

UNDERSTANDING OF THE DISTINCTIVE NATURE OF TRANSLATION STUDIES

Anyanwu Chidinma Ann

Department of French language
Faculty of Humanities, Imo State University, Owerri. Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *This paper has emerged out of the conviction that linguistic theory has more to offer to translation theory than is so far recognized and vice versa. As Gutknecht (2001) claims, the translation theorists have made little systematic use of the techniques and insights of contemporary linguistics. 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) although translation has taken on concepts and methods of other disciplines, "it is still conceived as a subdiscipline of applied linguistics" (Schaffner, 2004, p. 2). On the other hand, 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.*

KEYWORDS: Linguistic Theory, Translation Theory, Translation Studies, Cultural Studies, Sociocultural Context, Technological Advances, New Areas of Research, Intersemiotic Translation

INTRODUCTION

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, knowledge in which cultural exchanges have been widening, 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. Accordingly, the discussion, in the present study, proceeds primarily from the perspectives of "Translation Studies" and "Linguistics". One major goal is to show the interrelationships between linguistics and translation, and how they benefit from each other. The basic underlying theme, here, is that "inside or between languages, human communication equals translation. A study of translation is a study of language" (Bassnett-McGuire, 1980, p. 23). In addition, both translators and linguists deal with two linguistic systems, each with, perhaps, a different cultural system. So, if we agree that 'all communicators are translators' (Bell, 1991), we must

remember that the role of the translator is different from that of the ‘normal communicator’: the translator is a bilingual mediating agent between monolingual communication participants in two different language communities.

Moreover, the focus of translation studies has been, recently, shifted away from linguistics to forms of cultural studies. The present study, therefore, attempts to shed some light on the nature and development of the discipline of translation studies (TS), with a view to giving some indication of the kind of work that has been done so far. It is an attempt to demonstrate that TS is a vastly complex field with many far-reaching ramifications.

Translation: Brief Historical Perspective

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 translation section of the Third International Congress of Applied Linguistics in Copenhagen, but published and widely read only as of 1988. Holmes (1988, p. 71) outlined the field of what he termed “Translation Studies” 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 interdisciplinary, interwoven with many other fields. As Zakhir (2008) points out, when we talk about the history of translation, we should think of the theories and names that emerged at its different periods. Each era is characterized by specific changes in translation history. For centuries, people believed in the relation between translation and the story of the tower of Babel in the Book of Genesis.

According to the Bible, the descendants of Noah decided, after the great flood, to settle down in a plain in the land of Shinar. There, they committed a great sin. Instead of setting up a society that fits God’s will, they decided to challenge his authority and build a tower that could reach Heaven. However, this plan was not completed, as God, recognizing their wish, regained control over them through a linguistic stratagem. He caused them to speak different languages so as not to understand each other. Then, he scattered them all over the earth. After that incident, the number of languages increased through diversion, and people started to look for ways to communicate, hence the birth of translation (Benabdelali, 2006). With the birth of translation studies and the increase of research in the domain, people started to get away from this story of Babel, and they began to look for specific dates and figures that mark the periods of translation history.

Writings on translation go back to the Romans. Jacobsen (1958) claims the translating is a Roman invention (see McGuire, 1980). Cicero and Horace (first century BC) were the first theorists who distinguished between word-for-word translation and sense-for-sense translation. Their comments on translation practice influenced the following generations of translation up to the 20th century. Another period that knew a changing step in translation development was marked by St. Jerome (fourth century CE). “His approach to translating the Greek Septuagint Bible into Latin would affect later translations of the scriptures” (Munday, 2001). Later on, the translation of the Bible remained a subject to many conflicts between western theories and

ideologies of translation for more than a thousand years. As Zakhir (2008) points out, the invention of printing techniques in the 15th century developed the field of translation and helped in the appearance of early theorists.

The 17th century knew the birth of many influential theorists, such as Sir John Denhom, Abraham Cowley, John Dryden who was famous for his distinction between three types of translation; metaphrase, paraphrase and imitation. In the 18th century, the translator was compared to an artist with a moral duty both to the work of the original author and to the receiver. Moreover, the study of translation started to be systematic; Alexander Tayler's volume "Principle of Translation" is a case in point. The 19th century was characterized by two conflicting tendencies; the first considered translation as a category of thought and saw the translator as a creative genius, who enriches the literature and the language into which he is translating, while the second saw him through the mechanical function of making a text or an author known (McGuire, 1980). This period of the nineteenth century knew also the birth of many theories and translations in the domain of literature, especially poetic translation. An example of these translations is the one used by Edward Fitzgerald for Rubalyat Omar Al-

Khayyam. In the second half of the 20th century, studies on translation became an important course in language teaching and learning at schools. The period is also characterized by pragmatic and systematic approach to the study of translation. Nowadays, translation research has started to take another path, which is more automatic. The invention of the internet, together with the new technological developments in communication and digital materials, has increased cultural exchanges between nations. This leads translators to look for ways to cope with these changes and to look for more practical techniques that enable them to translate more and waste less. They also felt the need to enter the world of cinematographic translation, hence the birth of audio-visual translation. The latter technique, also called screen translation, is concerned with the translation of all kinds of TV programs, including films, series, and documentaries. This field is based on computers and translation software programs, and it is composed of two methods; dubbing and subtitling. In fact, audio-visual translation marks a changing era in the domain of translation.

In short, 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 gives its history a changing quality.

What is translation?

At the outset, it may be important to point out that translation has been defined in many ways, and every definition reflects the theoretical approach underpinning it.

