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This Chapter aims to survey the relevant literature concerned with some of the essential issues related to translation in general in order to shed some light on the relationship between translation and foreign language learning. These issues are, what is translation?, types of translation, the importance of translation, What does it mean to translate? translatability and untranslatability, translation equivalence, adequacy of translation theory, development of translation theory and translation studies and formulation of theory. Before doing so, it should be stated that the scope of such an enterprise is far too vast to be covered adequately in a single study, let alone in a single chapter. One cannot grasp a whole vast field by lists or catalogues, no matter how much she/he provides by way of coverage, some books, articles and ideas are going to be left out. Instead, this chapter attempts to look at the aspects that are considered to be important and essential to the limitation of this study.

2.1. WHAT IS TRANSLATION?

It sounds a good idea to decide on "defining" translation as a departure point. But soon it will be found that this is not as easy as it may appear. To start with, it is, perhaps, worthwhile to quote here some definitions of translation from two dictionaries and from an encyclopedia assuming the definitions in
such references plainly approach the subject without being affected by any pre-referential intention except that of standardizing the matter of concern.

The Oxford Companion to the English Language, 1992, defines translation as:

"The restatement of the forms of one language in another: the chief means of exchanging information between different language communities",

Mc Arthur, (1992, : 1051-2)

According to Collier's Encyclopedia (1960, 452), translation is:

"... the art of converting written or spoken communication from one language into another".

According to the Dictionary of Language and Linguistics, it is:

"the process or result of converting information from one language or language variety into another. In translating written or recorded material of natural languages, the aim is to reproduce as accurately as possible all grammatical and lexical features of the "source language" original by finding equivalents in the "target language",


In these definitions translation seems to be more or less like exchanging or converting currency. We get a new currency, but still we can use it exactly as we do with the previous one. Of course, we may lose or gain some of its value but the purpose or the benefit in both is the same. Unfortunately, in
translation, the process is not that simple. According to
Bassnett (1980) translation involves far more than replacement of
lexical and grammatical items between languages, and, as can be
seen in the translation of idioms and metaphors, the process may
involve discarding the basic linguistic elements of the SL
(Source Language) text in order to achieve Popovic’s goal of
"expressive identity" between the SL and TL (target language)
texts. And according to Toury (in Gentzler, 1993), translations
themselves have no "fixed" identity because they are always
subjected to different socio-literary contextual factors, so they
must be viewed as having multiple identities, dependent upon the
forces of history and the semiotic web called culture.

Catford, (1965 : 1 and 20), sees translation as "an
operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a
text in one language for a text in another", or, "...the
replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by
equivalent textual material in another language (TL)". While
Jacobson, 1966, states that it is in its simplest terms "the
interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language",

Wilss, (1982 : 112), thinks of translation as "a text
oriented event". Based on that, translation, to him, is "a
procedure which leads from a written SLT (source language text)
to an optimally equivalent TLT (target language text) and
requires the syntactic, semantic, stylistic and text-pragmatic
comprehension by the translator of the original text".
Newmark (1982: 7), defines translation as "a craft consisting in the attempt to replace a written message and/or statement in one language by the same message and/or statement in another language". He, however, admits that translation activity is complex and difficult to define to the extent that most people when asked to define translation hesitate, and that many dictionaries which offer synonyms for the verb (render, rephrase, word, interpret, convert, transform, transpose, express, transfer, turn) and add "from one language to another", do not state what is being translated. Others make use of expressions such as 'equivalent', "textual material", "similar", "like", "parallel", "equal", "identical", "comparable", "synonymous", and "analogous", (Newmark, 1985: 8). The problem in his opinion "belongs to the meaning of meaning rather than the meaning of equivalence, identity, similarity, likeness, sameness and so on". He believes that it is hard to talk about a specific meaning in a text to be transferred for the meaning in a text is multi-dimensional to be handled. He, nonetheless settled with what he calls "Nida's classical definition" of translation i.e. "the reproduction of the closest natural equivalent of the source language message," commenting that this definition could not be bettered (p.12).

The de Compos brothers, (Augusto de Campos and Haroldo de Campos), according to Gentzler, 1993: 192-3), refuse any sort of preordained original and they view translation as a form of transgression and they coin their own terms in which translation is a form of "cannibalism", a term
which is seen in a sense of respect, i.e. "a symbolic act of taking back out of love, of absorbing the virtue of a body through a transfusion of blood". But Bassnett, 1990, views it as "a rewriting of an original text". This "rewriting" is a "manipulation which can help in the evolution of a literature and a society" (p. ix).

Back to the twenties of this century, Benjamin, 1923, sees translation as "a life-force that ensures a literary text's survival". He maintains that translation is a mode and that it "serves the purpose of expressing the central reciprocal relationship between languages [...] it transplants the original into a more definitive linguistic realm since it can no longer be displaced by a secondary rendering. The original can only be raised there anew and at other points of time" (p. 75).

