Deciphering the Aim of Translation Studies: Examining the Five Translation Studies Perspectives

Marlijn Walraven

S1599178

m.walraven.5@umail.leidenuniv.nl

First reader: Drs. K.L. Zeven

Second reader: Dr. A.G.Dorst

MA Linguistics: Translation in Theory and Practice

2014-2015

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Opening Up Five Perspectives

Over the past century, the field of Translation Studies has evolved past many stages. After centuries of "sterile debate" (Munday 2009: 19) regarding the nature of a translation, new insights and ideas began to sprout and develop. On the one hand, so much new input and so many new approaches to the process of translation caused the discipline to formally come into being and flourish. On the other hand, it has become increasingly unclear what the aim of the discipline is. Many approaches, or perspectives, combine the discipline with other disciplines, such as psychology or linguistics, while others do not. In this way, each perspective added valuable and interesting theories to Translation Studies, all the while obscuring the actual aim of the discipline. Each perspective seems to have its own aim.

The aim of this thesis is to research the nature of Translation Studies by providing an answer to the following research question: what constitutes a 'good' translation? By formulating an answer to this question, the priorities and aims, in other words the 'nature', of this discipline can be made clear on the assumption that Translation Studies is concerned with the creation of quality translations. This assumption can be made because, as will become clear throughout this thesis, each perspective is concerned to some degree with defining how and when a satisfactory translation can be made.

The word 'good' in this thesis refers to all translational actions that are approved by the proponents of each perspective. This means that a 'good' translation may be different for each perspective. The term ''good' translation' always refers to a translation that is created in the way the proponent, or the perspective they belong to, believes a translation should be created.

This thesis tries to answer the question of what constitutes 'good' translation in order to help translators (and translator students) gain insight into the various academic perspectives on the nature of a high-quality translated text. It seeks this answer by way of examining the work of renowned translation theorists from across the five perspectives found in Translation Studies. The distinction and definitions of these perspectives are made by Hurtado Albir (1994) in his work *Perspectivas de los Estudios Sobre Traducción*. This thesis uses Ordóñez-Lopez' (2008) English translations of these definitions. The five perspectives are named as follows: the Philosophical and Hermeneutic perspective, the Textual perspective, the Communicative and Socio-cultural perspective, the Cognitive perspective,

and the Linguistic perspective. Each perspective approaches the field of Translation Studies in a different manner, which is the cause for many different interpretations and idea regarding translation practice. As this thesis seeks to unite opinions from across the academic field, and a number of perspectives only deal with written texts, multimodal translation will only lightly be touched upon.

While informative texts which discuss the different perspectives are in no short supply (see for example Venuti 2000, Malmkjaer 2005, Munday 2009, Pym 2010), this thesis attempts to add to their discussion by not only explaining, but also comparing each perspective with every other. Thus, it hopes to establish an overview of not only the differences, but moreover the similarities in approach between the different perspectives. Discussing these perspectives would thus, in the final chapter, reveal which aspects of translation are considered 'good' according to all perspectives. This definition of a 'good' translation could then serve as a basic principle in Translation Studies on which all theorists agree and to which can be referred to measure the quality of new theories or new solutions for translation issues. To the knowledge of the author of this thesis, no such definition or the idea thereof is propagated in this discipline as of yet, although knowing and understanding the nature of Translation Studies seems crucial if its (future) academics want to contribute to achieving its aim.

The structure of this thesis is as follows. Each chapter discusses one of the five perspectives. Each chapter opens with a short introduction to the approach of the perspective, followed by the examination of the works of one or more translation theorists from that perspective. Each chapter closes by stating the definitions of a 'good' translation found in that perspective. The final chapter will provide an overview of all definitions that are found in multiple perspectives and formulates a conclusion on the basis of those findings.

Chapter 2: The Philosophical and Hermeneutic Perspective

In this chapter, the work of the translation theorists and philosophers José Ortega y Gasset and George Steiner will be examined to form a definition of a 'good' translation from the Philosophical and Hermeneutic perspective in Translation Studies. According to Ordóñez López, the works of both these theorists fit into this perspective (2008: 50). These theories focus on the thoughts and responsibilities of the writer and the translator rather than semantic and linguistic values found in the text. Ortega y Gasset is chosen as representative of the old translation debate dominated by German Romanticism, of which his work is a clear continuation (Ordóñez-López 2008: 42). However, it will be pointed out that his work shows signs towards the more communicative approach that Steiner adopts. This is important, because it shows a closer relation to the more modern perspectives in Translation Studies, as will become clear throughout this thesis, which in turn allows for more accurate comparisons between all perspectives. Steiner's influence on the evolution of translation theory is described by Munday as opening up "a 'sterile' debate over the 'triad' of '**literal'**, '**free**' and '**faithful**' translation" that had dominated the field centuries (Munday 2009: 19; bold in original). His approach serves as a bridge between this perspective and the other, more modern ones.

This chapter will first, in section 2.1, discuss Ortega y Gasset by examining his *The Misery and the Splendor of Translation* (1937/2000). Then, in section 2.2, it will turn to Steiner through two of his texts, namely *On an Exact Art (Again)* (1982) and *The Hermeneutic Motion* (1975/2000). These texts touch upon a few similar subjects, such as the impossibility of successfully translating, making them interesting to compare. Finally, in section 2.3, the definitions found in these works will be combined to form a single definition of a 'good' translation for the aforementioned perspective.

2.1: In the case of Ortega y Gasset

José Ortega y Gasset opens his *The Misery and the Splendor of Translation* (1937/2000) by stating that properly translating a text is impossible. Just like most of the actions undertaken by mankind, translation "will always remain mere intention, vain aspiration" (1937/2000: 49). Such a statement fits neatly into his "philosophy of life" (Graham 1994), which draws a

parallel between the failure of human actions and the beauty of human attempts to achieve perfection. He captures this in his concept of the two utopianisms, which will be explained below. In *The Misery,* Ortega y Gasset shows a fascination for the doomed nature of certain aspirations: "Nature has simply endowed each creature with a specific program of actions he can execute satisfactorily" (1937/2000: 49). He claims that translation is "necessarily a utopian task" (49). Of course, what Ortega y Gasset is saying in these opening paragraphs is merely an indication of the high standards he expects a translation to meet before he considers it a 'good' translation, making this text a fitting choice for the subject of this thesis. First, this section will discuss his notion of 'writing well'. Second, it will explain his concept of the 'phenomenon of *flou*'. Then, it will examine more closely Ortega y Gasset's notion of culture-specific language balance. Fourth, the different kind of text types these notions apply to will be discussed.

The main difficulty for translators presented by Ortega y Gasset is how to 'write well'. He argues that writing well constitutes making "continual incursions into grammar, into established usage, and into accepted linguistic norms" (50). This means the author needs to provoke new meaning and interpretations through the use of, for example, unusual word combinations or unusual grammar. Ortega y Gasset considers this the correct way to write, because writing must be "an act of permanent rebellion against the social environs" (50). Ribeiro interprets this as the responsibility that "as translators we are to depict what the author means to say with a word, instead of attributing any meaning to a word based on how we would tendentiously read it" (2012: 12). She argues that the "author's style", their personal preference in linguistic incursions, must be faithfully represented (12). However, Ortega y Gasset claims that the translator is prone to betraying the text by placing the translation in a frame of correct grammar and standard linguistic usage. While his generalization of translators' tendencies seems somewhat arbitrary, his claim nonetheless reveals much regarding his ideas about 'good' translations. Clearly, he sides with Walter Benjamin's idea that when choosing between the two sides of Schleiermacher's dichotomy of bringing the reader to the language of the author, and bringing the author to the language of the reader (Lianeri 2011: 5), one should opt for bringing the reader to the language of the author (Benjamin 1923: 18). This sense of equivalence represents the persuasion that a translation should attempt to linguistically represent the original text, that is, to transmit the

idea presented in a text by retaining its linguistic quirks and irregularities so as not to needlessly influence this idea.

Ortega y Gasset argues it is important to retain these incursions because of the symbolism on which language is constructed: the definition of a word is as much dictated by social conventions as it is by the historical and geological location of its users. As an example, Ortega y Gasset translates the Spanish word *bosque* [forest] with the German word *Wald* [forest]. While the dictionary may claim that the words are interchangeable, the concept of a Spanish forest is not necessarily interchangeable with the concept of a German forest (1937/2000: 51). After all, Spanish forests are coniferous, while German ones are deciduous. Moreover, the many cultural-specific stories, such as the Grimm fairy tales, connect many different connotations to the German *Wald* that may not exist for the Spanish *bosque*, and a *bosque* may likewise have connotations non-existent for a *Wald*. This may merely seem to point at the impossibility to translate correctly, of which Ortega y Gasset is all too fond to remind us. However, what is implicit is that when a concept or word is lifted from its established usage in a text (e.g. in metaphors, symbolism), the translator must pay attention to the effect of this incursion and recreate this effect in the translation. It is, in fact, the only layer of the irregular usage that can be transferred. He bases this reasoning on what he calls the "phenomenon of *flou* [blur, haziness] in a visual image and in linguistic expression" (52). This phenomenon refers to combining words so that they all slightly diverge from their standard meaning towards an implicit second meaning, enabling an author to create a literary work that adheres to Ortega y Gasset's defition of 'writing well'. What is important for a translation, then, is that it retains this vagueness of meaning, this *flou*. Ribeiro refers to this as "cracking the code of an author's personal style" (2012: 13). However, this style cannot always be translated into a corresponding style. As shown in the *bosque/Wald* example, standard meaning is culture bound. Ortega y Gasset argues that it is allowed, or perhaps even necessary, to employ different literary techniques than can be found in the source text (1937/2000: 51).

A second difficulty shines through in Ortega y Gasset's discussion of 'thoughts'. A thought, which is the actual message the author wants to bring forward in a text, cannot be fully expressed through language. This focus on translation (in this case, translating thoughts to words (Ribeiro 2012: 15)) as an attempt of protecting one's identity can be seen more clearly in Steiner's work (Sharp 1989: 141). This aspect of language is the initial reason a

'good' writer makes incursions into established usage[1]. However, incursions can only account for a small percentage of deepened understanding; the unhinging of common connotation is mostly present to focus the reader's attention on what is not mentioned at all (56). Ortega y Gasset argues that a society's language can only be used to express concepts already known to its users and that it is ill-fitted for even that designated use. Ribeiro interprets this as the need to remain silent, to omit, when words do not exist or are unknown to the speaker. This silence would be necessary to point out that some thoughts cannot be expressed (2012: 17). However, a different interpretation is also possible, and seems to be more in line with the rest of Ortega y Gasset's views on translation. Ordóñez-López seems to disagree with Ribeiro as well when he claims that silence "actively participates in the act of translating" (2008: 46). The role of silence in the act of translating can be explained as follows. To express a new concept, the writer can use unusual word combinations or surprising grammar usage. For example, the word 'night' is usually associated with 'dark'. A writer could therefore write the phrase 'a light night' to unhinge 'night' from its usual association and push the reader towards a different interpretation frame. These incursions allow the reader to take a step back from the initial meaning of words to a more conceptual and generalized level. The less-defined nature of this conceptual level results in a wider meaning for the word: the word 'dark' gains meaning that is not present when it is used in a conventional context. Ortega y Gasset argues this additional meaning is a silent implication, because it focuses the reader's attention to what is not actually mentioned, but merely highlighted through unconventional use. This implication is what he means when he refers to "the mutual secrets that peoples and epochs keep to themselves and which contribute so much to [what is] in short – an audacious integration of Humanity" (1937/2000: 57). This silent implication is important for translation, as, assuming the writer realized this issue and carefully chose which words to unhinge, the translator must in some way not only correctly interpret the silence, that implicit and unmentioned extra meaning, of the writer, but use "his native tongue with prodigious skill" (51) to duplicate the message. Otherwise, the first difficulty, that of representing the source text linguistically, could never be overcome. Ortega y Gasset adds to this that "each language is a different equation of statements and silences" (57). A 'good' translation thus not necessarily

[1] Following this logic, aesthetic reasons for linguistic incursions can only follow after a thought has been expressed.

mirrors its source text in the concrete information that is provided: some elements must be omitted and others must be explicated to achieve that language's balance.

However, it is important to note that what Ortega y Gasset proposes here should not be classified as domestication on Venuti's scale of domestication/foreignization (1995: 20). After all, it has already been argued above that Ortega y Gasset clearly adopts a foreignizing approach to translation. Instead, what is argued here is that for his equivalence, the presence of a specific thought in both the source text and the translation, to be achieved, the translator has to create the culture-specific balance between statements and silences. While this seems to lean towards a domesticizing approach, it is important to realize that without this balance, there would be no equivalence and thus no translation to speak of. In other words, rather than catering to either the readership or the writer, Ortega y Gasset's notion of a balance precedes Venuti's scale in that it is the principle on which his definition of 'translation' is based.

All of the definitions referred to above which make up a 'good' translation for Ortega y Gasset neatly come together in his concept of the two utopianisms. Firstly, he speaks of 'bad utopianism', marked by its notion that anything that is desired should be attainable. This kind of utopian thought would prevent critical thinking and often only lead to frustration and failure (1937/2000: 52). The second kind of utopianism is 'good utopianism', which is a manner of thinking that acknowledges the unattainability of certain outcomes, while staying focused on how to reach the goal as closely as possible. The largest difference between these two ways of thinking is that 'good utopianism' is focused on progress and therefore "achieves many things. […] The only thing that Man does not achieve is, precisely, what he proposes to" (53). Ribeiro interprets this as encouragement, rather than discouragement, to create "exceptional work based precisely on the inherent obstacles" (2012: 14). Likewise, Ordóñez-López refers to "the possible splendor of translation" (2008: 43). He also adds that the idea of progress in translations explains Ortega y Gasset's argument to create "divergent translations of the same work" (1937/2000: 62), as it "would not be possible to approximate all the facts of the original text at the same time" (2008: 48). To Ortega y Gasset, a 'good' translation, then, is preceded by the desire to create the perfect translation, regardless of the existence of earlier translations. Steps towards a 'good' translation can only be taken if the translator acknowledges the difficulties of making a

perfect translation and subsequently makes a serious attempt at creating such a translation, even if they will inevitably fail to produce such a product.

