
| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Ideological Loss and Pragmatic Dilution in Political Interpreting: A SAT–CDA Analysis of English Interpretations of Abbas’s UN Speeches

Mahmoud Altarabin

Department of English, Islamic University of Gaza

Corresponding Author: Mahmoud Altarabin, **E-mail:** mtarabin@iugaza.edu.ps

| ABSTRACT

This study investigates the interpretation of 50 Palestinian colloquial expressions used by President Mahmoud Abbas in his speeches at the United Nations General Assembly (2022–2025), examining the extent to which their pragmatic force and ideological significance were preserved or altered in the English simultaneous interpretations. By applying Speech Act Theory (SAT) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), this study identifies a high frequency of omissions (50%) and modulation (32%), which contribute to rhetorical weakening and ideological dilution. The analysis shows that these interpretive strategies tended to silence expressions of defiance, frustration, and resistance that are central to the speaker’s political message. In addition, the findings demonstrate that omission and semantic flattening led to the non-performance or distortion of key illocutionary acts, while discursive sanitization turned politically loaded language into forms more acceptable within the institutional framework of neutrality. They also highlight how interpreter choices, shaped by real-time cognitive constraints and cultural unfamiliarity, mediate political meaning and reconfigure the speaker’s identity positioning. This study adds to the growing body of research on political interpreting by highlighting how interpreting strategies shape the transmission of emotionally and ideologically loaded content in sensitive diplomatic settings like the UN General Assembly. It emphasizes the need to incorporate pragmatic and cultural competence in interpreter training and to put forward targeted recommendations for improving interpretive accuracy in international contexts. This research encourages conducting comparative studies on how colloquial expressions are interpreted across various political contexts and language pairs.

| KEYWORDS

Critical Discourse Analysis, colloquial expressions, ideological framing, omission, political pragmatic loss, UN speeches

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 01 March 2026

PUBLISHED: 18 April 2026

DOI: 10.32996/jpda.2026.5.2.2

Introduction

Some information loss is a common occurrence when speech across languages is interpreted in real time. This loss can occur due to a combination of various interacting factors such as cognitive load, time pressure, and the unavailability of culturally embedded source-language expressions. The Effort Model presented by Gile (2009) suggests that simultaneous interpreting involves aligning a number of concurrent processing efforts with very strict time limitations. This can be associated with omissions, simplifications, or lowered pragmatic force when processing capacity is surpassed. Colloquial expressions that have been firmly embedded in the local cultural background offer special problems as they can encompass more than propositional material, and they are frequently recalcitrant to straightforward translation into the target language.

Language is a key factor in creating national identity, which serves as a symbol of common ancestry and as a tool of collective memory (Carter and Sealey 2007; Kamau 2022; Labibah and Surakhmat 2024). Speakers in political discourse also strategically use culturally marked terms to form collective identity, gain legitimacy, and place audiences in specific ideological contexts (Nabers 2009; Adham and Ali 2024). When these expressions are applied within an institutional context, a change in

pragmatic or rhetorical strength can thus cause changes in the manner in which a political position and identity positioning are communicated to global audiences.

In the context of the United Nations, simultaneous interpreting enables people from different linguistic groups to participate in politics and engage in diplomatic events held across languages. Even though Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) is one of the official languages used at the UN (Ryding 2005), Arabic political speech often contains idiomatic, metaphorical, and colloquial expressions that have culturally specific meanings and evaluative positions, which, however, may not be entirely recoverable in interpretation (Van Mol 2003). It is within this context that the current study adopts an integrated analytical approach that is an amalgamation of Speech Act Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis. The combined approach is used to discuss how United Nations General Assembly speeches by President Mahmoud Abbas (2022–2025) that include colloquial Arabic language were translated into English. This discussion will examine the role of omission, modulation, and semantic reduction in the pragmatic and ideological force of these utterances and will explore how agency, stance, and resistance discourse are reconstituted within the institutional environment of UN diplomatic communication.

Study rationale

The Palestinian struggle for self-determination is closely linked to language as a practical means for constructing identity, agency, and legitimacy in international political discourse. President Mahmoud Abbas’s speeches at the United Nations General Assembly clearly show how nationally grounded rhetoric is mediated for global audiences through simultaneous interpreting. While previous research has examined political discourse at the UN in relation to diplomacy, international law, and rhetorical positioning, limited attention has been given to the interpretation of culturally embedded Palestinian colloquial expressions and their pragmatic and ideological functions. Therefore, the current study investigates how such expressions are rendered in English interpretations of Abbas’s UNGA speeches (2022–2025). Speech Act Theory (SAT) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are jointly used to examine shifts in illocutionary force, ideological positioning, and resistance-oriented discourse through omission, modulation, and semantic reduction.

Unlike previous research on political discourse translation, which has mainly focused on written texts or on metaphor and ideology separately, this study, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, provides the first integrated SAT–CDA analysis of Palestinian colloquial expressions in UN simultaneous interpreting contexts. It demonstrates how pragmatic force and resistance-oriented positioning are reshaped within institutional diplomatic discourse. The findings highlight interpreting as a mediating practice in the construction of power, identity, and political stance and emphasize the importance of cultural and pragmatic competence in rendering politically sensitive language in institutional settings.

Problem statement

The paper focuses on how the rendering of informal idioms and rhetorical force in the interpretations of the 2022–2025 speeches delivered by Mahmoud Abbas at the UN General Assembly has led to a loss of their political undertones and rhetorical impact. It also discusses how interpreting strategies such as omission, modulation, and attenuation of meaning influence the dilution of the emotional tone, cultural specificity, and political disagreement in the original speech. These changes may be reflective of limited access to Palestinian colloquialisms and processing constraints associated with simultaneous interpretation. This, in turn, reduces the pragmatic, cultural, and emotional impact of the original message, compelling one to ask whether or not conveying politically charged messages is effective in the institutional setting of interpretation.

Omissions and errors in interpreting political speeches may limit the ability of the interpreter to convey the ideological positioning, rhetorical stance, and evaluative views of speakers to international audiences. Such interpretive changes can alter meaning and reduce the effects of a politically charged speech in sensitive diplomatic contexts.

In order to analyze the strategies of the interpreters alongside changes in ideological meaning, tone, and political messaging, the current study adopts Speech Act Theory (SAT) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). While SAT determines whether the illocutionary force (e.g., assertion, challenge, or appeal) is maintained or altered in interpretation, CDA helps demonstrate how interpreting strategies (e.g., omission and modulation) can reshape agency, ideological positioning, and identity construction within the institutional context of UN diplomatic communication.

Research questions

1. What Palestinian colloquial expressions did President Abbas use in his 2022–2025 UN General Assembly speeches, and what pragmatic and ideological functions do they serve?
2. Which interpreting strategies were applied to render these expressions, and how did these strategies affect their pragmatic force and ideological meaning in the interpreted speeches?
3. To what extent did the English interpretations preserve or weaken the illocutionary force and ideological meaning embedded in Abbas’s colloquial expressions?

Literature review

A. *Interpreting in Political Settings and the Role of Cultural Competence*

The analysis of political speech involves some unique linguistic and extralinguistic problems, and interpreters need to acquire advanced linguistic and cultural skills to improve their competence. Political speeches are characterized by the application of idioms and metaphors by different speakers to construct identities, emphasize particular problems, and shape the social response (Charteris-Black 2011; Musolff 2016; Jaworska and Vásquez 2022). These rhetorical choices influence the way political positions are presented and framed. For example, rhetorical devices were used in recent presidential debates in the U.S. to aid persuasive strategies. Even though they are effective as tools for political positioning, such devices make interpretation more challenging, especially when there are no direct counterparts in the target language (Mercieca 2020; Rowland 2021).

It is particularly difficult to interpret idioms and figurative expressions since literal interpretation does not always produce the same communicative and evaluative force. Paraphrasing, adaptation, and explicitation are consequently required (Farghal and Almanná 2014; Qassem and Vijayarathi 2015; Baker 2018). In addition, interpreters should not simply resort to lexical replacement since they need to take into account pragmatic and cultural levels of meaning, as Farghal and Almanná (2015) and Baker (2018) emphasized. Cultural awareness is thus crucial, as the lack of sensitivity toward culturally embedded expressions can lead to reduced clarity.

