



Theoretical Trends and Strategic Approaches to Translation Studies After World War II

Servais Martial Akpaca

Department of English, Faculty of Languages, Arts and Communication (FLLAC), University of Abomey-Calavi (UAC), Abomey-Calavi, Benin

Email address:

akpacasm@yahoo.fr

To cite this article:

Servais Martial Akpaca. Theoretical Trends and Strategic Approaches to Translation Studies After World War II. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and Translation*. Vol. 8, No. 4, 2022, pp. 140-147. doi: 10.11648/j.ijalt.20220804.12

Received: October 4, 2022; **Accepted:** October 26, 2022; **Published:** November 16, 2022

Abstract: This paper aims to explore the translation theories developed after World War II and to discuss the strategies applied by translators. Regarding the starting date of this study, it is important to note that translation was recognised as a scientific area of study in tertiary education institutions in Western Europe after World War II. Since then, several theories including linguistic theories, literary theories as well as the Translation Studies theory, the interpretative theory, the action theory, the Skopos theory, the functional theory, the polysystem theory, the feminist theory and the post-colonial theory have been developed. As far as translation strategies are concerned, three types, namely syntactic strategies, semantic strategies and pragmatic strategies, are discussed. The method adopted in this paper is both theoretical and descriptive. The findings of the paper are that translation theories are just like a centuries-old story about six blind men from Hindustan who were tasked with determining what an elephant looked like by feeling different parts of the elephant's body. The one who touched the leg said that an elephant was like a pillar. The one who felt the tail observed that an elephant was like a rope. The one who felt the trunk concluded that it was like a tree branch, etc. Indeed, there is a need to take a holistic approach to translation, which would combine all these theories into a single and more coherent whole. As regards the strategies, there are points of connection between syntax and semantics.

Keywords: Translation Theories, Strategies, Translation Studies, Semantics, Target Language

1. Introduction

This paper sets out to discuss translation theories and strategies after World War II. Therefore, it starts by shedding light on the concepts of theory and strategy. Indeed, As-Safi [1] (2011, p. 47) gives the following definition:

Webster's definition of 'theory' is a 'body of generalizations and principles in association with practice in a field of activity.' Manifestly, translation is intrinsically a practical activity from which generalizations can be inferred, and is in a dire need for principles to guide the practice. Generalizations are only inferences drawn from paradigms, instances of facts provided by contrastive analyses of various levels in both ST and TT: morphological, syntactic, textual and stylistic/rhetorical. When generalizations are universally applicable and predictable they become principles, norms, rules or laws to govern the translation activity.

It emerges from this quotation that a theory is a body of generalisations which are themselves the results of contrastive analyses of source language and target language morphological, syntactic, textual and stylistic features which become universally applicable.

In another perspective, Reiss Vermeer [14] (in Shuttleworth, 2007: 185) says that any theory, including one on translation, should contain: "(1) the statement of its basis, (2) the description of its object, and (3) an inventory of rules". After these initial remarks on translation theories, it is important to explain the concept of translation strategies as well.

Indeed, a translation strategy is a procedure for solving a problem encountered in translating a text or a segment of it Baker [2] (2005, p. 188). Examples of translation strategies include domestication, transposition, modulation, dynamic equivalence, etc. Translators universally have recourse to these strategies to solve problems that they encounter in

translating because there is always a particular way of conveying meaning in a particular language. This is understandably so because the resources that are available in a source language to express meaning in a particular way may not be available in a target language. Under these conditions, translators change tactics by using different stylistic, syntactic or rhetorical devices to convey ideas from one language into another. Strategies are thus forms of explicitly textual manipulation. They are directly observable from the translation product itself, in comparison with the source text. Jääskeläinen (1993).

In the following sections, translation theories and strategies will be presented and discussed with the view of understanding the nature of translation. The theories are many and it becomes difficult to tell whether translation is an art, a craft, or a science. Each theory presents an aspect of translation and concludes that it is either a linguistic operation, a literary exercise, an ideologically oriented transaction, etc. This situation suggests that translation is just like the centuries-old Hindu metaphor of the six blind men who were tasked to determine what an elephant looked like by touching different parts of its body.

2. Methodology

The initial part of this paper is theoretical in the sense that several translation theories have been read and presented in the context of the literature review. The main books from which these theories are extracted are *Les théories de la traduction* (2014) by Zuzana Raková, *Translation Theories, Strategies and Basic Theoretical Issues* (2011) by As-Safi, and *Memes of Translation* (2016) by Andrew Chesterman. The paper focuses mostly on these three books which have been read and summarised in the initial part.