As Shuttworth and Cowie (1997) observe 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, 1988, p. 2) study of translation, Catford (1965, p. 20) described it in these terms: [...] the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by the 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, p. 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 L 2 (the target-language text) and the source text in L 1 (the source language text) there exists a relationship, which can be designated as a translational, or equivalence relation".

Because complete equivalence (in the sense of synonymy or sameness) cannot take place in any of his categories, Jakobson (1959) declares that all poetic art is, therefore, technically untranslatable. That is, the translator has to take the question of interpretation into account in addition to the problem of selecting a TL phrase which will have a roughly similar meaning. Exact translation is impossible. In this regard, Bassnett (1996) claims that all texts, being part of a literary system descended from and related to other systems, are "translations 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.

Central to reflections on the nature of translation, the task of the translator has always been the question of the translator's responsibility towards the original. To what extent, scholars have been asking for hundreds of years, can the translator add to, omit from, or in any way alter the source text? Debates on this issue have given rise to much theorizing and are at the heart of the age-old free/literal translation paradigm. 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 valorisation 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 (1997a, p. 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" (Venuti, 1995/2008). 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 favour English social elites” (ibid., p. 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., p. 267). How the illusion of transparency might be distinguished from actual transparency is no 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.).

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, p. 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 refers 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, House, 2006b and House, 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, p. 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”). Also, it is postulated that translation entails different kinds of texts, from literary to technical. Moreover, from Shuttworth and Cowie’s definition it is also clear that nowadays translation includes other forms of communication, like audio-visual translation, through subtitles and dubbing. Also, the reference to machine translation in the quotation above makes clear that today translation is not seen as exclusively a human process and that, at least in certain professional areas, input from information technology has also had an impact, through, for instance, automatic or machine-assisted translation. Moreover, thanks to advances in new technologies, today we can also incorporate into TS the contribution of corpus linguistics, which allows both theorists and translators analyses of large amounts of electronic texts (Manfredi, 2008). On the other hand, Halliday (1992, p. 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 in Halliday and Hasan 1985/89, p. 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, p. 28). According to House (2001, p. 247) translation is thought of as a text which is a "representation" or "reproduction" of an original one produced in another language (see Anne Brooks-Lewis, 2009). Hatim and Munday (2004, p. 3) point out that we can analyze translation from two different perspectives: that of a 'process', which refers to the activity of turning an ST into a TT in another language, and that of a 'product', i.e., the translated text.

Long time ago, Mounin (1963) , the French theorist perceives translation as a series of operations of which the starting point and the end product are significations and function within a given culture. In this regard, Bassnett (1996, p. 23) points out that the emphasis always in translation is on the reader or listener and the translator must tackle the SL text in such a way that the TL version will correspond to the SL version. The nature of that correspondence may vary considerably, but the principle remains constant. Hence Albrecht Neubert's view that Shakespeare's Sonnet 'Shall I compare thee to a summer's day? cannot be semantically translated into a language where summers are unpleasant is perfectly proper, just as the concept of God the Father cannot be translated into a language where the deity is female. To attempt to impose the value system of the SL culture onto the TL culture is dangerous ground, and the translator should not be tempted by the school that pretends to determine the original intentions of an author on the basis of a self-contained text. The translator cannot be the author of the SL text, but as the author of the TL text has a clear moral responsibility to the TL readers. In this regard, Levy (1963) , cited in Holmes (1970) insisted that any contracting or omitting of difficult expressions in translating was immoral. The translator, he believed, had the responsibility of finding a solution to the most daunting of problems, and he declared that the functional view must be adopted with regard not only to meaning but also to style and form (see Moruwamon and Kolawole, 2007).

The development of translation studies

Translation was initially studied as a linguistic phenomenon, as a process of meaning transfer via linguistic transcoding, and consequently, translation studies was conceived as a linguistic discipline. Attempts were made to develop a "science of translation" (e.g. Nida 1964), or a linguistic theory of translation (Catford 1965), whose aim was to give a precise description of the equivalence relations between signs and combinations of signs in the source language (SL) and the target language (TL). After centuries dominated by a recurring and, according to Steiner, 'sterile' (1998, p. 319) debate over 'literal', 'free' and 'faithful' translation, in the 1950s and 1960s more systematic approaches to the study of translation emerged and they were linguistically oriented (see Munday, 2001, p. 9)

Over the following years, as Ulrych and Bolleteiri Bosinelli emphasize, the ties between translation and linguistics got even stronger, thanks to the development within linguistics of new paradigms which considered "[...] language as a social phenomenon that takes place within specific cultural context", like discourse analysis, text linguistics sociolinguistics and pragmatics "(Ulrych and Bosinelli,1999, p. 229).

Since the early 1960s significant changes have taken place in the field of translation studies, with the growing acceptance of the study of linguistics and stylistics within literary criticism that has led to developments in critical methodology and also with the rediscovery of the work of the Russian Formalist Circle. The most important advances in translation studies in the 20th century derive from the groundwork done by groups in Russia in the 1920s and subsequently by the Prague Linguistic Circle and its disciples. Since 1965, great progress has been made in translation studies. The work of scholars in the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Germany and the United States seem to indicate the emergence of clearly defined schools of translation studies, which place their emphasis on different aspects of the whole vast field. Moreover translation specialists have benefited a great deal from work in marginally related areas (Bassnett, 1996). Emerging in the 1970s, developing in the 1980s, and flourishing in the 1990s (Bassnett 1999, p. 214), TS has evolved enormously in the past 20 years and is now in the process of consolidating. TS has gradually evolved into a discipline in its own right, or rather, as said, into an 'interdiscipline', which draws on a wide range of other disciplines and hence could be effectively described as "a house of many rooms" (Hatim 2001, p. 8).