Empirical studies indicate that culture is one of the core elements of competence in political interpreting. Issa et al. (2021) were among the researchers who studied how professional Arabic interpreters handled cultural expressions in Trump's inaugural speech. The authors described transcoding, which is the direct replacement of source-language words, and addition as some of the most frequently employed tactics but noted that gaps in cultural mediation were still present. More recently, AlDayel and Alotaibi (2024) have stressed that omission errors are quite frequent among translation trainees due to rapid speech and the use of cultural and specialized expressions. They stressed the necessity of practice-oriented training that would enhance skills in cultural and linguistic adaptation.

The significance of pragmatic competence, meaning the capacity of interpreters to process meaning contextually, was highlighted in the literature on political retour interpreting. It shows that interpreters are required to communicate more than propositional meaning; they should also convey stance, tone, and political positioning (Pan and Wong 2018; Pan 2019; Onyshchak et al. 2023). Pragmatic competence, which is closely connected with cultural competence, therefore plays a central role in sustaining the communicative intentions of the speakers in political and diplomatic contexts (Pan and Wong 2018).

There are also studies that emphasize the necessity of providing interpreter training programs that combine cultural and pragmatic skills through context-sensitive practice and theoretical frameworks like Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1995; Mason 2000; Phelan 2001; Katan 2014; Setton and Dawrant 2016). This type of practice-based training can assist interpreters in making appropriate strategic decisions in stressful situations while maintaining pragmatic fidelity (Li 2015).

In conclusion, the accuracy of political interpreting greatly relies on the cultural and pragmatic competence of interpreters, especially when culturally marked expressions have ideological and affective meaning. With the increasing circulation of political discourse in institutional contexts, the role of cultural competence in interpreting becomes, accordingly, more prominent (Musolff 2016; Liu and Hale 2018; Onyshchak et al. 2023).

Previous studies

The available literature on the interpretation and translation of political texts and speeches between Arabic and English highlights a variety of linguistic, cultural, and rhetorical challenges. To illustrate, Shunnaq (2000) argued that repetition and emotion are important features of rhetoric and style used in Arabic political discourse, which should be observed carefully when translating into English. In another article, Al-Fahmawi (2014) noted that repetition is mostly minimized in English versions of Arabic political discourse and that this effect reflects the tension between the rhetorical emphasis of the source language and the stylistic expectations of the target language.

Another issue that is still under investigation is metaphor translation. Al-Zou'bi and Kanakri (2020) noted that MA translation students were confronted with the difficulty of translating metaphorical English speeches by presidential candidates because they were not familiar with political terminology. Moreover, Elqubaisi et al. (2023) explained that translation strategies can be affected by cultural and linguistic considerations and the type of metaphor. Some metaphors have direct Arabic counterparts, whereas others require adaptation. Al Alshniet (2021) adopted cognitive linguistic theories and concluded that conceptual frameworks and familiarity with culture could enhance the effectiveness of metaphor translation in the context of politically charged discourse.

Interpretation strategies and interpreter training have also been the focus of other recent studies. Issa et al. (2021) examined cultural expressions in Trump’s inaugural speech, with professional interpreters employed by major Arabic news networks interpreting these expressions. As the researchers found, the interpreters predominantly used literal translation, addition, and cultural equivalents to represent cultural expressions in the source text. In texts loaded with cultural terms, cultural adaptation was applied. The authors clarified that cultural mediation can be challenging even for skilled interpreters. In a more recent study, AlDayel and Alotaibi (2024) examined the types of errors committed by interpreting trainees and stated that omission was the most frequent strategy. This can be attributed to the fact that fast speech and specialized language lead to omissions due to processing limitations that influence the transfer of culturally specific meanings in simultaneous interpreting.

Other topics that have recently attracted the attention of researchers are the structural and cognitive aspects of simultaneous interpreting between Arabic and English. Al-Zahran (2021) found difficulties with the processing of English subject-initial structures in Arabic simultaneous interpreting in three real-life conference speeches and suggested that structural flexibility in Arabic should be used to generate more accurate translations. A more recent article by Al-Zahran and Jamoussi (2022) examined how Arabic interpreters dealt with structural asymmetries between the subject-verb-object (SVO) structure of English and the verb-subject-object (VSO) structure of Arabic. The authors found that interpreters tend to use SVO structures to facilitate the processing of information during live interpretation. In another study, Hanna and Hasan (2024) discussed the role of comprehension and accuracy in relation to omission in simultaneous interpreting between English and Arabic; they proposed that the more interpreters experience difficulty in fully understanding the source message, the more frequently omission occurs. This aspect reduces the transfer of pragmatic meaning in the interpreting process.

The studies conducted by Ineke and Lynn (2016), Mapson and Major (2021), and Alduhaim and Alkhaldy (2019) touched upon the level to which pragmatic equivalence, the familiarity of interpreters with speakers, and creative interpretation strategies can enhance the performance of interpreters in healthcare and political settings. For example, Alduhaim and Alkhaldy explained that cultural paraphrasing may be employed by interpreters in situations where direct target-language translations are not available. These results emphasize the need for awareness of rhetorical styles, cultural flexibility, and specific training, particularly where interpreters have to deal with high-pressure contexts where culturally and ideologically marked meanings should be expressed within processing constraints.

Theoretical framework

Speech Act Theory

A useful analytical model that can be used to examine language as performative action is Speech Act Theory (SAT), which was proposed by Austin (1962) and developed by Searle (1976). Searle (1979) noted that speech acts not only convey propositional information, but also the intentions, attitudes, and social roles of speakers. Austin (1962) identified three levels at which every utterance operates: the locutionary act, which reflects the literal meaning of the words; the illocutionary act, which reflects the intended function of the utterance; and the perlocutionary act, which reflects the potential effect of the utterance on the listener (see also Yule 1996). Searle (1976) further developed the theory and divided speech acts into five categories, namely assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. The current study employs this framework to analyze the pragmatic force encoded in colloquial expressions used by Abbas in his speeches at the 2022–2025 UN General Assembly and how the English interpretation of this force maintains or alters it. SAT analysis thus determines to what degree the communicative aims and illocutionary force of the speaker are preserved, weakened, or restructured in interpretation (Huang 2006; Cutting and Fordyce 2020). SAT is especially applicable to interpreting studies, since simultaneous interpreting requires the mediation of intended speech acts, not just the transfer of lexical meaning. A systematic evaluation of the impact of interpreting strategies on the fulfillment of communicative intentions in the English output can be achieved by analyzing the illocutionary force of colloquial expressions used by Abbas.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a framework for studying the way language serves as a vehicle for power, ideology, and identity construction, negotiation, and reproduction in social life (Fairclough 1995; Van Dijk 2008). CDA scholars believe that discourse is shaped by, and also shapes, socio-political contexts, while reproducing already existing power relations (Fairclough 2013). CDA is relevant to interpreting studies and translation studies, since it exposes how language choices made in translation may restructure ideological positioning, reframe political stance, and mediate institutional discourses (Schäffner and Bassnett 2010). Recent research on political translation has similarly shown that omission, lexical neutralisation, and reframing can align translated political discourse with institutional narratives and reduce the visibility of politically sensitive meanings (Al-Mushawwat 2025). Through CDA, this paper aims to demonstrate how interpreting decisions, specifically the omission or modulation of Palestinian colloquial terms, mediate ideological framing, whether by supporting the construction of dominant discourse by making resistance-oriented discourse visible within the institutional context of UN diplomatic communication (Van Leeuwen 2008; Wodak and Meyer 2015).

Interpretation and information loss

A loss of information in interpretation can be a common problem caused by distortion of meaning and omission of source-language (SL) content, as described by Flores et al. (2003). During the process of interpreting, errors by both novice and experienced interpreters may be the result of interpreters' cognitive overload, as explained in the Effort Model by Gile (2009). These errors are categorized by Moser-Mercer et al. (1998) as opposite target language (TL) errors, changes in speaker intent, unreasonable renderings, and incomplete semantic transfer of SL meaning. The professional experience of interpreters can minimize some of these errors; still, cognitive limitations and overload, such as time pressure and varying speech patterns, are bound to impact performance even in more experienced interpreters.

