

## **Ideological differences in Japanese and English transitivity usage: A comparison of two versions of an *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper editorial**

Xiaojian XIE

### **1. Introduction**

On the Fifth of April 2009, President Barack Obama delivered a historic speech in Prague in which he stated “America’s commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons”. The speech attracted great media attention throughout the world, especially in Japan, where opposition to nuclear weapons is a deep-rooted national policy. However, it is never possible for journalists to “simply report the facts”. Like all other users of language, journalists cannot do otherwise than produce texts in ways that reflect the ideologies that have influenced them. While there are undoubtedly numerous difficulties in decoding the ideological influences at work in the production (and, indeed, the consumption) of any text, this should not deter us from making the attempt, particularly in the case of such socially influential texts as those produced by the news media and about such a globally important issue as nuclear weapons. In order to investigate such ideologies, in a previous study, (Xie 2013), I conducted a transitivity analysis of the original Japanese version of an *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper editorial about the Prague Speech published on 7th April, 2009. The present study extends the findings of the previous one by comparing the transitivity usage in the original Japanese editorial with that in the English version. The principal aim of this study is to investigate in fine detail how the different linguistic resources deployed in the two texts afford differential readings of the texts in ways which might be regarded as ideologically significant.

## 2. Theory and method

The theoretical and methodological framework for this investigation is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Although there are many schools of CDA (see Wodak & Meyer 2009), the fundamental insight common to all is that language is a material form of ideology (Fairclough 1995: 73). Fairclough defines ideologies as “representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation” (Fairclough 2003: 9).

The version of CDA that I have drawn on in this study is the one that has been developed by Norman Fairclough and his colleagues at Lancaster University in the UK (Fairclough 2003). One characteristic feature of this version is the emphasis given to the close linguistic analysis of texts. While other versions of CDA focus on more abstract levels of discourse, the Faircloughian version argues that ideological analysis must be firmly based on evidence derived from textual analysis. To analyse texts Fairclough draws on the theoretical framework and methodological tools of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL).

The key insight underlying SFL is that languages are ‘meaning potentials’ that provide users with choices, arranged as ‘system networks’, about how to express their thoughts. At the level of lexis the ideological implications of this fact are widely recognized (such as in the differential use of “terrorist” and “freedom-fighter”). However, what is less well recognized is the ideological nature of grammar. To take an extremely simple example, we can describe what we see out of the window as “The girl is chasing the dog” or “The dog is being chased by the girl”. The choice between the use of active and passive voice here provides a clear illustration of the impossibility of neutrality in reporting. Since we cannot utter both active and passive statements simultaneously, in practice we must choose to say either one or the other. But whereas the former construes the situation in terms of an answer to the question “What is the

girl doing?” the latter construes it in terms of “What is happening to the dog?” Such choices, which the language system both enables and forces us to make in every utterance, are precisely the points at which the operation of ideology can and does occur.

The founder of SFL and the author of its key text, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2004) is the English linguist Michael Halliday. In this paper I have drawn extensively on Halliday’s model, particularly as elaborated by Eggins (2003).

### 3. Previous studies

The present study draws principally on two areas of previous research: ideological studies of news discourse and linguistic studies of news texts. In this section, I will limit my review to the work of just three scholars.

Sumikawa (2009) analysed the coverage of North and South Korea in the *Asahi Shimbun* and *Yomiuri Shimbun* newspapers from 2003 to 2007. He found that whereas both newspapers only reported about North Korea in negative terms their coverage of South Korea was mainly neutral.

The Korean scholar, E (2006) analysed Japanese and South Korean television news coverage of North Korea from January 2004 to June. He found that in the South Korean news North Korea was represented as opening up and expanding its communication with South Korea. By contrast, in the Japanese news North Korea was represented very critically as abducting Japanese citizens, practicing deception and hiding the truth.

Takagi (2009) compared two articles about a rape committed by U.S. service personnel in Okinawa in *The Japan Times* and *The New York Times* using Fairclough’s approach to focus particularly on word meanings, transitivity, news values and intertextuality. She showed how the *The Japan Times* article represents the resentment of the Japanese people and government officials together with their concrete demands to the US. On the other hand, she found that *The New York Times* article does not include such representations and frames the issue as a matter of bilateral diplomacy.

