This thesis concerns translation from English into Danish. Specifically, it concerns the practice of translation and the linguistic and textual competences of the translator. It has particular relevance to the academic disciplines of English linguistics and Translation Studies. Within Translation Studies, the thesis generally takes a linguistic approach and may be located within what Manfredi calls the 'contextual turn' (Manfredi 2008: 47) or what Munday calls the discourse and register analysis approach (Munday 2001).

I observe three problems in the translation process. First, translators, including myself, have a tendency to rely too much on intuition. Second, translators, including myself, have a tendency to make use of linguistic and textual analysis in a random way, often treating each clause in isolation. Third, in situations where several adequate translation solutions present themselves, it can be difficult for translators to establish a basis for choosing one solution over the other.

In the application of Systemic Functional Linguistics to the development of translators' linguistic and textual competences, I see a possible solution to all three problems. Systemic Functional Linguistics seems particularly relevant to translation because it is not "concerned with a static or prescriptive kind of language study, but rather describes language in actual use and centres around texts and their contexts" (Manfredi 2008: 49). At the heart of Systemic Functional Linguistics is the idea that language is structured to make three different kinds of meaning at the same time, experiential, interpersonal and textual. This thesis investigates to what extent the ability to map out systematically these three kinds of meaning in original texts, with the purpose of recreating them in translations, can enable the translator to make more informed translation decisions.

The method I employ is (1) to perform linguistic and textual analyses based on SFL on three English texts and (2) to discuss to what extent such analyses are helpful to the translator.

In my analytical approach, I draw on the work of German translation scholar Juliane House. In her model of translation quality assessment, she argues that the fundamental criterion of translation quality is equivalence on the level of textual function, that is to say, that the overall purpose(s) of the translated text must to a certain extent be the same as the overall purpose(s) of the original text. House applies elements of Systemic Functional Linguistics to analyse original texts with the purpose of establishing their textual function. She focuses especially on the levels of register and genre. Arguing that for translation production purposes, a more thorough and "close" analysis on the level of text/language is desirable, I focus especially on the level of lexicogrammar, building on M. A. K. Halliday's *Introduction to Functional Grammar*.

The results of my investigation demonstrate five key functions of the application of Systemic Functional Linguistics to translation production, specifically that linguistic analysis may be used...
1. as a basis for selecting macrostrategy;
2. as a basis for selecting microstrategies;
3. to establish practical translation guidelines;
4. to suggest strategies for dealing with recurrent structural dissimilarities between English and Danish;
5. to assess translation solutions to specific words, wordings, meanings, etc., with reference to register, textual function.

I argue that all five of these functions are relevant and valuable to the translation process, thus concluding that the application of Systemic Functional Linguistics to translation production can, to a certain extent, enable the translator to make more informed decisions.

I go on to suggest that linguistic and textual analysis on the level of register and textual function is particularly relevant to translation while analysis on the level of lexicogrammar needs to be further developed if it is to be unequivocally relevant. This supports House's overall analytical approach, but goes somewhat against my own hypothesis.

In a concluding discussion, I call for further research in the application of Systemic Functional Linguistics to translation so that, eventually, a model or theory might be developed that can indicate systematically how linguistic and textual analysis of experiential, interpersonal and textual meanings at the level of both lexicogrammar, discourse-semantics, register and genre might be approached. Furthermore, I call for a concept of register that is designed specifically for application to written texts, and which can account in greater detail for differences in the Field, Tenor and Mode variables.