

**Online Publication Date: 1<sup>st</sup> June 2012**  
**Publisher: Asian Economic and Social Society**



**Translation Studies: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow**

**Hosni M. El-dali** (Department of Linguistics, United Arab Emirates University)

**Citation:** Hosni M. El-dali (2012) "Translation Studies: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow"  
International Journal of Asian Social Science, Vol.2, No.6, pp.756-781.



**Author (s)**

**Hosni M. El-dali**  
Linguistics Programme United  
Arab Emirates University  
E-mail: [hasan.mostafa@uaeu.ac.ae](mailto:hasan.mostafa@uaeu.ac.ae)

**Translation Studies: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow**

**Abstract**

For a long time the study of translation has been considered a second-rate activity. It was viewed for many decades either as simple linguistic transcoding, or as a literary practice. Now, it has acquired full academic recognition. However, two points must be emphasized: (1) although translation has existed for many centuries, it was not until the second half of this century that 'Translation Studies' developed into a discipline in its own right, and (2) the past fifteen years or so have seen the focus of translation studies shift away from Linguistics and increasingly to forms of Cultural Studies. There has also been a shift towards studies that have incorporated models from functional linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis, locating the text within its sociocultural context. More recently, technological advances, which have transformed the working conditions of professional translators and researchers and have spawned new forms of translation, have also produced new areas of research, some linked to the effects of globalization and some to forms of intersemiotic translation.

The present study, therefore, attempts to outline the scope of the discipline of Translation Studies (TS), to give some indication of the kind of work that has been done so far. More importantly, it is an attempt to demonstrate that (TS) is a vastly complex field with many far-reaching ramifications.

**Introduction**

Translation has very wide and rich history in the West. Since its birth, translation was the subject of a variety of research and conflicts between theorists. Each theorist approaches it according to his viewpoint and field of research, the fact that give its history a changing quality. The present study, therefore, attempts to outline the scope of this discipline, to give some indication of the kind of work that has been done so far. Most importantly, it is an attempt to demonstrate that Translation Studies (TS) is a vastly complex field with many far – reaching ramifications.

The activity of translation has a long-standing tradition and has been widely practiced throughout history, but in our rapidly changing world its role has become of paramount importance. Nowadays, in which cultural exchanges have been widening, knowledge has been increasingly expanding and international

communication has been intensifying, the phenomenon of translation has become fundamental. Be it for scientific, medical, technological, commercial, legal, cultural or literary purposes, today human communication depends heavily on translation and, consequently, interest in the field is also growing.

Translators as applied linguists do have certain obligations to the furthering of our understanding of language and of our ability to explain the acts of communicating in which we are continually engaged. In their evaluation of all the developments in translation studies, Hatim & Mason (1990: 35) said that "Taken together, all of these developments ..... have provided a new direction for translation studies. It is one which restores to the translator the central role in a process of cross-cultural communication and ceases to regard equivalence merely as a matter of entities within texts Hua, 2011; Numan, 2011).

## **Theoretical Background**

Translation and interpreting as activities have existed for many centuries, and there is a long tradition of thought and an enormous body of opinion about translation (Delisle & Woodsworth, 1995; Robinson, 1997). But it was not until the second half of this century that Translation Studies developed into a discipline in its own right (Holmes, 1988; Snell-Hornby et al., 1992). Although at first conceived as a subdiscipline of applied linguistics, it has taken on concepts and methods of other disciplines, notably text linguistics, communication studies, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatics, comparative literature, and recently, cultural studies. Instead of a unified theory, we have a multiplicity of approaches, each of which focuses on specific aspects of translation, looks at the product or the process of translation from a specific angle, and uses specific terminology and research methods (Chesterman & Arojo, 2000; Gentzlaer, 1993; Schaffner, 1997). Some researchers postulate an autonomous status for translation studies, arguing that these studies bring together work in a wide variety of fields, including literary study, anthropology, psychology, and linguistics. Others claim that the domain of translation studies is an important sub-branch of applied linguistics. Proponents of both opinions would have to admit, however, that the field of translation studies has multidisciplinary dimensions and aspects (Baker, 1997). Hatim & Mason (1990) point out that the gap between theory and practice in translation studies has existed for too long. Thanks to work being done in several different but related areas, there is an opportunity to narrow that gap. Recent trends in sociolinguistics, discourse studies, pragmatics and semantics, together with insights from the fields of artificial intelligence and conversation analysis, have advanced our understanding of the way communication works. The relevance to translation studies of all this is obvious as soon translation is regarded not as a sterile linguistic exercise but as an act of communication (Gregorious, 2011).

Communication between different individuals and nations is not always easy, especially when more than one language is involved. The job of the translator and/ or interpreter is to try to

bridge the gap between two foreign languages. This can also include translation problems arising from historical developments within one language. We are all involved in translating all the time, if not between languages, then between dialects, registers and styles. Translating was and is a profession, with its own codes of conduct and criteria of performance, not accessible to all. In short, inside or between languages, human communication equals translation. A study of translation is a study of language (Bassnett, 1980). In this regard, Candlin (1990: ix) maintains that “translation allows us to put language into perspective by asserting the need to extend beyond the opposite selection of phrases to an investigative exploration of the signs of a culture, and to the social and individual motivations for particular choices. It offers the possibility of unraveling the complex of human and conceptual relations which make up the contexts in which we communicate. As such, it is as much social as linguistic .... It offers a broader conception of what it means to understand”. Translation, then, is a useful test case for examining the whole issue of the role of language in social life. In creating a new act of communication out of a previously existing one, translators are inevitably acting under the pressure of their own social conditioning while at the same time trying to assist in the negotiation of meaning between the producer of the source-language text (ST) and the reader of the target-language text (TT), both of whom exist within their own, different social frameworks. In studying this complex process at work, we are in effect seeking insights which take us beyond translation itself towards the whole relationship between the language activity and the social context in which it takes place (Hatim & Mason, 1990: 1). They further, argue that translation is a “Communicative transaction taking place within a social framework” (p. 2). As Robinson (2005: 142) points out, ‘a useful way of thinking about translation and language is that translators do not translate words; they translate what people do with words. Translation is, after all, an operation performed both on and in language’. As Candlin (1990: viii) points out, when we read or hear any language from the past, or when we receive as human beings any message from any other human being, we perform an act

of translation. Such an act involves (1) an understanding of the cultural and experimental words that lie behind the original act of speaking or of writing, ways into their schemata; (2) an understanding of the potential of the two semiotic systems in terms of their image-making; (3) a making intelligible of the linguistic choices expressed in the message; (4) an opportunity to explore the social psychological intentions of the originator or the message matched against one's own, and (5) a challenge to match all of these with our appropriate response in our semiotic and linguistic system, and our culture (Chandlers, 2011; Field, 2011; Leeuwen, 2011).

### **Translation: Its Nature And Status**

Some people may, mistakenly, think that knowing a foreign language makes a translator. This is the most common translation misconception and the most damaging one. Being able to read, speak and write a foreign language does not give anyone license to undertake translation work. Firstly, a translator must have in-depth understanding and knowledge of at least two languages: a foreign language and a mother tongue. Secondly, translating is a skill. He must be able to write well and have an excellent command of the nuances in language use. Thirdly, language is not free of cultural influences. If the culture behind the language which is being translated is not appreciated, an accurate translation is extremely difficult. Translation can be very intricate, complex and arduous work. Having to simultaneously concentrate on two different texts is mentally exhausting.

This is because a translator is continuously moving between two languages and mind frames. A translator must first read and register source information then manage to digest it and present it accurately in the target language. The third misconception is that computers can now do translation. No translation program can and ever will be able to take the place of a human translator. This is because computers do not understand what language is and how it is used. Computers may be able to translate simple one-dimensional sentences but they will never be able to tackle the complexities within literature or technical texts. Moreover, some may believe

that having a professional translation is not crucial. It may be true that the professional translators are not always necessary; however, if the translation is to be accurate and professionally prepared and presented, then, an experienced translator is crucial. Bad translations lead to many problems including people misunderstanding texts which ultimately reflect poorly on a company or organization. If you want your car fixed you take it to a mechanic, not a car salesman. He may know a bit about cars but not enough to address your problems properly (Payne, 2004).

Translation has been perceived as a secondary activity, as a 'mechanical' rather than a 'creative' process, within the competence of anyone with a basic grounding in a language other than their own, in short, as a low status occupation (Bassnett, 1996). Folk notions might still at times claim that proficiency in two languages along with a couple of dictionaries are all that one needs to produce a translation. Even though the most evident problems that come up when translating may seem to be a matter of words and expressions, translation is not only a matter of vocabulary; grammar also plays a large and important role.

With reference to its important role in translation, Torsello (1996: 88) has this to say: grammar should be a part of the education of a translator, and in particular functional grammar since it is concerned with language in texts and with the role grammar plays, in combination with lexicon, in carrying out specific functions and realizing specific types of meaning. Apart from proficiency in two languages, the source and target ones, translation presupposes much knowledge and know-how together with the flexibility, and capacity, to draw on a wide range of other disciplines, depending on the text being translated (Manfredi, 2008: 25). Beyond the notion stressed by the narrowly linguistic approach, that translation involves the transfer of 'meaning' contained in one set of language signs into another set of language signs through competent use of the dictionary and grammar, the process involves a whole set of extra-linguistic criteria also. Sapir (1956: 69) claims that language is a guide to social reality and that human beings are at the mercy of the language that has become the medium of expression for

their society. Experience, he asserts, is largely determined by the language habits of the community, and each separate structure represents a separate reality: "No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality. The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached" (P. 69).

Moreover, because translation is perceived as an intrinsic part of the foreign language teaching process, it has rarely been studied for its own sake. What is generally understood as translation involves the rendering of a source language (SL) text into the target language (TL) so as to ensure that (1) the surface meaning of the two will be approximately similar and (2) the structures of the SL will be preserved as closely as possible but not so closely that the TL structures will be seriously distorted. The instructor can then hope to measure the students' linguistic competence, by means of the TL product. But there the matter stops. The stress throughout is on an understanding the syntax of the language being studied and on using translation as a means of demonstrating that understanding.

It is hardly surprising that such a restricted concept of translation goes hand in hand with the low status accorded to the translator and to distinctions usually being made between the writer and the translator to the detriment of the latter. Belloc (1931) summed up the problem of status and his words are still perfectly applicable today: "The art of translation is a subsidiary art and derivative. On this account it has never been granted the dignity of original work, and has suffered too much in the general judgment of letters. This natural underestimation of its value has had the bad practical effect of lowering the standard demanded, and in some periods has almost destroyed the art altogether. The corresponding misunderstanding of its character has added to its degradation: neither its importance nor its difficulty has been grasped" (p. 32).

