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3.1. Introduction

It has been shown in the previous chapter that translation as an activity has an affinity with a wide range of subjects or, though it may sound as an exaggeration, with *everything*. ‘*Everything*’ in this context refers to whatever is documented in one language (SL) and is aimed to be documented in another language (TL). It has been pointed out that translation is not merely the replacement of the linguistic signs of one language with functionally similar linguistic signs of another, as this sounds rather mechanical and overlooks vital considerations such as linguistic gaps, culture, religion, context, etc.

This chapter is meant to deal with the teaching of translation with specific reference to the undergraduate level. What are the methodologies and tools that can contribute to familiarising translation students with translation as a theory and as a practice/activity as well? It would appear too ambitious to claim that a translation class should aim to produce professionally skilled translators by the end of a course. It is impossible to evoke scenarios of all real-life situations which students might face in their professional careers. Skill is something that can be obtained only through experience and coming face to face with different translation situations and constantly attempting to tackle different obstacles encountered while translating. But a translation course ideally aims to familiarise and equip the students with several methodologies and techniques to help them translate better. It grants them not the skill but the way to acquisition of the skill. Robinson (1997b: 94) notes:

Ideally, deductive principles – rules, models, laws, theories – of translation should arise out of the translator’s own experience, the inductive testing of abductive hypotheses through a series of individual cases. In abduction the translator tries something that feels right, perhaps feels potentially right, without any clear sense of how well it will work; in induction the translator allows broad regularities to emerge from the materials s/he has been
exposed to; and in deduction the translator begins to impose those regularities on new materials by way of predicting and controlling what they will entail.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section accounts for educational and pedagogical issues concerning the teaching of English as a foreign language in Yemen/the Arab world, language learning in translation classroom activities, parallelism between language learning and translating, teachability of translation (theory and practice), meeting students’ expectations, stylistic problems confronting Arab students in Arabic-English translation, etc. In addition to briefly presenting views and opinions of some translation scholars, the second section discusses four approaches of translation teaching offered by Newmark, Baker, Hatim and Munday, and Larson, respectively.

3.2. Teaching of Translation Studies at the Undergraduate Level

The importance of the views presented here lies in the practicality of the techniques suggested to help translators develop an awareness of the differences between languages, become aware of the nature of translation and its approaches, and deal with certain problems of translation. These techniques and approaches are then taken as a yardstick in the next chapter with reference to the translation syllabi used in the public universities in Yemen. In other words, the ‘textbooks’ of Newmark, Baker, Hatim and Munday, and Larson will be evaluated in terms of how they make translation teachable, or systematise translation teaching, and how far their models would apply to the Yemeni students of English at the undergraduate level. In this way, the discussion extends to cover also the theories referred to in the previous chapters, i.e. the applicability of these theories in teaching translation to Yemeni students in particular, and Arab students in general. The evaluation of the situation of translation teaching in the concerned universities is substantiated by quantitative and qualitative data collected through questionnaires and tests – in the next chapter. Then, it will
become possible to adopt certain theories, models and techniques of translation teaching, to develop guidelines for translation curriculum aimed to improve the situation of translation teaching and give students insights of how to deal with texts while translating, which will be proposed in the next chapter.

Broadly speaking, the English language being the global lingua franca makes it the most commonly spoken language on earth, either as a mother tongue or as an other tongue. More and more people every day have the desire to learn English as a second or foreign language. Teaching and learning of English as a second/foreign language have covered a long way since the beginning of the last century, and a variety of methods and approaches have been devised and adopted to this effect. This research contends that translation can be employed as a tool contributing to the English undergraduate students’ understanding of the English language while at the same time preserving the status of translation as an autonomous subject.¹

Obviously, translation is a useful tool to learn grammar, syntax, and lexis in both SL and TL. It is mainly through translation, directly or indirectly, that a student realises the differences between two language communities, linguistic as well as cultural. Through translation, students are also able to see a translated work as partly a TL image of the original ST and partly an independent text. The final text of a written translation is a new one, as Lefevere (1992a) has stated, i.e. translating is re-writing. In this sense, the translated work must “stand on its own”. Since the text has its own identity, it must respect the rules which govern its language. When translators (or translation students) translate, they unconsciously follow three steps: analysis, transfer, and restructuring (Nida & Taber 1963: 33). Therefore, students of translation need to know how to carry out these procedures systematically in order to be able to produce adequate translations. Robinson (1997b: 133) puts it forward: “Give students
the rules [of transferring meaning]; make them memorize those rules; test them on the thoroughness with which they have memorized them; then send them out into the world to put the rules into practice”.

If we turn to the notion of translation teaching, we will find that translation pedagogy is still in its infancy, and is in need of substantial theorisation. Regarding the question of improving the pedagogical principles and techniques of translation teaching, Wilss (2004: 14) acknowledges that a salient misconception is the belief that there is a ‘royal way’ in translation teaching methodology. He believes that no one can know or be aware of all the problems translation teachers (as well as practical syllabus designers) are faced with in classroom teaching. Hence, there can be no fixed canon of translation teaching methods, no series of certified and unquestionable teaching values (ibid.: 11), and there may well be no single approach to translation teaching which is, even theoretically, capable of organising this vast plurality of concerns and specialisations (ibid.: 13). But he agrees that one characteristic feature of translation teaching is the combination of knowledge and skills.

Historically, translation was the basis of language teaching for a very long time (especially the pre-20th century), and was then rejected as new methodologies started to appear. It was a key element of the Grammar-Translation Method, which was derived from the classical method of teaching Greek and Latin, and advocated language teaching namely through rote learning of abstract grammar rules and paradigm lists of vocabulary and the translation of isolated sentences constructed to illustrate grammatical points (Schjoldager 2004: 128). Little interest was taken in teaching the students any oral skills in L2, and the medium of instruction was the students’ L1. It was not a positive learning experience for many learners to memorise huge lists of rules and vocabulary. Blamed for its apathy to the improvement of
students’ audio and communicative skills and its concentration on language as a system (*langue*) rather than as a means of communication, this method was severely criticised (with effect from the mid- and late 19th century by members of the Reform Movement, later leading to the formation of the direct method of language teaching (ibid.)) to the extent that so many scholars viewed translation as a threat to second language learning progress and should not be used in language classroom at all. Unsurprisingly, new methodologies tried to improve on this. The Direct or Natural Method established in Germany and France around 1900 was a response to the obvious problems associated with the Grammar-Translation Method. In the Direct Method the teacher and learners avoid using the learners’ native language and use the target language only. Like the Direct Method, the later Audio-Lingual Method tried to teach the language directly, without using L1 to explain new items. But unlike the former, the latter focuses more on teaching grammar than on vocabulary. Subsequent ‘humanistic’ methodologies such as the Total Physical Response and the Communicative Approach moved even further away from L1, and from these arise many of the objections to translation.4 However, recent years have shown signs that the area is warming up to a reappraisal of the merits of translation in language learning (Cook 1998: 119, Schjoldager 2004: 129). Cook (ibid.) emphasises that the Grammar-Translation Method is just one way of using translation as a pedagogical tool in language learning. Schjoldager (2004: 129-130) distinguishes between three kinds of teaching activities which involve the use of translation one way or the other, i.e. language teaching, translation teaching, and translator training. She suggests that using a more or less modified version of the Grammar-Translation Method, teachers may view translation mainly as a means of teaching and testing L2 proficiency, and translations from L1 into L2 are supposed to test L2 production skills, whereas
translations the other way, i.e. L1 translations, are supposed to test comprehension skills. Secondly, translation may also be taught as a separate component in a language programme, i.e. an end in itself. Finally, translation can be taught for professional purposes, i.e. vocational training for would-be translators.

The use of translation in L2 classroom was criticised on the basis that translation strengthens L1 interference (negative transfer), and that the use of translation as a pedagogical tool is counterproductive, hindering the learning process by allowing students to rely on processing via L1. It was also claimed that L2 translation is ‘unethical’ (Schjoldager 2004: 135) because it might lead students to think that they were qualified to do translations professionally. In fact, Schjoldager refutes some of these claims and proves how translation can be effectively used to enhance language learning. According to her, if translation is viewed as text production, it then has a special kind of communication, with the caveat that students be given real-life scenario texts to translate, and be informed of the nature and circumstances of the text. Hence, translation has a communicative function (ibid.). Not only that, translating also increases one’s linguistic knowledge, linguistic accuracy and verbal agility, and promotes thoughtful, critical reading. L1 translation is also a time-saving way of checking comprehension and helping students add to their knowledge of L2; L2 translation increases knowledge of L2.5 She concedes that some degree of L1 interference (negative transfer) is inevitable, but it helps the student to contrast the two languages in hand (ibid.: 136) and the teacher to correct errors caused by first language pull. Regarding the ‘unethicality’ of translation, Schjoldager refutes it on the basis that translation is a skill that students will be called upon to perform in real life.
Leaving the position of ‘refuting accusations’ to a position of boasting the capacities of translation, Sewell (2004) discusses the supremacy of translation over the communicative method, which is epitomised in the ‘need for role-play’ in five respects:

a. the need for confidence and self-esteem: the role-play or make-believe situations that students are required to assume in the communicative methods can ‘infantilise’ them, especially adult and teenage students, and can ‘do serious damage to [their] self-image and [their] confidence’ (Sewell 2004: 153). But in written translation, there are always an ST and a TT, and the translator ‘stands between and outside both’ (ibid.: 154). Being saved the hazard of immediate, direct communication as s/he has the luxury of taking time to improve the TT, the translator’s self-image remains intact, and no ‘social pain or embarrassment’ is caused. Rather, this aspect gives students an opportunity to ‘enjoy enhanced self-esteem’ more than ‘the communicative class which is constantly challenging his/her self-image’ (ibid.: 155).

b. the need not to lose face: role-play situations are generally open-ended and unpredictable, which makes students feel vulnerable. In case something goes wrong during the process, the student stands the risk of losing face. But in translation, students always feel in control, work at home away from the restrictions of social interaction.

c. the need to be rewarded: whereas in communicative methods the effort is always the contribution of at least two persons, with no immediately tangible results, in translation, the translator works alone, and has (and knows a priori that s/he will get) a palpable product, the TT.
d. the need for certainty, for closure, for autonomy: role-play situations are invented, lack authenticity, and are ‘pure ephemera’; translation, on the other hand, has an original ST, and an ensuing TT which can be measured against ‘a visible yardstick, the ST’. Translation is ‘rock-solid as an activity’, is ‘seen as a close-ended activity’, and texts for translation have clear beginnings and endings, ‘and the student is in charge’.

e. the needs arising from any introversion in our personalities: communicative methods would seem to favour risk-taking, extraverted personalities and high levels of interaction, whereas translation seems to favour reflection, introverted personality traits and low levels of interaction.

Finally, Newmark (1988: 7) points out that, as a technique for foreign language learning, translation is a two-edged instrument: it has the special purpose of demonstrating the learner’s knowledge of the foreign language, either as a form of control or as to exercise his/her intelligence in order to develop his/her competence.⁶

Generally, translation is a process which is completed when the translator feels s/he has accounted for the lexical, idiomatic, syntactical, and cultural differences between the SLT and the lexical, idiomatic, syntactical, and cultural means of expression in the TLT and produced a qualitatively satisfactory text. In translation processes certain rather specific objective concepts based on the translator’s individual character and her/his background, experience and creativity are integrated into her/his work. Such anthropological foundations of translation processes include cognitive, interpretative, associative, and habitual procedural modes. Nevertheless, the nature of translation requires a systematic separation between planning and execution. Translation processes require the ability to set standards and make
judgements, but they also require a large measure of initiative, intuition, and willingness to take risks.

While translation, as distinct from interpretation, concerns itself only with written texts and not with oral productions, it does deal with language in use (\textit{parole} in the Saussurean sense), as does pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Syntax and semantics are concerned with language as a system. Reflections on the theory and pedagogy of translation extend far beyond the concerns of the linguist, which for the most part are centred on linguistics, mainly syntax (the set of rules governing the combinations of symbols) and semantics (the confrontation of those symbols with reality or with the symbols of another language). The translator must take into account the origin of the text to be re-expressed, its nature, and the audience for whom it was intended.

Translation as a method for language teaching and testing is not unknown to scholars and actually has prevailed for many centuries. At different periods it has been either an accepted or a controversial component, depending on prevailing objectives and teaching preferences. However, ever since language learning was recognised as a conscious and intellectual process within the cognitive code-learning theory, translation has become a learning/teaching device frequently incorporated into the curriculum. The central practical issue has been the use of translation as both a \textit{means} and an \textit{end} of foreign language instruction. It has been claimed that when translation is used as a \textit{means} it stimulates negative transfer (Schjoldager 2004: 131). The counterclaim is that translation helps to overcome and neutralise it. It has been argued that translation of the native language to the target language induces learners to make errors and thus amounts to setting traps. As Widdowson has pointed out (1979:104-5)
suppose that there is a direct one-to-one correspondence of meaning between the sentences in the TL and those in the SL. Another, and related, objection is that it draws the attention of the learner to the formal properties of the TL sentences and distracts him from the search for contextual meaning—that is to say, meaning which is a function of the relationship between sentences and appropriate situations.

Empirical observation, however, has shown that the same kinds of errors attributed to translation also occur when learners produce target language utterances (Schjoldager 2004: 136) without setting out from a native language (such as free composition). By applying translation consciously and systematically, learners can be conditioned to monitor their own code switching. Obviously, using translation as a pedagogical technique is a double-edged weapon: if used properly, it can prove efficient; but when used injudiciously, it can prove harmful. This is because translation allows for natural and easy comparison between the target and native languages of learners, thus facilitating faster decoding of difficult target language structures and elements. Secondly, it can lead to quick and effective comprehension control. Thirdly, it can help in overcoming and neutralisation of native language transfer.

Malmkjær (2004) maintains that for academic purposes a translation teaching programme should achieve “face validity”, i.e. a possible placement after graduation and insurance that the student has been equipped with the necessary knowledge and professional skills to enter the translation industry. This is necessary to avoid the split between theory and practice (ibid.: 2), and include, in addition to practice and input on language and culture, three components. The first of these components is an input on the history and theory of translation, i.e. history of the evolution of the theory of translation plus the major concepts and concerns underlying the practice of translation. The second component is input on the sociology of translation, i.e. the role played by translation in intercultural communication and in mediating and
shaping cultures, and how the purpose of translation, or the way the original text is interpreted may affect the product, that is the TT. Finally, the third component is an input on translation as a profession. She maintains that translation pedagogy can obviously not be equated with or subsumed under language pedagogy, but it is equally obvious that success in translation is predicated upon an ability to operate literately in more than one language; and that most people, whatever their language acquisition histories, need to be exposed to language education and training in order to become literate in any language (ibid.: 4).

Wilss (2004) accentuates the precedence of teaching translation theory through practice. He deems it as something real, definite, and valuable, and claims that in turn it will lead the student to discover the ‘so-called “underlying assumptions” about translation’, or about the principles which guide the translator in accomplishing more or less intricate translation tasks and understand translational task-specifications (ibid.: 9). He recommends plurality of texts in a translation course; in other words, translation teachers must introduce students to a plurality of related or unrelated fields ‘to prevent premature over-specialization’ (ibid.: 10). In relating translation to linguistic knowledge, he proposes that a university translation course should aim for two goals. It

should make students immune to recalcitrance towards their subject-matter, by helping them discover for themselves the manner in which the learning of translation relates to translation in the real world … translation teaching has to aim at the clarification of the relationship between the contents and patterns of translation on the one hand and the wider fields of linguistic behaviour and practical translation experience on the other …. Thus, translation teaching must in the final analysis be directed towards the day-to-day purposes of translation work, the communicative targets of translation and the systematization of translation teaching and translation learning. (ibid.)

Bernardini (2004) proposes that the priorities of translation courses should be set with concentration on ‘capacities to be fostered rather than competencies to be gained’ (ibid.: 21) because ‘translation’, she observes, ‘is an activity that requires
educated rather than trained professionals’ (ibid.: 22). Based on Widdowson’s (1979) distinction between training and educating, Bernardini does not recommend that the aim of translation educators, especially at the undergraduate level, be limited to passing on to their students a number of competencies and specific skills to meet the market requirements, i.e. training through a transfer of knowledge. This, she opines, is ‘relatively easy and fast, but hardly a generative process’. Instead, she asserts that educating the student is a more useful objective. Despite the longer time and the more effort, this can open the student’s-translator’s mind to acquiring new ideas and, hence, the student can fare better in the translation profession (ibid.: 19): ‘I think that translators can do without training but not without education’ (ibid.: 27). A similar view is held by Mossop (2000, quoted in Beeby 2004: 42):

In my view, the function of a translation school is not to train students for specific existing slots in the language industry, but to give them certain general abilities that they will then be able to apply to whatever slots may exist 5, 10, 15 or 25 years from now.

Upon this distinction between the aims and rationale of translator teaching and translator training, one can highlight the priorities of translation teaching as well as the differences between undergraduate and postgraduate courses.

According to Bernardini (2004), professional translators should possess three qualities: i) awareness, which is the critical ability that a translator must develop in order to perceive that his/her role is not merely trans-coding or substituting ST words for TL equivalent words, but rather constructing the meaning of the message and mediating the cultures involved; ii) reflectiveness, which is a capacity a translator should develop to practice, store and use relevant, specific strategies and procedures, such as text analysis, team work, project management, reading, writing, etc.; and iii) resourcefulness, the ability to make use of whatever resources available to cope with
new and unexpected challenges and to gain new experiences to meet the increasing needs.

The assumption of a majority of translation teachers that undergraduate students are best taught to translate by way of replicating or analogising potential professional situations has been criticised by Widdowson (1979 and 2000) and Breen (1985, in Bernardini 2004: 23) for the lack of authenticity. Bernardini (ibid.: 24) views such activities as belonging to translator training rather than translator education, ‘endors[ing] a reductive view of the profession and should be given limited space within undergraduate translation courses’ (ibid.). One might agree with Widdowson and Breen with reference to lack of authenticity. However, the other side of the coin shows that there is no better way. How can one acquire a skill without practising it? A practical translation teacher cannot confidently send his/her students (fully saturated with theory, but without a clear idea of how to apply the theory) to the translation market, nor is it easy for him/her to simply send his/her students to the work-field during a translation course for the sake of acquiring ‘authentic’ experience either. Therefore, the best way to amalgamate translation theory and practice is through simulating professional situations and providing lively and plausible texts for translation. These not only bring students close to real-life situations, but also help them determine several considerations relevant to a translation situation, such as the translation function, the type of audience implied, etc. It is only through this way that a teacher can help students apply translation theories to (semi-)real translation situations, and see how well they fare in this regard.

Bernardini (2004) objects to the view that language skills and translation skills be treated as two independent variables: first learn the language, then learn to translate. Rather, one learns the language in order to become a translator: that is,
language knowledge and skills must necessarily be consistent with translation skills, so that the two strengthen each other (ibid.: 26). A different view is that of Källkvist (2004: 179), who considers the issue of using translation for enhancing L2 proficiency empirically, and attempts to find out whether ‘enhanced memory retention’ can be traced in tests of the morphosyntactic accuracy of students who have been exposed to translation exercises. Her study concludes that if translation is used in the L2 classroom, it should be used only in conjunction with exercises in the target language which allow for a sharp focus on difficult L2 structures.

Concentrating on teaching language to translators-students, Beeby (2004) suggests that a syllabus design should be based on a pre-syllabus. The teacher starts by drawing up a pre-syllabus that includes general learning objectives for translators, based on research and experience, since the pre-syllabus provides a checklist of all those elements that intervene in the acquisition of language for translators (ibid.: 39). In the later stage, these elements will be tailored to fit the needs of a specific learning situation and a syllabus is drawn up with specific objectives. A syllabus design, according to Beeby (ibid.: 39-40), should be carried in three stages, respectively:

i. identification of the elements of a translation-based, student-oriented pre-syllabus;

ii. identification of the elements of a discourse-based, translation-oriented pre-syllabus; and

iii. designing a genre and task-based syllabus that integrates the elements of the first two stages, with very specific objectives for each task.

Beeby is of the view that a translation course should ideally aim at developing competence. Translation competence in the context of translation teaching can be
defined as a student-translator’s awareness and ability of application of aspects and requirements of professional translation. According to Schäffner (2004: 123), “translation competence is a complex notion which involves an awareness of and conscious reflection on all the relevant factors for the production of a target text that appropriately fulfils its specified function for its target addressees”. She recommends that translation competence be developed within a theoretical framework, a condition which can enhance the students’ ability in terms of making informed decisions in the future and in their practice of translation in general, particularly as students who practise translation need to view translation as a purposeful activity (ibid.: 118) and to have some knowledge about the processes of translating and about what is expected from the products of the processes, i.e. translations as target texts (ibid.: 114).

In teaching a translation course, Schäffner (2004) argues that a definition of translation can be deferred until later stages in a translation course, and recommends a kind of bottom-up technique so that translation students’ awareness of and knowledge about translation gets clearer as the course advances and, at the same time, the students’ understanding of the nature of translation and translating goes through processes of formulation and reformulation. With a translation course aiming at the development of translation competence through reflective practice within the theoretical framework provided by functionalist approaches to translation, Schäffner considers that giving the students a definition of translation and what it is to translate will come later to consolidate what the students have already become aware of, i.e. a confirmation of their reflective discovery of the nature of translation as they come to realise that translation is not merely a reproduction of an ST into a closely equivalent TT, but they instead become conscious of other essential factors such as the importance of genre conventions, addressees’ knowledge, text functions, etc. ‘Such a
discovery procedure’, Schäffner maintains, ‘allows for the conscious acquisition of knowledge (reflective learning) as opposed to an imposition of knowledge’ (ibid.: 124). She offers two approaches, or scenarios, based on her experience, to support this idea: a) teaching translation as part of a language programme, and b) teaching translation in a translation programme.

In the first scenario, a translation course (12 weeks duration) is taught where translation (and translation teaching) is meant to reinforce, and test, the students’ linguistic skills since, as appears in the general objectives of translation courses for the final year students on undergraduate language programme, translation is mainly intended to (Schäffner 2004: 115):

- show whether students have understood the content and the linguistic structure of an L2 source text which is translated into L1,
- show whether students can produce well-structured L2 texts when translating from their L1, conforming to linguistic rules and conventions of the L2,
- show whether students have fully understood the message of a text in L2 and whether they can reproduce this message in a well-structured text in L1, conforming to the rules and conventions of the L1.

The second scenario, i.e. teaching translation in a translation programme, shows a three-year translation programme the aim of which, in contrast, is to introduce students as quickly as possible to a more functionalist approach to translation.

Davies (2004b) looks at the undergraduate degree as a foundation laying stage emphasising the following points:

i. instrumentalisation, i.e. familiarisation with available tools and resources, especially new technologies,
ii. pre-specialisation, i.e. an introduction to different fields to encourage flexibility, i.e. an openness to face any specialisation later on,

iii. transferable skills that can be applied to most language combinations, i.e. strategy choice, decision-making based on motivated choices, awareness of conventions and cultural markers,

iv. ability to move away from an exclusively mechanical practice of translation towards reflective practice and constant updating.

These areas can be taught in a programme that tries to redress the balance between professional and academic issues by including subjects related to the following:

i. Language work: continuous acquisition and improvement of the source language(s) and target language(s), awareness of the existence and pitfalls of cross-linguistic transfer.

ii. Subject matter: introduction to encyclopaedic knowledge related to different disciplines, awareness of conventions of presentation in both the source and the target languages, and introduction to terminology management.

iii. Translation skills: problem-spotting and problem-solving, encouragement of creativity and self-confidence as translators, awareness and use of strategies, ability to decide on degrees of fidelity according to translation assignment and text function, learning to meet client’s expectations, ability to produce quality translations at speed, overcoming constraints, practicing direct and reverse translation to meet real market demands, and self and peer evaluation skills.


v. Computer skills: familiarisation with a translator’s workbench, computer-assisted translation, human assisted automatic translation, acquisition of electronic resourcing skills: databases and access to digital sources,
unidirectional (e.g. WEB pages) and bi-directional (e.g. e-mail) distance communication.

vi. Professional skills: awareness of translator’s rights, contracts, payment, familiarisation with different editing processes and as much real life practice as possible at least in their last two years.

Having discussed some of the general views on translation teaching, the remaining part of the chapter briefly exposes the translation courses proposed by Peter Newmark, Mona Baker, Basil Hatim and Jeremy Munday, and Mildred Larson, respectively.

3.3. Translation Textbooks


With his ‘literalist’ attitude to translation,\(^\text{12}\) Newmark (1988) presents a course in the principles and methodology of translation, designed for ‘final-year-degree and post-graduate classes as well as for autodidacts and home learners’ (ibid.: 3).\(^\text{13}\) He has the conviction that translation is ‘never finished’ (ibid.: 4), i.e. the revamping and proofreading process of a TT can never reach a point of absolute satisfaction as far as its translator is concerned, implying that the process of decision-making while translating remains fluctuating between the many possibilities offered by a language, between cultural and linguistic differences, between the functions of the ST and TT, etc. Like any other translation course designer, he concedes that his book aims to suggest some general guidelines for translating, i.e. to propose a way of analyzing the ST, discuss the two basic translation methods (semantic and communicative), set out the various procedures for handling texts, sentences and other units, and at times discuss the relation between meaning, language, culture and translation (ibid.).
Newmark seems to hold a conventional view of translation. He (ibid.: 5) defines translation as ‘rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text’, apparently ignoring the fact that the functions/intentions of both ST and TT ‘authors’ might vary from each other and the audience of both texts are different. Referring to the function of translation, Newmark sees translation as an activity which serves as a means of communication, a transmitter of cultures, a technique of language learning, and a source of personal pleasure (ibid.: 7). According to him (ibid.: 5), there are mainly ten factors (he calls them ‘tensions’) exerting influence on a text meant to be translated:

i. SL writer, i.e. idiolect and individual style;

ii. SL norms, i.e. grammatical and lexical usage depending on the topic and situation;

iii. SL culture;

iv. SL setting and tradition, e.g. format of a text in a book, periodical, newspaper, etc. as influenced by the tradition at the time;

v. TL relationship, i.e. expectations of the putative readership, whether to translate down (or up) to the readership;

vi. TL norms;

vii. TL culture;

viii. TL setting and tradition;

ix. the truth, i.e. the facts of the matter: e.g. what is being reported, ascertained or verified; and

x. the translator (i.e. his/her views and prejudices).

There are also other tensions in translation, especially between sound and sense, emphasis (word order) and naturalness (grammar), the figurative and the literal,
neatness and comprehensiveness, concision and accuracy, and function of ST and TT.\textsuperscript{14}

As for the qualities of a translator, Newmark (ibid.: 4) maintains that a translator has to have a flair and a feel for his/her own language, a ‘sixth sense’ which is a mixture of ‘intelligence, sensitivity and intuition, as well as knowledge’. To him (ibid.: 6), a translator works on four levels:

i. translation is first a science (i.e. knowledge and verification of the facts and meanings): a translator has to be aware of factual mistakes that may exist in the ST;

ii. translation is a skill which calls for appropriate language and acceptable usage;

iii. translation is an art, e.g. the ability to distinguish good from undistinguished writing. It is also the creative, the intuitive, sometimes the inspired, level of the translation;

iv. translation is a matter of taste, i.e. there are elements of subjectivity and personal preference involved in translating.

