DICTIONARY *of* TRANSLATION STUDIES

Mark Shuttleworth
Moira Cowie

ROUTLEDGE

Dictionary of Translation Studies

Mark Shuttleworth
&
Moira Cowie

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 1997 by St. Jerome Publishing

Published 2014 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

ISBN 13: 978-1900650-03-8 (pbk)

Cover design by Steve Fieldhouse, Oldham, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record of this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data
I. Shuttleworth, Mark   II. Cowie, Moira
Dictionary of translation studies / Mark Shuttleworth & Moira Cowie
Includes bibliographical references
1. Translating and interpreting
2. Dictionaries
P306.2.S65   1997
418/.02/03 21   98-209732

This page intentionally left blank

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Translation Studies – A discipline and its terminology

The 1990s are an exciting time for Translation Studies. Worldwide, the study of translation-based topics is assuming an increasingly high profile. International conferences are being organized, PhDs are being written, and new MA programmes are being set up all the time; in Great Britain alone, for example, at the time of writing postgraduate programmes in various aspects of Translation Studies are being offered by at least ten universities. Similarly, new textbooks and monographs are being produced at such a rate that it is becoming increasingly difficult to keep abreast of all the developments in thinking about translation. Furthermore, the whole endeavour has been characterized by a sheer determination to move forward in what can be meaningfully, usefully and – perhaps most importantly – non-trivially said about the practices of translation and the characteristics of translations. There is a positive feeling in the air that, while our grasp of certain matters connected with translation remains somewhat hazy, we are gradually increasing our knowledge and understanding of this intriguing yet highly complex subject.

However, Translation Studies as a discipline is in many ways still in a state of flux. Translation can be seen as a point of intersection between many different academic subjects; it is an area in which many other disciplines have legitimately expressed an interest, and conversely one which has provided its own experts with insights which can profitably be shared elsewhere. There is for example a considerable exchange of knowledge, insights and methodologies between Translation Studies and fields as diverse as literary studies, philosophy, anthropology and linguistics; indeed, such is the level of intellectual cross-fertilization that some writers have suggested that the field should be known as an interdiscipline (see Snell-Hornby 1991, 1994). Similarly, there are a number of equally legitimate reasons which scholars have had for pursuing an interest in Translation

Studies. For example, some are motivated by highly practical concerns, such as the need to provide future translators or interpreters with training which is of the highest possible quality, the desire to raise the professional profile of translators and interpreters, or the wish to develop increasingly powerful machine translation systems; others, on the other hand, simply seek to provide ever more accurate and comprehensive explanations for certain phenomena in the world about us, without being primarily concerned with the possible practical applications which may accrue. Thus goals and objectives can vary considerably within the discipline. Of course, Translation Studies has been enriched by dint of possessing such a multi-faceted nature. However, at the same time this very nature has meant that there is still considerable lack of agreement on the irreducible minimum of concepts which should form the foundation on which to build; added to this is the fact that Translation Studies is a relatively new discipline which is in many ways still “finding its feet”. The result of such a situation has often been that different branches of the discipline have at times experimented with widely differing methodologies, some of which have been imported wholesale from other areas of academic study, and not all of which, unfortunately, have been entirely germane to the study of translation. This is perhaps particularly true of certain approaches adopted from various branches of linguistics.

The impact that this situation has had on the evolving terminology of Translation Studies has of course been considerable. Along with their methodologies, whole terminologies designed as the descriptive apparatus for completely different areas have been taken over by the discipline. A particular instance of this is the way in which a number of writers interested in investigating translation from a linguistic angle have in the past adopted terms coined in linguistics, often optimistically assuming that these terms and the notions which lie behind them are equally valuable in the investigation of translation. However, there have of course been many occasions where terms have been borrowed and successfully adapted to their new environment; in this way the terminology of Translation Studies has been enriched by imports from disciplines as varied as linguistics, literary theory and even mathematics and biology. Finally – and probably most significantly from the point of view of the long-term health of the discipline as a whole – there has also been a huge amount of “native” terminology, or in other words terms which have been coined in order to describe concepts and phenomena specifically relevant to the study of translation.