While these and other previous studies offer useful insights into journalistic ideology, none have focused on particular texts in the kind of linguistic detail attempted in this paper. Furthermore, as far as I am aware, no studies have sought to investigate this topic by means of comparing versions of a single news text in different languages.

#### **4. Data**

The texts selected for analysis here are an editorial from the Japanese *Asahi Shimbun* newspaper published on the morning of 7th April 2009 and the version of it which appeared the following day in the English edition of the paper, *The Asahi Shimbun*. One of the five major national daily newspapers in Japan, the *Asahi Shimbun* is generally regarded as reflecting a relatively left-wing political position and has a daily circulation of approximately eight million copies. Commensurate with this, it has a significant influence on the formation of public opinion (Nohara 2007: 34).

#### **5. Transitivity analysis**

The texts have been analysed using the categories of SFL as developed by Halliday (2004) and Eggins (2003) for English and Teruya (2007) for Japanese. It is to be regretted that a more detailed explanation of this method cannot be provided here. However, since one of the aims of this paper is to respond to the criticism frequently made of CDA that it is too selective in its analysis I have felt it important to include an analysis of every sentence in the two editorials, which has inevitably required a considerable amount of space.

The first step in an analysis of this kind is always to divide the text into its individual clauses and groups of clauses (sentences). Then each element in each clause is coded, that is, labeled according to its grammatical function. Since in this paper my focus is on ideational (representational) aspects of ideology, the text has been coded only in terms of the transitivity system (Participants, Processes and

Circumstances). The coding has been done according to the Key shown below.

### **5.1 KEY for Transitivity Analysis**

Regarding the Key and the coding the following points should be borne in mind.

- (1) The texts are divided into sentences and labeled with Arabic numbers (1, 2, 3 ...). The Japanese text's sentences are indicated by J and those of the English text by E.
- (2) The sentences are divided into clauses and labeled with Roman numbers (i, ii, iii ...).
- (3) Embedded clauses are shown in [[double square brackets]].
- (4) Double slashed lines // indicate clause boundaries within embedded clauses.
- (5) Where Participants and associated verbal elements have been ellipsed from a clause they are shown in {single curly brackets} whenever possible.
- (6) For further details of the coding system employed, refer to Eggins (2003).

#### **Process Types**

**P** = Process; **Pm** = Material; **Pme** = Mental; **Pv** = Verbal; **Pr** = Relational; **Prp** = Relational (Possessive); **Prx** = Relational (Existential).

#### **Participants**

**A** = Actor; **G** = Goal; **R** = Recipient; **Sc** = Scope.

**S** = Sayer; **Ph** = Phenomenon.

**Sy** = Sayer; **Rv** = Receiver; **Vb** = Verbiage.

**Cr** = Carrier; **At** = Attribute; **At/Pr** = fused Attribute and Relational Process; **CD** = Carrier-Domain; **T** = Token; **V** = Value; **Or** = Possessor; **Ed** = Possessed; **E** = Existent.

#### **Circumstances**

**C** = Circumstance; **Ca** = Accompaniment; **Cc** = Cause; **Cl** = Location;

**Cm** = Manner;

**Co** = Role; **Cg** = Angle; **Ct** = Matter; **Ce** = Extent

## 5.2. Clausal Analysis

The sentences in the texts have been divided into six stages on the basis of their function in the overall generic structure. In this section, the texts have been coded sequentially to facilitate showing how the ideational meanings are made as the texts unfold. Although all of the sentences have been coded and presented below, detailed discussion of each one has not been possible due to limitations of space.

