

THE Theory OF TRANSLATION

WHAT IS TRANSLATION? AESTHETICS AND TRANSLATION

As a more nontechnical definition the Webster's New World dictionary define "to translate" as follows:

1. To move from one place or condition to another; transfer; specif. a) theol. To convey directly to heaven without death; b) Eccles. To transfer (a bishop) from one see to another; also, to move (a saint's body or remains) from one place of interment to another.
2. To put into the words of a different language;
3. To change into another medium or form; to translate ideas into action;
4. To put into different words; rephrase or paraphrase in explanation.
5. To transmit (a telegraphic message) again by means of an automatic relay.

According to this most simple definition, translation is putting the words of a certain text (written or spoken) into the words of a different language. But here, as with anything else, comes the issue of quality. Among many existing translations, which are "of high quality" and which are "of poor quality"? in other words, what are the differences between translations which once read are said to be "good" and the ones which are not said to be so? Is it a matter of enjoy ability? Literary beauty? Comprehensibility?

Clearly, we are talking about an evaluation. And any evaluation must be based on some certain well-defined and clear-cut criteria. The scope of such an evaluation is extremely vast because first, there are numerous languages; second, there are there are several various literary genres and different literary styles; third, it vitably counts that who has written the text and for whom it has been written.

Aesthetics is a basic element of our discussion. The Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines it as follows:

1. Plural but singular or plural in construction: a branch of philosophy dealing with the nature of beauty, art, and taste and with the creation and appreciation of beauty.
2. A particular theory or conception of beauty or art: a particular taste for or approach to what is pleasing to the senses and especially sight.
3. Plural: a pleasant appearance or effect.

Various translation theorists have defined "ideal" translation differently. Some translations have come across with the following approach in any relevant text:

Had the writer of a text, had a native- like competency in the target language (i.e. had he/ she been a perfect bilingual) and had he/she wanted to rewrite

the text he/she had previously written in the source language, in the target language, the target text (TT) he/she would have written, would be the ideal manifestation of the “Best Conceivable Translation” of the original text. Each and every assessment and/ or evaluation of any given translation should be based on this precious imaginary model. Any translator should try to translate as similarly as possible to this ideal model. And his/her translation is as “good” as it is similar there to.

The appearance of what was just said sounded as if it were rather something written about the ideal “translator” are not the ideal “translation”.

“Language” – is a system of conventional spoken or written symbols by means of which human beings, as members of a social group and participants in its culture.

Combining this definition with what goes on in the mind of writer, we get to the conclusion that the best or the ideal translation is the one which communicates the intentions of the original writer in the best possible way.

In the case of our imaginary writer and translator (who were the same) this soul (the producer of artistic beauty) is the same, too. So, the aesthetic value of both source text and target text should be the same. However, here another crucially important factor comes into, i.e. the aesthetic capacity of the two languages, which are almost never equal. That is exactly why they say that poetry is impossible to translate, although no theoretical proof has ever been given for this impossibility.

Anyway, in our imaginary case, the aesthetic level of both texts (ST and TT) will be aesthetically as close to each other as possible.

Aesthetics by itself is not a criterion of a good translation. Instead, it is the equality of aesthetic levels in both the ST and TT that counts. As far as exact equality usually cannot be achieved, the most desirable case would be “an as closely equal as possible”.

WHAT LOCALIZATION CAN LEARN FROM TRANSLATION THEORY

Translation theory may have a lot to learn from localization models, but the latter may have just as much to learn from the former.

Translation theory has a lot to learn from localization. Efficiency, team work, how to explain problems to clients, how to work with technology, to name just a few. So why would localization have nothing to learn from translation theory? It is a problem of sifting ideas from jargon. But that complaint works both ways.

Translation is just a small part of localization,

Process models of localization list as many as twelve steps, starting from “Analysis of Received Material”, “Scheduling and Budgeting”, through to

“Post-Mortem with Client”. Those are the phases that project managers have to consider. Translation is usually just one of those steps, so one concludes that translation is just a small part of localization. Seen in terms of the business model, that is entirely correct. However, you could equally argue that since bilingual secretaries translate, translation should only be taught and studied as part of general secretarial duties. Or better, since people talk on the telephone, phonetics is part of telephony. Translation is one of the fundamental things that people do with language, alongside speaking, listening, writing and reading. The localization models, on the other hand, are just business procedures, suited to a certain kind of product at a certain end of a certain century.

Let us map out a few dimensions here. If you think localization covers it all, consider that translation theory stretches back to Horace and Cicero, at least. If you imagine translation has disappeared under the growth of the localization industry, calculate the number of people that translate in speech and writing every day, within bilingual families, multilingual communities, in social services, the courts, business meetings, news services, as well as in literature, large conferences and our multilingual dreams.

Translation is just the replacement of language strings.

If translation is not just a part of localization, it must be more than what localization portrays it as: the replacement of natural language strings. Sure, we get all those wonderful notes on the need to adapt to date formats, currencies, time zones, even symbolic color codes and all those other things that localization seems to add in addition to translation. Those lists might impress clients. But translators have been dealing with all that for millennia, adapting as well as replacing language strings.

Among the many theories for this, perhaps the best known is Eugene Nida’s concept of “dynamic equivalence”, which covers all those bits of cultural adaptation.

Translation Theory is just part of applied linguistics.

For the past 20 years or so, translation theory has been accepting ever wider forms of text transformation, without having to call it “localization”. From at least 1984, Scopostheorie (theory of purposes) and Handlungstheorie (action theory) have insisted that translation is not dominated by the source text, but by relations with the client and the overall purpose or function that the translation has to achieve in the target culture. Those theories have pushed translation beyond the concept of equivalence, which always referred to the source text. In so doing, the theories have taken translation away from the clutches of linguistics as an academic discipline. The question of defining the purpose of a translation requires applied sociology, the ethics of communication and a Gamut of considerations that are loosely held under the term “cultural studies”.

Translation Output is like Translation Input.

Translation theory now freely admits that translators do more than produce equivalent texts. Another Branch of Translation Theory called Descriptive Translation Studies, has been showing this for rather more than 20 years. Those empirical studies have looked at all forms of translation in many cultures over long historical periods. They have found the following general tendencies:

- a) Translations are usually slightly longer than non-translations;
- b) Translations use a narrower range of words than non-translations;
- c) Semantics are more explicit values in translations than non-translations;
- d) Optional syntactic connectors are used more in translations;
- e) The more expert the translator, the larger the text units they work on.

The historical branch of Descriptive Translation Studies has also shown that the norms of translations are very different in different cultures and at different times.

Translation is thus operating not just on words, but on the ways cultures perceive their relations.

LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO TRANSLATION THEORY (1 PART)

The linguistic approach to translation theory focusing on the key issues of meaning, equivalence and shift began to emerge around 50 years ago. This branch of linguistics, known as structural linguistics, features the work of Roman Jakobson, Eugene Nida, Newmark, Koller, Vinay and etc. It wasn't long however, before some theorists began to realize that language wasn't just about structure – it was also about the way language is used in a given social context. This side of the linguistic approach is termed functional linguistics.

