Theories of Translation: Does One Exist?

Mardiha Mahzad

Sheikh Bahaei University, Iran.

ABSTRACT

During centuries many scholars and professionals in translation have suggested many theories in general sense and the best approach was always a controversial issue. In this paper, an attempt has been made to define theory in scientific sense which is totally different from its general sense. It shows that based on lack of necessary features of scientific theory, there is no translation theory and what exist are just different approaches and models to translation. Then approaches based on different insights such as philological, linguistic and sociosemiotic insights will be studied.

Introduction

Discussions about theories of translation are too often concerned with distinctions between literary and nonliterary texts, between prose and poetry, or between technical articles on physics and run-of-the-mill commercial correspondence. But in order to understand the nature of translation, the focus should not be on different types of discourse but on the processes and procedures involved in any and all kinds of interlingual communication (Bell 1987). Furthermore, a theory of interlingual communication should not be restricted to discussions between translating and interpreting (whether consecutive or simultaneous), since interpreting differs from translating primarily because of the pressures of time and exigencies of the setting. Some professional translators take considerable pride in denying that they have any theory of translation, they just translate. In reality, however, all persons engaged in the complex task of translating possess some type of underlying or covert theory; even though it may be still very embryonic and described only as just being "faithful to what the author was trying to say."

Instead of no theories of translation, there are a multiplicity of such theories, even though they are seldom stated in terms of a full-blown theory of why, when, and how to translate. One of the reasons for so many different views about translating is that interlingual communication has been going on since the dawn of human history. As early as the third millennium BC, bilingual lists of words, evidently for the use of translators, were being made in Mesopotamia, and today translating and interpreting are going on in more than a thousand languages — in fact, wherever there are bilinguals.(Chomsky 1965) One of the paradoxes of interlingual communication is that it is both amazingly complex (regarded by Richards 1953) as "probably the most complex type of event yet produced in the evolution of the cosmos" and also completely natural (Harris and Sherwood 1978). Interpreting is often done by children with amazingly fine results, especially before they have gone to school and have learned something about nouns, verbs, and adjectives.

One reason for the great variety of translation theories and sub-theories is the fact that the processes of translating can be viewed from so many different perspectives: stylistics, author's intent, diversity of languages, differences of corresponding cultures, problems of interpersonal communication, changes in literary fashion, distinct kinds of content (e.g. mathematical theory and lyric poetry), and the circumstances in which translations are to be used, e.g. read in the tranquil setting of one's own living room, acted on the theatre stage, or blared from a loudspeaker to a restless mob. The wide range of theories and the great diversity of problems in translation have been treated by a number of persons interested in translation theory and practice, e.g. Güttinger (1963), Vazquez Ayora (1977), and Wilss (1988). A theory should be a coherent and integrated set of propositions used as principles for explaining a class of phenomena. In scientific usage, a *theory* does not mean an unsubstantiated *guess* or *hunch,* as it often does in other contexts. A theory is a logically self-consistent model or framework for describing the behavior of a related set of natural or social phenomena. It originates from and/or is supported by experimental evidence. In this sense, a theory is a systematic and formalized expression of all previous observations that is predictive, logical and testable. In principle, scientific theories are always tentative, and subject to corrections or inclusion in a yet wider theory.

• The term *theoretical* is sometimes used to describe a result that is predicted by theory but has not yet been adequately tested by observation or experiment. It is not uncommon for a theory to produce predictions that are later confirmed by experiment. If enough experiments and observations are made by many researchers, such a theory may become sufficiently well-tested to be considered so reliable that its premises may after that stage be termed scientific laws in the sense of being generalizations based on empirical observations (not to be confused with laws which prescribe how the world should be Commonly, a large number of more specific hypotheses may be logically bound together by just one or two theories. As a general rule for use of the term, theories tend to deal with much broader sets of universals than do hypotheses, which ordinarily deal with much more specific sets of phenomena or specific applications of a theory.

• The term *theory* is occasionally stretched to refer to theoretical speculation that is currently unverifiable. Examples are string theory and various theories of everything. In common speech, *theory* has a far wider and less defined meaning than its use in the sciences.

Theories In fact answer to questions:

• Theories provide answers to *what* questions!

For instance:

• What is language?

