UNIVERZITET U SARAJEVU – FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

ODSJEK ZA ANGLISTIKU

ZAVRŠNI RAD

POJAM EKVIVALENCIJE U PREVODILAČKOJ PRAKSI: ANALIZA HRVATSKOG

PREVODA PREDSJEDNIČKE DEBATE TRUMP VS. BIDEN

Mentor: prof.dr. Amira Sadiković   Student: Lejla Lišić

Sarajevo, septembar, 2024

UNIIVERZITET U SARAJEVU – FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET
ODSJEK ZA ANGLISTIKU

ZAVRŠNI RAD
POJAM EKVIVALENCIJE U PREVODILAČKOJ PRAKSI: ANALIZA HRVATSKOG
PREVODA PREDSJEDNIČKE DEBATE TRUMP VS. BIDEN

Mentor: prof.dr. Amira Sadiković   Student: Lejla Lišić

Sarajevo, septembar, 2024

UNIVERSITY OF SARAJEVO – FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY
ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

MASTER THESIS

NOTION OF EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION PRACTICE:
ANALYSIS OF THE CROATIAN TRANSLATION OF THE *TRUMP* vs. *BIDEN*
PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE

Mentor: prof.dr. Amira Sadiković   Student: Lejla Lišić

Sarajevo, September, 2024

"Without translation, I would be limited to the borders of my own country. The translator is my most important ally. He introduces me to the world." **– Italo Calvino**

Contents

Abstract

This paper explores the notion of equivalence in translation practice through a comparative analysis of the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden presidential debate. It begins with an overview of the theory of literary translation, highlighting key strategies that are pertinent to literary translation. In applying these theoretical insights this paper highlights the challenges and limitations inherent in both classical and contemporary translation approaches when dealing with the nuances of political discourse. The debate's use of informal language, culturally specific references, and intricate rhetorical techniques presented substantial difficulties for the translator. This theoretical foundation sets the stage for an in-depth examination of how these strategies are applied in practice. The paper then shifts focus to a detailed comparative analysis of the original debate and its Croatian translation, scrutinizing the degree of equivalence achieved. The analysis considers linguistic, cultural, and contextual factors that influence translation choices. Through this examination, the paper aims to identify the challenges and successes in maintaining equivalence in translation and to contribute to a deeper understanding of translation strategies in the context of political discourse.

Key words: translation, equivalence, comparative analysis

Apstrakt

Ovaj rad istražuje pojam ekvivalencije u prevodilačkoj praksi kroz komparativnu analizu hrvatskog prijevoda predsjedničke debate između Trumpa i Bidena. Rad započinje pregledom teorije književnog prevođenja, ističući ključne strategije koje su relevantne za književno prevođenje. Primjenom ovih teorijskih uvida, rad naglašava izazove i ograničenja inherentna klasičnim i savremenim pristupima prevođenju kada se suočavaju s nijansama političkog diskursa. Korištenje neformalnog jezika, kulturno specifičnih referenci i složenih retoričkih tehnika u debati predstavljalo je značajne poteškoće za prevodioca .Ova teorijska osnova postavlja pozornicu za detaljno ispitivanje kako se te strategije primjenjuju u praksi. Zatim se rad usmjerava na detaljnu komparativnu analizu originalne debate i njenog hrvatskog prijevoda, ispitujući stepen postignute ekvivalencije. Analiza uzima u obzir jezičke, kulturne i kontekstualne faktore koji utiču na prevodilačke odluke. Kroz ovo ispitivanje, rad ima za cilj identificirati izazove i uspjehe u održavanju ekvivalencije u prevodu i doprinijeti dubljem razumijevanju prevodilačkih strategija u kontekstu političkog diskursa.

Ključne riječi: prevod, ekvivalencija, komparativna analiza

Introduction

Translation, as a discipline, transcends the mere conversion of text from one language to another. It is a complex and nuanced process that involves not only linguistic but also cultural, contextual, and interpretive dimensions. The primary objective of translation is to achieve equivalence between the source and target texts, ensuring that the meaning, tone, and intent of the original text are faithfully conveyed in the translation.

Translation involves far more than a working acquaintance with two languages and translators must consider the cultural and contextual nuances that influence meaning. (Bassnett, 2013: 13)

The concept of faithfulness or fidelity in translation has been a cornerstone of translation studies, guiding how translators navigate the complex task of transferring meaning from one language to another. Historically, fidelity in translation has been interpreted in various ways depending on the type of text and its intended purpose. St. Jerome, a foundational figure in translation theory, famously argued for different approaches based on the nature of the text being translated. For literary works, Jerome advocated for a *sense-for-sense* approach, prioritizing the overall meaning and artistic integrity of the text rather than adhering strictly to the original wording. In contrast, when translating religious texts, Jerome emphasized a *word-for-word* method, believing that the sacred nature of these texts necessitated a more literal approach to preserve every nuance of meaning. (Kelly, 1979: 15)

This distinction between sense-for-sense and word-for-word translation reflects broader debates within translation studies about the nature of fidelity and its role in different types of texts. While equivalence in translation often refers to achieving a balance between the source and target texts in terms of meaning, function, and effect, fidelity is more concerned with the translator's adherence to the original text's intent and content. The challenge lies in determining how best to remain faithful to the source material while also making the text accessible and relevant to the target audience.

Classical translation theories often prioritized staying true to the source text. For example, Newmark (1988: 47) distinguished between semantic translation, which focuses on preserving the original text's exact meaning, and communicative translation, which aims to produce a similar effect on the target audience. This reflects a traditional view of equivalence.

In contrast, a contemporary theorist like Venuti (1995: 18) advocated for a more balanced approach, where fidelity to the original text is combined with necessary cultural and contextual adaptations to ensure the translation resonates with the new audience.

In the context of political discourse, such as presidential debates, the stakes of translation are particularly high. These texts are charged with rhetorical strategies, persuasive techniques, and cultural references that must be accurately and effectively conveyed to the target audience. Political texts often aim to persuade or influence public opinion, and translating them requires an acute awareness of the socio-political context in both the source and target languages. (Altun & Sabah, 2020: 21).

According to Gile (1995: 35) the nature of the text—whether written or spoken—significantly impacts the translation process. Unlike written texts, which allow for careful consideration and revision, spoken texts are dynamic, immediate, and often rely heavily on the speaker's tone, pace, and body language.

When a presidential debate is transcribed and then translated, the translator must navigate the challenge of conveying not only the words but also the rhetorical strategies, persuasive techniques, and cultural nuances embedded in the spoken performance.

If the debate is simultaneously interpreted, the interpreter must make split-second decisions to convey meaning in real-time, often without the luxury of revisiting the original text. This real-time interpretation can then be transcribed, but the immediacy of the process might result in a translation that lacks the polish and precision of a text translated from a written transcript. In contrast, when a translator works from an audio recording, they might not have the visual or contextual cues that would be present in a live debate or a fully annotated transcript, which can further complicate the task of producing an accurate and effective translation.

Different translation modes—whether working from a transcript, providing simultaneous interpretation, or translating directly from an audio recording—each bring their own set of challenges. Regardless of the mode, translators and interpreters must address not only the linguistic aspects of the text but also the socio-political context in which it operates. This means that effective translation requires balancing accuracy with cultural and contextual sensitivity, ensuring that the intended meaning and significance are conveyed appropriately to the target audience.

The role of the translator in shaping how political discourse is perceived by the target audience is underscored by this complexity. They are required to maintain fidelity to the original message while also adapting it for cultural relevance and clarity. The translator's task is to navigate complexities, ensuring that the translated text retains the impact and intent of the original. These complexities refer to the shifts in the rhetorical situation that occur during translation.