It needs to be noted that the various translation theories mentioned in these books present both an ontological and an epistemological view of translation. Indeed, each of these theories attempts to disclose the nature of translation, which is an ontological question. Then, the approaches used by each theory to get to the truth about the nature of translation are just like epistemological approaches.

The second part of the paper is more analytical and evaluative. Indeed, it evaluates the validity of some of the theories. This is an initial reflexion that should be carried on in subsequent papers.

2.1. Problem Statement

It is a truism that translation theory shapes and orients the practice of translation in several ways. Translation (as a process or product) is not neutral. It is the result of theoretical manipulations. Depending on the translator's theoretical standpoint, a translation can reveal or hide source language or target language cultural realities. Various authors call this technique *foreignisation* or *domestication*; *naturalisation*, *cultural filtering*, *borrowing*, etc. The style or the structure of the translated text is not spared either. In the case of *formal correspondence*, e.g. a translator opts to faithfully render the

form of the SL text; while in the case of *dynamic equivalence*, s/he restructures the message in the TL. This is enough evidence that translation is not neutral and that the knowledge of various translation theories and strategies is critically important in this profession.

2.2. Results

- 1) Translation theories are just like a centuries-old story about six blind men from Hindustan who were tasked with determining what an elephant looked like by feeling different parts of the elephant's body.
- 2) In translation, text meaning can be generated taking into account the linguistic elements in the text. (This is a linguistic approach to translation).
- 3) In translation, text meaning can only be interpreted sometimes because it is beyond the words. (This is an extralinguistic approach to translation).
- 4) Translation is not neutral because it is often the subject of theoretical manipulations.
- 5) Translation strategies manipulate syntax, semantics and pragmatics.
- 6) There are production strategies and comprehension strategies in translation.

3. Translation Theories

In *Les théories de la traduction* (2014), Zuzana Raková presents 20th century translation theories under the title *Théories, approches et modèles de la traduction au XXe siècle*. Indeed, the following theoretical approaches to translation are presented and discussed in the book: linguistic approaches (1950-1960), literary approaches, *Translation Studies* approaches (1970s), *la théorie interprétative* of ESIT (i.e. Paris School of Interpreters and Translators) founded in 1957, the *Minimax* approach, the Action theory, the Skopos theory and functional approaches, the Polysystem theory, and sociological as well as feminist and postcolonial theories.

3.1. Linguistic Theories of Translation

As far as the linguistic theories are concerned, several names are mentioned, namely Jean Darbelnet and Jean-Paul Vinay, the authors of *Comparative Stylistics of French and English* (1958). This book has made a major contribution to the study of translation by formulating seven translation procedures or strategies. Raková [13] (2014, p. 104) notes that these two Canadian authors claim that translation is also related to stylistics, rhetoric and psychology. Another prominent name mentioned under the linguistic section in the book is Georges Mounin, the author of *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction* (1963). This book, which Raková refers to as '*traductologie linguistique théorique*' (i.e. theoretical linguistics in translation studies), provides a conceptual framework for the study of translation. In a subsequent section entitled *Traductologie linguistique appliquée* (i.e. applied linguistics in translation studies), Raková mentions the name of John Catford, the author of *A*

Linguistic Theory of Translation (1965). Furthermore, Raková states that Catford studies the translation process using applied linguistics tools.

In the following subtitle *Traductologie linguistique communicationnelle* (i.e. communicative linguistics in translation studies) Raková refers to the theories developed by Cary, Jakobson and Nida. Indeed, Edmond Cary wrote *La traduction dans le monde moderne* in 1956 and *Les grands traducteurs français* in 1963. He thinks that translation is an art and an act of communication but not a science. (op. cit. 109-110) [15]. However, in *Comment faut-il traduire ?* (i.e. How should translation be done?), a book published by Michel Ballard in 1985, Cary says that translation is not solely a linguistic exercise. As indicated above, Roman Jakobson (1896-1982) is among the authors promoting communicative linguistics in translation studies. He pioneered the development of the structural analysis of language, poetry and art, and formulated a functional approach to language. This functional approach led to the development of functional translation theories like the Skopos theory, critical discourse analysis, language registers and genres. In *Linguistic Aspects of Translation* (in Brower, 1959, pp. 232-239) [3], Jakobson distinguishes three types of translation, namely intralingual translation or reformulation, interlingual translation or translation proper and intersemiotic translation or transmutation.