In Newmark’s model, a translator, who wants to translate a text, should begin with an analysis of the text by reading it in order to determine:

i. the intention of the text: that is, the subject matter and the ST writer’s attitude to the subject matter.

ii. the intention of the translator: usually it is identical with that of the SL author, but there are certain elements that contribute to the formation of the translator’s intention, such as the purpose of translation vis-à-vis the putative readership.

iii. text styles: Newmark follows Nida’s classification of text types into a) Narrative (its salient features are sequence of events and emphasis on verbs), b) Description (static; emphasis on linking verbs, adjectives, and adjectival nouns),
c) Discussion (treatment of ideas; emphasis on abstract nouns/concepts, verbs of thought and mental activity, such as ‘consider’, ‘argue’, etc., logical arguments and connectives), and d) Dialogue (emphasis on colloquialisms and phaticisms).

iv. the readership: the average text for translation tends to be for an educated, middle-class readership, in an informal, not colloquial style. Here the translator has to pay attention to the putative audience with reference to adopting/using certain styles/expressions in certain positions in the text.

v. stylistic Scales: a) scale of formality: officialese, official, formal, neutral, informal, colloquial, slang, taboo. b) scale of generality or difficulty: simple, popular, neutral, educated, technical, opaquely technical. 3-scale of emotional tone: intense, warm, factual.

vi. attitude: in texts with evaluation and recommendations there are grades of estimating the qualities of something with negative, neutral or positive opinion.

vii. setting: how the TT is going to be published? As a book, in a newspaper, a periodical, etc.?

viii. connotations and denotations.

ix. the quality of writing.

After determining such elements, a last reading is recommended. Such an analysis of the text, as something to be remoulded in a different language and for a different readership in a different culture, is necessary for the purpose of selecting a suitable translation method and identifying particular and recurrent problems.

Next comes the process of translating. Newmark’s description of translating procedure is operational. It begins with choosing a method of approach. Secondly, while translating, a translator works with four levels more or less consciously and simultaneously in mind:
i. the SL text level or textual level: This is the level of language, where a translator begins and which s/he continually but not consciously goes back to. The text is the base level when one translates. It is the level of the literal translation of the SL to the TL. At this level, translators are advised to pay attention to synonyms, antonyms and figures of speech.

ii. the referential level: This is the level of objects and events, real or imaginary, which a translator progressively has to visualise and build up, and which is an essential part first of the comprehension, then of the reproduction process. The translator has to find out what is meant by each sentence referentially, and think about ambiguity. Then, s/he has to link the textual level with the referential level, the level of reality, semantically and pragmatically, in order to produce the nearest correspondence. Polysemy and metaphorical expressions form a special issue of concern here.

iii. the cohesive level: This level links the previous two levels. It consists of three sub-levels. The first sub-level deals with structurally functional items of language such as conjunctions, articles, reiterations, punctuation marks etc.; referential synonyms, general words; theme-rheme relationships; method of presentation such as thesis-antithesis-synthesis, argumentation, proposition, opposition, reiteration, etc. The second cohesive sub-level is mood (i.e. the attachment of positive, negative; emotive, or neutral value to lexical items). The third sub-level tries to trace coherence through connectives.

iv. the level of naturalness: The level of naturalness binds translation theory to translating theory, and translating theory to practice. Naturalness comprises idioms, collocations, registers, styles determined by the setting of the text. Here
the translator is advised to disengage him-/herself from the ST and pay attention to the TT, particularly in communicative translation.

Newmark (1988) suggests two approaches to translating: the translator either starts translating sentence by sentence for, say, the first paragraph of each chapter in order to get the feel and tone of the text, and then deliberately sits back and reviews the position, and reads the rest of the SL text; or s/he reads the whole text two or three times and finds the intention, register and tone, marks the difficult words and passages and starts translating after s/he has got hold of the thing in hand.

With his belief that all translations are based implicitly on a theory of language (ibid.: 39), Newmark adopts Bühler’s functional theory of language, which assigns three functions to language: expressive, informative (representation), and vocative (appeal). In the expressive function the core is the mind of the speaker/writer; its purpose is to express feelings irrespective of any response; and it is
predominant in serious imaginative literature; authoritative statements; autobiography, essay, and personal correspondence. The informative function has its core in external situation, reality outside language, facts of a topic, ‘truth’, and can be manifest in textbooks, papers, reports, thesis, minutes or agenda of a meeting. The core of the vocative function is the addressee, the readership; its goal is to make the addressee think, feel, react the way intended by the text; it has been given many names: conative (denoting effort), instrumental, operative, pragmatic; and it can be used in notices, instructions, publicity, propaganda, persuasive writing (requests, cases, theses), and possibly popular fiction which appeals for readers for saleability.

Three other functions have also been added by Jakobson (1960): the aesthetic function (designed to please the senses, firstly through its actual or imagined sound, and secondly through its metaphors and manipulation of extralinguistic reality, e.g. figures of speech, metaphors, and descriptive verbs of movement and action); the phatic function (i.e. where language is used for purely social purposes and expression of personal stances, e.g. in greetings, adverbials/clauses of opinion); and the metalingual function (i.e. the ability of language to describe itself, e.g. technical terms for linguistic categories, and expressions such as ‘by definition’, ‘in other words’, literally, so called, known as, etc.).

Newmark (1988) lists eight methods of translation, classified according to their emphasis: those which place emphasis on the SL and those where the emphasis is on the TL. The methods are:

i. **Word-for-word Translation**: The translator’s aim here is to preserve SL word-order, usually out of context. This method was mostly used while translating languages of the same family. The emphasis here is on the SL and its grammar.
ii. **Adaptation**: Adaptation is a method of translation where the ST is freely translated and modified to suit the TT reader’s cultural taste. It is often followed in translating works of literature e.g. comedies, poems, etc. Except for the characters, themes, and main plots, the translator modifies the ST at liberty in order to oblige the audience with an ‘adapted’ version of the ST. The TL is emphasised here more than the SL.

iii. **Literal Translation**: In literal translation the translator converts grammatical structures of SL into their nearest equivalents in the TL, more often out of context. The emphasis here is on the SL.

iv. **Free Translation**: In this method the translator is concerned more on the matter of the ST rather than the manner, i.e. the content without the form. The emphasis here is on the SL.

v. **Faithful Translation**: The translator tries as much as possible to be faithful to the SL author and to reproduce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the TL grammatical structures. Emphasis is on the SL here.

vi. **Idiomatic Translation**: This is a TT reader-oriented, and the translator may ignore or change nuances of meaning between ST and TT in order to make the translation more lucid and closer to the TT audience. Obviously, the emphasis is on the TL.

vii. **Semantic Translation**: The difference between faithful translation and semantic translation is that the latter is less dogmatic, less uncompromising, and more flexible than the former, and makes more use of the aesthetic value of language, allowing some freedom to the translator’s creative intuition with the proviso that
his/her empathy with the SL is maintained. The emphasis here is on the SL despite the little freedom the translator may have.

viii. **Communicative Translation**: This method of translation tends to convey the ST message and contextual meaning (i.e. the content and the language) in a manner comprehensible and acceptable to the TT reader but also tries to preserve the ST qualities. Emphasis is placed on the TL.

There are also some other methods of translation (e.g. Service Translation, Plain Prose Translation, and Cognitive Translation) which, however, are one way or the other modified versions of (or can be sub-classified under) the above-mentioned methods. Out of all the methods, Newmark (1988: 48) prefers the semantic and the communicative translations because, to him, these are the only methods which can as closely as possible produce an equivalent effect: that is, ‘to produce the same effect (or one as close as possible) on the readership of the translation as was obtained on the readership of the original’. He sees the equivalent effect as a desirable result, not the aim, of a translation.

While translating, a text has to be dealt with in terms of units of translation. Newmark (1988: 54) defines the unit of translation as ‘the minimal stretch of language that has to be translated together, as one unit’. The unit of translation, to Newmark (ibid.), is the sentence, since it is the basic unit of thought. Below the sentence level, there are the clause, the collocation/idiom, and the word, respectively. Although some theoreticians maintain that the only true unit of translation is the whole text (Newmark, ibid.), such a view would sound not practical enough for translators while translating because a translator needs to break the ST into manageable segments. Newmark (ibid.) opines that the largest quantity of translation in a text is done at the level of the word, the lexical unit, the collocation, the group,
the clause and the sentence; but rarely the paragraph, and never the text. Although the unit of translation is a ‘sliding scale’, on the main the sentence is the natural unit of translation since it is not only the natural unit of comprehension and recorded thought but, within a sentence, it is possible to make transpositions, clause rearrangements, and recasting – provided that Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP)\(^\text{17}\) is not infringed and that there is a good reason to make such modifications (Newmark 1988: 65).\(^\text{18}\) Of course, a translator, during the process of translation, has to sustain a broad view of each element within the framework of the context of the ST and TT. Linguistically, this will take the translator mainly to the area of discourse analysis, sociolinguistics and text linguistics, particularly to concepts such as text-type, cohesion and coherence. In considering discourse analysis and text linguistics, a translator comes across assisting tools consisting in

i. knowing the genre of the text (what it is about, and what function of language it has: expressive, informative, or vocative),

ii. considering the coherence of text (which is brought about by the extralinguistic information a reader knows about something in relation to the setting, by implicature, and by Grice’s co-operative principle)\(^\text{19}\)

iii. considering the elements of cohesion in a text: e.g. the titles can either be descriptive, as in eponymous works, or allusive (telling something of the nature of the subject); punctuation marks; connectives; elements of lexical cohesion; elements of grammatical cohesion; etc.

iv. structure of presentation: e.g. description, argumentation, exposition, etc.

v. determining the FSP, or theme-rheme relation.

Newmark’s allegiance to literal translation can be understood from the way he deals with the term itself. He is in no way in favour of literal translation as a *method*
of translation, but he is a devout supporter of literal translation as a procedure of translation. Newmark dedicates a complete chapter for literal translation, proposing that “literal translation is correct and must not be avoided, if it secures referential and pragmatic equivalence to the original” (1988: 68/69). Confirming the notion that literal translation is the basic translation procedure, both in communicative and semantic translation, because translation starts from the level of the word, he also indicates that, above the word level, literal translation becomes increasingly difficult (ibid.: 70).20

Newmark distinguishes between literal translation as a method and as a procedure. Translation methods relate to whole texts while translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of translation. While the literal translation is the most important procedure of translation there are also some other translation procedures are:21

i. **Transference**: This procedure is concerned with loan words, transcription, and transliteration. Generally, only cultural ‘objects’ or concepts related to a small group or cult should be transferred. To these, one can add names of objects, inventions, devices, processes to be imported to the TL community, and brand names. The argument in favour of transference is that it shows respect for the SL country’s culture; the argument against transference is that the translator’s job is to translate, to explain not to transfer. People who are linguistic bigots resist transference, seen as a means of imported linguistic and cultural pollution to their language and community.

ii. **Cultural Equivalent**: In this procedure, a translator tries to bring a cultural equivalent in the TL similar to that of the SL, e.g. kindergarten = حضانة *hadhaanah*, implying care and tenderness; passport= جواز سفر *jawaaz safar*. 
permit (of) travel; the last straw that broke the camel’s back = ظهر البعير 
alqashatu allati qasamat dähra al-ba’eer, the straw that broke the back (of) the camel.

iii. **Naturalisation:** This is the procedure of adapting a SL word first to the normal pronunciation, then to the normal morphology of the TL, e.g. the word *televison* in Arabic تلفزيون has been integrated into Arabic to the degree that the word can take all the inflectional and derivational forms allowed in Arabic syntax: تلفز، televised, televising, and televise, respectively). Naturalisation, or neutralisation, can be sub-divided into two:

a) **Functional Equivalent:** this procedure can be considered as neutralisation of a SL cultural term in the TL for functional purposes, e.g., the parliament= مجلس الشعب, assembly (of) the nation

b) **Descriptive Equivalent:** a procedure of translation where a SL item, which has no precise equivalent in TL, is translated in terms of description of its shape and/or function, e.g. *machete* = knife (function), جننية = Yemeni traditional dagger.

iv. **Componential Analysis:** This procedure is based on breaking up of a lexical unit into its sense components. The technique of componential analysis (CA) is a very useful tool in translation, with the aim of achieving the greatest possible accuracy. Each lexical unit or word, is composed of sense components (often called semantic features or semes – not to be confused with a single complete meaning of a word), which are referential and/or pragmatic. In linguistics, CA means analysis or decomposing the various senses of a word into sense-components which may or may not be universal. In translation, the basic process is to compare a SL word with a
TL word which has a similar meaning, but is not an obvious one-to-one equivalent, by demonstrating first their common and then their differing sense components (Newmark 1988: 114). Generally, an SL word may be distinguished from a TL word on the one hand in the composition, shape, size and function of its referent; on the other in its cultural context and connotations, as well as in currency, period, social class usage and its degree of formality, emotional tone, generality or technicality and, finally, in the pragmatic effect of its sound composition, e.g. onomatopoeia or repetitive phonemes or suggestive symbolical consonantal clusters. In order to translate important or key words in a ST which do not have one-to-one TL equivalents, a translator may analyse a word contextually (i.e. dealing with only one sense of the word) in order to restrict its TL sense-components and be able to decide which TL cognate s/he should choose. Normally, unimportant words in the ST can be translated without the use of CA, say using synonymy; but conceptual, cultural and institutional words require special attention as they are key elements to understand the text. With the help of CA, a translator can decide on how to bring the TT reader as close as possible to the correct meaning of the word intended in the ST, or whether it is necessary to make a gloss, add a not or footnote, etc. The usefulness of CA is not only limited to enabling the translator preserve the denotation and connotation of existing lexical units or to differentiate between different SL synonyms in context, it can help also in the analysis of neologisms and ‘untranslatable’ SL words. CA is a helpful tool, says Newmark, in ‘bridging the numerous lexical gaps, both linguistic and cultural, between one language and another’ (ibid.: 123-4).
v. **Translation Label**: This procedure produces a provisional translation, usually of a new institutional term, which should be made in inverted commas, which can later be discreetly withdrawn.

vi. **Compensation, Reduction and Expansion**: Compensation is meant to make up for loss of meaning, sound-effect, metaphor or pragmatic effect in one part of a sentence to be compensated in another part, or in a contiguous sentence. In the procedures of reduction and expansion, shift is inevitable, e.g. SL compound noun=TL noun, *eyeball* = البَعْيْنُ, *al-bo?bo?*, or *إِنسَانُ الْعَيْنِ*, man (of) the eye.

vii. **Synonymy**: A procedure where a near TL equivalent to a SL word in a context is used especially when a precise equivalent may or may not exist, i.e. when there is no one-to-one equivalent and the word is not important in the text, such as adjectives or adverbs of quality. Synonymy is used by the translator as a compromise based on the idea that in translation economy precedes accuracy: e.g., *privacy*= خصوصية, *khoosoosiyyah*).

viii. **Through-Translation**: also called calque or loan translation, through-translation is the literal translation of common collocations, names of organisations, etc., e.g. UNESCO=اليونسکو, *yonisko*; radio=رَادِيوُ, *radio*, or مَثلِيَّة, *methiya*, announcer (machine).

ix. **Shifts or Transpositions**: A translation procedure involving a change in the grammar from SL to TL. According to Newmark, this is the only procedure concerned with grammar, intuitive mostly:

a) the change from singular to plural (the rich=الأَلْغَتِينُ, *al-?ghniya*?), or in the position of the adjective (pretty girl=يَبْتِ حُجَاحًا, *bint-un jathabah*, ‘*bint*’ being the noun).
b) when a SL grammatical structure does not exist in the TL; e.g. the English progressive and perfect verb forms do not have equivalent grammatical structures in Arabic. Instead, Arabic uses certain elements to indicate whether an action is still in progress or belongs to the perfective mood.

c) where literal translation is grammatically possible but may not accord with natural usage in the TL; e.g. in the title, ‘minister of interior’= وزير الداخلية, minister (of) interior, Arabic does not use a preposition. One can also compare the article system between Arabic and English.

d) replacement of a virtual lexical gap by a grammatical structure; e.g. in total= كليا, kolliyan, there is no preposition.

x. **Modulation**: This is a kind of variation through a change of viewpoint, of perspective and very often of category of thought, e.g. negative SL-positive TL, passive-active, word-opposite, or vice versa. A translator uses familiar alternatives, e.g. the Red Army= الجيش الأحمر, al-jaysh al-ḥmar, to describe the former Soviet Union’s Communist army.

xi. **Recognised Translation**: This procedure calls for the necessity to use the institutional terms accepted by any organisational body and, if need be, a gloss may be provided for the sake of clarity as per the context and function and readership of the translation; e.g., *dog-leg* (a deviation in the verticality of the oil well during the drilling phase) in the context of petroleum industry.

xii. **Paraphrase**: A procedure used when an SL item has no equivalent in the TL and the translator feels the need to explain it to the TT readership. This procedure also includes gloss translation, footnotes, etc., i.e. any additional
information a translator supplies the TT readers with for the purpose of clarification. Notes, additions, and glosses are used to point out cultural, technical issues, or linguistic usage, and can be combined into the text (as minor description integrated in the text), or notes placed at bottom of page, notes at end of chapter, or notes or glossary at end of book.

xiii. **Couplets**: in this procedure, two or three or even more of the above-mentioned techniques are used for dealing with a single translation problem.

There are also some other procedures listed by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/95), e.g. **equivalence** (account for the same situation in different terms, e.g. in notices, idioms, proverbs) and **adaptation** (use of a recognised equivalent between two situations, e.g. at the beginning of a formal letter *Dear Sir= َّالأخ, al-?akh, The Brother*).  

Among the other concepts useful in translation are cultural categorisation and the application of Case Grammar to translation. Defining culture as “the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression”, Newmark (1988: 94-5) does not regard language as a component or feature of culture, but as a container of ‘all kinds of cultural deposits’. Problems of translation occur frequently when culture is on the focus because there may be cultural gaps between the SL and the TL. However, with reference to language, a translator has to differentiate between cultural items (e.g. *monsoon*, *steppe*, and *dacha*) and universal items (e.g. *live, die, star*). Just like the same technique in classifying semantic fields, it is also advisable to classify cultural items in an ST into ‘cultural’ categories – semantic fields themselves are/may be classified culturally – i.e. ecology (animals, plants, local winds, mountains, plains, etc.); material culture or artefacts (food, clothes, housing, transport and communications);
social culture (work and leisure); organisations, customs, ideas (political, social, legal, religious, artistic); and gestures and habits.²⁵

Regarding the application of Case Grammar to translation, Newmark (1988: 125) comments: “Grammar is the skeleton of a text; vocabulary, or, in a restricted sense, lexis, is its flesh; and collocations, the tendons that connect the one to the other” (my italics). In view of the importance of grammar in general and the verb in particular in communication, Newmark discuss the possibility of the application of Case Grammar (CG) to translation in a complete chapter (Chapter 12). Grammar determines the function of an utterance, i.e. statement, question, request, purpose, reason, condition, time, place, doubt, certainty, doer, patient, etc., and Case Grammar in particular gives prime importance to the verb as the verb is a central element in keeping ‘communicative dynamism’. CG is stated as “as a method of analysing a sentence, a clause, or a verbless compound in a manner that demonstrates the central position of the verb or the word that has verbal force within the word sequence” (ibid.: 126). Verbal force refers to the quality of potential ‘action’ that a word has: this word may be a noun (responsibility), an adjective (responsible), an adverb (responsibly), a collective noun (group: consisting of whom?), a common noun (wind in windmill: the wind propels the mill; factory in toy factory), or an adverbial in a verbless sequence where a verb is implied. CG is the study of the verb and its case-partners: i.e. agent, patient, instrument, adversary, goal, beneficiary, locative, etc. A verb may be omitted in the sentence, or implied in a word with verbal force. In such a case, not only does the translator have to be aware of the omission, s/he has to account for the reasons for omission, whether the reasons are syntactic, stylistic or pragmatic, and see how s/he can reconstruct that in the TL. e.g.,

*Who broke the window? You?*
John travels by car, and Tom by train.

The vast majority of verbs consist of one or more of a few meaning components (‗semantic primitives‘), such as ‘cause to’, ‘become’, ‘change’, ‘use’, ‘supply’, combined with an object or quality (ibid.: 129). Missing verbs leave case-gaps, which Newmark categorises into: i. Mandatory (mainly syntactical, e.g. John went there and so did I.), ii. Implied (e.g. the verb ‗to happen‘ implies time and/or place; verbs of duration, living, staying, standing, existing, and putting, all imply place; the genitive or possessive imply owner-owned relationship.), iii. Optional, and iv. Supplementary.

Newmark (1988: 139) maintains:

I believe that … [case grammar] has applications to translation either ‗mechanically‘, in the contrast between the way two languages manipulate their cases, or creatively, in the detection of various missing verbs or cases in the relevant texts. However, case grammar’s function is only to sensitise the translator to those gaps….

A special problem a translator frequently faces is how to translate neologisms. Neologisms are newly coined lexical units or existing lexical units that acquire a new sense (ibid.: 140). New objects and processes are continually created in technology; new ideas and variations on feelings come from the media; terms from the social sciences, slang, and dialects come into the mainstream of language; and some transferred words become integrated into the natural usage – these are some of the main sources for neologisms. Neologisms are usually coined to meet a particular need, and therefore most of them have a single meaning and can be translated out of context, but many of them acquire new (and sometimes lose the old) meanings in the TL.

There are 12 types of neologisms:

i. Existing lexical units acquiring new meanings:

(a) words (e.g. gay)
(b) collocations (e.g. real time in computer)

ii. New coinages (e.g. bite in computer)

iii. Derived words, especially from Greek and Latin affixes (particularly in medical sciences, e.g. chronopharmacology). In some countries, e.g. Arabic speaking countries, people resist naturalisation or neutralisation, and prefer through-translation. A translator has to consult the appropriate ISO (International Standards Organisation) glossary to find whether there exists a recognised equivalent. Examples of derived words are iconology, and blends (ecofreak, steelionnaire), etc.

iv. Abbreviations, e.g. WHO, ISO.

v. Collocations (noun compounds or adjective +noun), e.g. lead time, sexual harassment, domino effect, clawback, cold-calling, Walkman, acid rain. A translator can translate them and then add a small descriptive note.

vi. Eponyms (including toponyms), e.g. Archimedes’ Law, a Hemingway style.

vii. Phrasal words, e.g. work-out, trade-off, lookalike, check-up, sit-in.

viii. Transferred words, e.g. Adidas, sari, tandoori, kung fu, Intifada, hudnah (=truce).

ix. Acronyms, e.g. UNICEF, OPEC, FAQ, NATO.

x. Pseudo-neologisms, e.g. longitudinal springs.

xi. Internationalisms, e.g. global warming, nuclear deterrent.

Aware of the huge demand of translators specialised in translating technical texts, Newmark discusses Technical Translation in some detail. Technical translation is distinct from other types of specialised translation (e.g. politics, finance, commerce, government, etc.) in its use of terminology, although terminology usually constitutes
5-10% of a technical text (ibid.: 151). Among the other characteristics of a technical text are:

i. grammatically, a technical text abounds in passive constructions, nominalisations, third persons, empty/dummy verbs, and usage of present tense;

ii. a technical text has a remarkable format, e.g. technical reports, instructions, manuals, notices, publicity, etc.;

iii. a technical text puts more emphasis on forms of address and the second person;

iv. technical texts are significantly free of emotive language, connotations, sound-effects and original metaphor.

New terminologies and nomenclatures pose a special difficulty to the translator, but it is of much relief to point out that most neologisms are context free and have single references, and so they can be defined and can be found in dictionaries and encyclopaedias. In most of the cases, “to translate a text you do not have to be an expert in its technology or its topic; but you have to understand that text and temporarily know the vocabulary it uses” (Newmark 1988: 155). Based on Paepcke’s (1975)\textsuperscript{26} distinction of four varieties of technical language into scientific, workshop level, everyday usage level, and publicity/sales, Newmark suggests three levels with reference to medical vocabulary:

i. **academic**: this includes transferred Latin and Greek words associated with academic papers,

ii. **professional**: formal terms used by experts, and

iii. **popular**: layman vocabulary, which may include familiar alternative terms, e.g. chicken-pox, scarlet fever, lockjaw.
In translating a technical text, a translator is advised to read, underline the new and difficult, assess (the nature of the text, proportion of persuasion to information; its degree of formality, its intention; the possible cultural and professional differences in terms of readership), and give it the suitable format. S/he can then translate sentence by sentence. The language of a scientific text is concept-centred; contrastively, the language of a technological text is object-centred. The titles of technical texts are mostly descriptive (i.e. indicating the subject-matter and the purpose); allusive titles are characteristic of works of literature. In this regard, a translator has a certain extent of freedom to change not only the titles, but also the grammar and the format of the text as required by the customer.

Translating technical texts is relatively simple in comparison to translating serious literature or authoritative statements: The latter is “the most testing type of translation” (ibid.: 162) considering that special attention has to be paid to the text right from the word (its meaning, denotative and connotative, its sound-effect, etc.), then to the sentence and up to the whole text. Besides, works of literature have some allegorical element.

A translator is always in search for meanings, and the availability of search tools can make the translator’s task easier. In this regard, Newmark offers one chapter on the tools a translator needs, particularly to “trace ‘unfindable’ words”. Such tools include dictionaries (monolingual, bilingual, multilingual, specialised) and encyclopaedias. The discussion also relates to techniques for search, and reasons and sources of neologisms.

Finally, Newmark deals with translation criticism because it is “an essential link between translation theory and practice” (ibid.: 184) which has various aspects: a translation can be evaluated on the basis of its standards of referential and pragmatic
accuracy, or accounting for changes made by a translator, the extent of freedom a translator has and how s/he used it, etc. A translation may be assessed by various authorities: a reviser employed by a company, a translation teacher, a professional critic, or the readership. Newmark believes that there are “absolute values of accuracy and economy as well as relative values” (ibid.) but they should be reconsidered and rediscussed in various cultural contexts. However, he regards semantic translation to be absolute, communicative translation relative, depending on the evidence to the ‘group loyalty factor’ (ibid.: 185). For him, translation has followed the prevailing and sometimes the countervailing ideology of the time, and the main challenge to a translation critic is how to state his/her principles categorically, and to elucidate the translator’s principles, and even the principles s/he is following or reacting against. “In this sense”, says Newmark, “good translation criticism is historical, dialectical, Marxist” (ibid.: 184-5).

Newmark (ibid.: 185) considers translation criticism to be an essential component in a translation course, for the following reasons:

i. Translation criticism painlessly improves a translator’s competence;

ii. Translation criticism expands a translator’s knowledge and understanding of his/her own and the foreign language, as well as perhaps of the topic;

iii. In presenting the translator with options, it will help him/her to sort out him/her ideas about translation.

iv. As an academic discipline, translation criticism ought to be the keystone of any course in comparative literature, or literature in translation, and a component of any professional translation course with the appropriate text-types (e.g., legal, engineering etc.) as an exercise for criticism and discussion.

The plan of translation criticism has to cover five topics:
i. SL text analysis, stressing the intention and functional aspects of the text;

ii. Translator’s interpretation of the text’s purpose, his/her translation method and the translator’s likely readership;

iii. A selective but representative detailed comparison of the translation with the original;

iv. An evaluation of the translation in the translator’s terms as well as in the critic’s terms; and

v. An assessment of the likely place of the translation in the target language culture or discipline, where appropriate.

Newmark (1988: 189) proposes two approaches to translation criticism:

i. The functional approach: This is a general approach that attempts to assess whether the translator has achieved what s/he attempted to do and where s/he fell short. This response is in terms of ideas. Details tend to be missed out. To some extent this is a subjective approach, the equivalent, in the case of a teacher grading a script, of ‘impression making’, and therefore unreliable.

ii. The analytical approach: It rests on the assumption that a text can be assessed in sections and that just as a bad translation is easier to recognise than a good one, so a mistake is easier to identify than a correct or felicitous answer.