• What is thought?

• What is culture?

Etc.

A satisfactory theory should help in the recognition of elements which have not been recognized before, as in the case of black holes in astrophysics. A theory should also provide a measure of predictability about the degree of success to be expected from the use of certain principles, given the particular expectations of an audience, the nature of the content, the amount of information carried by the form of the discourse, and the circumstances of use.

• Humans construct theories in order to explain, predict and master phenomena (e.g. inanimate things, events, or the behavior of animals). In many instances we are constructing models of reality. A theory makes generalizations about observations and consists of an interrelated, coherent set of ideas and models.

• Central to the nature of models, from general models to scale models, is the employment of representation (literally, "re-presentation") to describe particular aspects of a phenomenon or the manner of interaction among a set of phenomena. For instance, a scale model of a house or of a solar system is clearly not an actual house or an actual solar system; the aspects of an actual house or an actual solar system represented in a scale model are, only in certain limited ways, representative of the actual entity. In most ways that matter, the scale model of a house is not a house.

• Several commentators (e.g., Reese & Overton 1970; Lerner 1998; Lerner & Teti 2005, in the context of modeling human behavior) have stated that the important difference between theories and models is that the first is explanatory as well as descriptive, while the second is only descriptive (although still predictive in a more limited sense). General models and theories, according to philosopher Stephen Pepper (1948) -- who also distinguishes between theories and models -- are predicated on a "root" metaphor which constrains how scientists theorize and model a phenomenon and thus arrive at testable hypotheses.

• Theories exist not only in the so-called hard sciences, but in all fields of academic study, from philosophy to music to literature. In the humanities, *theory* is often used as an abbreviation for critical theory or literary theory, referring to continental philosophy's aesthetics or its attempts to understand the structure of society and to conceptualize alternatives. In philosophy, theoreticism refers to the overuse of theory. Models are external representations of theories, their realization. They answer *how* questions, such as:

• How does language work?

• How does the mind work?

• How does language work in the society?

• Etc.

So a model is an attempt to describe rather than explain a phenomenon.

• What are we after? A theory or a model?

• Certainly we need a theory, but does one exist?

The answer is that we do not still have a general theory of translation since despite a number of important treatments of the basic principles and procedures of translation; no full-scale theory of translation now exists. The area is very complex and the theory will have to explain several phenomena, not just a single one. A fully satisfactory theory of translating should be more than a list of rules-of-thumb by which translators have generally succeeded in reproducing reasonably adequate renderings of source texts.

In fact, it is anomalous to speak of "theories of translation," since all that has been accomplished thus far are important series of insightful perspectives on this complex undertaking. The basic reason for this lack of adequate theoretical treatments is that translating is essentially a technology which is dependent upon a number of disciplines: linguistics, cultural anthropology, psychology, communication theory, and neurophysiology. We really know so little about what makes translators tick. But tick they must and increasingly so in a shrinking multilingual world. A Theory of Translation Should be:

• Statements of conventions which constrain the activity of translation rather than definitions of rules which determine it.

• Models which offer probabilistic post facto explanations of what has been done, rather than deterministic a priori models which claim to predict what will be done.

• Models of the dynamics of the process itself rather than static descriptions of the structure of the product.

• Indication of the relationships which exist between translation on one side and broader notions such as communicative competence, discoursal coherence and appropriateness in the use of code, rather than the more narrowly defined concerns of core linguistics on the other.

Reading above discussions, instead of speaking of theories of translation, we should perhaps speak more about various approaches to the task of translating, different orientations which provide helpful insight and diverse ways of talking about how a message can be transferred from one language to another. The different ways in which people go about the task of interlingual communication can perhaps be best described in terms of different perspectives: (1) the source text, including its production, transmission, and history of interpretation, (2) the languages involved in restructuring the source-language message into the receptor (or target) language, (3) the communication events which constitute the setting of the source message and the translated text, and (4) the variety of codes involved in the respective communication events. These four different perspectives could be regarded as essentially philological, linguistic, communicative, and sociosemiotic.