According to Bitzer (1968: 19) rhetorical situation is defined by the relationship between the speaker or writer, the intended audience, and the context in which the text is produced and consumed. In the original text, these elements are closely intertwined: the speaker tailors their message to the immediate audience, taking into account cultural references, shared knowledge, and the specific context of the speech or writing.

In the process of translation, the target audience and situation will inevitably be different. As a result, the translator needs to modify the message to effectively connect with a new audience, which may possess diverse cultural upbringings, perspectives, and understanding. This adjustment demands that the translator carefully considers how to communicate not only the direct meaning of the words, but also the rhetorical methods and convincing approaches used by the original speaker or writer.

Political texts play a crucial role in shaping the political identity and consciousness of a society, making their accurate translation imperative. Schäffner (2004: 117)

This paper will provide an overview of the theory of translation, focusing on strategies that are pertinent to the practice. Following this theoretical exploration, the paper will undertake a comparative analysis of the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden presidential debate. This analysis will explore instances where equivalence is successfully achieved, as well as those where the translation necessarily diverges from the source due to linguistic and cultural differences. By doing so, the research will provide a nuanced understanding of how translators manage the delicate balance between fidelity to the original and the need for adaptation in the face of differing rhetorical situations. Through this examination, the paper aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of translation strategies in the context of political discourse and to highlight the challenges and successes in producing a faithfull translation.

The Presidential Debate: Context and Significance

Presidential debates are a cornerstone of American political culture, offering a platform for candidates to present their policies, debate critical issues, and connect with the electorate. "Presidential debates have been a staple of campaigns for decades, and history has shown that they can have the power to sway undecided voters and solidify public perception of the candidates. During debates, candidates stand beside their opponents and present their policies, personality, and vision to millions of viewers—often the biggest audiences of their campaigns." (Popli, 2024)

The Trump vs. Biden presidential debate, held on September 29, 2020, was one of the most watched and contentious debates in recent history. As the first debate between the incumbent President Donald Trump and the challenger, former Vice President Joe Biden, it drew intense media scrutiny and public attention.

Context

The 2020 presidential debate took place in a highly charged political environment. The United States was grappling with numerous pressing issues, including the COVID-19 pandemic, racial tensions, economic instability, and questions about the integrity of the electoral process. These issues formed the backdrop against which the candidates articulated their visions for the country's future.

The debate was moderated by Chris Wallace of Fox News and covered a range of topics, including the Supreme Court, COVID-19, the economy, race and violence in U.S. cities, the integrity of the election, and the records of the two candidates. The format allowed for direct exchanges between the candidates, leading to moments of intense confrontation and heated exchanges that underscored the deep divisions within the country. This "direct exchange"' is what makes it so interesting for translation, because spontaneous speech, unlike written text, is characterized by its immediacy and lack of premeditation. Spoken language is typically less structured than written text. Speakers often use run-on sentences, interruptions, and frequent shifts in thought. This can make spoken language appear more fluid but also more chaotic when transcribed, as it lacks the deliberate organization found in writing.

During conversations, individuals often repeat themselves, either to stress a point or because of the impromptu nature of speech. This repetition, which occurs naturally and is often overlooked in verbal communication, can cause transcribed speech to come across as redundant or excessively wordy. Additionally, verbal communication heavily relies on non-verbal signals like tone, pitch, and body language, which contribute additional layers of significance. These aspects are absent in written language, potentially causing transcribed spontaneous speech to seem dull or less emotive.

Deciding whether to keep the informal, disconnected style of the original speech or to make it smoother for readability is a crucial choice for translators. Preserving the spontaneity can maintain the authenticity of the speech but may also make the translation harder to understand. On the other hand, improving the coherence of the text might remove its original character.

As non-verbal cues can't be directly translated, translators need to rely on context and linguistic tactics to convey the same emotions or emphases. This could involve selecting words with specific meanings or restructuring sentences to better capture the intended tone. Also, translators need to decide how to handle the natural redundancy in speech. While some repetition may be necessary to maintain the original's intent, too much can make the translation seem redundant or poorly written. Finding a balance is key to producing a translation that is both faithful and readable.

Significance

The debate's importance goes beyond its immediate political implications, offering insight into the rhetorical tactics used by each candidate, their communication approaches, and their capacity to react in high-pressure situations. Translators faced distinct challenges during the debate, given its fluidity, quick exchange of dialogues, as well as the use of idiomatic expressions, cultural allusions, and rhetorical embellishments.

In translating the debate into Croatian, it is important to navigate these complexities to ensure that the translated text remained faithful to the original while also being accessible and engaging for the target audience. The debate's significance in shaping public opinion and influencing voter behavior further heightened the importance of an accurate and effective translation.

Theoretical Framework

To analyze the notion of equivalence in translation practice, this paper adopts the theoretical framework outlined in Mona Baker's seminal work, *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Baker's approach to translation theory is particularly relevant for this study as it provides a comprehensive and practical perspective on the challenges and strategies involved in achieving equivalence between source and target texts.

Baker's *In Other Words* has had a profound impact on the field of translation studies, shaping the way scholars and practitioners conceptualize and approach translation. Its accessible style, theoretical depth, and practical insights make it a foundational text for anyone interested in exploring the complexities of cross-cultural communication and linguistic mediation.

Applying Baker's theoretical framework to the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden debate allows for a systematic analysis of the translation process. By examining how different levels of equivalence are addressed and which strategies are employed, this paper aims to uncover the complexities and nuances of translating political discourse. The framework gives a solid foundation for assessing the translation's success in preserving the meaning, tone, and impact of the original discussion, adding to a better understanding of translation practice in political communication.

The work will also analyze the notion of equivalence according to Sadikovic. In her book, Sadikovic (2017: 26) argues that equivalence is not a static concept but rather a dynamic process that evolves based on the context of the translation and the purpose of the translated text. Sadikovic's perspective on dynamic equivalence and functional purpose can provide a valuable lens for analyzing the translation of the debate. When examining the rhetorical situation, one can analyze how the translator's decisions were intended to serve the purpose and influence of the debate in the Croatian context. This method is effective for evaluating how well the translation addresses the requirements of the intended audience while staying true to the original meaning and function of the text. The focus of her work is on the text's function in the target language, indicating that translators should strive for functional equivalence rather than a literal translation. This entails comprehending the text's purpose and ensuring that the translated version serves the same function in the target culture.

Combining Baker and Sadikovic's observations creates a strong theoretical framework for studying political text translation. Baker's precise dissection of equivalent at several linguistic levels provides a great approach to analyzing translations, whereas Sadikovic's emphasis on functional and dynamic equivalence emphasizes the significance of context, purpose, and cultural sensitivity.

In analyzing the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden presidential debate, this integrated framework allows for a comprehensive examination of how well the translation captures the original's meaning, intent, and impact. It provides tools to assess whether the translation maintains the original's rhetorical and persuasive power and respects cultural nuances.

Aim, methodology and strategies

Aim

The aim of this paper is to explore the notion of equivalence in translation, specifically through a comparative analysis of the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden presidential debate. By leveraging the theoretical frameworks of Mona Baker and Amira Sadikovic, this paper seeks to evaluate how well the Croatian translation captures the original meaning, intent, and impact of the debate. The analysis will consider various levels of equivalence, including word-level, sentence-level, textual, and pragmatic equivalence, and will examine the functional and dynamic aspects of equivalence as outlined by Sadikovic.

Methodology

The methodology of this paper is designed to critically analyze the notion of equivalence in translation practice through a comparative case study of the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden presidential debate. The research will focus on how linguistic, cultural, and contextual factors influence the translator's decisions, with particular attention to the concepts of fidelity, as discussed by Newmark, and Venuti, and how these theories are applied or adapted in the translation of political discourse.