On the other hand, translation study in English has devoted much time to the problem of finding a term to describe translation itself. Some scholars such as Savory (1957) define

translation as an 'art'; others, such as Jacobsen (1958) define it as a 'craft'; while others, perhaps more sensibly, borrow from the German and describe it as a 'science'. Frenz (1961) even goes so far as to opt for 'art' but with qualifications, claiming that translation is neither a creative art nor an imitative art, but stand somewhere between the two. This emphasis on terminological debate in English Translation Studies, in which a value system underlies the choice of term. "Craft" would imply a slightly lower status than 'art' and carry with it suggestions of amateurishness, while 'science' could hint at a mechanistic approach and detract from the notion that translation is a creative process. At all events, the pursuit of such a debate is purposeless and can only draw attention away from the central problem of finding a terminology that can be utilized in the systematic study of translation (Bassnett, 1996).

Translation is, as Quirk (1974: 12) puts it, 'one of the most difficult task that a writer can take upon himself.' That translation involves far more than a working acquaintance with two languages is aptly summed up by Levy (1963) (Cited in Holmes, 1970), when he declares that a translation is not a monistic composition, but an interpenetration and conglomerate of two structures. On the one hand there are the semantic content and the formal contour of the original, on the other hand the entire system of aesthetic features bound up with the language of the translation. Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997), observe that throughout the history of research into translation, the phenomenon has been variously delimited by formal descriptions, echoing the frameworks of the scholars proposing them. For example, Bell (1991: XV) starts with an informal definition of translation, which runs as follows: the transformation of a text originally in one language into an equivalent text in a different language retaining, as far as is possible, the content of the message and the formal features and functional roles of the original text. At the beginning of the 'scientific' (Newmark 1981: 2) study of translation, Catford (1965: 20) described it in these terms: [...] the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL). That his concern was with

maintaining a kind of 'equivalence' between the ST and the TT is apparent. Thirty years later, in Germany, the concept of translation as a form of 'equivalence' is maintained, as we can see from Koller's definition (1995: 196): "The result of a text processing activity, by means of which a source language text is transposed into a target-language text. Between the resultant text in L2 (the target-language text) and the source text in L1 (the source language text) there exists a relationship, which can be designated as a translational, or equivalence relation". In this regard, Bassnett (1996: 20) claims that all texts, being part of a literary system descended from and related to other systems, are "translations of translation of translations": Every text is unique and at the same time, it is the translation of another text. No text is entirely original because language itself, in its essence, is already a translation: firstly, of the non-verbal world and secondly, since every sign and every phrase is the translation of another sign and another phrase. However, this argument can be turned around without losing any of its validity: all texts are original because every translation is distinctive. Every translation, up to a certain point, is an invention and as such it constitutes a unique text (Cobley, 2011; LoCastro, 2011).

On the other hand, Halliday (1992: 15) takes translation to refer to the total process and relationship of equivalence between two languages; we then distinguish, within translation, between "translating" (written text) and "interpreting" (spoken text). Halliday, thus, proposes distinguishing the activity of "translation" (as a process) from the product(s) of "translating", including both "translation" (concerning written text) and 'interpreting' (regarding spoken text). This of course reflects his notion of 'text', which "[...] may be either spoken or written, or indeed in any other medium of expression that we like to think of" (Halliday, 1985/89: 10). Nord's definition, conversely, clearly reflects her closeness to 'skopos theory' (Reiss and Vermeer 1984); hence the importance attributed to the purpose and function of the translation in the receiving audience: "Translation is the production of a functional target text maintaining a relationship with a given source text that is specified according to the intended or demanding

function of the target text (translation skopos)" (Nord 1991: 28). According to House (2001: 247) translation is thought of as a text which is a "representation" or "reproduction" of an original one produced in another language. Hatim & Munday (2004: 3) point out that we can analyze translation from two different perspectives: that of a 'process', which refers to the activity of turning a ST into a TT in another language, and that of a 'product', i.e., the translated text (Kimmel, 2010).

Manfredi (2008) points out that if we look for a definition of translation in a general dictionary, we can find it described as: (1) the process of translating words or text from one language into another; and (2) the written or spoken rendering of the meaning of a word, speech, book or other text, in another language [...] (The New Oxford Dictionary of English 1998). On the other hand, if we consider the definition offered by a specialist source like the Dictionary of Translation Studies by Shuttworth and Cowie (1997: 181), we can find the phenomenon of translation explained as follows: "an incredibly broad notion which can be understood in many different ways. For example, one may talk of translation as a process or a product, and identify such sub-types as literary translation, technical translation, subtitling and machine translation; moreover, while more typically it just refer to the transfer of written texts, the term sometimes also includes interpreting, [...] furthermore, many writers also extend its reference to take in related activities which most would not recognize as translation as such" (see Malmkjar, 2005; House, 2006a, b, 2008). In his analysis of the above definition, Manfredi (2008), points out that the above distinction can be divided into two main perspectives, those that consider translation either as a 'process' or a 'product'. To this twofold categorization, Bell (1991: 13) adds a further variable, since he suggests making a distinction between translating (the process), a translation (the product) and translation (i.e., "the abstract concept which encompasses both the process of translating and the product of that process").

Central to reflections on the nature of translation and the task of the translator has always been the question of the translator's

responsibility towards the original. In modern times, considerations of the relationship between translation and original have often focused on principles of 'faithfulness' and 'accuracy'. While usually understood in widely diverse ways, faithfulness has assumed the status of an ethical responsibility, with translators in many countries required to take an oath to guarantee the accuracy and correctness of their work before being officially licensed to practice. Translators, thus, are expected to present their readers with an 'accurate' picture of the original, without any 'distortions', and without imposing their personal values, or those of their own culture, on the intellectual products of other nations. For a long time this valorization of the original did not disrupt the almost universally accepted precept of 'natural' translation.

A translated text, it is often still emphasized, should read like an original composition and not call attention to its translatedness - an effect that is usually created through 'free' translation strategies. According to Robinson (1997: 126), free translation became an orthodoxy in the West from the Renaissance onwards. In recent years, however, challenges to the 'transparency' principle have been mounted chiefly by postmodernist and postcolonial critics. Perhaps the most widely circulated and influential of these challenges can be found in the work of Lawrence Venuti. Venuti has called attention to the ethnocentrism inherent in what he has termed 'domesticating translation', which assimilates the foreign text to the values of the receiving culture to create an impression of a natural text, whose translator is invisible. Indeed, Venuti equates domesticating translation with 'ethnocentric violence', a violence which involves appropriating others and assimilating them into the target culture's worldview, "reducing if not simply excluding the very differences that translation is called on to convey" (2008: 16).

Venuti also maintains that domesticating translation consolidates the power hierarchy that imposes hegemonic discourses on the target culture by conforming to its worldview. In Anglo-American culture, for example, it has contributed to "closing off any thinking about cultural and social alternatives that do not favor

English social elites" (ibid.: 35). Venuti has recently refined his position on domesticating translation. While domestication as a practice is still generally denounced, Venuti introduces a new potential function for it. He conceives of the possibility of a "foreignizing fluency that produces the illusion of transparency and enables the translation to pass for an original composition" (ibid.: 267). How the illusion of transparency might be distinguished from actual transparency is not made clear, but this newly recognized practice remains in essence a "foreignizing intervention" with the same purpose as foreignizing translation proper: "to question existing cultural hierarchies" (ibid. ).

### **Translation and Linguistics**

Linguistics-based approaches define translation as transferring meanings, as substituting source language (SL) signs by equivalent target language (TL) signs (Catford, 1965). The source text (ST) is to be reproduced in the TL as closely as possible, both in content and in form. Since the aim of a translation theory has often been seen as determining appropriate translation methods, language systems (as langues) have been studied in order to find the smallest equivalent units (at the lexical and grammatical levels) which can be substituted for each other in an actual text (as parole). Text linguistic approaches define translation as source text induced target text (TT) production (Neubert, 1985).

The text itself is treated as the unit of translation, and it is stressed that a text is always a text in a situation and in a culture. Therefore, consideration needs to be given to situational factors, genre or text-typological conventions, addresses knowledge and expectations, and text functions. The central notion of equivalence is now applied to the textual level, and defined as communicative equivalence, i.e., a relationship between the target text and the source text in which TT and ST are of equal value in the respective communicative situations in their cultures. Functionalist approaches define translation as purposeful captivity (Nord, 1991), as transcultural interaction, as production of a TT which is appropriate for its specified purpose (its skopos) for target addressees in target

circumstances (Vermeer's 'skopos theory', Vermeer, 1996). The actual form of the TT, its textual linguistic make-up, is therefore dependent on its intended purpose, and not (exclusively) on the structure of the ST. The yardstick for assessing the quality of target text is, thus, its appropriateness for its purpose, and not the equivalence to the source text. More modern linguistic approaches acknowledge that translation is not a simple substitution process, but rather the result of a complex text - processing activity. However, they argue that translations need to be set apart from other kinds of derived texts, and that the label 'translation' should only be applied to those cases where an equivalence relation obtains between ST and TT (House, 2001).

Mounin (1963) acknowledges the great benefits that advances in linguistics have brought to Translation Studies; the development of structural linguistics, the work of Saussure, of Hjelmslev, of the Moscow and Prague Linguistic Circles has been of great value, and the work of Chomsky and the transformational linguists has also had its impact, particularly with regard to the study of Semantics. Mounin feels that it is thanks to developments in contemporary linguistics that we can (and must) accept that: (1) Personal experience in its uniqueness is untranslatable; (2) In theory the base units of any two languages (e.g. phonemes, monemes, etc.) are not always comparable; (3) Communication is possible when account is taken of the respective situations of speaker and hearer, or author and translator. In other words, Mounin believes that linguistics demonstrates that translation is a dialectic process that can be accomplished with relative success: "Translation may always start with the clearest situations, the most concrete messages, the most elementary universals.

But as it involves the consideration of a language in its entirety, together with its most subjective messages, through an examination of common situations and a multiplication of contacts that need clarifying, then there is no doubt that communication through translation can never be completely finished, which also demonstrates that it is never wholly impossible either" (p.4) One of the first to propose that linguistics should affect the study of translation

was Jakobson who, in 1959, affirmed: "Any comparison of two languages implies an examination of their mutual translatability; the widespread practice of interlingual communication, particularly translating activities, must be kept under constant scrutiny by linguistic science" (1959/2000; 233-234). In 1965, Catford opened his, "A Linguistic Theory of Translation", with the following assertion: "Clearly, then, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language – a general linguistic theory" (Catford 1965: 1). As Fawcett (1997: 2) suggests, the link between linguistics and translation can be twofold. On one hand, the finding of linguistics can be applied to the practice of translation; on the other hand, it is possible to establish a linguistic theory of translation. Bell even argues that translation can be invaluable to linguistics: "[...] as a vehicle for testing theory and for investigating language use" (Bell 1991: xvi). Fawcett's view is that, without a grounding in linguistics, the translator is like "[...] somebody who is working with an incomplete toolkit" (Fawcett 1997: foreword). Taylor (1998: 10) affirms that "translation is undeniably a linguistic phenomenon, at least in part".