Baker’s book is based on some key concepts of linguistics and how an understanding of these concepts can provide some guidance for translators during the process of decision-making. It draws on areas such as lexical studies, text linguistics and pragmatics to maintain a consistent link between language, translation, and social and cultural environment. Despite the criticism directed against the concept of equivalence, Baker appears to be holding fast at it, implying that even though the
concept may come under attack, equivalence is a cornerstone in Translation Studies, its place is secured, and its value is immense. Nonetheless, Baker is aware of the limitations of the concept of equivalence: “[Although] equivalence can be obtained to some texts, it is influenced by a variety of linguistic and cultural factors and is therefore always relative” (1992/2006: 6) and also graded, yet the coursebook she offers adopts it as a matter of convenience because translators are used to it and not because it has any theoretical status. Designed to be studied with a bottom-up approach, the course is meant to gradually and hierarchically teach translation students what equivalence is, the problems of equivalence at various levels of translating, and how and when it is possible to claim it in translation, starting from the micro level to the macro level.

As the book title suggests, it is a coursebook. The course starts with a discussion of equivalence at the word level (lexical meaning), then above the level of the word (i.e. collocations, idioms, etc.), followed by grammatical equivalence (e.g. number, gender, etc.), textual equivalence (thematic and information structure, cohesion), and, finally, pragmatic equivalence (coherence, implicature, etc.). This arrangement is useful from several points of view:

i. Equivalence is meant as an umbrella concept to teach translation within a linguistic framework;

ii. In undergraduate courses, students are gradually able to understand translation in harmony with their understanding of linguistics; therefore, there is some kind of collaboration between language courses and translation courses;

iii. The simplicity with which the course starts, and the gradually increasing complexity and widening focus chapter-wise, felicitate the students’ understanding of the contents.
iv. A bottom-up approach is preferred because of the possibility that students may not have enough knowledge of linguistics.

Baker’s presentation of her model of teaching and learning translation is supported by a great number of examples, potential translation problems (along with possible strategies suggested to deal with them), and exercises. An Arab translation student may well make the most of it because her examples in general relate to Arabic and/or English or both. The book also makes use of back-translation technique, thus unravelling to the student of translation valuable information about the structural nature of the original text in relation to the translated text and the conventions of the SL and the TL. Besides, she provides at the end of each chapter a number of valuable sources and references related to the main points discussed in the chapter as a tip for the students who have an interest in further reading and expansion of their knowledge in specific areas.

In the introduction, Baker discusses the importance of academic training for translators, a kind of training that preferably integrates theory and practice as well. Classifying training in general (including translator training) into vocational (practical but without strong theoretical foundation, and leads to a ‘skill’ not a profession) and academic (provides tools as well as theoretical insights to help reflect on certain aspects), Baker views linguistics, a discipline which studies language both in its own right and as a tool for generating meanings (1992/2006: 4), as the truly scientific approach to teaching and learning translation, at least during the initial stages of learning. Moreover, for a translation course to be successful both translation teachers and students should understand beforehand that a translation course is basically meant to lead students to a possible future employment/profession: a translation course, therefore, is ideally designed to give the participants professional training imbued
with theoretical grounding. Adopting linguistics (and linguistics sub-disciplines) as its methodological framework, Baker’s coursebook attempts to explore some areas in which modern linguistic theory can provide a basis for training translators and can inform and guide the decisions they have to make in the course of performing their work (ibid.: 5).

Unlike Newmark, who regards everything as translatable, Baker believes that translation as a tool of language mediation across cultures is “an impossible task … [and] is doomed to failure because (a) languages are never sufficiently similar to express the same realities, and (b) even worse, ‘reality’ cannot be assumed to exist independently of language” (ibid.: 8). She adds (ibid.: 8-9):

But in spite of its many limitations, translation remains a necessary and valuable exercise. It has brought and continues to bring people of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds closer together, it has enabled them to share a more harmonious view of the world, it has built bridges of understanding and appreciation among different societies.

It seems, however, that Baker’s view is too much influenced by the scientificality of linguistics that translation as a means of cultural mediation is evinced to be trapped between two extremes, either yield a TT that is exactly and diametrically the same as the ST or “is doomed to failure”. Translation, no doubt, is an exercise, but medicine, architecture, and plumbing are exercises too. And like any profession, translation is a possible task. Throughout history translation has enabled people to get to know of others of different language communities and cultures. Besides, it is not necessary to be a part of a specific culture, or to adopt it, in order to understand it.

However, despite the delimiting view of translation as merely an activity, the value of Baker’s course cannot be ignored, especially as it endeavours to teach translation and language studies side by side. This is in fact one of the benefits so far as translation is taught as part of a language studies curriculum, not separately. Teaching translation in terms of equivalence right from the simplest level possible up
to the highest level has its own benefits, especially for beginners. Firstly, it shows to them the nature of equivalence in translation step by step, from the low levels upwards. Secondly, it exposes them to minor problems of translation, e.g. the lack of a TL lexical unit responding to an SL one, as well as major problems, such as those related to cultural and epistemological differences. Thirdly, even if the concept of equivalence has been attacked by many, it seems to be a ‘necessary evil’ of what a translator’s profession requires, so it is much better to face and investigate it academically rather than run away from it.

To begin with, a word is defined as “the smallest unit which we would expect to possess individual meaning”, and a written word is regarded as “any sequence of letters with an orthographic space on either side” (ibid.: 11). Actually, linguistic meaning starts from smaller units, the morphemes, i.e. the minimal unit of meaning and grammar in language. A study of equivalence at the word level, therefore, requires some kind of diving a little deeper into the sea of meaning, that is to the level of morpheme, and this is what Baker does. She briefly describes some of the main functions of morphemes: lexical, grammatical (to indicate plurality, or gender, or tense), word-class changing, negation morphemes, etc.

Moving on to investigate meaning above the morpheme level, the lexical meaning of a word or lexical unit “may be thought of as the specific value it has in a particular linguistic system and the ‘personality’ it acquires through usage within that system” (ibid.: 12). Based on Cruse’s (1986) treatment of lexical meaning, Baker (ibid.: 13-17) mentions four types of meaning in words and utterances:

i. **propositional meaning:** Propositional meaning arises from the relation between the word/utterance and what it refers to or describes in a real or imaginary world as conceived by the speakers of the particular language to
which the word/utterance belongs. Propositional meaning can be judged as true or false.

ii. **expressive meaning:** This is the kind of meaning contained in words/utterances of feelings and attitudes. It cannot be judged as true or false, but can be evaluative as positive or negative/derogatory, e.g. intensifiers, diminutives, and lexical units which carry undertones of (dis)approval alongside their basic meaning. It is worthwhile noting here that the meaning of a word can be both propositional and expressive, (e.g. *whinge*: to complain + peevishly, repetitively and annoyingly) or just propositional (e.g. *book*) or just expressive (e.g. *bloody* ‘as an informal intensifier’).

iii. **presupposed meaning:** Such meaning arises from co-occurrence restrictions, which can be: 1- selectional, e.g. adjectives that come with either human or inanimate nouns; 2- collocational, e.g. *break the law* in English, *contradict the law* in Arabic.

iv. **evoked meaning:** This kind of meaning arises from dialect (geographical, temporal, and social) and register variations. Baker’s understanding of register draws on Halliday (1956/2005, 1962/2005 and 1978, in Baker 1992/2006: 13). Register is defined as a variety that a language user considers appropriate to a specific situation. Register variation arises from variations in a) **field** of discourse, i.e., the topic determines the speaker’s selection/choice of linguistic items, b) **tenor** of discourse, i.e. the relationship between the addresser and the addressee, e.g. formal-informal, and c) **mode** of discourse, i.e. written, oral, speech, lecture, essay, etc.
Propositional meaning is the main type of meaning while other types contribute to meaning. However, the fact is that words have ‘blurred edges’ as far as their meanings are concerned, so meaning is generally negotiable.

Moving a little higher, but within the framework of the word level, Baker makes mention of semantic fields and lexical sets. Lexical sets are the items classified under semantic fields, which are imposed groupings of items of world experience as conceptualised by a specific community, and comprise divisions and sub-divisions of lexical items. Although, some terms defy classification under any headings (e.g. just ‘as an adverb’), the usefulness of the technique of semantic fields and lexical sets to translators is unmistakable as this technique can help the translator in: (a) appreciating the ‘value’ that a word has in a given system, i.e. by understanding the difference in the structure of semantic fields in the SL and TL, e.g. the temperature system between English and Arabic; (b) developing strategies for dealing with non-equivalence, i.e. the hierarchical organisation of semantic fields leads to differentiation between superordinate and hyponym: superordinates can be manipulated by the translator through circumlocution to fill semantic gaps between SL and TL; and (c) understanding the difference in the structure of semantic fields in the source and target languages, hence allowing a translator to assess the value of a given item in a lexical set.

The problems of non-equivalence at the word level may arise from different factors: linguistic and extra-linguistic. In some cases, the TL does not have a direct equivalence for a SL word. That is to say, a translator should not always expect to find one-to-one correspondence between orthographic words and elements of meaning within and across languages. Briefly, some of the common problems of non-equivalence mentioned by Baker (1988/2006: 21-26) are as follows:
i. There can be culture-specific concepts (e.g. *airing cupboard*);\(^{31}\)

ii. The SL concept is not lexicalised in the TL (e.g. Arabic does not have a word exactly equivalent to the English word *standardise*);

iii. The SL word is semantically complex (e.g. the Arabic word *tayammama*, which means ‘using clean dust for ablutions for prayers provided that there is no clean water’);

iv. The SL and TL make different distinctions in meaning (e.g. Indonesian word *kehujanan*, meaning ‘going out in the rain without the knowledge that it is raining’, as opposed to *hujanhujanan*, which means ‘going out in the rain with the knowledge that it is raining’);

v. The TL lacks a superordinate (e.g., Russian does not have a ready equivalent for *facilities* meaning ‘any equipments, building, services, etc. that are provided for a particular activity or purpose’);

vi. The TL lacks a specific term, hyponym (e.g., the superordinate English word *house* subsumes *bungalow, cottage, croft, chalet, lodge, hut, mansion, manor, villa, and hall*);

vii. There can be differences in physical or interpersonal perspective (the word *give* in Japanese has six perspectives, *yaru, ageru, morau, kureru, itadaku,* and *kudasaru*);

viii. There may be differences in expressive meaning (e.g. *homosexuality*, a neutral word, is rendered into Arabic as *شَخْص يَنْسَب* , *shothooth jensi*, ‘abnormality sexual’, which is completely pejorative. Here, the translator can add an evaluative word, a modifier or adverb etc.);
ix. There are differences in form (e.g. affixes as in *drinkable* can be translated into Arabic using two words *صالح للشرب*, *saalih lel-shorb* ‘acceptable for drinking’);

x. There can be differences in frequency and purpose of using certain forms (e.g., the -ing form);

xi. The use of loan words in the ST (e.g. *au fait*, *dilettante*). Here, a translator is reminded to be aware of false friends or *faux amis*: words or expressions which have the same form in two or more languages but convey different meanings, e.g. English *sympathetic* vs. French *sympathétique* =nice/likeable; English *sensible* vs. German *sensible* =sensitive).

Generally, propositional meaning can be compensated for. However, the shades and nuances of meaning of words are difficult to convey on the basis of one-to-one equivalence.

Among the strategies used by professional translators are:

- translation by using a superordinate, a more general word (e.g., ‘apply cream on skin’ can be translated into Arabic as *وضع انسهاٌ عهى انجهس*, *wadh? ad-dehan la al-jild*, where the word ‘putting’ is used instead of ‘apply’);

- translation by cultural substitution. Here, a translator’s decision depends upon how much license given to him/her by those who commissioned the translation, the purpose of translation, the norms of translation in a given community, and the extent of tolerance a culture has;

- translation using a loan word or loan word plus explanation;

- translation by paraphrase using a related word (creamy = *يَوشِبه الكريمة* / مثل الكريمة = *yoshbeh al-kreema/mithla al-kreema* ‘like cream’);
• translation by paraphrase using unrelated words (when the SL item is not lexicalised at all in the TL, e.g. affidavit = "ألفادة كتابية مشقوعة بيمين", a written note endorsed with a vow);

• translation by omission (e.g. words like already with recently). This technique is to be used as a last resort since there is loss of meaning;

• translation by illustration.

As a matter of course, words do not produce communicative meaning on their own. They normally occur in the accompaniment of other words in a text, and it is mainly the context of the text that gives a specific word its intended meaning.

Having shed light on the problem of non-equivalence at the word level, Baker moves on to discuss the same problem above the level of the word, that is, the levels of the phrase, the clause and to the sentence. Most words do not show the aptitude of co-occurring randomly in a text. There are rules and laws governing the process of words strung together to produce meaning, e.g. an article must precede a noun and not vice-versa. In addition, there is a special feature of word arrangement in a language, i.e. collocation. It is a feature of some words showing a tendency to regularly co-occur with certain other words in a language. In English, one can deliver a speech, but it is not so in Arabic and the word that collocates with a speech is yulqi khetaban (‘throw a speech’). In English, people commonly say law and order, but in Arabic people tend to say al-nedham wa al-qanoon (system and law). In other words, the collocational pattern in a language goes hand in hand with linguistic predictability, i.e. listener’s or reader’s expectations of what follows certain words or of where it is possible for certain words to (co-)occur. If the collocational pattern of a language is ‘violated’ or broken, the result is either a marked collocation (if used intentionally to impart particular shades of meaning) or an unlikely, unacceptable,
untypical or inadmissible collocation (say, if the translator fails to notice the collocation or tries to render it literally into the TT where the TL does not accommodate it).

In addition to collocation, a discussion of equivalence above the level of the word includes also idioms and fixed expressions, e.g. (kick the bucket, cross the t’s and dot the i’s) and (Ladies and Gentlemen, of course, in fact, phatic communion formulae, and proverbs), respectively. The difficulty of translating idioms stems from i) inability to recognise the existence of an idiom (e.g. to take someone for a ride meaning to deceive or cheat someone someway), ii) not knowing the meaning of an idiom especially when there are not enough indicators as to hint at its possible meaning, and iii) when both the SL and the TL have idioms with some conceptual similarity but with different shades of meanings, e.g. the English idiom to pull someone’s leg (to jocularly cheat somebody into believing something surprising) vis-à-vis the Arabic idiom in some dialects (i.e. Shami dialects in Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Jordan) yes-hab rejluh (‘to pull his (sb) leg’, meaning to trick somebody into divulging a secret). Moreover, the strategies followed in translating fixed expressions are not very different from translating idioms. Firstly, each language has its own fixed expressions used for connecting ideas or indicating a speaker/writer’s attitude towards something, such as in fact, to sum up, that is to say in English; قبوض واقع بمعنى آخر وختاما للامر in Arabic, (fi waaqe ε al-?amr, ‘in fact (of) the matter’; wa khetaman, ‘and finally’; bima?na ?akhar, ‘in meaning another’ respectively). In such expressions the logical and/or orientational function seems to have more significance than their semantic function. They tell the reader/listener of the way the writer/speaker handles his/her ideas, and also orientate the reader’s/listener’s mind regarding what follows or how to connect what follows to what has been said. Each
language has a repertoire of such fixed expressions. In most cases, it is not difficult for a translator to find an expression in the TL that is formally and functionally (at least a functionally if not formally as well) similar to an expression in the SL. But if there is not any, a translator should have the prudence to improvise on the basis that the TL has its own stylistic tools that help determine how something is to be received by the TL audience. However, the TL reader should be able to follow the logical direction intended by the ST author.

It is obvious that some collocations, idioms and fixed expressions, being mainly a picture of how a language community expresses itself, travel across languages and cultures, serving the role of a channel of transnational influence and interaction and a means of acculturation. Collocations, such as *nuclear deterrent* and *black and white* (TV screening) have found their way into Arabic: *(الرددعو النووي)* (*ar-rad* : an-nowawi, ‘the deterrence the nuclear’) and *(البيض والأسود)* (*bil-abyadh wa al-aswad*, ‘in the white and the black’), respectively. Some idioms, like *the last straw that broke the camel’s back*, have come from Arabic and found their way into English and are now part of the standard usage: *(الخشب التي قصمت ظهر البعير)*. A lot of fixed expressions have come from English or French and have been integrated into the normal stylistic tradition of Arabic rhetoric. In this context, it is clear that the main channel of the mutual, cultural and linguistic give-and-take is translation.

Having discussed problems of equivalence at and above the word level, Baker shifts attention to discussing grammatical equivalence. Morphology and syntax are the two dimensions of grammar: the former determines the basic information which must be expressed in a language, e.g. number as singular, dual and plural; the latter is concerned with the grammatical structure of groups, clauses, and sentences, i.e. the linear sequences of classes of words such as nouns, verbs, etc., and functional
elements such as subject, predicate, etc. imposing certain restrictions on the way messages may be organised in a particular language. By grammatical equivalence Baker refers to the problems of translation arising from differences between languages in reporting events of the world experience in terms of grammatical structures and notions, such as time, number, gender, tense and aspect, voice, shape, visibility, person, proximity, animosity, etc.

Linguistic expression is a matter of choice made by a speaker/writer from closed and/or open systems of a language. The closed systems are grammatical categories, i.e. systems which are non-expandable and assign a closed set of options, such as the pronominal system of a language (Arabic pronominal system is much more complicated than its English counterpart), or the number system (singular and plural in English, and singular, dual and plural in Arabic). On the other hand, the open systems of a language refer to the lexical categories and items of a language. The grammatical choices are represented morphologically (such as the use of either singular or plural) and syntactically (as in changing the word order to indicate a certain function such as expressing a statement or a question). The crucial difference between grammatical and lexical categories as far as translation is concerned is that the former are largely obligatory, rigorous and mutually exclusive (choosing one rules out the possibility of choosing another) while lexical choices are largely optional, may allow multiple choices, and are amenable to linguistic expansion (i.e., new words, idioms, collocations, and meanings are constantly created). The little freedom to introduce modifications in expression, within the confines of grammatical categories, is restricted to certain situations, and any such deviation or skewing, if acceptable, is generally meant to create a special effect or meaning.

On the whole, however, deviant grammatical configurations are simply not acceptable in most contexts. This means that, in translation, grammar often has the effect of a straitjacket, forcing the translator along a certain course
The difference between languages in expressing their respective world experiences is mainly reflected in their grammars. Even grammatical notions, such as tense, gender, and number, which might be thought to be shared, may not be the same in two languages. These differences in grammatical structures between a SL and a TL often lead to some change in the information content of the message (sometimes addition or omission of information in the TT) during the process of translation, more so if the TL lacks a grammatical structure which the SL has or if the TL has another way of expressing the same concept using a different grammatical pattern (ibid.: 86).

Having discussed problems of equivalence caused by differences in grammatical categories between languages, Baker then goes on to deal with equivalence in translation at a higher grammatical level, which is word order, i.e. how words are strung together to form texts. It is known that the syntactic structure of a language serves as a methodology of expression accepted by the users of that language, enabling them to organise and share their thoughts and experiences on the one hand, and imposing certain restrictions on how that is done on the other hand. In some languages, such as English, word order plays a vital role in determining the meaning by assigning specific positions within a sentence for the functional elements of meaning, i.e. subject, verb, and object/complement. Any change in the positions of such elements results in a change of meaning: e.g. while English has an SVO word order, Arabic usually prefers a VSO one. In fact, a discussion of this topic will be unnecessary to be accommodated within the confines of this research. But it is certainly important that an Arab translator be aware of the differences between Arabic and English with regard to their grammatical systems.
“Word order”, says Baker, “is extremely important in translation because it plays a major role in maintaining a coherent point of view and in orienting messages at text level” (ibid.: 110). Since word order does not have an equal status in all languages, it is safe to look at it as a concept indicating the existence of the functional elements of a sentence rather than a positional concept. With this in view, it can be said that the lexical units of a language interact with its grammatical structures in order to realise or actualise their ‘meaning potential’ (ibid.) in the form of a text. Text, according to Brown and Yule (1983: 6), is “the verbal record of a communicative act”, while for Baker (1998/2006: 111), it “is an instance of language in use rather than language as an abstract system of meanings and relations”.

In translation, a translator works for most of the time with lexical units and grammatical structures between SL and TL; however, that is only one part of the story. If it were so, translation would become a mere replacement of such units and structures between languages, i.e. a mechanical procedure and the product would certainly be a translated text that is a foreign version of the SL text in a different language community, hardly understood or appreciated by the target readers. The degree of readability and receptivity of a text in a language is in fact effected by a cumulative collaboration of the lexical units, grammatical structures, and organisational and discoursal features of that language. Since each language community has its own preferences of organising a text, it is the organisational features (which are language- and culture-specific) that distinguish text from non-text, i.e. random collection of sentences and paragraphs, and recognises a translated text as ‘normal’ or ‘foreign’. Therefore, a translator who aims at enhancing the readability of a TT will not only carry out the process of replacing the SL lexical units and grammatical structures with the equivalent TL counterparts, but will also have to
make modifications in the stylistic and organisational features of the SL text as to suit the TL reader, unless emphasis is otherwise.

The field of text-linguistics is not very popular and, save English, there is not enough data on how other languages recognise the linguistic features of different varieties of texts predominant in them. Yet, certain general guidelines, or ‘connections’ as Baker calls them, can be of much help for linguists as well as translators as to how a text, a specific genre, is organised and structured. First of all, a text can be said to grow, i.e. from the moment one starts to read it until its end. Words, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, and chapters are connected with what precedes and also what follows in such a way that the information presented appear to follow and relate to each other. Such growth or development of the theme of the text, its topic and the information it presents is normally recognised through thematic and information structures. Secondly, a text normally has surface connections establishing interrelations between persons and events (e.g. anaphora, proforms and co-references), known as elements of cohesion. Thirdly, the meaning a reader makes from a text is formed, consciously or unconsciously, in relation to the reader’s overall knowledge of the world (including linguistic awareness): these underlying semantic and logical connections are considered as features of coherence and implicature. Fourthly, notions of genre or text type, which have to do with the reader’s expectations of how a specific text related to a specific topic should be like, influence the organisation of a text in terms of genre conventions or ‘packaging’: i.e. context-based classification of texts into, e.g. scientific, journalistic, literary, etc.; or text-function/manner classification into narration, exposition, argumentation, etc. These features of text organisation, i.e. thematic and information structures, cohesion, and
coherence and implicature will be discussed in some detail below under equivalence at the textual and pragmatic levels.

Turning the attention to equivalence in translation at a higher level, the textual level, Baker starts by discussing the issue of ‘information flow’. For a text to deliver a message, the information it presents is expected to ‘flow’ as clearly as possible so that the reader can be able to process and assimilate the meaning intended. One of the important factors that assist the flow of information is the linear arrangement: how clauses follow each other, interconnectedly, to serve the presentation and expansion of the topic.

Over and above its propositional organization in terms of elements such as subject/object and agent/patient, a clause also has an interactional organization which reflects the addressee/addresser relationship. It is this interactional organization which motivates us to make choices that ensure that a clear progression of links is achieved and that a coherent point of view is maintained throughout a text.’

(Baker 1998/2006: 121)

For the purposes of analysis, Baker (ibid.) suggests that a clause be analysed as a message rather than merely a string of lexical and grammatical elements, in terms of two types of structures, the thematic structure and the information structure. She discusses these two structures with regard to both the Hallidayan approach and the Prague School approach. Baker seems to favour the Hallidayan approach to the analysis of clause as a message rather than that of the Prague School. According to her (ibid.: 121), the former treats these two structures distinctly and regards them as separate features of discourse organisation, albeit overlapping, whereas the latter generally conflates the two structures and combines them in the same description. In the Hallidayan framework, the distinction in the case of theme-rheme relationships is made on grounds of sequence, and markedness and unmarkedness are distinguished in information structure in terms of ‘tonicity’ (Baker 1998/2006: 156) or the focus placed on certain elements using tonal effects or certain typographic tools, such as
italics, in written communication. On the other hand, the Prague School approach is represented by Firbas and the principle of Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP). This approach is regarded more useful than Halliday’s especially for analysing languages other than English (ibid.: 160). The FSP theory is generally concerned with the investigation of the interaction between the syntactic structure and the communicative function of a language, proposing that “the communicative goals of an interaction cause the structure of a clause or sentence to function in different kinds of perspectives” (ibid.) Firbas’s (1972, 1992) conceptualisation of theme and rhyme is not based on binary distinction (as is Halliday’s), but on the notion of communicative dynamism (CD), which is, he (1972) remarks,

based on the fact that linguistic communication is not a static, but a dynamic phenomenon. By CD I understand a property of communication, displayed in the course of the development of the information to be conveyed and consisting in advancing this development. By the degree of CD carried by a linguistic element, I understand the extent to which the element contributes to the development of the communication, to which, as it were, it ‘pushes the communication forward’.

In this connection, the theme of a clause (which normally contains several elements) constitutes the elements that pave the way for the other elements to convey the message of the clause. The elements of a theme are context-dependent and carry a low degree of CD since they have little to do in ‘pushing the communication forward’. Subsequently, the remaining elements form the non-theme of a clause and are responsible for conveying the message; hence, they carry a high degree of CD. They are context-independent and constitute the core of the clause since it is these elements which complete the information and fulfil the communicative purpose of the clause. The way the verb is treated in FSP differentiates this approach from Halliday’s. In Halliday’s the verb is normally considered part of the rhyme. In FSP, a verb is assigned a thematic or rhematic status based on the context and its semantics: “Semantically, the less of a notional component the verb has, the more naturally it
goes with the theme as a foundation-laying element [i.e. for other elements to convey the message]” (Baker: 162). This approach may be said to go well with the translation into Arabic of English sentences such as *The room is hot* (الغرفة حارة, back-translated: ‘The room hot’), where Arabic does not use an auxiliary to link the subject to its complement. Again, a verb is assigned a thematic status if it has been mentioned earlier in the context: e.g.,

A: Where did you go?
B: I *went* to the supermarket.

The verb *go*, which has a rhematic status in the wh-question sentence, is promoted to the thematic position in the answer because it is part of the given information.

One can assume that Firbas’ view of what a theme and a rheme basically are depends on the newness and givenness of the information encoded in a clause: given information is thematic; new information is rhematic. While the linear arrangement of words constitutes the basis for the Hallidayan approach regarding the theme-rheme distinction, it is not the only criterion for such distinction in FSP. CD is the outcome of an interaction between linear modification, semantic structure, and context. This makes FSP more applicable in languages where word order does not play a vital role in conveying the meaning of a clause/sentence. This leads to the question of how markedness is realised in FSP theory. Baker points out that in FSP “one cannot talk specifically about ‘marked theme’” (1992/2006: 165), because it is the newness or givenness of information that determines what is what. Yet, even in FSP, the normal order is theme followed by rheme, a general attitude based on the notion of gradation of information. Markedness in FSP can therefore result from a U-turn of this customary order, that is, by constructing a rheme-theme clause/sentence: e.g. *Very delicious the food was*. Such an order is described as ‘pathetic order’ in FSP (ibid.).
One of the main schisms between the Hallidayan approach and the Prague School approach is linearity of word order. The former hangs high hopes on it to solve the problems of analysing the thematic and information structures of a clause/sentence; the latter views it as just a component in the analysis. Insomuch as English is concerned, “the lack of a differentiated morphemic system in many areas places heavy constraints on word-order patterns” (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 75). Perhaps, one can have the impression that the Hallidayan approach is based on English. But in languages with a relatively free word-order, FSP will possibly be more effective.