Included in this communicative approach to translation is Eugene Nida, the author of *Towards a Science of Translating* (1964) as well as of *The Message and Mission* (1960) and *Linguistics and Ethnology in Translation Problems* (1964). In these books, Nida discusses the concepts of *Formal Correspondence* and *Dynamic Equivalence* and mentions cultural and ethnological problems in translation. Under a different section entitled *Traductologie sociolinguistique* (i.e. sociolinguistics in translation studies), Raková explains that sociolinguistics studies language in its social context. In 1960s in the USA, under the influence of William Labov, Gumperz and Hymes, the sociolinguistic turn of translation focused on all phenomena relating to the translator and translation in its social context. In the French speaking world as well, Maurice Pergnier, the author of *Fondements sociolinguistiques de la traduction* (1978) distinguishes three types of translation: translation as a translated text, a final product or an outcome; translation as an exercise of mental reformulation; translation as a comparison of two idioms.

Under the title *traductologie linguistique sémiotique* (i.e. linguistics and semiotics in translation studies), Raková mentions Peirce, Barthes, Greimas, Jakobson and Eco. Roland Barthes published *Elements de sémiologie* in 1965 and *Système de la mode* in 1967. Julien Algirdas Greimas published *Sémantique structurale* in 1966. Another name mentioned by Raková is Ferdinand de Saussure (*Cours de Linguistique générale*, 1916). Semiotics, the study of signs and of their meaning systems, is the link between these authors. Then, Raková identifies *traductologie linguistique textuelle* (i.e. textual linguistics in translation studies) as well. This is associated with the name of Robert Larose. S/he states that many translation theorists have turned to discourse

analysis in translation studies.

In *Théories contemporaines de la traduction* (1989), Larose analyses the various elements included in the publications on translation from 1960 to 1980. The book focuses on Vinay and Darbelnet, Mounin, Nida, Catford, Steiner, Delisle, Ladmiral and Newmark. In the end, Larose proposes a teleological model based on the purpose of the translated text.

The next approach to the study of translation announced earlier is the literary approach.

3.2. Literary Theories of Translation

In justifying the link between literature and translation, Edmond Cary says that « *La traduction n'est pas une opération linguistique, c'est une opération littéraire.* » [9] (Mounin, 1963, p. 13). This statement is in line with ideas expressed by Roland Barthes and Umberto Eco who think that the meaning of a text depends on the readers' understanding.

3.2.1. Poetic Approaches

Poetics is the study of literary art. Tzvetan Todorov distinguishes three trends of poetic theories in the western tradition. The first one is a rhetoric trend which claims that poetry is used to embellish language. The second one stresses that poetry is the opposite of ordinary language and is used to communicate the things that ordinary language cannot say. The third one emphasizes the need to play with words and attracts attention to its poetic understones more than to the meaning it expresses. The names that are associated with these poetic approaches are Beaudelaire, Paul Valery, Efim Etkind and Meschonnic. Paul Valery says that it is not enough to translate the meaning of a poem; it is equally important to translate its form including its prosody. Therefore, the sounds and the meaning of a modern poem are equally important. [9] (Guidère, 2010, pp. 52-55) Etkind proposes a typology of poetic translations, which comprises the following: translation/information; translation-interpretation; translation-allusion; translation-approximation; translation-recreation; translation-imitation. [12] (Oseki-Dépré, 2011, pp. 86-92).

3.2.2. Ideological Approaches

Raková defines ideology as a set of ideas oriented towards political actions. The ideological approach emerged under the influence of the Cultural Turn in the study of translation. Ideological questions reveal realities such as censorship, cultural imperialism and European colonialism. Antoine Bermann distinguishes between 'ethnocentric translations', which highlight the target language standards, and 'hypertextual translations' which value the implicit relations between texts from various cultures. According to Louis Kelly (1979), it is possible to reinterpret the history of translation from an ideological point of view. This is understandably so because whereas translation was done literally in the Middle Ages, in the Renaissance era there was a shift from literal translation to free translation. In much the

same way, translations done in the Romantic era were 'romanticised', while translations done during the communist period were reviewed in accordance with communist dogmas.

3.2.3. The Hermeneutical Approach

Originally the word *hermeneutics* means 'to understand or to explain' in Greek, however it eventually came to designate a trend and an interpretation method initiated by German romantic authors. The main promoter of this trend in translation was Friedrich Schleiermacher (1767-1834). The latter believes that translators should not hide the foreign origin of a translation. He is an advocate of the foreignisation technique. [6] (Gromova, Raksanyiova, 2005, pp. 41-42) In a similar vein, George Steiner in *After Babel* (1975) lays the foundation of Translational Hermeneutics.