In other words, translation in this sense does not or cannot often convey the message of the original simply because no one knows exactly what it is that a work of art communicates. In addition, a work of art addresses a reader who knows its language, while the translation is directed to a different reader.

From all the above definitions, and in spite of all the similarities and differences which exist, it can be concluded that translation implies the process of transferring a message from one language to another, taking into account all the dimensions within in the SLT, linguistic organization, culture, style, time, intentions, feelings, etc. and reproducing the whole thing smoothly, naturally and as closely to the original as possible in the TLT.
2.2. TYPES OF TRANSLATION

Jacobson (1960), differentiates between three types of translation depending on the codes involved in transferring the message; (a) intralingual translation, in which the message is transferred within the same linguistic medium, (b) interlingual translation which deals with two different languages, and (c) intersemiotic translation or transmutation, includes non-linguistic media. This could be an interpretation of verbal signs by means of non-verbal signs system, (Jacobson, cited in Stiener, 1975 : 260) and in Bassnett, (1980 : 14). This study is mainly concerned with the interlingual translation.

Newmark (1985), however, distinguishes three basic types of translation based on three different types of texts, i.e. (a) scientific-technological, which are usually handled by the translation departments of public corporations, (b) multinationals and government departments; institutional-cultural texts (culture, social sciences, commerce) handled in particular by international organizations, and (c) Literary texts, normally handled by freelance translators. Accordingly, three types of translations exist: technical, cultural and literary and they are equally important. Technical is important in introducing inventions and innovations that improve health and living condition, cultural in enriching a way of life and its language and literary in transmitting human values.
Earlier in 1982, Newmark differentiates between two major methods of translation: communicative and semantic translations. The former addresses itself to the second reader and emphasizes the "force" rather than the content of the message, and "it is likely to be smoother, simpler, clearer, more direct, more conventional ..., etc.". The latter "attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original. [...] It tends to be more complex, more awkward, more detailed, more concentrated, and pursues the thought-processes rather than the intention of the transmitter", (p. 39).

This differentiation, however, does not mean that there is one communicative translation and one semantic, but they are not only "widely overlapping bands of methods", but "all translation must be in some degree both communicative and semantic," (p.40).

Apart from that, and depending on bilingual competence, McArthur (1992 : 1052 onwards), makes five distinctions, stating that none of which represent an absolute position, but rather end-points in an appropriate continuum:

(i) Translating and interpreting.

Written translation can be distinguished from oral translation or interpreting in that written translation is traditionally more important for its relative permanence and lasting influence.
(ii) Word-for-word and free translation.

Depending on the level at which translation equivalence can be established, translation can be more literal or free.

(iii) Literary and technical translation.

Literary (of aesthetic, imaginative, fictional texts) technical (of pragmatic and non-fictional texts).

(iv) Professional and pedagogical translation, translation as a vocation (working for a client) or translation as an exercise in the process of language learning.

(v) Human and machine translation.

Snell and Crampton (1983, ed. 1985) made the list of types of translation even longer.

2.3. THE IMPORTANCE OF TRANSLATION

The importance of translation stems from its inevitability in today’s global setting in which the whole world with its innumerable languages is, as commonly said, too small and interdependent. Its significance derives from the universal need for mediation between speakers and writers of different languages. It is in Stiener’s terms (1975 : 471), "... fully implicit in the most rudimentary communication". According to Verma (1992), translation is not the only means by which the language barriers can be crossed, but it is to a large extent the most effective way of breaking the language barriers and promoting better communication, specially when all attempts to evolve a simplified artificial or natural language like Esperanto or basic English have failed.
Catford, (1965) also states that translation is an activity of enormous importance in the modern world and a subject of interest to very many people in almost all literary, scientific and professional specializations. Kelly, 1979, goes as far as to say that "Europe owes its civilization to translators".

Bassnett, 1980, however, is convinced that translation, despite its importance, has never been granted the dignity of original work. Rather, it has been overlooked and seen as subsidiary art and derivative. This led to underestimating the translation value and consequently to lowering the standard demanded.

In the early fifties, McFarlane (1953), warned against value judgement about translation and asked instead for knowing more about its nature and suggested that an analysis of procedure is the approach that promises most. Benjamin (1923 : 74), holds that translation goes beyond enriching the language and culture, beyond renewing and maturing the life of the original. He says, "Although translation, unlike art, cannot claim permanence for its products, its goal is undeniably a final, conclusive, decisive stage of all linguistic creation" (p. 75).

Bassnett (1990 : ix), who sees translation as "rewriting" and "manipulation", maintains that this rewriting "can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices, and the history of translation is the history also of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another. [...] the study of the manipulative processes of literature as exemplified by
translation can help us towards a great awareness of the world in which we live."