This last category of terms – which is the area on which the *Dictionary* is almost exclusively focused – can be said to derive from a number of sources. First of all, many terms have been coined using what one might call "standard terminological morphemes". For example, a number of terms contain that highly productive suffix *-eme* (for example *architranseme* and *repertoreme*). Similarly, other terms have been formulated by using recognizable roots to create a semantically transparent compound (such as *minimax, polysystem* and *translatology*). However, such coinings are probably in a minority, as most of the terms in the *Dictionary* are quite simply "normal" English words which are being used in a new, technical sense. Indeed, the English language (among others) has been rifled for ideas which might cast new light on some aspect of translation. *Abusive translation, compensation, identity, loyalty, mapping, overt translation, protest, target language, thick translation, third code, unbounded translation* and *voids* are all examples of such terms.
In this connection words containing the prefixes *re-* (e.g. *recodification*, *recomposition*, *re-creation*, *reformulation*, *restatement* and *rewriting*) and *trans-* (e.g. *transcendence*, *transfer*, *transfusion*, *transmission*, *transmutation* and *transplantation*) have (quite understandably, given the nature of translation) found a particularly widespread application.

In each case, the meaning (or one of the meanings) of the word in question is figuratively extended so as to encompass the translational phenomenon to which it refers. Moreover, some of these uses (such as *mapping*, *target language* and *transfusion*) are clearly metaphorical in that they invite comparison between (some aspect of) translation and some other real-world phenomenon. Clearly, as Nida points out when talking about *models* of the translation process, our choice of terms must above all be dictated by "their practical usefulness and their explanatory power" (1969:489). Of course, most terms – including those listed above – succeed in reflecting important aspects of translation. However, there is surely a sense in which the terms which we choose to coin will influence the way in which we view translation. Many words could be used as translation terms but for some reason are not. Indeed it would be possible to argue that a large proportion of the words in any standard English dictionary are at least potentially applicable to translation; however, it is purely a matter of speculation whether Translation Studies would have been channelled in a significantly different direction had another, parallel set of terms been selected. We must therefore conclude – as Nida does in the case of models – that, while terms are "essential aids to comprehension", they must not be allowed to "dictate the nature of what they are supposed to explicate" (1969:488).

However, if the terminology affects the way thinking develops, its precise shape can also in some ways be said to provide a kind of profile of the way the discipline of Translation Studies as a whole has been evolving. Thus, for example, a considerable number of terms have arisen to describe types of translation which represent various stages between the extremes of *literal* and *free* translation (e.g. *interlinear translation*, *word-for-word translation*, *metaphrase*, *idiomatic translation* and *imitation*), while a large number of (generally speaking more recent) terms bear witness to the remarkable parallel evolution of the idea of distinguishing translation according to the extent to which the function of the original can or needs to be reproduced in the translation (e.g. *covert translation*, *secondary translation*, *observational receiver* and *documentary translation*). In this way, many of the issues which have occupied centre stage in the discipline over the last few decades are reflected in the sheer number of synonymous or related terms which refer to them. Detractors might wish to argue that this situation represents a conceptual log-jam in which a small number of concepts are endlessly reworded and relabelled without anything being brought into sharper focus. On the other hand, it could also be taken as evidence that people working in different parts of the world – and often in different languages and traditions – have frequently shared concerns and preoccupations which have been remarkably similar. While those who hold such a view would argue that translation is infuriatingly difficult to pin down with a single theory, always keeping one step ahead of one's attempts to categorize it in some way, they might also hope to see the terminology undergo a process of crystallization as various clearly defined approaches and commonly accepted insights gradually emerge.

Aims of the *Dictionary*

It is against this background that the *Dictionary* has been written.

For this reason one of its aims is – within the limitations of a reference work of such dimensions – to provide an overview of some of the issues, insights and debates in Translation Studies, inasmuch as these are reflected in the discipline's terminology. What this means in practical terms is investigated below.

Firstly, as stated in the previous section non-Translation Studies terms have been kept to a minimum in order to be able to devote as much space as possible to terminology specific to the study of translation. This means that while such terms are sometimes given a brief gloss in the discussion of a translation term, they rarely themselves form the subject of a separate entry.

Secondly, as a kind of "snapshot" of the discipline, the *Dictionary* tends to concentrate on work produced within the last three or four decades. This is not to say that nothing has been included which originates from before this period; however, most of the earlier works which have been consulted (such as Dryden, Schleiermacher and Walter Benjamin) are generally considered to be classics.

Thirdly, in order to give the *Dictionary* a broader overview it has been decided to include some important non-English terms. These have mostly been taken from works by the major scholars writing in French or German. However, it should be pointed out that the *Dictionary* is not intended as a multilingual glossary. It is thus not the work to consult if you are wanting to know the German for *pseudotranslation*, for example; similarly, very few entries are included with the main purpose of explaining interlingual differences in usage. The principle reason for discussing foreign terms is simply to provide monolingual readers of English with access to some of the important approaches which have been developed in these languages by making available in English some of the terms which they have generated.