Lastly, the mentions of literary effect as well as the meaning of new and hidden messages in a text indicate that Ortega y Gasset speaks mainly of literary texts and perhaps also of philosophical texts. In *The Misery*, he briefly mentions scientific texts, only to classify their terminology as some form of self-referential language. He adds that due to the high degree of jargon, "in every country these are written in almost entirely the same language" (51) but are rarely understood by the uninitiated who nonetheless speak the same mother tongue. Translating a scientific text, then, is from terminology to terminology, rather than from language to language. For this reason, he does not classify translations of such texts as translations at all. His silence on the translation of, for example, manuals, should perhaps be interpreted as including the message that such texts could never classify as a 'good' translation. After all, none of Ortega y Gasset's methods for achieving equivalence apply to non-literary or non-philosophical texts.

Ortega y Gasset's idea that a hidden message is present in a text is taken to a different level in Steiner's work. He argues that communication is only a secondary function of language, whereas the main function is "to create alternities" (Sharp 1989: 141), which refers to the creation of a personal identity and interpretation of the world. This main function could already be deduced to some degree from Ortega y Gasset's claim that the author's personal style needs to be translated, but will be further explained in the next section.

2.2: In the case of Steiner

Much like Ortega y Gasset does in *The Misery*, in *On an Exact Art (Again)* (1982) Steiner takes a closer look at "the *a priori* foundations of "semantic trust" which *underwrite* […] the actual business of translation" (8; italics in original). In *Exact Art*, Steiner focuses on the premises from which translators gain the notion that a text is translatable, as well as the consequences of a text being translated into English. Supported by Steiner's *The Hermeneutic Motion* (1975/2000), in which he discusses the conceptual process a translator goes through, these two texts will provide a compact but complete image of Steiner's notion of a 'good' translation. This section will first discuss Steiner's notion of translatability. Second,

it will discuss the relation between meaning and form. Then, it will examine Steiner's premise of worldly coherence. Fourth, Steiner's concept of 'translator aggression' will be explained and linked to translation equivalence. Fifth, the concept of 'answerability' will be discussed. Lastly, it will be determined to which text types the extracted definitions can be applied.

Steiner opens both *Exact Art* and *Motion* by stating that every translation is preceded by a notion of translatability (1982: 8, 1975/2000: 186). A text must be "meaning-ful" (1982: 11) and must contain a message "to be understood" (1975/2000: 186). The first definition for a 'good' translation for Steiner, then, is that it transfers the message inherent to the source text. Interesting for this thesis' hypothesis is that despite the high standards set for a 'good' translation by both Ortega y Gasset and Steiner[2], Steiner spends the first pages of *Exact Art* arguing that a "failure to translate" (1982: 9) has rarely seen the light of day. He mentions languages such as Etruscan and that of Easter Island as ones that have yet to be deciphered and thus cannot be translated yet, but sees them as temporary obstacles. And although he doubts the veracity of the theory, Steiner also mentions Chomsky's universalist approach, which must form the basis for almost all translators to believe their work is possible: "all languages share certain necessary features and operational means" (10). In other words, a translation can be made as long as the source language can be deciphered and the source text has a message to decipher. In *Motion,* this resembles the first movement of the hermeneutic motion, namely that of an "act of trust" (1975/2000: 186), the belief that the translator is capable of transferring the original into a translation. To Steiner, such claims are so innate to translation and the translator that they are merely "a *trivial* truth" (1982: 11; italics in original). However, exactly because all translators must believe so, this aspect of translation remains important for Steiner to discuss. This is a clear indication that Steiner demands more of a translation than a transfer of words before he considers it a 'good' translation.

Following this inherent "*meaning-fulness*" (11) of a text, that decipherable message, leads the translator to their first difficulty: to take away the meaning from the form. In chapter 6 of this thesis, which discusses Catford's Linguistic perspective, it is argued that the separation of meaning and form is not necessarily a difficulty at all. For Steiner, this separation poses two problems for the translator. The first is a conflict between language

[2] Steiner's standards will be explained later on in this section.

and translation (12), the second an act of betrayal (1975/2000: 187). The conflict between language and translation is crucial to understanding Steiner's notion of a 'good' translation. Steiner views language as using "form" to generate "content" (1982: 11). After the writer has used form (for example, words) to express content, or meaning, the translator must separate the meaning from the words and transfer them to another form. However, word and meaning are only separable if the meaning of the word is vague and relatively unmeaning-ful[3]. After all, language is at its most meaning-ful "where it is most packed with realized signification [and annuls] the distance between *significant* and *signifié*" (1982: 12). Sharp argues that here, "[u]nderstanding […] is correct or effective translation" (1989: 138). When all meaning is transferred between languages can a translation be considered correct. Steiner provides mathematics as an example, where the meaning of a mathematical unit cannot be expressed except by using its specified symbol. While admitting that language does not possess quite the same relationship between form and meaning as mathematics does, it is clear that he stresses the impossibility of a 'good' translation. Sharp underlines Steiner's stance when arguing for "the inadequacy of translation and its necessity" (138). Despite never succeeding in creating an adequate translation, "the attempt to translate must be made" (138). For Steiner, a 'good' translation must keep the relation between form and meaning intact while providing the meaning with a different form. The second problem for this difficulty can shed some more light on this condition.

The second problem, discussed in *Motion*, is an act of betrayal towards the text and follows logically after the first problem. When the translator, necessarily arbitrarily, separates meaning from form, they can only discover that "there is nothing there to elicit and translate" (1975/2000: 186). If meaning is detached from form, what follows is that anything can mean everything; the text becomes unmeaning-ful. However, according to what is discussed above, the translator must acknowledge a text to be meaning-ful before he can consider translating it and is thus responsible for the text to lose its meaning. To attempt to distill meaning in another form is, in reality, to betray the meaning of the original text. Moreover, when related to Steiner's claims of language in *After Babel* (1975), in which he argues language is a means to protect one's own identity (Sharp 1989: 141), such betrayal can be seen as an attack on the author. To remain faithful to their profession, which means to refrain from betraying the trust, the translator is forced to "gamble on the coherence […]

[3] This spelling is used to mirror Steiner's terminology.

of the world" (1975/2000: 187). It is these last two points that reveals another definition of Steiner's 'good' translation, and why Sharp explains Steiner's concept of culture as being "a tissue of translations, an enormously complex web" (1989: 137). For a 'good' translation to come into being, the premise must first be fulfilled that the world and all its languages must be intertwined on such a level that a conceptual message can be expressed and understood in multiple forms while retaining a singular meaning. This premise mirrors the equivalence found already in Ortega y Gasset, although here Steiner makes no explicit mention of literary linguistic usage[4]: the message inherent to the source text must be retained completely in the translation.

Another definition of Steiner's 'good' translation can be found in the second movement of the hermeneutic motion, aggression. It details how the translator "invades, extracts, and brings home" (187). When interpreting the content of the form, the translator engages in an appropriative act by choosing one or multiple interpretations to bestow upon it a meaning that can be transferred, or extracted, and put into the translation, or brought home. The obvious pitfall of this action is that singling out certain interpretations will leave others behind, thus disabling the source text message to be retained completely. This mirrors Ortega y Gasset's idea that a text can have second, silent messages embedded in it. In Steiner's terms, the result of such aggressiveness is that a "seductive otherness is dissipated" (187), texts have been "exhausted by translation" (187) and "the original text has thinned" (1982: 13). The comparison of a translator with an invader implies that Steiner, just as Ortega y Gasset, prefers a foreignizing approach to translation. Only if the message of the original text is not disturbed by the invading culture of the translator can the translation hope to create equivalence.

However, Steiner not only warns the translator for loss of information. Linguistic and aesthetic originality, if present in the original, must be present in the translation as well. The challenge lies, as similarly discussed in section 2.1 through the *bosque/Wald* example, in the "native semantic field [that] is already extant and crowded" (188). The originality of the author in the source culture may be lost by the practices and associations of the target culture. What is important for Steiner's 'good' translation, however, is that the source text's originality stays purely a product of the source culture. It must not become mixed with the target culture to produce something new yet again. This entails that the translator must

[4] He does mention this during the third movement of the hermeneutic motion, which is discussed below.

generate an integral response and not "a wash of mimicry" (188). When source and target culture would blend in such a fashion, the translation may let the "vein of personal, original creation [go] dry" (188). In other words, a 'good' translation portrays the originality of the source text, but makes no attempt to unify it with the target culture[5]. A 'good' translation is to exist in, but must not be a part of the target culture.

Steiner expands on this in *Exact Art* (1982) when he provides cases where the translator has improved the original text. While Ortega y Gasset insisted the translator must use "his native tongue with prodigious skill" (1937/2000: 51), Steiner argues that the translator must be careful that his version does not become "too sovereign" (1982: 17). If the translator is "too high a master in his own right" (17), the translation may enrich the original in such a way that the original becomes lame and obsolete. In other words, the translation should not be more aesthetically pleasing than the original, as its job is to mirror rather than improve the source text. Sharp explains the reasoning behind this to stem from a desire "to give [the text] full due as an object of understanding" (1989: 140). Steiner stresses that this also means the translator should not use the translation "to argue for, to deploy, to give tactical precedent and support to his own work or […] movement to which he adheres" (17). This adds a layer to the translation equivalence of a 'good' translation that has so far not been mentioned. A 'good' translation retains the message and originality inherent to the source text, and must contain only that, and no more, originality and message than is present in the source text.

While on the topic of 'translator', Steiner also argues for the "answerability" of the translator (16). Similar to the task of achieving the correct balance discussed in section 2.1, the translator working on a 'good' translation "aims for a condition of significant exchange" (18). Following the aggressive approach of the translator by interpreting the source text, they must proceed by trying to restore the balance that was thereby disrupted. A 'good' translation restores the intertextual connotation, the linguistic ambiguity and clarity that are present in the source text (19). Steiner even goes so far as to say that "[p]erfect translation is (or would be) the negation of entropy" (18). This means that a 'good' translation is answerable, or comparable, to the source text and stands on equal grounds with it, meaning that it is equal to but does not replace the original.

[5] Considering the intricate connection between language and culture, it seems unlikely such a separation is at all possible.

Unlike Ortega y Gasset, Steiner makes no mention of what text types these rules account for. Beyond stating that a text must have a decipherable meaning to transfer, he makes no distinction between any text types. However, it should be clear that such definitions for a 'good' translation regarding retaining linguistic and aesthetic originality and using form as a means of expression are largely directed at literary texts. Steiner's most important addition to the definition of a 'good' translation, that part which states the translation must only contain what is in the original, is very applicable to juridical texts.

2.3: 'Good' Translation from a Philosophical and Hermeneutic Perspective

Discussing these two translation theorists from the Philosophical and Hermeneutic perspective of Translation Studies has provided numerous definitions of what constitutes a 'good' translation. Most of these definitions are similar or at least comparable, supporting Ordóñez López' claim that theorists from the same perspective approach translation from the same angle (2008: 50). This allows for a combining of the individual definitions of Ortega y Gasset and Steiner into a single, more complete definition of 'good' translation from a Philosophical and Hermeneutic perspective.

From this perspective, a source text must first possess a decipherable message to transfer to the translation. The translator must acknowledge that it is impossible to complete this task satisfactorily, but must nonetheless make a serious attempt at completing it. Both theorists argue strongly for equivalence in which the message remains present in the translation in terms of information as well as linguistic originality. This means a 'good' translation has to establish a balance between literary effect, statements and silences, and personal and cultural identity. The translation must remain purely a product of the source culture: the translator may not implement aspects of the target culture into the translation nor attempt to improve any shortcomings of the source text. The translation must contain nothing more than what is stated in the source text so that it can stand on equal ground with the source text, while making no attempt to replace it.

Following this definition, it becomes clear that from the Philosophical and Hermeneutic perspective, a translation serves to allow a target readership to understand the

complexity and originality of a source text. In House's[6] (2009: 9) terms, the translation is an overt translation and on Venuti's (1995) scale it is foreignizing. This definition of a 'good' translation is mostly applicable to literary and philosophical texts, but is also useful for legal texts. It may be concluded that while both Ortega y Gasset and Steiner believe that every text can be translated, producing a 'good' translation is utterly impossible.

[6] House will be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3: The Textual Perspective

In this chapter, the theories put forward by translation theorists Juliane House, Basil Hatim and Ian Mason will be examined to form a definition of a 'good' translation from the Textual perspective in Translation Studies. According to Ordóñez-López, the work of these theorists is prominent in the field of Translation Studies (2008: 49). Quite differently from what was seen in the Philosophical and Hermeneutic perspective, the Textual theories argue for a functional, pragmatic and *skopos*-oriented view of translation. A 'good' translation of the Hermeneutic perspective focuses mainly on communicating the hidden message of the source text to the target readership. The Hermeneutic perspective tries to explain how to represent all elements present in the source text, and only those elements. The Textual perspective goes in a rather different direction and argues that it is largely up to the target culture to decide what the target text will become. The arguments behind House's distinction between overt and covert translations grant insight into the reasoning behind this, and the central role of the *skopos*-theory in Hatim and Mason's work further emphasizes the influence of the target culture on the resulting translation.

