



Transediting Trump's inaugural speech in Italian daily newspapers

M. Cristina Caimotto
University of Turin, Italy
mariacristina.caimotto@unito.it

DOI: 10.12807/ti.11222.2020.a07

Abstract: The inaugural speech of the new President of The United States is one of those rare cases in news translation in which it is possible to identify a Source Text (ST) and compare it to several Target Texts (TTs). This paper focuses on what was reported in eight Italian national daily newspapers concerning the inaugural address of Donald Trump in 2017 on the day following his inaugural address. It provides an overview of the different choices and levels of translation visibility that were observed in the selected newspapers, observing full translations, paratexts and migrated segments embedded in articles describing the inaugural. Through a focus on the ST-TT comparison – employing Selective Appropriation (Valdeón, 2008) and Munday's Evaluation paradigm (2012) – this investigation shows how the comparative analysis of translations can also be employed to enrich the textual analysis of the inaugural itself. Ideological translation choices are explored, focusing in particular on a case of omission in the right-wing *Libero* – which openly appreciated the election of Trump – and a case of addition in the communist *Il Manifesto* – which openly deplored Trump.

Keywords: USA; POTUS; news translation; selective appropriation; critical points

1. Introduction

News translation research is a relatively recent field of interest within the discipline of Translation Studies (Valdeón, 2015a; van Doorslaer, 2010). When describing its characteristics, many scholars highlight the invisibility of translation in news production (e.g. Bani, 2018; Bielsa and Bassnett, 2009, pp. 72-73; Davier, 2014) and the consequent difficulty when trying to trace it down, let alone identify a source text and a target text as they are traditionally conceived (see Davier, Schäffner and van Doorslaer, 2018, p. 156; Valdeón, 2015b). Scammell (2018) discussed the complexity of investigating translation in the news and offers a reflection on *foreignizing* and *domesticating* strategies, focusing in particular on the translation of direct quotations, which allow journalists to distance themselves from what was said, report facts, and add colour.

The case study analysed here represents an exception in news translation, as the inaugural speech of the President of the United States is a much-awaited event reported worldwide and it offers translation scholars the rare occasion of being able to collect several translations of the same text, to observe various degrees of editing along with the paratexts that accompany the translations of the inaugural address itself (Caimotto 2010 and 2019; Romagnuolo, 2009 and 2014). The publication of the address is thus an interesting case study for a critical and/or political discourse analysis and an

analysis of the various translations provided across the world from a Descriptive Translation Studies perspective. Munday (2012, p. 42) describes the vast number of interpretations and translations as “an unusual opportunity” for translation scholars and he explains that because of the “inherently evaluative and ethical tone”, “the speech lends itself well to exemplify appraisal analysis”, which consists in the application of Appraisal theory (Martin and White, 2005) to translational analysis, focusing on the features of the model that are “critical” for a translator. In his analysis of translations into Spanish of Trump’s inaugural address (2018), and in his former analysis of Obama’s (2012, pp. 42-83), Munday employs the notion of “critical points”, that is points and lexical features that in translation are likely to reveal the translator’s values, which the translator may have inserted in the text “perhaps surreptitiously and not consciously” (2012, pp. 40-41).

This paper focuses on what was reported in eight Italian national daily newspapers concerning the inaugural speech on the day after the inaugural. It is in order to underline the exceptional characteristics of this translation event, within the subarea of News Translation, that the term ‘transediting’ was employed in the title of this work, even if the choice of using the term, coined by Stetting (1989, p. 377), has been widely debated in the news translation literature. For example, Schäffner (2012, p. 881) argues that “if *transediting* is used as a substitute to and/or in opposition to the term translation, there is the danger that translation continues to be understood in a narrower sense of a purely word-for-word transfer process”. Similarly, Davier (2015, p. 539) warns against the introduction of “unnecessary distinctions” and the risk of “referring to a concept that is an empty vessel (such as ‘transediting’)”. In this paper, translation and transediting are used interchangeably, as the term ‘translation’ itself already includes the amount of editing involved, especially when news translation is concerned. Transediting has been chosen for the title simply in order to underline that this analysis focuses on the effects of editing in the process of news translation and news production.

The comparative analysis of the Italian newspapers under scrutiny allows the identification of the critical points, following Munday’s work (2012, pp. 40-41), and these are then observed and discussed employing Valdeón’s framework (2008), distinguishing additions, omissions and permutations. Their frameworks are outlined in the ‘Translations’ section. Before moving to the comparative analysis, in the following section, the inaugural address itself is introduced, focusing on its ideological aspects and the ways in which it differed from other inaugural speeches. The following section introduces Valdeón’s Selective Appropriation (2008) and Munday’s Evaluation Paradigm (2012), explaining how these are employed. Our overall goal is to show how ideology emerges in translation, sometimes making the ideology of the Source Text (ST) more explicit and visible in the Target Text (TT). Rather than trying to identify and point out the ideological position of the journalist/translator, our goal rather is to show how the act of translation itself is likely to make the TTs reveal ideologies that might have been less evident in the ST or to merge the ST ideology with ideologies that belong to the target culture.

