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From the Editor

Greetings,

We have the pleasure of announcing the publication of our especial issue on translation. It is a new achievement in AWEJ’s pathway to strengthen research in the field of English teaching and learning. The release of the new issue is accompanied with increasing international recognition of AWEJ. AWEJ is now also listed with the Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions (UHR), Max Perutz Library: the Austrian Library Network, and the Social Science Research Center Berlin (WZB).

AWEJ has received many suggestions and inquires from our colleagues from different parts of the world requesting publication of either the abstracts for or even full versions of their thesis/dissertation. So we would like to announce that Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) is planning to establish an additional new section for selected dissertations/theses in the field of English language education relevant to the Arab world context. Submissions of theses/dissertations on topics relevant to the AWEJ readership would be reviewed and those selected for inclusion in future AWEJ editions may be cited as a publication – in this way supporting the professional profile of those aiming to develop their academic careers.

I would like to seize this opportunity to express our great gratitude to our AWEJ’s team for their distinguished work and to our dear readers for their suggestions and supports.

Best Regards,

Prof. Dr. Khairi Al-Zubaidi
Editor: Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)
editor@awej.org
www.awej.org
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Abstract:
An examination of the historiography of translation, as a transformative and/or appropriationist act, for example, is important for a discipline that affects the contact between peoples interculturally, even intraculturally. Such an examination should consider translation as cultural movements that stem from and affect crisis, nation-building, and identity. Within this context, the purpose of this article is to assess what history labels the Medieval Arabic Translation Tradition (MATT) in terms of its culture, how it accommodated foreign cultures into Arabic and its role building the Arab/Islamic Empire (transformation) that globalized the world for centuries (appropriation). In other words, how MATT transformed its culture, on the one hand, and, on the other, how it assisted this culture in acquiring global influence.
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Introduction
Translatology has made significant strides over the last four decades or so. The contributions of many scholars from different parts of the world and from different theoretical and cultural backgrounds have influenced the issues and directions, which have characterised the study of translation on both macro and micro levels. A number of researchers from the so-called periphery (Latin America, Africa, Asia (particularly China and India), the Middle East), and many scholars in the centre (North America and Europe) interested in post-colonial and cultural studies, have all contributed to a burgeoning field with rich and varied theoretical bases.

The historiography of translation indicates that developments in the study of what translation involves and what ramifications it has are wide and cover issues almost unrelated to what seems to be an ‘obvious’ activity. In this context, Bassnett & Trivedi (1999, p. 2) — representing centre and periphery referred to above — appropriately write:

… translation does not happen in a vacuum, but in a continuum; it is not an isolated act, it is part of an ongoing process of intercultural transfer. Moreover, translation is a highly manipulative activity that involves all kinds of stages in the process of transfer across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Translation is not an innocent, transparent activity but is highly charged with signification at every stage; it rarely, if ever, involves a relationship of equality between texts, authors or systems.

It follows that the two obvious components of translation are culture and language. Since by its nature translation brings the two together, it is by necessity a multi-faceted, multi-problematic process with different manifestations and realizations in various cultures/traditions. Culture can be defined as shared knowledge: what the members of a particular community ought to know to react toward and interpret their experience and identity in distinctive ways. Language can be seen as the system that offers its users the tools to realize such distinctive ways. This intrinsic and intertwined relationship between culture and language is expressed by Bassnett in the following simple way: ‘Try as I may, I cannot take language out of culture or culture out of language’ (1998, p. 81). Emig (2001, pp. 203–4) summarizes the intrinsic and intertwined relationship between culture, language and translation:
Culture itself is shown to be the result of translations, and these translations are depicted not so much as inevitable forces of history, but as individual acts that rely on their interplay with social and political contexts. Inside these contexts they often fail, and the consequences of these failures can indeed be fatal. But equally fatal is the attempt to ignore or even abandon translation as a crucial prerequisite of the formation of identity, be it personal, national or indeed cultural.

So, an examination of the historiography of translation, as transformative and/or appropriationist acts, for example, is important for a discipline that affects the contact between peoples interculturally, even intraculturally (Faiq, 2010). Such an examination should consider translation as cultural movements that stem from and affect crisis, nation-building, and identity. Within this context, the purpose of this article is to assess what history labels the Medieval Arabic Translation Tradition (MATT) in terms of its culture, how it dealt with accommodating foreign cultures into Arabic — a hitherto predominantly literary language and of limited geopolitical influence — and to understand and explain it as a social and historical tradition. MATT played a central role in the rise of the Arab/Islamic Empire (transformation of a culture) that globalized the world for centuries (through the appropriation of knowledge from other cultures). The article first provides a short synopsis of MATT, and then considers how transformation and appropriation apply to MATT.

**MATT: A Synopsis**

Regarding Arabic translation in general and to coincide with the Arabic Booker Prize of 2009, the newspaper, The National, commissioned an article from which the following excerpt is taken:

> When the Muslim armies were on the move, defeating their enemies in battle and giving birth to a glorious and widespread empire, it was the translator who brought home the greatest prize. As warriors overran foreign cities, he entered the libraries of earlier civilisations and redrafted in Arabic the wisdom found there, allowing Islamic scholars to absorb the knowledge of thinkers who had gone before. His work laid the foundation for a golden age, strengthening the Islamic empire and making Arabic the global language of
the time. In this medieval period, the activity of translation had two clear objectives: to enrich the Arab world with what the rest of the world had to offer; and to enrich the rest of the world with what the Arab world had to offer. Consequently, centres of learning and splendour, unrivalled in their time, were created in Baghdad in the east and in Cordoba in the west. (Faiq, 2009)

It is within this historiographical context that the importance of MATT lies. Shortly after the establishment of the Islamic polity in the seventh century, the Arabs (new Muslims) recognised the importance of translation for spreading their new faith and strengthening their new state, *Ummah*. The Arabs were among the first in history to establish translation as a government enterprise. Successive rulers made it part of the government with its own budget and institutions. MATT gained momentum early in the eighth century A.D. when Arabs started to produce paper on a large scale and reached its zenith in the ninth and tenth centuries. In its historical development, MATT moved from a necessity phase through a truly golden and glorious phase to a phase of decline. In general terms, three main features characterized MATT.

1) Diversity of sources: Arabs translated from any language they came in contact within the course of their conquests: Hindi, Persian, Syriac, and Sanskrit. Their main source language/culture, however, was Greek.
2) Extensiveness: MATT, particularly in Baghdad in the east and Cordoba in the west, covered almost all areas of knowledge of the time, including mathematics, astronomy, philosophy, logic, medicine, chemistry, engineering, politics, and geography.
3) Organization: In the eight century, translation was seen as a necessity with the focus on medicine and warfare. In the ninth and tenth centuries, translation was made an official undertaking. The rulers encouraged translators, and even enticed them to translate by giving them - so the anecdote goes - the equivalent weight of translations in gold. The Abbasid Caliph al-Ma'moun (reign 813-833) established the *house of wisdom* (*baytu l-Hikma*), which was the equivalent of a modern centre of research excellence or academy. The main political and cultural concern of the rulers was to make Arabic the language of knowledge and learning, not only the language of poetry and religion. In this they succeeded, as Arabic remained the main international donor language for centuries.
The Caliph al-Ma'moun is historically seen as the champion of MATT. He recruited translators including non-Muslims, from different parts of the world as long as they met the strict criteria to function as translators. He made translators state employees with regular incomes. He also organised baytu l-Hikma into departments for translation, editing, research, publication and general scholarship. According to Khouri (1988), in one of his peace treaties with Byzantium, al-Ma’moun demanded as reparation a whole library in Constantinople. Nutting (1964, p. 125) sums up the cultural and intellectual aspects of al-Ma’moun’s reign:

With a deep love of the arts and sciences, he [al-Mamoun] became the greatest of all caliphal patrons of poetry, theology, philosophy, astrology and astronomy. He encouraged and imported men of learning regardless of race or religion. Christians, Greeks, Jews, Zoroastrians - even heathen Sabians whose star-worshipping was thought to make them experts in astronomy - were patronized and pampered in order that they might enrich the caliphate with their knowledge and creative power. The stream of culture that had earlier flowed into Greece from its sources in Egypt, Babylonia, Phoenicia and Judaea now poured back to refertilize the areas of its origins.

With the Arab-Islamic state firmly established and its resources diversified, a political decision was made: For the state to remain strong, it needed science and technology. This triggered the sustained and large-scale translation of major books in various fields of learning. But, from glory, MATT moved to a phase of chaos and decline, which can be attributed to two main factors:

1) The debate between different Islamic schools and between Muslims and other religious groups about Islam and interpretations of its book, the Qur’an, made Muslims decide that they needed philosophy - in particular logic - in order to argue their particular philosophy or interpretation of religion and other topics.

2) Translation became fashionable. In addition to the state, rich families and individuals sponsored translation projects, established private translation bureaux and commissioned translations, often given as gifts to rulers (Faiq, 2000). Notwithstanding its contribution to MATT, private sponsorship was also responsible for ushering in the chaotic phase. This historical period coincided with internal political divisions in the Arab-Islamic Empire and with the demise of strong
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central government. Translation lost its national momentum and became attached to individuals’ and patrons’ tastes, rather than national planning and aspirations.

Medieval Arab translators faced immense problems in rendering foreign works into Arabic, which, until the rise of Islam, was primarily a literary language. They had to assimilate new subjects and find appropriate equivalents for alien concepts in Arabic. The main problems they faced were terminological and, accordingly, most early translations remained inscrutably foreign and were revised, amended and at times even re-carried out. These translators adopted three main strategies: literal, semantic and gist. In literal translation, the translators considered each source language word and its meaning and then used Arabic approximations. This often meant that they transliterated technical terms that produced stilted and odd structures and style in the Arabic rendition. This strategy was predominant during the early or necessity phase of MATT.

Translators of the golden age adopted the semantic strategy which involved reading the original, processing it and trying to find semantically equivalent structures in Arabic regardless of lexical equivalence. Most translations produced according to this strategy did not require any revision or rewriting. There were strict criteria for recruiting translators, particularly during the glorious phase of MATT. As quoted in Khouri (1988, p. 54), al-Jahidh, a medieval Arab scholar and critic who stressed the relativity of translation particularly poetic translation, stipulated the following main criteria for translators (not different from today’s requirements/criteria):

- a full understanding of the subject matter,
- an awareness of current methods of translation and
- previous apprenticeship with an established translator,
- a sound command of the translator’s working languages,
- full knowledge of the author of the original work, including his style and idiosyncrasies, and
translating poetry and other sensitive and culturally bound works was to be avoided unless the translators wrote such texts themselves.

Later translators adopted gist translation, a strategy that involved summaries rather than full translations. This strategy came into use when the need for translation from Greek and other languages diminished as Arab scholars started to produce their own research. Gist translation was also characteristic of a new breed of translators who were competent in both the languages and the subjects with which they dealt; true translators-cum-experts.

Transformation, appropriation and MATT

In general terms, transformation often induces structural change, social, economic, political, etc. The change affects the way a community perceives itself and the world around it (Merriam, et. al., 2007). In other words, transformation means that a community becomes reflective, critical, open to, and accepting of others and novel ideas (Bear, 2006; Wright, 2008). Transformation occurs when new trajectories and their associated implementation strategies are introduced with the aim of formulating a new reality/perspective for the community.

In this context, while purely practical considerations triggered MATT, it was ideological (that is cultural in the broadest sense of the term) considerations that pushed it to its zenith. Its Omayyad time was witnessed by sporadic ad hoc activities and projects. Its Abbasid time, on the other hand, was more organized and prolific. The great achievements of this historically unique tradition reflected the collective cultural and civilizational development of the Arab/Islamic nation. By the same token, translation was a natural response to and reflection of the demands posed by such development.

From the start, MATT was not an end in itself. Translated texts were used to stretch intellectual capabilities and transform society. Through appropriation of the scientific and philosophical heritage of others, medieval Arab translators helped to develop a unique Arab/Islamic
cultural identity. Translators were educators of their community and popularizers of the scholarship of other cultures. Much appreciated by all sectors of the *Ummah* (nation), their work became the catalyst for native scholarship and the production of essentially Arab/Islamic works, the foundations of an empire that globalized (appropriation and transformation) the world for centuries. MATT easily fits the attributes of transformation. Delisle & Woodsworth (1995, p. 103) write:

Nestorian Christians, expelled from the Byzantine Empire after their patriarch Nestorius was condemned for heresy by the Council of Ephesus (431), settled in what is now southwestern Iran; they were responsible for translating the great authors of ancient Greece, along with Indian, and even some Chinese, medical texts. Ancient Greece and Syriac manuscripts were housed in the Bayt-al-Hikma or “House of Wisdom” in Baghdad, where they were translated into Arabic in the ninth century. In the twelfth century, these Arabic translations, many of which had outlived their originals, were translated into Latin in Toledo. Many of these Latin translations, medical works particularly, were subsequently retranslated into vernacular languages throughout Europe during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

But how did MATT succeed in transforming the medieval Arab into a global player? The answer lies in that “process” of translation called appropriation. Appropriation generally refers to the process of importing texts and associated cultures through translation into the socio-cultural and linguistic context of the translating culture.

The often negative connotation of cultural appropriation (state and status of minority/subordinate cultures vis-a-vis dominant ones) notwithstanding, the term is used here to refer to appropriation as the adoption of some elements of one culture by a different one. Once imported, these elements often take on meanings in the receiving socio-cultural contexts that are different from what they stood-for/still stand-for native socio-cultural contexts. Cultural appropriation is often defined by and practiced differently in different cultures.

Like all other traditions, MATT did not happen in a cultural vacuum or in isolation from the cultures and ideologies that surrounded Arab/Islamic lands. Armed with their new religion and its linguistic medium, Arabic, the Arabs and Muslims certainly practised what one may call religious
and cultural elitism. To strengthen their new state, they needed everything except for religion, poetry and language. Although medieval Arab translators tried to follow the original text as closely as possible, they often added bits of information from their own knowledge or deleted bits of information that did not confirm with their belief system: ‘traces of paganism were eliminated and substituted by references more in accordance with their own beliefs’ (Kruk, 1976, p. 18).

We would posit that the concepts of ‘monitoring’ and ‘managing,’ as explained by Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), would be useful tools for positioning a particular translation tradition along the continuum of translatology. Monitoring refers to the expounding of texts without intervention while managing involves steering texts towards specific goals and intentions. As for MATT, one could argue that medieval Arab translators managed more than they monitored. But then, their interest in translation did not spring from a genuine interest in Greek or any other culture: it was prompted by their urgent need to satisfy the necessities of a young nation. Thus, they carried out negation of the strangeness of the foreign works.

Medieval Arab translators marginalized certain canons, but they did not try to wholly domesticate them, in the sense Venuti (1995) assigns to the concept. Rather, they used intricate adaptive or compensatory strategies in transferring works into Arabic. Were they invisible or violent? We would argue that the answer lies more in their culture of translation and less in their translation of culture—a clear cultural (ideological) agendum was the thrust behind and catalyst for their translation practice.

Cultural hegemony was practised. Medieval Arab translators translated little literature because, on the one hand, they were proud of their own; and, on the other, because Greek literature contained ideas and myths that were not compatible with their belief system. In this context, Lewis (1994, p. 75) remarks:

... the literature of an alien and heathen society could offer neither aesthetic appeal nor moral guidance. The history of these remote peoples, without prophets or scriptures, was a mere sequence of events, without aim or meaning. [For the
medieval Arab translator], literature meant the poetry and eloquence of his own rich cultural tradition.

Culturally, MATT was the tool for an interactive dialogue between the Arab/Muslim nation and other cultures, but most importantly it was seen as the means for the transformation of a group into a nation through the appropriation of Greek and other nations’ intellectual heritage.

**Conclusion**

For MATT, it was a new religion, Islam that encouraged believers to do two things: to spread the new faith and to promote scholarship of their own. Within two centuries, the Arabs managed to do both. They carved out a large empire and, at the same time, translated widely from the languages and cultures they came in contact with. Consequently, centres of culture and splendour unrivalled in their time were created in Baghdad in the east and in Cordoba in the west – Muslim Spain.

The historical importance of medieval Arab translators as intercultural mediators is perhaps better appreciated in the assessment given by others as in the following citation from Burnett (1992, p. 1050):

The Arabs of the Middle Ages seem to have had a special flair for mathematics, and the Latin translations in this field provide only a dim reflection of the true splendour of the achievements of men like al-Mu’taman b. Hūd or Omar Khayyam. The translations did, however, introduce into the West calculation with Arabic numerals, algebra, trigonometry and advanced geometry. In medicine, above all, Arabic works became familiar in the Latin forms of Avicenna (this time as author of the *Canon of Medicine*), Rhazes, Mesue, Issac, and Abulcasim.

Medieval European scholars also stated the same. Echoing the views of many of his contemporaries, Hugo of Santalla, for example, wrote: “It befits us to imitate the Arabs especially, for they are as it were our teachers and precursors” (cited in Burnett, 1992, p. 1051).
As a culturally motivated enterprise, MATT managed to strike a balance between the universe of knowledge - as a human activity - and the universe of its discourse with its own cultural guidelines and discursive norms. It would indeed be beneficial to learn from MATT and the particular culture it helped to build at a time when our contemporary world is in a dire need for human, non-violent, non-stereotypical and certainly non-isolationist translation practices and projects. Such a need can be met by considering in a contrastive fashion how different cultural traditions view translation and the process and politics of translating. Projects and movements for translating cultures should be viewed and evaluated within the context of their cultures that triggered them in the first place.

MATT played a vital historical role in the cultural development not only of the Arab/Islamic world, but also of other worlds and cultures: a true mission of translation as intercultural communication. The great cultural shifts of history have been made possible because of translation. MATT is an outstanding case in point.
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Personal and Professional Ethics in Interpreting: Conflict or Harmony?

Saleh M. Al-Salman
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Abstract
This article explores the conflict between the personal and the professional modes of ethics in professional interpreting. The parameters against which an interpreter’s performance may be judged as ethical or otherwise include: accuracy, confidentiality, impartiality/objectivity, accountability, and integrity. Theoretically, professional interpreters are assumed to mediate between the source and target languages without real or potential conflict of interest that may adversely affect the delivery of their services. To examine this question, the data analyzed in this article were collected through a questionnaire, a review of tape scripts of interpreted materials, and personal interviews with interpreters. 35 professional interpreters, both consecutive and simultaneous, contributed. The analysis indicates that the personal mode of ethics is often triggered by ethnic, nationalistic, political, or ideological considerations. Adherence to the professional mode of ethics, on the other hand, is demonstrated in subduing the personal mode in favour of the established ethical values of the profession as intercultural mediation.

Keywords: ethics, interpreting, conflict, harmony, accountability, confidentiality, impartiality, integrity.
Introduction
The professional judgment of some groups seems to have been influenced by the complex nature of current world affairs, which have impacted their choices. For example, lawyers, journalists, news reporters, arbitrators, among others, are prone to indirectly engage in international conflicts which may have some bearing on their own judgments, contrary to the prescribed code of professional ethics governing the professional practices of the group members (cf. Al-Salman, 2008; Desjardins, 2003; Robinson, 2002).

The present study focuses on the profession of interpreting to probe into the nature of the conflict between the two modes of ethics, professional and personal. The paper investigates how a possible conflict can impede the flow of accurate and reliable output in the work of professional interpreters. This requires identifying the parameters against which an interpreter's input may be judged as ethically sound. Such parameters include, but are not limited to: (1) accuracy, (2) confidentiality, (3) impartiality/objectivity, (4) accountability, and (5) integrity. The paper shows that unlike “unaccredited/uncertified” interpreters, the “accredited/certified” group tends to abide by the above criteria without noticeable faltering.

Professional competence in interpreting presupposes accuracy and faithfulness in rendering the source language (SL) text. Likewise, integrity thrives on impartiality, non-discrimination, honesty and professional commitment in all professional practices. As such, interpreters ought to avoid any real or potential conflict of interest that may adversely affect the delivery of their services.

2. Hypotheses
This paper tests and validates the following set of hypotheses against the two independent variables of (1) accreditation/certification, and (2) professional experience.

2.1 As a rule, interpreters -- regardless of their political, ethnic, or ideological background-- are fully committed to their code of professional ethics.

2.2 Some interpreters are prone to give precedence to personal ethics and resulting gains, material or otherwise, over professional ethics.
2.3 The professional code of ethics comes first, but in matters of personal, national, and ideological considerations, conflict between the two modes is likely to surface.

2.4 There is a positive correlation between the interpreters’ “accreditation” and “professional experience” on the one hand, and their adherence to the code of ethics on the other.

3. Methodology

3.1. Sample

A sample of 35 professional interpreters contributed to this study. The subjects were selected largely from members of the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC), representing many countries in Europe, Australia, Canada, and the Americas, and were involved in different modes of interpreting, consecutive and simultaneous, in different contexts and situations. Each respondent was contacted directly by the author via e-mail, (see Appendix).

3.2. Corpus

The data were collected through a three-way method, comprising: (1) a questionnaire, (2) reviewing tape scripts of interpreted materials, and (3) face-to-face interviews, or on-line discussions with interpreters.

4. Data Analysis

The corpus of data was analyzed according to the participants’ three-way responses of: (Agree, Disagree, and Undecided), elicited through the 15-item questionnaire. Two types of variables were identified: (A) dependent, including: (1) accuracy, (2) confidentiality, (3) impartiality/objectivity, (4) accountability, (5) integrity, and (B) independent variables, including: (1) accreditation/certification: accredited/certified vs. unaccredited/uncertified, and (2) experience: 1-5 years, or 6 + years.

To validate and verify the data collected from the questionnaire responses, the second method of data collection was implemented. This involved reviewing samples of audio/video recordings of relevant tasks performed by interpreters.
The face-to-face interviews and on-line discussions were only applied in cases of inconsistency in the input obtained from the first and second methods of data collection.

In tabulating the responses, each of the 5 dependent variables was checked against a 3-way scale of: A= “Agree”, D= “Disagree”, and U= “Undecided”. To perform statistical analysis, the response options for the questionnaire items were coded in numeric values: “Agree”= 1, “Disagree”= 2, and “Undecided” = 3. On the other hand, the two independent variables were coded as: “accredited” = 1, and “unaccredited” = 2; whereas the “experience” variable was coded as: (1-5 yrs.) = 1, and (6+ yrs.) = 2.

The model answers for the fifteen questions were based on the responses acknowledged by the professional code of ethics for interpreters, (see Appendix).

The data were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences ‘SPSS’ (Sleiger and Shohamy, 2001), utilizing the following tests:

4.1 Descriptive tests:

4.1.1 Frequencies

4.1.2 Percentages

4.2 Analytical tests:

4. 2.1 Independent Sample T-test

4. 2.2 Kruskal-Wallice, non-parametric test

4. 2.3 Pearson Correlation Coefficient

4. 2.4 Chi-Square with cross-tabulation
5. Results

The results were obtained after a rigorous analysis of the data. Two types of results were actualized: (1) descriptive results, and (2) analytical results.

5.1. Descriptive Analysis

A descriptive analysis of the “independent” and “dependent” variables is given in the tables below.

5.1.1 Independent variables

Table 1: The frequency and percentages for the independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results obtained from Table 1 show that 60% of the respondents were accredited/certified by international professional interpreting organizations or associations. Incidentally, these associations are:

1. The International Association of Court Interpreters (AIIC)
2. The Argentine Association of Conference Interpreters (ADICA)
3. Australian Association of Certified Court Interpreters (ACCI)
4. National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI)
5. Association of Translators and Interpreters of Ontario, (ATIO), Canada
6. Italian Association of Translators and Interpreters, (AITI), Italy
7. The California Court Interpreters Association (CCIA), USA
8. American Translators Association (ATA)
9. The National Association of Judiciary Court Interpreters (NAJIT)
10. Massachusetts Medical Interpreters Association (MMIA), USA
11. The Association of Translators and Interpreters of Alberta (ATIA), Canada
12. Argentine Association of Translators and Interpreters (AATI)

On the other hand, the results have also shown that 40% of the respondents were unaccredited. With regard to professional experience, 80% of the subjects had 6 or more years of experience, compared to 20% with 1-5 years.

5.1.2 Dependent Variables

The data were checked against five independent variables. These are: (a) accuracy, (b) confidentiality, (c) objectivity/impartiality, (d) accountability, and (e) integrity (Al-Salman, 2008).

5.1.2.a Accuracy

A faithful rendering of the SL speech into the TL requires accurate transfer of the content of the message in terms of: purpose, tone, style, and spirit. This entails conveying all aspects of the original message without distortion by adding, omitting, condensing, or changing anything (cf. Al-Salman, 2008).

Table 2: The frequency and percentages for the "Accuracy" items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows that all the respondents recognize that an interpreter should be always accurate in rendering the TL meaning. In addition, 85.7% of the respondents were against the claim that the interpreter's degree of accuracy is influenced by his/her personal tendencies and interests, whereas 8.6% of them were “undecided”, and 5.7% “agreed”. Furthermore, 82.9% of the respondents refused to compromise accuracy in their interpreting even if their political party was involved in a conflict, whereas 11.4% were “undecided” and 5.7% agreed.

5.1.2. b Confidentiality

Confidentiality is defined as the non-disclosure of information acquired in the act of interpreting, and not taking personal advantage from confidential information gained in the course of professional service (cf. Al-Salman, 2007, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the respondents realize that all information related to interpreting assignments should be kept secret. On the other hand, 65.7% of the respondents rejected the notion that an interpreter may disclose information that will serve the interest of his/her ethnic, sectarian, or political affiliation, with 20% “undecided” and 14.3% in favor. In addition, 94.3% of the sample members were found to disagree that “it is not considered unethical to share secret information with clients”, while 5.7% agreed.
5.1.2. c Objectivity/Impartiality

Objectivity, in the act of interpreting, denotes that interpreters shall not allow personal bias, favoritism, or any other subjective considerations to interfere with their ability to interpret accurately. (cf. Humphrey, 1999; Al-Salman, 2008).

Table 4: The frequency and percentages for the "Objectivity" items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that 68.6% of the respondents rejected the idea that interpreters may be biased and therefore take sides in matters endangering their national identity. On the other hand, 14.3% were found to be ‘undecided’, and 17.1% agreed. Furthermore, 57% of the subjects denied that cases of armed conflict can affect an interpreter’s handling of an interpreting assignment by injecting personal views, whereas 22.9% were “undecided”, and 20.8% were in favor. Moreover, 48.6% of the sample members were against the idea that the interpreter's ideological tendencies may interfere with his/her value judgements in the interpreting process, while 28.6% were supportive, and 22.9% “undecided”.

5.1.2. d Accountability

As a rule, an interpreter is held accountable and shall accept full responsibility for any actions or decisions taken in the event of providing quality professional service.
Table 5: The frequency and percentages for the "Accountability" items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that 88.6% of the respondents acknowledged that an interpreter shall accept responsibility for all kinds of erroneous rendering of the SL speech into TL, but 5.75% of were to “disagree” and 5.7% were “undecided”. Moreover, 60% of the respondents did not approve that “during interpreting, interpreters may make decisions which coincide with their personal needs regardless of compliance with the professional code of conduct”, while 20% were supportive, and the other 20% were “undecided”. Furthermore, 88.6% of the respondents did not accept that “in cases involving human rights victims or asylum seekers, an interpreter's rendering is usually supportive of those groups”, but 8.6% were in favor, and 2.9% “undecided.”

5.1.2. e Integrity

Integrity refers to an interpreter's personal traits of honesty, moral soundness, and commitment, which stand in the face of bias or prejudice triggered by any personal or group interests or hidden agendas (cf. Shaw and Barry, 2004).

Table 6: The frequency and percentages for the "Integrity" items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 shows that 82.9% of the respondents agreed that “an interpreter is required to deal honestly and fairly with all customers and colleagues regardless of his/her personal beliefs, ethnic or political affiliation”. However, 11.4% were found to “disagree” and 5.7% were “undecided”. Moreover, 62.9% of the sample members agreed that “an interpreter shall always candidly disclose all conflicts of interest when accepting interpreting assignments”, with 20% “undecided” and 17.1% against. Furthermore, 42.9% of the respondents reported that, in an interpreting assignment, if they happen to be in a delicate situation whereby a compromise is needed”, they will most likely abandon their personal ethics in favor of professional ethics, but 34.3% were “undecided” and 22.9% disagreed.

5.2 Analytical Results

Table 7: The (T-test) results for the differences due to accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Accredited</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>K.W. sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>-2.291</td>
<td>0.036*</td>
<td>0.018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>-3.986</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>-4.726</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>-2.860</td>
<td>0.007*</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>-3.584</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant
5.2.1 The results of the T-test show that there are statistically significant differences according to the independent variable of “accreditation” in favor of the accredited group in all five dependent variables. Likewise, the Kruskal-Wallis test, a non-parametric test, confirms the results of the T-test. This means that the “accredited” group of the sample tends to reflect idealism in interpreting more than the “unaccredited” one.

Table 8: The (T-test) and Kruskal-Wallis results for the differences due to experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>experience</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
<th>T-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>K.W. sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>-1.879</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>-3.608</td>
<td>0.001*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>-2.426</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>-2.217</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
<td>0.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>-2.578</td>
<td>0.015*</td>
<td>0.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant

5.2.2 The T-test reveals statistically significant differences in favor of experience (6+ years) as an independent variable. A positive correlation was reflected in four of the five dependent variables, excluding “accuracy”. However, the Kruskal-Wallis test shows that there are significant differences in all five dependent variables. This means that interpreters with 6+ years of professional experience tend to reflect a higher degree of idealism than those with 1-5 years.
Table 9: The correlation coefficient between the dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Confidentiality</th>
<th>Objectivity</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant

5.2.3. The correlation co-efficient results show that there is a statistically significant positive relationship between the dependent variables of the questionnaire.

Table 10: The cross-tabulation for the accreditation*experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>Person Chi-square</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>6+ years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant

5.2.4. The Chi-Square test shows that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two independent variables of “accreditation” and “experience”.
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After tabulating and analyzing the questionnaire results, the second step was to validate them. This process entailed retrieving the audio/video recordings of relevant interpreting tasks performed by some of the sample interpreters. This measure targeted only interpreting tasks done from English into Arabic or vice versa, and particularly those participants: (1) without accreditation, and (2) with minimum experience. Interestingly enough, the results showed that all 21 “accredited/certified” interpreters were “experienced” as well. However, another 7 were “well-experienced” but “uncertified”, and the other 7 were “accredited” but with “limited experience”.

On listening to the recordings of the less privileged group of the “unaccredited” and “less experienced” interpreters, cases of inaccurate rendering were identified. This was due to adopting ill-chosen interpreting strategies resulting in instances of omission, substitution, and distortion of the intended meaning. Apparently, in most of the cases, the ear-voice-span (EVS) was poorly utilized. In addition, the interpreters failed to cope with the speaker due to hesitations and false starts, ending up with failure to render proper TL equivalents. Also, some of the omissions reflected insufficient familiarity with subject area, which may be attributed to the lack of experience and adequate professional training.