Douglas Robinson writes for some translators “the entire purpose of translation is achieving equivalence. The target text must match the source text as fully as possible.” Linguistic meaning and equivalence are the key issues for Roman Jakobson, in his 1959 work “On Linguistic Work of Translation”, states 3 types of translation:

- 1) Intralingual – rewording or paraphrasing, summarizing, expanding or commenting within a language;
- 2) Interlingual – the traditional concept of translation from ST to TT or the “shifting of meaning from one language to another”.
- 3) Intersemiotic – the changing of a written text into a different form, such as art or dance.

For Jakobson, meaning and equivalence are linked to the interlingual form of translation, which “involves two equivalent messages in two different codes”. His theory is linked to grammatical and lexical differences between languages, as well as to the field of semantics.

Equivalence is also a preoccupation of the translator Eugene Nida who rejects “free” versus “literal” debate in favour of the concept of formal and dynamic equivalence – a concept that shifts the emphasis to the target audience. Formal equivalence centres on the form and content of the message of the ST while dynamic equivalence, later termed functional equivalence, “aims at complete naturalness of expression” in the TT.

His linguistic theory moves towards the fields of semantics and pragmatics, which leads him to develop systems for the analysis of meaning. These include:

- 1) Hierarchical structures (superordinates and hyponyms) such as the hyponyms “brother” or “sister” and superordinate “sibling”. In a cultural context it may not be possible to translate “sister”, so “sibling” may need to be used.
- 2) Componential analysis, which identifies characteristics of words that are somehow connected, such as “brother” in Afro-American talk does not necessarily refer to a male relation born of the same parents.
- 3) Semantic structural differences where the connotative and denotative meanings of homonyms are identified, for ex, “bat” the animal and the piece of sporting equipment.

The emphasis of the structural approach to translation changes towards the end of the 1950s and early 1960s with the work of Vinay, Darbelnet and Catford, and the concept of translation shift, which examines the linguistic changes that take place in the translation between the ST and TT. Vinay and Darbelnet discussed three possible strategies of direct (literal) translation:

- 1) Literal translation or word-for-word ;
- 2) Calque, where the SL expression is literally transferred directly into the TL.
- 3) Borrowing – the SL word is transferred directly into the TL.

Oblique (free) translation covers 4 strategies:

- 1) Transposition – interchange of parts of speech that don’t effect the meaning.
- 2) Modulation – reversal of point of view.
- 3) Equivalence – same meaning conveyed by a different expression, which is most useful for proverbs and idioms.
- 4) Adaptation – cultural references may need to be altered to become relevant.

Two other important features arise from the work of Vinay and Darbelnet. The first of these is the idea of “servitude”, which refers to the compulsory changes from ST to TT; and “option”, which refers to the personal choices the translator makes, such as the modulation. Option is an important element in translation because it allows for possible interpretation of the text, especially literary texts.

In 1965 the term “shift” was first applied to the theory of translation by Catford in his work “A Linguistic Theory of Translation”. Here he discusses two types of shift:

- 1) Shift of level, where a grammatical concept may be conveyed by a lexeme;
- 2) Category, shifts, of which there are 4 types – structural shifts; class shifts; unit or rank; selection of non-corresponding terms.

His systematic linguistic approach to translation considers the relationship between textual equivalence and formal correspondence. Textual equivalence is where the TT is equivalent to the ST, while formal correspondence is where the TT is as close as possible to the ST. Catford also considers the law of probability in translation, a feature that may be linked to the scientific interest in machine translation at the time.

LINGUISTIC APPROACH TO TRANSLATION THEORY (II PART)

Some thirty years after Vinay and Darbelnet proposed the direct and oblique strategies for translation, Kitty van Leuven-Zwart developed a more complex theory, using different terminology, based on their work. Her idea is that the final translation is the end result of numerous shifts away from the ST, and that the cumulate effect of minor changes will alter the end product. She suggested two models for translation shifts:

- 1) Comparative – where a comparison of the shifts within a sense unit or transeme (phrase, clause, sentence) between ST and TT is made. She then conducts a very detailed analysis of the “architranseme” or the core meaning of the word, and how this meaning can be transferred to the TL. She proposes a model of shift based on micro- level semantic transfer.
- 2) Descriptive – situated in the linguistic fields of stylistics and pragmatics deals with what the author is trying to say, and why and how this can be transferred to the TT. It deals with differences between the source and target cultures and serves as a model on a macro level for literary works.

In 1970s and 1980s sees a move away from the structural side of the linguistic approach as functional or communicative consideration is given to the text. Katharina Reiss continues to work on equivalence, but on the textual level rather than on the word or sentence level. She proposes a translation strategy for different text types, and says that there are 4 main textual functions:

- 1) Informative- designed for the relaying of fact. The TT of this type should be totally representative of the ST, avoiding omissions and providing explanations if required.
- 2) Expressive – a “higher” level of literary text such as poetry in which the TT should aim at recreating the effect that the author of the ST was striving to achieve.

- 3) Operative – designed to induce a certain behavioral response in the reader, such as an advertisement that influences the reader to purchase a particular product or service. The TT should therefore produce the same impact on its reader as the reader of the ST.
- 4) Audomedial- films, television advertisements, etc. supplemented with images and music of the target culture in the TT.

Christiane Nord in “Text Analysis in Translation” (1989/91) states that there are 2 types of translation:

- 1) Documentary – where the reader knows that the text has been translated.
- 2) Instrumental – where the reader believes that the translated text is an original.

She places emphasis on the ST as she proposes a ST analysis that can help the translator decide on which methods to employ. Some of the features for review are subject matter, content, presupposition, composition, illustrations, italics, and sentence structure.

Linked to Nord’s theory of ST analysis is discourse and register analysis which examines how language conveys meaning in a social context. One of the proponents of this approach was M.Halliday, who bases his work on Systemic Functional Grammar – the relationship between the language used by the author of a text and the social and cultural setting. Halliday says that the text type influences the register of the language – the word choice and syntax. He also says that the register can be divided into 3 variables:

- 1) Field – the subject of the text;
- 2) Tenor – the author of the text and the intended reader;
- 3) Mode – the form of the text.

All of which are important on the semantic level.

The linguistic approach to translation theory incorporates the following concepts: meaning, equivalence, shift, text purpose and analysis, and discourse register; which can be examined in the contexts of structural and functional linguistics, semantics, pragmatics, correspondence, sociolinguistics and stylistics.

TRANSLATION PROCEDURES, STRATEGIES AND METHODS

Translation typically has been used to transfer written or spoken SL texts to equivalent written or spoken TL texts. In general the purpose of translation is to reproduce various kinds of texts – including religious, literary, scientific, and philosophical texts – in another language and thus making them available to wider readers.