2. Trump’s inaugural speech

When compared to inaugural addresses given by his predecessors, Trump’s speech presents a number of differences. Traditionally, the inaugural address

is the moment in which the president abandons the divisive rhetoric employed during the election campaign and aims to reunite the citizens, thanking his predecessor for the work done during his mandate and the results achieved. Trump did not adhere to this tradition, as he thanked the Obamas only for their “gracious aid” through the transfer of power, and he employed a rhetoric that was much closer to that of an election campaign, criticizing the previous government and referring to politicians “who are all talk and no action”; moreover, his speech was one of the shortest as it lasted only sixteen minutes (see Romagnuolo, 2017 for a full analysis). Munday (2018, p. 189) identifies a critical point in Trump’s use of the notion of “the establishment” and points out how this belongs to a recent tradition shared with populist politicians who attack the elite in order to gain the favour of “ordinary citizens”.

In addition, the way in which Trump employs pronouns and possessives – our, your and their in particular – consists in a discursive strategy to convey the feeling that he belongs to the group of ordinary citizens rather than being part of the powerful elite he is attacking, for example when he stated “the establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our Nation’s Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land” (Trump, 2017a). According to Chilton (2004, p. 159), who analysed Bush’s address to justify the military intervention after 9/11, the use of ‘we’ and ‘they’ generates a divisive attitude which is usually employed to justify a war; Bush’s address and Trump’s speech share some of the language features identified by Chilton, which reveals the nature of Trump’s inaugural address (see also Caimotto, 2019). In fact, Trump’s reference to a military intervention against Islamic terrorism proves a critical point in the translations published in *Liberio* and *Il Manifesto*, as will be explained in the sections focusing on the two newspapers.

Trump employed the term ‘America’/‘American(s)’ 35 times, more than in any previous inaugural (Rice, 2017), and 44 of the words he employed had never been heard in an inaugural address before (Bump 2017). Many of these words evoked a bleak and dark vision of the USA, for example tombstones, carnage, bleed. Munday (2018, pp. 185-6) shows how, when compared to Obama, Trump employed a much smaller number of metaphors, allusions and non-core vocabulary to convey invoked evaluation, but those that were employed revealed critical points in the Spanish translations. Finally, repetition is another characteristic of the speech, for example the repetition of ‘many’ in “many, many years to come” (Trump, 2017a).

3. Translations

Observing and comparing the various TTs offers an overview of the different choices and levels of translation visibility. Employing Selective Appropriation (Valdeón, 2008), this analysis identifies the cases of omission, addition and permutation and describes their ideological implications. Omissions occur when parts of the ST are deleted in the TT, which can happen simply because the translator has to adapt the text to the space requirements of the TT and some paragraphs are not believed to be relevant for the target audience. With additions, translators add information that is not present in the ST to help readers understanding the text and its implications. Valdeón reports examples in which the additions change the meaning of the

ST completely, and, in texts with a high political content, some additions can change important ideological nuances. As for permutation, it “goes beyond the boundaries of additions or omissions, since it implies the transformation of the linguistic input in order to adapt it to the needs, policies or ideology of the company they work for” and its textual characteristic is to activate ambiguity.

The array of different choices and strategies that can be observed through the Italian newspapers – which cater to all sections of the political spectrum – offers the chance of reflecting on the effects of political leaning on the ideological effects of the translation process. As Holland (2013) aptly points out, descriptive translation analyses focusing on news texts often appear to share an underlying theme stating that the media systematically misrepresent events. He argues that academics, and linguists in particular, should avoid misrepresenting the media in simplistic ways even when their goal is to critique mediated misrepresentations of the world. A detailed analysis of the various TTs reveals that some of the translation choices that generate ideological effects can be the consequence of the translation process itself rather than some explicit ideological intention of the translator (see also Baumgarten 2012; Evans and Fernández 2018, p. 2). The fact that the newspapers under investigation present very different political points of view, both moderate and extreme, grants the possibility of approaching the translation analysis of the inaugural in a balanced way – as hypotheses of ideological translation choices can easily be verified against the other choices found across the spectrum.

At the same time, translation choices that appear ideological, and are also very different in another newspaper with a different political leaning, can become candidates for a more grounded hypothesis of ideological choice, and Munday’s Evaluation paradigm (2012) proves a useful tool to identify and analyse them. As he explains, evaluation interfaces between “the ‘factual’ world and the inner world of subjective and individual value” (2012, p. 40) and observing the translation of ‘sensitive’ or ‘critical’ points helps uncovering the values that were inserted into the text by the translator. This allows scholars to better understand the micro-level process of translation. The election of Donald Trump in November 2016 was often reported in Italy by means of comparison with the figure of Silvio Berlusconi, hence one of the hypotheses worth investigating is whether influence of the political leaning of the Italian media outlet in question can be detected when analysing the Italian translations and reporting of the Inaugural event. The only two printed newspapers that published an Italian version of the speech without embedded comments were the strongly right-wing oriented (*Il Giornale* – which is owned by Silvio Berlusconi’s family – and *Liberò*) and also the only ones that openly welcomed Trump’s presidency. The other six newspapers observed (*La Repubblica*, *Corriere della Sera*, *La Stampa*, *Il Manifesto*, *Il Fatto Quotidiano*, *Il Sole 24 Ore*) foreground negative aspects related to the new president. From a translational perspective, these show different strategies, including an intriguing case of addition (Valdeón, 2008), as *Il Manifesto* attributed to Trump’s address words that were taken from a different White House document (2017), thus generating a relevant shift in the inaugural address’ core message.

