

Session VII

Double-edged Blade: Clichés and Cultural Transfer

Daisy S. Y. Ng

National University of Singapore

Daisy Ng has been teaching at the Department of Chinese Studies of the National University of Singapore (NUS) since September 2000. While her major research interests are in modern Chinese literature, film and culture, she taught both Chinese cinema and Translation courses at NUS. This year she has taken leave to attend the Translation and Interpretation program at MIIS.

Danica Seleskovitch in her article, “Language and Memory: A Study of Note-taking in Consecutive Interpreting” (translated by Jacolyn Harmer), makes a distinction between “literal” translation and “reflective” translation. She compares the former to reflex language production and the latter to voluntary language production. While she suggests that “[t]he correctness of a translation must be judged according to the result and not the process by which the result is obtained”, she also concedes that many literal translations are often wrong because “reflex” translation are like “stereotypical, or formulaic language, in which one word leads to the next” without intentional effort.

If Seleskovitch sees the unreflective, stereotypical nature of literal translation as “speech without thought”, she also discerns the role of automatic word association in helping the interpreter who has trouble coming up with the exact corresponding term in the other language by joggling the word loose with stereotypical utterances. In my presentation I will address the paradoxical role of formulaic language in translation as a double-edged sword which can hinder as well as promote cultural transfer. I must admit, however, that the discussion below is based on personal observations of student performance in my translation classes rather than on a systematic research of their language or translation production. At the risk of sounding anecdotal, I will quote specific incidents below to illustrate my points.

I first became interested in the role of clichés in cultural transfer in a situation unrelated to translation. I was discussing the Chinese film, *Hero*, with my Singaporean graduate student who did her B.A. in Chinese Literature in Shanghai, China. I was asking her about the possible symbolic meanings of colors in the film (which is neatly divided into four parts, each with a dominant color). She was able to read into the more easily discernible colors of red as symbolizing passion and white as symbolizing innocence, but when I asked her about the green, apparently she was at a loss and just blurted out the word “envy”. However, it is obvious in the film that the green color has no correlation to envy at all within its color schemata. Her reflex response of “green as envy” intrigues me because she is of Chinese descent, grew up and still live in a Chinese-speaking family, has spent four years studying in China and is a Chinese Literature major. To describe someone as turning green with envy is an English convention; the Chinese expression of jealousy is 眼红, literally, “eyes red with envy”. My student’s unreflective response comes from her internalization of English idioms through years of elementary and high school education with English as the medium of teaching. What I find interesting about this bilingual speaker’s reflex utterance is the exposure of our unreflective dependence upon clichés in language production and thus, conceptualization through language. Particularly in my student’s case, acculturation in clichéd expressions in a foreign language has interfered with her understanding of the culture of her own native language.

While this case may appear exceptional, a recent casual exchange with a new classmate from Taiwan in the Translation program has a surprisingly similar revelation. I was chatting with my classmate in a reception when she suddenly asked me in Chinese: “你有时间吗？” I was expecting her to follow with an invitation to do something together when she held up my wrist and looked at the time on my wrist watch. Then I realized that she had just done a literal translation of “Do you have the time?”, an idiomatic way of inquiring about time in the US. The same phrase rendered literally into Chinese as “你有时间吗？”, however, has a completely different denotation of asking if someone had the time for something. The phenomenon of how a bilingually proficient speaker can transfer (incorrectly) a culturally specific utterance from a foreign culture into her own culture by reflex is fascinating to me, for it illustrates that studies of translation must not be limited to a unilateral direction of linguistic transference and cultural transfer from the A language to the B language as the bulk of research tends to be, but should also take into consideration how acculturation in idiomaticity of a foreign language affects the production of native language in a trans-cultural context.

While the above examples of linguistic utterances were unconscious and unintentional acts of translation, conscious and intentional attempts in translation in the classroom by students fresh to my Basic Translation course demonstrate comparable problems. Very often, formulaic usage in one language begets clichéd expressions in another in reflex translation, unveiling the unconscious yet deep-seated conventional values of a certain time and place. For instance, when I asked my Singaporean students to translate passé phrases (without specified context) such as 红粉佳人、白脸书生、青衣侍婢, stereotypical ideas about Chinese society and culture in the past naturally surface in translation of 红粉佳人 as “classic beauty” or “blossom lover”, 白脸书生 as “willowy scholar” or “hypocrite”, 青衣侍婢 as “imperial servant maid” or “dedicated maid”. Conversely, some students’ translation of 红粉佳人 as “pink lady” or “female date”, 白脸书生 as “nerd” or “bookworm”, 青衣侍婢 as “housekeeper” or “waitress” illustrate the peculiar phenomenon in which students’ conditioning in clichéd expressions in the target language prevent them from grasping the historical and cultural connotations of these terms in the original language.