Having presented some of the features of the thematic and information structures, their role in encoding meaning in a clause/sentence, and some strategies for translators to deal with some problems arising from thematic structure differences between languages, Baker concentrates on equivalence at the textual level with a study of cohesion. She defines cohesion as “the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which provide links between various parts of a text” (1988/2006: 180). As a network of surface relation, cohesion interconnects ‘actual’ words and expressions used in a discourse. Reiterating the model of cohesion proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), Baker distinguishes five types of cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. In addition to the devices of cohesion suggested by Halliday and Hasan (1976), Baker mentions some other devices, e.g. continuity of tense, consistency of style, and punctuation devices. Most of the devices of cohesion mentioned above are available in most languages; difference is only a matter of how they are put to practice in a specific language.

In the final chapter of her coursebook, Baker (1998/2006) reflects on what she calls pragmatic equivalence, that is equivalence at the level of language in use,
combining both linguistic and extra-linguistic factors involved in the process of how people ‘communicate’ and how texts ‘make sense’. Pragmatics is considered as “the study of meaning, not as generated by the linguistic system but as conveyed and manipulated by participants in a communicative situation” (ibid.: 217). In this regard, Baker selects to discuss two particular notions which, she believes, are particularly helpful in “exploring the question of ‘making sense’ and in highlighting areas of difficulty in cross-cultural communication” (ibid.: 218), i.e. coherence and implicature.

Coherence is defined as “a network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text” (ibid.). Like cohesion, coherence plays an essential role in “organizing and creating a text” (ibid.), but while cohesion is concerned with surface relations linking words and expressions to other words and expressions in a text, coherence connects stretches of language by virtue of conceptual or meaning dependencies as perceived by language users (ibid.). Cohesion, to Baker (ibid.), can be regarded as “the surface expression of coherence relations” in the sense that cohesion makes conceptual relations explicit, e.g. a conjunction of reason like because can fulfil its function only if the reader/listener realises the underlying semantic relation connecting the proposition of result with the proposition of reason. A text may have explicit cohesive relations but, nonetheless, may not conceptually cohere.38

The coherence of a text is a result of the interaction between knowledge presented in the text and the reader’s own knowledge and experience of the world; the latter being influenced by a variety of factors such as age, sex, race, nationality, education, occupations, and political and religious affiliations.


The implication is that different societies and language communities have different ways or perspectives of the ‘real-world’ experience and, therefore, can show variations as to the styles and techniques of wording out their experiences and world-
views. The question of coherence of a text is not whether the world-view of a language community as presented in a text applies to a reader from a different language community or not, but whether a reader is able to make sense of a text no matter whether it belongs to his/her language community or not. Yet, this point also implies that a text may be coherent to one reader and incoherent to another, leading to different views as to whether meaning is inherent in a text or arises out of a communicative situation involving an interaction between participants, settings and a text (ibid.: 221). Taking the term ‘text’ to mean any stretch of language, spoken or written, intended to deliver an intelligible message, and in an attempt to avoid the extremes and hold a moderate point of view here, which is only reasonable, one cannot say that meaning comes from ‘out of’ a text, for if there is no text, there is nothing to say, that is, no communicative situation. But at the same time, meaning, which is encoded in a text, realises its potential and becomes coherent only through a communicative situation, with the reader’s/listener’s knowledge of the world, real or imaginary, known or yet to be known, all in effect. It is obviously for this reason that meaning is relative and variable. On the same line, Baker considers coherence not as a feature of text, but as the judgement made by a reader on a text.

The notion of coherence is of an immense value for translators. As a reader of the ST, a translator first tries to make sense of what is encoded in the ST, taking notice of its features, linguistic, extra-linguistic, and textual. For example, what type of audience the SL author is addressing? How? And what kind of information the SL author presupposes the audience to have in order to make sense? (Of course, a certain measure of subjectivity is inevitable here.) Then, as an author of a text that will be written in another language representing another culture and for another audience, the translator is expected to have presumptions as to the same factors presumed by the SL
author towards the ST readers. Here, one has to acknowledge the existence of various sources of pressure on the translator. For example, the function of the ST may differ from what a TT is intended for. Again, a translator may oscillate between sticking to the ST and its culture on the one hand and the needs and the degree of acceptability of the TT readers. An Arab translator cannot translate a joke about God into Arabic, and most of the time avoids expressions denoting taboo subjects such as sex (at most, an Arab translator may insinuate to sex, but is expected not to state it the way it is expressed in some other languages like English).

The other notion discussed here is implicature, or what Baker regards as the interface of coherence and processes of interpretation or “the question of how is it that we come to understand more than is actually said” (ibid.: 223). For example:

*In the hospital I saw a man with a swollen leg writhing in pain. Poisonous snakes can be very dangerous.*

Even if decontextualised, these two sentences can be related to each other: the second sentence may as well be interpreted as the reason for the event of the first sentence, although there is no explicit mention as to the *man* having been bitten by a *poisonous snake*. The meaning conceived here is an evidence that these two sentences cohere, despite the fact that there are no cohesive devices. In other words, how is it that a reader/listener reach to such interpretation without explicit linguistic indicators as to what happened?

Baker (ibid.: 223) reiterates the classification of coherence by Charolles (1983) into supplemental coherence and explanatory coherence. Supplemental coherence provides minimal links between sentences or clauses, e.g.

*I’ve decided to go back home. Flights are suspended due to bad weather conditions, though.*
Explanatory coherence maintains continuity of senses and (unlike supplemental coherence) also ‘explicates’ and ‘justifies’ this continuity. The preceding sentences can be examples of explanatory coherence if they are put in their right context so as to enable the reader/listener to reach plausible interpretations, i.e. if the topic in the first example is how deadly poisonous snakes can be; and, in the second example, if there are contextual indications that the subject of the first sentence will travel by aeroplane.

Implicature, as viewed by Grice (1975), refers to “what the speaker means or implies rather than what s/he literally says” (Baker 1992/2006: 223). Speakers, writers and addressees assume that everyone engaged in communication knows and accepts the communicational norms (Griffiths 2006: 134). This general acceptance is an important starting point for inferences. Implicature is nothing but a sort of inference(s), which may lead to single or multiple interpretations of a stretch of language, depending on the existence of norms for the use of language, such as the widespread agreement that communicators should aim to tell the truth.

*A: We’d like you to pay us a visit.*

*B: I am so busy these days.*

Communicator A would come up with several, and maybe different, interpretations of the utterance made by Communicator B. It might be a polite or indirect way of rejecting the invitation; Communicator B is unable to pay Communicator A a visit nowadays but may do that some other day; Communicator B is too busy to pay Communicator A a visit and may not do it indefinitely. The most possible interpretation Communicator A will infer from the utterance of Communicator B depends on several contextual and cultural factors or norms approved by the speakers.
of the language community to which they belong: e.g. their mutual relationship, the way a speaker responds to an invitation in a specific language community, etc.

According to Grice (1975), for discourse to achieve its communicative goals, it should be connected (i.e. not containing unrelated sequences), have a purpose, and be a co-operative effort. The last feature is of utmost interest in understanding implicature. Grice’s Co-operative Principle proposes that, by participating in a conversation\(^{41}\) (let us say prototypical conversation), a speaker implicitly signals his/her agreement to co-operate in the joint activity, to abide by the communicational norms approved by the speakers of a language community.

> Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

>(Grice 1975: 45)

This principle is elaborated by means of a set of four maxims which spell out what it means to co-operate in a conversational way.

1. The Maxim of Quality – Be truthful when communicating.
2. The Maxim of Quantity – Give appropriate amounts of information, not less or more.
3. The Maxim of Manner – Utterances should be clear: brief, unambiguous, orderly and not obscure.
4. The Maxim of Relevance – Contributions should be relevant to the assumed current goals of the people involved.\(^{42}\)

Generally, Grice’s maxims play an as-if role: the maxims are not meant as an advice on how to talk. The thing is that communication proceeds as if speakers are generally guided by these maxims. Yet, it can be regarded as a ‘norm’ that any deviation from the norm has a communicative goal to achieve. The implicatures, or pragmatic inferences, resulting from choosing not to observe (one of) the maxims are
examples of what Grice calls conversational implicature (Baker 1998/2006: 227). Violating a maxim can also be seen as a device of orienting the course of conversation. During actual communication, one (or more than one) of these maxims may be flouted, perhaps to evade some topic, or to show objection to something as in rhetorical questions, etc. And even in the case of a speaker choosing not to adhere to (one of) these maxims, the addressee is expected to be able to figure out and infer the implication of the deviation, which is most of the time context-dependent. If the addressee is able to grab the meaning of the implicature, conversation can have a better chance to continue, even if it takes to a different direction, since the addressee will find the addressee going along on the intended line. But if not, the course of conversation may at least take a jolt: the addressee may feel to have failed to deliver the message; the addressee may have misunderstanding.

According to Grice (1975), the extent to which an implicature can or cannot be understood depends on a number of factors:

i. the conventional meaning of the words and structures used (i.e. a mastery of the language system), together with the identity of any references that may be involved;

ii. the Co-operative Principle and its maxims;

iii. the context, linguistic or otherwise, of the utterance;

iv. other items of background knowledge; and

v. the fact (or supposed fact) that all relevant items falling under the previous headings are available to both participants and both participants know or assume this to be the case.

In her analysis of how coherence and implicature relate to pragmatic equivalence in translation, Baker (1998/2006) regards the above factors not only as data generators
of identifying the existence of a conversational implicature, but also as a good ground to explore the question of coherence in general as well as common problems and strategies in translation.

Initially, understanding the conventional meaning of words and lexical units in general is a precondition for understanding a text in a clear way, since misunderstanding the conventional meaning of a lexical unit is bound to result in mistranslation, which, at best, ‘may well affect the calculability of implicatures in the target text’ (ibid.: 229). For example, the word modest is conventionally translated into Arabic as متواضع (mutawadhe3: ‘humble’) or محترم (muhtashem: ‘decent’). In translating an expression like a man with modest means, if the Arabic word mutawadhe3 is used, the Arab reader may think of the man as a person whose material status only enables him to make ends meet, nothing more, whereas, in fact, the association of the English expression suggests some measure of riches.

Baker (ibid.: 229-30) points out:

As well as the conventional meaning of words, each language also employs conventionalized expressions and patterns of conveying implicatures. In other words, in every language there will be conventional associations between certain linguistic patterns and certain inferable meanings.

For instance, the rhetorical question How can you be so cruel? is used in English in certain contexts to indicate an emotional expression of amusement, shock, or indignation. While translating it into Arabic, the sense of amusement in particular will not be embedded and the Arab reader will not be able to recognise it in a humorous context unless the translator compensates for this loss: كم أنت قاس! (back-translation: How you cruel!).

Furthermore, some languages make use of its typographic features to create certain implicatures. Inverted commas in English, for example, highlight the expression/word inside in order to suggest emphasis, irony, tentativeness, etc. Arabic,
by contrast, often uses parentheses. In addition, a source text may sometimes include a metaphorical use of a reference to something with some SL cultural associations (e.g. *pumpkin*: associated with the Halloween), a personality famous/notorious of something (e.g. Rasputin), etc. In some cases, the reference may be well-known in both SL and TL cultures. But in case a translator thinks that a majority of TT readers may not be familiar with an SL reference, then his/her options are either the use of a cultural substitute (which more often than not does not guarantee the existence of an equivalent with similar associations) or the preservation of the original reference on proviso of clarifying it to the TT readers by using gloss, footnote, etc.

Looking at the Co-operative Principle and its maxims, which Grice (1975) claims are universal and are applicable linguistically and non-linguistically, Baker (1992/2006) indicates that there are certain contexts where (one of) these maxims may not apply even in the same linguistic and cultural community. Even further, some language communities may not show the same regard for these maxims as viewed in another language community. Moreover, politeness, which is the backbone of Grice’s principle and its maxims, is a relativistic notion and can show variation across language communities, e.g. translating a joke about God in an English ST into Arabic cannot be met with tolerance. In addition, while Grice insists on brevity, Arabic prose tends to prefer the use of repetition, in both form and content, as a major rhetorical tool. Baker gives examples from different languages where linguistic norms and stylistic preferences tend to violate Grice’s maxims, proving that they are language- and culture-specific rather than universal. To her (ibid.: 237-8),

Grice’s maxims seem to reflect directly notions which are known to be valued in the English-speaking world, for instance sincerity, brevity, and relevance, those do not necessarily have the same value in other cultures, nor should they be expected to represent any ideal basis for communication…. A more plausible suggestion would be that all discourse, in any language, is essentially co-operative and that the phenomenon of implicature (rather than the specific maxims suggested by Grice) is...
universal. In other words, the interpretation of a maxim or the maxims themselves may differ from one linguistic community to another, but the process of conveying intended meaning by means of exploiting whatever maxims are in operation in that community will be the same.

Implicature is also affected by the notion of context (including co-text). The context of a text not only determines the existence of an implicature but also assigns specific association(s) to the implicature and rules out other possibilities which are out of that particular context. Context is initially derived from the style or way a language community regards the realities of situation, how people perceive things around them and give vocal shape to these things. But different language communities can have different ways of expressing one and the same reality of situation, which again proves that the notion of context language- and culture-specific.

Broadly speaking, most of the time a change of the approved order can motivate a reader to search for implicature within the context where the change occurs. To elucidate this point, ordering things and events in one language may differ from another language for several reasons. But any change of the order followed in a specific language is likely to increase the possibility of the existence of implicature. For example, emotional affinities can impose themselves on how entities are ordered: the closer to the heart an entity is, the more to the front it is placed. For example:

*English, French, Spanish, and Arabic are among the languages used in the UN.*

اللغات العربية و الإنجليزية و الفرنسية و الأسبانية من اللغات المستخدمة في الأمم المتحدة.

Back-translated:

*The languages Arabic and English and French and Spanish from the languages used in the United Nations.*

Given the importance Arabic speakers give to word order, i.e. more important details come first, Arab readers would very much like to see their language posited first. If English were fronted, there may be no problem for Arab readers, considering the
status of English as a *lingua franca.* But if, for example, Spanish comes first, the Arab reader would think twice and try to grab the implicature of fronting.

Entities and events basically follow a kind of order thought to be the ‘normal’ order according to the speakers of a language community. Narrating events seems to be almost always restricted by temporality: one cannot simply say *I brushed my teeth and then woke up from sleep.* This point seems to be universal in all languages. But, for example, the date format, particularly in American English, cannot be followed while translating into Arabic: While American English adopts a *Month, Day, Year* order, Arabic uses *Day, Month, Year* order, respectively. In this regard, translators generally order entities and events according to what Baker (ibid.: 241) calls the ‘sense of appropriateness’ applicable to their language communities.

Understanding what is intended in a text depends on readers’ ability to make sense of what is written. The process of making sense hinges on various factors, linguistic and extra-linguistic. Linguistically, a reader can make sense of a text if and only if s/he knows what the linguistic signs and structures of a language mean – reader-specific. Secondly, the way information is presented can also have an immense influence on the readers’ ability to make sense of what is written – text-specific. But that is not all about how meaning and understanding are generated or achieved. The meaning of a text is realised only if the text ‘coheres’, and coherence of a text demands more than the above factors. Baker stresses the fact that coherence is a very problematic notion because of the diversity of factors, linguistic and non-linguistic, which can affect the varying degrees of importance which a particular factor can assume in a given context. The overall principle is that for the information in a text to be understood by a reader, such information should be *connected* somehow with what
the reader has in mind, i.e. through affirmation, contradiction, expansion, or modification of what is in mind.

However, this concept of what the would-be reader may have in mind is itself unstable. Even the average readers of a language cannot be claimed to have full or similar knowledge of a certain reference, for example. Besides, two languages may share a certain reference but the implicature and associations are not the same, e.g. Saddam Hussein is portrayed by the Western media as a ruthless monster, whereas most Arabs regard him as a hero, patriot, and shaheed (‘martyr’). Finally, there are references used in SL and are not familiar to the TL readers. In such a case, the meaning and relevance will not be clear to the TL readers unless they are supplied with a background of that reference, and a translator’s duty is to furnish what s/he thinks necessary to help the TL reader come to terms with the implicatures of foreign references so that the TL reader can perceive coherence in the TT. In other words, background information is the ground for understanding a text, and in the case of a TT, part of the background information relies on what a translator supplies in order to help his/her readers ‘make sense’. In fact, this role of the translator as to provide the necessary background for the TT reader to be able to access the meaning of the text is first played by the ST author, whose interest in sharing information with his/her readers conditions his/her use of implicatures so as to enable the ST reader access its meaning. Presumably, deviations arousing implicatures in a text in whatever form (phonological, syntactic, pragmatic, etc.) are a double-edged weapon. If accessible, they make the text a pleasure to read owing to cognitive processes of connecting ideas and if inaccessible, however, they block understanding.

Hatim and Munday’s book is ‘advanced’ in the sense that it presumes that the reader/student knows at least the basic notions of linguistics, literary theory, and culture studies, and so the course rather tends to adopt discourse analysis as a source for interpreting the phenomena involved in the process of translation, and also as a methodology of translation teaching. In other words, unlike Baker, whose approach presumes the possibility of translation students lacking sufficient knowledge of linguistics necessary to enable them to study translation from a linguistic perspective and, therefore, attempts to have translation taught alongside relevant, basic linguistic concepts, they take it for granted that a translation student is supposed to be in possession of some awareness of at least the basic concepts of not only linguistics but also other areas related to translation, such as culture studies and computer science. Besides, in its attempt to investigate both the theory and practice of translation in an accessible and systematic way, the book is ‘designed specifically with the needs in mind of students of Masters degrees and final year undergraduates in translation or applied linguistics, research students beginning to investigate the field, and practising translators who wish to examine the theory behind the practice’ (2004: xvii).

One of the interesting aspects of Hatim and Munday’s translation programme is its arrangement. The book is divided into three sections A, B and C, each section comprising 14 units, with identical titles of the units in each section. In Section A, each chapter or unit deals with a specific area in translation, which is expanded again in a parallel chapter in Section B, and is further explored in another parallel chapter in Section C. That is, Section A introduces some of the basic concepts of an approach to translation; Section B improves upon what has been introduced in Section A; and
Section C further develops the ideas discussed in Sections A and B. Generally, Hatim and Munday have designed Section A to serve as an introduction, Section B as extension, and Section C as exploration. Each of the three sections contains the following units or chapter titles:

1. What is Translation?
2. Translation Strategies
3. The Units of Translation
4. Translation Shifts
5. The Analysis of Meaning
6. Dynamic Equivalence and the Receptor of the Message
7. Textual Pragmatics and Equivalence
8. Translation and Relevance
9. Text Type in Translation
10. Text Register in Translation
11. Text, Genre and Discourse Shifts in Translation
12. Agents of Power in Translation
13. Ideology and Translation
14. Translation in the Information Technology Era

This division allows translation students/teachers to approach the book either linearly or in a parallel format, i.e. thematically. For the purposes of discussion here, however, it seems more practical to approach the units thematically.49

In addition, the book contains various other learning and teaching techniques that can help consolidate theoretical propositions and provoke the readers’ critical thinking. Each unit presents reflective tasks and projects to put the theory into practice, designed to gradually suit the translation learner’s level, yet initiating
him/her to think further. Besides, the book makes use of ‘concept boxes’, summarising the key points and main ideas. Among the other valuable techniques are the use of glossary (terms explained in the end of the book and are written in bold font in the main text), back-translation (a technique which is helpful in bringing the TT reader close to the lexical and syntactic patterning of the source text, hence assisting the reader in comparing the actual translation with the patterning of the original), and the capacity for the book to lend itself to practical teaching in classroom. In their endeavour to maintain a balance between theory and practice in translation, Hatim and Munday (2004) add to the above techniques genuine extracts from key texts in the body of translation theory, and most of the extracts are supplemented with instructions. For instance, the ‘Before-you-read’ tasks are meant to have the reader recall the points discussed earlier; the ‘As-you-read’ tasks serve as signposts for the reader as to the main idea(s) in an extract; and the ‘After-you-read’ tasks help in recapitulating the main ideas and motivating the reader to ‘think more’. By including readings from original key theoretical sources, the authors enable the readers to have a firsthand experience of points regarded vital in translation theory. These readings, which are offered in each thematic unit of Section B, are further consolidated and investigated respectively in the units of Section C.

As has already been mentioned, the book is discussed here on the basis of its thematic layout. The three chapters of each Section (A, B, and C) are considered as a whole, a thematic unit. Since Section A provides an introduction to the thematic units, the theoretical readings in Section B will be integrated to support the argument, and the points made in Section C (which is designed for ‘advanced’ learners and may be above the level of understanding of undergraduate students) will be discussed wherever it is deemed necessary.
In discussing the theme of “What is translation?”, this unit offers a broad definition of translation as a process and a product, and indicates the huge effect translation has on everyday life. Besides Jakobson’s intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic translation, students are also introduced to other concepts such as subtitling, dubbing, and adaptation. In addition, this unit also hints at some factors that shape translation process/product, such as the socio-cultural, linguistic, ideological and political phenomena. Briefly, the ‘ambit of translation’ (Hatim and Munday 2004: 5) is concerned with

i. the process of transferring a written text from SL to TL, conducted by a translator, or translators, in a specific socio-cultural context,

ii. the written product, or TT, which results from that process and which functions in the socio-cultural context of the TL,

iii. the cognitive, linguistic, visual, cultural and ideological phenomena which are an integral part of 1 and 2.

In their very brief account of the origin of Translation Studies, Hatim and Munday (2004) acknowledge the special role played by Jakobson, Holmes, Toury, and Chesterman in establishing the discipline and specifying its scope. They attribute the validity of Toury’s ‘laws’ of translation to the existence of ‘universals of translation’, which they (Hatim and Munday: 7) define as

Specific characteristics that, it is hypothesized, are typical of translated language as distinct from non-translated language. This would be the same whatever the language pair involved and might include greater cohesion and explicitation (with reduced ambiguity) and the fact that a TT is normally longer than a ST.

In this unit, students are supplemented with two readings, one excerpt from Jakobson’s paper ‘On Linguistic Aspects of Translation’ (1959/2000), and the other from Holmes’ paper ‘The Name and Nature of Translation Studies’ (1972/2000). In
Jakobson, the main line of discussion revolves round how verbal signs are interpreted, i.e. at intralingual, interlingual, and intersemiotic levels, and the issues of equivalence and translatability, emphasising the idea that “Languages differ essentially in what they must convey and not in what they may convey” (Jakobson 1959/2000: 116). Holmes’ paper, on the other hand, is considered by many as the initiation of the discipline of Translation Studies. Finally, Section C not only recapitulates the main ideas made earlier but also furthers the discussion of the nature of translation and TS, pointing out that translation cannot be easily defined due to its interdisciplinary nature, its functions, and some other factors inherent in it.

The next thematic unit ‘Translation strategies’ offers a discussion of some notions of translation, particularly the debatable ones, such as form vs. content, the comprehensibility-translatability tension, untranslatability, literal vs. free, translationese, and (in)fidelity in translation. In their discussion of the question of (in)fidelity in translation, Hatim and Munday draw on Steiner’s hermeneutic movement, or the act of interpretation and transfer of meaning that is involved in translation. According to Steiner (1975/2000), the existence of translated texts testifies to and proves the feasibility of translation, but with varying degrees of fidelity and tolerance. This unit concludes with an emphasis on the sterility of debates of the sort trying to fanatically decide what translation is and what it is not. Particularly in the case of free-literal and form-content dichotomies, Hatim and Munday confirm Steiner’s idea that such dichotomies cannot be considered as poles, but as a cline.

The third thematic unit in the book deals with “The unit of translation” with a special reference to the views of Newmark (1988) and Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995). Hatim and Munday define the unit of translation as “the linguistic level
at which ST is recodified in TL” (Shuttleworth and Cowie, quoted in Hatim & Munday: 17) or “the element used by the translator when working on the ST … [which] may be the individual word, group, clause, sentence or even the whole text” (Hatim & Munday: 17). Based on a Structuralist perspective, Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000) consider 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”, i.e. this is what Vinay and Darbelnet consider as the lexicological unit and the unit of thought. For them, the lexicological unit contains “lexical elements grouped together to form a single element of thought”, and the unit of thought is a lexicological unit, or more, with a pragmatic purpose (ibid.). Dividing an ST into translation units is important as it can help translators recognise changes in translation, i.e. translation shifts – especially by using valuable techniques, namely the use of electronic corpora, the Think-Aloud Protocols, and draft translations. Hatim and Munday (2004) agree with Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995) that the word cannot be considered as a unit of translation because translators focus on the semantic field rather than on the formal properties of the individual signifier, and words (even in dictionaries) tend to have multiple senses in accordance with their contextual or collocational settings. Therefore, the unit of translation is ‘text in communication’. However, they acknowledge that this is a contentious issue and that there is no unanimity over what the unit of translation is.

Pointing out that translation occurs at different levels, Hatim and Munday (ibid.: 56) agree with Fawcett’s (1997) idea that “[w]hat professional and even novice translators actually do is relate the translation of the microlevel of words and phrases to higher textual levels of sentence and paragraph, and beyond that to such parameters as register, genre, text conventions, subject matter, and so on.” In relation to this, they
refer to the influence of Halliday’s contributions in linguistics, particularly the rank system and sentence information structure, on studies made, for example, by Newmark (1988) and Baker (1992/2006). The Functional Sentence Perspective of Prague School, along with Firbas’ (1972, 1992) concept of Communicative Dynamism, and Reiss and Vermeer’s (1984) skopos-theorie are also briefly referred to.

In a nutshell, determining the unit of translation depends not only on the rank scale (morpheme, word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, text), but also on the function of the translation as well as on the socio-cultural, ideological and intertextual levels of texts. In theory, it might be possible to suggest a unit of translation, be it the word, sentence or otherwise. But in practice, it becomes difficult because it is not easy to analyse what goes on in the translator’s mind during the translation process.

Some understanding of the concept of the translation unit is a preliminary for detecting and tackling ‘Translation shifts’ – the next thematic unit in Hatim and Munday’s book – which they define as “The small linguistic changes that occur between ST and TT” (2004: 26). According to Catford (1965: 73), who first introduced this term, translation shifts are “departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL”. Catford (1965) refers to two kinds of translation shifts:

- **level shifts**: shifts between the levels of grammar and lexis, where “a SL item at one linguistic level has a TL translation equivalent at a different level” [sic].
- **category shifts**: shifts that occur in ‘unbounded’ and ‘rank-bound’ translation. Unbounded translation is “approximately ‘normal’ or ‘free’ translation in which SL-TL equivalences are set up at whatever rank is appropriate” usually at the sentence level; rank-bounded translation refers to “special cases where equivalence is deliberately limited to ranks below the sentence” (1965: 75-6).
Understanding what Catford (ibid.) means by translation shifts requires a clear distinction between his concepts of formal correspondence and textual equivalence. A formal correspondent is defined as ‘any TL category (unit, class, structure, element of structure, etc.) which can 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’ (ibid.: 32); a textual equivalent is defined as ‘any TL text or portion of text which is observed ... to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text’ (ibid.: 27). In other words, formal correspondence refers to 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, i.e. a TL noun corresponds to an SL noun, a verb to a verb, and so on. Formal correspondence therefore involves a comparison and description of the language systems, i.e. Saussure’s (1966) *langue*, but not a comparison of specific ST-TT pairs (textual equivalence). Formal correspondence has to do with the general, non-specific, relationship between elements in two languages whereas textual equivalence focuses on the relations that exist between elements in a specific ST-TT pair (Saussure’s *parole*). In this regard, a shift is said to occur if, in a given TT, a translation equivalent other than the formal correspondent occurs for a specific SL element.

