

Science of Translation

Dr. Romano Allati

2

Open Learning

1

Translation Department



4/1/2025

Good morning!

Lecturer: Did you read the chapter? How did you find the language of the chapter?

Student: Both easy and difficult.

Lecturer: The language is easy but the ideas need to be explained. I am not going to give you the whole chapter. I will tell you later what we are going to cancel. Today, we are going to cover language and culture, types of translation, the coding and decoding.

اليوم سنقوم بتغطية اللغة والثقافة وأنواع الترجمة والترميز وفك التشفير.

As a first impression, those who have read the chapter, how did you feel about the chapter? Did you find anything interesting? Did you find anything that triggered you to do some further research? Just tell me about your experience.

Student: There is some scholarly information.

Student: I liked the examples in the chapter.

Lecturer: Yes. We will see and discuss that. So, as I told you before, this book *Translation Studies* by Professor Suzan Bassnett. The first chapter is entitled "central issues". From the title, we can see that she is going to talk about important issues in translation. So let us start with the first piece, Language and Culture. Who would like to read?

Student:

"The first step towards an examination of the processes of translation must be to accept that although translation has a central core of linguistic activity, it belongs most properly to semiotics, the science that studies sign systems or structures, sign processes and sign functions (Hawkes, Structuralism and Semiotics, London 1977)."

يجب أن تكون الخطوة الأولى نحو فحص عمليات الترجمة هي قبول أنه على الرغم من أن الترجمة لها جوهر مركزي للنشاط اللغوي، إلا أنها تنتمي بشكل صحيح إلى علم الرموز (السيمانيات): العلم الذي يدرس أنظمة الإشارة أو الهياكل، وعمليات ووظائف الإشارة.

Lecturer: she is saying that the first step to examine the act of translation is to accept that there are two levels in translation. One is the linguistic and the other is the Semiotics. What is semiotics? She defined it as the science that studies the sign systems or structures, sign processes and sign functions. What do we mean by *signs*? When we talk about signs, we are talking about language, body language, and symbols. So, whenever we have the word sign, we need to think about it in a bit of a broad way. Anything that is in front of me could be a text, visual, auditory, or anything.

Now, when we talk about the linguistic activity, we are talking about pure language. Suzan is saying that we, most of the time, forget about semiotics, which means we forget about meaning. For example, if you are driving and you see the symbol of the sign to stop, this is a text in the shape of a symbol. It means that you need to stop here. These layers of meaning happen in the mind in a very quick way. So, any sign you see in life is a text and it tells something.

المحاضر: نقول إن الخطوة الأولى لفحص فعل الترجمة هي قبول وجود مستويين في الترجمة. أحدهما لغوي والآخر رمزي. ما هي السيميانيات؟ عرفته على أنه العلم الذي يدرس أنظمة أو هياكل الإشارة، وعمليات ووظائف الإشارة. ماذا نعني بالإشارات؟ عندما نتحدث عن العلامات، فإننا نتحدث عن اللغة ولغة الجسد والرموز. لذلك، عندما يكون لدينا إشارة الكلمة، نحتاج إلى التفكير في الأمر بطريقة واسعة بعض الشيء. أي شيء أمامي يمكن أن يكون نصًا سواء كان بصريًا أو سمعيًا أو أي شيء.

الآن، عندما نتحدث عن النشاط اللغوي، فإننا نتحدث عن لغة نقيّة. نقول سوزان إننا، في معظم الأوقات، ننسى السيميانيات، مما يعني أننا ننسى المعنى. على سبيل المثال، إذا كنت تقود السيارة ورأيت رمز للتوقف، فهذا نص بالنسبة لي على شكل رمز. هذا يعني أنك بحاجة للتوقف هنا. هذه الطبقات من المعنى تحدث في العقل بطريقة سريعة للغاية. لذلك، أي علامة تراها في الحياة هي نص يخبر شيئًا.

Let us continue reading.

Student:

"Beyond the notion stressed by the narrowly linguistic approach, that translation involves the transfer of 'meaning' contained in one set of language signs into another set of language signs through competent use of the dictionary and grammar, the process involves a whole set of extra-linguistic criteria also."

Lecturer: So, when someone asks you what translation is, you may answer transferring one language into the other, and this language is full of words, signs and symbols. This is the conventional meaning of translation because we are only using the dictionary and grammar.

Last time, we mentioned the word "meta-linguistic". So now, we have to differentiate between "meta-linguistic" and "extra linguistic". Can you guess the difference?

Student: Extra I think means deep.

Lecturer: Okay: Going into language more.

What about meta-linguistic?

Student: Maybe it is in general.

Lecturer: I said last time that **meta** stands for **beyond the language**. I told you also it might talk about body language, facial expression, and extra.

Student: Extra means the verbal and meta means non-verbal.

Lecturer: Let me tell you exactly what they mean because last time, I was general in defining it and did not specify the meaning. When you talk about extra, it means *external*. Here, we are talking about facial expression, intonation pattern (the way I am saying something, low or high intonation, fear, surprise) and body language. So, it is anything that is outside the language. I cannot use the language to say it, but I can describe it through language.

فيني اوصف الحالة بواسطة اللغة نفسها بس اللغة نفسها ما بتساعدني بشكل كبير

So, meta-linguistic has to do with what is beyond the language. More specifically, it is when we have a book of syntax. It is when using language to talk about language itself. It is like the theory. So, it is pure syntax and grammar.

For example, you want to comment on something really brutal like what is happening right now in the country. Sometimes, the best way is to stay silent. So, silence is **extra-linguistic**.

Silence is an extra-linguistic medium that I describe through the use of language. Example of that is the phrase "no comment". So, when you say "extra" is the idea of something outside something.

لذا فإن الصمت خارج اللغة. الصمت هو وسيلة غير لغوية أصفها من خلال استخدام اللغة. مثال على ذلك عبارة «لا تعليق». لذلك، عندما نقول «إضافي» هي فكرة شيء خارج شيء ما

For instance, what do we mean by the words "inter-relation" and "extra-relation"?

Inter-relation is like relations between two ministers within the same country. Extra-relation is like relations between two ministers but outside the country.