3.3. The Initial Stages of Translation Studies

Under this section, Raková notes that the *Translation Studies* approaches started in the Netherlands and Belgium. André Lefevere and James Holmes, two young researchers from the Netherlands, wanted in 1970s to overcome the opposition between the literary approach and the linguistic approach to translation by opening it up to interdisciplinary approaches. They were interested in the way the 'signified' is transformed in the translation process. The aim of these researchers was to formulate a general translation theory, as pointed out by Lefevere in 1978 in *Translation Studies: The Goal of the Discipline*, in J. S. Holmes, J. Lambert, R. van den Broeck (eds.), *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies with a Basic Bibliography of Books on Translation Studies*, Louvain.

More importantly it was Levi's text entitled *The Art of Translation (Umeni prekladu)* which spearheaded the development of the *Translation Studies* because it studies a literary work as an organised structure which can potentially yield an artistic effect.

In *Seven Strategies and a Blueprint* (1975), Andre Lefevere develops a similar approach with Holmes regarding the translation of poems. The seven strategies are *phonemic translation* (which undermines the meaning), *literal translation* (renders the meaning sometimes but sacrifices the literarity of the text), *metric translation* (retains the meter but destroys the meaning and the syntax as well), *prose translation* (keeps the meaning but sacrifices the poetic quality of the text), *rhyme translation* (is very constraining and the words express meanings that are different from that of the SL text), *free verse translation* (is more accurate and literary however it forces the translator to resort to amplification and/or reductions) and *interpretation*.

At the initial stages of the *Translation Studies*, theorists proposed an objective and descriptive theory based on SL and TL texts. [13] (Raková, 2014, p. 143).

3.4. The Interpretive Theory

This theory was promoted by some researchers of the *Ecole Supérieure d'Interprètes et de Traducteurs*, Paris, currently known as *Sorbonne Nouvelle, Université de Paris*

III. ESIT was founded in 1957. This theory was developed at the end of 1970s. The pioneers were Danica Seleskovitch (1921-2001) and Marianne Lederer. Moya [10] (2010, p. 69) notes that Jean Delisle, a Canadian researcher, and Amparo Hurtado, a Spanish researcher, also contributed to this theory. Unlike the linguistic theories of translation, the interpretive theory insists on contextual translation and highlights the analysis of the meaning as it appears in the discourse. (Delisle, 1984) This theory postulates that linguistics is not enough to study translation phenomena because there are non-linguistic factors that influence translation. They turned to textual linguistics or *textology*, as Delisle calls it. Danica Seleskovitch, a conference interpreter, said that there are three stages in interpretation/translation: *comprehension, deverbilization and reformulation*.

3.5. The Textual Linguistic Approach or Discourse Analysis Approach

In *Analyse du discours comme méthode de traduction: initiation à la traduction française de textes pragmatiques anglais: théorie et pratique*, Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa (1984), Jean Delisle proposes a translation method based on discourse analysis but it only focuses on pragmatic texts, i.e. non-literary texts. Pragmatic texts are denotative rather than connotative, refer to an objective reality and their interpretation reveals only one meaning. [10] (Moya, 2010, p. 75).

3.6. The Game Theory

John von Neumann is the author of the Game Theory also called the *minimax strategy*. The idea is to find the best strategy in a given situation to maximize the gains and to minimize the losses. Raková says that it is a formal and idealistic approach to translation that does not take into account the demands of the professional realities. The application of this theory to translation is problematic because translation is not a game.

3.7. Jiri Levy: Translation as a Decision Process (1967)

In *Translation as a Decision Process* published in *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, 11 October 1966, vol. 3, II, Hague, 1967, pp. 1171-1182, Levy [8] states that from a teleological point of view, translation is a communication process. The purpose of translation is to communicate information in the SL text to foreign readers. From the translator's point of view, translation is a decision making process. Most of the time, translators have to make a choice amongst several alternatives.

3.8. The Action Theory

The Action Theory was developed in Germany in 1980s by Justa Holz-Manttari. In *Translatorisches Handeln* (Helsinki, 1984), translation is envisaged as a process of intercultural communication. Holz managed to highlight the cultural difficulties that translators face in some professional contexts.

The main purpose of this theory is to promote functional translations to reduce cultural obstacles that prevent adequate communication. [7] (Guidère, 2010, pp. 71-72).

3.9. *The Skopos Theory and the Functional Approaches*

The Greek word *Skopos* means purpose or aim. It is used in translation studies to designate the theory initiated in Germany at the University of Heidelberg by Hans Vermeer in the late 1970s. Its promoters include Christiane Nord and Margaret Ammann. The *Skopos* theory focuses on pragmatic texts and their functions in target cultures. In 1978, Hans Vermeer noted that translation methods and strategies are mostly determined by the purpose of the text to be translated. Translation is done in accordance with its *Skopos*.