This chapter will first, in section 3.1, discuss House's theory by examining her works *Text and Context in Translation* (2006), *Moving Across Languages and Cultures in Translation as Intercultural Communication* (2009) and *Towards a New Linguistic-cognitive Orientation in Translation Studies* (2013). Then, in section 3.2, Hatim and Mason's notion of a 'good' translation will be defined by examining their works *The Translator as Communicator* (1997) and *Discourse and the Translator* (1990). Discussing these texts results in a logical progression away from the source text and towards an increased influence of the target culture on the translation process. Finally, in section 3.3, the definitions found in these works will be combined to form a single definition of a 'good' translation for the Textual perspective.

3.1: In the case of House

In her work *Text and Context* (2006), House visits three key aspects of her approach to Translation Studies. These are her functional-pragmatic view, her concept of overt and covert translation, and her re-contextualization theory. These three aspects yield numerous

definitions of her notion of what constitutes a 'good' translation. However, *Text and Context* merely glosses over two of these aspects, and instead focuses on the re-contextualization theory. House's works *Moving Across Languages* (2009) and *Towards a New* (2013) provide further insight into the other two aspects. Analyzing all three of these texts would thus, theoretically, provide a complete and clear understanding of House's notion of a 'good' translation based on the three key aspects of her approach. House's *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited* (1997) can provide further insight into these aspects and House's reasoning. However, it is in the opinion of the author that a cross-comparison of the three chosen texts, which largely cover the same topics, results in a more reliable analysis.

This section will first discuss the role of context in translation. Second, it establishes why House prefers the functional-pragmatic view over the other traditions. Third, the role of the function of a text will be examined. Then, this section will turn towards House's re-contextualization theory. Fifth, this theory will be combined with the concept of 'overt and covert translation'. Finally, the goal of the translator will briefly be touched upon (and further explained in section 3.2).

In *Text and Context* (2006), House argues that the role of context in translation is of great importance. In her Functional-pragmatic approach, context refers to the culture of both the speaker and the listener or reader, earlier conversations of the listener or reader, and the personal opinion of the subject matter of the parties involved (2006: 342). She claims that context is what allows the reader to understand the background to which the text was written; only once the reader places the text in the correct context, a correct frame of understanding can be constructed to decipher the deeper meaning embedded in that text (342). She later writes in *Moving Across Languages* (2009) that "translation cannot be fully understood outside a cultural frame of reference" (8). Thus, a translation can only hope to convey this message, to create equivalence, if the correct context is established for the reader to interpret. This argument can be phrased as a definition of what House regards as a 'good' translation: the translation must recreate an appropriate context for the reader to decipher the message constructed in the source text. The definition found in House's work is a translation's adherence to (c)overtness and will be discussed below.

House first discusses the many current traditions of defining 'context' and how those inevitably lead to a 'bad' translation[7]. While the numerous definitions range from philosophical to psychological to anthropological fields, House's main argument against all of them is that they "really only [apply] to oral language, not to written language" (2006: 342). That written texts experience a different kind of context than spoken texts appears to have gone unobserved in the other fields, causing Zarandona to call House's observation "extraordinarily meaningful and a key factor in translation" (2008: 491). In other words, none of the other fields' notions of context apply to the act of translation. Interestingly, this entails that House does not consider the interpreter's task to be a form of translation, as an interpreter does deal with oral language. For House, then, a 'good' translation must be based on a written source text and produced as a written target text.

The traditions that do define 'context' adequately are the functional-pragmatic and systemic-functional traditions (House 2006: 342). House sides with the functional-pragmatics by arguing that functional speech roles, such as providing or requesting information or making an assertion, are the primary role of context in a written text. This opposes the other traditions discussed in *Text and Context*, which all to some degree claim that context constructs itself between the actants involved in the dialogue, as each actant's knowledge and understanding leads to certain interpretations, which influences the directions a dialogue takes. In this way, the context shapes the text as much as the text shapes the context (340). However, functional-pragmatic scholars perceive written texts as a "stretched-out speech situation" (342). The reader can only start interpreting after the first actant, the writer, has said all they wanted to say, resulting in not a dynamic but a static creation of context. After all, since the author and the reader cannot immediately exchange thoughts and knowledge with one another, discourse cannot dynamically unfold from "turns-at-talk" (343). Static context then refers to the one-sided discourse that is created when no external input is given, for example when a writer writes their text. Pym rightly argues that this is not necessarily applicable to the translation process: "translation itself [is] a significantly variable mode of discursive work" (1992: 228). In creating the translation, the translator arguably discusses with the source text to create the translation, which would result, in House's terms, in a dynamic creation of context for the translation (228).

[7] For a detailed discussion of each tradition, see House (2006: 338-342).

Still, it is House's argument that in a static context, rather than the interaction between multiple actants involved in a dialogue, it is instead the function of the text that dictates the direction and message of the text. According to House, this is what makes this approach appropriate for translation, as translation "is an operation on (pre-existing) written text as opposed to talk as oral, linearly and sequentially unfolding, negotiable discourse" (2006: 342), in other words a static rather than a dynamic discourse. While House does not seem to realize the dynamic nature of translation that Pym argues for, she does perceive the translation process as a discourse. Zarandona shows that House's emphasis on the source text as a starting point for the function of the text is a sign of discourse analysis "[b]ecause of the overriding higher status given to the source text when translating" (2008: 492). A hierarchy between speakers is an important aspect of discourse analysis (492). On the basis of discourse analysis, House justifies that to produce a 'good' translation, the translator should first determine the function of the source text. However, as will be argued below, House does not believe this function must necessarily remain the same or even similar. According to Panou (2013) and Capelle (2011), this kind of functionalist approach is also typically found in House's other translation theories (2013: 3; 2011: 310), which points at the importance of a functionalist context concept for House's idea of a 'good' translation. Almost naturally, then, the functionalist concept of context forms the basis of her re-contextualization theory.

This theory argues that translation is an act of re-contextualization: translating separates the source text from its source context and embeds it in the new, target context. As House argues that meaning is derived from its context, this gap between source context and target text appears similar to Steiner's notion that the translator is forced to distill the same meaning in a different form. But, House takes her analysis in a slightly different direction. Her theory discusses how text is "a stretch of contextually embedded language" (2006: 343). In other words, it expresses the common notion that a linguistic unit can only be understood in combination with other linguistic units. In addition, House argues that besides the use of linguistic units, cultural background passively supports a text to render meaning. This means that all the information is clearly present in the text and to its readership, while the Hermeneutic perspective argued that a hidden meaning must carefully be deciphered from the author's personal style. What would logically follow for the Textual perspective is that a 'good' translation would somehow recreate the source cultural

background that is needed for the target readership to understand the translation. House's approach appears far more practical. To explain why, it is necessary to first understand the distinction between overt and covert translations.

Rather than opting for a universal approach of 'good' translation for all texts, House makes an important distinction that influences the assessment of any translation. This is the distinction between overt and covert translation, the choice of which depends on the goal or *skopos* of the translator. A 'good' overt translation achieves functional equivalence, while retaining those unfamiliar elements that lead the target readership to realize that they are not the author's intended readership; the text is clearly a translation, due to "an incompatibility of linguistic and cultural norms" (2009: 9), and not aimed at the target culture's demographic. Thus, in an overt translation, the source text's cultural background is not at all recreated into a target cultural background. An overt translation does not attempt to recreate the linguistic effect present in the original, but rather leaves it intact, despite the potentially different function of the effect in a different context. As a result, the goal of a 'good' overt translation is to allow "the new audience to gain an impression of […] the cultural impact that the original text has" (16). This is very much in line with the Hermeneutic perspective's argument that the translation should be a path to the original, rather than a replacement for it. The Socio-Cultural perspective, discussed in chapter 4, argues that such a replacement function is often impossible to produce.

So, an overt translation does not need to retain the text function of the source text. Zarandona sees this as House admitting "the shortcomings of her model, which she seems [to take] for granted" (2008: 492). Moreover, House seems enthusiastic about the approach related to overt translation in *Moving Across Cultures* (2009):

> It is only when we tear the reader away from his linguistic habits and force him to throw himself into the mind of the original author that a translation proper comes into being. In this case genuine linguistic and cultural transfer takes place – we have here a true meeting of languages, cultures and contexts. (14)

And shortly afterwards, she speaks of the value a text must have in order to be considered for overt translation:

> Source texts that call for an overt translation have an established worth or value in the source culture – and potentially in other cultures. In their universality, they are often 'timeless' as works of art and aesthetic creations. (15)

Such descriptions hint at House's value of a 'good' translation to overlap with her notion of an overt translation, which could be classified as the need to leave be the original text as much as possible due to its cultural value. Zarandona disagrees with this interpretation, arguing instead that only in cases of covert translation it is possible "to achieve or approach her [House's] ideal of functional equivalence" (2008: 491). While it is true that covert translation is more in line with her own definition of equivalence, House's choice of words when discussing the two provides hints as to which she actually prefers. In any case, House also argues for certain other texts to call for covert translations, so this singular concept of a 'good' translation may not necessarily apply.

A 'good' covert translation, then, is a translation that replaces the source text. It replaces the original in such a way that no linguistic choices fall outside the target readership's cultural frame of context; the target readership has no indications that they are not the originally intended readership (House 2009: 17). For a translator to create such a translation, they must recreate, rather than leave intact, the function of the source text and attain "'real' functional equivalence" (17). After all, in this case it is not only the source text, but also the target culture on which the translation must be based; in discourse analysis, this is seen as a more equal power distribution between the two speakers (Chakhachiro 2009: 33). This equality allows the target text to mirror the source text in a way that makes sense to the target culture: the translation is not seen as a translation, which determines the context into which it is place, making it possible for the textual function to remain intact. House argues this can only be done with such texts which do not appear to be culturally bound. In other words, only if the effect of the text is not achieved solely through literary methods specific to the source culture context can the exact same effect be recreated in the target text. For this re-creation, House develops the concept of a "cultural filter" (2009: 17). A 'good' covert translation applies this cultural filter, this compensating for culture specificity, in such a way that no trace of the source culture remains. A 'good' covert

translation is thus based on decades of empirical research of both the source and the target culture, in order to correctly frame the scope of the context of each (17). Such a high standard for creating a 'good' translation indicates that House thinks highly of these kind of translations, although she also argues it means it is "the translator's task to 'cheat' […] and remain hidden behind this feat of deception" (17) and mentions it can only apply to "mundane" (19) texts. While such distinct characterizations of overt and covert translation leads one to think House is clearly in favor of overt translation, which would point clearly at her values for a 'good' translation in general, she argues she holds a neutral stance throughout *Moving Across*.

Moreover, in the earlier published *Text and Context* (2006) she argues the actual reasoning behind choosing an overt or covert translation should depend on the goal of the translator (348). She argues it is possible to attempt either translation for any kind of text, although the difficulty to achieve a satisfactory result will clearly vary. She also argues that the goal of the project is what ultimately matters. This is further argued by House (2013), where she claims the following:

> translation is above all an activity involving language and its cognitive basis. A pre-occupation with external social, cultural, personal, historical, etc. factors impinging on translation 'from the outside' […] seems therefore to miss the point about the essence of translation. (47)

Here, House argues that the quality of a translation lies, in essence, in its language and cognitive basis, as expressed in the different goals of overt and covert translation explained above. Whether the translator pays tribute to the cultural value of a piece does not influence its assessment of being a 'good' translation. This role of the goal or *skopos* of the translator is seen more strongly in section 3.2, which discusses Hatim and Mason's work. Furthermore, House argues the personal interests of a translator need not necessarily remain hidden or absent from a target text either, although she notes that such methods as using footnotes or prefaces may be preferred to changing the actual message (48). However, whether a translation is 'good' or not ultimately depends, among the other values found in this section, on whether or not the translator produces a sound overt or covert translation.

3.2: In the case of Hatim and Mason

While showing many similarities with House's functional-pragmatic view, Hatim and Mason's notion of what constitutes a 'good' translation is based mostly on the *skopos* of the translation. This term, developed by Vermeer (1986: 269-304), refers to the importance of "the aim of any translation action, and the mode in which it is to be realized" (Vermeer 1989: 221). As such, Hatim and Mason's notion appears to differ per text. Still, in their work *The Translator* (1997), they develop an analysis of text types for translation that reveals a number of conditions a translator should keep in mind. They also touch upon the importance of relevance, which is explained in more detail in *Discourse* (1990). Examining both of their largest works, although the focus will be on the analysis provided in *The Translator*, will then provide a definition of Hatim and Mason's 'good' translation. This section will first discuss their general stance on 'good' translation. Second, the role of *skopos* will be explained. Then, their concept of 'effect and efficiency' will be examined. Fourth, ways of fulfilling the *skopos* will be analyzed, divided into 'intentionality' and 'situationality'. Fifth, the uses of 'writing convention' will be discussed. Lastly, the role of culture will be integrated into their definition of a 'good' translation.

Hatim and Mason's general stance on what constitutes a 'good' translation becomes clear early on in *The Translator*. They do not "plea for literalist adherence to the grammar […] in the source text" (1997: 5). Rather, their approach shares much of the pragmatic one House takes, as they attempt to analyze all signals of communication as inferring meaning "beyond the words-on-the-page" (5), meaning they need to be contextually interpreted. They also look for rules of translation that "transcend any artificial boundaries between different fields of translating"; Hatim and Mason argue that different kinds of translation have been conceptualized on arbitrary values and that a universal approach to translation should be opted for (5). This leads to the conclusion that Hatim and Mason's notion of a 'good' translation can be applied to every text type.