The translating procedures, as depicted by Nida (1964) are as follow:

1. Technical procedures:
 - a) Analysis of the source and target languages;

- b) A thorough study of the source language text before making attempts to translate it;
- c) Making judgements of the semantic and syntactic approximations.

2. Organizational procedures:

Constant reevaluation of the attempt mode;

Contrasting it with the existing available translations of the same text done by other translators, and checking the text's communicative effectiveness by asking the target language readers to evaluate its accuracy and effectiveness and studying their reactions;

Krings (1986) defines translation strategy as "translator's potentially conscious plans for solving concrete translation task", and Seguinot (1989) believes that there are at least 3 global strategies employed by the translators:

- 1) Translating without interruption for as long as possible;
- 2) Correcting surface errors immediately;
- 3) Leaving the monitoring for qualitative or stylistic errors in the text to the revision stage.

Moreover, Loescher (1991) defines translation strategy as "a potentially conscious procedure for solving a problem faced in translating a text, or any segment of it".

Bell (1998) differentiates between global and local strategies and confirms that this distinction results from various kinds of translation problems.

Venuti (1998) indicates that translation strategies "involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it". He employs the concepts of domesticating and foreignizing to refer to translation strategies.

Newmark (1988) mentions the difference between translation methods and translation procedures. He writes that, while translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language.

He goes on to refer to the following methods of translation:

- a) Word for word translation;
- b) Literal translation;
- c) Faithful translation;
- d) Semantic translation;
- e) Adaptation;
- f) Free translation;
- g) Idiomatic translation;
- h) Communicative translation.

Greedler puts 4 some procedures of translating CSCs:

- 1) Making up a new word.
- 2) Explaining the meaning of SL expression in lieu of translating it.
- 3) Preserving the SL term intact.

- 4) Opting for a word in the TL which seems similar to or has the same “relevance” as the SL term.

Defining culture-bound terms as the terms which “refer to concepts, institutions and personnel which are specific to the SL culture”, Harvey (2000) put forward the following 4 major techniques for translating CBTs:

- 1) Functional equivalence;
- 2) Formal equivalence or “linguistic equivalence”;
- 3) Transcription or “borrowing”;
- 4) Descriptive or self-explanatory translation;

The following are the different translation procedures that Newmark (1988) proposes:

- 1) Transference;
- 2) Naturalization;
- 3) Cultural equivalent;
- 4) Functional equivalent;
- 5) Descriptive equivalent;
- 6) Componential analysis;
- 7) Synonymy;
- 8) Through-translation;
- 9) Shifts or transpositions;
- 10) Modulation;
- 11) Recognized translation;
- 12) Compensation;
- 13) Paraphrase;
- 14) Couplets;
- 15) Notes.

Leppchalme (1997) proposes another set of strategies for translating the proper name allusions:

- 1) Retention of the name.
 - a) Using the name as such.
 - b) Using the name, adding some guidance.
 - c) Using the name, adding a detailed explanation, for instance, a footnote.
- 2) Replacement of the name by another:
 - a) Replacing the name by another SL name;
 - b) Replacing the name by a TL name.
- 3) Omission of the name:
 - a) Omitting the name, but transferring the sense by other means, for instance, by a common noun.
 - b) Omitting the name and the allusion together.

It can be claimed that the best translation method seem to be the one which allows translator to utilize “notes”.

THE HISTORY OF MACHINE TRANSLATION (1 PART)

The history of machine translation generally starts in the 1950s, although work can be found from earlier periods. The Georgetown experiment in 1954 involved fully automatic translation of more than sixty Russian sentences into English. The experiment was a great success and ushered in an era of significant funding for machine translation research. The authors claimed that within 3 or 5 years, machine translation would be a solved problem.

The history of machine translation dates back to the 17th century, when philosophers such as Leibniz and Descartes put forward proposals for codes which would relate words between languages. All of these proposals remained theoretical, and none resulted in the development of an actual machine.

The first patents for “translating machines” were applied for in mid 1930s. One proposal, by Georges Artsrouni was simply an automatic bilingual dictionary using paper tape. The other proposal, by Peter Troyanskii, a Russian, was more detailed. It included both the bilingual dictionary, and a method for dealing with grammatical roles between languages, based on Esperanto. The system was split up into 3 stages: the first was for a native-speaking editor in the source language to organize the words into their logical forms and syntactic functions; the second was for the machine to “translate” these forms into the target language; and the third was for a native-speaking editor in the target language to normalize this output. His scheme remained unknown until the late 1950s, by which time computers were well-known.

The Early Years.

The first proposals for machine translation using computers were put forward by Warren Weaver. These proposals were based on information theory, successes of code breaking during the II World War and speculation about universal underlying principles of natural language. A few years after these proposals, research began in earnest at many universities in USA. On 7 January 1954, the Georgetown –IBM experiment, the first demonstration of a MT system, was held in New-York at the head office of IBM. The system itself was no more than what today would be called a “toy” system, having just 250 words and translating just 49 carefully selected Russian sentences into English-mainly in the field of chemistry.

Early systems used large bilingual dictionaries and hand-coded rules for fixing the word order in the final output. This was eventually found to be too restrictive, and developments in linguistics at the time, for ex. Generative linguistics and transformational grammar were proposed to improve the quality of translations.

During this time, operational systems were installed. The USA Air Force used a system produced by IBM and Washington University, while the Aormic Energy Commission in the USA and Euratom in Italy used a system developed

at Georgetown University. While the quality of the output was poor, it nevertheless met many of the customer's needs, chiefly in terms of speed.

At the end of the 1950s, an argument was put forward by Yehoshua Bar-Hillel, a researcher asked by the US Government to look into machine translation against the possibility of "Fully Automatic High Quality Translation" by machines. The argument is one of the semantic ambiguity or double-meaning.

Consider the following sentence:

Little John was looking for his toy box. Finally he found it. The box was in the pen.

The word pen may have two meanings, the first meaning something you use to write with, the second meaning a container of some kind. To a human, the meaning is obvious, but he claimed that without a "universal encyclopedia" a machine would never be able to deal with this problem. Today this type of semantic ambiguity can be solved by writing source texts for machine translation in a controlled language that uses a vocabulary in which each word has exactly one meaning.

THE HISTORY OF MACHINE TRANSLATION (II PART)

The 1960s, the ALPAC report and the seventies

Research in the 1960s in both the Soviet Union and the USA concentrated mainly on the Russian- English language pair. Chiefly the objects of translation were scientific and technical documents, such as articles from scientific journals. The rough translations produced were sufficient to get a basic understanding of the articles. If an article discussed a subject deemed to be of security interest, it was sent to a human translator for a complete translation; if not, it was discarded.

A great blow came to machine translation research in 1966 with the publication of the ALPAC report. The report was commissioned by the US Government and performed by ALPAC, the Automatic Language Processing Advisory Committee, a group of seven scientists convened by the US Government in 1964. The US Government was concerned that there were a lack of progress being made despite significant expenditure. It concluded that machine translation was more expensive, less accurate and slower than human translation, and that despite the expenses, machine translation was not likely to reach the quality of a human translator in the near future.