العلاقات المتبادلة هي مثل العلاقات بين وزيرين داخل نفس البلد. العلاقات الخارجية مثل العلاقات بين وزيرين ولكن خارج البلاد.

Sometimes, within the boundaries of translation, you need to come up with new words, or mix two words (a prefix or a suffix to the root of the word). So, within a certain context, you need to show this particular word in itself but it has nothing to show it with something external. So, you come up with something new and include a footnote to explain yourself.

"Edward Sapir claims that 'language is a guide to social reality' and that human beings are at the mercy of the language that has become the medium of expression for their society."

How can you explain the sentence: 'language is a guide to social reality'?

Students: To communicate

Lecturer: Go a bit deeper.

Student: To respect the culture

Lecturer: How can we make this person respect me?

Student: Through using the language

Lecturer: Exactly. So, according to **structuralism**, we create our reality through the language we use. Imagine that we have no reality, we do not have books of history or anything, who would give us what this

life mean? Life would have no meaning. So, basically, we use language to create the reality we know through using some words about reality, about others, about anything.

لذلك وفقاً للبنوية، نخلق واقعنا من خلال اللغة التي نستخدمها. تخيل أنه ليس لدينا حقيقة، ليس لدينا كتب تاريخ أو أي شيء، من سيعطينا ما تعنيه هذه الحياة؟ الحياة لن يكون لها معنى لذلك، في الأساس، نستخدم اللغة لخلق الواقع الذي نعرفه من خلال استخدام بعض الكلمات حول الواقع، عن الآخرين، عن أي شيء.

"... that human beings are at the mercy of the language that has become the medium of expression for their society."

Sometimes, we express ourselves but the person we are talking to cannot understand. So, we cannot have a social reality without the use of language and culture. How do we get that? Through experience

"Experience, he asserts, is largely determined by the language habits of the community, and each separate structure represents a separate reality".

We know that this is the social reality of a community by using and reusing and keep using language of a community and its habits in a circular way.

"Each separate structure represents a separate reality": It is like when I say when I am in a condolences event: *may s/he rest in peace*. Here, I am talking about death and this is a reality that was shaped by language. So, we have certain structures: By a structure, we mean that it can be a word, a sentence, sometimes, an idea or anything.

"No two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality."

If say "Hello" and I say "Bonjour", we know that these words are equivalent. However, they are different in terms of the feelings you get when you say one of them.

"The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached."

So, the labels attached to the words are different according to the society.

Language, then, is the heart within the body of culture,"

Let us say that culture is like the body and the heart of it is the language.

"And it is the interaction between the two that results in the continuation of life-energy."

We said that language create the social reality.

"In the same way that the surgeon, operating on the heart, cannot neglect the body that surrounds it, so the translator treats the text in isolation from the culture at his peril."

Peril here means risking the meaning of the text under the responsibility of the translator. It means **danger** or **jeopardizing** (putting something in danger intentionally). If I am treating English in isolation and said "it is raining cats and dogs", imagine translating that literally without taking the culture and the meaning behind it into consideration.

Let us move now to the **Types of Translation**.

"In his article 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', Roman Jakobson distinguishes three types of translation:

(1) **Intralingual translation, or rewording** (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in the same language)."

So we have here, intralingual translation or rewording which means paraphrasing.

Student: is it like synonyms?

Lecturer: no, synonym is when you replace a word by another. Here, paraphrasing is when we write an introduction of a paragraph and the conclusion is the paraphrasing of the introduction, or it is when we have a line of poetry and we need to interpret the meaning of. So, this happens within the same language. It is only that we are having different words.

"(2) **Interlingual translation or translation proper** (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language)."

Here, we are talking about *translation proper*. What do we mean by translation proper? It is when we have one language or one linguistic sign system and we are transferring that into another linguistic sign system. So, this is **INTERLINGUIAL**. However, when talking about intra, it is in the same language between itself. For example, the use of

the word **peril** and the use of the word **jeopardizing** is intra. I am still in the same language and I am linking things together.

Inter is when you go between two languages. Example of that would be the words **international** or **intercultural**.

(3) **Intersemiotic translation or transmutation** (an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems).

What do you think this means?

Student: from words to signs

Lecturer: yes. An example of that is the sign language for deaf people. So here, we are using two systems; both are based on signs: one is non-verbal and the other is verbal. When we are talking about sign language, this is different from extra-linguistic. It could be part of it but it is kind of different.

For example, when you read a good or an important idea in an article, you put a star next to it. The star means that this is a very important idea. You should focus on it.

"Having established these three types, of which (2) *translation proper* describes the process of transfer from SL to TL, Jakobson goes on immediately to point to the central problem in all types: that while messages may serve as adequate interpretations of code units or messages, there is ordinarily no full equivalence through translation."

«بعد تحديد هذه الأنواع الثلاثة، والتي تصف (2) الترجمة المناسبة عملية النقل من SL إلى TL، يمضي Jakobson على الفور للإشارة إلى المشكلة المركزية في جميع الأنواع: أنه في حين أن الرسائل قد تكون بمثابة تفسيرات مناسبة لوحدات الشفرة أو الرسائل، لا يوجد عادة تكافؤ كامل من خلال الترجمة.»

We don't have one hindered exact equivalent of meaning.

"Even apparent synonymy does not yield equivalence, and Jakobson shows how intralingual translation often has to resort to a combination of code units in order to fully interpret the meaning of a single unit. Hence a dictionary of so-called synonyms may give *perfect* as a synonym for *ideal* or *vehicle* as a synonym for *conveyance* but in neither case can there be said to be complete equivalence, since each unit contains within itself a set of non-transferable associations and connotations."

So, although we have the word **perfect** and the synonym **ideal**, or **vehicle** and the synonym **conveyance**, but still every one of them has its own context as a word and I cannot use the word **perfect** as **ideal**.

Do you know what do we mean by 'connotation'? What comes to your mind when hear the word "tree"?

Students: roots, rural, fruits, green, garden

Lecturer: every one of us has his or her connotation of the word tree. So, connotation is the notion of an idea or the concept of it. Usually, **connotation** has to do with **denotation**, which is the opposite of connotation. With connotation, I would say it is subjective. It depends on every one of us: The way we grew up, the way we picture things, etc. **Denotation** is the meaning in a dictionary. It is objective because everyone can read it in a dictionary.

