CHAPTER FIVE
One of the enduring problems in both translation theory and practice has been the question of how to tell whether a translation is good or bad. Any statement that describes the positive and negative features of a given translation, arriving at a summative assessment of its worth, implies a conception of the nature and goals of translation. If translation is viewed as an artistic and creative activity depending to a large extent upon nonquantifiable stylistic institutions and interpretative skills on the part of the translator, then the question of translation quality assessment will most likely be tackled in an anecdotal and subjective manner. If translation is viewed as purposeful activity designed to produce a specific response in its readers, then the assessment of the quality of a translation will have to concern itself with measuring this effect. If translation is regarded as an attempt to construct a functionally equivalent textual product, then a necessary prerequisite for translation quality assessment will be the establishment of those language and/or textual functions that are relevant in translation. Of these three different approaches to evaluating translation quality, text based study is considered here.

**Text Based Studies:**

Koller (1983) suggests that a model for translation quality assessment should be in three main stages (a) source text criticism with a view to transferability into the target language, (b) translation comparison in which the particular methods used in the production of given translation are described, and (c) evaluation of the translation according to ‘adequate’ or ‘not adequate’ in terms of the text-specific features established in (a) and measured by
native speakers' metalinguistic judgements. Although stimulating these ideas remain

Wilss (1982) stresses the necessity of building a consistent model featuring criteria both for the detailed description and interpretation of the source text and for the evaluation of the 'dependent' translation text. He suggests that the area of the 'norm of usage' in a given language community with reference to a given situational context should be taken as a yardstick. It is the norm of usage that, as part of any native speaker's competence, accounts for a speaker's ability to make metalinguistic judgements. Therefore, a translation may be judged according to whether or not it is adequate vis-a-vis the 'normal' standard usage of native speakers in a given situation. However, there will always be several variants that are legitimately possible within the norm of usage and that these depend upon the individual's creative choice. Like any linguistic activity, translation is a creative process that always leaves the translator a freedom of choice between several approximately equivalent possibilities of realizing situational meaning. Moreover, the given situation in which the source text was written is by definition unique, and therefore a notion of norm existing in the source culture is a somewhat optimistic one. Even more optimistic is the idea that there should exist a 'norm' for this unique text in the target culture. Further, one should not underestimate the immense difficulties of empirically establishing what any norm of usage is.

Reiss assumes that for determining the quality of translation it is first necessary to determine the function and the textual type of the source text, claiming that different types of texts can be differentiated on the basis of Buhler's (1965) three functions of language content oriented texts form-oriented texts, and conative texts. According to Reiss it is these
textual types that have to be kept equivalent in an adequate translation. The determination of the textual type presupposes a careful analysis of the source text and it is here that the weakness of Reiss’ suggestions become apparent. In her model (despite its many examples) she gives no indication as to the precise method of establishing textual function and textual type.

A newer and more extensive theory, which incorporates Reiss’s original functional approach to translation, postulates that any translation is first and foremost a function of purpose and given the primacy of the purpose of a translation - it is the way the target culture norms are heeded that is the most important yardstick in assessing the value of a translation. Reiss and Vermee distinguish between equivalence and adequacy of a translation. Equivalence refers to the relationship between a source text and translation text that fulfill the same communicative function, adequacy refers to the relationship between a source and translation text in which the purpose of the translation has been consistently attended to (that is, there is no functional match between the original and the translation). Unfortunately, the authors fail to give any precise linguistically based guidelines as to how to determine whether a given translation is either adequate or equivalent let alone how to realize linguistically the global purpose of a translation text. What is needed in the evaluation of translations is a model that goes beyond programmatic theoretical pronouncements and isolated examples indicating a precise method of establishing and giving a linguistic description of whether and how a translation is equivalent to, or different from, its original source text.
5.2 Model For Evaluating Translation:

The original Model:

To understand better the assumption underlying the model, it is first necessary to define what is to be understood by translation. The essence of translation lies in the preservation of meaning across two languages. If it is assumed that there are three aspects to this meaning - semantic, pragmatic and textual - then translation may be defined in the following manner: translation is the replacement of a text in the source language by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the target language. The pragmatic aspect of meaning has overriding importance in translation. It is always necessary to aim at equivalence of pragmatic meaning even at the expense of semantic meaning. In this definition of translation the key term is 'equivalent', and the concept of equivalence is also taken to be the fundamental criterion of translation quality. Thus, an adequate translation text is a pragmatically and semantically equivalent one. As a first requirement for this equivalence, it is posited that a translation text has a function equivalent to that of its source text. Such a use of the concept of function presupposes that there are elements in any text that - given appropriate analytical tools can reveal the function of the text.