The third method of data collection was conducted through face-to-face interviews and on-line discussions in cases of inconsistency in the feedback obtained from the first and second methods of data collection outlined above. For example, three of the “accredited/certified” interpreters gave deviant responses on some of the questionnaire items, while showing near-perfect performance in their interpreting assignment. On conducting the on-line dialogue with the target interpreters, they reported that they are well aware of the responsibilities of a successful interpreter, having themselves been certified and experienced interpreters. However, to be transparent enough in responding to the questionnaire items presented to them, they gave responses consistent with their personal conventions, beliefs and attitudes, contrary to the provisions of the professional code of ethics for interpreters. As they themselves, their people, and nations were the victims of ethnic cleansing, discrimination, and persecution, they were prepared to see things differently when it comes to endangering or impinging on their own ideological, ethnic or sectarian affiliation. From their vantage point of view, such unfortunate circumstances make them identify with some cases of armed conflict, oppression, and issues.
pertaining to human rights and asylum seekers. As some of the interpreters put it, some separatist movements calling for independence, freedom, national liberation and self-rule are not necessarily aggressive, and, therefore, should not be categorically labeled as stigmatized or outlawed. In their opinion, immigrants fleeing their countries following acts of violence, ethnic cleansing, persecution, poverty and hunger are not necessarily law-breakers, but are victims of armed conflicts. They added that such groups should be treated as humanitarian cases emerging in the aftermath of unjustified wars, and, therefore, should be embraced by the UN and its specialized organizations under the chapter of human rights maintenance. In few cases, however, interpreters’ violations were triggered by material interests and personal gains which, in their opinion, warrant non-compliance with the code of ethics.

6. Discussion of Results

The results show that the findings of the present study are not necessarily consistent with the research hypotheses outlined in 2.1-2.4 above. In other words, some of the prescribed hypotheses, viz. 2.1, proved to be incongruent with the results. For example, the professional code of ethics for interpreters stipulates that interpreting, as a highly sophisticated, demanding, and transparent process, demands interpreters to ensure quality of service for all parties involved. This requires all members of the profession to abide by the code of professional rights and responsibilities governing the rendering of services characterized by accuracy, confidentiality, impartiality, accountability, and integrity, among others (Al-Salman, 2008).

Contrary to this premise, the results did not confirm the first hypothesis (2.1) stating that "interpreters, regardless of their political, ethnic, or political background, are fully committed to their code of professional ethics." For example, the fact that 11.4% of the respondents were identified as “undecided” and 5.7% of them “agreed” to compromise accuracy in their interpreting is quite revealing. Other interpreters, shocked by the thought of a possible breach of the code, denounced such practices by saying, "it is far from easy, especially for a person with strong conventions and ideals". The results pertaining to the questions on “objectivity/impartiality” came more surprising when 14.3% were found to be “undecided”, and 17.1% were to “agree” that an interpreter may be biased and therefore take sides in matters endangering his/her national identity and/or ideological tendencies, when only 48.65% of the
respondents agreed to the contrary. Another major blow was leveled when 40% of the respondents were equally divided between “agree” and “undecided” on the question: "Interpreters may make decisions which satisfy their personal needs regardless of compliance with the professional code of conduct”. And when the question of: “interpreting in cases involving human rights victims or asylum seekers” was addressed, some responses -- 8.6% “agree” and 2.9% “undecided”-- were supportive of those groups regardless of the provisions of the code. With regard to the interpreter’s “integrity” in handling interpreting assignments regardless of the interpreter's beliefs, ethnic or political affiliation, again, the results did not reflect strict adherence to the prescribed code of ethics, when 20% were “undecided” and 17.1% “disagreed” that "interpreters shall always candidly disclose all conflicts of interest when accepting interpreting assignments." Above all, the results reflected an even more assertive trend of disapproval when only 42.9% of the respondents confirmed that any compromise between personal and professional ethics is rejected, whereas 34.3% were “undecided” and 22.9% were ready to abandon professional ethics in favor of personal ethics.

The results are partly indicative of a trend which sets the stage for splitting away from the professional code of ethics for interpreters. This provides clear evidence that less than perfect responses, in varying degrees, have been recorded in all 15 items of the questionnaire. Such results lend support to hypothesis 2.2 which states that: "some interpreters are prone to give priority to personal ethics and resulting gains, material or otherwise, at the expense of professional ethics." Similarly, the results are consistent with hypothesis 2.3 which reads: "The professional code of ethics comes first, but in matters of personal, national, and ideological considerations, conflict between professional and personal ethics may arise”.

The results were, however, strongly supportive of the role of the independent variables of "accreditation/certification" and "professional experience" in affecting the interpreter's attitudes and reactions. This enforces the thesis expressed in hypothesis 2.4 that: "there is a positive correlation between the interpreters’ “accreditation” and “professional experience”, on the one hand, and their adherence to the code of ethics on the other. Interestingly enough, hypothesis 2.4 --emphasizing the role of the independent variables-- proved to be “statistically significant” by the results of the two tests, namely the T-test and the Kruskal-Wallice test.
The results have also shown clearly that, in theory, interpreters realize that full adherence to the professional code of ethics is a priority. For example, in her response to item 15 of the questionnaire stating: "During an interpreting assignment, if I happen to be in a delicate situation whereby a compromise is needed, I will most likely abandon my personal ethics in favor of professional ethics," a lady respondent coupled her “agree” response with the following comment: "I try to have compatible ethics. I don't believe that professional ethics are any different from personal ethics; otherwise, I would be in the wrong place. If what I do professionally is not compatible with my personal ethics, I might as well opt another trade."

The tendency to show more commitment to the professional code of ethics was ascertained by the category of interpreters who were labeled as: "accredited/certified" and/or "more experienced". This being the case, interpreting organizations and firms are called upon to adopt a recruitment policy whereby only “certified” interpreters may be tasked with an interpreting assignment. In other words, a formal evidence of “certification/accreditation” from an internationally recognized interpreting association, institution, or agency should be secured. Consequently, in order to guarantee quality interpreting consistent with the professional code of ethics, interpreting organizations are advised to recruit interpreters who are (a) accredited/certified, and (2) more experienced. It should be noted, however, that in a few cases where “accreditation” and “experience” have been satisfied, deviant responses were still detected. Such cases were motivated by bias or prejudice emanating from the individual interpreter's intrinsic and personalized value judgements and therefore reflecting poor adherence to the values of objectivity, accountability, and integrity.

At another level, the face-to-face interviews showed that:

1) Some “unaccredited” interpreters were not fully aware of the details of the professional code of ethics and thus may violate it unknowingly.

2) Some interpreters, especially the “unaccredited” and/or with “limited experience”, did not have the right qualifications, i.e., a degree in interpreting. They also did not receive formal training in specialized institutions or translation agencies, but happened to make it
on their own through work experience as translators and not necessarily as professional interpreters.

7. Conclusions and Recommendations

The present piece of research sends a clear message to the interpreting circles: companies, organizations, associations and agencies, warning them against possible malpractices in the rendering of interpreting services. Three categories of consecutive and simultaneous interpreters have been identified: (1) “accredited/certified”, with adequate training, experience and expertise, enabling them to render interpreting services with professionalism, transparency, responsibility and integrity, and (2) unaccredited, and with limited work experience, seeking to trespass on the realm of interpreting without proper academic qualifications and professional training, and (3) qualified interpreters, with adequate professional training and certification, but not fully cognizant of and compliant with the code of ethics due to their personal involvement or sensitivity to matters linked to their ethnic, ideological, or political background.

The results reflected the orientation of each of the three groups, signaling traces of conflict between personal and professional ethics in interpreting. It was clear, however, that group 1 interpreters, with high qualifications and commitment, were able to draw a line between the two modes of ethics which are mutually exclusive. Being strictly guided by non-personalized and highly recognized ethical values, this group of interpreters demonstrated strict adherence to professional ethics. However, the other two groups (2 and 3), showed less commitment and adherence to the code, either due to poor qualifications and experience, as in group 2 interpreters, or else being motivated by personal interests, material or otherwise, as in group 3.

But if the author is to have a say in the matter, then he is of the opinion that under no circumstances should the professional code of ethics of interpreters be breached or violated. No matter what the rationale is, an interpreter should always be neutral, fully cognizant of and strictly adhering to the prescribed code of ethics regardless of narrow personal or group interests. Interpreters should avoid any real or potential conflict of interest that may adversely affect the delivery of their services (see model responses to the questionnaire items in the appendix).
In order to curb the malpractices of the less privileged group of interpreters, and in an effort to bridge this gap, we recommend the following:

a) subjecting all interpreters to rigorous theoretical and practical training through formal education and course work in specialized academic institutions.

b) applying strict measures on exit exams and graduation requirements for certified/accredited interpreters.

c) demanding all interpreters to furnish evidence of formal certification/accreditation from internationally recognized interpreting institutions, associations, or agencies.

To conclude, the findings of the present research indicate that personal and professional ethics in the profession of interpreting may witness cases of conflict rather than total harmony. Efforts should be made to help implement the recommendations outlined above.
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Appendix

(Questionnaire)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Independent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you “accredited/certified” by an official interpreting organization, association, agency? Yes _______; No _______. If yes, please name the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of professional experience: 1-5 years __; more than 5 years __.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Accuracy:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1. An interpreter should be always accurate in rendering the TL meaning. |
| Model Answer: Agree: A |

| 2. The interpreter’s degree of accuracy is affected by his/her personal tendencies and interests. |
| Model Answer: Disagree: D |
3. I am inclined to compromise accuracy in my interpreting if my political party is involved in a conflict.

**Model Answer:** Disagree: D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B) Confidentiality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. All information related to interpreting assignments should be kept secret.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model Answer:</strong> Agree: A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. An interpreter may disclose information that will serve the interest of his/her ethnic, sectarian, or political affiliation.

**Model Answer:** Disagree: D

6. It is not considered unethical to share secret information with clients.

**Model Answer:** Disagree: D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C) Objectivity/Impartiality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An interpreter may be biased and therefore take sides in matters endangering his/her national identity.

**Model Answer:** Disagree: D

Cases of armed conflict can affect an interpreter’s handling of an interpreting assignment by injecting personal views.

**Model Answer:** Disagree: D

The interpreter’s ideological tendencies may interfere with his/her value judgments in the interpreting process.

**Model Answer:** Disagree: D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D) Accountability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. An interpreter may be biased and therefore take sides in matters endangering his/her national identity.</td>
<td>Model Answer: Disagree: D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cases of armed conflict can affect an interpreter’s handling of an interpreting assignment by injecting personal views.</td>
<td>Model Answer: Disagree: D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The interpreter’s ideological tendencies may interfere with his/her value judgments in the interpreting process.</td>
<td>Model Answer: Disagree: D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10. | An interpreter shall accept responsibility for all kinds of erroneous rendering of the SL speech into TL.  
  
  **Model Answer:** Agree:  
  
  A |
| 11. | During interpreting assignments, interpreters may make decisions which satisfy their personal needs regardless of compliance with the professional code of conduct.  
  
  **Model Answer:** Disagree:  
  
  D |
| 12. | When interpreting in cases involving human rights victims or asylum seekers, an interpreter’s rendering is usually supportive of those groups.  
  
  **Model Answer:** Disagree:  
  
  D |
| **E)** | **Integrity** |
13. An interpreter is required to deal honestly and fairly with all consumers and colleagues regardless of his personal beliefs, ethnic or political affiliation.

Model Answer: Agree: A

14. An interpreter shall always candidly disclose all conflicts of interest when accepting interpreting assignments.

Model Answer: Agree: A

15. During an interpreting assignment, if I happen to be in a delicate situation whereby a compromise is needed, I will most likely abandon my personal ethics in favor of professional ethics.

Model Answer: Agree: A
Translation and the Characteristics of Literary Text

Abdul Wahid Mohammed Muslat, PhD
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Abstract
The present paper discusses the universal characteristics of a literary text and how important it is for a translator to be well-aware of. Otherwise, he will not get access to a good translation without such knowledge. Thus the paper discusses the characteristics first and the process of translating a literary text, next. In the first part, five characteristics are almost briefly discussed, vis; the special language, the expressive function, the suggestive power, the form and the timelessness as well as the placelessness. By the special language is meant the literary one whether it is prose or verse. Being as such it has an expressive function mostly related to aesthetic scope. Added is the suggestive power which inspires readers with imaginary images. Besides the form plays a distinctive role in communication with others, for aesthetic, the difference between prose and verse. Lastly a treatment of time less ness as well as placelessness is made. In the second part, the paper highlights the process of translating necessary for this type of text. Some examples are given to show how the meaning of certain dictions may change with. Those examples are taken from Hamlet and Chaucer

Keywords: Dream-like state, expressive function, suggestive power, aesthetic elements, intra-lingual, translation.
1. What is a literary text?

It includes all forms of literature whether written in prose or verse. They are: the short story, the novel, the drama, the essay and the critical text. The latter might be objected to by some men of letters as bring a non-creative text. In reply to this objection, one can easily explain that the substance nourishing a creative literary text is normally derived from natural and social surroundings. In other words, a literary text can be viewed as a sort of parasite. The same can be said of a critical text as it almost largely draws on a literary text in developing its body. In some way or another, directly or indirectly, the substance made use of by a literary text, is also made use of by a critical text. Still, the latter might in its turn be a new substance for another fresh literary text. Thus the notion of being a parasite can equally be shared by both the literary text and the critical text as well.

Although all these kinds of literary texts apparently differ in form and content, yet they all have shared universal characteristics which distinguish them from other manners of writing. They are as follows:

1.1. Special Language

A literary text, whether verse or prose, has its own special language which clearly differs from everyday one. This special language has been the outcome of using words, syntactic structures and sentence patterns in a specific way that most likely creates emotional, mental, psychological, imaginary and even dream-like states which the ordinary language fails to achieve. Consequently, the special language is to form a sort of intuitive transmitting center that send out codes together with overt messages usually received by a recipient's private receptor. The transmitting centre, in a way or another, resembles a real T.V. transmitting one. If the receptor is of the black and white type, the message then shown on its screen will also be black and white. But if the receptor is of the colored type, the message
then will also be colored. In other words, the kind of message received is determined by the type of receiver the recipient has.

1.2. Expressive function:

Inevitably, any poet or writer is influenced by his own whole surroundings. This surroundings, that ever it may be, plays a dynamic role in formulating the writer's conceptions, attitudes and images. As a result it affects the method by which the attempts to produce the thoughts and impressions occurring to his mind, or to portray the sensations and feelings going on inside his soul. By a complicated process taking place inside the mind and heart, the writer will bring together all these elements, creating what might be described as “expressive function”, mostly conditioned by the character the writer has been endowed with.

1.3. Suggestive power:

Quite often it so happens that we may read a creative text and admire it. This admiration seems to be due to our interpretation and understanding of the text by virtue of its suggestive power. This power, of course, is due to the pattern of sounds, the adoption of words and their unique arrangement in larger structures and lastly the internal rhythm. All these as well as others will add quite a lot to the whole apparent surface meaning. It is more likely that these elements will constitute the major part of the text's original message.

1.4. Form:

Generally speaking, the main purpose of a text is to excite the recipient whether emotionally or intellectually. This excitement may be partly due to the kind of style used be a writer in exploiting metaphors or inventing new images. A writer as such is regarded to be a creator. He attempts to make us see the world
from a different angle. In order to realize this target, he tries to make the form a convenient vehicle for anticipating this new image.

1.5. Timelessness and Placelessness

It is an uncontroversial question that masterpieces need not be restricted to either time or place. They quite often transcend them. The place referred to in them could be anywhere in the world, and the time referred to could be no less than immortality itself. They are timeless and placeless, because they are mainly concerned with essential values such as those people constantly take interest in at any time or place. Besides they particularly handle the human themes that always appeal to people wherever they live such as: love, death, suffering, happiness, torment and worry. (As'ad, 1989: 16-17)

2. Translating a literary text:

Recognizing these characteristics in a literary text will enable the translator to be at least partly qualified to fulfill his task with much more accuracy. Moreover, the remaining rate of accuracy can only be achieved if the translator himself has had the fundamental literary qualifications. If so, he can transform to the target text nearly most of the syntactic, stylistic and aesthetic elements originally found in the source text, in a way which creates that desirable artistic correspondence, or rather the most acceptable equivalents. So it appears that the process of literary translation can never be just an automatic one narrowly restricted to merely finding words and sentences in the target language that correspond to those in the source language. If this is true in the case of a non-literary text, it is untrue in the case of a literary one. The fact is that a literary text is more likely to bear an extra message usually concealed behind the apparent and surface linguistic structures. Quite often such a message takes shape by the interaction of certain words and syntactic structure with each other in part or in whole, rather than by these apart. Also it is worth remembering that translation is
always concerned with the matter of co-existing cultures. Truly there are always distinctive differences between them in respect of folklore, mythology and symbolism of which the cleverest or the most qualified translator should be well-informed. Once again, being only aware of them is insufficient. He has indeed to recognize some historical or social facts about such culture distinction in order to be on a safer side when interpreting the text as properly as possible. Consequently, he had rather, whenever possible, acquaint himself with almost every piece of information related to the etymology or semantic development over decades and centuries; especially when translating older literary text. A relevant good example illustrating the semantic and conceptual differences due to historical stages, is found in Hamlet when the hero (Hamlet) addressing Ophelia like this: Get thee to nunnery. (Shakespeare, Hamlet, III. i, 1947; 1089).

According to Jabra Ibrahim Jabra's translation, this request or order by Hamlet means the Ophelia must become a nun. Yet, in his foot-note on page 96 of Arabic translation of the play he comments saying, "At the age of Shakespeare the word - nunnery- had another connotation : namely, -brothel- " (Jabra, 1986; 96). What maintains this is the notion given by the critic Dover Wilson sited in the book "What is happens in Hamlet?" (Wilfred, 1979; 84), who sees that "nunnery" meant brothel "in Elizabethan vernacular". As regards this point the Russian translator Nickollai Bannikove says, "any translator taking his work seriously ought to make an idea of the language in which the literary text had been written." (Bannikov, 1977; 156).

In special cases a translator involved in literary work is advised to read and comprehend old texts so that he may re-live the same old atmosphere. He will, of course, encounter, tete-a-tete, a number of problems concerning spelling, sounds, meanings and syntax. But what makes such problems all that easy is the fact that some modern writers of the target language have intra-lingually translated them. As an example, let us take these two lines from Chaucer:
When that a prille with his shoures soote  
The draughte of March hath preceed to the roote (Cowling, 1953; 1)

and then compare them with Nevil Coghill's translation into modern English verse:
When the sweet showers of April fall and shoot  
Down through the drought of March to pierce the root. 
(coghill, 1954; 25)

Another example of such an intra-lingual translation had been achieved by the famous Japanese novelist Junichero Tanizaki who translated the greatest classical Japanese novel, “A Tale of Genji” by lady Mourasaki. Before being translated into modern Japanese, this novel had previously been translated into English by the well-known English translator Arthur Waley. Before the date of translating it into English, the contemporary Japanese readers knew almost nothing about it. Thus, when the English version became available, the Japanese continued for a long time reading it, until the time Tanizaki intralingually translated it. (Mohammed, 1986;102).

In addition, a translator may come across certain symbols in older literature. He may, subsequently, get shocked as he discovers that these symbols stand for something of which he is almost entirely unconscious, the best thing for him to do is to consult various reliable sources and reference books on this matter. It often happens that a translator may find such symbols and myths frequently employed in modern poetry and prose. Unless he gets at home with them, he will face a difficulty. Although the stress is laid here upon the point that a translator must know the other foreign language as best as possible, yet the fact remains that his excellent mastery of his own mother tongue comes in the first place. It is, indeed, the solid base upon which he entirely depends in implementing a successful literary translation. In this connection, Bannikov says, "Only a perfect command of your native tongue and a deep creative knowledge of it can, in my opinion, guarantee success in this field. In
my work as a translator I ascribe an utmost importance to my knowledge of Russian language. "(Bannikov, 1977; 154-155).

Dr. Samiyah As'ad says, "It is a pity that a translator's meager knowledge of his mother tongue forms the weakest point in his work. Practicing translation presupposes a translator whose knowledge of it ought to be almost comprehensive. Why? It is simply because the mother tongue is his own musical instrument on which he plays his symphony. "(As'ad, 1989; 24). Lastly Bilnisky says, "It is teasing to read good books badly translated." (cited in Kashkeen, 1977; 171).
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Abstract
The paper seeks to propose a predictive model on level of difficulty in English (L2)-Mandarin (L1) translation. Among the three non-Verbal functions (i.e., nominal, adjectival, and adverbial) and five different structures (i.e., infinitives, gerunds, participles, clauses, and phrases) in English, there exists a general contingent relationship in the course of translating each of the structures into Mandarin in coordination of the functions each structure serves. This predictive model can be most useful when dealing with recursive and mixed structures, and thus offers a general guideline for English-Mandarin translators. In this paper a brief deduction of sentential structures of L2 will be introduced first with mathematic interpretations, followed by presenting the cognitive steps involved in English-Mandarin translation (i.e., chunking the structures, identifying their functions, and arranging the structure order), and drawing the predictions of levels of difficulty on each structure in terms of the cognitive steps involved. The validity of such a tentative prediction model requires further examination and elaboration.

Keywords: English-Chinese translation, cognitive steps, syntactic differences, recursive structures
A Predictive Model on Level of Difficulty in English-Chinese Translation

“I have not hesitated to propose a general principle of linguistic structure on the basis of observations of a single language” (Chomsky, 1980: 48). Indeed, as the mathematician and linguist Noam Chomsky put it, there is a general principle of linguistic structure that can be elaborated or interpreted mathematically. Since the general principle of linguistic structure may exist in both English (L2) and Mandarin (L1), thus there must also be a general principle that serves as a bridge (translation) between L2 and L1, and such a bridge can be expressed concisely from mathematic perspectives. Such a translation principle requires the understanding of both languages (target and source), especially of their syntactic structures as well as their cultural connotations (Liu, 1997).

As Wingfield and Titone (1998) indicates, to understand a sentence, one must determine its syntactic structure. For this, Noam Chomsky’ transformational Syntax does provide a good framework in dealing with the assignment of words in a sentence to their relevant linguistic categories (i.e., sentence parsing), but still when one relates it to translating sentences of complex syntactic structures, especially those of recursive structures, difficulties will inevitably ensue for such cognitive model (simple cognitive steps) that focuses specifically on syntactic structures is yet to evolve even though there are a whole lot of discussions about how difficult sentences are produced, as in Noam Chomsky’s universal grammar (1965), but few (if there is any) about how they are translated in another language (Kimble, 1973).

This paper proposes a predictive model of level of difficulty in translating complex English sentences (L2) into Mandarin (L1) by, firstly reviewing the general concepts about differences between L1 and L2, then working on the development from “eight parts of speech (8ps)” to “four parts of speech (4ps)”, and further into “two parts of speech (2ps)”,
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then introducing the cognitive steps involved in English-Mandarin translation, next identifying the functions of different structures and determining levels of relative difficulty, and finally making predictions and giving suggestions based on the model for further investigation.

The number of Verbs in a sentence between L2 and L1

For Mandarin-English bilinguals (where Mandarin is L1), learning English (L2) is basically applying L1 system to that of L2 (Obler & Albert, 1977). In this way, there is no need to encode a completely new set of linguistic rules, but rather what is already available in L1. In the course of translation, if the input information of L2 corresponds to the constructs available in L1, then it can be integrated with the first language and form the shared conceptual and language stores (i.e., schema for L1-L2 compound). The interconnectedness between similar forms can, according to “cognitive load theory” (Sweller, 1994) reduces the load in the “working memory” for translation. By the same token, if there is a sharp contrast between the input data of L1 and L2 on both semantic and syntactic levels, then there should be certain transformation between L2 and L1 to accomplish the translation task (Chan, Chau & Hoosain, 1983). Thus, comprehending each language input as well as translating it into the other language involves quite a few cognitive steps. To specify, when dealing with sentences with only one VERB (L2), or simply put, the five basic sentence patterns in the course of English-Mandarin translation, translators can easily translate L2 into L1; however, when more than two VERBs appear in L2 sentences, then translating them into L1 will become naturally complex for the essential difference between L2 and L1 lies in the number of VERBs in a legitimate sentence of each language.

In specific, to understand the novel L2 input information, one must first monitor its
surface forms and encode its relevant semantic nodes to infer the plausible L2 semantic meaning, and then translate it into L1. In such a case, a direct pathway between L2 and L1 is not possible because there exist gaps between L2 and L1 (i.e., there is no schema for L2 and L1). That is, translating L2 means establishing links (as schemas) with cognitive steps between L2 and L1. As long as the links are established, the load of L2 processing in our working memory may be reduced, thus speeding up the translating processing. In this regard, the links are the necessary mediations for different syntactic structures between L2 and L1 (Brooks & Dansereau, 1983). See the Mandarin-English paired sentences as an example below:

Case 1: Wh-movement (L2-English, L1-Mandarin, L1 in terms of L2 order)

L2 \rightarrow (What they do) Depends on (where they come from)
L1 \rightarrow (他們是做什麼的) 依 (他們從那兒來)而定
L1 order \rightarrow (they do what) depends on (they come from where)

To comprehend the above L2 sentence: “What they do depends on where they come from,” the translator needs to know the “Wh- Movement” (Radford, 1981) and how it is translated in L1. As is shown, the difference lies mainly in “word order” between these two languages. Translating such a structure would be relatively easier with the knowledge of WH-movement as a mediator. That is, WH-movement here may serve as the schema to bridging the gap between these two languages (Brooks & Dansereau, 1983). With the help of cognitive rules such as WH-movement, translation may be more efficient in the course of encoding and decoding of the novel structures of the sentence. What then, if such cognitive rules concerning differences between L1 and L2 are so numerous and trivial (in most cases they are) that they might cause difficulties in translation process?
In fact, there exist similarities (compound) or differences (coordinate) of surface forms between L1 and L2 (Weinreich, 1953; Kohlers, 1963), which may shed a new light on translation. The levels of compound and coordinate relationships of language structures themselves may have much to do with the nature of translation process. That is, more transformations in translation are required when language structures of L1 and L2 are more coordinate in nature. For example, the WH-movement as Noun Phrases are coordinate in one way, while compound in another, under which circumstance fewer transformations are required in the process of translation than the completely coordinates such as adjectival clauses (Wang, 1990). Besides WH-movement, similarities (compound) between L2 and L1, as mentioned earlier, lies in sentences with only one VERB (basic sentence patterns), and differences (coordinate) of surface forms between L1 and L2 are often seen in sentences with ADJECTIVAL structures (e.g., relative clauses or adjectival phrases), which may indeed cause cognitive load for translators especially when dealing with such structures in their embedded forms (e.g., adjectival structures embedded in sentences of adjectival structures.) Since there is much evidence for different amounts of compound and coordinate storage across bilinguals of different languages due to the differences in language structures (Chan et al., 1983; Fang, Tzeng, & Alva, 1981; Poplack, 1980; Timm, 1975), a model which specifies different levels of compound or coordinate between L1 and L2 in relation to the levels of difficulty in translation is required.

To propose a prediction model of level of difficulty in L2-L1 translation, one must first resort to the existing syntactic system of L2 in the eyes of L1 users, then to examine such a system to see if it is cognitively convenient or efficient in our working memory when doing translation, to work out a mathematical expression in which level of difficulty can be
operational and quantified, and thus prediction can be made and further exploration through empirical validation with practical examples can be suggested. The mathematic model adopted in this study can be manifold. First, English sentences, as defined by the present model, are made up of two parts: verbs and non-verbs. This can be indicated as:

\[ \text{Sentence} = \text{Verb} + \text{Non-verb} \]

Or,

\[ S = V + \sim V \] (1)

And,

\[ \sim V = N (\text{nominal}) + \text{Adj (Adjectival)} + \text{Adv (adverbial)} \] (2)

Assumptions behind L2 sentence compositions

There are all kinds of assumptions and theories in any given field of discipline, including the field of English syntax. From macro perspective, there exist simple underlying assumptions about sentences with complex structures:

1) Only one main \text{VERB} is allowed in a sentence with the other verbs, if any, being transformed into infinitives, gerunds, participles, clauses or phrases.

2) Any unit other than \text{VERB} in a given sentence can be roughly classified into the functions of nouns, adjectives, and adverbs.

3) Sentences with symmetric structures can be created around the main \text{VERB}.

4) Structures of identical function are interchangeable and can be recursively created.

The Five non-\text{VERB} structures

First, suppose there is more than one \text{VERB} in a giving sentence (L2), how to deal with the extra-\text{VERBs}? Here are the variations of the second verb: (i.e., there are ways to make a \text{VERB} “non-\text{VERB}”)

These five Verbal variations can be coined as five structures, and they are “~V” (non-VERB). As mentioned, there are four parts of speech (N, V, Adj., Adv.) in a given sentence, these five ~V cannot be a VERB any longer, but they can be, according to assumption two, Nominal, Adjectival, and Adverbial. Thus, if we combine the five structures with the three functions, then logically we can have:

\[ \sim V = N(\text{Inf}, \text{Par}, G, \text{Cl}, \text{Phr}) + \text{Adj}(\text{Inf}, \text{Par}, G, \text{Cl}, \text{Phr}) + \text{Adv}(\text{Inf}, \text{Par}, G, \text{Cla}, \text{Phr}) \]  

(3)

Or, similarly,

\[ \sim V = \text{Inf}(N, \text{Adj}, \text{Adv}) + \text{Par}(N, \text{Adj}, \text{Adv}) + G(N, \text{Adj}, \text{Adv}) + \text{Cla}(N, \text{Adj}, \text{Adv}) + \text{Phr}(N, \text{Adj}, \text{Adv}) \]

(4)

Note that formula (3) = formula (4).
Three functions and symmetric structures

As the second assumption indicates, sentences with symmetric structures can be created around the main VERB. Such assumption has to do with the permutation of structures in a legitimate sentence (L2). Four parts of speech (functions) in a given sentence actually suggest their individual relative positions in a given sentence. Principally, nominal structures are to be placed around the main VERB, adjectival structures around the modified nouns, whereas adverbial structures in every possible position (position free, but mostly around the main structure- N V N). With such a principle, we may start inducing the prototype of sentences as below: (note that permutation is basically symmetrically around the VERB, and the symmetrical structure only serves as a framework for structure identification, and one can also create a sentence without symmetrical structures.) Below are the steps of structure development:

Step 1: Create the most important Verb; namely,

\[
V
\]

Step 2: Create Nouns around the main Verb; namely,

\[
\text{N} \quad V \quad \text{N}
\]

Step 3: Create Adjectives around the Nouns; namely,

\[
\text{Adj N Adj} \quad V \quad \text{Adj N Adj}
\]

Step 4: Create Adverbs around the main structure (N V N) VERB; namely,

\[
\text{Adv, (Adj)+N+(Adj)} \quad V \quad (\text{Adj}+N+(\text{Adj},) \quad \text{Adv}
\]

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8)

Step 5: Put all the ~V structures in the non-VERB positions, and then the global patterns of each structure can be created. To take infinitives as an example, we have:
Note that positions (2) and (5) are missing; they do not exist because by convention adjectival structures more than 1 unit must be placed behind the nominal they modify, and [to+V~] is obviously more than 1 unit. Note also that the other four structures (participles, gerunds, clauses, and phrases) can also be theoretically assigned to the positions like those of infinitives, with differences on certain positions (e.g., gerunds as adjectives must be on either (2) or (5), whereas adjectival clauses on either (4) and (7), etc.)