M. Tavangar, in a conference paper entitled “Colour Terms, Idiomaticity and Translation”, has emphasized the crucial role played by color lexicon in the idiomatization process in language. As he points out, color-oriented idioms are “linguistic entities deeply embedded in their socio-cultural milieus”, the highly culture-specific nature of idiomatic expressions in which color words feature prominently thus pose serious problems to the translator. What I consider a more challenging task is, to quote Peter Bush: “One of the difficulties I have as a teacher of translation is that students are norm-conditioned”. I would like to add that the difficulty is all the more acute when the norm represents mostly clichéd expressions and formulaic language.

Secret Agencies: Censorship, Norms and Publishing Demands

Michelle Woods

Centre for Translation and Textual Studies, DCU

Michelle Woods is an IRCHSS Government of Ireland Postdoctoral Fellow at the Centre for Translation and Textual Studies, Dublin City University. Her book, Translating Milan Kundera will be published shortly by Multilingual Matters. Her translation of Adolf Hoffmeister's 1930 interview and translation lesson with James Joyce, 'Osobnost James Joyce,' was published in Granta in 2005 as 'The Game of Evenings'.

After 1968, following the creative outpouring of the Prague Spring, the Soviet-backed hardline regime introduced a period called 'normalizace' or 'normalization', which from 1970 onwards banned the works of the protagonists of the reform movement, including those by Milan Kundera. At the beginning of this politicized fossilization of the arts, Kundera's work began to be translated in the West, an experience that Kundera described as traumatic and that he equated with the actions of the 'Moscow censors' (Kundera 1969: 1259). Reading Kundera's 1969 open letter to his London publisher and translators in the *Times Literary Supplement*, the tone seems hysterical and pedantic. Yet his accusation of interference in the text in order to sell more books – not simply to the translators, but also, significantly, to the publisher – is embedded in the realization that in the West too there existed what Translation Studies has identified as a modality of 'normalization'.

Reading Kundera through the prism of recent movements in Translation Studies affords readers a more holistic sense of the issues surrounding the dissemination of his work and its interpretation, especially in light of research on normalizing practices in the 1980s and 1990s in the translation process (Tourey. 1995; Baker 1996; Kenny 2001). These lexical norms, predicated on given societal norms, are articulated by a society at a given time in order to maintain its power discourse. Translation, in effect, can become a means of intra- or inter-cultural domination and of appropriative representation of other cultures (Niranjana 1992; Robinson 1997; Bassnett and Trivedi 1999). Social pressures on translators may be overt, as in the kind of ideological norms placed on the translation process in communist Eastern Europe or covert, as in the pressure of market demands in the globalized publishing industry today (Gentzler 2001: 136; Venuti 1998). The censorship of texts or translated texts, in other words, is not a practice limited to repressive political regimes but also occurs contemporaneously in the 'free' market, which demands that texts subscribe to norms in order to sell them (Venuti 1998). The effacement of stylistically different or difficult authors in the translation process in the English-language market parallels the effacement of the translation process itself. Michael Cronin divides the notion of translation and censorship into 'anthropoemic censorship' and 'anthropophagic censorship': the first describing an aggressive censorship policy towards translation; and the second describing a more covert censorship that denies translation as a process and the translator as an enabler or agent of translation (Cronin 2003: 95-6). The 'invisibility' of the translator (Venuti 1995) and the denial of translation as an issue can lead to a form of 'clonialism' (Cronin 2003: 127), a desire to reproduce the same as the marketable. However, although the translation process and the skills of the translator are denied in this clonialism, they are also central to its propagation – Cronin arguing that the notion of simulacra can be a destabilizing force and can bring to the fore the beneficial modalities of counterfeiting and of the translator's primacy as an agent-copyist, a reader *par excellence* (Cronin 2003: 130). In this case, can the translatorial moment destabilize the originary validation of norms in the very application of those norms?

Milan Kundera is an exemplary case and timely case study in examining the effects of anthropoemic and anthropophagic censorship and possible liberatory strategies for understanding these modalities and for escaping binary thinking in norms theories in Translation Studies that focuses on the relationship of author / translator *in situ* of published texts in discussing the question of norms and normalization. The archival material relating to Kundera – the archives of his editor at Knopf, Nancy Nicholas, and the archives of one of his translators, Peter Kussi – illustrate the complexity of the problem and help to situate questions of power, the market, editorial control, translatorial decision-making, the translator-editor relationship, and normalization in a concrete rather than speculative way. In analysing the Nicholas and Kussi archives alongside Kundera's own writing on style (in light of Philip E Lewis's notions of 'abusive fidelity' (Lewis in Graham 1985), the paper focuses on two issues: the extent of editorial control on importing style; and secondly, the implicit ideological stance behind these editorial decisions. In Kundera's case, his style was seen by Knopf and, earlier, Macdonald, as being deficient (a) because it was identified as being a peculiarly Czechoslovak style and therefore inadequate to 'Western' norms, and (b) because it was not regarded to be a marketable style – in needed to be changed in order to sell it within the constraints of what the publishers envisaged the function of his writing to be, i.e., social criticism.