One of the first moves towards interdisciplinarity can be considered Snell-Hornby's (1988/1995) "integrated approach". The approach was meant to bridge the gap between linguistic and literary-oriented methods, aiming at proposing a model which would embrace the whole spectrum of language and draw insights from other disciplines, such as psychology, ethnology, philosophy, as well as cultural history, literary studies, socio-cultural studies and, for specialized translation, the study of the specific domain involved (medical, legal, etc.). In Europe translation was seen for many decades either as simple linguistic transcoding (studied as a sub-discipline of applied linguistics, and only focusing on specialized translation), or as a literary practice (viewed as a branch of comparative literature and only concerned with the translation of canonical works of art). Lefevere (1978) proposed that the name translation studies should be adopted for the discipline that concerns itself with the problems raised by the production and description of translation. The Routledge Encyclopaedia of translation studies (Baker, 1998) defines 'Translation Studies' as "[...] the academic discipline which concerns itself with the study of translation". As Baker points out, although initially focusing on literary translation, TS "[...] is now understood to refer to the academic discipline concerned with the study of translation at large, including literary and non-literary translation" (1998, p. 277).

Hatim defines TS as the discipline "[...] which concerns itself with the theory and practice of translation" (Hatim, 2001, p. 3). When Lefevere (1978) tried to define the goal of translation studies, he suggested that its purpose was to produce a comprehensive theory which can also be used as a guideline for the production of translations, and whilst some may question the specificity of this statement, his clear intention to link theory with practice is indisputable. The need for systematic study of translation arises directly from the problems encountered during the actual translation process and it is as essential for those working in the field to bring their practical experience to theoretical discussion, as it is for increased theoretical perceptiveness to be put to use in the translation of texts. To divorce the theory from the practice, to set the scholar against the practitioner as has happened in other disciplines would be tragic indeed (see El-dali, 2008).

The practice of translation without a theoretical background tends toward a purely subjective exercise. As Yallop (1987, p. 347) reminds us one of Halliday's main contributions to linguistics is his desire to build bridges between linguistic theory and professional practice. "When dealing with translation, we firmly believe that this need is even stronger. Proficiency

in two languages, the source one and the target one, is obviously not sufficient to become a competent translator” (Manfredi, 2008 and Hatim and Munday, 2006).

Translation theory is relevant to translators’ problems, and not only for academic purposes, but also to the practice of a professional translator, since it can “[...] offer a set of conceptual tools [that] can be thought of as aids for mental problem-solving” (Chesterman, in Chesterman and Wagner, 2002, p. 7). Theory and practice are indissolubly linked, and are not in conflict. Understanding of the processes can only help in the production and, a theory of translation without a link to practice is simply an abstraction.

Moreover, as Bassnett (1996) points out, although translation studies covers such a wide field, it can be roughly divided into four general areas of interest, each with degree of overlap. Two are product-oriented, in that the emphasis is on the functional aspect of the TL texts in relation to the SL text, and two of them are process-oriented, in that the emphasis is on analysing what actually takes place during translation. The first category involves the History of Translation and is a component part of literary history. The type of work involved in this area includes investigation of the theories of translation at different times, the critical response to translations, the practical processes of commissioning and publishing translations, the role and function of translation in a given period, the methodological development of translation and, by far the most common type of study, analysis of the work of individual translators. The second category, translation in the TL culture, extends the work on single texts or authors and includes work on the influence of a text, author or genre, on the absorption of the norms of the translated text into the TL system and on the principles of selection operating within that system (see Genc and Bada, 2005). The third category, translation and linguistics, includes studies which place their emphasis on the comparative arrangement of linguistic elements between the SL and the TL text with regard to phonemic, morphemic, lexical, syntagmatic and syntactic levels. Into this category come studies of the problems of linguistic equivalence of language-bound meaning of linguistic untranslatability of machine translation, etc. and also studies of the translation problems of non-literary texts. The fourth category, loosely called translation and poetics, includes the whole area of literary translation, in theory and practice. Studies may be general or genre-specific including investigation of the particular problems of translating poetry, theatre texts and the affiliated problem of translation for the cinema, whether dubbing or sub-titling. Under this category also come studies of the poetics of individual translators and comparisons between them, studies of the problems of formulating a poetics, and studies of the interrelationship between SL and TL texts and author-translator-reader (see Sehsah, 2006).

Ulrych and Bosinelli (1999, p. 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, p. 10).

According to Snell-Hornby (2006, pp. 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 Studies and Linguistics

Along with the conviction that a multifaceted phenomenon like translation needs to be informed by multidisciplinary, Manfredi (2008) believes that, within this perspective, 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, p. 13).

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 have been of great value, and the works of Chomsky and the transformational linguists have also had their 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 linguistics theory” (Catford, 1965, p. 1). As Fawcett (1997, p. 2) suggests, the link between linguistics and translation can be twofold. On one hand, the findings 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, p. 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 and Bosinelli, 1999, p. 229). According to Munday (2001, p. 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 sceptical attitude. He finds it paradoxical that many translation theorist should make little systematic use of the techniques and insights offered b 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-Horney 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, p. 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’.