"Because complete equivalence (in the sense of synonymy or sameness) cannot take place in any of his categories, Jakobson declares that all poetic art is therefore technically untranslatable: Only creative transposition is possible: either intralingual transposition—from one poetic shape into another, or interlingual transposition—from one language into another, or finally intersemiotic transposition—from one system of signs into another, e.g. from verbal art into music, dance, cinema or painting."

Now, a very famous example of intersemiotic transposition is when we have a text written by Shakespeare and we make it as a movie.

"What Jakobson is saying here is taken up again by Georges Mounin, the French theorist, who perceives translation as a series of operations of which the starting point and the end product are *significations* and function within a given culture."

Do you know what do we mean by signification?

Students: content, specific words, specific meaning

Lecturer: No, did you study semantics?

Students: no

Lecturer: okay. There is a French theorist whose name is de Saussure who started the signs of semiotics or semantics. Semantics is the study of meaning in a language without context, decontextualized. He says that

language is an interdependent system of signification. Basically, we have a **signifier** and this signifier has to be related to a **signified**. Signifier is the linguistic sign or the "word" but the signified is the concept behind. Every linguistic sign has an image in mind. The signified is the concept.

Do not mix that with the word **connotation**. Pay attention that we are not talking about the actual thing. De Saussure started this duality relation that we have only two parts. Then later, came after him someone who said that we have a signifier, signified and added to it the **referent** in the real world. This is how language works. Every sign has an idea and that how we link things together.

هناك منظر (واضع نظريات) فرنسي اسمه de Saussure بدأ علم الرموز أو الدلالات. لذا فإن الدلالات هي دراسة المعنى بلغة بلا سياق. يتحدث عن النظام الذي يعتبر اللغة نظاماً مترابطاً للدلالة. الدال هو العلامة اللغوية أو «الكلمة» ولكن المدلول هو المفهوم الكامن وراءه. كل علامة لغوية لها صورة في العقل. المدلول هو المفهوم.

لا تخلطوا ذلك مع كلمة connotation. انتبهوا لأننا لا نتحدث عن الشيء الفعلي. De Saussure بدأ علاقة الازدواجية هذه، أن لدينا جزأين فقط. ثم لاحقاً، جاء بعده شخص قال إن لدينا دال ومدلول وأضاف إليها المرجع في العالم الحقيقي. هذه هي الطريقة التي تعمل بها اللغة. كل علامة لها فكرة وكيف نربط الأشياء معاً.

"So, for example, the English word *pastry*, if translated into Italian without regard for its signification, will not be able to perform its function of meaning within a sentence, even though there may be a dictionary 'equivalent'; for *pasta* has a completely different associative field."

Being aware of the culture is vital in translation.

"In this case the translator has to resort to a combination of units in order to find an approximate equivalent. Jakobson gives the example of the Russian word *syr* (a food made of fermented pressed curds) which translates roughly into English as *cottage cheese*. In this case, Jakobson claims, the translation is only an adequate *interpretation* of an alien code unit and equivalence is impossible."

Alien means here something outside the language. You have to find the closest word and you need to explain it in a footnote.

Now, let us go to decoding and recoding.

"The translator, therefore, operates criteria that transcend the purely linguistic"

Translation is like this: we understand the grammar and try to give the equivalent but with no meaning most of the time. This is what the author is trying to say: We need to go beyond the linguistic level.

"and a process of decoding and recoding takes place. Eugene Nida's model of the translation process illustrates the stages involved"

We have a source language, which is the text. We analyse the text, break it down, and then we transfer and transcend. Then, we need to deconstruct the language again in order to have a good translation.

"As examples of some of the complexities involved in the interlingual translation of what might seem to be uncontroversial items, consider the question of translating *yes* and *hello* into French, German and Italian."

Interlingual means translation proper, as we discussed, and it is between two languages. So, she is saying that you might find the process easy but it is not actually.

This task would seem, at first glance, to be straightforward, since all are Indo-European languages, closely related lexically and syntactically, and terms of greeting and assent are common to all three. For *yes* standard dictionaries give:

French: *oui, si*

German: *ja*

Italian: *si*

Although they seem close, they differ lexically and syntactically.

"It is immediately obvious that the existence of two terms in French involves a usage that does not exist in the other languages."

So here, she is saying why the French language has two words for "yes."

Further investigation shows that whilst *oui* is the generally used term, *si* is used specifically in cases of contradiction, contention and dissent."

If you want to answer positively to a negative question, you answer "*si*" instead of "*oui*". Contention means agreement. Dissent means disagreement. When you give your consent to something, it means you are approving. Dissent is the opposite.

"The English translator, therefore, must be mindful of this rule when translating the English word that remains the same in all contexts."

If you are translating a dialogue between French and English, for example, and you want to translate "*si*" or "*oui*" into English, it is going to be "yes", but into French, there is still a gap in meaning that I cannot give, especially when agreeing into a negative question with "*si*". So, it is important to notice that sometimes you cannot give the same meaning.

Let us move to the next paragraph.

"When the use of the affirmative in conversational speech is considered, another question arises."

"*Oui*" or "yes": we call them affirmative.

"Yes cannot always be translated into the single words *oui, ja* or *si*, for French, German and Italian"

Sometimes and usually in conversations, we say a word and the other person wants to affirm to you; they say "yes, yes, yes, yes". However, when I am translating, do I need to repeat the word "yes" four times? No, because it is going to take from the meaning of the text.

"All frequently double or 'string' affirmatives in a way that is outside standard English procedures (e.g. *si, si, si; ja, ja*, etc). Hence the Italian or German translation of *yes* by a single word can, at times, appear excessively brusque"

What do we mean by the word "brusque"? When we say brusque, it is like short and quick but it might be rude for a bit. So, at times, it feels like you are not paying the text justice. This is the effect that translation shows. In the native language, the repetition of the word yes, shows energy. However when translating it for the only with one word, it showed rudeness.

"whilst the stringing together of affirmatives in English is so hyperbolic that it often creates a comic effect."

What do we mean by hyperbolic?