These four major perspectives on the problems of interlingual communication should not, however, be regarded as competitive or antagonistic, but as complementary and supplementary. They do not invalidate one another but result in a broader understanding of the nature of translating. They do, nevertheless, reflect an interesting historical development as the focus of attention has shifted from emphasis on the starting point, namely, the source text, to the manner in which a text is understood by those who receive and interpret it. Such a development is quite natural in view of the fact that all communication is goal oriented and moves from the source's intention to the receptor's interpretation.

Diversity of Translation Approaches

A more useful approach to the study of the diversity of translation theories is to group together variously related theories on the basis of the disciplines that have served as the basic points of reference for some of the primary insights: 1. philology, although often spoken of as "literary criticism" or "literally analysis", 2. linguistics, and especially sociolinguistics (language used in communication), and 3.semiotics, particularly

socio-semiotics, the study of sign system used in human communication. This order of disciplines reflects a somewhat historical development, but each of these orientations in translating is endorsed and favored by a number of present-day scholars. At the same time it is important to recognize some of the important contributions being made to translation by other related disciplines, for example, psychology, information theory, informatics, and sociology.

There are, however, two fundamental problems in practically all approaches to theories of translating: (1) the tendency for advocates of a particular theory to build their theory on a specific discipline and often on its applicability to a single literary genre or type of discourse and (2) the primary or exclusive concern for designative (denotative) rather than associative (connotative) meanings.

Approaches based on philological insights

Philology, the study and evaluation of written texts, including their authenticity, form, meaning, and cultural influence, has for more than 2000 years been the primary basis for discussing translation theories and practice. In general such texts have been literary productions because they seemed to be the only texts that warranted being translated into other languages.

In the Classical Roman world, Cicero, Horace, Catullus, and Quintilian discussed primarily the issues of literal vs. free translating. Was a translator justified in rendering the sense of passage at the expense of the formal features of word order and grammatical constructions? Also, should a choice metaphor be sacrificed for the sake of making sense of a passage? For the most part. Roman writers opted for freedom in translating, but the practice of translating and concern for principles of effective interlingual communication largely died out during the early Middle Ages. With the intellectual explosion of the Renaissance Us Belles Infideles "the beautiful unfaithful ones" dominated the new trend in translating the Classics into the vernacular languages of Europe.

The philological perspective on translation in the Western World goes back ultimately to some of the seminal observations by such persons as Cicero, Horace, Augustine, and Jerome, whose principal concerns were the correct rendering of Greek texts into Latin. For example, In Cicero's view, a translator must be either an interpreter or rhetorician. He castigated literal translation and called it an unskilled work. He outlined his approach to translation in De optimo genre oratorum (46BCE/1960 CE), introducing his own translation of the speeches of the Attic orators Aeschines and Demosthenes:

And I did not translate themes an interpreter, but as an orator, keeping the same ideas and forms, or as one might say, the 'figures' of thought, but in language which conform to our usage. And in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style and force of the language. (Cicero 46 BCE/1960 CE: 364) St. Jerome favored natural and colloquial translation and advocated sense for sense translation. He criticized word for word approach of translation.

Jewish scholars had no interest in translation theories, because they believed no intent or structure other than Holy Scripture has value. They thought that translator is inferior to God's words. Therefore they followed word for word approach which also dominated after Babel to 4th century A.D But Jerome made a distinction between attitude and purpose in translation and it caused a change in typology of translation in that age. St Jerome, defending himself against criticisms of 'incorrect' translation, describes his strategy in the following terms:

Now I not only admit but freely announce that in translating from the Greek except of course in the case of the Holy Scripture, where even the syntax contains a mystery- I render not word- for- word, but sense-for-sense. (St Jerome 395 CE/1997: 25)

Since then, there was a line between holy texts which were translated in word for word method and more general topics which followed sense for sense approach. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Europe, the philological orientation in translating focused on the issue of "faithfulness," usually bound closely to the history of interpretation of the text, something which is especially crucial in the case of Bible translations. For the most part, arguments about the adequacy of translations dealt with the degree of freedom which could or should be allowed, and scholars discussed heatedly whether a translator should bring the reader to the text or bring the text to the reader. Some of the most important early contributions to the philological aspects of translation were made by Luther (1530), Etienne Dolet (1540), Cowley (1656), Dryden (1680), and Pope (1715), but Luther's influence was probably the greatest in view of his having directly and indirectly influenced so many Bible translations first in Western Europe and later in other parts of the world. (Munday 2001)