Similarly, Derrida, 1985, cited in Gentzler, (1993 : 166), thinks that translation process "ensures the rebirth, the regeneration, the emergence, "the holy growth" of languages in general, and the means by which we understand ourselves." Obviously, Derrida adopts Benjamin's point of view and almost uses his terms.

Finally, as in the case of India, contrary to the notion that says that Indian literature is one but written in many languages, Prasad, 1995, believes that India will remain a home for many languages and literatures since there is no likelihood of India opting a single language or even accepting a link language, whether Hindi or English. Therefore, the need for more and more translators is a must even though he thinks that they are not always dependable and can be capricious and wayward. Thus, translation as can be seen from this example, is, and will continue to be, of a great effect not only to people from different nationalities, but also to people of the same nation.

2.4. WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO TRANSLATE? 

Before answering this question, other questions can be asked: Do we translate because every language nearly offers its own reading of life, and moving between languages, translating is experiencing "... the almost bewildering bias of the human spirit towards freedom"? (Stiener, 1975 : 473). Or, do we translate in
order to convey a message to someone whose culture and language differs from our own language and culture and thus prevent direct communication? (Vermeer, 1990: 236). Lefever, 1981, opines that translations are produced by translators not only to make a foreign work available, but also as a contribution to the cause of a victorious literary trend. In fact, it can be said, we translate because translation is becoming more and more a part of our life.

In considering the issue of process of translation, Wilss, (1982: 133), maintains that different text-types require both "specific transfer methods and specific translation equivalence yardsticks". The translation process, according to him, involves a decision-making process in a great variety of texts that are of practical importance to translation. As for Vermeer, 1987, we all translate "by intuition" and there is no "science of translating". To translate means to produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addresses in target circumstances. Therefore, we should admit new thoughts from foreign source culture into a target culture, the very act of translating is the consciousness of diversity in equality.

Similarly, Benjamin, (1923: 76), asks to find in translating "that intended effect [intention] upon the language into which he is translating which produces in it the echo of the original". Benjamin, 1923, McFarlane, 1953, and Vermeer, 1985, call for tolerance and for allowing the translator's language to be affected by the foreign language.
Based on Nida's (1975) point of view, the competent translator goes through a roundabout process of analysis, transfer, and restructuring. First, he analyses the message of the original into its simplest forms, transfers it at this level, and then restructures it to the level of the Receptor language for the intended audience. The processes of analysis involve the grammatical relationships between constituent parts, the referential meanings of semantic units, and the connotative values of the grammatical structures and semantic units. And according to Newmark, 1982, the translator has to acquire the techniques of transferring smoothly between the two basic translation processes: comprehension, which may involve interpretation, and formulation, which may involve creation. Sympathetic understanding, (Mc-Farlane, 1953) or linguistic sensitivity, (Nida, 1975, and Newmark, 1982) based on an informed intuition are indispensable in the process of translation, (See also, Lefever in Bassnett, 1980).

Rose (1981: 2-3), however, sees the translation process as a six-step scheme to be carried out by translators:

(i) preliminary analysis by which material is judged worthy of translation.

(ii) exhaustive style and content analysis, by which we come to know what makes this literary text literary or what makes this scholarly text authoritative?

(iii) acclimation of the text, the translating goes from internal to external. We work our strategies to settle for a workable equivalent or comparable effect.
(iv) reformulation of the text. All the verbalizing must be done in the target language now.

(v) analysis of the translation. Translator revises his translation. This is when the translation is measured against the large context of culture, with the related subcontext of language and rhetorical tradition.

(vi) review and comparison. The translation is handed to someone for review and comparison.

Finally, as shown by Gill (1989), unless a "semiotic reading" of the original is done in order to help in judging the immanent, the introvert undercurrent of the original and in apprehending the corresponding conceptual structure of the discourse, a very qualified translator with maximum linguistic competence is likely to commit serious mistakes in his translation and come up with an entirely different discourse, which, in such a case cannot even be "another reading", but a complete distortion.

2.5. TRANSLATABILITY AND UNTRANSLATABILITY

With regard to this issue, it seems as if the situation, in which Goethe, 1813 (cited in McFarlane, 1953) stated that translation is impossible, essential and important, has not much changed. To Benjamin (1923: 81-2), the original "contains the law governing the translation; its translatability". The text which is "unconditionally translatable" is the text "which is identical with the truth or dogma, where it is supposed to be "the true language" in all its literalness and without the mediation of meaning [...] to some degree all great texts contain
their potential translation", and the translation in this case "must be one with the original in the form of the interlinear version, in which literalness and freedom are united". But, to what extent, is this really possible? Benjamin himself says, "Indeed, the problem of ripening the seed of pure language in a translation seems to be insoluble, determinable in no solution".