Interchangeability

Structures of identical function can be interchangeable and made recursive, as indicated in Equations (3) or (4), “−V = N (Inf, Par, G, Cl, Phr) + Adj (Inf, Par, G, Cl, Phr) + Adv (Inf, Par, G, Cla, Phr).” See the elaborations below:

1) To+V~ (Infinitive) -(Nominal) (a)/(Adjectival) (b)/(Adverbial) (c)
2) Ving/Vpp~ (Participles) -(Nominal) (d)/(Adjectival) (e)/(Adverbial) (f)
3) Ving~ (Gerund) -(Nominal) (g)/(Adjectival) (h)/(Adverbial) (i)
4) Cj+S+V~ (Clause) -(Nominal) (j)/(Adjectival) (k)/(Adverbial) (l)
5) (wh-to+V~/Prep + N~) Phrases-(Nominal) (m)/(Adjectival)(n)/(Adverbial)(o)

In short, we can find that, functionally, (a) = (d) = (g) = (j) = (m); (b) = (e) = (h) = (k) = (n); (c) = (f) = (i) = (l) = (o). Note also that the interchangeability mentioned above is basically on syntactic aspect, rather than on the semantic one, and it is theoretically valid, but scarce in language data in some; thus, adjectival gerunds and nominal participles may not be elaborated here forth.
Recursive structures

What makes English-Mandarin translation most intriguing is the translation of sentences embedded with recursive structures, especially those embedded with recursive adjectival clauses. Recursive structures can be both homogeneously recursive (e.g., repetition of identical structures) and heterogeneously recursive (e.g., repetition of mixed structures). Sentences such as *He went home to ask her mother to purchase reference book* are homogeneously recursive on infinitives, whereas sentences such as *He went visiting a professor that lives in the village located on the hill* are heterogeneously recursive on participles, clauses, and phrases. On the other hand, sentence embedded with recursive structures can also appear in nominal, adjectival, and adverbial positions. The recursive structures can be specified as:

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{n} \text{Random } (\text{infinitive}_i + \text{gerund}_i + \text{participle}_i + \text{clause}_i + \text{phrase}_i)
\]  

(5)

If “i=0,” then no such structure exists in a given sentence, but “i” can also be any positive number. If we combine functions with structures, then the complexity can be specified as:

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{3} \sum_{i=0}^{n} (\text{initive}_i + \text{gerund}_i + \text{participle}_i + \text{clause}_i + \text{phrase}_i) \times (\text{function})_j
\]  

(6)

Note also that “j” is from 1 to 3. (e.g., 1=adverbial, 2=nominal, 3=adjectival, though arbitrarily assigned. To further specify, suppose we have three different clauses embedded in the sentence without other structures, then:

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{3} \sum_{i=0}^{n} (\text{clause}_i) \times (\text{function})_j
\]  

(7)

With the mathematical expression of the sentence patterns on the bases of the four assumptions, we still cannot decide the level of complexity or difficulty until the
introduction of English-Mandarin translation principles in which cognitive load is taken into account.

**General L2-L1 translation principles**

It is generally accepted that nominal structures in L2 and those in L1 are compound by nature, so when dealing with nominal structures, one can always follow the Mandarin word order, thus little problems exist in translation. As to adjectival structures in L2, especially those with more than one word unit, there is a reverse order in the correspondence of L1, so one must deal with the adjectival structures first prior to the nominal structures they modify. And such adjectival structures may easily cause problems, and thus considered more difficult. Lastly, for the adverbial structures, there is consistency between L2 and L1 sentences, the latter of which allows either following or reversing word order in a given sentence.

**Word Order based on different functions of structure**

As we have learned that any constituent of a given sentence can be categorized in terms of 4ps (four parts of speech), the next task is to make a comparison between L2 and L1 in terms of nominal, adjectival, and adverbial structures. We wonder whether there is any rule behind the differences between L2 and L1. Let’s start from clausal structures (Cases 2, 3, and 4). The bracketed unit in Case 2 is nominal clause, in Case 3 adjectival clause, and in Case 4 adverbial clause. See the attached L1 translation of each sentence below:

**Case 2: nominal clause**

L2 \(\rightarrow\) We know (that the girl is gracious).

L1 \(\rightarrow\) 我們知道 (那女孩是典雅的)。

L1 order \(\rightarrow\) We know the girl is gracious.
Case 3: Adjectival clause

L2 → The girl (that you met) is gracious.
L1 → (你遇到的)女孩是典雅的。
L1 order → the (you met) girl is gracious.

Case 4: Adverbial clause

L2 → The girl is gracious (that we all admire her.)
L1 → 這女孩是典雅的 (所以我們都愛慕她)。
L1 order → the girl is gracious (that we all admire her).

As is shown, there are some rules behind the order of translations between L1 and L2. In Case 2 (where nominal clause lies), both L1 and L2 follow the same word order, while in Case 3 (adjectival clause), the adjectival clause is translated prior to its modified noun, and in Case 4 (adverbial Clause), like in Case 2, both L1 and L2 remain the same in word order. Thus we may draw tentative principles regarding translating L2 into L1 below:

Principle 1:

For nominal and adverbial clauses in translation, L1 and L2 follow similar word order.

Principle 2:

For adjectival clauses in translation, L1 and L2 are mutually reversed in word order.

As indicated above, it is then plausible to obtain a general rule regarding differences between L1 and L2 on different clausal structures. In reality, for adverbial clauses, one can either follow or reverse the structure order of each language (Guey, 2000b). Interestingly, such logic also applies to other structures (infinitives, gerunds, participles, and phrases).
Identifying the function of each structure unit

In most cases, the function of each structure unit can be identified through its semantic meanings (Chomsky, 1975). To specify, the structure unit can be nominal if it serves as a *Subject*, an *Object* of a VERB or followed by a preposition; it can be adjectival if it serves as a modifier of a noun; it can be adverbial if it provides additional message concerning time, space, state, cause, effect, result, condition, and etc. to the main structure. Confusions might arise if, for example, there are clausal structure units with conjunctions (such as “when”, “that”, “as” …etc.), because structures with the same conjunction may serve different functions (i.e., nominal, adjectival, and adverbial). In such a case, syntactic structure analysis may be supplementary. As mentioned earlier, the bracketed unit of the sentence in Case 2 is nominal clause in that it serves as the *Object* of the VERB. The sentence in Case 3 is adjectival clause because it modifies its antecedent (the girl). Finally, the sentence in Case 4 is adverbial clause for it is the result of the main structure. All the descriptions made above are mainly based on semantic connotations of each sentence.

To conduct syntactic analysis, we may focus attention on the differences of structures before or after the conjunction (the case in point is ‘that’) to see whether there is any rule regarding the differences. So we have (ignore ‘that’ for each sentence, and ‘C*’ stands for complement):

**Case (2).** We know (that) The girl is gracious.

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \quad V \\
& \rightarrow \\
S & \quad V \quad C*
\end{align*}
\]

In the main structure, (S V) is incomplete.

In the nominal clause, “*The girl is gracious (S V C*)” is complete.

**Case (3).** The girl (you met) is gracious.

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \quad S \quad V \\
& \rightarrow \\
V & \quad C*
\end{align*}
\]
Again, such logic also applies to other structures (infinitives, gerunds, participles, and phrases).

So, we can summarize the above mentioned phenomena below:

Principle 3:

3.1 For nominal clauses, the main clause is incomplete, while the nominal clause complete.

3.2. For adjectival clauses, the main clause is complete, while the adjectival clause incomplete.

3.3 For adverbial clauses, both clauses are complete.

Though it is yet to be confirmed that such a principle may fit in all the possible structure units, it can still serve as a general guideline for identifying functions of each structure unit in a given sentence. In most cases, when we do the translation, information from other levels of analysis (semantic or syntactic) could freely interact with the message reflected at one level allowed to facilitate processing at other levels (Tyler & Malslen-Wilson, 1977). In this regard, it is suggested that one may start from syntactic analysis based on the principles proposed in the present paper, and shift to semantic analysis when there is ambiguity in the course of identifying function of each structure unit.
Determining levels of relative difficulty

Now comes one of the most important issues: how can we specify the levels of relative difficulty in translating any given structure from L2 to L1? As mentioned earlier, to conduct a quality translation, one needs to understand the semantic meaning of each single word, phrase and the syntactic structure on sentential level along with having a good command of relevant cultural connotations (Liu, 1997). In this paper we are going to confine the issue solely to the syntactic aspect of the text in translation. As Sweller put it (1994), the number of cognitive processes involved in a given task may substantially have to do with its level of difficulty. That is, the more cognitive processes involved in a given task, the more difficult it is. And cognitive processes can be operationally defined in terms of cognitive steps. We may start by specifying what possible steps are involved in translating a given sentence as below:

Step 1: Chunk each structure in terms of the five main structures (infinitives, participles, gerunds, clauses, phrasal expressions, and the main structure “S + V + O/C”).

Step 2: Specify the function of each chunk in terms of its nominal, adjectival, and adverbial functions on the basis of theorem 3 (i.e., principles 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3).

Step 3: Decide the proper chunk order (when translating L2 into L1) on the basis of principle 1.

Step 4: Work on inserted structures (i.e., a certain chunk may be inserted by another chunk, as in recursive or mixed structures).

Still these cognitive steps involved in translation are not comprehensive, and some of the steps are of trivial difference, say, the steps involved in the recursive adjectival structures of Subject and of Object. The factors determining levels of difficulty may include: 1) the length of hunks, 2) the number of the structures, 3) the function of each chunk, 4) recursive
chunks, and 5) mixed chunks.

Length of chunks

Apparently, the longer the string of the structure in a sentence is, the more difficult it is. According to cognitive load theory (Sweller, 1988), if the number of chunks is beyond the capacity of working memory (e.g., more than 7), then it will cause cognitive load to our working memory, and thus makes it difficult. But the length of a sentence itself is not independent unless other factors are kept constant. To take the sentences below as examples:

Case 5
L2 ➔ (a) The girl studies the book [about psychology].
(b) The girl studies the book [which is about psychology].

L1 ➔ (a) 這女孩讀關於心理學的書
the girl studies about psychology book
(b) 這女孩讀有關心理學的書

It can be predicted that the sentence (a) in Case 5 is easier because the length of the chunk is smaller than that in the sentence (b). This naturally leads to our first prediction stated below:

Prediction 1:

The longer the chunk in a given sentence, the more difficult it is to be translated, with other factors being equal.

Such a prediction can be expressed by the equation:

\[ D = f (S_L) \]  \hspace{1cm} (8) \]
That is, difficulty level (D) can be the function of structure length ($S_L$).

The number of chunks

The number of chunks and the length of chunks may not mean the same thing because some sentences are long but with few chunks. And also there are short sentences with many chunks. The number of chunks mentioned here may not have much to do with the length of the sentence. When considering cognitive load, the larger the number of the chunk in a given sentence, the more difficult it is. See the sentences below:

Case 6 (Radford, 1981, p. 49)

L2 $\rightarrow$ (b) Fred knows (that) John knows Joe.

(c) Jim knows (that) Fred knows (that) John knows Joe.

(d) Pete knows (that) Jim knows (that) Fred knows (that) John knows Joe.

L1 $\rightarrow$ (b) Fred 知道 John 認識 Joe.

Fred knows John knows Joe.

(c) Jim 知道 Fred 知道 John 認識 Joe.

Jim knows Fred knows John knows Joe.

(d) Peter 知道 Jim 知道 Fred 知道 John 認識 Joe.

Peter knows Jim knows Fred knows John knows Joe.

From the sentence in Case 6 (b) to (d), the number of chunks is getting larger, we can easily predict that sentence (b) is the easiest, while sentence (d) the most difficult because of the different amount of cognitive load they have caused. Again other factors involved should be kept constant. Thus, we have:

Prediction 2:
The larger the number of the chunk in a given sentence, the more difficult it is to be translated, other factors being equal.

In the same vein, the prediction can be expressed by the equation:

$$D = f \left( S_N \right)$$

That is, difficulty level (D) can be the function of structure number ($S_N$).

The function of the chunk

As discussed earlier, L1 and L2 can be compound in nominal, coordinate in adjectival, and mixed in adverbial structures. Thus, the relative difficulty levels in translation among these three functional structures can be, nominal easiest, adjectival most difficult, while adverbial in between (e.g., the sentences (1), (2) and (3) on ‘that’ clauses mentioned previously.) Our prediction for this category is:

Prediction 3:

In translating a given sentence, the nominal chunks are the easiest, adjectival chunks the most difficult, whereas adverbial chunks in between, other factors being equal.

This prediction can be also elaborated as:

$$D = \sum_{i=1}^{3} F_i (S_L \times S_N)$$

As is shown, the equation is a combination of predictions 1, 2, and 3, where ‘F’ denotes “functions” of structure (S); namely, three functions: nominal-1, adverbial-2, and adjectival-3 the weighed scores for each function 1, 2, 3 also indicate their relative difficulty, though arbitrary.

Recursive chunks

Understanding recursive chunks can be less difficult than translating them into another language, because ordering the word sequence may cause cognitive load in the
working memory. This factor may also interact with length and the function of each structure in a given sentence. Hence, the more recursive structures in a given sentence, the more difficult in their translation especially when dealing with adjectival structures. See the sentences in Case 7 below:

Case 7. (Wingfield & Titone, 1998, p. 238)

L2 →  
(a) The mouse ate the cheese.

(b) The mouse (that) the cat bit ate the cheese. (n=1)

(c) The mouse (that) the cat (that) the dog chased bit ate the cheese. (n=2)

L1 →  
(a) 这老鼠吃了乳酪

the mouse ate cheese.

(b) 这（猫咬了的）老鼠吃了乳酪

the （cat bit）mouse ate Cheese.

(c) 这（狗追了的）（猫咬了的）老鼠吃了乳酪

the （dog chased）（cat bit）mouse ate cheese.

As is known, the “that” in the adjectival clauses embedded in the (a), (b), and (C) of Case 7 can be deleted because it serves Object case. Again, in relation to principle 2 (For Adjectival Clauses in translation, L1 and L2 are mutually reversed in word order,) we need to translate each of the recursive structure one by one. That is, we need to translate adjectival clause prior to its modified nouns in a sense that the L1 translation wording seems to be recursive accordingly. Apparently, sentence 7 (c) is more difficult than sentence 7 (b) when translated. Hence this naturally leads to:
Prediction 4:

*In translating a given sentence, the more recursive chunks, the more difficult they are, other factors being equal.*

The corresponding mathematical expression of this prediction can thus be:

\[ D = f(R_N) \quad (11) \]

That is, difficulty level can be the function of the number of recursive structure \((R_N)\).

\[ D = \sum_{i=1}^{3} F_i(S_L \times S_N \times R_N) \quad (12) \]

Again, the equation is a combination of Predictions 1, 2, 3, and 4. “R” denotes “recursive structures”.

**Mixed chunks**

It is not uncommon to see sentences with chunks of various structures such as infinitive, participle, gerund, phrase, and clause combined (Rose & Carroll, 1974). Though the difficulties mainly lie in the identification of the function of each chunk, interactions with the length and the number of each chunk may aggravate cognitive load in the working memory when doing the translation. Considering the sentences below:

**Case 8**

L2 ➔

(a) The girl is a champion.

(b) The girl seated by the river is a champion in a spelling bee contest.

(c) The girl seated by the river lying behind the hill is a champion in a spelling bee contest that is held once a year.

(d) The girl seated by the river lying behind the hill to be removed is a champion in a spelling bee contest that is held once a year.
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L1 → (a) 這 女孩 是 冠軍
the girl is champion.

L1 → (b) 這坐在 河畔 的女孩 是 拼字 比賽的 冠軍
the seated by river girl is spelling contest Champion.

L1 → (c) 這坐在 山丘 後 河畔 的 女孩 是
the seated hill behind by river girl is

L1 → (d) 這 坐在 將移除 的 山丘 後 的 河畔 的 女孩
the seated will remove hills behind by river girl

Note that English words under each L1 in the example above are re-ordered according to word order of Mandarin. From (a) to (d), the number of mixed structures is increasing, and it can be expected that the level of difficulty in translating them is increasing accordingly. Again, we can have:

Prediction 5:

In translating a given sentence, the more mixed chunks, the more difficult they are, other factors being equal.

Difficulty on sentences with mixed chunks is at least twofold in terms of cognitive load, first on chunking, and second on identification. The corresponding mathematical expression can be: (where $m_i$ denotes the varieties of mixed structures, “$e^x$” exponential function)
\[ D = \sum_{i=1}^{m} e^{-m_i} \quad (13) \]

Here we have extra exponential element “\(e\),” because exponential function arises whenever a quantity grows or decays at a rate proportional to its current value. It is assumed that additional ‘recursive, mixed’ structures (especially with adjectival clauses) will overwhelmingly aggravate the cognitive load in the course of sentence processing and translation. This can also be elaborated through the curve below:

For every extra- mixed structure (in numbers), the difficulty of processing them will be higher out of proportion (as in \(Y\), denoting difficulty level). Such an assumption is not groundless, as suggested by the study on the segmentation of Chinese words during reading (Li, Rayner, & Cave, 2009). In their study, ‘eccentricity’ \(E_i = \ell^{-\gamma i}\), is used to indicate the level of eccentricity, where ‘\(\gamma\)’ refers to a parameter to be fit during the simulation, “\(i\)” refers to “location” of the target character. Though processing of words is basically different from that of sentences, it will be interesting to further examine such a mathematical interpretation on sentence processing level.

Then in combination of equations (12) and (13), thus, we have,

\[ D = \sum_{j=1}^{3} \sum_{i=1}^{5} e^{-m_i} \times F_j(S_L \times S_N \times R_N) \quad (14) \]

It is important to note from the above predictions that variables involved are interwoven, and thus to further clarify the relative influence of each variable requires carefully designed experimental studies. Indeed, it is quite difficult to precisely quantify or define each level of difficulty with regard to translating different structures in different situations with the knowledge at the present stage. The above-mentioned predictions along with their corresponding equations only serve as a tentative guideline when considering the possible
variables involved in the whole process.

Implications for further research

The present paper starts from introducing the assumptions about English syntax, then followed by the demonstration of sentence development on the basis of these assumptions, with the focus on the structural transformation laws (i.e., symmetry, interchangeability, recursion), which are essential for English-Mandarin translation on sentential level. Examples were given under each category to specify the laws, followed by the introduction of translation principles as the bridge between English and Mandarin syntactic structures. The relationships between functions (nominal, adjectival, and adverbial) and structures (infinitives, gerunds, participles, clauses, and phrases) were elaborated and specified to offer the framework for prediction of level of difficulty in English–Mandarin translation. Each of the five predictions was made on the basis of the amount of cognitive load involved in the course of translation under the guideline of translation principles, and the factors determining levels of difficulty (the length of hunks, the number of the structures, the function of each chunk, recursive chunks, and mixed chunks) were indicated through mathematical equations.

Inevitably, there are problems that require further clarification and elaboration.

First, the assumptions proposed may not fit all the real life language data. For example, in the first assumption, “Only one main VERB is allowed in a sentence with the other verbs, if any, being transformed into infinitives, gerunds, participles, clauses or phrases,” it is not uncommon to find sentences with more than one main VERB (e.g., He came to the door, took out the key, plugged it in the keyhole, and turned…). It is convenient to argue that these VERBS are essentially symmetrically aligned to fulfill description of an episode, and it is hard to imagine if the episode is described otherwise. To our conviction, the catch phrase...
“better rules than without,” is especially of much value when dealing with translation between two drastically different languages (e.g., English and Mandarin).

Second, the legitimacy of emphasis on syntax in building translation framework will beyond doubt invite criticism because translation is generally recognized as a cognitive process during which lexicons, collocations, syntax, cultural contexts, writers’ intention are all interwoven, and none of which can be isolated and treated independently. Truly, all these are interdependent, but the syntactic differences do, in most cases, cause relatively more confusions than others in translation, especially when managing recursive adjectival clauses embedded in a sentence. As indicated, translating L2 into L1 is a complicated and exhaustive task, and dealing with syntactic aspects on two languages is certainly not enough, but it is well worth of more discussion since monitoring surface forms, as Wingfield and Titone (1998) put it, is the first step for understanding and translating L2 input information. In most cases, with the knowledge regarding how to chunk and specify each structure along with its individual function, one may then be more capable of assigning appropriate word orders in translations. In short, miscomprehension of structures can be fatal, whereas confusions derived from words can always be adjusted by accurate comprehension of syntax.

Next, the introduction of mathematical equations in the present study is, beyond doubt, an audacious, if not risky endeavor. Firstly, the mathematician and linguist, Noam Chomsky (1975) in his The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory has suggested the underlying mathematical concepts, which did create an overwhelmingly fresh standpoint in looking at the nature of languages as well as their translation (e.g., from English to Mandarin.) Such a picture can be enlightening, thus contributive, given that the accuracy of such a modeling is at issue. Second, with the mathematical equations, studies of languages, specifically of
translation, can be made more operational and objective. For one thing, the embedded structures (especially those with adjectival units) are inherently difficult as compared with other structural units, and thus can be better elaborated and clarified through mathematical ideas. Besides, the mathematical concepts involved in the study are open to discussions, and therefore serve to trigger interdisciplinary inquiries. Third, like mathematical equations in other fields, translation of two languages is always faced with multi-dimensional complexity of various factors, and mathematical equations can be tools to facilitate scientific endeavor.

Interested researchers in the future may further elaborate 1) the validity of the mathematic equations proposed by designing experiments to test the predictions made in the present study (e.g., manipulating the number, the length, the recursive structures as independent variables, whereas time spent on translating each target sentence and level of accuracy as dependent variables), 2) proposition of translation instruction techniques or strategies to facilitate student translators’ coping with sentences with high complexity.
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Abstract:
The role of the translator is not really distinct from that of the communicator in any typical intercultural communication encounter/verbal exchange. In both instances the translator as well as the communicator is called upon to deliver what is being intended in the written or spoken linguistic code. Having said that, then the task which both of them is bound to focus on is identical or similar since it presupposes that each person possesses a high level of competence in two linguistic and cultural systems in order to accomplish the very task they are called upon to accomplish. Therefore, the primary goal of this paper is two-fold: to underscore the family resemblance or interconnection between the process of translation and that of intercultural communication encounter; and to underscore the merits of treating translation as an intercultural or inter-lingual act of communication since the constraints which face the translator are quite similar to those which the communicator encounters.
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1- Introduction: some theoretical grounding

If one takes a thorough look at what the process of translation involves, one is inclined to seriously consider translation to be a hyponym of intercultural communication or vice versa. The major elements or components which constitute intercultural communication are precisely those which literally constitute translation. Samovar and Porter (2003) claim that Intercultural Communication as a social science discipline is concerned about the blending of culture and communication and their overall impact on social interaction and understanding. They also claim that to understand the relationship between these two entities, that is say culture and communication, participants in intercultural communication need to be fully acquainted with a set of ‘cultural syndromes’ which Samovar and Porter (2003) defines as, “a shared pattern of beliefs, attitudes, self-definitions, norms, and values organized around a theme” (p.4).

What this really means is that the entities –that is language and culture -which have the greatest impact on the process of translation are the same entities which exert a great deal of influence and are responsible for the success or failure of the outcome of any intercultural communication encounter. What really this involves is that participants approach the encounter of intercultural communication with some ‘cultural syndrome’ very much identical to the situation in which the translator finds himself or herself in carrying out his task. In both instances / encounters participants are destined to act based on their own cultural background or be influenced by their cultural and linguistic background. In either process there is no guarantee whatsoever that either party would not be subject to ideological biases and influences he/ she is holding whether consciously or unconsciously when confronted with any situation (Tymockzo, 2003; Schaffner, 2003; Gumperz, 1982; Thomas, 1983).

In his discussion of this social inquiry, Bennett (1998) remarks that, “the study of intercultural communication has tried to answer the question, “How do people understand one another when they do not share a common cultural experience” (p. 1)? Bennett’s
comments seem to be consistent with both Schaffner’s (2003) and Tymoczko’s (2003) ideas regarding translation. Both of them claim that the process of translation is ideology-driven and that the production of a target text is usually influenced by the translator’s ideological background, intended purpose, and the stance which the translator assumes or holds for the target audience. They further claim that ideological influences can manifest themselves in various textual forms in the target text itself for the sole purpose of either maximizing the influence of a particular action or mitigating its impact. Such instances are pervasive whether in the act of translation or in any intercultural communication encounter.

Another translation scholar whose views on what the act of translation involves is Hans Vermeer, whom the researcher has had the privilege of becoming acquainted with before he passed away during a conference on the Role of the Translator in Interfaith Dialogue which was held at An-Najah National University in 2010. Vermeer (2010) made the following comments via e-mail to the researcher at that time and the researcher thinks that Vermeer (2010) deserves quoting due to the relevance of his ideas to the proposed claim:

“That a translator finds himself in a situation partly known and partly unknown to him to carry out his task. He claims further that the translator feels hard pressed to translate a text whose author is partly known and partly unknown to the translator and this applies to the language and culture of the author of the concerned text. And finally, the translator finds himself while deciphering the text hard pressed to uncover the genuine intention of the target text. Therefore, the translator is clearly in a situation in which his primary concern is to produce an intelligible text consistent with the target culture and at the same time adhering to the principles of accountability and integrity as much as s/he can.” (via email)

Other scholars from relevant discipline (see, Thomas, 1983; Trosborg, 1987; Takahashi & Beebe, 1993; House, 1996; Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Rose, 2000) attribute the breakdown of intercultural communication to a pragmatic failure due to the tendency of
some participants to misconstrue the speaker's intended meaning. According to Thomas (1983), 'pragmatic failure' can be defined as in, "the inability to understand and recognize the force of the speaker's intention" (p. 91).

Another type of pragmatic failure which participants in intercultural communication can fall into according to Thomas (1983) is 'socio-pragmatic failure', an instance which refers to 'the social conditions placed on language use'. This failure results from cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behavior (p.99).

Intercultural communication breakdown can potentially occur in other instances which involve the performance of speech acts. According to Trosborg (1987) and El Samaty (2005) pragmatic transfer is something inevitable to occur when participants perform speech acts, they are very like to transfer L1 norms and styles in their performance of speech acts into L2. Pragmatic failure occurs also in instances in which translators as well as communicators pay a great deal of attention to the semantic import of any communicated message at the expense of the pragmatic one and by virtue of that participants are very likely to misconstrue one another. Pragmatic failure occurs also in an instance where the speaker’s interpretation or translation of a message from or into the target language is influenced by relying or using social norms and native-like strategies (see, Gumperz, 1982; Thomas, 1983; Rose, 2000).

Such ideas seem to coincide and be consistent with what Toury (2000) claims about translators and communicators. According to Toury, ‘cognition itself is influenced probably even modified by socio-cultural factors’ (p. 119). According to Toury, what applies to translators applies to communicators too. This means that the socio-cultural factors have great impact on communicators as well as translators to the extent that such knowledge induces them to think and interpret any particular message in a way very much consistent with one’s socio-cultural knowledge.

Another important point which one should never underestimate its overall significance is the type of mistakes and errors committed by students of translation since some of these mistakes and errors are very telling and diagnostic. Therefore, the findings of students’
mistakes in translation along with the primary reasons responsible for intercultural communication breakdown, lend great support to the belief that some of these constraints which seem to undermine the ability of both the translator and communicator can be attributed to the lack of pragmatic competence in the target culture—an issue which seems to confirm Thomas’s (1983) notion of cross-cultural pragmatic failure and the importance of acquiring ‘communicative competence’, in the target culture. These constraints or impediments seem also to confirm some of the ideas of Gumperz (1982) which state that one’s linguistic system is destined to induce one to perceive any communicated message in the prism of one’s linguistic structure/system; consequently, one is bound to misconstrue part of the intended meaning of any written or spoken message.

In today’s global world we can’t afford to pay a great deal of attention to the linguistic code as much as to the information being conveyed through it; and that is due to the fact that ‘formal translation’ proves problematic in instances particularly when dealing with rhetorical and idiomatic expressions since these types of expressions violate semantic rules; and that the meaning of such expression lies mostly in their associative rather than in their conceptual content. In addition to the fact that there are overwhelming differences among languages even among the most genetically related ones such as Germanic or Semitic languages which make the task of finding structural similarities among these languages a far reaching goal.

As an approach, ‘formal translation’ proves inadequate particularly in translating rhetorical and idiomatic expressions since the translation of such instances constitute a real challenge for students of translation on account that there is a clear disparity between their conceptual and associative meaning. For instance, the translation of the following sentences has constituted a real challenge to students of translation since the majority of them were able to account for the disparity between the conceptual and associative meaning:

1. Ali’s vehicle is a lemon.
2. Dr. Johnson is a butcher.
Based on the researcher’s solicitation of students’ responses and analysis of their written answers, the researcher believes that the primary cause for students’ difficulty in dealing with the first sentence stems from students' inability to realize that there are two distinct meanings to both sentences. In the first sentence, the majority of students attended to the semantic meaning as expected but were unable to understand the meaning for which the metaphor stands and by virtue of that students failed to capture the second and most important meaning due to their lack of pragmatic competence in the target language.

This can also be attributed to the fact that there is less emphasis on improving and enhancing students' pragmatic competence at the college level due to the type of difficulties associated with this particular inquiry. Only a minority of students were able to construe the metaphor correctly and understand its function in both sentences. In the second sentence there was clear variation in their translation. Some of them gave one translation while others gave two different translations and thus were able to capture the complete meaning of the second utterance. Overall, the key point in all of the above sentences is that sentences such as the above continue to pose a real challenge to students of language and translation on account that such sentences require two types of competences on the part of the translator to fully capture the distinction between the conceptual and the associative meaning.

Therefore, one can easily see that the challenges which confront intercultural communication participants are not terribly distinct from the same daunting challenges which the translator encounters upon deciphering the real intention of the author of a particular text; and as a result of that, it would not be hasty to include that there is a family of resemblance between these two processes in many various ways and having said that then it probably would be conducive if we treat translation as an encounter of intercultural communication where the translator has to focus on relaying the intended meaning of any translation task. And by virtue of that, the mechanisms which should be employed in both processes have to be consistent with the type of challenges which are involved in both processes /encounters.
In the following section, the researcher presents some of the family of resemblance between these two processes for the sake of buttressing the proposed claim and justifying it on the ground that the act of translation can potentially be considered a communicative act and it should be treated as such by both the communicator and the translator. This would probably sharpen the mechanisms being used in translation by drawing on intercultural communication concepts since the primary concern of intercultural communication is the capturing of both the semantic and pragmatic aspects of any intercultural encounter and this seems to be consistent with what several translation theorists are calling for when they talk about the question of equivalence (See, House, 1977; Baker, 1992; Nida & Taber, 1982).

2. Cases of resemblance

2.1. Slippery process:

A quick glance at what both processes is likely to convince one that they are slippery, fragile, and their outcome is quite unpredictable since neither the communicator nor the translator can be consciously aware of everything primarily in terms of capturing the intended meaning of the target text or the communicated messages in the intercultural communication encounter. In the translation process, the translator embarks on an unsettled project in terms of being unable to uncover the real intention of the author or that of the text itself after the completion of the translated text. If one just examines Venuti’s (1995) definition of what the translation process involves, one is destined to realize how unpredictable and slippery that process can be:

“A process by which the chain of signifiers in the target-language text that constitutes the source language is replaced by a chain of signifiers in the target-language text which the translator provides on the strength of an interpretation”

( p. 17).
My read of Venuti’s (1995) quote is that he is appealing to semiotics as well as to linguistic symbols to decipher what they stand for in another language as an adequate mechanism to fully arrive at a satisfactory translation from one linguistic code to another. Furthermore, Venuti’s (1995) views on translation shows that the process of translation is an indefinite one and therefore he is clearly an advocate or a proponent of the post-structuralist perspective - a perspective which entertains the belief in which culture plays a significant role in the translation of a particular text and it has much more precedence over the linguistic element due to its great influence on the translation process.

In fact, Venuti (1995) spares no efforts in expressing his remarks on how slippery the process of translation can be as one can make sense of the following comments which he expresses:

*Meaning is a plural and contingent relation, not an unchanging unified essence, and therefore a translation cannot be judged according to mathematics-based concepts of semantic equivalence or one-to-one correspondence (p.18).*

In the above quote Venuti (1995) is clearly downplaying the validity and utility of our reliance on mechanisms such as ‘semantic or formal equivalence’, in translation and thus in so doing he is calling for a real transformation not only in our outlook and perspective but also in the tools and mechanisms translators frequently employ in performing their task. Thus, Venuti (1995) is departing from old and impractical approaches to more optimal and realistic ones in translation. To Venuti, (1995) neither linguistic nor semantic equivalence can provide an optimal approach to the process of translation on account that such approaches are not adequate enough to account for rhetorical and idiomatic or formulaic expressions and by virtue of that such approaches do not measure up to the expectations. That is to say, translators cannot appeal to semantics only in order to fully capture the intended meaning of rhetorical and idiomatic expressions. This applies to some extent to the intercultural communication encounter except that in such an encounter the communicator is being assisted by the context in which this encounter takes place in addition to the freedom with which he/she can decide on the interpretation.
of the communicated message being received from the interlocutor and assisted by all the paralinguistic devices available at his/her disposal.