The main source texts for this analysis are the original English-language transcripts of the Trump vs. Biden presidential debate and their Croatian translations. These texts will be sourced from tabloid online newspapers.

Scholarly articles and books on translation theory, particularly those by Mona Baker, Amira Sadiković, and other relevant theorists, will be used to provide a theoretical framework for the analysis. Specific attention will be given to works that discuss the translation of political discourse and the differences between translating spoken versus written texts.

The analysis will begin by examining the rhetorical situation of the original debate, focusing on the relationship between the speakers, the audience, and the context. This will include an exploration of the cultural references, rhetorical strategies, and persuasive techniques used by the debaters and how these are tailored to the original audience.

The Croatian translations will be compared to the original transcripts to identify how equivalence has been achieved or where it has been compromised.

This comparison will focus on specific elements such as tone, register, idiomatic expressions, and cultural references, as well as the handling of redundancy and spontaneity inherent in spoken discourse.

An additional layer of analysis will be introduced by considering the translation as if it were the result of simultaneous interpretation. This perspective will help explain any omissions, simplifications, or deviations from the source text, as these are common in real-time interpretation where the interpreter must prioritize clarity and speed over exhaustive accuracy. The analysis will evaluate the balance between fidelity to the original text and the necessary adaptations made for the Croatian audience. This will involve assessing whether the translator has preserved the original intent and impact while making culturally appropriate adjustments.

The degree to which equivalence is achieved will be critically assessed, recognizing that perfect equivalence may not always be possible, especially in the context of spontaneous spoken discourse. The analysis will consider whether the translation successfully conveys the same rhetorical effect and persuasive power as the original.

The findings will be contextualized within broader translation theories, particularly those that address the challenges of translating political discourse and the differences between spoken and written texts.

The methodology outlined above is designed to provide a comprehensive and nuanced analysis of how equivalence is approached in the translation of political discourse, using the Trump vs. Biden debate as a case study. The findings will contribute to a deeper understanding of the complexities involved in translating such high-stakes texts and offer insights into how translation theory can be applied to real-world practice.

Translation Strategies

Baker outlines various strategies that can be used to evaluate how well the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden debate achieves equivalence:

Literal Translation: Directly translating words or phrases without regard to cultural or idiomatic differences

Cultural Equivalence: Adapting cultural references in the source text to align with the cultural knowledge and expectations of the target audience.

Functional Equivalence: Maintaining the functional purpose of the text while adjusting the linguistic form to suit the target language.

Linguistic Equivalence: Ensuring that grammatical and syntactic structures in the target language mirror those in the source language, where possible.

Pragmatic Equivalence: Replicating the communicative function and effect of the original text in the translation context.

In examining the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden presidential debate, the translation strategies discussed by Mona Baker and Amira Sadikovic are crucial for understanding the complexities involved in achieving effective and faithful translation. These strategies provide a framework for evaluating how well the translation captures the nuances of the original text, particularly in the highly charged context of political discourse.

The translation strategies proposed by Mona Baker, including word-level, grammatical, and pragmatic equivalence, are particularly applicable to this paper as they provide a methodical framework for evaluating the translation. For example, the assessment of word-level equivalence assists in determining whether the Croatian translation effectively captures important political terms and ideas from the debate, which frequently carry significant ideological and cultural connotations. Examining how well the translation follows Croatian's syntactical rules while maintaining the meaning and purpose of the original English sentences is enabled by grammatical equivalence. When it comes to political texts, pragmatic equivalence is especially crucial as nuances in tone and implication can have a strong persuasive impact. By concentrating on these approaches, the paper can thoroughly assess whether the translation upholds the original debate's rhetorical strength and ideological nuances.

In addition to this, the paper will also be exploring the translational strategies discussed by Sadikovic. One of the central challenges for translators is navigating between formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence, both of which are central to Sadikovic's framework of translation. Sadikovic (2017: 26) describes formal equivalence as striving to maintain the original message by closely replicating sentences, concepts, and structures from the source language in the target language. However, Sadikovic notes that while formal equivalence can effectively be used with individual words, it frequently struggles when applied to entire sentences because of the varying language structures and idiomatic expressions.

The focus of dynamic equivalence is on the connection between the message and the recipient, aiming to produce the same impact in the target language as in the source language. Sadikovic explains that dynamic equivalence requires adjusting the cultural and idiomatic elements of the source text to ensure that the translation connects with the target audience. This method emphasizes the naturalness of expression, making the translation more relatable and culturally appropriate.

Sadikovic points out the difficulties of translating texts that are strongly connected to the idiomatic and cultural subtleties of the original language. She suggests that when the original text is exceptionally well-written and reflects a thorough understanding of the idiomatic expressions of the language, creating a truly natural translation becomes more challenging. This is especially important in political discussions, where persuasive language, rhetoric, and cultural allusions are intricately integrated into the conversation.

Comparative analysis

Introduction

The comparative analysis presented in this paper examines the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden presidential debate through the lens of translation theory, particularly focusing on the concept of equivalence as articulated by Mona Baker in *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. This section aims to evaluate how effectively the translation preserves the meaning, style, and rhetorical impact of the original English debate, considering linguistic, cultural, and pragmatic dimensions.

The USA Today transcript was published on August 24, 2024, which is the day after the debate took place on August 23, 2024. This means the transcript was made available to the public within a day of the debate, offering timely coverage. Given the rapid publication, the Croatian translator would likely have had access to the USA Today transcript. It would have been available online and potentially used as a reference for creating an accurate Croatian translation of the debate.

The Index.hr transcript is incomplete. It is missing several portions of the debate, which may result in gaps or missing context in the translated text. This incompleteness is important to note as it could affect the overall analysis of the translation's fidelity. USA Today caters to a broad, general audience in the United States. Its purpose is to provide comprehensive and neutral coverage of current events, including political debates, to inform a diverse readership while the Index.hr primarily serves a Croatian audience and is known for its regional focus. Its coverage might be tailored to local interests and perspectives, potentially emphasizing aspects of the debate that resonate more with Croatian readers or reflect local viewpoints.

English	Croatian
Trump: "We have done a great job handling the pandemic. We have produced millions of ventilators and have the vaccine ready." Biden: "220,000 Americans are dead. This is a national tragedy. We need a president who takes this seriously."	Trump: "Napravili smo izvrstan posao u rješavanju pandemije. Proizveli smo milijune respiratora i imamo cjepivo spremno." Biden: "220,000 Amerikanaca je mrtvo. Ovo je nacionalna tragedija. Trebamo predsjednika koji ovo ozbiljno shvaća."

At the word level, Baker emphasizes the necessity of identifying equivalent terms that faithfully convey the meaning and connotations of the source language. In the Croatian translation, several strategic choices highlight this principle. For instance, 'handling' in the original text is translated to "rješavanju" in Croatian, avoiding the literal translation "rukovati" which would not appropriately fit the context of the original message.

Similarly, "ventilators" is accurately rendered as "respiratori" in Croatian. Regarding "vaccine", the translator opts for "cjepivo".

The structure of both Trump's and Biden's statements is relatively simple, without complex idioms or nuanced cultural references that typically pose challenges for automated translation systems. In fact, platforms like Google Translate or DeepL would likely generate translations close to what we see here, as both the English and Croatian sentences involve common vocabulary and syntactic patterns that these algorithms are trained to handle effectively.

However, if this example was a case of simultaneous interpreting an interpreter could potentially mistake "'ventilators" for "ventilatori" during simultaneous interpreting, especially given the high-pressure nature of this mode of translation. Since "ventilators" and "ventilatori" are false friends, meaning they appear similar but have different meanings in English and Croatian, an interpreter might accidentally use the Croatian word "ventilator" (meaning "fan") instead of "respirator" (the correct term for the medical device). The cognitive load of simultaneous interpreting can increase the likelihood of such errors, particularly in cases where the interpreter is not specialized in the subject matter (in this case, medical terminology).