The fourth point concerns the need to provide a reasonable breadth of perspective on terms, rather than just one point of view. Translation Studies contains many different and often conflicting perceptions, insights and beliefs, and reflecting this, the *Dictionary* does not exclusively follow one single approach. It is therefore possible to find statements in different entries which, taken out of context, seem to contradict each other. For example, terms such as *exegetical fidelity* reflect the conviction of most Bible translators that their source text has a single, correct meaning which has to be retrieved and conveyed, while in the entries on *information offer* or *metatext*, for example, one finds the opposite view that the meaning of a text is determined not only by the author's original intentions, but also to a large extent by the language in which it is written, the context in which it is meant to be read and indeed the personality, interests and beliefs of the reader (or, of course, translator). A further, natural consequence of trying to provide a balanced overview is that no particular attempt has been made to reconcile differing attitudes to the validity and applicability of such translation strategies as *adaptation* or *literal translation*. However, it is of course impossible to rid oneself of all bias, although the attempt has been made, for example, to avoid using certain terms and stylistic effects (such as *target-oriented*, *traditional*, *pre-scientific* and *prescriptive*, or unnecessary inverted commas) in such a way that they might appear to be conferring either strong approval or strong disapproval on what they are being applied to.

The *Dictionary* is thus designed to follow a basically uncritical, "hands-off" approach. In line with this, it seeks to document the accumulation of knowledge and insights which has occurred over the last few decades, rather than introduce large numbers of new terminological distinctions. The one main exception to this is that on occasion attempts have been made to suggest ways of distinguishing between various terms which refer to a similar phenomenon (such as *third code*, *third language* and *translationese*), or in areas where some confusion seems to exist (such as the terminology used to describe different types of *corpora*). However, there will no doubt be those who argue with the emphases that the *Dictionary* contains or consider that a particular group of terms should not have been given the prominence accorded it. In response to such potential criticism, it should be pointed out that a work of this type inevitably represents a *selection*, and one can only hope that the criteria used are not too personal, partisan or slanted in any other way.

While the *Dictionary* offers an overview of the discipline in the ways described above, it is essential to remember that it is a dictionary of terms, not topics. Consequently the *Dictionary* has tended to draw mainly from sources which are rich in terminology, regardless of how well established they are considered to be. Reading the *Dictionary* the user might thus get the impression that certain very important figures in the discipline (such as George Steiner and Georges Mounin) are not properly represented. It should be stressed that this is not due to any lack of appreciation for the major contributions which these writers have made to the discipline; it is simply a result of the fact that their contributions, important as they are, are not terminology-rich. Similarly, many important topics (such as *literary translation*, the *translation of names* or the *impossibility of translation*) have not been included as entries in their own right, although many of the issues which they involve are raised in the discussion of specific terms. Readers can properly expect all prominent authors and major themes to be better represented in encyclopaedias, which essentially deal with topics and not with terms (see for example *An Encyclopaedia of Translation: Chinese-English- English-Chinese* published by the Chinese University of Hong Kong, the Routledge *Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (1998) and the de Gruyter encyclopaedia, which is due to appear some time after the year 2000).

Some theoretical problems

The problems involved in writing a dictionary of this type are considerable. Many of them do not need to be aired in public; however, in order for the user to obtain a fuller understanding of the nature of translation-specific terminology, it will be necessary to discuss two particularly problematic areas.

Firstly, as stated above, there is the question of selection. It is clear that no reference work can hope to be completely exhaustive; in the case of the present *Dictionary*, there were certainly a large number of terms which were considered for inclusion, but were eventually rejected, at least as separate entries. Thus for example, many minor terms have either been omitted entirely, or explained briefly in the context of a more important term (so that *junction* is explained under *texteme*, and *cultural filter* under *covert translation*). Furthermore, there would quite simply not have been room to accommodate all the "normal" English (let alone French or German) words which are constantly being press-ganged into service in Translation Studies. Many words of this type are used in ways which are clear and transparent, and often also informal and *ad hoc*; consequently, no separate entry has been considered necessary for such items as *cover-to-cover translation*, *content-based translation*, *naturalization*, or *reader-oriented translation*, as well as for many of the *re-* and *trans-* words listed above.

Of course, selection problems do not cease once the basic headword list has been settled. Probably more significant than decisions about including or excluding a particular term are the problems involved in determining the shape of each article. Which sources should be used? Whose pronouncements on a given term should be considered most definitive? Issues like these need to be confronted for each entry if the *Dictionary* is going to combine its unavoidable brevity with a high level of informativeness.

The second problematic area concerns what is sometimes termed *fuzziness*, or in other words the tendency of natural phenomena to resist classification in rigid, clear-cut categories. It is sometimes thought that the fuzziness of meaning does not extend to terminology; however, while this may be the case with terms specially coined with a precise function in mind, there are nonetheless several important ways in which the drawing of cut-and-dried distinctions is problematic.

