SRINIVASAN COLLEGE OF ARTS &SCIENCE

(Affiliated to Bharathidasan Universiy, Tiruchirappalli)

PERAMBALUR-621 212.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Course: M.A ENGLISH **Year: II** **semester: IV**

Course material on : Translation: Theory and Practice

Course code : Core course – XIV

Sub code : P16EN42

Prepared by : R.SELVAKUMAR

Month & year: March-2020

Core course – XIV

Translation: Theory and Practice

Objectives:

To familiarize learners with the history and theories of translation
To introduce learners to the techniques involved in translation of literary and non-literary texts
To enhance the employability of the learners as translators

Unit – I
A Brief History of Translation and Translation Theory, Aspects of Translation Theory

Unit – II
Types of Translation Procedure, Communicative and Semantic Translation

Unit – III
Translation Procedures, Translation Process and Synonymy, Translation and the Meta Lingual Function of Translation

Unit – IV
Linguistics and Translation, Theories of Translation, Equivalence in Translation, Problems in Translation – Untranslatability

Unit – V
Translation Practice in Tamil and English – Proverbs and Prose Passages

UNIT I

History of Translation

Translators have always played a key role in society. Early medieval translators contributed to the development of modern languages and national identities around these languages. Translators went on playing a major role in the advancement of society for centuries. After being regarded as scholars alongside authors, researchers and scientists for two millennia, many translators have become invisible in the 21st century. It is time to acknowledge again the translators' major impact on society — past and present. This essay was written with the help of Wikipedia.

In Antiquity

The translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek in the 3rd century BCE is regarded as the first major translation in the Western world. Most Jews had forgotten Hebrew, their ancestral language, and needed the Bible to be available in Greek to be able to read it. The translation of the Bible from Hebrew to Greek is known as the "Septuagint", a name that refers to the seventy scholars who were commissioned to translate the Hebrew Bible in Alexandria, Egypt. Each translator worked in solitary confinement in his own cell, and according to legend all seventy versions proved identical.

The translator's role as a bridge for "carrying across" values between cultures has been discussed since Terence, a Roman playwright who adapted Greek comedies in the 2nd century BCE.

Cicero famously cautioned against translating "word for word" ("verbum pro verbo") in "On the Orator" ("De Oratore", 55 BCE): "I did not think I ought to count them [the words] out to the reader like coins, but to pay them by weight, as it were". Cicero, a statesman, orator, lawyer and philosopher, was also a translator from Greek to Latin, and compared the translator to an artist.

The debate about sense-for-sense translation vs. word-for-word translation has been ongoing for centuries. The coiner of the term "sense for sense" is said to be Jerome (commonly known as St. Jerome) in his "Letter to Pammachius" (396). While translating the Bible into Latin (a translation known as the "Vulgate"), Jerome stated that the translator needed to translate "not word for word but sense for sense" ("non verbum e verbo sed sensum de sensu").

Kumārajīva, a Buddhist monk and scholar, was a prolific translator into Chinese of Buddhist texts written in Sanskrit, a monumental work he carried out in the late 4th century. His most famous work is the translation of the "Diamond Sutra", an influential Mahayana sutra in East Asia, that became an object of devotion and study in Zen Buddhism. A later copy (dated 868) of the Chinese edition of "Diamond Sutra" is "the earliest complete survival of a printed book", according to the website of the British Library (that owns the piece). Kumārajīva's clear and straightforward translations focused more on conveying the meaning than on precise literal rendering. They had a deep influence on Chinese Buddhism, and are still more popular than later, more literal translations.

The spread of Buddhism led to large-scale translation efforts spanning more than a thousand years throughout Asia. Major works were sometimes translated in a rather short time. The Tanguts for example took mere decades to translate works that had taken the Chinese centuries to translate, with contemporary sources describing the Emperor and his mother personally contributing to the translation, alongside sages of various nationalities.

Large-scale translation efforts were also undertaken by the Arabs after they conquered the Greek Empire, in order to offer Arabic versions of all major Greek philosophical and scientific works.

In the Middle Ages

Latin was the lingua franca of the Western world throughout the Middle Ages. There were few translations of Latin works into vernacular languages. In the 9th century, Alfred the Great, King of Wessex in England, was far ahead of his time in commissioning translations from Latin to English of two major works: Bede's "Ecclesiastical History of the English People", and Boethius' "The Consolation of Philosophy". These translations helped improve the underdeveloped English prose.

In the 12th and 13th centuries, the Toledo School of Translators became a meeting point for European scholars who traveled and settled down in Toledo, Spain, to translate major philosophical, religious, scientific and medical works from Arabic, Greek and Hebrew into Latin.

Roger Bacon, a 13th-century English scholar, was the first to assess that a translator should have a thorough knowledge of both the source language and the target language to produce a good translation, and that he should also be well versed in the discipline of the work he was translating.

The first "fine" translations into English were produced by Geoffrey Chaucer in the 14th century. Chaucer founded an English poetic tradition based on translations or adaptations of literary works in Latin and French, two languages that were more established than English at the time.

The “finest” religious translation was the “Wycliffe’s Bible” (1382–84), named after John Wycliffe, the English theologian who translated the Bible from Latin to English.

In the 15th century

The trip of Byzantine scholar Gemistus Pletho to Florence, Italy, pioneered the revival of Greek learning in Western Europe. Pletho reintroduced Plato’s thought during the 1438–39 Council of Florence, in a failed attempt to reconcile the East–West Schism (an 11th-century schism between the Eastern Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church). During the Council, Pletho met Cosimo de Medici, the ruler of Florence and its patron of learning and the arts, which led to the foundation of the Platonic Academy. Under the leadership of Italian scholar and translator Marsilio Ficino, the Platonic Academy took over the translation into Latin of all Plato’s works, Plotinus’ “Enneads” of Plotinus and other Neoplatonist works. Ficino’s work — and Erasmus’ Latin edition of the New Testament — led to a new attitude to translation. For the first time, readers demanded rigour in rendering the exact words of Plato and Jesus (and Aristotle and others) as a ground for their philosophical and religious beliefs.

A “fine” work of English prose was Thomas Malory’s “Le Morte d’Arthur” (1485), a free translation of Arthurian romances on the legendary King Arthur and his literary companions Guinevere, Lancelot, Merlin and the Knights of the Round Table. Malory adapted existing French and English stories while adding original material, for example the “Gareth” story as one of the stories of the Knights of the Round Table.

In the 16th century

Non-scholarly literature continued to rely heavily on adaptation. Tudor poets and Elizabethan translators adapted themes by Horace, Ovid, Petrarch and other Latin writers, while inventing a new poetic style. The poets and translators wanted to supply a new audience — created from the rise of a middle class and the development of printing — with “works such as the original authors would have written, had they been writing in England in that day” (Wikipedia).

The “Tyndale New Testament” (1525) was regarded as the first great Tudor translation, named after William Tyndale, the well-known scholar who was its main translator. For the first time, the Bible was directly translated from Hebrew and Greek texts. After translating the whole New Testament, Tyndale started translating the Old Testament, and translated half of it. He also became a leading figure in Protestant Reformation before being sentenced to death for the unlicensed possession of the Scripture in English. After his death, one of his assistants completed the translation of the Old Testament. The “Tyndale Bible” became the first mass-produced English translation of the Bible on the printing press.

Martin Luther, a German professor of theology and a seminal figure in the Protestant Reformation, translated the Bible into German in his later life (1522–34). Luther was the first European scholar to assess that one translates satisfactorily only towards his own language, a bold statement which became the norm two centuries later. The publication of the "Luther Bible" contributed significantly to the development of the modern German language.

Along with the "Luther Bible" in German (1522–34), two other major translations were the "Jakub Wujek Bible" ("Biblia Jakuba Wujka") in Polish (1535) and the "King James Bible" in English (1604–11), with lasting effects on the languages and cultures of the three countries. The "Luther Bible" also had lasting effects on religion. The disparities in the translation of crucial words and passages contributed to some extent to the split of Western Christianity into Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The main factor for the split was the Protestant Reformation's goal to eliminate corruption in the Roman Catholic Church.

During the same period, the Bible was also translated into Dutch, French, Spanish, Czech and Slovene. The Dutch translation was published in 1526 by Jacob van Liesvelt. The French translation was published in 1528 by Jacques Lefevre d'Étaples (Jacobus Faber Stapulensis). The Spanish translation was published in 1569 by Casiodoro de Reina. The Slovene translation was published in 1584 by Jurij Dalmatn. The Czech translation was published in 1579–93. All these translations were a driving force in the use of vernacular languages in Christian Europe, and contributed to the development of modern European languages.

In the 17th century

Miguel de Cervantes, a Spanish novelist known all over Europe for his novel "Don Quixote" (1605–15), expressed his own views on the translation process. According to Cervantes, translations of his time — with the exception of those made from Greek to Latin — were like looking at a Flemish tapestry by its reverse side. While the main figures of a Flemish tapestry could be discerned, they were obscured by the loose threads, and they lacked the clarity of the front side.

In the second half of the 17th century, English poet and translator John Dryden sought to make Virgil speak "in words such as he would probably have written if he were living as an Englishman". Dryden also observed that "translation is a type of drawing after life", thus comparing the translator with an artist several centuries after Cicero.

Alexander Pope, a fellow poet and translator, was said to have reduced Homer's "wild paradise" to "order" while translating the Greek epic poems into English, but these comments had no impact on his best-selling translations.

“Faithfulness” and “transparency” were better defined as dual ideals in translation, while often being at odds. “Faithfulness” was the extent to which a translation accurately renders the meaning of the source text, without distortion, by taking into account the text itself (subject, type and use), its literary qualities, and its social or historical context. “Transparency” was the extent to which the end result of a translation stands as a text of its own that could have been originally been written in the language of the reader, and conforms to its grammar, syntax and idiom. A “transparent” translation is often qualified as “idiomatic” (source: Wikipedia).

In the 18th century

According to Johann Gottfried Herder, a German philosopher, theologian and poet, a translator should translate towards (and not from) his own language, a statement already expressed two centuries earlier by Martin Luther, who was the first European scholar to assess that one translates satisfactorily only towards his own language.

But there was still not much concern for accuracy. “Throughout the 18th century, the watchword of translators was ease of reading. Whatever they did not understand in a text, or thought might bore readers, they omitted. They cheerfully assumed that their own style of expression was the best, and that texts should be made to conform to it in translation. Even for scholarship, except for the translation of the Bible, they cared no more than had their predecessors, and did not shrink from making translations from languages they hardly knew” (Wikipedia).

At the time, dictionaries and thesauri were not regarded as adequate guides for translating into a foreign language. In his “Essay on the Principles of Translation” (1791), Scottish historian Alexander Tytler emphasized that assiduous reading was more helpful than the use of dictionaries. Polish poet and grammarian Onufry Andrzej Kopczyński expressed the same views a few years earlier, in 1783, while adding the need to listen to the spoken language.

Polish encyclopedist Ignacy Krasicki described the translator’s special role in society in his posthumous essay “On Translating Books” (“O tłumaczeniu ksiąg”, 1803). Often named Poland’s La Fontaine, Krasicki was a novelist, poet and fabulist, and a translator from French and Greek to Polish. In his essay, he wrote that “translation is in fact an art both estimable and very difficult, and therefore is not the labour and portion of common minds; it should be practised by those who are themselves capable of being actors, when they see greater use in translating the works of others than in their own works, and hold higher than their own glory the service that they render their country.”

In the 19th century

There were new standards for accuracy and style. For accuracy, the policy became “the text, the whole text, and nothing but the text (except for bawdy passages), with the addition of extensive explanatory footnotes” (in J.M. Cohen, “Translation” entry in “Encyclopedia Americana”, 1986, vol. 27). For style, the aim was to constantly remind readers that they were reading a foreign classic.

An exception was the translation and adaptation of Persian poems by Edward FitzGerald, and English writer and poet. His book “The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyám” (1859) offered a selection of poems by Omar Khayyám, an 11th-century poet, mathematician and astronomer. FitzGerald’s translation from Arabic to English actually drew little of its material from the Persian poems, but it has stayed the most famous translation of Khayyám’s poems to this day, despite more recent and accurate translations.

The “non-transparent” translation theory was first developed by German theologian and philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher, a major figure in German Romanticism. In his seminal lecture “On the Different Methods of Translating” (1813), Schleiermacher distinguished between translation methods that moved the writer towards the reader, i.e. transparency, and those that moved the reader toward the author, i.e. an extreme fidelity to the foreignness of the source text. Schleiermacher favoured the latter approach. His distinction between “domestication” (bringing the author to the reader) and “foreignisation” (taking the reader to the author) inspired prominent theorists in the 20th century, for example Antoine Berman and Lawrence Venuti.