Why the separation between linguistics and TS

It is my conviction that linguistic theory has more to offer to translation theory than is so recognized, and vice versa (see El-dali, 2008). Perhaps one reason for the relative separation between the two fields is the domination of formal approaches to language study over modern linguistic thinking and research for a considerable period of time. Formal approaches to language, with their focus on structure and confinement to the sentence boundaries, are of limited benefit to translation theory and practice, for which a textually-oriented approach is more appropriate. With the spread of functional linguistics in the last three decades, there have been growing hopes for establishing links between linguistics and translation studies. Although there have been a number of contributions in this direction, much work is still possible, and still required, to help establish such links (Halliday, 1985 and Al-Wahy, 1999 ; Hatim and Mason, 1997). In 1961, Halliday wrote a paper on linguistics and machine translation in which he made the remark: “It might be of interest to set up a linguistic model of the translation process, starting not from any preconceived notions from outside the field of language study, but on the basis of linguistic concepts” . The translation theorists, almost without exception, have made little systematic use of the techniques and insights of contemporary linguistics (the linguistics of the last twenty years or so) and the linguists, for their part, have been at best neutral and at worst actually hostile to the notation of a theory of translation (Gutknecht, 2001). This state of affairs seems particularly paradoxical when one recognizes the stated goal of translation: 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. It does seem strange that such a process should, apparently, be of no interest to linguistics, since the explanation of the phenomenon would present an enormous challenge to linguistic theories and provide an ideal testing ground for them. Equally, it is difficult to see how translation theorists can move beyond the subjective

and normative evaluation of texts without drawing heavily on linguistics. The need for access to and familiarity with the accumulated knowledge about the nature and function of language and the methodology of linguistic enquiry must become more and more pressing and less and less deniable if translation theory is to shake off individualist anecdotalism and the tendency to issue arbitrary lists of 'rules' for the creation of 'correct' translations and set about providing systematic and objective description of the process of translation. This paradox has arisen as a result of a fundamental misunderstanding, by both translation theorists and linguists, of what is involved in translation; which has led, inevitably, to the failure to build a theory of translation which is at all satisfactory in a theoretical or an applied sense (Ibid, p. 693).

According to Hatim and Mason (1997, p. 22), the emergence of linguistics as a new discipline in the 20th century brought a spirit of optimism to the pursuit of language study, a feeling that the groundwork was at last being laid for a systematic and scientific approach to the description of language. Insights into the way language functions as a system might be expected to shed light on the kinds of language problems experienced in social life. Many areas of social life called for investigation from a linguistic standpoint: the teaching of modern languages, the

treatment of language disorders, the role of language in education, the status and treatment of minority languages, language planning policy in emergent nations and, of course, translation. Hatim and Mason (1997) suggest some of the reasons why earlier developments in linguistics theory were of relatively little interest to translators. Structural linguistics sought to describe language as a system of interdependent elements and to characterize the behaviour of individual items and categories on the basis of their distribution. Morphology and syntax constituted

the main areas of analysis, largely to the exclusion of the intractable problem of meaning, which was either ignored or else dealt with purely in terms of the distribution of lexical items: the statement of meanings is, therefore, the weak point in language study, and will remain so until human knowledge advances very far beyond its present state' (Bloomfield, 1933, p. 140). In their evaluation of this issue, Hatim and Mason (1997, p. 25) argue that "since meaning is at the very heart of the translator's work, it follows that the postponement of semantic investigation in American linguistics was bound to create a gap between linguistics and translation studies. Quite simply, linguists and translators were not talking about the same thing".

In addition, linguistic description was in general limited to single language systems. For the translator, every problem involved two language systems, a statement of the distribution of an item in one language is of no particular value. However, structuralist theories of language were, nevertheless, influential in translation theory and there were some serious attempts to apply structuralist notions to translation problems (Catford, 1965). As a result of Catford's work with its emphasis on contextual meaning and the social context of situation in which language activity takes place, translation theory becomes a branch of contrastive linguistics, and translation problems become a matter of the non-correspondence of certain formal categories in different languages. This has led to an investigation of "equivalence probability": "an attempt to arrive at a statistical calculation of the degree of probability that a given SL category will, in any given text, be rendered by an equivalent TL category" (Hatim and Mason, 1997, p. 26). According to Nida (1964), the non-correspondence of grammatical and lexical categories is the main source of information loss and gain in translation. The influence of contrastive structural linguistics has made itself felt in translation teaching methodology. Many published manuals of translating devote separate sections to the translation of verbs, objectives, pronouns, and prepositions (Astington, 1983).

Among the insights brought by Chomsky and others to language analysis was the distinction between ‘surface structure’ and ‘deep structure’; that is “the notion that the arrangements of elements on the surface of discourse, ‘the words on the page’, so to speak, mask an underlying structural arrangement, reflecting the actual relations between the concepts and entities involved” (Hatim and Mason, 1997, p.31). In this regard, Nida (1964, p. 68) went as far as to suggest that the activity of translating involved:

- (1) breaking down the SL text into its underlying representation or semantic ‘kernels’;
- (2) transfer of meaning from SL to TL ‘on a structurally simple level’, and
- (3) generation of ‘stylistically and semantically equivalent expression in the TL. Moreover, in its insistence on according priority to the investigation of ‘competence’, over the investigation of ‘performance’, transformational grammar drew attention away from language as communication, the very substance of the translator’s work.