Luther believed intelligibility is the goal of any translation and he dealt with words and expressions which didn't have equivalent in TL as follows:
a) Shifts of word order (change)
b) Using modal auxiliary (addition)
c) Introducing connectives (addition)
d) Use of phrase where necessary to translate word (expansion)
e) Shift of metaphors to non-metaphors (simplification)
f) Careful attention to textual equivalents

He mocked literal translations of his predecessors and believed that normal prose style could be effective. In fact, Luther follows St Jerome in rejecting a word- for- word translation strategy since it would be unable to convey the same meaning as the ST and would sometimes be incomprehensible. Dolet sets out five principles in order of importance as follows:
1. The translator must perfectly understand the sense and material of the original author, although he should feel free to clarify obscurities.
2. The translator should have a perfect knowledge of both SL and TL, so as not to lessen the majority of the language
3. The translator should avoid word for word renderings.
4. The translator should avoid Latinate and unusual forms.
5. The translator should assemble and liaise words eloquently to avoid clumsiness.

Dryden (1680 1992: 17) reduces all translation to three categories:
1. Metaphrase: 'word by word and line by line' translation, which corresponds to literal translation;
2. Paraphrase: 'translation with attitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense; this involves changing whole phrases and more or less corresponds to faithful or sense-for-sense translation;
3. Imitation: 'forsaking' both words and sense; this corresponds to Cowley's very free translation and is more or less adaptation.
In his opinion, translator must
a) Understand SL
b) Be familiar with author's thoughts
c) Know author's characteristics
His approach was between very free and very close translation.

This philological perspective is still very much alive, as witnessed by the important contributions of such persons as

Cary and Jumpelt (1963), George Steiner (1975), and John Felstiner (1980). It is amazing, however, that avowedly philological approaches to translating can result in such radically different results. Those who set their priorities on preserving the literary form produce the kinds of translations of the Bible. (Munday 2001) Many translators have, however, succeeded brilliantly in combining sensitivity to style with faithfulness to content, perhaps represented most strikingly in the rendering of the plays of Aristophanes by Benjamin B. Rogers in the Loeb series (1924). Rogers makes the text come alive with frequent shifts in meter to match the mood, clever plays on the meanings of words, and particularly adroit handling of dialogue, even to the point of toning down the scatological comments to match the Victorian tastes of his readers.

A number of the essential features and limitations of the philological perspective on translating literary works are helpfully described and discussed by Paz (1971) and by Mounin (1963). Octávio Paz has the special gift of being able to discuss issues of literary translation with the touch of a literary artist, which indeed he is. And Georges Mounin has a way of delineating diverse opinions and judgments so as perform an elegant balancing act. Those who have followed primarily a philological orientation toward translating have increasingly recognized that other factors must be given greater attention. In the volume *On Translation,* edited by Brower (1959), and in the volume *Translation: Literary, Linguistic, and Philosophical Perspectives,* edited by Frawley (1984), these broader factors of linguistic and cultural matters are introduced and point the way to a more satisfactory approach to some of the crucial problems confronted by translators (Munday 2001).

Approaches based on linguistic insights

Since translating always involves at least two different languages, it was inevitable that a number of persons studying the issues of translation would focus upon the distinctive features of the source and receptor languages. Important studies of diverse linguistic structures by such persons as Sapir, Bloomfield, Trubetskoy, and Jakobson laid the foundation for a systematic study of the functions of language.

Several scholars have approached the issues of translating from the viewpoints of linguistic differences between source and target texts. Some of the more important contributions include Vinay and Darbelnets comparative analysis of French and English as a basis for a method of translating (1958), Catford's volume, A Linguistic Theory of Translating (1965), Toury's book In Search of a Theory of Translation (1980), Larson's textbook Meaning-based Translation (1984), and Malones transformational-generative approach, The Science of Linguistic in the Art of Translation (1988).

As in the case of the philological orientation to translating, linguistics theories have also been influenced and enriched by a number of developments, including cultural anthropology, philosophical approaches to semantics, information and communication theories, computational linguistics, machine translation, artificial intelligence, psycholinguistics, and sociolingusitcs.