Yan Fu, a Chinese scholar and translator, developed in 1898 his three-facet theory of translation: faithfulness, i.e. be true to the original in spirit; expressiveness, i.e. be accessible to the target reader; and elegance, i.e. be written in an “educated” language. Yan Fu’s theory of translation was based on his experience with translating works in social sciences from English to Chinese. Of the three facets, he considered the second as the most important. If the meaning of the translated text was not accessible to the reader, there was no difference between having translated the text and not having translated the text at all. According to Yan Fu, in order to facilitate comprehension, the word order could be changed, Chinese examples could replace English ones, and people’s names could be rendered Chinese. His theory had much impact worldwide, but was sometimes wrongly extended to the translation of literary works.

In the 20th century

Aniela Zagórska, a Polish translator, translated into Polish nearly all the works of her uncle Joseph Conrad, a Polish-British novelist who wrote in English. In Conrad’s view, translation, like other arts, involved choice, and choice implied interpretation. Conrad would later advise his

niece: “Don’t trouble to be too scrupulous. I may tell you that in my opinion it is better to interpret than to translate. It is, then, a question of finding the equivalent expressions. And there, my dear, I beg you to let yourself be guided more by your temperament than by a strict conscience” (cited in Zdzisław Najder, “Joseph Conrad: A Life”, 2007).

Jorge Luis Borges, a writer, essayist and poet living in Argentina, was also a notable translator of literary works from English, French, German, Old English or Old Norse to Spanish. He translated — while subtly transforming — the works of William Faulkner, André Gide, Hermann Hesse, Franz Kafka, Rudyard Kipling, Edgar Allan Poe, Walt Whitman, Virginia Woolf, and others. Borges also wrote and lectured extensively on the art of translation, holding that a translation may improve upon the original, may even be unfaithful to it, and that alternative and potentially contradictory renderings of the same work can be equally valid.

Other translators still consciously produced literal translations, especially translators of religious, historical, academic and scientific works. They often adhered as closely as possible to the source text, sometimes stretching the limits of the end language to produce an non-idiomatic translation.

A new discipline named “Translation Studies” appeared in the second half of the 20th century. The term “Translation Studies” was coined by James S. Holmes, a poet and translator of poetry, in his seminal paper “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies” (1972). While writing his own poetry, Holmes translated many works from Dutch and Belgian poets into English. He was hired as a professor in the new Institute of Interpreters and Translators (later renamed the Institute of Translation Studies) created in 1964 by the University of Amsterdam.

Interpreting was only seen as a specialised form of translation — spoken translation instead of written translation — before becoming a separate discipline in the mid-20th century. Interpreting Studies gradually emancipated from Translation Studies to concentrate on the practical and pedagogical aspect of interpreting. It also included sociological studies of interpreters and their working conditions, while such studies are still sorely lacking for translators to this day.

In the 21st century

Like their ancestors, contemporary translators contribute to the enrichment of “target” languages (the languages they are translating into). When a target language lacks terms that are present in a source language (the language they are translating from), they borrow those terms, thereby enriching the target language with source-language calques (literally translated words or phrases) and loanwords (words incorporated into another language without translation).

Translation Studies have become an academic interdiscipline that includes many fields of study (comparative literature, history, linguistics, philology, philosophy, semiotics, terminology, computational linguistics). Students also choose a speciality (legal, economic, technical, scientific or literary translation) in order to be trained accordingly.

The internet has fostered a worldwide market for translation and localisation services, and for translation software. It has also brought many issues, with precarious employment and lower rates, and the rise of unpaid volunteer translation (including crowd sourced translation) promoted by major organisations that have the necessary funds to hire many professionals, but no professional translators. Bilingual people need more skills than two languages to become good translators. To be a translator is a profession, and implies a thorough knowledge of the subject matter.

After being regarded as scholars alongside authors, researchers and scientists for two millennia, many translators have become invisible in the 21st century, with their names often forgotten on the articles, books covers and websites they spent days, weeks or months to translate.

Despite the omnipresent MT (machine translation) and CAT (computer-assisted translation) tools created to speed up the translation process, some translators still want to be compared to artists, not only for their precarious life, but also for the craft, knowledge, dedication and passion they put into their work.

Aspects of translation

Culture and its meaning in translations. Culture may be defined in many ways. When the study of translation is taken into account, it must be defined with an understanding of the correlation involving language, culture and religion. In view of the fact that culture is a useful device while dealing with problems of translation, numerous translation theorists make efforts to identify the expression “Culture”. A good illustration of this is the work Primitive Culture and Religion in Primitive Culture by Sir Edward Burnett Tylor.

Tylor’s work is divided into two volumes. In his first work, Primitive Culture (1871) forms well-known definition concerning the basis of modern understanding of the term “culture” in which he states that:”Cultureâ€¦ taken in its widest ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. In second volume, Religion in Primitive Culture, Taylor deals largely with his analysis of animism.

Animism isâ€¦(I tried to think of something and connect it but I'll have to leave it for now, maybe later on I'll use it)

Others researchers who perceive translation through culture are Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952:167) for whom "culture is a product; is historical; includes ideas, patterns, and values; is selective; is learned; is based upon symbols; and is an abstraction from behaviour and objects of behavior"; Lee McKay (2002:86) adds that culture is said to be embedded in the semantics of a language; while Danial Bates and Fred Plog (1990:7) consider culture to be a system of shared beliefs, values, customs, behaviours, and artefacts that the members of society use to cope with their world and with one another, and that are transmitted from generation to generationâ€¦. Danial Bates and Fred Plog as a stepping-stone to language acquisition consider artifacts of culture such as cinema and television programming, these two types are viewed as the windows into the target culture along with target language.

It is tempting to suggest that the means of communication that passes on any culture is inevitably language.

In the view of Karamanian (IS3), three different aspects of human activity are expressed by the term culture and these are: the personal, the collective, and the expressive.

First aspect implies that individuals think and function as such; the collective describe the social context in which people function, the expressive in which society expresses itself.

We need to bear in mind that the process of translating cultural factor is a very demanding task as it covers concepts like history, religion, tradition, social life or everyday customs. It is widely acknowledged that these aspects are the main components of the translator's work which leads to the flawless translation. A good translator need to have an excellent comprehension of the real nature of the original message being brought over to the target language receptors. A good understanding of a hidden message in a given text is crucial in the process of translation and depends on the background knowledge of the translator whose main aim is to convert it into target language. Conveying the original message meaning in the given source culture is the true aim of the good translator.

UNIT II

1. Translation procedures & Types

Vinay and Darbelnet (1958) reject individual words as units of translation by emphasizing that translators deal with ideas and feelings in various semantic fields, rather than individual lexemes. They define the unit of translation as "the smallest segment of the utterance whose signs are linked in such a way that they should not be translated individually" (Vinay & Darbelnet 1958 quoted in Hatim & Munday 2004: 18). From this outlook, the translation unit is equivalent to the above-mentioned *lexicological unit* and corresponds largely to a *unit of thought*, since all these terms basically convey the same concept with emphasis put on different facets. Following this perspective Hatim and Munday (2004: 27) de- scribe the unit of translation as "a TL piece of language which plays the same role in the TL system as an SL piece of language plays in the SL system". Such a denomination of the translation unit delimits borders between formal corre- spondence at the structural level, on the one hand, and semantic equivalence in the particular context, on the other. The translation shift occurs when rendering a translation for a particular segment of the text requires the translator to break the formal correspondence between surface structures functioning in SL and TL.

Sometimes, translation shifts are required to achieve a meaningful transla- tion of relatively common lexemes. For example, the adverb "upstairs" conflates both the direction (up) and the medium (stairs) of movement. Consequently, translating "(She went) upstairs" into Polish, which does not have a parallel ad- verb, requires using at least three distinct lexemes "schodami na górę", but even four "po schodach na górę" would not be inappropriate. And vice-versa, translat- ing instrumental forms of Polish nouns used to encode instruments of motion, such as "autobusem", often requires using prepositional phrases, such as "by bus". Moreover, the translation shifts are employed to achieve equivalence at the pragmatic level. For example, translating "Once upon a time…" as "Dawno, dawno temu …" creates a parallel dramatic effect on the reader; using forms "Pani/Pani" for translating "you" enables the translator to preserve the level of formality in correspondence; changing the adjective-noun order for the nominal "blue shark" into "żarłacz błękitny" effectuates in retaining naming conventions; and so on. Understanding such systematic shifts between linguistic structures is a basic aspect of daily practice in translation.

which the translator interprets, e.g. elaborates or summarizes, the explicit con- tents of the original, embraces *transposition*, *modulation*, *equivalence*, and *adap- tation* translation procedures. Moreover, these procedures can be employed at three levels of language: (a) the lexicon; (b) the grammatical structures; and (c) the *message*, which stands for higher elements of text, including, besides sen- tences and paragraphs, certain situational utterances that convey broader mean- ings. For instance, although the phrase "Polish jokes" refers in its origins to jokes made specifically of Poles, it can be used as an umbrella term for jokes made of other ethnic groups (Brzozowska 2010). It must be emphasized, howev- er, that while the direct translation is more closely tied to the original text and the oblique translation relies to a greater extent on interpretive resemblance to function independently, this distinction is not always a clear-cut dichotomy. In real life scenarios, it marks two opposite ends of a wide spectrum of options available to translators. A particular choice is often dictated by the *relevance* of a given message to the intended audience (see Chapter 7; see also Bogucki 2004; Sperber & Wilson 1995).

2. *Direct* translation procedures

Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000) note that due to structural and metalinguistic parallelisms that occur between languages it is often possible to overcome gaps (or *lacunae*) between the source language and the target language by transposing the SL message piece by piece into the TL. In such cases, when the translator notices a gap in the target language, they can employ either a parallel category or a parallel concept to convey the meaning of the source text. This can be accom- plished with one of the following *direct translation procedures*.

(1) **Borrowing**, which is relatively the simplest of all procedures used for translation, involves using foreign phrasing in the target text. The reason for the gap in the target language is usually metalinguistic. Nowadays, it is frequently caused by new technologies entering rapidly the surrounding reality. For exam- ple, while "laptop" can be translated into Polish as "komputer przenośny", its more recent variant, i.e. "tablet" appears to function in Polish exclusively in a lexical form borrowed directly from English. Another reason for using borrow- ings is that the concept discussed in the source text is relatively unknown to the target audience. This seems to be the case with the much discussed *gender* ide- ology, which was not translated into Polish, as "ideologia płci", but rather "ideo- logia gender". Although the concept of *gender* is obviously as universal to Polish speakers as it is to any other audience worldwide, the recent discussion

focuses on some specific aspects of European regulations, which is emphasized by using that particular foreign term

in this otherwise familiar context.

As pointed out by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000), perhaps the most in- teresting aspect of using borrowings relates to creating specific stylistic effects,

e.g. introducing the flavor of the foreign culture into a translation. For instance, certain phrases from French are sometimes used to create an aura of nostalgia for the past when French was the *lingua franca*, which can be exemplified with the famous *Michelle* ballad by the Beatles. In such cases the translator may opt to leave the foreign elements intact. On the other hand, terms borrowed from Eng- lish tend to be associated with the modern socio-economic development, which seems to explain why some companies in Poland decide to call their human re- sources departments "Dział Human Resources" instead of "Dział Kadr".

A remarkable example of employing borrowings for a stylistic effect in *lit- erary translation* (Chapter 9) are Robert Stiller's subsequent translations of the novel "A Clockwork Orange" by Anthony Burgess (1991, 2001). In order to emphasize a violent, outright barbaric, nature of the protagonist and his gang, Burgess invented a special slang for the book, which was based on modified Slavic words borrowed mainly from Russian. For instance, "droog" means "friend", "korova" means "cow", and so on. To preserve the harshness of that slang for the Polish reader, who is naturally much more familiar with the sound of Slavic languages than the original English-speaking audience, in his second attempt Stiller back-translated, in a way, Slavic borrowings into English- sounding expressions to make them more outlandish (Kubińska & Kubiński 2004; Lukas 2008).

(2) **Calque** is a special kind of borrowing in which the TL borrows an ex- pression form the SL by translating literally each of the original elements. The result creates either, a *lexical calque*, which preserves the syntactic structure of the TL, but at the same time introduces a new mode of expression; or a *structural calque*, which introduces a new construction into the language. Ex- amples of lexical calques functioning in Polish include "lokowanie produktu" (product placement), "przeglądarka internetowa" (Internet browser), "drapacz chmur" (skyscraper), and "dział zasobów ludzkich", which is another common variant of labeling human resources departments in Polish companies. An exam- ple of an unfortunate calque that occurs when translating without proper back- ground from Polish to English is the bar notice "asking to not throw away full cups" quoted in the introductory section.