### Stage 1. Responsible America, Irresponsible North Korea

#### **Presentation of Obama's declaration of "moral responsibility"**

J1. 「米国は(Or)、核保有国として(Co)、そして [[ [[核兵器を(G)使った(Pm)]] ことが(Ed)ある(Prp)]] 唯一の核保有国として(Co)、 [[行動する(Pm)]] 道義的責任が(Ed)ある(Prp)」。

E1. "As a nuclear power (Co), as the only nuclear power (Co) // to have used (Pm) a nuclear weapon (G), the United States (Or) has (Prp) a moral responsibility (Ed) // to act (Pm),"

Both editorials open with a direct quotation from Obama's original words. The two versions are almost exactly the same. They have the same processes (one Possessive Relational process and two Material processes) but they differ in terms of their point of departure. E1 begins with a Role Circumstance — "As a nuclear power" whereas J1 starts with a Possessor — "米国" ("the US"). We should remember that the English editorial is a translation of the Japanese one and that, all other things being equal, it should closely follow it. However, in this instance the authors have opted to use Obama's original words instead. To do so is, of course, straightforward for the authors of the English version given that the original speech was in the same language and so this difference seems unlikely to have an ideological basis although, as we shall see below, it

may have ideological consequences.

### **Contextualization (spacio-temporal) of Obama's declaration**

J2. {これは(T)}[[オバマ米大統領が(A)プラハで(CI)行った(Pm)]]演説の一節(V)である(Pr)。

E2. U.S. President Barack Obama (Sy) said (Pv) in his address (CI) in Prague (CI) on Sunday (CI).

Unlike E2, J2 does not have a Temporal Circumstance equivalent to “on Sunday”. Moreover, J2 is a Relational process with an elided Subject and a Material process in an embedded clause whereas E2 is a Verbal process with an explicit Subject. It is likely that the authors of the English version felt the need to specify the day because of the one day delay in publication.

### **Contextualization (historical) of Obama's declaration**

J3. 広島、長崎への原爆投下から(CI)今年で(CI)64年。

E3. Sixty-four years (A) have passed (Pm) since the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 (CI).

J3 is a minor clause with no explicit process. The effect of being untethered to the tense system in this way is that the information seems timeless and profound. By contrast, E3 is a Material process clause containing both a verb and a circumstance — “in August 1945”. It seems likely that this was added by the translators because, unlike the readers of the Japanese version, some of the English paper's readers would not have known this.

### **Evaluation (positive) of Obama's declaration**

J4i. 米国大統領が(Sy)「道義的責任」を(Vb)語り(Pv)、

E4i. The president of the United States (Sy) has acknowledged (Pme) America's moral responsibility (Vb) and

J4ii. {彼が(Sy)} 核廃絶への {彼の} 決意を(Vb)表明した(Pv)。

E4ii. {he (Sy)}voiced (Pv) his resolve (Vb) [[ to abolish (Pm) nuclear weapons (G) ]].

The Japanese writers chose one of the most neutral verbal processes, 語り (“talk”) to describe Obama’s action whereas in E4i the word used, “acknowledge”, is fundamentally a mental process (although it may also include a verbal element) which is less neutral than “talk”. It interprets Obama’s remarks as constituting an acknowledgement of moral responsibility. It is possible that the Japanese authors did not wish to be seen as overly-accepting of Obama’s position in the eyes of their Japanese readers.

J5. {日本人が(S)} 被爆国の国民として(Co)、[[ [[ 「核のない世界」を(G)目指し(Pm)]]、// [[時代の歯車を(G)回そう(Pm)]]という]]呼びかけを(Ph)重く(Cm)受け止めたい(Pme)。

E5. As citizens of the only country (Co) [[ ever (Ce) subjected (Pm) to nuclear attacks (G) ]], Japanese (S) must respond (Pme) fully (Cm) to Obama’s call (Ph) [[ [[ for turning (Pm) the wheels of history (G) ]]] // [[ to realize (Pm) “a world without nuclear weapons” (G) ]]] ].

The Japanese version uses a desiderative Mental process accompanied by a Circumstance of Manner “重く受け止めたい” (“want to take seriously”) whereas the English version also uses a Mental process, but modified by modality — “must”. The use of “must” makes the Mental process sound more obligatory and forcible.

### **Description of action of North Korea and its evaluation (negative)**

J6i. この演説の直前に(Cl)、北朝鮮が(A)ミサイル発射を(G)強行し(Pm)、

J6ii. {北朝鮮が(A)} 世界に(R)冷水を(G)浴びせた(Pm)。

E6. Hours before Obama’s address (Cl), North Korea (A) threw (Pm) cold

water (G) on the international community (R) with a missile launch (Cm).