Katharina Reiss wrote *La critique des traductions, ses possibilités et ses limites* (i.e. Translation Critique, its Possibilities and Limits). In this book, she explains that the purpose of a translation may be different from that of the source text. Hans Vermeer wrote, in 1978, *Esquisse d'une théorie générale de la traduction*, a book in which he distanced himself from the linguistic theory of translation and advocated the *Skopos* theory.

3.10. *The Polysystem Theory*

The *Translation Studies*, which started in 1970s, had two schools of thought, i.e. the University of Amsterdam where James Holmes used to teach and the University of Tel Aviv where Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury used to teach. Since the publication of *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation* in 1985 by Theo Hermans, the *Translation Studies* and the Polysystem theory united into a single translation theory called the *Translation Studies*. The promoters showed a sense of awareness of the cultural, political and economic importance of translation in their multicultural societies. Some of the aspects that these schools had in common were as follows: Literature is a complex and dynamic system; their method is descriptive and objective; they are interested in literary translation (unlike the promoters of the *Skopos* theory); they are oriented towards the target language text; they have a functional and systemic vision of translation: they are interested in the place and/or role of a translation in a national literature and the mutual relations between national literatures; they are interested in the standards and the limitations of the production and reception of translation; they focus on the relation between translation and other types of textual production; they are aware of the evolving and historical nature of translations and take into account social forces such as power and ideology and their influence on translated texts.

The representatives of the Translation Studies included James Holmes, Andre Lefevere, Jose Lambert and Susan Bassnett; Itamar Even-Zohar and Gideon Toury assumed a sort of notoriety in developing the concept of Polysystem. [10] (Moya, 2010, pp. 122-130) In 1989, *Target: The International Journal of Translation Studies*, John Benjamins Publishers, was founded.

3.10.1. *Sociological, Feminist and Post-Colonial Theories*

Sociological perspectives pave the way for a subjective translation process. The sociological approach regards translation as a job that is done by a translator to defend his or her political, financial or symbolic interests. The feminist theories started in 1970s and 1980s in the USA and in Canada. The key date was 1972 which coincided with the foundation of *Aphra*, the first literary critique journal. [10] (Moya, 2010, p. 195) Moya reports that according to Africa Vidal, translation used to be faithful, impersonal, equivalent and invisible but the feminist perspective changed this approach. Louise von Flotow says that "Derida gave a female translator the right to abuse the original text" [5] (Flotow, 1991, p. 180). Feminist translators abuse the original texts by adopting a reformist and radical approach to translation. The reformist approach ensures that women's identity and/or presence is not hidden behind the generic word 'Man' (e.g. the rights of Man). The radical approach rebels against standard syntax and traditional literary genres that perpetuate women's oppression. According to Luce Irigaray, it is necessary to change the grammar of the language and create a new grammar that would suit women. (Ibid, pp. 201-202).

The post-colonial perspectives regard translation as an instrument of domination unlike the humanist perspective which views translation solely as a medium of communication between peoples. The promoters of this approach rebel against classical works which treat foreigners as uncivilised people. Postcolonial translation uses translation as a potential tool to reject the differences between pure languages and dialects and between peripheral languages and central languages.

3.10.2. *Translation Theories According to As-Safi*

Professor As-Safi has also published a book on translation theories, entitled *Translation Theories, Strategies and Basic Theoretical Issues* (2011). He distinguishes four periods in the history of translation. The first period ran from the first statements of Cicero and Horace to the publication of Alexander Fraser Tytler's *Essay on the Principles of Translation* in 1791. This period was characterised by word for word translation and sense for sense translation. The second period ran up to 1940s, according to George Steiner. It is characterised as a period of theory and hermeneutic inquiry with the development of a vocabulary and methodology of approaching translation. The third period started in 1940s with the publication of the first papers on machine translation and the introduction of structural and applied linguistics and ran up to 1960s. The fourth period started in the early 1960s and was characterised by a recourse to hermeneutic enquiries into translation and interpretation, i.e. by a revision of translation that sets the discipline in a wide frame which includes a number of other disciplines. This contemporary period has witnessed the emergence of new theories such as polysystem, *Skopos* theory, functionalism, etc.

As-Safi [1] quotes Nida (1976, pp. 66-79) saying that due

to the fact that translation is an activity involving language, any and all theories of translation are to some extent linguistic. Nida classifies these theories into three: philological theories, linguistic theories and socio-linguistic theories. If the emphasis is on literary texts, the underlying theories of translation are philological; if it is on structural differences between SL and TL, the theories may be considered linguistic; and finally if it is on a part of communication process, the theories are best described as sociolinguistic. "However, a more comprehensive survey subsumes far more than Nida's three sets of theories." (As-Safi, 2011, p. 30).