Firstly – and probably least problematically – is the fact that most pairs or groups of terms which are seemingly intended to contrast with each other in reality usually represent different tendencies, or different positions on a cline, rather than being polar opposites. This means that notions such as *overt* and *covert translation* or *rules*, *norms* and *conventions* are quite clearly overlapping concepts, at least to some extent.

Secondly, it must be emphasized that the terminology of Translation Studies does not break down into uniform, discrete units. This means for a start that a particular item (such as *adequacy* or *competence*) will sometimes be used in a special technical sense, but sometimes in a way which is to a greater or lesser extent more in accordance with its "normal", everyday meaning. However, there are in addition further dimensions along which the limits of different terms can be difficult to determine. Usage of a particular term will vary among writers. For example, some writers treat *word-for-word translation* as distinct from *literal translation*, while others consider it as a special type of this latter category; similarly, there is considerable variation in the use of the various terms denoting different types of *corpora*. In the case of some of the more central terms it thus becomes difficult to decide whether writers who opt for different terms reflect subtle distinctions in meaning, or simply the fact that the terms are largely interchangeable (a problem which arises with *faithfulness* and *fidelity*, for example). Probably more serious than this is the Pandora's box of deciding when and how major terms should be broken down into more than one separate meaning. On the basis of what criteria does one decide if a term really is being used differently in a variety of contexts, rather than the usages found in different authors simply being examples of *parole*, i.e. permissible variations within the limits of a single definition? (In this respect *back-translation* and *linguistic translation* are both problematic entries, since for both of these a whole range of sub-meanings could be distinguished, although in the event the *Dictionary* does not in fact subdivide the former and crystallizes out only three separate meanings for the latter.) Furthermore, what does one do when an author includes a standard term in a typology alongside a number of his or her own coinings (as Lefevere does with *literal translation,* for example)? Is one to split the entry or deal with both usages within one unified entry? Once again, it is only possible to judge each case on its own particular merits, and the decisions one reaches will of course always contain a subjective element.

The third important way in which fuzziness manifests itself is in the treatment of foreign terms. There is some debate within the discipline about whether the terms used in different languages to denote major concepts can in fact be assumed to be completely symmetrical (see for example Snell-Hornby 1988/1995:15-19 for a discussion of English *equivalence* and German *Äquivalenz*). Thus the decision has to be taken whether to treat "similar" terms from different languages as separate entries with distinctive definitions, or whether the obvious "family resemblances" which exist between them should be taken as sufficient grounds for handling them as single entities. The *Dictionary*'s general favouring of the latter policy can be justified not only in the light of the above comments on permissible variation, but also simply because most of the more important work on translation is read, absorbed and developed by scholars writing in other languages, thus creating a reasonable level of interpenetration and interdependence between the ideas, concepts and terms produced in different languages.

How to use the *Dictionary*

The *Dictionary* is intended to be used as a reference tool by students, teachers and researchers working in the field of Translation Studies. It aims for a high level of transparency, flexibility and accessibility, and with this purpose in mind each article follows the same basic format and uses the same general conventions. These are described briefly in the following paragraphs.

Broadly speaking, each term is presented and defined within the context in which it first occurred. Major entries also generally include a discussion of a number of different viewpoints on the term as well as comments on how usage and application might have developed since it was first coined or used. In the interests of consistency and accessibility nearly all foreign terms are cited in English translation (e.g. *loyalty* and *coherence* rather than *Loyalität* and *Kohärenz*), even if this has on occasion meant coining a new term (e.g. *verifiability*); conversely, if a headword is supplied with a translation in another language this usually indicates that the term originates from – or is at least widely used within – that particular language.

In addition to the information it contains, each entry includes two important features which should be utilized if maximum use is to be made of the *Dictionary*. These are the extensive cross-referencing to other entries and the suggestions for further reading.

While every entry is intended to be as free-standing and intelligible as possible in its own right, it is hoped that in the case of major theories and approaches enough articles have been included in the *Dictionary* to enable the user to acquire a systematic knowledge of a given theme through an intelligent use of the suggested cross-references. Any headwords which could profitably be read in conjunction with a particular entry are indicated in SMALL CAPITALS, either in the body of the entry or in the "see also" section at the end. While the "see also" section is fairly self-explanatory, the following brief points need to be made about cross-references which occur in the body of an entry:

- To avoid littering the text with large amounts of extra formatting, a headword is generally given in small capitals only the first time it is mentioned in any particular entry.