Student: hyper?

Lecturer: no. hyperbole means exaggeration. It is like in English when you say "I am so hungry, I could eat a horse". So, this is a hyperbolic expression. مبالغة

"With the translation of the word *hello*, the standard English form of friendly greeting when meeting, the problems are multiplied. The dictionaries give:

French: *ça va?*; *hallo*

German: *wie geht's*; *hallo*

Italian: *olà*; *pronto*; *ciao*

"Whilst English does not distinguish between the word used when greeting someone face to face and that used when answering the telephone, French, German and Italian all do make that distinction. The Italian *pronto* can only be used as a telephonic greeting, like the German *hallo*. Moreover, French and German use as forms of greeting brief rhetorical questions, whereas the same question in English *How are you?* or *How do you do?* is only used in more formal situations. The Italian *ciao*, by far the most common form of greeting in all sections of Italian society, is used equally on arrival and departure, being a word of greeting linked to a moment of contact between individuals either coming or going and not to the specific context of arrival or initial encounter. So, for example, the translator faced with the task of translating *hello* into French must first extract from the term a core of meaning and the stages of the process, following Nida's diagram, might look like this:"

"في حين أن اللغة الإنجليزية لا تميز بين الكلمة المستخدمة عند تحية شخص ما وجهاً لوجه وتلك المستخدمة عند الرد على الهاتف، فإن الفرنسية والألمانية والإيطالية كلها تميز. لا يمكن استخدام البرونتو الإيطالي إلا كتحية هاتفية، مثل القاعة الألمانية. علاوة على ذلك، تستخدم الفرنسية والألمانية كأشكال لتحية الأسئلة الخطابية الموجزة، بينما نفس السؤال باللغة الإنجليزية كيف حالك؟ أو كيف حالك؟ لا يستخدم إلا في حالات أكثر رسمية. يتم استخدام *ciao* الإيطالي، وهو إلى حد بعيد الشكل الأكثر شيوعاً للتحية في جميع قطاعات المجتمع الإيطالي، بالتساوي عند الوصول والمغادرة، كونه كلمة تحية مرتبطة بلحظة اتصال بين الأفراد القادمين أو المتجهين وليس بالسياق المحدد للوصول أو اللقاء الأولي. لذلك، على

سبيل المثال، يجب على المترجم الذي يواجه مهمة ترجمة مرحباً إلى الفرنسية أن يستخرج أولاً من مصطلح جوهر المعنى وقد تبدو مراحل العملية، باتباع مخطط نيدا، على النحو التالي:

I think it is clear. This is how the process goes. I need to analyse it in my mind and then use the dictionary maybe. It is important there to distinguish between forms of greeting available. I need to see in French if I have a departure or an arrival. I need to take that into consideration. Since I am talking about arrival, it is "ca va".

We are going to stop here. Next time, we are going to talk about "semiotic transformation" and I will tell you what is deleted from the article.

4 13/1/2025

GOOD MORNING!

Lecturer: Did you all get the article?

Student: Yes!

Lecturer: So, let us start with it. I told you it is an article written by Susan Bassnett. I told you also that it is not required in its entirety. Last time, we stopped at page 28 with **semantic transformation**.

Susan Bassinet is a very important female in the domain of translation, so it is really important to look at her ideas. You might find her article a bit theoretical but you may also find interesting examples. Her article is about what the translator should do with the text, how s/he look at it, decoding and encoding and all of these things.

We started with the idea that language is part of culture and vice versa. Then, we moved to types of translation and we talked about three types of translation. We said that the first one is "rewording", which is in the same language. Then, we moved to the second type which is "translation proper", which is the types we are doing in our courses when we translate from one language to another. Finally, the third type is inter-semiotic translation.

When we mention the word semiotic, we remember that semiotic has to do with the study of sign. We said also that this view in front of me

could be a visual text. If I hear a song, this is an auditory text. So, not only language is text; anything could be a text. So, everything for us is a text. When we say inter-semiotics, we mean it is an act that happens in the mind. Let us say that I have a blind or a deaf person; I have to give them the text in a different medium so they can understand, whether it is a sign language or a Braille.

Then, we move to decoding and recoding, and we look at this diagram in which we have the source language. We have to analyze, transfer it into the target language. We went into some interesting examples, like "hello" and "yes" in all of French, German, and Italian. We also went to the "hello" example, in which we have a very specific criteria in which we have to translate based on.

Lastly, we took the second diagram page 27 where we have examples of French "Ca va", English "hello". So, if we want to analyze this "hello" and go to the linguistic function: First, it is a word. Can we know what this word is? It is a noun. So, when I want to analyze it, I need to seek the semantic function. If we say "hello" in a cultural context, what does it mean? It means greeting but on arrival. Remember, we discussed the French arrival greeting whether they are "ca va" or "hello". "hello" is only used when talking on the phone. So, it is on arrival, or when I see someone face-to-face.

Whilst English does not distinguish between the word used when greeting someone face to face and that used when answering the telephone, French, German and Italian all do make that distinction. The Italian pronto can only be used as telephonic greeting, like the German hallo. Moreover, French and German use as forms of greeting brief rhetorical questions, whereas the same question in English How are you? Or How do you do? Is only used in more formal situations.

في حين أن اللغة الإنجليزية لا تميز بين الكلمة المستخدمة عند تحية شخص ما وجهاً لوجه وتلك المستخدمة عند الرد على الهاتف، فإن الفرنسية والألمانية والإيطالية كلها تميز. لا يمكن استخدام البيروننو الإيطالي إلا كتحية هاتفية، مثل "مرحباً" الألمانية. علاوة على ذلك، تستخدم الفرنسية والألمانية كاشكال لتحية الأسئلة الخطابية الموجزة، بينما نفس السؤال باللغة الإنجليزية كيف حالك؟ يستخدم فقط في المواقف الرسمية.

What has happened during the translation process is that the notion of greeting has been isolated and the word hello has been

replaced by a phrase carrying the same notion. Jakobson would describe this as interlingual transposition, while Ludskanov would call it a semiotic transformation.