It was Dell Hymes (1971) who questioned the limitations of the notion of grammatical ‘competence’ as narrowly conceived within Chomskyan linguistics. Hymes claims that linguistics addresses itself to accounting for the fact that children acquire the ability of how to produce utterances which are not only grammatical but also appropriate. They, in other words, acquire “communicative competence”. This concept is directly relevant to translation studies. As Hatim and Mason (1997, p. 33) point out, “the translator’s communicative competence is attuned to what is communicatively appropriate in both SL and TL communities and individual acts of translation may be evaluated in terms of their appropriateness to the context of their use”. In this regard, Widdowson (1997) makes a useful distinction between “usage” defined as a “projection of the language system or code” (p. 8), and ‘use’ defined as the actual use of language in communication. As Hatim and Mason (1997, p. 33) claim, the preoccupation in translation studies with non-correspondence of grammatical categories in individual languages was an exercise in usage rather than in use, in language-as-system rather than in language-as-communication.

Moreover, the scope of linguistics has widened beyond the confines of the individual sentence. Text linguistics attempts to account for the form of texts in terms of their users. If we accept that meaning is something that is negotiated between producers and receivers of texts, it follows that the translator, as a special kind of text user, intervenes in this process of negotiation, to relay it across linguistic and cultural boundaries. In doing so, the translator is necessarily handling such matters as intended meaning, implied meaning, presupposed meaning, all on the basis of the evidence which the text supplies. The various domains of sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse linguistics are all areas of study which are germane to this process (Hatim and Mason, 1997, p. 33). In their evaluation of all these developments, Hatim and Mason (1997, p. 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.

Translator’s competence

‘What is the translators’ need to know and be able to do in order to translate?’ We are seeking, in other words, a specification of ‘translator competence’. In this regard, Bell (1991) argues that the professional (technical) translator has access to five distinct kinds of knowledge; target language (TL) knowledge; text-type knowledge; source language (SL) knowledge; subject area

(‘real world’) knowledge; and contrastive knowledge. This means that the translator must know (a) how propositions are structured (semantic knowledge), (b) how clauses can be synthesized to carry propositional content and analysed to retrieve the content embedded in them (syntactic knowledge), and (c) how the clause can be realized as information bearing text and the text decomposed into the clause (pragmatic knowledge). Lack of knowledge or control in any of the three cases would mean that the translator could not translate. Without (a) and (b), even literal meaning would elude the translator. Without (c), meaning would be limited to the literal (semantic sense) carried by utterance which, though they might possess formal cohesion (being tangible realizations of clauses), would lack functional coherence and communicative value (Bell, 1991). As Raskin (1987) argues, given the goal of linguistics to match speaker’s competence, an applied linguistic theory of translation should aim at matching the bilingual native speaker’s translation competence. This would necessarily involve seeking an integration between the linguistic knowledge of the two languages with specific and general knowledge of the domain and of the world via comparative and contrastive linguistic knowledge.

One approach would be to focus on the competence of the ‘ideal translator’ (Katz, 1978) or ‘ideal bilingual’ who would be an abstraction from actual bilinguals engaged in imperfectly performing tasks of translation ... but (unlike them) operating under none of the performance limitations that underlie the imperfection of actual translation. This approach reflects Chomsky’s view of the goal of the linguistic theory and his proposals for the specification of the competence of the ‘ideal speaker–hearer’. Accordingly translation theory is primarily concerned with an ideal bilingual reader–writer, who knows both languages perfectly and is unaffected by such theoretically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention or interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying this knowledge in actual performance.

An alternative to the ‘ideal translator’ model would be to adopt a less abstract approach and describe translation competence in terms of generalizations based on inferences drawn from the observation of translator performance. A study of this type suggests an inductive approach: finding features in the data of the product which suggest the existence of particular elements and systematic relations in the process. We would envisage a translator expert system (Bell, 1991). A final alternative would be to deny the competence–performance dichotomy and redefine our objective as the specification of a multi-component ‘communicative competence’ which would consist, minimally, of four areas of knowledge and skills; grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence (Swain 1985 and Hymes, 1971). This approach would lead us (adapting Hymes’ definition of communicative competence) to attempt to specify ‘translator communicative competence’: the knowledge and ability possessed by the translator which permit him/her to create communicative acts – discourse – which are not only (and not necessarily) grammatical but ... socially appropriate (Halliday, 1985). A commitment to this position would make us assert that translator must possess linguistic competence in both languages and communicative competence in both cultures.

Shift to sociocultural oriented concept of translation Translation: two languages and two cultural traditions

“Translation is a kind of activity which inevitably involves at least two languages and two cultural traditions” (Toury, 1978, p. 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, p. 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 a culture can exist which does not have at its centre, the structure of natural language" (Lotman and Uspensky, 1978, p. 211–232). Bassnett (1980, pp. 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, p. 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 (Pym et al., 2006).

Denigration of linguistic models has occurred especially since the 1980s, when TS was characterized by the so-called 'cultural turn' (Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990). What happened was a shift from linguistically-oriented approaches to culturally-oriented ones. Influenced by cultural studies, TS has put more emphasis on the cultural aspects of translation and even a linguist like Snell-Hornby has defined translation as a "cross-cultural event" (1987). Vermeer (1989) has claimed that a translator should be 'pluricultural' (see Snell-Hornby, 1988, p. 46), while V. Ivir has gone so far as to state that "translating means translating cultures, not languages" (Ivir, 1987, p. 35).

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, p. 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 call for a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach (Shamma, 2009). Since translation involves texts with a specific communicative function, the limitations of a narrow linguistic approach soon became obvious. Thus, 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 an 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 (1989) with his Skopos Theory.