Snell-Hornby (1988) has effective described how a number of translation theorists in Germany pushed the idea of equivalence to the point of insisting that semantic differences can-and should be rigorously distinguished. In fact they went so far as to insist that true translating can only apply to nonliterary or nonfigurative texts, since they considered literary texts as structurally marginal uses of language. Fortunately, Newmark (1981) has never hesitated to say bluntly what many others have thought, namely, that when a theory becomes so arbitrary or

restricted as to exclude some of the most creative and meaningful aspects of language, it is essentially useless.

Jakobson goes on to examine key issues of interlingual translation, notably linguistic meaning and equivalence. He follows the relation set out by Saussure between the signifier (the spoken and written signal) and the signified (the concept signified). Together the signifier and signified form the linguistic sign, but that sign is arbitrary or unmotivated (Saussure, 1916/83: 67-9) Jakobson then moves on to consider the thorny problem of equivalence in meaning between words in different languages. He points out (1959; 2000: 114) that there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units. In Jakobson's description, interlingual translation involves 'substitut[ing] messages in one language not for separate code-uints, but for entire messages in some other language:

The translator recodes and transmits a message received from another source. Thus translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes.

From a linguistic and semiotic angle, Jakobson approaches the problem of equivalence with the following, now-famous, definition: 'Equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics. "In Jakobson's discussion, the problem of meaning and equivalence thus focuses on differences in the structure and terminology of languages rather than on any inability of one language rather than on any verbal language.

The two general translation strategies identified by Vinay and Darbelnet (2000: 84-93) are direct translation and oblique translation, which hark back to the 'literal' vs. free division discussed in chapter 2. Indeed, 'literal' is given by the authors as a synonym for direct translation (p. 84). The two strategies comprise seven procedures, of which direct translation covers three:

1. Borrowing: The SL word is transferred directly to the TL.
2. Calque: This is 'a special kind of borrowing' (p. 85) where the SL expression or structure is transferred in a literal translation.
3. Literal translation: This is 'word-ford-word' translation, which Vinay and Darbelnet describe as being most common between languages of the same family and culture (pp.86-8). Literal translation is the authors' prescription for good translation: 'literalness should only be sacrificed because of structural and metalinguistic requirements and only after checking that the meaning is fully preserved (1995: 288). But say Vinay and Darbelnet (pp. 34-5), the translator may judge literal translation to be 'unacceptable' because it:

a) gives a different meaning;
b) has no meaning;
c) is impossible for structural reasons;
d) 'does not have a corresponding expression within the metalinguistic experience of the TL';
e) Corresponds to something at a different level of language.

In those cases where literal translation is not possible, Vinay and Darbelnet say that the strategy of oblique translation must be used.. This covers a further four procedures:

4. Transposition: This is a change of one part of speech for another without changing the sense. Transposition can be obligatory or optional (2000: 88 and 1995: 94-9). Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 94) see transposition and probably the most common structural change undertaken by translators'. They list at least ten different categories, such as: verb → noun or adverb → verb

5. Modulation: This changes the semantic and point of view or the SL. It can also be obligatory or optional. Modulation is a procedure that is justified, in the words of the English edition, 'when, although a literal, or even transposed, translation results

in a grammatically correct utterance, it is considered unsuitable, unidiomatic or awkward in the TL' (2000: 89).

Vinay and Darbelnet place much store by modulation as 'the touchstone of a good translator', whereas transposition 'simply shows a very good command of the target language' (1995: 246). Modulation at the level of message is subdivided (pp. 246-55) along the following lines:

1. abstract for concrete
2. cause-effect
3. part-whole
4. part-another part
5. reversal of terms
6. negation of opposite
7. active to passive (and vice versa)
8. space for time
9. rethinking of intervals and limits (in space and time)
10. change of symbol (including fixed and new metaphors)

This category therefore covers a wide range of phenomena. There is also often a process of originally free modulations becoming fiexd expressions.

6. Equivalence: Vinay and Darbelnet use this term (2000: 90) to refer to cases where languages describe the same situation by different stylistic or structural means. Equivalence is particularly useful in translating idioms and proverbs.

7. Adaptation (pp. 90-2): This involves changing the cultural reference when a situation in the source culture does not exist in the target culture.