ما حدث أثناء عملية الترجمة هو أن فكرة التحية قد تم عزلها وتم استبدال كلمة مرحباً بعبارة تحمل نفس الفكرة. يصف جاكوبسون هذا بأنه نقل بين اللغات، بينما يسميه لودسكانوف تحولاً رمزياً.

So, this is another term for translation itself. When you see **interlingual transposition**, it is as **semiotic transformation**. When I want to translate a word, a sentence, or a text, I need to take it out from the language for a short time just to understand what it is purely. Here, in this example, "hello" is for greeting. When I put it back in a language context, I use it when I am talking face-to-face and it is a friendly greeting. The same should be done in the target language. I need to see what has the same criteria as friendly and face-to-face and then translate it.

Semiotic transformations (Ts) are the replacements of the signs encoding a message by signs of another code, preserving (so far as possible in the face of entropy) invariant information with respect to a given system of reference.

التحويلات السيميائية: (Ts) هي استبدال العلامات التي تشفر رسالة بعلامات رمز آخر، وتحافظ (قدر الإمكان في مواجهة الإنتروبي¹) على المعلومات الثابتة فيما يتعلق بنظام مرجعي معين.

Lecturer: Can you give me another word for sign here?

Student: Words

Lecturer: Yes. We agreed that a word is a sign.

If I am changing one word from one language to another, what factors do I have there, other things that are in the process?

Student: The system of reference can be changed to the word culture or social context, what gives meaning to the word.

Lecturer: Yes! So, if we are translating something political, I need to see who is speaking, a woman or a man. Then, we go to their style and what they are saying. What about variant information?

Student: Different

Lecturer: No! It is the semantic function.

In the case of *yes*, the invariant information is *affirmation*.

So, it is greeting, but it is a positive one to agree or affirm.

Whilst in the case of *hello*, the invariant is the *notion of greeting*.

This is the job or the semantic function in the sentence.

But at the same time, the translator has had to consider other criteria, e.g. the existence of the *oui/si* rule in French, the stylistic function of stringing affirmatives, the *social context of greeting*—whether telephonic or face to face, the class position and status of the speakers and the resultant *weight* of a colloquial greeting in different societies. All such factors are involved in the translation even of the most apparently straightforward word. The question of semiotic transformation is further extended when considering the translation of a simple noun, such as the English *butter*.

لكن في الوقت نفسه، على المترجم أن ينظر في معايير أخرى، مثل وجود قاعدة *oui/si* في الفرنسية، والوظيفة الأسلوبية للإيجابيات التسلسلية، والسياق الاجتماعي للتحية - سواء كانت هاتفية أو وجهاً لوجه، ووضع ومركز الطبقة للمتكلمين وما ينتج عن ذلك من ثقل التحية العامة في المجتمعات المختلفة. كل هذه العوامل تدخل في ترجمة حتى الكلمة الأكثر وضوحاً على ما يبدو. يتم توسيع مسألة التحول السيميائي أكثر عند النظر في ترجمة اسم بسيط، مثل الزبدة الإنجليزية.

What does this picture tell you of someone who is putting butter on a toast?

Students: breakfast, mouth-watering, sweet, pleasure

Lecturer: okay. When you think of the word "butter", you think of classy or British people.

Following Saussure, the structural relationship between the signified (*signifié*) or concept of butter and the signifier (*signifiant*) or the sound-image made by the word *butter* constitutes the linguistic sign *butter*.

تبعاً لـ Saussure فإن العلاقة الهيكلية بين المدلول أو مفهوم الزبدة والذال أو الصورة الصوتية التي تصنعها كلمة زبدة تشكل الإشارة اللغوية "زبدة".

I told you last time that every word in the language (language as a system of codes) is a sign. The linguistic sign of the word "tree" for example is "T R E E". This word would not be a linguistic sign unless I have it as a concept in mind (the signified).

If I told you the word "cat", give me the image that comes to your mind.

Student: White fur

Lecturer: This is the signified or the concept and it is very subjective. When we talk about a signifier, it is the sound of the word. When you hear it, you remember the linguistic sign.

Now, let us have this example with the word "butter"; when I think of the word, what image comes to your mind?

Student: Yellow, melting, hunger

Lecturer: For me, it is a red box that mom has that she keeps butter in. This is pure linguistics.

And since language is perceived as a system of interdependent relations,

Because we do not have meaning unless we have words having relation between each other, the verb with the subject, the subject with the verb, etc.

... it follows that *butter* operates within English as a noun in a particular structural relationship.

Now, after I have this word as a linguistic sign, I need to go to the semantic function. How do I get that? After I put it in a sentence or as the author puts it, a structural relationship

Give the image that comes to your mind when I say the word "Hello".

Student: Adele.

Lecturer: now that is the metaphorical meaning. Maybe, we can imagine the smile face or someone in our life saying "hello" to us. Because "hello" is a single word and we can consider it one sentence and I use it a lot in cultural contexts, the semantics function is easy to detect. It is used for greeting, but if you think about any other word that is not used for greeting, you need to put the word in a sentence so we can know what it means.

For example, let us say we have "bread and butter." At the first glance, what does that mean? What are the images that come to your mind?

Student: breakfast.

Lecturer: So, the sound-image is an English breakfast maybe. Then, we imagine the linguistic sign. Then, we can also think of the semantic function of that. Maybe it is an idiom. Imagine saying "bread and butter" but it is not meant literary, rather metaphorically. In English, when you

say "teaching is my bread and butter", it means that it is my source of income. It is an idiom. So, can we know the semantic function without it being put in a sentence?

Student: No

Lecturer: So, I need a sentence in order to know the semantic function. This is how I can translate in a text. Some words in English, depending on changing the context, tend to have a different meanings.

But Saussure also distinguished between the syntagmatic (or horizontal) relations that a word has with the words that surround it in a sentence

لكن Saussure ميز أيضا بين العلاقات النحوية (أو الأفقية) التي تربطها بالكلمات التي تحيط بها في جملة.

Can you give me a sentence?

Student: I love butter.

Lecturer: What linguistic function do I have here?

Student: Subject, verb, and object

Lecturer: Think about the relation between the subject, the verb and the object. We call this syntagmatic relation, from the word syntax. When I go horizontal, I talk about the relation between words and I cannot change the order of the words. I cannot say "like I butter". "I like butter" is proper English grammar. In opposite to the syntagmatic, we have the "paradigmatic". In it, we go vertically. We are dealing with semantic function of word. We are talking about the association between the words: How words are linked between each other, meaning wise.