Linguistics, thus, can be said to have "[...] had the advantage of drawing [translation] away from its intuitive approach and of providing it with a scientific foundation" (Ulrych & Bosinelli 1999: 229). According to Munday (2001: 9) "[t]he more systematic and 'scientific' approach in many ways began to mark out the territory of the academic investigation of translation", represented by Nida (1964). In spite of all this, on many sides the relevance of linguistics to translation has also been critiqued, or worse, neglected. Bell (1991) showed his contempt for such a skeptical attitude. He finds it paradoxical that many translation theorists should make little systematic use of the techniques and insights offered by linguistics, but also that many linguists should have little or no interest in the theory of translation. In his view, if translation scholars do not draw heavily on linguistics, they can hardly move beyond a subjective and arbitrary evaluation of the products, i.e. translated texts, they are, in short, doomed to have no concern for the process. Similarly, Hatim warns against those introductory books on TS which tend to



criticize the role of linguistics in the theory of translation and blame it for any, or all, failure in translation. According to Hatim (2001) these books seem to ignore those branches within linguistics which are not divorced from practice and whose contribution to translation is vital. However, despite this scepticism, a genuine interest in linguistics does continue to thrive in TS. Even though Snell-Hornby takes her distance from it, recently TS seems to have been characterized by a new 'linguistic turn' (Snell-Hornby 2006).

Up to the end of the 1970s, as Snell-Hornby reports (1988: 15), most linguistically-oriented theories were centered around the concept of equivalence. In the 1980s, the concept reappeared in a new light, 'resuscitated', as it were, by Neubert (1984), who put forward his idea of 'text bound equivalence'. Manfredi (2008) believes that, linguistics has much to offer the study of translation. Since linguistics deals with the study of language and how this works, and since the process of translation vitally entails language, the relevance of linguistics to translation should never be in doubt. But it must immediately be made clear that we are referring in particular to "[...] those branches of linguistics which are concerned with the [...] social aspects of language use" and which locate the ST and TT firmly within their cultural contexts (Bell 1991: 13).

### **Translation: Art or Science – The Issue of Equivalence**

The comparison of texts in different languages inevitably involves a theory of equivalence. 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 (Leonardi, 2000). The notion of 'equivalence' has definitely represented a key issue throughout the history of TS. Basically, 'equivalence' is "[a] term used by many writers to describe the nature and the extend of the relationships which exist between SL and TL texts" (Shuttleworth & Cowie 1997; 49) usually, the relationship "[...] allows the TT to be considered as a translation

of the ST in the first place" (Kenny 1998: 77). As Leonardi (2001) points out, the difficulty in defining equivalence seems to result in the impossibility of having a universal approach to this notion. The problem of equivalence, a much-used and abused term in Translation Studies, is of central importance. It is undoubtedly one of the most problematic and controversial areas in the field of translation theory. The term has caused, and it seems quite probable that it will continue to cause, heated debates within the field of translation studies. This term has been analyzed, evaluated and extensively discussed from different points of view and has been approached from many different perspectives (Walker, 2011).

Jakobson's study of equivalence gave new impetus to the theoretical analysis of translation since he introduced the notion of 'equivalence in difference'. On the basis of his semiotic approach to language and his aphorism 'there is no signatum without signum' (1959: 232), he suggests three kinds of translation: (1) Intralingual (within one language, i.e. rewording or paraphrase). (2) interlingual (between two languages) and (3) intersemiotic (between sign systems). Jakobson claim that, in the case of interlingual translation, the translator makes use of synonyms in order to get the ST message across. This means that in interlingual translations there is no full equivalence between code units. According to his theory, 'translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes' (ibid: 233). Jakobson goes on to say that from a grammatical point of view languages may differ from one another to a greater or lesser degree, but this does not mean that a translation cannot be possible, in other words, that the translator may face the problem of not finding a translation equivalent. He acknowledges that 'whenever there is deficiency, terminology may be qualified and amplified by loanwords or loan- translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and finally, by circumlocutions' (ibid: 234).

Nida (1964) argued that there are two types of equivalence, namely formal equivalence – which in the second edition by Nida and Tabler (1982) is referred to as formal correspondence – and dynamic equivalence. Formal

correspondence ‘focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content’, unlike dynamic equivalence which is based upon ‘the principle of equivalent effect’ (1964: 159). In the second edition (1982) of their work, the two theorists provide a more detailed explanation of each type of equivalence. Formal correspondence consists of a TL item which represents the closest equivalent of a SL word or phrase. Nida and Taber make it clear that there are not always formal equivalents between language pairs. They therefore suggest that these formal equivalents should be used wherever possible if the translation aims at achieving formal rather than dynamic equivalence. The use of formal equivalents might at times have serious implications in the TT since the translation will not be easily understood by the target audience (Fawcett, 1997).

Nida and Taber themselves assert that ‘typically, formal correspondence distorts the grammatical and stylistic patterns of the receptor language, and hence distorts the message, so as to cause the receptor to misunderstand or to labor unduly hard’ (ibid: 201). Dynamic equivalence is defined as a translation principle according to which a translator seeks to translate the meaning of the original in such a way that the TL wording will trigger the same impact on the TC audience as the original wording did upon the ST audience. They argue that ‘frequently, the form of the original text is changed; but as long as the change follows the rules of back transformation in the source language, of contextual consistency in the transfer, and of transformation in the receptor language, the message is preserved and the translation is faithful’ (Nida and Taber, 1982: 200).

Catford (1965) advocated a theory of translation based on equivalence: “The central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL translation equivalents. A central task of translation theory is that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence (1965: 21)”. Catford had a preference for a more linguistic-based approach to translation and this approach is based on the linguistic work of Firth and Halliday. His main contribution in the field of translation theory is the introduction

of the concept of types and shifts of translation. Catford proposed very broad types of translation in terms of three criteria: (1) the extent of translation (full translation vs. partial translation), (2) the grammatical rank at which the translation equivalence is established (rank-bound translation vs. unbounded translation), and (3) the levels of language involved in translation (total translation vs. restricted translation). The second type of translation is the one that concerns the concept of equivalence. In rank-bound translation an equivalent is sought in the TL for each word, or for each morpheme encountered in the ST. In unbounded translation equivalences are not tied to a particular rank, and we may additionally find equivalence at sentence, clause and other levels.

In his definition of translation equivalence, Popovic (1976) distinguishes four types: (1) Linguistic equivalence, where there is homogeneity on the linguistic level of both SL and TL texts, i.e. word for word translation; (2) Paradigmatic equivalence, where there is equivalence of ‘the elements of a paradigmatic expressive axis’, i.e. elements of grammar, which Popovic sees as being a higher category than lexical equivalence; (3) Stylistic (translational) equivalence, where there is ‘functional equivalence of elements in both original and translation aiming at an expressive identity with an invariant of identical meaning; and (4) Textual (syntagmatic) equivalence, where there is equivalence of the syntagmatic structuring of a text, i.e., equivalence of form and shape. “It is an established fact in Translation Studies that if a dozen translators tackle the same poem, they will produce a dozen different versions. And yet somewhere in those dozen versions there will be what Popovic calls the ‘invariant core’ of the original poem. Transformations, or variants, are those changes, which do not modify the core of meaning but influence the expressive form” (Bassnett, 1996: 15).

House (1977) is in favor of semantic and pragmatic equivalence and argues that ST and TT should match one another in function. House suggests that it is possible to characterize the function of a text by determining the situational dimensions of the ST. According to

her theory, every text is in itself placed within a particular situation which has to be correctly identified and taken into account by the translator. After the ST analysis, House is in a position to evaluate a translation; if the ST and the TT differ substantially on situational features, then they are not functionally equivalent, and the translation is not of a high quality. In fact, she acknowledges that 'a translation text should not only match its source text in function, but employ equivalent situational-dimensional means to achieve that function' (ibid: 49). Central to House's discussion is the concept of overt and covert translations. In an overt translation the TT audience is not directly addressed and there is therefore no need at all to attempt to recreate a 'second original' since an overt translation 'must overtly be a translation' (ibid: 189). By covert translation, on the other hand, is meant the production of a text which is functionally equivalent to the ST. House also argues that in this type of translation the ST 'is not specifically addressed to a TC audience' (ibid: 194).

An extremely interesting discussion of the notion of equivalence can be found in Baker (1992) who seems to offer a more detailed list of conditions upon which the concept of equivalence can be defined. She explores the notion of equivalence at different levels, in relation to the translation process, including all different aspects of translation and hence putting together the linguistic and the communicative approach. She distinguishes between four types. First, the equivalence that can appear at word level and above word level, when translating from one language into another. Second, grammatical equivalence, when referring to the diversity of grammatical categories across languages. She notes that grammatical rules may vary across languages and this may pose some problems in terms of finding a direct correspondence in the TL. Third, textual equivalence, when referring to the equivalence between a SL text and a TL text in terms of information and cohesion. Texture is a very important feature in translation since it provides useful guidelines for the comprehension and analysis of the ST which can help the translator in his or her attempt to produce a cohesive and coherent text for the TC

audience in a specific context. It is up to the translator to decide whether or not to maintain the cohesive ties as well as the coherence of the SL text. His or her decision will be guided by there main factors, that is, the target audience, the purpose of the translation and the text type. Fourth, Pragmatic equivalence, when referring to implicatures and strategies of avoidance during the translation process. Implicature is not about what is explicitly said but what is implied. Therefore, the translator needs to work out implied meanings in translation in order to get the ST message across. The role of the translator is to recreate the author's intention in another culture in such a way that enables the TC reader to understand it clearly. Baker (1992:6) recognized that equivalence "is influenced by a variety of linguistic and cultural factors and is therefore always relative" (Baker, 1992:6). Similarly Ivir (1996: 44) defended the concept of equivalence as relative and not absolute, being strictly connected to the context of situation of the text.