The use of the term 'function' in this context is open to misinterpretation. Mainly because different language functions can coexist inside what will here be described as an individual text’s function and because language functions have often been directly correlated with textual types. Many different classification schemes for the 'function of language' have been proposed but most of them can be reduced to a basic division into a cognitive referential (content-oriented) function and various other non-cognitive...
(emotive- expressive, person or interaction oriented) functions. Whereas these two broad functional categories cannot be used to establish a functional - textual typology for translation such that any text exhibits a predominant function they are useful as a basis for providing convenient labels for the two components of a text’s function, which are always co-present and will be referred to as the ideational and the interpersonal functional component.

The evidence in the text that characters it on any one particular dimension is of course, itself evidence. This linguistic evidence is broken down into three types syntactic, lexical, and textual. Important is the inclusion of textual means, as these have traditionally been neglected in translation quality assessment. Among the phenomena to be considered are (a) theme dynamics taking account of various patterns of semantic relationship by which themes recur in a text (for example, repetition, anaphoric and cataphoric referencing) and of the concept of functional sentence perspective capturing theme -theme distribution, (b) clausal linkage described by a system of basically logical relationship between clauses and sentences for instance, additive, causative, or temporal connections.

Furthermore, two basic types of text constitution need to be taken account of emic and etic texts. An emic text is one that is solely determined by text-immanent criteria whereas an etic text is one that is determined through text-transcending means, that is, personal temporal, and local dieetics pointing to the various features of the situation enveloping the text, the author, and the addressee(s).

The situational dimensions and their linguistic correlates are then considered to be the means by which the text’s function is realized. A translation text should not only match its source
text in function but employ equivalent situational-dimensional means to achieve that function, that is, for a translation of optimal quality, it is desirable to have a match between source and translation text along these dimensions that are found in the course of the analysis - to contribute in a particular way to each of the two functional components, ideational and interpersonal of the text's function. By using situational dimensions for opening up the source text, a particular textual profile is obtained for the source text. This profile, which characterizes the function of the text, is then the norm against which the quality of the translation text is to be measured a given translation text is analyzed using the same dimensional scheme and at the same level of delicacy and the degree to which its textual profile and function match or do not match that of the source text is the degree to which the translation text is more or less adequate in quality.

If a translation text, to be adequate, is to fulfil the requirement of a dimensional, and as a result of this, a functional match, then any mismatch along the dimensions is an error. Such dimensional errors are referred to as covert covert errors. These are to be differentiated from those overt errors that result either from a mismatch of the denotative meanings of source and translation text elements or from a breach of the target language system. Overt errors have traditionally been given more attention whereas covert errors, which demand a much more qualitative-descriptive in-depth analysis, have often been neglected. The relative weighting of individual errors both within the two categories and across them is a problem that varies from text to text.

The final qualitative judgement of a translation text consists, then of a listing of both covert and overt errors and of a statement of the relative match of the ideational and the interper-
sonal functional components. The notion that a mismatch on a particular situational dimension constitutes a covert error presupposes that:

a) the sociocultural norms, or more specifically the norm-conditioned expectations generated by the texts, are essentially comparable. Obvious differences in the unique cultural heritage must, of course, be stated explicitly and discussed in each particular text;

b) the differences between the two languages are such that they can largely be overcome in translation, that is basic intertranslatability between the two languages is assumed. Again, exceptional cases such as the nonavailability of the German Du-Sie distinction in English must be stated explicitly and treated as exceptions; and

c) no special second function is added to the translation text, that is works translated for special purposes or special audiences are excluded. Such translations are no longer translations but will be defined as overt versions of an original text.

Given these three presuppositions, it is thus assumed that the addresses of a translation text form a basically similar subgroup in the target community to the subgroup formed by the addresses of the source text in the source language community both being defined as speakers of the contemporary standard language, that is, that supraregional variety that is (commonly) used by the educated middle class speaker and that is at the same time accepted by the majority of the whole language community.