In thinking about the equivalence of an ST unit and a TT unit, these units have to be evaluated using some criterion or evaluator as an attempt to avoid the ‘inevitable’ subjectivity inherent in deciding about the occurrence of a translation shift. One of the known techniques used in translation for this purpose is called *tertium comparationis*, which is “a non-linguistic, intermediate form of the meaning of a ST and TT” (Hatim and Munday 2004: 31). It is “an invariant against which two text segments can be measured to gauge variation” (Munday 2001: 49). However, even such evaluator is contentious and cannot be said to be free of subjectivity (Hatim
and Munday 2004: 31, Munday 2001: 49). Several attempts have been made to reach some objective criterion of comparison. One of the most valuable attempts has been made by van Leuven-Zwart’s (1989 and 1990) architranseme.\textsuperscript{55} His concept revolves around the dictionary meaning of the ST term being taken as a comparator and used independently to evaluate the closeness of the ST and TT terms. However, “the success of the Architranseme”, Hatim and Munday stipulate (2004: 32), “rests upon the absolute objective dependability of the decontextualized dictionary meaning and the analyst’s ability to accurately and repeatedly decide whether a shift has occurred in the translation context”.

This discussion about comparison implies that a shift in translation may cause loss and gain of meaning. Following Vinay and Darbelnet’s (1958/2000), a translation strategy called compensation can be used by translators to try to redress balance between the ST and the TT. In the excerpt taken from Vinay and Darbelnet (ibid.), they propose taxonomies for describing the changes that occur in specific SL-TL pairs, summarised in terms of seven procedures:

i. Borrowing: This is the simplest translation procedure used by translators particularly to deal with a metalinguistic lacuna.

ii. Calque: This is a loan translation pertinent to two cases. Either a complete syntactic unit is borrowed, but its individual elements are translated literally (cf. French \textit{Compliments de la saison} from ‘Compliments of the season’ [on a Christmas card]; Arabic ردع نوروي \textit{rad’ nawawi} from English ‘nuclear deterrent’), or it may be a structural calque, which introduces a new construction into the TL (such as \textit{science fiction}, used as such in French).
iii. Literal Translation: This is a word-for-word translation where the resulting TL text is grammatically and idiomatically correct, especially between languages which have much in common.

iv. Transposition: This procedure means the replacing of one word-class by another, without changing the meaning of the message. Depending on the structural differences between SL and TL, transposition can be either obligatory or optional.

v. Modulation: This refers to a variation in the message due to a change in the point of view, i.e. seeing something in a different light. It is justified when a literal or transposed translation results in a form which is grammatically correct but not quite natural, or going against the feel of the TL.

vi. Equivalence: This procedure is concerned with using different stylistic and structural devices to account for a specific situation. Here, a total syntagmatic change may take place, especially in the translation of proverbs, clichés, idioms and collocations.

vii. Adaptation: This is the extreme ‘limit’ of translation and is used in cases where the situation to which the message refers does not exist at all in the TL and must thus be recreated by reference to a new situation.

Vinay and Darbelnet (ibid.) offer two methods of translation that cover their seven procedures:

i. direct (or literal) translation, which covers borrowing, calque and literal translation, and

ii. oblique translation, which includes transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation.
These procedures are applied on three levels of language:

i. the lexicon,

ii. the grammatical structures, and

iii. the ‘message’, which is used to refer to the situational utterance and some of the higher text elements such as sentence and paragraphs.

With a brief note on the notion of translation shifts, Hatim and Munday (2004) then turn to ‘The analysis of meaning’ by dint of ‘scientific’ approaches based mainly on studies made by Nida (1964) and Larson (1984/1998) that bear an impact of Chomskyan linguistics. In his influential book *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964), Nida borrows Chomsky’s (1957/2002) concepts of surface structure and deep structure in his analysis-transfer-restructuring model of translation. The analysis phase involves examination of sentence structure and of two kinds of linguistic meaning: referential (the denotative meaning, which deals with the words as signs or symbols) and connotative (the kind of meaning which deals with the emotional reaction engendered in the reader by a word).

Hatim and Munday (2004: 34) indicate that the frequent lack of one-to-one equivalence across languages is the key problem for translators because languages differ not only in terms of the signifier but also in the way they depict reality (through semantic fields). Some concepts are language/culture-specific to the degree that, even if rendered into another language community and culture, they may not evoke the same meaning in TL as that of the SL. Further, even the referential meaning of a polysemous word or a near-synonym or a word used figuratively may have to be determined by what Hatim and Munday (ibid.: 35) call ‘the semotactic environment’ or co-text (the other words around it).
In all circumstances, as a reader a translator ought to disambigu(e)te the various possible senses of an SL word in order to determine its TL equivalent. Here, Hatim and Munday present the students with an extract from Larson (1984/1998), who provides some useful techniques to help ‘discover’ meaning by grouping and contrast, i.e. part-whole relations, contrastive pairs, componential analysis, and kinds of meaning components. Other useful techniques used to disambiguate referential meaning include hierarchical structuring (i.e. semantic fields, hyponymy) and componential analysis. As for connotative meaning, Hatim and Munday suggest that a translator may as well disambiguate the connotative senses of a term using clines, and also in relation to its ‘semantic space’. Besides, students are also advised to make use of some other useful tools such as bilingual dictionaries, glossaries, term banks, and parallel texts as assisting tools to ‘discover’ meaning.

The next thematic unit is titled ‘Dynamic equivalence and the receptor of the message’ marking a shift of the book’s focus from semantics to pragmatics and semiotics, yet within the confines of the concept of equivalence with regard to broader contextual categories such as culture and audience. With two extracts from Nida’s ‘Science of Translation’ (1969) and Toward a Science of Translating (1964), respectively, this unit is concerned mainly with the problems of establishing equivalent effect in translation and how this factor, which draws heavily on context, affects meaning and determines the choice of translation method.

Nida’s (1964) concepts of formal correspondence and dynamic equivalence are relevant here. The former refers to “a relationship which involves the purely ‘formal’ replacement of one word or phrase in the SL by another in the TL” (ibid.:129), and is always a ‘contextually motivated’ method of translation, i.e. a procedure purposefully selected in order to preserve a certain linguistic/rhetorical
effect. The latter is a method of translation aiming to create in the TT reader a response to a (piece of) text similar to the ST reader’s response. Hatim and Munday (2004) emphasise that it is mainly the translator’s attitude to comprehensibility and translatability that determines his/her choice of either formal correspondence or dynamic equivalence. While translating, a translator may notice the importance of preserving the formal (stylistic or rhetorical) qualities or effects of certain SL expressions, consciously attempt to render them into the TL as closely as possible, and thus, bring the target reader nearer to the linguistic or cultural preferences of the ST. But if the translator finds that the translation of an SL form or expression using formal correspondence is likely to affect the TT reader’s comprehensibility and would compromise the intended meaning, s/he should intervene by explicating and/or adjusting the ST by using a dynamic equivalence form. That is to say, if the form does not constitute a part of the meaning and that literal or formal translation seems unnecessary, the translator may exercise freedom allowed by dynamic equivalence, which has varying degrees (i.e. explicating, adjusting, gisting, re-ordering, compensating, jettisoning less accessible SL items, regulating redundancy, etc.), provided that the intended meaning and effects of the ST are conveyed in the TT. These procedures are often introduced in what Nida calls the ‘restructuring’ stage.

An important point to underline here is that opting for this or that form of equivalence is not an either/or choice. The distinction dynamic vs formal equivalence (or dynamic vs structural correspondence) is best seen in relative terms, as points on a cline. The two methods are not absolute techniques but rather general orientations.

(Hatim and Munday: 43)

Hatim and Munday differentiate between literal, formal, and dynamic translations. In a cross-reference, they refer to Newmark’s ‘semantic translation’ as the closest to formal equivalence because in it, “the translator attempts, within the bare syntactic
and semantic constraints of the TL, to reproduce *the precise contextual meaning* of the author*" (ibid.: 255).

The next thematic unit deals with ‘Textual pragmatics and equivalence’. Here the authors extend the range of Baker’s (1992/2006) discussion under the ‘pragmatic equivalence’ theme. They add to the concepts of cohesion and coherence other concepts which are text-centred (e.g. function of the translation) and translator-centred (e.g. the translator’s interests, ideology, focus, etc.). A translation is supposed to account for the pragmatic factors involved in the process of translation. This unit presents a discussion of the notion of equivalence, as proposed by Koller (1995), and how equivalence is an essential factor in the process of decision-making in translation.

Hatim and Munday (2004) argue that for a text to be classified as translation proper, it should maintain a ‘translational’ or ‘equivalence’ relation with the original ST – to borrow Koller’s (1995) view. The term *translational* refers to the fact that the TT is a translated text and has an original ST, i.e. it is not an original writing. For this reason, equivalence of the TT to the ST is a precondition; or else, it cannot be regarded as translation proper. This is in spite of the fact that the concept of equivalence is controversial as to how it can be defined or how it could be measured in a real situation where different languages have their own different ways of expressing similar ideas, and in trying to reconcile the differences (linguistic, cultural, world-view, stylistic, aesthetic, etc.) and bridge the gaps between language communities.

Hatim and Munday reiterate Koller’s (1995) distinction of equivalence into two kinds: *langue*-oriented and *parole*-oriented. The first relates to formal similarities at the level of virtual language systems (*langue*); the second refers to equivalence
relations obtaining between texts in real time at the actual level of parole. Koller (1995) advocates that it is the latter, parole-oriented notion of equivalence (Äquivalenz in German) that constitutes the real object of enquiry in Translation Studies. Based on this, Hatim and Munday view textual equivalence as obtaining not between the languages themselves at the level of the linguistic system, but between real texts at the level of text in context. They regard pragmatics (as the study of intended meaning) to be the most suitable basis for studying equivalence, and suggest a middle path between the two extremes of langue-oriented vs. parole-oriented approaches to translation, and that is by defining equivalence in relative (not categorical) terms and in hierarchical (not static) terms. In other words, equivalence is not an ‘either/or’ choice, nor is it an ‘if, then’ formula. With pragmatics as the ground for analysis, this view of equivalence, they maintain, is dynamic, variable and flexible in accounting for relationships between comparable elements in the SL and TL.

The concept of equivalence goes hand in hand with the notion of decision-making. The process of decision-making involves several, fairly subjective as well as objective factors working simultaneously, which Levý (1969/2000: 150) calls ‘system of instructions’. For example, ‘the structure of the translator’s memory, his aesthetic standards’ [sic] (ibid.: 151) can influence the translator’s decision-making movement up and down the hierarchy of equivalence suggested by Koller (1995), iteratively.59 Secondly, the translator’s cognition and knowledge – what Hatim and Munday describe as the ‘socio-cognitive system’, i.e. the translator’s system of values, beliefs, etc. – can be said to stand behind reasoning of choices and decisions made by the translator in his/her search for equivalents, ‘thus confirming the hierarchical-iterative and relative nature of equivalence relations’ (Hatim and Munday: 53). Again, the factor of commission (i.e. the agreement between the translator and his/her client)
determines the purpose of the translation\(^60\) (also called ‘translation *skopos*’) and may have a considerable impact on the translator’s loyalty factor, hence decision-making.\(^61\) Moreover, the factor of text type (textual pragmatics) is regarded by Hatim and Munday as the grounds of the most concrete set of criteria for effective decision-making because “the decision-making involved would thus be partly subject to system criteria such as grammar and diction, and partly to contextual factors surrounding the use of language in a given text” (ibid.: 55).

During the 1970s the central issue in translation was equivalence, and translation theory drew from such flourishing disciplines as psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. But the impact of pragmatics was all the more pervasive, especially under the influence of “the so-called ‘contextual turn’ in linguistics” (ibid.), the most notable proponents of which are Koller (1995) and de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). This resulted in diminishing the priority of form over meaning/content, and of language system over communicative context. Consequently, equivalence began to be regarded as relative, and translation decisions as hierarchical and iterative. The issue of decision-making has therefore become an essential part of any discussion of the concept of equivalence or of the translation process, represented particularly by Levý’s Minimax strategy.

Translation theory tends to be normative, to instruct translators on the OPTIMAL solution; actual translation work, however, is pragmatic; the translator resolves for that one of the possible solutions which promises a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort. That is to say, he intuitively resolves for the so-called MINIMAX STRATEGY. [sic] (Levý 1967/2000: 156)

Having dealt with the study of translation based on ‘mostly texts or fragments of texts’ and also with the notion of equivalence as being largely ‘text-based’, Hatim and Munday (2004) in the next thematic unit “Translation and relevance” point out that while the formal vs. dynamic equivalence models signalled the shift from the
form of the message to the response to the message (itself a problematic touchstone), the relevance model, being based on cognitive-linguistic considerations, has come as an alternative in an attempt to put an end to the ‘response’ controversy and herald a new direction in Translation Studies.

Relevance was seen as a corrective to theories which, out of pragmatics, had argued for the relative nature of equivalence (e.g. Koller) and, out of text linguistics, had postulated text as a unit of translation (e.g. Beaugrande). Relevance research has certainly shed light on a number of important issues including the role of such mechanisms as ‘inference’. However, it is perhaps fair to say that relevance research has in turn raised more questions than it could answer.

(Hatim and Munday: 66, my italics)

Among these questions are the value of working with such concepts as ‘intended readership’ and ‘equivalent effect’, besides the little concern with textual criteria such as genre membership. Hatim and Munday (ibid.) indicate that among the methodologies of post-text typologies and equivalence classifications (which dominated the area of the analysis of translation up to late in the 1980s), pragmatics of ‘relevance’ has come as a flourishing perspective. From this the cognitive aspect of what happens in translation and what it is that regulates the elusive notion of equivalence can be investigated. According to Gutt, “Relevance theory . . . tries to give an explicit account of how the information-processing faculties of our mind enable us to communicate with one another. Its domain is therefore mental faculties rather than texts or processes of text production” (quoted in Hatim and Munday: 176).

The model of relevance proposed by Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995, 2004/2006) set the path for a new perspective to the study of language (hence, translation), and Grice’s (1975 and 1989/1995) work provided a general framework for studying pragmatics, with relevance as one of the maxims listed under the Co-operative Principle.62

The impact of psycholinguistics, mainly the cognitive-linguistic analysis of the translation process, has however shifted the focus from texts to mental processes, with
translation regarded as a form of communication, and decision-making as a process that has to do with coherence relationships or, to use the general technical term, inferencing.

Reiterating Gutt (1991), Hatim and Munday (2004: 57) consider inferencing as “a cognitive activity taken to be central to any act of communication and thus crucial in any act of reading or translation”. It constitutes the ability of language users to produce and make sense during communication. Relevance theory postulates that communication is usually set off by a ‘stimulus’ (be this verbal or otherwise), and these stimuli play the role of signposts for the reader/hearer to reach the speaker/writer’s ‘informative intention’. Here, communication is made possible by dint of the ability of language users to convey and analyse inferences, and identify the intended stimuli of the communicative situation. It is a corollary, then, that inferencing implies the existence of a context of communication. The context of communication is taken in the Relevance theory to refer not only to the linguistic and situational features and the socio-cultural norms of appropriateness (polite, taboo, etc.) but also to assumptions (known as the cognitive environment) pertinent to the cognitive and mental process of the language users in relation to the world, such as the assumption that communication is intended to perform certain acts.

Therefore, context can be said to contribute explicitly or implicitly to the meaning of an utterance in a communicative situation. Inferencing determines the amount of the processing effort exerted in the analysis of the interaction of stimulus-assumptions-interpretation. That is, if it becomes hard for a participant in a communicative act to infer meaning, to relate what is being said, this interaction is said to be disturbed, and the effort to have exceeded the reward. So far as translation
is concerned, the interaction of stimulus-assumptions-interpretation might be disturbed if the cognitive environment of an utterance varies in the two languages. This effort-reward balance constitutes the core of Levý’s Minimax Principle: in any translation the process of decision-making works according to a mechanism whereby every problem has a number of solutions and the translator’s choice of a specific solution to a given problem ultimately attempts to ensure maximum effect for minimal effort on the part of the reader. For example, the translator might think over preserving or ignoring a certain feature of an ST (e.g. rhyme) if s/he settles on a decision as to whether or not this feature is relevant to the meaning of the ST and is worth the TT reader’s effort.

Seen from the standpoint of text production and reception, then, Minimax suggests that writers tend to ensure, and readers expect, that any extra effort is justified and commensurately rewarded, and that such textual manifestations as opaque word order, repetition, the use of metaphorical language or any other form of implicitness are not gratuitously used.

(Hatim and Munday: 60)

In other words, the use of rhetorical devices or what is known as ‘textual salience’, i.e. markedness, in a text is expected to be communicatively and ‘contextually motivated’ so as to maintain the effort-reward balance. If used gratuitously, such utterances would not be considered functional.

Purposeful changes of form are thus regarded as functional if they are communicatively and contextually motivated, i.e. they not only strike a balance between the effort and reward, but are also relevant. In order to tackle problems arising from the form-content dichotomy, the relevance model of translation employs a range of cognitive tools, including inference and the ability to perceive and interact with textual salience functionally. In this regard, texts/utterances are categorised into descriptive and interpretive with reference to language users, reflecting the two ways in which human minds entertain thoughts. Descriptive utterances are those which
the speaker intends to be true of a state of affairs in some possible world whereas interpretive utterances are intended not to represent his/her own thoughts but those of somebody else.64

This distinction leads to another equally important distinction of translation into direct and indirect, referring to the extent of freedom the translator is allowed. It aims to settle the fluctuation of choice as to whether or not the TT audience should be given a TT which is as close as possible to the ST and not modified by the translator’s own interpretation. In direct translation, the translator has to stick to the explicit content of the ST, but in indirect translation the translator enjoys some degree of latitude so as to explicate, elaborate, summarise, etc. in an attempt to make the TT sound fluent or natural to the readers. According to Hatim and Munday (2004: 62):

*Obviously, this is not an either/or choice but rather the two ends of a continuum. Indirect translations are intended to survive on their own, and involve whatever changes the translator deems necessary to maximize relevance for a new audience (i.e. the predominantly ‘descriptive’ mode of the tourist brochure type of translation in the example discussed above). Direct translations, on the other hand, are more closely tied to the original, a case of what we have called ‘interpretive’ resemblance.*

Indirect translation is questionable in terms of faithfulness and its status in relation to the ST. Some even consider it to be ‘not translation at all’ (Gutt 1991, quoted in Hatim and Munday: 63). But one cannot dismiss it outright as a non-translation. Of course, most translators cherish to present the TT audience with a translation that has as much flavour and spice of the ST as possible. But too much ST spice and flavour would clearly make the taste of the TT unbearable, sometimes ‘uneatable’. Matters related to the form-function relationship, e.g. style, relevance, coherence, and cohesion, particular to a language may not show amenability to give similar communicative clues alongside the formal features in another language.

Hatim and Munday (2004: 275) also introduce the concept of ‘semantic representation’, which they define as “a mental/linguistic formula … [of, say, a word,
constituting its] meaning plus contextual implications (effect, etc.)”. Semantic representations need to be *inferentially* enriched to become ‘proper language use’ so that meaning can become derivable not only from the stimulus alone but also from the interaction of the stimulus with the cognitive environment, i.e. ‘all the assumptions and implicatures which utterances convey in a given context of use’. They propose a typology of communicative clues, i.e. semantic, syntactic, phonological, stylistic, or any kind of clue that can suggest a meaning. They state that writers use communicative clues as “sign-posts to guide the reader through the maze of communicative values conveyed by the text” (ibid.: 277), and the duty of the reader/translator is hereby to learn to:

- identify what constitutes a ‘clue’;
- define the function, which the clue might conceivably serve.

At this stage, the translator must go a step further and

- identify a suitable communicative clue capable of conveying ST function.

This is an ideal scenario. Often, translators have to settle for less than this theoretical ideal when they

- opt for some form of re-wording that often does not have the making of a communicative clue.

In this last-resort option, we would be translating the ‘what’ and not necessarily the ‘how’.

To relevance theoreticians, inferencing can be cognitively achieved without resorting to such templates as text typologies and communicative acts. According to Hatim and Munday (2004), however, the binary dichotomies or distinctions proposed by the relevance theory (as descriptive vs. interpretive use, direct vs. indirect translation and so on) all seem to involve concepts that are rather points on a sliding
scale: the relationships involved are ‘more or less’ and ‘probabilistic’. “[To] be meaningful for the translator”, say Hatim and Munday (ibid.: 279), “these dichotomies have to be seen in terms of a complex set of factors, with some correlation, albeit fairly weak, inevitably existing between orientation (say, interpretive use), translation strategy (indirect) and text type and purpose constraints.” This is what is discussed in the next thematic unit, “Text type in translation”.

Relevance research took a cognitive perspective to the analysis of texts and came essentially as a critique to and a swerve from the ‘textual’ perspective, which was prevalent in the 1970s and until the late 1980s. Considering mental resources such as ‘inference’ as a more viable alternative to taxonomic classifications such as text typologies, the proponents of relevance model on translation strategy (descriptive vs. interpretive, direct vs. indirect), could not, however, completely ignore macro-structures such as text type or genre. By the end of the 1990s, it was clear that inference can only be enriched by awareness of the conventions governing the communicative event within which texts or genres occur (Gutt 1988). Basically, the textual model of translation seeks to analyse pragmatic equivalence and regards as indispensable the status of text type in the translation process. A good example of this approach to translation is the model proposed by Hatim and Mason (1990 and 1997), which is based on the notions of text type and critical discourse analysis.

Rejecting the form-meaning split, text linguistics emanated in the 1970s to stress that form is also part and parcel of meaning. The translation model informed by textual pragmatics views equivalence as a relative and hierarchical notion and regards ‘translation’ – any translation, ranging from a literal replica to a free paraphrase – as a valid representative of ST communicative acts.65 From a textual point of view, context
is viewed as purpose and function underpinned by several standards of textuality, which all well-organised texts (hence their translations as well) must meet. It is

A strategic configuration in which what things ‘mean’ coincides intentionally and in systematic ways with what they are used for and with whatever else is going on in the situation.

(de Beaugrande, quoted in Hatim and Munday: 67)

The standards of textuality include cohesion, coherence, situationality, intentionality, informativity, acceptability, and intertextuality (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981). Cohesion refers to the diverse surface relations in which strategy is not just an ST issue, nor is it exclusively a context of situation matter. Rather, it is bound up with the entire context of culture within which texts and their translation are produced.

In the production (or reception and translation) of texts, the contextual focus may fluctuate between one end of a continuum emphasizing ‘managing’ (a form of evaluation) to the other which caters for ‘monitoring’ a given situation (or general detachment).

(Hatim and Munday: 92)

In dealing with text type in relation to the concept of register, the discussion addresses how text type accommodates the way language generally varies according to different situations, and how cohesion turns sentences into coherent texts especially in relation to the immediate context of situation. From a sociolinguistic viewpoint, language differs according to its context, and different contexts customarily call upon users to use different language varieties. It is important here to distinguish between two varieties of language, i.e. registers and dialects. Registers are related to the use of language and have to do with such factors as occupation, age, etc. and whether the occasion of the use is formal or informal, i.e. legalese, journalese, motherese, etc. Dialects, on the other hand, are related to the language users representing geographical, social and temporal factors. These variations (i.e. register and dialect) form two dimensions.

The use-user dimensions essentially indicate who is communicating with whom, what is being communicated, and how this is communicated, hence the institutional – communicative focus. Together with intentionality (covering such pragmatic factors as the force of an utterance), and
intertextuality (or how texts as ‘signs’ conjure up images of other virtual or actual texts), register mediates between language and situation (i.e. we use language registers to access situations).

(Hatim and Munday: 77, My italics)

By institutional, it is meant that determining these two dimensions in an utterance can bring to notice details such as the sender’s (and sometimes the receiver’s) class, time, place, etc. The ‘communicative focus’ is taken to refer to the values communicated by a text or an utterance which are relevant to the situation at hand, such as the sense of identity, authority or power, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register Membership</th>
<th>Intentionality</th>
<th>Intertextuality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(communicative transaction)</td>
<td>(pragmatic action)</td>
<td>(semiotic interaction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User (dialects etc.)</td>
<td>Speech Acts</td>
<td>Socio-culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use (Field, Tenor, Mode)</td>
<td>Inference</td>
<td>Socio-textual practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implicature</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

text, genre and discourse typologies

**STRUCTURE**

**TEXTURE**

*Figure:* The three dimensions of context, adapted from Hatim and Mason (1990) (in Hatim and Munday: 78)

Hatim and Munday stress that user-related (i.e. dialectal) variables are not sufficient by themselves as defining features which can capture the intricacies of language use. In fact, a particular use imposes certain constraints on the producers as well as the receivers of a text as to how language is manipulated, i.e. the field of discourse (involving both subject matter and social institutions, e.g. feminism), the
mode of interaction (written or spoken, or written to be spoken, etc., covering the cohesion and coherence of texts), and the tenor (catering for the level of formality or informality of the relationship or interaction between the participants in the linguistic event, including the style of discourse, and the way these aspects give rise to complex relationships of power and solidarity) (Halliday 1985/1989). According to Hatim and Munday (2004: 81), the tenor of discourse is accorded a special status in register because of “the overlap between formality and field, on the one hand, and between formality and mode, on the other.” Producers of texts engage with their receivers in various role relations, bringing about particular shifts in tenor (e.g. politician-preacher role-switching), and thus the institutional-communicative transactions take on an interactive character which is “the domain of the other level of context, of texts as signs, or semiotics” (ibid.: 82). Thus, meaning between interlocutors becomes negotiable and constitutes the basis of one fairly rudimentary level of ‘semiotic interaction’.

The semiotic level of context makes institutional-communicative transactions into more meaningful interactions (ibid.: 83). The following diagram represents the ways in which levels of basic communication (field, mode and tenor) acquire a semiotic specification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>IDEATIONAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>TEXTUAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENOR</td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>DISCOURSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semiotics of field, mode and tenor (Hatim and Munday: 83)

Communication moves to a slightly higher level than that of the speaker/hearer to include the utterance produced, i.e. the interaction occurs not only between the speaker and the hearer with each other, but between them with utterances
as well. Consequently, “utterances become signs in the semiotic sense of ‘meaning something to somebody in some respect or capacity’, ultimately embodying the assumptions, presuppositions and conventions that reflect the way a given culture constructs and partitions reality” (ibid.: 84).

In examining how register is preserved in translation by contrasting rhetorical purpose with text function, Hatim and Munday (2004) refer to the model of translation quality assessment proposed by House (1977 and 1997). To them, her approach is largely based on register theory, and views equivalence on the basis of text function in terms of:

- the linguistic and situational features of the ST and TT,
- a comparison of the two texts,
- an assessment of ST–TT relative match.

However, Hatim and Munday regard function not ‘solely in terms of the minutiae of a text’s grammar and vocabulary’ but as a higher level category more closely linked to text type. Referring to Lyons (1977), and in order to include a receiver-oriented goal of text function, they see function as ‘the application or use which the text has in the particular context of a situation’ (Lyons 1977: 434). They maintain that a text’s function and rhetorical purpose and the function of translation should ideally be similar, if not identical.