The published TTs can be classified into four categories: the closest to ‘translation proper’ is found in *Il Giornale*, a translated speech that specifies the name of the professional translator who performed it, Seba Pezzani. Next is *Liberò*, which published an abridged version of the address “by Donald

Trump” with signalled omissions and no reference to the fact the text was a translation. *La Stampa* and *Corriere della Sera* published partial translations in which the passages from the speech are within inverted commas and the journalists intervened with comments between the quotations. Finally, the articles focusing on the inaugural address in *La Repubblica*, *Il Manifesto*, *Il Fatto Quotidiano*, and *Il Sole 24 Ore* are articles signed by journalists in which translated quotes – fewer compared to those which appeared in *La Stampa* and *Corriere della Sera* – are embedded. Aside from *Il Giornale*, no other newspaper specified who performed the actual translation. The translation strategies observed include several permutations, omissions and additions (Valdeón 2008). Readers are sometimes informed of the changes that have been made to the ST, the variety of changes range from the one signalled within brackets in *La Repubblica* – hence clearly presented as an addition – to the one enclosed within inverted commas in *Il Sole 24 Ore*, which can be classified as a permutation. Omissions are sometimes signalled with three dots, as discussed in the section analysing *Libero*. Here are the examples from *La Repubblica* (addition) and *Il Sole 24 Ore* (permutation):

ST “We’ve defended other nations’ borders while refusing to defend our own” (Trump, 2017a)

TT “un’America che va a difendere le frontiere di altre nazioni, e poi non difende il proprio confine” (dagli immigrati clandestini, s’intende). (Rampini, 2017)

BT “an America that goes to defend other nations’ borders, and then does not defend its own border” (from illegal immigrants, of course).

ST “We, assembled here today, are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power. From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land. From this this day forward, it’s going to be only America first. America first.” (Trump, 2017a)

TT “Che il mondo prenda nota, da oggi l’America metterà il suo interesse davanti a qualunque altra cosa” (Platero, 2017)

BT “The world must take note, from today America will put its own interest before anything else”

In the first translation, *La Repubblica* interprets Trump’s message and offers a completion: it may be argued that the idea of protecting the borders from irregulars is influenced by Italian and European issues with immigration. Trump certainly had illegal immigrants from Mexico in mind, but also the people from some Muslim countries, whether illegal or not, whom he banned from entering the US a few days later. As for the second example, *Il Sole 24 Ore* used this sentence to close the article. While the other quotes in the text are precise, this one transforms the message into something more aggressive, as the passive “to be heard” is translated with a hortative form. By comparing these two quotes, we see how the target reader of *Il Sole 24 Ore* would not be able to distinguish the close translation of previous quotes from the last one, more heavily edited, while a reader of *La Repubblica* would distinguish what was added from what was said by Trump.

In each of the following sections, our analysis will focus on a specific newspaper to explain in detail the (ideological) effects of their respective translation choices. The analysis starts from the right-wing political side with the TT closest to ‘translation proper’, *Il Giornale*, moving to *Libero*, which published an abridged version of the speech. Next, the analysis moves to the other side of the political spectrum with the communist daily *Il Manifesto*, to contrast the fact that a passage – which can reasonably be interpreted as warmongering – was omitted in *Libero* but included in *Il Manifesto*. This is

followed by *Il Fatto Quotidiano*, observing a metaphorical addition, and closes with *La Stampa* and *Corriere della Sera*, focusing on the ideological effects generated by translation and by the comments added by the journalists.

4. Il Giornale

Il Giornale, which is owned by Silvio Berlusconi's family, was the only newspaper to publish an unabridged translation of the address and the only one specifying the name of the translator, thus this is the one categorised as the closest to 'translation proper'. Apart from a minor omission and an addition, most strategies worth observing in this TT are permutations. Only one sentence is missing and not signalled as abridged ("We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again"), but the omission appears to be insignificant from the ideological point of view. As for the permutations, some are there to render the text clearer for non-American readers, for example "Chief Justice Roberts" is translated as "*Presidente della corte suprema*" (BT "President of the supreme court") and "inner cities" is rendered as *bassifondi* – in Italy the inner part of a city is usually the most expensive and best kept part of a municipality and what corresponds to inner cities in the USA is found in the outskirts. Hence, the translation needs to convey the information about the social implications without referring to the spatial part of the city. Sarkozy's statement about *banlieues* ("poor, high immigration areas on the peripheries of major cities") which Scammell (2018) analysed in its rendering as 'suburbs' poses the same problem, even if in this case English is the target language rather than the source.

Il Giornale shows other minor changes that do not alter the meaning of the ST but tend to reinforce it. For example the verb "bring back" repeated four times referring respectively to "jobs, borders, wealth, dreams" is translated as "*riporteremo in patria*" (BT "we will bring back to our homeland") for jobs and wealth, thus reinforcing through addition the theme of patriotism foregrounded elsewhere in Trump's speech – e.g. "From this day forward, it's going to be only America first." (Trump, 2017a). Another permutation concerns the pronoun 'they' in "while they celebrated in our nation's Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land" was rendered with "*quella gente*" (BT "those people"), a locution that makes the negative judgement more explicit in the TT. Given the fact that verbs in Italian convey subjects through suffixes, the pronoun itself could have been omitted. Specifying "*mentre loro festeggiavano*" instead of a simple *mentre festeggiavano* is already a marked choice underlining that 'they' (*loro*) were able to celebrate and thus implying that someone else was not. Hence the choice of adding 'those people' to substitute 'they' can be considered a strategy to reinforce the negative image of the establishment.