Since *borrowing* and *calque* are strongly related, it is sometimes difficult to draw an absolute border between these two translation procedures. For example, the translation "aplikacje dla Androida" (applications for Android) borrows both the structure and lexis, which makes it an amalgamation of these categories. The problem of loan expressions in contemporary Polish is much more complex. Otwinowska-Kasztelanic (2000)

distinguishes several types of loans at different language levels. She classifies *loan shifts* as incorporating both *calques*, i.e. loans where "foreign language elements are replaced by semantically equivalent native ones" (Otwinowska-Kasztelanic 2000: 15), and *semantic loans*, i.e. native language words used in accordance with the donor word semantics.

Polish has a long history of borrowing expressions from English in a wide variety of semantic areas, including business, sport, technology, as well as nu- merous other domains (Mańczak-Wohlfeld 2006). Although borrowings and calques are relatively straightforward solutions to various problematic situations encountered in the translation process, they should be used with caution. It seems that a lot of translators are biased to think that words and structures bor- rowed from English sound perfectly right to Polish speakers, which is not neces- sarily true. Expressions like "marketingowiec" (marketer) or "zjeść coś w fast- foodzie" (to eat something in a fast-food [restaurant]) sound awkward, despite the fact that both *marketing* and *fast-food* have become popular words used in common contexts. More natural equivalents for these expressions, at least in most common contexts, are "specjalista ds. marketingu" and "zjeść coś w barze", respectively.

(3) **Literal translation,** or *word for word* translation, relies on the direct transfer of a text from SL into a grammatical and meaningful text in TL. Using

this procedure, the translator focuses predominantly on adhering to the linguistic rules of the target language. In practice, literal translation occurs most common- ly when translating between two languages of the same family, such as French and Italian, and works most efficiently when they also share the same culture. Despite seemingly limited scope of applications, this procedure is among pre- ferred ways of translating in those functional contexts where more emphasis is laid on preserving the verbatim meaning of the original text than attaining stylis- tic elegance, which is often the case with *legal translation* (Chapter 10).

If, after applying the first three procedures, the resulting translation is still unacceptable, i.e. the target text has no meaning, gives another meaning, or skews the original message in any other way, the procedures of *oblique transla- tion* can be employed to achieve a better result.

3. *Oblique* translation procedures

Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000) note that due to structural and metalinguistic differences between languages certain stylistic effects are unattainable without upsetting the lexis or the syntactic order in the target language. In such cases more complex methods must be employed to convey the meaning of the source text. Although at a cursory glance they might look fairly sophisticated, or even unusual, the *oblique translation procedures* allow translators to exert a strict control over the reliability of their efforts.

(4) **Transposition** involves replacing one word class with another without changing the meaning of the text. It can be applied intralinguistically, i.e. within a particular language. For instance, "She announced she would resign" can be transposed to "She announced her resignation". Similarly in Polish, instead of saying "Ogłosiła, że rezygnuje" we can use "Ogłosiła [swoją] rezygnację". The original expression is referred to as the *base expression*, and the result as the *transposed expression*.

Transposition is a highly versatile translation procedure. For example, Eng- lish adjectives "elven" or "elvish" (from the word *elf*, which descends from Germanic mythology) do not seem to have natural equivalents in Polish, despite the fact that due to contacts with Germanic cultures, and in particular the enor- mous popularity of Tolkien's books/film adaptations, *elves* are widely known to Polish audience. Although some translators attempt to use adjectives "elfowy" or "elficki", they may sound awkward to some Polish speakers, because Polish usually employs a genitive form in postposition in such contexts. For that rea- son, expressions "miecz elfów" and "księżniczka elfów" seem to sound more natural than "elficki miecz" and "elfowa księżniczka" as translations for "evlish sword" and "elven princess", respectively. Similarly, the phrase "okręty wik- ingów" seems to be a better choice than "wikińskie / wikingowe / wikingowskie okręty". Moreover, transposition can be employed for a better economy of the target text. For instance, the sentence "[The word 'Hispanic' can refer to] people whose origins range from Mexican and Puerto Rican to Cuban and Argen- tinean." can be translated literary as ". . . osób pochodzenia zarówno meksykańskiego i portorykańskiego, jak i kubańskiego i argentyńskiego". How- ever, perhaps a more efficient choice is to use country names instead of national- ities: ". . . osób pochodzących zarówno z Meksyku i Portoryko, jak i z Kuby

i Argentyny". The transposed expression is both more manageable for the trans- lator and more easily graspable for the reader.

As demonstrated above, the transposed expression sometimes has a substantially different stylistic value than the base expression. Since transposi- tion enables rendering specific nuances of style, it is a basic means for

fine- tuning stylistic elegance of the translated text. Moreover, if a translation ob- tained in this manner fits better the resulting utterance from the stylistic perspec- tive, the transposed expression is, somewhat paradoxically, more literary in character.

(5) **Modulation** involves changing the form of the message through a change in perspective. An alteration of this kind may be required in contexts where a literal or transposed translation still sounds unidiomatic or awkward in the TL, despite being a grammatically correct utterance. As with transposition, in some cases modulation may be optional, while in others it is obligatory. A good example of fixed modulation is the change that occurs between some Polish and English verbal constructions in grammatically prescribed contexts, which can be observed for certain expressions of state. For example, "He is 40 years old" must be translated as "On ma 40 lat" and "Are you on the phone?" as "Czy masz/posiadasz telefon?" (cf. Fisiak, et al. 1987). Yet, modulation typical- ly operates at the phrase level. For instance, the set phrase "If it wasn't for . . ." must be translated, more or less, as "Jedynie dzięki . . .", because any attempts at word by word translation, e.g. "Jeśli to nie byłoby dla / z powodu", sound pre- posterous. Examples of optional modulations that are frequently encountered in Polish translations of English texts include rendering "unless" as "chyba, że", or "It is not uncommon . . ." as "Dość powszechnie . . .". However, the distinction between obligatory and optional modulation is not always clear-cut, as it is de- termined in each case by the wider linguistic context.

(6) **Equivalence**, also known as *reformulation*, produces an equivalent text in the target language by using completely different stylistic and structural methods. Classical examples of equivalence include translation of exclamations and expletives. For instance, English "Ouch!" corresponds to Polish "Au!", while "Damn it!" to "Niech to szlag [trafi]!". Another type of expressions that normally require reformulation to fit into the target text involves onomatopoeia of animal sounds. For instance, while horses in Polish stomp "patataj", English ones apparently generate "bumpety-bump" with their hooves, etc. Such exam- ples demonstrate a specific feature of equivalence as the translation procedure: it practically always relates to the whole of a message. Moreover, since it embrac- es an opulent repertoire of idioms, sayings, proverbs, clichés, etc., it tends to be fixed in most cases.

Translating proverbs is a good example of employing equivalence for ren- dering more elaborate structures between SL and TL. For example, "Rome wasn't built in a day" equals to "Nie od razu Kraków zbudowano"; "Don't count your chickens before they're hatched" corresponds, at least for the most part, to "Nie dziel skóry na niedźwiedziu". In some cases, however, finding an

equiva- lent may not be so easy. For instance, the old-fashioned, but still common Eng- lish saying "A rolling stone gathers no moss", which according to CALD (2008) is used to mean that "a person who is always travelling and changing jobs has the advantage of having no responsibilities, but also has disadvantages such as having no permanent place to live" does not seem to have an equally widespread counterpart in Polish. It can probably be translated as "Toczący się kamień nie obrasta mchem" (PWN-Oxford 2004), yet it is not something frequently heard in everyday speech. For that reason, it resembles a calque rather than an equiva- lence, which demonstrates that within this procedure certain borderline cases exist, as well. The equivalence is also typically employed to translate idioms. For example, "like two peas in a pod" is probably best translated as "jak dwie krople wody", while "apples and oranges" can be rendered in a good number of contexts as "różne jak woda i ogień". Again, one must bear in mind that not all English idioms have direct counterparts in Polish, and vice-versa.

(7) **Adaptation** is used when the type of situation referred to by the SL message does not function in the TL culture. In such cases the translator must re- create a situation that can be regarded as more or less equivalent. From this out- look, adaptation is a specific kind of *situational* equivalence. Vinay and Dar- belnet (1958/2000: 91) discuss an example of an Englishman who, without tak- ing much notice, kisses his daughter on the mouth as a greeting of a loving fa- ther after a long journey. However, translating "He kissed his daughter on the mouth" literary would probably sound awkward to French audience, since in that culture it may have a different connotation. Consequently, a translation into French requires a special kind of over-rendering.[1]

Adaptations are particularly common in translations of book and movie ti- tles (Jarniewicz: 2000). A good example of adaptation in this context is the translation of "Broken Arrow" (Segan & Woo: 1996). Although, at a first glance, it seems that the title could be translated literally as "Złamana strzała", a closer look reveals that it refers to US nuclear accident definition codes, where

---

[1] Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000: 91) also quote an anecdote about a simultaneous interpreter who, having adapted "cricket" into "Tour de France" in a context of a particularly popular sport, put himself in a difficult situation when the French dele- gate thanked the original speaker for reference to such a typically French sport. To avoid embarrassment the interpreter simply reversed the adaptation back into "cricket" when translating to his English client.

the phrase signifies "an actual accident involving a nuclear weapon, warhead, or component" (Hebert

2008: 26). Since Poland at the time when the movie was released had not officially admitted possession nor even storage of nuclear weapons on its territory (Łuczak 1996), such emergency codes were not availa- ble for use in translations. The film was distributed under the title "Tajna broń".

Translators are often reluctant to make use of adaptation, as it invariably af- fects not only the syntactic structure, but also the development and representa- tion of ideas within the paragraph, chapter, or the text as a whole. In extreme scenarios, a particular adaptation can affect extra-textual contexts, which can be illustrated with the following movie title sequence, in which the initial transla- tion influenced subsequent releases: *Die Hard* (Margolin & McTiernan 1988) [original movie] – "Szklana pułapka"; *Spy Hard* (Nielsen & Friedberg 1996) [a parody comedy with numerous references to the original movie] – "Szklanką po łapkach"; A *Good Day to Die Hard* (Karnowski & Moore 2013) [the latest film in the series] – "Szklana pułapka 5".

The absence of adaptation may be noticeable by the overall tone of the text that does not sound right in an indefinable way. It is the unfortunate impression given by some international organization publications, where, for the sake of an exaggerated insistence on parallelism, the people in charge demand translations based on calques. The result often sounds unnatural, which is referred to as *translationese*.[2]

4. Conclusion

From a general perspective, translation shifts can be viewed either as unwelcome deviations from the source text in the course of the translation act or as some- thing indispensable and desired to overcome specific differences between the SL and TL (Bakker, Koster & van Leuven-Zwart 1998). Although the taxonomy introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet has been criticized for being nothing more than a comparison between English and French at the level of words, phrases, and sentences taken out of the context, it can be regarded as the proposal that formed a springboard for later taxonomies of translation *techniques* and *strate- gies*. Scholars exploring the translation shifts labeled and re-labeled them in various ways to achieve a more comprehensive and clear-cut categorizations (see Marco 2009 for a review of inconsistencies between the terms *procedure*, *strategy*, *method*, and *technique* within translation studies). For example, Nida (1964) uses the term *techniques of adjustment* to discuss processes targeted at producing semantically equivalent structures from a communicative perspective. Newmark (1988) discusses *procedures* applied to sentences and smaller units of language, which he distinguishes from *methods* referring to the whole text. Van Leuven-Zwart (1989, 1990) presents an extensive analysis of translation proce- dures based on extracts from translations of Latin American fiction. Chesterman (1997) makes a distinction between *global* and *local strategies*, as well as be- tween *comprehension* and *production strategies*. Diaz-Cintaz & Remael (2007) review strategies

applied specifically in the practice of *subtitling*. Despite such efforts, all existing classifications still demonstrate certain deficiencies (Gambier 2010), which can be attributed to the fact that all categorizations demonstrate a natural tendency to overlap to some extent (cf. Rosch 1978).

A closer look at Vinay and Darbelnet's taxonomy of translation procedures encourages one to look beyond simple structural alterations between SL and TL to see the role of the translator as a creative intermediary between the original author and the target audience in the process of translation-mediated communi- cation. The last few decades have seen a considerable change in the focus of translation studies from the formalist approaches concentrating predominantly on linguistic transcoding to more functionally (e.g. Vermeer 1978/2000), and socio-culturally (e.g. Sperber & Wilson 1995) oriented approaches taking into consideration a vast array of extra-textual factors involved in the process of translation. More recently, an increasingly important role is attributed to *cogni- tive linguistics* as the frame of reference for the discipline of translation studies (see Tabakowska 1993; Hejwowski 2004; Deckert 2013).