- When a major article is broken up into sub-entries, the first is usually the most general one. When cross-referencing to such entries, in the interests of readability the number 1 is frequently omitted; thus a cross-reference to *literal translation*, for example, implies that the reader should consult *literal translation 1*.

- In some of its cross-references the *Dictionary* may use just a keyword (e.g. *descriptive* and *literal* for *Descriptive Translation Studies* and *literal translation*) or a variety of grammatical forms which may differ slightly from the actual headword (e.g. *dynamically equivalent*, *map* and *rewriters* for *dynamic equivalence*, *mapping* and *rewriting*). The purpose of this is to make cross-referencing as flexible and as unobtrusive as possible. (This also explains why the *Dictionary* prefers the term *faithfulness* to the virtually synonymous but perhaps slightly commoner *fidelity*: quite simply, the former has a cognate adjective ("faithful"), while the latter does not.

- An item is not cross-referenced if it is felt that in that particular context it is not being used in its technical sense. Similarly, very basic terms such as *source language*, *translation* and so forth are not generally cited in small capitals unless there is a good reason for doing so (for example *source text* in the entry on *target text*).

Suggestions for further reading are given at the end of nearly every entry. These are listed alphabetically, rather than in some kind of order of importance; in the case of foreign terms, at least one English reference is given wherever possible. It should be noted that the works chosen for inclusion in this section are not necessarily those which are cited in the course of the entry, some of which might contain just a single relevant sound-bite; they have been selected simply because they are important sources for information on the term under discussion. Sometimes the further reading section includes works which do not mention the term as such, but clearly address the same subject, e.g. Lehmuskallio et al. (1991) in *degree of differentiation*.

Abbreviations

The following very standard abbreviations are used throughout the *Dictionary*:

SL Source Language
ST Source Text
TL Target Language
TT Target Text

Any other abbreviations used are glossed in the article in which they occur.

Note on quotations

All quotations from non-English sources, unless otherwise stated, have been translated specially for the *Dictionary*.

Acknowledgements

Finally, writing a work of this kind inevitably – and rightly – involves the participation, help and encouragement of many people. I am lucky to be surrounded by colleagues at the University of Leeds who have on every occasion shown themselves more than willing to offer assistance in various ways. In this connection I should in particular like to thank Professor Michael Holman for his constant encouragement, and also for his unflagging willingness to lend me books. My sincere thanks go to the staff of the inter-library loans section of the Brotherton Library, and in particular to Pat Shute and Carol Coggill, for the patient and helpful way in which they tracked down innumerable works for me. I should also like to acknowledge with gratitude the advice of Tony Fox, Peter Fuller, Peter Millican and Ian Moxon, all of whom helped to resolve various queries which arose.

I am very much indebted to Mona Baker for much encouragement, innumerable pieces of advice and the loan of many books, articles and other material.

I should also like to thank Moira Cowie for her contribution to the writing of the *Dictionary*.

I am very grateful to Yelena Belyaeva of Voronezh State University and Peter Fawcett of Bradford University for initial guidance on Russian and German writers respectively. Peter Fawcett and Juan Sager read the entire manuscript and offered much valuable advice on possible ways of improving it, and Kirsten Malmkjær offered on more than one occasion some very useful comments on the difficult area of the Quinean terms.

I should finally like to express my gratitude to my wife Tanya and my mother, brother and all my friends for being so patient with my prolonged unsociability.

It goes without saying that none of the people mentioned above bears any responsibility for any mistakes or deficiencies which the *Dictionary* may contain.

Mark Shuttleworth

This page intentionally left blank

Absolute Translation (French ***Traduction Absolue***) According to Gouadec (1989, 1990), one of seven types of translation which can be used by professional translators to respond to the various translation requirements which can arise during the course of their work. In absolute translation the whole of ST is transferred into TL, with no alteration to the content or the form of the original document. Clearly, there are constraints on this type of translation, as if the "quantity of information" and "quality of communication" (1990:335, translated) are to be retained in this way, there can be no technical or linguistic variation from the original text, and all terminology must be exactly as in ST (1989:28). See also ABSTRACT TRANSLATION, DIAGRAMMATIC TRANSLATION, KEYWORD TRANSLATION, RECONSTRUCTIONS (TRANSLATION WITH), SELECTIVE TRANSLATION and SIGHT TRANSLATION. Further reading: Gouadec 1989, 1990; Sager 1994.