Catford (1985), distinguishes between two types of untranslatability: (a) linguistic - no lexical or syntactical substitute in the TL for an SL item due to differences in languages, and (b) cultural - the absence in the TL culture of relevant situational feature for the SL text. Here, Catford says that "it is the task of translator to find solutions to such problems, and this is in itself a creative act". Wilss (1982: 49-50), sees that "the translatability of a text guaranteed by the existence of universal categories in syntax, semantics and the (natural) logic of experience". While following Catford, untranslatability exists whenever all resources in the TL have been exhausted and functional equivalence between SL and TL remains beyond reach. The reason for this, as noted by Catford is either linguistic or cultural. But Wilss argues that translation procedures generally present possibilities for compensation, since translation is in principle possible whenever the transfer is preceded by an understanding of the content of the original text. Furthermore, he believes that the "relative comparability of the extra-linguistic experience of mankind and the empirically proven cognitive commensurability of languages", make it possible "to achieve interlingual communication on the level of the text.
with a relatively high degree of TE (translation equivalence) of content and style".

Newmark (1982: 7-8), tackles this issue slightly differently. He sees that loss of meaning occurs when:

(i) the text describes situation with peculiar elements of its language.

(ii) two languages have different lexical, grammatical, sound systems etc.,

(iii) the individual uses of language by writer and translator do not coincide.

(iv) writer and translator have different theories of meaning and different values.

Popovic (1970: 79-80), views that the changes which occur in translation result from the differences between the two languages, the two authors and the two literary situations involved. So, he emphasizes the need for a method for objective classification of differences between the translation and the original for the purpose of evaluating them and defining the shifts of expressions precisely and systematically. To him, "the identification of the shifts of expression and their semantico-stylistic interpretation should be considered as the most important aspects of translation analysis".

On the other hand, he also distinguishes between two types of untranslatability, (a) linguistic, in which an element in the original cannot be replaced in the target language, and (b) when the relation between the creative subject and its linguistic
expression in the original does not find an adequate expression in the translation.

Schogt (1988), points out that the major dilemmas that face the translator of literature lie in dealing not only with rare cases, but also in general with flaws and stylistic peculiarities in the source text. He argues that one of these dilemmas is that the choice of usual stylistic level is in accordance with the target code and therefore legitimate. It also caters to the reader's expectations and the result may be so different from the original that it hardly qualifies as a translation, and the target language is unable to match the source language in such a way that the special relationship between form and meaning characterizing the source is preserved.

As far as this study is concerned, it seems plausible, however, to conclude that in translation, differences of languages, circumstances, audience and translators are important components of translation. And, following Schogt, discussion about the quality of different translations, somehow, becomes meaningless, it is only possible to compare interpretations.

2.6. TRANSLATION EQUIVALENCE

The term 'equivalence' is clearly a key term in both translation theory and translation practice Wilss,(1982 : 135) says that "... there is hardly any other concept in translation theory which has produced as many contradictory statements and has set off as many attempts at an adequate, comprehensive definition as TE (translation equivalence) between SLT and TLT".
McFarlane (1953), quotes Firth saying that the use of the word "meaning" is subject to the general rule that each word when used in a new context is a new word. He argues, then, that the point that needs the strongest emphasis is not that literal translation is "bad", nor that it should be avoided, but that we should not set up literalness as a standard by which to judge the fidelity of a translation, or posit it as an ideal of accuracy to be approached. He holds that it is not difficult to see why equivalence in meaning sometimes is not possible. He says: "the problem is the comparatively simple one of comparing the respective powers of symbolic reference of the two languages. Anyone who feels he must look for a precise equivalent between precise symbolic is however, doomed to disappointment" (p. 84). Most of our verbal symbols have a 'fringe' round their area of meaning where their application is doubtful.

Catford (1965 : 27-9), distinguishes between textual equivalence and formal correspondence. A textual translation equivalence is "that portion of a TL text which is changed when and only when a given portion of SL text is changed[...]". In some cases there is no TL equivalent of a given SL item. The TL equivalent in such cases is nil. A formal correspondence is "any TL category [...] which may be said to occupy, as nearly as possible, the "same" place in the 'economy' of the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL".