The publication of the report had a profound impact on research into machine translation in the USA, and to a lesser extent the Soviet Union and United Kingdom. Research, at least in the US, was almost completely abandoned for over a decade. In Canada, France and Germany, however, research continued; in 1970, the Systran system was installed for the US Air Force and subsequently in

1976 by the Commission of the European Communities. The METEO System was installed in Canada in 1977 to translate weather forecasts from English to French, and was translating close to 80,000 words a day or 30 million words a year until it was replaced by a competitor's systems on the 30th September, 2001.

While research in the 1960s concentrated on limited language pairs and input, demand in the 1970s was for low-cost systems that could translate a range of technical and commercial documents. This demand was spurred by the increase of globalization and the demand for translation in Canada, Europe, and Japan.

The 1980s and early 1990s

By the 1980s, both the diversity and the number of installed systems for machine translation had increased. A number of systems relying on mainframe technology were in use, such as Systran, a Logos.

During the 1980s there are a lot of activity in MT in Japan especially, with the fifth generation computer Japan intended to leap over its competition in computer hardware and software, and one project that many large Japanese electronics firms found themselves involved in was creating software for translating to and from English.

At the end of the 1980s there was a large surge in a number of novel methods for machine translation. One system was developed at IBM that was based on statistical methods. Other groups used methods based on large numbers of example translations, a technique which is now termed example-based machine translation. A defining feature of both of these approaches was the lack of syntactic and semantic rules and reliance instead on the manipulation of large text corpora.

During the 1980s, encouraged by successes in speech recognition and speech synthesis, research began into speech translation.

The field of machine translation has in the last few years seen major changes. Currently a large amount of research is being done into statistical machine translation and example-based machine translation. Today, only a few companies use statistical machine translation commercially, e.g. Language Weaver (sells translation products and services), Google (uses their proprietary statistical MT system for some language combination in Google's language tools) and Microsoft (uses their proprietary statistical MT system to translate knowledge base articles). There has been a renewed interest in hybridization, with researchers combining syntactic and morphological knowledge into statistical systems, as well as combining statistics with existing rule based systems.

LITERARY APPROACH TO TRANSLATION THEORY

In the 1970s a literary approach to translation theory began to emerge, partly as a response to the prescriptive linguistic theories that had monopolized thinking for the previous two decades. Key elements of this new literary approach are the writings of the Manipulation School; Systems theories; and Gideon Toury's descriptive translation studies (DTS), which tries to identify laws in translation, of which Itamar Even-Zohar's Polysystem Theory (PS) forms a vital part. At the Leuven Conference in 1976, Even-Zohar presented a paper entitled "The Position of Translated Literature in the Literary Polysystem" where he considers the position of translated literature within the literary, cultural and historical contexts of the target culture. He does not advocate the study of individual translations, but rather views the body of translated works as a system working within and reacting to the historical, social and cultural systems of the particular target audience.

The notion of "System" does, perhaps, need some classification at this point. Translated literature itself is also considered to operate as a system in at least 2 ways:

- Firstly in the way that the TL chooses works for translation, and secondly in the way translation methodology varies according to the influence of other systems.

PS functions as a system on the level of a series of relationships between apparent opposites. There are:

- Canonized (high) and non-canonized (low) forms, which opens the door for the consideration of detective and children's stories and their role in translation;
- Centre and periphery;
- Primary (innovative) and secondary (stagnant) models;
- ST and TT;
- Translated and non-translated texts.

The key idea of PS is that there is a continual repositioning of genres in relation to each other, "a continual struggle for power between various interest groups", which helps give rise to the dynamic nature of literature.

There are occasions when translated literature can occupy both a central position and peripheral position within a literary system.

PS is important because it moves translation away from the traditional ST-TT linguistic comparisons of shift and equivalence towards the viewing of translation in a social, cultural and historical context.

There is also a change from the study of individual text as a systemic approach tries to uncover the universal laws and principles that govern translation. It is also quite significant because it can be applied to other systems other than literary systems, such as television programming and politics, making the system itself universal.

Gideon Toury worked with Even-Zohar before moving on to develop his own general theory of translation. In his “Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond” (1995), he calls for a systematic approach to translation rather than the study of individual cases. Firstly, he acknowledges that translation occupies a place in the social and literary system of the target culture, therefore recognizing polysystems. He proposes a three-phase TT-oriented methodology:

- 1) Consider the text in terms of the target culture to determine its significance and acceptability.
- 2) Compare segments of the ST and TT to determine the linguistic relationship, by mapping the TT onto the ST to find “coupled pairs”;
- 3) Distinguish trends, make generalizations, identify norms, and draw conclusions for future-making.

This allows for the creation of a profile for the genre, period and author.

Toury sees different kinds of norms in action during various stages of the translation process. The first kind is the “initial norm” where the norm shifts either towards the ST or the TT. If the shift is towards the TT, the ST is described as acceptable. This is an interesting concept because Toury himself says that no translation is ever totally adequate or acceptable. He describes other norms:

- 1) Preliminary norms, which vary depending on translation policy, whether translation occurs, choice of text, and directness of translation.
- 2) Operational norms, which describe the presentation and linguistic nature of the TT.

Through the identification of norms, Toury hopes to formulate translation laws. The first law he proposes is “the law of growing standardization”, which refers to the loss of source language variations and features as the TT is made to conform to target language standards.

The second law is “the law of interference” where ST norms are translated as such in the TT. This refers to such things as ST syntax being transferred across to the TT, making it “read like a translation”. This relates back to polysystems, because a target language is more likely to accept source language syntax if the position of translated literature is in the centre of the polysystem.

Andrew Chesterman (1997) states that the very concept of norms makes them prescriptive. Chesterman proposes an alternative set of norms:

- 1) Product or explanatory norms are what the reader would expect from a translated text in regards to fluency and readability.
- 2) Professional norms are those that “regulate the translation process” (1997). There are 3 types of professional norms – the accountability norm that deals with professional standards of integrity, the communication norm that aims to ensure communication between all the parties involved, and the relation norm that deals with the ST/TT linguistic relationship.

In 1976, 1978 and 1980 The International Comparative Literature Association held meetings and conferences around the world on the subject of translated

literature. The main outcome was a publication entitled “The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation” edited by Theo Hermans. It viewed literature as dynamic and complex, and called for more interaction between theoretical models and practical case studies. In 1985 Jose Lambert and Hendrik van Gorp produced a paper called “On Describing translations” which proposes a scheme to compare ST and TT literary systems and the relationships between the author, text and reader. There are 4 sections to their scheme:

- 1) Preliminary data, which includes information on the title page, in the preface, and any other information about the translation;
- 2) The macro level, which deals with the text is divided, the title, chapters and structure ;
- 3) The micro level, which investigates linguistic shifts.
- 4) Systemic context involves a comparison of macro levels, and text and theory, leading to the identification of norms.