This example shows how even skilled interpreters may fall into the trap of false cognates, especially when working under intense time constraints, and why expertise in the specific field being discussed can be crucial in minimizing mistakes during interpretation.

In high-stakes settings like political debates or medical discussions, such an error could cause significant confusion, further underscoring the value of careful translation and subject matter expertise.

English	Croatian
"I will tell you very simply. We won the election. Elections have consequences. We have the Senate, we have the White House, and we have a phenomenal nominee respected by all. So I think that she will be outstanding. She's going to be as good as anybody that has served on that court. And we won the election and therefore we have the right to choose her, and very few people knowingly would say otherwise. And by the way, the Democrats, they wouldn't even think about not doing it." (2:29)	"Bit ću jednostavan, osvojili smo izbore i Bijelu kuću. Izbori imaju posljedice. Imamo sjajnu kandidatkinju koju podržava puno ljudi. Ona će biti odlična, kao i svi drugi koji su služili prije nje. Osvojili smo izbore i imamo je pravo izabrati. Demokrati se toga ne bi odrekli, napravili bi to i ranije."

For context, his excerpt is a response from former U.S. President Donald Trump during a discussion about his nomination of a Supreme Court Justice. The "candidate" being referred to here is Amy Coney Barrett, who was nominated by Trump to fill the Supreme Court seat left vacant by the death of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg in September 2020.

This example illustrates several differences between the original text and its translation. Firstly, it is evident that the translation is notably shorter than the original, potentially impacting the conveyed message depending on the significance of the omitted segments. There are several simplifications and omissions made in this example which could be attributed to the nature of simultaneous interpreting. The original phrase is straightforward, and the translation retains this simplicity with "Bit ću jednostavan", which literally means "I will be simple". This choice maintains the direct and unambiguous tone of the original. The pragmatic effect-setting up a clear and direct statement-is preserved. The translation effectively prepares the audience for a straightforward message. In the second sentence of the original text, "We won the election" and "We have the Senate, we have the White House" from the third sentence are condensed into the first sentence of the translation, "osvojili smo izbore i Bijelu kuću". This condensation results in the omission of specific details such as "Senate". By omitting the mention of "the Senate", the translation may slightly weaken the perceived breadth of political control being emphasized.

To maintain the pace of interpretation, the translator may have chosen to prioritize the White House as the more recognizable and significant element for the target audience, especially in a Croatian context where the importance of the Senate might not be as prominent.

In Croatian political culture and for the general Croatian audience, the White House might be a more familiar and recognizable symbol of U.S. power than the Senate. The Senate, while an integral part of the U.S. political system, might not carry the same weight or be as widely understood by a non-American audience. The White House is often seen as a direct representation of the presidency and executive power, making it more prominent in the eyes of the international public, including Croatia.

Therefore, in simultaneous translation, the translator might opt to omit it to streamline the message and focus on elements that would resonate more strongly with the target audience, ensuring clarity and relevance in a fast-paced setting.

However, it still conveys a significant electoral victory. Furthermore, the translation selectively employs the word "won" ("osvojili") from the first sentence to encompass the entire section, disregarding the nuanced distinction conveyed by the word "have" in the original. In the translation, "and we have a phenomenal nominee respected by all" from the third sentence appears as a separate sentence which makes it more emphasized than in the original. The adjective "phenomenal", which directly translates to "fenomenalna", is replaced with "odlična" ('excellent') in the translation. Similarly, the word "respected" meaning "poštovana" is substituted with "podržava" ("supported"). While the word "podržava" maintains the general meaning of the sentence, it represents a missed opportunity to employ a potentially more precise translation equivalent.

In simultaneous translation, perfect equivalence is often sacrificed for brevity and clarity. Here, "supported by many" conveys a similar sentiment without being a direct translation. The translation maintains the positive portrayal of the nominee but shifts the emphasis from universal respect to widespread support, which might slightly alter the perceived level of endorsement.

The word "court" is omitted from the translation which affects the overall message and context. The phrase "the Democrats, they" includes a double subject, which emphasizes the party's agency or responsibility.

"Demokrati se toga ne bi odrekli" translates to 'The Democrats wouldn't give that up", which conveys the same message but loses the emphasis on "they".

This subtle emphasis in the original English serves to underscore the speaker's point, possibly suggesting a critical or accusatory tone.

"They wouldn't even think about not doing it" uses a double negative structure ("wouldn't" and "not doing") to reinforce the certainty of the Democrats' action.

The Croatian "ne bi odrekli" translates as "wouldn't give up", which simplifies the construction and loses the nuance of the original's double negation. The translation is more straightforward and less nuanced in expressing the inevitability of the Democrats' actions. The addition of "napravili bi to i ranije" (they would have done it earlier) aligns well with the original statement's implication that they would have acted sooner if feasible.

While adapting to Croatian syntax and idiomatic expressions, the translation ensures dynamic equivalence by conveying Trump's straightforward and assertive style. This includes maintaining the repetition and emphasis on electoral victory.

If we took this example as simoultaneous interpretation, it would explain the omissions and constraints because simultaneous interpreters work with minimal delay, translating as the speaker talks. This rapid pace often necessitates simplifications or omissions to keep up with the speaker's speed and ensure that the audience receives information in a timely manner. To manage time and cognitive constraints, interpreters often summarize longer passages or complex sentences. They distill the essence of the message while preserving its core meaning, which helps keep the interpretation clear and concise.

English	Croatian
(14:25) The fact is that everything he's saying so far is simply a lie. I'm not here to call out his lies. Everybody knows he's a liar. You graduated last in your class not first in your class.	Sve što on govori je laž. Neću ga prozivati, svi znaju da je lažac. Diplomirao si kao najgori u razredu, ne najbolji.

The translation "Sve što on govori je laž" corresponds closely to "everything he's saying so far is simply a lie". It maintains the accusatory tone and directness of Biden's statement. In Trump's statement, the word "last" is translated as "najgori" which means "worst", instead of "zadnji" because it would not be an accurate choice in this case. The translation adapts Trump's insult regarding Biden's academic performance ("last in your class") into a form that resonates effectively with Croatian cultural and linguistic norms, ensuring the insult's intended impact is maintained. The translation effectively conveys Trump's attack on Biden's academic standing, maintaining the confrontational nature of his response.

English	Croatian
(21:31) If we would've listened to you, the country would have been left wide open, millions of people would have died, not 200,000. And one person is too much. It's China's fault. It should have never happened. They stopped it from going in, but it was China's fault. And, by the way, when you talk about numbers, you don't know how many people died in China. You don't know how many people died in Russia.	Znači, po tebi, ti bi ostavio otvorenu zemlju. I jedna mrtva osoba je previše. Kriva je Kina. Pričaš o mrtvima u Kini i Rusiji, ne znaš koliko ih je tamo preminulo.

The translation is notably shorter than the original and missing some of the information from the original text. The translation summed up this entire section in three sentences but captures the accusatory and critical tone of the original text.

Both versions convey the sentiment that even one death is too many, though the translation does not specify the large numbers (millions vs. 200,000) as in the original. This adaptation may slightly diminish the dramatic impact on scale but retains the core argument about the severity of the situation.

The translation strives for equivalence in conveying the accusatory tone and critical arguments present in the original text. The original text has a more dramatic tone because of a few repeated sentences, which were omitted in the translation.