Having focussed on investigating interaction from the perspective of textual registers, Hatim and Munday (2004) move on in the next thematic unit ‘Text, genre and discourse shifts in translation’ to examining how translation shifts can occur in related areas of text, genre and discourse (i.e. translation shifts within the text-genre-discourse framework). That is to say, alongside the macro-structures which are related to the context of situation that contribute to the understanding of texts, e.g. register,
schemata and script, there are socio-cultural meanings embedded in texts. According to Hatim and Munday (ibid.), these meanings have to do with:

- ‘rhetorical purpose’ in the case of what can be technically called the ‘unit text’,
- the conventional requirements of a set of ‘communicative events’ or genres,
- ideology (or other kinds of ‘attitude’) implied by adopting a particular discourse.

They support the argument with two extracts: the first one is taken from James (1989), who is the first “to recognize, from an essentially applied-linguistic perspective, the distinction between two levels of abstraction in approaching the notion of genre in translation” (Hatim and Munday 2004: 192). The second one comes from Bruce (1994) and deals with discourse from the perspective of culture studies. It can be taken as a representative text of an approach which shows an awareness of the importance of discourse studies in the study of culture and translation (as opposed to the approach which pays no attention to the role of linguistics in this regard).

James (1989) maintains that intertextuality relates to coherence and “the most coherent texts are those that are perceived as instances of genres, so much so that genre-compliance on the part of a speaker or writer (or translator) is marked by an ability to maintain coherence” (Quoted in Hatim and Munday: 194). The two levels of genre in translation as proposed by James are the sense of translation as a genre by itself (i.e. Savory’s (1957/1968) famous paradox that a translations should read like an original work and like a translation as well) on the one hand, and the sense of considering the ST genre while translating it into the TL on the other.

Adopting another perspective, i.e. cultural yet inclusive of discursive models and socio-political theory, Bruce (1994) reflects the position occupied by discourse
alongside other types of sign (genre, text, etc.) with reference to the choice of which
text to read/translate and which to ignore – a sensitive decision which is closely bound
up with the translation strategy favoured by a given translation tradition. This
phenomenon is what Bruce calls *ghettoisation* of certain texts for political, cultural
and historical reasons due to their non-conformity or lack of support for the status
quo; thus marginalising such texts in terms of reading and translating.

In the next thematic unit ‘Agents of power in translation’, Hatim and Munday
(2004) concern themselves not only with culture studies but also with the semiotic
dimension of context which caters for the diverse range of rhetorical purposes, modes
of speaking and writing, and statements of attitudes towards aspects of socio-cultural
life. Texts, genres and discourses are macro-signs within which language users do
things with words. Words thus become instruments of power and ideology. With
discourse regarded as the expression of attitude towards areas of socio-cultural
practice, texts and genres are viewed to embody a stance or a particular perspective
towards certain issues (e.g. racism, postcolonialism), thus becoming mouthpieces for
such social institutions and processes. The power vested in these institutions finds its
manifestation in the ideology they adopt, which, through its propagation by means of
language, plays a significant role in shaping a particular version of reality. Such
power can be tangibly substantiated by using language to ‘include’ or ‘exclude’ a
particular kind of reader, a certain system of values, a set of beliefs or an entire
culture, that is, “somewhere, somehow, there is some exclusion of a reader (coerced
to read in a particular way), an author (committed to oblivion) or a translator (doomed
to be invisible)” (ibid.: 93), e.g. academically oriented translations tend to exclude
common readers and include specialists only. Hatim and Munday (ibid.) explain that
the Anglo-American translation tradition, for example, tends in most cases to bend
STs in such a way as to suit TT readers, making all translations almost ‘read the same’, thus usurping the specificity and uniqueness of the ST and the voice of the ST original author as well (cf. Venuti 1995 and 1998). That is, translators exercise a sort of power to exclude a certain reader directly and consciously through selecting particular texts or selectively engaging in such translation procedures as ‘free’ translation, heavy glossing, gisting, or compensation. Besides, a translator’s conceptualisation of the TL norms, real or imagined, can also purposefully induce an ideological exclusion of an author, i.e. by making use of such procedures as omission or normalisation to claim to sustain fluency and avoid boredom.

Bassnett and Lefevere (1990), for example, argue that translation in general cannot be void of some form of manipulation of the ST, which can be purposeful and which is induced by some factors that prompt the translator’s motives or in response to the pressures of different linguistic, literary and cultural codes impacting on one another. Power relations can also be manifest in the ethics, rights and obligations related to a translator’s job. Moreover, power may be exercised on the translator by editors and censors, orienting the course of the product in a specific direction. Again, the circumstances, rights and commitments surrounding the translator’s job can reflect characteristics of power relations, e.g. the model contract for literary translation as proposed by the Translators Association in London.

Regarding the agents of power in translation, certain factors can have an impact on a translation. First, the term ‘norms’ has a special status in this regard. Among the different uses it has had in TS, this term has acquired a conspicuous weight in cultural and literary Translation Studies particularly at the hands of such notable theorists as Toury (1995 and 1978/1995/2001) and Chesterman (1999). From the perspective of the Descriptive Translation Studies, Toury (1995) holds a TT-
oriented view of translation norms, i.e. “translation behaviour typically obtaining under specific socio-cultural or textual situations”, encompassing not only translation strategy but also how, if at all, a TT fits into the literary and social culture of the target system. Chesterman (1999), on the other hand, proposes “product and expectancy norms” governed by the readers’ expectations of what a translation should be, and “professional norms” governing the translator and the translation process.

The exercise of power can also be seen in other features like the author’s voice which a text echoes, more particularly in literary translation. Hatim and Munday (2004) take ‘voice’ here to refer to the narrative character and rhythm reflecting the author’s way of composition. But the translator also has a voice, or what Hermans (1996) calls ‘discursive presence’, and the more power the translator has over the text the louder (or more noticeable) this voice becomes. But ideally, especially when there are no external ideological factors impinging on how a text should be translated, a translator tries to have his/her voice melted in the overall voice of the original author as presented in the ST.

Related to the notion of voice, the dominant poetics in a national language or literature can impose certain constraints on what and how to translate. The theory of Polysystem may be taken as an approach revealing how the poetics and the ‘canonised texts’ dominant in a specific language or literature can affect translation.

Fawcett (1997) proposes an analysis of how translators, editors, publishers, etc. can be victims of power in translation. Venuti (1995 and 1998) indicates how certain factors and powers can impinge on the rights of the translator, and can influence not only the quality of a translation but also the texts selected for translation. Another model for the analysis of power in translation has been proposed by Bassnett and Lefevere (1990): it approaches relationships of power in socio-
literary contexts, and sees translation as a form of re-writing, even manipulation, essentially driven by such all-pervasive power structures as ideology and poetics as well as political and literary pressures in an attempt to construct *image*:

> the desire to promote through translation a work, or an author (or, in the most general sense, an entire way of thinking or set of cultural values), in such a way that the translation can begin to exert a greater influence in the target culture than that which the original has had in its native culture.

(Hatim and Munday: 100)

Finally, patronage can be said to exercise a great measure of power on a translation. Lefevere (1992a: 15) defines patronage as “the powers (persons, institutions) which help or hinder the writing, reading and rewriting of literature”. These powers can come in the form of individuals, political and religious institutions, media (e.g. BBC), etc. In this way, if the patronage assumes control on the subject matter, the budget, and the manner in which a text has to be translated in order to serve certain goals set by the patron, the patronage is described as undifferentiated. Patronage becomes differentiated when the translation is not meant to support/denounce a certain ideology, e.g. perhaps if the interest of a translation is only commercial success.75

In the next thematic unit ‘Ideology and translation’ Hatim and Munday (2004) touch upon some areas of culture studies and their interaction with translation (and language in general). In this regard, the role played by culture studies in TS is embodied more prominently by what is known as the ‘cultural turn’, a metaphor (first coined by Snell-Hornby (1990), and made popular by Bassnett and Lefevere (1990 and 1998)) adopted by translation theorists who approached translation from a culture studies perspective to refer to the analysis of translation in its cultural, political and ideological context. Hatim and Munday (2004: 102) state: “Since 1990, the turn has extended to incorporate a whole range of approaches from Cultural Studies and is a true indicator of the *interdisciplinary* nature of contemporary Translation Studies” (my italics).
Ideology, a quite important and relevant concept here, is thought to include “the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups’ (Hatim and Mason 1997:144). Hatim and Mason distinguish between the ideology of translating and the translation of ideology. Ideology of translating refers to the basic orientation chosen by the translator operating within a social and cultural context (the choice, for example, between Venuti’s domesticating and foreignising translation). In the translation of ideology, they are concerned with the extent of mediation supplied by a translator of sensitive texts. They define mediation as “the extent to which translators intervene in the transfer process, feeding their own knowledge and beliefs into processing the text” (ibid: 147). Moreover, mediation relates not only to the translator’s intervention in the transfer process but also to the ST original author’s conscious choices in the drafting of the ST itself. To analyse mediation in a translation, Hatim and Mason set some lexicogrammatical parameters of lexical choices, cohesion and transitivity. 

To put the whole thing differently, translation theorists became aware of the interdisciplinary nature of translation, and different theorists began to analyse the interaction of translation with other disciplines. In this regard, translation has been studied with regard to two main concerns of culture studies: gender and postcolonialism. So far as the interaction between gender and TS is concerned, Chamberlain (1988) figures prominently in that she has attempted to apply feminist theories and gender issues to traditional metaphors of translation to prove what she calls ‘sexualization of translation’ (ibid. 315), e.g. some metaphors such as ‘les belles infidèles’, ‘beautiful’, ‘faithful’ were put under feminist lenses to postulate that translation (itself regarded as feminine on par with the French feminine noun traduction), along with other artistic forms of expression (such as the performing
arts), is feminine and, thus, derivative. In this regard, as a counter-example to Venuti’s (1995) complaint over the ‘invisibility’ of the translator, some feminist translators and translation theorists even tried to affirm or challenge the erasure of female gender identity by making the ‘female’ more significant in translation theory and translated works by, for instance, linguistically subverting the text or by using female third person pronouns for neutral positions. The feminist challenge to the metaphor of les belles infidèles (‘unfaithful beauties’) can be illustrated by an example cited by Chamberlain (1988), i.e. Suzanne Jill Levine, whose translation of a novel by the Cuban exile Cabrera Infante which is ideologically offensive to women attempted “to subvert the text, to play infidelity against infidelity, and to follow out the text’s parodic logic … first by choosing to translate the text and second by challenging the reader linguistically with new puns, forcing the reader to question the status of the original” (Hatim and Munday: 104).

Relevant to this feminist and gender-based approach to translation is a school of translation called the ‘translation project’. It was formed in the 1990s by a group of French Canadian feminist translators, such as Barbara Godard, Suzanne de Lotbiniere-Harwood and Luise von Flotow, whose aim was to challenge the status quo, namely in literary translation, openly advocating and implementing strategies (linguistic and otherwise) to foreground the feminist in the translated text. It can be construed as a reaction to what seemed to them derogatory to the female in relation to translation and TS in general, i.e. like women, the more beautiful a translation is, the less faithful it is. An example of comparing translation to women is the metaphors used by Steiner (1975/1998, 1975/2000) to describe the four-part hermeneutic (interpretative) process of translation:
1. initiative *trust* – the translator *approaches* the ST with *trust* that there is meaning there;

2. *aggression* (or *penetration*) – the translator *takes over* or ‘*captures*’ the foreign text;

3. *incorporation* (or *embodiment*) – the text becomes part of the translator’s language; and

4. *compensation* (or *restitution*) – the translator *restores* something to the TT to compensate for what has been *taken away*.

The other very important concern indicating the interaction between culture studies and TS is that of the postcolonialist (known also as the Subaltern Studies) approach to translation. In relating translation to postcolonialism, Hatim and Munday (2004) indicate that this field of study has come out with diverse, and sometimes discrepant, views about the relationship between translation and (post)colonialism. Some views regard translation as a tool which colonialists used to erase the ethnic identity of the colonised and to make it easier for the coloniser to control the colonised whereas opposite views see translation as a means of *resistance* and affirmation of identity. Works of prominent scholars, such as Spivak (1992/2000) and Niranjana (1992), have enriched this field with a myriad of ideas, showing not only how translation can be a tool of resistance but also how it can be detrimental.

The last thematic unit of the course, ‘Translation in the information technology era’, focuses on MT, its development over the last sixty years, the most important techniques devised so far, and the use of electronic corpora as an assistant tool in translation. Hatim and Munday (2004) attribute the increasing involvement of translation with technology to globalisation (with English being a *lingua franca*), the advent of the internet and advance in communication systems, and the growth of
international organisations, such as the United Nations and the European Union. The expansion of trade on a global scale has led to commercial translation, where translation is seen as “big business” (Hatim and Munday: 113), being part of what is known as GILT business (Globalisation, Internationalisation, Localisation and Translation). Globalisation is defined here as “a multi-level term that is used to refer to the global nature of the world economy with the all-pervasive spread of multinationals” (ibid.: 112). Localisation involves taking a product and making it linguistically and culturally appropriate to the target locale (country/region and language) where it will be used and sold. Generally speaking, technology has been invested in translation “to replace the translator, aid the translator or aid the translation theorist” (Hatim and Munday: 120). Replacing the translator, the human agency, seems to be a response to the excessive need for translators to meet the demand of the global translation market, but is hitherto a wish that is difficult to attain, for after all any machine translated text requires a translator to edit it and see how much success has been achieved. Moreover, “it seems as though automation of translation is a social and political necessity for modern societies which do not wish to impose a common language on their members” (Arnold et al. 1994: 4).

In their discussion, Hatim and Munday (2004) browse the history and development of MT, indicating a number of the significant steps and projects made in this field and the benefits and shortcomings of MT. They (2004) conclude their book by pointing out the challenge facing TS, i.e. how can TS research and researchers encompass all the approaches discussed above and make them complementary to each other? This, indeed, is the rudimentary premise for any endeavour to develop a more comprehensive theory of translation.

The last methodological approach to translation teaching discussed in this dissertation is the one offered by Larson (1984/1998). The title is indicative of the nature of the course’s approach, i.e. discussing equivalence from a semantic perspective. Although there is nothing in the title to explicitly state that the book is meant for teaching, Larson has meant the book to be a textbook (ibid.: ix) which is designed for the teaching of translation as “meaning-based rather than form-based” (ibid.). Throughout the book, Larson appears to avoid being “too philosophical and abstract to relate at all closely to the translator’s mundane problems” (ibid.: vii, italics mine). For the sake of illustration the book is rich with examples, drawn from several languages, giving the impression of the author’s extensive reading and of the applicability of the ideas and techniques offered on several languages at once. Each chapter is also followed by exercises and questions to help consolidate the ideas discussed in the chapter. The book is divided into six parts containing 37 units. The six parts are:

1. Overview of the Translation Task
2. The Lexicon
3. Propositional Structure
4. Communication Relations
5. Texts
6. The Translation Program.

As a matter of convenience, the discussion below will be carried through part-wise, not chapter-wise, and will briefly present an account of the methodology and content of Larson’s course of translation.
Quite reasonably, Part I introduces Larson’s point of view of the nature of translation and how she is going to deal with it in her book. In attempting to indicate the form-meaning interaction in translation, she remarks that “Translation, by definition, consists of changing of one state or form to another” (ibid.: 3) and the translation process “consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation, and cultural context of the source language text, analyzing it in order to determine its meaning, and then reconstructing the same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate to in the RECEPTOR LANGUAGE and its cultural context” (ibid.). This view of translating is reminiscent of Nida’s (1964) analysis-transfer-restructuring scheme. To Larson, then, translation is basically a change or replacement of form (i.e. the surface structure of a language: actual words, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, etc.) from one language to another – again, revealing the impact of Nida and Chomsky on her approach. In a nutshell, the view of translation here consists in transferring the meaning of the source language into the receptor language, by going from the form of the first language to the form of a second language by way of semantic structure. The implication is that languages use different lexical choices and grammatical structures to signal the same meaning. Thus, meaning is transferred by altering forms (Larson 1984/1988), implying that meaning is constant and stable across languages while form is changing.80

The main point is transference of meaning across languages in order to achieve equivalence, and the likely obstacles that might hamper such transference. Fluency in both SL (Source Language) and RL (Receptor Language, Target Language) felicitates rapid transfer, and the opposite is true: poor competence in any of the languages involved in a translation stands as a hindrance to transfer. A number
of factors involved in this process stand as a challenge for attaining a happy cross-lingual transfer, e.g. grammatical (gender and number), lexical or semantic, pragmatic, contextual, textual and extra-textual – which will be discussed in some detail in the following pages. It is necessary, therefore, to provide translators with techniques and principles that can enhance their transfer competence. Tapping on linguistic and sociolinguistic factors involved in translating, the underlying premise upon which this book is based is that the best translation is the one which (i) uses the normal language forms of the receptor language, (ii) communicates, as much as possible, to the receptor language speakers the same meaning that was understood by the speakers of the source language, and (iii) maintains the dynamics of the original source language text, i.e. evoking a response in the translation similar to that the ST attempted to evoke.

Larson classifies meaning initially into primary meaning and secondary/figurative meaning. Primary meanings/senses of a lexical item are most of the time easy to translate. But since “language is a complex set of skewed relationships between meaning (semantics) and form (lexicon or grammar)” (ibid.: 10), problems normally occur when translating figurative/secondary meanings/senses, i.e. when there is skewing. And since forms change from one language to another, priority in translation must be given to meaning over form.

This is also a reason behind preferring idiomatic translation over literal or word-for-word translation and even modified literal translation. Larson maintains that literal and modified literal translations consistently err in that they choose literal equivalents for the words, i.e. the lexical item being translated. Literal translations of words, idioms, figures of speech, etc. result in an unclear, unnatural, and sometimes nonsensical translation. In a modified literal translation, the translator
usually adjusts the translation enough to avoid real nonsense and wrong meanings, but the unnaturalness still remains. For this reason, “To do effective translation”, exhorts Larson, “one must discover the meaning of the source language and use receptor language forms which express this meaning in a natural way” (6, italics mine).

However, it is difficult to mark a demarcation line between idiomatic and literal translation. Generally, translations fall on a continuum from very literal, to literal, to modified literal, to near idiomatic, to idiomatic, and then may even move on to be unduly free. But the translator’s goal should always be to reproduce in the receptor language a text which communicates the same message as the source language but using the natural grammatical and lexical choices of the receptor language, i.e. idiomatic translation (ibid.: 19).

Idiomatic translation is also preferred because interference from SL forms can affect the TT, leading to the translator needing to make some adjustments in form. For example, certain grammatical features such as parts of speech, person, voice, word order may differ from one language to another. In addition, languages show difference in their lexical features: different languages have different idioms, secondary meanings, metaphors, figurative meanings, figures of speech (which are challenging even in an idiomatic translation due to the cultural role in perceiving idiomatic and metaphorical expressions). In order to provide an adequate translation, a translator, therefore, is bound to carry out a careful semantic analysis of the ST and of how to express its message in the RL, naturally.

Efficient semantic analysis of a language stems from knowledge and awareness of its semantic structure. Following Chomskyan linguistics, Larson talks about two kinds of structures: surface and deep. Surface structure relates to form whereas deep structure is concerned with meaning (Chomsky 1957). Meaning is
structured in such a way that it becomes the network of semantic units and the relations between these units. To Larson (1984/1998: 29), it is the deep structure that is the meaning, and it is this meaning that serves as the base for translation into another language.

Larson (ibid.) indicates that semantic structure is more universal than grammatical structure: the types of units, the features and the relationships are essentially the same for all languages, and all have meaning components which can be classified as THINGS, EVENTS, ATTRIBUTES, or RELATIONS, for example. But not all languages have the same surface structure grammatical classes. Semantic propositions occur in all languages. They consist of concepts (groupings of meaning components) related to one another with an EVENT, THING, or ATTRIBUTE as the central concept, and can be represented in many different ways or surface structures.

In discussing semantic units, Larson (ibid.) shows how the semantic structure is hierarchically formed, starting with meaning component up to units of discourse. Meaning component is the smallest unit in the semantic structure. Meaning components are “packaged” into lexical items, but they are “packaged” differently in one language than in another, e.g. plurality and singularity with reference to verbs and nouns. The same meaning component can occur in several surface structure lexical items (forms), e.g. the word sheep is included in the word lamb [sheep+young], in the word ram [sheep+young+male], and in the word ewe [sheep+young+female]. Meaning components group together to form concepts. Meaning components and concepts can be classified semantically into four principal groups: THINGS (animate and inanimate), EVENTS (processes and experiences), ATTRIBUTES (quality and quantity), and RELATIONS (prepositions and connectives, relations between any two of the above semantic units).
This classification into semantic units is mainly meant to make things easier for semantic analysis of texts in a hierarchical pattern. In other words, just as in surface structure, units are grouped into increasingly larger units in a hierarchy of grammatical structures: morphemes unite into words, words into phrases, phrases into clauses, clauses into sentences, sentences into paragraphs and discourse units of various kinds, and these unite to form a text-story, letter, sermon, or whatever. Meaning components unite into concepts, concepts into propositions, propositions into propositional clusters, propositional clusters into semantic paragraphs, semantic paragraphs into episodes, episodes into episode clusters, and these units unite to form larger units of the discourse. While the former classification is form-based, the latter is meaning-based.

A distinction between form and meaning can also be made with reference to the communication situation. Following Grimes (1975), Larson maintains that meaning and form can be distinguished in terms of the speaker’s ability to control or have choices: there is much choice in meaning, but little in form. A speaker can choose which meaning to convey. After the intended meaning is determined, the speaker is then limited to a closed set of forms to choose, and priority is given to the forms that can best carry the meaning along with the emotive charge that the speaker wishes to express. The meaning which is chosen will be influenced by the communication situation, e.g. by who the speaker is, who the audience is, the traditions of the culture, etc. In translation, whichever form is chosen, it should communicate both the information and the emotion of the source language.

In the chapter titled, ‘Implicit Meaning’, Larson (ibid.) indicates that the information carried by a text can be either explicit or implicit. Explicit meaning does not pose a major difficulty to the translator; however, problems do occur when the
translator has to convey implicit information from a source language to a receptor language.

Generally, Larson (ibid.) divides meaning into three categories: referential, organisational, and situational. By ‘referential meaning’ it is meant the meaning which refers to a certain thing, event, attribution, or relation which a person can perceive or imagine, be it a word (‘apple’) or a sentence (What happened? What is happening? What may happen? Or is imagined like happening?). Organisational meaning is the meaning produced by organising referential meaning into bigger ‘packages’ and in different varieties of combinations; e.g. the word ‘apple’ referred to at the beginning of a text is the same apple throughout. It is this meaning that connects the text or discourse; it is the topic of the discourse. It is this meaning that puts referential information (old and new, theme and rheme) together into a coherent text. This meaning is signalled by deictics, repetition, groupings, and by many other features in the grammatical structure of a text. Finally, situational meaning is the meaning perceived according to the communication situation, i.e. the addressee-addressee relation, the place/time of communication, age, gender, social status, cultural setting, etc.

Meaning is expressed in information chunks. Information embedded in an expression can be either explicit or implicit. Implicit information is normally thought to be known by the addressee and might be let out by the addressee. Explicit information is overtly stated by lexical items and grammatical forms. Implicit information can be

1. Referential: e.g. Help will come soon. (agent known)
2. Organisational: i.e. pronouns referring to an afore-mentioned name or noun or event, etc.
3. Situational: e.g. A woman may say to her husband: *Tony is sick.* without explicitly mentioning that Tony is their son. ‘*No!*’ to a child might mean ‘*Don’t put your hand in the fire.*’

Broadly speaking, languages differ as to the manner and quantity of implicit meaning. Therefore, sometimes the translator might need to make implicit ST information explicit in the TT to compensate for the absent “shared information” due to cultural or linguistic reasons.

The final chapter in Part I introduces the reader to the practical side of translation. In this chapter, titled ‘Steps in a Translation Project’ – which is dealt with in some detail in an entire part later in the book – Larson sets six stages to the project, listed respectively as follows:

1. Establishing the project, i.e. also defined as ‘the four T’s’ (text [SLT], target [audience], team, and tools).
2. Exegesis, i.e. discovering the meaning of SLT through analysis.
3. Transfer and initial draft.
4. Evaluation.
5. Revised draft.
6. Consultation, i.e. accuracy of content, naturalness of style, and effect on the receptor language audience.

Part II, ‘The Lexicon’, includes twelve chapters, and is meant to discuss meaning as enshrined in lexical items and to provide the translator with some techniques that may help him/her in the process of analysing and transferring lexical meaning while translating.

Words are considered as ‘bundles’ of meaning components, and understanding the meaning of each word in a ST is a precondition for understanding, and hence
translating the ST into the TL. To do so, lexical items should be analysed and ‘unpacked’. In this process, it is important to say that lexical items carry concepts: “it is not the word that is being translated, but the total meaning of the word in combination” (ibid.: 202), i.e. in context, with reference to neighbouring words, genre, register, etc.

A concept is a recognisable unit of meaning in any given language. It is a bundle of components of meaning. It refers not to the form (word) but only to the meaning or content. In this regard, difference in communities can be noticed: not all language communities have the same ideas; reality is conceptualised differently in different communities (ibid.: 60). In translating concepts, the translator should unpack them even if s/he may use several words, or vice versa. The translator should be aware of skewing, i.e. between grammar and semantic categories, e.g. blue sky vs. sky blue. In such cases, the translator may make use of the ‘restatement’ technique, i.e. paraphrasing in order to clarify skewing.

Larson (ibid.) discusses some relations between lexical items, pointing out that an awareness of these relations can be of tremendous assistance to the translator in figuring out the meaning. Among these relations are: generic-specific relations, substitute words, synonyms, antonyms, reciprocal words (i.e. binary opposites), part-whole relations, and contrastive pairs. Componential analysis is also a very useful technique in this regard. It can show the translator which components are central (e.g. ‘human’ for man, woman, boy, girl), contrastive (ADULT, MALE, YOUNG, FEMALE), and even sometimes incidental (e.g. a chair with(out) arm in the set of furniture/chairs).

Different languages reveal mismatching in their lexical systems. It is this very mismatch which is the challenge for the translator, who must find the best way to
communicate the meaning of the source language in a receptor language which is often very different in its lexical inventory and different in how that inventory is grouped and divided. Mismatching between languages can occur at different levels. At the level of reference, for instance, speakers of the language “know the meaning” of a word because of their interaction with the THING, EVENT, or ATTRIBUTE to which it refers. Even though the same THING, EVENT, or ATTRIBUTE may exist in the referential world, the systems of reference do not match one-to-one across languages. Languages arbitrarily divide the meaning differently. A language may use one word to refer to something while another language may use more than one word to refer to the same thing. Here, the translator may make use of semantic sets analysis and componential analysis and, if need be, a descriptive phrase will need to be added in translation to make clear the contrastive meaning components.

Secondly, a translator is likely to come across mismatching of the semantic sets between the SL and the TL. According to Larson, “The lexical items of a language represent a great network of interrelated meanings often called a cognitive network” (ibid.: 100). Meaning can be discovered in terms of semantic contrast. That is, the analysis of meaning can reveal not only lexical disparities (even in subgroups of vocabulary closely related e.g. part-whole related words) but also points of connection between lexical items in languages (since lexical items in different languages may have certain meaning components in common, i.e. certain words occur in certain registers/topics, e.g. agriculture terms).