LANGUAGE INTERPRETATION

MODES, TYPES AND MODALITIES OF INTERPRETATION (I PART)

Language interpretation is the facilitating of oral or sign-language communication, either simultaneously or consecutively, between users of different languages. The process is described by both the words interpreting and interpretation.

In professional parlance, interpreting denotes the facilitating of communication from one language form into its equivalent, or approximate equivalent, in another language form; while interpretation denotes the actual product of this work, that is, the message thus rendered into speech, sign language, writing, non-manual signals, or other language form. The important distinction is observed in order to avoid confusion.

An interpreter is a person who converts a thought or expression in a source language into an expression with a comparable meaning in a target language in “real time”. The interpreter’s function is to convey every semantic element and every intention and feeling of the message that the source-language speaker is directing to target-language recipients.

Despite being used in a non-technical sense as interchangeable, interpretation and translation are not synonymous. Interpreting takes a message from a source language and renders that message into a different target language. In interpreting, the interpreter will take in a complex concept from one language, choose the most appropriate vocabulary in the target language to faithfully render the message in a linguistically, emotionally, tonally, and culturally equivalent message.

Translation is the transference of meaning from text to text, with the translator having time and access to resources (dictionaries, glossaries, etc.) to produce an accurate document or verbal artifact. Lesser known is “transliteration”, used within sign language interpreting, takes one form of a language and transfer those same words into another form.

A very common misconception of interpretation is that it is rendered verbatim, as a word-for-word syntactic translation of an utterance. A literal, verbatim interpretation of a source-language message would be unintelligible to the target-language recipient because of grammar differences, cultural and syntactical context.

In court interpretation, it is not acceptable to omit anything from the source, no matter how fast the source speaks, since not only is accuracy a principal canon for interpreters, but mandatory. The alteration of even a single word in a material can totally mislead the triers of fact. The most important factor for this level of accuracy is the use of a team of two or more interpreters during a lengthy process, with one actively interpreting and the second monitoring for greater accuracy.

Translators have time to consider and revise each word and sentence before delivering their product to client. While live interpretation’s goal is to achieve total accuracy at all times, details of the original (source) speech can be missed and interpreters can ask for clarification from the speaker. In any language, including signed languages, when a word is used for which there is no exact match, expansion may be necessary in order to fully interpret the intended meaning of the word. Another unique situation is when an interpreted message appears much shorter at times because of unique efficiencies within a certain language.

In simultaneous interpretation (SI), the interpreter renders the message in the target-language as quickly as he or she can formulate it from the source language, while the source-language speaker continuously speaks; a spoken-language interpreter (SI), sitting in a sound-proof booth, speaks into a microphone, while clearly seeing and hearing the source-language speaker via earphones. The simultaneous interpretation is rendered to the target-language listeners via their earphones.

In consecutive interpreting (CI), the interpreter speaks after the source-language speaker had finished speaking. The speech is divided into segments, and the interpreter sits or stands beside the source-language speaker, listening and taking notes as the speaker progresses through the message. When the speaker pauses or finishes speaking, the interpreter then renders a portion of the message or the entire message in the target language.

Consecutive interpretation is rendered as “short CI” or “long CI”. In short CI, the interpreter relies on memorize. In long CI, the interpreter takes notes of the message to aid rendering long passages. These informal divisions are established

with the client before the interpretation is effected, depending upon the subject, its subject, its complexity, and the purpose of the interpretation.

On occasion, document sight translation is required of the interpreter during consecutive interpretation work.

Sight translation combines interpretation and translation; the interpreter must render the source-language document to the target-language as if it were written in the target language. Sight translation occurs usually, but not exclusively, in judicial and medical work.

Consecutively-interpreted speeches, or segments of them, tend to be short. 50 years ago, the CI interpreter would render speeches of 20 or 30 minutes; today, 10 or 15 minutes is considered too long, particularly since audiences usually prefer not to sit through 20 minutes of speech they cannot understand.

In whispered interpreting, the interpreter sits or stands next to the small target-language audience whilst whispering a simultaneous interpretation of the matter to hand; this method requires no equipment, but may be done via a microphone and headphones if the participants prefer.

Relay interpreting is usually used when there are several target languages. A source-language interpreter the text to a language common to every interpreter, who then render the message to their respective target languages.

Liaison interpreting involves relaying what is spoken to one, between two, or among many people. This can be done after a short speech, or consecutively, sentence-by-sentence, or as whispering; aside from notes taken at the time, no equivalent is used.

LANGUAGE INTERPRETATION MODES, TYPES AND MODALITIES OF INTERPRETATION (II PART)

Types of Conference

Conference interpreting is the interpretation of a conference, either simultaneously or consequently, although the advent of multi-lingual meetings has consequently reduced the consecutive interpretation in the last 20 years.

Conference interpretation is divided between 2 markets: the institutional and private. International institutions holding multi-lingual meetings, often favour interpreting several foreign languages to the interpreter's mother tongues. Local private markets tend to bi-lingual meetings (the local language plus another) and the interpreters work both into and out of their mother tongues; the markets are not mutually exclusive. The International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) is the only worldwide association of conference interpreters. Founded in 1953, it assembles more than 2,800 professional conference interpreters in more than 90 countries.

Judicial, Legal or Court Interpreting, occurs in courts of justice, administrative tribunals, and whenever a legal proceeding is held (i.e. a police station for an interrogation, a conference room for a deposition or the locale for taking a sworn statement). Legal interpreting can be the consecutive interpretation of witnesses' testimony for ex, or the simultaneous interpretation of entire proceedings, by electronic means, for one person, or all of the people attending.

The right to a competent interpreter for anyone who does not understand the language of the court considered a fundamental rule of justice. Therefore, this right is often guaranteed in national constitutions, declarations of rights, fundamental laws establishing the justice system or by precedents set by the highest courts.

Depending upon the regulations and standards adhered to per state and venue, court interpreters usually work alone when interpreting consecutively, or as a team, when interpreting simultaneously. In addition to practical mastery of the source and target languages, thorough knowledge of law and legal and court procedures is required of court interpreters. They often are required to have formal authorization from the state to work in the Courts – and then are called certified court interpreters.

In escort interpreting, an interpreter accompanies a person or a delegation on a tour, on a visit, or to a meeting or interview. An interpreter in this role is called as escort interpreter. This is liaison interpreting.

Also known as community interpreting, is the type of interpreting occurring in fields such as legal, health, and local government, social, housing, environmental health, education, and welfare services. In community interpreting, factors exist which determine and affect language and communication production, such as speech's emotional content, hostile or polarized social surroundings, its created stress, the power relationships among participants, and the interpreter's degree of responsibility – in many cases more than extreme; in some cases, even the life of the other person depends upon the interpreter's work.