In this excerpt Vermeer (2010 via-email) illustrates how the perception of each individual impact on the act of translation. His illustration is designed to underscore the inevitability of the variation in our perception of any translated material.

Hans Vermeer.

“All human beings, like other living creatures (organisms) are different from each other. They are individuals. Even brothers and sisters are different from each other. All grow up under different circumstances. One is older or stronger or taller or more intelligent, has different habits and interests etc. But do we not say that they are similar, in spite of their differences? They live in one family, have the same friends, go to the same school, read the same books etc. Yet, we will never say that they are identical. We distinguish two relative levels of observation: there is a ‘broad’ level of observation, where small differences do not matter, and there is a ‘close’ level of observation, where even tiny differences are noticed. (Cf. an hour and a second and a second and a nano-second.) We need both levels for understanding the world. No two persons can stand on the same spot at the same moment. Consider football players. Each one has his original place on the field and therefore his task and the positions may change, but the tasks remain different, otherwise the game cannot succeed.

Each individual has his or her own head with its neuro-physical apparatus and specially its brain as the all-commanding organ. No one can look directly into someone else’s brain. No one can even know what goes really on in one’s own brain on the micro-level, leave aside what happens in someone else’s brain, what he or she feels, thinks, intends to do in the next second and so on. The German social scholar Niklas Luhmann (1984/1995) speaks of humans (and other organisms) as closed systems. Taking everything together, taken all circumstances holistically, humans live all their lifelong in absolute individual loneliness. They cannot even understand each other directly. Their interactions function by “penetration” (Luhmann’s word), that is, the
receiving organism must adapt what ‘comes in’ from outside to its own conditions, like food which must be digested to be used. We cannot directly understand another person. We must adapt what we hear (or read) to our own conditions, circumstances etc. The mathematician and philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein (s. a. 2.115 § 1) explains thus: “When I say about the other that he has a toothache, I mean with “tooth-ache” something like an abstract of what I normally call “my tooth-ache”. (2010, via email)

2.2. The mode of thinking and speaking:

Whorf’s (1956) view on the influence of language on our mode of thinking is being made abundantly clear in his famous quotation and in which he analogically implies that the relation between one’s mind and language as an organizing mechanism of that mind correlates with the type of relation which is likely to exist between a computer set and its software. Language is the organizing mechanism of one’s mind without which one cannot perceive and conceive of things in a meaningful structure without language. It organizes and conditions our thinking and perception of things around us. The crucial point in all of this is that while the majority of us continue to talk about the impact of one’s linguistic system on one’s thinking and perception, not all of us seem to be fully aware of how to pin down or note such influence in our daily interaction.

“the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds-and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds” (p. 89-90). Cross-cultural studies have revealed that people have lived and brought up in diverse environments and they have inculcated diverse cultural values which have a great deal of impact on their perception of things (see, Wierzbicka, 1991; Gumperz 1982; Gudykunst & Kim, 1997; Thomas, 1983). This inclines people of diverse social and linguistic backgrounds to perceive and conceive things differently. This implies that the act of interpretation initially is in and of itself an act of sheer understanding and since people from diverse ethnic backgrounds employ different communication strategies, then the likelihood is that they are very destined to perceive things to some degree distinctly and
differently and that is due obviously to the impact of one’s language and mode of thinking on the interpretation of a spoken or written message.

Such impact has been reiterated by translation theorists and intercultural communication scholars. For instance Barna (1994); Gumperz (1982) and other intercultural communication scholars have claimed that the use of specific language as the medium of communication does not necessarily safeguard the outcome of any intercultural encounter or interfaith dialogue. Several studies on language use and perception have concluded that the perception of native and non-native language of English is greatly distinct and this applies to the speakers of all natural languages (see, Elsamaty, 2005; Bergman & Kasper, 1993; House, 1996; Trosborg, 1987).

There is also a potentially great possibility that participants in inter-cultural communication encounter resort to native-like strategies to interpret their communicated messages (see Thomas, 1983; Wierzbicka, 1991). Too often participants are unconscious about their employment of these native-like strategies and the likelihood outcome is that the process of intercultural communication becomes so unpredictable and exposed to the ever-changing moods of the participants engaged in the verbal exchange. This is a scenario heading for a real intercultural communication breakdown. Unless the participants are discreetly aware of these impediments, then the avenue they resort to seems to be replete with some sort of misunderstanding or distortion of the real message.

To mitigate the consequences of one’s style of speaking or mode of thinking on the overall outcome of any translated material or any intercultural communication encounter is very likely to result in misunderstanding and therefore it may jeopardize the sought-after goals of this process. Gudykunst and Kim (1997) are two highly prominent cultural linguists who have studied the impact of one’s style of communication or thinking on either process and have cautioned against minimizing its overall impact. They both make a distinction between several styles of speaking such as “the understated” and “the elaborated style”, which seem to apply cross-culturally.
The “understated style”, is a mode of speaking that uses rhetorical devices such as understatements in conversation and it is primarily used by Japanese, Chinese, and Korean. The second one is the “elaborated style”, a mode of speaking used by French, Arabs, and Latin Americans. This style of speaking involves the use of expressive language and is replete with other rhetorical devices such as exaggeration and animation.

Gudykunst and kim (1997) report that the speaking style of Arabs contrast sharply with that of Anglophone speakers since Arabs have a proclivity to use a set of rhetorical devices such as over-statements, exaggeration, repetition which make their verbal mode of speaking imprecise and ambiguous. Both scholars claim also that the Arabs employ the elaborate style to sound more trustworthy and credible. This has contributed to their being misconstrued by others especially Anglophone speakers who consider them as devious and evasive speakers. As a consequence, Americans are inclined to perceive Arabic-speaking style as indirect, dishonest and think of them as incompetent communicators.

A case in point is what happened on the opposite Direction Program show on Al-Jazeera T.V, station. This TV show is considered an excellent forum particularly when the host of this show invites guests from foreign cultures, one can easily note that there is a great deal of misconstruing; and the debate becomes terribly heated to the extent that some participants would refuse to carry on the dialogue or would ask the host to be excused as a result of feeling offended so they would attempt to walk out without permission because they would feel that their self-image was being tarnished.

This interview was aired on T.V., on 19th of Feb, 2007, and in which Faisal Al-Qasim hosted two guests: Indic Larson, the former American ambassador in Jerusalem and the Egyptian scholar, Bayumi. The show has shown the type of debacle which has resulted from the speaking style and mode of thinking of both the host Al-Qassim’s numerous interjections and Bayumi’s verbal attack on the US ambassador in contrast with their American counterpart. Their style of debate and line of reasoning have undermined the
listening/viewing public from having a constructive, unbiased, and impartial interfaith dialogue.

Both participants felt offended by each other and did not have a chance to express their point of view in a clear-cut and unimpeded way. While one can note that both of them have had two distinct views on the purpose of interfaith dialogue; however, their style of speaking and mode of thinking have certainly marred and spoiled the overall outcome of this T.V. encounter.

It is obvious to the viewing/listening public that this T.V. interview stands as a real testimony of the type of impediments which we are likely to see happening in any convention of inter-cultural dialogue. There is no denying that had the participants been aware of such striking differences in their style of speaking or mode of thinking, they would have been more sensitive to these differences and would have been more prepared to accommodate and be considerate of one another as professionally as expected.

Mindful of the fact that this interview has violated some of the regulations which govern the type of institutional talk that Heritage and Greatbatch discuss (1991), it is, indeed, an excellent case since it epitomizes a genuinely real life situation in which the cultural patterns of two distinct cultures have literally drawn into a collision route and have manifested themselves in the speaking/thinking style and the use of para-linguistic devices that each one was resorting to in order to interpret each other communicated message. They both have misconstrued each other’s primary point due to that fact that one participant refused to turn down the floor to the other participant and in so doing he has deprived the other participant of his institutional rights.

Heritage and Greatbatch (1991) claim that there is a set of regulations which participants are obligated to abide by them; however, the viewing audience has noted that the participants have to great extent violated some of these regulations primarily the host Al-Qassim and his guest, Bayumi in their constant interruption and interjections and by virtue of that they have deprived the other party the right to stage his argument. It is indeed insightful and revealing on the ground that it does account for some of the most
interesting testimonies of cultural differences and the impact of these differences on the overall outcome of the act of interpretation /intercultural dialogue. Several studies on language use and perception have concluded that the perception of native and non-native language of English is greatly distinct and this applies to the speakers of all natural languages (see, Thomas, 1983; El-samaty, 2005; Bergman & Kasper, 1993; House, 1996; Trosborg, 1987).

The whole process requires the engaged participants to be distinctly keen on the undermining constraints and be highly sensitive to these deep and thorny pitfalls because once one falls into them, misunderstanding is inevitable and this is destined to spoil the whole outcome of any inter-cultural dialogue and have some impact on the translation of any task.

2.3. Ethnocentricity:

Like any intercultural communication encounter, the process of translation is replete with instances of ethnocentrism and transgression of other cultural or ethnic-related matters. Some of these instances of violation and transgression are being committed wittingly or unwittingly since the translator/communicator is not always aware of committing such violation (see, Venuti, 1995; Bennett, 1998; Barna 1994).

Studies have shown that participants in international conventions have a tendency to pass judgment affected by the background knowledge that they have about the foreign culture they are dealing with (See, Bennett, 1998; Barna, 1994). There is no denying that the process of inter-cultural communication resembles that of translation. What this implies is that the act of translation which the translator engages in is identical to the same act which the communicator engages in in any intercultural communication. They are bound to face the same daunting challenges which the translator faces upon deciphering a particular text. Accordingly, some of the obstacles which stand in the way of having smooth and successful inter-cultural communication are visible and transparent to the participants; however, other obstacles can potentially be covert and implicit; and
therefore it seems as if one needs to have a great deal of competence to vigorously and effectively deal with some of these obstacles.

According to Venuti (1995) translators are vulnerable to falling prey into the trap of ethnocentricity whether this happens intentionally or unintentionally. Venuti claims that the act of translation is both context and culture bound. To clarify his points further, Venuti (1995) provides a keen distinction between two types of translation strategies adopted by translators in general: the first one which he calls “Domestication” strategy used when the translator attempts to cater to his target audience, she/he is inclined to make certain changes in the foreign text so that it measures up to the values, and conventions of the target-language culture. This implies that the foreign text has to undergo some sort of transformation to be consistent and amenable to the values and beliefs of the concerned culture. It has been noted that this strategy is replete with instances of “ethnocentrism”.

The second strategy which Venuti (1995) talks about is called “Foreignization”. This strategy is being adopted by some translators who are inclined to translate the work as it is for the sake of preserving the foreign text without making any changes and by virtue of that, they might break some taboos of the other culture and being accused of some sort of ethnocentrism.

The deadlock and impasses encountered by the participants in most inter-cultural/faith dialogues have often resulted from the uncompromising stance which participant members hold on the basis of one’s ethnic background. Most often we hear that the exchange of accusations and allegations have marred and spoiled the outcome of any interfaith/intercultural dialogue. The reason was and has frequently been attributed to ethnic-related issues or such issues have been the primary cause or have a key role in the impasses of such dialogues. A case in point is the unprecedented controversy which Huntington's book, *the Clash of civilization*, has engendered in the Muslim world. A book which epitomizes the concept of ethnocentrism due to the fact that it has
underscored and widened the cultural gaps among peoples/ nations instead of bridging such gaps.

It has been reported that participant members find it extremely difficult not to hold firmly on matters pertain to their ethnic background and by virtue of that, they are compelled to be uncompromising in their views. Another important instance is that the majority of held interfaith dialogue conferences have frequently turned into political conventions with an intense exchange of accusations and allegations due to ethnocentric views, uncompromising political agendas, and attitudes. Therefore, it would be detrimental and counterproductive to mitigate the impact of one’s ethnic background on the overall outcome of any task be that translation or an intercultural encounter. According to Venuti (1995) translators are vulnerable to falling prey into the trap of ethnocentricity whether this happens intentionally or unintentionally.

2.4. World view and Ideology:

There are several scholars who have written extensively on the influence of one’s ideological convictions and world view on one’s translation or interpretation of any verbal exchange (see, Eagleton, 1996; Eco, 1992; Hatim and Mason, 1990; Venuti, 1995; Bakir, 2004; Le Fevre, 1992; Gumperz, 1982; Bennett, 1998; Barna, 1994) This is a situation where the translator and the communicator find themselves whether consciously or unconsciously being influenced by the ideological convictions they subscribe to in translating or in interpreting the intended meaning of a communicated message.

According to those scholars instances like these occur so often with little consciousness on the part of the translator/communicator involved in these situations. Whether to satisfy their own ideological convictions or to tailor their translated works to the type of audience they have in mind remains the heart of the problem which confronts both the translator and the communicator. Therefore, it would be counterproductive to argue that the outcome of the process of translation or that of any intercultural communication encounter is free from the influence of ideological convictions. For instance Eagleton (1996) is a prominent translation theorist who cautions against the consequences resulting
from the interference of the translator’s ideological biases and prejudices in carrying out his/her task. On this account, Eagleton (1996) has made the following comments on the impact and consequences of one’s ideology and conviction on both processes:

“ideologies like to draw rigid boundaries between what is acceptable and what is not, between self and non-self, truth and falsity….central and marginal, surface and depth” (p.115).

This shows that the act of translating any text is subject to the ideological conviction and the biases of the translator/communicator regardless of one’s ability to be able to discover the pitfalls and impasses with which the translated text implanted. This seems to lend some truth to the proposition that the translated work is replete with suppression and addition which are harmonious and consistent with what the translator believes and regardless whether the intention of the text is being translated and deciphered honestly and faithfully (see, Bakir, 2004; Lefevere, 1992; Eco, 1992). It also appears that this process is subject to the biases and ideological convictions of the translator which he/she holds and cherishes and not those of the author of the text. This certainly underscores the validity of the assumption that the task of the translator as well as that of the communicator is not only identical but also as fragile and as slippery as one can conceive of. Therefore, translators and communicators are called upon to acquire the type of cultural and linguistic literacy which helps them minimize the consequentiality of these challenges on the overall intercultural communication encounter at the same time they are obligated to remain open-minded and to adopt a neutral stance when dealing with their task.

Bakir (2004) claims that the translation process is replete with all types of censorship whether it is “external” or “internal”. Bakir (2004) provides an excellent example to point out the type of censorship which translators are compelled to make. Bakir claims that Stephen Pinker’s book, “the Language Instinct”, translated into Arabic in 2000, is a good exemplar of such instances where the author leaves, changes, and suppresses textual materials to cater to his/her target audience.
Lefevere, (1992) another prominent translation theorist, stresses the impact of ideology on translation. He claims that ideological beliefs determine what can be translated. Therefore, he believes that a dominant culture can exercise some sort of censorship on what gets translated. Thus confirming what other scholars have reiterated concerning the impact of one’s ideological convictions on the overall outcome of the translation process or the interpretation of any intercultural encounter.

And finally, support for such a perspective is being drawn from the views of another prominent scholar in semiotics and translation whose views on the same subject seem to lend a great deal of support to the proposed assumption about the constraints which confront both the translator and the communicator alike. Eco’s (1992) views seem also to confirm the validity of the proposition which purports that some interpreters think they are translating a specific text when in fact they are using it and designing it to suit their specific purpose.

Eco’s (1992) remarks in the following quote are likely to shed light on the question of translation and the task of the translator:

“In some of my recent writings I have suggested that between the intention of the author (very difficult to find out and frequently irrelevant for the interpretation of a text) and the intention of the interpreter who (to quote Richard Rorty) simply ‘beats the text into a shape which will serve for his purpose’, there is a third possibility. There is an intention of the text”. (p. 25)

Other prominent scholars who claim expertise on the same subject are Hatim and Mason (1990) who claim that the translator is usually constrained by his/her ideology- this amount to saying that the translator’s cultural and ideological background would have an influence on his interpretation of a specific text. Therefore, one can conclude that the challenges which the competent translator is destined to face are very much similar to those faced by participants in any intercultural communication setting.

Some of these challenges are insurmountable on the ground that sometime these ideological transgression and biases are being committed consciously and unconsciously.
Therefore, translators and communicators are called upon to acquire the type of cultural and linguistic literacy which helps them minimize the consequentiality of these challenges on the overall intercultural encounter.

3. Paradigm Change: Translation as an Intercultural communication Encounter

In the following section, the researcher attempts to provide his own rationale for the merits of adopting the proposition of why it is more adequate and practical to consider or treat translation as a hyponym of intercultural communication encounter (see, Nazzal, 2011). The researcher’s rationale for such a claim comes from various but highly salient reasons one of which is the existing heated debate which has been taking place among translation theorists over the optimal approach of equivalence in translation (see, Nida and Taber, 1982; Jakobson, 1959; Catford, 1965; House, 1977; Baker, 1992).

This heated debate has underlined the fact that there is no real equivalence in translation and that the act of translation is clearly an act of communication (see, Schaffner, 2003; Vermeer, 2000; Farghal, 2009; Nazzal, 2011). Therefore, the optimal approach, in the researcher's opinion, is an approach which takes into account not only the semantic and pragmatic implications which seem to account for most of the problems encountered in either process but also to account for the importance of catering to the target audience along with the potentially instrumental role of the translator's intervention in the act of translation.

The debate over the interpretation of a linguistic code is an interminable question when all of us know well that there isn’t a precise pair of synonym in any natural language including English which can provide an exact and precise meaning of its synonym. To illustrate this point further if one takes the adjective ‘deep’, and its synonym ‘profound’, one is destined to realize that while they are synonymous, there are not always interchangeable. One can say for example that X’s thinking is ‘deep’ or ‘profound’ but one cannot say that the pool is ‘profound’ instead of ‘deep’. Such an instance is pervasive in any natural language and it requires a fresh and panoramic view of what matters mostly in the act of translation.
A calculating look at the state of affairs that has been taking place in translation equivalence is likely to induce one to see that there is some sort of a genuine shift of focus from ‘translation equivalence’, (see, Nida 1964; Catford 1965; Newmark 1988; House 1981) to ‘skopos’ theory (Schaffner 2003; Vermeer 2000). This shift, in the researcher’s opinion, parallels the one from ‘E-language to I-language’ which Chomsky (1986) talks about in Knowledge of Language (p.24). This shift represents or can be construed as the culmination of the heated debated which has been taking place concerning the approaches on translation equivalence; and thus it has given way to the evolution of other theories which might be considered more adequate for such a task. Such a state of affairs has resulted in the evolution of what is called ‘skopos’ theory (See, Schaffner, 1998, 2003; Vermeer 2000).

This shift of translation approach from equivalence to a functionalist approach or skopos theory in and of itself can potentially be considered a ‘paradigm change’ since it calls for the treatment of the act of translation as a communicative act with an intended purpose which has to be conveyed as intelligibly as possible to a specific audience.

Such an approach ought to take into account that the act of translation is pure communicative and that the importance of function over form has taken precedence over the approaches of ‘linguistic or semantic’ equivalence on account of their being not adequate enough to account for the type of associative meaning that some expression might manifest in their textual content.

‘Paradigm change’ is a concept originally coined and founded by the prominent linguist, Kuhn (1996); and that such paradigm change is justified and warranted on ideological, conceptual, and other pertinent constraints embedded in the process of translation. In his book, The Structure of Scientific Revolution, Kuhn talks about ‘paradigm change’ and the circumstances which are responsible for the occurrence of such a change. Kuhn (1996) remarks that, “a Paradigm theory is meant to define the problem and provide a stable solution to it” (p.28).
A great deal of support for the merits of treating translation as a communicative act comes also from Vermeer’s (2000) Skopos’s theory, Schaffner (1996) and Farghal (2009). The proponents of ‘skopos’ theory do not subscribe to the notion that the act of translation is an act of trans-coding a linguistic term from one language to another. The same ideas concerning the act of translation have been underscored by Farghal (2009) who considers translation a communicative act involving the relaying of meaning as it relates to the context in which it is being produced. Therefore, translation shall bear no fruitful results unless it relates to the social context of the target audience.

The arrival of the functionalist approach came as a result of the fact that the primary purpose of the Target Text (TT) is what really matters about translation and this has induced translation scholars to adopt a functionalist approach to translation and pay less attention to what is known as ‘linguistic equivalence approach’. To those translation scholars who adopt the functionalist approach over the linguistic equivalence strongly believe that translation is a communicative act and what is at stake in this transaction is the conveying of the intended message as intelligibly as possible rather than finding consistency in two linguistics codes (see, Schaffner, 1996, 2003).

A great deal of support for the adoption of this proposition comes from Carbonell’s comments regarding meaning. Carbonell (1996) claims that meaning is both culture and context-bound. Carbonell(1996) claims further that, “since the nature of the context of signification in both the source and target culture is heterogeneous, meaning changes unavoidably in the process of translation and there will be always possibility of contradiction between the author’s intentions and the translator’s” (p. 98). This implies that it would be safer for the translator to deal with the act of translation as an act of communication since the process is not only fragile but also unpredictable.

Time and again the findings of translation studies underlie the fact that relying on old approaches might not prove as optimal as one is inclined to believe. For example, relying on the linguistic or semantic equivalence approaches has become unsound due to the type of problems translators encounter in accomplishing their tasks. Such
equivalence approaches might be adequate at some linguistic level; however, they prove to be inadequate to account for nonlinguistic meanings as presented in the introductory part of this manuscript. Therefore, they are not any more acceptable nor are they practical at a time when the role of the author has become less relevant as that of the translator/communicator.

4. Conclusion:

This research paper has underscored the family of resemblances in the tasks of both the translator and the communicator along with the type of constraints encountered in both tasks and consequently treating translation as an intercultural communication encounter would probably sharpen the mechanisms being used in translation by drawing on intercultural communication concepts since the primary concern of intercultural communication is the capturing of both the semantic and pragmatic aspects of any intercultural encounter and this seems to be consistent with what several translation theorists are calling for when they talk about the question of equivalence (See, House, 1977; Baker, 1992; Nida & Taber, 1982).

Therefore, it makes great sense to seriously consider the proposition that if we deal with translation as an intercultural communication encounter, the task ahead of us would probably be more manageable on the ground that intercultural communication involves and calls for the discovery of the intended meaning and purpose of any communicated or written message. This is very likely to save us a lot of effort and spare us the process of addition and suppression and all forms of censorship which is associated with translation.

This research paper has also underscored the impact of ideological or cultural constraints on both processes. A case in point is the type of mistakes that translation students commit in translation. In addition, the type of instances of communication breakdown which occur in cross-cultural communication or interfaith dialogues among people of diverse ethnic backgrounds stand as a genuine testimony of the impact of cultural or ideological constraints which seem to undermine the ability of participants from reaching a real understanding. Therefore, acquiring literacy in the target culture
and knowing one’s target audience members are exceedingly essential to account for some of the problems encountered in the interpretation/translation of spoken or written messages.

Support for the proposition which the researcher has tried to back up in this paper comes mostly from several sources primarily the findings of translation studies which indicate that relying on traditional linguistic equivalence would not help translators overcome the obstacles undermining their way for the accomplishment of their task satisfactorily. The validity of the adopted proposition is being confirmed time and again by the arguments adopted by many translation theorists who call for the adoption of a semantic and pragmatic approach, which is the same approach being used in intercultural communication encounter (see, House, 1977; Baker, 1992; Nida & Taber, 1982).
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Abstract:
The role of the translator is not really distinct from that of the communicator in any typical intercultural communication encounter/verbal exchange. In both instances the translator as well as the communicator is called upon to deliver what is being intended in the written or spoken linguistic code. Having said that, then the task which both of them is bound to focus on is identical or similar since it presupposes that each person possesses a high level of competence in two linguistic and cultural systems in order to accomplish the very task they are called upon to accomplish. Therefore, the primary goal of this paper is two-fold: to underscore the family resemblance or interconnection between the process of translation and that of intercultural communication encounter; and to underscore the merits of treating translation as an intercultural or inter-lingual act of communication since the constraints which face the translator are quite similar to those which the communicator encounters.
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1- Introduction: some theoretical grounding

If one takes a thorough look at what the process of translation involves, one is inclined to seriously consider translation to be a hyponym of intercultural communication or vice versa. The major elements or components which constitute intercultural communication are precisely those which literary constitute translation. Samovar and Porter (2003) claim that Intercultural Communication as a social science discipline is concerned about the blending of culture and communication and their overall impact on social interaction and understanding. They also claim that to understand the relationship between these two entities, that is say culture and communication, participants in intercultural communication need to be fully acquainted with a set of ‘cultural syndromes’ which Samovar and Porter (2003) defines as, “a shared pattern of beliefs, attitudes, self-definitions, norms, and values organized around a theme” (p.4).

What this really means is that the entities –that is language and culture -which have the greatest impact on the process of translation are the same entities which exert a great deal of influence and are responsible for the success or failure of the outcome of any intercultural communication encounter. What really this involves is that participants approach the encounter of intercultural communication with some ‘cultural syndrome’ very much identical to the situation in which the translator finds himself or herself in carrying out his task. In both instances / encounters participants are destined to act based on their own cultural background or be influenced by their cultural and linguistic background. In either process there is no guarantee whatsoever that either party would not be subject to ideological biases and influences he/ she is holding whether consciously or unconsciously when confronted with any situation (Tymockzo, 2003; Schaffner, 2003; Gumperz, 1982; Thomas, 1983).

In his discussion of this social inquiry, Bennett (1998) remarks that, “the study of intercultural communication has tried to answer the question, “How do people understand one another when they do not share a common cultural experience” (p. 1)? Bennett’s
comments seem to be consistent with both Schaffner’s (2003) and Tymoczko’s (2003) ideas regarding translation. Both of them claim that the process of translation is ideology-driven and that the production of a target text is usually influenced by the translator’s ideological background, intended purpose, and the stance which the translator assumes or holds for the target audience. They further claim that ideological influences can manifest themselves in various textual forms in the target text itself for the sole purpose of either maximizing the influence of a particular action or mitigating its impact. Such instances are pervasive whether in the act of translation or in any intercultural communication encounter.

Another translation scholar whose views on what the act of translation involves is Hans Vermeer, whom the researcher has had the privilege of becoming acquainted with before he passed away during a conference on the Role of the Translator in Interfaith Dialogue which was held at An-Najah National University in 2010. Vermeer (2010) made the following comments via e-mail to the researcher at that time and the researcher thinks that Vermeer (2010) deserves quoting due to the relevance of his ideas to the proposed claim:

“That a translator finds himself in a situation partly known and partly unknown to him to carry out his task. He claims further that the translator feels hard pressed to translate a text whose author is partly known and partly unknown to the translator and this applies to the language and culture of the author of the concerned text. And finally, the translator finds himself while deciphering the text hard pressed to uncover the genuine intention of the target text. Therefore, the translator is clearly in a situation in which his primary concern is to produce an intelligible text consistent with the target culture and at the same time adhering to the principles of accountability and integrity as much as s/he can.” (via email)

Other scholars from relevant discipline (see, Thomas, 1983; Trosborg, 1987; Takahashi & Beebe, 1993; House, 1996; Bergman & Kasper, 1993; Rose, 2000) attribute the breakdown of intercultural communication to a pragmatic failure due to the tendency of
some participants to misconstrue the speaker's intended meaning. According to Thomas (1983), 'pragmatic failure' can be defined as in, "the inability to understand and recognize the force of the speaker's intention" (p. 91).

Another type of pragmatic failure which participants in intercultural communication can fall into according to Thomas (1983) is 'socio-pragmatic failure', an instance which refers to 'the social conditions placed on language use'. This failure results from cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behavior (p.99). Intercultural communication breakdown can potentially occur in other instances which involve the performance of speech acts. According to Trosborg (1987) and El Samaty (2005) pragmatic transfer is something inevitable to occur when participants perform speech acts, they are very likely to transfer L1 norms and styles in their performance of speech acts into L2. Pragmatic failure occurs also in instances in which translators as well as communicators pay a great deal of attention to the semantic import of any communicated message at the expense of the pragmatic one and by virtue of that participants are very likely to misconstrue one another. Pragmatic failure occurs also in an instance where the speaker’s interpretation or translation of a message from or into the target language is influenced by relying or using social norms and native-like strategies (see, Gumperz, 1982; Thomas, 1983; Rose, 2000).

Such ideas seem to coincide and be consistent with what Toury (2000) claims about translators and communicators. According to Toury, ‘cognition itself is influenced probably even modified by socio-cultural factors’ (p. 119). According to Toury, what applies to translators applies to communicators too. This means that the socio-cultural factors have great impact on communicators as well as translators to the extent that such knowledge induces them to think and interpret any particular message in a way very much consistent with one’s socio-cultural knowledge.

Another important point which one should never underestimate its overall significance is the type of mistakes and errors committed by students of translation since some of these mistakes and errors are very telling and diagnostic. Therefore, the findings of students’
mistakes in translation along with the primary reasons responsible for intercultural communication breakdown, lend great support to the belief that some of these constraints which seem to undermine the ability of both the translator and communicator can be attributed to the lack of pragmatic competence in the target culture—an issue which seems to confirm Thomas’s (1983) notion of cross-cultural pragmatic failure and the importance of acquiring ‘communicative competence’, in the target culture. These constraints or impediments seem also to confirm some of the ideas of Gumperz (1982) which state that one’s linguistic system is destined to induce one to perceive any communicated message in the prism of one’s linguistic structure/system; consequently, one is bound to misconstrue part of the intended meaning of any written or spoken message.

In today’s global world we can’t afford to pay a great deal of attention to the linguistic code as much as to the information being conveyed through it; and that is due to the fact that ‘formal translation’ proves problematic in instances particularly when dealing with rhetorical and idiomatic expressions since these types of expressions violate semantic rules; and that the meaning of such expression lies mostly in their associative rather than in their conceptual content. In addition to the fact that there are overwhelming differences among languages even among the most genetically related ones such as Germanic or Semitic languages which make the task of finding structural similarities among these languages a far reaching goal.

As an approach, ‘formal translation’ proves inadequate particularly in translating rhetorical and idiomatic expressions since the translation of such instances constitute a real challenge for students of translation on account that there is a clear disparity between their conceptual and associative meaning. For instance, the translation of the following sentences has constituted a real challenge to students of translation since the majority of them were able to account for the disparity between the conceptual and associative meaning:

1. Ali’s vehicle is a lemon.
2. Dr. Johnson is a butcher.
Based on the researcher’s solicitation of students’ responses and analysis of their written answers, the researcher believes that the primary cause for students’ difficulty in dealing with the first sentence stems from students' inability to realize that there are two distinct meanings to both sentences. In the first sentence, the majority of students attended to the semantic meaning as expected but were unable to understand the meaning for which the metaphor stands and by virtue of that students failed to capture the second and most important meaning due to their lack of pragmatic competence in the target language. This can also be attributed to the fact that there is less emphasis on improving and enhancing students' pragmatic competence at the college level due to the type of difficulties associated with this particular inquiry. Only a minority of students were able to construe the metaphor correctly and understand its function in both sentences. In the second sentence there was clear variation in their translation. Some of them gave one translation while others gave two different translations and thus were able to capture the complete meaning of the second utterance. Overall, the key point in all of the above sentences is that sentences such as the above continue to pose a real challenge to students of language and translation on account that such sentences require two types of competences on the part of the translator to fully capture the distinction between the conceptual and the associative meaning. Therefore, one can easily see that the challenges which confront intercultural communication participants are not terribly distinct from the same daunting challenges which the translator encounters upon deciphering the real intention of the author of a particular text; and as a result of that, it would not be hasty to include that there is a family of resemblance between these two processes in many various ways and having said that then it probably would be conducive if we treat translation as an encounter of intercultural communication where the translator has to focus on relaying the intended meaning of any translation task. And by virtue of that, the mechanisms which should be employed in both processes have to be consistent with the type of challenges which are involved in both processes /encounters.
In the following section, the researcher presents some of the family of resemblance between these two processes for the sake of buttressing the proposed claim and justifying it on the ground that the act of translation can potentially be considered a communicative act and it should be treated as such by both the communicator and the translator. This would probably sharpen the mechanisms being used in translation by drawing on intercultural communication concepts since the primary concern of intercultural communication is the capturing of both the semantic and pragmatic aspects of any intercultural encounter and this seems to be consistent with what several translation theorists are calling for when they talk about the question of equivalence (See, House, 1977; Baker, 1992; Nida & Taber, 1982).