As Robinson (2005, p. 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. Translation theorists have been cognizant of the problems attendant upon cultural knowledge and cultural difference at least since ancient Rome, and translators almost certainly knew all about those problems long before theorists articulated them. 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. The main concern has traditionally been with so-called realia, words and phrases that are so heavily and exclusively grounded in one culture that they are almost impossible to translate into the terms – verbal or otherwise – of another. Long debates have been held over when to paraphrase, when to use the nearest local equivalent, when to coin a new word by translating literally, and when to transcribe. And these “untranslatable” culture – bound words and phrases continue to fascinate translators and translation theorists (see Rheingold, 1988 and Renner, 1989).

Nevertheless, Manfredi (2008, p. 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 House (2002, pp. 92–93) clearly states, 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, p. 93). Culturally-oriented and linguistically-oriented approaches to translation “[...] are not, necessarily mutually exclusive alternatives” (Manfredi, 2007, p. 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. Instead, Chesterman proposes a classification “consisting of four complementary approaches. These are ‘the textual, the cognitive, the sociological and the cultural’” (p. 20). ‘Textual’ covers old (linguistic) chestnuts, such as equivalence, naturalness, fluency and translation universals, and calls for observation of translation products (source text-target text pairs); ‘cognitive’ covers the study of different forms of decision-making, the way a translator processes a text (studied by think-aloud protocols) eye-tracking, or interviews with translators; the ‘sociological’ involves the study of the people, not only the identity and history of translators and their profession but also the networks established with publishers, commissioners, reviewers and others; the ‘cultural’ looks

at the role of ideologies, values, power and ethics in translation and sees translation in Bourdieu's terms as 'cultural capital'. Since these different spheres are overlapping, Chesterman attempts to define 'a set of shared assumptions' for investigation in a field that, hermeneutically, draws on literary analysis, cultural studies and postmodernism and, empirically, on methods from human sciences such as sociology and psychology (p. 24).

Chesterman considers that the growth in translation studies as an interdiscipline has led to fragmentation and that concepts and methodologies are 'borrowed [from other disciplines] at a superficial level' which leads to 'misunderstandings' since those working in translation studies are often lacking expertise in the other field and even borrowing concepts that may be outdated (p. 19). This is an important criticism; Chesterman's solution is for collaborative work with scholars in other fields. Chesterman's proposal is for the adoption of the term 'consilience', which has its roots in the ancient Greek concept of the unity of knowledge and was recently revisited in the field of socio-biology by Edward Wilson. Consilience is relevant, in Chesterman's view, since 'modern translation studies [...] announces itself as a new attempt to cut across boundaries in the search for a deeper understanding of the relations between texts, societies and cultures' (p. 25).

Disenza (2006) summarizes the advantages of this multidisciplinary approach: translation studies help 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.

What has changed in recent translation scholarship on culture is an increasing emphasis on the collective control or shaping of cultural knowledge; the role played by ideology, or what Gramsci (1971) called "hegemony", in constructing and maintaining cultural knowledge and policing transfers across cultural barriers. Beginning in the late 1970s, several groups of scholars began to explore the impact of cultural system on what gets translated, and why, and how, and how the translation is used. And beginning in the late 1980s, other group of scholars began to explore the ongoing impact of colonization on translation – especially the surviving power differentials between "first world" and "third world" countries and how they control the economics and ideology and thus also the practice of translation (Robinson, 2005 and Baker, 2006).

Pym (1992, p. 25) attempted to define 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 extralingually) 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, p. 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.

The first group of scholars to begin to move the cultural study of translation out of the realm of realia and into the large-scale political and social systems have been variously identified as the polysystems, translation studies, descriptive translation studies, or manipulation school (see Gentzler, 1993). Beginning in the late 1970s, they – people like Holmes, 1975 , Even-Zohar, 1979 , Even-Zohar, 1981 , Toury, 1995, Lefevere, 1992 and Bassenett, 1980 , Snell Hornby, 1995 and 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 assumption 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 The cultural turn might best be highlighted by imaging two scenarios. In the first scenario, God created heaven and earth and everything on it, including translation To everything he gave a stable form, appearance, and name. To the act of restating in a second language what someone has expressed in a first he gave the name translation; its appearance was to be lowly, humble, subservient; its form fidelity or equivalence, as exact a correspondence as possible between the meaning of the source and target texts. These properties he decreed for all times and all places. This and only this was translation. Anyone who deviated from the form and appearance of translation did not deserve the name of “translator”, and the product of such deviation could certainly not be named a “translation”. In the second scenario; translation arose organically out of attempts to communicate with people who spoke another language; its origins lay in commerce and trade, politics and war. Translators and interpreters were trained and hired by people with money and power who wanted to make sure that their messages were conveyed faithfully to the other side of a negotiation, and that they understood exactly what the other side was saying to them. Eventually, when these people grew powerful enough to control huge geographical segments of the world; these power affiliations were dressed up in the vestments of universality – whence the first scenario. But translation remained a contested ground, fought over by conflicting power interests: you bring your translator, I’ll bring mine, and we’ll see who imposes what interpretation on the events that transpires. Today as well, professional translator must in most cases conform to the expectations of the people who pay them to translate. If a client says edit, the translator edits; if the client says do not edit, the translator does not edit. If the client says do a literal translation, and then a literal back-translation to prove you’ve followed my orders, that is exactly what the translator does. Translators can refuse to do a job that they find morally repugnant, or professionally unethical, or practically impossible; they can also resist and attempt to reshape the orders they get from the people with the money. But the what’s and the how’s and the whys of translation are by and large controlled by publishers, clients, and agencies – not by universal norms (Robinson, 2005, p.