Medical interpreting is a subset of public service interpreting, consisting of communication among medical personnel and the patient and his or her family, facilitated by an interpreter, usually formally educated and qualified to provide such interpretation services. In some situations medical employees who are multilingual may participate part-time as members of internal language banks. The medical interpreter must have a strong knowledge of medicine, common medical procedures, the patient interview, the medical examination processes, ethics, and the daily workings of the hospital or clinic where he or she works, in order to effectively serve both the patient and the medical personnel. Moreover, and very important, medical interpreters often are cultural liaisons for people who are unfamiliar with or uncomfortable in hospital, clinical or medical settings.

By its very nature, media interpreting has to be conducted in the simultaneous mode. It is provided particularly for live television coverages such as press conferences, live or taped interviews with political figures, musicians, artists, sportsmen or people from the business circle. In this type of interpreting, the interpreter has to sit in a sound-proof booth where ideally he/she can see the speakers on a monitor and the set. All equipment should be checked before recording begins. In particular, satellite connections have to be double-checked to ensure that the interpreter's voice is not sent back and the interpreter gets to hear only one channel at a time. In the case of interviews recorded outside the studio and some current affairs programme, the interpreter interprets what he or she hears on a TV monitor. Background noise can be a serious problem. The interpreter working for the media has to sound as slick and confident as a television presenter.

Media interpreting has gained more visibility and presence especially after the Gulf War. Television channels have begun to hire staff simultaneous interpreters. The interpreter renders the press conferences, telephone beepers, interviews and similar live coverage for the viewers. It is more stressful than other types of interpreting as the interpreter has to deal with a wide range of technical problems coupled with the control room's hassle and wrangling during live coverage.

Modalities.

Interpreting services can be delivered in multiple modalities. The most common modality through which interpreting services are provided is on-site interpreting.

On-site, also called "in-person interpreting", "this delivery method requires the interpreter to be physically present in order for the interpretation to take place. In on-site interpreting settings, all of the parties who wish to speak to one another are usually located in the same place. This is by far the most common modality used for most public and social service settings.

Also referred to as "over-the-phone interpreting", "telephone interpreting" and "tele-interpreting", "telephone interpreting enables the interpreter to deliver interpretation via telephone". The interpreter is added to a conference call. Telephone interpreting may be used in place of on-site interpreting in some cases, especially when no on-site interpreter is readily available at the location where services are needed. However, telephone interpreting is more commonly used for situations in which all parties who wish to communicate are already speaking to one another via telephone.

STYLE AND STYLISTIC ACCOMMODATION IN TRANSLATION

Accommodation in translation emerges in perspectives such as cultural accommodation, collocation accommodation, ideological accommodation and

aesthetic accommodation. This theme focuses specifically on stylistic accommodation in translation, proposing that accommodation should be oriented to style which includes writer's style, genre style and historical genre.

Style means all kinds of things. Sty is used as a term distinguished for content in writing and it stresses form or format.

If style comes only second in priority, it certainly stands very high in importance. In translation discussion faithfulness in content has always been emphasized and treated seriously, but faithfulness in style seems to pose more difficulties. In literature, style is the novelist's choice of words and phrases, and how the novelist arranges these words and phrases in sentences and paragraphs. Style allows the author to shape how the reader experiences the work.

E.Nida (1984) defines translation as "Translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style ". how is style transferred in the receptor language becomes a problem and challenge for every translator or interpreter. As translators and interpreters we are mediators. Translators mediate between cultures (including ideologies, moral systems and socio-political structures), seeking to overcome those incompatibilities which stand in the way of transfer of meaning.

But there is another sense in which translators are mediators; in a way, they are "privilege readers" of the SL text. The translator uses as input to the translation process information which would normally be the output and therefore the end of, the reading process.

It is widely-acknowledged nowadays that translation is interaction.

Philosophically arguing, that content and style formulate a whole that cannot be neatly separated. Any content is expressed in a specific style. Yet when comparison and contrast is carried out, certain nuances are found to exist uniquely among a group of writers, between different genres and within a certain historical period.

Writer's style.

Writer's style is the most-discussed topic in our literary course. Lecturers encourage us to read extensively about a certain author and compare between authors so we could formulate in our mind "style" of a specific author. For instance, Hemingway's economical writing style often seems simple and almost childlike, but his method is calculated and used to complex effect. In his writing Hemingway provided detached descriptions of action using simple nouns and verbs to capture scenes precisely. Hemingway was also deeply concerned with authenticity in writing. He believed that a writer could treat a subject honestly only if the writer had participated in or observed the subject closely. Without such knowledge the writer's work would be flawed because the reader would sense the author's lack of expertise. In contrast, a complex style uses long, elaborate sentences that contain many ideas and descriptions. The writer uses

lyrical passages to create the desired mood in the reader, whether it be one of joy, sadness, confusion, or any other emotion.

Genre style.

Encarta English dictionary defines genre as “category of artistic works: one of the categories that artistic works of all kinds can be divided into on the basis of form, style, or subject matter.” From this definition we can see genre is also closely associated with style. Literary genres cover the following: biographies and autobiographies, children’s literature, history writing, science writing, poetry, short stories and so forth. For ex, as history is concerned the totality of all past events, historiobiography should try to be the authentic written record of what is known of human lives and societies in the past, though inevitably how historians have attempted to understand them is also included. Of all the fields of serious study and literary effort, history may be the hardest to define precisely, because the attempt to uncover past events and formulate an intelligible account of them necessarily involves the use and influence of many auxiliary disciplines and literary forms.

Historical style.

In the English literature history, there were 2 important movements, classic and romantic movement, which formed their own specific styles. Classicism, when applied generally, means clearness, elegance, symmetry, and repose produced by attention to traditional forms. It is sometimes synonymous with excellence or artistic quality of high distinction. More precisely, the term refers to the admiration and imitation of Greek and Roman literature, art and architecture. Because the principles of classicism were derived from the rules and practices of the ancients, the term came to mean the adherence to specific academic canons.

In translating this style, the translator will have to equip him/herself with wide knowledge about Greek and Roman literature, art, and other cultural aspects so as to preserve the archaism in the target language and to make such stylistic accommodation easy to carry out.

Although in literature romantic elements were known much earlier, as in the Elizabethan dramas, many critics now date English literary romanticism from the publication of Wordsworth and Coleridge’s *Lyrical Ballads* (1798). In the preface to the second edition of that influential work (1800), Wordsworth stated his belief that poetry results from “the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings”, and pressed for the use of natural everyday diction in literary works.

A USE OF THEMATIC STRUCTURE THEORY IN TRANSLATION

According to systematic functional grammar model; language is said to fulfill 3 functions: the ideational macrofunction, the interpersonal macrofunction, the textual macrofunction. The textual function is as it is the focus of this study,

express the discursual meaning by drawing on the system and network of THEME to create text in actual communicative event.

This lecture attempts to apply thematic structure theory in the translation. Translator must not underestimate the cumulative effect of thematic choices on the way the text is interpreted. It is very important to take into account the thematic structure of the original text in translation.

