverse as "bilateral or multilateral treaties, speeches made during an electioneering campaign or at a congress of a political party, a contribution of a member of parliament to a parliamentary debate, editorials or commentaries in newspapers, a press conference with a politician, or a politician's memoirs" (Schäffner 1997e, 119). There are intertextual references across political texts, for instance one in the interviewer's question beginning on line 16, which serves as an allusion to another (unidentified) text about the American missile programme.

There are, moreover, intertextual links that cut across and beyond genres. These specific forms of intertextuality tend to be grouped under the notion of interdiscursivity (Fairclough 1992), which "highlights the normal heterogeneity of texts in being constituted by combinations of diverse genres and discourses" (Fairclough 1995, 134). There are multiple ways in which generic features may visibly overlap across texts, for instance in the ways oral speech is echoed in the heterogeneous textual representations of Putin's interview. Are markers of spoken discourse, pauses, hesitations, repetitions, etc., faithfully reproduced, or are they smoothed over, as in the extract from *Spiegel International*, to provide a more fluent reading experience?

The significance of intertertextual and interdiscursive relationships for political discourse analysis cannot be overestimated, but this means little unless a stretch of text is conceptualised as an instance of (cross-cultural) recontextualisation. Here, "arguments may be transformed across genres, and yet remain identifiable as links in the chain of discourse", a process

that "illustrates the power struggle about specific opinions, beliefs or ideologies" (Blackledge 2005, 121). Political responsibilities, ideological leanings and discursive attitudes 'congeal' in textual products, and an analysis of these three dimensions implies attention to (at least some of the) minutiae of context and to the ways this context has been (cross-culturally) rearticulated (i.e. recontextualised) within different orders of discourse (Foucault 1971/1981; see also Fairclough 1992, 1995).

Ultimately, it is "the task of political discourse analysis to relate the fine grain of linguistic behaviour to what we understand by 'politics'" (Chilton and Schäffner 1997/2011, 311), so let us now turn our attention to the 'finely grained' textual, or communicative dimensions of Christina Schäffner's approach to political discourse analysis.

Political Discourse as Text: The Communicative Dimension

The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 remains a powerful symbol of the end of the Cold War era, of the collapse of the communist Eastern bloc and of German reunification. The collapse of the wall is, of course, open to various interpretations that are themselves determined by a large variety of discursive positions (Thrift 1997, Borneman 1998).

As a contemporary witness to momentous historical events, Christina Schäffner has examined key speeches and documents of the period. Her discursive analyses of speeches delivered on the eve of German unification by Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and by well-known German writer Günter Grass, provide valuable insights into the historical determinations of linguistic choices (Schäffner 1996d, 1997d). Schäffner understands ideology as belief systems that are shared by social groups; such belief systems are communicated through discourse and embedded in institutional practices. Hence, correlations found between institutional practices and textual profiles can in turn be interpreted and explained through ideology (Schäffner 2012d, 123).

When dealing with political discourses, analysts must relate the social and situational contexts of text production and reception to textual features (Schäffner 2004d). In one study, for instance, Schäffner (2003) provides insights into intertextual (i.e. knowledge-related) and interdiscursive (i.e. genre-related) practices across political discourses by relating the production context of a joint policy document, published by the British

Labour Party in partnership with the German Social Democratic Party, to its fine linguistic details.

The arrival of pragmatics in the 1960s and of text linguistics in the 1970s had important repercussions for political discourse analysis. These sub-disciplines moved linguistics away from word-centred analysis. Rather than solely focusing on words or sentences, text linguistics popularised new analytical tools such as textuality and macrostructure (e.g. de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, van Dijk 1980). As a discipline, text linguistics tries to understand how texts function in human interaction, 'text' being understood here as a communicative occurrence (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, 3). Pragmatics brought context to the fore, with the notion of 'speech acts' (e.g. Austin 1962, Searle 1969) as its signature concept. Speech acts comprise language as action (Chilton and Schäffner 1997/2011), thus they allow analysts to see language as a vital manifestation of human activity.

Also central to political discourse analysis is the study of pronouns, which analysts have found useful when they wish to map ideological relations that exist between politically responsible actors. Schäffner's and Porsch's (1998) analysis of speeches delivered between 1989 and 1991, during the political transition that followed the GDR's peaceful revolution, is an interesting case in point. These speeches shared temporal situationality and political intentionality, which are two standards of textuality as defined by Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). Another example, in pragmatics this time, is Schäffner's study of 'hedges' in political texts (1998). Based on the work of Robin Lakoff (1971) and George Lakoff (1973), hedges help either to clarify and explicate an expression or, on the contrary, contribute to its ambiguity. Specifying and modifying hedges of political texts are often used in implicit argumentation, which suggests a link to presuppositions and implicatures.