Translators generally have the luxury of time to ensure that the entire message is captured accurately. They can rephrase, edit, and ensure that all the nuances are preserved. In this case, the Croatian translation has left out several key phrases from the original; -"millions of people would have died, not 200,000" is omitted -"It should have never happened. They stopped it from going in, but it was China's fault" is also absent.

The omissions could significantly alter the impact of the original speech, reducing the emotional weight and the accusatory tone directed towards China. Interpreters, especially those working in a simultaneous mode, operate under immense time pressure. They must deliver the message almost instantaneously, often forcing them to omit, paraphrase, or condense content. The omissions in the Croatian version could suggest an interpreting approach, where the interpreter prioritized brevity and the most critical points due to the rapid pace of speech.

The Croatian translation provided seems more indicative of an interpreting scenario rather than a full, reflective translation. It captures the key points but omits and simplifies significant parts of the original speech. This analysis illustrates the challenges and differences between translation and interpreting. While translation allows for more detailed and nuanced rendering of the original message, interpreting requires quick, on-the-spot decisions that often result in a more condensed and sometimes less precise rendition of the original content.

On the other hand, in an effort to capture the audience's attention, media outlets may prioritize sensational or simplified versions of political content. This can lead to translations that favor dramatic or emotive language over the more nuanced and detailed expressions of the original text. Such practices are intended to enhance the appeal of the content but can also result in a loss of the original context and subtleties.

The broader media agenda includes editorial priorities that influence which parts of the debate are covered and how they are presented. These priorities often reflect the media outlet's strategic goals, such as driving viewership, promoting specific narratives, or addressing current socio-political issues. As a result, the translation may emphasize certain aspects of the debate while downplaying others, based on what the outlet considers most newsworthy or engaging.

If a media outlet has a particular political leaning, it might choose to emphasize statements that align with its perspective or downplay those that contradict its stance. This bias can lead to selective translation, where certain elements of the debate are highlighted while others are minimized or omitted to support the media outlet's narrative.

English	Croatian
(22:07) We got the masks. We made the ventilators. You wouldn't have made ventilators. The only thing I haven't done a good job, and that's because of the fake news, no matter what you say to them, they give you a bad press on it. You could've never done that, Joe. Well, you didn't do very well in Swine Flu. H1-N1, you were a disaster.	Nabavili smo maske, napravili respiratore. Ti to ne bi napravio. Nisam napravio dobar posao samo po lažnim vijestima koje o tebi pišu dobro, a o meni loše. Ti to nikad ne bi dobro napravio. Nisi bio dobar za vrijeme svinjske gripe, bio si katastrofa.

The English sentence "The only thing I haven't done a good job, and that's because of the fake news..." is structurally complex and colloquial, reflecting the speaker's spontaneous speech pattern. The Croatian translation simplifies this into "Nisam napravio dobar posao samo po lažnim vijestima..." (I didn't do a good job only according to fake news). This translation not only simplifies the structure, resulting in a more straightforward statement that loses some of the informal, rambling quality of the original, it is also the translator's way of trying to make sense out of a complex and nebulous sentence.

According to Bassnett (2013: 6), translation often involves negotiating between the source text's nuances and the target audience's expectations. In this translation, there is a clear process of condensation, where the translator simplifies the original's disjoined syntax. This simplification highlights the translator's attempt to maintain clarity while negotiating between the original's style and the norms of the target language.

The original phrase "no matter what you say to them, they give you a bad press on it" is translated as "koje o tebi pišu dobro, a o meni loše" (which write well about you, but badly about me). The translation significantly alters the original meaning, focusing more on the contrast between good and bad press, which may change the nuance.

The Croatian translation omits certain redundancies, such as the double mention of "ventilators", creating a more cohesive narrative without losing essential information.

Qiu (2008: 97) discusses the role of omission in translation when certain elements are either culturally redundant or would disrupt the flow in the target language.

Pragmatically, the translation effectively conveys the original message's accusatory and confrontational tone. For example, "You could've never done that, Joe" becomes "Ti to nikad ne bi dobro napravio", preserving the implication of incompetence.

In English, using a first name, especially in a debate setting, signals a certain level of informality or even condescension, similar to the effect of using "Ti" in Croatian. English lacks a formal/informal distinction for the word "you", so the directness of addressing someone by their first name (or nickname) serves to personalize the conversation, potentially diminishing the other party's status. In Croatian, where there is a clear distinction between "Ti" (informal) and "Vi" (formal), the translator's choice of "Ti" carries a similar connotation. By pairing the informal "Ti" with the first name "Joe", the translator effectively mirrors the informal, dismissive tone intended in the original English

However, in Croatian, the choice between "Ti" (informal "you") and "Vi" (formal "you") carries significant cultural and social implications. Unlike English, where "you" is used universally, Croatian (like many other languages) has a distinction between formal and informal address. This distinction can affect the tone, level of respect, and the perceived relationship between the speaker and the listener. In the original English phrase, the lack of a formal address is standard, but in Croatian, using "Ti" instead of "Vi" can make the statement feel more personal and direct. It could reflect an intentional strategy to portray the speaker as condescending or to diminish the status of the opponent in the eyes of the audience. This aligns with the nature of political debates, where speakers often seek to assert dominance. Had the translator chosen "Vi" it would have conveyed a more respectful tone, maintaining a formal distance between the speaker and Joe Biden.

The decision to use "Ti" instead of "Vi" in this context could also reflect the translator's interpretation of the original speaker's tone and intent. If the original statement was meant to be accusatory or dismissive, the informal "Ti" reinforces that intent more strongly in the Croatian language.

In translating political discourse, the choice between "Ti" and "Vi" can be a strategic decision by the translator to either maintain the original tone or to adapt it to suit the cultural expectations of the target audience. This decision can enhance or mitigate the rhetorical impact of the translated statement.

This example highlights how translators must navigate not just the words, but the cultural context in which those words will be received.

English	Croatian
(27:13) This man, this man is a savior of African-Americans? This man cares at all? This man's done virtually nothing. Look, the fact is that you have to look at what he's talking about. You have to look at what he did. And what he did has been disastrous for the African-American community.	Trump nije spasitelj Afroamerikanaca, on nije napravio gotovo ništa. Ono što je on napravio je bilo katastrofalno za afroameričku zajednicu.

In this case, the Croatian translation reduces the original text significantly, omitting some rhetorical questions and repetitive structures present in the English version. The original sentence "This man, this man is a savior of African-Americans?" is shortened to "Trump nije spasitelj Afroamerikanaca" (Trump is not a savior of African-Americans), which captures the core meaning but loses the emphatic repetition and questioning tone that heightens the original's critical stance.

The repetition and rhetorical questions in the original underscore the speaker's doubt and strong criticism. By streamlining these elements, the translation sacrifices some of the rhetorical force and the nuances of the speaker's attitude, reflecting a shift from the emotional to a more straightforward critique.

The omission of "Look, the fact is that you have to look at what he's talking about" results in a loss of the original's guiding tone. Bassnett (2013: 56) argues that equivalence often involves balancing meaning with form; here, the translator's choice prioritizes a concise form at the cost of some of the source text's nuance.

Drawing on Altun's perspective, the translation demonstrates an attempt at dynamic equivalence, aiming to evoke a similar response from the Croatian audience as the original does in English. The simplification and directness of the translation make the message more accessible and potent for the Croatian audience, likely due to cultural and linguistic preferences for more concise expressions in formal discourse.

The Croatian translation simplifies the original English text significantly, omitting rhetorical questions and repetitive structures that emphasize the speaker's disbelief and criticism.

While this directness may align with the need for clarity and brevity, it can be argued that it compromises the expressive intensity and persuasive force of the original.