Similar to House's arguments for choosing an overt or covert translation, Hatim and Mason emphasize that for the translator, the goal or *skopos* of the text depends on the initiator of the translation (9). Therefore, any aesthetic, functional or linguistic effect lost in a translation may be considered 'good' for a translation if that fits the *skopos* of the target text. Pym argues that, contrary to all discussion on translation before this concept of skopos,

the Textual approach and *skopos* theory are part of the first paradigm that is "*not* dominated by the source text, or by criteria of equivalence" (2010: 44; italics in original). Instead, Pym explains, the author and source text's role is diminished, and purely the target text function decides the quality of the translation (44). This means that those translators opting for the *skopos* theory share none of the responsibility felt by those of the Hermeneutic perspective to translate the author's message and identity. Hatim and Mason claim to provide an unprejudiced view on translation, in which betraying the author is condoned, and focus on the goal of an individual text as a crucial element to creating a 'good' translation (1997: 9), they still attempt to define a unifying framework in which to place the translation practice. Zooming in on this framework, then, will produce a certain universal definition for a 'good' translation.

Such a definition can be found in the further description of the translator's *skopos*-influenced task, where the text's readership is also taken into account: "one might define the task of the translator as […] being one of seeking to maintain **coherence** by striking the appropriate balance between what is **effective** […] and what is **efficient** […] in a particular environment" (10; bold in original). While incorporating the target readership's role into the quality of the translation is seen for the first time in the Textual perspective (Pym 2010: 49), it is seen to play a larger role in the Socio-Cultural perspective. Hatim and Mason argue that the communicative goal of the text (the effect) must coincide with the level of readership engagement that the target readership is willing to utilize (the efficiency). The communicative goal is similar to their notion of relevance argued in *Discourse* (1990: 95-96), where it is explained that the relevance of certain information and words is relative to the goal of the translation and the culture of the target readership. Malmkjaer (1992) agrees that the degree of analytic approach defines the "full interpretation it causes a hearer [or reader] to arrive at" (26). This approach is largely defined by the relevance of the information to the reader, as it influences the amount of participation (Malmkjaer 1992: 27). In short, a 'good' translation must be accurately balanced between its choice of words, the function of the text and the presumed reader engagement.

For example, a technically complicated text that aims to explain a highly abstract subject should only be produced for an readership that either possesses the knowledge needed for understanding the subject matter, or an readership willing to invest time and effort to obtain that knowledge while or after reading the text. If the readership falls into

neither category, the *skopos* of the translation, which is to make the readership understand the subject matter, cannot be achieved. This reveals two more of Hatim and Mason's conditions for creating a 'good' translation. First, the vocabulary and effects created in a translation must coincide with its *skopos*. Second, a 'good' translation must achieve its *skopos*. An assumption underlying these values is an overarching third value, namely that the initiator must have a clear notion of what the *skopos* of the translation is, and this *skopos* must be achievable.

To fulfill the *skopos* of a translation, the translator must focus on the intentionality of the text (1997: 16). This involves adapting or adjusting the biased view of the original author and considering the socio-cultural, pragmatic meaning of certain word combinations or connotations. For example, if the *skopos* is for the text to appeal to a female readership, a text from a misogynist author may be translated with a more feminist vocabulary. For Hatim and Mason, a 'good' translation is one in which the view of the *skopos* of the initiator comes to full fruition. Similar to House and in contrast to to the Hermeneutic perspective, they argue for the translation as a product separated from its source, which therefore has no obligations to overlap with any opinionated lexical choices, depending on the *skopos*. Moreover, if the *skopos* so requires, a 'good' translation does have the obligation to retain, omit, explicate, stress or generalize cultural references and influence pragmatic meaning. But, should the translator adjust the views expressed in the source text, they should ensure the "socio-textual focus of the text as a whole" (17) remains intact. This means that, while the changing of values and tone of a text takes place at word and sentence level, a 'good' translation must be coherent and cohesive on a text-as-a-whole level. As such, the role of the translator shifts from being an interpreter to a communicator. Above all, it is the message that needs to come across that is of import for a 'good' translation, and not its similarity to what is said in the source text.

Next to the concept of intentionality, Hatim and Mason place situationality (17). This next aspect of *skopos*-fulfillment relates to the use of vocabulary in terms of register, and the efficiency of readership interaction explained above. While a text and its views may be understood when expressed in a variety of ways, the translator working on a 'good' translation must keep in mind to balance the effect and efficiency of their text. This means that the correct register must be chosen so that the target readership can easily notice what kind of text they are dealing with and how thoroughly it should be analyzed. It seems

strange, then, that Elmgrab (2013), after discussing Hatim and Mason, merely concludes that "different text-types place different demands on the translator" (367), thereby ignoring the role of the readership in their theory. In fact, Hatim and Mason name two ways in which the translator can take the readership's register into account: social distance and physical proximity (18). Social distance pertains to the relationship established between reader and writer. If this tone is one of a teacher to a student, for example, this will invoke a certain response among the readership that will influence the way the text is interpreted. While physical proximity mostly relates to the mode of the text, which is spoken or written, it also deals with the writer's acknowledgement of the readership: if the writer would "talk less 'like a book' and more intimately as colleague to colleague" (19), the text would allow for and allow for different interpretations. These are arguments for Hatim and Mason's notion that a 'good' translation must achieve its *skopos*. A 'good' translation must consider which vocabulary fits and influences the reader's interpretation to reach the *skopos*.

Reminiscent of House's idea of translation as re-contextualization (House 2006), Hatim and Mason argue that the conventionality of stylistic and linguistic approaches per text type may heavily influence the amount of information gained by the readership (1997: 22). Writing informally where a formal tone is expected can potentially receive more attention from readers, who will in turn extract more information from the text due to their heightened attention. Certain vocabularies are evocative of certain types of texts, which warrant their own kind of interpretation. The translator can choose to unhinge or leave intact the writing conventions depending on the *skopos*, but, because of the influence of this choice on the intentionality and situationality of the text, its effect should not be underestimated (23). House (2006) argues that contextual information is, among other things, embedded in linguistic units (343). This means that by changing the linguistic units, the context changes accordingly. While Hatim and Mason focus on the level of awareness of the reader, the method to achieve this also brings about changes in context. Thus, giving the translation a new context, or re-contextualizing, through unconventional writing styles is a way for the translator to influence reader behavior and information presentation. They add to this that a balance between deviating from and adhering to the conventions is the only way to guide the wanted amount of attention to certain information (23). After all, a prolonged technique loses its uniqueness and effect over time, possibly resulting in a dulled down text. A 'good' translation, then, must find the correct balance between adhering to

and deviating from writing conventions as befits the skopos. This is yet another micro-level technique to apply the definition of Hatim and Mason's 'good' translation which states that 'the translation must achieve its *skopos*'.

Finally, also along the same lines as the re-contextualization theory (House 2006), all of Hatim and Mason's values for a 'good' translation are ultimately and concretely defined by the source and target cultures. Hatim and Mason argue that the notion of culture must be further divided up into cultures of communities. While House makes no such distinction explicitly, she also never argues a culture is nation-specific. Nevertheless, Hatim and Mason's distinction between different communities with, albeit overlapping, individual cultures helps differentiate between the various applicable domains of context to choose from (1997: 19). The target readership culture can be determined by nationality, but also by profession, field of interest or age, each culture having their own particular discourse and texts. It is the initial defining of a *skopos* that is most influenced by this distinction, as it further embeds the goal chosen and limits the options available. After all, if the goal is to educate translation master students on the aim of Translation Studies, so that no ambiguity remains on the subject matter, a translation cannot have the heavy use of symbolism, metaphors and other artistic, literary techniques as a simultaneous *skopos*.

3.3: 'Good' Translation from a Textual Perspective

Discussing these translation theorists from the Textual perspective of Translation Studies has yielded a number of conditions for achieving a 'good' translation. Many of these conditions show a similarity in approach, and their various nuances provide different arguments for why these conditions must be fulfilled in order to produce a 'good' translation from a Textual perspective.

From the Textual perspective, the initiator of the translator must first develop a clearly defined, realistic *skopos*. The *skopos* determines whether the translation calls for an overt or covert translation. A 'good' overt translation ensures that the target readership understands that they are not the originally intended readership by leaving the original linguistic effect intact, despite its possible different interpretation from the source text readership. A 'good' covert translation instead replaces the source text by letting no linguistic choices fall outside the target readership's cultural framework. This can be

achieved by applying a cultural filter. Regardless of its status of overt or covert, a 'good' translation must fulfill its *skopos*. It can do so by balancing the intentionality and situationality of the text, as well as the desired effect and the presumed readership engagement (efficiency). This balance must create the appropriate context for the readership to decipher the message.

Interpreting these values reveals that this perspective is above all concerned with the goals of the initiator of the translation project. While the readership and text type must be taken into account, and the function of the source text is important for the range of *skopos*-options, it mainly provides techniques and distinctions to help achieve any type of text as translation, regardless of equivalence or moral implications. Unlike the theories seen in the previous chapter, the Textual perspective deems creating a 'good' translation possible.

Chapter 4: The Communicative and Socio-cultural Perspective

In this chapter, the work of Katharina Reiss will be closely examined to formulate a definition of a 'good' translation from the Communicative and Socio-cultural perspective in Translation Studies. Only one translation theorist will be discussed this chapter due to length constraints, but one theorist will prove enough to point out the differences and similarities with the closely related Textual perspective. The Communicative and Socio-cultural perspective predates the Textual perspective of the previous chapter, and can perhaps be seen as its predecessor (Venuti 2000: viii; Ordóñez-Lopéz 2008: 50). These two perspectives show many similarities in terms of their focus on translation goals and the "ethical obligation of source-text function" (Pym 2010: 47), which refers to the choice to retain the function of the source text in the target text. However, the foundations and nuances differ greatly between them. As such, while it is still prudent to examine this perspective in its own right, there is lesser need to go into detail of two of its great contributors, having already discussed the Textual perspective. The work of Reiss will be discussed here in great part due to the discussion of House's work in chapter 3. In multiple instances, House has referred to Reiss specifically for her supposedly erroneous approach (see House 2006: 345; House 2009: 8, 13). For this reason, it seemed interesting to point out the similarities and differences that exist between the perspectives Reiss and House belong to.

This chapter will, by examining Reiss' *Type, Kind and Individuality of Text: Decision Making in Translation* (1981), attempt to define her notion of a 'good' translation in section 4.1. It will do so while comparing it to the values found in previous perspectives, especially the Textual perspective, as well as secondary literature. In section 4.2, a definition of what constitutes a 'good' translation will be provided for the perspective in question.

4.1: In the Case of Reiss

Reiss is perhaps most famous for her text-type typology, published in 1977 in a work called *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen der Übersetzungskritik*, which is a "functional approach [which] aims initially at systematizing the assessment of translations" (Munday 2007: 73). However, the academic community soon took it upon itself to criticize Reiss' approach and point out the flaws of her typology (cf. 2007: 76). In practice, it was often unclear to which function

many texts belong, and how exactly the typology would concretely influence the translation of such a text. What can be read in Reiss' *Type, Kind* (1981), then, is an updated, more nuanced, and more explanatory version of her earlier work in response to these criticisms, which in turn led Christiane Nord to create a list of questions that, when answered, revealed the text's text type (Pym 2010: 47-48). This means the text is more fitted for the subject of this thesis than *Möglichkeiten*, and should provide a clear and understandable notion of what 'good' translation is according to Reiss.

This section will first detail Reiss' definition of translation in general and the three text types she discerns. Then, it will discuss the temporal aspect of language. Third, it will examine Reiss' distinction between intentional and unintentional changes. Fourth, a brief comparison with the Textual perspective will be made. Then, Reiss' perceived importance of text variety will be discussed. Sixth, this section will take a closer look at Reiss' ideas about stylistic components of a text. Lastly, the definition of a 'good' translation will be examined by analyzing Reiss' discussion of the translation process itself.

Reiss opens *Type, Kind* by providing a definition of interlingual translation, stating it "may be defined as a bilingual mediated process of communication, which ordinarily aims at the production of a TL [target language] text that is *functionally equivalent* to an SL text [source language]" (1981: 160; italics added). To this definition should be added an aspect of translation provided by Reiss much later in her article, stating that the contents of the source text must be conveyed in the target text (167). Otherwise, this would mean that a 'good' translation not necessarily copies the information or hidden message in a text. Pym (2010) also points out this dissimilarity with Hatim and Mason's approach, observing that Reiss appears "uncomfortable" with the notion that a target text can take on a different function than the source text has (47). However, Reiss' initial definition hints at her priorities in creating a 'good' translation: first and foremost, a 'good' translation is a text that is the same in function as the text on which it is based. Thus, before the translator can hope to produce a 'good' translation, they must first analyze the source text in order to determine its function (162). Reiss distinguishes between three functions – or text-types – based on the communicative goal of the text. First, a text can be 'informative', meaning it attempts to communicate content. The second type is 'expressive' and deals with the communication of artistic value, such as the aesthetics of a poem. The third type is an 'operative' text, of which the main goal is to persuade its reader, for example an advertisement or political speech.

Because of the universal nature of these functions, they can be found in texts of any culture, and are therefore possible to reproduce in any target language (163). What Reiss argues is that any text possesses at least one, but likely more than one, of these communicative functions (162). It is the translator's task to determine the main function of the source text and reproduce that function in the target text. A 'good' translation, then, is a text which reproduces the main function of the source text.

However, an additional condition for this definition can be found in Reiss' article. This condition deals with the temporal aspect of language. Reiss argues that since texts are bound to language, and language changes over time, the main function of a text can change over time as well (162). As an example of a function changing over time, she names an electioneering pamphlet dating from the Roman Empire. In Roman times, the pamphlet was an operative text, as its main function was to persuade people to vote for a certain candidate. However, Reiss argues, its main function in contemporary cultures is that of an informative text, because it has turned into a historical report (162). In other words, what the translator should pay attention to is not the original function of the source text, but its function in contemporary culture. Thus, a 'good' translation does not need to be a target text in which the content or function of the original is fully retained, but rather a target text that reproduces the function of an original text as it is perceived by contemporary readers. Changing the text function seems to contradict Pym's observance of Reiss' preferences. But, it is important to note that, for Reiss, the function of the text is not decided on by the author. Speakers of Latin in contemporary society would read the pamphlet as a historical text, so that is the function the translation should possess: source and target text must have the same function, even if this function differs from the one the source text originally had. Năznean (2012) agrees to this and argues that while retaining the original function might be "sensible" and "desirable", the difficulty, if not impossibility, of the task means that "it is still not a necessary thing to do" (187).