Firstly, we should note that E6 is a clause simplex. By contrast, the Japanese text has two clauses. In E6, “with a missile launch” is a Circumstance of Manner but in J6i the same part is construed as the Goal of a Material process with North Korea as the Actor. The missile launch was described in J6i using “強行” (“forcefully carry out”), a word with military connotations, in order to emphasize North Korea’s shockingly aggressive action. In this way the Japanese editorial criticized North Korea more severely than the English editorial although both the English and Japanese editorials support the studies of Sumikawa (2009) and E (2006) who both found that North Korea is frequently criticized by the Japanese news media.

### **Presentation of Obama’s response and expression of support for it**

- J7. だからこそ[[ [[ 「[[核の脅威に(G)対応する(Pm)]]ため(Cc)、より  
 厳しい新たな手法が(Cr)必要(At)だと(Pr)]]改めて(Cm)思い起こし  
 た(Pme)」という]]オバマ氏の言葉に(Ph){我々が(S)}共感する(Pme)。
- E7. We (S) could not agree more (Pme) with the U.S. president (Ca)  
 [[ who (Sy) noted (Pv), [[ “Just this morning (Cl), we (S) were reminded  
 (Pme) again [[ why we (A) need (Pm) a new and more rigorous  
 approach (G) // to address (Pm) this threat (G)” ]] (Ph) ]] ]].

At this point it is interesting to note that the English editorial is based on Obama’s original words more than just being a translation of the Japanese editorial. Whereas Obama and the English version say “this threat”, in J7 it is “核の脅威” (“nuclear threat”). There are, in fact, several other places in the text where this occurs, suggesting that there may be an ideological aspect to the way in which the English writers made judgments regarding whether or not to stick to the original editorial or to quote directly from Obama’s speech.

## Stage 2. Non-Proliferation Treaty

### Explanation of Non-Proliferation Treaty

J8. [[核廃絶の中心に(E)なる(Prx)]]のは(T)、核不拡散条約 (N P T) 体制の強化(V)である(Pr)。

E8. [[ Bolstering (Pm) the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) (G) ]] (T) is (Pr) central to the pursuit of a nuclear-free world (V).

No substantial ideological differences.

J9i. N P Tは(S)、米ロ英仏中の5カ国を(Ph)核兵器国として(Co)認め(Pme)、

J9ii. {N P Tが(Sy)} 他国には(Rv)核兵器の保有を(Vb)禁じている(Pv)。

E9i. The treaty (S) acknowledges (Pme) the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China (Ph) as “nuclear-weapon states” (Co)

E9ii. and {the treaty (Sy)} bans (Pv) the possession of nuclear weapons (Vb) by any other nation (Rv).

No substantial ideological differences.

J10. それでも[[多くの非核国が(A)加盟してきた(Pm)]]のは(T)、[[N P Tが(A)核兵器国に(R)「[[誠実に(Cm)核軍縮交渉を(G)行う(Pm)]]義務」を(G)課している(Pm)]](V)からだ(Pr)。

E10i. Yet, many non-nuclear-weapon states (A) have joined (Pm) the NPT (G)

E10ii. because the treaty (Sy) requires (Pv) nuclear states (Rv) // to “pursue (Pm) negotiations (G)” in good faith (Vb) on effective measures (Ct) // relating to (Pm) cessation of the nuclear arms race (G) at an early date (Cl) and to nuclear disarmament (G).

Whereas the Japanese version of the second clause includes only one Goal,

nuclear disarmament negotiations (“核軍縮交渉”), the English version adds a second Goal, “cessation of the nuclear arms race”. It may be that the authors of the English version wished to emphasize to its readers from the five nuclear powers that their countries are still engaged in such a race.

### Stage 3. Nuclear States

#### Description of Obama’s proposals regarding the nuclear weapons possessed by states

J11i. オバマ氏は(Sy)ロシアのメドベージェフ大統領と(Ca)、  
<<J11ii>> 合意した(Pv)。

J11ii. <<[[核兵器を(G)大幅(Cm)削減する(Pm)]]新条約を(G)年内に  
(Cl)締結する(Pm)と>>

E11. Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev (Sy) have agreed  
(Pv) // to sign (Pm) a bold, new strategic nuclear arms reduction treaty  
(G) by the end of this year (Cl).