2. Cases of resemblance

2.1. Slippery process:
A quick glance at what both processes is likely to convince one that they are slippery, fragile, and their outcome is quite unpredictable since neither the communicator nor the translator can be consciously aware of everything primarily in terms of capturing the intended meaning of the target text or the communicated messages in the intercultural communication encounter. In the translation process, the translator embarks on an unsettled project in terms of being unable to uncover the real intention of the author or that of the text itself after the completion of the translated text. If one just examines Venuti’s (1995) definition of what the translation process involves, one is destined to realize how unpredictable and slippery that process can be:

“A process by which the chain of signifiers in the target-language text that constitutes the source language is replaced by a chain of signifiers in the target-language text which the translator provides on the strength of an interpretation” (p. 17).
My read of Venuti’s (1995) quote is that he is appealing to semiotics as well as to linguistic symbols to decipher what they stand for in another language as an adequate mechanism to fully arrive at a satisfactory translation from one linguistic code to another. Furthermore, Venuti’s (1995) views on translation shows that the process of translation is an indefinite one and therefore he is clearly an advocate or a proponent of the post-structuralist perspective- a perspective which entertains the belief in which culture plays a significant role in the translation of a particular text and it has much more precedence over the linguistic element due to its great influence on the translation process.

In fact, Venuti (1995) spares no efforts in expressing his remarks on how slippery the process of translation can be as one can make sense of the following comments which he expresses:

*Meaning is a plural and contingent relation, not an unchanging unified essence, and therefore a translation cannot be judged according to mathematics-based concepts of semantic equivalence or one-to-one correspondence (p.18).*

In the above quote Venuti (1995) is clearly downplaying the validity and utility of our reliance on mechanisms such as ‘semantic or formal equivalence’, in translation and thus in so doing he is calling for a real transformation not only in our outlook and perspective but also in the tools and mechanisms translators frequently employ in performing their task. Thus, Venuti (1995) is departing from old and impractical approaches to more optimal and realistic ones in translation. To Venuti, (1995) neither linguistic nor semantic equivalence can provide an optimal approach to the process of translation on account that such approaches are not adequate enough to account for rhetorical and idiomatic or formulaic expressions and by virtue of that such approaches do not measure up to the expectations. That is to say, translators cannot appeal to semantics only in order to fully capture the intended meaning of rhetorical and idiomatic expressions. This applies to some extent to the intercultural communication encounter except that in such an encounter the communicator is being assisted by the context in which this encounter takes place in addition to the freedom with which he/she can decide on the interpretation.
of the communicated message being received from the interlocutor and assisted by all the paralinguistic devices available at his/her disposal.

In this excerpt Vermeer (2010 via-email) illustrates how the perception of each individual impact on the act of translation. His illustration is designed to underscore the inevitability of the variation in our perception of any translated material.

**Hans Vermeer.**

“All human beings, like other living creatures (organisms) are different from each other. They are individuals. Even brothers and sisters are different from each other. All grow up under different circumstances. One is older or stronger or taller or more intelligent, has different habits and interests etc. But do we not say that they are similar, in spite of their differences? They live in one family, have the same friends, go to the same school, read the same books etc. Yet, we will never say that they are identical.

We distinguish two relative levels of observation: there is a ‘broad’ level of observation, where small differences do not matter, and there is a ‘close’ level of observation, where even tiny differences are noticed. (Cf. an hour and a second and a second and a nanosecond.) We need both levels for understanding the world. No two persons can stand on the same spot at the same moment. Consider football players. Each one has his original place on the field and therefore his task and the positions may change, but the tasks remain different, otherwise the game cannot succeed.

Each individual has his or her own head with its neuro-physical apparatus and specially its brain as the all-commanding organ. No one can look directly into someone else’s brain. No one can even know what goes really on in one’s own brain on the micro-level, leave aside what happens in someone else’s brain, what he or she feels, thinks, intends to do in the next second and so on. The German social scholar Niklas Luhmann (1984/1995) speaks of humans (and other organisms) as closed systems. Taking everything together, taken all circumstances holistically, humans live all their lifelong in absolute individual loneliness. They cannot even understand each other directly. Their interactions function by “penetration” (Luhmann’s word), that is, the
receiving organism must adapt what ‘comes in’ from outside to its own conditions, like food which must be digested to be used. We cannot directly understand another person. We must adapt what we hear (or read) to our own conditions, circumstances etc. The mathematician and philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein (s. a. 2.115 § 1) explains thus: “When I say about the other that he has a toothache, I mean with “tooth-ache” something like an abstract of what I normally call “my tooth-ache”.(2010, via email)

2.2. The mode of thinking and speaking:

Whorf’s (1956) view on the influence of language on our mode of thinking is being made abundantly clear in his famous quotation and in which he analogically implies that the relation between one’s mind and language as an organizing mechanism of that mind correlates with the type of relation which is likely to exist between a computer set and its software. Language is the organizing mechanism of one’s mind without which one cannot perceive and conceive of things in a meaningful structure without language. It organizes and conditions our thinking and perception of things around us. The crucial point in all of this is that while the majority of us continue to talk about the impact of one’s linguistic system on one’s thinking and perception, not all of us seem to be fully aware of how to pin down or note such influence in our daily interaction.

“the world is presented in a kaleidoscopic flux of impressions which has to be organized by our minds-and this means largely by the linguistic systems in our minds” (p. 89-90). Cross-cultural studies have revealed that people have lived and brought up in diverse environments and they have inculcated diverse cultural values which have a great deal of impact on their perception of things (see, Wierzbicka, 1991; Gumperz 1982; Gudykunst & Kim, 1997; Thomas, 1983). This inclines people of diverse social and linguistic backgrounds to perceive and conceive things differently. This implies that the act of interpretation initially is in and of itself an act of sheer understanding and since people from diverse ethnic backgrounds employ different communication strategies, then the likelihood is that they are very destined to perceive things to some degree distinctly and
differently and that is due obviously to the impact of one’s language and mode of thinking on the interpretation of a spoken or written message.

Such impact has been reiterated by translation theorists and intercultural communication scholars. For instance Barna (1994); Gumperz (1982) and other intercultural communication scholars have claimed that the use of specific language as the medium of communication does not necessarily safeguard the outcome of any intercultural encounter or interfaith dialogue. Several studies on language use and perception have concluded that the perception of native and non-native language of English is greatly distinct and this applies to the speakers of all natural languages (see, Elsamaty, 2005; Bergman & Kasper, 1993; House, 1996; Trosborg, 1987).

There is also a potentially great possibility that participants in inter-cultural communication encounter resort to native-like strategies to interpret their communicated messages (see Thomas, 1983; Wierzbicka, 1991). Too often participants are unconscious about their employment of these native-like strategies and the likelihood outcome is that the process of intercultural communication becomes so unpredictable and exposed to the ever-changing moods of the participants engaged in the verbal exchange. This is a scenario heading for a real intercultural communication breakdown. Unless the participants are discreetly aware of these impediments, then the avenue they resort to seems to be replete with some sort of misunderstanding or distortion of the real message.

To mitigate the consequences of one’s style of speaking or mode of thinking on the overall outcome of any translated material or any intercultural communication encounter is very likely to result in misunderstanding and therefore it may jeopardize the sought-after goals of this process. Gudykunst and Kim (1997) are two highly prominent cultural linguists who have studied the impact of one’s style of communication or thinking on either process and have cautioned against minimizing its overall impact. They both make a distinction between several styles of speaking such as “the understated” and “the elaborated style”, which seem to apply cross-culturally.
The “understated style”, is a mode of speaking that uses rhetorical devices such as understatements in conversation and it is primarily used by Japanese, Chinese, and Korean. The second one is the “elaborated style”, a mode of speaking used by French, Arabs, and Latin Americans. This style of speaking involves the use of expressive language and is replete with other rhetorical devices such as exaggeration and animation.

Gudykunst and Kim (1997) report that the speaking style of Arabs contrast sharply with that of Anglophone speakers since Arabs have a proclivity to use a set of rhetorical devices such as over-statements, exaggeration, repetition which make their verbal mode of speaking imprecise and ambiguous. Both scholars claim also that the Arabs employ the elaborate style to sound more trustworthy and credible. This has contributed to their being misconstrued by others especially Anglophone speakers who consider them as devious and evasive speakers. As a consequence, Americans are inclined to perceive Arabic-speaking style as indirect, dishonest and think of them as incompetent communicators.

A case in point is what happened on the opposite Direction Program show on Al-Jazeera T.V. station. This TV show is considered an excellent forum particularly when the host of this show invites guests from foreign cultures, one can easily note that there is a great deal of misconstruing; and the debate becomes terribly heated to the extent that some participants would refuse to carry on the dialogue or would ask the host to be excused as a result of feeling offended so they would attempt to walk out without permission because they would feel that their self-image was being tarnished. This interview was aired on T.V., on 19th of Feb, 2007, and in which Faisal Al-Qasim hosted two guests: Indic Larson, the former American ambassador in Jerusalem and the Egyptian scholar, Bayumi. The show has shown the type of debacle which has resulted from the speaking style and mode of thinking of both the host Al-Qassim’s numerous interjections and Bayumi’s verbal attack on the US ambassador in contrast with their American counterpart. Their style of debate and line of reasoning have undermined the
listening/viewing public from having a constructive, unbiased, and impartial interfaith dialogue.

Both participants felt offended by each other and did not have a chance to express their point of view in a clear-cut and unimpeded way. While one can note that both of them have had two distinct views on the purpose of interfaith dialogue; however, their style of speaking and mode of thinking have certainly marred and spoiled the overall outcome of this T.V. encounter.

It is obvious to the viewing/listening public that this T.V. interview stands as a real testimony of the type of impediments which we are likely to see happening in any convention of inter-cultural dialogue. There is no denying that had the participants been aware of such striking differences in their style of speaking or mode of thinking, they would have been more sensitive to these differences and would have been more prepared to accommodate and be considerate of one another as professionally as expected.

Mindful of the fact that this interview has violated some of the regulations which govern the type of institutional talk that Heritage and Greatbatch discuss (1991), it is, indeed, an excellent case since it epitomizes a genuinely real life situation in which the cultural patterns of two distinct cultures have literary drawn into a collision route and have manifested themselves in the speaking/thinking style and the use of para-linguistic devices that each one was resorting to in order to interpret each other communicated message. They both have misconstrued each other’s primary point due to that fact that one participant refused to turn down the floor to the other participant and in so doing he has deprived the other participant of his institutional rights.

Heritage and Greatbatch (1991) claim that there is a set of regulations which participants are obligated to abide by them; however, the viewing audience has noted that the participants have to great extent violated some of these regulations primarily the host Al-Qassim and his guest, Bayumi in their constant interruption and interjections and by virtue of that they have deprived the other party the right to stage his argument. It is indeed insightful and revealing on the ground that it does account for some of the most
interesting testimonies of cultural differences and the impact of these differences on the overall outcome of the act of interpretation /intercultural dialogue.

Several studies on language use and perception have concluded that the perception of native and non-native language of English is greatly distinct and this applies to the speakers of all natural languages (see, Thomas, 1983; El-samaty, 2005; Bergman & Kasper, 1993; House, 1996; Trosborg, 1987).

The whole process requires the engaged participants to be distinctly keen on the undermining constraints and be highly sensitive to these deep and thorny pitfalls because once one falls into them, misunderstanding is inevitable and this is destined to spoil the whole outcome of any inter-cultural dialogue and have some impact on the translation of any task.

2.3. Ethnocentricty:

Like any intercultural communication encounter, the process of translation is replete with instances of ethnocentrism and transgression of other cultural or ethnic-related matters. Some of these instances of violation and transgression are being committed wittingly or unwittingly since the translator/communicator is not always aware of committing such violation (see, Venuti, 1995; Bennett, 1998; Barna 1994).

Studies have shown that participants in international conventions have a tendency to pass judgment affected by the background knowledge that they have about the foreign culture they are dealing with (See, Bennett, 1998; Barna, 1994). There is no denying that the process of inter-cultural communication resembles that of translation. What this implies is that the act of translation which the translator engages in is identical to the same act which the communicator engages in in any intercultural communication. They are bound to face the same daunting challenges which the translator faces upon deciphering a particular text. Accordingly, some of the obstacles which stand in the way of having smooth and successful inter-cultural communication are visible and transparent to the participants; however, other obstacles can potentially be covert and implicit; and
therefore it seems as if one needs to have a great deal of competence to vigorously and effectively deal with some of these obstacles.

According to Venuti (1995) translators are vulnerable to falling prey into the trap of ethnocentricity whether this happens intentionally or unintentionally. Venuti claims that the act of translation is both context and culture bound. To clarify his points further, Venuti (1995) provides a keen distinction between two types of translation strategies adopted by translators in general: the first one which he calls “Domestication” strategy used when the translator attempts to cater to his target audience, she/he is inclined make certain changes in the foreign text so that it measures up to the values, and conventions of the target –language culture. This implies that the foreign text has to undergo some sort of transformation to be consistent and amenable to the values and beliefs of the concerned culture. It has been noted that this strategy is replete with instances of “ethnocentricity”.

The second strategy which Venuti (1995) talks about is called “Foreignization”. This strategy is being adopted by some translators who are inclined to translate the work as it is for the sake of preserving the foreign text without making any changes and by virtue of that, they might break some taboos of the other culture and being accused of some sort of ethnocentrism.

The deadlock and impasses encountered by the participants in most inter-cultural/faith dialogues have often resulted from the uncompromising stance which participant members hold on the basis of one’s ethnic background. Most often we hear that the exchange of accusations and allegations have marred and spoiled the outcome of any interfaith/intercultural dialogue. The reason was and has frequently been attributed to ethnic-related issues or such issues have been the primary cause or have a key role in the impasses of such dialogues. A case in point is the unprecedented controversy which Huntington's book, the Clash of civilization, has engendered in the Muslim world. A book which epitomizes the concept of ethnocentrism due to the fact that it has
underscored and widened the cultural gaps among peoples/nations instead of bridging such gaps.

It has been reported that participant members find it extremely difficult not to hold firmly on matters pertain to their ethnic background and by virtue of that, they are compelled to be uncompromising in their views. Another important instance is that the majority of held interfaith dialogue conferences have frequently turned into political conventions with an intense exchange of accusations and allegations due to ethnocentric views, uncompromising political agendas, and attitudes. Therefore, it would be detrimental and counterproductive to mitigate the impact of one’s ethnic background on the overall outcome of any task be that translation or an intercultural encounter. According to Venuti (1995) translators are vulnerable to falling prey into the trap of ethnocentricity whether this happens intentionally or unintentionally.

2.4. World view and Ideology:

There are several scholars who have written extensively on the influence of one’s ideological convictions and world view on one’s translation or interpretation of any verbal exchange (see, Eagleton, 1996; Eco, 1992; Hatim and Mason, 1990; Venuti, 1995; Bakir, 2004; Le fevere, 1992; Gumperz, 1982; Bennett, 1998; Barna, 1994) This is a situation where the translator and the communicator find themselves whether consciously or unconsciously being influenced by the ideological convictions they subscribe to in translating or in interpreting the intended meaning of a communicated message. According to those scholars instances like these occur so often with little consciousness on the part of the translator/communicator involved in these situations. Whether to satisfy their own ideological convictions or to tailor their translated works to the type of audience they have in mind remains the heart of the problem which confronts both the translator and the communicator. Therefore, it would be counterproductive to argue that the outcome of the process of translation or that of any intercultural communication encounter is free from the influence of ideological convictions. For instance Eagleton (1996) is a prominent translation theorist who cautions against the consequences resulting
from the interference of the translator’s ideological biases and prejudices in carrying out his/her task. On this account, Eagleton (1996) has made the following comments on the impact and consequences of one’s ideology and conviction on both processes:

“ideologies like to draw rigid boundaries between what is acceptable and what is not, between self and non-self, truth and falsity….central and marginal, surface and depth” (p.115).

This shows that the act of translating any text is subject to the ideological conviction and the biases of the translator/communicator regardless of one’s ability to be able to discover the pitfalls and impasses with which the translated text implanted. This seems to lend some truth to the proposition that the translated work is replete with suppression and addition which are harmonious and consistent with what the translator believes and regardless whether the intention of the text is being translated and deciphered honestly and faithfully (see, Bakir, 2004; Lefevere, 1992; Eco, 1992). It also appears that this process is subject to the biases and ideological convictions of the translator which he/she holds and cherishes and not those of the author of the text. This certainly underscores the validity of the assumption that the task of the translator as well as that of the communicator is not only identical but also as fragile and as slippery as one can conceive of. Therefore, translators and communicators are called upon to acquire the type of cultural and linguistic literacy which helps them minimize the consequentiality of these challenges on the overall intercultural communication encounter at the same time they are obligated to remain open-minded and to adopt a neutral stance when dealing with their task.

Bakir (2004) claims that the translation process is replete with all types of censorship whether it is “external” or “internal”. Bakir (2004) provides an excellent example to point out the type of censorship which translators are compelled to make. Bakir claims that Stephen Pinker’s book, “the Language Instinct”, translated into Arabic in 2000, is a good exemplar of such instances where the author leaves, changes, and suppresses textual materials to cater to his/her target audience.
Lefevere, (1992) another prominent translation theorist, stresses the impact of ideology on translation. He claims that ideological beliefs determine what can be translated. Therefore, he believes that a dominant culture can exercise some sort of censorship on what gets translated. Thus confirming what other scholars have reiterated concerning the impact of one’s ideological convictions on the overall outcome of the translation process or the interpretation of any intercultural encounter.

And finally, support for such a perspective is being drawn from the views of another prominent scholar in semiotics and translation whose views on the same subject seem to lend a great deal of support to the proposed assumption about the constraints which confront both the translator and the communicator alike. Eco’s (1992) views seem also to confirm the validity of the proposition which purports that some interpreters think they are translating a specific text when in fact they are using it and designing it to suit their specific purpose.

Eco’s (1992) remarks in the following quote are likely to shed light on the question of translation and the task of the translator:

“In some of my recent writings I have suggested that between the intention of the author (very difficult to find out and frequently irrelevant for the interpretation of a text) and the intention of the interpreter who (to quote Richard Rorty) simply ‘beats the text into a shape which will serve for his purpose’, there is a third possibility. There is an intention of the text”. (p. 25)

Other prominent scholars who claim expertise on the same subject are Hatim and Mason (1990) who claim that the translator is usually constrained by his/her ideology- this amount to saying that the translator’s cultural and ideological background would have an influence on his interpretation of a specific text. Therefore, one can conclude that the challenges which the competent translator is destined to face are very much similar to those faced by participants in any intercultural communication setting.

Some of these challenges are insurmountable on the ground that sometime these ideological transgression and biases are being committed consciously and unconsciously.
Therefore, translators and communicators are called upon to acquire the type of cultural and linguistic literacy which helps them minimize the consequentiality of these challenges on the overall intercultural encounter.

3. Paradigm Change: Translation as an Intercultural communication Encounter

In the following section, the researcher attempts to provide his own rationale for the merits of adopting the proposition of why it is more adequate and practical to consider or treat translation as a hyponym of intercultural communication encounter (see, Nazzal, 2011). The researcher’s rationale for such a claim comes from various but highly salient reasons one of which is the existing heated debate which has been taking place among translation theorists over the optimal approach of equivalence in translation (see, Nida and Taber, 1982; Jakobson, 1959; Catford, 1965; House, 1977; Baker, 1992).

This heated debate has underlined the fact that there is no real equivalence in translation and that the act of translation is clearly an act of communication (see, Schaffner, 2003; Vermeer, 2000; Farghal, 2009; Nazzal, 2011). Therefore, the optimal approach, in the researcher's opinion, is an approach which takes into account not only the semantic and pragmatic implications which seem to account for most of the problems encountered in either process but also to account for the importance of catering to the target audience along with the potentially instrumental role of the translator's intervention in the act of translation.

The debate over the interpretation of a linguistic code is an interminable question when all of us know well that there isn’t a precise pair of synonym in any natural language including English which can provide an exact and precise meaning of its synonym. To illustrate this point further if one takes the adjective ‘deep’, and its synonym ‘profound’, one is destined to realize that while they are synonymous, there are not always interchangeable. One can say for example that X’s thinking is ‘deep’ or ‘profound’ but one cannot say that the pool is ‘profound’ instead of ‘deep’. Such an instance is pervasive in any natural language and it requires a fresh and panoramic view of what matters mostly in the act of translation.
A calculating look at the state of affairs that has been taking place in translation equivalence is likely to induce one to see that there is some sort of a genuine shift of focus from ‘translation equivalence’, (see, Nida 1964; Catford 1965; Newmark 1988; House 1981) to ‘skopos’ theory (Schaffner 2003; Vermeer 2000). This shift, in the researcher’s opinion, parallels the one from ‘E-language to I-language’ which Chomsky (1986) talks about in Knowledge of Language (p.24). This shift represents or can be construed as the culmination of the heated debated which has been taking place concerning the approaches on translation equivalence; and thus it has given way to the evolution of other theories which might be considered more adequate for such a task. Such a state of affairs has resulted in the evolution of what is called ‘skopos’ theory (See, Schaffner, 1998, 2003; Vermeer 2000).

This shift of translation approach from equivalence to a functionalist approach or skopos theory in and of itself can potentially be considered a ‘paradigm change’ since it calls for the treatment of the act of translation as a communicative act with an intended purpose which has to be conveyed as intelligibly as possible to a specific audience. Such an approach ought to take into account that the act of translation is pure communicative and that the importance of function over form has taken precedence over the approaches of ‘linguistic or semantic’ equivalence on account of their being not adequate enough to account for the type of associative meaning that some expression might manifest in their textual content.

‘Paradigm change’ is a concept originally coined and founded by the prominent linguist, Kuhn (1996); and that such paradigm change is justified and warranted on ideological, conceptual, and other pertinent constraints embedded in the process of translation. In his book, The Structure of Scientific Revolution, Kuhn talks about ‘paradigm change’ and the circumstances which are responsible for the occurrence of such a change. Kuhn (1996) remarks that, “a Paradigm theory is meant to define the problem and provide a stable solution to it” (p.28).
A great deal of support for the merits of treating translation as a communicative act comes also from Vermeer’s (2000) Skopos’s theory, Schaffner (1996) and Farghal (2009). The proponents of ‘skopos’ theory do not subscribe to the notion that the act of translation is an act of trans-coding a linguistic term from one language to another. The same ideas concerning the act of translation have been underscored by Farghal (2009) who considers translation a communicative act involving the relaying of meaning as it relates to the context in which it is being produced. Therefore, translation shall bear no fruitful results unless it relates to the social context of the target audience.

The arrival of the functionalist approach came as a result of the fact that the primary purpose of the Target Text (TT) is what really matters about translation and this has induced translation scholars to adopt a functionalist approach to translation and pay less attention to what is known as ‘linguistic equivalence approach’. To those translation scholars who adopt the functionalist approach over the linguistic equivalence strongly believe that translation is a communicative act and what is at stake in this transaction is the conveying of the intended message as intelligibly as possible rather than finding consistency in two linguistics codes (see, Schaffner, 1996, 2003).

A great deal of support for the adoption of this proposition comes from Carbonell’s comments regarding meaning. Carbonell (1996) claims that meaning is both culture and context-bound. Carbonell(1996) claims further that, “since the nature of the context of signification in both the source and target culture is heterogeneous, meaning changes unavoidably in the process of translation and there will be always possibility of contradiction between the author’s intentions and the translator’s” (p. 98). This implies that it would be safer for the translator to deal with the act of translation as an act of communication since the process is not only fragile but also unpredictable.

Time and again the findings of translation studies underlie the fact that relying on old approaches might not prove as optimal as one is inclined to believe. For example, relying on the linguistic or semantic equivalence approaches has become unsound due to the type of problems translators encounter in accomplishing their tasks. Such
equivalence approaches might be adequate at some linguistic level; however, they prove to be inadequate to account for nonlinguistic meanings as presented in the introductory part of this manuscript. Therefore, they are not any more acceptable nor are they practical at a time when the role of the author has become less relevant as that of the translator/communicator.

4. Conclusion:

This research paper has underscored the family of resemblances in the tasks of both the translator and the communicator along with the type of constraints encountered in both tasks and consequently treating translation as an intercultural communication encounter would probably sharpen the mechanisms being used in translation by drawing on intercultural communication concepts since the primary concern of intercultural communication is the capturing of both the semantic and pragmatic aspects of any intercultural encounter and this seems to be consistent with what several translation theorists are calling for when they talk about the question of equivalence (See, House, 1977; Baker, 1992; Nida & Taber, 1982).

Therefore, it makes great sense to seriously consider the proposition that if we deal with translation as an intercultural communication encounter, the task ahead of us would probably be more manageable on the ground that intercultural communication involves and calls for the discovery of the intended meaning and purpose of any communicated or written message. This is very likely to save us a lot of effort and spare us the process of addition and suppression and all forms of censorship which is associated with translation.

This research paper has also underscored the impact of ideological or cultural constraints on both processes. A case in point is the type of mistakes that translation students commit in translation. In addition, the type of instances of communication breakdown which occur in cross-cultural communication or interfaith dialogues among people of diverse ethnic backgrounds stand as a genuine testimony of the impact of cultural or ideological constraints which seem to undermine the ability of participants from reaching a real understanding. Therefore, acquiring literacy in the target culture
and knowing one’s target audience members are exceedingly essential to account for some of the problems encountered in the interpretation/translation of spoken or written messages.

Support for the proposition which the researcher has tried to back up in this paper comes mostly from several sources primarily the findings of translation studies which indicate that relying on traditional linguistic equivalence would not help translators overcome the obstacles undermining their way for the accomplishment of their task satisfactorily. The validity of the adopted proposition is being confirmed time and again by the arguments adopted by many translation theorists who call for the adoption of a semantic and pragmatic approach, which is the same approach being used in intercultural communication encounter (see, House, 1977; Baker, 1992; Nida & Taber, 1982).
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Abstract
This study explores the possibility of rendering culture-laden texts from English into Arabic, relying on a corpus of literary texts representing the local cultures of 16th and 18th century England. Therefore, this study taps into the applicability of using SL cultural texts to help students appropriately render culture-specific lexicon. The study made use of an experimental research method in order to identify the possibility of using literary texts to help learners of the Translation III course enhance their culture-specific translation skills and the traditional method of teaching translation in the College of Languages and Translation. Findings of the study suggest that the use of culture-laden literary texts is efficient in introducing the culturally loaded lexicon of the English language.
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Introduction

Translation theorists have noted an interwoven relationship between the language and culture, maintaining that translation is a process of intercultural exchange (Lotman & Uspensky, 1978; Kloepfer & Shaw, 1981; Newmark, 1988; Kramsch, 1998; Pena, 2007; Pennycook, 2007). Hermans (1999) believes that translation should be recognized as a cultural practice. Gerding-Salas (2000) suggests that the main aim of translation is to serve as a cross-cultural bilingual communication vehicle among people of different tongues and cultures. According to several authors (Toury, 1998; Alvarez & Vida, 1996; Vollmer & Irmscher, 1998; Snell-Hornby, 2006), translation is certainly a highly skilled activity, a first-class art based on a high level of competence not only in the two languages but in both cultures, as contemporary approaches to translation have emphasised.

Al-Qurashi (2004), in this respect, too, believes that translation is significant to all nations, given its essential role in transmitting knowledge and learning from one culture into another inducing to a rich process of cross-cultural awareness and inter-lingual acculturation; it indeed assumes the function of ‘cultural archives’ (Evan-Zohar, 2000). Therefore, Bahameed (2008) argues that the question of intercultural translation has received a plethora of attention in the current socio-linguistic theory as well as in translation studies. Badawi, in a similar vein, claimed that translation, as a means of communication, has the potential to foster intercultural communications and mutual understanding, advocating a cultural approach to translation rather than maintaining the present linguistic approach.

In this vein, too, researchers and practitioner translators believe in the necessity that translators assume a mediatory role as bilingual or multi-lingual cross-cultural transmitters of culture by attempting to interpret concepts and speech in a variety of texts as faithfully and accurately as possible. To do this, Pena, (2007) argues that cultural
equivalence should be considered in translating process. In a word, it could be concluded that both language and culture should be highly regarded in the act of translation. Otherwise, communication pitfalls and misinterpreted messages may ensue if culture-laden meanings are excluded or ignored, knowingly or unknowingly, by the translators. Hence, Nida, in a classical warning, said that "differences between cultures may cause more serious problems for the translator than do differences in language structure" (Nida 1964, p.130).

The cultural connotations of concepts under translation are thus of significant importance as well as lexical and structural items are. In this regard, Lotman's theory states that “no language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist which does not have at its centre, the structure of natural language” (Lotman & Uspensky, 1978, p.211-32). Federici (2007) therefore has posed a happy note that "the translator between two worlds faces not only the question of displacement and untranslatability, but once again that of intertextuality" (p. 147). According to her,

the translating subject has to read between the lines the many and varied intertextual practices, the recognition of the author’s intertextual references, the many traces from previous texts and former translations, the various signs of cultural and socio-political markers and possible linguistic adaptations. The text must be revealed as a complex web of intertextual references not always easy to reproduce in the target text/culture, but nonetheless a central element for the author’s image in the target culture and the reception of the translated text. The translator becomes a cultural mediator who, dialoguing between cultures, carries on a transcultural interaction (Federici, 2007, p. 147).
Furthermore, Savory (1968) asserts that translation can be possibly rendered accessibly and communicatively by adopting an equivalent of the thoughts and underpinnings that the different lexical and structural idioms assume. By the same token, Nida and Taber (1969) believe that the process of translation consists of reproducing in the translation language the "closest natural equivalent" of the source language message, firstly in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style – a process that requires a rewriting of discourse in the style of the translation language. Correspondingly, Brislin (1976) defines translation in this light as “the transfer of thoughts and ideas from one language (source) to another (target), whether the languages are in written or oral form” (p. 1).

The importance of the translation process as above identified is a process of rewriting the piece of discourse at issue in order to make it possible to convey the same message(s) of the SL author for communication purposes. This has led 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). 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 (1964), in this regard,

... 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 (p.129).

Contrasting with this idea, dynamic equivalence seeks 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 (Nida, 1964, p.129).