The discussion of the interpretation of the colloquialisms used by Abbas shows that they represent different degrees of accuracy, inaccuracy, and omission, which result from processing limitations specifically related to simultaneous interpreting (Setton 1999). Some of these limitations are especially connected to the cultural competence of interpreters as discussed in the section titled *Interpreting in Political Settings and the Role of Cultural Competence*. Spinolo (2017) and Su (2020) define strategic omission as the condition in which lower processing capacity becomes the norm, which is normally brought about by cognitive load and constrains interpreters' ability to find TL equivalents or paraphrase phrases in the SL under the influence of time pressure. Practically, skilled interpreters might omit content to produce more fluent output by excluding unusual or lengthy phrasing to prevent possible errors of understanding or incomprehensibility. This is regarded as a feasible trade-off, which is consistent with Gile's model of cognitive resource distribution.

Information loss in interpretation is a challenge in effort-demanding tasks like diplomatic or political discourse. Gile (2009) argued that simultaneous interpreting places a heavy burden on the processing capacity of the interpreter since it involves simultaneous listening, analysis, memory, and speech production. In this case, cognitive overload can result in omissions, simplifications, and inaccurate translations of the original speech (Flores et al. 2003; Gile 2009). These effects can even be intensified by time pressure, technical issues, and unexpected features of live speech, all of which can affect the transfer of pragmatically and culturally marked meanings.

Minor differences in language and culture also make interpretation more difficult. As Pöchhacker (2016) pointed out, interpreter competence lies not only in language proficiency but also in cultural awareness and contextual knowledge. Such competencies are especially significant in the interpretation of figures of speech such as idioms and metaphors. In situations where interpreters are not familiar with the expressions of some cultures, they can employ strategies such as euphemism, literal translation, or omission, which lead to a reduction in intended meaning and pragmatic force (El-Zawawy 2019; Fischer 2019). These problems were already observed in the interpretation of the speeches of Abbas at the UN, as the discussion of this paper reveals, where numerous cultural expressions were toned down or omitted in the English interpretations.

Several empirical studies support the assumption that interpreters resort to omission as a common coping strategy whenever they are faced with unfamiliar cultural forms (Al Salman and Al Khanji 2002; Spinolo 2017; Alduhaim and Alkhalid 2019). Interpreters can also resort to literal translation and explicitation when target equivalents are available; nevertheless, both strategies do not necessarily reflect the intended message and the rhetorical effects speakers want to achieve (Farghal and Almanna 2015; Baker 2018). The loss of information is thus a common characteristic of simultaneous interpreting because of cognitive overload, time pressure, and cultural differences that most often occur in politically or diplomatically sensitive situations (Gile 2009; Pöchhacker 2016).

Methodology

Research Design

In the current paper, I will use a qualitative research design based on Speech Act Theory and Critical Discourse Analysis to explore how Palestinian colloquial expressions were interpreted in the speeches delivered by President Mahmoud Abbas at the United Nations General Assembly between 2022 and 2025. The theoretical framework allows a dual analysis of the pragmatic functions of the source expressions and the ideological positioning of these expressions in their English interpretations. The research design will allow analysis of interpreting strategies within the institutional environment of UN diplomatic discourse in a context-sensitive manner. The analysis shows how the English interpretation mediates pragmatic force, agency, and ideological meaning.

Data Collection

The data used in this study consists of a collection of 50 Palestinian colloquialisms that President Abbas employed in his speeches at the UNGA between 2022 and 2025. These expressions were selected because of their oral delivery style as well as their pragmatic and ideological significance in Palestinian political discourse. At first, speeches from 2020–2025 were consulted,

but the 2020, 2021, and 2025 speeches were delivered remotely via video conference and did not provide cases of colloquial speech.

This paper is designed in a qualitative form, which is purposive in nature. The 50 expressions were not chosen to statistically represent the whole of the Palestinian political speech or the whole of UN interpreting production, but rather to allow a close analysis of pragmatically and ideologically interesting colloquialisms within a specific diplomatic context. This kind of purposive sampling is in line with qualitative discourse-analytic research, which focuses more on interpretive richness than on statistical representativeness.

The speeches were obtained from UN Web TV to facilitate institutional credibility and accessibility to the general public. The speeches in Arabic were reviewed in order to identify colloquial expressions that are specific to Palestinian Arabic in the formal environment of UN General Assembly discourse.

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection process was conducted in two main stages:

1. **Identification of expressions:** The original Arabic videos of the speeches by President Mahmoud Abbas were carefully examined to determine the colloquial expressions employed by President Abbas in his speeches at the UNGA. All of the phrases were extracted from the speeches according to how they occurred during spoken delivery and how they were culturally marked within otherwise formal diplomatic language.
2. **Identification of interpreted equivalents:** The simultaneous interpretations of the same expressions, delivered by English interpreters at the UN, were examined to identify how each expression was rendered in the official interpreted output.

All the colloquial expressions were compiled in a bilingual table including the literal meaning and the contextual meaning of each source expression. In addition, their English interpretations were provided, which enabled systematic comparison of the source and interpreted discourse as well as analytical transparency.

Data Analysis

I conducted the analysis in three stages, integrating insights from Speech Act Theory (SAT) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA):

1. Speech act classification:

The illocutionary force of each source expression in context was determined by classifying each expression according to Searle’s (1976) taxonomy of speech acts, i.e. assertives, directives, commissives, and expressives. This step defined the communicative role of individual expressions in the source discourse and also provided a basis for evaluating variations in pragmatic force in the interpreted product.

2. Interpretation strategy analysis:

I analyzed and coded the interpreters’ rendering of the expressions according to three strategy categories observed in the data:

- **Omission (25 instances):** The expression was partially or fully omitted in the English interpretation.
- **Modulation (16 instances):** The expression was rendered with a shift in meaning or perspective, reflecting a reorientation of the message in the interpreted discourse.
- **Semantic translation (8 instances):** The expression was translated with a focus on meaning preservation but without **maintaining its idiomatic or culturally marked form**.

Misinterpretation: Though one of the cases was noted as a misinterpretation, it should be mentioned that misinterpretation is not a strategy; it is simply an inaccurate rendering that results from the failure to fully understand the expression in the source language. Such misunderstanding may result from linguistic or cultural differences, which lead to misinterpretations. Misinterpretation therefore reflects processing challenges as opposed to an intentional interpreting strategy (Chesterman 1997; Gile 2009).

3. Critical Discourse Analysis:

I applied Fairclough’s (1995) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis, drawing on the findings provided by Fairclough (2013) on the thematic aspects of language, ideology, and institutional power, and centered the analysis of the

English interpretations on four discourse-level phenomena. These levels indicate alterations of ideological meaning and rhetorical power, namely:

- (a) discursive reframing,
- (b) reduction or amplification of speaker agency,
- (c) loss of cultural specificity, and
- (d) politically sensitive omissions or modifications.

These correspond to the three levels, namely the textual, discursive, and social dimensions of Fairclough's model, which offer a systematic framework through which interpreting strategies transform the ideological meaning and rhetorical power of the English versions of the speeches given by Abbas.

Analysis and discussion

Percentages of interpretation strategies:

Translation Strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Omission	25	50%
Modulation	16	32%
Semantic Translation	8	16%
Misinterpretation	1	2%

Data presentation and categorization

In this study, 50 Palestinian colloquial expressions used by President Mahmoud Abbas in his speeches at the United Nations General Assembly between 2022 and 2025 were analyzed. The expressions were classified into five thematic tables according to their pragmatic function and rhetorical tone. The tables are organized as follows:

- Table 1: 22 expressions categorized as expressions of disappointment or frustration.
- Table 2: 10 expressions reflecting challenge or defiance.
- Table 3: 9 expressions categorized as expressions of sarcasm or irony.
- Table 4: 6 expressions functioning as appeals or requests.
- Table 5: 3 expressions categorized as calls for unity or solidarity.