In E11 there are two Sayers (Obama and Medvedev) whereas in J11i there is only one, President Obama because President Medvedev is construed as a Circumstance of Accompaniment. In the Japanese version, therefore, President Obama’s role is emphasized whilst that of President Medvedev is somewhat backgrounded. This might again reflect the author’s awareness of their more international readership.

J12. 来年には(Cl)NPT再検討会議も(G)開かれる(Pm)。

E12. And next year (Cl), the 2010 NPT Review Conference (G) will be  
held (Pm).

No substantial ideological differences.

J13i. 米ロが(A)真剣に(Cm)核軍縮に(G)取り組めば(Pm)、

13ii. {これは(T)} [[[インド、パキスタン、北朝鮮などに(Rv)非核  
化を(Vb)求める(Pv)]] {彼らの} 立場を(G)強める(Pm)]] ことに(V)

なる(Pr)。

E13i. If the United States and Russia (A) aggressively (Cm) pursue (Pm) nuclear disarmament (G),

E13ii. they (T) will be (Pr) in a stronger position (V) // to urge (Pv) India, Pakistan, North Korea and others (Rv) // to denuclearize (Pm).

Of all the ellipsed words and phrases in the Japanese version, the modifier of “立場” (“position”) here is the most difficult to recover. It might refer to the international community (or just the NPT signatories) or even, possibly, Japan. It was not until I read the English version that I realized that the position was meant to be that of the US and Russia. There is ideology at work here. It is possible that the US will, indeed, as Obama said, “reduce the role of nuclear weapons in [its] national security strategy, and urge others to do the same”. However, it is much less likely that Russia will “urge” likewise because it depends on Russia’s national interests which differ markedly from those of the US (NTI 2013). The US will “urge” like this because a “nuclear free world” is the new policy of the Obama administration. Therefore, the inclusion of Russia here seems to reflect more the hope of the authors rather than the actuality of nuclear diplomacy.

One other point to note here is that the word “urge” in the English version is in a much stronger tone than “求める” (“ask”) in the Japanese text. Obama himself said “we will ... urge”, possibly because he wished to identify the US as the global leader in nuclear disarmament. The Japanese version, however, reflects the authors’ view that a more equal and consensual approach is desirable.

J14i. オバマ氏は(Sy)、 <<J14ii >> 明言した(Pv)。

J14ii. << [[ブッシュ前政権が(A)ストップを(G)かけていた(Pm)]]包括的核実験禁止条約を(G)批准し(Pm)、// さらに兵器用核分裂物質の生産禁止条約の交渉開始を(G)目指す(Pm)と>>

E14i. While the preceding administration of George W. Bush (A) was

- against ratifying (Pm) the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (G),  
 E14ii. Obama (Sy) declared (Pv) that <<E14iii >> (Vb)  
 E14iii. his administration (A) “will immediately and aggressively (Cm) pursue (Pm) U.S. ratification” of the CTBT (G) and // “seek (Pm) a new treaty (G) that [[ verifiably (Cm) ends (Pm) the production of fissile materials (G) [[ intended (Pm) for use in state nuclear weapons (G) ] ] ].”

There is no equivalent in the Japanese version of the phrase “immediately and aggressively” in E14iii. The English version is a direct quotation from Obama’s speech. By contrast, the Japanese version is an indirect summary of Obama’s speech. The latter might have excluded the phrase in question to further soften the impression given by Obama’s words rather as we saw in the case of “urge” versus “求める” above.

- J15i. 条約発効までには(CI)多くの困難が(Ph)予想されるが(Pme)、  
 J15ii. 米国が(A)先頭に(CI)立てば(Pm)  
 J15iii. 打開の道は(A)開けるはずだ(Pm)。  
 E15i. Many challenges (G) will have to be overcome (Pm)  
 E15ii. before such a treaty (A) can come into (Pm) effect (G).  
 E15iii. But we (S) believe (Pme)  
 E15iv. It (G) can be done (Pm) with [[ the United States (A) leading (Pm) the way (G) ]].