Semantic translation :

Semantic translation differs from 'faithful translation' only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value of the source language text, compromising on the 'meaning' where appropriate so that no assonance, word-play or repetition jars in the finished version. Further, it may translate less important cultural words by culturally neutral third or functional terms but not by cultural equivalents. It may make other small concessions to there leadership. The distinction between 'faithful' and 'semantic' translation is that the first is uncompromising and dogmatic, while the second is more flexible admits the creative exception to 100% fidelity and allows for the translator's intuitive empathy with the

original,

UNIT III

Translation Procedures

Introduction

A question of *translation procedures* is associated with *equivalence* (see Chapter 1; see also Baker 2011) and a division between *literal* and *free* translation strate- gies, where the *literal* generally refers to translation of the target text by follow- ing individual word of the source text as closely as possible, while the *free* trans- lation focuses on capturing the sense of longer stretches of the source text. It is also closely related to a distinction of *translation units* (see Hatim & Munday 2004 for a review), in particular a *lexicological translation unit*, understood as a group of lexemes that form a single element of thought. A basic survey across a given language pair normally reveals units that are structurally incongruent with one another. It can be illustrated with the verb "fetch", whose meaning corresponds to two Polish verbs "iść + przynieść", or the compound "apple pie",

which is normally rendered in Polish with a single noun "szarlotka". Such ex- amples demonstrate that translation cannot be reduced to establishing a straightforward correspondence between individual words.

In real life scenarios, translators often cope with more elaborate structures, which due to *entrenchment** require certain ways of translating, while not others, to produce a massage that is meaningful to the target language users.

*) In modern approaches to language there is a growing tendency to replace the idea of *grammaticality* with that of *entrenchment*, which is derived from the usage-based approach to meaning postulated by *cognitive linguistics*. As put by Langacker (2008a: 38): "Meanings (like other linguistic structures) are recognized as part of a language only to the extent that they are (i) entrenched in the minds of individual speakers and (ii) conventional for members of a speech community. Only a limited array of senses satisfy these criteria and qualify as established *linguistic units*. But since entrenchment and conventionalization are inherently matters of degree, there is no discrete boundary between senses which have and which lack the status of es- tablished units. We find instead a gradation leading from novel interpretations, through incipient senses, to established linguistic meanings". For example, Apple, Inc. is famous for notoriously using marketing slogans that break conventions of grammaticality. In 1997 the company introduced the attention-grabbing slogan "Think different", which was received as grammatically unconventional. Despite initial criticisms, the slogan has been widely accepted, which makes it grammatical (see Trenga 2010).

(author's note)

For example, the following notice spotted in a Polish self-service bar above gar- bage cans: "Prosimy nie wyrzucać pełnych kubków" with the accompanying translation "We ask to not throw away full cups" may sound unfortunately puz- zling to native speakers of English, who would probably expect in this context a more conventional message, like "Please do not dispose of liquids". Such examples demonstrate that the structure of the SL often must be changed in the target language to properly render the meaning of the source text. Those small, yet meaningful, changes that occur in the process of translation are called *trans- lation shifts*. Catford (1965/2000: 141) defines them as "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL". Although Cat- ford was the first to use the term *shift*, a comprehensive taxonomy of shifts that occur in translation was established by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet (1958), who developed a taxonomy of *translation procedures*.

Translation and Synonymy

My point of departure here is to suggest that translation is not a form of synonymy, simply because words may have semantic values that are not translatable into other languages. For example, although words such as *lie, falsehood*, *untruth*, *fib*, and *misrepresentation* may be used to substitute one another in most contexts within the same language, they cannot be used to substitute one another in all contexts. According to Edmonds and Hirst (2002: 107), these are regarded as near or partial synonyms. The explanation is given by Edmonds and Hirst as follows:

> Indeed, near-synonyms are pervasive in language; examples are easy to find. *Lie*, *falsehood*, *untruth*, *fib*, and *misrepresentation*, for instance, are near-synonyms of one another. All denote a statement that does not conform to the truth, but they differ from one another in fine aspects of their denotation. A *lie* is a deliberate attempt to deceive that is a flat contradiction of the truth, whereas a *misrepresentation* may be more indirect, as by misplacement of emphasis, an untruth might be told merely out of ignorance, and a *fib* is deliberate but relatively trivial, possibly told to save one's own or another's face (Gove 1984). The words also differ stylistically; *fib* is an informal, childish

term, whereas *falsehood* is quite formal, and *untruth* can be used euphemistically to avoid some of the derogatory implications of some of the other terms.

From a different angle, the Arabic words *hisaan*, *faras*, *jawaad*, *agarr*, stand for the English word *horse.* Although these words can be used interchangeably in most contexts (since they all refer to the word *horse*), they are not interchangeable in all contexts. If we take the words for *horse*, we may find the following meanings that are synonymous and used in a context related to that word:

1. The word *hisaan* has the components of *horse* and *male*.
2. The word *faras* has the components of *horse* and *male* or *female*.
3. The word *jawaad* has the components of *a particular horse*, which is *fast*, *male* or *female*.
4. The word *agarr* has the components of *a particular horse*, which has a *white patch on its forehead* and *male* or *female*.

The plural form of any of these forms is *khayl* (horses), though (1) and (2) can have their distinct plurals as *hisaan/ahsina* and *faras* as *furus*/*afraas*, respectively. The above synonymous words have more than one semantic component in common. All of them have the component *horse* and *male* and *female* components. Only (1) has the component *male* alone, while (2) and (4) share the component *male* or *female.* We can also find that (1) and (2) have no distinctive qualities as *horses*, other than the components mentioned. However, (3) is characterized by *agile movement* and *fastness* and (4) by *a special white patch on the forehead,* which naturally contrasts with the overall dark color of the horse. How can the translator render these words in translation with their shared meanings into other language, without any loss or gain of meaning? This is an area where more research needs to be done.

In actuality, however, (1) and (2) can be used to substitute one another, without posing serious syntactic or semantic difficulties. I believe translators will have no difficulty transferring any of these two forms into English as *horse* since the words denote species and gender. Although (3) denotes a *race horse,* it can also be used to refer to *horse* in the general sense, with some loss of meaning in its associative meaning, i.e. *fast horse*. As for the word in (4), translators have to

make it clear when transferring the meaning of this word into English as *horse*, that it denotes *a horse of a particular color*. If translators choose to be more faithful to the (SL) text, they can resort to paraphrase, in which case the word *jawaad* can be translated as a *race horse*, and *agarr* as a *horse with a white patch on the forehead.* If one agrees with Nida that, when dealing with synonymous words, we must look at the different componential features of the meanings of these synonyms and "select only those meanings which compete in the same semantic fields" (Nida 1969: 64), then we can be sure that the Arabic words for *horse* mentioned above are near synonyms. Such words show certain overlapping areas of meaning which 'compete in the same semantic field.'

Also, Arabic words such *sayf, muhannad, husaam,* among other words or expressions, stand for the English word *sword*. The word *sayf* is a neutral word, denoting the English word *sword*. Although the words *muhannad* and *husaam* share all the characteristics with the word *sword*, they connote additional characteristics. For example, the word *muhannad* refers to a sword in its sheath or scabbard, case, indicating that the sword has not been used yet. The word *husaam* refers to a sword that is pointed or sharp. It also suggests meanings of straightforwardness or uprightness. The neutral Arabic word *sayf* does not allude to such connotations. The question now is whether or not these words can be used to replace one another in all contexts without any loss or gain of meaning. In other words, are all these synonyms substitutable for one another in all contexts?

From a linguistic perspective, Nida (1969: 73) defines synonymy in language as "words which share several (but not all) essential components and thus can be used to substitute one another in some (but not all) contexts without any appreciable difference of meaning in these contexts, e.g. *love* and *like*. Peter Newmark (1981:101) takes a position similar to that of Nida declaring very clearly "I do not approve of the proposition that translation is a form of synonymy". Susan Bassnett-McGuire explains synonymy and the complexities associated with it in more detail. She points out that even apparent synonymy does not yield equivalence, "hence a dictionary of so-called synonyms may give the word *perfect* as a synonym for *ideal* or *vehicle* as a synonym for *conveyance* but in neither case can there be said to be complete equivalence, since each unit contains within itself a set of non-translatable associations and connotations" (Bassnett-McGuire 1980: 15). Furthermore, Bassnett-McGuire (1980:29) argues that "equivalence in translation

should not be approached as a search for sameness, since sameness cannot even exist between two (TL) versions of the same text, let alone between the (SL) and the (TL) versions.

translatability by analyzing the deep structures of a language in terms of what she calls semantic primitives. Discussing the problems involved in translating the English color words and kinship terminology into other languages, she arrives at the conclusion that utterances in Anna Wierzbicka, on the other hand, examines the problem of synonymy and various languages differ, not only in their surface structures, but in their deep structures as well. Wierzbicka (1980: 67) maintains that "those different deep structures are always expressible in languages, which are mutually isomorphic; they are all isomorphic with respect to the universal lingua, that is to the language of semantic primitives. For this reason, deep structures of sentences in different languages (different as they may be in themselves) are always mutually translatable".

Metalingual Function in Translation

Metalingual function of language is the ability of language to talk about its own features. Thus talking about phrasal verbs in English will be an instance of metalingual function. Metalingual function of language becomes relevant in translation when a particular word is used in a special sense, deliberately a word play is done or linguistic ambiguity is created.

The translator has to assume that second reader needs more information about that ‘grammatical peculiarity’ as compared to the first reader. So he has to decide whether the target (second) reader is a specialist of some SL knowledge or he does not know anything at all. Such decision will determine how to deal with the particular case, whether it be: (a) transcribed, (b) loan translated, (c) neologised, (d) defined in footnotes, (e) exemplified, (f) interlinearly translated to show the syntax, or (f) functionally translated.

If a word is used in SL in a special sense, the translator has several choices. He can translate the term in its obscure sense as translating ‘libertinage’ to ‘guilty of libertinage’. Or he can chose to use a more expressive term e.g. ‘freethinking in religious matters’. The choice will be dependent on his assessment of reader’s knowledge and interest. Thus he can choose to delete a special sense of a word, if it is of no interest to the reader. Alternative terms for same referent in the text

can be deleted. Similarly, if TL synonyms are less frequent as compared to SL one, they can be dropped.

Translation of word play in literary and non-literary texts can be done in two ways. The reader will need all available and possible information in non-literary texts. Thus as Newmark (2001, p.105) notes, in translating a joke from German to English, the translator adds original German text in brackets. e.g.

'Mr. and Mrs. X live in fairly grand style. Some people think that the husband has earned a lot and so has been able to lay by a bit (sich etwas zuruckgelegt); others again think that the wife has lain back a bit (sich etwas zuruckgelegt) and so has been able to earn a lot' (p.106)

As he notes that punning element is retained by reproducing German text to illustrate the rearrangement of 'precisely same verbal material'. Thus the same punning effect, with slight changes of course, can be created in English. But this is not always possible as neatly as the example shows.

The second method to translate word play is to drop them altogether or replacing them with translator's own examples. This method 'substitutes translator's insights for the authors'. Thus for the above example the translator could create a wholly new joke and replace with another one. Newmark (2001, p.107) notes that the first method is most important and correct one in cases where "words are as important as thought, and 'dramatic illusion' is less important".

Proverbs in non-literary texts can be translated to their known equivalents in TL. Alternatively, the translator can translate the proverb from SL to TL and give its relevance to current text as an explanation; or he can simply absorb the proverb during the translation.

Word play in literary texts (i.e. plays and poems etc.) where 'dramatic illusion' is a must can be translated in different ways. Widely used method is that translator captures one of two senses of the word. As Newmark (2001, p.108) exemplifies the translation of Shakespeare's play Helmet in Germen, where source has three puns and two sets of alliterations, but translator preserves only two puns and one set of alliteration.

If a literary text has double meaning within a lexical unit, firstly the translator tries to reproduce it with a word having same double meaning. At second attempt he will try to use a synonym with

same double meaning. At a third attempt, he might decide to distribute two senses of words to two or more lexical units; or he can sacrifice one of two meanings.

While translating imaginative literature ‘loss of meaning comes from metaphorical properties rather than sound effects’. As Newmark is of the view that metaphors are rooted in particular environments. Thus literal and metaphorical meaning, at the same time, are difficult to transfer from SL to TL.

Imaginative literature develops events and people in symbolical character, which is done through more general words that denote them. As Newmark (p.109) describes, “connotation, metonymy, metaphor, word-play merge into each other”. A new ‘separate sense’ is developed for the words which becomes a pun on the primary sense of the word. It is upto the translator to select more general concrete sense or more culturally influenced sense, or combine them both.

Concluding his paper, Newmark (p.109) says that for translating metalanguage, there are alternative solutions. His view is that nothing is untranslatable, only a ‘supplementary gloss’ is often required. Metalanuage is often signalled by expressions like ‘so called’, ‘by definition’, ‘so to speak’ … (p.109). It is usually imaginative literature where force or the meaning may have to be sacrificed, otherwise metalangauge can be handled neatly.