Halliday (2001) who based his definition of translation on the notion of equivalence, has more recently reassessed the centrality of equivalence in translation quality and proposed categorization according to three parameters , i.e. 'Stratification', 'Metafunction' and 'Rank' (Halliday 2001: 15). Halliday is not a translation scholar, but a linguist, or as he is fond of defining himself, a 'grammarian', one who, however, has also shown interest in "[...] some aspect of linguistic which relate closely to the theory and practice of translation" (1992: 15). Vinay and Darbelnet (1995) view equivalence-oriented translation as a procedure which 'replicates the same situation as in the original, whilst using completely different wording' (1995: 342). They also suggest that, if this procedure is applied during the translation process, it can maintain the stylistic impact of the SL text in the TL text. According to them, equivalence is therefore the ideal method when the translator has to deal with proverbs, idioms, clichés, nominal or adjectival phrases and the onomatopoeia of animal sounds. With regard to equivalent expressions between language pairs, Vinat and Darbelnet claim that they are acceptable as long as they are listed in a bilingual dictionary as 'full equivalents' (ibid: 255). However, later they

note that glossaries and collections of idiomatic expressions 'can never be exhaustive' (ibid: 256).

To sum up, these theorists have studied equivalence in relation to the translation process, using different approaches, and have provided fruitful ideas for further study on this topic. These theories can be substantially divided into three main groups. In the first there are those translation scholars who are in favor of a linguistic approach to translation and who seem to forget that translation in itself is not merely a matter of linguistics. In fact, when a message is transferred from the SL to TL, the translator is also dealing with two different cultures at the same time. This particular aspect seems to have been taken into consideration by the second group of theorists who regard translation equivalence as being essentially a transfer of the message from the SC to the TC and a pragmatic/semantic or functionally oriented approach to translation.

Finally, there are other translation scholars who seem to stand in the middle, such as Baker for instance, who claims that equivalence is used 'for the sake of convenience – because most translators are used to it rather than because it has any theoretical status' (quoted in Kenny, 1998: 77). In this regard, Bassnett (1996) argues that equivalence in translation, then, should not be approached as search for sameness, since sameness cannot even exist between two TL versions of the same text, let alone between the SL and the TL version. And, once the principle is accepted that sameness cannot exist between two languages, it becomes possible to approach the question of loss and gain in the translation process. It is again an indication of the low status of translation that so much time should have been spent on discussing what is lost in the transfer of a text from SL to TL whilst ignoring what can also be gained, for the translator can at times enrich or clarify the SL text as a direct result of the translation process.

Closely related to 'the literal versus free issue' is the debate on the primacy of content over form or vice versa. The translator is here faced with what amounts to a conflict of interests. The ideal, according to Hatim & Mason (1990)

would be to translate both form and content, but this is frequently not possible. According to Nida (1964), the overriding criteria are (1) type of discourse, and (2) reader response: "the standards of stylistic acceptability for various types of discourse differ radically from language to language" (p. 169). Thus, adherence to the style of the source text may, in certain circumstances, be unnecessary or even counterproductive. In this regard, Hatim & Mason (1990) maintained that "the term 'style' seems to have become a kind of umbrella heading, under which are lumped together all kinds of textual/contextual variables..... 'style' may be seen as the result of motivated choices made by text producers" (p. 10). This means that 'style' in this sense, is not a property of the language system as a whole but of particular languages users in particular kinds of settings (O'Keefe & Clancy, 2011; Moutner, 2011).

### **Translation: An Interdiscipline**

In the course of its development, the focus of Translation Studies has, thus, shifted markedly from linguistic towards contextual and cultural factors which affect translation. Major inspiration for the development of the discipline has also come from research conducted with the framework of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS), aiming at the description of translating and translations "as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience" (Holmes, 1998: 71). Research here includes and received, identifying regularities in translators behavior and linking such regularities to translation norms which operate both in the social event and the cognitive act of translation (Toury, 1995). DTS and postmodern theories thus define translation as norm-governed behavior (Toury, 1995) and / or a cultural political practice (Venuti, 1996: 197). Modern translation studies sees itself increasingly as an empirical discipline, aiming to describe translations (both as products and processes), to explain why translators act in certain ways and produce target texts of a specific profile, and to assess effects of translations.

The term "Translation Studies" was coined by Holmes in his well known paper, "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies", originally presented in 1972 to the translation section of

the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics in Copenhagen, but published and widely read only as of 1988. Holmes (1988: 71) outlined the field of what he termed "Translation Studies" (which has become the widely accepted term) and its two main objectives: (i) to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience, and (ii) to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted. Since Holmes' paper, TS has evolved to such an extent that it has turned into an interdiscipline, interwoven with many other fields. Beginning in the late 1970s, they — people like Holmes (1975), Even-Zohar (1979, 1981), Toury (1995), Lefevere (1992), Bassnett (1991), Snell-Hornby (1995), Hermans (1985) - explored the cultural systems that controlled translation and their impact on the norms and practices of actual translation work. One of their main assumptions was, and remains today, that translation is always controlled by the target culture; rather than arguing over the correct type of equivalence to strive for and how to achieve it, they insisted that the belief structures, value systems, literary and linguistic conventions, moral norms, and political expediencies of the target culture always shape translations in powerful ways, in the process shaping translators' notions of "equivalence" as well.

This "relativistic" view is typical of the cultural turn translation studies has taken over the past two decades or so: away from universal forms and norms to culturally contingent ones; away from prescriptions designed to control all translators, to descriptions of the ways in which target cultures control specific ones. In the late 1980s and 1990s several new trends in culturally oriented translation theory have expanded upon and to some extent displaced descriptive translation studies. In particular, feminist and postcolonial approaches to translation have had a major impact on the field.

Ulrych and Bosinelli (1999: 237) described the burgeoning discipline of TS as follows: The term 'multidiscipline' is the most apt in portraying the present state of translation studies since it underlines both its independent

nature and its plurality of perspectives. Translation studies can in fact be viewed as a 'metadiscipline' that is able to accommodate diverse disciplines with their specific theoretical and methodological frameworks and thus to comprehend areas focusing, for example, on linguistic aspects of translation, cultural studies aspects, literary aspects and so on. Their account of TS is akin to Hatim's view that "[t]ranslating is a multi-faceted activity, and there is room for a variety of perspectives" (Hatim, 2001: 10). According to Snell-Hornby (2006: 150-151) [...] Translation Studies opens up new perspectives from which other disciplines – or more especially the world around – might well benefit. It is concerned, not with languages, objects, or cultures as such, but with communication across cultures, which does not merely consist of the sum of all factors involved. And what is not yet adequately recognized is how translation (studies) could help us communicate better – a deficit that sometimes has disastrous results.

"Translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions" (Toury 1978: 200). As this statement implies, translators are permanently faced with the problem of how to treat the cultural aspects implicit in a source text (ST) and of finding the most appropriate technique of successfully conveying these aspects in the target language (TL). These problems may vary in scope depending on the cultural and linguistic gap between the two (or more) languages concerned (see Nida 1964: 130). Language and culture may, then, be seen as being closely related and both aspects must be considered for translation. The notion of culture is essential to considering the implications for translation and, despite the differences in opinion as to whether language is part of culture or not, the two notions appear to be inseparable. Lotman's theory states that "no language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist which does not have at its centre, the structure of natural language" (Lotman 1978: 211-232). Bassnett (1980: 13-14) underlines the importance of this double consideration when translating by stating that language is "the heart within the body of culture," the survival of both aspects being interdependent. Linguistic notions

of transferring meaning are seen as being only part of the translation process; "a whole set of extra-linguistic criteria" must also be considered. As Bassnett further points out, "the translator must tackle the SL text in such a way that the TL version will correspond to the SL version.... To attempt to impose the value system of the SL culture into the TL culture is dangerous ground" (Bassnett, 1980: 23). Thus, when translating, it is important to consider not only the lexical impact on the TL reader, but also the manner in which cultural aspects may be perceived and make translating decisions accordingly. Discussing the problems of correspondence in translation, Nida confers equal importance to both linguistic and cultural differences between the SL and the TL and concludes that "differences between cultures may cause more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure" (Nida, 1964: 130). It is further explained that parallels in culture often provide a common understanding despite significant formal shifts in the translation. The cultural implications for translation are thus of significant importance as well as lexical concerns (Robinson & Ellis, 2011).

Culturally-oriented and linguistically-oriented approaches to translation "[...] are not, necessarily mutually exclusive alternatives" (Manfredi 2007: 204). On the contrary, the inextricable link between language and culture can even be highlighted by a linguistic model that views language as a social phenomenon, indisputably embedded in culture. Chesterman (2006) does not support the linguistic-cultural studies divide that is typically used to categorize the shift or conflicting focus of research in Translation Studies. Manfredi (2008: 66) argues that taking account of culture does not necessarily mean having to dismiss any kind of linguistic approach to translation. As we have seen, even from a linguistic point of view, language and culture are inextricably connected. Moreover, as J. House clearly states (2002: 92-93), if we opt for contextually-oriented linguistic approaches – which see language as a social phenomenon embedded in culture and view the properly understood meaning of any linguistic item as requiring reference to the cultural context, we can tackle translation from both a linguistic and cultural

perspective: [...] while considering translation to be a particular type of culturally determined practice, [to] also hold that is, at its core, a predominantly linguistic procedure (House, 2002: 93). Thus, as suggested by Garzone (2005: 66-67), in order to enhance the role of culture when translating, it is not at all necessary to reject the fact the translation is primarily a linguistic activity. On the contrary, if we aim at a cultural goal, we will best do so through linguistic procedures. DisENZA (2006) summarizes the advantages of this multidisciplinary approach:

Translation Studies helps us to recognize the various goals and components of translation without focusing on only one or degrading some, allowing scholarship to extricate itself from modern notions of fidelity to the text to recover the strategies of particular eras, movements, or translators. The direction Translation Studies is taking is firmly towards the idea of the translator and interpreter as active mediating agents in an activity and a product where cultural difference, social roles and linguistic and economic power are most clearly expressed and need to be problematized and theorized through relevant frameworks from sociology, ethnography and related disciplines (Segalowitz, 2011; Goddard & Geesin, 2011)

Manfredi, (2008) has, recently, pointed out that language is not a simple matter of vocabulary and grammar, but that it can never be separated from the culture it operates in and is always part of a context. And, if you know the words, but do not recognize and understand the meanings, it is because you do not share the background knowledge of a different language/culture. Or, if you have problems knowing which lexico-grammar is appropriate for a particular event, then you may have problems with situated communication, since language use will vary according to different contexts. All this is even more evident when dealing with the activity of translation, when you are faced not only with recognizing and understanding a different social and cultural source context, but also with being able to reproduce meanings in a totally different environment, the target one. And this is true both for languages that are culturally 'close' and for those that are culturally 'distant'. In

short, a translator deals with two different cultures, the source and the target one, and is often faced with the problem of identifying culture specificity, which obliges finding a way to convey those features to his or her culture audience. As a result, it is believed that an approach which focuses on language embedded in context can prove itself to be a real help in the act of translating. As Robinson (2005: 191) points out, it is probably safe to say that there has never been a time when the community of translators was unaware of cultural differences and their significance for translation. The more aware the translator can become of these complexities, including power differentials between cultures and genders, the better a translator/he will be. Cultural knowledge and cultural difference have been a major focus of translator training and translation theory for as long as either has been in existence.