While such a concept already allows for, or even obligates, great deviations from the original, Reiss distinguishes two more, related, instances of change: intentional and unintentional change (160). Unintentional changes are those changes that occur naturally when transposing from one language to another. Certain linguistic aspects that are innate to a language will inevitably cause generalization or explication due to the information carried in a single word. For example, whereas French grammar forces its user to define the gender

of a subject when using an adverb, such a practice cannot in all cases be duplicated in English. As such, information can unintentionally, but unavoidably, be left out in a translation. Intentional changes, then, are those that are arbitrarily made by the translator, depending on their goal (161). Perhaps the most notable form of intentional change is the use of "lexical forms in the TL – either already available or *of his or her own creation*" (Ortín 2013: 37; italics added). The creation of words as an option for translators is notable as it is not present in the other perspectives, aside from the Linguistic perspective discussed in chapter 6. Intentional change happens in a 'good' translation when the function of the text has changed from its original function. Reiss argues that such a change in communicative function occurs when "there is a change in the reading circle" (161). In other words, the communicative function of a text changes depending on the interpretation of its readership. Thus, intentional changes should only be present in a 'good' translation if the target text has a different target demographic than the source text.

Reiss' focus on the communicative aspect of translation is reminiscent of the Textual perspective of Translation Studies, in particular to that outlined by Hatim and Mason in *The Translator as Communicator* (1997). It is true that many similarities exist between the Textual perspective and the Communicative and Socio-cultural perspective, with their mutual focus being on the goal of the translation as the most notable similarity. However, it is important to note that the goal of the translation is derived from two different starting points. For the Textual perspective, as detailed in section 3.2, the goal of a translation is decided upon by the initiator of the translation. It is an arbitrary choice made on the side of the translators and translation initiators which defines the communicative function of the target text. However, what the Communicative and Socio-cultural perspective argues for is that the communicative function of the text is defined by the culture of the target readership. In other words, it is not the side of the translation producers but the side of the receivers which dictate the function of the translation. Moreover, this is not decided actively by the persons involved, but passively by the culture in which they live. After all, many cultural aspects decide for a person how they will likely interpret foreign information.

Another value for Reiss' notion of a 'good' translation can be found in her concept of 'text variety' (165). After defining the communicative function of the target text, the translator must define its variety. Similar to what Hatim and Mason argue for with their concept of 'situationality' (1997: 17), Reiss argues that the 'text variety' influences the tone

and register of the text in such a way that it becomes an important indicator for the reader to identify the communicative function of the text (1981: 165). After all, a sermon written in the style of a reference work will elicit different responses and interpretations from its readership than one written in the conventional style of a sermon. It is also important to Reiss that the translator adapts the conventions of the text variety to those of the target language: "the establishment of the text variety is of decisive importance for the translator, so that he may not endanger the functional equivalence of the TL text by naively adopting SL conventions" (165). This makes Reiss' notion of a 'good' translation a domesticizing one on Venuti's (1995) scale. For a 'good' translation, this means it must adapt its form, content and stylistic convention to those that are adequate for that text variety in the target language.

Yet Reiss' focus on text function and variety does not mean she foregoes completely the stylistic components of a text. Reiss stresses the importance of analyzing the style of the source text in order to "clarify in detail, firstly, what linguistic means are used to realize specific communicative functions, and, secondly, how the text is constructed" (166). Such an approach seems much more related to those of House, Steiner and Ortega y Gasset, as it hints at the importance of the deeper meaning of a text. What Reiss argues here is the following: only when, by close examination of linguistic techniques, the hidden structure and functions of a text is found, can the actual communicative function of the text be deciphered. This hidden function, or the 'hidden meaning' seen in the Hermeneutic perspective, is important because form and function never "show a 1:1 relation" (166). For Reiss, 'form' is "inclusive of everything in the communicative use of language that contributes to its expressive function" (Ortín 2013: 32), while 'content' refers to the information included in such expressive acts. Reiss acknowledges here that a text does not always say what it seems to say, and this hidden meaning influences the functions of the text. It seemed earlier that Reiss argued for the need to translate only the main communicative function of the source text, but this argument implies a 'good' translation must also retain secondary, perhaps even tertiary, functions. However, Năznean rightly points out that "the strategy to be applied will be determined by the "overall text type" and not the subdivision" (2012: 187). he dominant function of a text has a higher priority than the others, meaning those others can be omitted if their inclusion obstructs the effect of the primary function of the text.

The definitions mentioned so far are all based on the text analysis which a translator must complete before starting the actual translation process. When discussing this translation process, Reiss mentions a number of aspects that provide a more detailed definition of a 'good' translation. The most notable of these nuances relates to the content of both the source and target text. As explained earlier, the relation between function and content is such that the content is subject to change in order to retain the function of the text. However, Reiss adds to this that the overall content must still remain invariable (167). This means that the content of both source and target texts must remain intact. If the function is informative, the information provided in a 'good' translation must be the same or similar (i.e. generalizations and explications are allowed if the target culture requires them). In the case of expressive texts, it is the mode of expression that is considered the content of the text. In other words, it is not so much the specific use of words, but the "artistic and creative intention" (167) that must be reproduced. This means the translator of a 'good' translation recreates, through imagery and word usage befitting the target language, the source text's function, even if none of the concepts used in this re-creation can be found in the original text.

A different condition is mentioned for operative texts, as the effectiveness of its function relies on a combination of its readership and the idea or product the text is trying to sell. Advertisements, speeches and sermons are examples of texts that fall into this category. This function seems to relate most to Reiss' concept of the 'multi-medial' text type (164), a type she ranks above the other three. Multi-medial texts are those texts which rely for a large degree on a visual cue to derive their meaning, such as the image to which a slogan is put on a marketing poster. Reiss states that a number of multimodal text types, such as movies, musicals, presentations and speeches, also fall into this category. During translation of such texts, "the focus should be placed on "non-linguistic determinants"" (Black 2013: 37). Black argues that it is not so much the content of the words as it is the way they fit into the visual cue that is important here (37). As the text on, for example, a marketing poster is highly related to the image displayed, and as the effect of the whole is highly dependent on the target culture's receptiveness to such imagery, a 'good' multi-medial operative translation might completely overhaul the original, resembling it only in being a persuasive text.

4.2: ‘Good’ Translation from a Communicative and Socio-cultural Perspective

Even though only one translation theorist from this perspective has been discussed, numerous and detailed values for a ‘good’ translation have been found. This chapter showed how Reiss’ perspective shares many similarities with the Textual perspective, while clearly stemming from fundamentally different ideas. The notion that the goal of a translation is determined by the possible interpretation of the reader’s culture leads to different values than those found in the Textual perspective.

From the Communicative and Socio-cultural perspective, a ‘good’ translation can be defined as follows: first and foremost, a 'good' translation is a text that is the same in function (i.e. informative, expressive, or operative) as the text on which it is based. When a text has multiple functions, its main function should be determined and translated. In cases when such a function cannot be achieved, due to temporal and cultural changes, a 'good' translation is a target text that reproduces the function of an original text as it is perceived by contemporary readers. If the function changes in such a way, and only then, the translator is allowed to make intentional changes to the text. Besides text function, a 'good' translation must also be written in the right tone and register as befits its text variety. Since the hidden meaning of a text influences the function of the text, the translator working on a 'good' translation must try to include this same meaning in the translation, but only if it does not obstruct the effect of the primary function of the text. In case of an informative function, the translation must inform the reader of the same information. In case of an expressive function, not the information (content) but the artistic form of the text must be equivalent. In case of a persuasive function, both content and form may be overhauled as long as the desired persuasive effect is achieved.

In concordance with the Textual perspective, and opposed to the Philosophical perspective, the creation of a ‘good’ translation is considered possible in the Communicative perspective. By closely taking into account the interpretation of the target culture of the source text, its function and variety can be duplicated. As this notion of a ‘good’ translation is based first on function and only on variety second, it should in principle be applied to all text types.

Chapter 5: The Cognitive Perspective

In this chapter, the work of Donald C. Kiraly will be examined to formulate a definition of the translator working on a 'good' translator from the Cognitive perspective in Translation Studies. In the words of Ordóñez López, "'[c]ognitive theories' are those focusing on the analysis of the mental process made by translators" (2008: 49). Most of the studies done in this field are on translator training and decision making processes. This means that rather than looking for definitions of a 'good' translation, as has been done for the other perspectives, the Cognitive perspective calls for a closer inspection of the translator. This means that the focus of this chapter will be on the definition of a 'good' *translator*, rather than a translation, and shed light on the subject of this thesis in a different manner than the other perspectives do. This focus on the translator and, by extension, the translation process will still reveal a number of new as well previously seen definitions and conditions for producing a quality translation. Kiraly has been selected because of his focus on and innovation in translator education, which reveals more values than most of the other theorists active in this perspective.

This chapter will analyze three works published by Kiraly: *Pathways to Translation: Pedagogy and Process* (1995), *Towards a Constructivist Approach to Translator Education* (2001) and *Growing a Project-Based Translation Pedagogy: A Fractal Perspective* (2012). The following section will first discuss the overarching values while explaining the choice of sources. Then, it will discuss Kiraly's distinction between didactic and professional translation. It will analyze the position of the student as well as the influence of the instructor. Third, it will examine Kiraly's notion of translation creativity. Fourth, it will explain the need to understand the recursive nature of translation. Then, it will discuss the concept of social constructivism and what it is. Lastly, the section will move to Kiraly's distinction between the cognitive and social aspects of translation, and ways to influence the unconscious process of the translator. Then, in section 5.2, a definition of the 'good' translator will be provided.

5.1: In the case of Kiraly

In *Pathways* (1995), Kiraly bases his arguments on two distinctions. One distinction is made between the cognitive and social aspects of translation, which will be discussed below. The second distinction concerns the difference between didactic and professional translation. This distinction is made by separating those translation activities that relate to didactic purposes, such as language acquisition as well as many instances of translator training, from those activities that professional translators should undertake to create a product of value (6). According to Kiraly, at the time he wrote *Pathways*, many translator trainees were instructed in a way that perpetuated "a popular misconception that translation involves little more than the mechanical replacement of linguistic elements in a text with objectively identifiable equivalent linguistic elements from a secondary language" (6). He regrets that translators are thus taught to believe that translation practice is nothing more than swapping the words from one language into the other. He argues that a professional translator should possess "cognitive, social, and textual skills and access to appropriate stores of linguistic, cultural, and real-world knowledge" (6). These traits already point strongly toward the values of a 'good' translation. They imply the need for a translator to have a far-reaching knowledge of both the source and target language. Kiraly argues this is necessary, because the translator must be able to identify both the source text's and the target text's function, information content and readership. What Kiraly understands these traits to be will be detailed in the following paragraphs. While these notions were already long popular among those active in the field of Translation Studies, as can be read in chapters two through six of this thesis, this was not the case amongst translation instructors (Kiraly 2001: 50).

Kiraly's regret regarding this situation stresses the importance of the knowledge and skills of the translators for what constitutes a 'good' translation. In *Pathways* (1995), Kiraly puts forward a model that should improve the pedagogical system used for translator trainees. Nearly two decades later, in 2012, Kiraly publishes *A Fractal Perspective*, in which he positively notes that "[t]he *Zeitgeist* in translator education has indeed changed" (83; italics in original). He argues this change took place in part thanks to the model put forward in *Pathways* and the more concrete model examined in *A Social Constructivist Approach* (2001). This chapter is based foremost on the model proposed in *Pathways* (1995), as it

poses the most conceptual definitions of Kiraly's perspective regarding what traits and skills a professional translator should possess. To support these values, this chapter also draws from *A Fractal Perspective* (2012) and *A Constructivist Approach* (2001), which provide more concrete examples of what Kiraly expects of translator education and how it can still be improved upon from its current position.

The main argument Kiraly makes against classical translator training is that the quality of a student translation is made purely by comparing it to an arbitrary, different translation, while there is a "lack of commonly accepted guidelines or standards" (1995: 9) to which a translation must adhere. However, what Kiraly argues for is not the establishment of commonly accepted guidelines. His argument here is twofold: it speaks of inconsistent and potentially erroneous judgment of translation quality, as well as a passive attitude of translation students. Comparing the student's translation to what is often the instructor's own translation and basing correct and wrong translation choices on the basis of that 'master translation', stifles class discussion, individual thinking and propagates only the translation theory to which the instructor adheres (21). After all, the nature of such a class promotes the belief that the instructor has the solution and that the students need merely copy their instructor to achieve the desired result. This kind of transmissionist paradigm, in which all necessary knowledge can simply be taken or transferred from the teacher to the student, is the direct opposite of what Kiraly proposes (Pym 2010: 105). Kiraly argues the importance of autonomous thinking for translator students, which is trained "as students actively participate in their learning process" (Pym 2010: 105). This autonomous thinking can only be brought about through stimulation of translation creativity, or the ability to "see alternatives, the range of possible translations for any given source text" (Kiraly 1995: 21). A translator working on a 'good' translation, then, must possess this ability. Class discussion is one way that may help train this ability as it brings forward the differences in approaches between individual students and the instructor (22), meaning a far more active attitude from students is required.