Although Vinay and Darbelnet do not use the word 'shift', in discussing translation shift, that is in effect what they are describing. The term itself seems to originate in Catford's A Linguistic Theory of Translation (1965), where he devotes a chapter to the subject. Catford (1965: 20) follows the Firthian and Hallidayan linguistic mode, which analyzes language as communication, operating functionally in context and on a range of different levels (e.g. phonology, graphology, grammar, lexis) and ranks (sentence, clause, group, word, morpheme, etc).

As far as translation is concerned, Catford makes an important distinction between formal correspondence and textual equivalence.

• A formal correspondent is 'any TL category (unit, class, 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' (Catford 1965: 27).

• A textual equivalent is 'any TL text or portion of text which is observed on a particular occasion to be the equivalent of a given SL text or portion of text'.

Textual equivalence is thus tied to a particular ST-TT pair, while formal equivalence is a more general system- based concept between a pair of languages. When the two concepts diverge, a translation shift is deemed to have occurred. In Catford's own word (2000: 141), translation shifts are thus 'departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from the SL to the TL'.

Catford considers two kinds of shift: 1) shift of level and 2) shift of category:

1. A level shift (2000: 141-3) would be something which is expressed by grammar in one language and lexis in another.
2. Most of Catford's analysis is given over to category shifts. (2000: 143-7) Theses are subdivided into four kinds:

a) Structural shifts: These are said by Catford to be the most common form of shift and to involve mostly a shift grammatical structure.

b) Class shifts: these comprise shifts from one part of speech to another.

c) Unit shifts or rank shifts: these are shifts where the translation equivalent in the TL is at a different rank to the SL. 'Rank' here refers to the hierarchical linguistic units of sentence, clause, group, word and morpheme.

d) Intra-system shifts: These are shifts that take place when the SL and TL possess approximately corresponding system but where the translation involves selection of a non-corresponding term in the TL system' (2000: 146).

Toury focused on developing a general theory of translation. In his influential descriptive translation studies (Toury 1995: 10), he calls for the development of a properly systematic descriptive branch of the discipline to replace isolated free standing studies that are commonplace:

What is missing is not isolated attempts reflecting excellent institutions and supplying fine insights (which many existing studies certainly do), but a systematic branch proceeding from clear assumptions and armed with a methodology and research techniques made as explicit as possible and justified within translation studies itself. Only a branch of this kind can ensure that the findings of individual studies will be intersubjectively testable and comparable, and the studies themselves replicate (Toury 1995: 3).

Toury goes on to propose just such a methodology for the branch of descriptive translation studies (DTS). For Toury (1995: 13), translators first and foremost occupy a position in the social and literary systems of the target culture, and this position determines the translation strategies that are employed. Toury (1995: 36-9 and 102) proposes the following three phase methodology systematic DTS, incorporating a description of the product and the wider role of the sociocultural system:

1-Situate the text within the target culture system, looking at its significance or acceptability.

2- Compare the ST and the TT for shifts, identifying relationships between Coupled pairs of ST and TT segments, and attempting generalizations about the underlying concept of translation.

3- Draw implications for decision making in future translating.

The second step of Toury's methodology is one of the most controversial areas. The decisions on which ST and TT segments to examine and what the relationships are between them is an apparatus what Toury (1995: 85) states should be supplied by translation theory.

Newmark's Approaches to Translation (1981) and A Textbook of Translation (1988) have been widely used on translator training courses and combine a wealth of practical examples of linguistic theories of meaning with practical applications for translation. Yet Newmark departs from Nida's receptor-oriented line, feeling that the success of equivalent effect is 'illusory' and that 'the conflict of loyalties. The gap between emphasis on source and target language will always remain as the overriding problem in translation theory and practice' (Newmark 1981: 38). Newmark suggests narrowing the gap by replacing the old terms with those of 'semantic' and 'communicative' translation:

Communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. Semantic translation attempts to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original (Newmark 1981: 39).