Accordingly, Modern Translation Studies is no longer concerned with examining whether a translation has been “faithful” to a source text. Instead, the focus is on social, cultural, and communicative practices, on the cultural and ideological significance of translating and of translations, on the external politics of translation, on the relationship between translation behaviour and socio-cultural factors. In other words, there is a general recognition of the complexity of the phenomenon of translation, an increased concentration on social causation and human agency, and a focus on effects rather than on internal structures. The object of research of Translation Studies is thus not language(s), as traditionally seen, but human activity in different cultural contexts. The applicability of traditional binary opposites (such as source language/text/culture and target language/text/culture, content vs. form, literal vs. free translation) is called into question, and they are replaced by less stable notions (such as hybrid text, hybrid cultures, space-in-between, intercultural space).

It is also widely accepted nowadays that Translation Studies is not a sub-discipline of applied linguistics (or of comparative literature, cf. Bassnett and Lefevere 1990:12) but indeed an independent discipline in its own right (Chesterman and Arrojo 2000). However, since insights and methods from various other

disciplines are of relevance for studying all aspects of translation as product and process, Translation Studies is often characterised as an interdiscipline (cf. Snell-Hornby et al. 1992). In other words, translation itself being a crossroads of processes, products, functions, and agents, its description and explanation calls for a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach. From the 1970s, insights and approaches of text linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, communication studies, were adopted to translation studies. Translation was defined as text production, as retextualising a SL-text according to the TL conventions. The text moved into the centre of attention, and notions such as textuality, context, culture, communicative intention, function, text type, genre, and genre conventions have had an impact on reflecting about translation. Texts are produced and received with a specific purpose, or function, in mind. This is the main argument underlying functionalist approaches to translation, initiated by Vermeer (1996) with his Skopos Theory.

Vermeer (1989/1996) introduced ‘skopos theory’ which is a Greek word for ‘aim’ or ‘purpose’. It is entered into translation theory as a technical term for the purpose of translation and of action of translating. Skopos theory focuses above all on the purpose of translation, which determines the translation method and strategies that are to be employed in order to produce a functionally adequate result. The result is TT, which Vermeer calls *translatum*. Therefore, knowing why SL is to be translated and what function of TT will be are crucial for the translator. Reiss and Vermeer (1984) in their book with the title of ‘Groundwork for a General Theory of Translation’ concentrated on the basic underlying ‘rules’ of this theory which involve: (1) A *translatum* (or TT) is determined by its *skopos*, (2) A TT is an offer of information in a target culture and TL considering an offer of information in a source culture and SL. This relates the ST and TT to their function in their respective linguistic and cultural context. The translator is once again the key player in the process of intercultural communication and production of the *translatum* because of the purpose of the translation.

### **Translation In Cultural Studies**

It can be said that the first concept in cultural translation studies was cultural turn that in 1978 was presaged by the work on Polysystems and translation norms by Even-Zohar and in 1980 by Toury. They dismiss the linguistic kinds of theories of translation and refer to them as having moved from word to text as a unit but not beyond. They themselves go beyond language and focus on the interaction between translation and culture, on the way culture impacts and constrains translation and on the larger issues of context, history and convention. Therefore, the move from translation as a text to translation as culture and politics is what they call it a Cultural Turn in translation studies and became the ground for a metaphor adopted by Bassnett and Lefevere in 1990. Cultural Turn refers to the analysis of translation in its cultural, political, and ideological context. The turn has been extended to incorporate a whole range of approaches from cultural studies and is a true indicator of the interdisciplinary nature of contemporary translation studies. One consequence of this has been bringing together scholars from different disciplines. These cultural approaches have widened the horizons of translation studies with new insights but at the same there has been a strong element of conflict among them. It is good to mention that the existence of such differences of perspectives is inevitable.

Pym (1992: 25) attempted to define a culture as follows: "How might one define the points where one culture stops and another begins? The borders are no easier to draw than those between language and communities. It is enough to define the limits of a culture as the points where transferred texts have had to be (intralingually or interlingually) translated. That is, if a text can adequately be transferred [moved in space and 'or time] without translation there is cultural continuity. And if a text has been translated, it represents distance between at least two cultures". In this regard, Robinson (2005: 192) argues that texts move in space (are carried, mailed, faxed, e-mailed) or in time (are physically preserved for later generations, who may use the language in which they were written in significantly different ways). Cultural difference is largely a

function of the distance they move, the distance from the place or time in which they are written to the place or time in which they are read; and it can be marked by the act or fact of translation. As we approach cultural boundaries, transferred texts become increasingly difficult to understand, until we give up and demand a translation – and it is at the point, Pym suggests, that we know we have moved from one culture to another.

Newmark (1988) defines culture as "the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression" (1988: 94), thus acknowledging that each language group has its own culturally specific features. He further clearly states that operationally he does "not regard language as a component or feature of culture" (Newmark 1988: 95) in direct opposition to the view taken by Vermeer who states that "language is part of a culture" (1989: 222). According to Newmark, Vermeer's stance would imply the impossibility to translate whereas for the latter, translating the source language (SL) into a suitable form of TL is part of the translator's role in transcultural communication. When considering the translation of cultural words and notions, Newmark proposes two opposing methods: transference and componential analysis (Newmark, 1981: 96). As Newmark mentions, transference gives "local colour", keeping cultural names and concepts. Although placing the emphasis on culture, meaningful to initiated readers, he claims this method may cause problems for the general readership and limit the comprehension of certain aspects. The importance of the translation process in communication leads Newmark to propose componential analysis which he describes as being "the most accurate translation procedure, which excludes the culture and highlights the message" (Newmark, 1981: 96)

Venuti (1992) believed that in addition to governments and other politically motivated institutions which may decide to censor or promote certain works, there are groups and social institutions which would include various players in the publication as a whole. These are the publishers, editors, the literary agents, marketing and sales teams and reviewers. Each



of these players has a particular position and role within the dominant cultural and political agenda of their time and place. Power play is an important theme for cultural commentators and translation scholars. In both theory and practice of translation, power resides in the deployment of language as an ideological weapon for excluding or including a reader, a value system, a set of beliefs, or even an entire culture. Venuti (1995) insisted that the scope of translation studies need to be broadened to take account of the value-driven nature of socio-cultural framework. He used the term invisibility to describe the translator situation and activity in Anglo-American culture. "A translated text, whether prose or poetry or non-fiction is judged acceptable by most publishers, reviewers and readers when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning the foreign text; the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the original" (Venuti, 1995). Venuti discussed invisibility hand in hand with two types of translating strategies: domestication and foreignization.

He considered domestication as dominating Anglo-American (TL) translation culture. Just as the postcolonialists were alert to the cultural effects of the differential in power relation between colony and ex-colony, so Venuti bemoaned the phenomenon of domestication since it involves reduction of the foreign text to the target language cultural values. This entails translating in a transparent, fluent, invisible style in order to minimize the foreignness of the TT. Venuti believed that a translator should leave the reader in peace, as much as possible, and he should move the author toward him. Foreignization, on the other hand, entails choosing a foreign text and developing a translation method along lines which excluded by dominant cultural values in target language. Venuti considers the foreignizing method to be an ethno deviant pressure on target language cultural values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad. According to him, it is highly desirable in an effort to restrain the ethnocentric violence translation. The foreignizing method

of translating, a strategy Venuti also termed 'resistancy', is a non-fluent or estranging translation style designed to make visible the persistence of translator by highlighting the foreign identity of ST and protecting it from the ideological dominance of the target culture. In his book 'The Scandals of Translation' Venuti (1998) insisted on foreignizing or, as he also called it, 'minoritizing' translation, to cultivate a varied and heterogeneous discourse. As far as language is concerned, the minoritizing or foreignizing method of Venuti's translation comes through in the deliberate inclusion of foreignizing elements in a bid to make the translator visible and to make the reader realize that he is reading a translation of the work from a foreign culture. Foreignization is close adherent to the ST structure and syntax. Venuti also said that the terms may change meaning across time and location.

Simon (1996) mentioned that cultural studies brings to translation an understanding of the complexities of gender and culture and it allows us to situate linguistic transfer. She considered a language of sexism in translation studies, with its image of dominance, fidelity, faithfulness and betrayal. She mentioned the seventeenth century Image of "les belles infidels" (unfaithful beauties), translations into French that were artistically beautiful but unfaithful. She went further and investigated George Steiner's male-oriented image of translation as penetration. The feminist theorists, more or less, see a parallel between the status of translation which is often considered to be derivative and inferior to the original writing and that of women so often repressed in society and literature. This is the core feminist translation that theory seeks to identify and critique the tangle of the concepts which relegate both women and translation to the bottom of the social and literary ladder. Simon takes this further in the concept of the committed translation project. Translation project here can be defined as such: An approach to literary translation in which feminist translators openly advocate and implement strategies (linguistic or otherwise) to foreground the feminist in the translated text. It may seem worthy to mention that the opposite of translation project occurs when gender-

marked works are translated in such a way that their distinctive characteristics are affected.

With the spread of deconstruction and cultural studies in the academy, the subject of ideology became an important area of study. The field of translation studies presents no exception to this general trend. It should also be mentioned that the concept of ideology is not something new and it has been an area of interest from a long time ago. The problem of discussing translation and ideology is one of definition. There are so many definitions of ideology that it is impossible to review them all. For instance as Hatim and Mason (1997) stated that ideology encompasses the tacit assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups. They make a distinction between the ideology of translating and the translation of ideology. Whereas the former refers to the basic orientation chosen by the translator operating within a social and cultural context. In translation of ideology they examined the extent of mediation supplied by a translator of sensitive texts. Here mediation is defined as the extent to which translators intervene in the transfer process, feeding their own knowledge and beliefs into processing the text (Tyler, 2011; Sebba et al., 2011).