Working from a micro-level perspective, Christina Schäffner has pinpointed major ideological markers in political discourse, that is, linguistic features which reproduce the values and ideas of a particular group and/or of an institution. These features take multiple forms and she has established herself as a leading scholar in one of them, which is the analysis of metaphorical expressions in political texts and translations (e.g. Schäffner 2005, Schäffner and Shuttleworth 2013).

Metaphors constitute a crucial element in the discursive representation of politics (Schäffner 1992b, 146), an insight also evident in Paul Chilton's (1996) comprehensive study *Security Metaphors: Cold War Discourse from Containment to Common House*, which provides examples from different languages.

Many studies of metaphors and political discourse draw on Lakoff and Johnson's seminal work (1980) in cognitive linguistics, where metaphors are conceptualised as a "means to understand one domain of experience, a new, unknown one (a target domain) in terms of another, a familiar one (source domain)" (Schäffner 1997c, 58). The concept of metaphor itself needs to be distinguished from metaphorical expression, the former being a conceptual mapping (e.g. BEING PROTECTED IS BEING UNDER A COVER) and the latter the linguistic realisation of a metaphor (e.g. the *umbrella* of a European employment pact) (Schäffner 2004c). At the macro-level, across texts, metaphors provide intratextual and intertextual coherence as well as conceptual and interdiscursive (i.e. generic) anchoring points for political discourses (Chilton and Schäffner 2002b, 29).

In order to facilitate micro- and macro-level analysis of political discourse, Chilton and Schäffner (1997/2011) have postulated categories of strategic functionality, drawing partly on Jürgen Habermas' influential theory of communicative action (1979, 1981) and on linguistic research inspired by the cognitive sciences (Langacker 1987, 1992, Fauconnier 1994, Werth 1999). Strategic functions represent an intermediate level of analysis which helps to link political contexts, situations and processes to discursive themes, attitudes and sociotextual structures. The model of strategic functionality has been taken up by numerous scholars, both in political discourse analysis (e.g. García Pastor 2001, Lee 2007, Stewart 2008, Del Solar Valdés 2009, Majstorović 2009, Dunmire 2012, Mazid 2014) and in translation studies (e.g. Baumgarten and Gagnon 2005, Gagnon 2009, 2010, Bánhegyi 2014). Initially, Chilton and Schäffner (1997) introduced four functions: coercion, resistance, dissimulation and legitimisation/delegitimisation. Whilst most scholars mentioned above have used this earlier model, Chilton (2004) eventually reduced the number of functions to three. Chilton and Schäffner also used three categories in their 2011 article 'Discourse and Politics', with the final model now comprising three double-edged categories: coercion/resistance, representation/misrepresentation and legitimisation/delegitimisation.

Coercion/Resistance

The *coercion* function indicates not only a strong control of language, but also relates to the speaker's position and resources. A political speaker could take part in a coercive discourse (most evidently in the case of authoritarian regimes), or a potential hearer could be prevented from having access to a particular political message (a prominent strategy in liberal democratic discourse). Prime examples of coercion are speech acts that are supported by legal or physical sanctions, such as commands or laws. Other forms of coercive action involve placing people in a role from which they are unlikely to escape, i.e. by spontaneously answering a request or a question.

Instances of censorship, including self-censorship, are prime examples of coercive functionality. Majstorović (2009) leans on the notion of coercion in her analysis of excerpts from press releases issued by the Office of the High Representative, an international institution in Bosnia and Herzegovina created in 1995 after the Bosnian War. In one example, a list issued by the Office embodied a coercive action, where the Office unilaterally removed public officials from their positions. This concrete legal sanction entails that "what has been said immediately becomes law and there is no accountability to the … public" (Majstorović 2009, 202). If coercion is a powerful and a somewhat obvious discursive strategy, it can sometimes be counteracted by politically responsible agents who are part of an oppositional discourse. Then, communicative strategies such as *resistance,* opposition or protest are put forward. When used by people in a relatively powerless position, these strategies can involve the use of innovative media (e.g. graffiti) or specific genres (e.g. petitions, appeals). Those using the strategy see resistance and protest as opposing power.

Legitimisation/Delegitimisation

At the heart of the strategic function of *legitimisation* and *delegitimisation* lies the notion of 'legitimacy', which entails (official) acceptance. This function is linked to that of coercion, "because it establishes the right to be obeyed" (Chilton and Schäffner 1997/2011, 312). If legitimisation techniques may include charisma and positive self-presentation, then delegitimisation may include speech acts of blaming or accusing. Stewart (2008) employs strategic functionality as an analytical method in order to show how, during staff meetings, a delegitimisation strategy may be used by people in hierarchical relations, to ensure that