Newmark distances himself from the full principle of equivalent effect, since that effect 'is noperant if the text is out of TL space and time' (1981: 69). Newmark's definitions (1981: 39-69) of his own terms reveal other differences: Newmark indicates that semantic translation differs from literal translation

in that it' respects context', interprets and even explain (metaphors, for instance) (p.63). Literal translation, on the other hand, means word-for-word in its extreme version and, even in its weaker form, sticks very closely to source text lexis and syntax. Importantly, literal translation is held to be the best approach in both semantic and communicative translation:

In communicative as in semantic translation, provided that equivalent effect is secured, the literal word-for-word translation is not only the best, it is the only valid method of translation.

Information theory, as formulated primarily by Wiener (1948: 1954) and Shannon and Weaver (1949) have had a very useful role in helping translators recognize the functions of redundancy. Communication theory, which is an enlargement of information theory, has helped translators see the importance of all the many factors that enter into interlingual communication: source, target, transmission, noise (physical and psychological), setting, and feedback (immediate and anticipatory). Computational linguistics is especially rewarding as it clarifies and systematizes lexical and syntactic properties of language.

Communication theory has had considerable influence on the work of Kade (1968) and Neubert (1968), and especially on the insightful studies of Reiss (1972; 1976), whose breadth of approach has been unusually effective.

Research in machine translating has also helped translators appreciate more fully the striking differences between the routine correspondences between texts and those that require creative innovation. In Wilss volume The Science of Translation (1982) communication theory and machine translation figure prominently.

The linguistic orientation in translating has been especially enlarged by work in sociolinguistics, in which the emphasis is not on language as a structure but on the role of language as by speakers and writers.

Sociolinguistics has called attention to the function of levels and registers in language, linguistic dialects, the roles of power and solidarity in language usage and in the systematic character of what some linguists in the past have treated as mere accidental variation.

Approaches based on communicative insights

The volume *From One Language to Another* (de Waard & Nida 1986) reflects the importance of a number of basic elements in communication theory, namely, source, message, receptor, feedback, noise, setting, and medium. It also treats the processes of encoding and decoding of the original communication and compares these with the more complex series in the translation process. Linguists working in the field of sociolinguistics, e.g. Labov (1972), Hymes (1974), and Gumperz (1982), have made particularly important contributions to understanding principles of translating which focus upon various processes in communication. This relation between sociolinguistics and translation is a very natural one, since sociolinguists deal primarily with language as it is used by society in communicating. The different ways in which societies employ language in interpersonal relations are crucial for anyone concerned with translating.

Any approach to translating based on communication theory must give considerable attention to the paralinguistic and extra linguistic features of oral and written messages. Such features as tone of voice, loudness, peculiarities of enunciation, gestures, stance, and eye contact are obviously important in oral communication, but many people fail to realize that analogous factors are also present in written communication, e.g. style of type, format, quality of paper, and type of binding.

For effective impact and appeal, form cannot be separated from content, since form itself carries so much meaning. This joining of form and content has inevitably led to more serious attention being given to the major functions of language, e.g. informative, expressive, cognitive, imperative, performative, emotive, and interpersonal, including the recognition that the information function is much less prominent than has been traditionally thought. In fact, information probably accounts for less than twenty percent of what goes on in the use of language.

This emphasis upon the functions of language has also served to emphasize the importance of discourse structures, also spoken of as "rhetoric" and "poetics," in which important help for translators has come through contributions by Jakobson (1960), Grimes (1972), and Traugott and Pratt (1980). This focus on discourse structures means that any judgment about the validity of a translation must be judged in terms of the extent to which the corresponding source and receptor texts adequately fulfill their respective functions. A minimal requirement for adequacy of a translation would be that the readers would be able to comprehend and appreciate how the original readers of the text understood and possibly responded to it. A maximal requirement for translational adequacy would mean that the readers of the translation would respond to the text both emotively and cognitively in a manner essentially similar to the ways in which the original readers responded. The minimal requirement would apply to texts which are so separated by cultural and linguistic differences as to make equivalent responses practically impossible, e.g. translations into English of West African healing incantations.

Such requirements of equivalence point to the possibilities and limitations of translating various text types having diverse functions. Mounin (1963) treats this same issue as a matter of "translatability," and Reiss (1972) has discussed the communicative aspects of translation by calling attention to the issue of functional equivalence.