Hermans (1999) stated that Culture refers to all socially conditioned aspects of human life. According to him translation can and should be recognized as a social phenomenon, a cultural practice. He said that we bring to translation both cognitive and normative expectations, which are continually being negotiated, confirmed, adjusted, and modified by practicing translators and by all who deal with translation. These expectations result from the communication within the translation system, for instance, between actual translations and statements about translation, and between the translation system and other social systems. Regarding cultural translation, Hervey (2002) mentioned that for dealing with the cultural gaps cultural transposition is needed. According to him cultural transposition has a scale of degrees which are toward the choice of features indigenous to target language and culture rather than features which are rooted in source culture. The result here is foreign features reduced in target text and is to some extent naturalized.

The scale here is from an extreme which is mostly based on source culture (exoticism) to the other extreme which is mostly based on target culture (cultural transplantation): (1) Exoticism: The degree of adaptation is very low here. The translation carries the cultural features and grammar of SL to TL. It is very close to transference; (2) Calque: Calque includes TL words but in SL structure therefore while it is unidiomatic to target reader but it is familiar to a large extent; (3) Cultural Borrowing: it is to transfer the ST expression verbatim into the TT. No adaptation of SL expression into TL forms. After a time they usually become a standard in TL terms. Cultural borrowing is very frequent in history, legal, social, political texts; for example, “La langue” and “La parole” in linguistics; (4) Communicative Translation: Communicative translation is usually adopted for culture specific clichés such as idioms, proverbs, fixed expression, etc. In such cases the translator substitutes SL word with an existing concept in target culture. In cultural substitution the propositional meaning is not the same but it has similar impact on target reader. The literal translation here may sound comic. The degree of using this strategy sometimes depends on the license which is given to the translator by commissioners and also the purpose of translation, and (5) Cultural Transplantation: The whole text is rewritten in target culture. The TL word is not a literal equivalent but has similar cultural connotations to some extent. It is another type of extreme but toward target culture and the whole concept is transplanted in TL. A normal translation should avoid both exoticism and cultural transplantation.

According to Wiersema (2004), cultures are getting closer and closer and this is something that he believed translators need to take into account. In the end it all depends on what the translator, or more often, the publisher wants to achieve with a certain translation. In his opinion by entering SL cultural elements: (a) the text will be read more fluently (no stops); (b) the text remains more exotic, more foreign; (c) the translator is closer to the source culture, and (d) the reader of the target texts gets a more genuine image of the source culture. Ke Ping (2004) paid attention to misreading and presupposition. He mentioned that of the many

factors that may lead to misreadings in translation is cultural presuppositions. Cultural presuppositions merit special attention from translators because they can substantially and systematically affect their interpretation of facts and events in the source text without their even knowing it. He pinpointed the relationship between cultural presuppositions and translational misreadings. According to him misreadings in translation are often caused by a translator's presuppositions about the reality of the source language community. These presuppositions are usually culturally-derived and deserve the special attention of the translator. He showed how cultural presuppositions work to produce misreadings in translation. According to Ping "Cultural presupposition," refers to underlying assumptions, beliefs, and ideas that are culturally rooted, widespread. According to him anthropologists agree on the following features of culture: (1) culture is socially acquired instead of biologically transmitted; (2) culture is shared among the members of a community rather being unique to an individual; (3) culture is symbolic. Symbolizing means assigning to entities and events meanings which are external to them and which cannot be grasped alone. Language is the most typical symbolic system within culture; and (4) culture is integrated. Each aspect of culture is tied in with all other aspects.

### **Globalization**

Wiersema (2004) in his essay "globalization and translation" stated that globalization is linked to English being a *lingua franca*; the language is said to be used at conferences (interpreting) and seen as the main language in the new technologies. The use of English as a global language is an important trend in world communication. Globalisation is also linked to the field of Translation Studies. Furthermore, globalisation is placed in the context of changes in economics, science, technology, and society. Globalization and technology are very helpful to translators in that translators have more access to online information, such as dictionaries of lesser-known languages. According to him such comments can be extended to the readers of translations. Should the target text be challenging for a reader, the

Internet can help him understand foreign elements in the text. Thus the text can be written in a more foreignising / exoticising manner. He mentioned a relatively new trend wherein culturally bound elements (some, one might say, untranslatable), are not translated. He believed that this trend contributes to learning and understanding foreign cultures. Context explains culture, and adopting (not necessarily adapting) a selection of words enriches the target text, makes it more exotic and thus more interesting for those who want to learn more about the culture in question. Eventually, these new words may find their way into target language dictionaries. Translators will then have contributed to enriching their own languages with loan words from the source language. He considered these entering loan words into TL as an important aspect of translation. Translation brings cultures closer. He stated that at this century the process of globalization is moving faster than ever before and there is no indication that it will stall any time soon. In each translation there will be a certain distortion between cultures. The translator will have to defend the choices he/she makes, but there is currently an option for including more foreign words in target texts. Therefore, it is now possible to keep SL cultural elements in target texts. According to him translator has three options for the translation of cultural elements: (1) adopting the foreign word without any explanation; (2) adopting the foreign word with extensive explanations; and (3) rewriting the text to make it more comprehensible to the target-language audience.

Snell-Hornby (1988) discusses globalisation and translation in a wider sense, not only in respect to translations contributing to creating images or stereotypes of others. Her starting point is the argument that all these current developments concerning international communication and the role of cultures and languages in this respect have also deeply affected translation and the work of the professional translator. Mary Snell-Hornby shows what kinds of problems a source text can pose which has been written in 'global English'. Her example is a United Nations text, and its structure and form is characteristic of texts that are produced within international

organisations. As Snell-Hornby illustrates, source texts written in international English can pose initial comprehension problems and may require an editing stage. Literary hybrid texts, on the other hand, pose different problems for translators. She refers to an increasingly important role which translators (and interpreters) will play. There is sufficient evidence that the translator profession has undergone rapid and profound changes. Translators today do a lot of things, they also do terminological work, give advice, do public relations. Moreover, translation memory and machine translation systems are transforming the field of human translation, and translators are expected to master the new technologies. As Pavlovich (1999: 37) argues, '[n]owadays clients expect and demand finished products complete with RAM-eating graphics on self-opening disks in addition to electronic transfers'.

Stressing the important role of human translators is particularly relevant in view of frequently heard predictions that human translators will become superfluous with the advance of machine translation systems. The prediction that translators will become extinct in the near future is not shared by translation scholars. It is, however, true that translations need to be done ever more quickly, much more efficiently, and at a high quality. Machines may be quicker than human translators, and in some cases a defective output of a machine translation system will be sufficient for the immediate need. But there are still many translation assignments which require the production of a target text where appropriateness for the specified purpose may involve rearrangements of information, deletions, additions, etc. And these decisions can only be taken by a human translator whose translation competence is much more than linguistic competence alone. It also includes, at least, subject-specific competence, cultural competence, text-typological competence, technical writing competence, (re)search competence. Nevertheless, accounting for such advances in technology, and influencing them, is part of the discipline of Translation Studies in its widest sense. As Barat and Fairclough (1997) have shown, in the world of today discursive practices increasingly flow across

boundaries of culture and language, so that we can speak of globalisation of discursive practices. This involves the international dissemination of genres and discourses, i.e. the spread of particular ways of using language (for example, in politics, business, advertising) across national, cultural and linguistic boundaries. In all these respects, translation plays a highly relevant role, since it is through translations that new concepts or genres are introduced into a language and culture. With respect to language and communication, globalisation of discursive practices may equally be felt to be a loss rather than a gain. Opposite trends to globalisation, then, may be deliberate attempts to resist any danger of losing national languages and communicative conventions. A relevant concept in this respect is the notion of 'cultural identity'. Mary Snell-Hornby contrasts a 'McWorld' with 'linguistic retribalisation, especially in areas of Central and Eastern Europe, which results in a changing awareness of national identities and mother tongues. Between 1989 and 1999, 15 new nation states have emerged within Europe, all of them ethnically oriented. These political developments, have linguistic consequences; for example, a previously 'unified' language can be 'undone' (e.g. Serbo-Croat vs. Bosnian, Serbian, Croatian), separate languages may (re)converge (e.g. Moldovian and Romanian). The new 'national' languages are promoted to confirm a nation's cultural identity through expanding the use of its language. Snell-Hornby uses the notion of cultural identity in its more traditional sense as developed in sociology. This sense is somewhat different from the one used in other writings of Translation Studies, especially by Venuti (1994). Venuti defines 'cultural identity' in two ways, relating to the creation of domestic subjects, and in addition, to the formation of cultural identities in the sense of a cultural 'Other'. For this second aspect, Snell-Hornby would prefer to speak of the formation of stereotypes. In both of those respects, translation can play a decisive or supportive role. It plays a role in presenting to a target culture an image of a source culture, or translation plays a role in the formation of cultural identities (in Venuti's second sense of the term). For example, what the people in the UK learnt about India was the result of the

perceptions of soldiers, administrators and officials of the East India Company (Polezzi, 1998). Another aspect is that cultures also use translations (as products) and translation (as activity, process) to represent and define, or redefine, themselves. For example, Kwiecinski (1998) illustrates what happens currently with translations in Poland. He reports that translations of originally English source texts which offer an Anglo-American interpretation of Polish culture are published in the Polish press. These texts have the function to help 'define Polishness at a time of abrupt change' (Kwecinski, 1998: 201), to use a western-based interpretation to allow Poles to interpret themselves in novel terms. When information crosses borders via translation, the effects may be varied: it maybe that the local culture uses this information to re-identify itself, to delimit itself from other cultures and thus to evaluate itself higher (or lower); or common and different aspects may become obvious, thus achieving mutual understanding in the sense of a growing awareness of differences. What Venuti and others have pointed out is that translation does not always enhance cross-cultural understanding, and does not always narrow the gap between different cultures (see Venuti, 1998; Hermans, 1998; Roozgar, 2008).

### **Postcolonial Translation Studies**

Post-colonialism can be defined as a broad cultural approach to the study of power relations between different groups, cultures or peoples in which language, literature and translation may play a role. The linking of colonization and translation is accompanied by the argument that translation has played an active role in the colonization process and in disseminating an ideologically motivated image of colonized people. The metaphor has been used of the colony as an imitative and inferior translational copy whose suppressed identity has been overwritten by the colonizer. The postcolonial concepts may have conveyed a view of translation as just a damaging instrument of the colonizers who imposed their language and used translation to construct a distorted image of the suppressed people which served to reinforce the hierarchal structure of the colony. However, some critics of post-colonialism, like Robinson (1997), believe that

the view of the translation as purely harmful and pernicious tool of the empire is inaccurate.