UNIT I V

A linguisrlc Theory of TransIation.

This distinction relates to the extent, in a syntagmatic sense, of source language text whichis submitted to the translation process. By text **we tile an** any stretch of language, spoken orwritten, which is under discussion. According to the circumstances a text may thus be awhole library of books, a single volume, a chapter, a paragraph, a sentence, a cause.... Etc. Itmay also be a fragment not coextensive with any formal literary or linguistic unit.

In a full translation the entire text is submitted to the translation process; that is, every part of the source language text is replaced by target language text material. In a partial translation, some part or parts of the source language text are left untranslated; they are simply transferred to and incorporated in the target language text. In literary translation it is not uncommon for some source language lexical items to be treated in this way, either because they are regarded as 'Untranslatable' or for the deliberate purpose of introducing 'local colour' into the target language text. This process of transferring source language lexical items into a target language text is more complex than appears at first sight, and it is only approximately **tnrc** to say that they remain 'untranslated'.

The distinction between 111 and partial translation is hardly a (linguistically) technical one.
Total vs. RaMcted traealation : This distinction relates to the levels of language involvedin translation. By total translation we mean what is most usually meant by translation. That is, translation in which **all** levels of the source language text are replaced by target language material. Strictly **speaking,** total translation is a misleading term, since, though total replacement is involved it is not replacement by equivalents at all levels. In total translation **source** language *grammar* and lexis are replaced by equivalent target language grammar and lexis. This replacement entails the replacement of source language phonology graphology by target language phonology graphology, but this is not normally replacement by target language equivalents, hence there is no translation, at this level. Total

translation may best be defined as: replacement of source language **grammar** and lexis by equivalent target language grammar and lexis with consequential replacement of source language phonology/graphology by (non-equivalent) target language phonology/ graphology.

By restricted translation Catford means: replacement of source language text material byequivalent target language textual material, at only one level, that is translation performed

only at the phonological or at the graphological level, or at only one of the two levels of *grammar* and lexis.

Rank of translation: **A** third type of differentiation in translation relates to the **rank** in a grammatical hierarchy, at which translation equivalence is established, In normal total translation the grammatical units between which translation equivalences are set up may be at any rank, and in a long text the ranks at which translation equivalence

occur are constantly changing; at one point, the equivalence is sentence-to-sentence, at another, group to group, at another, word-to-word etc., not to mention formally 'shifted' or skewed equivalences. It is possible, however to make a translation which is total but in which the selection of

target language equivalents is deliberately **confined** to one rank (or a few ranks low in **the rank scale)** in the hierarchy of grammatical units. We may call this rank-bound translation. **The** cruder attempts at machine translation are rank-bound in this **sense,** usually at word or

morpheme rank. That is, they set up word-to-word **or** morpheme to morpheme equivalences, but not equivalences between high-rank such as the group, clause or sentence. In contrast with this, nonnal total translation in which equivalences shift freely up and down the **rank** scale may be termed unbounded translation. In rank-bound translation, an attempt is made always to select target language equivalents at the same **rank.**

A **free** translation is always unbounded- equivalents shunt up and down the rank scale, but tend to be at the higher ranks- some times between larger units than the sentence. Word-for-word translation generally means what it says; i.e.., essentially rank-bound at word rank. Literal translation lies between these extremes; it may start from a word-for-word

translation, but make changes in conformity with target language grammar. One notable point is that literal translation like word-for-word, tends to remain lexically word-for-word i.e., to use the highest probability lexical equivalence for each lexical item. Lexical adaptation to target language collocational or idiomatic requirements seems to be characteristic of free translation, as in this example:

Source language text : It's raining cats and dogs

word-for-word adu male baruttide bekkugalu mattu n'ayigaiu

literal n'ayi bekkuga!~ ma!e baruttive

frte male jzragi baruttide

Casagdc (1954) distinguishes four 'ends' of translation :

1) Pragmatic translation: It refers to the translation of a message with an interest in accuracy of the information that was meant to **be** conveyed in **the** source language form. Translator would have no concern other than getting **the** infonnation across in the second language as in the translation of technical documents.

2) Aesthctical- poetic translation: It is a translation in which the translator takes into account the effect, emotion and feeling of an original language version, the aesthetic form, **as** in the translation of a sonnet, heroic couplet or a hatic monologue, used by the original author **as** well as any information in the message.

3) Ethnographic translation: its purpose is to explicate the cultural context of the source and the second language versions. With this as their goal, translators have to be sensitive to the way words are used. (Ex.'yes9 as against 'yea' in America) and must know how the words fit into the cultures that use the source and target languages.

4) Linguistic translation: is concerned with equivalent meanings of the constituent morphemes of the second language and with grammatical form.

PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION

Because literature consists of conventional symbols, there exists in literature **the** problem of translation which does not exist in the other arts *. When one seeks to make a work of

literature available to a wider audience than that composed of only the native speakers of the language in which the work was written, the process of translation must be restored to and in the process a great deal of the work's original character is lost. In a poem there are

1) sounds

2) the dictionary meanings of the words

3) the connotations of the words - The manifold associations that they evoke (sensory, intellectual and emotional) in the minds of the readers. The sounds are the least important of the three, and many a great poem as sheer sound is hardly ever pleasing. The finding of like dictionary meanings is

usually a simple matter and when there is a word that has no rough equivalent in the other language, it may be simply retained in the original language, (for example, the Sanskrit word **Dhanna** or yoga is retained in English translation of Sanskrit works). As for the associations that hover about a word, they **may** vary from one language to another, so that if a

work translated rather literally, the associative values of the words are lost. **Thus** 'Karnbi **in Kaanada,** if -1akd into English, literally, may **mean** 'cut the wire' though it is **Encyclopedia Britanica Vol., 25 PP 698** literally **comb** it is **an unfaithhl** translation **because** it actually means 'take to heels'. Words can often **be** found in the second language that have a roughly equivalent associative value to the original, but these will usually not provide a literal translation; thus the translator is faced with the dilemma of being able to provide the literal meaning translation or a translation that renders the spirit or 'feel' of the original, but not both. The **task** of the translator is **the** same whether the material is oral or written, but of course, translation between written text allows more time for stylistic adjustments and technical

expertise. The main problems have been recognized since antiquity and were expressed by St. Jomes, translator of the famed Latin Bible, **the** Vulgate, form the Hebrew and Greek originals. Semantically, these problems relate to the adjustment of the literal and the literary translation of each word, **as** far as his is possible, and the production of a whole sentence or even a whole text that conveys as much of the meaning of the original **as** can be managed, These problems and conflicts arise because of factors already noticed in the use and functioning of language;

languages do not operate in isolation but within and **as** a part of cultures, and cultures differ from each other in various ways, even between the languages of communities whose cultures **are** fairly closely allied, there is by no means a one-to-one relation of exact lexical equivalence between the items of their vocabularies, In their lexical meanings, words acquire various overtones and associations that are not shared by the nearest corresponding words in other languages; this may vitiate a literal translation. The English author and theologian Roland Knox has pointed to the historical connections of the **Oreek** 'Skandalon' "Stumbling block, trap, or snare" inadequately rendered by "offence", its usual New Testament translation. In modern times translators of the Bible into the languages of peoples culturally remote from Europe are well aware of the difficulties of finding a lexical equivalent for 'lamb', when the intended readers, even if they have seen sheep and lambs, have no tradition of blood sacrifice for expiation nor long-hallowed associations of lambs with lovableness, innocence and apparent helplessness. **The** English word uncle has, for various **reasons,** a coy and slightly comic set

of associations. The Latin poet Virgil uses the words 'Avunvulus Hector' in a solemn heroic passage of the Aenied (Book **In,** line 343); to translate this by Uncle Hector gives us an entirely unsuitable flavour to **the** text.

The translation of poetry, especially into poetry, presents very special difficulties, and the better the original poem, the harder the translator's task. This is because poetry is, in the first instance, carefully contrived to express exactly what the poet wants to say. Second, to achieve this end, the poet calls forth all the resources of the language in which he is writing, matching the choice or words, the order of words and grammatical constructions, **as** well **as** phonological features peculiar to **the** language in meter, perhaps supplemented by rhyme, assonance and alliteration. The available resources differ from language to language; English and Gemre ly on stress-marked meters, but Latin and Greek used quantitative meters, contrasting long and short syllables, while French places approximately equal stress and length on each syllable. The translator must **try** to match the stylistic exploitation of the particular resources in the original language with comparable resources from his own. Becawe lexical grammatical and metrical considerations are all interrelated and interwoven in poetry, a satisfactory literary translation is usually very far **Erom** a literal word for word rendering. The more the poet relies on language fom, the more embedded his verses **are in that** particular language, and the harder they are to

translate adequately. This is Especially true with lyrical poetry in several languages, with its wordplay, complex rhymes and frequent assonances.

Untranslatability

Untranslatability is the property of text or speech for which no equivalent can be found when translated into another language. A text that is considered to be untranslatable is considered a *lacuna*, or lexical gap. The term arises when describing the difficulty of achieving the so-called perfect translation. It is based on the notion that there are certain concepts and words that are so interrelated that an accurate translation becomes an impossible task.[1] Some writers have suggested that language carries sacred notions or is intrinsic to national identity. Brian James Baer posits that untranslatability is sometimes seen by nations as proof of the national genius. He quotes Alexandra Jaffe: "When translators talk about untranslatable, they often reinforce the notion that each language has its own 'genius', an 'essence' that naturally sets it apart from all other languages and reflects something of the 'soul' of its culture or people".[2]

A translator, however, can resort to a number of translation procedures to compensate for a lexical gap. From this perspective, untranslatability does not carry deep linguistic relativity implications. Meaning can virtually always be translated, if not always technically accurate.

Theories[edit]

There is a school of thought identified with Walter Benjamin that identifies the concept of "sacred" in relation to translation and this pertains to the text that is untranslatable because its meaning and letter cannot be disassociated.[3] It stems from the view that translation should realize the imagined perfect relationship with the original text.[4] This theory highlights the paradoxical nature of translation wherein it—as a process—assumes the forms of necessity and impossibility at the same time. This is demonstrated in Jacques Derrida's analysis of the myth of Babel, a word which he described as a name that means confusion and also a proper name of God.[5] Furthermore, Derrida noted that when God condemned the world to a multiplicity of tongues, he created a paradoxical need and impossibility of translation.[5]

Derrida himself has put forward his own notion of the untranslatability of the text, arguing in his early works such as the *Writing and Difference* and *Margins of Philosophy* that there is an excess of untranslatable meaning in literature and these cannot be reduced to a closed system or a restricted economy[3] "in which there is nothing that cannot be made to make sense."[6]

Brian James Baer posits that untranslatability is sometimes seen by nations as proof of its national genius. Literature that can be easily translated may be considered as lacking originality, while translated work themselves may be regarded merely as imitations. Baer quotes Jean-Jacques Rousseau defining true genius as "the kind that creates and makes everything out of nothing". Paraphrasing Robert Frost's remark about poetry ("Poetry is what gets lost in translation"), Baer suggests that "one could define national identity as that which is lost in translation". He further quotes Alexandra Jaffe: "When translators talk about untranslatable, they often reinforce the notion that each language has its own 'genius', an 'essence' that naturally sets it apart from all other languages and reflects something of the 'soul' of its culture or people".[7]

Quite often, a text or utterance that is considered to be "untranslatable" is considered a *lacuna*, or lexical gap. That is, there is no one-to-one equivalence between the word, expression or turn of phrase in the source language and another word, expression or turn of phrase in the target language. A translator can, however, resort to a number of translation procedures to compensate for this. From this perspective, untranslatability or difficulty of translation does not always carry deep linguistic relativity implications; denotation can virtually always be translated, given enough circumlocution, although connotation may be ineffable or inefficient to convey.

Translation procedures[edit]

N.B.: The majority of examples and illustrations given below will involve translating to or from the English language.

The translation procedures that are available in cases of lacunae, or lexical gaps, include the following:

Adaptation[edit]

An **adaptation**, also known as a **free translation**, is a procedure whereby the translator replaces a term with cultural connotations, where those connotations are restricted to readers of the

original language text, with a term with corresponding cultural connotations that would be familiar to readers of the translated text.

For example, in the Belgian comic book *The Adventures of Tintin*, Tintin's canine sidekick *Milou* is translated as *Snowy* in English, *Bobbie* in Dutch, *Kuttus* in Bengali, and *Struppi* in German; likewise the detectives *Dupont* and *Dupond* become *Thomson* and *Thompson* in English, *Jansen* and *Janssen* in Dutch, *Jonson* and *Ronson* in Bengali, *Schultze* and *Schulze* in German, *Hernández* and *Fernández* in Spanish, 杜本 and 杜朋 (*Dùběn* and *Dùpéng*) in Chinese, *Dyupon* and *Dyuponn* in Russian and *Skafti* and *Skapti* in Icelandic.