Abstract Translation (French ***Traduction Synoptique***) One of seven strategies proposed by Gouadec (1990) to fulfil the various translation needs which arise in a professional environment. In abstract translation a condensed translation of all the information in ST is made in order to give the client "rapid access to specific types of information" (1990:335, translated). This may be done in various ways. Firstly, the generic themes of the text may be translated; secondly, a description may be given of the generic content and the objectives of the text and its sub-units; thirdly, an abridged translation of all the useful content of the text may be supplied (1990:335). See also ABSOLUTE TRANSLATION, DIAGRAMMATIC TRANSLATION, KEYWORD TRANSLATION, RECONSTRUCTIONS (TRANSLATION WITH), SELECTIVE TRANSLATION and SIGHT TRANSLATION. Further reading: Gouadec 1990; Sager 1994.

Abusive Translation A term used by Lewis (1985) to refer to a radical alternative approach to literary translation. Conceived on the basis of Derrida's (1978) comment that "a 'good' translation must always commit abuses" (quoted in Lewis 1985:39), abusive translation is based on a view of translation as "a form of representation that necessarily entails interpretation" (Lewis 1985:39) and also as a process which produces gain as well as loss (1985:40). Lewis stresses the importance of avoiding "weak, servile translation" (1985:40), or in other words translation in which the translator compromises by "[giving] primacy to message, context, or concept over language texture" (1985:41). He argues that the translator should instead opt for "whatever might upset or force or abuse language and thought, might seek after the unthought or unthinkable in the unsaid or unsayable" (1985:41); what he means by this might include the idea of attempting to use types of discourse and modes of expression which are not in any way typical of TL. He therefore defines abusive translation as "strong, forceful translation that values experimentation, tampers with usage, seeks to match the polyvalencies or plurivocities or expressive stresses of the original by producing its own" (1985:41). In this way the adoption of abusive translation gives rise to a new concept of FAITHFULNESS (1985:42), as the translator compensates for the inevitable loss incurred in translation by directing the abusive move towards "clusters of textual energy" (1985:43) in order to "renew the energy and signifying behavior" of the original (1985:42). However, Lewis also states that "the translator's aim is to rearticulate analogically the abuse that occurs in the original text ... [and] also to displace, remobilize, and extend this abuse in another milieu" (1985:43); abusive translation therefore constitutes a complex compromise between reproducing the abuse found in the original, and adapting or extending ST for the purpose of compensating for any loss caused by the act of translation (1985:45). See also FOREIGNIZING TRANSLATION and RESISTANCY. Further reading: Lewis 1985.

Acceptability A term used by Toury (1980, 1995) to denote one of two tendencies which can be observed in translated texts. Toury's approach to literary translation rejects any notion of there being one "proper" way to translate, and aims rather to describe the translational NORMS which operate in the output of a single translator or which typify the translational practices prevalent in a particular literature at a given time. In Toury's model, translation is seen as involving "an encounter, if not a confrontation, between two sets of norms" (1980:55), one of which is drawn from ST or SL and the other from TL. Any translated text occupies a position between the two poles of ADEQUACY 2 – or adherence to the norms (both linguistic and textual) of the source SYSTEM – and *acceptability* – or adherence to those of the target system. Which of these poles is favoured by a given translation is determined by the value of the INITIAL NORM, although almost all TTs represent a compromise between the two tendencies. Translations which lean towards acceptability can thus be thought of as fulfilling the requirement of "reading as *an* original" written in TL rather than that of "reading as *the* original" (1980:75), and consequently generally have a more natural "feel". See also DESCRIPTIVE TRANSLATION STUDIES and TARGET TEXT-ORIENTED TRANSLATION STUDIES. Further reading: Puurtinen 1989; Toury 1980, 1995.

Accuracy A term used in translation evaluation to refer to the extent to which a translation matches its original. While it usually refers to preservation of the information content of ST in TT, with an accurate translation being generally LITERAL rather than FREE, its actual meaning in the context of a given translation must depend on the type of EQUIVALENCE found in the translation; thus – to take an extreme example – accuracy in the Zukofskys' translation of Catullus would be primarily a question of copying the sound patterns of the original as closely as possible (see PHONEMIC TRANSLATION). Put in more general terms this means that, as Venuti argues, the "canons of accuracy are culturally specific and historically variable" (1995:37). The establishment of accuracy for a given translation is of course a painstaking procedure which in practice has to be carried out "unit by unit at the level of the phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph and the whole text" (Sager 1994:148). Because of its PRESCRIPTIVE nature, departures from strict accuracy are frequently perceived as shortcomings; however, in reality such deviations – especially in the translation of literary texts – are often inevitable, as the translator will need to introduce SHIFTS in order to reproduce the original "in its totality, as an organic whole" (Popovič 1970:80). See also FAITHFULNESS and NATURALNESS. Further reading: Chukovsky 1966, 1984.