196). The happy universalism of liberal humanist thought, according to which people are basically the same everywhere, everybody wants and knows basically the same things and uses language in roughly similar ways, so that anything that can be said in one language can be said in another, has come under heavy attack.

That universalism is increasingly seen as an illusion projected outward by hegemonic cultures (patriarchy, colonialism, capitalism) in an attempt to force subjected cultures to conform to centralized norms: be like us and you will be civilized, modern, cultured, rational, intelligent; be like us and you will be seen as “truly human”, part of the great “brotherhood of man”.

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 constraints 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. In fact, Cultural Turn is the metaphor adopted by Cultural Studies oriented translation theories to refer 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. As the result of this so called Cultural Turn, cultural studies have taken an increasingly keen interest in translation. One consequence of this has been bringing together scholars from different disciplines. It is here important to mention that these cultural theorists have kept their own ideology and agendas that drive their own criticism. These cultural approaches have widened the horizons of translation studies with new insights but at the same time 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.

The first theory developed in this field was introduced by Mounin in 1963 who underlined the importance of the signification of a lexical item claiming that only if this notion is considered will the translated item fulfil its function correctly. The problem with this theory is that all the cultural elements do not involve just the items, what a translator should do in the case of cultural implications which are implied in the background knowledge of SL readers? 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, p. 130). It is further explained that parallels in culture often provide a common understanding despite significant formal shifts in translation. The cultural implications for translation are thus of significant importance as well as lexical concerns. Nida’s definitions of formal and dynamic equivalence (see Nida, 1964, p. 129) may also be seen to apply when considering cultural implications for translation. According to Nida, a “gloss translation” mostly typifies formal equivalence where form and content are reproduced as faithfully as possible and the TL reader is able to “understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression” of the SL context (Nida, 1964, p. 129). Contrasting with this idea, dynamic equivalence “tries to relate the receptor to modes of behaviour relevant within the context of his own culture” without insisting that he “understand

the cultural patterns of the source-language context” (idem). According to him problems may vary in scope depending on the cultural and linguistic gap between the two (or more) languages concerned.

Vermeer (1989) 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 the 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 the 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 contexts. The translator is once again the key player in the process of intercultural communication and the production of the *translatum* because of the purpose of the translation.

Newmark (1988) defines culture as “the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that use a particular language as its means of expression” (1988, p. 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, p. 95) in direct opposition to the view taken by Vermeer who states that “language is part of a culture” (1989, p. 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, 1988, p. 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, 1988, p. 96).

Venuti (1992) mentioned the effective powers controlling translation. He 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 and editors who choose the works and commission the translations, pay the translators and often dictate the translation method. They also include 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 his/her 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. Baker (1992) believed that it is necessary for a translator to have knowledge about semantics and lexical sets. Because in this case S/he would appreciate the “value” of the word in a given system knowledge and the difference of structures in SL and TL. This allows him to assess the value of a given item in a lexical set,

and S/he can develop strategies for dealing with non-equivalence semantic field. Baker stated that SL word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target culture. It can be abstract or concrete. It maybe a religious belief, a social custom or even a type of food. In her book, *In Other Words*, she argued about the common non-equivalents to which a translator comes across while translating from SL into TL, while both languages have their distinguished specific culture.

Coulthard (1992) highlighted the importance of defining the ideal reader for whom the author attributes the knowledge of certain facts, memory of certain experiences ... plus certain opinions, preferences and prejudices and a certain level of linguistic competence. Then the translator should identify TL reader for whom he is translating and match the cultural differences between two languages. He said that the translator's first and major difficulty is the construction of a new ideal reader who, even if he has the same academic, professional and intellectual level as the original reader, will have significantly different textual expectations and cultural knowledge.

Venuti (1995) insisted that the scope of translation studies need to be broadened to take the 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. He said that this invisibility is produced by: (1) the way the translators themselves tend to translate fluently into English, to produce an idiomatic and readable TT, thus creating illusion of transparency; and (2) the way the translated texts are typically read in the target 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 was 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 and Venuti, 1998b 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 foreign culture. Foreignization is a 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 bring 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 a 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.

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 into 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, Schulte (2002) mentioned that for dealing with the cultural gaps cultural transposition is needed. According to him cultural transposition has a scale of degrees that 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 S structure, therefore, while it is

unidiomatic to target reader but it is familiar to 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 expressions, 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. He mentioned that of the many factors that may lead to misreadings in translation are 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 misreading 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 than being unique to an individual; (3) culture is symbolic. Symbolizing means assigning to entities and events meaning 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

Snell-Hornby’s important book, “Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach”, first published in 1988, was one of the very first publications which argued strongly for the recognition of translation studies as an academic discipline in its own right. She situates translation into the wider context of multilingual and multicultural communication. She illustrates how recent trends, notably globalization and advances in technology, have influenced international communication and translation, and she discusses the consequences for the job profile of the translator. Globalization, however, is accompanied by an opposite trend, tribalisation, which too, has an effect on our perception of language, and also on

translation. Snell-Hornby argues that advances in technology have affected people's production and perception of language. The fact that ever-increasing amounts of information are (to be) processed with ever increasing speed, has consequences for the languages. However, there seems to be a counter-trend: with the rapidly growing number of Internet users, the number of languages is growing too. However, English is still by far the most widely used language, the language by which a global market can best be reached (Bielsa, 2005). 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 foreignizing/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 and 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.