Translation is definitely a complicated activity. Although much discussion has been held as to such question as it is science or art, whether theory in translation, etc. it has been widely accepted that translation is an interdisciplinary practice, particularly related to the linguistics, so during 1960s and 1970s came the immensely influential linguistic turn in translation , which enriched translation study tremendously.

Theme and thematic structure of the clause and text play a fundamental role in producing the same SL discourse in TL. Theme as the point of departure of the message play a pivotal part not only in the text interpretation but also in implication derived from the text.

Modification in theme or thematic structure from SL into TL falls the text foul of futile translation at the expense of losing some aspects of SL discourse, and herby, necessary to embody knowledge based on the thematic structure of the SL. On the one hand, it is significant to keep thematic structure (T structure) of the source text in the target text; on the other hand, it is also necessary to make some appropriate alternation because of the difference between languages.

Vilem Mathesius, first put forward the ideas of Theme and Rheme in his work Functional Sentence Perspective (1939). According to him, Theme is the part that comes first in a sentence, a Rheme remains the following part. In general Theme holds the old information, and Rheme carries the new.

In 1970, F.Danes in his paper "On Linguistic Analysis of Text Structure" used the term thematic progression to signify the intricate relations between Themes in a text, and stated clearly that such thematic progression reflects the framework of the text. Based on these previous findings, M.A.K. Halliday, the representative figure of functional grammar, conducted a full investigation on T structure. Halliday analysed this subject from the perspective of functional grammar.

In most cases the T structure is not arranged at random; instead, there is usually some meanings behind it. In other words, it is not only a grammatical phenomenon, but also a kind of writing skills employed by the author.

The most important point for source text thematic analysis is that the translator should be aware of the relative markedness of the thematic and information structure.

It is doubtless that the T structure mirrors the information distribution of a text. Then when translated, the T structure of the original text should remain unchanged as long as the translated text reads smoothly. There are at least 2 points supporting this argument:

- 1) As many people commended, translation means translating meaning. And the meaning of a text is constructed by bricks of information, so rearranging the T structure is likely to reverse the relationship between the old and the new information, consequently distorting the original meaning value to his choice of information order.
- 2) In communication two propositionally equivalent but structurally different sentences can differ contextually communicatively, choosing one specific forms at the expenses of others is not a random structure, to a great extent shows an image of the author's flow of thought.

In most cases, if not in all the T structures is organized on purpose by talented writer. Behind it there is likely to be some covert significance that the translator is responsible to convey, otherwise the accuracy of the translation is questionable. The case study reveals that except those differences embedded in the grammatical structure, the T structure bearing the author's intention should always be reproduced in the translation. Therefore, awareness to the T structure is valuable tool as to measure whether a translation is good, and how to translate.

PROBLEMS OF DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION

Formal Equivalence and Dynamic Equivalence caused heated controversy. The concept of equivalence has been one of the key words in translation studies. Equivalence can be said to be the central issue in translation although its definition, relevance, and applicability within the field of translation theory have caused heated controversy, and many different theories of the concept of equivalence have been elaborated within this field in the past fifty years. The comparison of texts in different languages inevitably involves a theory of equivalence.

Eugene Nida in consultation with other pioneers in the field, developed the theory of "dynamic equivalence" or "functional equivalence", which stressed the importance of transferred meaning, not grammatical form. Nida discussed various kinds of complexity in meaning even at a comparatively early date, beginning with his 1947 publication of Bible translating. He explicitly spoke about translating "fullest meaning" instead of a bare minimum.

There are problems, however, with dynamic equivalence translations. Since the translator is "freer" from the grammatical forms of the original language he/she is more likely to exceed the bounds of an accurate translation, is an effort to speak naturally in the native language. That is, the dynamic equivalence translations are capable of being more natural and more precise than are formal equivalence translations, but they are also more capable of being precisely wrong.

There are some scholars of translation who opposed the theory of Dynamic Equivalence such as Eco who argues against Equivalence in meaning; “then translation scholars should have had, at least once in their life, both the experience of translating and that of being translated”. Eco believes that those who have been involved in the art and craft of translation are definitely in a better position to formulate theoretical reflections on the subject. Moreover, it is perfectly clear to Eco that a successful translation cannot be anchored in the notion of word equivalences.

Eco sees that “The translator does not translate a text on the basis of the dictionary, but rather “on the basis of the whole history of two literatures”. Therefore translating is not only connected with linguistic competence, but with intertextual, psychological, and narrative competence. Thus, the translator is forced at all times to go beyond linguistic competence to the cultural spectrum. Consequently, translations don’t constitute a comparison between two languages but the interpretation of two texts in two different languages”. In order for a translation to come to life, “a good translation must generate the same effect aimed at by the original”. Yet all translations are preceded by the interpretive perspective that the translator brings to the text, which means that the translator as interpreter must become visible in the translation.

However, all of his explanations and examples reconfirm his major conviction that the goal of all translations is “to produce in a different language the same effect as the source discourse, and poetic discourse is said to aim at producing an aesthetic effect”. The discussion of equivalence shows the refined thinking that Eco brings to the analysis of all the other Practical aspects of translation presented in the section “Translating and Being Translated”. (2001)

Basically there are two competing theories of translation. In one, the predominant purpose is to express as exactly as possible the full force and meaning of every word and turn of phrase in the original, and in the other the predominant purpose is to produce a result that does not read like a translation at all, but rather moves in its new dress with the same ease as in its native rendering. In the hands of a good translator neither of these 2 approaches can ever be entirely ignored.

As a matter of fact, and perfect theory of translation should be an overall concern of all theories and should meet the functional requirements of an accepted and adequate translation theory, that provides some guidelines for translating to facilitate the task and transfer cultural elements in the source language to the target language, and thus achieve the same effect on the target receivers as on the original receivers.

MENTALITY AND LANGUAGE

It is well known that human culture, social behavior and thinking cannot exist without language. Being a social and national identity, and a means of human communication, language cannot help bearing imprints of ethnic and cultural values as well as the norms of behavior of a given language community. All is reflected in the vocabulary of a language. But it should be noted that the grammatical structure of a language more exactly reflects the mentality of a nation as it is closer to thinking. While the number of words in a language represents the volume of its world, the grammatical structure of a language gives an idea of the inner organization of thinking.

Frequent repetition of certain relations creates in a person's mind the so called the category of experience. Essentially it is a notional category which can be expressed in a language. And how this category can be expressed in a language depends on the linguacreative thinking. The linguacreative thinking is capable of choosing the means of expression, it might determine the semantic volume of the category, the peculiarities of its combination and etc. the national categories exactly serve the foundation for the morphological categories of the language. They are the system forming units which constitute the basic attributes of any language. It is well known that the category of gender is one of the important categories of the Russian language. The category divides all the names, objects into 3 gender groups in accordance with the outer formal indicators like inflexions. It isn't difficult for native speakers of Russian to define the gender characteristics of the nouns, while for foreigners to learn the rules of gender characteristics is one of the complicated tasks. And it is quite natural: gender opposition of the feminine, masculine and neuter gender exists in the language consciousness of the Russian people. But it is necessary to make every effort for a foreigner to assimilate this category, to comprehend it and to put it in good order in his language consciousness and then to use it in his speech. This property characterizes all the morphological categories irrespective of the type of the language: they constitute the basic "foot hold" of the language consciousness.