If this translation was intended for media use, especially in a headline or summary format, the translator or editor might have chosen to distill the content into a more direct and impactful statement. Media outlets often prefer short, punchy quotes that are easily digestible and can be highlighted in articles or used in headlines. The translation, therefore, focuses on the most critical aspects of the statement—Trump's lack of action and its negative impact on the African-American community—while omitting less essential details.

While the Croatian translation captures the essence of the original statement, it does so at the cost of losing some of the rhetorical power and emotional intensity present in the English version. This choice could be justified by the context in which the translation was produced—whether it was done live, edited for media, or adapted for a Croatian-speaking audience. However, these justifications highlight the inherent trade-offs in translation, particularly when it comes to political discourse, where both content and form are crucial to conveying the speaker's intent.

Altun emphasizes that the effectiveness of a translation depends on how well it resonates with the target audience. The Croatian version may appear more assertive and authoritative, aligning with the audience's expectations for political discourse.

As for structual and stylistic adjustment; the structural complexity of the original text is reduced in the translation. The English text's repeated use of "this man" creates a rhythm and an intensifying critique. In the Croatian translation, this is condensed, resulting in a more straightforward statement. Bassnett would argue that this reflects a loss of some of the original's rhetorical structure, which plays a crucial role in the text's persuasive power. As for style; the translation opts for a more formal and direct critique ("Trump nije spasitelj Afroamerikanaca"), reflecting a stylistic shift from the conversational tone of the original. This shift aligns with Altun's views on the necessity of adjusting style to meet the expectations of the target culture, but it also highlights the tension between retaining the source text's style and adapting it for the target audience.

English	Croatian
(30:59) But look, the vast majority of police officers are good, decent, honorable men and women. They risk their lives every day to take care of us. But there are some bad apples. And when they occur, when they find them, they have to be sorted out. They have to be held accountable.	Da, postoji. Većina policajaca su dobri i odgovorni ljudi, ali ima i nekih loših i oni moraju odgovarati.

According to Mona Baker's emphasis on word-level equivalence (2018: 10), the translation uses "odgovorni ljudi" for "decent, honorable men and women." While "odgovorni" (responsible) captures some of the ethical implications of "decent" and "honorable", it lacks the full connotative richness of the original, which conveys a stronger sense of moral integrity. This reflects Baker's observation that achieving perfect equivalence at the word level is challenging and often involves compromises.

The phrase "risk their lives every day to take care of us" is omitted in the translation, potentially due to the translator's focus on brevity or the assumption that the meaning is implied. However, this omission results in a loss of the original's emphasis on the sacrifices made by police officers, which alters the tone and reduces the emotional impact of the message, as discussed by Baker in terms of textual omissions.

The translation condenses several sentences into a single, streamlined sentence. Bassnett would view this as a trade-off between preserving the original's rhetorical structure and adapting to the target language's syntactical norms. The original's segmented structure, with pauses and emphases, helps build a nuanced argument, which is somewhat flattened in the translation. The translation simplifies this complexity, potentially making the text more accessible but less rhetorically rich.

The phrase "bad apples" is translated simply as "nekih loših" (some bad [people]), omitting the metaphor. The term "bad apples" originates from the proverb, "One bad apple spoils the whole barrel", which suggests that a single negative or corrupt element can have a detrimental effect on the whole group.

Over time, however, the phrase has been shortened and commonly used in a way that minimizes the scope of the problem, implying that the issue is contained to just a few individuals rather than being systemic.

In the context of policing, "bad apples" refers to individual police officers who engage in misconduct or unethical behavior. The use of this term suggests that these individuals are exceptions rather than representative of broader issues within law enforcement. However, critics argue that the "bad apple" metaphor downplays systemic problems and the need for comprehensive reform.

The original phrase, "one bad apple spoils the whole barrel" actually suggests that a few corrupt individuals can influence and degrade the entire system. However, this full meaning is often lost when the phrase is truncated. The implication here is that removing these individuals ("the bad apples") will prevent further harm. In reality, addressing systemic issues requires more than just identifying and removing problematic officers; it necessitates examining and reforming the policies, practices, and cultures that allow such behaviors to persist.

According to Bassnett (2013: 32), cultural adjustment is crucial when translating idiomatic expressions. Here, the translator opts for a direct description rather than attempting to preserve the metaphor, which might not resonate as strongly with a Croatian audience. This decision reflects the translator's negotiation between fidelity to the source and clarity for the target audience.

The Croatian translation maintains the core message but simplifies the language, which could make it more direct and effective in a Croatian context, but in this case, it is oversimplified and not as interesting as it could be. However, this focus on pragmatic clarity leads to the loss of some subtleties, such as the moral and emotional undertones in the original's portrayal of "honorable" police officers.

By streamlining the translation, the translator ensures that the message is clear and unambiguous. However, Altun might argue that the reduction of rhetorical and metaphorical elements shifts the text's impact, potentially making it less persuasive or evocative for the target audience compared to the original.

English	Croatian
(31:38) We're going to work this out. So we change the way in which we have more transparency, in when these things happen. Most don't like it, but we have to have a system where people are held accountable when–and by the way, violence in response is never appropriate, never appropriate.	Moramo promijeniti ovo, moramo dati više transparentnosti. Moramo imati sustav u kom su ljudi odgovorni. Ostalim policajcima se ovo ne sviđa. Nasilje nikad nije prikladan odgovor.

The original phrase "We're going to work this out" is omitted in the translation, and the phrase "Moramo promijeniti ovo" is used for "So we change the way". While this reduction may reflect Mona Baker's point about translation often involving adjustments to fit the syntactical or cultural norms of the target language, this particular omission cannot be fully justified on these grounds.

In Croatian, there are no significant syntactical or cultural constraints that would prevent the inclusion of "We're going to work this out" as "Riješit ćemo ovo." The omission seems to reduce the motivational and reassuring tone of the original, which conveys a sense of leadership and resolution. This alteration shifts the emphasis, making the translation feel more directive ("we must change") rather than collaborative and hopeful, as in the original. The omission, therefore, appears to result in a subtle but important shift in tone and intent that is not fully accounted for by linguistic or cultural necessity.

The original text's segmented structure, which provides a gradual buildup of the argument, is compressed in the translation. Bassnett emphasizes that maintaining the structural integrity of the source text is essential for preserving its rhetorical power. The Croatian version omits phrases like "Most don't like it" and "by the way" which serve to acknowledge opposition and guide the audience through the speaker's reasoning. This reduction results in a more straightforward but less nuanced argument, reflecting a potential loss of the original's rhetorical rhythm.

The translation omits some of the hedging and softening language present in the original, such as "when these things happen" and "never appropriate, never appropriate".

Altun would argue that while this makes the text more direct, it also makes it less reflective of the original's emphasis on caution and balance. The repetition of "never appropriate" in the original adds weight to the condemnation of violence, which is somewhat diluted in the Croatian version.

The original text's somewhat tentative and reassuring tone is replaced by a more assertive tone in the translation. For example, "We're going to work this out" is softened and collaborative in English, whereas the Croatian "Moramo promijeniti ovo" (We have to change this) is more directive. This shift aligns with Altun's view that stylistic adjustments are often necessary to align with the cultural expectations of the target audience.

The omission of certain phrases and the translation's more concise structure lead to a loss of rhetorical nuances. Bassnett would highlight that these changes may affect the persuasive power of the text, particularly in a context where the speaker's authority and sensitivity to differing opinions are crucial.