While the application of Postcolonial Studies to Translation Studies has provided fertile analyses of the impact of and agendas in cross-cultural transfer, it has tended not to analyse intra-European power relationships, apart from the case of Ireland (Cronin 1996; Tymoczko 1999). An analysis of translations from the languages of the 'other Europe' (Rupnik 1988) may, in effect, open up more diverse avenues for understanding interculturality and plurilingualism within Europe, and in understanding a Europe that is not wholly Occidental.

Kundera's stylistic tendencies were exacerbated by translation – through the re-reading of his novels when checking their translations and in his re-writing (as a result) and writing of novels, in the full knowledge that they would almost entirely be read in translation. In other words, they would always be read 'second-hand'. Kundera, the *scriba duplex*, began writing and re-writing in a second hand, self-consciously crafting the linguistic style of the novels in a way in which he could engage with translation first-hand. In essence, taking Lewis's concept of 'abusive fidelity' and Cronin's notion of counterfeiting and simulacra within 'clonialism', I suggest that Kundera engages in a form of abusive writing predicated on a full awareness of a positive second-handedness. The displacement of the language (Czech) of his novels, because his readership was largely non-Czech speaking, becomes central to the epistemological goals of the novels and is intricately tied into their rhetorical style. It is this displacement that has caused most discomfort with Kundera's publishers and reviewers, where the style is seen as foreign, and perhaps more so once he begins writing in French. For what Kundera translates (in the sense of transposing) from his Czech writing to his French is this style, borne in a 'minority language' and incubated in translation. In doing this, Kundera postulates that language is itself foreign, destabilized, as often misinterpreted as interpreted.

**Regional Dialects of Spoken and Written Arabic:
An Obstacle to Communication and a Challenge to Translators and Interpreters**

David Wilmsen
The American University in Cairo
Riham Osama Youssef
The American University in Cairo
Australian Institute of Translators and Interpreters

David Wilmsen is Associate Dean for Instructional Affairs at the American University in Cairo, where he was director of Arabic and Translation Studies until January 2005. He studied Gulf, Levantine, and Egyptian Arabic at the University of Arizona and holds a Ph.D. in Arabic language and linguistics at the University of Michigan; he has also participated in intensive language programs at Yarmouk University in Jordan and the American University in Cairo. His research interests include issues in pure and applied linguistics especially as they relate to Arabic language pedagogy. He is an occasional commentator on various dimensions of discourse on Arab media and culture, with writings appearing in the Transnational Broadcasting Studies Journal (www.tbsjournal.com) the Arizona Daily Star and other venues.

Riham Youssef holds a BA in Translation and English Literature from Cairo University and an MA in Translation and Linguistics, University of Western Sydney. She also holds the Advanced Professional Certificate in Translation & Simultaneous Interpreting from the American University in Cairo, where she taught classes in the Arabic and Translation Studies division and the Center for Arabic Studies Abroad and supervised advanced interpreting students in the annual Cairo International Model Arab League. She is accredited as an advanced professional Arabic translator by the National Accreditation Authority of Translators and Interpreters (NAATI) and is a member of the Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators (AUSIT). She works as an Arabic subtitler and radio producer at the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS) of Australia and as a conference and community interpreter.

Arabic is usually described as possessing numerous, somewhat mutually unintelligible regional vernaculars, against which is posited a superposed, supposedly standardized (usually) written variety often called in the West “Modern Standard Arabic”. What is less frequently acknowledged is that Modern Standard Arabic also exhibits regional variations that are somewhat incomprehensible to users from different Arabic dialect areas. Just as there are dialects of spoken Arabic, there are also dialects of written Arabic. This assertion is contrary to the image that native speakers of Arabic cherish about their language: that the formal code used in writing is a super-regional standard comprehensible to the educated regardless of their native dialects and used as such in international forums, and for that reason and others, it is the only appropriate medium for the discussion of serious, scholarly, or scientific subjects.