Nida (1975 : 46), admits that absolute communication is quite impossible, but he states that "very close approximation to
the standard of natural equivalence may be obtained, but only if
the translations reflect a high degree of sensitivity to
different syntactic structures and result from clear insight into
cultural diversities". He also distinguishes between two types of
equivalence, formal and dynamic. The formal focuses on the
message in both form and content, while the dynamic equivalence
is based on the relationship between the receiver and the message
in both SL and TL text. This brings in the notion of equivalence
effect which, according to Bassnett (1980), enjoys great
popularity inspite of its applicability to the formal properties
of a text which shows that Nida's categories can actually be in
conflict with each other. Newmark (1982 : 132), also points out
that "the equivalence response principle is mentalistic and needs
further definition". Moreover, it is not easy to achieve similar
responding when the readership is different. Besides, "similar
response where the function is expressive is difficult to
analyse". Zlateva (in Bassnett, 1990 : 34), raises another point
in this respect. According to her, the criteria for judging
adequacy of language use in translation are much more complex
than those by which we evaluate the use of language in an
original work. To her, the translation is a maximally close
analogue of the original if the translator has managed adequately
to render the original's overall content, both aesthetic and
conceptual. She opines that translators should not be blamed when
failing to elicit an effect on their readers. The reason is that
"this effect is the result of something very much not part of the
actual text the translators had to deal with" (p. 30) (see also,

Following Holmes (1987), Bassnett (1980 : 29), says that TE (translation equivalence) "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 SL and TL version". She believes that Popovic's (1976) four types of equivalence (linguistic, word for-word translation, pragmatic, elements of grammar, stylistic and textual, form and shape), offer a useful starting point; while Neubert's (1968) three semiotic categories (syntactic, semantic and pragmatic) point out the way to an approach that perceives equivalence as a dialectic between the signs and the structures within and surrounding the SL and TL texts (ibid).

Wilss (1982 : 45-7), as Nida, holds that anything can be said in one language can be said in another with reasonable accuracy. He says : "... in principle, any SLT can be replaced by a TLT having a comparable communication function (with the exception of certain lyrical production)". He maintains that TE cannot be integrated in a general translation theory, but must be looked in upon as part of specific translation theories which are single-text-oriented. To him, that is why a translation practitioner "prefers to rely on his translational intuition, his individual translational range of experience and his TE norms, if he has to make a statement as to whether in his opinion a translation is equivalent, less equivalent or non-equivalent".
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In accordance with this point of view, Shveitser (1993), remarks that translators themselves try to devise all kinds of ways round the equivalence, whereas translation scholars who do not actually translate themselves, like Catford, cling to some notion of equivalence as the only yardstick by which the activity of translation can be measured.

2.7. ADEQUACY OF TRANSLATION THEORY

The theories of translation that have been produced to date appear to be to scholars no more than "critical introductions", to such a general theory. A good share of them can not be considered theories as such "but an array of axioms, postulates and hypotheses" (Holmes (1987).

Stiener (1975), argues that "all theories of translation, formal, pragmatic, chronological, are only variants of a single, inescapable question. In what ways can fidelity be achieved? What is the optimal correlation between the (A) text in the source-language and the (B) text in the receptor language?". His answer to the question is that "the range of theoretical ideas as distinct from the pragmatic notation, remains very small". In his view this is the case because language is not a science, and very likely it never will be. "What we are dealing with (translation) is not a science, but an art".

Graham (in Rose, 1981), picks up the point to announce, "Surely the best reason to propose any theory, after all, is that we have none". He points out that much of what has been written on the subject yields very little and much of it was "personal
anecdote and pieces of advice" which do not help in constructing a coherent theory for translation.

Kelly (1979 : 1-2), remarks that "few writers have presented a universal applicable theory of translation". From those few, the only example that comes to his mind is George Cambell's (1719-96), 500- page introduction of his 1789 translation of the Gospels. According to him, "a comprehensive theory of translation has proved elusive. For through neglect of non-literary work, significant thought and practice have been suppressed and forgotten". Kelly, however, settles down on the idea that "Fortunately, good translation has never depended on adequate theory (p.4)".

Wilss (1982), who is enthusiastic for constructing a scientific theory of translation, is also not happy about the fact that translation theory is inadequate. He says that many views expressed on translation in the past centuries amount to a mass of uncoordinated statements. And although some of them were of great importance they never coalesced into a coherent, agreed upon, intersubjectively valid theory of translation. He thinks that the difficulties of formulating a scientific theory of translation are caused by:

(i) the fact that it is possible to connect very different goals with the activity of translating.

(ii) the fact that technical literature of the science of translation is qualitatively disparate and that the informational value of the theory, method or application of many publications on the subject leave something more to be desired.
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On the other hand, Hans Vermeer (1987) states that "We all translate by intuition. There are scientifically embroidered theories, and there are even scientific theories of translation. But there is no "scientific-translating". Verma (1992 : 238), says: "there is a realization that there is no adequate theory of translation". He even goes as far as to ask whether it is possible to construct a theory of translation or if translation is a subject for theory construction. He suggests that translation methods and criteria need to be investigated properly. From his point of view, like Firth (1968) who sees "translation theory as the basis of a new theory of language" (cited in Newmark, 1982, p. 9), it "might turn out that a theory of translation is, in fact, a theory about comparing languages". And this might help us to construct a theory of language.