The most succinct and accessible introduction to postcolonial translation studies is offered by Jacquemond (1992) and Robinson (1997). Jacquemond is specifically concerned with translation between France and Egypt, but is also inter-ested generally in the power differentials between cultures, in particular between "hegemonic" or dominant or more powerful cultures (usually former colonizers) and "dominated" or less powerful cultures (usually former colonies). The translator from a hegemonic culture into a dominated one, he says, serves the hegemonic culture in its desire to integrate its cultural products into the dominated culture - this is the classic case where the source culture controls translation. Even when the target culture desires, or seems to desire, the translation, that desire is manufactured and controlled by the source culture. Going the other way, the translator from a dominated culture into a hegemonic again serves the hegemonic culture, but this time not servilely, rather as the "authoritative mediator" (Jacquemond 1992: 156) who helps to convert the dominated culture into something easy for the hegemonic culture to recognize as "other" and inferior.

He covers four broad areas of comparison: (1) a dominated culture will invariably translate far more of a hegemonic culture, (2) when a hegemonic culture does translate works produced by the dominated culture, those works will be perceived and presented as difficult, mysterious, inscrutable, esoteric, and in need of a small cadre of intellectuals to interpret them, while a dominated culture will translate a hegemonic culture's works accessibly for the masses, (3) a hegemonic culture will only translate those works by authors in a dominated culture that fit the former's preconceived notions of the latter, and (4) authors in a dominated culture who dream of reaching a "large audience" will tend to write for translation into a hegemonic language, and this will require conforming to some extent to stereotypes. Interestingly, while post colonial approaches to translation have tended to analyze the power structures controlling translation and call for more resistance to those

structures, feminist approaches have been more oriented toward resistance than to analysis

(Robinson, 1997). One theorist who has paid attention to the project of translation in the context of post-colonialism is Gayatri Spivak. The most original aspect of Spivak's discussion of translation is its combined post-colonial and feminist frame. On the one hand, Spivak is sensitive to the political weight of language, and in particular the hegemonic position of English; on the other she recognizes the need for translation that is grounded in feminist solidarity. These tensions are not always recognized as conflictual, and Spivak is scathing in her critique of the insouciance with which cultural inequalities can be treated by First World feminists. Translation is a practical necessity, she grants.

It is important that the texts of women who write in Arabic or Vietnamese “be made to speak English” (Spivak 1993: 182). But is translation a form of hospitality or rather an expression of the law of the strongest? If you really want to establish solidarity, she asks, why not learn the mother tongue of the women you are interested in? “In other words, if you are interested in talking about the other, and / or in making a claim to be the other, it is crucial to learn other languages” (Spivak 1993: 192). By “other” languages she is referring to those tongues generally learned only by anthropologists. This suggestion reaches to the heart of postcolonial inequities and to the ways they are reproduced in academic feminism and in cultural studies. This critique is extended to Spivak’s insistence on high standards of translation from Third World languages. Such standards, she understands, imply the risk of marginalizing the translator and the language of the original. Rigorous attention to the forms of expression of the foreign text run the risk of producing texts too opaque for immediate consumption, or too distant from prevailing esthetic norms. Yet these high standards must remain the translator's goal, and can be reached only if translators are well-prepared to take on their task. It is not sufficient to have depth of commitment to correct cultural politics. The translator must be familiar with the “history of the language, the history of the author's moment, the history of the language-in-and-as-

translation” (1993: 186). To decide whether you are prepared enough to start translating, it might help if you have “graduated into speaking, by choice or preference, of intimate matters in the language of the original” (1993: 187). The translator must know the difference between resistant and conformist writing by women, must know the literary scene, must be able to recognize that what seems resistant in the space of English may be reactionary in the space of the original. It may seem surprising that Spivak feels obliged to labour the point that the translator must be able to “discriminate on the terrain of the original” (1993: 189).

### **Concluding Remarks**

Reviewing Translation Studies for 2005 (Anderman, 2005; Anderman and Rogers, 2005; Armstrong, 2005; Bermann and Wood, 2005; Englund, 2005; House et al.; 2005; Hung Eva, 2005; Malmkjar, 2005; Santaemilia, 2005), shows that the most recent development in TS tends toward the strong interest in non-Western traditions, translation history and the interface with other disciplines, especially with sociology and identity theory. This situation reflects “a booming discipline, or interdiscipline, but also in some ways a divergence of opinion as to the core subject of study” (Munday, 2008: 1). The year 2006 continued these foci but was remarkable for the number, breadth and quality of publication (Delabastita, D’hulst and Meylaerts, 2006; Snell-Hornby, 2006; Duarte, Rosa and Seruya, 2006; Pym, Shlesinger and Jettmarova, 2006; Baker, 2006; France and Haynes, 2006; Morini, 2006; Boase – Beier, 2006; Woods, 2006; Van Coili and Verschuere, 2006; Lathey, 2006; Cronin, 2006; Cheung, 2006; Hermans, 2006). The question which imposes itself in this regard is, “How do we prepare future professional translators more and more effectively for the continuously changing requirements of the world? What are the consequences of a changing job profile for translator training at institutions? Today, for example, specialization becomes more and more necessary. But can, and should, universities prepare their translation students for highly specialized translation in a variety of subject domains? Is training in specialized translation better left to translation agencies or to professional organizations?

Should training at institutions rather focus on developing an awareness of what professional decision-making in translation involves? Is training in technology-management skills, business and customer-management abilities to be part of translator training? Do we risk that what we do today will be outdated tomorrow because the developments are extremely fast? What exactly is the task of a university in this context?

Decisions as to a general translation policy in a country (e.g. who decides how many and which texts are translated, from and into which languages?), including a policy of translator training (where are translators trained? in which languages? based on which curriculum and syllabus?) are also influenced by the status of Translation Studies as an academic discipline. As Snell-Hornby(1988) argues, globalization puts new demands on the discipline as well. What kind of academic discipline is it? Where is the discipline today, and where is it going? Over the last years, it has increasingly been recognized and more and more forcefully argued within the discipline that translation is not a purely linguistic activity. As a consequence, knowledge and methods from other disciplines, notably psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, communication studies, anthropology, cultural studies, have been integrated into Translation Studies, making it into an interdiscipline par excellence.

Although most scholars today do agree that Translation Studies is not a sub-discipline of (applied) linguistics, the questions 'where do we stand?' and 'where do we go?' are being discussed more and more vigorously. Translation Studies continuously brings new theoretical developments to bear upon its disciplinary object. What is obvious in the substantially growing literature is that scholars have come to translation (studies) from a variety of fields and disciplinary backgrounds. Whereas traditionally this background was linguistics (or its sub-disciplines, particularly pragmatics, textlinguistics), and also literature. Nowadays there is an increasing input from Cultural Studies. One of the consequences is terminological inconsistency (Schaffner, 1999). When we take concepts from different disciplines we should clearly define them and

clarify their disciplinary origin. It seems to be a general phenomenon that different academic disciplines use the same labels, however, with different meanings.

## References

- Anderman, G. and Rogers M. (eds.), 2005.** In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse? In: Multilingual Matters.
- Anderman, G., 2005.** Europe on Stage: Translation and Theatre. Oberon.
- Armstrong N., 2005.** Translation, Linguistic Culture: A French-English Handbook. Multilingual Matters.
- Baker M. (ed.), 1997.** The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies, London/New York: Routledge.
- Baker, M., 1992.** In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation, London/New York: Routledge.
- Baker, M., 2006.** Translation and Conflict. London and New York: Routledge.
- Barat, E. and Fairclough, N., 1997.** Globalization of TV News in Hungary. Paper presented at the International Conference 'Analyzing Political Discourse', Aston University Birmingham, 17 - 19 July 1997.
- Basset, S. and Lefevere. A (eds), 1990.** Translation, History and Culture, London: Printer.
- Bassnett, S., 1980/1991/2002.** Translation Studies, London / New York: Routledge.
- Bassnett, S., 1996.** Translation Studies. London: Routledge.
- Bell, R.T., 1991.** Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice London/ New York: Longman.
- Belloc. H., 1931.** On Translation (Oxford: The Clarendon Press).
- Bermann S. and Wood M. (eds.), 2005.** Nation, Language and the Ethics of Translation Princeton University Press.
- Bielsa, E., 2005.** Globalization as Translation: An Approximation to the Key but Invisible Role of Translation in Globalization. CSGR Working Paper, No. 163/05.
- Boase-Beier, J., 2005,** Stylistic Approaches to Translation. Translation Theories Explored: St. Jerome.
- Candlin, C., 1990.** General Editor of 'Discourse and the Teacher'; In Hatim & Mason, Longman, London & New York.

- Catford, J., 1965.** A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay on Applied Linguistics, London, Oxford University Press.
- Chandler, D., 2011.** Semiotics: The Basics. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Chesterman, A., 2006.** Memes of Translation: The Spread of Idea: In: Translation Theory. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chesterman, A. and Arrojo, R., 2000.** "Shared Ground in Translation Studies" Target Vol.12, 1, pp.151-160
- Cheung M. (ed.), 2006.** An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation: Volume 1: From Earliest Times to the Buddhist Project. St. Jerome.
- Cobley, P., 2011.** The Routledge companion to semiotics. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Delabastita, D., Lieven D and Reine M. (eds.), 2006.** Functional Approaches to Culture and Translation: Selected papers by Jose Lambert. Benjamins Translation Library; John Benjamins.
- Discenza Nocole G., 2006.** The King's English: Strategies of Translation in the Old English Boerthius. New York State, UP.
- Duarte, J., Ferreira, A., Assis R and Teresa S. (eds.), 2006.** Translation Studies of the Interface of the Disciplines. Benjamins Translation Library EST Subseries: John Benjamin.
- Englund D., 2005.** Expertise and Explication in the Translation Process; Benjamins Translation Library: John Benjamins.
- Even-Zohar, I., 1979.** "Polysystem Theory". Poetics Today Vol.1, No.1-2, pp.283-305.
- Even-Zohar, I., 1981.** "Translation Theory Today: A Call for Transfer Theory". Poetics Today 2, 4:1-7. Reprinted as "Translation and Transfer". Poetics Today 11, 1 (1990): pp.73-8.
- Fawcett, P., 1997.** Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained, Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
- Field, J., 2011.** Psycholinguistics. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- France P. and Kenneth H. (eds.), 2006.** The Oxford History of Literary Translation into English. Volume 4: pp.1790 - 1900. Oxford University Press.
- Frenz, H., 1961.** 'The Art of Translation' in: N.P. Stalknecht and H. Frenz (eds.), Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective (Carbondale): Southern Illinois University Press.
- Garzone, G., 2005.** "Sull'intrinseca vaghezza della definizione di traduzione: prospettive traduttologiche e linguistiche", in Garzone, G. (a cura di), Esperienze del tradurre: Aspetti teorici e applicative, Milano Franco Angeli, pp.53-79.
- Gentzlaer, E., 1993.** Contemporary Translation Theories. London and New York: Routledge.
- Goddard, A. & Geesin, B., 2011.** Language and Technology. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Gregorious, C., 2011.** Language, ideology and identity in serial killer narrative. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Halliday M.A.K. and R. Hasan, 1985/1989.** Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective, Australia, Deakin University Press; Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Halliday M.A.K., 1992.** "Language Theory and Translation Practice", Revista Internazionale di tecnica della traduzione, .0: pp.15-25.
- Halliday M.A.K., 2001.** "Towards a Theory of Good Translation", in Steiner, E. & C. Yallop (eds.), pp.13-18.
- Hatim B., 2001.** Teaching and Researching Translation, Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hatim B., and Ian, M., 1990.** The Translator as Communicator. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. and J. Munday, 2004.** Translation: An Advanced Resource Book, London/New York: Routledge.
- Hermans, T., 1999.** Translation and Normativity. Current Issues in Language and Society Vol.5, pp.51-72.
- Hermans, T. (ed.), 1985.** The Manipulation of the Literature: Studies in Literary Translation, London; Cropom Helm.
- Hermans, T. (ed.), 2006.** Translating Others. Volume 1. St. Jerome.
- Hermans, T., 1998.** Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-Oriented Approaches Explained. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Holmes, J., 1975.** The Nature of Translation. The Hague: Mouton.
- Holmes, S., 1970.** The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. Amsterdam: Translation



Studies Section, Department of General Literary Studies, University of Amsterdam.