The data in the tables are organized as follows: the original expression, its literal meaning, the interpreter's English rendition, and the interpretation strategy (e.g., modulation, semantic translation, omission, or misinterpretation (1 case)). The contextual meaning of each expression is further elaborated in the analytical sections that appear after the tables, where changes in pragmatic force and ideological meaning are analyzed based on Speech Act Theory (SAT) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA).

Expressions of disappointment or frustration

Expression	Meaning	Interpretation	Strategy
علينا شي وعلى الآخرين شي	One thing applies to us, and another to others.	They do not treat us equally	Modulation
طب كيف	Then how?	How come?	Semantic translation
فارعاً فارعاً دارعاً	Rushing in, towering in might, and armed to the teeth	call	Misinterpretation
تزيلونا	You're dumping your crap on us	Ignore us	Modulation
كما زبلتمونا	As you dumped your garbage on us	As you have been doing	Modulation
الله أعلم	God knows	None	Omission
ولا حد داري فينا	No one is aware of us	no one has done anything	Modulation
ولا حد سائل عنا	No one cares about us	no one has done anything	Modulation
ما نحملكم جوز فاضي	Make you carry empty walnut shells	None	Omission
بدناش إياه يكون كلام كله في الهوا	We don't want empty talk.	None	Omission

Expression	Meaning	Interpretation	Strategy
حاكمك ظالمك	Your ruler is your oppressor	None	Omission
تشكي أمرك لمين	To whom can you complain	To whom can we complain	Semantic translation
احنا الحيطه المايلة	We are the leaning wall.	we are the exception	Modulation
كلمة شر	a harmful remark	None	Omission
شبعنا كلام	Enough talk	Enough words	Semantic translation
إلى ما شاء الله	for an indefinite time	None	Omission
ول	Are you serious?	None	Omission
كوم	a motionless heap	None	Omission
كل يوم قتل وذبح	Daily killing and slaughter	Everyday there is a case of murder	Modulation
قاعدين عنا	They are settling on our land	they are living on our land	Modulation
شقفه من هون وشقفه من هون	cutting off piece by piece	it was a place here and a place there	Modulation
بتلم أي حدا بدھا	Israel arrests anyone it wants	arrests whoever it wants	Modulation

SAT Analysis – Contextualized Expressive Acts

The expression *تزيلونا* (*do not do what we have requested—i.e., implement UN Resolution 181 → ignore us*), *ولا حد داري فينا* (*his statements in support of the two-state solution are empty promises— no one has done anything*), and *شبعنا كلام* (*a statement rejecting repeated rhetorical support for the two-state solution - Enough words*) are emotionally charged expressive moves. From a CDA perspective, such expressions are not merely reflections of emotional states but forms of protest and resistance that shift responsibility to the international community. However, their interpreted renditions partially soften this function. For example, *تزيلونا*, stripped of its metaphor of being discarded like trash, reduces the strength of the speaker’s accusation toward the international community. The interpretation of *ولا حد داري فينا* reframes the expression as a neutral description of inaction, diminishing its moral accountability appeal. The expression *احنا الحيطه المايلة* (Palestine is treated as weak and subject to double standards due to its non-member status) is also softened to “*we are the exception*,” a vague interpretation that backgrounds the asymmetry implied in the source expression. The interpretations convey a general sense of the speaker’s message. However, they do not capture its full rhetorical force. These general softened interpretations weaken the illocutionary force of the original expressions and reduce their function as expressions of grievance and resistance within UN institutional discourse.

CDA Analysis

Considering the expressive acts from a CDA perspective, they represent a narrative of resistance towards the lethargy of the international community and the perceived bias of international institutions. The expression *تزيلونا* “*ignore us*” neutralises the figurative offence and its endorsement of responsibility in the existing institutionalized discourses of Palestine to the international community; *ولا حد داري فينا* reinforces the insignificance of the international response to the call of Palestine for international protection, but the lack of response becomes a weak and mere observation, and its responsibility is all but absent. More importantly, *احنا الحيطه المايلة* was rendered as “*we are the exception*” which obscures the criticality of the source articulation regarding structural differentiation and international double standards. These shifts of interpretation constitute discursive mediation, as per the institutional requirements not to interfere within a diplomatic environment. As a result, the confrontational tone used by the speaker is toned down in the interpreted discourse.

SAT Analysis – Omitted Expressives

Omitted expressions like *الله أعلم*, which can be used sarcastically to indicate the absence or ineffectiveness of UN Resolution 2334 and other decisions of this type, as well as *كلمة شر*, which expresses a willingness to voice criticism, perform more than mere expressive functions. Based on SAT, the utterances are not mere expressions; they also carry illocutionary force, indicating frustration, challenging moral legitimacy, and dissociating the speaker from the dominant political orientation. Such omission causes the suppression of these speech acts in the interpreted discourse. The omission of *الله أعلم* and *كلمة شر* from the interpretation weakens the speaker’s expressive and critical stance, while the absence of *كوم* removes a salient representation of human suffering. The expressions *بدناش إياه يكون كلام كله في هوا* and *ما تحملكم جوز فاضي*, rejecting empty diplomatic language, are also omitted. Such omissions eliminate critical instances of expressive resistance to international indifference and rhetorical

double standards. As a result, the speech loses much of its rhetorical force, producing a more neutralized and less confrontational message within the interpreted version.

CDA Analysis – Omitted Expressives

Applying CDA, the → [Omitted] interpretations signify discursive suppression of evaluative and resistance-oriented language, thereby muting expressions of resistance embedded in culturally marked discourse. *الله أعلم* questions the validity of international resolutions, whereas *كلمة شر* questions the willingness to criticize the international community. These omissions reduce the visibility of the ideological agency of the speaker. In a similar context, the omission in the English interpretation of *كوم* removes a personalized manifestation of suffering, which reflects institutional constraints on the transfer of culturally and emotionally marked expressions (Baker, 2007). The expressions *ما نحملكم جوز فاضي* and *كله في الهوا*—both critiques of performative diplomatic discourse—are also absent. The omission here reduces the speaker's ability to challenge the institutional discourse of dominance. Such omissions indicate ideological containment, where language that resonates politically is backgrounded within diplomatic framing conventions. Such changes transform confrontational opposition into a more neutralized institutional narrative.

SAT Analysis – Assertive Acts

The phrases *علينا شي وعلى الآخرين شي* (meaning the UN and the US treat Palestine unfairly, rendered as “*They do not treat us equally*”), *كل يوم قتل وذبح* (Israeli weapons and drugs are smuggled into Palestine, rendered as “*Everyday there is a case of murder*”), and *قاعدين عنا* “*they are living on our land*” serve as assertive acts. Though the semantic maneuvers that the interpreter uses do not weaken the propositional meaning, the interpretations weaken the critical impact of the speaker and make the assignment of responsibility less conspicuous. For example, the expression *كل يوم قتل وذبح* is attenuated to an instance of murder (rendered as- *everyday there is a case of murder*), in which systematic killing is depersonalized and presented as a sudden incident. Similarly, *علينا شي وعلى الآخرين شي* loses its meaning of lack of consistent standards, and *قاعدين عنا* loses the meaning of unreasonable occupation of Palestinian land. The omission of *إلى ما شاء الله* does not only erase the reference to indefinite imprisonment, but also deprives it of its religious connotation and its expression of political perseverance. Such an interpretative redirection reduces the illocutionary force of the speech acts in their original form and reframes highly assertive statements of dispossession as less assertive institutional commentaries.

CDA Analysis – Assertive Acts

The expressions provide a form of resistance discourse foregrounding injustice, settler colonialism, and legal double standards, as seen through a CDA lens. They attribute responsibility for systemic complicity, everyday violence, and the political burden of indefinite detention to international actors in the Arabic original. However, their English interpretations are characterized by discursive neutralization within institutional diplomatic speech: *علينا شي وعلى الآخرين شي* is rendered as an appeal to equality; *كل يوم قتل وذبح* no longer refers to external violence; *قاعدين عنا* does not refer to justice or land appropriation. The phrase *شقيقة من هون وشقيقة من هون* loses its critical commentary on territorial division, loss of territorial sovereignty, and spatial fragmentation. More importantly, the omission of *إلى ما شاء الله* removes the ironic religious allusion and its judgmental attitude towards indefinite imprisonment. These readings neutralize the political dimension of the message conveyed by the speaker and transform acts of resistance into more procedural institutional language, while consolidating institutional discourses that background Palestinian agency.