Approaches based on socio-semiotic insights

The most pervasive and crucial contribution to an understanding of translation is to be found in socio-semiotics, the discipline that treats all the systems of signs used by human societies. The great advantage of semiotics over other approaches to inter-lingual communication is that it deals with all types of codes and signs. No holistic approach to translating can exclude semiotics as a fundamental discipline in encoding and decoding signs.

Semiotics is as old as the writings of Plato and Aristotle, but its present-day formulations depend in large measure on the unusual insights of Peirce (1934), the systematization of these in Eco (1979), and the practical implications of these in Sebeok (1976; 1986).

The central focus in a socio-semiotic perspective on translation is the multiplicity of codes involved in any act of verbal communication. Words never occur without some added paralinguistic or extra-linguistic features. And when people listen to a speaker, they not only take in the verbal message, but on the basis of background information and various extra-linguistic codes, they make judgments about a speaker's sincerity, commitment to truth, breadth of learning, specialized knowledge, ethnic background, concern for other people, and personal attractiveness. In fact, the impact of the verbal message is largely dependent upon judgments based on these extralinguistic codes. Most people are completely unaware of such codes, but they are crucial for what people call their "gut feelings." These types of codes are always present in one way or another, whether in oral or written communication, but there are certain other accompanying codes which are optional and to which the verbal message must adjust in varying ways, e.g. the action in a drama, the music of a song, and the multiple visual

and auditory features of a multimedia essay. These optional codes often become the dominant factors in a translation, especially when lip synchronization is required in television films.

The problem of multiple codes and their relation to the social setting of communication have been helpfully treated by a number of persons, e.g. Eco (1976), Krampen (1979), Merrell (1979), and Robinson (1985). The beginning of a sociosemiotic approach to translating has been undertaken by de Waard and Nida (1986) and by Toury (1980), but a good deal more must be done to understand the precise manner in which the language code relates to other behavioral codes. The advantages of a sociosemiotic approach to translating are to be found in:

1- Employing a realistic epistemology which can speak relevantly about the real world of everyday experience, since its basis is a triadic relation between sign, referent, and interpretant (the process of interpretation based on the system of signs and on the dialogic function of society.)

2- Being at the cutting edge of verbal creativity, rather than being bound by reductionist requirements which depend on ideal speaker-hearers, who never exist.

3- Recognizing the plasticity of language, the fuzzy boundaries of usage, and the ultimate indeterminacy of meaning which makes language such a frustrating and subtly elegant vehicle for dialogue.

4- Being essentially interdisciplinary in view of the multiplicity of codes. The full implications of sociosemiotic theories and their relation to translation are only now emerging, but they have the potential for developing highly significant insights and numerous practical procedures for more meaningful and acceptable results.

Conclusion

In order to understand the nature of translation, the focus should not be on different types of discourse but on the processes and procedures involved in any and all kinds of interlingual communication (Bell 1987). A theory should be a coherent and integrated set of propositions used as principles for explaining a class of phenomena. But a fully satisfactory theory of translating should be more than a list of rules-of-thumb by which translators have generally succeeded in reproducing reasonably adequate renderings of source texts. A satisfactory theory should help in the recognition of elements which have not been recognized before, as in the case of black holes in astrophysics. A theory should also provide a measure of predictability about the degree of success to be expected from the use of certain principles, given the particular expectations of an audience, the nature of the content, the amount of information carried by the form of the discourse, and the circumstances of use. Despite a number of important treatments of the basic principles and procedures of translation, no full-scale theory of translation now exists.

In fact, it is anomalous to speak of "theories of translation," since all that has been accomplished thus far are important series of insightful perspectives on this complex undertaking. The basic reason for this lack of adequate theoretical treatments is that translating is essentially a technology which is dependent upon a number of disciplines: Linguistics, cultural anthropology, psychology, communication theory, and neurophysiology. Thus, instead of speaking of theories of translation, we should perhaps speak more about various approaches to the task of translating, different orientations which provide helpful insights and diverse ways of talking about how a message can be transferred from one language to another.

References

Catford, John. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation.* London, Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge, MA, M.I.T. Press.

Hatim, Basil. & Munday, Jeremy. (2004). *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book.* London: Routledge.

Miremadi, S. Ali. (2004). *Theories of Translation and Interpretation.* Tehran: SAMT publication.

Munday, Jeremy. (2001). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications.* London: Routledge.