Another way is to let students be involved in "authentic work experience" (2012: 84). By letting students tackle a series of professional translation projects, as opposed to texts specifically chosen for certain translation issues, they would be exposed to the recursive nature of translation competence building, rather than the linear one supported by comparing the student's 'wrong' translation to the instructor's 'correct' one. This sense of

recursive training would be built through the equivalent of 'class discussion' for professional translators: "the input and feedback of clients, proofreaders and editors" (84). This is similar to the role of the initiator and readership as seen in the Textual and Communicative perspectives: there are factors outside of the texts themselves, such as the *skopos* or the target culture, that influence the quality of the translation. Kiraly steps away from the notion that any translation can be the final and only good translation. In fact, he argues it is crucial for translators to realize that such a thing does not exist. For him, a translator working on a 'good' translation must be an autonomous thinker, who is capable of judging which possibility fits the function, information and readership of the translation. Such a translator must also be prepared to accept that their first attempt likely does not result in the final translation. According to Raído (2011), more direct methods to cultivate autonomy and translation creativity do not exist, because "conscious processes underlying choices, judgment and behavior are [inaccessible to] direct introspection" (16). She explains how students must unconsciously adapt to a certain way of working to consequently adapt, or in this case empower, the thoughts underlying the decision making process (17).

A third way to develop translation creativity comes from Kiraly's notion of social constructivism. He describes social constructivism as the view that "while our personal meanings and understandings of the world can never be identical to those of any other individual […], language serves as a common denominator of interpretation" (2001: 50-51). In other words, communication can take place because language exists to relate one speaker's experience to another speaker. What follows from this is that no objective meaning of a word can exist, as the interpretation of all speakers involved account for what words mean. Pym is right to note that "[h]ere there is no drastic uncertainty that would destroy all attempts at communication" (2010: 106) as is the case in other constructivist theories. Rather, the act of communication itself is what constructs the information. This is done not just by decoding the author's message, as Steiner (1975/2000) argues, but by adding one's own meaning to an utterance as well. This changes the position of the translator from merely a language swapper to that of a meaning creator: by not only interpreting the original, but also producing different words to express the original, the translator plays a large part in the creation of meaning in a text. Kiraly argues that the translator's understanding of their position is "embodied cognition" (2012: 84), an awareness and recognition of their function as a professional translator. This understanding

results in the empowerment of translators. This empowerment allows for the growth of autonomous thinking, but it also creates a sense of responsibility. The translator, as meaning creator, should "produce translations that are as literal as possible and as free as necessary" (1995: 11). Kiraly does not distinguish whether the restriction of the 'free translation' is based on the interpretation of the target readership or the *skopos* of the initiator, as is done by the Socio-cultural and Textual perspectives respectively. He does specify, however, that the translator working on a 'good' translation must be aware of the responsibility of their freedom in translation creativity due to the meaning creation effect of the translation process (12). That no clear restrictions are put in place for this creativity is typical for the social constructivist approach. Werhane et al. (2011) explain how the approach is based on the idea that "we do order the [information in the] world,[…] and this ordering and organizing process is always incomplete" (106). The learning process influences the way the world is ordered for each individual, and will thus change over time (106). To put restrictions on translation creativity implies there exists a limit to translation possibilities, while social constructivism argues that possibilities may change as a person's worldview changes.

The empowerment of the translator has further consequences. Kiraly notes that the translator themselves is part of what makes every translation situation unique. Arguing against the strictness of, for example, Ortega y Gasset (1937/2000), Kiraly claims the translator's idiolect and stylistic preferences are a translation-changing factor that cannot be ignored (12). While a 'good' translation must be as literal as possible, this seems to pertain more to the function and content of the text than its stylistic tendencies. Contrary to Ortega y Gasset, who has been shown to argue for a close adherence to the source text especially in terms of stylistics, Kiraly's empowered translator has the choice to apply his own preferences into the target text, or perhaps cannot help but apply these. So, not only does the translator create meaning, they also create style in the target text. This turns the translated text in much greater part into a creation of the translator than the Philosophical and Hermeneutic perspective would allow. In the Cognitive perspective, the translator working on a 'good' translation is allowed to make stylistic changes in the target text according to their own preferences. While Kiraly does not specifically discuss the limits to these changes, it could be assumed that the addendum "as free as necessary" (11) mentioned earlier applies here too; the translator's sense of responsibility governs the degree of changes allowed for.

All of Kiraly's arguments concerning educating a translator capable of producing a 'good' translation point towards Kiraly's second distinction: he sees the translation process as a social (external) and a cognitive (internal) activity. Albir and Alves (2009) describe the social aspects of Kiraly's translator as being "an active participant in three interrelated situational contexts" (58). The first two contexts encompass the source text and the target text and the people affiliated with them, whereas the third situational context refers to the translational activity itself. This activity can be understood as the cultural responsibility and self-image of the translator as a social agent (58), the influences of which are detailed above. A few of the cognitive aspects of translation have also already come forward, such as translation creativity and an understanding of the recursive process. Other parts of Kiraly's cognitive, or psycholinguistic, model regard "uncontrolled, non-observable processes" (58), which includes such processes as the synthesis of the translator's memory of external sources with the source text input. These complicated psycholinguistic processes influence the resulting translation by a large degree. Albir and Alves describe Kiraly's conclusion as if the uncontrolled nature does not allow for conscious influence (58). However, Kiraly's continued extensive research into translator education point at an opposing conclusion.

Kiraly's previously stated notion that a professional translator should possess "cognitive, social, and textual skills and access to appropriate stores of linguistic, cultural, and real-world knowledge" (1995: 6) shows a number of possibilities to influence these processes. The social and textual skills refer to the social part of Kiraly's model. Textual skills in this sense should be understood as the ability to understand texts and text functions and to produce coherent texts with the intended text functions (11). The social skills have been detailed above, as well as the cognitive skills Kiraly envisions. The last aspect of Kiraly's notion, then, is what influences these 'uncontrollable processes'. The access to appropriate knowledge mostly refers to the importance of long-term memory in the translation practice (101): everything a translator remembers influences the translation outcome. Rather than a passive intake of information, Kiraly argues for an active curiosity among translation students, nurtured by their instructors.

When such curiosity is fed to grow, the active processing of information regarding not only translation theories, but also anything else the students mentally digest, results in a more cohesive storage in the long-term memory of these students (102-3). According to studies in psycholinguistics, this means such information will be more readily available both

consciously as well as unconsciously to be used in daily practices (Raído 2011: 101). This is where the two parts of Kiraly's model most clearly influence each other: the cognitive process is influenced due to a heightened social activity. Kiraly's translator working on a 'good' translation is thus a translator whose unconscious linguistic processes have adapted to actively apply the necessary information that the source and target text contexts ask for. This relates to information of events mentioned in the texts, as well as wishes of the author or initiator regarding translation practices, and the translator's own preferences during the translation process.

5.2: 'Good' Translation from a Cognitive perspective

As the part of the translation discipline that focuses on the processes within the translator in a descriptive manner, not many values for a 'good' translation could be found. Instead, nearly all values found for the Cognitive perspective relate to the skills and competences of the 'good' translator, rather than to the traits of the translation itself. These values could be identified due to Kiraly's focus on translator education, which revealed the possibility to influence cognitive processes. The direction he argued this influence should provide, allowed for the extraction of a few values relevant to this thesis.

For the Cognitive perspective, the translator working on a 'good' translation must possess cognitive, social, and textual skills, as well as access to broad real-world knowledge. Social skills include translation creativity and an understanding and acceptance of the recursive nature of the translation process. This should result in an autonomous thinker, capable of judging which translation possibility fits the function, information and readership of the target text. Cognitive skills include a sense of responsibility towards the language making process that is translation, and self-recognition of their function of translator. This sense of responsibility allows the translator to insert his own stylistic preferences into the text. The translator must make their broad real-world knowledge more accessible by actively consuming information on a broad range of subjects. The only value found regarding the translation itself states that it should be as literal as possible, but as free as necessary. Kiraly, who is the representative of the Cognitive perspective in this thesis, does not elaborate on this value.

Chapter 6: The Linguistic Perspective

In this chapter, two translation theorists from the fifth and final perspective will be examined. This is the Linguistic perspective. The two theorists to be examined are J.C.Catford and Gideon Toury. Both scholars have published extensive work in the field of Translation Studies. Ordóñez-Lopez (2008) defines theories belonging to this perspective as "based on the application of a specific linguistic model" (49). It shares the most similarities with the Philosophical and Hermeneutic perspective, as it views the text and its language as the most central part of the translation process, rather than the initiator, the text function, reader's interpretation, or the mental process of the translator, as seen in the other perspectives that have been discussed in this thesis. However, the Linguistic approach clearly distances itself from the Philosophical perspective. In fact, Catford is one of the first to clearly break with the Hermeneutic's sense of equivalence (Malmkjaer 2005:23). Toury, on the other hand, is the bridging theorist between the Linguistic and the Socio-cultural perspectives (Merkle 2008: 176).

This chapter will first, in section 6.1, discuss Catford's *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965). A number of chapters from this monograph will be examined to develop a structured view of Catford's ideas. Then, in section 6.2, two works of Toury wil be examined: *The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation* (1978) and *Interlanguage and its Manifestations in Translation* (1979). These two articles will supplement each other to provide a clear view of Toury's notions. Lastly, in section 6.3, the definitions found in this chapter regarding 'good' translation will be combined to form a single definition for the Linguistic perspective.

6.1: In the case of Catford

In 1965, J.C. Catford published a work titled *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. This comprehensive volume extensively describes Catford's linguist approach to translation practice. In it, he explains among other things the different types of translation he discerns, what translation equivalence means and what kind of translation shifts (should) occur during translation. According to Munday (2007), Catford's examination of these concepts are considered an important contribution to Translation Studies (61). Malmkjaer (2005) adds

that Catford's definition of 'translation equivalence' formed the base for a new concept of equivalence, due to its focus on the different aspects of a text on which equivalence can be approximated (23). This concept goes against the traditional, hermeneutic sense of equivalence, in which the style, communicated information and silent information of a text must all be transferred to the target text. Instead, Catford's concept allows a text to only be equivalent on some levels of the text. It could be argued that this concept opened up the way for the other Translation Studies perspectives to develop. For these reasons, Catford's work will be examined in this section to discover his definition of a 'good' translation.

First, this section will discuss Catford's definition of translation. Then, his term 'textual material' will be examined. Third, his concept of transference will be explained, by dividing it into his three categories of 'extent', 'level' and 'rank'. All terms will be explained in the appropriate paragraphs. Finally, this section will pay attention to Catford's translation shifts to further detail the definition underlying his approach.

Catford defines translation as follows: "the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL)" (1965: 20). He argues that translation can be practiced between any language pair, regardless of the nature of the "spatial, temporal, social or other relationship between them" (20). This reflects Steiner's argument that a "failure to translate" has rarely seen the light of day (1982: 9), as any text can, theoretically, be translated into any other language.

Catford claims that two terms in his definition need further clarification: 'equivalent', which will be discussed later, and 'textual material'. Catford uses the term 'textual material' in his definition to underline the idea that the translator is not tasked to, as Kiraly (1995) called it, swap every word in a text from one language to another (6), but to create a phrase, or textual material, in the target language that corresponds with a source language phrase (1965: 22). Put as a definition for 'good' translation, this means a 'good' translation makes changes in grammar and lexis between the source and target text in order to create a corresponding target phrase. Catford also mentions that this means some source language terms or phrases may be transferred to the target text without being translated. He calls this process "transference" (1965: 43). While in normal translation the "TL text has *TL meaning*" (43; italics in original), meaning the words and phrases are part of the target language's system, in the case of transference the source language meaning is kept intact. Malmkjaer (2005) provides the example of a Danish phrase translated into English as "she gave me two

kroner [crowns]" (24; italics in original), to indicate that the Danish coins are meant, rather than British coins. This clarification might be preferable in order to pre-empt any wrong assumptions, even if it means making a text harder to understand for the reader because of untranslated words (24).

Catford argues transference is mostly preferred, or even necessary, when source language terms refer to concepts that have a different contextual meaning in the target culture (1965: 43). This refers, in the previous example, to difference in the Danish versus British coin association for the word 'crown' between source and target readership, respectively. In other cases, entirely new words may be created to refer to concepts that are not present or differently represented between languages. As an example, Catford provides the word 'bogop' to refer to a Navaho color, that in standard English vocabulary can otherwise only be approximated by stating that it is a shade of green, blue and purple (43). Transference can be applied on the level of lexis, as well as grammar. Malmkjaer adds that, in practice, "new words are rarely 'manufactured' […]. Instead, old words often get new uses" (2005: 23). Henry (1984) argues that there is no difference between a transference and a translation calque, or using a loan word (154), and in fact does not constitute translation at all. Nonetheless, the creation of new meaning for words is a practice available for translators who prefer Catford's 'good' translation. This means that a 'good' translation creates a new word or leaves a source language word untranslated when necessary. To determine when transference is necessary, what must be measured is the equivalence that the target language concepts can provide for the source language concept. The choice to opt for transference or normal translation depends on the possible translation equivalence.

Catford distinguishes three categories that define the type of equivalence of a translation, and consequently the need for transference. These categories are the 'extent', the 'level' and the 'rank' of the translation (1965: 21). The rank refers to the translation taking place at word, sentence or sentence group level. The translation equivalence may change throughout a text between these different ranks. At one point in the text, the translation can be only equivalent at word rank, while at other points whole sentence groups may share the same meaning across languages. The different ranks determine the amount of context the translator needs to take into account, meaning that the concepts represented in them tend to become increasingly complex the more words are in play. Thus, the translator of a 'good' translation must be aware of the rank of their translation.