A similar effect is obtained with the use of *sicurezza* to translate 'confidence'. The word is one of the possible ways of rendering the noun, but in the TT context most readers would understand *sicurezza* as security, a lexical choice likely to evoke in Italian readers references to issues related to crime and illegal immigration. *Fiducia* (confidence) would have proved closer to the meaning intended in the ST and in fact it was used by other journalists/translators (*Libero*). With *sicurezza* (security), target readers are likely to understand this as referred to the lack of defence of America's borders mentioned by Trump in the previous sentence rather than to the lack

of confidence due to the economic decline, which appears to be the most likely interpretation expected from readers of the ST. Further permutations can be observed in the TT, for example, “Fellow Americans” was translated into “*Americani*”, removing ‘fellow’. A possibility would have been *concittadini* (fellow citizens), as the use of *compagni americani* would not be idiomatic and would be perceived as the words of a Marxist (‘*compagni*’ is also the Italian word for ‘comrades’) – which might be why the translator decided to omit the word. Moreover, the alternative solution, *concittadini*, would have removed the reference to *America*. Here the target language itself forces the translator to make a choice that – in either case – proves subtly ideological, foregrounding either the fellowship or the Americanness, but not both.

In terms of permutations, the most significant example in this TT is *protezionismo* (protectionism) to translate ‘protection’ in the sentence “We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength.” It is worth noting that *Il Sole 24 Ore* – an economy-focused broadsheet – made the same choice. One of the main characteristics of Trump’s speech is its vagueness, which is one of the reasons why many commentators accused him of populism. He chose to use the word ‘protection’ rather than ‘protectionism’ and some commentators pointed out that the former does not imply any action from the government. Elsewhere in the address Trump stated “We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and hire American”, but he did not specify whether his government would enforce the rules through policy. The permutation from protection to protectionism and the choice of *sicurezza* (security) to translate confidence can be considered ways of rendering Trump’s discourse more explicit, adding ideological undertones that were not clearly recognisable in the ST. This happens within the frame of a newspaper that has a positive attitude towards the American leader, which is evident from the analyses of the inaugural provided in the other articles published on the same day.

5. Libero

The other newspaper that openly welcomed Trump and published the speech without embedded comments is *Libero*, which also offered an extra book *Trump, uno di noi* (BT “Trump, one of us”) edited by Libero journalists. On the main page Libero titled an analysis “*Peggior di Obama, Trump non può essere*” (BT “Worse than Obama, Trump cannot be”) (Socci, 2017). In this case the address is not presented as a translation, the author of the article is Donald Trump followed by an asterisk, which specifies at the bottom of the text “*Il discorso d’insediamento del Presidente degli Stati Uniti*” (BT “The inaugural address by the President of the United States”). But unlike *Il Giornale*, *Libero* removed parts of the speech and signalled the cuts with dots between round brackets, even if square brackets are normally employed for that purpose. In this TT, we observe omissions and permutations, while the former can be ascribed to ideology the latter rather appear to be caused by a lack of translator training.

Among the cuts, we notice the opening greetings and the paragraph in which Trump thanked the Obamas for the smooth transition, i.e. the first part of the following passage:

ST “Every four years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent. Thank you.

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, D.C. and giving it back to you, the People.”

TT “(...) *La cerimonia di oggi, tuttavia, ha un significato molto speciale perché oggi non stiamo semplicemente trasferendo il potere da un’amministrazione all’altra o da un partito all’altro, ma stiamo trasferendo il potere da Washington DC, e lo stiamo dando di nuovo a voi, il popolo.*”

As Munday (2018, p. 188) points out, the second sentence “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*”. But in *Liberò* we see how the presence of *tuttavia*, which translates as ‘however’, does not appear to make sense in the context, as the previous friendlier statement was omitted.

While this could simply be ascribed to careless editing, there are other examples suggesting the text was translated by someone who does not translate as his/her main professional activity, as at times the TT proves opaque in its meaning and appears to be influenced by lack of time and training. Here are a few examples:

ST “Politicians prospered, but the jobs left, and the factories closed.”

TT “*I politici hanno prosperato ma sono rimasti i posti di lavoro e le fabbriche chiuse.*” (*Liberò*)

BT “Politicians have prospered but what remained were jobs and closed factories.”

TT “*I politici prosperavano, ma i posti di lavoro venivano meno e le fabbriche chiudevano.*” (*Il Giornale*)

BT “Politicians prospered, but the jobs disappeared, and the factories closed.”

The main issue in the TT from *Liberò* is the incorrect translation of “left”, which, together with closed, appears to be understood as a past participle employed as an adjective rather than a past simple tense. Hence the TT does not make sense in Italian as it suggests *there are* jobs left even if the factories are closed. Moreover, it is worth observing the difference in the translation of tenses: the simple past in English can be translated in three different ways in Italian, *passato prossimo*, *passato remoto*, or *imperfetto*. The latter, chosen by the *Il Giornale* translator, appears to be the most appropriate in this case – as Trump is referring to an undefined past and that tense in Italian conveys a narrative tone. The other two possibilities, *prossimo* and *remoto*, refer respectively to a recent past with current effects and a remote past perceived as finished and distant. But in spoken language the former tends to be favoured in Northern Italy and the latter in the South. The relationship with English tenses is further complicated by the fact that *passato prossimo* can also be employed to translate some occurrences of the present perfect.

Another problematic point is the understanding of ‘just’ as an adverb rather than an adjective:

ST “These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public.”

TT “*Queste sono solo richieste ragionevoli di gente giusta.*”

BT “These are only reasonable demands of righteous people.”