Sometimes editorial policies guide how content is adapted for different audiences, often balancing accuracy, readability, and audience engagement. In political translations, these policies play a crucial role in shaping the final output. They serve as a framework to guide the translation process, and while they can justify omissions, they also come with trade-offs. Omissions made under editorial policies are often intended to align the translation with audience expectations, practical constraints, and legal or ethical considerations. However, these decisions can also affect the fidelity and completeness of the translated text, making it essential to strike a balance between accuracy and audience needs. While editorial policies can justify certain omissions, they also highlight the complex interplay between maintaining translation fidelity and adapting content for specific contexts. Understanding these policies can provide valuable insight into the translation process and the factors that influence how political texts are presented to different audiences

The translation of political discourse must effectively communicate the original message to the target audience, maintaining the same rhetorical impact. In the examined translations, while many key points are conveyed, there are instances where nuances and rhetorical effects are not fully captured. For example, the translation often simplifies complex phrases or omits contextually significant details, which could diminish the intended impact on the Croatian audience.

The translation often uses more general terms and omits specific political or cultural references, which might lead to a loss of the original's emotional and persuasive force. The translator's choices, such as simplifying terms or phrases, might ensure comprehension but could also reduce the translation's effectiveness in conveying the original's full impact. The Croatian translation sometimes opts for brevity and simplicity, which may enhance readability but can compromise the fidelity of the translation, particularly regarding the emotional and rhetorical strength of the original text.

English	Croatian
(46:42)	On je predsjednik, za vrijeme njega smo postali podjeljeniji. A moj sin, način kako govorite o vojsci... Moj sin je godinu dana bio u Iraku, dobio je brončanu zvijezdu. On je domoljub, a ljudi koji su tamo su junaci.
He's President of the United States. It's on his watch. And with regard to more divided, the nation, it can't stay divided. We can't be this way. And speaking of my son, the way you talk about the military, the way you talk about them being losers and being, and, and, and just being suckers. My son was in Iraq. He spent a year there. He got, he got the Bronze Star. He got the Conspicuous Service Medal. He was not a loser. He was a patriot and the people left behind, there, were heroes.	

The original specifies "President of the United States," emphasizing the importance and responsibility tied to the role. The Croatian translation omits "of the United States," which could reduce the specificity and significance of the title. According to Baker's theory of equivalence (2018: 40), a translator may decide to omit a particular item or expression which he finds unvital to the development of the texts. In this case, the translator possibly found this particular piece of information obvious and decided to omit it.

The original emphasizes the division with repetition ("divided...divided"), while the Croatian version simplifies this to "postali podjeljeniji" (became more divided). The repetition in the original text serves to underline the severity of the issue, which is lost in translation. Bassnett would argue that the loss of repetition weakens the rhetorical force of the statement. The original text uses repetition and filler ("and, and, and") to emphasize Biden's frustration and emotional state. The Croatian translation condenses this to "način kako govorite o vojsci" (the way you talk about the military), losing the original's hesitation and emotional depth. Baker would note that this omission removes the speaker's implied emotional struggle, which was originally conveyed through the repetition and disfluency.

The original text is marked by complex sentence structures, interruptions and repetition, which reflect the speaker's emotional intensity. The translation simplifies these into more straightforward, concise sentences.

For example, the phrase "And speaking of my son, the way you talk about the military, the way you talk about them being losers and being, and, and, and just being suckers" is reduced to "A moj sin, način kako govorite o vojsci". The emotional depth and frustration conveyed by the disjointed structure in the original are lost, leading to a more neutral tone in the translation. Bassnett would suggest that this simplification may alter the audience's perception of the speaker's emotional state, potentially reducing the persuasive impact.

The translation omitts several details from the original, for example the word "suckers". In English, "suckers" is a highly charged word with shock value, suggesting strong disdain and a personal attack. It carries an informal, almost vulgar connotation, which adds emotional weight to the accusation. In the Croatian translation, the omission of this word removes this emotional intensity. One possible explanation for this is that in Croatian political discourse, using a direct equivalent like "glupani" or "naivčine" might be perceived as too crude or informal for the context. Croatian political rhetoric tends to favor more formal language, and such an informal term might be seen as inappropriate for a public debate or for conveying respect in a politically charged conversation.

The translator also omitts "Conspicuous Service Medal" and condenses the sentence "He was not a loser". Similarly, the word "loser" is omitted from the Croatian translation. While an equivalent such as "gubitnik" could have been used, it may have been deemed too harsh or too informal for the political stage. In many cultures, including Croatian, public political discourse often avoids words that could be considered overly disrespectful, particularly when referring to individuals or groups like the military. The translator may have chosen to soften the tone to align with the expectations of the audience, where direct insults are less commonly accepted in formal political discussions. This reflects the translator's interpretation of cultural norms and the need to maintain a level of formality and decorum that the target audience expects from political figures.

The sentence "He was a patriot and the people left behind, there, (meaning the people who died there), were heroes" has a simplifed structure in the translation. These omissions, while

making the translation more concise, also reduce the emotional and factual richness of the original.

This highlights the subjective nature of equivalence in translation, where the translator's choices are influenced by the cultural and political landscape of the target audience, sometimes at the cost of losing the rhetorical power of the original text.

Translation and Media Framing of Political Texts

In an increasingly globalized world, the translation of political texts for media consumption plays a critical role in shaping public perception and international relations. Media outlets often translate political discourse to make it accessible to diverse audiences, but this process involves complexities that can impact accuracy and message conveyance.

Fox (2021: 30) examines translation strategies used in political discourse and emphasizes that media translations must balance fidelity to the source text with the need for clarity and cultural relevance.

Media outlets often adapt translations to align with their editorial perspectives and the cultural context of the target audience. This adaptation can involve simplifying complex political jargon or modifying rhetorical devices to make the text more engaging. While these strategies can enhance accessibility, they may also lead to a loss of nuance and impact. Similarly, simplifying complex arguments or rhetorical flourishes can affect the perceived strength and credibility of the political message.

A study published by Yuen (2020) explores how media framing influences the interpretation of translated political texts. The study highlights that media outlets often modify translations to align with editorial perspectives or cultural expectations, which can lead to discrepancies between the source and target texts. This practice can shape public opinion by emphasizing certain aspects of the message while downplaying others, thus affecting how political issues are perceived.

The way media outlets translate political texts can shape public perception and influence how political issues are framed. Translation choices, including lexical selection and sentence structure, play a significant role in determining how political messages are conveyed and understood. For example, the decision to use a particular term or phrase can affect how a political figure or policy is perceived by the target audience. In a study done by McDonald (2021) it is revealed that media outlets may prioritize certain aspects of the translation to align with their editorial stance, which can lead to variations in how political issues are presented. These adjustments can result in variations in how political figures and issues are portrayed, highlighting the need for careful consideration of translation choices.

Research on the accuracy of media outlets in presenting translated political texts reveals significant challenges and biases. A key issue is the "recontextualization" process, where translation doesn't merely involve linguistic conversion but also adapting the text to the target audience's cultural and political context. This adaptation can result in significant shifts in meaning, sometimes intentionally, to align with the media outlet's ideological stance. Federici (2011: 1396) discusses this in the context of the Calipari case, where journalistic manipulations during translation served specific political agendas. Such manipulations can lead to significant shifts in meaning, tone, and emphasis, often reflecting the media outlet's ideological stance rather than the original intent of the political text.

Such transformations are especially evident in the translation of political speeches and news reports, where the translator's agency and the institutional context influence the final product.

Furthermore, the interdisciplinary nature of this field shows that the translation of political texts often involves more than just linguistic fidelity. It includes considerations of media bias, the objectives of the media organization, and the political implications of how certain events are portrayed across languages. Studies have noted that the accuracy of translated political texts can vary significantly, with the process often shaped by the political pressures and agendas of the publishing media. The translation of political texts for media outlets is a complex process that involves balancing accuracy, clarity, and cultural relevance. Accurate translation is essential for providing a balanced view and avoiding the propagation of misleading information.