Finally, the translator is likely to face cultural mismatch of lexical items as different languages have different concentrations of vocabulary depending on the culture, geographical location, and the world view of the people. For example, an agricultural language community will tend to have more agricultural vocabulary than
non-agricultural communities. Here, the central component may be the same, but contrastive components may distinguish a lexical item from others in the same language and may have no exact equivalence in TL. Moreover, the translator has also to pay attention to incidental components as well, since what may be considered an incidental component of a lexical item in one language may be a contrastive component in another.

Analysing a lexical item with a single sense may not pose a big problem for the translator. But lexical items with primary as well as secondary senses can sometimes become difficult to translate. Secondary senses/meanings are generally context-dependent, and understanding them requires that the translator understand the context and be able to connect them to it. “It is the collocates which determine which sense, secondary or figurative, is indicated in a given phrase or sentence” (ibid.: 155): for example, the meaning of the word ‘dress’ varies in the following two clauses, *dress the chicken* (i.e. take the feathers off) and *dress the child* (put the clothes on). Collocation is concerned with how words go together, i.e. which words may occur in constructions with which other words. In English, speakers normally say *I had a dream*, in Russian *I saw (in) a dream*, in Arabic *I dreamt that .../ I saw in sleep / A dream occurred to me*. Some collocations in English, just as in other languages, are special in the sense that they have become fixed collocations (and are not idioms): e.g. *spick and span, hale and hearty, to and fro, now and then, neat and tidy, bread and butter, day and night, knife and fork, black and white, black and blue, ladies and gentlemen, rant and rave*. By contrast, idioms are special collocations or fixed combinations of words which have a meaning as a whole, but the meaning of combination is not the same as the meaning of the individual words, e.g. *kick the
bucket, hit the sack (to sleep), read between the lines, pass the buck (to shift a responsibility to someone else), keep/maintain/break the law.

Every word has its collocational range or restrictions which limit its meaningful usage. That is, a word’s collocational range is its collocational possibilities: Shiny coin/floor (collocates only with objects in which the surface is significant to the meaning) vs. bright sun/colour (with objects in which intensity of light is involved). Each language has lexical collocational restrictions: e.g. a person’s hand/fingernail vs. an animal’s paw/claw. Compare how the concept of ‘blame’ can be expressed in English and Arabic: Eng. Hold someone to blame vs. يلقي باللوم عليه yulqi billawmi ʿalayhi (to throw blame on him). Awareness of the collocation system of a language is of prime importance for the translator since translators are prone to collocational errors especially in non-mother tongue mostly as a result of cultural clashes between what is said in the ST and the patterns of the receptor culture.

Furthermore, Larson (ibid.) exhorts translators to pay attention to concordance, which means consistent matching of lexical items. A certain word may have several meanings in several occurrences in the same text, and the meaning is determined by the context. If this word is translated the same way every time it occurs in the ST, the translation would be full of collocational clashes, and there would not be concordance between the words of the SLT and those of the TLT. Larson mentions two types of concordance: real concordance and pseudo-concordance.84

She (ibid.) indicates that the process for discovering the various senses of words is rather complicated but can be very crucial for making dictionaries, learning a second language, and may also be helpful to the translator when no dictionaries are available which give an adequate description of the senses of words in the language (ibid.: 111). She points out that the two main rules about secondary senses are: (i) the
secondary senses of the source language can probably not be translated literally but will need to be understood in order to find a good equivalent, and (ii) the secondary senses of words in the receptor language will only mean what they are intended to mean if the context includes collocates which will signal the sense desired (ibid.: 117). She suggests four steps to the analysis of senses of words:

i. Collecting data: collecting as many examples of the use of the word as possible.

ii. Sorting the collocates into generic classes (e.g. depending on the (in)transitivity of the verb and its relation with the subject/doer).

iii. Regrouping the contexts (putting the examples of the collocates under each heading).

iv. Listing and labelling the senses of the word.

Such analysis along with awareness of context can help the translator resolve cases of semantic ambiguity: e.g. This suit is lighter (in weight? or in colour?).

Another related issue here is that of the figurative senses of a lexical item. Figurative senses are based on associative relations with the primary sense. In this connection, Larson discusses in some detail a number of figures of speech to draw the translator’s attention to some ways of manipulating meaning, especially in literary texts: metonymy, synecdoche, idioms, euphemism, and hyperbole.

Owing to the importance of the pronominal system in a language, Larson (ibid.) dedicates a complete chapter, ‘Person Reference’, to the discussion of the ins and outs of pronouns in translation. The pronouns of a language form a special semantic set which can be analysed by componential analysis: person, singular/plural, masculine/feminine, familiar/formal, animate/inanimate, honorifics, etc. Due to variations in pronominal systems across languages, ‘it is inevitable that some
components of meaning will be lost or added in the translation of pronouns’ (Larson, 133). In a nutshell, the translator should be aware of the differences between the pronominal systems of the languages s/he is dealing with and the specific use of a pronoun in the context of the text s/he is translating.

As has been mentioned above, meaning is categorised by Larson (ibid.) into referential, organisational and situational. In discussing the relationship between lexical items and situational context, it is important to point out that situation not only determines the choice of words but also their meanings. Used in certain circumstances or contexts, some words have the capacity to evoke extra feelings/senses other than their denotative meanings. Generally, connotative or emotive meanings of lexical items are often culturally conditioned, and (the degree of) their positivity or negativity is more or less a matter of the cultural setup of a language community. That is to say culture implies a world-view or a perspective, and a connotation-conditioner: How people view things, e.g. animals such as pig, which ranges from very positive in Papua New Guinea, neutral in English (Larson, 149) to downright negative in Arabic. Another important situational factor is the addresser-addressee relationship. This often determines choices of vocabulary that result in sub-dialects of a language, e.g. technical, motherese, journalesque, legalese, etc. Factors such as age, social class, educational level, levels of politeness and technical expertise of the audience will affect the choice of vocabulary and forms used. Obviously, the translator will want to avoid vocabulary which is specific to a limited group of readers and use the vocabulary which is understood by the majority of the people without excluding other readers, unless the source text author intends to show indications to any of these factors by the choices in the original or the translation is meant for a predetermined group of readers with a predetermined objective to achieve.
Moreover, it is quite important for the translator to pay attention to the communication situation with regard to the medium or manner of communication: i.e. formal speech, casual conversation, informal talk and the choice of vocabulary. The matter of formal versus informal is often closely related to the location where the speech is made, in writing especially formal letters than to a friend, the difference in subject matter, choice of technical terminology (to impress the audience with the speaker’s level of education or status in the community, but exclude non-expert audience), the region (America vs. Britain), etc.

Broadly speaking, Larson holds a general view of translation as the process of studying the lexicon, the grammatical structure, and the communication situation of the source language text, analysing it in order to determine the meaning, and then reconstructing this same meaning using the natural forms of the receptor language. In this sense, the translator is constantly looking for lexical equivalents between the SL and RL despite the cultural differences. In choosing adequate lexical equivalents, three matters must be kept in mind: i. there will be concepts in the ST which are known (shared) in the RL, but which will be translated by a non-literal equivalent; ii. there will be concepts in the SL which are unknown in the RL; and iii. there are lexical items in the text which are key terms, that is, they are important to the theme and development of the text and need special treatment.

In the first case, Larson (ibid.: 170) points out that “There is an extensive core of meaning components which are shared between languages. However, total matching cannot be assumed.... There is usually complete mismatch between the secondary senses and figurative senses of lexical items between languages”. The translator must not expect that there will be a literal equivalence between lexical items in different languages. A SL word may be translated by one TL word or by many, and
vice versa. It should be remembered that languages differ (i) as to the number and selection of meaning components combined in a word, and (ii) as to the semantic interrelationships that may exist between words. The translator should not expect concepts to be presented the same way in the receptor language as they are in the source language text being translated. In dealing with problems of the sort, the translator may use descriptive phrases or related words as equivalents. The translator should first “unpack” the meaning components of a word and, then, may decide to use descriptive/explanatory phrases to clarify things.  

Finding lexical equivalence between languages is easier when concepts are shared. But often the translator faces difficulties in finding a lexical equivalent for an object or event which is not known in the receptor culture and, therefore, there is no word or phrase in the RL. Here, the translator’s task is not only to look for an appropriate way to refer to something which is already a part of the experience of the RL audience, but he will be looking for a way to express a concept which is new to the speakers of that language. There are three ways in which a translator can find an equivalent expression in the RL: (i) a generic word with a descriptive phrase; (ii) a loan word; and (iii) a cultural substitute.

In order to do that, the translator should first of all analyse the form and function of the problematic lexical item. It is the translator’s responsibility to understand clearly the meaning and use in the context in which it occurs and find out ‘Which are the most important semantic components?’ ‘What is the author trying to communicate in that particular context?’ ‘Is the author concerned with the form or the function of the THING or EVENT? Or is it merely used to create a special effect?’

There are four possibilities to see this point: i. the form and function of a THING or EVENT in SL and its culture are the same in TL (e.g., ear); ii. same form
but different function (e.g., ‘bread’ may (not) be the staple food in a specific language culture); iii. same form not available but an alternative with a similar function exists (bread vs. manioc/cassava); iv. no reference available in the SL, no correspondence of form and function at all. Generally, a form that a word makes reference to may be substituted, omitted, described, or otherwise adjusted to avoid wrong, zero, or obscure meaning; and the function that a word makes reference to may be made explicit to avoid wrong, zero, or obscure meaning. If the translator attempts to achieve equivalence by modifying a generic word, s/he may resort to i. making explicit the form of the item, ii. making explicit the function of the item, iii. making explicit both the form and the function, or iv. modifying with a comparison to some THING or EVENT which does occur in the RL. If the translator attempts to achieve equivalence by explicating a loan word, especially names of people, places, etc. s/he may use a classifier (e.g. a man/place/thing etc. called so-and-so) or a modifying description of form and/or function. Again, a translator may try to find equivalence by dint of cultural substitute, e.g. burial vs. cremation. Here, the translator should be faithful (in terms of information communicated), avoid anachronism/historical concepts (e.g. an aeroplane in the 16th century), substitute things which are symbolic or create certain effects in SL by something similar in the RL in terms of symbolism and effect.

The last case is to try to find equivalence while translating key words in a text. All key words in a ST should be translated with consistency. The translator should not use different TL forms to indicate the same SL lexical item if it has the same meaning or refer to the same THING in several occurrences in the same text, or else the text will be less cohesive and the theme less obvious. This is beside the possible loss of the main point of the theme. In a cultural text/context, for example, key words should be translated as loan words, especially ‘token words’ which would rather be
transliterated, i.e. a special item in a civilisation’s dress code, because these token words, or what Newmark (1981) calls ‘theme words’, are the writer’s main concepts and terms of art (Larson, 199). Likewise, words with symbolic value, carrying metaphorical or figurative meaning as well as the basic meaning of the word, “may have to be supported with an attribute unless there is a strong cultural overlap between source and target language countries” (Newmark 1981). Symbolic words which are key words should be retained especially in a religious text.

The translator should also be sensitive to word combinations and false literal translation, e.g. house of representatives, minor premise, minus sign, miracle play, pale blue. In translating technical terminology, where many word combinations occur, the translator must always be on the alert so that s/he does not fall into the error of a false literal translation (livre de classe, *book of class’ instead of textbook, كتب *كتاب الأطفال instead of ‘كتاب المدرسي‘ kitaab as-saf instead of ‘الكتاب المدرسي‘ kitaab al-madrasa). Related to this is a problem in translation called faux amis, which may be defined as words in the SL which look very much like words in the RL because they are cognate with them, but in fact mean something different. They can be found mainly in historically related languages, and may be a result of borrowing where the borrowed word has undergone a semantic shift, or the interpretation of certain SL concepts in the light of TL culture.

While Part II above has offered some ways of identifying the meaning components of the lexical items of a language, showed how languages organise the lexicon very differently and also discussed ways of finding adequate lexical equivalents, Part III, titled ‘Propositional Structure’, moves up a step in the semantic approach to translation. This implies that translation is much more than finding word equivalences. Languages reveal similarity in terms of their propositional structures. Formal differences appear between languages when they express propositional
structures. That is, to translate is to abandon the grammatical structure of the SL and focus on identifying the semantic structure, i.e. the meaning of the grammatical structures, and by comparing how the meaning is expressed in different languages the translator will then choose the best way to express that meaning. Probably, this perspective of the translation process is the main motif behind Larson’s semantic approach.

A proposition is a grouping of concepts into a unit which communicates an idea (ibid.: 207). It is the smallest unit of communication (ibid.: 211). It is a semantic unit consisting of concepts, one of which is central and the others directly related to the central concept. A proposition may be encoded in various ways in a given language. The translator will look for the best way, the most natural way (ibid.: 208-9). A proposition may be described as a semantic unit consisting of concepts (THINGS, EVENTS, ATTRIBUTES) in which one concept is central and the other(s) related to it through a system of RELATIONS. This part of the book deals in some detail with propositions on the basis of their referential, situational and organisational meanings. On the basis of the referential meaning, propositions are classified into EVENT propositions (containing an EVENT as its central concept – a single action, experience, process, or state – and PARTICIPANTS and RELATIONS) and state propositions (containing THINGS and ATTRIBUTES which are related to one another by state relations, and consisting of two parts: the topic and the comment). Larson points out that identifying propositions helps the translator with explicit-implicit information. The situational meaning of a proposition consists in its illocutionary force, i.e. how a statement can be understood as a question; a question as a request or a command etc. depending on the illocutionary force driven by the situation of communication. The organisational meaning of propositions hinges on
their capacity to connect discourse in a streamline. In spite of the usefulness of semantic analysis of meaning on the basis of propositional structure, Larson, nevertheless, attracts the attention to possible complexity, especially when there is skewing in form or content, since language is never static but rather dynamic, i.e. in figurative propositions. She, however, provides some useful techniques that can help students with translating skewed constructions, e.g. marked expressions, metaphors, similes, irony, etc.

To conclude this part, such semantic analysis of a text by breaking all the sentences in a text into propositions and then analysing each one individually in order to understand and then translate the text would make translation a very tiresome and time-consuming task. However, it can be of immense value if this procedure is exercised on specific sentences, i.e. the sentences which the translator finds difficult to understand and/or translate.

In Part IV titled ‘Communication Relations’ Larson (ibid.) deals with meaning above the level of the proposition. By communication relations, she refers to the logical connections that relate propositions and proposition clusters together to make up higher unites of communication, i.e. addition and support, orientation and classification, and logical relations (reason-RESULT, means-PURPOSE, grounds-CONCLUSION, concession-CONTRAEXPECTATION), and stimulus-response roles (capitalisation here indicates the HEAD proposition, and the lower case the propositions or proposition cluster supporting the HEAD).

The relations among propositions should be compatible with other concepts as well as propositions in a text. Propositions can relate to concepts by way of delimitation and/or association. Delimitation relations occur when there is a proposition which is embedded within a concept relates to another HEAD proposition
by means of identification or description. Association relations can occur when the HEAD proposition or propositional cluster relates to a concept by way of a comment or parenthesis. Turning to communication relations between propositions, the two main relations are addition and support relations or, grammatically speaking, coordination and subordination. Addition relation occurs between propositions when both have equal status. Support relation is less prominent since it cannot share the same status endowed to the HEAD proposition.

Based on time of occurrence, communication relations of addition and support can also be classified into chronological and non-chronological. If the time factor is at play, then the relation is chronological, and is either sequential (when propositions follow one another in a chronological order) or simultaneous (when propositions occur at the same time). On the other hand, in non-chronological relations, time is not in the focus. “Most nonchronological relations are of a support-HEAD variety” (Larson 312). However, non-chronological addition relations between propositions do sometimes occur by means of conjoining (when two propositions are in parallel relation to each other and are of equal prominence in the discourse) or alternation (when the application of one proposition invalidates the other). The various non-chronological support-HEAD relations are divided into three types: orientation (by adding information regarding time, location, subject matter, and so on), clarification (by explaining further or restating), and logical (by giving grounds, reasons, etc.).

Adopting a behaviourist perspective in the final chapter of Part IV entitled ‘Stimulus-RESPONSE Roles’, Larson (ibid.) deals with communication relations that go beyond the chronological (sequential and simultaneous) sequences of EVENTS typical of narrative and dialogue discourses (cf. expository discourse, in which the structure of the discourse is based on logical, or argumentation, relations). “The
units of discourse have relations which are called stimulus-RESPONSE relations” (ibid.: 353), i.e. a question (stimulus) elicits an ANSWER (RESPONSE), and a problem (stimulus) a RESOLUTION (RESPONSE). That is to say, a stimulus EVENT brings about a RESPONSE EVENT.  

She (ibid.) points out that while the grammatical structure may leave certain components of meaning implicit for the reader/listener to deduce, in the semantic structure all the information, whether explicit or implicit, is included (ibid.: 345-6). Therefore, the translator should account for all the information in such a way that the TT readers are able to realise the potential of the ST meaning. TT readers are expected to understand the text, and the semantic analysis can help the translator clarify things which otherwise would seem to the TT readers obscure or nonsensical.

In Part V, Larson’s (ibid.) semantic approach deals with ‘Texts’. The author reiterates that texts are composed of semantic groupings arranged hierarchically: Meaning components unite into concepts, concepts into propositions, propositions into propositional clusters, propositional clusters into semantic paragraphs, semantic paragraphs into episodes, episodes into chapters, and so forth. In this way, she suggests for translators a way of how to view texts. In this regard, the translator should have a clear idea of how languages organise texts semantically, and attempt to mould the TT in such a way as to suit the conventional patterns of the TL and its speakers.

With reference to the importance of discourse genre for the translators, Larson (ibid.) points out seven types of discourse:

i. Narrative discourse: Its purpose is to recount. Its deep structure is characterised by plot structure, and the units consist of chronologically ordered and related past events. Generally, the agent of events is usually
FIRST PERSON and/or THIRD PERSON. The backbone is main-line events, which are usually ACTIONS. The primary structure of this type of discourse is stimulus-RESPONSE.

ii. Procedural discourse: Its purpose is to prescribe. Often, the event is a PROCESS, or an ACTION which is a PROCESS ACTION. Its constituents are procedures which consist of sequentially ordered and closely related steps. Generally, most of the ACTIONS have an AFFECTED, and the propositions often contain an INSTRUMENT or MANNER.

iii. Expository discourse: Its purpose is to explain or argue. Its constituents are logically related points about a theme, and these points consist of a theme plus comments.

iv. Descriptive: Its purpose to describe. Like expository discourse, units are related logically rather than chronologically. Both discourses centre on a theme, a topic to develop. But unlike expository discourse, in descriptive discourse the points related to the theme, i.e. the comments, are most likely state propositions rather than event propositions, and the theme is a THING or EVENT, rather than a proposition.

v. Hortatory: Its purpose is to propose, suggest, or command. The constituents are logically related proposed or obligatory injunctions, and the injunctions consist of proposed ACTIONS plus supporting reasons, purposes, etc. The SECOND PERSON is the agent.

vi. Repartee discourse: The purpose of this type of discourse is to recount speech exchanges. Its surface structure comprises a series of speech exchanges, i.e. called ‘drama’. The content of these exchanges may be narrative, expository, hortatory, procedural etc. The constituents are sequential exchanges, which are
related to one another in a structure which Longacre (1976: 193-94) calls game structure as in drama.

vii. Dialogue discourse: This is a combination of narrative and repartee. Its purpose is to recount events, speech events/exchanges, usually in the past (like a narrative) but within a repartee structure.

Such classification is undoubtedly useful for translators, but the translator should also take into account the fact that ‘almost any long text will be a mixture of genres’ (Larson: 423, italics in the original). Besides, the translator should be aware of how different languages prefer certain ways to handle certain genres even while presenting the same themes.

Turning to cohesion, Larson defines it as a discourse property which is “linear, running through the discourse, weaving it together” (ibid.: 425, italics in the original). As an integral element in the structural meaning of a text, cohesion is marked by three features:

i. the relational structure which binds propositions and propositional clusters together;

ii. spans, which are lexical and grammatical, e.g. participant span, location spans, temporal spans, setting spans, and spans related to a particular event or happening. This is marked by the repeated presence, continuous indication of something in a semantic paragraph;

iii. semantic domain, i.e. the things being referred to belong to the same domain; they centre around the same topic or have certain semantic components in common, e.g. sea, casting nets, lake, fisherman, boat, fish, etc.
Larson (ibid.) gives clues for mapping cohesion in the various discourse types. Such clues include: surface structure devices (e.g. pronouns, substitute words, verb affixes, deictics, pro-verbs, conjunctions, special articles, forms of topicalisation, etc.), lexical cohesion (synonyms, antonyms, substitution, parallel expressions, expectancy chains, pronouns), role (the relationship between participants, e.g. family relations etc. and how they are inferred without explicitly mentioning them repeatedly), conjunctions (temporal, non-chronological, etc.), chaining (part of previous sentence is mentioned in the next sentence, mostly at the beginning), verb morphology (tense, affixes, etc.), order (chronological and logical order, flashbacks, foreshadowing, etc.).

Another important feature of discourse structure is prominence, i.e. making one part of a text more important, more significant and more prominent than another. There are three kinds of prominence: thematic prominence (‘What is the topic all about?’ ‘What is its main issue?’ ‘And how it is maintained throughout the discourse?’), focus (on a specific participant or event), and emphasis (on certain pieces of information which are expected to surprise or excite or stir the emotions of the hearers). Among the devices that are used to signal prominence are markedness, cleft sentences, forefronting or change of order, passivisation, verb affixation, emphatic pronouns, sentence length, rhetorical questions, paraphrase, and performatives. Larson (ibid.: 457) remarks: “A misrepresentation of prominence in the translation can distort the meaning intended by the author, as well as make the translation sound very unnatural”. What the translator should do, then, is analyse the ST, recognise prominence and its devices, and find equivalent way to render it into the TL.

As pointed out earlier, Larson argues that there are three kinds of meaning: referential, structural, and situational. Therefore, an awareness of the communication
situation (i.e. the situational meaning) is a precondition for an understanding of the meaning of a text. In addition to the author’s intent, mood and style, situational meaning has to do with the relationship between the author/speaker and the addressee(s), where the communication takes place, when, the age, sex, and social status of the speaker and hearer, the relationship between them, the presuppositions that are brought to the communication (including the information that are left implicit), the cultural background of the speaker and of the addressee(s), and many other matters which are part of the context in which the discourse is spoken or written. The translator has to deal with all these aspects on two levels: first at the level of the audience of the original ST (including the author’s intent and purpose, the style and mood of communication, and some other factors such as age, status, culture, viewpoint of the world etc.), and then at the level of the TT audience.

The final chapter of Part V, ‘Information Load’, deals with how information, both old and new, is encoded and arranged in texts. According to Larson (ibid.: 477), “The information load is related to the speed at which new information is introduced and to the amount of new information which the language normally incorporates in particular constructions”. This mechanism varies not only in different languages but also in different genres within the same language. Larson (ibid.: 478-79) indicates five ‘special translation problems related directly to information load’: 

i. There can be information in the ST and source culture which is unknown to the TL speakers.

ii. The TL may have different ways of handling old vs. new information within the text itself, and the rate at which new information may be introduced may vary from language to language as well as the ways it is introduced.
Different languages vary in terms of expectancy chains and predictability, i.e. certain words or phrases are expected to follow certain others. This depends on the amount of shared, explicit and implicit information.

Redundancy patterns and functions will not match between languages.

Some implicit information of the source language and culture may need to be made explicit in the translation. By contrast, some explicit information in the ST may need to be made implicit in the TT.

Part VI, ‘The Translation Project’, is a more detailed account of the final chapter of Part I. This part presents some practical steps to be considered in a translation project so that it can achieve the desired goal. The first step is to establish the project. In so doing certain factors need to be taken into account. The first and foremost factor is the text. Before undertaking any translation, ‘the feasibility of the project and the desirability of the translation should be clear’ (ibid.: 509). In other words, which text is to be translated and why? The text factor is important in the sense that a lot that has to do with the translation depends on the choice of the text to be translated. Choosing a text entails subsequent awareness of its type and its aspects. Sometimes, choice of texts for translating is not made by the translator, such as in companies where it is the translator’s job to translate and s/he has little or no control over the material to be translated. It seems that literary or freelance translators enjoy some freedom in this regard.

The second factor is that of the target audience. Certain elements related to the target audience must be determined before translation, such as dialect, age level, educational level, bilingualism level, social level, purpose of the translation, prestige of the TL and SL, and so forth. The third factor is related to the translation team. The translation team is customarily made up of several people:
i. The translator: his/her background, knowledge, commitment, etc., and whether s/he is freelance or committed.

ii. Testers, reviewers, (sometimes) keyboarders and proofreaders, consultant, publisher, distributors, editorial committee, project coordinator, and all the other staff involved in bringing the translator up to life.

iii. The tools, i.e. the tools and equipments required, including stationery, dictionaries, references, encyclopaedias, thesauruses, computers and software, and the financial resources.

Having determined all the above-mentioned requirements, the translation project is now ready to move to the next step. There are some procedures to be followed in the translation project. These procedures are as follows:

i. Preparation: Assuming that the translator has sufficient linguistic and translational knowledge, s/he is supposed to go through the text several times and determine how the translation is going to be carried out, which points require further reading, etc. The translator should also refer to some background material to expand his/her knowledge of the topic.

ii. Analysis: This involves a critical reading of the text, and determining its semantic characteristics and the changes that should be made while translating the ST into the TL. Skewing should be eliminated at this stage. The analysis of the ST should be done at various levels: linguistic, semiotic, cultural, etc.

iii. Transfer: This is “the process of going from the semantic structure analysis to the initial draft of the translation” (ibid.: 524).

iv. Initial Draft: The first tangible version of the translation product remains at a rudimentary level. Here the translator may feel the need for more information
which can be extracted from different sources, like dictionaries, thesauruses, encyclopaedias, etc.

v. Reworking the Initial Draft: After the initial draft is prepared, this stage is dedicated to making the necessary corrections and amendments. Both accuracy and naturalness are taken care of at this stage and the second draft of the translation gets ready.

vi. Testing the Translation: This is a necessary stage that the second draft has to go through in order to maintain accuracy, clarity and naturalness in the translation. A freelance translator can do that him/herself, but it is always recommended that testing a translation should be done by someone else who is a translation expert. If the translator is committed then there can be various authorities to test the translation, ranging from the translator’s immediate boss to testers, reviewers, consultants, and editorial committees. Several testing techniques can be applied: e.g. comparison with the ST, back-translation into the SL, comprehension tests, naturalness and readability tests, and consistency checks.

vii. Polishing the Translation: After the translation is tested, testes’ recommendations, if applicable, are implemented at this stage, and the final script of the translation is made.

viii. Preparing the manuscript for the publisher: This is the final stage. The translation has come to a satisfactory level at which it can be submitted for publication.

3.4. Summary

This chapter has attempted to present the principal concerns of teaching translation at the undergraduate level, differentiating between translation taught as an
independent Bachelor’s programme and translation taught as a component of L2 undergraduate programme. Four translation textbooks have been presented. Given that translation is taught in the public universities of Yemen as a component of L2 undergraduate programme, these textbooks have been taken as a touchstone for incorporating TS theory and practice and as teaching materials for undergraduate students in Yemeni (and Arab) universities. In terms of suitability to undergraduate L2 Yemeni students, the four textbooks discussed above show the following:

i. Newmark’s book can be used more effectively as a manual for undergraduate students than as a textbook for translation class. It is very useful in terms of solving particular problems and indicating a variety of techniques for practical translation. But it lacks in pollinating the theories and concepts of linguistics, literary theory and culture studies into the translation class.

ii. Baker’s book is very useful since it adopts the study of equivalence in translation at different hierarchical levels. Its heavy reliance on linguistic studies is a positive aspect given the fact that the best way to understand the mechanisms of translation and translating is through linguistic investigation.

iii. The book by Hatim and Munday is excellent as a teaching material in the context of students at university, but being an ‘advanced resource book’ it should be chosen for students who have already been introduced to the basics of translation and several concepts of linguistics, literature, culture studies, etc.

iv. Larson’s book, though useful as it is, appears too difficult for students at the BA level, particularly as they are not introduced to functional grammar or in-depth semantics. Parts of it, however, are fairly relevant to the targeted group of students.
Endnotes

1 Here I am not limiting the use of translation as a pedagogical tool to the Grammar-Translation Method, which has been widely criticised and condemned. However, even this method cannot be judged as completely useless, and it seems that if applied in a planned manner, this method can be a useful tool for the student by increasing the student’s awareness of the structural differences between languages.