Contrary to such assertions, it is precisely in the arena of specialized terminologies where the regional variations are most acutely felt, and it is especially in the arena of scientific discourse that standard Arabic terminologies are lacking. There have been attempts to adapt scientific and technical discourse to Arabic, but such efforts have been only partly successful. The language academies working in various parts of the Arab world typically respond slowly to the flood of new terminology inundating the separate countries of the Arab world

Local varieties appear in the orthography, morphology, syntax, and especially the lexicon. The first three will probably not hinder understanding between dialect areas. Rather, it is the lexicon that throws up obstacles to comprehension between speakers of different dialects. For, the variation in lexis occurs precisely in content-rich key words, often conveying concepts that are new to Arabic discourse.

There is a long tradition of lexicography in Arabic, but the work has not changed in character much since its beginnings. That is to say, most reference works of the Arabic language are the work of a single individual working alone. When a particular lexicographer retires or dies, his work is rarely if ever revised or updated. This presents a monumental problem to those working professionally with the language, especially when translating, in that technical and specialist dictionaries manifest the same individualistic tradition.

It is almost impossible for lone lexicographers to keep their works current. Most of the well-known bilingual Arabic technical works were last updated in the nineteen eighties, some in the early nineties. This means, that all technical vocabulary introduced into the language since they were last updated does not appear in them. Moreover, the fields covered in bilingual Arabic technical dictionaries are few in comparison with those intended for the European languages.

Of the range of techniques lexicographers utilize when attempting to Arabize the novel concepts that enter the language, not all of them successful all of the time, the preferred method is to exploit the derivative properties of the language and expand the meanings of available roots, either those current in the modern language or those from archaic words that have fallen out of use. When that is not possible a periphrastic translation of the meaning of a term can substitute. Occasionally a blending of two separate roots is attempted, which together would convey a more complete rendering of the concept in question. This has never been a terribly productive process in Arabic, there being only a handful of such words inherited from the classical tradition, and it is generally resisted by more cautious lexicographers and language users alike. If all of these options are exhausted, the foreign word itself may be adopted, either the whole word or a clipped version thereof to conform to the canonical Semitic three or four consonant root system. A final process must be added to this: the adoption of terms from the local vernaculars. This is not usually acknowledged as a legitimate process, but it is employed nonetheless.

We have conducted a study of twelve individual writers and translators from different region of the Arab world, writing in the fields of psychology and sociology in order to assess the terminological solutions they adopted in their formal written Arabic. From the seventeen works we examined, we have extracted ninety-one terms, which we then checked against sixteen general and specialist dictionaries and two United Nations glossaries. In this presentation, we will adduce only six terms from those we have collected to illustrate the process involved in assimilating such unfamiliar concepts into Arabic and to demonstrate the variability in solutions to the problems presented by the process of assimilating them. For the sake of simplicity, we will also concentrate on only five authors and five reference works, occasionally making reference to the two UN glossaries as well. Tremendous variability was found between all authors, sometimes within the work of a single author, and even between the reference works.

Given the situation in Arabic described here, the label “standard” in the Western appellation “Modern Standard Arabic” is ill conceived. What is more, since this variety is not the native language of any of its speakers or users, oral performance in this code is characterized by a shifting of styles between canonical forms of the written code and the vernacular. This means that in order for interpreting to be carried out effectively in all but the most formal situations, interpreters must have control of the local vernacular and the formal written code as well as being

acquainted with regional variations in the formal code. The implications of this for translators and interpreters are that they effectively must learn more than one language.

Summary Translation Research at CASL

Gregory M. Shreve
Center for the Advanced Study of Language
and Kent State University

Gregory M. Shreve, Ph.D is Professor and Chairman of Modern and Classical Language Studies at Kent State University. He is also Founder / Director of the Institute for Applied Linguistics at Kent State University, one of the country's foremost university-based translation programs. He received his doctorate in anthropology from Ohio State University and a Certificate of Advanced Study in Information Science from the University of Pittsburgh. He is the general editor of the monograph series Translation Studies and co-author of several influential books and anthologies on translation studies including Translation as Text with Albrecht Neubert and Cognitive Processes in Translation and Interpreting with Joseph H. Danks. He has authored and co-authored over fifty articles and has been a principal or co-principal investigator on grants totaling over 1 million dollars. He is currently a co-principal investigator with the Center For the Advanced Study of Language at the University of Maryland investigating summary translation in the federal government. Shreve has broad research interests in translation theory and practice, computer-assisted translation, corpus linguistics, internationalization, software localization and language informatics.

The Center for the Advanced Study of Language (CASL) at the University of Maryland seeks to improve the performance of foreign language professionals (FLPs) in the federal government. A major form of professional work is “summary translation,” a kind of translation ubiquitous in the federal government. An important research thread at CASL is devoted to the empirical study of summary translation using a testbed of annotated Chinese, English and Korean texts, metapragmatic descriptions of oral source recordings, systematic observation of FLPs, and psycholinguistic experiments.