5.3.3 Overt Translation

A distinction between two types of translation, which is crucial for the evaluation of translations, is suggested overt translation and covert translation.
An overt translation is one in which the addresses of the translation text are quite 'overtly' not being directly addressed; thus an overt translation is one that must overtly be a translation not, as it were, a 'second original'. In an overt translation the source text is tied in a specific manner to the source language community and its culture. The source text is specifically directed at source culture addressees but at the same time points beyond the source
tial general human interest. Source text that call for an overt translation have an established worth or status in the source language community and potentially in other communities. Such source texts may be divided into two groups.

a) Overt historically linked source texts that, is those tied to a specific occasion in which a precisely specified source language audience is/was being addressed. Examples from the test sample mentioned above are a sermon (by Karl Barth given at a Basel prison) and a political speech (given by Winston Churchill on the steps of the town hall in Bradford in 1942).

b) Overtimeless source texts, that is, those transcending, as works of art and aesthetic creations, a distinct historical meaning while, of course, always necessarily displaying period and culture-specificity because of the status of the addressee, who is a product of that time and culture. Examples in the test corpus are a moral anecdote (a nineteenth century Kalendergeschichte by the well-known German author Johann Peter Hebel) and a comedy dialogue (an excerpt from Sean O'Casey's one-act play, The End of the Beginning). Both these texts - although timeless and transmitting a general human message - are culture-specific because they are marked on the language user dimensions (presence of a particular temporal dialect and a geographical dialect respectively) and because they have
independent status in the language community through belonging to the community's cultural products.

Both groups of source texts, historically linked and timeless ones, then, necessitate an overt translation. The requirements for this type of translation lead to an important modification of the model of translation quality assessment as outlined earlier: a direct match of the original function of the source text is not possible in overt translation, either because the source text is tied to a specific nonrepeatable historic event in the source culture (Barth's sermon or Churchill's speech, both given at a particular time and place to a particular audience) or because of the unique status (as a literary text) that the source text has in the source culture.

5.3.4 Covert Translation

A covert translation is a translation that enjoys or enjoyed the status of an original source text in the target culture. The translation is covert because it is not marked pragmatically as a translation text of a source text but may conceivably have been created in its own right. A covert translation is thus a translation whose source text is not specifically addressed to a particular source culture audience, that is, it is not particularly tied to the source language and culture. A source text and its covert translation text are pragmatically of equal concern for source and target language addresses. Both are, as it were, equally directly addressed. A source text and its covert translation have equivalent purposes; they are based on contemporary equivalent needs of a comparable audience in the source and target language communities. In the case of covert translation texts, it is thus both possible and desirable to keep the function of the source text equivalent in the translation text.
In the sample texts analyzed in House (1981), a scientific text (an excerpt from a course book in mathematics) an economic text (a letter written by the president of an international investment company to the shareholders), a journalistic text (an article of anthropology, that appeared in a popular magazine) and a tourist information booklet (an advertising brochure on Nuremberg) exemplify the category of source texts necessitating a covert translation. All these translation texts have direct target language addresses, for whom they are as immediately and ‘originally’ relevant as is the source text for the source language addresses.

In the case of the economic text in the test sample, for instance, both source and target language addresses are shareholders of the same investment company, that is, they differ only accidentally in their respective mother tongues. Similarly, a text taken from a mathematics course book is potentially of equal concern for German and English speaking science students, and a journalistic article on an anthropological topic is of potential equal interest to both German readers of the journal NESCO Kurier who are interested in anthropology and English speaking readers of the UNESCO Courier who share this interest in anthropology. A tourist information booklet is (generally) as much directed at German speaking visitors to Nuremberg as it is directed at English-speaking ones.

Whereas it is thus clear that such texts are not source culture specific, it is the covert type of translation that such texts require that presents more difficult, and more subtle, cultural translation problems than those encountered in the case of overt translation, where the particular source culture specificity had to be either left intact and presented as a culturally and historically linked monument, or overtly matched in the target culture setting. If the source text and its translation text are to have truly equivalent functions, which is necessary
in a covert translation, the translator has to take different cultural presuppositions in the two language communities into account in order to meet the needs of the target language addresses in their cultural setting, and in order to achieve an effect equivalent to the source text's effect. In a covert translation, the translator has to make allowances for underlying cultural differences by placing a cultural filter between the source text and the translation text to, as it were, view the source text through the glasses of a target culture member.

Given the goal of achieving functional equivalence in a covert translation assumptions of cultural difference should be carefully examined before any change in the source text is undertaken. In cases of unproven assumptions of cultural difference the translator may be led to apply a cultural filter whose application, resulting in possibly deliberate mismatches between the source text and the translation text along several situational parameters is not justified.