... and the associative (or vertical) relations it has with the language structure as a whole.

Paradigmatic is sometimes called the associative relations, the vertical relations, or relations between words but can be substitutive between words.

Moreover, within the secondary modelling system, there is another type of associative relation and the translator,

When we talk about a modelling system, we are talking about the language. When we talk about a secondary system, we talk about Literature.

like the specialist in advertising techniques must consider both the primary and secondary associative lines.

So, we are talking about something like imitating the primary language.

For butter in British English carries with it a set of associations of whole-someness, purity and high status

In addition for butter being a food, it has all these words, purity and whole-someness. It is also used for something that is whole. Butter also is associated with high status.

(in comparison to margarine, once perceived only as secondrate butter though now marketed also as practical because it does not set hard under refrigeration).

Margarine is a kind of English butter that English people see as a secondary type.

When translating butter into Italian, there is a straightforward word-for-word substitution: butter—burro. Both butter and burro describe the product made from milk and marketed as a creamy coloured slab of edible grease for human consumption. And yet within their separate cultural contexts, butter and burro cannot be considered as signifying the same.

When you look at the culture, it is something different. We said earlier that equivalent is something impossible, i.e. to have the same synonyms in two languages.

In Italy, burro, normally light coloured and unsalted, is used primarily for cooking, and carries no associations of high status, whilst in Britain butter, most often bright yellow and salted, is used for spreading on bread and less frequently in cooking.

In Italian, butter has nothing to do with culture. They used butter in a different way. However, if you go to Britain, they use butter for breakfast. In Italy, it is used for cooking. Maybe in Italy, they think of it as سمنة.

Because of the high status of butter, the phrase bread and butter is the accepted usage even where the product used is actually margarine.

Because of the cultural meaning for butter in Britain, people there use it as idiom. So, when you say "something is my bread and butter", it means it is my source of income. There is a distinction between butter and burro and between the cultural value or the semantic significance of these two objects.

So there is a distinction both between the objects signified by butter and burro and between the function value of those objects in their cultural context. The problem of equivalence here involves the utilization and perception of the object in a given context.

لذلك هناك فرق بين الأشياء التي تدل عليها الزبدة والبوررو وبين وظيفة وقيمة تلك الأشياء في سياقها الثقافي. تتطوى مشكلة التكافؤ هنا على استخدام المادة وإدراكها في سياق معين.

So, context is very important.

The butter-burro translation, whilst perfectly adequate on one level, also serves as a reminder of the validity of Sapir's statement that each language represents a separate reality.

Because of one word, we now understand Italian as different from British.

The word butter describes a specifically identifiable product, but in the case of a word with a wider range of SL meanings, the problems increase.

SL is source language as we said earlier.

Nida's diagrammatic sketch of the semantic structure of spirit (see p. 28) illustrates a more complex set of semantic relationships.

Before we go to the example, let us just look at the example "spirit". What do you know when I say "spirit"?

Students: freedom, Phantom or a ghost, The life of everything, Character and personality, Love, Behaviour

Lecturer: Thank you. All of these words are true only if they are used in a context.

Where there is such a rich set of semantic relationships as in this case, a word can be used in punning and word-play, a form of humour that operates by confusing or mixing the various meanings (e.g. the jokes about the drunken priest who has been communing too often with the 'holy spirit', etc.). The translator, then, must be concerned with the particular use of spirit in the sentence itself, in the sentence in its structural relation to other sentences, and in the overall textual and cultural contexts of the sentence.

عندما تكون هناك مجموعة غنية من العلاقات الدلالية كما هو الحال هنا، يمكن استخدام كلمة في اللعب على الكلمات، وهو شكل من أشكال الفكاهة يعمل عن طريق الخلط بين المعاني المختلفة (على سبيل المثال النكات حول الكاهن المخمور الذي كان يتواصل كثيرًا مع «الروح القدس»، إلخ) ومن ثم، يجب أن يهتم المترجم بالاستخدام الخاص للروح في الجملة نفسها، وفي الجملة في علاقتها الهيكلية مع الجمل الأخرى، وفي السياقين النصي والثقافي العام للجملة.

So, if you are talking about a spirit, you are talking about an angle. We might be talking about religious topics. We might be talking about a lot of things like demons, angles, ghosts. Sometimes and especially if you are talking about Greek classical culture, the gods are called spirits, like the spirit of water. You might talk about fairies, which are also spirits. We can talk about someone who has high spirits, which means energetic. We can also talk about the spirit of the group in an example like "we should keep the spirit of the group". When you talk about spirits, we talk about intent meaning of a document. This is non-human. It is like for example, the vibe of the play.

And the one difficult translation is when you do holy texts like the Quran or the Bible because we have ancient culture. They were written in old times and now, we are in a different time. So, we need to pay attention when we are translating that.

Where there is such a rich set of semantic relationships as in this case

When you talk about demons and angles, we start with having personality and not having personality, human or non-human. If we are talking about theological creatures which might be inferior or superior, we have a very complicated semantic association.

a word can be used in punning and word-play, a form of humour that operates by confusing or mixing the various meanings (e.g. the jokes about the drunken priest who has been communing too often with the 'holy spirit', etc.).

Punning is when you play on words. The people of letters really like to use puns.

The translator, then, must be concerned with the particular use of spirit in the sentence itself, in the sentence in its structural relation to

² تمكن النكتة هنا في اللعب على الكلمتين: "الروح القدس" و"المشروبات الروحية"

other sentences, and in the overall textual and cultural contexts of the sentence.

So, do not bother your mind with thinking a lot. You have to do the research, but you have to stick to the sentence because we are translating the sentence.

Now, these abstract ideas should be applied in a metaphorical way. For example, if I am talking about a compound complex sentence, which has three parts (independent, dependent, and the relative clause in-between), this is syntax. However, when I talk about the paradigmatic, each time I translate the sentence, we have to consider the overall meaning of the text.

So, for example, { *The spirit of the dead child rose from the grave* }

What spirit are we talking about here?