Summary translations can be produced from both written (graphic summary translation) or audio sources (voice summary translation) and comprise a significant portion of the FLP's workload. Summary translation is much more common in government than in commercial environments and is therefore rarely studied and generally ill understood outside of the government context. In order to identify the cognitive skills, cognitive resources and component cognitive processes required to produce acceptable summary translations, it is necessary to undertake rigorous empirical study of the task as it is performed in specific government agencies.

Summary translation certainly involves many of the cognitive processes that emerge in the full translation task (*verbatim translation* in government parlance). However, because the final result of the languaging task is a summary as well as a translation, these component cognitive processes are necessarily altered in specific ways. We hypothesize that summary translation shares much in common with full translation, but differs in at least three significant areas. Each of these areas of difference has implications for the gross cognitive processes underlying translation: text comprehension, mental model construction, decision-making/problem-solving, and text production.

While both full and summary translations are concerned with the transfer and preservation of semantic content, summary translation is also involved with the deliberate *reduction* of semantic content. Second, although both summary translation and full translation are both recipient-oriented and purpose-driven, summary translation is much more *explicitly directed*, usually by a clearly articulated (but sometimes implicit) *request for information* (RFI) absent in normal full translation. Summary translation also differs from normal within-language (generic) summarization in this respect. The RFI identifies specific topics to be summarized or requests answers to particular queries (*targets*) and thus has a direct impact on mental model construction and output production. Finally, full translation generally involves some sort of emphasis on text-linguistic *correspondences* between source and target text. In summary translation the correspondence of source and target text units is devalued in favor of the succinct expression of selected semantic content, what some in the summarization research community have called *semantic content units*.

In discourse analysis, texts are sometimes viewed as a socially-specific mechanism to deliver these content units. A text's *informativity* is a function of "what" new (relevant, interesting) information units are delivered in the text. The information in a text is a global meaning distributed linearly over its linguistic structure. In verbatim translation the translator, it is assumed, sequentially extracts the semantic content corresponding to linguistic/structural elements of the text and assembles these into some sort of whole or partial mental representation of the meaning of the text and its constituent segments prior to target text production.

Some of the "sentences" or linguistic structures in a text contain less information or less important information than others; this "scale" of significance is called the *order of informativity*. For verbatim translators it is important to understand the order of informativity when determining, for instance, whether omission/deletion of translation units is possible—although for the most part semantic content is preserved in its entirety in the target text even if linguistic structure is transposed or modulated. In summary translation the relative importance or weight of a semantic content unit is evaluated against a pre-existing RFI as well as the source text. Omission of semantic elements is specifically enabled, often even demanded, by the RFI. Summary translation calls for semantic filtering/decision-making strategies not generally present in verbatim translation. In summary translation or gisting, the notion of orders of informativity is likely to be a very important one for empirical study, as decisions about the relative importance of semantic content have to be made on the basis of some sort of on-line (in the psychological sense) appraisal of the semantic weight and the relative value of semantic content units as measured against the semantic targets expressed in the RFI. This is likely not an innate skill, nor a skill that necessarily accompanies linguistic proficiency or translation expertise.

Thus, while both translation tasks aim for accuracy in the re-construction of textual meaning, summary translation also values the cognitive ability to determine the relative semantic weight or importance of content units. While verbatim translation is generally meaning preserving down to the micropropositional level, summary translation may allow both for the "collapse" of semantic levels and the omission of semantic units. The collapsing of semantic levels implies the integration and expression of lower level micro-propositional content, generally allotted their own surface representations in verbatim translation, in semantically "denser" higher level target structures.

Since summary translation often involves the production of written abstracts from spoken, possibly recorded, discourse, it may also be a cross-modal task, further complicating the comparison with translation from written texts. If the aural text is recorded, then replay is possible, making the task more closely resemble translation, although one where listening processes substitute for reading processes. If the aural text is being listened to in "real time" then the task more closely resembles interpreting.

Inadequate summaries are a common complaint of translation managers and reviewers in government contexts. The empirical study of both successful and “flawed” summary translations would produce a better understanding of where a summary can fail: e.g., does it fail because of a mismatch between the language capabilities of the summarizer and the level of the text (inadequate decoding), because the summarizer cannot understand specific elements of the source text (inadequate domain knowledge), or because the summarizer understands the text but cannot discriminate between important and unimportant content (inability to summarize against an RFI)? In addition it is important to understand where the loci of failure are: at what particular point or set of points in cognitive processing (comprehension, semantic representation, production)?