An important theory mentioned by As-Safi is the Relevance theory which is associated with pragmatics. Pragmatics deals with 'speaker's meaning' and the way it is interpreted by the hearer (s), in what is known as implicature. (Palumbo, 2009) Pragmatic equivalence is Baker's seventh kind. The theory, according to Gutt, is developed by Sperder and Wilson who emphasize the interpretive use of language as distinct from the descriptive use. See Gutt (2000, p. 210) Its domain is mental faculties rather than text or processes of text production. (Gutt 21).

3.10.3. Translation Strategies According to Chestermann

At this stage, the discussion will focus on Chesterman's three translation strategies which are syntactic strategies, semantic strategies and pragmatic strategies.

3.10.4. Syntactic Strategies

According to Chestermann, syntactic strategies [4] (pp. 91-98) manipulate form. The main ones are these: Literal translation; loan, calque; transposition, unit shift; phrase structure change; clause structure change; sentence structure change; cohesion change; level shift; scheme change.

An attempt is made to explain only the less popular concepts below:

Unit shift: this is a term from Catford (1965). The units are morpheme, word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph. A Unit Shift occurs when a source text unit is translated as a different unit in the target text.

Phrase structure change: a number of changes including number, definiteness and modification in the noun phrase, and person, tense and mood in the verb phrase. The internal structure of the ST phrase changes.

Clause structure change: change of constituent order (subject, verb, object, complement, adverbial), active vs. passive voice, finite vs. non-finite structure, transitive vs. intransitive.

Sentence structure change: changes include main clause and sub-clause status.

Cohesion change: something that affects intra-textual reference (ellipsis, substitution, pronominalisation and repetition, or the use of connectors of various kinds, etc.).

Level shift: level includes morphology, phonology, syntax and lexis. For example, an idea that English can express through intonation (e.g. interrogation) would be expressed in other languages through morphology (Finnish) or word order (German).

Scheme change: the changes that translators incorporate in the translation of rhetorical schemes.

3.10.5. Semantic Strategies

Under semantic strategies I group kinds of changes which mainly have to do with lexical semantics, but also include aspects of clause meaning such as emphasis. (Chesterman, p. 98) They include synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, converses, abstraction change, distribution change, emphasis change, paraphrase, trope change, other semantic changes.

In using the hyponymy strategy, for example, a translator can translate the word scarlet or crimson by the word *rouge* in the French language. Actually, *rouge* or red is a superordinate noun compared to scarlet. Therefore, the relation between the ST and the TT is as follows:

ST hyponymy (scarlet) → TT superordinate (red/*rouge*).

Abstraction change prompts the translator to substitute an abstract word (in ST) with a more concrete word (in TT).

Distribution change entails the distribution of the same semantic components over more items (expansion) or fewer items (compression).

In the case of paraphrase, a TT version can be described as loose, free, and in some contexts even undertranslated.

Trope change applies to the translation of rhetorical tropes (figurative expressions). A ST metaphor may be or may not be retained as a metaphor in TT. In case it is not retained, the figurative element is dropped. [4] (Ibid, pp. 98-104).

3.10.6. Pragmatic Strategies

If syntactic strategies manipulate forms, and semantic strategies manipulate meaning, pragmatic strategies can be said to manipulate the message itself. (Ibid, 104).

Pragmatic strategies include cultural filtering, explicitness change, information change, interpersonal change, illocutionary change, coherence change, partial translation, visibility change, and transediting.

Chesterman indicates that cultural filtering is also referred to as naturalisation, domestication or adaptation. Explicitness change orients the translation towards more explicitness or more implicitness. Information change adds or omits information in the TT. Interpersonal change may change, for example, the ST second person plural by a mere phrasal verb; or it may alter the formality level, e.g. 'dear passengers' translated as '*distingués passagers*'. In this case, 'dear' expresses solidarity, while *distingués* stresses passengers' high status. Illocutionary change may, for example, change the mood of the verb from indicative to imperative or from statement to request. Coherence change changes the logical arrangement of information in the text, at the ideational level (Blumkulka 1986). Visibility change makes changes in the status of the authorial presence, or causes the overt intrusion or foregrounding of the translatorial presence. For instance, translators' footnotes or bracketed comments are examples of visibility change. Transediting is a term suggested by Stetting (1989) to designate the sometimes radical re-editing that translators have to do on badly written original texts. Other pragmatic changes include, for example, the choice of a dialect, British English vs. American English. The ST is not

readership-specified in this way. (Ibid, pp. 104-109).