According to the *Cambridge Dictionary* (2018), the adverb is a B1 level and the adjective a C2 in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, which means that a lower-intermediate knowledge of English is sufficient to be familiar with “just” used as an adverb but only the most proficient language users will understand its meaning when used as an adjective. In this case, the meaning is not drastically distorted, but the presence of this issue suggests, as many scholars have pointed out (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009, pp. 57-8) that translations of news-related items are often carried out by professionals who are not translation specialists. If this lack of translator training may appear unrelated to the main aspect we are observing here, namely ideological effects in translation, it is relevant to bear these language issues in mind before moving on to the omission of the sentence concerning “Islamic terrorism”, as this omission proves particularly significant when compared to other TTs and to *Il Manifesto* in particular.

In terms of ideological implications, that specific omission – signalled with three dots – is particularly surprising. Trump’s sentence “We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones and unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth” was not reported in the TT. One of the two articles (Socci, 2017) accompanying the speech, and providing an analysis of the political situation, focuses on how Trump’s friendship with Putin “will keep us away from catastrophe” and appreciates the “linguistic and cultural revolution initiated by Trump” of calling “Islamic terrorism” the terrorism of Isis and Al Qaeda. In light of these comments and of the well-known fact that *Libero* is a newspaper that often publishes articles against immigrants and has been criticised as racist (e.g. Feltri, 2017), the choice of omitting that sentence proves even more significant when we observe the translation of a newspaper on the other side of the political spectrum, *Il Manifesto*.

6. *Il Manifesto*

On its main page, *Il Manifesto* describes itself as a “Communist daily” newspaper. The article about Trump’s inauguration (Pieranni, 2017) is a narration of the events interspersed with quotations between inverted commas. This TT presents the most important example of addition. The sections of the article are signalled by internal titles and the last of five is “*nel frattempo c’è l’Isis*” (BT “in the meantime there is Isis”). The section opens by explaining that Donald Trump often described Isis as something created by Obama and Hillary Clinton during the campaign, but as the two were present at his inauguration, he glossed over the origins of the Islamic State and concentrated on what is to be done:

TT “*Sconfiggere l’Isis e i gruppi di terrorismo islamico sarà la nostra priorità. Come? Semplice: “Lavoreremo con i partner internazionali per tagliare i fondi ai gruppi terroristici, e ci impegneremo in una cyberguerra per distruggere e disabilitare la propaganda, nel perseguire una politica estera basata sugli interessi americani,*

ricorreremo alla diplomazia. Il mondo deve sapere che non andiamo all'estero in cerca di nemici". (Pieranni, 2017)

BT "Defeating Isis and Islamic terror groups will be our priority". How? Simple: "We will work with international partners to cut off funding for terrorist groups and we will engage in a cyberwar to destroy and disable propaganda, while pursuing a foreign policy based on American interests, we will embrace diplomacy. The world must know that we do not go abroad in search of enemies".

This passage is presented in *Il Manifesto* alongside with other quotes in inverted commas translated from the inaugural address and it is not signalled as coming from elsewhere, hence a reader would reasonably infer that Trump spoke those words during his inaugural address. That is not the case. The only occurrence of 'terrorism' in the original speech is in the sentence "We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones and unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism". The words that *Il Manifesto* reported actually come from a page published on the White House website in January 2017 as a "top issue" and titled "America First Foreign Policy". The original source text passage was:

Defeating ISIS and other radical Islamic terror groups will be our highest priority. To defeat and destroy these groups, we will pursue aggressive joint and coalition military operations when necessary. In addition, the Trump Administration will work with international partners to cut off funding for terrorist groups, to expand intelligence sharing, and to engage in cyberwarfare to disrupt and disable propaganda and recruiting.

[...] Finally, in pursuing a foreign policy based on American interests, we will embrace diplomacy. The world must know that we do not go abroad in search of enemies, that we are always happy when old enemies become friends, and when old friends become allies. (Whitehouse.gov 2017)

Trump's actual words "we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth" convey an actively aggressive attitude and can be interpreted as the announcement of upcoming military attacks. Moreover, Trump deliberately chose to use the phrase "Islamic terrorism" that Obama had actively attempted to remove from public discourse (Diaz, 2016), thus sending a message of drastic change compared to the previous administration. The effects of Trump's new approach would become clear one week later with his first travel ban barring citizens from seven Muslim-majority countries from entering the United States (Almasy and Darran, 2017).

Why did *Liberio*, a right-wing, anti-immigration newspaper decide to omit a sentence that should arguably be appreciated by its journalists and readers while *Il Manifesto*, a communist, anti-racist and anti-war newspaper went to the point of publishing the declarations of a war-mongering policy as if they were part of the inaugural address? The answer to this question goes beyond the scope of this paper, still, it is worth advancing some hypotheses. The most plausible one appears to be the fact that both *Liberio* and *Il Manifesto* recognised the implied violence of the declaration and, given their opposite views of Trump's presidency, they had opposite ways of dealing with the sentence. Throughout its article, *Il Manifesto* is clearly trying to foreground the negative aspects and dangers of the new presidency. When it comes to conveying the most worrying aspect – i.e. the possibility of a war against an international problem (a war without borders) initiated by the country with the strongest military power in the world and governed by someone that *Il Manifesto* deems untrustworthy – the journalist introduces elements that were

not in the speech, but were still part of Trump's policy, to heighten the level of warning. On the other hand, *Libero*'s goal is to highlight how positive the new presidency will be for the United States and for the rest of the world and in their attempt to paint the best possible image of Trump, they omit the sentence that appears to announce religion-based hostility and discrimination. *Libero* also published an article explaining why Trump's presidency will bring a time of peace, criticizing the largest majority of media outlets, and also the Pope, for not having understood the positive effects of cooperation between the USA and Russia (Socci, 2017).