Newmark (1982), although he views the fascination of translation theory lies in the large scope of its pertinence, its basic appeal and its disparate levels, he is convinced that its present standing is not secure. He concludes by suggesting what translation theory cannot and can do. It cannot make a student intelligent or sensitive—two qualities of a good translator. It can show what is involved in the translation process and provide principles and guidelines. And finally, "Translation theory precipitates a methodology concerned with making the translator pause and think, with producing a natural text or a conscious deviation from a natural text or a closest equivalent, with sensitizing him against howlers and false cognates, but not being afraid to recognize true cognates" (p. 36).
2.8. DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSLATION THEORY

The literature on the theory, practice and history of translation is large. Stiener (1975 : 237 onwards) divides it into four periods admitting that the lines of division are in no sense absolute. These divisions can be summarized as follows:

(i) From Cicero (46 B.C.), Horace (20 ys. later) to Holderlin's commentary on his own translation from Sophocles (1804). This long period includes various contributions to translation theory based on certain famous works of translation. Seminal analyses and pronouncements stemmed directly from the enterprise of the translator. One of the fullest accounts is Huet's treatise of the nature and problems of translation and the main characteristic is that of "immediate empirical focus".

(ii) The second stage from 1813 to 1946. The question of the nature of translation is posed within the more general framework of theories of language and mind. The hermeneutic approach was initiated by Schleiemacher and taken up by Schlegel and Humboldt. It gives the subject of translation a frankly philosophic aspect, (it includes, Goethe, Schopenhauer, Mathew Arnowld, Paul Valery, Ezra Pound, I.A. Richards, Benedetto Croce, Walter Benjamin and Ortega Y. Gasset. This age of philosophical - poetic theory and definition, extends to 1946.

(iii) The modern current machine translation 1940. Russian and Czech Scholars and critics, heirs to the Formalist movement, apply linguistic theory and statistics to translation. Structural linguistics and information theory are introduced into the discussion of interlingual exchange.

(iv) The "discovery" of Walter Benjamin's paper originally published in 1923, together with the influence of Heidegger and Hans-Gorge Gadamer, has caused a reversion to
hermenutic, almost metaphysical inquiries into translation and interpretation. The development of transformational generative grammars has brought the argument between "universalist" and "relativist" positions back into the forefront of linguistic thought. The study of the theory and practice of translation has become a point of contact between established and newly evolving disciplines.

Both Bassnett, 1980, and Verma, 1993, criticize this kind of division on the ground that this "periodization" or "compartmentalization" may not help us to understand the theory. According to Verma, some of the views expressed in the first period (in Stiener's classification) are valid even today and different lines of approaches co-exist during any period. He suggests, giving more examples to prove his point of view, that the major "lines of approach" to translation have been: (a) the sense-to-sense approach, and (b) the word-to-word approach. In the sense-to-sense translation (free), the translator "judges the function of the whole text in discourse and searches for elements that could fulfil that function in a goal language situation"; whereas in word-to-word translation (literal), the translator "decomposes the text into single elements (or small groups of elements) and replaces each into a corresponding element (or group) in the goal language", (de Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981), quoted in Verma, 1992, p. 241). To Verma, an effective translation, then, has to strike a balance between the two approaches outlined above. He also sees that "the problem of making a delicate distinction between what constituted a faithful rendering and what was a stylistic variation was a major issue.
for centuries; the "correct" interpretation of original and its "loyal" recreation in other language have always been the central issues in all translation activities".

Bassnet (1980), states that the distinction between word for word and sense for sense translation, established within the Roman system, has continued to be a point for debate in a way or another untill the present time. She says that these lines "can be seen emerging again and again with different degrees of emphases in accordance with differing concepts of language and communication" (p. 42). She also maintains that there are certain concepts of translation that prevail at different times, which can be documented, but she thinks that it is better to follow a loosely chronological structure without attempting to set up clear-cut divisions.

Her lines of approach could be outlined as follows: the Romans, Bible translation, education and the vernacular, early theorists, the Renaissance, the seventeenth century, the eighteenth century, Romanticism, post-Romanticism, the Victorians, Archaizing and the twentieth century.

She concludes that the history of translation studies "should be seen as an essential field for the contemporary theories, but should not be approached from a narrowly fixed position" (p. 75). Her conviction is that although translation has a central core of linguistic activity, it belongs most properly to semiotics. To her, the linguistic approach narrows translation involvement to transfer of "meaning", while the process involves a whole set of extra-linguistic criteria also.
Throughout his book, Kelly (1979: 2-4), focusses on the following approaches:

(i) The first begins from the prologues of the dramatists, Terence (190-150 BC) and extends to Jiri Levy. The focus of attention has been the creative aspect of translation. Reciprocal influences between form and content, ramification of source and target texts in their respective literary traditions, the rights and duties of the translator, all are constant themes. This stream of theory has analysed aims and results without paying much attention to the linguistic operations involved.