Research in summary translation at CASL focuses on developing an empirical model of this unique activity and its underlying cognitive framework. The model will identify the specific ways in which summary and full translation differ and isolate the cognitive resources and skills necessary for producing acceptable summary translations. The empirical model can lead to improved professional education and government training practices and better protocols for task assignment, hiring and personnel management.

Teaching Specialised Translation into L2 - Standing the Pyramid on its Head

Caterina Jeffcote
Senior Lecturer
SLAS

Caterina Jeffcote is a Senior lecturer in Greek Specialised Translation and Interpreting and Greek Language at the University of Portsmouth. She has graduated in Contemporary European Studies at the University of North London and acquired a Masters Degree in French- English Translation at the University of Surrey. She has worked as a trainee and freelance translator and terminologist at the European Parliament in Luxembourg and has gained further experience in translating for a broadcast monitoring company in London. Her research interests include teaching translation at Postgraduate level and cognitive aspect of translator training.

When I was interviewed (many years ago) to attend a MA degree Course in Specialised Translation I was asked why I chose a course that would train me to translate into a language that was not my mother tongue. At the time, I was asked how I was going to deal with the difficulties I would definitely have. “Let me put it this way”, my interviewer said: “If you had a text that needed to be translated into Greek, would like it to be translated by a native Greek speaker or not? A rather directive question, I thought at the time, but as I was trying to ensure a place in that course, I refrained from revealing my thoughts.

I am using this example to demonstrate the type of stigma that revolves around translating into L2. And quite rightly so... There are enough bad translations around, without having non-native speakers attempting to do the work that belongs (by right) to a qualified professional that possesses, apart from the appropriate training, a comparative advantage in the use of his/her mother tongue. In a competitive environment such as most translation markets are, where a world of bidding and infinite competence tests prevail, what chance does a non-native speaker of a given language have in getting a job? And how can we as trainers, ensure that a trainee translator can begin to feel competent in using their tools (taught or otherwise) effectively?

My presentation is entitled “Teaching Translation into L2”. It is an approach that has been used in class for 10 years and has brought (to my knowledge) results; a number of translation devotees

now confidently working as translators into both their mother tongue and into L2. Depriving students from such flexibility is not, in my view, wise. Providing them with the tools, however, that will enable them to translate into both directions is desirable as it gives them a head start in their future careers. It, also, often comes as a surprise to them that their level of competence can be rapidly improved through a number of simple exercises, common sense and a critical approach to what they write.

What is used in class is not based on an established theoretical approach. It cannot even be considered as a model. It is a personally chosen hands-on approach that, in a classroom environment, regularly meets with student approval and excitement. It is based on comparative syntax between source and target language, the use of known (or not) collocations, Think-Aloud Protocols (Taps) and student creativity. It is subjected to class scrutiny and written and re-written according to student and teacher suggestions. The result is a translation unit that is needs to be acceptable to all its creators (a number that can vary from 6 to 12 people according to each year's intake) and can be improved as a result of joint collaboration. A number of examples are used to demonstrate this approach and its results. What transpires is that students ultimately feel more confident to tackle texts that would otherwise feel were outside their reach. They learn to dissociate themselves from an innate tendency to translate word-for-word (for want of another skill) and realise that conveying their ST is far from a dictionary job. Their creative skills are expanded and their quest for reading in the second language further fostered. They are encouraged to use the same approach when translating at home, either in groups or on their own.

Eventually, and not without effort, "the pyramid stands on its head". When translating word for word from Greek, a large number of words are needed. Sentences are long and convoluted, simple ideas are conveyed in a rather periphrastic manner. Students are then encouraged to express themselves more concisely and question whether the same notion is included in more than one units. They proceed to re-write their sentence, using more acceptable for the target audience grammar, syntax, idioms and collocations. If possible, they compare parallel texts in the TL in their effort to achieve the desired effect. Above all, they are constantly encouraged to bear in mind the fact that their audience are English. Will they be questioning the final result? Will they suspect that the text was written by a non- native speaker? Will it (the text) bear the tell-tale signs of a translation? Everything in their power must be employed to avoid that. From the use of corpora, parallel texts, native speakers, moving dictionaries (i.e., experts). What matters, is a naturally reading text that complies with the norms of TL habitual usage, but at the same time conveys the meaning of the SL text.

Finally, they learn that editing is everything. It is the only way of ironing out any imperfections they can detect in their or their peers' texts. To do that, they must read and re-read. They must distance themselves from their work and approach it at a later stage (at least while they are training, as it is only now that they have the luxury of time). Attention to detail should not be underestimated, not now not ever. It can make or break in their future careers. It can make the difference between getting a job and trying again in their future.