Action, Translatorial See TRANSLATORIAL ACTION.

Adaptation 1 A term traditionally used to refer to any TT in which a particularly FREE translation strategy has been adopted. The term usually implies that considerable changes have been made in order to make the text more suitable for a specific audience (e.g. children) or for the particular purpose behind the translation. However, the phenomenon has frequently been approached from a PRESCRIPTIVE point of view, and many comments have been pejorative. For example, Nida & Taber equate adaptation with CULTURAL TRANSLATION 2 (1969/1982:134); thus for them – who are writing about Bible translation – an adaptation cannot be considered FAITHFUL. In a similar vein, but perhaps more extreme, Radó characterizes adaptation as a type of PSEUDOTRANSLATION 2, or in other words not as "real" translation at all (1979:192). Indeed, SOURCE TEXT-ORIENTED comments of this nature abound. However, other writers take a more flexible view of the subject. Nord, for example, views adaptation as a relative quantity reflecting a translation's SKOPOS; according to her, any one translation will be characterized by the relative proportion (or percentage) of adaptation which it contains (1991a:29-30). Approaching the subject from a different angle, Bassnett, writing about literary translation, observes that much time and ink has been wasted "attempting to differentiate between *translations*, *versions*, *adaptations* and the establishment of a hierarchy of 'correctness' between these categories" (1980/1991:78-79). She argues that the reason for this is that the text has been perceived as "an object that should only produce a single invariant reading", so that "any 'deviation' on the part of the reader/translator will be judged as a transgression" (1980/1991:79). Like Bassnett, Toury also views the phenomenon from a non-normative perspective; he thus sees prescriptive comments like those cited above as examples of "a priori, and hence non-cultural and ahistorical" distinctions which can be imposed on translation (Toury 1995:31). Another DESCRIPTIVE approach, this time concerned with how literary SYSTEMS develop, sees adaptations simply as one of a number of different types of REWRITING. See also IMITATION 1 & 2 and VERSION 1 & 2.

2 **(**French ***Adaptation*****)** A term used by Vinay & Darbelnet (1958, 1958/1995) to refer to one of seven translation procedures. Adaptation is described as a type of OBLIQUE translation, which means that it does not rely on the existence of structural and conceptual parallels between SL and TL (1958:46-47, 1958/1995:31). According to Vinay & Darbelnet, adaptation is a strategy which should be used when the situation referred to in ST does not exist in the target culture, or does not have the same relevance or connotations as it does in the source context. As such it is a kind of "situational equivalence" (1958/1995:39; see EQUIVALENCE 2) as it works by replacing ST elements by TL items which in some way serve the same function and are thus "equivalent". For example, a reference to *cricket* as a popular sport in England could be replaced in a French translation by a reference to the *Tour de France* (1958:53, 1958/1995:39). Vinay & Darbelnet argue that adaptation represents "the extreme limit of translation" (1958:52, 1958/1995:39), in that it involves a considerable amount of rewording. They also point out that an avoidance of

adaptation can result in a text which is perfectly correct, yet retains the unmistakable feel of a translation (1958:53, 1958/1995:39). See also BORROWING, CALQUE, LITERAL TRANSLATION, MODULATION 1 and TRANSPOSITION. Further reading: Vinay & Darbelnet 1958, 1958/1995.

Adequacy 1 A term used by some commentators on translation to discuss the nature of the relationship between ST and TT. However, even where it does occur there is little agreement over the proper application of the term, as it is used sometimes synonymously with, sometimes instead of, and sometimes in contrast with the related term EQUIVALENCE. Various definitions for adequacy have been suggested by various writers; in most of these the term has an evaluative, even normative character (in contrast to ADEQUACY 2 below). However, where the two terms are used side by side, adequacy generally refers to a looser, less absolute ST-TT relationship than equivalence. Thus Reiss & Vermeer, for example, use adequacy within their SKOPOS THEORY model when referring to a translation which has a different communicative function from ST; in this context it therefore denotes "the relationship between ST and TT with due regard to a purpose (or *skopos*) which is being followed in the translation process" (1984:139, translated). Shveitser, who writes in a tradition which views equivalence as an absolute criterion, defines adequacy in terms of the translator's response to the communicative situation: "adequacy proceeds from the assumption that a decision taken by the translator frequently has the nature of a compromise, that translation demands sacrifices, and that in the translation process the translator frequently has to resign himself to certain losses for the sake of conveying the main, essential aspects of ST (i.e. its predominant functions)" (1988:96, translated). Thus a translation can be adequate even if it is equivalent with ST only in one functional dimension; however, it is necessary that "any deviation from equivalence should be dictated by objective necessity, not by the will of the translator" (1988:96, translated). See also CORRESPONDENCE. Further reading: Reiss & Vermeer 1984; Shveitser 1988, 1993; Turk 1990.