7. Il Fatto Quotidiano

Il Fatto Quotidiano is a more recent arrival, compared to the other Italian newspapers examined here, as it was founded only in 2009 and its political position is not explicit. The article concerning Trump's inaugural was signed by a journalist (Gramaglia, 2017) and it included quotations within inverted commas, interspersed with triple dots without any brackets (these should normally be used for actual pauses made by the speaker, not to signal cuts). For our analysis, the TT presents a case of addition concerning some metaphors which, according to Munday (2018, p. 186), posed problems to the interpreters. Munday observes the quantitative difference between Obama's and Trump's speeches in terms of evoked reference – this is visible in the number of metaphors employed – and explains that the few metaphors that were present in Trump's address proved critical, in particular the translations of carnage and tombstones. The sentence including those two metaphors was rendered in the TT of *Il Fatto Quotidiano* through the introduction of a whole new image:

ST “But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our Nation; an education system, flush with cash, but which leaves our young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge; and the crime and the gangs and the drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential.

This American carnage stops right here and stops right now.”

TT “*Dell'America che Obama gli lascia, Trump fa un quadro da Germania Anno Zero di Rossellini. E afferma: 'Questa carneficina americana si ferma qui e ora'*”. (Gramaglia, 2017)

BT “Of the America that Obama left for him, Trump paints a picture like Rossellini's *Germany Year Zero*. And he states: 'This American carnage stops here and now'.”

This is probably the most difficult kind of translation choice to analyse, as we need to reflect on the implications and the effects of introducing a metaphorical reference to Rossellini's film in the speech. The length of the TT is shorter than the ST, but not significantly, so there are probably other reasons to explain the choice than a simple space-related issue.

A potential explanation for the addition is this: the post WWII Germany depicted in the film is certainly in a much worse condition than the USA in 2017, hence the translation choice can be interpreted as an indirect way of stating that Trump exaggerated in his description. But we can also envisage the choice of that specific film as an intention (possibly unconscious) on the part of the journalist to evoke an image of Nazism and its consequences, thus implying that Hitler's Germany and Trump's America have a lot in common.

Of course, a simple ST-TT comparative analysis cannot provide a definite answer to this question, and, as some scholars have demonstrated, even interviewing the journalist/translator does not always provide a definite answer (Davies, Schäffner and van Doorslaer, 2018, p. 158).

8. Corriere della Sera and La Stampa

As explained above, *Corriere della Sera* and *La Stampa* are the newspapers which published articles embedding a larger number of longer quotations within their descriptions and comments of the inaugural address. These comments reflect ideological positioning. For example, *La Stampa* describes Trump as “*un leader populista*” (BT “a populist leader”) and ‘America first’ as “*uno slogan isolazionista*” (BT “an isolationist slogan”). *Corriere della Sera* uses the adjective “*brutale*” (BT “brutal”) and states that “*queste frasi sembrano scritte con martellate rabbiose*” (BT “these sentences appear to be written through heavy hammering”), closing the article by referring to the protests, the use of tear gas and the 95 people arrested. As far as translation is concerned, we focus here on permutations in the TTs.

One of the translated parts of the address in *Corriere della Sera* shows a permutation that deserves attention:

ST “We’ve defended other nation’s borders while refusing to defend our own and spent trillions of dollars overseas while America’s infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay.”

TT “*Da anni spendiamo migliaia di miliardi di dollari per proteggere Paesi che si rifiutano di difendere casa loro. E intanto le nostre infrastrutture vanno in rovina.*” (Sarcina, 2017)

BT “For years we’ve been spending trillions of dollars to protect countries that refuse to defend their own home. And in the meantime our infrastructure is falling into decay”

We observe here a misunderstanding of the ST, shifting the criticism against America to other countries, thus cancelling out the implied ST criticism against immigration policies. The introduction of the metaphor “their home” shows that there is more than a translation mistake here. An Italian reader will immediately recognise an affinity with the Italian phrase “*aiutiamoli a casa loro*” (BT “let’s help them in their own homeⁱ”) employed by Italian politicians (Il Post, 2017) to cut the funds to help immigrants arriving in Italy. Once again, it is worth hypothesising over the origin of this permutation: the comments added between the quotes tell us that Sarcina is clearly critical of Trump, but there is no reason to think he changed the speech deliberately for ideological purposes. More likely, time constraints resulted in him misunderstanding the meaning of the ST. In addition, the influence of Italian discourse about immigration, influenced by the constant use of the ‘our home/their home’ metaphor, caused him to associate Trump with Italian anti-immigration politicians and transfer their discourse features into his speech.

The quotes reported in *La Stampa* are often strongly reduced in length, thus weakening Trump’s rhetoric. The order of the quotes follows that of the address, with the exclusion of the decision to front one quote to open the article:

ⁱ “Their own home” is a metaphor to mean “their own country”.

ST “[...] America will start winning again, winning like never before. [...] A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions.[...]”