While media outlets strive to make political discourse accessible to a global audience, the need for cultural adaptation and the influence of editorial perspectives can lead to variations in how the original message is conveyed. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for ensuring that translations maintain the integrity of the original text and provide a reliable account of political events. "The tension between fidelity to the source text and adaptation to the target culture illuminates the intricate dance that translators must perform to ensure meaningful and culturally relevant communication in the dynamic landscape of media." (Chabhane, 2024: 30)

In conclusion, the accuracy of political texts translated by the media is influenced by a complex interplay of ideological, institutional, and cultural factors. Translation in a media context is not neutral and often involves recontextualization and adaptation, potentially distorting the original

message. Therefore, studying translated political texts within the media is not only a linguistic activity but also a critical examination of how power, ideology, and culture intersect in the creation and spread of political discourse across different languages. The implications of these translations on public perception and international relations highlight the significance of continuous research and scrutiny in this field.

Conclusion

This paper explored the concept of equivalence in translation, particularly through the lens of the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden presidential debate. By focusing on the interplay between theoretical frameworks provided by scholars like Mona Baker, Susan Bassnett, and Amira Sadiković, and the practical outcomes observed in the translated debate, this research highlights the complexity of achieving equivalence in political discourse translation. The study's findings emphasize the challenges of preserving the original meaning, tone, and rhetorical strategies when translating politically charged content, especially within the context of media representation.

One of the key themes that emerged from the analysis is the notion of equivalence, as articulated by Mona Baker. Baker's framework provides a valuable lens through which to assess the accuracy and appropriateness of translations. The analysis revealed that achieving equivalence at the word level is often challenging due to cultural and contextual differences between the source and target languages. For instance, the translation of culturally specific terms or idiomatic expressions often requires creative solutions that may not always align perfectly with the original text. In political discourse, where every word is loaded with significance, such deviations can have profound implications for how the message is received and interpreted by the target audience.

Furthermore, the research underscored the importance of dynamic equivalence, as advocated by theorists like Eugene Nida and, more recently, Altun. Dynamic equivalence focuses on the effect of the translation on the target audience, rather than a literal word-for-word rendering of the source text. In the context of media translations, achieving dynamic equivalence is crucial because the goal is often to evoke the same response in the target audience as the original message does in the source audience. This involves not only linguistic accuracy but also cultural adaptation and sensitivity to the target audience's socio-political context. This requires not only linguistic precision but also adapting to the target audience's cultural and socio-political context. The case studies examined in this study show that while some translations successfully achieved dynamic equivalence, others missed the mark, resulting in misunderstandings or distorted portrayals of the original message. In applying these theoretical insights to the Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden debate, this paper has demonstrated the limitations of both classical and contemporary approaches when faced with the complexities of political discourse. The debate, characterized by its use of

colloquial language, cultural references, and rhetorical devices, posed significant challenges for the translator. For example, Trump's use of informal language and colloquialisms required not just a linguistic translation but also a cultural adaptation that could resonate with a Croatian audience. Similarly, Biden's more measured tone and policy-driven arguments needed careful handling to ensure that his intended message was not lost or distorted in translation.

The analysis revealed that while the translator was able to achieve a degree of equivalence in terms of content, there were notable discrepancies in tone and rhetorical impact. This outcome aligns with Sadiković's observations on the inherent difficulties in translating political discourse, particularly in a media context where the pressures of time, audience expectations, and institutional biases can lead to compromises in translation accuracy. The Croatian translation of the debate, while faithful to the original in many respects, inevitably reflected the translator's interpretations and the broader media agenda, thus highlighting the subjective nature of equivalence in practice.

Moreover, this research underscores the critical role of media in shaping public perception through translation. The recontextualization of political texts in the media, as discussed by scholars like Federici, reveals the ways in which translations can be influenced by ideological biases and institutional pressures. In the case of the Trump vs. Biden debate, the Croatian media's presentation of the translated content was not merely a reflection of the original debate but an adaptation that served specific narrative purposes. This reinforces the idea that translation in a political context is a site of negotiation, where meaning is constructed rather than simply transferred.

The implications of these findings are significant for both translation studies and media studies. They suggest that achieving true equivalence in the translation of political texts is an elusive goal, one that is continually mediated by cultural, contextual, and institutional factors. For translators, this means that the pursuit of equivalence must go beyond linguistic fidelity and engage with the broader social and political contexts in which the translation will be received. For media outlets, it raises important ethical questions about the role of translation in shaping public discourse and the responsibility to present translated content with integrity and accuracy.

In conclusion, this paper has demonstrated that the notion of equivalence in translation is both theoretically complex and practically challenging, particularly in the realm of political discourse. The translations show a commendable effort to convey the core messages of the

political debates. However, when assessed through the lenses of Baker, Bassnett, and Altun, it is evident that there are areas for improvement. The translations could benefit from more nuanced handling of specific terms and cultural references to better capture the original's rhetorical and emotional impact. While the translations are functional and provide a clear understanding of the source material, striving for greater equivalence and cultural sensitivity would enhance their effectiveness in conveying the intended message and impact of the original political discourse.

The Croatian translation of the Trump vs. Biden debate serves as a case study that illustrates the tension between maintaining fidelity to the source text and adapting it to meet the needs of a different cultural and linguistic audience. As translation theory continues to evolve, it is clear that equivalence must be understood as a dynamic and context-dependent concept, one that requires a careful balancing act between the demands of the source text and the expectations of the target audience. Ultimately, this research highlights the importance of ongoing critical engagement with the concept of equivalence, both in translation practice and in the broader field of translation studies.

Bibliography

Altun, M., & Sabah, R. (2020). *Common Problems in Translation of Political Texts: The Case of English and Kurdish Languages*. Canadian Journal of Language and Literature Studies.

Aragrande, G. (2020). *Multilingual News Discourse and Translation: Towards a Theoretical Approach.*

Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation.* London: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2013). *Translation Studies.* Routledge.

Chahbane, K., Chahbane, M. M., & Zrizi, H. (2024). *Translation of Media Discourse: Approaches and Strategies.* International Journal of Translation and Interpretation Studies

Fox, M. L. G. (2021). *Translation and the Media: An Overview of Translation Strategies in Political Discourse.* Translation Studies.

Gile, D. (1995). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training.* Amsterdam

Index.hr. (2020, September 30*). Trump cijelu debatu prekidao Bidena, Biden: "Hoćeš li začepiti, čovječe?"* Index.hr. https://www.index.hr/amp/vijesti/clanak/trump-cijelu-debatu-prekidao-bidena-biden-hoces-li-zacepiti-covjece/2217943.aspx

Kelly, L. G. (1979). *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West.* New York: St. Martin's Press

McDonald, R. H. (2021). *The Role of Translation in Shaping Media Narratives: A Case Study of Political Reporting*. Media, Culture & Society.

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

Patel, C. J. (2023). *Accuracy and Bias in Political Translation: Analyzing Media Coverage of International Affairs.* International Communication Gazette.

Popli, N. (2004). *President Debates in History That Moved the Needle.* Time.

Qiu Hemin (2008). *On strategies for translating Chinese tourism texts into English: a manipulative perspective.* Journal of Shaoxing University

Rev.com. (2020, September 29). *Donald Trump & Joe Biden 1st Presidential Debate Transcript 2020. Rev.* https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-joe-biden-1st-presidential-debate-transcript-2020

Sadiković, A. (2017). *Klasici u prevodu*

Schäffner, C. (2004). *Political Discourse Analysis from the Point of View of Translation Studies.* Journal of Language and Politics.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.

Yuen, E. K. W. (2020*). Political Translation in the Media: A Study of Media Framing and Translation Practices.* Journal of Language and Politics.