Student: The ghost.

Lecturer: Yes. It is the soul of the child. Here, the word *ghost* is not a bad word.

{ *The spirit of the house lived on* }

The word "spirit" here is associated with "house". What meaning can we have here?

Student: The environment or the atmosphere, family.

Lecturer: The word *ghost* is a bad word. So, it might be the energy between the family, the atmosphere of the house, or that we have something living in the house, something non-human.

could refer to 5 or 7

If it is used literally, there might be a guardian spirit in the house. We need a context to know.

or, used metaphorically, to 6 or 8 and the meaning can only be determined by the context.

If it is used metaphorically, it is according to the author's intended meaning. We need a context to know. It depends.

Firth defines meaning as 'a complex of relations of various kinds between the component terms of a context of situation, and cites the example of the English phrase *Say when*, where the words 'mean' what they 'do'.

يعرف فيرث المعنى بأنه "مجموعة من العلاقات من مختلف الأنواع بين المصطلحات المكونة لسياق الموقف، ويستشهد بمثال العبارة الإنجليزية قل عندما، حيث تعني عبارة "ما يقطونه".

In English, do you know what is the meaning of the phrase *say when*?

Student: When to stop.

Lecturer: If I want to translate it literally.

Student: قل متى

Lecturer: However, if I am in a gathering and the host is pouring me some juice and said *say when*, he means *when to stop*. If we have two people racing and someone says "*say when*," it means "*when to go*".

In translating that phrase, it is the function that will be taken up and not the words themselves, and the translation process involves a decision to replace and substitute the linguistic elements in the TL. And since the phrase is, as Firth points out, directly linked to English social behavioural patterns, the translator putting the phrase into French or German has to contend with the problem of the non-existence of a similar convention in either TL culture.

عند ترجمة هذه العبارة، فإن الوظيفة هي التي سيتم تناولها وليس الكلمات نفسها، وتتطوى عملية الترجمة على اتخاذ قرار باستبدال العناصر اللغوية في سجل الترجمة. وبما أن العبارة، كما يشير فيرث، مرتبطة مباشرة بآداب السلوك الاجتماعي الإنجليزية يجب على المترجم الذي يضع العبارة في الفرنسية أو الألمانية أن يتعامل مع مشكلة عدم وجود استخدام مماثل في ثقافة اللغة الهدف.

TL is target language. Here, we have the problem of non-equivalent or non-existent translation in the target language. It is like when we say *بless you*. So far, I did not find an equivalent in English. Sometimes, they say *I hope you have a nice shower*. It is also like when we say *صحة*.

Likewise, the English translator of the French *Bon appetite* has a similar problem, for again the utterance is situation-bound.

Specifically for French, when they are having a meal, they say *Bon appetite*. In English, we do not have an equivalent, so they use the same word. All of these things should be paid attention to when we translate something.

As an example of the complexities involved here, let us take a hypothetical dramatic situation in which the phrase *Bon appetite* becomes significant:

So, this is a bit of a dramatic situation. Just imagine it with me.

A family group have been quarrelling bitterly; the unity of the family has collapsed, and unforgivable things have been said. But the celebratory dinner to which they have all come is about to be served, and the family sit at the table in silence ready to eat. The plates are filled, everyone sits waiting; the father breaks the silence to wish them all 'Bon appetit' and the meal begins.

كانت مجموعة عائلية تتشاجر بمرارة، وانهارت وحدة الأسرة، وقيلت أشياء لا تتغفر. لكن الضياء الاحتفالي الذي أتوا إليه جميعاً على وشك أن يتم تقديمه، وتجلس الأسرة على الطاولة في صمت جاهزة لتناول الطعام. تملأ الأطباق، ويجلس الجميع في الانتظار، ويكسر الأب الصمت ليتمنى لهم جميعاً «وجبة هائلة» وتبدأ الوجبة.

We need to get to the vibe of the text. Mechanically is when you say something like a machine does. For translating, and because this is a grammatical situation, we cannot stick to the text. We need to see the performance in order to know the whole context. So, it can be interpretative to a lot of meanings. We cannot use footnotes to show the possibilities of meanings. We need to provide one single translation of the text.

Whether the phrase is used mechanically, as part of the daily ritual, whether it is used ironically, sadly or even cruelly is not specified. On a stage, the actor and director would come to a decision about how to interpret the phrase based on their concept of characterization and of the overall meaning and structure of the play.

لم يتم تحديد ما إذا كانت العبارة تستخدم بشكل تلقائي، كجزء من الطقوس اليومية، سواء تم استخدامها بشكل مثير للسخرية أو مؤسف أو حتى بقسوة. على خشبة المسرح، يتوصل الممثل والمخرج إلى قرار حول كيفية تفسير العبارة بناءً على مفهومهما للتوصيف والمعنى العام للمسرحية وهيكلها.

So, if I am watching a performance or if I am the actor or the director, there should be one single version of the text to be rehearsed and delivered. So, as if here we have two languages. One of them is the text and the other is the performance.

The translator has to take the question of interpretation into account in addition to the problem of selecting a TL phrase which will have a roughly similar meaning. Exact translation is impossible; *Good appetite* in English used outside a structured sentence is meaningless. Nor is there any English phrase in general use that

fulfils the same function as the French. There are, however, a series of phrases that might be applicable in certain situations situations—the colloquial *Dig in* or *Tuck in*.

ويتعين على المترجم أن يأخذ في الاعتبار مسألة الترجمة الشفوية بالإضافة إلى مشكلة اختيار عبارة TL التي سيكون لها معنى مماثل تقريباً. الترجمة الدقيقة مستحيلة: الشهية الجيدة في اللغة الإنجليزية المستخدمة خارج جملة منظمة لا معنى لها. كما لا توجد أي عبارة إنجليزية بشكل عام تؤدي نفس وظيفة الفرنسيين. ومع ذلك، هناك سلسلة من العبارات التي قد تكون قابلة للتطبيق في حالات معينة مثل التركيبين *Dig in* أو *Tuck in*.

Do you know what do we mean by *tuck in* or *dig in*?

Student: Investigate, think deep about something.

Lecturer: What about *tuck in*?