(ii) The second is that of linguists and grammarians who have identified theory with analysis of semantic and grammatical operations. The major tradition of this type, lasting from St. Augustine (324-430) to the twentieth-century European-structuralists, sees meaning in terms of the dualistic Aristotelian model of sign. (American structural linguistics, London School Publication, J.R. Firth).

(iii) The third approach, hermeneutics, treats language and its signs as creative energy. Thus translation was not primarily the production of a text, but interpretation and contemplation of language and work. Romantics sought through translation to transfer the creative power of great writers of other languages into their own, (Friedrich Hölderlin, 1780-1843, Martin Heidegger, 1889).

Kelly comments on the previous approaches to translation by stating that each one of these theories of translation falls short, for the first and third ones leave aside technique, and the second assumes a very generalized purpose for translation. Besides, they all have an unrealistically restricted view of
their section of theory. In the case of the literary theorist, not all uses of language are literature, and so there is a large body of translation resting on noncreative language functions and purely objective transfers of information. For him, a complete theory of translation has three components: specification of function and goal, description and analysis of operations; and critical comment on relationships between goal and operation.

In Eugene Nida’s (1975) view, insights from linguistic theory have provided important help for those interested in the scientific analysis of translation. At the same time, scientific analysis of translation can provide important insights for various theories of linguistics. According to Wilss (1982), the speculative question which had dominated considerations of methodology up until 1800 was: should a translation adopt itself to the original, or—vice versa—should the original be subordinated to the translation? He opines that "concepts and terminology in the science of translation developed slowly, as cautious, probing moves in theory and method were made in the wings of the linguistic scene in the 1950s [...]. Since then, the science of translation has become so consolidated that it is possible to speak of a goal for the science". The science, that is "rather cognitive / hermeneutic / associative one [...] it seeks answers to the question of the possibilities and limits of the translatability of text and of the similarity of the effect produced by the source language text (SLT) and that produced by the target language text (TLT)" (p. 12-13). It thus developed a series of models to describe the process of translation; these
were oriented partly toward linguistics and partly toward the science of communication.

Schogt (1988) stresses that linguistic elements are inextricably mixed with cultural and aesthetic components, that it makes it impossible to formulate a theory that covers all possible translation situations. To him, general linguistic studies on translation, such as works by George Monnin, Jean-René Ladmiral, and Catford give the reasons why translating is difficult rather than indicating how to solve the difficulties. And comparative studies such as the one by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet on English and French do give some practical advice based on linguistic analysis and on relative frequency when a construction is known in both target and source languages. Schogt believes that the most comprehensive translation theory where all the different aspects are linked together and very explicit practical advice concludes each theoretic discussion is offered by Nida and Charles Taber. But their theory is combined to one specific text, the Bible, seen not as a work of art, but a text written to educate and instruct, to convince and convert, i.e. the purpose here is clearly defined on the opposite of that purpose in a literary work.

2.9. TRANSLATION STUDIES AND FORMULATION OF TRANSLATION THEORY

James Holmes (1987) in his article "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies" distanced himself from the previous theories and called for a new approach to translation. He gives a full description of the structure that translation studies should
eventually have, i.e. a collective and inclusive designation for all research activities taking the phenomena of translation as their basis.

According to Gentzler (1993) the most characteristics about the new field was its insistence on openness to interdisciplinary approaches. Distinctions between right and wrong, literal and free, art and science, theory and practice become less important and translation was no longer viewed as either literary or non-literary but as both.

Translation studies became a field of pure research, a discipline with two objectives: (a) to describe particular phenomena of translating and translation and (b) to establish general principles by means of which they can be explained and predicted. It has, as schematized by Holmes (19??) two divisions: Pure and applied. The former is mainly concerned with:

(i) descriptive translation studies, i.e. (a) product-oriented, (b) function-oriented, and (c) process-oriented;

(ii) theoretical translation studies, i.e. (a) general translation theory that can serve to explain and predict all phenomena of translating and translation, and (b) partial translation theories, viz., theories specific in their scope and dealing with only one or a few of various aspects of translation theory as a whole. Those are:

- medium-restricted translation theories (human, machine - mixed).
- area-restricted theories (language-involved, culture-involved).
- rank-restricted theories (words-sentences).
- text-type restricted theories (literary text, Bible text, other sacred texts).
- time-restricted theories (contemporary text, old period).
- problem-restricted theories (variance and in-variance in translation - nature of translation equivalence, translation of metaphor-proper names, etc.)

The second main division is that of applied translation studies which has four disciplines:

(i) translator training: The teaching of translating is of two types: (a) translating as a technique in foreign language teaching, and (b) translating as taught in schools and courses to train professional translators and interpreters (teaching method, testing, curriculum planning);

(ii) the preparation of translation aids (lexicographical, termenology, grammars);

(iii) translation policy;

(iv) translation criticism.