SAT Analysis – Indirect Directives

Expressions like *تشكي أمرك لمين؟* (how come UN resolutions are yet to be implemented? → *how come?*) and *طب كيف؟* (we cannot complain because the US, as a leading power, blocks our membership → *to whom can we complain?*) are indirect directives that implicitly invite international actors to take responsibility. SAT shows how these phrases attempt to amplify moral responsibility and expose institutional injustices. The interpreter employed semantic translation, which was only partially accurate and lowered the critical position of the speaker as well as his evaluative stance. Consequently, the illocutionary force and the accountability-oriented perlocutionary effect are diluted. This is because the omission of *حاكمك ظالمك* (the US unjustly controls Palestinian statehood → [Omitted]) removes an explicit expression of resistance, since the expression contains a direct attribution of responsibility.

CDA Analysis – Indirect Directives

These rhetorical questions are considered to be part of a strategic challenge to mainstream institutional forms of authority. *تشكي أمرك لمين؟* and *طب كيف؟* are both expressions of political dissatisfaction and serve to reveal imbalances in global decision-making processes. Nonetheless, the confrontational dimension of the original is lost in the semantic renderings, which reconfigure ideological protest as a sub-process within institutional discourse. Attention should be paid to what this

omission of *حاكمك ظالمك* eliminates in particular: the most direct criticism of the inequality in the world. This shift causes the interpretation to shift towards institutional demands of civility and not confrontation. These interpretive practices enable the discursive neutralisation of oppositional arguments, silencing oppositional discourse and backgrounding the attribution of responsibility of the speaker in the discourse of dominant institutions.

SAT & CDA Analysis – Misinterpretation

The interpreter inaccurately rendered the colloquial phrase *فازغًا فارغًا دارغًا* (UN member states act with full force to implement resolutions in other contexts but not in Palestine) into “*call*” and therefore did not convey the intended illocutionary act. The Arabic phrase can be considered a direct critique of the hypocrisy of international relations and foreign intervention. Rendering the phrase into *call* weakens the assertive and evaluative power which the speaker intended, as demonstrated by SAT. therefore, the use of *call* re-frames the utterance as a procedural reference rather than a critique of selective international enforcement. This misinterpretation, as CDA indicates, depoliticizes the message, reframing a focused political gesture as institutional language lacking political stance and thus reducing the visibility of the resistance-oriented position inherent in the original utterance.

Expressions of challenge or defiance

Expression	Meaning	Interpretation	Strategy
احفظوها	Memorize it	None	Omission
أتحدى أمريكا	I dare America	I dare the US	Semantic translation
شو ناقصين	What are we lacking	None	Omission
اقلعوا عينا	We dare you to act	Tell us	Modulation
حطو علينا	We dare you to implement it	Go ahead	Modulation
اكسروا عينا	We dare you to implement it	Tell us	Modulation
لا ناقصنا ايد ولا اجر	We’re fully capable	None	Omission
الي يزعل يزعل والي يرضى يرضى	Those who are upset, let them be — and those who accept it, so be it.	None	Omission
وان عدتم عدنا	If you do it again, so will we	if you return then we will return	Semantic translation
والي يزعل يزعل	Those who are upset, let them be	None	Omission

SAT Analysis – Indirect Directives

The expressions *اقلعوا عينا* (challenging the UN to implement the resolution and show proof → *Tell us*), *حطو علينا* (daring international actors to act if serious → *Go ahead*), and *اكسروا عينا* (mocking the powerlessness of institutions to humiliate Palestinians → *Tell us*) are indirect directives as part of a broader discourse of resistance and collective assertion of political agency. According to SAT, these expressions do not seek information but rather publicly confront, discredit, or expose inaction. The English interpretations (*Tell us, Go ahead*) reduce this deliberate provocation to general imperatives. The interpretations, therefore, weaken the illocutionary force of these accountability-oriented directives within their socio-political context. From a CDA perspective, the interpretations reduce the cultural framing of humiliation and resistance encoded in the Arabic expressions, reframing oppositional political speech as more neutral institutional discourse. The ideological challenge implied in the Arabic expressions is therefore neutralized in ways consistent with institutional norms of diplomatic communication.

CDA Analysis – Indirect Directives

As a CDA resource, these indirect directives were used by the speaker as discursive assets that challenge the construction of the institutional field of authority by publicly holding international actors accountable. The speaker does not request anything in Arabic but presents implicit criticism of the selective application of international law. The words *اقلعوا عينا* and *حطوا علينا* are full of sarcasm, provocation, and moral reproach. They underline the opposition of the speaker towards international complacency. Even though the English renderings (i.e., *Tell us, Go ahead*) partly reflect the situation, they cannot fully convey the confrontation expressed by the speaker and his responsibility-directed stance in the original speech. This loss of meaning repositions the speaker no longer as one who challenges world power, but rather as a more impersonal institutional narrator. The new discursive shift from confrontation to consultation nullifies the political urgency and evaluative capacity of the Arabic original.

SAT Analysis – Commissives and Assertives

The speaker used the expression *أتحدى أمريكا* (He is directly challenging the US – “*I dare the US*”) as a commissive act, according to which he reveals a challenging attitude towards the dominant state in the international system, the United States. It

is an open statement that shows resistance and constitutes a clear political stance. Equally, the sentence وإن عدتم عدنا (If you continue to deny our rights, we will reapply to be full members of the UN – “if you return then we will return”) is structurally conditional but pragmatically a promise to take further political action. Such aggressive phrases as شو ناقصين (What do we lack that we should not be a state? → [Omitted]) and لا ناقصنا إيد ولا إجر (We lack neither ability nor capacity → [Omitted]) did not appear in the English interpretation. Such an omission causes the renderings to lose their illocutionary force, and eliminate any explicit declaration of Palestinian competence and a right to statehood. This negatively affects the commissive and assertive force expressed in the original and neutralizes the discourse of resistance to a less eminent confrontational position of the speaker.

CDA Analysis – Commissives and Assertives

The expressions وإن عدتم عدنا and أتحدى أمريكا reflect a form of self-proclamation and a statement of disobedience towards hegemonic discourses of international institutions. The phrase أتحدى أمريكا is a call challenging the supremacy of the West and is a sign of direct political confrontation. The English interpretation, however, makes it a more institutionally neutral version, and thus dilutes its evaluative strength. The speaker tries to state the position of Palestine in international law through the phrase وإن عدتم عدنا. Its forceful defiance, however, is softened and becomes a kind of stereotypical diplomatic expression. Equally, شو ناقصين and لا ناقصنا إيد ولا إجر criticize the narratives that portray Palestinian ability as inadequate. The English interpretation in which these utterances are omitted removes an explicit act of opposition and reduces the presence of this counter-positioning in the interpreted discourse. The purpose of such omission contributes to the creation of power relations and conformity to the institutional narratives that the initial expressions tried to challenge.

SAT Analysis – Expressives

Psychological states are expressed with phrases like اللي يزعل يزعل واللي يرضى يرضى (He praises Palestinian prisoners and does not care who is upset → [Omitted]. By excluding these expressions in the English interpretation, their illocutionary force is reduced, and the speaker loses his appeal to international accountability and his explicit and open praise of Palestinian resistance. These expressions make a major contribution to building a resistant position in the source discourse. Their absence reduces reference to evaluative positioning and commitment inherent in the original speech acts.

CDA Analysis – Expressives

Considering the CDA perspective, the speaker employs the phrase اللي يزعل يزعل واللي يرضى يرضى, showing his opposition. The phrase, when applied to the speech context, is an obvious sign of support to Palestinian prisoners and moral independence from external recognition. The fact that the speaker does not appeal to international sympathy is an indication of a position of support and protest. This is reflected in the omission of this phrase in the English interpretation, which is evidently a discursive suppression of resistance-focused positioning. Further, the narrative of rebellion and ethical commitment of the speaker is replaced by silence, which makes the initial tone softer and transforms it into institutional neutrality. CDA indicates that this exclusion is an ideological issue within a larger discursive practice where expressive counter-positioning is neutralized, thus strengthening hegemonic institutional discourses, which legitimize diplomatic decorum over dissident practices.