This, too, raises further challenges to culture translation, or transculturation. One of these challenges when translating interculturally, arises as to how to render cultural nuances of the source language text in the translated version, and avoid either making the translated
version neutral of any cultural nuances, or imposing the world view of the language into which the text is being translated (Agti, 2005). It is apposite here to regard meanings in one language that may not be easily expressible in some other languages, posing further challenges to transculturation. For instance, the word "أمانة" ['amaana] (possibly honesty, candidacy, integrity, sincerity, truthfulness, trustworthiness, etc.) in Arabic may not have an equivalent in other languages because the word bears further religious connotations. In Arabic, and Muslim traditions, it refers to the condition of keeping up to promise when entrusted with something or someone until given back to its owner. It may also, according to Muslim traditions and faith, refer to the Muslim belief in monotheism – a meaning which is purely cultural, because it did not exist in the Arabic language before Islam. Such ‘untranslatable elements’ are accepted through “a critical perspective of the ineluctability of a cultural difference envisioned not through a hierarchical juxtaposition but as an enriching interweaving” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 219).

Therefore, cultural implications are difficult to render from one language to another, inducing to a variety of problems and challenges for the translator. This is what leads to undertranslation where there will be some loss of information in rendered texts. Meanings that we assign to words are determined by the culture of which they are an integral part. And this difficulty exemplifies the challenge implicit in translation, that is, to convey difference and similarity of meaning through a complex process of translation considered as a “transformative practice” (Federici, 2007, p. 149).

If the translator is supposed to render the communicative intentions of the producer of the original text, this entails preserving the intact meanings of the source text totally unchanged when it is transmitted into target text. But this depends on the choices the translator makes when s/he embarks on a translational writing activity. In this regard, Goethe cited in Thriveni (2001) notes:

There are two principles in translation. The translator can bring to his fellow countrymen a true and clear picture of the foreign author and foreign circumstances, keep strictly to the original; but he can also treat
the foreign work as a writer treats his material, altering it after his own tastes and customs, so that it is brought closer his fellow countrymen, who can then accept it as if it were an original work.

Such foreignising translation strategies can be adopted only when the source and translation languages are similar or they share similar cultural backgrounds, for culturally shared elements and mutually inclusive socio-cultural features of the source text will become transparent to target readers as is the case in interlingual translation into Indo-European languages (e.g., English and German) or Semitic languages (Arabic and Urdu).

Although the target readers may lack background knowledge possibly possessed by source readers, maintaining the otherness of the source text is based on the expected readers' willingness to negotiate the meaning of obscure spots by drawing on their own experience. This view joins the idea that there are more similarities than differences among cultures in translation. So, this in turn strengthens the cultural ties among peoples belonging to different cultures and at the same time can make the task of translating culture less challenging.

By the same token, translating culture-laden texts requires a lot of training in order to avoid pitfalls of communication. No doubt, then, that Pena (2007) contended that translators should carefully attend to cultural equivalence.

Therefore, the aim of transferring “an understanding to people in their own language and create the same impact as the original text” (Galibert, 2004, p.1) assumptively requires that translation be considered as “the process of establishing equivalence between the source language texts and target language texts” (Sa'edi, 2004, p.242). In this regard, Sugimoto (2005:1) assertively writes:

Simply speaking, translation is the exchange of one set of clothes for another set of clothes that will cover the same meaning or thought. However, when we think of translation culture, first we must understand its background and give some thought to the age in which it was born (p.1).
In other words, the SL culture is converted to the TL culture and the text is rewritten. Accordingly, equal importance to both linguistic and cultural differences between the SL and the TL must be taken in consideration, and students of translation should be trained thereunto.

**Context of the Study**

As of late, there is a paucity of research attention paid to translating culture-laden features of the source language into the translation language. Culturally-laden content is virtually difficult to render in one language by the same or a similar phraseology in the translation language (Armellino, 2008). Culture-specific content includes metaphors, proverbs, idioms and collocations. because the meaning which lies behind this kind of idioms is usually associated with specific cultural context where the text originates in or with the cultural context the translation seeks to recreate.

However, idioms and expressions laden with specific cultural content are hard to come by. Therefore, cultural translation involves translating cultural meanings associated with idioms and collocations represent real translation problems especially among non-natives.

As such, information exchange, particularly cross-language and cross-culture information retrieval between the two languages, are pertinent and, therefore, are fundamental to the process of inter-linguistic translation in the two languages. However, translation instruction and training has been traditional for a longer period of time in Arab universities. In fact, translation has been favoured for teaching language and literature since long (Morgan, 1917; Goggio, 1925; Finney, 1941; Irvin, 1942; Myron, 1944; Virtue & Baklanoff, 1952; Hall, 1952; Gillis, 1960; Woolsey, 1974; Rees, 1974; Beichman, 1983; Venuti, 1996; Cook-Sather, 2003). Most of it is grounded in dictionary work, sentence and short text processing that is approached oftentimes by grammar and lexicon work, drilling, practicing and modelling (Hartmann, 1989). With beginner students of translation, a lot of work is done to introduce to them the art of translation and the rudiments of its practice as a methodical science.
Problem of the Study

The translation of culture-specific content from Arabic into English and vice versa is not well documented by empirical evidence in EFL translation teaching institutions in Saudi Arabia. The case being as such, translating culture-laden idioms and discourse raises potentially problematic difficulties for trainee translators at colleges of languages and translation, KSA. Therefore, the present study seeks to identify intermediate level students of Translation III as to translating culture-laden content in literary discourse from different samples of English literature of 16th and 18th century England - particularly idioms and collocations of literary discourse for identifying their translational writing strategies they employ when rendering this type of discourse. The research question the present study sought to answer is as follows: How effective is the training course in helping translation students render culture-laden literary discourse?

Methodology of Research

Participants

The participants were two groups of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners, altogether forming 51 learners assigned to an experimental group and a control group. The students in both groups were equated on such factors as language proficiency, based on information provided from the academic advisor on the GPAs. There ages ranged from 21 to 23 years old. The sample was limited to the fourth year English language majors who were supposed to be well acquainted with English language and translation courses, especially Translation III as well as having access to literary forms and texts available at this level of their study.

Instrumentation

Culture-specific Discourse Test

The researchers selected a set of 4 literary discourse pieces from literary texts modelling the material covered in class training, which were thought to be laden with cultural loadings. The idioms and collocations in the translation literary excerpts were not
actually taught during coursework prior to the experiment, but reproducing similar strategies of translating cultural content.

The main objective of the test was to assess the participants' ability to translate culture-bound expressions, idioms and collocations implied in the literary excerpts on the test.

For assessing the validity and reliability of the test, it was adjudicated by 5 teachers in the department who have had prior expertise with teaching translation. The jury approved its face and content validity. For estimating the reliability of the test, it was assessed for a test-retest reliability piloting by administering it twice in a period of two weeks to 25 students in the department, other than the participants. The test-retest procedure was used to calculate the reliability of the test using Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The reliability coefficient of the test was \( r = 0.86 \).

**Procedures**

**Control Treatment**

Students in the control group studied Translation III in a traditional fashion of Islamic and literary texts assignments for translation in class and at home, with the effort being mostly on the part of the learners. No training on inter-cultural nuances between Arabic and English were explained to the control participants.

**Experimental Treatment**

The experimental group learners studied a specially designed course involving culture-specific literary texts from 16th century Shakespearean drama and 18th century novels. Though similar texts were also used with the two groups, emphasis was laid on cultural translation strategies with the experimental group. The problem of tone has always seemed to be essential in choosing the right medium for translating such texts. By expansion, an idiom too classical and grand would lead to declamation and inanity; and an idiom too common and ‘low’ may falsify certain ‘effects’ in such texts, especially in Shakespearean dramatic texts. However, it was important to emphasise for the students in the experimental group that lexical accuracy should never be sacrificed for special effects, of course, but an individual interpretation may tip the balance in favour of an
apparent synonym that seems to fit the sense in better fashions. The faithfulness of the literary texts, we assured the trainees, should be felt in transmitting the beauty and pleasure of the original text with the use of target language words and structures that convey these values. For example, the students were given some lines from a Shakespearean sonnet (in Quiller-Couch, 1918, p. 145) that reads:

```
Shall I compare thee to a summer’s day?  
Thou art more lovely and more temperate:  
Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May  
And summer’s lease hath all too short a date:  
Sometimes too hot the eye of heaven shines  
And often is his gold complexion dimmed;  
And every fair from fair sometimes declines.
```

The instructor asked the participants to try assay preserving the essence of beauty implied in the British culture, in the above quoted lines, which is hardly attainable when the lines are rendered into Arabic. This is because the Arabic culture does not have these favourable qualities permeated in these poetic lines. It was also necessary to train the experimental students that the target text cannot be achieved through the exact equivalents of the source; rather, replacing expressions that gush forth emotive values can be a solution for pressing more emotive power on the new reader would solve the problem of losing these emotions and qualities in translation. The instructor more frequently cited Robinson (2001, p.166), quoting Dryden’s (1680) to help them take liberty with the text and adapt it to the new culture at issue:

```
... since every language is so full of its own properties, that what is beautiful in one, is often, barbarous, nay sometimes nonsense, in another, it would be unreasonable to limit a translator to the narrow compass of his author’s words: ‘tis enough if he chooses out some expression which does not vitiate the sense.
```
Back again to the instructional module for translating Shakespeare’s Sonnet 18, the instructor explained that in the Arabic culture, summer is related to unfavourable values and connotations, such as ruthless and cruel weather, long hot daytime, windy sands, droughts, among many other inauspicious elements. For that reason, an Arabic poet or an Arabic translator of English poetry cannot compare his beloved lady with summer, and should try to find other natural elements that can bear similar meanings. Therefore, text accommodation and adaptation had been adopted as a common translation procedure. This required that the trainee translator should have created new situations that can be considered as being equivalent, and this special kind of equivalence is what is known as the ‘situational equivalence’.

Towards the end of the semester, participants in the two groups took the same test during class time, two grades were assigned to each culture-laden piece of discourse: one mark for the correct translation of the word (comprehension of lexicon) and another for correct cultural rendering of the entire excerpt (cultural translation). Furthermore, the two researchers marked the tests for both groups. Disagreement about scoring occurred only in a few instances of ‘approximate’ cultural translations in the test. However, the inter-rater reliability was 0.91.

**Results**

Differences among participants in the experimental and control groups were scrutinized by running a t-test in SPSS (Vers. 14). Considering the t-values in Table 1, readers can detect significant differences between both experimental and control groups of the study in the comprehension of and further appropriate cultural rendering of the idioms and collocations compared against the performance of the control group participants, as indicated in the learners’ translation of these idioms and cultural expressions in the test items assessed by the overall scores, and the overall effectiveness as expressed by the summation of both comprehension and cultural translation scores. The t-value differences between all groups show that the experimental group that was trained on cultural corpus translation yielded the best results.
Table 1: *t*-test Results of the differences between both Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Lingua-cultural Comprehension</th>
<th>Cultural Translation</th>
<th>Lingua-cultural Comprehension &amp; Cultural Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex (25)</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl (26)</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>t</em>-value</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All *p*-values on the comprehension and cultural translation pretest/posttest assessments and the aggregate comprehension and cultural translation pretest/posttest assessment were significant at .00001, .00001, and .05, respectively. It appears from the table above that the *t*-values on comprehension and cultural translation as well as on the aggregate comprehension and cultural translation were all statistically significant to the good of the experimental group (*t*-values = 4.2, 4.3, and 4.89, where the calculated *t*-values are larger than the tabular *t*-values, indicating that the differences are favourable to the post-assessment). In addition, the results of the study also made clear the fact that training the students on transculturation of literary corpus from the target language culture into Arabic culture facilitates Saudi EFL learners' comprehension of cultural features of the literary eras which the texts belonged to; this is clear from the comprehension and cultural translation pretest/posttest assessment where the *t*-value was comparatively more than the individual assessments of lingua-cultural comprehension and cultural translation (*t* = 4.89).
The experimental group outperformed the control group that was indulged in bilingual dictionary work for their translation. In the light of this finding, it could be concluded that EFL translation students' performance in translating culture-bound English expressions and idioms excerpted from literary corpus has been improved after the training programme as reflected by their scores on the culture-based translation test. As mentioned before, it seems that training on culture-specific literary corpus translation to reach out for the correct meanings may have helped the experimental group, while they had enough vocabulary knowledge to understand the defining vocabulary available in their dictionaries.

Conclusions

This study strongly supports the view that culture influences comprehension and interpretation, and hence the significance of cross-culture awareness for apposite, sound translation. When reading a text, especially literary corpus, readers acquire meaning from the text by analyzing words and sentences against the backdrop of their own personal knowledge of the world which, in turn, is conditioned by their culture (See Galibert, 2004; Sa'edi, 2004, for further relevant discussions). However, in translating foreign corpus, an awareness of the culture of the target language needs to be conditioned, too. In other words, the target culture influences knowledge, beliefs, and values, and they, in turn, provide an interpretive framework which the reader will utilize during reading.

Findings from the present research, commensurate with prior research (Savory, 1968; Nida and Taber, 1969; Lotman & Uspensky, 1978; Pena, 2007), too, confirm this fact that the target culture understanding can be conducive to better comprehension, and consequently, to more apposite translations. Since the target culture literary texts used in the present study depicted aspects of the indigenous EFL culture, which they have been exposed to and familiarized with in other literature courses, they were more in line with the readers' knowledge, beliefs, and values and thus more comprehensible to the participants. This warrants the observation that the use of literature in translation teaching
can better induce more improved culture-specific interpretation of literary corpus (Woolsey, 1974; Rees, 1974; Beichman, 1983; Venuti, 1996; Cook-Sather, 2003).

The study also showed, at least in the theoretical body, that there is a close relationship between language and culture has become virtually axiomatic. Being the primary means of human communication, language is bound up with culture in multiple and complex ways. In this vein, Kramsch (1998) adeptly explained that language expresses cultural reality, embodies cultural reality, and symbolizes cultural reality.

Therefore, a short story, a novel or a play written in English language by an English writer expresses, embodies, and symbolizes the realities of the English culture. According to Bock (2006), there are considerable differences, amongst pieces of literary discourse from different cultures because each culture's literature contains characters, events, themes, and value systems that are common within that specific culture but not necessarily known or understood by other cultures (pp. 72-73). Indeed, transculturation is a process of changing the cultural elements of the target language discourse into learners’ own culture so that it can express, embody, and symbolize the cultural reality of the learner's life and experiences.

The findings of this study are consistent with the results found in Erten and Razi (2003) and Razi (2004) that transculturation of literature corpus from target language culture into learner's own culture enhances their comprehension of this corpus and enables better rendition skills.

Findings from the present study are also commensurate with the results of prior research on the relationship between cultural modification of texts and reading comprehension (e.g., Chihara et al., 1989; Sasaki, 2000), which demonstrated that adapting texts to conform to the learners' cultural expectations makes these texts more comprehensible to the readers of the rendered texts. The findings also lend further support to the larger body of research which has investigated the role of cultural background knowledge or cultural schemata in reading comprehension and culture translation (Abu-Rabia, 1996, 2003; Carrell, 1987; Droop & Verhoeven, 1998; Johnson,
Recommendations & Pedagogical Implications

In line with these studies, the current study suggests that translators be exposed to the different socio-linguistic and cultural features of target texts. To this end, they should be trained on how to deal with both the source language and the translation language cultures for which they have well-developed cultural background knowledge than texts that deal with a less familiar or unfamiliar culture and for which they lack the appropriate cultural schemata. More time and effort should also be allocated for the students both in class and in home-work assignments in order for them to be able to produce culturally appropriate versions of rendered texts. In a parallel mode, especially in Saudi colleges of languages and translation, there should be more courses on the culture and literature of target languages than is currently allotted. Such courses can provide a culturally rigorous background into the target language culture.
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Abstract:
This study investigates the semantic shift in call for help in vocative sentence in some qur`anic texts when translated into English. The present study aims at exploring a message change in call for help in vocative sentence in the glorious Qur`an when translated into English. It also aims at following the syntactical and grammatical shift that might be affected in bringing out the meaning of call for help in vocative sentence when translated into English. To achieve this aim, a componential analysis of both the ST and the TT is adopted to uncover the similarities and differences in the message content of both Arabic and English languages. To assess the message of both languages, Newmark’s approaches to translations are used in this study, including the use of his terminologies such as overtranslation, undertranslation, replacement translation, and inaccurate translation. The Quranic texts and their English version are analyzed according to Katz and Fodor’s (1963) theory to observe the differences in the message of both ST and TT. The results of the current study show how the meaning is preserved in some occasions and lost in other occasions.
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Introduction
Meaning is the heart of a language, without it a word or a sentence would be silly. The meaning of a given word is bounded to various criteria. It is bounded to external object, idea that a given word belongs to, using the same given word or phrase in a particular way, in particular context and to a particular effect (Baker and Lazim, 2005). Generally speaking, vocative is used to draw the attention of the hearer to the speaker. It also used to identify the addressee whether it is person, object or thing. This common meaning is deviated to a secondary meaning “call for help”. In which the speaker in a certain circumstance ask the aid and help from the addressee. The Meaning of call for help might be changed to other far meaning if the translator could not be able to infer that meaning. This leads in consequence to unsuccessful translation. The current study presents a theoretical and practical value to an English reader who likes to grasp the aesthetic aspect of Arabic language. It also presents a good directory to translators as it brings out a phenomenon not studied in much concern. Accordingly, the present study tries to investigate a message change that might be occurred in call for help in a Qur’anic vocative sentence when translated into English. In a first step, it is necessary to review the notion of vocative and call for help in Arabic since this study is concerned with Arabic language. Secondly, the present study endeavours to handle the translation of lexical items of some vocative sentences in Qur’anic texts of call for help meaning in terms of componential analysis of Katz and Fodor’s theory. In addition, approaches of Newmark to translation under various terminologies like undertranslation, overtranslation and replacement translation are used to evaluate a message in both languages.

The Concept of Vocative in Arabic

Arab grammarians have studied vocative under accusative nouns. According to them, vocative is used to draw the attention of the hearer to the speaker. By vocative the addressee is identified whether it is person or non- person. To fulfil the vocative, only eight particles such as ﯾّ / hamza, أَيّ / ay, ﯾَ / yā, ﯾِلُ / aya, ﯾَ / āy, ﯾِا / āy, َ / ā
and /wā/ are used. The first two particles “/ay” are used for calling the addressee near the speaker. While, the rest six particles /ay/, /a/, /ā/, /āy/, /ā/, /wā/ are used for calling the addressee away from the speaker. Occasionally, the general meaning of vocative is deviated to other new one. Arab grammarians have suggested specific structure for distinguishing that. They have stated that the structure of vocative by call for help should compose of 1) the vocative particle “/yā/” 2) the preposition “/lam/” indicated by “kesra/” 3) “almustaghath bihi” the name of person or thing called to help 4) the preposition “/lam” indicated by “fetha/” 5) “almustaghath min ajjlihi” the name of the person or thing against whom/which help is implore. For example, “/yā li Zaydn la Amrun / O Zayd for Amr! i.e. O help zayd against Amr!. In this example, Zayd is the person called to help, while Amr is the person against whom the help is required (Hasan, 2004). Arab linguists and rhetoricians have talked about vocative from the semantic point of view. They have listed vocative in the category of demanding non-declarative sentences. This category includes five types of sentences: interrogative, negative, wish, prohibited and vocative which are the pillar of the current study. They point out that vocative is deviated sometimes to various new meanings inferred from the linguistic and non-linguistic context. Deviation from the general rule is considered “rhetoric meaning” according to Arab linguists and rhetoricians (Atiq, 1992; Zawbaï, 1997; Fūd, 1998).

Methodology

To follow the purpose of the current study, five vocative sentences with call for help meaning are collected from the glorious Qur'an against one English version for Yusuf Ali (2006) are examined based on Newmark’s approaches (1981, 1988) and Katz and Fodor’s (1963) theory, which are summarized as follows.

Newmark’s approach (1981, 1988)
A loss of meaning is inescapable in the process of translation because of the differences between languages. This, in turn, puts the translator in the field of overtranslation and undertranslation. Overtranslation provides the reader additional detail and information than the original text. In contrast, undertranslation provides the reader lesser detail than the original text (Newmark, 1988). He points out that ambiguous translation “carries a deal of lexical and grammatical ambiguity which may be linguistic or referential; hopefully this ambiguity will be cleared up by the micro and macrocontext” (Newmark, 1988, p. 122). Moreover, he makes a distinction between semantic and communicative translation. In semantic translation, a translator endeavours to follow the author of the original text, whereas in communicative translation, the translator endeavours to reproduce the same effect as the source text on the target text. Other approaches of translations have been discussed by Newmark, such as word-for-word translation and literal translation. In word-for-word translation, a translator attempts to sustain the word order of the source text (Newmark, 1988). In literary translation, a translator attempts to convert the grammatical constrictions of the source text to the nearest equivalents in the target text.

*Katz and Fodor’s theory (1963)*

It deals with the semantics within the frame of generative grammar. Katz and Fodor (1963) have differentiated two types of components: “semantic markers” and “distinguishers”. The former stands for elements pertaining to a lexical item in a dictionary and reflect the systematic relations existing between the item itself and the rest of the vocabulary in the language. The latter stands for idiosyncratic features of the meaning of an item (p. 185). Decomposing words/phrases/ clauses of a language into their meaning components in terms of semantic features denoted by [+ ] (present) and [-] (absence) of a feature shall be used in this study wherever applicable as notational techniques of changes of messages between those of the ST in Arabic and their corresponding messages in the TT English translation.
Data analysis

The present study gives attention to call for help in vocative sentence in qur`anic text as one of the linguistic phenomenon. We partially shed light on its syntactic structure to be more valuable. The data of this investigation are based on five verses from qur'an and their English translation by Yusuf Ali (2006). The rhetorical message change by the English translation in each case is explored.

Table (1) Semi-replacement translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>(وَنَادَوْنَ أَباَّا مَا لَكَ لِيُقَضِّي عَلَيْنَا رَبُّكَ) الزَّحَرَفُ (٧٧)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>They will cry: <em>O Mãlik!</em> <em>would that thy Lord make an end to us!</em> (Ali, 2006, p.1279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>Yā Mãliku <em>li</em> yaqđi <em>alaynā rabbuka</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>O Mãlik let your Lord put an end to us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between the semantic features of ST and the semantic features of TT:

| ST: |
| Yā [+Voc part ] |
| Māliku [+proper noun,+human,+animate,+ intended indefini ] |
| li- yaqđi [ (li)+ imp part, +positive command,+call for help ] |
| yaqđi [ + V , +pre , jussive mood +action ] |

| TT |
| alaynā [ (Ala)+prep ] |
| Nā [ + pron, +1st person , +plu , +object ,± human ] |
| Rabbuka [ (Rabbu)+N , +head ,+animate ] |
In this verse, those settled down in hell asking help from Mālik. They are asking help against hell. In other words, they call Mālik to ask Allah to put an end for them as they cannot endure the torment of hell. As it is noted the vocative sentence carries the meaning of the call for help. The addressee Mālik is prefixed by the vocative particle “يَا/yā”. He is identified by the following semantic features ( +proper noun ,+voc ,+ the guardian of Hell,+ head ,+ the called angle from whom the help is wanted) . The construction “يَا مَّالِكَ/Yā Māliku” is NP rendered into NP. The particle “لـ/li” is indicated by the semantic features (+imperative particle ,+ positive command ,+call for help). It is prefixed the present verb in jussive mood “ليَقْضِ/li- yaqđī” in the ST .The translator has produced a semi-replacement translation and shifted the meaning of the ST “لـ/li” into other meaning . He has translated it into wish form “would that” . Bearing in mind that the jussive mood in Arabic is characterized by two functions: emphatic form and non – emphatic form. The former conveys the positive command and wish expression. The
latter communicates negation as it is always introduced by negative particles. Upon this fact, the internal meaning of the ST “لـ /li” has been distorted and the translator has reproduced other far meaning different from the original. Consequently, his translation is incorrect. Further, the ST “يَقْضِ / yaqđi” is present verb in the jussive mood translated into “make an end”. The translator has given the suitable equivalent of the ST “يَقْضِ / yaqđi” and produced a semi–replacement translation as he changed the V in the ST to phrasal verb.

The ST “عَلَيْنَا / alaynā” is a prepositional phrase is rendered into prepositional phrase “to us” The ST “رَبُّكَ /Rabbuka” is a noun phrase translated also into noun phrase “thy Lord”. It is observed that this verse contains two called nouns from whom the help is wanted .The main is “رَبُّ /Rabb” (+N, +Creator, +the real helper) and the second is Mālik (+ the guardian of hell …). Rationally, the help is wanted from the main as he is the Creator. But it is noted that the speakers do not ask the help from the main directly. Instead they direct their speech directly to Mālik since he is supervised their torment.

Table (2) overtranslation , semi replacement translation and undertranslation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>Trs</th>
<th>BT</th>
<th>Differences between the semantic features of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Therein will they cry a loud (for assistance ): &quot;Our Lord !Bring us out: we shall work righteousness , Not the ( deeds)we used To do !&quot; (Ali,2006 p.1112)</td>
<td>rabbană akhrijnā namalu salihan ghayra alladhī kunnā namalu</td>
<td>Our Lord bring us out we will do righteousness other than we were doing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( وهَمْ يُصَلِّخُونُ فِيهَا رَبَّنَا أَخْرِجْنَا نَّعْمَالْ صَالِحًا غَيْرَ الَّذِي كُنَّا نَّعْمَال) فَاعْلَمَ (37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ST : rabbanā [ (Rabba ) +N , +head ,+animate +accusative ]
ST and the semantic features of TT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nā [ + pron, +1st person, +plu, + poss, + human ]</td>
<td>Our [ +possessive (pron), +plural ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akhrijnā [ (Akhrij) +V, +imperative, + action ]</td>
<td>Lord [ +N, +sing, +head, animate ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nā [ + pron, +1st person, +plu, + object, ± human ]</td>
<td>Bring us out [+Phrasal verb, + action ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>namalu [ +V, +pre, +action, (jussive mood) ]</td>
<td>We [+person (pron), +, plural, + subjective ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salihan [ +N, +active, +masc, +sing, + accusative ]</td>
<td>Shall [ +V (modal), +future tense, +V +ought, + must ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghayra [ +N, accusative, +masc ]</td>
<td>Work [ +V, +present, + action, + do, + perform, + act, +N ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alladhī [ +rel pron, +sing, +masc ]</td>
<td>Righteousness [ +N, -V ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunnā [ (kana) +V, + past, + action ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The verse reveals the conduct of those people in the hell. They are asking help directly from the Lord. They are imploring to Allah to save them from the torment of hell. Their asking for help is manifested in the act of “يَصْتَرِخُونَ / yaštarikūna/ will cry” prefixed the vocative sentence and the act of “أَخْرِجْنَا / akhrijnā”. They are calling the addressee “رَبَّنَا / rabbanā” without vocative particle “يَا / yā”. The omission of the vocative particle reflects the extent of their severe, critic situation and how much they are needed to help. It also reveals they are in hurry for asking the help as they are under the pressure of torment. The lexical item “رَبَّنَا / rabbanā” is composed of the noun “رب/ rabb” annexed by the first person possessive pronoun “نّا / nā / our”. The lexical item “أَخْرِجْنَا / rabbanā” contains the semantic features (+ Voc, +NP,+ Creator,+ helper) . The ST “أَخْرِجْنَا / akhrijnā” is a VP changed to phrasal verb. It is translated into phrasal verb “bring us out”. It is a semi-replacement translation. Looking at the ST “أَخْرِجْنَا / akhrijnā”, it seems that the ask for help is shown in the act of “أَخْرِجْنَا / akhrijnā” (+ imperative, +remove, + to move from a position or place,- to take off , - to dismiss from office or position). The denotative meaning of the act “أَخْرِجْنَا / akhrijnā” is to oblige the addressee to do something. In this vocative sentence it is deviated to other new meaning “call for help”. This meaning is reinforced by some lexical items mentioned inside and outside the vocative sentence such as “يَصْتَرِخُونَ / yaštarikūna”. The act of “يَصْتَرِخُونَ / yaštarikūna / will cry” is present tense composed of the bare verb “يَصْرِخُ / yašarik/ cry”
and the third person plural subject pronoun "ون / they". The extra letter "ط / t" has a hyperbolic sense. It indicates sever of crying and their urgent to call for help.

Besides, the ST "نَّعْمَلْ / namalu" is VP composed of the imperfect tense "نَّعْمَلْ / namalu" annexed by an implicit first person plural pronoun "we". It is rendered into VP in the future form. It is changed to "we shall do". The translator has provided a semi replacement translation. He has presented the suitable tense in TT as the imperfect tense "نَّعْمَلْ / namalu / do" indicates to future. Semantically, the act of "نَّعْمَلْ / namalu / do" in both Arabic and English indicated by the semantic features as (+ to perform an act or duty, + to put forth, - to be the cause of good or harm, - to execute a piece or amount of work). The act of "نَّعْمَلْ / namalu / do" carries a promise that we will do right. Thus, the meaning of the ST is retained by this shift.

With regard to the ST "صَالِحًا / salihan" is a noun rendered into noun "righteousness". The noun "صَالِحًا / salihan / righteous" is identified by such semantic features as (+ righteous conduct, - the quality or state of being righteous, + good deed and action). It is translated into accurate equivalent. The ST "غَيْرَ / ghayra" is a N transposed to negative particle "not" functions as Adv. It has the meaning of (+ diversity, + negation). In a sense, it is used to affirm something non–mentioned and negate something mentioned. The TT negative particle "not" has the semantic features as (+ negation, + to indicate that the previous statement is untrue). The ST "الَذِي / alladhī" is relative pronoun extended into two splits definite article "the" and the plural noun "deeds". This leads to an overtranslation.

The ST "كُنَا / kunnā" is VP composed of the perfect verb annexed by the first person plural object pronoun "we". It is rendered into VP "we used to". The translator has produced an overtranslation since he added further semantic feature [+prep]. Finally, the ST "نَّعْمَلْ / namalu" is a VP translated into V "do". So, the translator has retained the meaning of the ST "نَّعْمَلْ / namalu" in Arabic and presented undertranslation.
VP “نَّعْمَلٌ / namalu” is composed of the perfect verb annexed by the first person plural object pronoun “we”.

Table (3) overtranslation and semi-replacement translation

| ST | (قَالَ رَبِّ انّصُرْنِّي بِّمَا كَذَبُّونِ) المؤمنون (62) |
| TL | (Noah) said: "O my Lord! help me: for that they accuse me of falsehood!" [Ali, 2006, p.243] |
| Trs | rabbī unšurnī bimā kadhabūnī |
| BT | My Lord help me since they have accused me of falsehood |

Differences between the semantic features of ST and the semantic features of TT:

- **ST**:
  - rabbī [(rabb) +N, +singu, +head, +animate, -V]
  - ī [(+pron, +Poss, +1st person, -V, +sing, ±human)]
  - unšurnī [(+V, +action, +imper, +win victory)]
  - bimā [(bi) +prep]

- **TT**:
  - mā [+rel pron]
  - kadhabūnī [(kadhab) +V, +past, +action, -N, +deny, +rebuff]
  - ūn [(+pron, +1st person, +sing, +subject)]
  - ī [(+pron, +1st person, +object, +sing, +masc, +fem)]

**TT**:
- O [+Voc part, +interj]
The vocative verse uncovers sadness feelings of Noah’s since his people accused him of lying. Therefore, he asked help and aid from Almighty Allah to overcome his people. This is realized by calling the addressee “ربّ /rabbî” without the vocative particle “يا /yâ”. Addressing the Almighty without using the vocative particle indicates that Allah is too near from his slaves. The lexical item “ربّ /rabbî” is composed of the N “ربّ /Rabb” annexed by the first person possessive pronoun “my”. On the other hand, the vocative particle “يا /yâ O” has become explicit in English. Hence, it is an overtranslation. The verb phrase “انصُرْنِّي /unṣurnĩ” is an imperative verb suffixed by the first person singular object pronoun ‘me’ with implicit subject estimated b “you”. It is translated into imperative verb phrase “help me”. The original meaning of the
imperative verb "انّصُرْنِّي / unšurnĩ" is deviated from order to call for help. His people accused him of falsehood; therefore he asks aid from Almighty.