4. Discussion

Many approaches have been adopted in the study of translation, including linguistic approaches, literary approaches, the interpretive approach, the critical discourse analysis approach, the minimax approach, the Action theory, the Skopos theory and functional approaches, the Polysystem theory, the sociological, feminist and post-colonial approaches, the philological theory, the aesthetic communication theory, and the pragmatic theory.

Almost each of these concepts consists of one or several other sub-concepts. As a result, it is obvious that they orient the process of translating in many different directions. The source language texts have been the subjects of multiple theoretical manipulations. Indeed, in some instances, the realities described by the SL texts are ignored and replaced by TL realities because what matters is the TL audience. In some other instances, although the message of the SL is faithfully translated into the TL, the style is completely different from the SL style. In yet another instance, the translation of the SL text is handled as an act of sociolinguistic communication or theoretical linguistic exercise.

The purpose of translation differs according to every school of thought. Indeed, for some schools, what matters is the style. For others, what matters includes the following: the reflection of the cultural realities of the target audience in the translation; the reflection of the cultural aspects of the source language in the translation; the translator's ideology; the beauty of the language; the way the message is interpreted into the target language; the similarities or differences between SL and TL structures; the reception of the translated text in the target language; the central or peripheral place of the translation in the target language; intertextuality and/or the synchronic and diachronic relations between SL and TL; the reformulation of the SL text in the TL; the discursive features of the TL text; the presence of the translator's identity in the translation; the feminist orientation of the translation; the break with the grammatical and conventional use of the target language; the sociolinguistic trend of the translation; the agenda of the commissioner of the translation.

Against this background of multiple approaches to the study of translation, two questions come to mind: What is translation and whither translation?

What is translation?

In answering this question, the metaphor of the six blind men from Hindustan comes to mind again. Therefore, there is a need to give a more comprehensive answer which would comprise a good number of the theories mentioned above.

From this perspective, an analysis of translation strategies may provide an insight into this multifaceted activity.

As mentioned earlier, Chestermann distinguishes syntactic strategies, semantic strategies and pragmatic strategies.

Syntactic strategies manipulate form. Semantic strategies have to do with lexical semantics and clause/sentence

semantics. Pragmatic strategies manipulate the message itself.

Syntax consists of the structure and the grammatical functions of syntactic elements (i.e. subject, verb, object, adjective, adverb, etc.). Meaning is at three levels, namely word level, clause level and sentence level. Interpretation can be done at sentence level. And the meaning of a sentence is not the sum of the words that it is made up of.

Furthermore, can a concept like cultural filtering be operationalized at syntactic, semantic or pragmatic level? Let us give an example? In *Comparative Stylistics of French and English*, Vinay and Darbelnet give an example of an English father who comes from a trip and kisses his daughter on the mouth. Then, they stress that this message should not be translated literally into French because the French audience may tend to think that there is a love affair between the father and his daughter. Therefore, the message needs to be adapted to the French context. The suggested translation is « *Il serra tendrement sa fille dans ses bras* ». [15] (1958, p. 53) This strategy, which they call *adaptation*, is a pragmatic strategy. It validates the Interpretive Theory of translation.

In *Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969), Nida gives the following examples to show how a poor handling of syntax can make a message confusing and unclear in the target language.

In addition to being quite misleading, a translation may also be so stylistically heavy as to make comprehension almost impossible. For example, in the American Standard Version (1901), 2 Corinthians 3:10 reads, "For verily that which hath been made glorious hath not been made glorious in this respect, by reason of the glory that surpasseth." The words are all English but the sentence structure is essentially Greek. The New English Bible quite rightly restructures this passage to read, "Indeed, the splendour that once was is now no splendour at all; it is outshone by a splendour greater still." [11] (Nida & Taber, 1969, p. 2).

This example shows that there is a close relation between syntax and semantics. Therefore, Chestermann's strategies are not three separate categories. Between the American Standard Version (ASV) and the New English Bible (NEB), the Greek sentence is restructured in English and it results in meaning change.

It is important to note that so far there has been no mention of an 'institutional approach to translation'. What is meant by this term is the translation work done or commissioned by institutions such as international organisations (UN, ILO, IMF, etc.). Nowadays, international organisations do so much translation that they cannot be ignored in a discussion on translation approaches and theories. Two salient issues characterise their approach to translation, i.e. their terminology and phraseology. Most of the time, there are thematic areas in which they carry out their business. For example, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) deals with labour issues; the UN deals with a range of issues including climate change, human rights, democracy, etc. IMF deals with finance and loans.