Adaptation is often used when translating poetry, works of theatre, and advertising.

Borrowing[edit]

See also: Loanword

Borrowing is a translation procedure whereby the translator uses a word or expression from the source text in the target text unmodified.

In English text, borrowings not sufficiently anglicised are normally in italics.

Calque[edit]

Calque entails taking an expression, breaking it down to individual elements and translating each element into the target language word for word. For example, the German word *Alleinvertretungsanspruch* can be calqued to "single-representation-claim", but a proper translation would result in "exclusive mandate". Word-by-word translations may have comic value, but can be a means to save as much of the original style as possible, especially when the source text is ambiguous or undecipherable to the translator.

Paraphrase[edit]

Paraphrase, sometimes called **periphrasis**, is a translation procedure whereby the translator replaces a word in the source text by a group of words or an expression in the target text. For example, the Portuguese word *saudade* is often translated into English as 'the feeling of missing a person who is gone'. A similar example is *dor* in Romanian, translated into English as 'missing someone or something that's gone and/or not available at the time'.[*citation needed*]

An example of untranslatability is seen in the Dutch language through the word *gezelligheid*, which does not have an English equivalent, though the German equivalent *Gemütlichkeit* is sometimes used. Literally, it means a 'cozy, friendly, or nice atmosphere', but can also connote time spent with loved ones, the fact of seeing a friend after a long absence, the friendliness or chattiness of a specific person, or a general sense of togetherness. Such gaps can lead to word borrowing, as with pajamas or Zeitgeist.

Translator's note[edit]

A **translator's note** is a note (usually a footnote or an endnote) added by the translator to the target text to provide additional information pertaining to the limits of the translation, the cultural background, or any other explanations.

Examples[edit]

Register[edit]

Although Thai has words that can be used as equivalent to English "I", "you", or "he/she/it", they are relatively formal terms (or markedly informal). In most cases, Thai people use words which express the relation between speaker and listener according to their respective roles. For instance, for a mother to say to her child "I'll tell you a story", she would say "□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□" (mae ja lao nitaan hai luuk fang), or "Mother will tell child a story". Similarly, older and younger friends will often use sibling terminology, so that an older friend telling a younger friend "You're my friend" would be "□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□" (nawng pen peuan pii), would translate directly as "Younger sibling is older sibling's friend". To be translated into English correctly, it is proper to use "I" and "you" for these example statements, but normal Thai perceptions of relation are lost in the process. Similar phenomena can also be observed in Indonesian. One may use the formal form of pronouns, which are generally distinct from the informal/familiar forms; however, the use of these pronouns does not evoke sufficient friendliness or intimacy, especially in spoken language. Instead of saying "Anda mau pesan apa?", a waiter/waitress will most likely say "Bapak/Ibu mau pesan apa?" (lit. 'Sir/Madam wants to order what?'). Both expressions are equally polite; however, the latter is more sympathetic and friendly. When conversing with family and relatives, most Indonesians also prefer using kinship terminology (father, mother, brother, sister) when

addressing older family members. When addressing younger family members, informal pronouns are more prevalent.

Grammar[edit]

Possession[edit]

Translating the English word "have" to Arabic, Bengali, Finnish, Hebrew, Hindi, Irish, Japanese, Korean, Russian, Turkish, Urdu, or Welsh, is somewhat difficult, as there is no specific verb with this meaning in these languages. Instead, for "I have X" these languages use a combination of words that mean "X is to me"; or (in Finnish) "at me is X"; (in Turkish) "my X exists" or "at me exists X"; or (in Hebrew) "there-is of-me (represents ownership, could mean to-me) X."

In Hungarian, there is a word corresponding to "have": *bír*—but its use is quite scarce today, usually turning up in very formal and legal texts. It also sounds outdated, since it was used to translate the Latin *habeo* and the German *haben* possessive verbs when these languages had official status in Hungary. The general grammatical construction used is "there is a(n) X of mine". For example, the English sentence "I have a car." translates to Hungarian as "Van egy kocsim." which would translate back to English word-by-word as "There is a car of mine."

A similar construction occurs in Russian, where "I have" translates literally into "at ("or" by) me there is". Russian does have a word that means "to have": *иметь* (imet')—but it is very rarely used by Russian speakers in the same way English speakers use the word "have". In some cases, it may be misinterpreted as vulgar slang for the subject rudely using the object for sexual gratification; for example, in an inept translation of "Do you have a wife?"

In Japanese, the English verb "to have" is most often translated into the verbs *iru* (いる or 居る) and *aru* (ある or 有る). The former verb is used to indicate the presence of a person, animal, or other living creature (excluding plant life) while the latter verb is closer to the English "to have" and is used for inanimate objects. "I have a pen" becomes "Watashi ni wa pen ga aru" (私にはペンがある) which can be represented in English as "I (topic) pen (subject) exists". To indicate the English "have" in the sense of possession, the Japanese language uses the verb *motsu* (持つ), which literally means 'to carry'. This could be used as "Kare wa keitai wo

motteiru" (彼は携帯を持っている), which becomes "He (subject) cellphone (object) is carrying" or "He has a cellphone".

Verb forms[edit]

English lacks some grammatical categories.

There is no simple way in English to contrast Finnish *kirjoittaa* or Polish *pisać* (continuing, corresponding to English 'to write') and *kirjoitella* or *pisywać* (a regular frequentative, 'to occasionally write short passages at a time', or 'to jot down now and then').
Also, *hypätä* and *skoczyć* (to jump once) and *hyppiä* and *skakać* (to continuously jump; to be jumping from point A to B) are another example.

Irish allows the prohibitive mood to be used in the passive voice. The effect is used to prohibit something while expressing society's disapproval for that action at the same time. For example, contrast *Ná caithigí tobac* (meaning 'Don't smoke' when said to more than one person), which uses the second person plural in the imperative meaning "Do not smoke", with *Ní caitear tobac*, which is best translated as 'Smoking just isn't done here', uses the autonomous imperative meaning 'One does not smoke'.

Italian has three distinct declined past tenses, where *fui* (*passato remoto*), *ero* (*imperfetto*), and *sono stato* (*passato prossimo*) all mean 'I was'. The first indicates a concluded action in the (remote) past, the second a progressive or habitual action in the past, and the latter an action that holds some connection to the present, especially if a recent time is specified ("stamattina ho visto" for 'this morning I saw'). The *passato remoto* is often used for narrative history (for example, novels). Nowadays, the difference between *passato remoto* and *passato prossimo* is blurred in the spoken language, the latter being used in both situations. What difference there exists is partly geographic. In the north of Italy the *passato remoto* is very rarely used in everyday speech, whereas in the south it often takes the place of the *passato prossimo*. The distinction is only alive in Tuscany, which makes it dialectal even if hardline purists insist it should be applied consistently.

Likewise, English lacks a productive grammatical means to show indirection but must instead rely on periphrasis, that is the use of multiple words to explain an idea. Finnish grammar, on the contrary, allows the regular production of a series of verbal derivatives, each of which involves a

greater degree of indirection. For example, on the basis of the verb *vetää* ('to pull'), it is possible to produce:

- *vetää* (pull),
- *vedättää* (cause something/someone to pull/to wind-up (lie)),
- *vedätyttää* (cause something/someone to cause something/someone to pull),
- *vedätätyttää* (cause something/someone to cause something/someone to cause something/someone to pull).

Finnish	**English**	**Translation/paraphrase of boldface verb**
*Hevonen **vetää.***	A horse **pulls.**	pulls
*Ajomies **vedättää.***	A driver **commands** the horse **to pull**.	causes something to pull
*Urakoitsija **vedätyttää.***	A subcontractor **directs** the driver **to command** the horse **to pull**.	causes someone to cause something to pull
*Yhtiö **vedätätyttää.***	The corporation **assigns** the subcontractor **to have** the driver **command** the horse **to pull**.	causes someone to cause someone to cause something to pull

Hindi has a similar concept of indirection. *Karna* means 'to do'; *karaana* means 'to make someone do'; *karwaana* means 'to get someone to make yet another person do'.

Most Turkic languages (Turkish, Azeri, Kazakh) contain the grammatical verb suffix *miş* (or *mis* in other dialects), which indicates that the speaker did not witness the act personally but surmises or has discovered that the act has occurred or was told of it by another, as in the example of *Gitmiş!* (Turkish), which can be expressed in English as "it is reported that

he/she/it has gone", or, most concisely, as "apparently, he/she/it has gone". This grammatical form is especially used when telling jokes, or narrating stories.

Similar to the Turkic *miş*, nearly every Quechua sentence is marked by an evidential clitic, indicating the source of the speaker's knowledge (and how certain they are about the statement). The enclitic *=mi* expresses personal knowledge (*Tayta Wayllaqawaqa chufirmi*, "Mr. Huayllacahua is a driver - I know it for a fact"); *=si* expresses hearsay knowledge (*Tayta Wayllaqawaqa chufirsi*, "Mr. Huayllacahua is a driver, or so I've heard"); *=chá* expresses high probability (*Tayta Wayllaqawaqa chufirchá*, "Mr. Huayllacahua is a driver, most likely"). Colloquially, the latter is also used when the speaker has dreamed the event told in the sentence or experienced it while intoxicated.

Languages that are extremely different from each other, like English and Chinese, need their translations to be more like adaptations. Chinese has no tenses per se, only three aspects. The English verb "to be" does not have a direct equivalent in Chinese. In an English sentence where "to be" leads to an adjective ("It *is* blue"), there is no "to be" in Chinese. (There are no adjectives in Chinese, instead there are stative verbs that do not need an extra verb.) If it states a location, the verb *zài* (在) is used, as in "We *are* in the house". In some other cases (usually when stating a judgement), the judgment verb *shì* (是) is used, as in "I *am* the leader." And in most other cases, such structure ("to be") is simply not used, but some more natural structure in Chinese is used instead. Any sentence that requires a play on those different meanings will not work the same way in Chinese. In fact, very simple concepts in English can sometimes be difficult to translate, for example, there is no single direct translation for the word "yes" in Chinese, as in Chinese the affirmative is said by repeating the verb in the question. ("Do you have it?" "(I) have".)

Vocabulary[edit]

German, Dutch and Danish have a wealth of modal particles that are particularly difficult to translate as they convey sense or tone rather than strictly grammatical information. The most infamous example perhaps is *doch* (Dutch: *toch*, Danish: *dog*), which roughly means "Don't you realize that . . . ?" or "In fact it is so, though someone is denying it." What makes translating such words difficult is their different meanings depending on intonation or the context.

A common use of the word *doch* can be found in the German sentence *Der Krieg war doch noch nicht verloren*, which translates to *The war wasn't lost yet, after all* or *The war was still not lost.*

Several other grammatical constructs in English may be employed to translate these words for each of their occurrences. The same *Der Krieg war doch noch nicht verloren* with slightly changed pronunciation can also mean excuse in defense to a question: *. . . but the war was not lost yet (. . . so we fought on).*

A use which relies heavily on intonation and context could produce yet another meaning: "So the war was really not over yet (as you have been trying to convince me all along)."

Another change of intonation makes the sentence a question. *Der Krieg war doch noch nicht verloren?* would translate into *"(You mean) the war was not yet lost (back then)?"*

Another well-known example comes from the Portuguese or Spanish verbs *ser* and *estar*, both translatable as *to be* (see Romance copula). However, *ser* is used only with essence or nature, while *estar* is used with states or conditions. Sometimes this information is not very relevant for the meaning of the whole sentence and the translator will ignore it, whereas at other times it can be retrieved from the context.

When none of these apply, the translator will usually use a paraphrase or simply add words that can convey that meaning. The following example comes from Portuguese:

> "*Não estou bonito, eu **sou** bonito.*"
>
> Spanish equivalent:"*No estoy guapo; yo **soy** guapo.*"
>
> Literal translation: "I am not (apparently/just right now) handsome;
>
> I **am** (essentially/always) handsome."
>
> Adding words: "I am not handsome today; I am always handsome."
>
> Paraphrase: "I don't look handsome; I **am** handsome."

Some South Slavic words that have no English counterparts are *doček*, a gathering organized at someone's arrival (the closest translation would be *greeting* or *welcome*; however, a 'doček' does not necessarily have to be positive); and *limar*, a sheet metal worker.

Family[edit]

Main article: kinship terminology

Kinship terminology often varies across languages. Terms are often too specific or too general to translate into another language. Some rules used for defining kinship terminology include the following:

Paternal or maternal. For example, Nordic languages, Indo-Aryan languages and Chinese languages distinguish paternal and maternal relatives such as paternal grandmother and maternal grandmother. Conversely, son's son and daughter's son are also distinguished. Similarly, aunts and uncles are further divided in many languages.