Student: Stick something in.

Lecturer: If you are talking about fashion, then *tuck in* means when you put, for example, a blouse in your pants. Another meaning: *when you tuck in your child* is when you put them under covering. When you *dig in* a situation, it means that you doubt this situation. Your opinion becomes weaker and you do not show much effort.

the more formal *Do start*, or even the ritualistically apologetic *I hope you like it*, or *I hope it's alright*. In determining what to use in English, the translator must:

(1) Accept the untranslatability of the SL phrase in the TL on the linguistic level.

So, we do not have a word-for-word translation. I need to accept the untranslatability.

(2) Accept the lack of a similar cultural convention in the TL.

I need to search and accept that I am dealing with a different culture, and that there will always be a lack in meaning. Maybe this culture has a different convention.

(3) Consider the range of TL phrases available, having regard to the presentation of class, status, age, sex of the speaker, his relationship to the listeners and the context of their meeting in the SL.

I need to consider the person who is talking, to whom and who is writing, sex (man or a woman), age, status, is he more powerful to the listener or the audience is more powerful than him (power dynamic). I need to keep all this criteria in mind.

(4) Consider the significance of the phrase in its particular context—i.e. as a moment of high tension in the dramatic text.

It is like when you had the *bon appetite* example. The high tension of the text mentioned above.

(5) Replace in the TL the invariant core of the SL phrase in its two referential systems (the particular system of the text and the system of culture out of which the text has sprung).

Meaning, at the end, when I have a lot of choices, I need to pay attention to the linguistic choice and I need to have the semantic function as well.

Levý, the great Czech translation scholar, insisted that any contracting or omitting of difficult expressions in translating was immoral.

As a translator, I cannot delete according to my mood. I need to find a solution for everything because I am not the author. I do not mean to objectify, but a translator is kind of a tool. You have a text and you need to give it to another audience without them knowing that you have translated it. Sometimes, it is really difficult. For example, if I am a translator of a worldwide company and I had a text about atheism (not believing in God), it is really difficult for me to translate because I believe in God. How can I translate that? I need to make myself transparent. I need to read about this topic and put my beliefs aside and deal with the text. We take off our feelings as a jacket and go there and get the job done. Then, we go back to our normal life.

The translator, he believed, had the responsibility of finding a solution to the most daunting of problems, and he declared that the functional view must be adopted with regard not only to meaning but also to style and form.

Sometimes, it is really hard to translate as we said. If we have time at the end of the course, we can work on a small passage or a video. It is an animation movie that has puns. Puns are really challenging because some puns in English are really funny. However, in Arabic, you cannot just hit it with the same thing because things are a bit different for the Arab world. A very good example of that are the Holy books as we said because we need to pay attention to the style, content and form of these books.

The wealth of studies on Bible translation and the documentation of the way in which individual translators of the Bible attempt to solve their problems through ingenious solutions is a particularly rich source of examples of semiotic transformation.

When it comes to translating holy books, it is a really daunting job because we have some phrases in style and the language in ancient. So, how am I going to translate it to suit the modern mind?

In translating *Bon appetit* in the scenario given above, the translator was able to extract a set of criteria from the text in order to determine what a suitable TL rendering might be, but clearly in a different context the TL phrase would alter.

So, whenever you are changing the culture, the target language changes by default.

The emphasis always in translation is on the reader or listener, and the translator must tackle the SL text in such a way that the TL version will correspond to the SL version.

Do not forget that audience is the most important thing. If you are writing an essay or translating, the audience are the most important thing. What culture are you giving the text to? I need to understand that. We are going to see that in text types, in genre, when we are talking about new reports. Is the English news reports are the same as the Arabic news reports?

the translator must tackle the SL text in such a way that the TL version will correspond to the SL version.

We try to make them as much identical as possible but it is impossible actually.

The nature of that correspondence may vary considerably (see Section 3) but the principle remains constant. Hence Albrecht Neubert's view that Shakespeare's Sonnet 'Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?' cannot be semantically translated into a language where summers are unpleasant is perfectly proper, just as the concept of God the Father cannot be translated into a language where the deity is female.

قد تختلف طبيعة التجاوب اختلافًا كبيرًا (انظر القسم 3) ولكن المبدأ يظل ثابتًا. ومن هنا جاءت وجهة نظر البرشت نيوبرت بأن قصيدة شكسبير «هل أقرنك بيوم الصيف؟» لا يمكن ترجمتها دلاليًا إلى لغة يكون فيها الصيف غير سار أمرًا مناسبًا تمامًا، تمامًا كما لا يمكن ترجمة مفهوم الله الأب إلى لغة يكون فيها الإله أنثى.

In his sonnet, Shakespeare is talking about a lover and his comparing that lover to summer's day. So basically, the view of summer is positive. Now imagine we are translating Shakespeare to a culture and in this culture, summer is a bad season. **How would they read it?** This is just one problem of the problems that a translator might encounter. Let us say that I have a text from a culture that believes in God and we are translating it to a culture that does not believe in God or believe in old gods like paganism. It might be confusing for that culture.

To attempt to impose the value system of the SL culture onto the TL culture is dangerous ground, and the translator should not be tempted by the school that pretends to determine the original intentions of an author on the basis of a self-contained text.

إن محاولة فرض نظام القيم لثقافة SL على ثقافة TL هو أمر خطير، ويجب ألا يُغري المترجم من قبل المدرسة التي تتظاهر بتحديد النوايا الأصلية للمؤلف على أساس نص قائم بذاته.

This is from the first school of translation where I need to give a copy-paste translation of the author, culture and etc. You cannot do that. The product would be dull to read and it will not be authentic. Do not get tempted by the school. It is really old. We need to be flexible. We need to understand both cultures and see what the perfect solution would be.

The translator cannot be the author of the SL text, but as the author of the TL text has a clear moral responsibility to the TL readers.

He might be the author of the target language. Let us say that I have an English text and we do not have a copy of it in Arabic. If the author is English and I am translating it, I am kind of an author but I do not have the right to change anything.

We are going to stop here. **PROBLEMS OF EQUIVALENCE IS CANCELLED** and for next time page 47. So, everything between 33 and 47 is not required.

See you next week!