TT “*L’America tornerà a vincere come mai prima’, e da questo successo nascerà ‘un nuovo orgoglio nazionale che curerà le nostre divisioni’. È la scommessa su cui Donald Trump ha giocato la sua presidenza, durante l’Inauguration di ieri.*” (Mastrolilli, 2017)

BT “‘America will start winning again like never before’, and out of this success will be born ‘a new national pride that will heal our divisions’. This is the bet on which Donald Trump has played his presidency, during yesterday’s Inauguration.”

This example exemplifies what happens throughout the article, the quotes are abridged, most repetitions and most metaphors are removed, while the comments introduce the viewpoint of the journalist presenting these as facts rather than his opinions.

9. Concluding remarks

Every newspaper analysed shows clearly whether Trump’s new role as President is welcome (*Il Giornale* and *Libero*), or criticised in various ways with different levels of perplexity and forwarding different viewpoints. The accuracy of the translations and the level of transparency/opacity in signalling where the speech was edited – cut or modified – also has political and ideological implications. The exceptionality of the translation event, as explained in the introduction, paired with the divisive attitude generated by Trump’s election campaign resulted in an opportunity for translation scholars. The comparative critical analysis of the unusual number of TTs allowed observing ideological translation choices emerge. By ‘ideological’ we do not mean ‘militant’ and we do not want to imply that the journalists/translators who translated the address had an ideological agenda. Apart from the addition observed in *Il Manifesto*, which could possibly be part of a conscious strategy to discredit Trump, the other additions, omissions and permutations observed are rather subtle and could simply be the result of time constraints and a need to fit the report in limited space. Similarly, the ideological implications of these permutations could be explained as the result of the influence of mainstream, hegemonic discourse associated with the political positioning of the newspapers. Moreover, in a few cases, such as the translation of ‘fellow Americans,’ the very act of translation requires a change in the TT that entails ideological implications. The translator is forced to choose between two (or more) alternatives, but none of the available choices will cover all the ideological (implied) meanings of the ST, hence ideological choice is inevitable when translating.

This is why it is important to identify critical points (Munday, 2012) as these are where the translation process is likely to allow ideology to come to the surface. This is likely to happen even when the translator is not fully conscious of the ideological implications that are embedded in the ST or which emerge as additions in the TT. As we have seen with the translation choices in *Corriere della Sera* referring to ‘our/their home’, ideological implications in the ST are also likely to evoke and generate new ideological implications in the TT, through addition (Valdeón, 2008), a process that reveals underlying connections between discourses. In this specific case,

populist discourse features in Trump's speech and their Italian anti-immigration counterpart fused in the TT.

The observation of the translation phenomena generated by the inaugural address analysed here helps scholars to overcome the risk denounced by Holland (2013) of representing the media in simplistic ways. This analytical approach offers the possibility of revealing ideological discourse and ideological translation choices by contrasting them with other translation choices. This allows the translation analysis to become more grounded in empirical evidence than the observation of a single TT. When only one TT is available, the alternative translation choices can only be provided by the scholar doing the analysis and these alternative hypotheses will inevitably be influenced by the scholar's own views. Through the comparative observation of translations from different political points of view, we can work towards a more holistic approach and make sure our own views will not weaken our analysis. Thus, we stop searching for conscious ideological choices made by the journalist/translator and rather envisage how the act of translation itself can play an ideological role. The analysis of translations thus becomes a tool allowing the hegemonic, less visible, discourse in which we are all immersed to come to the surface and reveal its presence. This has important implications both for the training translators, who need to be made aware of hegemonic invisible ideology and how it emerges in translation, and for the analysis of ideology in political texts.

References

- Almasy, S. & Darran S. (2017) A timeline of President Trump's travel bans. *CNN.com*, <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/02/10/us/trump-travel-ban-timeline/index.html>
- Bani, S. (2018). *Additare ciò che è nascosto. La traduzione giornalistica*. Roma: Aracne Editrice.
- Baumgarten, S. (2012). Translation and ideology. In Gambier Y. & van Doorslaer L. (Eds.) *Handbook of translation studies*, Vol. 3 (pp. 59–65). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bielsa, E. & Bassnett. S. (2009). *Translation in global news*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bump, P. (2017). Trump's inaugural address was demonstrably bleak. In *The Washington Post*, January 20, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2017/01/20/trumps-inaugural-address-was-demonstrably-bleak>
- Caimotto, M. C. (2010). 'Obamania' and how Italy joined in the party. In Camboni, M., Carosso, A. & Di Loreto S. (Eds.) *Translating America, proceedings of the 20th AISNA biennial conference* (pp. 55–62). Torino: Otto Editore.
- Caimotto, M. C. (2019), *Transediting Trump: The inaugural speech reported in Italy*. In Davier L. & Conway, K. (Eds.) *Journalism and translation in the era of convergence* (pp. 43-62). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cambridge Dictionary. (2018). Retrieved on November 20, 2018. <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/just>
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse. Theory and practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Davier L. (2015) 'Cultural translation' in news agencies? A plea to broaden the definition of translation. In *Perspectives*, 23(4): 536-551, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1040036>
- Davier, L. (2014). The paradoxical invisibility of translation in the highly multilingual context of news agencies. In *Global Media and Communication* 10(1): 53–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742766513513196>