The prepositional phrase “بِّمَا / bimā” consists of the preposition “ـ / ba” used for reason and the relative pronoun “ـ / mā”. The translator changed it to “for that”. Hence, it is a semi-replacement translation. The meaning of the ST “بِّمَا / Bimā” is retained. The verb phrase “كَذَبُّون / kadhabūnĩ” is composed of the perfect verb “كَذَبَ / kadhab”, subject “و / they”, and the first person singular object pronoun ‘me’. The translator has rendered it into “they accuse me of falsehood!”. Note that the translator has given an overtranslation to reproduce the meaning of the message. He transposed the VP to simple sentence. Consequently, he has provided a semi-replacement translation.

The prepositional phrase “بِّمَا / bimā” consists of the preposition “ـ / Ba” used for reason and the relative pronoun “ـ / mā”. The translator changed it to “for that”. Hence, it is a semi-replacement translation. The meaning of the ST “بِّمَا / bimā” is retained. The verb phrase “كَذَبُّون / kadhabūnĩ” is composed of the perfect verb “كَذَبَ / kadhab”, subject “و / they”, and the first person singular object pronoun ‘me’. The translator has rendered it into “they accuse me of falsehood!”. Note that the translator has given an overtranslation to reproduce the meaning of the message. He transposed the VP into a simple sentence. Consequently, he has provided a semi-replacement translation.

Table (4) inaccurate translation and semi-replacement translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>(ئَرْبَنَا إِكْشِفْ عَنَا الْعَذَابَ إِنَّا مُؤْمِّنُونَ) الدخان (12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>(They will say:) &quot;Our Lord! Remove the Penalty from us, for we do really believe!&quot; [Ali, 2006, p. 596]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trs</td>
<td>rabbanā ikshif annā al-adhaba innā ma’ināna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Our Lord! Remove the torment from us, we really believe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences between the semantic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>features of ST and the semantic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>features of TT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rabbanā [(rabb) + N, + sing, + head, + animate, -V]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nā [ + pron, + 1st person, + poss, + plu, + human]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikshif [ + V, + action, + imp]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annā [(An) + prep]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nā [ + pron, + 1st person, + object, + plu, + human]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-adhaba [(al) + definite art, + generic reference, + specific reference]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhaba [ + N, + inanimate, + accusative, + masc]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innā [(innā) + accusative part, + quasi - verb, + action, -N]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nā [ + pron, + 1st person, + object, + plu, + human]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muṣminūna [ + N, + plur, + animate, + masc, + active participle, + believers]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our [ + pron, 1st person, + poss, + plu, + D ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord [ + N, + sing, + head, animate]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove [ + V, + action, + imp, - N, + take away, + take out]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The [ + defi art, + spec reference, + generic reference, ± sing ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty [ + N, + inanimate, + singular, - V, torment, + punishment ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calling for help is gushed out in this verse of those who stay in the hell asking Almighty Allah to remove torment from them. Vocative is realized by calling the addressee “رَبَّنَا”/rabbanā” without the vocative particle “يا/yā”. As it seems that the vocative particle “يا/yā” is also omitted from the target text with keeping the meaning same. The verb “كْشِفْ/ikshif” is an imperative verb rendered into imperative verb “remove”. The prepositional phrase “عَنَا/annā” is translated into prepositional phrase “from us”. The lexical item “الْعَذَابَّ/al-adhaba” is a NP in the sense of “torment”. It is translated into NP “the penalty”. Evidently, there is a difference in meaning between the lexical item “الْعَذَابَّ/al-adhaba” in Arabic and the English lexical item “penalty”. The former has the meaning of severe physical and mental sufferings. The latter means a punishment for breaking a law, rule or legal agreement. Accordingly, the word “penalty” has given another far meaning of that in the Arabic text and the meaning of the message has been distorted. As a result the translation is inaccurate. The lexical item “إِنَّ/Innā” is a particle which resembles the verb since it has certain verbal meaning and force. Therefore, it is a semi –verb in Arabic language. Semantically, it has an emphatic function. The particle “إِنَّ/Innā” has implicit first plural person pronoun “we”. The lexical item “إِنَّ/Innā” is changed to PP. It is translated into “for we do really”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From [ +prep ]</th>
<th>Us [ + pron , + 1st person, + plu , +Masc , +Fem ,+object ,+human ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For [ +conj,+perp]</td>
<td>We [+ pron , + 1st person , + plu ,+ subject ,+animate ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do [+V( aux) ,+pre ,+action, +emphatic + perform ,+ make]</td>
<td>Really [ +adv,+truly ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe [+V, +pre, +action, +faith , +trust ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meaning of the ST “إِنَّ / innā” is rather retained and the translator has provided a semi-replacement translation. The lexical item “مُؤْمِّىٰنَ / mu'minûna” is an adjective in the sense of “believers”. The translator has made a transposition. He has translated it to V “believe!”. Hence, he has produced a semi-replacement translation.

Table (5) semi-replacement translation

| ST | "Our Lord! bring us out of this: if ever we return (to Evil), then shall we be wrong-doers indeed!" |
| TL | rabbanā akhrijnā minhā fa in auðnā fa innā žālimûna |
| BT | Our Lord! bring us out of it; if we return [to evil] we would indeed be wrongdoers |

Differences between the semantic features of ST and the semantic features of TT:

| ST: | rabbanā [ (rabba) +N, +head, +animate ] |
| nā [ +pron, +1st person, +poss, +plu, +human ] |
| akhrijnā [ (akhrij) +V, +imperative, +action ] |
| nā [ +pron, +1st person, +plu, +object, ± human ] |
| TT: | minhā [(Min) +prep] |
| hā [+pron, +3rd person, +sing, +fem, +object ] |
| fa in [(Fa) +resumption part] |
| in [ +Conditional part ] |
| audnā [+V, +action, +past, +return, +come back] |
| fa innā [(Fa) +resumption part] |
| Innā [+accusative part] |
| nā [+pron, +1st person, +plu, +object, ± human] |
| ṣālimūna [+N, +plul, +masc, +active participle] |
| TT: |
| Our [+pron, 1st person, +poss, +plu, +D] |
| Lord [+N, +sing, +head, animate] |
| bring us out of [+Phrasal V, +action, +imp, +go out] |
| This [+demon, +D, +sing, +near] |
| If [ +cond part] |
| We [+pron, +1st person, +plu, +subject, +animate] |
| Return [+V, +action, +pre, +N, +go back] |
| Then [+adv of time] |
| Shall [+pre participle, +V(modal), +N] |
| We [+pron, +1st person, +plu, +subject, +animate] |
| Be [ +V(aux), +V, +action, exist, go, stand] |
| wrong-doers [+N, +animate, +plu] |
indeed [+adv, +actually]

The pagans in this verse ask aid from the Almighty to bring them out of hell. They promise Allah if they come back to do evil actions they would be wrong-doers. Once more the vocative by call for help is recognized by calling the addressee “رَبَّنَا/rabbanā” with no vocative particle. It is rendered into English “Our lord!”. The imperative verb “akhirnā” is suffixed by the first person plural object pronoun “نّا/nā/us”. It is changed to phrasal verb “bring us out”. Hence, the translator has provided a semi-replacement translation with retaining the meaning of the message.

The prepositional phrase “مِّنْهَا/minhā” consists of the preposition “مِّنْ/min” and the pronoun “hā/it” that it refers to something inanimate [hell]. The translator has rendered the prepositional phrase into PP “from this”. The pronoun ‘hā/it’ is rendered into demonstrative pronoun ‘this’ to refer to hell. The lexical item “فَإِنَّ/fa in” is composed of the conjunction word “فَ/fa” It is called resumption particle. And the conditional particle “إِنْ/in” in the sense of ‘if’. The conjunction “fa” is changed to adverb “ever”. Thus, it is a semi-replacement translation.

The perfect verb in jussive mood “عُدْنَا/audnā” suffixed by the first person plural subject pronoun “نّا/nā/we”. It is rendered into “we return”. In a sense, the VP “عُدْنَا/audnā” is translated into VP. The lexical item “فَإِنَّا/fa innā” consists of the conjunction word Fa, the emphatic particle “إِنْ/Innā” and the first person plural subject pronoun “نّا/nā/we”. The conjunction “fa” is changed to adverb of time “then” and the emphatic particle is changed to adverb “indeed”. The translator has kept the meaning of the message through this shift. Hence, he has produced a semi-replacement translation.

Finally, the lexical item “ظَالِمُونَ/žālimūna” is changed from noun to simple sentence “shall we be wrong-doers”. Hence, the translator has provided a semi-replacement translation. Meanwhile, the meaning has been maintained.
Conclusion

In the present study, one type of rhetorical meaning “Call for help” in the glorious Qur’an is investigated. Based on the beneficial uses of the componential analysis of the approaches of Katz and Fodor (1963) and Newmark (1981, 1988), five vocative sentences from the glorious Qur’an and their English version are analyzed to present the message change. This study reinforces that the meaning of Qur’anic vocative sentences is not preserved as much as possible in the given analysis since we found that the translator has used overtranslation, undertranslation, semi-replacement translation and inaccurate translation. In a sense, the message is extended, pointed or put in the same tense and sometimes in a different tense to coincide with the original text. However, the meaning of the Qur’anic vocative sentences is lost in TT when the translator fails to infer the internal meaning of the ST. From a theoretical perspective, using the componential analysis has been substantiated to be a highly feasible tool in this study to observe similarities and differences between the original text (i.e., Qur’an) and the English rendering. Consequently, it helps us to distinguish between the message of the source text and the given translated text.

Note:

To express the grammatical categories in this study, we use the following symbols:

ST( source text), TT(target text), Trs( transliteration), BT( back translation), Voc( vocative), Part( particle), VP(verb phrase), V(verb), NP(noun phrase), N(noun), PP(prepositional phrase), P( preposition), AP(adjective phrase), Adv P ( adverb phrase), Adv(adverb), DP(determiner phrase), D(determiner), Sing(singular), Plur(plural), Pron(pronoun), Poss(possessive), interj(interjection), Indefi art( indefinite article), Spec( specific reference), Masc( masculine), Fem(feminine), Conj(conjunction), Demon ( demonstrative), pr perf(present perfect), PUH( peace on him)
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### List of Arabic Phonemic Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic letters</th>
<th>Arabic phonemic symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>ء</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ا</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>Kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>Dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ش</td>
<td>Sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>Š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>Ž</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ع</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غ</td>
<td>Gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ف</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ك</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ل</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ى</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ</td>
<td>Ä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ؤ</td>
<td>Ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ی</td>
<td>Ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>۴</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>۳</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>۱</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Interpretation of Pun Translation

XU Jianzhong  
College of Foreign Languages  
Tianjin University of Technology, China

ZHOU Yan  
College of Foreign Languages  
Tianjin University of Technology, China

Abstract
Pun translation is considered to be one of the most challenging tasks because of the different features between the two languages, especially those belonging to different linguistic families. To be translatable or untranslatable, that is a question. This paper, by applying the four model spaces in Conceptual Integration Theory to pun translation, explores the operation of human mind in the translation process, and tries to seek out the mechanism of understanding the source text and reproducing what the source contains in the target language.
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Introduction

Puns exist in almost every language. According to Collins English Dictionary, pun is “the use of words or phrases to exploit ambiguities and innuendoes in their meaning, usually for humorous effect.” (2000:1251)

Each language is unique in vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar and figures of speech, which inevitably lead to corresponding vacancy between every two languages. Translation is a complicated cross-cultural communication, during which the loss of information is almost unavoidable, especially between English and Chinese because they belong to the different families. Even with adaptations and compromises, translators frequently find themselves facing with a translated text neither “faithful” nor “equivalent” to the original. No matter how hard a translator may try, treason in his or her work is unavoidable Therefore, puns are hard to deal with in translation, and there even comes the idea of its untranslatability.

The Conceptual Integration Theory is a newly born theory in the cognitive linguistics. It is originally used to explain human language—talking and thinking, the mental spaces of human mind, analyzing the psychological process of language activities. This paper, by applying Conceptual Integration Theory to translation, probes into the operation of human mind in translation process, trying to find out the mechanism of understanding the source language and expressing the relevant information in the target language.

Conceptual Integration Theory

The Conceptual Integration (blending) Theory is an important part of Cognitive Linguistics, which is initiated by Gills Fauconnier and Mark Turner in 1994. It is developed from Mental Space, which is also initiated by Fauconnier in Mental Space: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language in 1985. According to Fauconnier, there are four mental spaces in his model. They are shown in Figure 1:
In Figure 1, the circles represent mental spaces, the points in the four circles refer to the linguistic elements, the solid lines represent the simple counterpart projection, and the dotted lines stand for the abstract projection between the elements in different spaces. The square inside the blend represents the emergent structure.

The two input spaces are actually the two different kinds of information one can get from a meaningful sense group. Generic Space is a necessary space filled with abstract characters, which are shared by two input spaces. In this space, one can find the similarities of the input spaces, and this provides the possibility of blending. Blended Space is the most important one among the four mental spaces, which is a dynamic and general operation. In this space, new knowledge and meaning are created on the basis of input spaces and generic space, and the essence is to project selectively from the two input spaces into the next level — blended space.

The four spaces are connected in particular ways so that people can get the hidden meaning of some words or sentences. The network model of Conceptual Integration Theory is the detailed instruction of every space, selective projection and Emergent Structure. All the spaces are connected by the selective projection, which means that not every element in the input space is projected into the blended space, i.e., this procedure is selective. The emergent structure is the core of Conceptual Integration Theory. It appears in human mind based on the reality and logic, and it comes from input spaces and has many elements that do not belong to any input space. The blend process is completed.
by three operations, which are Composition, Completion and Elaboration. These three operations work together and make the blend possible.

The network model of Conceptual Integration Theory intends to describe the relationship between different mental spaces. When we talk or think, a few mental spaces are set up. Using the network model, we could explain the process inside one's mind, especially the process of translation.

**Interpretation of the Translation Process**

*The Psychological Process of Translation*

"From the perspective of Psycholinguistics, ‘translation’ is a kind of psychological transition between two languages. Simply speaking, such transition includes two processes: the comprehension process of the source language and the production process of the target language.” (Liu Shaolong, 2007: 1) Comprehension and production are two basic psychological processes in the use of language, and it is the first and vital step. Then it moves on to the second step — production, which expresses what we have got in the comprehension stage in another language. This article deals with the mental spaces of translators and its functions on puns translation, so this involves psychological pattern of human mind. Here I introduce a term “Translation Thinking”. According to Liu Miqing, thinking is the indirect and general reflection made by human being toward objective things; it is from but higher than human perception. People acquire, choose, and accumulate information by sense organs, and then provide it to their brains as material for logical thinking. At this moment, sensing has already been promoted to thinking. The main means of Logical thinking is concept or conceptual system, grammar for example; and its main tool is language.

However, translation thinking is not common logical thinking. The feature of translation is: what the translator receives is the linguistic system of source language, which is the surface of source language rather than deep concept. The translator's task is to dig into the conceptual system, which is the deeper structure of source language, on the basis of surface information of the source language. And this depends on his judgment and inference (Liu Miqing, 2005: 93-94).
Conceptual Integration Theory and Translation process

As is stated above, the main processes of translation are comprehension and production, which are proceeded in the translator's mind at fast speed. Translation is a kind of code-switching including receiving, decoding, remembering, encoding and expressing. The first four phases represent the inside process of cognitive psychology or bi-linguistic transition; while receiving of source language, decoding, and expressing of target language represent a whole process of linguistic comprehension and production. Such process is carried out in different levels, including phonetics, vocabulary, syntax, discourse and pragmatics.

1. Comprehension

Linguistic comprehension is a kind of active psychological inference procedure. It extracts the deep meaning from the surface of language. The comprehension in a listener's mind starts from the stimulation of the speech from the speaker, then the listener searches for the meaning in his or her mental lexicon, and in the last, he or she analyses the meaning of sentences and forms the concept of conversations. For the translator, especially literary translator, the comprehension process is to understand the source text totally; and for the pun translator, he has to understand the multi-meaning and hidden cultural background of puns.

Moreover, the comprehension process is a vital step in translation because in this process all the information and elements from the source text is decomposed and digested by the translator. It is in the source language space. The translator pays great attention to determining what and how the author conveys to the target readers while reading the written text — in the form of words. Then the translator may visualize the pictures and graphic signs of the text to get a vivid picture in his mind or to mentally reproduce the sounds they symbolize. Such physical act of perception is accompanied by mental activities that analyze the relationships of an intricately woven network — the written text.

In pun translation, these relationships fall into two broad categories: semantic relationship among words in the text and referential relationship between the words and non-linguistic phenomena. In a sentence or conversation with puns, there is usually one
word or one phrase that expresses the punny effect. So the comprehension of the source text can be fulfilled at two different steps: the first is the literal meaning comprehension at which words and sentences of the language system are analyzed; and the second is the hidden meaning comprehension at which meaning is hidden behind the surface of the text, which is what the speaker or writer really want to convey. In fact, the translator is in the position as a source text reader who is pursuing a full understanding of the information provided by the text. Puns have two levels of meaning, i.e. the literal meaning and the hidden meaning. Therefore, this paper tries to apply the Conceptual Integration Theory to pun comprehension in two models: literal comprehension and hidden comprehension.

a. Literal Comprehension

In the literal comprehension process, the translator makes full use of his source language vocabulary to understand the source text, and searches in his memory for the signification of every word. As soon as the translator reads or hears a pun, two input spaces (the vocabulary space and the background knowledge space) are created in a larger source language space. Through the selective projection from these two input spaces to the third one, the blended space, the literal meaning of words is identified and confirmed.

![Image of the concept of literal meaning]

Figure 2: How literal meaning is achieved
From this figure, we can clearly see how the literal meaning of a pun is achieved. Input I is the grammar space, in which the translator acquires the structure meaning of a sentence; while Input II is the vocabulary space, in which the surface meaning of every word is shown. The frame space provides an empty grammatical structure and the elements space provides the corresponding vocabulary with their meaning. Integration consists of the matching of the two input spaces and projecting into a third mental space — the blended space. In this space, the words with its meaning from the vocabulary space and the structure from the frame space are integrated. As a result, the pun becomes a semantic unit rather than meaningless word groups. In this way, the literal meaning is actually obtained by the translator. To be clear, this literal meaning is not a simple collection of meanings, the reason for which is because the blending process is constrained by the “optimality principles”. Through selective projection, the elements that are not suitable to fill in the structure are abandoned. However, this whole process is only based on linguistics and such directly trans-coded formulation may not be appropriated for the target readers in the target culture, or even in the context. Comprehension at this level is essential, but it is a partial interpretation for the meaning analysis.

After literal comprehension, it is easy to come up with literal translation. In pun translation, it is impossible to get punny effect only on this level because the understanding of translated sentence will be blocked by cultural and geographical difference. So in order to convey the whole information to the readers, the translator must finish his or her work by digging into the deep meaning of the pun— hidden meaning comprehension.

b. Hidden Meaning Comprehension

The comprehension process of hidden meaning takes place at the second level of comprehension to confirm the conceptual content of the source text by drawing on the referential context in which the text is embedded. Based on the significations of decoded linguistic signs, this operation aims to discover what the signs mean as parts of the messages. Translation is the procedure of communicating messages rather than matching similar words, and it is not to express the linguistic signs or codes but the concepts of ideas. It is this nature that makes it possible to bridge the gap between different
languages, the distinctive sentence structures, as well as the alienating words and expressions.

The hidden meaning of puns is quite different from its literal one because what puns intend to show is not the literal relationship but a kind of double relationship. It holds deep meaning and it is difficult and improper to judge the meaning from one level of punny sentence. So the complete comprehension of the pun requires not only comprehension of its literal meaning but also the comprehension of the meaning on the occasion that puns are used.

Interpretive analysis for comprehension at this level is necessary because languages do not have any separate and distinct signs for every concrete or abstract element of human experience. Translation would simply be a matter of substituting notion, consisting of one univocal unit for another. Words and sentences are always adopted to do translation according to the situational parameters that define the communicative situation and they take on an additional dimension. As a result, a model of translation must contain interpretive analysis of comprehension, in which concepts are drawn out of the signification and are connected to the world of knowledge and experience.

After the literal meaning is accomplished, the blended space in the literal comprehension process turns to be one input space in the second round of blending, which is the comprehension process of the hidden meaning. The hidden meaning space contains the pun with its literal meaning and also the image. The other input space is the context space which contains not only the unwonted verbal or written context of the pun but also the context of background culture and the psychological context of the translator. The frame of the source input is used to organize the abstract target input. The target input offers concrete values for the roles in the source input. The corresponding values and roles are compressed into the blended space while the shared schema of the two input spaces is projected to the genetic space. Because the relation of analogy depends on the role-value compression, the source and the target input are analogous. This integration activity can be also illustrated in a single-scope network shown as follows:
From this figure, we can see that we take the literal meaning in the first step as the input. But in fact, when that happens in human mind, it takes little time for the translator. The "hidden structure" in Input I contains several kinds of elements such as words with similar or same pronunciation, same word with different meanings, a phrase of sentence imitating a fixed proverb, etc. Using his rich background knowledge, the translator can get the hidden structure apart from the literal structure, and then blend it with its corresponding meaning. At last, the hidden meaning emerges in the translator's mind. The only task to do is to express the hidden meaning and literal at the same time in order to convey every effect in the original text. However, sometimes it is very hard to convey all the information into the target text. Appropriate methods are involved to do a better work.
2. Production

The translator's task in production process is to express the intended meaning clearly. However, sometimes it is impossible to convey all the elements in the source text, so the production process needs techniques. The Conceptual Integration Theory is very useful anyway. The production process is a cognitive process in which the pun in the source language is transformed into the target language. In this process, the translator performs the act of restructuring concepts with the special factors of the target language. However, this rewriting or reformulation is least analyzed from the perspective of the mental operating process, and it is also the least understood procedure, too. Through the process of comprehension, the ideas arouse a set of analogical reasoning in the translator's mind, and he will search into his deep internal memory store for the corresponding words or phrases or sentences to fit for this concept. Generally speaking, the production process is based on the intelligence of the translator, and the operation of the whole procedure is not all conscious. For most people, thought is usually an unconscious activity of the mind, which leads to the limitations of our undertaking. To deal with this problem, the translator ventures into the little known area of the mind and searches for it. When it can not be reached there, a necessary "library work" should be done because some cultural and linguistic background knowledge is vital for pun translation. Background knowledge plus logical thought can strongly influence the final translation product.

The Conceptual Integration Theory can be applied to the production. The two input spaces contain two meanings from the comprehension process, literal meaning and hidden meaning, which the production needs. That is to say, production is also a psychological process for the translator in which he tries to organize a whole image expressing every element in the input spaces. But as is stated, the projection is selective, i.e., not every element is projected into the blended space. As a result, the translation would not be so complete. In the reformulating, the translator should constantly shuttles between the deverbalized meaning in order to seek for expressions and the target linguistic forms through which it could be verbalized. Such repeating action will not stop until a satisfactory expressive decision is made. To discover the meaning of source text within a communicative context, and to re-express it in target language, the translator reasons by analogy, and probes into the resources of expression in the target language through a series of associations. He is involved in a cognitive process in which his
creative reasoning, general information, cultural and linguistic knowledge are stored in the mind. In a word, a competent translator is not only a bilinguist but also biculturalist. He can greatly solve the conflicts between culture and language any time. Human brains work by association, and the translator’s competence depends to a huge extent on his associative and deductive abilities to exploit the associations between ideas. Having grasped the original meaning, the translator must search for proper words or punny expressions in the target language, which can be obtained by recreating the context. His knowledge, intelligence and imagination allow him to establish the similarities in the process of analogical reasoning. Then he starts to explore into the resource of the target language in order to find linguistic signs which are capable of rendering those ideas. Scanning his memory for signs coinciding with the ideas, he comes up with solutions at a subconscious level. Some solutions may be set aside right away for linguistic or referential reasons, while some solutions may be rejected for inappropriate connotations. Reflecting on the choices, the translator might have intuitively perceived another analogy and may become vaguely aware of some possible solutions to the problem. On the other hand, some words or phrases may have evoked other relevant expressions in the translator's mind. He may have tried to produce the fundamental elements in a translator's mind and may have tried to produce the fundamental elements in a probable conjecture. The fact is that if the meaning is grasped, it is reformulated not by means of words but by ideas. Either consciously or subconsciously, the translator gropes for a most suitable formulation while information is summoned or evoked from the memory. Such mental process can also be illuminated by Conceptual Integration Theory. The blending diagram is shown as follows:
Every element in the mental spaces is clearly seen. As is analyzed above, the blending process is selective, and the projection is selective, too. In Input II, the cultural background contains much more things that need to be grasped and the result would be the proper translation.

**Illustration of Conceptual Integration Theory**

In the previous parts, we have discussed the theoretical mechanism and its application, and it is necessary to do some example illustrations in order to make the translation process clear. So in this part, we turn to some specific examples. The examples will be analyzed from the perspective of Conceptual Integration Theory in two steps: comprehension and production. Each step will apply the theory to explain the thinking in the translator's mind. The purpose of this part is to show the working mechanism of pun translation.
(1) She drove her expensive car into a tree and found out how the Mercedes bends.

This sentence is about a girl and her expensive car. Something happened with her car — Mercedes Benz.

a. Literal Meaning Comprehension

In Input I, there are several grammatical structures: “drove” and “found out” represent the past tense; “and” connects the two paralleling sentences together. At the end of the sentence, there is an independent clause: “how the Mercedes bends”. The whole grammatical structure implies the series of movements happened in the past. The last word "bends" implies the present tense, which means it is a truth.

In Input II, the corresponding vocabulary shows the clear meaning of what happened. The three verbs in the sentence are: drove, found, and bends. “Expensive car” refers to Mercedes Benz, and the first two verbs means the woman made a mistake and hit a tree with her fancy car. We will never know the reason for it, but the fact is her car was broken. “Bend” means to curve from the original shape to another irregular shape.

So far, we have picked up every element in the two input spaces. The generic space is the shared meaning of the two input spaces, namely the acts in the sentence. Through selective projection, the grammatical structure corresponds with its counterparts of vocabulary and expressions and blended. Therefore, we have got the literal meaning or surface meaning of the pun, i.e., “She drove the car so fast that she hit a tree and broke her car, and the specific shape of the car in the accident is curved.”

b. Hidden Meaning Comprehension

As to the hidden meaning, we come to some background knowledge behind this sentence. First, the Input I contains the literal meaning analyzed above. It is obvious that something happened with the woman's luxury car and nobody knows if there is something wrong with herself. But Input II is more complicated and important for the translator to dig deeper. The most important point is the word "bends". Originally, it means to change the shape from original to curved, but from the perspective of pronunciation, the word also means the brand of the famous German car "Benz", "Mercedes Benz" for whole. The brand name came from the one of the co-founders Carl
Benz. But the pronunciation is similar with the word "bends". So "Mercedes bends" are the punny words, implying Mercedes Benz. Through blending, we can get the similar pronunciation of two words and its implication. The two elements are literal meaning of "bends", and the name of Benz, the co-founder and the brand. The result of blending is the hidden meaning. The writer played on the pronunciation of one word and implied two meaning: one of them is fixed, car brand in other words; the other is the result caused by car accident. So the hidden meaning of this sentence is that “She drove very fast and hit a tree, and she found out what Mercedes Benz really looks like.”

c. Production

In this process, it is hard for the translator's to combine all the important elements and to blend them into the blended space. Input I and Input II are the literal meaning and the hidden meaning from the previous comprehension. There are also many other elements in the two input spaces for the translator for references. In the Input I, there should be a vivid picture in the translator's mind after reading the sentence, i.e., “A woman drove too fast and knocked into a tree, and her car, Mercedes Benz is broken to curve. The whole accident happened before her eyes and she certainly saw how it happened.” On the other hand, the Input II includes the background of the famous car brand “Mercedes Benz” which is similar in pronunciation with “bends”. The punny effect lies in this word, and it is also the point where the writer intended to express the humorous meaning. It is a kind of satire. After receiving the elements and background information, the blended space include both the literal meaning and the hidden meaning. Now in the translator's mind, a satiric image emerges and he has already found a way to express it in the target language. He could translate like this:

她开着昂贵的车撞到了树上，终于看到了梅赛德斯如此“奔驰”的后果。

In this translation, the author tries to convey the "Benz" effect in Chinese, and the brand name is usually translated into Chinese as “奔驰”, which means running quickly. With this coincidence, we could abandon the meaning of twisted and broken, and apply an acceptable word in the target language. In this way, a replacement is adopted and it proves to be effective.
(2) It looks like we have some academic dignitaries in the audience, Dr. Randall from the Geology Department. Only man who is happy when they take his work for granite.

(U.S. TV drama *The Big Bang Theory* Season Three Episode Eighteen)

This paragraph is also taken from the American comedy *The Big Bang Theory*. In this episode, the protagonist physicist Sheldon Cooper is nominated this year's Chancellor's Award for Science, and he has to prepare a speech in front of all the faculty members of the university. But he is afraid of delivering a speech in front of so many people. In order to soothe his fear his friends offer him wine before the speech. However, he is drunk on the stage. This monologue is a part of his winning speech.

a. Literal Meaning Comprehension

This short paragraph contains two short sentences. The speaker is drunk when speaking, so it is not so strict on grammar. In Input I, the grammatical structure is simple: he sees a man in the audience and talks about him. “Looks like”, “have”, “is”, and “take” all indicate that the sentence is in the present tense, “who is happy” is a clause, and “when they take his work for granite” is an adverbial clause of time.

In Input II, the corresponding vocabulary means that in the audience, there is a doctor from the geology department. Sheldon sees him, and talks about his work. Granite is a kind of rock, which is a major object of geological research.

Therefore, in the Blended Space, we match the grammatical structure and its corresponding vocabulary. We take the necessary elements from the two Input Spaces (the grammatical structure and the meaning of each word), and blend them together. It is easy to come up with the literal meaning: I am looking at the audience and there is a Dr. Randall from Geology Department. He is happy when others believe that his whole work is to deal with granite.

b. Hidden Meaning Comprehension

In this sentence, the punny phrase is “take his work for granite”. It is an embedded pun. The original phrase is “take somebody or something for granted”, meaning “look
down upon somebody or something” or “consider somebody or something is not worthy at all”. So the Input II contains a fixed phrase “take his work for granted”.

In the Generic Space, the elements shared the meaning of the two input spaces, which are “Dr. Randall is in the audience and he is the only one who is happy because he works with granite”. But in the Blended Space, the literal meaning is blended with the linguistic background. With the similar pronunciation, the last half of the sentence could be seen as “only man who is happy when they take his work for granted”. And this is the hidden meaning of the pun. It adapts an embedded pun to express his contempt for Dr. Randall.

So the hidden meaning is like this: I can see Dr. Randall in the audience, he is the only man who is happy when they take his work for granted, because he can not figure out other people's attitude at all.

c. Production

Just as the examples mentioned above, in the production process, the Input I contains literal meaning while Input II carries the hidden meaning of the sentence. Besides, there are also some elements in the two input spaces needed to be included here, such as the tone and the punctuation marks. The background of the sentence is a drunk man making winning speech, so the tone should be ridiculous and careless. In the original sentence, the grammar is not right, so in the translated sentence, the grammar should also be imperfect. And that is also the sarcastic point.

After blending, we can come up with the final meaning of the pun. On one hand, Dr. Randall is happy when others think his work is about granite; on the other hand, Dr. Randall’s work is taken for granted, and he does not know it.