Gender. Whereas English kinship terms make clear distinction between genders, many languages do not. For example, Thai does not distinguish between siblings by gender, but only by age. Thai also disregards gender when aunts or uncles are younger than their parents. Thai also has one word for all nieces, nephews, and grandchildren. On the flip side, the English word *cousins* does not distinguish gender, but many languages do, included Romance languages, Slavic languages and Chinese languages.

By blood or by marriage. For example, the English word *uncle* can refer to a parent's brother, or a husband of a parent's sibling. Many languages, such as Hindi, Bengali, Hungarian and Chinese distinguish these.

Full or half sibling. In Arabic, "brother" is often translated into أخ (*Akh*). However, whilst this word may describe a brother who shares either one or both parents, there is a separate word - شقيق (*Shaqīq*) - to describe a brother with whom one shares both parents.

Age relative to oneself or one's parent. For example in Bengali, father's elder brothers are called *Jethu* (□□□□□□)' while younger brothers are called *Kaku* (□□□□). Their wives are called *Jethi-ma* (□□□□-□□) and *Kaki-ma* (□□□□-□□), respectively. Another common issue is translating *brother* or *sister* into Chinese or Japanese, which have separate words for older and younger ones.

Relations by marriage[edit]

There is no standard English word for the Italian "*consuoceri*", Yiddish *"makhatunim"*,[8] Spanish "*consuegros*" or Portuguese "*consogros*": a gender-neutral collective plural like "co-in-laws". If Harry marries Sally, then in Yiddish, Harry's father is

the *"mekhutn"* of Sally's father; each mother is the *"makheteyneste"* of the other. In Romanian, they are *"cuscri"*. In Bengali, both fathers are *beayi* and mothers, *beyan*. Bengali has *dada*/*bhai* for *brother* and *jamai-babu*/*bhagni-pati* for *brother-in-law*; *chhele* for *son* and *jamai* for *son-in-law*.

Spanish and Portuguese contrast "brother" with "brother-in-law" ("*hermano*/*irmão*", "*cuñado*/*cunhado*"); "son" with "son-in-law" ("*hijo*/*filho*", "*yerno*/*genro*"), and similarly for female relatives like "sister-in-law" ("*cuñada*/*cunhada*") and "daughter-in-law" ("*nuera*/*nora*"). Both languages use "*concuño*" (Sp.) or "*concuñado*/*concunhado*" (varying by dialect), as the relationship between two men that marry siblings (or two women, using the feminine "*concuñada*/*concunhada*" instead). In the English language this relationship would be lumped in with "*cuñado*/*cunhado*" (sibling's husband or spouse's brother) as simply "brother-in-law".

Serbian and Bosnian have specific terms for relations by marriage. For example, a "sister-in-law" can be a *"snaha/snaja"* (brother's wife, though also family-member's wife in general), *"zaova"* (husband's sister), *"svastika"* (wife's sister) or *"jetrva"* (husband's brother's wife). A "brother-in-law" can be a *"zet"* (sister's husband, or family-member's husband in general), *"djever/dever"* (husband's brother), *"šurak/šurjak"* (wife's brother) or *"badžanak/pašenog"* (wife's sister's husband). Likewise, the term *"prijatelj"* (same as *"makhatunim"* in Yiddish, which also translates as *"friend"*) is also used. Bengali has a number of in-law words. For example, *Boudi* (elder brother's wife), *Shaali* (wife's sister), *Shaala* (wife's younger brother), *Sambandhi* (wife's elder brother/Shaali's husband), *Bhaasur* (husband's elder brother), *Deor* (husband's younger brother) *Nanad* (husband's sister), *Jaa* (husband's brother's wife), etc.

In Russian, fifteen different words cover relations by marriage, enough to confuse many native speakers[*citation needed*][*dubious* – *discuss*]. There are for example, as in Yiddish, words like "сват" and "сватья" for "co-in-laws". To further complicate the translator's job, Russian in-laws may choose to address each other familiarly by these titles.

In contrast to all of the above fine distinctions, in American English the term "my brother-in-law" covers "my spouse's brother", "my sibling's husband", and "my spouse's sibling's husband". In British English, the last of these is not considered strictly correct.[*citation needed*]

Work and school relations[edit]

Japanese has a concept, *amae*, about the closeness of parent-child relationship, that is supposedly unique to that language and culture as it applies to bosses and workers.[9]

Japanese and Chinese have words for classmates and colleagues of different seniority and/or gender. The most well-known example to English speakers is probably the Japanese word 先輩 (senpai), referring to a senior classmate or colleague.

Foreign objects[edit]

Objects unknown to a culture can actually be easy to translate. For example, in Japanese, *wasabi* わさび is a plant (*Wasabia japonica*) used as a spicy Japanese condiment. Traditionally, this plant only grows in Japan. It would be unlikely that someone from Angola (for example) would have a clear understanding of it. However, the easiest way to translate this word is to *borrow* it. Or one can use a similar vegetable's name to describe it. In English this word is translated as *wasabi* or *Japanese horseradish*. In Chinese, people can still call it *wasabi* by its Japanese sound, or pronounce it by its Hanzi characters, 山葵 (pinyin: *shān kuí*). However, wasabi is more frequently called 芥末 (jiè mò) or 绿芥 (lǜ jiè) in China and Taiwan, meaning mustard. One may specify *yellow mustard* and *green mustard* to avoid confusion.

Another method is using description instead of a single word. For example, languages like Russian and Ukrainian have borrowed words *Kuraga* and *Uruk* from Turkic languages. While both fruits are now known to the Western world, there are still no terms for them in English. English speakers have to use "dried apricot without core" and "dried apricot with core" instead.

One particular type of foreign object that poses difficulties is the proper noun. As an illustration, consider another example from Douglas Hofstadter, which he published in one of his "Metamagical Themas" columns in *Scientific American*. He pondered the question, *Who is the first lady of Britain?* Well, first ladies reside at the prime minister's address, and at the time, the woman living at 10 Downing Street was Margaret Thatcher. But a different attribute that first ladies have is that they are married to heads of government, so perhaps a better answer was "Denis" Thatcher, but he probably would not have relished the title.

Poetry, puns and wordplay[edit]

The two areas which most nearly approach total untranslatability are poetry and puns; poetry is difficult to translate because of its reliance on the sounds (for example, rhymes) and rhythms of the source language; puns, and other similar semantic wordplay, because of how tightly they are tied to the original language. The oldest well-known examples are probably those appearing in Bible translations, for example, Genesis 2:7, which explains why God gave Adam this name: "God created Adam out of soil from the ground"; the original Hebrew text reveals the secret, since the word **Adam** connotes the word **ground** (being *Adama* in Hebrew), whereas translating the verse into other languages loses the original pun.

Similarly, consider the Italian adage "*traduttore, traditore*": a literal translation is "translator, traitor". The pun is lost, though the meaning persists. (A similar solution can be given, however, in Hungarian, by saying *a fordítás: ferdítés*, which roughly translates as "translation is distortion".)

That being said, many of the translation procedures discussed here can be used in these cases. For example, the translator can compensate for an "untranslatable" pun in one part of a text by adding a new pun in another part of the translated text.

Oscar Wilde's play *The Importance of Being Earnest* incorporates in its title a pun (resonating in the last line of the play) that conflates the name Ernest with the adjective of quality *earnest*. The French title of the translated play is *"L'importance d'être Constant"*, replicating and transposing the pun; however, the character Ernest had to be renamed, and the allusion to trickery was lost. (Other French translations include *"De l'importance d'être Fidèle"* (faithful) and *"Il est important d'être Aimé"* (loved), with the same idea of a pun on first name / quality adjective.) A recent Hungarian translation of the same play by Ádám Nádasdy applied a similar solution, giving the subtitle *"Szilárdnak kell lenni"* (lit. "One must be Szilárd") beside the traditional title "Bunbury", where *"Szilárd"* is a male name as well as an adjective meaning "solid, firm", or "steady". Other languages, like Spanish, usually leave the pun untranslated, as in "La importancia de llamarse Ernesto", while one translation used the name Severo, which means "severe" or "serious", close to the original English meaning. Catalan translations always use "La importància de ser Frank". This example uses the homophones "Frank" (given name) and "franc" (honest, free-spoken). Although this same solution would work in Spanish also ("La importancia de ser Franco"), it

carries heavy political connotations in Spain due to Francisco Franco's dictatorship (1939–1975), to a point that even this possible title can be taken directly as ironic/sarcastic: literally, "The importance of being Franco", so this alternative was never used. However, the German translation *"Ernst sein ist alles"* (literally "Being Ernst is everything") only changes the name very slightly, in fact - unlike the equivalents in English - the adjective *ernst* is even spelt exactly as the name *Ernst* and, given the position at the beginning of the title, both meanings would be capitalised.

The Asterix comic strip is renowned for its French puns; its translators have found many ingenious English substitutes.

Other forms of wordplay, such as spoonerisms and palindromes are equally difficult, and often force hard choices on the translator. For example, take the classic palindrome: "A man, a plan, a canal: Panama". A translator might choose to translate it literally into, say, French – "*Un homme, un projet, un canal: Panama*", if it were used as a caption for a photo of Theodore Roosevelt (the chief instigator of the Canal), and sacrifice the palindrome. But if the text is meant to give an *example* of a palindrome, he might elect to sacrifice the literal sense and substitute a French palindrome, such as "*Un roc lamina l'animal cornu*" ('A boulder swept away the horned animal').

Douglas Hofstadter discusses the problem of translating a palindrome into Chinese, where such wordplay is theoretically impossible, in his book *Le Ton beau de Marot*[10] – which is devoted to the issues and problems of translation, with particular emphasis on the translation of poetry. Another example given by Hofstadter is the translation of the jabberwocky poem by Lewis Carroll, with its wealth of neologisms and portmanteau words, into a number of foreign tongues.[11]

A notable Irish joke is that it is not possible to translate mañana into Irish as the Irish "don't have a word that conveys that degree of urgency".

Iconicity[edit]

According to Ghil'ad Zuckermann, "Iconicity might be the reason for refraining from translating *Hallelujah* and *Amen* in so many languages, as if the sounds of such basic religious notions have to do with their referents themselves – as if by losing the sound, one might lose the meaning. Compare this to the Kabbalistic power of letters, for example in the case of gematria,

the method of interpreting the Hebrew Scriptures by interchanging words whose letters have the same numerical value when added. A simple example proverb נכנס יין יצא סוד (*nikhnas yayin yåSå sōd*), or lit. "entered wine went out secret", i.e. "wine brings out the truth", *in vino veritas*. The gematric value of יין, or wine, is 70 (י=10; י=10; ן=50) and this is also the gematric value of סוד, or secret, (ס=60; ו=6; ד=4). Thus, this sentence, according to many Jews at the time, had to be true."[12]

Equivalence in Translation

Equivalence can be said to be the central issue in translation although The aim of this paper is to review the theory of equivalence as interpreted by some of the most innovative theorists in this field—Vinay and Darbelnet, Jakobson, Nida and Taber, Catford, House, and finally Baker. These theorists have studied equivalence in relation to the translation process, using different approaches, and have provided fruitful ideas for further study on this topic. Their theories will be analyzed in chronological order so that it will be easier to follow the evolution of this concept. These theories can be substantially divided into three main groups. In the first there are those translation scholars who are in favour of a linguistic approach to translation and who seem to forget that translation in itself is not merely a matter of linguistics. In fact, when a message is transferred from the SL to TL, the translator is also dealing with two different cultures at the same time. This particular aspect seems to have been taken into consideration by the second group of theorists who regard translation equivalence as being essentially a transfer of the message from the SC to the TC and a pragmatic/semantic or functionally oriented approach to translation. Finally, there are other translation scholars who seem to stand in the middle, such as Baker for instance, who claims that equivalence is used 'for the sake of convenience—because most translators are used to it rather than because it has any theoretical status' (quoted in Kenny, 1998:77).

1.1 Vinay and Darbelnet and their definition of equivalence in translation

Vinay and Darbelnet view equivalence-oriented translation as a procedure which 'replicates the same situation as in the original, whilst using completely different wording' (ibid.:342). They also suggest that, if this procedure is applied during the translation process, it can maintain the stylistic impact of the SL text in the TL text. According to them, equivalence is therefore the ideal method when the translator has to deal with proverbs, idioms, clichés, nominal or adjectival phrases and the onomatopoeia of animal sounds.