The 'level' of the translation can be 'total' or 'restricted'. A total translation is one in which all elements of the source text are translated into target language material. This means both grammar and lexis are translated, as well as the phonology and graphology. However, none of these items will be equivalent. In the case of grammar and lexis, this means that target language options replace the original; Catford argues that, since the target language grammar is different from the source language grammar, this is not an equivalent but rather a replacement (23). Due to the close relation between grammar and lexis, some information will almost always be added or left out when this replacement takes place (e.g. the difference in clarity of gender in English and French). In a 'total' translation, this replacement must also take place at the level of phonology and graphology. In the case of phonology, this means that the source language pronunciation of a word is replaced by the target language pronunciation without changing the spelling. In a 'restricted' translation, the spelling, meaning and grammatical use of the word may still be the same as those of the source language. For graphology, 'total' translation indicates that the spelling used is that of the target language rather than that of the source language. In a 'restricted' translation, the pronunciation and other aspects of the word, such as grammatical function or meaning, may remain the same or similar. This can be the case if the target language uses a different alphabet to transpose a source language word. When all of these levels are replaced by target language material, the translation is a 'total' translation. When only one or some of these levels are replaced, Catford calls it a 'restricted' translation.

When a 'restricted' translation is made, this is never a "contextual translation" (22), as context is derived from the interaction of all text elements. A contextual translation is a text that keeps intact in the target text the context established in the source text. For Catford, this also proves that total equivalence can never be established between two languages, as the context is too much bound to the combination of text elements. It may be possible at sentence level, but the combination of the effect of all sentences in a text is too intricate for a translator to transfer (23). This reflects Ortega y Gasset's view of standard usage (1937: 51) in that the way of phrasing information is always time and culture bound; a phrase can never retain its conceptual meaning if transferred to a different culture. Henry (1984) presents his critique on Catford by arguing that Catford dismisses the difference between the language that expresses a message and the message itself: " even if the pattern is the language, is the language *per se* the message?" (153; italics in original). He claims that

"all cognitive experience (…) is conveyable in any existing language" (153), meaning that any message present in the source text can also be present in the target text. However, Henry's critique is too strongly focused on the presence of an equivalent message in source and target text. In fact, what Catford argues for is that while the message can likely be translated on the rank of word or sentence, the meaning of such a message within a larger context will always change due to the subtle changes in context on the rank of sentence group level. It is not the message itself, but its effect in the text as a whole which cannot be kept from changing when transferring between two languages.

Malmkjaer argues that, at this point, the difference between earlier concepts of 'equivalence' and Catford's 'translation equivalence' is most clear; the ranks and levels that determine the kind of translation and the information that is translated can be used as an evaluative base to assess the quality of a translation, whereas the earlier concept referred to some kind of impossible, complete transfer of text and context (2005: 24-25).These differences between the levels account for several ways in which the equivalence between the target and source text can be determined. For a 'good' translation, this means that the decision must be made whether it is to become a total, contextual translation, or a restricted translation.

The third and final category to determine the degree of translation equivalence is 'extent'. The extent of the translation is determined by the level and rank, and the category the translation falls into is what ultimately decides whether transference is appropriate or not. Catford discerns 'full' and 'partial' translations in this category (1965: 21). In essence, a 'full' translation is similar to a 'total' translation, as it describes a translation in which all source language material is replaced by target language text material. Catford implies that a total translation is likely made at word or sentence rank, as these ranks allow for a restriction of context that keeps it transferrable (25). A 'partial' translation, then, is a translation that includes transference: "[i]n a *partial* translation, some part or parts of the SL text are left untranslated" (21; italics in original). Catford explains this is mostly the case in literary works, where the translation rank causes such a complexity of context, that the concept is often considered untranslatable and is therefore left intact by transferring it. Another reason for choosing a partial translation is "the deliberate purpose of introducing 'local colour' into the TL text" (21). All of the categories provide clear definitions for a 'good' translation. A 'good' translation is allowed to use transference if it is a partial translation,

which in turn is based on the values for level and rank, or if it wants to purposely come across as a text with foreign elements.

Catford's categorizing system for translations already results in a number of definitions for 'good' translation. Aside from this system, Catford is well-known for his mapping of translation shifts. The shifts in level, category, structure, grammar, class and more are explained in chapter 7 of *A Linguistic Theory of Translation* (1965). In general, the shifts explain ways in which the structure or grammar of textual material must change across languages to represent the same information. While there is not enough space to discuss every shift individually, it is interesting to note that all of the shifts argue for the retention of information across texts. Catford's examples all relate to differences in grammar and lexis and argue that not equivalence but replacement is the only way to retain the information present in the source text (73-82). Henry remarks that the greatest difficulty in deciding how to replace a word is "defining what is relevant" to the target context (1984: 155). By using the three categories discussed above, Catford offers the translator tools to handle this difficult task. This reveal's Catford's tendency in evaluating a 'good' translation, and sets him apart from the Socio-cultural and Textual perspectives: according to Catford's system, the translator is to create either a full translation, in which all textual material is transferred to the target language, or a partial translation, in which some elements are kept in the source language to better transfer the information it represents. In both cases, as is also shown in the many examples for his translation shifts, Catford apparently only considers a translation a translation when it properly encapsulates all the information present in the source text. In other words, a 'good' translation is to mirror the source text in message, if not in text.

6.2: In the Case of Toury

Over the course of his career, Toury has written a large number of articles and theories regarding the translation practice. Although Toury is most well-known for his descriptive approach to Translation Studies, this section will reveal that certain aspects of his theories contain prescriptive notions. In *Interlanguage* (1979), Toury describes the concept of interlanguage, that it is the only gateway to actual translation, and how it should be used. According to Merkle (2008), the concept of interlanguage "has been credited [for] shifting the focus of research in Translation Studies from the source text and culture to the target

text and culture" (176). Toury's view in *Interlanguage* is examined in this section, supplemented by an examination of *The Nature* (1995), in which he attempts to make clear which norms should govern the translation process in order to arrive at a quality translation. These two works together should then provide a relatively complete view of Toury's definition of a 'good' translation. It should be noted that, according to Ordóñez-Lopez (2008), Toury's work falls in the Socio-Cultural perspective (49). However, this section will argue that Toury's definitions are more inherent to the Linguistic perspective than the Socio-Cultural.

This section will first explain the concept of interlanguage. Then, it will detail how the use of interlanguage can lead to a 'good' translation. Afterwards, it will discuss the three ways in which interlanguage can manifest itself. This section will then move towards the norms governing Toury's models. The difference between an 'adequate' and an 'acceptable' translation will be made clear. Lastly, the groups of 'preliminary' and 'operational' norms governing the translation process will be detailed.

In *Interlanguage* (1979), Toury views translation as "one of the purest and most common situations" (220) of the interlanguage phenomenon. In general, this linguistic phenomenon, made prominent by Selinker, refers to the situation where a person is learning a new language, and in the process of learning creates a form of in-between language; a mix between the source and target language (Selinker 1972: 214). In the case of a multilingual, a third language may influence this mix (Toury 1979: 227). This mix is called the interlanguage and forms the linguistic system that connects the foreign language to the mother tongue: it is based on an incomplete understanding of the target language structure that is supported by the source language structure (223). Toury argues the linguistic system of an interlanguage is seen "as an *undesirable* state of affairs" (224; italics in original), but pleads for a more neutral approach. This hints at Toury's perceived importance of this interlanguage system for translation. In fact, rather than describing the interlanguage as an erroneous understanding of the target language through source language interference, he claims "that the occurrence of interlanguage in translation follows from the very definition of this type of activity" (224). In other words, Toury argues that the interlanguage is what allows for translation to occur in the first place. Gomes de Matos (1991) responds to this by arguing that if interlanguage is to be used constructively, a translator's "sense of

interlanguage equivalence [must] be refined" (256) through the feedback of other translators.

With regard to the definition of a 'good' translation, it cannot be said that the translator must simply be in possession of the interlanguage; anyone who speaks more than one language has the corresponding interlanguage. Instead, Toury argues that the interlanguage allows the translator to create a 'good' translation by creating a target text that is "*regarded* as a translation from the intrinsic point of view of the target system" (225; italics in original). This means that the target system, by which Toury means the readers from the target culture (226), defines whether a text is a translation or not. Only when the target text is written in the interlanguage can the text in question be marked as being a translation. By placing emphasis on the readership in this way, this approach is reminiscent of Reiss' Socio-cultural approach, but it is only so in that it focuses on the perception of the text rather than its intended function. Reiss argues that the function of the text is determined by the interpretation of its readers, which therefore limits the possibilities of achievable functions and thus a successfully translated text (1981: 165). Toury, on the other hand, is not concerned with text function, but rather with the observation of the text as a translation or a target language original text, on which the cultural role of the text is based. Moreover, Meylaerts (2008) argues that the actual focus of Toury's approach is the effect of cultural products on the individual, which in this case can be the translator as well as the reader (92). This effect is determined by the cultural value given to the text, and consists out of shaping the normative system of an individual (92).

When Toury's is compared to Ortega y Gasset's view, these two approaches argue for the exact opposite. While Ortega y Gasset argues that all meaning and artistic value should be transposed in such a way that these are all left completely intact for the target culture (1937: 52-53, 56-59), Toury argues that translating in such a way would make it impossible for the translation to be regarded as a translation. This means that Toury argues for a foreignizing translation on Venuti's scale. A 'good' translation for Toury is marked as a translation by the reader and is written in the interlanguage. This can be achieved in three ways which have no "clear-cut borderlines between them" (1979: 226).

The first way is to translate "[a]ltogether *outside* the TL code, in full […] or in part" (226; italics in original). This refers to the practice of copying directly from the source language; the source text elements are kept in the target text . Whether this is done in full or

in part depends on, in Catford's terms, the level of the translation. A full direct copy is indistinguishable from the source text element, while copying in part may include changing the source language alphabet or grammar for increased comprehension without using target language vocabulary or grammar. The second way to translate is "*[b]etween* the two codes" (226; italics in original), which includes creating new target language words, such as Catford's 'bogop' (1965: 43), using loan-translations and mirroring source language grammar. The third way to translation is "[s]eemingly *within* the TL code, but under obvious influence of SL/ST" (226; italics in original). This is the case when certain target language structures are used more often due to their similarity to the source language structure, even if more common target language structures would allow for more functional equivalence. These three ways show the two categories through which interlanguage can manifest itself: through non-existing target language and through deviated usage of the target language. What follows is that a 'good' translation is constructed by letting interlanguage manifest in these three ways.

Next to the concept of interlanguage, Toury also argues for translation norms. He does this in *The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation* (1979). Meylaerts (2008) claims Toury's focus on these norms is "a personification of collective structures [as] omnipresent" (92), stressing the effect of culture on an individual's perception. In *The Nature*, Toury explains that the value of a translation, by which he means the readership's appreciation of the translation, is determined by two major elements. The first element is that the translation is a text itself, "occupying a position […] in the appropriate culture" (200). This is the role of any text, original or translation, once it is released unto the public, and refers to the role of texts as contributing value to a culture. The second major element is native to translations only, in that the text is a representation of "another, preexisting text in some other language, belonging to some culture and occupying a definite position within it" (200). This element refers to the reader noticing or simply knowing that the text in front of them is a translated text. This second element often causes the reader to view the text as occupying a different position than an original text, which only contains the first element. The appreciation of the translation depends on the balance between these two elements.

Toury claims that each culture prefers a certain balance that "tends to manifest [in] certain *regularities*" (200; italics in original); being used to read and recognize translations in a certain way, the reader assigns a certain position to the text. The implication of this is that

striking a different balance between presenting the work as a target culture original through linguistic conventions and presenting it as a translated text will change the reader's appreciation of the text. Moreover, Merkle (2008) argues that Toury's translator is part of a translator community, which selects ways of translating based on "a common understanding of what is correct and proper behaviour in a given situation" (178). This means that not only the reader's conventions, but also the translators' own conventions influence which translation options are considered correct. Thus, for a 'good' translation to be valued properly, it must adhere to the balance between the two elements that is common in the target culture. While this again shows a Socio-cultural side to Toury's approach, the quality of the translation is not ultimately determined by the reader's interpretation of the target text function, which is a crucial aspect of Reiss' Socio-Cultural perspective. Instead, the reader's recognition of the linguistic system in use and its adherence to the translators' community's rules is what defines the quality. This makes Toury's view a typical example of the Linguistic perspective according to Ordóñez-Lopez' definition (2008: 49).

Toury calls the choice to adhere to this balance the "initial norm" (1979: 200). Choosing to retain the regularities of the source culture is characterized as the pursuit of an "adequate translation" (201). When the regularities of the target culture are preferred, he refers to the "acceptability" of the translation. The term 'acceptable' hints at a passivity and ignorance of the readership, which would simply accept the text as a text, possibly giving it a higher target cultural value as they recognize it as something of their own culture, rather than seeing it as a proper translation. While target culture oriented texts may achieve a higher status within the target culture, Toury states that "[s]hifts from the source text would be an almost inevitable price" (201). Combining this statement with his preferred use of the interlanguage leads to the conclusion that a 'good' translation is the same as Toury's 'adequate translation', rather than an 'acceptable translation'. He adds that while both kinds of translation deal with translation shifts, only those of an adequate translation are non-random (i.e. deliberate and with reason) and therefore norm-governed (201). While Toury does not claim that this process of shifts always happens by choice of the translator, his preference towards 'adequate' rather than 'acceptable' translation points at an inclination towards a rule-bound approach to translation, in which only obligatory shifts take place during the translation process, thus keeping the target text as close to the source linguistic system. This inclination can be seen as another definition for a 'good' translation.