Here is the suggested translation:

我看，今天来的观众里有不少学术伟人吧，那儿坐的是地理学院的兰德尔博士。他呀，也就只有他啦，在别人说他的工作不如他的花岗岩值钱的时候，他还得笑纳。
小男孩：“妈妈，给我点零用钱花。”

母亲：“过来，我给你一角（脚）！”

This is a short dialogue between a little boy and his mother. He came to his mother for money, and she obviously did not want to give him any money, maybe because he had spent so much on the snack or something bad. The translation procedure is as follows:

a. Literal Meaning Comprehension

Chinese language does not lay much stress on grammar, but it has some implications on grammar. For instance, “给我” implicates the imperative tone, “过来” is an order and suggests that the mother was a little angry, “我给你一角！” is in future tense, means that the mother wants to kick the boy, and the exclamation mark at the end of the sentence also represents the tone of the mother.

In Input I, the grammatical structure is listed above and it is simply enough to guess the mood of the mother at that moment. In Input II, the Chinese vocabulary is also very simple, only several words: come on, I, give, you, dime.

In the Blended Space, the grammatical structure plus corresponding vocabulary means: the boy wanted some more money, he must have asked for money for many times and this time, his mother did not want to give him any more. So the mother said she will give him a dime, which is a very little value of money. In conclusion, the literal meaning of the conversation is: “Mom, give me some more money.” “Come on, I will give you a dime.”

b. Hidden Meaning Comprehension

The literal meaning from above fills in the Input I of this process. As for Input II, it is a little more challenging, which involves the cultural background in China. First, the children in China do not do part time jobs for money, and they take money from their parents whenever they need, while in the West, children work as newspaper delivery boys, babysitters, lawn mower and so on, for money. So when the west children need anything, they will work to earn it. But Chinese parents do not want their children work
so early, and they want them to enjoy their childhood. Second, the word “角”, pronouncing “jiao”, in China means the smallest unit of money, a dime. If the mother really wants to give her boy a dime, it will not worth for anything. But the pronunciation “jiao” also can be spelled as another Chinese character “脚” which means foot, or a kick on someone's body. The mother was angry about her kid always asking for money, so she threatened the boy if he kept asking for money like this, she would kick him on the butt. That is a kind of punishment for the naughty children in China.

Therefore, in the blended space, literal meaning plus cultural background offers us a double explanation of the mother: If you keep asking money like this, I will punish you by kicking you on the butt.

c. Production

In this process, the literal meaning and the hidden meaning are going to be mixed together, but there is a problem, “a dime” and “kick you on your butt” have noting to do with each other in pronunciation. So it is impossible to convey these two images in one English sentence. Then the analysis from the perspective of Conceptual Integration Theory is necessary.

Its literal meaning in Input I is a dime of money. That means the mother wanted to give her child money, but only a little. While in Input II, she did not want to give her son anything but a punishment — kick him on the butt. The pun in this sentence is Homophonic which means two words share the same pronunciation. So we had better find another pair of word with similar pronunciation to express the punny effect. In the Blended Space, there are elements from two input spaces: image of the value, the punishment, the mood, and the treat. Now, in a translator's mind, a search for the proper match begins: what kind of words can express all the images at a time, and avoid the loss of information as little as possible. At last, the author comes up with a phrase, “a cake of kick”. “Cake” here means “a piece of”, a kind of unit word, and “cake” also have the meaning of “snack”, “or treat”. On the other hand, “kick” matches with the Chinese word “脚”. So in the phrase “a cake of kick”, images of treat and punishment are demonstrated at the same time. And the antithesis implies the mood of the mother. And the
pronunciation of “cake” and “kick” is similar, so they form pun perfectly. Its translation could be like this:

"Mom, can I have some more money?" the boy asks.
"Come here, and I will give you a cake of kick!" the mother answers.

Conclusion

This paper discusses the translation of puns from the perspective of the four mental spaces in the Conceptual Integration Theory. The purpose is to create a model for pun translation process in the translator's mind, thus producing a better translated version. However, only the central elements of Conceptual Integration Theory have been applied in pun translation analysis. Such ideas as the governing principle of selective projection or the detailed mechanism of Generic Space are not put into discussion because they are rather complicated and difficult to operate in the analysis. It is our hope that more of the theory will be applied to the study of pun translation.
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Abstract:
This study aims to show that a good translation of poetry provides the reader with a similar effect to that gained by reading the original text. It draws upon the importance of faithful translation as presented by Horst Frenze, in “The Art of Translation”. This paper attempts to introduce a case in point: Abdul Wahid Lulua’s translation of The Waste Land and its effect on the Arab reader. Although The Waste Land challenges any translator, Lulua’s gift enabled him to use his imaginative powers freely and produced a work of art which could stand on its own as an original work. His version thus created a standard work, which has captured the Arabic mind satisfyingly and thoroughly. It is this mastery of translation which gives the Arabic text its genuineness, making it look as if it were originally written in Arabic, despite confinement to the foreign original. Such a translation contributes to the development of literary works through professed cases of intellectuality, without distorting the original texts.

KeyWords: Faithful Translation, poetry, genuineness, Abdul Wahid Lulua, The Waste Land.
Introduction:

The rendering of poetry into another language has always been a debatable matter, since a large number of critics have emphasized the difficulty of translating extraordinary poems. Across the ages critics have raised grave doubts over the feasibility of translation of poetry. It has been claimed that it is not possible for anyone to combine in another language the thoughts, the emotions, the style, the form, and the effect of a poem. Eliot’s poem has influenced different Arab readers, who are not fluent in English, indirectly through Lulua’s excellent translation.

The Iraqi critic is a specialist in English literature and literary criticism and has translated more than 40 books, including three plays of Shakespeare and The Waste Land. Lulua’s is one of the most distinguished Arab translators who presented his translation of The Waste Land in 1980 to the Arab reader. Before that date, Eliot’s poem was translated in full for four times by other Arab translators: the first by the two Arab poets Adonis and Yousef al-Khal under the title of The Ruined Land (1958); the second by Dr. Fa’iq Matta, included in his book entitled Eliot (1966); the third by Lewis ‘Awadh under the title of The Ruined Land (1968); the fourth by Youssef al-Youssef under the title of The Waste Land (1975).

Lulua has presented the fifth full translation of The Waste Land with a critical view to the poem and the poet in his book entitled T. S. Eliot’s The Waste Land: The Poet and the Poem. It seems that fidelity is the principle on which this translation was based; Lulua preserved Eliot’s verse form and substance in many ways; he also perceived the metrical and rhyming schemes of the original.
Definition of Translation:

Ravis Varma, in ‘Literary Translation and Cultural Integration”, defines literary translation as follows:

Literary translation is a text in a target language that represents other pre-existing text in some other language. It is an interpretation by enactment and like its original strives to be a verbal object whose value is inseparable from the particular words used. It attempts to give the reader the same image and the same delight which the reading of the work in original language would afford any reader who is familiar with the foreign language while it yet always remains foreign to him. (1990, p.1)

Robert Escarpit, in his essay “Creative Treason as a Key to Literature”, defines translation as “being the passage from one linguistic environment to another, it is liable to the most spectacular kind of errors, factual errors” (1967, p.16). Nevertheless, the study of influence between literary works through translation is a major area of investigation in the field of comparative literature. E. Gentzler, in his book Contemporary Translation, realizes that the translator is required to painstakingly reveal “competence as literary citric, historical scholar, linguistic technician, and creative artist.”(1993, p.7) Mona Baker, in her book In Other Words: A Course book on Translation, recognizes “that a reader’s cultural and intellectual background determine[s] how much sense s/he gets out of a text.”(1996, p.14)
Who is the Faithful Translator?

All of these definitions would take us a step further towards the meaning behind what is meant by faithful translation. George Szirtes, in his article “A Faithful Translation” asserts that we think we know what we mean by the expression “faithful translation”.

It means not putting in too much that isn't there; trying to maintain a respectable degree of similarity of tone and form; and hoping that the impression made on the reader in the receiving language resembles, as closely as possible (as closely as you can judge) the impression made on the reader in the original language. (2009, p.1)

Horst Frenze, in “The Art of Translation” has a remarkable point of view regarding the translation of poetry; he believes that considerable “agreement exists that poetry should be translated into poetic form, but there is less agreement on the question whether or not the same verse form, rhyme scheme, etc., should be used in translation” (1973, p.109). He believes that almost “all authorities maintain that faithfulness should be adhered to in the process of translating, but they do not always mean the same thing by faithfulness (1973, p.111). After presenting a number of perspectives, Frenz asks, “if there is any justification for calling translating an art?” (1973, p.119). In his attempt to answer this question, he says:

It is clear that a translator must bring sympathy and understanding to the work he is to translate. He must be the original author’s most intimate, most exact, in short, his best reader. But he must do more than read. He must attempt to see what the author saw, to hear what he heard, to dig into his own life in order to experience anew what
the author experienced… The translator as well as the
writer must be sensitive to the mythological, historical, and
social traditions reflected in a language and must use words
to convey not only sounds but also rhythm, gesture,
expression, melody, color, and association (1973, p.119-
120).

However, his answer to the question about calling translating an art stems from his
confidence in the importance of the translator’s role:

However, it should be pointed out that translating is neither
a creative art nor an imitative art, but stands somewhere
between the two…. The translator must be creative, a
“maker”; at the same time, he must submit to the reality of
the writer whom he is translating. Thus translating is a
matter of continuous subconscious association with the
original, a matter of meditation (1973, p.120).

Finally, Frenz expresses his hope that writers will follow the dictum of Andre Gide who
has expressed his point of view that every creative writer is supposed to serve his country
by translating at least one foreign work that suits his talent and temperament to enrich his
own literature. “Only then will the position of the translator become more respected, will
the quality of translations improve, and will we be less hesitant to speak of translating as
an art” (1973, p.121).

Lulua’s Faithful Translation of The Waste Land:

Mariam M. al-Serkal, in her article “Lost in Translation? Never if You Keep
These Points in Mind”, mentions Lulua’s belief that it is essential for the translator of
poetry to love it, and that “the translator needs to understand the culture and history of the
source when translating poems (2009, p 23). She Quotes Lulua’s saying: "If the
translator is unaware of the cultural meaning behind a word then this can lead to the poem’s distortion and the whole essence of the poem can get lost” (ibid). He identifies three general principles when translating literature: “The translator should be well grounded in his own language as well as the foreign language, he should have an excellent command of a language’s history and how it developed over time” as well as “knowing the culture of the language” (ibid). Explaining why he translated *The Waste Land*, he says:

"I translated The Waste Land into Arabic for the fifth time because there were defects in the translation. The translated expressions meant different things than what was originally intended in the original text, which is why it is important for translators to understand the history and culture of a language" (ibid).

It seems that Lulua believes in utter faithfulness to the sense, rhythm, meter and rhyme, as far as it is possible, in transferring from English to Arabic. Here is an exemplary passage taken from the opening lines where Eliot echoes quotations from Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*:

April is the cruelest month, breeding
Lilacs out of the dead land, mixing
Memory and desire, stirring
Dull roots with spring rain.
Winter kept us warm, covering
Earth in forgetful snow, feeding
A little life with dried tubers.
Summer surprised us, coming over the Starnbergersee
With a shower of rain; we stopped in the colonnade.
And went on in sunlight, into the Hofgarten.

This opening is a reversal of Chaucer’s image where spring is a season of life renewed joyfully after the “death” of winter. In Christianity April is the month of resurrection. In Eliot’s poem, April is described as the cruellest month because it brings life to death. This first segment introduces one of the poem’s major themes, that is, the growing pains involved in any revival. It is the first allusion to the idea that people are dead in life. Derek Traversi, in his book *T.S. Eliot: The Longer Poems*, depicts how April which is normally the month of rebirth, has become “the month which produces in men momentary flowerings of intuitive life in a soil which has no nourishing qualities” (1976, p. 24).

The above quoted verses establish the picture of the world that Eliot wants to present. The images employed here fill out the initial impression that the world in this poem is characterized as cruel and bleak. Such paradoxical and strange images create a sense of disorder. John Peck, in his book *How to Study a Poet*, reveals how the conjunction here of rain and summer suggests “that a traditional order has been lost, and even the seasons are all awry” (1988, p.99). The snow that “kept us warm” suggests the same effect too. In an ironic and paradoxical situation, winter has kept the Wastelanders warm by covering them with a blanket of forgetful snow, while summer came and surprised them by bringing with it a “shower of rain”.

An ideal translation of this passage would attempt to solve specific questions of phrasing, and look for some Arabic equivalent of the intricate variety of rhythm and allusions. It would also seek to reflect the echo of language and metaphoric structure. Fortunately, Lulua has strikingly achieved a high quality of translation:

نيسان أقسى الشهور، يخرج
الليلك من الأرض الموات، يمزج
الذكرى بالرغبة، يحرك
The two texts have got the same number of lines and they can be regarded as fully

The English 11 lines are met with 11 Arabic lines. The Arabic version is

less in number of words and different in rhyme. However, the linguistic and technical

features of the Arabic translation are indeed made to come as close to those of the

original as can be imagined. Arabic equivalents associated with alien cultural images are

used, which make the original image appear clearer, with the same effect, and supply the

Arabic language with fresh images. Such recombination of the original lines does not

make them look musical, which is a primary feature of verse; nor does it seem to serve

the structure of the Arabic lines; it rather breaks the grammar of Arabic language.

Contrary to Arabic norms of structuring a sentence, some sentences begin with the

subject nouns "الشتاء" و "الصيف" (as literally as the original does).

The translator preserves most of the technical features of the original (concerning

rhythm or tempo, sequence of ideas, tone, and point of view) in a completely different

linguistic and cultural matrix. He ideally produces a kind of translation that carries the

general cultural and linguistic parameters of the source text. Lulua’s translation matches

with Lawrence Venuti’s preference for the technique of Foreignization over


Munday, in his book Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications,

believes that if Foreignization is applied to a translation, the target text readers will feel
that the translator is “visible” and they will tell “they are reading a translation” (2001, p. 147). This solution would highlight the importance of translators according to Venuti.

**Conclusion:**

Lulua loves poetry; therefore, he excels in poetic translation. He captures the essence and the rhythm of *The Waste Land* by understanding the true meaning of Eliot’s words. He is not a poet himself, but appreciates and enjoys poetry. He is a faithful translator who is capable of revealing to the Arab reader the various elements of a wonderful poem like *The Waste Land*.
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Abstract
Over the past 10 years, there has been a great deal of research on how Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has affected Translation education. This paper presents a study about use of ICT practices among undergraduate English translation students at the University of Helsinki. It tests the hypothesis: While translating, contemporary English translation students at the University of Helsinki rely primarily on the Internet for reference material. A mixed method was utilized in this paper. A quantitative methodology involving questionnaires with a 5-point Likert scale was used to gather data in 2010. Qualitative data was also gathered in the form of detailed answers that some respondents wrote on their questionnaires. Results suggest that a major shift in Translation Studies has occurred and contemporary Western learners rarely use the library or printed sources when doing their translations. Instead, they tend to use the Internet which is more closely related to training future translators for real world tasks.

Keywords: Translation education, parallel texts, translation
Introduction

Over the past 10 years, there has been a great deal of research on how Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has affected Translation education as well as education in general in the West. For example, Berber (2008) did a comprehensive worldwide study on the use of ICT in teaching conference interpretation. A common perception in the university is that the library is dead and students acquire all or almost all of their information from the Internet. Is this true? It can be argued that access to computers and the internet is not globally equal and that training of future translators is thus affected by “geopolitics of pedagogy” (Cronin 2005). Nevertheless we believe this claim to be valid within Western training institutions.

After we presented this study as a conference paper, eminent translation scholar Andrew Chesterman put forth:

“What kind of evidence would persuade you that this kind of teaching method is not the best method and the old fashioned method might be better? What would make you change your mind since the kind of data that you have presented is mostly data on what students think? In fact, maybe whether students ‘like it’ or ‘don’t like it’ is not relevant, you might say. What would make you change your mind to go back to the old method?”

Maria González Davies (2005) claims that research on translation studies should pay more attention to “what happens [...] in the classroom”. She calls for more studies on class dynamics and the tools of the trade of translation teachers. Burden (2003) suggests that students are conditioned to think that anything that is beneficial is going to be disagreeable and this attitude is at odds with the way teachers plan teaching approaches.

This study will be limited to the law translation course in the English translation section of the University of Helsinki. This paper will present an introduction, literature review, research methods, results and a discussion and conclusion section.

Literature Review

Since Dewey's research (1938/1997) the role of the experiential learning has been seen as an important approach to teaching. More recently Gibbs (1988) and Kolb (1984, 2005) have brought out the essential role of experience in the learning process: the learners “learn by doing”. However in order for the learning to be proper it is essential that the learning takes place “in context” (McLellan, 1994) and the context and activities need to be authentic in
relation to a real life situation where the same skill or knowledge would be used. Kiraly (2000: 3) shares this constructivist approach to education and suggests that “true [translation] expertise can only be developed on the basis of authentic situated action, the collaborative construction of knowledge, and personal experience”. Kiraly (2003, 2005) and Robinson et. al. (2008) have further developed this social constructivist approach to translator training, the latter reviewing its contribution to the educational field in general and also online learning.

According to Kearsley (1996) “The most significant aspect of the Web for education at all levels is that it removes the artificial wall between the classroom and the ‘real world‘”. Chouc (2010) further suggests that many researchers and teachers have accepted that the computer can provide an alternative to real-life setting, and that such technology can be used without sacrificing the authentic context which is a critical element of the model.


**Research Method**

Originally, a quantitative research methodology was chosen for this study because our literature review found none addressing this specific field of translator education that utilizes a blended learning approach. In addition, one colleague had recently argued that qualitative research is useless applied language study without actually writing a paper to support this concept. The writers feel differently and decided to conduct a quantitative study to show that such studies are useful in our field.
Our hypotheses are:

1. English translation students at the University of Helsinki rely primarily on the Internet for reference material.
2. English translation students at the University of Helsinki collaborate on the Internet but also need face-to-face teaching.

We seek to prove or disprove these. This study is limited to English Translation students at the University of Helsinki although it may give a good indication about student practices elsewhere. In addition, this study was interested in how these features manifested themselves among the learners.

A questionnaire was designed using a 5-point Likert scale as developed in 1932 by Rensis Likert. (Duprey & Shehan 1999). This required the individuals to make a decision on their level of agreement with a statement: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. According to Duprey & Shehan 1999, this is the most commonly used question format for assessing participants’ opinions of usability.

In keeping with the Likert research tradition, our questionnaire addressed student opinions concerning teaching and learning practices built on experiential learning, social constructivism and blended learning in general used in the courses they participated. The questionnaire as a whole had 34 questions, but this paper will be limited to address only the questions related to computer and Internet use. Therefore, one could say that a modified system was utilized because in a full scale Likert survey questions relate to a wide range of areas and are correlated with the number of respondents. This was not deemed necessary because of the limited nature and statistically small number of participants of this study.

The questionnaire was administered through the online platform Moodle. In some cases, respondents added qualitative answers to their questions. These answers were integrated into the analysis because they flesh in the quantitative data. Rather than being purely quantitative or purely qualitative this paper utilized mixed methods. Mixed methods are widely accepted in educational research today (see Creswell & Plano Clark 2007, Greene 2007, Johnson & Christensen 2008, Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004, Leech & Onwuegbuzie 2009, Onwuegbuzie & Collins 2007, Onwuegbuzie & Leech 2006, Ridenour & Newman 2008). The researchers feel that in educational research, mixed methods yield reliable and valid results.
The total number of respondents for the entire survey was 20 (N=20). The respondents were a combination of students from two different groups: first group was comprised of advanced students in an LSP course on legal and administrative translation. The class had eight (8) participants, 7 of which responded. This was an 87.5% response rate among the advanced student target group. The second group was comprised of thirteen (13) second year English translation majors. At that time, there were sixteen (16) second year English Translation majors studying in the program. So, the sampling consisted of a representative sample of 88% of the students in the program. One must keep in mind that the department only accepts 18 students per year. So, unlike in many other countries, our groups are quite small. In addition to practical translation and translation theory courses the students are also trained in the use of the Internet for searching information in a compulsory ICT-skills course for all the students of the university (Helminen 2007: 184) and during their translation skills courses.

Reliability
The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was tabulated using the PASW Statistics 18 software. It was found that the overall Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the questionnaire is high (r = 0.984) which in turn indicates a high degree of internal consistency and thus relatively high level of reliability of the instrument.

Means and standard deviations for individual questions will be presented in a following table in with “m” standing for “mean” and “sd” for “standard deviation”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is always better to have translations via web platform (Moodle etc.)</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is always better to have your translations through email instead of a web platform</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is always better when you can download the course materials and assignments from the web</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is always better to use term banks such as Eurlex, IATE etc. whenever you can [in class]</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It is always better to translate without parallel texts from the Internet</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. It is always better when you can use parallel texts that are on the Internet &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;4.65 &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;0.49

7. It is (always) better to translate with only printed dictionaries &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;1.60 &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;0.68

8. It is (always) better to use the Internet to find background information &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;4.65 &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;0.93

9. It is always better when you can write and edit assignments in class with Word or some other word processing software &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;3.20 &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;1.32

10. It is always better to have translation lessons in a computer classroom &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;2.55 &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;1.05

11. It is always better to be able to use programs such as Google Docs &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;3.60 &nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;0.88

Results

In the following paragraphs we will describe 11 out of the 38 questions. The questions were chosen since they focus on the tools the students use in their translation exercises both in class and on their own or during group assignments. For the composition of the two courses and students groups see chapter 3 Research methods.

Moodle vs. Email

The use of Moodle versus email was addressed by the study. Moodle is a web-based platform widely used in the Finnish education system. Instructors have all of their material, forums, assignments, links, and course material there.

The results can be seen in Tables 1 and 2.
Tables 1 and 2. Web Platforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>It is always better to have translations via web platform (Moodle etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>It is always better to have your translations through email instead of a web platform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Str Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students in the studied institution are used to have their translations and other assignments in an electronic form. A web platform, the Moodle, was used as a communication and cooperation tool during the studied courses, although students could use e-mail too. A majority of the respondents (12% or 65%) favoured a web platform and only one in ten preferred some other method when asked whether or not it is better to use a web platform instead of some other method in completing in their assignments. Although the standard deviation in replies concerning the web platform was relatively higher (1.27) and two respondents (10%) strongly disagreed with their use, it should also be noted that none were strongly against both of the electronic communication methods.

Using electronic course materials

The use of electronic course materials was also addressed by the study. The results can be seen in Table 3.
Table 3. Downloading materials from the web

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Str Dis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str Agr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 It is always better when you can download the course materials and assignments from the web

When asked about their opinion on using electronic course materials and the web as the distribution channel for assignments and course materials only one respondent (5%) reacted negatively and 15 (80%) positively. As can be seen from the mean value of 4.25, the students clearly preferred using a web platform for their classes. If we record the scores for ‘agree’ and ‘strongly agree’, 12 of the students (65%) preferred using a web platform for their classes. For them, it was preferable to download course materials and assignments from the web.

The answers may reflect practices in the courses the students have been attending. When we started studying translation the teachers photocopied the material and they handed it over to the students. If one did not come to class, one did not get the material. In our classes, the teacher often posts the assignment on the web and the students download the text and translate it.

For many assignments, the students form groups to translate texts. Then they post their drafts and finished texts on Moodle and comment on them using the forums. So, by the time we actually went through the translated text in class we were looking at third or fourth versions.
which were pretty clear. Such activities teach the learners to use the tools available to develop their remote translating and co-operation skills, abilities and perspectives.

**Term Banks**

The use of term banks was also addressed by the study. Term banks are specialized terminology databases on the Internet or an intranet and alongside more traditional specialised terminological dictionaries and standards seen as important tool in translation of LSP texts. The results can be seen in Table 4.

**Table 4. Term banks use in class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Str Dis</th>
<th>Dis</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agr</th>
<th>Str Agr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4, one can see that students prefer using internet based term banks for their translation. Mean value of 4.05 and standard deviation of 0.83 indicate a clear preference for online terminology tools among the respondents. On a closer analysis of the results one can note, that since one third (7) of the respondents were specializing in legal translation and were thus familiar with the Eurlex and the IATE, both online databases containing EU terminology and translations of legal texts. Two thirds (12), general translation students, were familiar with the tools, but used them sporadically. Still 13 of the students (70%) agreed or strongly agreed when they were presented with the claim “In translation classes, it is (always)
better when you can use term banks such as Eurlex, IATE etc. [in class]”. The remaining 30% were indifferent.

**Parallel texts**

Finding parallel texts was also addressed by the study. The results can be seen in Table 6 and 7.

**Table 6 and 7. Parallel Texts and the Internet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Table 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is always better to translate without parallel texts from the Internet</td>
<td>It is always better when you can use parallel texts that are on the Internet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 5 and 6 show clearly that respondents favour parallel texts from the Internet. So, even if you encourage them to go into the library, contemporary translation students avoid it. Recently there has been some discussion in Finland that the university no longer needs a library because students can find everything they need using computers. Tables 6 and 7 support this. According to classroom discussions and translation commentaries of translation students studied here, the students use mainly the Internet when they search for background information, terminology, parallel texts or vocabulary; this was clearly evident from the responses.

All of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the claim that: “In translation classes, it is (always) better when you can use parallel texts that are on the Internet” (mean of 4.65) and
only one (5%) disagreed with the question “In translation classes, it is (always) better to translate without parallel texts from the Internet” (mean of 1.60).

**Googling vs. print**

The study also asked if it was better to translate with only printed dictionaries versus using Internet to find background information. The results can be seen in Tables 7 and 8.

**Tables 7 and 8. Dictionaries vs. Internet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7 It is (always) better to translate with only printed dictionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Str Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8 It is (always) better to use the Internet to find background information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Str Dis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two more questions analysed the same phenomena of information mining in the internet or, as students commonly put it, Googling, “In translation classes, it is (always) better to use Internet to find background information” and “In translation classes, it is (always) better when you can use term banks such as Eurlex, IATE etc. [in class]”, this was tested by asking the opposite later in the survey “In translation classes, it is (always) better to translate with only printed dictionaries”. Although only 70% favoured term banks and other online sources for terminology searches, none of the respondents preferred printed dictionaries. When the replies for both questions are compared statistically using online term banks has a mean of 4.05 (standard deviation of 0.83) and using printed dictionaries has a mean of 1.60 (standard deviation of 0.68). Respondents as a whole are thus a slightly more inclined not to use printed sources than using online sources. It would be interesting to analyse the reason for this tendency. One could hypothesize that the ease of use of the Internet (most students have personal computers in their dormitories and a free of charge Internet connection provided by the university) and the availability of free, although of often less than perfect quality, online dictionaries weights heavily against purchasing fairly expensive printed dictionaries.

**Background information**

The use of the Internet to find background information was also addressed by the study. The results can be seen in Table 8, presented above.

When students were asked on their preference for the Internet as the best source for information (“It’s always better to use Internet to find background information”) an overwhelming majority, 18 respondents (95%), agreed or fully agreed with it. Interestingly one respondent, an outlier, strongly disagreed with the claim differing from the mean (4.65) by more than three times the standard deviation (0.93).

When compared to Table 8 (It is always better to translate with only printed dictionaries) with 90% disagreement rate this clearly shows that the surveyed students favoured electronic resources. This supports a general trend towards using the Web instead of printed resources observable in translation commentaries provided by the students during the academic year. The mean values of both questions further indicate strong preference (1.60 and 4.65 respectively) towards the Internet as the main information source.
Class room equipment

The use of word processing software was also addressed by the study. The study also addressed the use of how learners write and edit assignments in class with MS Word or some other word processing software and if they preferred to have translation lessons in a computer classroom. The results can be seen in Tables 9 and 10.

Tables 9 and 10. Computer use in class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. It is always better when you can write and edit assignments in class with Word or some other word processing software</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str Dis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. It is always better to have translation lessons in a computer classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str Dis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 9 and 10 created two out of the three widest standard deviations (1.32 and 1.05 respectively) in the survey. This may have been caused by the difference in the two groups surveyed and will be further analysed in the Tables 9b and 10b in the following. Most translation lessons the students attended during the academic year did not include translation in class, this was especially true for the second year group of the two groups surveyed. Translation assignments were discussed and analysed in groups and by students themselves who identified translation problems in the texts, sometimes creating draft translations, but they usually did not have time or were asked for finished translations.
When students were asked about classroom facilities (“It’s always better when translation lesson is in a computer class”) only 5 (20%) agreed or strongly agreed with this against 9 (45%) who did not think (disagreed or strongly disagreed) this as important for translation lesson. A third remained indifferent (neither agreed nor disagreed). Since most of the students consider Internet as their main information source and they all returned their translations through a web platform or email, they possibly did not consider translation lesson as a place for actually doing translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Word processing in classroom</th>
<th>10. Lessons in computer class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree or Disagree</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed or Strongly agree</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean / Standard deviation</td>
<td>2.71/1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(LSP = LSP course students; General = general translation students)

Interestingly the replies of the two student groups were very different from each other. Due to the small number of students the difference is not statistically significant but qualitatively it is interesting. The answers of the students who attended the LSP course and were third or fourth year students were polarised, they either disagreed or strongly disagreed (3 students or 43%) or agreed or strongly agreed (3 students or 43%) to both questions. Whereas the general translation students, comprising second year students were more indifferent on both questions (six neither agreed nor disagreed 46% in both questions). This may be explained by the type of texts usually translated: general texts, where the amount of new information to be searched is limited, versus specialized texts that often require more knowledge mining and thus more time and concentration.

The subgroup results will be presented in the below tables 9b and 10b.
Tables 9b and 10b. Detailed computer use in class

Table 9b. It is always better when you can write and edit assignments in class with Word or some other word processing software

Table 10b. It is always better to have translation lessons in a computer classroom
This structure of translation lessons might explain the results for another question concerning the importance of possibility to edit translations in class with the help of word processing software and a computer. Nearly half agreed or strongly agreed with the claim, a third remained indifferent and a surprisingly large number, 20% of the students, strongly disagreed with this.

**Google Docs**

The use of Google docs was also addressed by the study. Google docs are a package of web-based, free office programs offered by Google. The package allows users to collaboratively create and edit texts, spreadsheets and other items. The results can be seen in Table 11.

**Table 11. Google Docs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>45%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Str Dis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str Agr</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The package was not used as a compulsory learning tool during the academic year the students took part in the research, but some of the students used it spontaneously. According to the replies more than a half (55% or 11) of the students recognised the usefulness of such a collaborative tool.
Discussion and Conclusions

The results clearly indicate that among our respondents those using only printed sources and the resources at hand for translation are extinct. Today, the students and the professionals translate with the help of the Internet, its resources, its tools and with the help of the networks of their colleagues and other contacts.

A move from email to web platforms, which was supported by the surveyed students, improved management of knowledge from the student side and management of the teaching from the teacher side.

A step further in making learning environments even more authentic would be to move the process of writing a new translation from students’ local desktops into the web and into the cloud. According to the survey results, especially the question on GoogleDocs, students do not yet recognize the possibilities offered by the cloud software tools. This may be due to understanding of translation as an individual effort, by lack of information on the new software developments or some other reasons. Cloud software and various social networking tools are among the areas we want to look in for our future research and – also – help the students to understand and to learn how to use them for collaboration and working together more flexibly.

Adoption of more student and learning centred practices and the Internet as a communication and information searching tool transformed the teaching into more flexible modern social constructivist learning environment where the students can build the information together wherever they are and whenever they can do that. In essence work and translate like the professional translators they are turning into.

The proposed change is further supported by the fact the Finnish elementary and secondary level educational systems have already changed. Most students beginning their university studies have already adopted social constructive learning philosophy, are using the Internet as their main information source and - at least some of them - understand problem solving and knowledge building as a co-operative and experimental process.
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