Covert versions must be clearly differentiated from overt versions which are produced whenever a special function is (overtly) added to the translation text. This special function can involve cases in which the translation text is to reach a special audience (for example, special editions for a youthful audience with the resultant omissions, simplifications, different accentuations of certain features of the source text, etc.) or it can involve cases in which the translation text is given a special added purpose, for example, resumes or abstracts where it is the special purpose of the version producer to pass on only the most essential facts.

In the discussion of different types of translation and the distinction between a translation and a version it was implicitly assumed that a particular text may be adequately translated in
only one particular way. The assumption that a particular text necessitates either an overt or a covert translation may, however, not hold in every case. Thus any text may, for specific purposes, require an overt translation, that is, it may be viewed as a document that 'has independent status' and exists in its own right: (for instance, a commercial circular) It may be cited as evidence in a court of law, or its author may, in the course of time, prove to be a distinguished political or literary figure. In these two instances, the texts would clearly not have an equivalent function in translation, that is, in both cases an overt translation would be appropriate and it should be equivalent as such.

Further, there may well be source texts for which the choice between an overt or covert translation is a subjective one, for instance, fairy tales may be viewed as folk products of a particular culture, which would predispose a translator to opt for an overt translation, or as non culture specific texts, anonymously produced, with the general function of entertaining and educating the young, which would suggest a covert translation or consider the case of the Bible which may be treated as either a collection of historical literary documents, in which case an overt translation would seem to be called for, or as a collection of human truths directly relevant to Everyman, in which case a covert translation might seem appropriate.

It is clear that the specific purpose for which a translation' is required will determine whether the aim should be a translation or an overt version. In other words, just as the decision as to whether an overt or a covert translation is appropriate for a particular text may be conditioned by factors such as the changeable status of the text producer, so clearly the initial choice between translating a given source text and producing a version of it cannot be
made on the basis of features of the text but is conditioned by the arbitrarily determined purpose for which the translation version is required.

The comparative assessment of different translation texts of the same source text can be conducted on the basis of the evaluative model outlined above to the extent that the relative importance of the individual situational dimensions has been demonstrated in the analysis of the source text. A relative weighing of covert and overt errors can only be achieved through a consideration of each individual textual pair. However, the subgroup of overt errors referred to as mismatches of the denotative meanings of elements of the source and translation texts will detract more seriously from the quality of a translation text, whenever the source text has a strongly marked ideational functional component, for instance, mismatches of the denotative meaning of items in a science text are likely to be rated higher than a mismatch on 'social attitude'.

A detailed hierarchy of errors for any individual case can, however, only be given for a particular comparison of two or more texts depending in any particular case on the objectives of the evaluation.
5.3 CONCLUSION

I conclude with a brief recapitulation of some of the most significant aspects of my thesis. Translations have been in practice all over the world since times immemorial.

Though there are several theories of translation, most of them advocate faithful adherence to the sense and spirit than the form of the SL.

Though several differences and contrasts do exist between culturally distinct languages like English and Kannada translation seems to be convincingly possible in the case of less involved and nonpoetic literature.

Translation poses fundamental problems at the comprehension level and at the level of choosing equivalences. These problems can be easily solved by the translator’s perseverance and effort. But certain inherent problems cannot be solved which arises due to the cultural differences and the limitations of the languages.

A faithful translation exacts not only the expertise in the mechanics of the language but also a keen sensibility and sharp analytical insight to understand the intricacies of the ST and reproduce it in the target language effectively.

The different aspects that the thesis has tried to highlight are very little when compared to the real potentiality that this field offers.

Not many scholars have made such linguistic approaches to the translation studies and contrastive grammar. This is only a point of departure. If any prospective research scholar takes up contrastive linguistic study of a specific genre like poetry or play or a particular translator or his works, on the practicability of total translation, inspired by my work, then
this dissertation becomes more meaningful.

All the syntactic structures used in the translations of BMS may be one of the recommended subjects for the further study. The translation of advertisements in Electronic and print media, the translation of the discourse in the feature films for voice dubbing and sub-titling in the phonetic perspective would be very interesting.

A comparative study of A K Ramanujam with BMS with respect to their choice of topic and grappling with the problems of cultural words and syntax, would prove an interesting study.

Translating puns and figures of speech in poetry and idiomatic usage and proverbs in prose make good topics for research.