Transcription and Translation of Forensic Recordings

Haydee Claus

Haydee Claus was raised in El Salvador. She received a B.A. in English from UC Berkeley, an M.A. from SFSU in Teaching ESL and then taught intensive ESL at the UC Berkeley Extension. She graduated in Translation and Interpretation at MIIS. She has worked extensively in the state and federal courts and has testified as an expert witness in the transcription and translation of tapes. She designed a certificate program at SFSU for court interpreters.

Although exams to certify court interpreters have been in place for over 20 years, there are still no statewide or nationwide exams to test the proficiency of transcribers and translators of forensic recordings. As a result, these transcripts are, at best, prepared by court interpreters who are not necessarily qualified as translators, or by bilingual clerks or police personnel who may not have any training in either translation or interpretation. This presentation will address some of the most common questions regarding the preparation of such transcripts, based on cassette tapes, CD's and videos of undercover meetings, police interviews and phone taps.

We will begin with formatting conventions which affect the readability and comprehension of the transcript. Among the most fundamental considerations is the production of a transcript that includes both a transcription; that is, what is heard on the recording in the original language (L1) and a translation of it (L2). A side-by-side, two-column format is very reader friendly. (See handout 001.) Since errors can be made at multiple levels, this format can help determine whether an error in the translation stems, for example, a) from the interpreter present at the time of the recording who misheard something and therefore rendered it incorrectly; b) from an error in interpretation at the time of the interview; c) from a word misheard on the tape by the person preparing the transcript; or d) from an error in translation by the person preparing the transcript. If an attorney challenges the translation in mid-trial, for instance, determining the source of the error or confirming the accuracy of the translation, requires reviewing the original tape and then reconstructing the entire transcription and translation process in order to pinpoint the source of the problem, a very time-consuming proposition.

Since the accuracy of the translation depends largely on the accuracy of the transcription, it is important to be as precise as possible with the latter, and to indicate for example, a) the duration of unintelligible dialog, b) stuttering and repetitions and c) instances of overlapping voices. (See handout 001)

One of the most technically difficult challenges in this type of work is to decide how best to deal with language errors heard on the recordings. For example, if a bilingual policeman makes such an error while interviewing a suspect, depending on the error heard, do you try to come up with an equally mispronounced word, for example? Do you create an equally misconjugated verb? Do you make up a word that is as nonsensical as the one used on the tape? The danger lies in determining what constitutes "equally" in all these instances. Since it is important to both a) keep the transcript reader-friendly by limiting explanatory notes and b) point out significant language errors, it is best to limit oneself to alerting the reader to serious errors only, such as misconjugated verbs that affect comprehension, mispronunciations that interfere with meaning, or made up words that may cause confusion, and, furthermore, that we create a designation to show that the errors are in the original, not in your translation—something akin to a "sic" notation. We must be careful, however, to not overstate the error. It is also important to let the client know whether there are errors that have not been reflected in your transcript, such as gender mistakes, and to do this verbally,

not in writing, to save your client the possible obligation of sharing your comments with the other side.

Another source of difficulty is the translation of profanity and slang, for which the following mental checklist is recommended: 1) Have I used the right register? 2) Have I conveyed the same level of intensity? 3) Have I preserved the same meaning/connotations? 4) Would this be said in L2 in a similar situation? When not all items on the checklist can be achieved, it is best to sacrifice register to retain meaning and intent. Remember that how you translate a person's words may affect his/her credibility in court. (See handout 001 for examples.)

A further point is to remember to have the spoken language read as it sounds on the tape, without formalizing or correcting it.

So if a person says:

You shouldn't've asked.
No le digas a naiden.

You should not write:

You should not have asked.
No le digas a nadie.

Likewise in the translation, the use of contractions and other indicators of spoken language may determine how credible the speaker sounds and they also help make the dialog sound as plausible as it does in the original.

Another point to remember is that in order to preserve the fluency of L1, one may wish to avoid translating stuttering or repetitions verbatim. For example, "No, no, no puedo" may be best rendered as, "I ca- ca- can't" rather than as, "No, no, I can't."

Finally, interpreters often wonder how best to limit their responsibility for areas in this arena that lie beyond their control. Below are samples of the most common disclaimers used:

- Identification of voices:

[The above is not intended to be a definitive identification of the speakers by the transcriber/translator. The designations represent identifications by the government, self-identifications by the speakers, or are based on the transcriber's best attempt at recognizing the voices on the tape.]

- Equipment used:

[The above is a true and correct transcription and translation of the recording indicated, as heard on a (make) transcribing machine, (model #).]