**Holmes, S., 1988.** Translated papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

**House J., 2001.** "How do we Know when a Translation is Good?", in Streiner, E. & Yallope (eds.), pp.127-160.

**House J., 2002.** "Universality versus Culture Specificity in Translation", in Richardi, A. (ed.); *Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline*, Cambridge: CUP, 92-110.

**House J., 2006a.** Communicative Styles in English and German. *European Journal of English Studies* No.10, pp.249 - 267.

**House J., 2006b.** Text and Context in Translation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol.38, pp.338-358.

**House J., 2008.** Beyond Intervention: Universals in Translation. *Trans-kom* No.1, pp.6 - 19.

**House J., Rosairo M, Martin, B., (eds.) 2005.** Translation and the Construction of Identity. International association for Translation and Intercultural Studies.

**House, J., 1977.** A Model for Translation Quality Assessment, Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

**Hung E. (ed.), 2005.** Translation and Cultural Changes: Studies in History, Norms and Image-Projection. Benjamin Translation Library: John Benjamins.

**Hua, Z., 2011.** The language and intercultural communication reader. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

**Ivir, V., 1996.** A Case for Linguistics in Translation Theory". *Target* Vol.8, No.1, pp.149-157.

**J. Levy, 1963.** The Art of Translation. (Prague).

**Jacobson F. 1958.** Translation: A Traditional Craft (Copenhagen: Nordisk Forlag, 1958).

**Jacquemond, R., 1992.** "Translation and Cultural Hegemony: The Case of French-Arabic Translation". In" Lawrence Venutti (ed.), *Rethinking Translation*. London and New York: Routledge. Pp.139 - 58.

**Jakobson, R., 1959.** "On Linguistic Aspect of Translation", in Venuti, L. (ed.) (2002/2004). *The Translation Studies Reader*, 2nd Edition, New York/ London: Routledge, pp.138-143.

**Kenny, D. (1998)** "Equivalence", in Baker. M. (ed.), pp.77-80.

**Kimmel, M., 2010.** Why we mix metaphors (and mix them well): Discourse coherence, conceptual metaphor, and beyond. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42.

**Koller, W., 1995.** The Concept of Equivalence and the Object of Translation Studies. *Target*, Vol.7, No.2, pp.191-222.

**Kwiecinski, P., 1998.** Translating Strategies in Rapidly Transforming Culture. *The Translator* Vol.4, pp.183-206.

**Lathey G. (ed.), 2006.** The Translation of Children's Literature: A Reader. *Multilingual Matters*.

**Leeuwen, T., 2011.** Introducing social semiotics. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

**Lefevere, A., 1978.** Translation Studies: The Goal of the Discipline, in James S. Holmes, Jose Lambert and Raymond van den Broeck (eds). *Literature and Translation* (Louvain: ACCO, 1978).

**Lefevere, A., 1992.** Translation Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame. London Routledge.

**Leonardi, V., 2001.** Equivalence in Translation: Between Myth and Reality. *Translation Journal* Vol. 4, No. 4.

**LoCastro, V., 2011.** Pragmatics for language educators. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

**Lotman, J. and Uspensky, B., 1978.** "On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture", *New Literary History*, pp. 211-32.

**Malmkjaer K., 2005.** Linguistics and the Language of Translation, Edinburgh UP; Edinburgh Textbooks in Applied Linguistics.

**Malmkjaer, K., 2005.** Norms and Nature in Translation Studies. *Synaps* Vol.16, pp.13-20.

**Manfredi, M., 2007.** "The Issue of 'Visibility' in Translating Topography and the Culture of London and Bombay/ Mumbai", in Jottini, L., G. Del Lungo & J. Douthwaite (eds.), *Cityscapes: Islands of the Self*. *Language Studies*, Vol. 2, Cagliari: CUEC, 203-214.

**Manfredi, M., 2008.** Translating Text and Context: Translational Studies and Systematic Functional Linguistics. Vol. (1), Cagliari, CUEC.

**Morini, M., 2006.** Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice. Ashgate.

**Mounin, G., 1963.** Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction, Paris: Gallimard.

**Moutner, G., 2011.** Language and the market society. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

- Munday, J., 2001.** *Introducing Translation Studies*, London / New York: Routledge.
- Neubert, A., 1984.** "Text-bound Translation Teaching", in Willis, W. & G. Thome (eds.), *Translation Theory and its Implementation in the Teaching of Translating and Interpreting*, Tübingen: Narr., 61-70.
- Newmark, P., 1981.** *A Textbook of Translation*, New York / London/ Toronto / Sydney: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E., 1964.** "Principle of Correspondence". In: Venuti, L. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Nida, Eugene A. and C.R. Taber, 1969/1982.** *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nord, C., 1991.** *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Nunan, D., 2011.** *Language and Culture*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Pavlovich, H., 1999.** Director's Notes. *The Linguist* 38, 37.
- O'Keeffe, A. & Clancy, B., 2011.** *Introducing pragmatics in use*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Polezzi, L., 1998.** *Rewriting Tibet. Italian Travelers in English Translation. The Translator* Vol.4, pp.321- 42.
- Propovic, A., 1976.** *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*, Department of Comparative Literature. University of Alberta.
- Pym, A., 2006.** *Globalization and the Politics of Translation Studies. Meta: Translators' Journal*, vol. 65 pp. 1-16.
- Pym, A., 1992.** *Translation and Text Transfer: An Essay on the Principle of Intercultural Communication*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Pym, A., Mariam, S. and Zuzana, J. (eds.), 2006.** *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*. Benjamins Library. John Benjamins.
- Pyne, N. *Translation Misconceptions*. [www.kwintessential.co.uk / translation/ translation.html](http://www.kwintessential.co.uk/translation/translation.html).
- Quick, R., 1974.** *The Linguistic and the English Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Reirs K. and Vermeer, J., 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, Tübingen, Germany, Niemeyer.
- Robinson D., 1997.** *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
- Robinson, D., 2005.** *Becoming a Translator: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Translation*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Robinson, P. and Ellis, N., 2011.** *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Roozgar, M., 2008.** *Hybrid Texts, Sources and Translation*. Department of Translation Studies, Safashahr University, Iran.
- Santaemilia José (ed.), 2005.** *Gender, Sex and Translation: The Manipulation of Identities*. St. Jerome.
- Sapir, E., 1956.** *Culture, Language and Personality*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Savory, T., 1957.** *The Art of Translation (London Cape)*.
- Segalowitz, N., 2011.** *Cognitive bases of second language fluency*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Schaffner, C., 1997.** *Globalization, Communication, Translation. Current Issues in Language and Society*, Vol. 6, No. 2.
- Sebba, M., Mahootian, S. and Johnson, C., 2011.** *Language mixing and code-switching in writing*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Shuttleworth, M. and M. Cowie, 1997.** *Dictionary of Translation Studies*, Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Simon, S., 1995.** *Translation and Gender*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Simon, Sherry, 1996.** *Gender in Translation. Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London Routledge.
- Snell-Hornby, M., 1995.** *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Revised edition, Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Snell-Hornby, M., 2006.** *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Snell-Hornby, M., 1988.** *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Snell-Hornby, M., Pochhacker, F. and Kaindl, K. (eds.), 1992.** *Translation Studies*.

- An Interdiscipline. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Spivak, G., 1993.** "The Politics of Translation", *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, New York and London, Routledge.
- Taylor, C., 1998.** *Language to Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Torsello, C., 1996.** "Garmmatica e traduzione", in G. Cortese (a cura di), *Tradurre I linguaggi settoriali*, Torino: Edizioni Liberia Cortina, 87-119.
- Toury, G., 1978. (revised 1995).** "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation." In: Venuti, L. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Toury, G., 1995.** *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, P.A.: John Benjamins.
- Taylor, C., 1998.** *Language to Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ulrych, M. and R.M. Bollettieri B., 1999.** "The State of the Art in Translation Studies: An Overview". *Textus XII Vol.2*, pp.219-241.
- Van Coillie, J. and Walter, P.V. (eds.), 2006.** *Children's Literature in Translation: Challenges and Strategies*. St. Jerome.
- Venuti, L. (ed.), 1994.** Introduction. *The Translator* 4, 135 - 144. Special Issue on "Translation and Minority".
- Venuti, L., 1996.** *Translation and the Formation of Cultural Identities*. *Current Issues in Language and Society Vol.1*, pp.201-17.
- Venuti, L., 1992.** "Translation as Cultural Politics: Regimes of Domestication in English", *Textual Practice Vol.7, No.2*, pp.208-23.
- Venuti, L., 1995/2008.** *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, Second Edition, London & New York: Routledge.
- Venuti, L., 1998.** *The Scandals of Translation: Towards on Ethics of Difference*. London and New York; Routledge.
- Vermeer, H., 1996.** "Skopos and Commision in Translational Activity". In: Venuti, L. *The Translation Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Vinay, J.P. and J. Darbelnet, 1958/1995.** *Comparative Stylistic of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, Translated by J.C. Sager and M. J. Hamel, Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Walker, J., 2011.** *Variation in linguistic systems*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Wiersema, N., 2004.** *Globalisation and Translation*. *Translation Journal*, Vol. 8, No.1, pp.1-5.
- Woods, M., 2006.** *Translating Milan Kundera*. *Multilingual Matters*.