While working for the International Trade Union

Confederation (ITUC), an ILO constituent representing unionised workers around the world, a group of translators came across the term ‘*working poor*’ in a Congress resolution. Their translation into the French language was ‘*pauvres travailleurs*’. This translation generated a long and passionate debate which lasted more than an hour because many French-speaking unionised workers were not happy with the translation. Others suggested ‘*travailleurs pauvres*’, which was also rejected. The point that was made by most challengers of the translations was that it was important for such a term to reflect the exploitation workers were the victims of. They said that workers were poor because the employers and governments used to take the lion share after the production processes. They demanded that workers have a fair share of the wealth they contributed to creating. Several labour theories, including the marxist theory, the capitalist theory and the unionised workers theory, were evoked and finally the Resolutions Committee agreed on the following translation: ‘*les travailleurs en situation de pauvreté*’. Actually this was a politically motivated translation. The only justification was that most unionised workers came from a background of class struggle and to effectively translate their discourse, it is important to know their history as well as their agenda and mission.

Another example of institutional approach to translation is given through the term ‘*distributive justice*’ which is nowhere to be found in a traditional bilingual English/French dictionary. The comprehension of this term necessitated the following strategy: A terminological exploration was carried out in a corpus of trade union publications containing between fifty thousand and seventy thousand words. The term ‘*distributive justice*’ occurred several times in the corpus. Each of its occurrences was copied together with the sentence in which it appeared and pasted on a blank page. Thereafter, the copied sentences were read one by one and the meaning of the term was deducted from them. Actually, the term means ‘a fair share of the wealth between workers and employers/governments’ in the spirit of tripartism. The equivalent term in French is ‘*répartition équitable de la richesse*’.

It so often happens that the meanings of the labour terms are in labour publications and only an effective terminological exploration makes it possible to get it right.

To come back to the interpretive theory of translation, which insists on the mental process of comprehension, it needs to be made clear that comprehension is not solely a mental process since it involves in some instances linguistic investigations. The comprehension process described in this example involves both a linguistic and a cognitive process.

5. Conclusion

This paper has recalled translation theories developed after World War II in Western countries. These theories are many and include linguistic theories, literary theories, ideological theories. It is difficult to give a single definition to translation which would combine and reflect all the theories and

strategies developed so far. However, the knowledge of these theories and strategies assists translators in getting meaning out of the meanders of literary and pragmatic texts. Given that meaning is not expressed in the same way in most languages, the theories and strategies create a sense of awareness in the translator, which assists him/her in handling complex translation questions and situations in real time.

Doing translation without any knowledge of translation strategies and theories is like doing business in the dark. The relation between the theory and the practice cannot be overemphasized.

Every translated text is the result of textual, pragmatic and theoretical manipulations.

References

- [1] As-Safi, A. B. (2011). *Translation Theories, Strategies And Basic Theoretical Issues*, Petra University.
- [2] Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London: Routledge (ed.) (2005). Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. Lndon: Routledge.
- [3] Brower, R. A. (1959). Linguistic Aspects of Translation, in *On Translation*, pp. 232-239.
- [4] Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of Translation. The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Revised Eition, vol. 123, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- [5] Flotow, L. v. (1997). Translation and Gender. *Translating in the Era of Feminisme*. St Jerome Publishing and University of Ottawa Press, Manchester and Ottawa.
- [6] Gromova, E. & Kaksanyiova, J. (2005). *Translatologické reflexie*. Book & Book, Bratislava.
- [7] Guidère, M. (2010). *Introduction à la traductologie. Penser la traduction: hier, aujourd’hui, demain*. De Boeck, Paris.
- [8] Levy, J. (1995). La traduzione come processo decisionale. In Nergaard, siri (a cura di): *Teorie contemporanee della traduzione*. Strumenti Bompiani, Milano, pp. 63-83, traduit de l’anglais “Translation as a Decision Process” (1967) par Stefano Traini.
- [9] Mounin, G. (1963). *Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction*. Gallimard, Paris Mounin, G. (1976). *Linguistique et traduction*. Dessart et Mardaga, Bruxelles.
- [10] Moya, V. (2010). La selva de la traducción. *Teorias traductológicas contemporaneas*. Madrid: Catedra, 3a ed.
- [11] Nida, E. & Taber, C. (1969). *The Theory and Practise of Translation*. E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands.
- [12] Oseki-Dépré, I. (2011). *Théories et pratiques de la traduction littéraires*. Armand Colin, Paris (1999).
- [13] Raková, Z. (2014). *Les théories de la traduction*, Vydala Masarykova Univerzita, Vydani.
- [14] Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H. J. (1996). *Fundamentos para una teoria funcional de la traducción*.
- [15] Vinay, J. P. & Darbelnet J. (1958). *Stylistique comparée du français et de l’anglais*. Didier, Paris.