- Language errors in the recording:

[The apparent misspellings, incorrect grammar, mispronunciation, or awkward syntax in the English translation are all intended to reflect the Spanish interpretation at the time of the interview, as heard on the recording.]

- Material delivered electronically:

[At counsel's request, the above transcript was also delivered electronically]

- Partial translations:

[At counsel's request, the following is a partial transcription and translation of the recording indicated.]

Metaphor in Retrospective with Reference to Political Discourse

RAMADAN ALMGRAB
University of Garyounis,
BENGAZI, LIBYA

NATIONALITY: Libyan. Qualifications: MA in translation studies, Salford University UK, PhD in applied translation studies, the University of Leeds UK. My main areas of interest are text linguistics, applied translation studies and translation from English into Arabic. Current positions: Lecturer in Translation studies and head of the English department of the University of Garyounis Benghazi, Libya... I have participated in many conferences in UK and Canada. I have published some articles on translation, theory and practice, in UK, Morocco and Libya.

Metaphor is the application to one thing of the name of another thing. This classic definition of metaphor by Aristotle still remains today the starting points of any further investigation of the phenomenon. This paper focuses on investigating some approaches, by no means exhaustively, that can be useful for the translation of metaphor. We shall see that the selectional rules approach probes into the syntactic structures of metaphor, the semantic and pragmatic approaches ask what does it mean, while semiotics examines how such meanings are possible intertextually and by considering the iconic status of metaphor. As far as translation is concerned, it is difficult to declare any of these approaches as completely appropriate but rather restricted in scope when isolated. Each approach presupposes or builds on the other in a complementary fashion. An appropriate rendering of a metaphor would be one that combines all aspects of meaning (syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and semiotic) whenever necessary. To substantiate this view, this paper takes an investigative assessment towards the possible approaches to the rendering of metaphor with particular reference to political discourse.

Edeman (1985:114) postulates that “the employment of language to sanctify action is exactly what makes politics different from other methods of allocating meaning.” As a prelude to the main subject of metaphor in political discourse, this paper begins with a brief introduction to figurative and literal language and how to distinguish the former from the latter. Then an attempt is made to answer some basic questions concerning metaphor such as the nature of metaphor and how it emerged as an intriguing field of study within different discipline both traditional and modern. Since metaphor is a figurative of speech characterized by its deviance from the literal meaning, it would be helpful to provide a brief account of both literal and figurative meaning.

Language is conventionality called literal when the speaker utters words or expressions and intend to convey to hearer exactly the direct semantic, i.e. lexical or dictionary meaning of his utterance, and the hearer interprets it as intended. In other words, the intention of the speaker and the understanding of the hearer are in agreement and no secondary or substitute meaning is conveyed. Searle (1969:18) defined literal language as “[when] literal sentence meaning and speaker’s utterance meaning are the same”. He argues that literal meaning of a sentence can be determined by analyzing the meaning of the word-forming morphemes with a consideration to the

syntactical rules according to which these elements are combined. In his book *Metaphor* Hawkes (1972:2) gives the following definition of literal language: “Language which means (or intends to mean) what it says, and which uses words in their literal sense, derived from the common practice of ordinary speakers of the language”.

On the other hand, an utterance is called figurative when the speaker’s meaning is conveyed indirectly in the sentence, i.e. the speaker’s message is not determined by the meaning of the component words of the utterance.

The meaning of metaphor or the connotation it many involve usually vary according to its linguistic, situational and cultural contexts. There are many approaches to metaphor: we have the classical view tends to see metaphor as a combination of the familiar usages of language with the unfamiliar usages. The romantic view is the oversimplified view of metaphor as a charming and distinctive way of using language was opposed by the romantic approach. The approach is heavily based on the notion of imagination.

There are the modern approaches to metaphor such as the selectional rules approach which is mainly based on the Chomskyan theory. This approach views language as a generative system. It claims that languages have similar underlying structural rules for sentences which are transformed and marked in different ways at the surface level (Wardhaugh 1994). The semantic approach is unlike the selectional rules approach, goes beyond the analysis of the formal elements of a metaphorical text to account for its meaning. It relates these elements with what they refer to in the real world. In this respect we can distinguish two semantic methods of interpretation: the comparison theory and the interaction theory (Livenson 1983:148) Unlike semantic approach, the pragmatic approach goes beyond word and demonstrates that sentences themselves can be, to some extent, predicted from their context just as words can. (Bell 1992: 209) Within pragmatics we can differentiate between two main approaches to metaphor: the Grecian theory which views metaphor as deviance from the cooperative principle but accounts for its meaning in terms of his theory of conversational implicature, and Searle’s speech act theory, which perceives metaphor as a performative unit rather than a saying event.