In the English version, E15iii is a Mental process with the Senser as “we”. The meaning of this notoriously slippery pronoun here may extend to include all “right thinking” people (in the view of the editorial writers) but at least it must refer to the English editorial writers themselves. Such a phrase, however, is not present in the Japanese version. Of course, the ellipsis of such pronouns in subject position in Japanese is very common. Nevertheless, the non-obligatory inclusion of “we believe” in the English version gives the impression that the English editorial writers wished to

express their support for the US. However, in doing so they took away something of the original Japanese's objectivity which a phrase such as "But it is thought that" would have helped to preserve.

J16i. オバマ氏は(Sy) <J16ii> 宣言した(Pv)。

J16ii. <<核兵器が(E)存在する限り(Prx) // 抑止力は(G)維持するとしながらも(Pm) // 「米国の安全保障戦略の中での核兵器の役割を(G)減らす」(Pm)と>>

E16i. While Obama (Sy) noted (Pv) that <E16ii> (Vb)

E16ii. the United States (A) will "maintain (Pm) a safe, secure and effective nuclear arsenal (G) // to deter (Pm) any adversary (G)" // as long as nuclear weapons (E) exist (Prx),

E16iii. He (Sy) also vowed (Pv), <E16iv> (Vb)

E16iv. "We (A) will reduce (Pm) the role of nuclear weapons (G) in our national security strategy (Cl)."

From this sentence, we can see again how the English editorial writers tend to prefer directly quoting Obama's words whereas the Japanese editorial writers tend to offer a summary. While it is, of course, far easier for the English writers to do this, it would on the face of it seem to be a worthwhile strategy that allows readers better access to the facts. However, as we saw in Sentence 15, this can be undermined by other grammatical choices.

J17. {これは(T)} [[[[大量の核保有を(G)正当化してきた(Pm)]]軍事戦略を(G)修正するという(Pm)]]こと(V)だ(Pr)。

E17. In short, Obama (A) is revising (Pm) the traditional U.S. military strategy (G) that [[ justified (Pm) the possession of a massive nuclear arsenal (G) ]].

The English version clearly gives the Actor as Obama in the embedded Material clause whereas in the Japanese version this can only be retrieved

from the context, so once again we see the English version emphasizing the key role of Obama as a leader.

J18. [[中国を(G)含む(Pm)]]他の核保有国も(A)、同じ検討に(G)着手すべきだ(Pm)。

E18i. We (S) believe (Pme)

E18ii. China and other nuclear powers (A) should consider following (Pm) Obama's lead (G).

The English version is divided into two clauses with the main Mental clause projecting the second as the content of what “we” “believe”. By contrast, there is only one sentence in the Japanese text which is presented as an imperative.

There is another interesting difference in the structure of the Actor. In the English version, China is highlighted and included as part of the Actor function. In the Japanese version, China forms the Goal of an embedded clause that modifies “他の核保有国” “other nuclear powers”. However, both strategies succeed in placing China in the thematically prominent first item position which reflects the writers' ideology regarding the geopolitical significance of that country.

#### Stage 4. Nuclear Terrorism

##### Description of Obama's proposals regarding nuclear terrorism

J19. 核兵器は(CD)存在そのものが(Cr)、危険(At)だ(Pr)。

E19. Nuclear weapons (Cr) are (Pr) dangerous (At) in themselves (Cc).

No substantial ideological differences.

J20. [[オバマ政権が(S)そう(Ph)考える(Pme)]]背景には(CI)、[[ [[核テロが(A)差し迫った(Pm)]]脅威に(E)なったという(Prx)]]認識が(T)ある(Prx)。

E20i. The Obama administration (S) is fully cognizant of (Pme) this (Ph)

E20ii. because nuclear terrorism (A) has become (Pm) a real and imminent threat (G).

The English version uses a Mental process (“is cognizant of”) with the Senser as “the Obama administration”. However, the Japanese version uses an Existential Relational process “認識がある” (“there is recognition”) which is rather less congruent but gives the impression of being more objective and abstract. This again shows the ideological difference in emphasis between the two versions regarding the individualistic and active leadership of Obama and the US.