2 According to Toury (1980, 1995), one of the two poles of the continuum which relates to the NORMS used in the translation process. A translation is termed *adequate* if the translator seeks throughout to follow source rather than target linguistic and literary norms. In other words, a translator who is translating adequately will perform only those translational SHIFTS which are truly obligatory, thus producing a TT which where possible retains ST features unchanged. Such a

translational procedure may of course produce a TT which in some respects is incompatible with target linguistic or literary norms. The reason for this is that "... the translation is not being made into TL at all, but into a model-language, which is at best some part of TL and at worst an artificial, as such non-existing language, and that TT is not introduced into the target literary polysystem but imposed on it" (Toury 1980:56; see POLYSYSTEM THEORY). However, such an imposition can have positive as well as negative consequences, as not only violations but also innovations may be introduced into the target linguistic and literary SYSTEM. Clearly, most TTs are a compromise between adequacy and the opposite pole of ACCEPTABILITY, in some matters following ST norms and in others conforming to those of the target system. Toury (1980) also suggests using a maximally adequate translation, which he terms "the Adequate Translation" and which contains only obligatory shifts, as an "invariant of the comparison" (or TERTIUM COMPARATIONIS; 1980:49); the purpose of this is to reveal what kind of optional shifts have occurred in a translation, and consequently, the type of translational strategies which the translator has been using. However, Toury (1995) rejects this notion as being an unnecessary factor in the process of translation analysis. See also INITIAL NORM, TARGET TEXT-ORIENTED TRANSLATION STUDIES, THIRD CODE and TRANSLATIONESE. Further reading: Hermans 1995; Toury 1980, 1995.

Adjustment According to Nida, a set of techniques used in Bible translation which are designed to "produce correct equivalents" in TL (1964:226) and thus help a translation achieve DYNAMIC EQUIVALENCE. More specifically, Nida defines the purposes of these techniques as follows: "(1) permit adjustment of the form of the message to the requirements of the structure of the receptor language; (2) produce semantically equivalent structures; (3) provide equivalent stylistic appropriateness; and (4) carry an equivalent communication load" (1964:226). Although such aims will frequently entail minor changes in form, Nida emphasizes that the translator's task is to reproduce, not to improve. Radical changes may be necessary in certain circumstances, however, if use of a close FORMAL EQUIVALENT gives a translation which is meaningless or causes TT to convey a wrong meaning (1964:226). Techniques used in adjustment include addition or subtraction of material, alteration, inclusion of footnotes (explaining LITERAL translations which are preserved in the text) and modification of the language to fit the experience of the target audience. It should be pointed out that the notion of adjustment was replaced in Nida & Taber (1969/1982) by TRANSFER and RESTRUCTURING. See also COMMUNICATION LOAD. Further reading: Nida 1964.

Aesthetic-Poetic Translation According to Casagrande (1954), one of four types of translation. Casagrande's classification relates to the possible purposes which may lie behind the act of translation; aesthetic-poetic translation thus refers to the translation of poetic texts, where it is necessary to retain the expressive and stylistic features of the author's work to as large an extent as possible. Casagrande states that, while the content is clearly important, "express consideration is given to the literary or aesthetic form of the message in both languages" (1954:335). This type of translation thus places heavy demands on the translator, since elements of poetic or aesthetic expression such as rhyme, metre or metaphor are "precisely those aspects of language which are most resistant to translation" as they "partake of the unique qualities of the individual language" (1954:336). See also ETHNOGRAPHIC TRANSLATION, LINGUISTIC TRANSLATION 2 and PRAGMATIC TRANSLATION 2. Further reading: Casagrande 1954.

Agent A term used by Sager to refer to the person who is "in an intermediary position between a translator and an end user of a translation" (1994:321). According to Sager, any translation process will involve a number of participants. These include text producers, mediators who modify the text (for example abstractors, editors, revisors and translators; see 1994:111), communication agents, who commission and send the text, and recipients, or end users, although it is possible that one person may perform more than one of these functions (but may not, of course, be both producer and recipient). The agent of a translation may be a publisher who commissions a translation, or any other person who assigns a job to a translator. He or she is independent of both writer and reader and decides whether or not a document is to be translated. According to Sager, the agent "is at the beginning and the end of the speech act of translation; the previous speech act of writing the document, and the subsequent speech act of a reader receiving the document are both temporally, spatially and causally quite independent" (1994:140). Further reading: Sager 1994.