Postcolonial translation studies

Post-colonialism is one of the most thriving points of contact between cultural studies and translation studies. It 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. Spivak's work is indicative of how cultural studies and especially post-colonialism has over the past decade focused on issues of translation, the translational and colonization. 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, 1997a and

Robinson, 1997b, 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, 1997a and Robinson, 1997b. Jacquemond is specifically concerned with translation between France and Egypt but is also interested 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, p. 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 accessible 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 analyse the power structures controlling translation and call for more resistance to those structures, feminist approaches have been more oriented toward resistance than toward analysis Robinson, 1997a and Robinson, 1997b .

One theorist who has paid attention to the project of translation in the context of post-colonialism is Gayatri Spivak. With experience in the translation of Derrida, as well as texts by Mahasweta Devi and other Bengali writers, Spivak is one of the few cultural studies theorists to speak of translation from a practical as well as theoretical point of view. She presents these ideas principally in “The Politics of Translation” (Spivak 1993)

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, 2005, Malmkjar, 2005 and Santaemilia, 2005) clearly demonstrates that the most recent development in TS shows 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, p. 1). The year 2006 continued these foci but was remarkable for the number, breadth and quality of publication (Delabastita et al., 2006, Snell-Hornby, 2006, Duarte et al., 2006, Pym, 2006, Baker, 2006 and France and Kenneth, 2006 ;

Morini, 2006 and Boase-Beier, 2005 ; Woods, 2006 , Van Coillie et al., 2006 , Lathey, 2006, Cronin, 2006 , Cheung, 2006 and 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, and 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 its background was linguistics (or its sub-disciplines, particularly pragmatics, text linguistics), 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 discipline 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

- Al-Wahy, 1999 A. Al-Wahy Translation and the textual meaning of the clause: a systematic-functional perspective *Philology*, XXXIII (1999), pp. 68–106
- Anderman, G., 2005. *Europe on Stage: Translation and Theatre*. Oberon.

- Anderman and Rogers, 2005. (Eds.), 2005. In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse? Multilingual Matters.
- Anne Brooks-Lewis, K., 2009. Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Language Learning*, vol. 62.
- Armstrong, N., 2005. Translation, Linguistic Culture: A French–English Handbook. Multilingual Matters.
- E. Astington, Equivalence. *Translation Difficulties and Devices, French–English, English–French* Cambridge University Press (1983)
- Baker, 1992, M. Baker In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation, Routledge, London/New York (1992)
- Baker, 1998, M. Baker (Ed.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, Routledge, London/New York (1998)
- Baker, 2006, M. Baker, *Translation and Conflict*, Routledge, London and New York (2006)
- Bassnett and Lefevere, 1990, S. Bassnett, A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Translation, History and Culture*, Printer, London (1990)
- Bassnett, S., 1980/1991/2002. *Translation Studies*. Routledge, London/New York.
- Bassnett, 1999, S. Bassnett (Ed.), *Post-colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, Routledge, London and New York (1999)
- Bell, 1991, R.T. Bell, *Translation theory; where are we going?*
- Benabdelali, 2006. *Fi Attarjama [in translation]*, first ed. Dar Toubkal, Casablanca, Bermann and Wood, 2005
- Bermann, S., 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.
- Catford, 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay on Applied Linguistics*, Oxford University Press, London (1965)
- Chesterman, 2006, A. Chesterman, *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Idea in Translation Theory*
- John Benjamins, Amsterdam and Philadelphia (2006), *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue Between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface*
- St. Jerome, Manchester (2002) Andrew Chesterman, Rosemary Arrojo, *Shared Ground in Translation Studies*
- Cheung, M. (Ed.), 2006. *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation: From Earliest Times to the Buddhist Project*, vol. 1. St. Jerome.

- Coulthard, M., 1992. Linguistic Constraints on Translation. In *Studies in Translation*. Universidad Federal de Santa Catarina, pp. 9–23.
- Cronin, Michael, 2006. *Translation and Identity*. Routledge.
- Delabastita, D., Lieven, D., 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.
- J. Duarte, A. Ferreira, R. Assis, S. Teresa (Eds.), *Translation Studies of the Interface of the Disciplines*, John Benjamin, Benjamins Translation Library EST Subseries (2006)
- El-dali, H., 2008. How Much Translation is Permitted in FL Instruction? Perspectives from Translation Studies and Linguistics. Paper Presented at the First International UAE Conference on Translation and Globalization.
- Englund, D., 2005. *Expertise and Explicitation in the Translation Process*. Benjamins Translation Library, John Benjamins.
- Poetics Today, 2 (4) (1981), pp. 1–7 (Reprinted as “Translation and Transfer”. Poetics Today 11, 1 (1990) 73–78)
- France, P., Kenneth, H. (Eds.), 2006. *The Oxford History of Literary Translation into English*, vol. 4. Oxford University Press, pp. 179–190.
- Genc, B., Bada, E., 2005. *Culture in Language Learning and Teaching*. The Reading Matrix, vol. 5, No. 1.
- Gramsci, 1971, Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Translated and Edited by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith
- Halliday, M., 1961. Linguistics and machine translation. In: McIntosh, A., Halliday, M. (Eds.), *Theory of Translation*. Methuen, London.
- Halliday, M.A.K., 1985/1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, second ed. Arnold, London.
- Halliday, M.A.K., Hasan, R. 1985/1989. *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Deakin University Press/Oxford University Press, Australia/Oxford.
- Hatim and Munday, 2004, *Translation: An Advanced Resource Book*, Routledge, London/New York (2004)
- B. Hatim, J. Munday, *Translation: An Advance Resource Book*, Routledge, London and New York (2006)
- Hermans, Theo (Ed.), 1985. *The Manipulation of the Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. Cropom Helm, London.