The grammatical (morphological) categories are normally formed in any language as a result of long generalization of the concrete lexical material, the further abstracting of a certain semantic idea. Thus, for all Turkic and Slavonic languages the semantic notion of quantity has become the semantic dominant characteristics of the nouns. But the notion of quantity (one-many) is the semantic general notion (universalis) for many languages. But we cannot affirm that this category is topical for native speakers of all languages. Facts of language are not the cause and effect; not all the categories of collective thinking are expressed by the language categories. At the same time not everything is expressed by the language belongs to what is more realized and more socially important. To become an integral property of this or that language two main conditions are required: firstly, it should be a binding characteristics of the basic word stock due to which it is constantly claimed in speech of this

native speaker; secondly, this semantic dominant is split into several “portions” and distributed among all the words of this part of speech dividing them into forms opposing to each other. These opposed forms exist as logical and semantic oppositions in the language thought of the people. The grammatical opposition “one-many” is characteristic of the Russian language, that is why native speakers of this language would make more precise the quantitative characteristics of objects with a help of corresponding grammatical indicators.

The composition of grammatical categories in different languages is different as every language selects those attributes of the word stock appropriate for it and this selection takes place for a long historic space of time. The grammatical system of any language is the most stable and the most slowly liable to changes part of the language structure. It is formed for many centuries and even millenniums, therefore the peculiarities of the national mentality and thinking cannot help reflecting in it. They are conditioned by the social and political climated, cultural and ethical values characteristic of this or that nation. We suppose that it influences certain extralinguistic events. According to Malinovsky it is necessary to create a special discipline the aim of which would be to reveal the real nature of the grammatical categories proceeding from the primitive attitude of Man to Reality.

WESTERN TRANSLATION THEORY

In Western tradition most statements about translation that date before the demise of positivism are relatively useless for current theorizing about translation because most are limited by the dominant ideological perspective of their Western imperialism are primarily applicable to a particular Western historical circumstances, the position of a national language and literature within a large cultural hegemony.

There are several basic assumptions upon which contemporary Western translation theory rest, assumptions that have not been well examined or fully interrogated.

- 1) Translators are necessary in interlingual and intercultural situations: they mediate between two linguistic and cultural groups. This is a basic assumption of the discipline of translation studies, yet all who study translation are subliminally aware that there are many situations in which this presupposition does not apply. Monolingualism has been taken as the norm, whereas it may turn out to be the case that plurilingualism is more typical worldwide. This basic premise of translation involves presuppositions about the way that languages function in plurilingual

layering, the purpose of translation as primarily communicative and the belief that translation operated to connect different groups.

- 2) Translation involves (written) texts. This second premise of dominant Western translation theory has marginalized interpretation as a central activity to be theorized in translation studies. A sign of the bias toward seeing translation as a literary practice is that even studies of interpretation are slanted in favor of conference interpretation, an activity that begins with a fixed written text. The focus on written texts as the subject of translation has been decried within translation studies by those promoting the study of interpretation. Orality is the central condition of human biology and culture, and translation must be theorized so as to acknowledge these conditions.
- 3) The primarily text types that translators work with have been defined and categorized. Many Westerners believe that they know, use and have categorized the central human text types: epic, drama and lyric poetry. In fact, text types can vary dramatically from culture, and defining a culture's repertory of primary forms and text types is enormously complex. The question of text types is further complicated by other aspects of cultural embeddedness of discourse: speech acts, signals pertaining to relevance, and so on.
- 4) The process of translation is a sort of "black box": an individual translator decodes a given message to be translated and recodes the same message in second language.
The concept decoding /encoding has become a matter of scholarly debate, but the overall picture of a single translator engaged in a mysterious inner process (conditioned, of course, by social context) continues to hold away. The translator's process thus conceived is very individualistic as well as dominant Western translation practice, but the model has assumed normative status in a great deal of translation studies research. This view of translation practice does not reflect the full range of translation practices worldwide and may not even be the dominant mode crossculturality.
- 5) Translators are generally educated in their art and they have professional standing; often they learn their craft in a formal way connected with schooling or training that instructs the translator in language competence, standard of textuality, norms of transposition and so on. The difficulties with this assumption have been most obvious to those scholars who are interested in community translation, where translators are rarely trained or schooled, indeed where they are amateur almost by definition.
- 6) Currently translation is entering a completely new phase and assuming radically new forms because of cultural movements and diasporas associated with globalization and because of the hybridity of the ensuing cultural configurations. This is a hypothesis that has genealogical writing on

translation in the last 15 years, but it is clearly a view that can only be sustained by those who know very little history, even very little modern history. The written history of the West alone documents vast population migrations from the earliest times. In the modern era, the types of hybridities associated with diasporas that cultural studies scholars touched as new can be traced in most immigrant cultures, notably those of North and South America, where the phenomena have a documented history dating to the European discovery of the Americans in the XV century. Diasporas, population movements, cultural and linguistic contact, cultural mixing and hybridity, and translation have been part of human history since the law of our species and its diffusion out of Africa. This hypothesis must be rehabilitated before it can be useful and non-western data will aid in the rehabilitation.

- 7) Translation can be identified as such: translation theory has defined the objects of its study. A persistent enterprise in Western translation theory for more than a century has been the attempt to define translation: there have been efforts to specify definitions; to distinguish translations from imitations, adaptations, and versions; to categorize types of translations; to look for commonalities linking types of translations; to establish hierarchies among translation types and establish prototypes of translation and soon. The interest in and the insistence on defining translation are not in fact trivial or irrelevant. A major aspect of the scientific method – is the definition of the objects of study; such definitions are part of the theoretical framework of a research methodology. Conceptual elements must be delineated, which involves identification of both the “units” of investigation and the means to classify those units. Such definitions actually constitute the objects of study and the field of inquiry. The difficulty with efforts to define translation in Western translation theory is that it is so easy to find exceptions to the various definitions proposed. Similarly many translations associated with oral Western literary tradition defy conventional definitions of translation, and translations produced under the constraints of postcolonial contestations show unexpected differences as well.
- 8) The parameters of the relationship between source text and translation have been delineated, even though debate remains on the particulars. The difficulties with this assumption follow from the incomplete and culturally bound definitions of translation used by many translation studied scholars. The words most commonly used for translation in European languages – particularly the words deriving from Latin, including translation itself – have in many ways distorted Western understandings about the relationship between a text and its translation. The word “translation” suggests a carrying across, indicating that the relationship between text and translation should be a strong form of

equivalence, a type of identity relationship rather than a similarity relationship which entails difference.