J21. その対策として(Cc)オバマ氏は(Sy)、[[核テロを(G)封じる(Pm)]]ための国際機関の創設(Vb)、[[核物質を(G)安全な管理下に(Cm)おく(Pm)]]ための体制づくり(Vb)、[[核の安全管理に(G)関する(Pm)]]首脳会議、などを(Vb)提案した(Pv)。

E21. To deal with (Pm) this threat (G), //Obama (Sy) made (Pv) several proposals (Vb), such as the creation of “durable international institutions” // to combat (Pm) nuclear terrorism (G), the establishment of “a new international effort // to secure (Pm) all vulnerable nuclear material around the world (G),” // and holding (Pm) a “global summit on nuclear security (G),” [[ which Obama (Sy) said (Pv) [[ the United States (A) “will host (Pm) within the next year.” (Cl) ] ] (Vb) ]]

Here again we may note the differential use of direct quotations with the English version using four whereas the Japanese version uses none. Of course, direct quotation can be used in newspaper texts with various ideological effects (see, for example, Walsh 2001: 83-84) but the difference in this case creates an impression that, whereas in the English version the readers are afforded a sense of direct communication with the President, in the Japanese version the readers are being kept at more of a distance. This might be because the Japanese writers see their role more as

active interpreters rather than simply as conduits of information even though, as we have seen elsewhere, it is the English writers who tend to foreground their own communicative presence.

## Stage 5. Difficulty and determination

### Prediction regarding difficulty of achieving aims

J22i. [[こう(G)した(Pm)]手段を(G)尽くしても(Pm)、

J22ii. 核廃絶への道は(Cr)険しい(At/Pr)。

E22. For all such efforts (Cm), however, the path to a nuclear-free world (Cr) will certainly (Cm) be (Pr) arduous (At).

The English text's addition of a Circumstance of Manner ("certainly") strengthens the impression of difficulty that the writers wish to give to their readers. It is as if they wish also to stress their own identity as not just reporters but also opinion leaders by interposing this emphatic comment on the assertion expressed through the Relational Process. This may be an ideological difference between English and Japanese journalistic practices and communication more generally.

### Presentation of Obama's declaration of determination

J23i. [[ [[「[[私が(A)生きている(Pm)]間は(Cl){核廃絶が(Cr)}不可能(At)だろう(Pr)」]]とそのことを(Ph)認めた(Pme)]]オバマ氏(E)だが(Prx)、

J23ii. しかし、<<「[[あきらめる(Pm)]ことは(Cr)簡単(At)で(Pr)、//そして{それは(Cr)}臆病なこと(At)だ」(Pr)と>>、

J23iii. {彼が(Sy)} 行動への決意を(Vb)強調した(Pv)。

E23i. "This goal (G) will not be reached (Pm) quickly (Cm)—perhaps not in my lifetime (Cl),"

E23ii. Obama (Sy) said (Pv).

E23iii. But he (Sy) also reiterated (Pv) his resolve (Vb) // to keep trying (Pm):

E23iv. “[ [ To denounce or shrug off (Pm) a call for cooperation (G) ] ] (Cr) is (Pr) an easy (At) but also a cowardly thing (At) // to do (Pm).”

No substantial ideological differences.

## Stage 6. Japan’s response

### Statement of implications of Obama’s speech for Japan

J24. 日本にとっても(Co) [[ 「あきらめる(Pm)」 という ]] 選択肢は(E) ない(Prx)。

E24. [[Shrugging off (Pm)]] is (Prx) certainly (Cm) not an option (E) for Japan (Co).

See comments above regarding the use of “certainly” in E22.

### Assertion of opinion concerning Japan’s response

J25. [[オバマ政権が(A)打ち出した(Pm) ]]核廃絶構想に(Ct)、 [[同盟国として(Co) {日本が(A)} 協力できる(Pm) ]]ことは(Cr)多い(At/Pr)。

E25. As an ally of the United States (Co), Japan (A) can cooperate on (Pm) many of the proposals (G) [[ made (Pm) by the Obama administration (A) // to rid (Pm) the world of nuclear weapons (G) ]].

Compared with the English version, we can see that the Actor — “日本” (“Japan”) was ellipsed in J25. As noted in relation to Sentence 15, the subject is often ellipsed in Japanese sentences in this way. However, it is worth observing that in this case, since the expression “同盟国として” (“as an ally country”) is used, there is no difficulty in retrieving the intended referent.