2 Schjoldager (2004: 131) comments that the reasons behind the widespread use of translation in language teaching are: i) the influence of tradition of L2 teaching, ii) some people actually like the grammar-translation approach because this method makes few demands on teachers, who can use the same material year after year, making the same corrections again and again because students tend to make exactly the same mistakes as their predecessors did; iii) with its emphasis on grammatical analysis and learning rules by heart, the grammar-translation method may be rather appealing to teachers and students who enjoy this approach to language.

3 As its name suggests, the direct method is the teaching of an L2 without reference to L1. The underlying idea is that L2 learning is – and should be – similar to natural L1 learning, which means of course that the use of translation as a tool is impossible. However, the direct method has been criticized for overemphasizing and distorting similarities between natural L1 learning and classroom L2 learning, and it is now widely acknowledged that an exclusive use of L2 in the classroom is neither practical nor recommendable (Schjoldager 2004: 129).

4 A brief account of these methods can be obtained in Norland and Pruett-Said (2006) and Bhatia and Ritchie (2006).

5 ibid. Original text:
To sum up, the basic argument is that translating increases one’s linguistic knowledge (Sewell 1996: 142), linguistic accuracy (Duff 1989/1992: 7) and verbal agility (Sewell 1996: 142) and that it promotes thoughtful, critical reading (Stibbard 1994: 15). Specifically, L1 translation is a time-saving way of checking comprehension (Stibbard 1994: 15) and helping students add to their passive knowledge of L2 (Fraser 1996: 112); L2 translation perfects ‘knowledge about and active mastery of’ L2 (Snell-Hornby 1985: 21). The reason why translation is such an asset for the L2 classroom is that it involves a beneficial constraint on the writing process: the learner is not free to choose the meanings that s/he must express and therefore may be forced to venture into unknown areas of the L2 system (e.g. Duff 1989/1992: 7, Cook 1998: 119, see also Campbell 1998: 58).

6 I do not assert that translation be the sole method for teaching L2, but I argue that it can be a useful tool, though.

7 Widdowson (1979) views learning through training as a cumulative process in which the learner is expected to work collectively with a large inventory of pieces of information in the work field, and that the aim of training is the preparation of learners to solve formerly identified problems by pre-established or acquired procedures – an approach fit for teaching Language for Specific Purposes, for instance, ‘particularly when the short-term objectives of the course and the long-term aims of instruction coincide to a large extent’ (Bernardini 2004: 19-20). Contrastively, learning through education is a generative process since it focuses on the growth of the student’s intellectual and cognitive capabilities, consistently enabling him/her to invest what s/he has learnt in dealing with the professional difficulties s/he might face (ibid.).

8 Bernardini (2004: 24) suggests that a general 3-year degree in translating and interpreting, which she calls ‘Disciplines of Linguistic Meditation’, should aim at providing:
- solid linguistic and cultural, written and spoken competencies in at least two languages
- a good background in economics, law, history, politics, literature and social anthropology
- a good understanding of the fields in which students will be likely to operate (depending on the socio-economic situation of each institution and its specialised interests)
- a good command of communication and information technology tools
- the development of the socio-cultural skills required for international relationships and for every aspect of linguistic support for businesses
- the capacity to work autonomously and to adapt easily to variable working situations.

For our purposes, some of these objectives can be adopted while designing and teaching a translation syllabus for the students in Yemeni universities. However, most of these aims belong to translator training rather than translator teaching. Besides, it has been mentioned that Yemeni universities have not yet set an independent undergraduate degree in translation.
Bernardini (2004: 27) insists that ‘undergraduate courses should focus decidedly on education’ and opines that ‘replication activities’ have little use for educating undergraduate students of translation, and should be considered as part of translator’s training, which should take place only after translator’s education, and may as well be taken care of in postgraduate degrees (ibid.: 24). Later in her paper she appears to somehow contradict her suggestion and concedes that ‘translators be formed through a reasoned, timely and thought-out balance of education and training’ (ibid.: 27), but she does not define the nature or features of such training and how it should be conducted. To view this matter with regard to Yemeni universities, this suggestion can only be partly applicable because of several considerations. First, there is hardly any institutions that offer postgraduate degrees in Translation Studies – the case is more so as far as students in the public universities in Yemen are concerned. That is, there is no BA nor MA degrees in translation. Translation is taught only as a part of the syllabus of the English Language Departments in the Faculties of Arts and Languages. Besides, if the undergraduate student does not get the chance to learn how to translate through invented professional scenarios or simulations, s/he may hardly find any other chance. Instead, s/he will come out with a bunch of theoretical concepts about translation, but perhaps without the knowledge of how to professionally apply them. In brief, there will be no coordination between theory and practice. It seems that Bernardini’s proposal is motivated by her occupation with the idea of translator specialisation after graduation. However, even if this is the case, not every undergraduate translation student knows for sure what he/she will specialise in after graduation. In addition, it is proposed at the beginning of this chapter that one of the basic aims of teaching translation at the undergraduate level, especially in universities such as the public Yemeni universities where translation is taught as a part of the Second Language Learning, not autonomously, is to provide the student with a possible job after graduation.

Beeby cites PACTE (Proceso de Aprendizaje en la Competencia Traductora y Evaluación) project, which works with a translation competence model that is divided into six sub-competencies: communicative competence in two languages, extra-linguistic competence, transfer competence, instrumental and professional competence, psycho-physiological competence and strategic competence. In order to decide which sub-competencies should be given priority in the foreign language class, the language teacher should know what the students are learning or are going to learn in other classes and what the objectives of the translation and interpreting classes are at different levels. In the context of teaching translation to students in Yemen, one can feel the necessity for coordination between language courses and translation courses.

Later in her paper, Schäffner (2004) appears to be in favour of a functionalist approach to the definition of translation. She recommends that students know translation as ‘the production of a functional target text maintaining a relationship with a given source text that is specified according to the intended or demanded function of the target text, i.e. translation skopos (Nord 1991: 28), and that ‘To translate means to produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addressees in target circumstances’ (Vermeer 1987, quoted in Schäffner 2004: 124).

“I am somewhat of a ‘literalist’, because I am for truth and accuracy. I think that words as well as sentences and texts have meaning, and that you only deviate from literal translation when there are good semantic and pragmatic reasons for doing so, which is more often than not, except in grey texts” (Newmark 1988: xi).

Though the book is, as Newmark claims, designed for final year undergraduate students, postgraduate students, autodidacts and home-learners, I find the book a suitable material, a reference book, for translators at any level. The book abounds in techniques based on pedagogical prudence. Although it seems to have more to do with translator training than translator education, the book also offers theoretical aspects of translation, and can be prescribed, in part, to the undergraduate students.

Newmark seems to have ignored the last ‘tension’.

Newmark seems to echo Vinay and Darbelnet’s definition of the unit of translation: ‘the smallest segment of an utterance whose cohesion of signs is such that they must not be separately translated’, although, apparently, reluctantly.

Newmark adds that in translating on the basis of unit of translation, Free Translation favours the sentence. Literal Translation the word.

The main premise of Functional Sentence Perspective theory is that the communicative goals of an interaction cause the structure of a clause or sentence to function in different kinds of perspectives. (e.g. put the stress on different words of a statement to make question, to affirm, to convey information. Jan Firbas, its pioneer and one of the leading linguists of Prague School, maintains that the focus in a sentence (markedness vs. unmarkedness, or given vs. new information), especially in non-SVO languages, cannot be determined on the basis of word-order or fronting (as is the case in English, where, in unmarked sentences, the theme comes first, carrying the ‘given’ information, and then...
follows the theme loaded with the ‘new’ information). But generally, a sentence in any language can have two parts: the given (theme, which is context-dependent) and the new information (rheme or non-theme, which can be context-independent). The determination of which part of a sentence is the given or the new depends on which part carries the higher degree of communicative dynamism (CD), which, according to Firbas (1972: 78), is based on the fact that linguistic communication is not a static, but a dynamic phenomenon. By CD I understand a property of communication, displayed in the course of the development of the information to be conveyed and consisting in advancing this development. By the degree of CD carried by a linguistic element, I understand the extent to which the element contributes to the development of the communication, to which, as it were, it ‘pushes the communication forward’.


Obviously, Newmark keeps sliding in the ‘sliding scale’ (Newmark 1988: 67) of what a unit of translation can be. He keeps fluctuating between the sentence, the clause and the word. In this regard, it is much safer to say that the word is the basic unit of translation since in fact it is the word and its basic meaning that a translator considers first while translating. The next step is to choose among the possibilities of meaning that a word carries as the context dictates. However, here one wonders whether idioms and fixed expressions can be dealt with in the same way as words, particularly as an idiom or a fixed expression generally has a single reference, even less than some words have, i.e. some words have more than one meaning.

During communication, participants are expected to observe the Co-operative Principle:  

Make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

(Grice, 1975: 45)

This implies a number of maxims of communication the participants are expected to adhere to, and are related to quantity (of information required in the exchange), quality (truth), relevance (to the situation, or exchange), and manner (clarity, brevity, and order). Any breaching of these would result in a swerve of communication track, and sometimes ‘marked’ talk.

Newmark does not agree that literal translation is widely viewed as inappropriate in translating literature, particularly poetry.

Newmark’s (1988) classification of these procedures is somehow confused and unclear. See chapter 8, and p. 103.

I think that the last example particularly is originally Arabic translated, and now accepted as a normal usage, into English. First, this is a very ancient Arabic proverb, and secondly camels have a wider place in the Arabic culture and life than in the English one.

Newmark dedicates a full chapter to the discussion of the use of componential analysis in translation, although it seems rather unpractical for a translator to apply it to the analysis of a complete text. Besides, there should be standards for CA which are applicable for all words.

Notice that Semantic Field Analysis is also a procedure which Newmark does not list here but somewhat else in the book.


Paepcke, F. 1975, in CEBAL No. 3, Copenhagen.

“Ironically”, says Newmark (1988: 185), “many reviewers of translated works neither know the original work, nor the foreign language, and judge a translation on its smoothness, naturalness, easy flow, readability and absence of interference, which are often false standards”.

Such collaboration between L2 courses and translation course is of special interest for us here since it applies to the situation in the universities in Yemen.

A written word cannot simply be “any sequence of letters with an orthographic space on either side” (Baker 1992/2006: 11, my italics). This stretch of letters, utnyutfbdft, is not a word. Baker should have added the phrase, “with a semantic value” or simply “any meaningful sequence of letters…….”. Of course, one has to agree with Baker in that meaning starts right from morphemes, through words, and up to complex lexical units, but it is too obvious that a sequence of letters which carries no meaning is not a lexical unit at all.


Baker cites the word privacy as an example of culture-specific non-equivalence between English and Arabic. It is obvious that she is completely wrong here, and Arabic does have an equivalent term, خصوصية, which means ‘the personal right to be alone or have personal matters of which you are the sole proprietor and have complete freedom to share them or keep them for yourself only’. Perhaps, one
would agree if Baker said that this concept got lexicalised under the influence of translation from, say, English, although the concept is as old as hill in Arabic culture.

32 Besides collocation, one of the main problems that Arab learners of English, especially the beginners, face is homonymy in relation to the use of dictionaries. Both the words ‘college’ and ‘kidney’ are translated in English-Arabic dictionaries with the same orthographic shape (ـلاطـ), where the former is pronounced as kolleyah, and the latter as kelyah. Had it not been for the diacritic system used in Arabic, which some dictionaries slightly use, beginners tend to confuse these words and their likes.

33 Again, Baker (1992/2006: 49) makes a mistake in her example of the equivalent of law and order in Arabic (al-qanoon wa al-taqatild – law and convention/tradition). These two (the three, in fact) Arabic words may co-occur, but this arrangement is stylistically harsh on the one hand, and on the other hand the word al-qanoon (law) collocates with al-ned’dam (system or order) where al-ned’dam comes before al-qanoon, as in al-ned’dam wa al-qanoon. Al-qawaneen (laws) collocates with al-aa raaf (عرف-), and al-a’?adaat (habits, customs) with al-taqualeed (conventions, tradition), respectively.

34 Baker (1992/2006: 83) defines grammar as a “set of rules which determine the way in which units such as words and phrases can be combined in a language and the kind of information which has to be made explicit in utterances”.

35 The English system of tenses, especially the perfective tenses and the modal verbs, poses a serious problem not only for Arab learners of English but also translators, who are faced with the obligation of rendering as much of the shades of meaning enshrined in the English perfective and modal structures into Arabic, despite the existence of some tools to indicate certain functions of the perfective mood and modalities.


37 Baker (182) also points out that Halliday and Hasan do not completely exclude a situational, rather than purely linguistic, relationship between a reference and its referent. For example, the first-person and second-person pronouns do not refer back to a nominal expression in the text but to the speaker/writer and hearer/listener respectively.

38 Baker (1992/2006: 218-9) reproduces an example by Enkvist to illustrate this point.

I bought a Ford. The car in which President Wilson rode down the Champs Elysees was black. Black English has been widely discussed. The discussions between the presidents ended last week. A week has seven days. Every day I feed my cat. Cats have four legs.

The cat is on the mat. Mat has three letters.

39 Blum-Kulka defines coherence as ‘a covert potential meaning relationship among parts of a text, made overt by the reader or listener through processes of interpretation’ (Quoted in Baker: 221), i.e. a property of the text despite the reader/listener’s engagement with the text through interpretation. Similarly, but with a slight difference, Sinclair opines that ‘the recall of past experience and knowledge of the world … are not part of the meaning of a text, but part of the human apparatus for working out the meaning of a text’ (ibid.), suggesting that meaning ‘resides’ in a text but is accessible only through the reader/listener’s interpretation mechanisms. On the other hand, Firth maintains that “‘meaning” is a property of the mutually relevant people, things, events in the situation’ and Kristen Malmkjær contends that ‘meaning arises in situations involving language’ (ibid.). Either way, one cannot deny the role played by the individual’s cultural and intellectual background in determining the meaning conveyed in a text through linguistic, textual and contextual elements. Both the views, it seems, are complementary to each other, and the coherence of a text remains a feature of the reader/listener’s judgement on the text. That is to say, whether a TT is coherent or not is based on the TT reader’s judgement, and has little to do with the ST structure of presentation. The aspect of coherence of a ST matters only to the translator insofar as s/he perceives it and is able to make ‘sense” out of the ST – a precondition for translating the ST for the TL audience.

40 Baker here uses the word literally to mean not the literal meaning of each word in a sentence or expression, but rather the wording or the literal or surface meaning of a complete sentence or expression. That is why she tries here to clarify a potential confusion that may be caused by this word: e.g., idiomatic expressions would shatter this definition to pieces if a speaker draws implication from the meanings of their individual words. According to Baker (1992/2006: 223), “idiomatic meaning is conventional and its interpretation depends on a good mastery of the linguistic system in question rather than on a successful interpretation of a particular speaker’s intended or implied meaning in a given context”.

41 The cat is on the mat. Mat has three letters.
Baker indicates that Grice delimited his discussion to spoken language only, namely to question-answer type of communication. But in the discussion here, owing to the usefulness of the Co-operative Principle in written discourse as well, terms such as speaker, conversation, say, etc., may also be taken to include the written form of language/communication.

However, at this point, one can but find a number of loopholes in this argument. Sometimes a roundabout way of expression is possible, as in circumlocution and innuendo. Again, sometimes a speaker may want to be purposefully ambiguous, e.g. using pun. Ambiguity here is part of the communication. Some people would, however, want to be intentionally irrelevant, perhaps as an indicator of a desire for change of conversation topic.

Political discourse is a hotbed of flouting these maxims.


Notice that the Arabic sentence does not use a verb here. Besides, modality in the English sentence is removed from the Arabic translation, for otherwise the translation would have deviated from the fixed or conventional expression used in Arabic.

Grigori Efimovich Rasputin is a Siberian monk who was religious advisor in the court of Nicolas II. He was assassinated by Russian noblemen who feared that his debauchery would weaken the monarchy (1872-1916). Rasputin is used now as a reference for his hiding behind a religious mask to satisfy his political intrigue, bestiality, and lecherousness.

Grice (1975: quoted in Baker 1998/2006: 233) elucidates his idea of universality for non-linguistic events by giving a scenario where a mechanic repairing a car asks his assistant to bring four screws with different sizes: the assistant will bring four screws, not two or three (Quantity); he will bring screws, not books (Relevance); he will bring screws with different sizes, not of the same size (Quality).

Baker (1998/2006: 248-9) suggests that a translator may ‘rightly’ delete extra information (footnotes, etc.) on a reference which is well-known to the target readers in order to avoid redundancy. I do not agree with her because the target readers have the right to know what the author of the SL text has said about a particular thing even if they know it. Not all information can be treated objectively.

The ‘parallel’ or theme-wise approach is preferred for several reasons: to avoid repetition and to maintain continuity. Another reason is that, even if the units are approached from a parallel perspective, linearity is still maintained in terms of gradualness of the topics discussed in the units.

Hatim and Munday (7) indicate Toury’s (1995) two tentative general ‘laws’ of translation:

1. the law of growing standardization – TT’s generally display less linguistic variation than ST’s,
2. the law of interference – common ST lexical and syntactic patterns tend to be copied, creating unusual patterns in the TT.

See Chapter II for more details.

Hatim and Munday refer also to other terms used of translationese: Spivak (1993/2000) uses ‘translatese’ to indicate ‘a lifeless form of the TL that homogenizes the different ST authors’, and Newmark uses ‘translatese’ “to mean the automatic choice of the most common ‘dictionary’ translation of a word where, in context, a less frequent alternative would be more appropriate.”


For example, the unit of translation is defined by Lörcher (1993:209) as the stretch of source text on which the translator focuses attention in order to represent it as a whole in the target language (quoted in Malmkjær 1998/2001: 286).

See also (Hermans 1999a:58-63) for a short description of Leuven-Zwart’s concept of transeme and archtranseme.

This is also the title of this thematic unit.


Hatim and Munday (2004) use the term “formal equivalence” instead of Nida’s “formal correspondence”.

Koller’s (1995) hierarchical equivalence is as follows, respectively: Formal equivalence (similar orthographic or phonological features), referential or denotative equivalence, connotative equivalence, text-normative equivalence, and pragmatic or dynamic equivalence.

Hatim and Munday (2004) distinguish between ‘the purpose of the translation’ and ‘the purpose of translation’ (in the collective). While the former is related to the agreement between the translator and his/her client(s) over a specific translation, i.e. an ST to be translated into a TT, the latter has to do with the skill involved in translating within a particular professional setting, e.g. subtitling.

For example, if a translator is committed to translating a text for a specific group, s/he may have to avoid explicit mention of what this group is sensitive to or may regard as inimical or politically, religiously, etc. hurtful to their sentiments, unless otherwise required.
In a way to avoid repetition, Grice’s maxims and Co-operative Principle, and the concept of implicature will not be discussed here. Some details are available under the Mona Baker heading above.

Gutt (1998) classifies language use (hence translation process) into interpretive and descriptive. Focussing more on the interpretive use of language, he points out that an original utterance and what is used to represent it should be interlinked by a relationship of ‘interpretive resemblance’ in which the speaker selects a specific form to interpret the original utterance, on the one hand ‘satisfying’ the expectation of optimal relevance, and based on ‘a claim to faithfulness’ by the speaker, on the other. In exposing the pragmatic role of the notion of ‘translation’, Gutt maintains that the relevance theory locates translation under the umbrella of the interpretive use of language because ‘translation is intended to restate in one language what someone else said or wrote in another language’. Moreover, Gutt views text typologies as guides to relevance whereby, as per what speakers of a language consider as conventional to certain situations of language use, the speaker uses certain ‘labels’ conventionally known to fall in certain text types as a means of guidance for the hearer/reader ‘in their search for optimal relevance’.

Hatim and Munday (2004: 61-62) illustrate the effect of descriptive-interpretive dichotomy by suggesting two translation situations, one involving the production in English of a tourist brochure (with the instruction of producing a text that is ultra-functional in guiding tourists round a city), the other the production of an advert (with the instruction that the translation is for use by top planners of marketing strategy). Thus, while the resultant English tourist brochure could conceivably be composed without reference to the original, the translation of the advertisement would be crucially dependent on the ST. The tourist brochure would be an instance of descriptive use in that the TT is intended to achieve relevance in its own right, whereas the advertisement translation could succeed only in virtue of its resemblance to some SL original.


Monitoring is expounding in a non-evaluative manner. This is in contrast with managing, which involves steering the discourse towards speaker’s goals (Hatim and Munday: 344).

Hatim and Munday support Gregory (1980), and also include an extract from his paper.

However, there are situations where this supposition may not apply, e.g. translating a political text which is meant to serve the ends of a particular group as opposed to another – for example, a (Palestinian) suicide bomber is sometimes translated into Arabic as فیدا عی, ‘a patriot who sacrifices his/her life for a noble cause’ or انیهما ‘suicide (person)’ in certain contexts.

SCHEMA (plural SCHEMATA): A global pattern representing the underlying structure which accounts for the organization of a text. A story schema, for example, may consist of a setting and a number of episodes, each of which would include events and reactions. SCRIPT: Another term for ‘frame’. These are global patterns realized by units of meaning that consist of events and actions related to particular situations. For example, a text may be structured around the ‘restaurant script’ which represents our knowledge of how restaurants work: waiters, waitresses, cooks, tables where customers sit, peruse menus, order their meals and pay the bill at the end” (Hatim and Munday: 348).

See also Venuti (1995). Also, Hatim and Munday (2004: 97) point out:

The Translators Association in London proposes a model contract for literary translation based on recommendations to improve the status of translators passed by the general conference of UNESCO held in Nairobi in 1976. The translator undertakes to deliver a translation ‘which shall be faithful to the [original] Work and rendered into good and accurate English’, and guarantees s/he ‘will not introduce into the translation any matter of an objectionable or libellous character which was not present in the Work’. At the same time, the translator’s right to copyright over the translation is asserted as well as a moral right to be identified as the producer of the TT.


Hatim and Munday (2004: 201-4) support the argument with an excerpt from Peter Fawcet’s article ‘Translation and Power Play’ (1995), in which he sees the reader, the author and the translator as the main ‘actors and victims of power play’.
The important elements in this ‘politeness’ strategy must be kept in translation; Hatim and Mason (1997: 87) specify the following elements as important in the encoding of ‘politeness’ strategy, i.e. “lexical choice, sentence formation, imperatives, interrogatives, unfinished utterances, intonation, ambiguity of reference.” For example, in a cigarette offer, the invitation “Wanna fag?” is acceptable between two friends who maintain an equal power relationship, while if a clerk expressed himself in the same way to his boss, there would have to be a reason transcending the mere offer of ‘goods’.

See also the Brazilian Cannibalism.

Cronin’s Translation and Globalization (2003) offers an in-depth study of some of the complex cultural, political and philosophical consequences of translation in the global age.


One can but doubt the apparent naivety of such generalisation, for the stability of meaning across languages implies universality of meaning. Of course, (almost) everything in one language can be expressed in another, but the manner of expression, the attitude towards what is expressed, and the speakers’ worldview, and culture-specific meanings may very often show variance.

To Larson, idiomatic translation is a translation which has the same meaning as the source language but is expressed in the natural form of the receptor language, i.e. by retaining the meaning, not the form. Modified literal translation is one that changes the order of SL text into a TL structure/form, but still does not communicate the meaning clearly.

An interesting point to mention here is that Larson’s book is foreworded by Peter Newmark, who holds a different view of literal translation.

According to Larson, unduly free translations are not considered acceptable translations for most purposes since they may add extraneous information not in the source text, or may change the meaning of the source language, or distort the facts of the historical and cultural setting of the source language text. Sometimes, Unduly Free T’S are made for purpose of humour or to bring about a special response from the receptor language speakers.

Real concordance occurs when within the same text/document the same word or expression is used repeatedly to refer to the same concept; that is, it has the same meaning each time it occurs, e.g. the boy ran to the store, ran up to the shopkeeper, and asked for a can of milk. Then he ran out into the street and, holding the milk tightly, ran home as fast as he could run (i.e. to express urgency). On the other hand, pseudo-concordance occurs when a lexical item has different meanings in the same text, e.g. the motor of the car stopped running near brook which was running, and the driver decided he would run back to the town and see if he might run into someone who could help him.

For instance, in translating money terms (money system): 1. sometimes the value of monetary unit would change over years and it is very difficult to be sure of an exact equivalence. Here perhaps the alternative is to borrow the lexical form from the SL but that would mean nothing to the RT reader; 2. if the value of the money is not in focus, the translator can say “a type of money called peso”, or s/he may as well equate it with the RL type of money.


In discussing EVENT propositions, Larson also deals with case roles, i.e. agent, causer, affected, beneficiary, accompaniment, resultant, instrument, location, goal, time, manner, and measure.

This topic-comment division resembles the theme-rheme categorisation, but tends more towards the Firbas’ perspective.

For example, in The students who failed will be allowed to retake the exam, the second proposition (the students failed...) has a delimiting relation with the first one (the students will be allowed to retake the exam), an identifying relation. That is to say, these two propositions are not independent of each other; instead, the second proposition in particular is embedded within the concept (i.e. of failing, of identifying or delimiting). Likewise, in the sentence Damascus, which is the capital of Syria, is the oldest inhabited city in the world, the second proposition (Damascus is the capital of Syria) merely adds further descriptive information to the first one (Damascus is the oldest inhabited city in the world).

A comment “is used to label associative units which are more closely tied to the concept to which they relate” (Larson 1984/88: 302): e.g. The accident, I think I have never seen something like that before, is the result of reckless driving. Parenthesis, on the other hand, is used for associative units which are ‘more peripheral’ to the HEAD proposition: e.g. That corrupt officer (someday I hope he will caught red-handed and brought to justice) asked me for a huge bribe.

e.g. That fat thug stood, lifted his hand, and slapped Jack on the face.

e.g. The baby cried because it was hungry. There is a RESULT-reason relation here.
93 e.g. You left and she started crying; You may go out after you finish your work.
94 e.g. One of the robbers was driving the car and the other was shooting at the police car; She usually sings while she cooks.
95 e.g. She works for a computer company and brings up her children.
96 e.g. Are you coming or going?. Either take it, or leave it.
97 The stimulus-RESPONSE relation is described as more flexible than the reason-RESULT relation: while the latter is a fixed pair, the former can allow more flexible roles. For example, a question can be responded to by a COUNTERQUESTION, not an answer as is expected in reason-RESULT relation. The stimulus-RESPONSE roles divide into two main groups: narrative roles (characteristic of narrative discourse) and speech roles (characteristic of dialogue).
98 Larson crams this part of the book with terminologies and classifications, much above the level of understanding capabilities of an undergraduate student. That is why the discussion here appears to be on a touch-and-go basis.