With regard to equivalent expressions between language pairs, Vinay and Darbelnet claim that they are acceptable as long as they are listed in a bilingual dictionary as 'full equivalents' (ibid.:255). However, later they note that glossaries and collections of idiomatic expressions 'can never be exhaustive' (ibid.:256). They conclude by saying that 'the need for creating equivalences arises from the situation, and it is in the situation of the SL text that translators have to look for a solution' (ibid.: 255). Indeed, they argue that even if the semantic equivalent of an expression in the SL text is quoted in a dictionary or a glossary, it is not enough, and it does not guarantee a successful translation. They provide a number of examples to prove their theory, and the following expression appears in their list: *Take one* is a fixed expression which would have as an equivalent French translation *Prenez-en un*. However, if the expression appeared as a notice next to a basket of free samples in a large store, the translator would have to look for an equivalent term in a similar situation and use the expression *Échantillon gratuit* (ibid.:256).

1.2 Jakobson and the concept of equivalence in difference

Roman Jakobson's study of equivalence gave new impetus to the theoretical analysis of translation since he introduced the notion of 'equivalence in difference'. On the basis of his semiotic approach to language and his aphorism 'there is no signatum without signum' (1959:232), he suggests three kinds of translation:

- Intralingual (within one language, i.e. rewording or paraphrase)
- Interlingual (between two languages)
- Intersemiotic (between sign systems)

Jakobson claims that, in the case of interlingual translation, the translator makes use of synonyms in order to get the ST message across. This means that in interlingual translations there is no full equivalence between code units. According to his theory, 'translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes' (ibid.:233). Jakobson goes on to say that from a grammatical point of view languages may differ from one another to a greater or lesser degree, but this does not mean that a translation cannot be possible, in other words, that the translator may face the problem of not finding a translation equivalent. He acknowledges that 'whenever there is deficiency, terminology may be qualified and amplified by loanwords or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and finally, by circumlocutions' (ibid.:234). Jakobson provides a number of examples by comparing English and Russian language structures and explains that in such cases where there is no a literal equivalent for a particular ST word or sentence, then it is up to the translator to choose the most suitable way to render it in the TT.

There seems to be some similarity between Vinay and Darbelnet's theory of translation procedures and Jakobson's theory of translation. Both theories stress the fact that, whenever a linguistic approach is no longer suitable to carry out a translation, the translator can rely on other procedures such as loan-translations, neologisms and the like. Both theories recognize the limitations of a linguistic theory and argue that a translation can never be impossible since there are several methods that the translator can choose. The role of the translator as the person who decides how to carry out the translation is emphasized in both theories. Both Vinay and Darbelnet as well as Jakobson conceive the translation task as something which can always be carried out from one language to another, regardless of the cultural or grammatical differences between ST and TT.

It can be concluded that Jakobson's theory is essentially based on his semiotic approach to

translation according to which the translator has to recode the ST message first and then s/he has to transmit it into an equivalent message for the TC.

1.3 Nida and Taber: Formal correspondence and dynamic equivalence

Nida argued that there are two different types of equivalence, namely *formal equivalence*—which in the second edition by Nida and Taber (1982) is referred to as *formal correspondence*— and *dynamic equivalence.* Formal correspondence 'focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content', unlike dynamic equivalence which is based upon 'the principle of equivalent effect' (1964:159). In the second edition (1982) or their work, the two theorists provide a more detailed explanation of each type of equivalence.

Formal correspondence consists of a TL item which represents the closest equivalent of a SL word or phrase. Nida and Taber make it clear that there are not always formal equivalents between language pairs. They therefore suggest that these formal equivalents should be used wherever possible if the translation aims at achieving formal rather than dynamic equivalence. The use of formal equivalents might at times have serious implications in the TT since the translation will not be easily understood by the target audience (Fawcett, 1997). Nida and Taber themselves assert that 'Typically, formal correspondence distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the receptor language, and hence distorts the message, so as to cause the receptor to misunderstand or to labor unduly hard' (ibid.:201).

Dynamic equivalence is defined as a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original in such a way that the TL wording will trigger the same impact on the TC audience as the original wording did upon the ST audience. They argue that 'Frequently, the form of the original text is changed; but as long as the change follows the rules of back transformation in the source language, of contextual consistency in the transfer, and of transformation in the receptor language, the message is preserved and the translation is faithful' (Nida and Taber, 1982:200).

One can easily see that Nida is in favour of the application of dynamic equivalence, as a more effective translation procedure. This is perfectly understandable if we take into account the context of the situation in which Nida was dealing with the translation phenomenon, that is to say, his translation of the Bible. Thus, the product of the translation process, that is the text in the TL, must have the same impact on the different readers it was addressing. Only in Nida and Taber's edition is it clearly stated that 'dynamic equivalence in translation is far more than mere correct communication of information' (ibid:25).

Despite using a linguistic approach to translation, Nida is much more interested in the message of the text or, in other words, in its semantic quality. He therefore strives to make sure that this message remains clear in the target text.

1.4 Catford and the introduction of translation shifts

Catford's approach to translation equivalence clearly differs from that adopted by Nida since Catford had a preference for a more linguistic-based approach to translation and this approach is based on the linguistic work of Firth and Halliday. His main contribution in the field of translation theory is the introduction of the concepts of types and shifts of translation. Catford proposed very broad types of translation in terms of three criteria:

1. The extent of translation (*full translation* vs *partial translation*);

2. The grammatical rank at which the translation equivalence is established (*rank-bound translation* vs. *unbounded translation*);

3. The levels of language involved in translation (*total translation* vs. *restricted translation*).

We will refer only to the second type of translation, since this is the one that concerns the concept of equivalence, and we will then move on to analyze the notion of translation shifts, as elaborated by Catford, which are based on the distinction between formal correspondence and textual

equivalence. In *rank-bound translation* an equivalent is sought in the TL for each word, or for each morpheme encountered in the ST. In *unbounded translation* equivalences are not tied to a particular rank, and we may additionally find equivalences at sentence, clause and other levels. Catford finds five of these ranks or levels in both English and French, while in the Caucasian language Kabardian there are apparently only four.

Thus, a *formal correspondence* could be said to exist between English and French if relations between ranks have approximately the same configuration in both languages, as Catford claims they do.

One of the problems with formal correspondence is that, despite being a useful tool to employ in comparative linguistics, it seems that it is not really relevant in terms of assessing translation equivalence between ST and TT. For this reason we now turn to Catford's other dimension of correspondence, namely *textual equivalence* which occurs when any TL text or portion of text is 'observed on a particular occasion ... to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text' (ibid.:27). He implements this by a process of commutation, whereby 'a competent bilingual informant or translator' is consulted on the translation of various sentences whose ST items are changed in order to observe 'what changes if any occur in the TL text as a consequence' (ibid.:28).

As far as translation shifts are concerned, Catford defines them as 'departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL' (ibid.:73). Catford argues that there are two main types of translation shifts, namely *level shifts,* where the SL item at one linguistic level (e.g. grammar) has a TL equivalent at a different level (e.g. lexis), and *category shifts* which are divided into four types:

1. *Structure-shifts,* which involve a grammatical change between the structure of the ST and that of the TT;

2. *Class-shifts,* when a SL item is translated with a TL item which belongs to a different grammatical class, i.e. a verb may be translated with a noun;

3. *Unit-shifts*, which involve changes in rank;

4. *Intra-system shifts,* which occur when 'SL and TL possess systems which approximately correspond formally as to their constitution, but when translation involves selection of a non-corresponding term in the TL system' (ibid.:80). For instance, when the SL singular becomes a TL plural.

Catford was very much criticized for his linguistic theory of translation. One of the most scathing criticisms came from Snell-Hornby (1988), who argued that Catford's definition of textual equivalence is 'circular', his theory's reliance on bilingual informants 'hopelessly inadequate', and his example sentences 'isolated and even absurdly simplistic' (ibid.:19-20). She considers the concept of equivalence in translation as being an illusion. She asserts that the translation process cannot simply be reduced to a linguistic exercise, as claimed by Catford for instance, since there are also other factors, such as textual, cultural and situational aspects, which should be taken into consideration when translating. In other words, she does not believe that linguistics is the only discipline which enables people to carry out a translation, since translating involves different cultures and different situations at the same time and they do not always match from one language to another.

1.5 House and the elaboration of overt and covert translation

House (1977) is in favour of semantic and pragmatic equivalence and argues that ST and TT should match one another in function. House suggests that it is possible to characterize the function of a text by determining the *situational dimensions* of the ST.* In fact, according to her theory, every text is in itself is placed within a particular situation which has to be correctly identified and taken into account by the translator. After the ST analysis, House is in a position to evaluate a translation; if the ST and the TT differ substantially on situational features, then they are not functionally equivalent, and the translation is not of a high quality. In fact, she acknowledges that 'a translation text should not only match its source text in function, but employ

equivalent situational-dimensional means to achieve that function' (ibid.:49).

Central to House's discussion is the concept of *overt* and *covert* translations. In an overt translation the TT audience is not directly addressed and there is therefore no need at all to attempt to recreate a 'second original' since an overt translation 'must overtly be a translation' (ibid.:189). By covert translation, on the other hand, is meant the production of a text which is functionally equivalent to the ST. House also argues that in this type of translation the ST 'is not specifically addressed to a TC audience' (ibid.:194).

House (ibid.:203) sets out the types of ST that would probably yield translations of the two categories. An academic article, for instance, is unlikely to exhibit any features specific to the SC; the article has the same argumentative or expository force that it would if it had originated in the TL, and the fact that it is a translation at all need not be made known to the readers. A political speech in the SC, on the other hand, is addressed to a particular cultural or national group which the speaker sets out to move to action or otherwise influence, whereas the TT merely informs outsiders what the speaker is saying to his or her constituency. It is clear that in this latter case, which is an instance of overt translation, functional equivalence cannot be maintained, and it is therefore intended that the ST and the TT function differently.

House's theory of equivalence in translation seems to be much more flexible than Catford's. In fact, she gives authentic examples, uses complete texts and, more importantly, she relates linguistic features to the context of both source and target text.

1.6 Baker's approach to translation equivalence

New adjectives have been assigned to the notion of equivalence (grammatical, textual, pragmatic equivalence, and several others) and made their appearance in the plethora of recent works in this field. An extremely interesting discussion of the notion of equivalence can be found in Baker (1992) who seems to offer a more detailed list of conditions upon which the concept of equivalence can be defined. She explores the notion of equivalence at different levels, in relation

to the translation process, including all different aspects of translation and hence putting together the linguistic and the communicative approach. She distinguishes between:

- Equivalence that can appear at word level and above word level, when translating from one language into another. Baker acknowledges that, in a bottom-up approach to translation, equivalence at word level is the first element to be taken into consideration by the translator. In fact, when the translator starts analyzing the ST s/he looks at the words as single units in order to find a direct 'equivalent' term in the TL. Baker gives a definition of the term *word* since it should be remembered that a single word can sometimes be assigned different meanings in different languages and might be regarded as being a more complex unit or *morpheme.* This means that the translator should pay attention to a number of factors when considering a single word, such as number, gender and tense (ibid.:11-12).

- Grammatical equivalence, when referring to the diversity of grammatical categories across languages. She notes that grammatical rules may vary across languages and this may pose some problems in terms of finding a direct correspondence in the TL. In fact, she claims that different grammatical structures in the SL and TL may cause remarkable changes in the way the information or message is carried across. These changes may induce the translator either to add or to omit information in the TT because of the lack of particular grammatical devices in the TL itself. Amongst these grammatical devices which might cause problems in translation Baker focuses on number, tense and aspects, voice, person and gender.

- Textual equivalence, when referring to the equivalence between a SL text and a TL text in terms of information and cohesion. Texture is a very important feature in translation since it provides useful guidelines for the comprehension and analysis of the ST which can help the translator in his or her attempt to produce a cohesive and coherent text for the TC audience in a specific context. It is up to the translator to decide whether or not to maintain the cohesive ties as well as the coherence of the SL text. His or her decision will be guided by three main factors, that is, the target audience, the purpose of the translation and the text type.

- Pragmatic equivalence, when referring to implicatures and strategies of avoidance during the translation process. Implicature is not about what is explicitly said but what is implied. Therefore, the translator needs to work out implied meanings in translation in order to get the ST message across. The role of the translator is to recreate the author's intention in another culture in such a way that enables the TC reader to understand it clearly.

1.7 Conclusion

The notion of equivalence is undoubtedly one of the most problematic and controversial areas in the field of translation theory. The term has caused, and it seems quite probable that it will continue to cause, heated debates within the field of translation studies. This term has been analyzed, evaluated and extensively discussed from different points of view and has been approached from many different perspectives. The first discussions of the notion of equivalence in translation initiated the further elaboration of the term by contemporary theorists. Even the brief outline of the issue given above indicates its importance within the framework of the theoretical reflection on translation. The difficulty in defining equivalence seems to result in the impossibility of having a universal approach to this notion.