J26. {我々は(Sy)} [[ 「核のない世界」を(G)実現する(Pm) ]]政策を(Vb)、日本からも(Cl)発信していきたい(Pv)。

E26. And the Japanese government (Sy) ought to propose (Pv) its own

policy (Vb) [[ for realizing (Pm) a nuclear-free world (G) ]].

The English and Japanese sentences are both Verbal processes with a Material process in an embedded clause but they differ in their use of Modality. It is the English editorial writers who are making the strongest demand by using “ought to”. Hence, the English editorial writers are presenting themselves as being in the powerful position of being able to make demands on the Japanese government, as the Sayer in the Verbal process. On the other hand, the Japanese editorial writers are just expressing their wish by using “発信していきたい” (“want to send out”). So once again here, we see a more consensual and cooperative ideology at work in the Japanese text.

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper I have made extensive use of Systemic Functional Linguistics to analyse the editorial text in terms of its transitivity structure. Using SFL, in this way allows us to understand not only *what* texts mean but *how* they mean. That is, it allows us to understand how the options made available by the linguistic resources of a particular language are selectively drawn on by text producers to express their meanings. In this paper I found that (a) the English version used Circumstances of Manner to enhance a stronger tone than the Japanese version; (b) the English version used Modality much more than the Japanese version; (c) the English version used many more direct quotations from Obama’s speech than the Japanese version. In other words, the English version is closer to Obama’s speech than the Japanese one but not necessarily thereby more objective or factually accurate.

Limitations of space have meant that I have not been able to discuss every aspect of the relationship between ideology and the linguistic structure of this text and there are, indeed, many other points that could be made it, particularly regarding the Mood and the Textual systems. These topics will form the subject for my future work.

## 7. References

- E, Gwangho (2006). Futatsu no “Kitachosen”: Nihon to Kankoku no TV nyusu niokeru Kitachosen hodo no naiyo bunseki (Two “North Korea”: A comparative analysis of TV newscoverage of North Korea). *Media komyunike-shon (Media communication)* (56), 59-71, Institute for Media and Communications Research, Keio University.
- Eggins, Suzanne (2003). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. 2nd ed. London: Continuum.
- Fairclough, Norman (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Matthiessen, Christian (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Arnold.
- Nohara, Hitoshi (2007). Nagarakawa kakouzeiki mondai ni kan suru Asahi Chunichi ryoushi shasetsu no bunseki (An Analysis of Asahi Shimbun’s and Chunichi Shimbun’s editorials on the dam at the mouth of Nagara River’s problem). *Gifu daigaku chiiki kagakubu kenkyu houkoku (Bulletin of the Faculty of Regional Studies, Gifu University)* 21, 33-79, Gifu University.
- NTI (2013). Country Profile: Russia. *Nuclear Threat Initiative* <http://www.nti.org/country-profiles/russia/nuclear/> (last accessed 1/10/2014)
- Sumikawa, Haruhito (2009). Nihon no ni dai shinbun no kitachousen houdou: kankoku houdou・yoron doukou to hikaku shite (Analysis of 2 major japanese dailies’ reports on North Korea : Compared with reports on South Korea and public opinion trend). *Jinbun komyunike-shon (Studies in humanities and communication)* 6, 159-180, Faculty of Humanities, Ibaraki University.
- Takagi, Sachiko (2009). Political and Criminal Discourses in Japanese and American Newspaper Articles: A Study of Representations in the News Media Based on Critical Discourse Analysis. *Journal of language and culture* (4), 53-74, Department of Language and Culture, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Osaka Prefecture University.
- Teruya, Kazuhiro (2007). *A Systemic Functional Grammar of Japanese*. London: Continuum.
- Walsh, Claire (2001). *Gender and Discourse: Language and Power in Politics, the Church and Organizations*. London: Longman.

- Wodak, Ruth and Meyer, Michael (ed.) (2009) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Xie, Xiaojian (2013). “Words Must Mean Something”: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Some Aspects of Ideational Meaning in a Japanese Newspaper Editorial. *Studies in Media and Society*, **5**, 41-67, Graduate School of Languages and Cultures, Nagoya University.