Sarcasm or irony

Expression	Meaning	Interpretation	Strategy
بتسووها ان شاء الله	Are you actually going to do it — God willing?	do you think this will take place?	Modulation
ما بينفع	Doesn't it work out?	None	Omission
هالهالة	Inflated media hype	None	Omission
الزيطة والزمبليطة	Exaggerated media hype	None	Omission
قدس الله سره	May God sanctify his soul	None	Omission
مش دقمة	we're not a button you press	None	Omission
انبسطت	I was pleased	None	Omission
تبيعني كلام	Stop giving me lip service	None	Omission
وين بينباع الكلام هادا	Who's buying that nonsense	None	Omission

SAT Analysis – Sarcastic/Ironic Expressive Acts

The colloquial expressions انبسطت (sarcastically suggesting that an Israeli apology would have no value), ما بينفع (sarcastically referring to diplomatic claims about a two-state solution – omitted), and قدس الله سره (also

omitted) are expressive acts that the speaker employs to express frustration and disappointment. These utterances, according to Speech Act Theory (SAT), are evaluative expressive acts through which criticism is conveyed through sarcasm and irony. Their omission in the interpretation removes the illocutionary force through which the speaker questions the validity of diplomatic and media diversion, thereby limiting the expression of critique in the interpreted discourse.

CDA Analysis – Sarcastic/Ironic Expressive Acts

From a CDA perspective, these expressions act as subtle resistance to dominant institutional narratives within diplomatic discourse. The speaker’s critique targets diplomatic theater and the visual symbols of authority. Omitting these reduces the visibility of the speaker’s evaluative stance and resistance-oriented positioning and tones down discursive resistance, thus reinforcing institutional norms of neutrality and impartiality.

SAT Analysis – Sarcastic/Ironic Assertive Acts

Expressions like *تبيعي كلام* (accusing actors of political lip service → [Omitted]) and *وين بينباع الكلام هادا* (mocking absurd policies about deceased Palestinian bodies → [Omitted]) serve as sarcastic assertives. Irony is employed to assert factual claims and critique political practices. Within the SAT framework, this act combines assertion with evaluative criticism. Their absence results in the loss of both assertive force and the speaker’s critical evaluative positioning.

CDA Analysis – Sarcastic/Ironic Assertive Acts

These acts challenge dominant institutional discourse by exposing contradictions in policy narratives. CDA analysis shows that *تبيعي كلام* exposes the emptiness of symbolic diplomacy. *وين بينباع الكلام هادا* explicitly challenges discursive representations that normalize policies affecting deceased Palestinian bodies. Omitting these expressions softens the oppositional stance and reduces the visibility of the resistance-oriented narrative embedded in the original discourse.

SAT Analysis – Sarcastic/Ironic Indirect Directives

Expressions such as *بتسووها ان شاء الله* (sarcastically rejecting the likelihood of reparations – “do you think this will take place?”) and *مش دقمة* (a declaration of non-submission → [Omitted]) function as indirect directives. Their use of sarcasm questions the credibility of proposed actions and implicitly challenges international actors to demonstrate accountability. The partial interpretation of *بتسووها ان شاء الله* weakens its illocutionary force, while omitting *مش دقمة* removes an explicit expression of refusal and resistance-oriented positioning within the source discourse.

CDA Analysis – Sarcastic/Ironic Indirect Directives

These expressions challenge dominant institutional power relations by foregrounding resistance-oriented positioning and confronting institutional complicity. *بتسووها ان شاء الله* employs ironic futurity to critique injustice, and *مش دقمة* defies discursive representations of Palestinian incapacity. Their omission leads to discursive containment, where provocations are stripped from the record and reframed within the institutional norms of neutrality in diplomatic discourse.

Appeals or requests

Expression	Meaning	Interpretation	Strategy
من شان الله	For God’s sake	None	Omission
هاي جايينكم	We’re heading your way	None	Omission
100 خط أحمر	With absolute confidence	None	Omission
نترجي	Beg	beg	Semantic translation
دخليكم	We implore you	plead	Semantic translation
كثر خيركم وشكرا	May your goodness increase, and thank you.	we will thank you for your help	Modulation

SAT Analysis – Expressive Acts

Colloquial expressions like *من شان الله* (I earnestly request your international protection → [Omitted]), *خط أحمر 100* (indicating a lack of genuine confidence in international institutional commitment → [Omitted]), and *كثر خيركم وشكرا* “we will thank you for your help” serve expressive purposes in Speech Act Theory (SAT). Such expressions reflect evaluative attitudes like urgency, sarcasm, and conditional appreciation. But when *من شان الله* and *خط أحمر 100* are omitted, the result is a loss of illocutionary force in appeals to protection and in ironic criticism of institutional commitment. Instead, the literal rendering of *كثر خيركم وشكرا* is modified into politeness, rather than its strategic meaning, in which thanks are connected to tangible results. These interpretations do not preserve the illocutionary force of the original utterances, namely, the conditional positioning and the ironic evaluative stance on which the Arabic utterances depend.

CDA Analysis – Expressive Acts

From a Critical Discourse Analysis perspective, these speech acts form a discursive stance of moral address and complaint. *من شان الله*, which reflects the speaker's frustration with the international community, anticipates an act of exposure by the speaker while making an appeal to institutional responsibility. The expression *خط أحمر 100* ironically indicates that reliance on international mechanisms lacks credible grounds. The absence of these two expressions eliminates the speaker's evaluative positioning as well as his ideological criticism, which neutralizes the speaker's disappointment. Interpreting *وَشكرا كتر خيركم* as *we will thank you for your help* dilutes the interpretation, eliminating the conditional political framing of the Arabic phrase. In this regard, it becomes unqualified gratitude. This is an expression of discursive sanitization: politically sensitive or emotionally charged material is deleted or weakened in force, tone, or political impact, thus aligning interpretation with institutional principles of diplomatic neutrality and muting resistance-oriented criticism.

SAT Analysis – Directive Acts

Indirect requests such as *نترجى* (sincerely requesting full membership → *beg*), *دخليكم* (sincerely requesting full membership → *plead*), and *هاي جايينكم* (announcing application for full membership and an implied plea → [Omitted]) are strategic. SAT shows that expressions of this sort, though framed as polite or informational expressions, are signals of urgent calls to action and position the speaker in a stance of dependency reflecting his political situation in the original discourse. The omission of *هاي جايينكم*, which functions as an announcement of political agency, eliminates a principal act of agency foregrounding. As such, interpretation choices present a context of either a shift in directive stance or omission, either modifying the speaker's intended directive force or nullifying the speech act.

CDA Analysis – Directive Acts

These polite directives, in CDA terms, negotiate the asymmetry of global power relations in diplomatic discourse. The two expressions *نترجى* and *دخليكم* indicate how the speaker is trying to establish political legitimacy through diplomatic means. However, interpreting the two terms as *beg* or *plead* reframes Palestinian agency as dependent rather than rights-based. The renderings indicate a change from entitlement-based claims to requests for assistance. Conversely, the absence of *هاي جايينكم* is another omission of a political assertion. Such changes and omissions indicate the way in which interpretation can reproduce dominant institutional power relations. Hence, the appeals made by the speaker are either softened or no longer linked to their strategic political framing, making them more compatible with dependent positioning and compromising the performative objectives of the speech.

Calls for solidarity or unity

Expression	Meaning	Classification	Interpretation	Strategy
خدوها قاعدة	Know this for a fact	Calls for solidarity or unity	I promise you	Modulation
مرارنا طويلة	We have immense patience	Calls for solidarity or unity	None	Omission
ما ضاع حق وراءه مطالب	No right is ever lost when someone demands it	Calls for solidarity or unity	a right is never lost when there is a demand behind it	Semantic translation

SAT Analysis – Assertive and Commissive Acts

The personal promise in the English interpretation "*I promise you*" dilutes the tone of principle-setting in the original. The Arabic idiom serves as a collective position, rather than as a personal guarantee. This transition in the illocutionary force from a policy statement to a commitment between individuals minimizes the legal force. Such a sentence as *مرارنا طويلة* (Palestinians are extremely patient and will keep on demanding their rights → [Omitted]) is expressive because it expresses emotional as well as political protest. This omission constitutes a rejection of the psychological and ideological determination embedded in the expression, which removes an act of collective stance-making. Another relevant example is *ما ضاع حق وراءه مطالب* "*a right is never lost when there is a demand behind it*", indicating a firm belief in the fact that justice will prevail. The English translation softens the judgmental force of the expression. This partial reduction of discursive power weakens the performative validation of justice-seeking in the original.