Thus, it can be concluded that the development of translation theory in all its ramifications (including translation studies) is mainly concerned with the linguistic and denotational factors in an original text and offering translators principles, rules and guidelines by which they can be helped in transferring that original to the other language.
2.10. CONCLUSION

The aim of the present chapter was to survey the relevant literature on translation in general in order to gain some insight of the relationship between translation and foreign language teaching and learning.

First, a survey of different definitions of translation was made. The search for a precise and comprehensive definition of the term "translation" proved to be, somehow, elusive. The reason(s) being that various components are involved in the translation process, and also different scholars and theorists in different times and places consider and think of those components from different perspectives and points of view. But despite of the similarities and differences which exist in the definitions of translation, it is concluded that translation implies the process of transferring a message from one language to another, taking into account all the dimensions within the SLT (source language text), linguistic organisation, culture, style, time, intentions, feelings, etc. and reproducing the whole thing smoothly, naturally and as closely to the original as possible in the TLT (target language text) (Sec. 2.1).

As for the types of translation (Sec. 2.2), it was found that there is a distinction between different types of translation depending on : (a) the codes involved in transferring the message (intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic), (b) the types of text (technical, cultural and literary), (c) methods of translation (communicative and semantic translations) and (d)
bilingual competence (translating and interpreting, word-for-word and free, literary and technical, professional and pedagogical, and human and machine).

The learner of a foreign language is entitled to have the opportunity not only to know about these types of translation but also to try his hand on them as this can contribute to increasing his command of the foreign language.

The importance of translation (sec. 2.3) stems from its vital role in our life in which translation is an essential factor in ensuring an effective communication. It is also of a great effect in enriching languages and cultures.

The process of translating involves not only the replacement of lexical and grammatical items between languages, it also requires the syntactic, semantic, stylistic and text-pragmatic comprehension, and, in certain cases, deviating and making shifts from the original in order to achieve "expressive identity" and reproduce the closest natural equivalent of the source language. This process engages the translator in intensive reading, in going beyond the language in order to understand and interpret messages and intentions of the original. Consequently, it involves him/her in developing the skills of writing, reformulating, because reading/writing are recursive interdependent and mutually enhancing (Sec. 2.4).
The survey of the issue of translatibility and untranslatability of a text (Sec. 2.5) revealed that the potential translation of a text is contained and guaranteed by the universality of linguistic conventions shared by languages and by human experiences of everyday life. In other words, that which can be said in one language can be said in any other. None the less, untranslatability between source language and target language exists due to either the absence of a linguistic element or to cultural differences. However, a part of the task of the translator is to compensate and find proper solutions to those particular problems. Differences of languages, circumstances, audients and translators are important components of translation which could result in different translation for the same original work.

Section (2.6) dealt with the concept of translation equivalence. The discussion showed that this concept is considered an important one in translation theory and translation practice. It is believed that looking for an exact and precise equivalence between two linguistic items is not possible. It is only possible to look for an approximate one or close analogue of the original.

Distinction between different types of equivalence was made, (textual equivalence and formal correspondence, formal and dynamic and linguistic, pragmatic, stylistic and textual). The notion of equivalence effect associated with Nida's dynamic equivalence which enjoyed a wide acceptance, seemed to be facing
objection among scholars as it is being applicable to the formal properties of a text or as being "mentallistic" which needs further definition. Furthermore, the criteria of evaluating the use of language in translation are different and much more complex than those by which we evaluate the use of language in an original.

The concept of equivalence is apparently left to individual translators themselves to say whether their translations are considered equivalent, less equivalent or non-equivalent. While some scholars seem to stick to certain notion of equivalence as a yardstick for measuring translation.

Considering the issue of the adequacy of translation theory (sec. 2.7), it was found that there is a general feeling among the theorists that what was achieved in this area yields very little. That is because translation and language is seen on one hand as an art not as a science and good translations mostly do not depend on theory for translators translate by intuition. There is even a doubt whether translation is a subject for theory construction. On the other hand, it is believed that the difficulties of constructing a scientific theory of translation are due to the numerous goals that can be connected to the translating activity and the technical literature related to the subject is insufficient. Translation theory, however, is viewed as being able to provide principles and guidelines to the translator which could help him when carrying out his task, but it cannot make a good translator.
Different attempts have been made to historically accommodate the trends of translation theory and practice (Sec. 2.8). But it appears that there was no satisfactory classification as it is not easy to periodize the theory of translation for different views and approaches continue to exist for centuries and at different times (e.g. literal or free translation, faithful or nonfaithful translation).

The evolution in the last two decades, however, is the field of Translation Studies which has become a discipline with very many branches and opened to almost all fields of knowledge. Translation studies has become a collective discipline of pure research which covers all kinds of activities related to translation.