- Davier, L., Schäffner C., & van Doorslaer, L. (2018). The methodological remainder in news translation research: outlining the background. In *Across Languages and Cultures* 19:2. 155-164. <https://doi.org/10.1556/084.2018.19.2.1>
- Diaz, D. (2016) Obama: Why I won't say 'Islamic terrorism'. *CNN.com*, September 09, 2016, Retrieved from <http://edition.cnn.com/2016/09/28/politics/obama-radical-islamic-terrorism-cnn-town-hall/index.html>
- Evans J. & Fernández F. (Eds.) (2018) *The Routledge handbook of translation and politics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Feltri, V. (2017) Vittorio Feltri: sono a un passo dal diventare un razzista [Vittorio Feltri: I am one step from becoming racist]. *Libero*. <http://www.liberoquotidiano.it/news/opinioni/13217339/vittorio-feltri-tra-immigrati-boldrini-piagnoni-diventero-razzista--.html>
- Gramaglia, G. (2017). 'Ridiamo il potere al popolo' Giuramento anti-Obama & C. ['Let's give power back to the people' An oath against Obama & Co.] *Il Fatto Quotidiano* January 21, 14-15.
- Holland, R. (2013). News translation. In Millan C. & Bartina F. (Eds.) *The Routledge handbook of translation studies* (pp. 332-346). London: Routledge.
- Il Post*. (2017) E poi, cosa vuol dire "aiutiamoli a casa loro"? [And then, what does "let's help them in their own home" actually mean?] Retrieved from <https://www.ilpost.it/2017/07/08/aiutiamoli-a-casa-loro/>
- Martin J.R. and White P. R. R. (2005) *The language of evaluation. Appraisal in English*. London: Palgrave.
- Mastrolilli, P. (2017). Trump: 'Da oggi il potere torna agli americani' [Trump: 'From today the power goes back to Americans']. *La Stampa* January 21, 10.
- Munday, J. (2012). *Evaluation in translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Munday, J. (2018) A model of appraisal: Spanish interpretations of President Trump's inaugural address 2017. In *Perspectives* 26(2):180-195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2017.1388415>
- Pieranni, S. (2017). Trump è presidente: "Assumete americani, comprate americano" [Trump is president: 'hire Americans, buy American']. *Il Manifesto* January 21, 8.
- Platero, M. (2017). Trump: prima l'America, potere ai cittadini [Trump: America first, power to the citizens]. *Il Sole 24 Ore* January 21, 5.
- Rampini, F. (2017). Il manifesto populista [The populist manifesto]. *La Repubblica* January 21, 12-13.
- Rice, J. (2017). Does Trump really have the best words? A statistical analysis of Trump's inaugural address. Retrieved from <http://www.litcharts.com/analitics/inaugural>
- Romagnuolo, A. (2009). Political discourse in translation: A corpus-based perspective on presidential inaugurals. In *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 4(1):1-30.
- Romagnuolo, A. (2014). *Transediting the President*. 2a edizione, aggiornata e ampliata. Viterbo: Sette Città Edizioni.
- Romagnuolo, A. (2017). La comunicazione politica di Donald Trump tra nuovo e nuovismo. In *Lingue e Linguaggi* 23, 257-273. <https://doi.org/10.1285/i22390359v23p257>
- Sarcina, G. (2017). Trump ha giurato: "Ora il potere ritornerà al popolo" [Trump has sworn: 'Now the power will return to the people']. *Corriere della Sera* January 21, 10.
- Scammell, C. (2018). *Translation strategies in global news. What Sarkozy said in the suburbs*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schäffner, C. (2012). Rethinking transediting. In *Meta* 57 (4): 866-883. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1021222ar>
- Socci, A. (2017). Peggior di Obama, Trump non può essere [Worse than Obama, Trump cannot be]. *Libero* January 21 2017, 15.
- Stetting, K. (1989). Transediting. A new term for coping with the grey area between editing and translating. In Caie G. et al. (Ed.) *Proceedings from the fourth Nordic conference for English studies* (pp. 371-382). Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.

- Trump, D. J. (2017a). Inaugural address. January 20. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American presidency project*. <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/inaugural-address-14>.
- Trump, D. J. (2017b). Il discorso di Donald [Donald's speech]. *Liberio* January 21, 14.
- Trump, D. J. (2017c). Ecco Re Trump: “L’America prima di tutto Con me il popolo ritorna al potere” [Here is King Trump: ‘America first With me the people are back in power’].” Translated by Seba Pezzani, January 21, 12–13.
- Tsai, C. (2005). Inside the television newsroom: An insider’s view of international news translation in Taiwan. In *Language and Intercultural Communication* 5(2):145–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708470508668890>
- Valdeón, R. (2008). Anomalous news translation: Selective appropriation of themes and texts in the Internet. In *Babel* 54(4):299–326. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.54.4.01val>
- Valdeón, R. (2015a). Fifteen years of journalistic translation research and more. In *Perspectives* 23(4): 634–662. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2015.1057187>
- Valdeón, R. (2015b). (Un)stable sources, translation and news production. In *Target* 27:3 (2015), 440–453. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.27.3.07val>
- van Doorslaer, L. (2010). Journalism and translation. In Gambier Y. & van Doorslaer L. (Eds.) *Handbook of translation studies*, vol. 1 (pp. 180–184). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- van Doorslaer, L. (2012). Translating, narrating and constructing images in journalism with a test case on representation in Flemish TV news. In *Meta* 57(4): 1046–1059. . <https://doi.org/10.7202/1021232ar>
- Whitehouse.gov. (2017). America first foreign policy. In *Issues*, Retrieved on 10 August 2017 <https://www.whitehouse.gov/america-first-foreign-policy>