CDA Analysis – Reframing of Resistance and Identity

In CDA terms, the meaning of the expression *خدوها قاعدة* lies in Abbas's adherence to a non-violence policy as a strategic move, driven by moral authority and not a sign of weakness. The interpreter rendered the sentence as *I promise you*

and, consequently, it lost its ideological salience and became an individual pledge of resistance rather than a collective one. The interpreter deleted *ممارتنا طويلة* in the English interpretation and, thus, eliminated a statement that is an important part of the positioning of the speaker. Resistance is associated with the discourses of patience and perseverance. *ما ضاع حق وراءه مطالب*, in interpretation, loses its cultural embeddedness and idiomatic salience. The English translation, *a right is never lost when there is a demand behind it*, is less convincing than the Arabic expression, and its ideological significance is reduced. These modifications, either through simplification or direct omission, reconstruct the discourse in line with institutional norms of depoliticized diplomatic speech, eliminating resistance-oriented expressions that constitute the source discourse and obscuring the discursively positioned resistance of collective defiance.

Discussion

The above findings address the three research questions of the study. They answer the first question, which relates to the pragmatic functions of the colloquial expressions used by Abbas (RQ1); the second, which focuses on the nature of the strategies applied in interpreting these expressions (RQ2); and the third question, which evaluates the extent to which the illocutionary force and ideological positioning of the colloquialisms were preserved or weakened.

The English interpretations of the colloquial expressions used by Abbas reveal substantial losses in pragmatic and ideological connotations. Among the 50 expressions identified, 50% were omitted, and a large number were misinterpreted or pragmatically weakened, especially those reflecting disappointment, frustration, defiance, and sarcasm. In one-third (32%) of cases, the interpreters used modulation as a form of a softening strategy of the sensitive politically-focused or culturally-connoted expressions. Semantic translation resembled 16% of the cases which reflects that the interpreters did not retain literal and culturally implicit meanings. Misinterpretation occurred in 2% of the cases only. Although limited in frequency, misinterpretation in politically sensitive situations affected speech-act performance and ideological orientation.

The answer to RQ1 focused on the identification of the colloquial expressions used by Abbas and their pragmatic and ideological roles in the speeches he delivered at the UNGA. Many of these expressions, as the analysis shows, reflect resistance, evaluative stance, sarcasm, and cultural identity. Abbas’s assertive, expressive, commissive, and directive speech acts were deliberately used to construct agency, assign responsibility, and define political positioning in Palestinian diplomatic discourse.

RQ 2 was related to the identification of the interpretation strategies and their impact on the pragmatic force and ideological clarity of these statements. The analysis shows that omission regularly resulted in the discursive silencing of resistance-oriented and culturally particular utterances, eliminating utterances which are related to evaluative stance, political criticism, or cultural particularity. Indicatively, words such as *كلمة شر* were omitted in the English interpretation which caused a loss of a significant ideological content. Modulation, however, weakened colloquialisms to conform to institutional norms of neutrality. It seems that the interpreter preferred to render less noticeable ideological salience. Rhetorical politeness in terms of rephrasing resistance softened confrontational discourse into an institutional communication process. In addition, semantic translation was less common but, to some extent, maintained meaning and tended to not be idiomatic and cultural.

Responding to RQ3, which examined whether the interpretations maintained or weakened illocutionary force and ideological meaning, the results indicate significant weakening. From an SAT perspective, many expressive and assertive acts were either omitted or attenuated, resulting in a reduced realization of important illocutionary functions in the interpreted discourse. From a CDA perspective, such interpretive choices reflect broader institutional practices of discursive neutralization and ideological containment, minimizing resistance-oriented positioning and backgrounding responsibility attribution.

Overall, the frequent omission and dilution of ideological expressions used by Abbas reconstruct his discourse in a depoliticized tone. This changes the orientation of the speaker, who no longer challenges global power structures but instead appears only minimally oppositional within institutional diplomatic interaction. Such a process undermines the rhetorical and moral positioning of the original speech, especially in a context where strategic communication and identity construction play a pivotal role.

Recommendations

Based on these findings, the study puts forward the following recommendations:

1. Enhanced interpreter training: Interpreter training programs should be intensified in institutions, and emphasis should be placed on the cultural and pragmatic competence of interpreters in addition to language proficiency. Additionally, focused training on political colloquial expressions and the meanings they imply in relation to ideology can help interpreters maintain pragmatic force and stance positioning in delicate diplomatic contexts, including UNGA meetings.
2. Context familiarity: Professional interpreters employed by institutions like the UN should be briefed on relevant cultural contexts and idiomatic expressions, which may help minimize the omission and modulation of culturally marked expressions observed in this study.

3. Institutional awareness: Institutions (like the UN) may benefit from being aware of the power of culturally and ideologically salient forms of expression in diplomatic speech and also from supporting interpretive practices that retain the evaluative stance of speakers in institutional communicative practices.
4. Further research: Future studies might investigate meaning-making in more political situations and across other language combinations in order to determine whether the same patterns of stance attenuation and discursive neutralization occur. Moreover, the use of SAT and CDA frameworks in the analysis of interpreting strategies and cognitive processing could further elucidate the mediating role of interpretation in agency, responsibility attribution, and ideological positioning in diplomatic speech.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

- [1]. Adham, R. A., and A. H. Ali. 2024. "A Critical Pragmatic Study of National Identity Representation in American Political Discourse." *Journal of Language Studies* 8 (2): 327–48. <https://doi.org/10.25130/Lang.8.2.16>.
- [2]. Al Alshniet, M. 2021. Translating English Political Metaphors into Arabic: A Cognitive Perspective. PhD diss., University College London. <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10130144/>.
- [3]. Al Salman, S., and R. Al Khanji. 2002. "The Native Language Factor in Simultaneous Interpretation in an Arabic/English Context." *Meta* 47 (4). <https://doi.org/10.7202/008040ar>.
- [4]. AlDayel, R. S., and H. M. Alotaibi. 2024. "Insights into Challenges Faced by Interpreting Trainees and Their Error Patterns." *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 15 (2): 414–23. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1502.20>.
- [5]. Alduhaim, A., and M. Alkhalidy. 2019. "Interpreting in the Libyan Uprising: A Study of Interpreting Strategies from Arabic to English." *Advances in Language and Literary Studies* 10 (5): 36–42. <https://journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/alls/article/view/5869>.
- [6]. Al-Fahmawi, O. 2014. "Translating Repetition in Political Speeches." *Arab World English Journal* 1 (3): 105–15. <https://awej.org/translating-repetition-in-political-speeches/>.
- [7]. Al-Mushawwat, B. (2025). Critical discourse analysis of ideology in translating political news. *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 9(4), 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol9no4.10>
- [8]. Al-Zahrán, A., and R. Jamoussi. 2022. "A Corpus-Based Investigation of VSO-SVO Usage in Simultaneous Interpreting." *Hikma* 21 (2): 231–55. <https://doi.org/10.21071/hikma.v21i2.14281>.
- [9]. Al-Zahrán. 2021. "Structural Challenges in English>Arabic Simultaneous Interpreting." *Translation & Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research* 13 (1): 51–70. <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.113201.2021.a04>.
- [10]. Al-Zou'bi, A., and M. Kanakri. 2020. "The Translatability of Metaphor in Political Speeches from English into Arabic." *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 3 (7): 78–87. <https://doi.org/10.30845/ijll.v7n3p7>.
- [11]. Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [12]. Baker, M. 2007. "Reframing Conflict in Translation." *Social Semiotics* 17 (2): 151–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10350330701311454>.
- [13]. Baker, M. 2018. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- [14]. Carter, B., and A. Sealey. 2007. "Languages, Nations and Identities." *Methodological Innovations Online* 2 (2): 20–31. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.4256/mio.2007.0009>.
- [15]. Charteris-Black, J. 2011. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [16]. Chesterman, A. 1997. *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [17]. Cutting, J., and K. Fordyce. 2020. *Pragmatics: A Resource Book for Students*. 4th ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- [18]. Elqubaisi, E., S. Abdullah, and H. Haroon. 2023. "Translating Metaphors in Political Speeches from English to Arabic: Strategies and Procedures." *Journal of Communication in Scientific Inquiry* 5 (2): 87–95.
- [19]. El-Zawawy, A. 2019. *Exploring the Cognitive Processes of Simultaneous Interpreting: English–Arabic–English Dynamics*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- [20]. Fairclough, N. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- [21]. Fairclough, N. 2013. *Language and Power*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- [22]. Farghal, M., and A. Almanna. 2014. "Some Pragmatic Aspects of Arabic/English Translation of Literary Texts." *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literature* 6 (2): 93–114.
- [23]. Farghal, M., and A. Almanna. 2015. *Contextualizing Translation Theories: Aspects of Arabic-English Interlingual Communication*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- [24]. Fischer, M. 2019. "Developing Terminology Competence with Special Focus on Recognizing Terms." In *Fit-for-Market Translator and Interpreter Training in a Digital Age*, edited by R. Besznyak, M. Fischer, and C. Szabo, 65–84. Wilmington, DE: Vernon Press.
- [25]. Flores, G., M. B. Laws, S. J. Mayo, B. Zuckerman, M. Abreu, L. Medina, and E. J. Hardt. 2003. "Errors in Medical Interpretation and Their Potential Clinical Consequences in Pediatric Encounters." *Pediatrics* 111 (1): 6–14. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.111.1.6>.
- [26]. Gile, D. 2009. *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [27]. Hanna, S., and M. Hasan. 2024. "The Effect of Comprehension on Omissions in English-Arabic Simultaneous Interpreting." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 14 (5): 1411–20. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1405.13>.