The remaining norms are grouped by Toury into “preliminary” and “operational” norms (202), which contain much overlapping material. The preliminary norms exist out of the translation policy and the directness of translation. A translation policy can only exist for an adequate translation, and thus for a ‘good’ translation, as it contains rules to govern the non-random translation choices. Toury suggests that the translation policy for a ‘good’ translation is made by examining the text-type of the original and the target text, as well as the human agents involved in the translation (e.g. editors or publishers), calling the interface between them a “very fertile grounds for policy hunting” (202). Merkle notes that while these policies should exist to help make translation choices, they also function as a constraint for the translator, who might lose the freedom to be impartial (2008: 179). In this way, Toury draws a very rule-bound translation process for the translator. Of course, these rules are mostly there to help the translator. The norms governing the directness of a translation answer questions regarding what regularities are allowed in which language combinations, but also if translating an already translated text is permitted. Answering these questions will offer the translator a “threshold of tolerance” (202) that further defines the translation policy.

Operational norms direct the decisions of the translation act itself. This group exists out of matricial norms and textual-linguistic norms. The matricial norms govern not only what can be considered a correct translation of textual material, but also where to place the translation in the text, if at all, and how to structure the text as a whole. In other words, these are the norms that provide a solution to translation issues and can explain translation shifts. Toury does not explain how such a norm would be formulated, but their degree of responsibility imply they are important for creating a ‘good’ translation. After all, as these norms must provide explanations for concrete translation choices, they could be seen as the translation policy as applied to a specific text or text element. Lastly, the textual-linguistic norms relate to the mode of formulation of the target text, such as a visual or a spoken text, and also the length of a speech or an article. Toury provides little explanation of these norms, besides stating that they “may be identical to the norms governing non-translational text production” (203). This means that these norms do not necessarily relate to translation issues or the use of the interlanguage, but rather with rules of text production in general. All of these norms together influence whether the translation will turn out adequate or acceptable.

6.3: 'Good' Translation from a Linguistic Perspective

Examining the work of these two translation theorists from the Linguistic perspective has revealed the approach of the last perspective in the field of Translation Studies to be discussed. This chapter revealed that the definitions of this perspective frequently almost agrees with those found in other perspective, but that it is, in the end, so much focused on the linguistic system underlying any text that its nuances differ from that of any other perspective.

From the Linguistic perspective, a 'good' translation can be defined as follows: it must be based on the source language system, under the carefully created translation policy, which is governed by matricial and textual-material rules. A 'good' translation is allowed to contain target language neologisms or untranslated, source language words. It may contain changes in grammar and lexis in order to create a corresponding target phrase. This is called transference. By adjusting the target linguistic system to that of the source system, a 'good' translation can mirror the source text in message and source culture position, which is more important than mirroring it in text. For this, the translator must be aware of the rank at which they are translating. Applying the aforementioned definitions results in creating a new language, the interlanguage, which allows the reader to identify the text as being a translation.

This definition can be applied to all text types. The Linguistic perspective has the notion unique among all perspectives that the quality of a translation can *only* be assessed if the text is recognized as being a translation. By focusing on the linguistic system underlying both languages, the importance of linguistic elements for the quality of a translation is emphasized. This ranks the definition closest to the Philosophical perspective, though the way the two perspectives approach the role of text still causes some disagreement among them. The perspective also frequently nods to the Socio-cultural perspective due to the receiver oriented equivalence.

Chapter 7: What Constitutes a 'Good' Translation?

All five perspectives of Translation Studies have now been examined and discussed. Across the discussion of the perspectives, many similarities and dissimilarities have already been pointed out. The aim of this thesis is to provide an overview of the definitions of a good translation that are shared by all perspectives. In this way, a definition of a 'good' translation can be established that is shared by all translation theorists on those aspects of a translation that the definition covers. This would provide the translator (and translation student) with a solid base with which translation issues could be solved. It would also make clear which points of debate in Translation Studies have met a consensus and which ones need further discussion. However, not a single shared definition was found in all perspectives. The table on the next page instead provides an overview of those definitions shared by at least two perspectives. All text in the table is a summary of the definitions found in each respective perspective. It should be noted that not all definitions are completely equivalent, and that the chapters on the respective perspectives shed light on the different nuances present in each definition.

Fig.1 Overview of 'good translation' definitions shared by at least two perspectives

Hermeneutic Perspective	**Textual Perspective**	**Socio-Cultural Perspective**	**Cognitive Perspective**	**Linguistic Perspective**
A text must contain a message.	Decide the message to transfer based on your *skopos.*			Mirror the source text in message.
Achieve equivalence in both information and style.		Source and target text must be the same in function.	Target text must be as literally translated as possible.	
Transfer implied, silent information and meaning of a text.		Hidden meaning influences the text function, so it must also be transferred.		
Do not alter source culture presence; it must be a foreignizing translation.	Overt translation must be foreignizing.			Translation must be foreignizing and mirrors the original in its cultural position.
The original text must not be improved upon.		Improve only if text cannot be read as the original would have been.		
	The translation must achieve its *skopos* and function.		Translator must be able to judge which translation option fits the text function.	
	Take readership engagement into account.	Take into account how readers will perceive text.	Translator must be able to judge which translation option fits the readership.	
			Translator may insert personal preferences into the text.	The translation may contain changes in grammar and lexis to create a corresponding target phrase.

As can be seen in the table, no definition is shared by more than three out of five perspectives. As such, the research question posed in the introduction of this thesis – what is a 'good' translation? – cannot be answered conclusively. While all perspectives discuss such aspects of translation as equivalence or cultural value, they each define it differently and not necessarily similarly. In the Hermeneutic perspective, equivalence is found in a one-to-one equation of message, meaning and style, whereas the Socio-cultural perspective defines equivalence as (merely) copying the source text function. This means that even those definitions found in multiple perspectives are not necessarily compatible, even if they are comparable. This incongruence is also noticed by Pym (2010), who devoted an entire chapter of his *Exploring Translation Studies* to the question 'what happened to equivalence?'. It seems strange that an academic field that is concerned with providing frameworks for solving translation issues and discussing the cultural implications of transferring communication from one language to another has no shared set of principles on which it bases its theories. Surely, a shared set is needed in order to generate a coherent discussion on the field's topics and create frameworks that translators can actually put to use? After all, how can a framework hope to operate in general if its parts are based on the context of specifics of specific texts?

Perhaps the interdisciplinary nature of Translation Studies can be seen as an explanation for this fractured nature of Translation Studies. The Hermeneutic perspective finds its roots in translation studies and philosophy, the Cognitive perspective deals with Translation Studies and Psychology, whereas the Linguistic perspective views translation from Translation Studies and Linguistics. It would be interesting to see more research done into the nature of Translation Studies, which could perhaps figure out whether or not Translation Studies should be seen as one field as a whole, or whether it should be divided into multiple disciplines, perhaps along the line of the five separate perspectives observed in this thesis. Or perhaps it is the youngest of the five perspectives, the Cognitive perspective, that, by moving away from the translation to the translator, has found a level on which a shared set of principles and understanding can be formed. After all, the only shared notion among the five perspectives is that whether or not achieving a 'good' translation or not is possible depends on which text is being translated. If the text is too specific and changeable

a level at which to discuss the nature of a good translation, perhaps the level of translator is constant enough to allow for more opportunities to unite views and opinions.

At any rate, while many noteworthy theories and ideas have been and are being put forward in Translation Studies, it seems prudent to first develop a consensus on how it can contribute to creating quality translations. Without that, this discipline is doomed to aimlessly wander around, criticizing itself and generating new ideas that tackle the same subject in yet another way, without any of its academics knowing exactly what it is they want to discuss in their discipline. This thesis has shown there is no clear definition of a 'good' translation. Instead, it brought to light a greater need: to create a definition of 'Translation Studies'.

Bibliography

Albir, Amparo Hurtado. *Perspectivas de los Estudios Sobre Traducción*. Universitat Jaume I: Castellón. 1994.

Albir, Amparo Hurtado and Fabio Alves. "Translation as a Cognitive Activity". *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies* (pp. 54-73). Routledge: London. 2009.

Black, Thierry. *Away from theAbyss: Borgesian Translation Reconsidered through Buddhist Philosophy*. Heritage Branch: Ottawa. 2013.

Capelle, Bert. "Juliane House, Translation". *English Text Construction* (pp. 310-314). 2011.

Catford, John Cunnison. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1978.

Elmgrab, Ramadan A. "Implication for Translation Teaching Pedagogy: A Case of Benghazi University". *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* (70, pp. 358-369). University of Benghazi: Benghazi. 2012.

Gomes de Matos, Francisco. "Human Rights Applied to Translation: A Case for Language Learners' Right to Translate". *Translation: Theory and Practice, Tension and Interdependence* (pp. 254-258). John Benjamins Publishing: Amsterdam. 1991.

Graham, John Thomas. *Theory of History in Ortega y Gasset: "The Dawn of Historical Reason"*. University of Missouri Press: Missouri. 1997.

Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. Longman: Harlow. 1990.

--. *The Translator as Communicator*. Routledge: London. 1997.

Henry, Ronald. "Points of Inquiry into Total Translation: A Review of J.C. Catford's *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*". *Meta: Translators' Journal* (29:2, pp. 152-158). 1984.

House, Juliane. "Text and Context in Translation". *Journal of Pragmatics* (38, pp. 338-358). 2006.

--. "Towards a New Linguistic-Cognitive Orientation in Translation Studies". *Target* (25:1, pp. 46-60). John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2013.

--. "Moving Across Languages and Cultures in Translation as Intercultural Communication". *Translational Action and Intercultural Communication* (pp. 8-26). Routledge: London. 2009.

--. *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Gunter Narr Verlag: Kornwestheim. 1997.

Kiraly, Donald C. "Towards a Constructivist Approach to Translator Education". *Quaderns: Revista de Traducció* (6, pp. 50-53). 2001.

--. *Pathways to Translation: Pedagogy and Process*. Kent State University Press: Kent. 1995.

--. "Growing a Project-Based Translation Pedagogy: A Fractal Perspective". *Meta: Translators' Journal* (57:1, pp. 82-95). 2012.

Lianeri, Alexandra. “Translation and the Ideology of Culture: Reappraising Schleiermacher’s Theory of Translation”. Current Writing: Text and Reception in Southern Africa. University of Bristol. 2011.

Malmkjaer, Kirsten. *Linguistics and the Language of Translation*. Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh. 2005.

--. “The Relevance of Translation Studies”. *Ilha do Desterro* (28, pp. 25-36). 1992.

Merkle, Denise. “Translation Constraints and the “Sociological Turn” in Literary Translation Studies”. *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury* (pp.175-186). John Benjamins Publishing: Amsterdam. 2008.

Meylaerts, Reine. “ Translators and (Their) Norms: Towards a Sociological Construction of the Individual”. *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury* (pp. 91-101). John Benjamins Publishing: Amsterdam. 2008.

Munday, Jeremy. *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*. Routledge: London. 2009.

Năznean, Adrian. “Functionalist Approaches to Translation with Reference to Medical Articles”. *Studia Universitatis Petru Major – Philologia* (12, pp.186-190). 2012.

Ordóñez-Lopez, Pilar. *Ugly Translations: Ortega Y Gasset’s Ideas on Translation within Contemporary Translation Theories*. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. 2008.

Ortega y Gasset, José. “The Misery and the Splendour of Translation”. *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 49-64). Routledge: London. 2000.

Ortín, Marcel. “From Charles Lamb to Josep Carner: Translation and Rewriting of the Familiar Essay”. *Translation Review* (87:1, pp.30-45). 2013.

Panou, Despoina. “Equivalence in Translation Theories: A Critical Evaluation”. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*(3:1, pp. 1-6). 2013.

Pym, Anthony. “Limits and Frustrations of Discourse Analysis in Translation Theory”. *Revista de Filologia de la Universidad de La Laguna* (11, pp. 227-239). Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. 1992.

--. *Exploring Translation Theories*. Routledge: London. 2010.

Raído, Vanessa Enríquez. *Investigating the Web Search Behaviors of Translation Students: An Explanatory and Multiple-Case Study*. Universitat Ramon Llull. 2011.

Reiss, Katharina. “Type, Kind and Individuality of Text: Decision Making in Translation”. *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 160-171). Routledge: London. 2000.

Ribeiro, Daniela M. *Ortega y Gasset: Considerations on Translation and Silence*. University of Wyoming: Laramie. 2012.

Selinker, Larry. “Interlanguage”. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* (10, pp. 209-241). 1972.

Sharp, Ronald A. “Interrogation at the Borders: George Steiner and the Trope of Translation”. New Literary History (21:1, pp. 133-162). The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore. 1989.

Steiner, George. “On an Exact Art (Again)”. *Then Kenyon Review: New Series* (4:2, pp. 8-21). 1982.

--. “The Hermeneutic Motion”. *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 186-191). Routledge: London. 2000.

--. *After Babel*. Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1975.

Toury, Gideon. “Interlanguage and its Manifestations in Translation”. *Meta: Translators’ Journal* (24:2, pp. 223-231). 1979.

--. “The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation”. *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 198-211). Routledge: London. 2000.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Routledge: London. 2000.

--. *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. Routledge: London. 1995.

Vermeer, Hans J. “Skopos and Comission in Translational Action”. *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 221-232). Routledge: London. 2000.

--. *Voraussetzungen für eine Translationstheorie – Einige Kapiel Kultur- und Sprachtheorie*. Heidelberg. 1986.

Walter, Benjamin. “The Task of the Translator: An Introduction to the Translation of Baudelaire’s *Tableaux Parisiens*”. *The Translation Studies Reader* (pp. 15-25). Routledge: London. 2000.

Werhane, Patrica H. et al. ”Social Constructivism, Mental Models, and Problems of Obedience”. *Journal of Business Ethics* (100, pp.103-118). 2011.

Zarandona, Juan M. “Two Different Translations of Tennyson’s *The Idylls of the King* into Spanish: The Road From a Text-Oriented Model to an Functional Model of Translation”. Meta: Translators’ Journal (53: 3, pp. 490-506). 2008.