- [28]. Huang, Y. 2006. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [29]. Ineke, C., and G. Lynn. 2016. "Thrown in the Deep End: Challenges of Interpreting Informal Paramedic Language." *Translation and Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research* 8 (2). <https://doi.org/10.12807/ti.108202.2016.a01>.
- [30]. Issa, S. H. M., G. Ahmad, and F. Al Ersan. 2021. "Differences Among English–Arabic Simultaneous Interpreters in Interpreting Trump’s Inaugural Speech in Washington." *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation* 4 (3): 239–56. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.3.27>.
- [31]. Jaworska, S., and C. Vásquez. 2022. "COVID-19 and the Discursive Practices of Political Leadership: Introduction." *Discourse, Context & Media* 47 (1): 100605. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2022.100605>.
- [32]. Kamau, R. 2022. "The Role of Language in the National Identity of a Socially Dynamic Society." *European Journal of Linguistics* 1 (1): 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.47941/ejl.898>.
- [33]. Katan, D. 2014. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- [34]. Labibah, F., and A. Surakhmat. 2024. "The Role of Language in Shaping National Identity: A Comparative Study of Indonesia, Kazakhstan, and Monaco." *Proceeding of the International Conference on Language, Literature, and Culture Studies* 1 (2): 24–29. <https://prosiding.aspirasi.or.id/index.php/ICOLLICS/article/view/10>.
- [35]. Li, X. 2015. "Putting Interpreting Strategies in Their Place: Justifications for Teaching Strategies in Interpreter Training." *Babel – International Journal of Translation* 61 (2): 170–92. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.61.2.02li>.
- [36]. Liu, X., and S. B. Hale. 2018. "Achieving Accuracy in a Bilingual Courtroom: The Effectiveness of Specialised Legal Interpreter Training." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 12 (3): 299–321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2018.1501649>.
- [37]. Mapson, R., and G. Major. 2021. "Interpreters, Rapport, and the Role of Familiarity." *Journal of Pragmatics* 176: 63–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.01.020>.
- [38]. Mason, I. 2000. *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [39]. Mercieca, J. R. 2020. *Demagogue for President: The Rhetorical Genius of Donald Trump*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- [40]. Mohammed, J. M. 2025. "Linguistic and Cultural Barriers in Translating English Idioms into Arabic." *Journal of Ecohumanism* 4 (2): 820–37. <https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i2.6350>.
- [41]. Moser-Mercer, B., A. Künzli, and M. Korac. 1998. "Prolonged Turns in Interpreting: Effects on Quality, Physiological and Psychological Stress (Pilot Study)." *Interpreting* 3 (1): 47–64. <https://doi.org/10.1075/intp.3.1.03mos>.
- [42]. Musolff, A. 2016. *Political Metaphor Analysis: Discourse and Scenarios*. London: Bloomsbury.
- [43]. Nabers, D. 2009. "Contesting National Identity: Discourse Analysis of Political Speeches." *International Affairs Forum*. <https://www.ia-forum.org/Files/YZZSLG.pdf>.
- [44]. Onyshchak, H., N. Liutko, A. Yarova, R. Povoroznyuk, K. I., and I. Gontsa. 2023. "Pragmatic Competence in Political Discourse Interpreting." *Revista Romaneasca Pentru Educatie Multidimensionala* 15 (3): 76–399. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/15.3/772>.
- [45]. Pan, J. 2019. "The Pragmatics of Political Discourse: An Analytical Framework and a Comparative Study of Policy Speeches in the United Kingdom and Hong Kong." *Bandung: Journal of the Global South* 6 (2): 252–84. <https://doi.org/10.1163/21983534-00602006>.
- [46]. Pan, J., and J. Wong. 2018. "Pragmatic Competence in Chinese–English Return Interpreting of Political Speeches: A Corpus-Driven Exploratory Study of Pragmatic Markers." *TRAlinea*, Special Issue: New Insights into Translator Training. <https://www.intralinea.org/specials/article/2415>.
- [47]. Phelan, M. 2001. *The Interpreter’s Resource*. Vol. 19. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [48]. Pöchhacker, F. 2016. *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. 2nd ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- [49]. Qassem, M. A., and G. Vijayasarithi. 2015. "Problematicity of Translating Cultural Idiomatic Expressions from English into Arabic." *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies* 2 (1): 57–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23306343.2015.1016259>.
- [50]. Rowland, R. C. 2021. *The Rhetoric of Donald Trump: Nationalist Populism and American Democracy*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- [51]. Ryding, K. 2005. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Standard Arabic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [52]. Schäffner, C., and S. Bassnett, eds. 2010. *Political Discourse, Media and Translation*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- [53]. Searle, J. R. 1976. "A Classification of Illocutionary Acts." *Language in Society* 5 (1): 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006837>.
- [54]. Searle, J. R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [55]. Setton, R. 1999. *Simultaneous Interpreting: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- [56]. Setton, R., and A. Dawrant. 2016. *Conference Interpreting – A Complete Course*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [57]. Shunnaq, A. 2000. "Arabic–English Translation of Political Speeches." *Perspectives* 8 (3): 207–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2000.9961389>.
- [58]. Sperber, D., and D. Wilson. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [59]. Spinolo, N. 2017. "Studying Figurative Language in Simultaneous Interpreting." In *Making Way in Corpus-based Interpreting Studies*, edited by M. Russo, C. Bendazzoli, and B. Defrancq, 133–56. Cham: Springer.
- [60]. Su, W. 2020. *Eye-Tracking Processes and Styles in Sight Translation*. Cham: Springer Nature.
- [61]. Van Dijk, T. A. 2008. *Discourse and Power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [62]. Van Leeuwen, T. 2008. *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [63]. Van Mol, M. 2003. *Variation in Modern Standard Arabic in Radio News Broadcasts: A Synchronic Descriptive Investigation into the Use of Complementary Particles*. Leuven: Peeters.
- [64]. Wodak, R., and M. Meyer, eds. 2015. *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*. 3rd ed. London: Sage.
- [65]. Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.